

Andrews University

Digital Commons @ Andrews University

Dissertations

Graduate Research

2014

The Eschatological Role of the Jerusalem Temple: An Examination of Jewish Writings Dating from 586 BCE to 70 CE

Eric W. Baker

Andrews University, bakere@andrews.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Jewish Studies Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Baker, Eric W., "The Eschatological Role of the Jerusalem Temple: An Examination of Jewish Writings Dating from 586 BCE to 70 CE" (2014). *Dissertations*. 13.

<https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations/13>

<https://dx.doi.org/10.32597/dissertations/13/>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Research at Digital Commons @ Andrews University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Andrews University. For more information, please contact repository@andrews.edu.



Seek Knowledge. Affirm Faith. Change the World.

Thank you for your interest in the

**Andrews University Digital Library
of Dissertations and Theses.**

*Please honor the copyright of this document by
not duplicating or distributing additional copies
in any form without the author's express written
permission. Thanks for your cooperation.*

ABSTRACT

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL ROLE OF THE JERUSALEM TEMPLE:
AN EXAMINATION OF JEWISH WRITINGS
DATING FROM 586 BCE TO 70 CE

by

Eric W. Baker

Adviser: Roy Gane

ABSTRACT OF GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH

Dissertation

Andrews University

Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary

Title: THE ESCHATOLOGICAL ROLE OF THE JERUSALEM TEMPLE: AN
EXAMINATION OF JEWISH WRITINGS DATING FROM 586 BCE TO 70 CE

Name of researcher: Eric W. Baker

Name and degree of faculty adviser: Roy Gane, Ph.D.

Date completed: March 2014

Topic

This research investigates the relationship between eschatology and the Jerusalem temple within the second temple period.

Purpose

This research investigates the role of the Jerusalem temple within the second temple Jewish writings to establish whether the Jerusalem temple has any role to play in relation to the end of the exile and the beginning of the *eschaton*. Previous analyses of second temple Judaism have not focused on the role of the Temple in eschatology.

Sources

The primary documents investigated in this research were the proto-canonical,

deutero-canonical, Qumran writings, and the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.

Conclusion

The Jerusalem temple has been found to have an eschatological role in some second temple period Jewish writings. This research has investigated the Jerusalem temple in the Hebrew Scriptures as well as later writings. This research reports that in some second temple period Jewish writings, the Jerusalem temple plays an eschatological role in the sense that it is expected to hasten or speed up the conclusion of the present age and commencement of a new age. Such a role is indicated in *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, Pseudo Philo, Tobit, Sirach, 2 Maccabees, and the Temple Scroll.

Andrews University
Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL ROLE OF THE JERUSALEM TEMPLE:
AN EXAMINATION OF JEWISH WRITINGS
DATING FROM 586 BCE TO 70 CE

A Dissertation
Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
Eric W. Baker

March 2014

© Copyright by Eric W. Baker 2014
All Rights Reserved

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL ROLE OF THE JERUSALEM TEMPLE:
AN EXAMINATION OF JEWISH WRITINGS
DATING FROM 586 BCE TO 70 CE

A dissertation
presented in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by

Eric W. Baker

APPROVAL BY THE COMMITTEE:

Faculty Advisor,
Roy E. Gane
Professor of Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near Eastern
Languages

Director, PhD in Religion
Thomas Shepherd

Richard M. Davidson
J. N. Andrews Professor of Old Testament
Interpretation

Dean, SDA Theological Seminary
Jiří Moskala

Robert M. Johnston
Professor of New Testament and Christian Origins,
Emeritus

Jiří Moskala
Professor of Old Testament Exegesis and Theology

Lawrence H. Schiffman
Professor of Judaic Studies
Yeshiva University

Date approved

DEDICATION

I want to thank my wife for believing in me, sticking by me, and helping me through this work. I also must thank Lu for helping me nearly every day for over five years on this work until she finished this life November 26, 2010. I miss you, Lu.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		
	1. INTRODUCTION	1
	Background: The Effect of the Loss of the Temple and the Exile on Israel	1
	Purpose of the Research.....	6
	Justification for the Research.....	7
	Scope and Delimitation.....	9
	Definition of Terms.....	12
	Methodology	17
	2. THE ORIGINS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ESCHATOLOGY AND THE JERUSALEM TEMPLE	21
	The Relationship between Creation and the Jerusalem Temple	21
	The Relationship between Protology and Eschatology	27
	The Jerusalem Temple and Eschatology.....	38
	3. REVIEW AND CRITIQUE OF THE LITERATURE WITH REGARD TO THE ESCHATOLOGICAL ROLE OF THE JERUSALEM TEMPLE	41
	Introduction.....	41
	Review	45
	Concluding Remarks.....	62
	4. ESCHATOLOGY AND THE JERUSALEM TEMPLE IN THE EXILIC AND POST-EXILIC HEBREW SCRIPTURES	66
	Ezekiel.....	66
	Introduction.....	66
	Restoration in the Book of Ezekiel	67
	The Critique of the Solomonic Temple	88
	Examination of Ezekiel 43:1-12	108
	Ezekiel 47:1-12: The Effects of Ezekiel 43:1-12.....	145
	Haggai	149
	The Timeline to Blessing in Haggai	149
	The Eschatological Blessing and the Temple in Haggai	158
	The Timeline to Eschatological Blessing in Haggai.....	162
	The Actions of Humanity and the Temple in Haggai	194

Zechariah.....	204
Isaiah 56–66.....	213
Micah 4:1-7/Isaiah 2:1-4.....	226
Malachi	228
The Psalms.....	231
5. THE ESCHATOLOGICAL ROLE OF THE JERUSALEM TEMPLE IN THE DEUTERO-CANONICAL WRITINGS.....	235
Introduction.....	235
Tobit.....	236
Introduction.....	236
The Jerusalem Temple in Tobit	238
Conclusion	251
Sirach	253
Introduction.....	253
The Prayer for the Future.....	253
Conclusion	259
Second Maccabees.....	260
Introduction.....	260
The Eschatological Expectation of the Temple	261
Conclusion	264
Conclusion	265
6. THE ESCHATOLOGICAL ROLE OF THE JERUSALEM TEMPLE IN THE TEMPLE SCROLL OF QUMRAN.....	268
Introduction.....	268
The Teaching of the Temple Scroll	270
The Temple of the Temple Scroll.....	277
Eschatology and the Temple Scroll	305
Conclusion	308
7. THE ESCHATOLOGICAL ROLE OF THE JERUSALEM TEMPLE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT PSEUDEPIGRAPHA AND THE QUMRAN SCROLLS.....	312
The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha	312
<i>1 Enoch</i>	313
<i>1 Enoch</i> 90:20-31	314
<i>1 Enoch</i> 91:12-14.....	318
Third <i>Sibylline Oracle</i>	320
<i>Jubilees</i>	321
<i>Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum</i>	326
The <i>Apocryphon of Ezekiel</i>	330
The Qumran Scrolls	332
4Q174.....	332

Conclusion	333
8. THE ESCHATOLOGICAL ROLE OF THE JERUSALEM TEMPLE IN THE CHRISTIAN SCRIPTURES OF THE SECOND TEMPLE PERIOD.....	335
Introduction.....	335
Second Thessalonians 2:1-12.....	336
Introduction.....	336
The Gathering during the Day of the Lord	338
The Temple of 2 Thessalonians 2:4.....	341
The Eschatological Role of the Temple.....	352
9. EPILOGUE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATION	354
Summary	354
Conclusion	359
Recommendation	360
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	363
VITA.....	409

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background: The Effects of the Loss of the Temple and the Exile on Israel

This research on the second temple Jewish writings investigates one aspect of the Jerusalem temple, the role that the Jerusalem temple may play in eschatological events. In this research, it is vital to start with the supreme importance that Judaism placed on the temple in the second temple period. In what may be an axiom, Goldhill observes, “In the history of the Temple there are no coincidences, only narratives fraught with symbolic significance.”¹ In considering any issue regarding the Jerusalem temple, one risks erring on a matter that is at the heart of Judaism. Second temple Jewish writings lift up the temple as the key institution of Israel.² Although many Jewish writings debate some issues, Jewish writings are united in their reverence for Israel’s holy place.³

With all the political and cultural factors pressing in on Israel’s sacred covenant, one of the important ways in which second temple Judaism reacted to these outside influences was to focus on the correctness, purity, and structure of the Jerusalem temple.

¹Simon Goldhill, *The Temple of Jerusalem* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005), 122-123.

²“Les cantiques ultimes de la prophétie biblique mobilisent les énergies juives au service du Temple.” André Neher, *L’Essence du Prophétisme* (Paris: Universitaires de France, 1955), 300.

³While noting the different sects’ positions during the Hasmonean period, Levine notes that the temple and the temple mount were “revered as Judaism’s single holy site by an ever-growing population in Judaea (partly by natural increment, partly by forced conversions), the Temple was also the subject of much attention and debate among the newly established sects, each emphasizing, in its own way, the centrality of Jerusalem’s sacred site. For all their differences, no group ever denied the sanctity of this site, even though some might have been critical about the way in which the Temple was being run.” Lee I. Levine, *Jerusalem: Portrait of the City in the Second Temple Period (538 B.C.E.-70 C.E.)* (Philadelphia: JPS, 2002), 134.

The major political factor was foreign subjugation by Babylon, Persia, Greece, and Rome. The cultural influence can be seen in how the people “built a gymnasium in Jerusalem, according to the Gentile custom” (1 Macc 1:14). This is just one example of how the internal and external pressures were manifested under foreign subjugation. Throughout the Persian period, the Jerusalem temple itself was a central theme of prophecy.⁴

After Alexander conquered Israel in 323 BCE, the Hellenistic culture began to further change the fabric of Judaism internally. The Hasmonean period, starting with Simon and ending with Roman subjugation under Pompey (ca. 140–63 BCE), was the only time when the land and people of Israel were not dominated by foreign powers between the destruction of the Jerusalem temple by the Neo-Babylonian Empire and the destruction of the second Jerusalem temple by the Roman Empire. There appeared to be the belief among scribes of the second temple Judaism period that after the Babylonian captivity, even though some had returned to the land, Israel was still in exile.⁵

The political realities mentioned above influenced writings after the destruction of

⁴Knowles presents a much firmer comment. “The assertion that the Jerusalem temple was central is itself a central tenant in much of biblical scholarship that is concerned with the Persian period.” Melody D. Knowles, *Centrality Practiced: Jerusalem in the Religious Practice of Yehud and the Diaspora in the Persian Period* (Atlanta: SBL, 2006), 10.

⁵Steck presents a Deuteronomistic picture of the prophetic writings in late Judaism showing the concept of exile when the people are in the land of Israel. Odil H. Steck, *Israel und das Gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des Deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum* (Wageningen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967), 110-193. Specifically, Steck claims that “[n]eben sie tritt das *edliche Gericht*, aber nun *an den Feinden Israels*, den Völkern, deren gegenwärtige Herrschaft über Israel Zeichen der Gerichtsandauer (D) ist.” Ibid., 123. Ezra 9:8-9 affirms this exile. Here, Ezra and the people hope that the Lord will spare a remnant to build a temple even though they are in the land. Regarding this passage in Ezra, Evans notes how it shows the incompleteness of Israel’s restoration. Craig A. Evans, “Aspects of Exile and Restoration in the Proclamation of Jesus,” in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*, ed. James M. Scott (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 309. VanderKam notes, “The historical return, even if the apocalyptic authors mention it, is usually considered of little importance.” James C. VanderKam, “Exile in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature,” in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*, ed. James M. Scott (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 109. The exile was a central theme in the Qumran literature and the faithful were to wait for a time when God would usher them into the Promised Land. Martin G. Abegg, Jr., “Exile and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*, ed. James M. Scott (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 125.

the first Jerusalem temple. This influence shows through in the profound impact it had on the nature and content of biblical prophecy, as can be seen when comparing the book of Amos (written before the destruction of the temple) to Ezekiel, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, and Tobit (written after the destruction of the first Jerusalem temple).⁶ There was a new kind of focus on the Jerusalem temple by some Jewish writings after the temple's destruction. The Jewish writings became more concerned about salvation of the people and the nation, rather than judgment.⁷ Thus, the destruction of the temple became the demarcation line that separated prophecy into two different time periods.⁸ However, prophetic interest in the cult did not leave the content of biblical prophecy after the destruction of the first Jerusalem temple (e.g., Ezek 45-46, Hag 2:10-19, Zech 4, Tob 13-14, and Jdt 8).⁹ Even with the theological change that had occurred, the necessity for the temple remained ingrained in the fabric of second temple Jewish writings.

The exile had been more than a physical separation from the Promised Land; it was an exile from the presence of God as the temple was the heart of Israel. Talmon summarizes the change in Judaism by noting that it “came to be understood not only as a physical uprooting from the homeland, of the individual and of the collective, but also as entailing remoteness from God. Biblical faith locates the most prominent anchor point of

⁶Barker notes that “[t]here is much evidence to suggest that there was a theological and literary revolution in between the first temple and the second.” Margaret Barker, *Temple Theology: An Introduction* (London: SPCK, 2004), 36.

⁷“This prophetic, materially unified, predictive event in the books ultimately encompasses the following primary metahistorical stages: from the preexilic period to the guilt and guilt status of the people in the exile, the judgment and judgment status of the people in the exile, the behavioral status of Israel after the exile, Israel’s salvific change in the world of the nations, and in many respects the realization of that salvation.” Odil H. Steck, *The Prophetic Books and Their Theological Witness*, trans. James D. Nogalski (St. Louis: Chalice, 2000), 143.

⁸“Le prophétisme biblique a connu, en réalité, deux grandes époques, très distinctes l’une de l’autre. La date de démarcation, c’est la chute du Temple de Jérusalem, en 586. Jusqu’à cette date, la prophétie était en face d’une religion comportant des rites. A partir de là, elle s’adressait à une religion sans rites. Cette différence est capitale pour l’orientation du prophétisme.” Neher, *L’Essence*, 300.

⁹Neher observes that after the destruction of the temple “avec la même ténacité et la même vigueur, le prophétisme revendique le rite.” Neher, *L’Essence*, 300.

YHWH in his temple in Jerusalem, the very heart of the Holy Land.”¹⁰ Therefore, it is crucial to the understanding of second temple Jewish writings, though perhaps not surprising, that hope for the return of the presence of God became an important theme in these writings. Many second temple Jewish writings gave prophetic promise of renewal and restoration with a full measure of divine presence and blessing.

In the past, reconciliation with God and enjoyment of his presence and blessing had required functioning ritual systems. The altars prior to the tabernacle as well as the tabernacle itself and the Jerusalem temple had fostered a complex array of ideas within the Israelite community, and they were important to the identity of Israel and to Israel’s concept of the presence of God.¹¹ Reconciliation was at the heart of these institutions. The primary role of the altars, tabernacle, and temple was to reconcile Israel with God and to bring atonement into the relationship between Israel and God. The primary agency in Israel’s relationship with and reconciliation to God was the tabernacle in the wilderness. This ministry of relationship and reconciliation was eventually transferred to the Jerusalem temple when Israel gained control of the key regions of the land. With the destruction of the Jerusalem temple in 586 BCE, the ministry was interrupted. It could be expected that a renewed ritual worship system at a rebuilt temple would be approved by God (including the new physical layout of the temple). It could also be expected that this renewed ritual worship at the divinely approved temple would be foundational to restoration of the divine covenant with the entire land of Israel in a new order.

After 586 BCE, new prophetic trajectories arose in the area of reconciliation and restoration of relationship. One of the most crucial of these trajectories in second temple

¹⁰Shemaryahu Talmon, “‘Exile’ and ‘Restoration’ in the Conceptual World of Ancient Judaism,” in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*, ed. James M. Scott (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 110.

¹¹Wardle notes that “the temple was also a symbol, a physical embodiment of the relationship between Israel and its God.” Timothy Wardle, *The Jerusalem Temple and Early Christian Identity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 45.

Jewish writings is the relationship between the people's cultic holiness, which would include the hope for the restoration of the physical Jerusalem temple, and their self-determination, sometimes expressed in eschatological terms.¹² For example, starting in the exilic or early post-exilic period, Ezekiel introduces a connection between cultic holiness and eschatological events.¹³ Ezekiel 36 depicts pure waters (Ezek 36:25), meaning pure in a cultic sense,¹⁴ with this purity of the people leading to the peaceful dwelling in the land of Israel (Ezek 36:28), often expressed in eschatological terms (e.g., Ezek 47:1-12).

¹²The exilic time frame is when eschatology began to change in these second temple Jewish writings. Stanley B. Frost, "Eschatology and Myth," *Vetus Testamentum* 2 (1952): 80. In an investigation of the Jerusalem temple in the second temple period and its role in Jewish eschatology, it is important to understand the eschatological developments in the time period that took place. Louis F. Hartman, "Eschatology," *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 2nd ed., ed. Fred Skolnik (Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 2007), 6:493. Hartman goes on to note that this new idea "can be seen especially in the writings of Ezekiel, the so-called Deutero-Isaiah (Isa. 40:1-55:13), the so-called Trito-Isaiah (Isa. 56:1-66:24), Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, Joel, the so-called Apocalypse of Isaiah (Isa. 24:1-27:13), and finally in the Book of Daniel." Ibid. "[W]ithin the Old Testament much eschatological hope was linked with the restoration of the temple." James Bradley Chance, "Jerusalem and the Temple in Lucan Eschatology" (PhD dissertation, Duke University, 1984), 128. McKelvey also notes this important idea. "[T]he new temple is the central idea of Jewish eschatology from its very beginning." R. J. McKelvey, *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford, 1969), 12. McKelvey concludes with a more encompassing assertion: "The new temple is a central idea of biblical eschatology from the earliest times and is found in the most diverse backgrounds." Ibid., 179. Clements also addressed this concept. "From being the basis of a future hope, the belief in the divine presence has become an object of that hope itself. The promises of cult-festivals have been transformed into an eschatology." Ronald E. Clements, *God and Temple* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965), 106.

¹³The whole book of Ezekiel appears to introduce this problem, which is then developed by later writings. For the spark provided by Ezekiel, see Jon D. Levenson, *Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40-48* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976). From the NRSV, Ezek 36:25-28 has "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and you shall be clean from all your uncleannesses, and from all your idols I will cleanse you. A new heart I will give you, and a new spirit I will put within you; and I will remove from your body the heart of stone and give you a heart of flesh. I will put my spirit within you, and make you follow my statutes and be careful to observe my ordinances. Then you shall live in the land that I gave to your ancestors; and you shall be my people, and I will be your God" (NRSV). Block notes this "description mixes priestly cleansing rituals and blood sprinkling ceremonies." Daniel I. Block, *The Book of Ezekiel* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 2:354. Gaines notes this foundational aspect of Ezekiel as well. "Only at the dawn of the new age will the diaspora be gathered from the far corners of the earth and the prophetic vision of the eschatological Jerusalem realized for all generations." Elizabeth A. Gaines, "The Eschatological Jerusalem: The Function of the Image in the Literature of the Biblical Period" (PhD dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1988), 344.

¹⁴Clements compares this cleansing and sprinkling to the former temple cultic service. Ronald E. Clements, *Ezekiel* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 163. Also, see Block's comment in the previous note. Cultic rituals are different from forgiveness, but this does not exclude the possibility of forgiveness going on before or after, although forgiveness terminology is lacking.

The lack of self-determination (i.e., not having control over the festivals, people, or land) sparked many different approaches to solving the problem of foreign subjugation, leading to a completely new world order, or even a new cosmic order. One approach to resolving the crisis in faith (or cognitive dissonance) caused by foreign subjugation was that some second temple Jewish authors interpreted this oppression by foreign powers as a theological exile, even when the Judeans occupied the land.

This interpretation resolved the crisis by putting God in charge of the oppression, not the foreign power. For example, in assessing what it means for God to have Abraham abandon his land, Philo offers his insights about Israel's banishment. Philo believed that the exile was a condition even below death, since death ends misery but exile demonstrates that the misery is in its inception.¹⁵ Tobit (the book in general, but Tob 13-14 specifically) looks beyond the second temple to a new time, even though the book was written while Judeans occupied the land and at a time when the second Jerusalem temple operated.

The desire for self-determination on Israel's part led to broad speculation, numerous striking prophecies of far-reaching scope, and much anticipation about what God desired of Israel in order to bring an end to the divinely enforced exile or foreign subjugation. Many second temple Jewish writings struggled with what God desired of Israel so that this foreign subjugation would end. Some of the second temple Jewish writings turned to cultic holiness as one answer to this struggle (e.g., Ezek 40-48, *Jubilees*, and 2 Macc 2).

Purpose of the Research

This research aims to investigate the role or roles of the physical Jerusalem temple within the second temple Jewish writings in terms of whether the physical temple

¹⁵Philo, *De Abrahamo*, 14.64.

has any role to play in relation to the pivot point in eschatology. The pivot point or fulcrum in time refers to the end of the exile and perhaps the beginning of the *eschaton*. The exile may be theological, but many second temple Jewish texts address the physical gathering of the children of Israel to the land of Israel (i.e., from physical exile, even if the text also addresses a theological exile), thus, making the return a complete ingathering of the children of Israel.

There may be no direct link between the end of the exile (theological or physical) and the beginning of the *eschaton*, but unless they are identical (highly improbable and unlikely,¹⁶ though one might attempt to argue this point) there is a period of time between these two events that can be investigated in the second temple Jewish writings. If any eschatological role is indicated, this research will attempt to ascertain what role is expected within the writing or writings. The goal of this work is to add to the understanding of the Jerusalem temple in the second temple period and to illuminate possible eschatological expectations present within those writings.

Justification for the Research

Analyses of second temple Judaism have not focused on the role of the temple in relation to the pivot point in eschatology. The cultic rituals and how they act as a vehicle to bring reconciliation between God and Israel have been studied. However, possible eschatological expectations regarding the Jerusalem temple structure have been neglected in second temple Jewish studies.¹⁷

¹⁶No second temple Jewish text has the return of the exiles, as a completely different people, to a completely changed Promise Land, but have the exiles return followed by further events (e.g., judgment of Israel or the nations, the coming of the Lord to the temple, or the cleansing of the land or people).

¹⁷By using the word “structure,” the research emphasizes the physical building but includes the furniture, physical layout of the temple, and holy nature affecting the physical world around the temple. Either the neglect of the eschatological role or the assertion that the passages do not contain eschatological material can be seen in works of many commentators such as Block’s analysis of Ezekiel, Smith’s analysis of Haggai, Whybray’s analysis of Isa 56–66, Nickelsburg’s analysis of *1 Enoch*, Harrington’s analysis of *Pseudo-Philo*, and Wise’s analysis of the Temple Scroll for just a sample. Block, *Ezekiel*; Ralph L. Smith, *Micah-Malachi* (Waco: Word, 1984); Roger N. Whybray, *Isaiah 40-66* (London: Oliphants, 1975); George

Contemporary scholars have differing opinions regarding aspects of the temple prophecies of the second temple period. For instance, a variety of theories have been presented regarding when or whether the temple in Ezek 40–48 will be established.¹⁸ However, past investigations have not adequately addressed the possibility that an eschatological role of the Jerusalem temple exists.

When it comes to exploration of the nature of the eschatological role that such a temple could fulfill, if such a role exists, there has not been any investigation at all, even on a cursory level. One could expect dozens of investigations in this area, considering the number of studies on matters that are of less importance to Christian or Jewish theology. Yet, there has not been any investigation, whether in-depth or even as a survey. The present study is the first in the field and hopefully it will open up the area for other researchers.

The chosen of God, Jerusalem and the temple, are of crucial importance to Judaism and Christianity. Any role of the physical Jerusalem temple that is found where the temple performs any function in relation to the events surrounding the beginning of the new age, or the *eschaton*, would be quite significant to the understanding of second temple Jewish writings. Analysis of the Jerusalem temple's role in the eschatology of the second temple period would greatly add to the knowledge and understanding of that period.

W. E. Nickelsburg, *A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1-36; 81-108* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2001); Daniel J. Harrington, "Pseudo-Philo: A New Translation and Introduction," *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1983); Michael O. Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11* (Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1990).

¹⁸Tuell posits that Ezek 40–48 was accomplished, after a fashion, in the Persian period. Steven S. Tuell, "Ezekiel 40-42 as a Verbal Icon," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 58 (1996): 649-664. Stevenson presents the idea that Ezek 40–48 is rhetoric, not a temple meant to be built. Kalinda R. Stevenson, *The Vision of Transformation: The Territorial Rhetoric of Ezekiel 40–48* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996). Levenson argues that Ezek 40–48 is a restoration prophecy that has not been fulfilled. J. D. Levenson, *Theology*.

Scope and Delimitations

This research deals only with the interplay between two issues, eschatology and the Jerusalem temple,¹⁹ in second temple period writings (including the exilic period), that is, between the destruction of the two Jerusalem temples. The concern with eschatology will be limited to initiation of the *eschaton* or the transition from this age to the next, not the *eschaton* itself.²⁰ While this research covers writings spanning many centuries, it is meant to explore the problem detailed above, not to trace any diachronic development of the interplay between eschatology and the Jerusalem temple. Such developmental issues are left for other studies and are delimited as outside the scope of this research.

The delimitation to the writings composed between the destruction of the first temple in 586 BCE and that of the second temple in 70 CE sets up issues at the boundaries of this span of time because there is disagreement on the dating of writings.²¹ The principle of selection was that the documents to be investigated must be second temple Jewish writings, that is, written between the destruction of the first temple and the destruction of the second temple, and for dating issues, according to widely held scholarly opinion as represented by standard scholarship.²² For example, Watts cites some who still date the whole book of Isaiah to pre-exilic times;²³ yet, for chaps. 40–66

¹⁹See below under the definition of terms for further clarification on each of these two terms.

²⁰For a semantic exploration of the *eschaton* and eschatology, see below under procedural methodology.

²¹There are passages mentioning the temple in an eschatological context after 70 CE. However, this must be a separate analysis. As one can clearly see from Revelation, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch (among others), the role has been radically changed because of the earth-shaking destruction of the physical Jerusalem temple.

²²Standard scholarship is seen in commentary series such as Anchor, Word, Hermeneia, New International Commentary, Interpretation, etc.

²³John D. W. Watts, *Isaiah 34-66* (Waco, TX: Word, 1987), 70.

“the arguments for a 6th-century date have proved decisive for most interpreters,”²⁴ and many assign the portion commonly called Trito-Isaiah, the last eleven chapters of the book to the post-exilic period.²⁵ Therefore, this section of Isaiah is included in the scope of the present research.

The issue of whether some might argue with these dates is inconsequential to the outcomes of this research because in this present study there is no combining of theologies of different texts. Therefore, there is no impact on this present analysis besides the obvious disregarding of the disputed material based upon a different assumed date of the ancient writing. The analysis of Ezekiel is not dependent on the analysis of Isa 56–66. Analysis of *Jubilees* is not dependent on the analysis of *I Enoch*. Analysis of Sirach is not dependent on the analysis of Tobit. Going beyond proto-canonical, deuterocanonical, or pseudepigraphical categories, the analysis of the Temple Scroll is not dependent on the analysis of Ezekiel or any other text, showing that whether within or across categories, no textual analysis is dependent on another.

Because the texts are treated separately and the theology of one text is not affected by another, if one disagrees that the pericope in Isa 2 and Mic 4 is from the time of Cyrus, then one could exclude that from consideration of the second temple theme examined here. Any exclusion would not affect any analyses of the other texts, and the lack of subsequent effects of an exclusion makes this date delimitation quite undisruptive to the analysis as a whole. This research is not intended to develop one theology of the period; thus, the loss of any particular writing from the selected corpus will affect no conclusion other than that regarding the disputed material.²⁶

²⁴Ibid.

²⁵For example, Anderson dates Isa 56–66 to 520–500. Bernhard W. Anderson, *Understanding the Old Testament*, 4th ed. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1986), 504.

²⁶It is quite possible that even the analysis or conclusion will not be affected in any way, as perhaps the disagreement over the date of composition may not affect the analysis of the text.

Although this work presents only detailed analyses of passages where the physical Jerusalem temple is included in an eschatological context, an earlier stage of research did explore all second temple Jewish writings to locate instances of the intersection between these elements.²⁷ These documents were the proto-canonical,²⁸ deutero-canonical, Qumran, Pseudepigrapha, and the writings of Philo written within the second temple period.²⁹ The overlap between the Jerusalem temple and an eschatological setting narrows the number of second temple Jewish writings down to a small number of texts.

The relevant ancient sources have been preserved in different languages. Most of them (with the exception of the Christian Scriptures) were originally written in Hebrew and will be investigated in that language, if a Hebrew manuscript exists. There are extant Hebrew manuscripts of the proto-canonical writings and now with the texts of Qumran in hand, we know that texts such as *Jubilees*, Tobit, as well as the Temple Scroll and 4Q174

²⁷Joel is dated to many different centuries and is, therefore, left out of this research as it fails to solidly fall in the time after the destruction of the first temple. However, some would put the book in the post-exilic time frame. Allen favors the positions of Ahlström and Meyers in his review of the dating of the book of Joel, which implies a 520–515 BCE date. Leslie C. Allen, *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1976), 24. Joel addresses eschatology in connection with the Jerusalem temple at different points. The coming of the Lord into the temple and linking it with the day of the Lord, which brings about the new age, are important points made in Joel. The day of the Lord is coming (Joel 1:15 and 2:1), events happen before that day (Joel 3:4 and 4:1-12), and events happen after the Lord comes (Joel 4:17-20). The important event that happens before the coming of the Lord is the ingathering of the exiles. The events subsequent to the coming of the Lord are described in Joel 4:17-20: no aliens going through Jerusalem, the mountains dripping with wine, the hills flowing with milk, abundant water in the dry areas of Judah, as well as the end result for Egypt and Edom. These are all eschatological in nature and they happen only after the Lord comes to Zion. The Lord comes to dwell in the temple, using the Hebrew root יָדַשׁ, and this dwelling critiques the existing temple, whether that was the first or the second Jerusalem temple, at the same time that it presents the eschatology in connection with the Jerusalem temple. There is no further call to build the temple, as it already exists for Joel. Joel is willing to let whatever temple of his time period stand, but the coming of the Lord is the day when the *eschaton* starts.

²⁸The proto-canonical writings include the Hebrew Scriptures and the Christian Scriptures. Furthermore, as the parting of the ways between second temple Jewish and Christian authors did not occur before 70 CE, Christian writings before 70 CE would obviously be considered as a part of second temple Jewish writings. For further exploration on this topic, see Dunn's work. James D. G. Dunn, *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways A. D. 70 to 135* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999).

²⁹The writings of Josephus are excluded summarily because they were written after the rebellion and destruction in 70 CE. This groups his writings chronologically in a different category than the second temple Jewish writings. The group of post-second temple writings exhibits a different understanding regarding the Jerusalem temple since it has been visibly destroyed, as can be seen in 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra.

were originally written in Hebrew,³⁰ even though not all of these are fully preserved in that language. Even *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* was probably composed in Hebrew.³¹ The prologue of Sirach in the Septuagint also indicates that Hebrew was the original language of that writing.

Some analysis must be carried out on texts such as *I Enoch*, *Jubilees*, and *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*, which are preserved in Ethiopic and Latin. Those texts, without an extant Hebrew manuscript, are studied primarily in English translation. The Christian Scriptures that are examined here in this current research are examined in the Greek language where necessary.³²

Definition of Terms

Second temple Jewish writings use many appellations to refer to the Jerusalem temple. The most prevalent are מִקְדָּשׁ (sanctuary or hallowed ground), בַּיִת (house or temple), הַיְכָל (palace or temple), and צִיּוֹן (Zion). This last appellation, Zion, refers to the temple mount, the specific location of the temple. References to גְּבַעְתִּי (my hill), הַרֵּי (my mountains), הַר הַקֹּדֶשׁ (my holy mountain or the mountain of my holiness), as well

³⁰*I Enoch* was composed in Aramaic.

³¹Eleazar ben Asher ha-Levi, Jeraḥmeel ben Solomon, and *Pseudo-Philo*, *The Hebrew Fragments of Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum Preserved in the Chronicles of Jeraḥmeel* (Missoula, MT: SBL, 1974). Many second temple Jewish writings are in the Greek language such as Philo, the Wisdom of Solomon, and Ps 151, but perhaps 2 Maccabees and 2 Thessalonians are the only texts analyzed in this work that were written in a language other than Hebrew.

³²No denial of oral traditions or sayings, preserved from earlier times, is intended by excluding writings such as the Gospel of Mark; yet, the composition of the writings such as this Gospel is a product of its time period (the revolt and the temple destruction), which this research is avoiding by investigating writings of the time period between the destructions of the two Jerusalem temples and clearly the Jewish revolt would also effect the understanding of the temple as well. "It is usually dated to the period of the First Jewish Revolt against Rome (66-73 C. E.) or shortly thereafter." *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, eds. John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010), s.v. "Mark, Gospel of." Furthermore, this work envisions little work within the Pauline epistles since the Pauline corpus does not engage the Jerusalem temple as Witherington explains, "Paul shows little or no interest in either the future of cultic religion in Jerusalem or Jewish territorial theology." Ben Witherington III, *1 and 2 Thessalonians: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2006), 51. The Pauline, or as many would claim, Deutero-Pauline, writing 2 Thessalonians is the only writing of the Christian Scriptures included in this analysis.

as *הַר מְרוֹם יִשְׂרָאֵל* (mountain at the height of Israel) indirectly refer to Zion or the temple. Several terms indicate God’s presence at the Jerusalem temple: the verb *שָׁכַן* (to dwell) or the verbs *קָדַשׁ* (be consecrated or be made holy) and *כָּבֵד* (to be glorified or to appear in glory) in the *Niphal* stem. Other important implicit references to the temple would include the use of cultic verbs *זָרַק* (to sprinkle) and *כִּפֶּר* (to cleanse or to atone) as well as the phrase *רִיחַ נְיָחָה* (soothing aroma), which denote cultic ministries.

Eschatological language is understood to indicate not only an end to the present order of things; it clearly implies a start of a new order of things. Eschatology, the study of last things, clearly cannot be limited to what comes last, as most ancient texts do not present an end to creation, but present a last act that leads to a new age, which then continues on into the future.³³

Petersen defines eschatology in how “[i]t refers to a time in the future when the course of history will be changed to such an extent that one can speak of an entirely new state of reality.”³⁴ Nickelsburg depicts eschatology as “a decisive end to the present order and the beginning of a totally new order.”³⁵ This can be seen in the temporal phrasing of Ezek 45:1, *וּבְהַפִּילְכֶם* (“when you allot”), and the ramifications of these new borders.³⁶

³³Humanity, the earth (land and sea), and the cosmos are a part of creation and are not ended as part of a new order without humanity, earth, and cosmos. None of the second temple Jewish writings declare an absolute end to all creation as the last days. All eschatological passages have creation, which includes land, sea, humanity, and the cosmos.

³⁴David L. Petersen, “Eschatology (OT),” *Anchor Bible Dictionary (ABD)*, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 2:575.

³⁵George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Eschatology (Early Jewish),” *ABD*, 2:580.

³⁶Block opens his analysis on this section by noting that “[t]his section opens with a temporal clause, anticipating the apportionment of the land of Israel among its residents.” Block, *Ezekiel*, 2:651. This example of Ezek 45:1 is meant to show that the land is, at that time, being divided anew and a new order is beginning in this passage. This new order is quite visibly different in Ezek 45 as the portions assigned to the Lord and priests are strikingly different from the old order. This can be seen by comparing the boundary list from this casting of lots (given in Ezek 47:15-20) and the tribal inheritance of the old order given in the second half of Joshua. Howard’s map shows the old tribal lands from the old order. David M. Howard, Jr., *Joshua* (Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1998), 296. Block’s map shows the new order of tribal inheritance. Block, *Ezekiel*, 2:711. Notice that Issachar and Zebulun move from the north to the south of the Promised Land. Notice that the tribes of the concubines of Jacob move farther away from the Jerusalem temple. The priestly cities from the old order have been replaced by priestly land in the new order. The

The new state or new order transforms the entire cosmos as the “existing world will soon be overthrown.”³⁷ The reference to new heavens and new earth in Isa 66:22 shows this transformation of the cosmos. It has been noted that there are two principles to eschatology: It is cosmic in scope and it involves terrifying images of upheaval of the old order.³⁸ Haggai 2:22 describes the terrifying image of a complete upheaval, a physical overturning of kingdoms and armies.

The ancient Near East’s perception of history was modified by the ancient Hebrews. Rather than simply a cyclical renewal or a simple linear view of history, the new age becomes an end (a modified linear view of history), or perhaps more appropriately denoted as an aspiration, as “special divine revelation led the Hebrew to see history as moving towards a future goal.”³⁹ This future goal is posited as a restoration of creation, including the land and people of Israel. Many texts, after the exile of Judah, show how “the eschatological expectation of Second Temple Judaism is *restorative*; it is concerned with the restoration of Israel to an idealized form of its former state.”⁴⁰

To summarize thus far, eschatological language implies the coming of a new age, state, or order that displays a new orientation compared to the past and is cosmic in scope.⁴¹ Additionally, in second temple Jewish texts, eschatological language displays

Torah of Moses asserts that in the Jubilee year, each man can return to the tribal inheritance (Lev 25:10). However, in the Torah of the Temple in this new order, the tribal lands have been changed, superseding the Torah of Moses.

³⁷David E. Aune, “Eschatology (Early Christian),” *ABD*, 2:594.

³⁸*Dictionary of Biblical Imagery*, ed. Leland Ryken et al. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1998), s.v. “End Times.”

³⁹S. H. Travis, “Eschatology,” *New Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Sinclair B. Ferguson, David F. Wright, and J. I. Packer (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1988), 228.

⁴⁰John J. Collins, “Eschatology,” *Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010), 595. First and foremost, the restorative text that should be mentioned is Ezekiel. However, Malachi, Ezra-Nehemiah, and Tobit would also show this new focus.

⁴¹See the list of themes below to display the different ways (e.g., covenant, life, nation) in which this new age, state, or order is depicted.

some restoration of the past glory, yet going beyond the former glory to an ideal, new future existence, a protological event.

Description of the new age in the language of second temple Jewish writings is highly nuanced and quite implicit. Many will cite expressions of *בְּאַחֲרֵי הַיָּמִים* (“in the end of days” or “in latter days”) as indicative of an eschatological passage.⁴² Yet, this phrase is quite unreliable for indicating whether the passage is eschatological or not. This phrase is used in Gen 49:1, Num 24:14, Deut 4:30, and 31:29 in ways that may lack eschatological implications.⁴³ Regarding Gen 49:1, most versions translate this phrase as “the days to come.”⁴⁴ The usage in Gen 49:1 depicts what will happen after Jacob dies, which is not an eschatological period, but the period after the Egyptian slavery. Wenham notes regarding this phrase, “In some passages it has a clearly eschatological sense (e.g., Isa 2:2; cf. NT ‘last days’), but elsewhere it seems to have a less technical sense, ‘in the distant future,’ after certain other things, which the prophet has just described or hinted at, have happened (cf. Num 24:14; Deut 4:30; 31:29; cf. *TDOT* 1:210-12).”⁴⁵

⁴²Ryken, *Biblical Imagery*, s.v. “End Times.”

⁴³Even if one were to argue that this phrase must be eschatological in nature, this would not imply that every eschatological passage must contain this phrase. This phrase does not show up in many passages so that it could be called quite unreliable as an eschatological indicator. The phrase shows up only 13 times in all of the Hebrew Scriptures. Therefore, the following methodology is still necessary.

⁴⁴This includes NRSV, NJPS, NLT, NIV, NAS, NAB, ESV, and CSB. The NET translates the phrase with the general phrase “the future.” Sailhamer translates this phrase in three of the four uses in the Torah (page 434 shows he skips over the use in Deut 4:30 that does not fit his theory) “in the last days.” John H. Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch as Narrative: A Biblical-Theological Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1992), 233. Perhaps middle ground between these ideas might better describe this phrase. Davidson posits: “I recognize that this expression can refer to open-ended future time, but like Sailhamer I find that the ‘last days’ also includes a glimpse of the ultimate eschatological fulfillment in salvation history.” Richard M. Davidson, “The Eschatological Literary Structure of the Old Testament,” in *Creation, Life, and Hope: Essays in Honor of Jacques B. Doukhan*, ed. Jiří Moskala (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 2000), 353. This middle ground translation and interpretation allows it to refer to future events, yet it may hint at an eschatological outcome.

⁴⁵Gordon Wenham, *Genesis 16-50* (Dallas, TX: Word, 1994), 471. Wenham notes that the use in Gen 49:1 falls into this latter idea that is non-eschatological. “Such a sense here would explain why Jacob looks beyond the period of Egyptian slavery and exodus to the era of settlement in Canaan.” Ibid. The phrase “last days” in the Christian Scriptures, to which Wenham refers in this quote, occurs in Acts 2:17; 2 Tim 3:1; Heb 1:2; Jas 5:3; and 2 Pet 3:3. Rashi notes that this end of days refers to the end of Israel’s exile. Abraham Ben Isaiah and Benjamin Sharfman, *The Pentateuch and Rashi’s Commentary: A Linear Translation into English* (Brooklyn, NY: SS&R, 1976), 483. Walton translates this phrase in Gen 49:1 as

Not one definitive linguistic indicator exists that a passage is eschatological in nature. However, many literary themes, when used in conjunction and not in a stand-alone fashion, can indicate that the nature of the passage may be eschatological. On the other hand, a passage containing different indicators does not necessitate that the passage is eschatological, only that it must be examined to ascertain whether or not it is in fact eschatological (i.e., contains indications of the coming of a new age, state, or order that displays a new orientation compared to the past and that is cosmic in scope).

The list of these themes is long and at a minimum would include: (1) a gathering or return of the house of Israel to the land, (2) covenantal language (including possibly a renewed covenant or using phrases such as *בְּרִית עוֹלָם* or *בְּרִית שְׁלוֹם*), (3) judgment or separating the peoples for judgment, (4) the fact that the people or the nations or both would know God, (5) inclusive and universal language (e.g., all the nations, all the days, all flesh, or all offerings), (6) purification of the land or people, (7) consecration of God before the people or the consecration of God before the nations through the people, (8) walking in the statutes of God and abolishing or banishing evil ways, (9) the people enjoying the fruit of the land (possibly with increased yield), (10) dwelling securely, (11) long life, (12) giving of a new order or a new Torah, (13) shaking or renewing the earth and sky (all creation), (14) overturning the current order, (15) the nations coming to Israel to worship God (to Zion where salvation comes from), (16) eternal peace or having the gates of Jerusalem open eternally or other proclamations with the idea of lasting forever, (17) abundant prosperity, (18) an opulent description of Jerusalem, and (18) the return of

“in the days to come.” John H. Walton, *Genesis: From Biblical Text . . . to Contemporary Life*, NIV Application Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2001), 705. Towner and Maher also translate this phrase as Walton does. W. Sibley Towner, *Genesis* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 279. Michael Maher, *Genesis* (Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1982), 264. Plaut notes about the phrase “in the days to come” that this is not a reference to messianic days. W. Gunther Plaut, *The Torah: A Modern Commentary* (New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1981), 308. Sarna notes that this phrase, as in the Akkadian, “means simply ‘in the future,’ without precise definition. In the Torah the phrase is used in a context of historical time.” Nahum M. Sarna, *Genesis: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation* (Philadelphia: JPS, 1989), 332.

the inheritance to Israel.⁴⁶ There are also a few crucial words that are often part of the expression of these themes such as עולם or ועד עולם “forever” or “forever and ever,” היום, הנה, היום ההוא, “the/this/that day,” as well as מועד “appointed time.”

Methodology

A wide variance in second temple literature methodologies surfaces when analyzing, comparing, and contrasting texts of the time period. Historical studies covering large periods exist.⁴⁷ Studies that focus on the intra-Jewish dialogue of the time characterize much of the analysis of the Qumran materials.⁴⁸ However, more specialized studies use texts from the second temple period. Schiffman presents a systematic study on the Jewish cultic system.⁴⁹ Gowan presents “a study of the theology of the eschatological traditions of Israel.”⁵⁰ Gowan’s study is more a thematic investigation based upon the

⁴⁶This partial list is my creation from primary sources of the second temple period. This list is empirical, that is, it has been compiled from observation of primary sources, not from theory or from a synthesis of secondary sources. However, Collins notes that eschatology in the second temple period contains: judgment of the nations, restoration (this description would include most of the list given here), far-reaching and definitive changes, cosmic (new heaven and new earth), and long life. Collins, “Eschatology,” 595. Hoffman points out the problem this list is trying to address when noting “how can eschatology in the Hebrew Bible be examined and its essence and development studied, when there is no common criterion for selecting the relevant passages?” Yair Hoffman, “Eschatology in the Book of Jeremiah,” in *Eschatology in the Bible and in Jewish and Christian Tradition*, ed. Henning G. Reventlow (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 77. Hoffman’s list of criteria is much shorter, containing: a future perspective, universal overview, and miraculous, supernatural elements. Ibid. Yet, even here Hoffman notes how the Talmud has in b. Ber. 34b (Shabbat, 63a) Shemuel’s opinion that “[t]here is no difference between this world and the days of the messiah except for the Bondage of Kingdoms.” Ibid., 78. Hoffman is correct in commenting that there is no set list of criteria that allows one to deduce that a passage is eschatological.

⁴⁷Paolo Sacchi, *The History of the Second Temple Period* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000); James C. VanderKam, *An Introduction to Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2001).

⁴⁸Gabriele Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998). This text examines the Jewish sect Boccaccini would call “Enochic Jews” and focuses in on their split and distinction from the other sects of Judaism. John J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000). Collins examines the texts to investigate the differences between the diaspora Jews and those of the land of Israel.

⁴⁹Lawrence Schiffman, “The Sacrificial System of the Temple Scroll and the Book of *Jubilees*,” SBLSP 24 (1985): 217-233.

⁵⁰Donald E. Gowan, *Eschatology in the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986), 1.

Hebrew Scriptures. Nickelsburg also examines the theological underpinnings of the eschatological texts; he examines both those within the Hebrew Scriptures and later second temple Jewish writings.⁵¹ Examining many of the same texts regarding the physical Jerusalem temple, Fujita asserts that “[b]ecause of this aim, this study is of a literary and theological nature.”⁵²

This present study is a literary-theological investigation of second temple Jewish writings to ascertain their ideas regarding a possible thematic connection between the Jerusalem temple and eschatology. More specifically, this work will concentrate on the function of the Jerusalem temple in the transition from the end of the exile to the beginning of the *eschaton*. Therefore, the methodology for the present research resembles the literary-theological approaches of Fujita, Gowan, and Nickelsburg, with some exegesis of the texts required in order to clarify their meanings on relevant points.⁵³

When the physical Jerusalem temple is found in an eschatological context in a source text, an assessment is made on whether or not the temple in the given context is expected to perform any eschatological role. This assessment is made on a case-by-case basis through a literary analysis of the content of the passage, informed by its larger context, consisting of the temple theology of the entire composition.

⁵¹George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins: Diversity, Continuity, and Transformation* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2003), 120-134.

⁵²Shozo Fujita, “The Temple Theology of the Qumran Sect and the Book of Ezekiel: Their Relationship to Jewish Literature of the Last Two Centuries BC” (ThD dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1970), 1.

⁵³In order to perform literary-theological analysis, textual analysis and exegesis must be accomplished. Text-critical aspects in this research have been shaped by Tov’s and Brotzman’s works. Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1992); Ellis R. Brotzman, *Old Testament Textual Criticism: A Practical Introduction* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1998). Exegetical inquiries in this research have been shaped by Stuart’s and Steck’s works. Douglas Stuart, *Old Testament Exegesis: A Primer for Students and Pastors* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1984); Odil H. Steck, *Old Testament Exegesis: A Guide to the Methodology*, trans. James D. Nogalski (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998). The goal of the analysis in this research is to stay as close as possible to the texts of the second temple Jewish writings.

This literary analysis entails examination of the theme, tone, and climax(es) of the text and involves assessment of any relevant aspects of the grammar, syntax, lexicography, and overall structure of the passage. Thus, the analysis investigates the manner of presentation, including word choices (and semantic ranges of those word choices) and the flow of elements. However, the primary focus of the study is on the realities reflected or envisioned by the text, particularly as indicated by unobtrusive aspects of the imagery and what elements are presented. All of this literary analysis is done to search for the physical Jerusalem temple in the passage, the eschatological context of the passage, and what, if any, eschatological role the physical Jerusalem temple performs in the passage.

Internal consistency is vital to this analysis. Specifically, when an assessment is made whether or not the temple in the given context is expected to perform any eschatological role, it may be the case that internal consistency brings to light information on a textual ambiguity. The internal consistency, as well as the larger context, may present a solution as to how a vague reference meshes within the text as a whole.⁵⁴

This investigation will examine each text individually on its own terms. In an attempt to determine what eschatological role, if any, was expected of the future physical Jerusalem temple, this investigation will identify passages in the second temple period Jewish writings, including the exilic period, where a future Jerusalem temple explicitly or implicitly appears in explicit or implicit eschatological contexts. A summary of the individual eschatological roles of the second temple Jewish writings shows whether or not any common theme of an eschatological role for the Jerusalem temple in the second temple Jewish writings exists. Beyond this concluding summary (which will merely group roles for comparison and will not develop one theology in different writings), this

⁵⁴See the analysis below on Ezek 4 for further illumination regarding how internal consistency and vague material combine in this analysis.

study will not develop one theology of the different second temple Jewish writings, combining assertions or conclusions from different texts, nor will it attempt to trace the chronological development of any theme.

With the exception of this section and the epilogue, all sections are written to stand alone and can be reviewed in any order. The following sections are arranged with an introduction to the topic followed by a literature review of the topic, textual analysis sections, and an epilogue. The sections of textual analysis are arranged roughly on a chronological timeline with a section on the Hebrew Bible followed by a section on the Greek Bible, a section on the Temple Scroll, a section on the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and other Qumran writings, and a section on the Christian Scriptures.

CHAPTER 2

THE ORIGINS OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ESCHATOLOGY AND THE JERUSALEM TEMPLE

The Relationship between Creation and the Jerusalem Temple

As a first step in exploring any possible relationship between eschatology and the Jerusalem temple, it is necessary to evaluate and to understand the relationship between the Jerusalem temple and creation. Eschatology is the study of a new order, the last order, which will follow this present order. In order to understand any eschatological role of the temple, it is necessary to start with the relationship of the temple to the start of the present order, its creation.

The Garden of Eden, the tabernacle, the first Jerusalem temple, the second Jerusalem temple, and Ezekiel's temple vision (Ezek 40–48) are depicted as places for God to dwell. The Garden of Eden is the garden of God and the place where human and divine first coexisted (at least for a time). This original coexistence has been interpreted as the original dwelling of God.¹ Later places have important allusions and connections to Eden within their design. As many of the correspondences between the temple/tabernacle and Eden are in the physical design features, the layout or ground plan of the temple is a vital attribute that some second temple Jewish writings expect will enable the temple to perform an important function and is, therefore, a crucial aspect of any investigation into the Jerusalem temple.² Barker explains, "The temple (and the tabernacle, which for the

¹Wallace notes that "even in Gen 2-3 it is probably meant to be understood primarily as a dwelling place of Yahweh rather than simply a place of human habitation." Howard N. Wallace, "Eden, Garden of," *ABD*, 2:281.

²See below for biblical references to the correspondences between Eden and the temple/tabernacle.

most part shared its symbolism) represented the creation.”³

The ideas that the Jerusalem temple is linked to creation and that creation is symbolically expressed in temple architecture have precedence in Egyptian temple theology.⁴ The ancient Near Eastern background of Egyptian temples illuminates the theological milieu of the Jerusalem temple and shows key insights, which aid the investigation into the Jerusalem temple.⁵ Egyptian temples were believed to have been built on the *ben-ben*, the first land created from the waters of chaos.⁶ This “identity of the temples with the Primeval Hill amounts to a sharing of essential quality and is expressed in their names and in their architectural arrangements by means of ramps or steps.”⁷

Egyptian temples were representations of creation, both the act of first creation

³Barker, *Temple Theology*, 17. Wenham also notes this fact. “Many of the features of the garden may also be found in later sanctuaries particularly the tabernacle or Jerusalem temple.” Gordon J. Wenham, “Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story,” in *I Studied Inscriptions from before the Flood: Ancient Near Eastern, Literary, and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1-11*, ed. Richard S. Hess and David T. Tsumura (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1994), 399.

⁴Ward notes how the temples of Egypt “symbolized the divine creation of the universe.” William A. Ward, “Temples and Sanctuaries: Egypt,” *ABD*, 6:369. Mesopotamian temples could express this bond between creation as well, shown by the temple of Ishtar at Nippur called “House, Bond of Heaven and Underworld.” A. R. George, *House Most High: The Temples of Ancient Mesopotamia* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1993), 80.

⁵Wright notes that temples of Babylon and probably Canaan show important creation symbolism as well. G. Ernest Wright, “The Significance of the Temple in the Ancient Near East: Part III, The Temple in Palestine-Syria,” *Biblical Archaeologist* 7 (1944): 74.

⁶Byron E. Shafer, “Temples, Priests, and Rituals: An Overview,” in *Temples of Ancient Egypt*, ed. Byron E. Shafer (Ithaca, NY: Cornell, 1997), 8. In fact, the holy of holies is built around this mound of earth. Henri Frankfort, *Ancient Egyptian Religion* (1948; repr., New York: Harper & Row, 1961), 153. Even though there were many temples, each of them claiming their holy of holies was the original earthen mound, the basis of these differing claims was the idea that “originally there was only one temple.” Eve A. E. Reymond, *Mythical Origin of the Egyptian Temple* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1969), 208. Barker notes this concept is part of the Jerusalem temple as well. “But the temple was also built in accordance with a heavenly plan to represent on earth the garden of God. . . . The Garden of Eden was the first dry land created in the midst of the primeval waters and so the temple was the centre of the created order.” Margaret Barker, *The Gate of Heaven: The History and Symbolism of the Temple in Jerusalem* (London: SPCK, 1991), 57. She goes on to relay how “[i]t has often been observed that the garden of Eden in Israel’s tradition replaced the temple of other creation myths, and this is certainly true of the Old Testament in its present form. There is, however, a great deal which suggests that the garden of Eden and the temple had at one time been one and the same.” *Ibid.*, 63-64.

⁷Henri Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods: A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Integration of Society and Nature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948), 152.

and the world of creation,⁸ establishing the temple as the bridge between the world of the gods and the world of humanity.⁹ The Egyptian temple was a microcosm of creation.¹⁰ The first Jerusalem temple and the temple vision of Ezek 40–48 contain many symbols of creation.¹¹ The capitals on the pillars at the temple are symbolic of the Garden of Eden,¹² as well as the date palms engraved on the paneling (Ezek 41:18).¹³ The cherubim in the

⁸“Temples and rituals were loci for the creative interplay of sacred space and sacred time.” Shafer, “Temples,” 2.

⁹“The temple—literally ‘god’s house’ in Egyptian—is characterized repeatedly as a horizon: it represents the seam between this world and the next, peopled by gods and the deceased. The temple is built as a residence for the divinity who is present as a religious image in the inner sanctum; yet it also has a processional path that allows the divinity to venture out into this world and appear to human beings. In addition, the temple mirrors the entire cosmos.” Erik Hornung, *Idea into Image: Essays on Ancient Egyptian Thought*, trans. Elizabeth Bredeck (New York: Timken, 1992), 115-116. Bell notes that temples in Egyptian theology were located in sacred space, an understanding that the temple was both a part of the world, yet separate from it. Lanny Bell, “The New Kingdom ‘Divine’ Temple: The Example of Luxor,” in *Temples of Ancient Egypt*, ed. Byron E. Shafer (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997), 135.

¹⁰To Egypt, “monuments of the gods were in fact nothing less than models of creation and of the cosmos itself—parts within parts, worlds within worlds.” Richard H. Wilkinson, *The Complete Temples of Ancient Egypt* (Hong Kong: Thames and Hudson, 2000), 52. “Temples symbolized not only the realms of sky and netherworld but also the world of Egypt.” Shafer, “Temples,” 3. Shafer explicitly notes Egyptian temples are a microcosm of the entire cosmos. *Ibid.*, 8.

¹¹Many have seen symbols of creation in the temple beyond those explored in this present work. This includes the tabernacle of Exodus. Ryken, *Biblical Imagery*, s.v. “temple”; Peter J. Kearney, “Creation and Liturgy: The P Redaction of Ex 25-40,” *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 89 (1977): 375-387. Barker notes, “The building of the tabernacle corresponded to the days of creation. The veil which screened the holy of holies corresponded to the creation of the firmament on the second day, and so everything beyond the veil represented the works of Day One.” Margaret Barker, “Enthronement and Apotheosis: The Vision in Revelation 4-5,” in *New Heaven and New Earth Prophecy and the Millennium: Essays in Honour of Anthony Gelston*, ed. P. J. Harland and C. T. R. Hayward (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 221. Here, Barker sees symbols of creation in the layout of the temple. J. D. Levenson, *Theology*, 28. The temple is located on the holy mountain which itself is equated to the garden of God. Jon D. Levenson, *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible* (Minneapolis, MN: Winston Press, 1985), 128. Himmelfarb observes how the temple symbolizes Eden in the last temple vision of Ezekiel. “The use of traditions about the Garden of Eden in relation to the restored Temple, so surprising at first glance, appears on closer consideration quite characteristic of Ezekiel.” Martha Himmelfarb, “The Temple and the Garden of Eden in Ezekiel, the Book of Watchers, and the Wisdom of Ben Sira,” in *Sacred Places and Profane Spaces: Essays in the Geographics of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, ed. Jamie S. Scott and Paul Simpson-Housley (New York: Greenwood, 1991), 66.

¹²Victor A. Hurowitz, “YHWH’s Exalted House: Aspects of the Design and Symbolism of Solomon’s Temple,” in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*, ed. John Day (London: T. & T. Clark, 2005), 84. Bloch-Smith associates the two pillars with the tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil in the garden of Eden. Elizabeth Bloch-Smith, “‘Who Is the King of Glory?’ Solomon’s Temple and Its Symbolism,” in *Scripture and Other Artifacts: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Honor of Philip J. King*, ed. Michael D. Coogan, J. Cheryl Exum, and Lawrence E. Stager (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994), 27.

¹³In 1 Kgs 6:29, the first Jerusalem temple was also decorated with palm trees and flowers.

Holy of Holies connect the most holy place to Eden.¹⁴ It has been suggested that the tripartite layout of the court, holy place, and holy of holies also reflects creation.¹⁵ In biblical texts, the Jerusalem temple is depicted as a dwelling place of God equivalent to Eden.¹⁶ The five uses of יָם (the sea) in 1 Kgs 7 tie the first Jerusalem temple to the sea of creation.¹⁷ The tree of life is symbolized by the sanctuary menorah of the temple.¹⁸ The life-giving river in Ezek 47 evokes remembrances of the rivers of Eden.¹⁹ The fruit trees, which are fed by this river, yield their fruit all year long turning the desert into a

¹⁴Karl C. W. F. Bähr, *Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus* (Heidelberg: Mohr, 1837), 1:374. Gage also notes how the symbolism of the cherubim in the holy of holies equates the place to the Garden of Eden. Warren A. Gage, *The Gospel of Genesis: Studies in Protology and Eschatology* (Winona Lake, IN: Carpenter Books, 1984), 57.

¹⁵Beale summarizes ancient sources and modern commentators, both Jewish and non-Jewish, holding that “the three parts of Israel’s temple represented the three parts of the cosmos: the outer court symbolized the visible earth (both land and sea, the place where humans lived); the holy place primarily represented the visible heavens (though there was also garden symbolism); the holy of holies stood for the invisible heavenly dimension of the cosmos where God dwelt.” G. K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church’s Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 48. Vermeylen sees another tripartite symbolism between the temple and creation. “Dès une époque très ancienne apparaît une triple symbolique: celle qui, dans l’axe vertical, distingue des étages dans le cosmos, celle qui, sur le plan horizontal, oppose le centre et la périphérie, et enfin celle du temps.” Jacques Vermeylen, *Jérusalem centre du monde: Développements et contestations d’une tradition biblique* (Paris: Cerf, 2007), 12. Vermeylen means the temple is vertically between the waters above and the waters below on the highest mountain (ibid., 13), horizontally it is as heaven on earth and source of life (ibid., 14), and temporally he refers to how the temple is referred to in Gen 8:22 as the festivals allow a restoration back to the time of origin (ibid., 17). One could understand this verse providing background to the festivals at the temple, but Vermeylen posits an interesting link between the narrative of Gen 8:22 and the temple.

¹⁶Bähr notes about the dwelling of God, “denn diese Wohnung ist eine symbolische Stätte des Lebens.” Bähr, *Symbolik*, 1:373. Monson notes “the divine dwelling atop a high mountain, a life-giving water source, and the conquest of chaos (figuratively and politically).” John M. Monson, “The Temple of Solomon: Heart of Jerusalem,” in *Zion, City of Our God*, ed. Richard S. Hess and Gordon J. Wenham (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999), 7. Barker notes how the Jerusalem “temple interior was a garden representing the heavenly garden on the mountain of God, the original Garden of Eden.” Barker, *Gate of Heaven*, 27.

¹⁷Bloch-Smith notes the allusion of the water of Eden (Gen 3:10) in the sea built outside the temple. Bloch-Smith, “King of Glory,” 27. In his analysis, Kearney also ties the sea to creation. Kearney, “Creation and Liturgy,” 377. Brown claims that “King Solomon’s Temple was an architectural replica of the Garden of Eden, and the king of Israel was a typological representation of Adam, the first king.” Matthew B. Brown, *The Gate of Heaven: Insights on the Doctrines and Symbols of the Temple* (American Fork, UT: Covenant Communications, 1999), 139.

¹⁸Jacques B. Doukhan, *Secrets of Revelation: The Apocalypse through Hebrew Eyes* (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2002), 198. The menorah is not mentioned in 1 Kings or 2 Chronicles.

¹⁹Hurowitz, “Exalted House,” 80.

paradise just like Eden. Just as Eden was a temple for Adam,²⁰ the temple of Ezekiel is to become Eden again.²¹

Not only does the temple building echo creation, the temple rituals as well have symbolic connections to creation.²² The priests' kindling the lights of the temple (Exod 30:8, 1 Sam 3:3, and 2 Chr 13:11) alludes to the first light (Gen 1:3) showing "[t]he significance of the light of creation and the light in the tabernacle (Ex 25:31-40; 37:17-24) is retained in the temple (2 Chr 13:11)."²³ The lights were kept in the morning and the evening (Lev 24:3) as Gen 1 reiterates rhythmically (Gen 1:5, 8, 13, 19, 23, 31). The *tamid* offering was also accomplished every morning and evening.²⁴ The bread of the presence was to be placed in the temple every Sabbath (Lev 24:8), keeping the seven-day rhythm of creation in the temple service.

²⁰Beverley notes that "Paradise especially was a Temple to Adam." Thomas Beverley, *The Pattern of the Divine Temple, Sanctuary, and City of the New Jerusalem Measured according to Ezekiel's Last and Greatest Vision, chap. 40 to the End* (London: John Salusbury, 1690), 7. *Jubilees* depicts Adam using Eden as a temple in that he offered a sacrifice for a pleasing aroma to God (Jub 3:27), as well as waiting the appropriate number of days for a male and female before going into the temple (Jub 3:9-10), that is Eden. Davidson gives an extensive bibliography supporting the idea that the garden was the original temple. Richard M. Davidson, *Flame of Yahweh: Sexuality in the Old Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007), 47, n133.

²¹This is not just constrained to Ezekiel as detailed above. Stager notes the relationship between the temple of Solomon and the garden of Eden. "For ancient Israel, the Temple of Solomon—indeed, the Temple Mount and all Jerusalem—was a symbol as well as a reality, a mythopoetic realization of heaven on earth, Paradise, the Garden of Eden." Lawrence E. Stager, "Jerusalem as Eden," *Biblical Archaeology Review* 26 (2000): 37.

²²"The temple was Eden and its rituals will have interacted with this fundamental belief about the creation. The temple itself, like Eden, was between heaven and earth with access to both the divine and material worlds." Barker, *Gate of Heaven*, 102.

²³Ryken, *Biblical Imagery*, s.v. "temple."

²⁴The *tamid* was to be the first offering of the day. Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus*, Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 1:388. Thus, creation began anew each morning. "Offerings were more than gift giving; they were reciprocal creation." Shafer, "Temples," 24. The priests of Egypt performed the rituals constantly so that creation would continue, that is, the cycle of the sun would be maintained from day to day. "This cycle is viewed as a perpetual repetition of the creation, the maintenance of which is the main objective of the daily rituals in great state temples of Egypt." Jacobus van Dijk, "Myth and Mythmaking in Ancient Egypt," in *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*, ed. Jack M. Sasson (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995), 3:1706. Vermeylen observes that the idea of the continuous nature of the world in Gen 8:22 is tied to the sacrifices. "La pérennité de la terre et des rythmes de la nature est annoncée au moment de la célébration liturgique (offrande des sacrifices), et c'est sans doute significatif." Vermeylen, *Jérusalem*, 18.

The history of the Jerusalem temple is mirrored in the basic thread of the Genesis narrative. God created all things in seven days and there was perfection (Gen 1:31-2:2). This was followed by humanity degrading the nature of creation (Gen 6:5). Creation became common and corrupt; creation was no longer holy to God (Gen 6:11). God brought the flood in order to destroy (most of) creation and almost all life in creation (Gen 7:23). After this devastation and destruction, a remnant of humanity began to rebuild with a promise of eternity from God (Gen 9:12).

This narrative parallels the account of the temple. God created the temple in seven years (1 Kgs 6:38). “The foundation of the temple thus becomes a protological event, going back to the beginnings of time and established by God not by either David or Solomon (see Ps 78:69-70).”²⁵ Humanity degraded the nature and abused the role of the temple (Jer 7). The temple became profane and no longer holy to God (Ezek 8). God brought the Babylonians in order to destroy the temple and to exile the children of Israel (2 Chr 36:17-21). After this devastation and destruction, a remnant of humanity will rebuild the temple with a promise of eternity with God (Ezek 43:1-7).

The temple, with its obvious and subtle references to creation,²⁶ is depicted as a miniature creation that acts toward God on behalf of creation and toward creation on behalf of God.²⁷ Just as Egyptian theology understood a temple as a microcosm as noted above, the Jerusalem temple was a microcosm of creation.²⁸ Just as Egyptian theological

²⁵Carol Meyers, “Temple, Jerusalem,” *ABD*, 6:360.

²⁶Clements notes how “[t]he furnishings of the temple were full of cosmic symbolism, as was in effect true also for the temple as a whole.” Clements, *God and Temple*, 65.

²⁷Levenson aptly summarizes the reason for the symbolic nature of the temple to creation in that “the Temple meant, among other things, a rich and powerful re-presentation of creation.” Jon Douglas Levenson, *Creation and the Persistence of Evil* (New York: Harper and Row, 1985), 95.

²⁸Barker, Beale, Gage, and Levenson declare that the temple is a microcosm. Barker, *Temple Theology*, 62; Beale, *Church’s Mission*, 29-80; Gage, *Genesis*, 54; J. D. Levenson, *Sinai and Zion*, 138. Vermeylen writes that the temple is the representation of the cosmos. “Le Temple de Jérusalem ne fait pas exception: il est représentation du cosmos, dont il tient la place centrale, mais il est aussi frontière et lien entre le sacré et le profane.” Vermeylen, *Jérusalem*, 11. Later Jewish writings also noted this fact. Taylor notes that Juan Bautista Villalpando viewed the Jerusalem temple as a microcosm of God’s creation. René

understanding of the holy of holies has the original land and the sky above, the temple as a dwelling of God combines the two.²⁹ Schiffman comments that the temple was a microcosm of the land of Israel;³⁰ yet, this fails to show the universal impact that the Jerusalem temple performs in the world.³¹ “Collectively, the function of these correspondences is to underscore the depiction of the sanctuary as a world, that is, an ordered, supportive, and obedient environment, and the depiction of the world as a sanctuary, that is, a place in which the reign of God is visible and unchallenged, and his holiness is palpable, unthreatened, and pervasive.”³²

The Relationship between Protology and Eschatology

As a second step in exploring the relationship between eschatology and the Jerusalem temple, it is necessary to understand the relationship between protology and eschatology, the creation and the *eschaton*.³³ Protology and eschatology show congruence

Taylor, “Architecture and Magic: Considerations on the *Idea* of the Escorial,” in *Essays in the History of Architecture Presented to Rudolf Wittkower*, ed. Douglas Fraser, Howard Hibbard, and Milton J. Lewine (London: Phaidon, 1967), 92. Mottolese notes that the sanctuary as a microcosm “had been hinted at already in the Bible, but was worked out in post-biblical literary stages, according to increasingly complicated and detailed patterns.” Maurizio Mottolese, *Analogy in Midrash and Kabbalah: Interpretive Projections of the Sanctuary and Ritual* (Los Angeles: Cherub Press, 2007), 77.

²⁹Bähr notes the combination by commenting that “[w]enn nun das Innere der Wohnung vermöge der Cherubim und Blumen in Verbindung mit den heiligen Geräthen als eine Parallele des Paradieses erscheint, so fällt hier, da diefs Innere, wie sich uns von den verschiedensten Seiten auf’s Bestimmteste ergeben hat, zugleich Bild des Himmels is, Paradies und Himmel in Eins zusammen.” Bähr, *Symbolik*, 1:374.

³⁰Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord: Studies on the Temple Scroll*, ed. Florentino García Martínez (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 228.

³¹Vermeulen notes that “[s]ans la présence du sanctuaire, il ne peut y avoir d’ordre, mais seulement chaos.” Vermeulen, *Jérusalem*, 14. Going further, he calls the temple the keystone of cosmic order. *Ibid.*, 16.

³²J. D. Levenson, *Creation*, 86. Mottolese’s study of the sacred space of the temple, although most of that study is with later documents, sees a role based upon the correspondence. One of Mottolese’s interpretational types considered “is the common representation that points to a correspondence between the Tabernacle and the Creation, the Sanctuary and the Universe, endowing the sacred place with a cosmic role.” Mottolese, *Analogy*, 77.

³³Hardy notes that to address one, the other must be addressed. “To address creation without considering eschatology risks serious distortion to both topics. . . . Why? As we shall see, the two are intrinsically interconnected.” Daniel W. Hardy, “Creation and Eschatology,” in *The Doctrine of Creation:*

in many different areas,³⁴ six of which are briefly explored below.

First, protology and eschatology show congruity in the fact that both are a beginning or an origin, with similar language used to describe each of them.³⁵ The *eschaton* is the last origin as opposed to the original origin.³⁶ Brueggemann defines eschatology as the Lord's "capacity to move in and through and beyond the end of history, to reinitiate the life-giving processes of history."³⁷ The idea of reinitiating all of life in history is truly a new start. Eschatology is viewed as both envisioning the final destiny of humanity or each individual person as well as envisioning the end of one period in history followed by a very different period in history.³⁸ Yet, both of these ends are actually beginnings. Eschatology is about the hope for an end to present

Essays in Dogmatics, History and Philosophy, ed. Colin E. Gunton (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1997), 105. Gage notes 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." Gage, *Genesis*, 8. Brunner has observed that "we do not understand the 'end' God has in store unless we understand the 'beginning,' that is, the Creation. But we also misunderstand the beginning, the Creation, if we know nothing of the End." Emil Brunner, *The Divine Imperative*, trans. Olive Wyon (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1947), 127.

³⁴Bell notes that Egyptian temples are located in sacred time. He defines sacred time as referring to "the stability of the changeless or timeless realm of Osiris as Lord of the Dead and stresses the coinciding of beginning and end, first and last." Bell, "Divine Temple," 283, n10. Vermeulen notes the idea that sacred time is connected to the temple. "C'est pourquoi il faut périodiquement monter au sanctuaire et, par l'action rituelle, rejoindre le temps sacré de l'Origine; ainsi, les individus forment un seul peuple et retrouvent les énergies nécessaires à la vie." Vermeulen, *Jérusalem*, 30.

³⁵Westermann notes that the "final events cannot be portrayed in the language which we use when we speak of historical events. They lie beyond history, just as the primal events do." Claus Westermann, *Beginning and End in the Bible*, trans. Keith Crim (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), 22.

³⁶Leppäkari notes that "to focus on the end, not for the sake of the end in itself, but for its potential to bring about, or recreate, a new start. 'The end' is never just an end, but also a beginning." Maria Leppäkari, *The End Is a Beginning: Contemporary Apocalyptic Representations of Jerusalem* (Åbo: Åbo Akademi Förlag, 2002), 245. Egyptian understanding of time, which may have impacted the Hebrew understanding of time, is that time is "a spiral of patterned repetitions, a coil of countless rebirths." Shafer, "Temples," 2.

³⁷Walter Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1997), 646.

³⁸Hartman, "Eschatology," 489.

circumstances, whether those are the culmination of history, the earth, or this age, but this end of circumstances begins new circumstances.³⁹

Kelly writes about this hope and how eschatology brings dialogue between people about the future state of affairs as well as bringing hope for the future.⁴⁰ The future, as described by eschatological texts, is not about an end, so much as it is about a new life in a new age or in the last age or state of affairs of creation.

Eschatology refers to the “concept of the *eschata*, the last things. For these early human beings it was clear that the *eschata* are not simply things that occur at the end, but in a decisive way they influence present people and their well-being. Eschatology, therefore, is a comprehensive concept extending to this life and beyond.”⁴¹

Eschatological texts shift their expectation to the final time, a time of great peace, justice, and prosperity.⁴² Another example of the fact protology and eschatology use similar language is shown in how the eschatological water in the desert hearkens back to the water of Eden.⁴³ In order to study the *eschaton*, one must study creation, because the *eschaton* is creation, not just a part of creation.⁴⁴

³⁹John T. Carroll, “Eschatology,” *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. David Noel Freedman (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 420.

⁴⁰Anthony Kelly, *Eschatology and Hope* (New York: Orbis, 2006), 22.

⁴¹Hans Schwarz, *Eschatology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 25-26.

⁴²Craig A. Evans and Peter W. Flint, “Introduction,” in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Craig A. Evans and Peter W. Flint (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007), 2.

⁴³The eschatological water can be seen in Isa 43:20, 44:3, 49:10, 58:11, Jer 31:9, and Ezek 47:1-12. Hess uses the Tell Fakhariyah inscription to adduce nuances of the meaning of Eden: it means “to make abundant” and “refers to a garden of abundance, that is a garden that can be described as ‘luxuriant and fruitful.’ . . . We might more appropriately translate the word as ‘providing an abundance of water.’” Richard S. Hess, “Eden: A Well-Watered Place,” *Bible Review* 7, no. 6 (December 1991): 32. This insight is important given the fact that much of the land of Israel goes for four to five months of the year without rain and annual amounts range only from four to 36 inches. Alfred J. Hoerth, *Archaeology and the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1998), 77. Ezekiel describes the eschatological age with a river from the temple watering the dry land and reviving the Dead Sea.

⁴⁴“Creation presupposes eschatology. How so? If eschatology has as its theme the glorification of God, then such eschatology is the presupposition of creation.” Peter Scott, “The Future of Creation: Ecology and Eschatology,” in *The Future as God’s Gift: Explorations in Christian Eschatology*, ed. David Fergusson and Marcel Sarot (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2000), 92. Scott builds on the idea that an

The *eschaton* is not only creation anew; it is presenting a new order over the old as an improved creation. Therefore, in order to understand the new features of this new order, one must completely understand the old order. By definition, eschatology is the study of the last things, or times. Yet, the language of Isa 11:11, regarding the remnant that the Lord will reach out to save, hearkens back not only to the Exodus from Egypt, but to the remnant of Noah and his family.

Just as creation had deteriorated from its pristine state and experienced a cataclysmic event and a renewal,⁴⁵ eschatology is a study of an upcoming cataclysmic event as well as a renewal of creation. Haggai 2:6 depicts the eschatological events in the language of creation.⁴⁶ Isaiah and Ezekiel present eschatological events with descriptions of a new unspoiled creation. Psalm 95 shows a similar prophetic declaration with a call for renewal, as people are called to prostrate before God at the temple.⁴⁷

Second, both the past work of creation and the future work of the *eschaton* stem from the sovereignty of the Lord.⁴⁸ It is only the Lord who owns these events on the horizons of time.⁴⁹ “Creation is an ‘eschatological concept’ in that it teaches that, since

important theme of eschatology, bringing glory to God, is also an important theme of creation. Scott should be understood as presenting eschatology as an integral part of creation as “creation presupposes eschatology” in bringing glory to God.

⁴⁵This decline is depicted in Gen 4:1-6:4. The cataclysmic event is described in Gen 7:10-8:12. The renewal is delineated in Gen 9:1-11 culminating in the covenant of God.

⁴⁶Smith notes that Hag 2:6 depicts the *eschaton*. R. Smith, *Micah-Malachi*, 158.

⁴⁷Marvin E. Tate, *Psalms 51-100* (Waco: Word, 1990), 499. This psalm presents creation and the community entering into the Lord’s rest. This prophetic rest is an eschatological rest.

⁴⁸Westermann notes this idea of the sovereignty of the Lord by observing about creation that “the creator brought the world into being out of ‘chaos’ (Gen 1:2), and through a decision of the creator it can return to chaos (Gen 6-9), because he continues to be lord of the world.” Westermann, *Beginning*, 25.

⁴⁹Moltmann relates this idea of eternity to the sovereignty of the Lord by noting that “the temporal concept of eternity, as we know it from Platonism, is called upon in order to depict eschatology as being essentially a development of God’s sovereignty.” Jurgen Moltmann, *The Future of Creation*, trans. Margaret Kohl (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 26.

the beginning has been the fact of God, the end belongs to him.”⁵⁰ Protology and eschatology are congruent in composition in that these events flow freely from the sovereign God. It is the sovereignty of the Lord, demonstrated in Gen 1, which provides the understanding of the *eschaton*.⁵¹ The direct intervention into history in such an unambiguous and significant manner shows not only the capability of the Lord, but the intervention shows that the source of creation is from the Lord.⁵² “Thus eschatology in the broad sense has to do with the realization of the expected kingdom of God.”⁵³

Third, eschatology has to do with “creation,”⁵⁴ which is cosmic in scope.⁵⁵ The mountains, trees, and animals will be radically changed. Protology is the study of creation and its origin. Eschatology is the study about what happens to creation at a new beginning or origin. The creation narrative describes the pristine environment of the animals, trees, and of all creation. Eden is where the origin begins.⁵⁶ All in Eden

⁵⁰Jacques B. Doukhan, “The Literary Structure of the Genesis Creation Story” (ThD dissertation, Andrews University, 1978), 231.

⁵¹Pannenberg argues that “we can derive the expectation of a saving consummation of creation only from God’s eschatological work.” Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Systematic Theology*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 3:593.

⁵²Both the events of creation and the events of the *eschaton* show God’s direct actions. Westermann strongly states his case on the correlation between the beginning and the end. “This shows clearly and unequivocally that primal history and the history of the end correspond to each other in that both portray a direct confrontation between God and man such as is found nowhere else in the Bible.” Westermann, *Beginning*, 22.

⁵³John R. Stephenson, *Eschatology*, vol. 13 of *Confessional Lutheran Dogmatics* (Fort Wayne, IN: Luther Academy, 1993), 24.

⁵⁴Jones notes that “eschatology is about the destiny of humans and creation. . . . But eschatology is not just about humans; it is also about the destiny of the whole creation.” Joe R. Jones, *A Grammar of Christian Faith: Systematic Explorations in Christian Life and Doctrine* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2002), 2:690. Eschatology is “the doctrine of the last things, that is the ultimate destiny both of the individual soul and the whole created order.” *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (1997), s.v. “eschatology.”

⁵⁵“The word ‘eschatology’ comes from the Greek word *eschatos*, which means ‘last.’ Eschatology is thus the study of the final end of things, the ultimate resolution of the entire creation. So considered, eschatology is obviously cosmic in scope.” Jerry L. Walls, *The Oxford Handbook of Eschatology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 4.

⁵⁶Levenson notes that the *eschaton* for Ezekiel is explicitly depicted as Eden. Levenson, *Program of Restoration*, 34.

peacefully coexist as Adam names and interacts with the animals, although none of the animal kingdom is his counterpart.⁵⁷

A change develops within the creation narrative going from the peaceful interaction of Adam and the animals to a state of fear and animosity between humanity and the wild animals. However, the relationship between the animal kingdom and humanity in the *eschaton* will resemble that of Eden (Isa 11:6-9).⁵⁸ It is clear that all creation anticipates the restoration of Eden.⁵⁹ Ezekiel 47 shows the extent that nature will be changed.⁶⁰ The desert, which is the opposite of Eden in many ways, will become like Eden (Isa 51:3).⁶¹ Creation will be restored and the grandeur of the creation narrative can then begin anew. It is this return to the creation's origin that is the eschatological hope of some of the prophets.⁶²

⁵⁷Anderson describes the relationship between humanity and other animals by observing "the picture presented in the creation story is that of a paradisiacal peace in which human beings and animals live together in a peaceable kingdom." Bernhard W. Anderson, "Creation and Ecology," in *Creation in the Old Testament*, ed. Bernhard W. Anderson (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 163.

⁵⁸Aune also sees Eden here. "[T]he imagery of Isaiah's prophecy that 'the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid' (Isa 11:6), is a vision which conceptualizes the idyllic future in the imagery drawn from the myth of Eden." Aune, "Eschatology," 2:594-595.

⁵⁹Aune posits the optimistic return of Eden. "'Prophetic eschatology' it was claimed, was essentially an optimistic world view espoused by the classical Israelite prophets, who expected that God would ultimately transform the world by reinstating the lost Edenic conditions." *Ibid.*, 2:595.

⁶⁰Gage maintains with Ezekiel that the earth, especially Jerusalem, will change as "Edenic Zion will be the fulfillment of Eschatology." Gage, *Genesis*, 49.

⁶¹Cohn analyzes the Isaianic recreation, showing that when God turns the desert into a well-ordered and fertile place, "it is another way of foretelling the triumph of cosmos over chaos." Norman Cohn, *Cosmos, Chaos, and the World to Come* (New Haven, CT: Yale University, 1993), 145. The important concept presented both in this work and in Cohn's work is that the change of the desert into Eden is a beginning just as in the creation narratives. Order over chaos must be seen as a new beginning, protology and eschatology are bound together in Scripture and theology. Aune also declares "[i]n early Judaism the protological conditions described in Gen 2-3 became the source of imagery for the widespread belief that the ideal conditions which existed before the fall would be restored in the eschaton." Aune, "Eschatology," 2:598. Isaiah and Ezekiel have already been noted in addition to texts like Haggai. The prophets drew on the creation narratives as well as their cultural setting to present their message. "The idea of water as a symbol of life in the Ancient Near East is also used by the Prophets." I. Cornelius, "Paradise Motifs," *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 14 (1988): 60.

⁶²"[T]he Edenic city upon the cosmic mountain fully expresses the great redemptive hope of biblical eschatology." Gage, *Genesis*, 51. Barker holds that "[t]he prophets looked forward to a time when

Fourth, protology and eschatology show congruence in the fact that both are part of God's creative action. It is only God who created all of creation and it is only God who will create the new creation.⁶³ The study of the last times is an attempt to examine what creation becomes, what creation was created to be.⁶⁴ Just as the remnant of Noah's family began anew after the flood, creation anticipates the eschatological renewal.⁶⁵ The *eschaton* and creation are two events that are a part of a single plan or even a single work.⁶⁶ God's works in history are shown "in all these events. It is the same creative work which is being carried forward."⁶⁷ "We are justified in saying that Israel's unique conception of God as the God of history is the root of eschatology."⁶⁸

The distinction between the act of creation and the initiation of the *eschaton* blurs

the End would be like the Beginning, and everything would be restored to its original state." Barker, *Gate of Heaven*, 68.

⁶³The relationship between the beginning and the ending should not be seen as connected by the thread of history, but rather as a solid unity. On this point, Brunner writes that due to "the fact that, for us, time is divided into the past and the future on the boundary line of the present, we are obliged to conceive of God and His action in the twofold conception, although in God Himself this action is only one." Brunner, *Imperative*, 123.

⁶⁴This statement contends that "the God who created the world, created it for an *End*." Brunner, *Imperative*, 127. Pannenberg observes concisely that "the future of God will be the consummation of creation." Pannenberg, *Theology*, 454. God's plan is shown in Scripture and this plan depicts the end, the *eschaton*, as the culmination of all the preceding events. The contention that God has a plan for creation and that the *eschaton* is the final end of that plan is presented in Bromiley's work. "It contends for the truth that the God who created the world has a plan for it that he will unquestionably bring to fulfillment." Geoffrey W. Bromiley, "Eschatology: The Meaning of the End," in *God and Culture: Essays in Honor of Carl F. H. Henry*, ed. D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993), 75.

⁶⁵Kehm is correct in observing that "[i]t is the Noachic covenant and not the creation narratives that provide the source of hope for a new creation." George H. Kehm, "The New Story: Redemption as Fulfillment of Creation," in *After Nature's Revolt: Eco-Justice and Theology*, ed. Dieter T. Hessel (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1992), 93.

⁶⁶It is hard to separate eschatology and protology if the two are the same process of beginning creation afresh. Anderson describes the whole creation process starting from Eden and ending with the *eschaton* as a single narrative. "This initial phase of the unfolding story has a dynamic of its own: a movement from creation toward chaos and finally to a new beginning, indeed, a kind of new creation." Anderson, "Creation," 157.

⁶⁷Regin Prenter, *Creation and Redemption*, trans. Theodor I. Jensen (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), 197.

⁶⁸Sigmund Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, trans. G. W. Anderson (Oxford: Blackwell, 1956), 153.

as the two events have the same purpose.⁶⁹ As the earth and sky were created in Gen 1:1, so shall the new earth and sky be created (Isa 65:17). The initial creation and the *eschaton* are congruent as is seen by how they are both creations of God.⁷⁰ Even though eschatology is the study of the end times, it is an origin, not an end.⁷¹ There is no end of God or of being with God. If the new creation is a new beginning or origin, not an end, then eschatology can be viewed as congruent to protology.⁷²

The *eschaton* is part of the creative process originally started with Eden; the *eschaton* will complete the creation process.⁷³ There may be an attempt to distinguish the first creative act resulting in Eden from a later creative act resulting in the *eschaton* by the latter's terrifying aspects.⁷⁴ However, the aspects of the destructive flood of Genesis are equally terrifying and the flood is linked to the story of creation, and this destructive creation is a necessary part to the renewal, which can occur only after the flood.⁷⁵

⁶⁹“The end or goal of God’s saving action can only be the same as the end of God’s action as Creator.” Kehm, “New Story,” 105.

⁷⁰The *eschaton* is a beginning that “will correspond to an earlier beginning.” Nickelsburg, “Eschatology,” 2:592.

⁷¹Rahner is correct regarding the *eschaton* by noting “we can only speak of this beginning by describing it as a beginning.” Karl Rahner, *Theological Investigations*, trans. Kevin Smyth (London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1966), 4:336.

⁷²“In the beginning was God, the Creator, and his creation was very good and perfect. At the end it will be again as it was at the beginning: τα εσχάτα ως τα πρώτα. Redemption is then nothing other than the restoration of original creation with all its goodness: *restitution in integrum*. If we understand redemption in this way, in the light of creation and for the sake of creation, then we have a *protological understanding of eschatology*.” Moltmann, *Creation*, 116.

⁷³“‘Creation’ as the quintessence of God’s creative activity comprehends creation at the beginning, the creation of history, and the creation of the End-time. It embraces the initial creative activity, creative activity in history, and the eschatological consummation.” *Ibid.*, 119. Schuurman comments that “Creation and eschaton should be envisioned as basically continuous, so that the eschaton is the restoration and transformation of creation rather than its annihilation.” Douglas J. Schuurman, *Creation, Eschaton, and Ethics: The Ethical Significance of the Creation—Eschaton Relation in the Thought of Emil Brunner and Jürgen Moltmann* (New York: Peter Lang, 1991), 157.

⁷⁴The day of the Lord in prophetic texts indicates humbling and frightful events (Isa 13:9, Jer 46:10, Ezek 30:3, Joel 1:15, Amos 5:20, Obad 1:15, Zeph 1:14, Mal 4:5).

⁷⁵The flood narrative must not be separated from the rest of the creation narrative. “The creation of the world is in the context that also contains the possibility of its destruction. The story of the flood is just as much a part of the primal history as creation.” Westermann, *Beginning*, 25.

Weaving the theme of creation throughout, biblical texts present the history of God's people in a protological light.⁷⁶ The *eschaton* becomes a new origin, a new order,⁷⁷ a new environment, but it is creation fulfilled and righted to its Edenic origins anew.⁷⁸

Fifth, the understanding that "creation is forever" is another important issue regarding creation and the *eschaton*. There are eternal declarations in biblical texts (e.g., God giving Abram and his descendants the Promised Land forever in Gen 13:15). Moreover, the inclusiveness of all things within eternity shows an important congruous aspect between protology and eschatology. The covenant with Israel is a promise that the Lord will never break (Judg 2:1; Pss 105:8, 111:5, 9). The eternal covenant with Noah is with all of creation.

If the *eschaton* were a complete break with this creation in order to usher in a new creation, these everlasting covenants would not span the cataclysmic break. The covenants with Noah, Abraham, Moses, and David would be broken by the Lord's new

⁷⁶Referring to Second Isaiah, Nickelsburg writes, "Constitutive for Israel is the Exodus, which is described, however, in the language that is at home in Genesis 1-2; God has 'created,' 'formed,' and 'made' Israel. God's creation of Israel in the past is the guarantee of the coming salvation, which is depicted in heavily mythical language as a new Exodus led by God (52:11-12; 40:3-5, 9-11) and as a new creation." Nickelsburg, "Eschatology," 2:581.

⁷⁷Nickelsburg emphasizes the new order. "All the texts designated as 'eschatological' envision a decisive end to the present order and the beginning of a totally new order." Ibid., 2:580.

⁷⁸Although Nickelsburg is correct regarding the order, one must not forget the clear declaration from Scripture that creation is forever and that the *eschaton* is a renewal, not a completely new and different creation. Aune phrases the understanding this way from the point of view of the Christian Scriptures. "[T]he conditions of eschatological salvation are usually conceptualized as a restoration of primal conditions rather than an entirely new or utopian mode of existence with no links to the past." Aune, "Eschatology," 2:594-595. Kehm, using the Hebrew Scriptures, avers "the Isaianic school produced a vision of ultimate salvation as a transfigured cosmos, 'new heavens and a new earth' (Isa. 65:17ff.; note the repetition of Isa. 11:9ff.). 'New' here means a renewed, fulfilled version of the old, not a replacement of it by a totally new production, as if the old were simply abandoned." Kehm, "New Story," 98. Bauckham negotiates a balanced approach, but his claim matches both Kehm and Aune. "But Jewish eschatological hope was not just for the resurrection of individuals. It was hope for the future of God's whole creation. It was hope for *new* creation. . . . That the contrast between 'the first heaven and the first earth,' on the one hand, and the 'new heaven and the new earth,' on the other, refers to the eschatological renewal of this creation, not its replacement by another." Richard Bauckham, *New Testament Theology: The Theology of the Book of Revelation* (Cambridge: University Press, 1993), 49.

creation. God's steadfast loyalty, **נֶאֱמָר**, would become forever tarnished.⁷⁹ This rending of covenants is contradictory to the character of the God. The decrees are not always positive or unconditional, but there are many that are eternal.⁸⁰ These eternal covenants and statutes demonstrate that the new creation must be within the existing creation, not resulting in a brand-new creation.

Sixth, the theme of relationship, specifically about the restoration or renewing of the relationship between God and humanity, shows a congruency between protology and eschatology.⁸¹ Just as the *eschaton* is a time of restored relationships, Gen 3, 4, and 7-9 present God trying to restore relationship with humanity.⁸² At creation's origin, there was only God and through the creation of humanity, the relationship began.⁸³ When Eden

⁷⁹There are other eternal covenants, like the command to present the show-bread and incense (Lev 24:8) and that of the Sabbath (Exod 31:16). The show-bread, one might say, has been broken because it is not ongoing, but this is due to the fact that there is no dwelling place for God on earth for the show-bread to be placed. The eternal covenant of the Sabbath is a reminder of creation (Exod 20:11). This particular covenant would be pointless if that creation, of which the Sabbath is a reminder, would be gone. There are many other eternal commandments (**מִצְוֹת עוֹלָם**) such as the wardrobe of the priest. All the eternal statutes, ordinances, and covenants would be broken by the Lord if creation were wiped out to start afresh.

⁸⁰The curses of Deut 28:46, the statute that no Ammonite or Moabite shall be admitted to the assembly of the Lord (Deut 23:4), and the fact that the sword shall not depart from the house of David (2 Sam 12:10) are all eternal. The promise of forever can be altered. If the individual despises the Lord (1 Sam 2:30), it can be altered. Humanity can break an eternal covenant, though not eliminate one (Isa 24:5). The eternal covenant can be conditional (1 Chr 28:7) or unconditional (Ezek 43:7).

⁸¹Schuurman observes that protology and eschatology are linked in that both "[c]reation and eschaton are marked by celebration of and communion with" God. Schuurman, *Creation*, 157. Hinze notes that Schillebeeckx maintained a connection between protology and eschatology was solidly rooted in intimate relationship between God and humanity. Bradford E. Hinze, "Eschatology and Ethics," in *The Praxis of the Reign of God: An Introduction to the Theology of Edward Schillebeeckx*, ed. Mary Catherine Hilkert and Robert J. Schreier (New York: Fordham University Press, 2002), 174.

⁸²Among the many examples, Gen 3:21 presents God as providing clothes for humanity, Gen 4:15 has God protecting Cain, and Gen 9:12 shows God laying down a weapon and making a covenant relationship with humanity. God's creation of the universe and the end times are about renewing relationships. "Creation and redemption belong together. Creation is the beginning of redemption, and redemption is the consummation of creation." Prenter, *Creation*, 200.

⁸³Kaplan notes that the tabernacle and temple were to be a small Eden where humanity's fallen state would be excluded. Aryeh Kaplan and Abraham Sutton, *Innerspace: Introduction to Kabbalah, Meditation and Prophecy* (Jerusalem: Moznaim, 1990), 229. Although Kaplan uses the Midrash Rabbah, among other documents well after the destruction of the second temple, the Jewish tradition shows the continuation of the earlier tradition based on the tabernacle and temple.

comes again, relationships will be restored.⁸⁴ Eschatology is more than the study of the events of the end times;⁸⁵ it is about the saving actions of God by starting afresh in relationship.⁸⁶

The six congruencies presented above, between protology and eschatology, demonstrate that eschatology must be considered congruent to protology.⁸⁷ Each of the six congruencies detailed above represent strong correlations individually, perhaps even enough to verify that eschatology is congruent to protology. However, the combination of these six demonstrates conclusively that the *eschaton* and the creation are congruent. It should be clear by now that eschatology restores a relationship as it was in pristine times;

⁸⁴Pannenberg aptly phrases the nature of the divine/human relationship. “On the whole path from the beginning of creation by way of reconciliation to the eschatological future of salvation, the march of the divine economy of salvation is an expression of the incursion of the eternal future of God to the salvation of creatures and thus a manifestation of divine love.” Pannenberg, *Theology*, 646. Volf describes the intimate relationship between God and humanity by noting: “The eschatological bliss of God’s people in the presence of their God and the eschatological *shalom* of God’s world are two inseparable dimensions.” Miroslav Volf, “A Rhythm of Adoration and Action: A Response to Jürgen Moltmann,” in *All Together in One Place: Theological Papers from the Brighton Conference on World Evangelization*, ed. Harold D. Hunter and Peter D. Hocken (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 40.

⁸⁵The Lord’s work of the *eschaton* was the anticipated event that could end the exile. Cohn notes how “[t]he collapse of the kingdom of Judah, the capture of Jerusalem, the exile itself—these things represented a victory of chaos over cosmos. Only a god who in the beginning had converted primordial chaos into the ordered world could reestablish such a world.” Cohn, *Cosmos*, 153.

⁸⁶Von Rad declares: “The prophetic teaching is only eschatological when the prophets expelled Israel from the safety of the old saving actions and suddenly shifted the basis of salvation to a future action of God.” Gerhard Von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, trans. D. M. G. Stalker (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), 2:118. Lodahl expresses eschatology as the redemption of relationship noting that “a thoroughly Wesleyan eschatology does not posit an ‘end,’ as in a temporal closure point, for creation; rather, Wesleyan eschatology bears witness to God’s ‘end.’ As in an inner *telos* grounded in God’s character: God’s ‘end’ for us is that we human beings, those creatures fashioned to image God and thus to be God’s representatives in the world, would join our Maker in covenantal relationship and cooperation toward the redemption and mending of creation.” Michael Lodahl, *God of Nature and of Grace: Reading the World in a Wesleyan Way* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2003), 183.

⁸⁷Vos states that “[t]he correlate of eschatology is creation.” Geerhardus Vos and James T. Dennison, Jr., *The Eschatology of the Old Testament* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2001), 1. Vos may or may not agree here, as “correlate” can mean a relationship that is “causal, complementary, parallel, or reciprocal.” *Webster’s II New Riverside University Dictionary* (Boston: Riverside, 1984), s.v. “correlate.” However, the six congruencies detailed here argue for a congruent relationship. Gunkel cites an unknown author “*idou poiō ta eschata hōs ta prōta*” and goes on with “Er selber, das Alpha und Omega, der Erste und der Letzte, gestaltet das Letzte so, wie das Erste gewesen war. Will man wissen, wie das Ende sein werde, so muss man fragen, wie der Anfang gewesen sei.” Hermann Gunkel, *Schöpfung und chaos in urzeit und endzeit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1895), 369.

it is not an end. Eschatology reestablishes Eden, the original origin. “[E]schatology and creation are the reflections of one another in the past and in the future.”⁸⁸ Wensinck’s use of the term reflection may be misunderstood. The eschaton is a renewed creation and therefore may be, at least in parts, entirely new and different. The human understanding of the *eschaton* must not be too restricted since, after all, it is an action of God.

The Jerusalem Temple and Eschatology

With the above analysis showing that there are various origins to the relationship between the Jerusalem temple and eschatology, then these origins may indicate a role for the Jerusalem temple to accomplish in eschatological matters. The writings of this time period must be explored to obtain a solid understanding of the relationship between the temple and eschatology.⁸⁹ An origin of this relationship between the Jerusalem temple and eschatology is rooted in the creation symbolism in the temple. The temple is depicted as Eden.⁹⁰ This origin is linked closely to another origin of the relationship between the temple and eschatology, which is the fact that protology is congruent to eschatology as shown above. Logic dictates that if $a=b$ and $b\cong c$, then $a\cong c$. More in line with the language of this work, it has been shown that the Jerusalem temple is equivalent symbolically to Eden and creation (i.e., protology). Also, it has been shown that protology is congruent to eschatology.

Therefore, it is logical to assert that the Jerusalem temple is congruent to

⁸⁸A. J. Wensinck, “The Semitic New Year and the Origin of Eschatology,” *Acta Orientalia* I (1923): 181.

⁸⁹Frost succinctly relates that it is “from the time of the Exile onwards the principle *Endzeit wird Urzeit* operates at full strength.” Frost, “Eschatology and Myth,” 80.

⁹⁰Price notes that “the Temple as a microcosmic world was the site of unpolluted holiness, a true paradisiacal garden, made after the pattern of the heavenly Eden (Ezek 28:13-14; Isa 51:3). Every later development of the concept of the eschatological Temple is derived in some manner from this cosmic paradigm outlined in Tanakh.” John Randall Price, “The Desecration and Restoration of the Temple as an Eschatological Motif in the Tanach, Jewish Apocalyptic Literature, and the New Testament” (PhD dissertation, University of Texas Austin, 1993), 94.

eschatology. “The Temple serves, among many other things, as a survival of the primal paradise lost to the ‘profane’ world, the world outside the sanctuary (Latin, *fanum*) and as a prototype of the redeemed world envisioned by some to lie ahead. It connects the protological and the eschatological, the primal and the final, preserving Eden and providing a taste of the World-to-Come.”⁹¹ The origins of the relationship between the Jerusalem temple and eschatology that are established upon the links to creation and creation’s link to eschatology display the foundations of why Israel might expect the Jerusalem temple to play a role in coming eschatological matters.⁹²

Second temple Jewish writings, both canonical and non-canonical, show an emphasis on the Jerusalem temple and posit a relationship between the temple and eschatology and, therefore, merit investigation.⁹³ This relationship is not dependent upon a human messiah, although a human messiah is sometimes an element of eschatology. “Eschatology could and often did exist without the figure of a Messiah but never without the thought of God’s dwelling in the midst of his people.”⁹⁴ The temple is more than a

⁹¹Jon D. Levenson, *Resurrection and the Restoration of Israel: The Ultimate Victory of the God of Life* (New Haven: Yale, 2006), 90.

⁹²Turner notes the four functions of sacred space as center, meeting point, microcosm and a presence of the transcendent in the world. Harold W. Turner, *From Temple to Meeting House: The Phenomenology and Theology of Places of Worship* (The Hague: Mouton, 1979). However, he does not explore the expectation of what the sacred space accomplishes for the earthly surroundings, both people and land. Eliade notes that in religion, creation can be seen as erupting from the sacred space and that the sacred space breaking into existence effects relationship between sacred and profane and causes evolution of the cosmos. Mircea Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*, trans. Willard R. Trask (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1959), 63. Yet, this general principle is only half of the picture; the expectations of the people for the effects of this relationship on the land and the people are left unexplored.

⁹³Ackroyd may be correct in his observation about scholars’ ideas that hold “[l]atter prophecy, because it does not always seem to show a direct concern with questions of ‘morality’, is thought to be lower than earlier prophecy; its concern, too, with cultic matters, such as rebuilding the Temple and the reorganization of a pure worship, is evaluated as lower than the ideal of a religion without a Temple, a worship without cultus.” Peter R. Ackroyd, *Exile and Restoration: A Study of Hebrew Thought of the Sixth Century B.C.* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968), 5. This may be part of the reason why the relationship between the temple and eschatology still needs to be explored. By some, it appears the temple is only a vestige of the past that needs to be left in the past.

⁹⁴McKelvey, *New Temple*, viii.

symbol in second temple Jewish writings as is shown in this emphasis;⁹⁵ the temple stands at the center of different theological declarations in some second temple Jewish writings with a key role to play in restoration.⁹⁶

God, as announced through second temple Jewish writings, has connected restoration with worship at the Jerusalem temple. “Without a properly built temple, that is a ritually correct place for the worship of God, such worship is impossible. This is not because God is thought of as being limited to the Temple, but because this is what he has chosen.”⁹⁷ However, further investigation into the relationship between the Jerusalem temple and eschatology is needed to understand the effects of the destruction of the first temple and the exile in second temple Judaism.⁹⁸

⁹⁵Porteous maintains that Jerusalem, the place of the temple, became only a symbol of the universal kingdom that is to come. Norman W. Porteous, “Jerusalem-Zion: The Growth of a Symbol,” in *Berbannung und Heimkehr Beiträge zur Geschichte und Theologie Israels im 6. und 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* ed. Wilhelm Rudolph (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1961), 236.

⁹⁶Leppäkari notes that “issues of the Temple Mount play a key role in redemption.” Leppäkari, *The End*, 195.

⁹⁷Ackroyd, *Exile*, 160.

⁹⁸Mintz and Deitsch note how the central “belief that a rebuilt Temple signifies the Messianic era, a time when the city of Jerusalem will be the center of the world, permeates the philosophy of Judaism.” Sharon L. Mintz and Elka Deitsch, *Towards the Eternal Center: Israel, Jerusalem and the Temple* (New York: Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1996), 7.

CHAPTER 3

REVIEW AND CRITIQUE OF THE LITERATURE WITH REGARD TO THE ESCHATOLOGICAL ROLE OF THE JERUSALEM TEMPLE

Introduction

Different scholars discuss and cite the eschatological temple of second temple Jewish writings, but this is a problem, since this research area is vague and broad. What makes it eschatological? What role does the temple perform in relation to the eschatological time frame? Is the temple built before the *eschaton*? Who builds the temple? Some of these questions have been addressed and some have not been addressed. As a beginning into the investigation on any eschatological role of the Jerusalem temple, a review of pertinent literature needs to be presented. Yet, in ten years of research into the field that includes eschatology and the Jerusalem temple with focus on what the role of the physical Jerusalem temple is expected to be in the second temple Jewish writings, one sentence in one work has been uncovered. That is everything, one sentence.¹

No scholars discuss or cite any eschatological role of the Jerusalem temple in bringing about the beginning of the new age.² The scope of this analysis deals with the second temple Jewish writings, but this same dearth of work on the eschatological role of the Jerusalem temple extends to writings before this period as well. The same could be

¹This sentence of Haran is reviewed below and given here. “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.” Menahem Haran, *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into Biblical Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School* (1978; repr., Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 45.

²Particular second temple Jewish texts do cause some to dismiss perfunctory any eschatological temple entirely and, therefore, some would dismiss any role that it would have performed.

said for ancient writings after the second temple time period. Therefore, the best review and critique of literature of the intersection, or overlap, between eschatology and the Jerusalem temple would only review this one sentence. With only one sentence to be reviewed, this would be a one-page review that would not be productive or helpful.

In evaluating the diverse second temple Jewish writings, several approaches to writings that address the Jerusalem temple have been used. An obvious place to start off a brief presentation of different approaches is with the simple methodology that merely skips the mention of the temple in the analysis. For example, Jacobson does not evaluate the mention of the temple in *L.A.B.* 56:2.³ A different approach, on a different text, is given by Tiller who denies that the temple is even in the picture in *1 En.* 90:20-31.⁴

Other secondary sources show other approaches to ancient texts. For example, some focus of analysis of the temple in *Jub.* 1 is more on whether God or humanity will build the temple.⁵ In 4Q174, some approaches seem to focus on whether the physical temple is in view with the phrase מִקְדָּשׁ אֱלֹהִים,⁶ or whether this document holds to a temple that is not a physical building.⁷ Regarding 11Q19, the Temple Scroll, the different approaches to the text seem to focus on whether the plan for the temple building is to be accomplished before or after the new age to come, as well as whether it is built by God or

³Howard Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 2:1150.

⁴P. A. Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 20-51.

⁵Charles holds that humanity built the second temple, the temple of *Jubilees*. Robert Henry Charles, *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902), 5. VanderKam holds that God, not humanity, will build the temple. James C. VanderKam, "The Scroll and the Book of *Jubilees*," in *Temple Scroll Studies*, ed. George J. Brooke (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 232.

⁶Fujita, "Temple Theology," 318-319.

⁷Michael O. Wise, "4QFlorilegium and the Temple of Adam," *Revue de Qumran* 15 (1991): 103-132.

humanity. One position holds that the temple will be built by God in the new age.⁸ Another position has humanity building the temple before the new age.⁹ A third position is that humanity will build one temple and God will build the next temple.¹⁰

Even regarding proto-canonical works such as Haggai, Ezekiel, and Isaiah, different approaches to the temple texts exist. Concerning Ezek 40–48, views differ, such as those of Tuell,¹¹ who does not hold that the temple text depicts a physical temple on earth, and Levenson, who holds to a physical building program described by this vision.¹² Rabbinic analyses have highlighted the fact that a *halachic* problem exists with the layout of Ezek 40-42 in that it differs from the legally binding instructions given to David and brought about by Solomon.¹³

Another problem in Jewish literature is the difference of opinion between *Rambam* and *Rashi*. *Rambam* holds that this temple will be built by humanity whereas *Rashi* holds that this temple will descend from the sky fully built.¹⁴ Regarding Haggai, views differ on whether the language, and, therefore, the temple within the language, pertains to a new age.¹⁵ Concerning Isa 66:1-4, positions differ on whether the text is

⁸Ben Z. Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness* (Cincinnati, OH: Hebrew Union College: 1983), 27.

⁹Sidnie W. Crawford, *The Temple Scroll and Related Texts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 28.

¹⁰Michael O. Wise, “The Eschatological Vision of the Temple Scroll,” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 49 (1990): 161.

¹¹Tuell, “Verbal Icon,” 649-664.

¹²J. D. Levenson, *Program of Restoration*, 44.

¹³Moshe Eisemann, *Yechezkel: The Book of Ezekiel: A New Translation with a Commentary Anthologized from Talmudic, Midrashic, and Rabbinic Sources* (Brooklyn, NY: Mesorah, 2009), 605.

¹⁴This is summarized by Eisemann. *Ibid.*, 606.

¹⁵Von Rad holds that Haggai is describing the new age. Gerhard von Rad, *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, trans. E. W. Trueman Dicken (London: Oliver and Boyd, 1965), 240. March holds that Haggai is not describing the new age. W. Eugene March, “The Book of Haggai: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections,” *New Interpreter’s Bible*, ed. Leander E. Keck et al. (Nashville: Abingdon, 1996), 7:723.

postulating that God does not need a physical temple. However, in all the analyses of the second temple Jewish writings, no one has examined any role that the physical temple in Jerusalem is anticipated to perform, eschatologically, for the people.

Why is there such a dearth of study into this field? Perhaps von Rad gives the reason. Without much further investigation into the post-exilic prophets and second temple Jewish writings apart from Haggai and Zechariah, von Rad notes a basic reason why an analysis into the Jerusalem temple's part in the coming new age may have been overlooked. Haggai and Zechariah bring their prophecies to a climax with the coming of the Lord and the reign of God on earth. Regarding this message of the advent of the Lord and establishing the Lord's kingdom, von Rad observes, "To the great embarrassment of not a few of the commentators, this message is linked most closely to the rebuilding of the Temple in Jerusalem which had been destroyed by the Babylonians; the link is, indeed, so close that for these two prophets the rebuilding of the Temple is actually the necessary precondition" of the Lord's return to Israel and the establishment of the kingdom of God.¹⁶

Yet, von Rad puts forth nothing that would make this review and critique of this field. The precondition, itself, of the Jerusalem temple has not been fully investigated nor has any role performed by the temple in this coming kingdom of God, perhaps due to the embarrassment von Rad mentions.

Therefore, this review will be widened to incorporate works that deal with eschatology and the Jerusalem temple with no focus on what is the focus of this study: the role of the Jerusalem temple in this field. This broadening has the productive effect of presenting a broader look at a field that still needs emphasis. However, the drawback to this review on a topic where no work addresses the topic of this current work, excluding one sentence, is that there is no way to compare works to or on the current focus of this

¹⁶Von Rad, *OT Theology*, 2:281.

work. Thus, there is no synthesis or grouping of the texts since all the works equally miss the topic. There is no way to ascertain why these works failed to address the topic under consideration, which would be the best way, if known, to synthesize these works on this topic. Thus, if the authors explicitly stated why they chose not to address this topic, then these works could be grouped and synthesized by the reasons why they chose not to address this topic. Yet, the following chronological exploration illuminates what aspects of the Jerusalem temple and the presence of the Lord in that temple in relationship to the new age to come have been investigated.

The scope of this review requires at a minimum two things to be included in the secondary source: that it covered the physical Jerusalem temple to come after the destruction of the first physical Jerusalem temple and that it covered the new order or state of affairs to come, commonly called the eschatological age, although the actual end of affairs is highly debatable. If a secondary source covered the same second temple Jewish text as covered in this analysis (e.g., Ezek 40–48) but did not consider that text as pertaining to a physical Jerusalem temple to come or to a new order or state of affairs that could be viewed as eschatological, then this source would not be covered here.

Review

For the eschatological analysis that takes the Jerusalem temple into account, this review starts with Causse's writings. He explores the growth of the belief, myth as he called it, in the new Jerusalem.¹⁷ He explored the Babylonian, Persian, Hellenistic, and Egyptian influences upon the people, priests, and leaders of Israel. Tracing the history of Israel before and after the destruction of the Northern and Southern kingdoms, he finds growth in the idea of the gathering of all the people to the Jerusalem temple to worship God, starting from the text of Deutero-Isaiah and continuing through other Jewish

¹⁷Antonin Causse, "Le mythe de la nouvelle Jérusalem du Deutero-Esaie a la IIIe Sibylle," *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 18 (1938): 377-414.

documents, to include some from the second century CE. He credits a “school of Ezekiel,” along with Deutero-Isaiah, with the development of new, important ideas in prophetic eschatology that founded the idea of a new Jerusalem.¹⁸

Causse holds that these developments in eschatology were from the influences of the environment caused by the Babylonian exile, not crediting the effects of the loss of the temple on the developments in eschatology. He recognized the development within the ancient Jewish writings claiming that there would be an intervention into human history by God, which would move creation from the present age into the eschatological age,¹⁹ but he placed no emphasis on the role of the temple in this divine intervention.²⁰ Although paying no attention to the role of the temple, its loss or expected new building, Causse’s exploration into the development of eschatology in the period after the destruction of the Solomonic temple presents an analysis that parallels this present undertaking.

The next important work is Schmidt’s examination of how the closeness of God to the world in general, and to Israel specifically, is understood within the prophetic writings of biblical texts.²¹ Schmidt focuses on the struggle for the right understanding between prophet and cult over how the closeness of God to creation is manifested and, therefore, what the temple (by this usage he means temple, cult, practice, and temple theology) means within the corpus of biblical texts. Schmidt sees a true closeness of God manifested in judgment and that the temple, both former and future, is a sign or symbol to

¹⁸Ibid., 380.

¹⁹Ibid., 382. He also stresses the different ages elsewhere. Antonin Causse, “De la Jérusalem terrestre à la Jérusalem céleste,” *Revue d’Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuse* 18 (1938): 21.

²⁰Causse refers to the paradise on the mountain of God or to Jerusalem, the city of the temple, but does not investigate the temple. Causse, “De la Jérusalem terrestre à la Jérusalem céleste,” 33.

²¹Martin Schmidt, *Prophet und Tempel: Eine Studie zum Problem der Gottenähe im Alten Testament* (Zurich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1948).

Israel of that nearness and/or a future promise of nearness.²² His study examines the enigma of why God has an attachment to this small unworthy people.²³

Schmidt examines prophetic writings that are before and after the destruction of the Solomonic temple. The ethical struggle of the prophets before the destruction of the temple is viewed as trying to overcome the temple.²⁴ Schmidt holds that the nearness of God is displayed through the prophetic writings, such as Jeremiah and Ezekiel, even without a temple. The temple in Ezekiel is seen as important since the prophet claims a new temple will seal the immanence of God in the new Israel.²⁵ Again, this ongoing emphasis that the temple is a sign, a seal, or a reminder of the promise does mean that temple building is necessary for the true closeness of God. The servant songs in Deutero-Isaiah are seen as a much more direct representation of the closeness of God than is the understanding of the temple.²⁶ Schmidt goes so far as to hold that Haggai contributed to the narrowing and legal formulation of the Israelite religion.²⁷ The sign, not role, of the temple shows that the closeness of God comes from God's actions taken with humanity.²⁸ Schmidt does maintain that for second temple Judaism, the temple is both an eschatological hope and a place of redemption.²⁹ However, throughout his work, Schmidt

²²Ibid., 13, 214.

²³Ibid., 184.

²⁴Ibid., 18. Notice that Schmidt's usage of the word "Tempel" is quite expansive.

²⁵“[S]ondern weil ein neuer Tempel endgültige Offenbarungsnähe Jahves in einem neuen Israel besiegeln wird.” Ibid., 156. This view that the temple seals the final eschatological nearness of God with the people avoids the point of the current research, to find out what role the temple, the actual structure, is expected to perform for the people and for all of creation.

²⁶Ibid., 190-191.

²⁷Ibid., 197.

²⁸Ibid., 210. This ignores humanity's part in building the Jerusalem temple, as well as ignoring the use and function of the temple by maintaining that there is no role for the temple; it is merely a signpost to something else.

²⁹He holds that “ist der Tempel einerseits Gegenstand der eschatologischen Hoffnung, andererseits Ort gegenwärtiger Heilserfahrung.” Ibid., 219.

treats the temple as a sign, not a dwelling of God. The temple, itself, has no role to play in eschatological matters. Schmidt avers no role for the temple; he sees the Jerusalem temple as merely the final mark of God's true salvation.³⁰

Although choosing to concentrate on three eschatological passages from the Hebrew Scriptures, where two of the three are not directly focused on the temple building, Plöger's analysis presents issues relevant to the issue of this work.³¹ Plöger claims that Scripture does not see an eschatological need for the Jerusalem temple. Plöger agrees with Rudolph when noting that "Rudolph's argument that the Chronicler was so convinced of the embodiment of his theocratic ideal within the Jewish community that there was no longer any need of eschatological expectation is undoubtedly correct."³² Plöger uses Isa 24–27, Zech 12–14, and Joel as the basis for his demonstration of the transformation in eschatology.

Plöger discusses prophetic eschatology, apocalyptic eschatology,³³ and opponents to the eschatological faith showing developments within the Jewish faith of the post-exilic leaders of different eschatological groups.³⁴ The prophetic eschatological outlook was "the future hope of a nation which was conscious of being separate from the other nations of the world as a result of its relationship to God, although it did not overlook the significance of this for the other nations, pressing, in fact, towards a consummation of creation without surrendering its own privileges."³⁵

³⁰"Der Tempel ist in keiner Weise Instrument der Heilsverwirklichung, sondern abschließendes Zeichen der Heilswirklichkeit." Ibid., 161.

³¹Otto Plöger, *Theocracy and Eschatology*, trans. S. Rudman (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1968). Note, the first edition of this work dates to 1959.

³²Ibid., 40. He is correct regarding Chronicles, but this is only one second temple Jewish writing. To allow the Chronicler to have the only say in the matter does not do justice to other works of the period.

³³Ibid., 50.

³⁴Ibid., 94, 96.

³⁵Ibid., 50.

Plöger discusses the “transformation of eschatological expectations.”³⁶ He contends that his selections of passages show a growth from a restoration eschatology to a conglomeration that includes a more apocalyptic form of eschatology as well.³⁷ He holds that the tension between the priestly leaders and the eschatological prophecies led to a diminished view of eschatology.³⁸ However, the marginalized group holding on to eschatological prophecies may not have let go of much of the work and ideas of the Priestly Writing, which gives rise to eschatological ideas reviewed by this present work. Although not focusing on Haggai and Zechariah or their theology, Plöger claims that these prophets “made the coming of salvation dependent on the erection of the Temple.”³⁹

The next work under consideration is a seminal work that is often cited in temple studies by Clements, although for the most part, he avoids the arena of eschatology. Clements studies the “meaning and theological significance of the Jerusalem temple as a witness to the presence of God in Ancient Israel” in his important work *God and Temple*.⁴⁰ His work on the Jerusalem temple acknowledges the evolution of the institution of the temple into eschatological expectations of the presence of God with the community.⁴¹ Clements holds that the presence of the Lord is the key element in the restoration of the community and the social and cultic organizations. The ending verse of Ezekiel, which presents the new name of Jerusalem, gives Clements the key significance of the restored remnant of Israel: “The Lord is there.”⁴² Integral to the developing faith of

³⁶Ibid.

³⁷Ibid., 108.

³⁸Ibid., 110.

³⁹Ibid., 33.

⁴⁰Clements, *God and Temple*, ix.

⁴¹Ibid., xi.

⁴²Ibid., 106.

Israel is the belief that the transformation of the Land into the Garden of Eden and the full return of the people to the land were not abandoned; they were only deferred, expected at the origin of the eschatological age.⁴³

Clements notes the changes in the understanding of the Jerusalem temple that came at the time of the destruction of the first temple and with the exilic and post-exilic prophets; the presence of the Lord in Jerusalem takes on important effects for the people and the land. “Thus both Haggai and Zechariah took up the deferred hope of the returned exiles and promised that in the near future, when the temple was rebuilt, and true worship re-established, then the glowing hopes of Deutero-Isaiah would be fulfilled.”⁴⁴

This trajectory, presented by Clements, is close to the line of investigation of this present study. However, he did not evaluate the critique of the first temple presented by Ezekiel and other writings. The absence of this analysis of the critique on the temple left Clements with the idea that even after the rebuilding of the second temple was realized, “[t]he promise of the fullness of the divine presence on earth remained a central feature of the eschatological hopes of the post-exilic community.”⁴⁵ If Clements had included the analysis of the critique on the first temple, he might have recognized that the form of the temple played an important part, not merely its existence.

The roadmap of the prophets to the eschatological age is left to the reader to ponder without the important aspect of the correct nature of the temple in Jerusalem being investigated. The correct nature of the Jerusalem temple is approached in second temple Jewish writings in terms of its physical layout (e.g., in Ezekiel and the Temple Scroll) and in terms of its holy nature (e.g., in Sirach), as well as other aspects.

Clements also left the timetable of eschatological events vague whereas many of

⁴³Ibid., 123.

⁴⁴Ibid., 125.

⁴⁵Ibid.

the second temple Jewish writings are not that vague.⁴⁶ Furthermore, he concludes his understanding of the transformation of the temple with the idea that “old answers were no longer valid and Judaism resorted to its eschatology to provide the solution, or gave up altogether seeking the answer in this world, and averred that only in heaven would the ancient promises be fulfilled.”⁴⁷

In his influential work on the Christian Scriptures, McKelvey explores the role of the temple as an image of the church in the Christian Scriptures.⁴⁸ The preliminary steps of his research investigate the Hebrew Scriptures, second temple Jewish writings, and Greek writings. His background research notes important conclusions regarding the Jerusalem temple and eschatology. He observes that “eschatology has as its central idea the regathering and reunion of Israel at the divine dwelling.”⁴⁹ Also a similar, tangential conclusion is that his work shows “that the new temple is the central idea of Jewish eschatology from its very beginning.”⁵⁰ These results express his view that the Hebrew Scriptures and other second temple Jewish writings do indeed focus on the temple in eschatological matters.

Fujita investigates the Jerusalem temple in terms of the way in which the writings of Qumran used Ezekiel’s temple theology in their own writings.⁵¹ Tracing influences of Ezekiel’s theology of the Jerusalem temple through the Jewish writings of the exilic and post-exilic periods, Fujita shows how the temple theology of the book of Ezekiel is absorbed and amplified in the Qumran writings. He concludes that Ezekiel had a

⁴⁶The timetable of eschatological events is addressed in many different second temple period works that are addressed in this research. For a clear example, see *1 En.* 90:20-31.

⁴⁷*Ibid.*, 134.

⁴⁸McKelvey, *New Temple*.

⁴⁹*Ibid.*, 12.

⁵⁰*Ibid.*, 22.

⁵¹Fujita, “Temple Theology.”

profound effect on the foundation of Qumran's temple theology.

Fujita's work provides insight into the evolution of Ezekiel's temple theology for later second temple Jewish writings. Using a methodology of examining each later text and comparing it with the book of Ezekiel, Fujita's work investigates many of the second temple Jewish writings in the hunt for Qumran's temple theology origins. Fujita shows that the destruction of the Jerusalem temple was an important event that changed the understanding of the temple for later writers.

Fujita's methodology at times uses broad strokes to cover over important disputes. One such area upon which he uses broad strokes is the temple of Ezek 40–48. He declares, without exploration, that it is a heavenly temple and not a vision meant for humanity, or God, to build or create.⁵² Since he avers this, he avoids the issue of the purpose of Ezek 40–48 as well as the question of how the temple is constructed.⁵³ Fujita postulates, "The precedence of the pious Jews over the physical temple which is characteristically seen in the writings of the Diaspora, may be traced back to an exilic prophet, Ezekiel."⁵⁴

Thus, Fujita holds that the book of Ezekiel is the source of marginalization of the physical temple in later writings. Again, this ignores others who hold that the physical temple is held in high regard in the book of Ezekiel. His analysis of the Jewish writings of the last two centuries BCE includes the Targums, which furthers his argument. However, he does not take into account the dating of the Targums, which were probably written, at least in final form, after the time period addressed in his work. This dating issue needed to be addressed for his work to include them within his scope.

Fujita's conclusion on 4Q174 agrees with a segment of scholars that the sanctuary

⁵²Ibid., 82.

⁵³Ibid., 85.

⁵⁴Ibid., 203.

of man (מקדש אדם) is a spiritual temple, an opinion with which many, if not most, disagree, and this conclusion is fundamental in shaping his analysis. Since no other Jewish document in the scope of his analysis contained the understanding of a spiritual temple, Fujita proposes that a spiritual temple was original to Qumran. Yet, his flawed understanding of 4Q174 led him to propose this faulty conclusion,⁵⁵ which was the basis for him to make a highly questionable claim about Ezek 20:40-41, that the physical temple was not meant in this passage.⁵⁶ This caused Fujita's analysis to completely lose touch with the Jerusalem temple altogether.

In his work on the last nine chapters of Ezekiel, Levenson investigates restoration within Ezekiel.⁵⁷ He examines the temple, the messiah, the land, and the priests in the time of the restoration within the text of Ezekiel by the school of Ezekiel. Levenson takes on many topics and events within the text of Ezekiel, but of most importance to this present investigation is his theology of the temple. He delves into the mythic backgrounds of the Zion and Eden traditions and how these are manifested in the theology of the Jerusalem temple. He observes the importance of the temple and its crucial character: "This centrality of Jerusalem and its Temple to the cosmic and historical order of the world is one of several mythic elements which the restoration program receives from the older Zion traditions."⁵⁸

The centrality of the temple in the book of Ezekiel along with other passages in the Hebrew Scriptures, which Levenson investigates, gives insights into the functions of the temple. "The Temple service in a sense incarnates the new relationship made known

⁵⁵Ibid., 319.

⁵⁶Ibid.

⁵⁷J. D. Levenson, *Program of Restoration*.

⁵⁸Ibid., 10.

in the deliverance.”⁵⁹ The temple is the unique place that is the focus of Ezekiel and, therefore, has needed (and still needs) evaluation, which Levenson shows has taken place to some extent. “In Rabbinic eschatology, the goal of Israel’s deliverance is the Land of Israel, centered on the rebuilt Temple.”⁶⁰ The eschatological character of the temple is peripherally examined, but the role the temple plays in the upcoming events of the future is not broached.

Levenson also explores the relationship between divine action and human action, especially when it comes to the temple. Levenson shows that the eschatological vision of Ezek 40-48 is a program meant for human action. With the text of Ezekiel, as well as other texts from the Hebrew Scriptures, Levenson notes that “man can hasten the eschatological era by his deeds.”⁶¹ Levenson’s illumination of the idea that the deeds of humanity are important to the program and progress of the restoration presented in Ezekiel is vital to understanding the book of Ezekiel and the temple theology embedded in the book, and this understanding plays an important part of this present work. The vision of the temple (Ezek 40:1–43:12) is given to the prophet to report it to the people so as to accomplish the vision. “In sum, the order defined by the vision is still a goal to be effected through human striving and was understood as such by the tradition.”⁶²

In his influential work, Haran focuses on the essence of the temple and the phenomena that go along with the temple in Israel.⁶³ Although most of Haran’s text is devoted to the cultic implements and sacrifices, temple furniture and personnel, as well as the tabernacle, Haran has points to make about the Jerusalem temple building. He notes

⁵⁹Ibid., 8.

⁶⁰Ibid., 33.

⁶¹Ibid., 48.

⁶²Ibid., 46.

⁶³Haran, *Temples*, 1.

that it is important to understand the foundation of the temple as the dwelling place of the Lord.⁶⁴

However, the important avenue that Haran opens up, without detailing, is an eschatological character that developed after the destruction of the first Jerusalem temple. Haran states that at that time Judaism began “turning the temple’s restoration into an eschatological expectation.”⁶⁵

The writings of the second temple period present the Jerusalem temple as an entity in transition. Haran presents one sentence key to this current research. Referring to the second temple, he writes, “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.”⁶⁶ This vague comment has sparked at least some debate, with Petersen wondering, “Did the temple become an ‘eschatological symbol’? If so, how did that symbol work?”⁶⁷

Haran writes in another work that “[t]he temple was 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.”⁶⁸ Haran shows that “[i]n the Jewish prayer book, the plea for restoring worship to the temple and reinstating the priests in their service is still one of the central expressions of eschatological expectation.”⁶⁹

⁶⁴“Since, by its very nature, a temple was considered to be a divine dwelling-place it was equipped with furnishings that would symbolize the divine presence in that house.” Ibid., 16.

⁶⁵Ibid., 44.

⁶⁶Ibid., 45. His next sentence explains that this was one reason why it was beyond the scope of his research.

⁶⁷David L. Petersen, “The Temple in Persian Period Prophetic Texts” in *Second Temple Studies: 1. Persian Period*, ed. Philip R. Davies (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 126.

⁶⁸Menahem Haran, “Temple and Community in Ancient Israel,” in *Temple in Society*, ed. Michael V. Fox (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1989), 22.

⁶⁹Ibid., 20.

From the destruction of the first Jerusalem temple to the *Siddur*, the Jewish prayer book, many centuries later, the Jerusalem temple maintained a presence, even when the temple itself was in ruins. If this symbol is “to be resurrected only at the end of days” (i.e., as an eschatological expectation of the Jerusalem temple presented as a symbol), then Haran does not assign, explain, or explore any eschatological role of this symbol, the Jerusalem temple. Thus, Haran’s work notes the concept that may be the heart of this work, but does not flush out any of its details. Haran’s concept of an eschatological expectation of the Jerusalem temple may be an undeclared eschatological role for temple. Did Haran envision this current research?

In his introduction to the second edition of his work on eschatology, Gowan introduces his topic by questioning the meaning of eschatology.⁷⁰ It is a study of the end, but end of what? Although there are a few eschatological passages that predate the destruction of the Jerusalem temple (e.g., Zeph 3:14-20), they may look more to the end of struggle or war. After the destruction of the Jerusalem temple, the eschatology in the Hebrew Scriptures looks to an end of exile from God and the Promised Land. The Scriptures look to a restoration of relationship between God and people as well as the Land and the people.⁷¹ Yet, Gowan, in his investigation, does not emphasize the temple. His first chapter is on the centrality of Zion and mentions that in Ezek 37 a sanctuary will be established, though he does not investigate the temple or its role in eschatology.⁷²

One of the two discoveries that led Gowan to organize his work on eschatology is the fact that “Jerusalem appears with a prominence unparalleled by any other theme. It was surprising to find a ‘center’ of OT eschatology, but the evidence strongly suggests

⁷⁰Gowan, *Eschatology*, viii. The first edition was published in 1986.

⁷¹Gowan notes that most eschatological passages in the Hebrew Scriptures are presented from an exilic context. *Ibid.*, 21.

⁷²Gowan concludes that this chapter is about Jerusalem. Again, this highlights the fact that he misses the role of the temple in eschatology. *Ibid.*, 128.

Jerusalem does play such a role.”⁷³ Gowan recognizes that after the fall of the Jerusalem temple in 70 CE, 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch contain shifts away from the earthly Jerusalem to heavenly Jerusalem.⁷⁴ Gowan does not develop the role of the temple in either the earlier or the later view; he just notes the change.

Gowan’s thematic approach to Old Testament eschatology is focused on three issues of transformation: on the individual, on human society, and on creation.⁷⁵ A foundational scriptural passage for Gowan’s work is Ezek 36:24-32. Gowan focuses on the new spirit within humanity as the enabling power to follow God’s commandments. Yet, Gowan ignores the assertion in that passage (Ezek 36:27) that it is God’s action that gives humans the ability. Gowan ignores the temple here.⁷⁶ He mentions the temple in reference to the stream in Ezek 47,⁷⁷ but the emphasis is never on the temple or what the temple does. Gowan mentions that the light of Isa 60 is from the place where God is, yet again, he does not address the temple or its role. Nevertheless, his focus on systematizing the eschatology of the Hebrew Scriptures is important, paralleling the temple investigation of the current work.

Gaines evaluates the use of the image of the eschatological Jerusalem in the different writings of the biblical period.⁷⁸ She investigates the role of the envisioned city, Jerusalem, in a wide range of writings from the sixth century BCE to the first century CE. Gaines calls attention to four uses of the eschatological Jerusalem image in the writings of this time: a response to the loss of the actual city of Jerusalem, a critique against the

⁷³Ibid., 3.

⁷⁴Ibid., 17.

⁷⁵Ibid., 2.

⁷⁶However, he does note that the sprinkling of water is forgiveness in ritual form. Ibid., 74. This ritual may be Gowan’s way of bringing the temple into this text but, at best, he leaves it quite vague.

⁷⁷Ibid., 115.

⁷⁸Gaines, “Jerusalem.”

actual city of Jerusalem, the use of the eschatological Jerusalem in an apologetic argument, and as a literary tool to motivate right conduct.⁷⁹

Her focus is on the literary use of the future Jerusalem that the texts depict in the eschatological age. Her analysis is not on the temple, and it is not on the initiation of the eschatological age. Gaines concludes, “The eschatological Jerusalem has become a fundamental symbol of hope in both Jewish and Christian traditions.”⁸⁰ How to realize this hope is not within the scope of her research on the writings that she evaluated. However, the hope that she investigates is directly applicable to this current study on the Jerusalem temple.

In her work on temple ground plans, Patton investigates the temple of Ezek 40–48 as well as that of the Temple Scroll from Qumran and uncovers parallels.⁸¹ Her observations are valuable to the present investigation. With her emphasis on the actual building and architecture of the temple in Ezek 40–48, the focus of her work is similar to the present analysis, which she notes has not been the focus of much study.⁸²

Patton’s investigation of the Temple Scroll of Qumran also leads her to conclude that the Temple Scroll develops trajectories from Ezekiel and expands upon them.⁸³ Thus, she demonstrates a link between Ezekiel and the Temple Scroll that is important for this present investigation. However, her final conclusion is that the temple of Ezekiel should not and could not be built. The temple then would no longer function in the manner she believes it should. The “textualization of the building plan” was not to present a blueprint

⁷⁹There is a chapter devoted to each of the four uses in her text.

⁸⁰*Ibid.*, 424.

⁸¹Corrine L. Patton, “Ezekiel’s Blueprint for the Temple of Jerusalem” (PhD dissertation, Yale University, 1991).

⁸²*Ibid.*, 25.

⁸³*Ibid.*, 133.

for the temple building, in her opinion, but to present a hope for the future.⁸⁴

In his work, Price analyzes an eschatological motif of the desecration and restoration of the temple, beginning with the Hebrew Scriptures and utilizing other second temple Jewish writings, with the purpose of tracing this motif through the New Testament.⁸⁵ He does not analyze the Jerusalem temple in the ancient writings. Price applies conclusions on the eschatological Jerusalem given by Gaines (see above) to the Jerusalem temple, assuming that the extrapolation holds.⁸⁶ This allows Price to offer functions that the eschatological temple held for the Jewish authors of the second temple period. Indeed, Price understands the Jerusalem temple as only a visible symbol (similar to Schmidt above) of God's invisible presence, since Price claims that God could not truly dwell in any particular place upon the earth, only in heaven.⁸⁷

Price's understanding that the temple and the city are essentially the same does not allow him to examine the role that temple plays as it is lost in the actions in and against the city. Price notes that the temple in Ezek 40–48 is the properly purified eschatological temple,⁸⁸ not the proper temple leading into the eschatological period. This

⁸⁴Ibid., 187-190. Her conclusion is similar to Tuell's concept that the chapters are a verbal icon described below. Tuell, "Verbal Icon," 649-664.

⁸⁵Price, "Desecration and Restoration," 16.

⁸⁶Ibid., 128-129. Gaines, in her work, concluded that "the image of the eschatological Jerusalem functioned as: (1) a response to the loss of the physical city; (2) a critique of Judaism's cultic center; (3) a form of apologetic argument; and (4) a means of motivating righteous conduct." Gaines, "Jerusalem," 2. Price's extrapolation seems risky like any extrapolation. One must be wary when going outside the bounds of explored and determined research and then citing the result as fact. Chapra and Canale note that extrapolation is going outside the known bounds "and consequently, the error in extrapolation can be very large." Steven C. Chapra and Raymond P. Canale, *Numerical Methods for Engineers with Personal Computer Applications* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1985). 331. Here, Chapra and Canale understate the problem, although the warning of large errors is a strong warning to any researcher, but they detail it enough (especially in graphical form) to go to all costs to avoid the process of extrapolation. Extrapolation should be presented with error estimates whenever possible, which Price does not attempt to address in his work.

⁸⁷Price, "Desecration and Restoration," 83. Price rejects the idea of God dwelling in the temple by writing that "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." Ibid., 94.

⁸⁸Ibid., 243.

comment again does not deal with the interplay between the temple and the world or the interplay between Jerusalem and the temple. However, the motif that Price examines illuminates the present analysis on the Jerusalem temple.

Hayward examines the meaning of the Jerusalem temple and the temple service.⁸⁹ Hayward explores texts from the Pseudepigrapha, Philo, Josephus, and Sirach to investigate how the second temple Jewish writings understood the temple service. The temple is depicted as symbolizing the universe and sustaining it. He explores how the temple and the temple service were understood to have spiritual dimensions and what these dimensions meant to the Jewish authors.⁹⁰ Hayward's approach is to evaluate the temple and its service, instead of just the temple itself; however, his focus is not one consistent focus or theme across the second temple writings. Rather, he explores new facets of the temple and temple service in each of the ancient Jewish writings.

The temple-like structure of the city of Jerusalem at the end of Revelation sparked Beale's investigation on how the layouts of the temple or tabernacle lead symbolically to the eschatological reality of God dwelling with humanity.⁹¹ Although dealing with many texts that describe the physical Jerusalem temple, Beale posits how the culmination of many prophecies regarding the physical Jerusalem temple should be understood spiritually, not physically. Beale illustrates many parallels with temples in the Hebrew Scriptures and other ancient writings to show how the Jerusalem temple parallels creation, as well as the Garden of Eden. He uses these parallels to show that "Israel's temple pointed to the end-time goal of God's presence residing throughout the entire cosmos, not merely in one little, isolated structure."⁹²

⁸⁹C. T. R. Hayward, *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook* (London: Routledge, 1996).

⁹⁰Ibid., 5.

⁹¹Beale, *Church's Mission*.

⁹²Ibid., 60.

However, Beale's text diminishes the need for the temple to be built or the need for a physical temple at all, which many second temple Jewish texts point to and call for in order for the presence of God to dwell with God's people. Beale notes the scriptural critiques of both the first temple and the second temple, neither of which fulfilled prophecies of the true temple.⁹³ However, his understanding that no physical temple is to be built in eschatological or near eschatological times should be tested, given the numerous references within second temple Jewish writings on the subject. The fact that his work is based and focused upon texts written after 70 CE limits its usefulness to the present research.

An important compilation of essays edited by Day contains insights regarding the temple in the second temple period.⁹⁴ Day's text contains an essay by Middlemas on the role of the temple in the last part of Isaiah, where she presents an understanding of the temple as a source of God's actions beginning the new order of "eschatological scenes."⁹⁵ Middlemas notes, "The Temple, linked to the advent of divine intervention, becomes the place from which the radical reversal of the present distress stems."⁹⁶

This observation concerning the end of Isaiah has ties to this current research. Thus, Middlemas notes that the text of Isaiah presents the Jerusalem temple as a source of God's actions in bringing an end to the current order and establishing a new order. From her observation, it is not a large jump (of this research) to note that the Jerusalem temple may have had an expected eschatological role. However, she does not enter that field of study. In the same volume, Brooke's article on the temples of Qumran gives ten different

⁹³Ibid., 110.

⁹⁴John Day, ed., *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel* (London: T. & T. Clark, 2005).

⁹⁵Jill Middlemas, "Divine Reversal and the Role of the Temple," in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*, ed. John Day (London: T. & T. Clark, 2005), 181.

⁹⁶Ibid.

understandings of temple in the second temple period.⁹⁷

Zahn's detailed analysis of the Temple Scroll explores the theology of the temple at Qumran.⁹⁸ Her conclusion, that the Temple Scroll presents its authority as Torah, shows that the principles laid out in the Temple Scroll were intended to carry the same force as canonical Torah. Many of the essays in the volume investigate the evolution of second temple Judaism's eschatology, whereas this present work focuses on only one aspect of the multifaceted eschatology within this period.

Concluding Remarks

This chronological review of the literature on the Jerusalem temple in eschatological matters has shown sparse analyses where most do not focus on the temple structure. Also, and especially, the literature does not focus on how this temple structure may or may not be involved in the timing of the eschatological events.

Few analyses to date on the temple and eschatological matters seem to accept that the temple is a future hope,⁹⁹ or an eschatological symbol. However, if it is such a hope or symbol, the possibility that in second temple Jewish writings the physical Jerusalem temple was expected to perform an eschatological role has not been explored. A detailed investigation to consider this possibility could be vital to understanding eschatological expectations of the Jerusalem temple; without such work, the understanding of the temple in these ancient writings could lose a significant part of its meaning.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁷George J. Brooke, "The Ten Temples in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*, ed. John Day (New York: T. & T. Clark, 2005), 417-434. These ten temples are: the primordial temple (the holy of holies), the wilderness tabernacle, the first temple, the second temple, the temple plan, the community as temple, Herod's temple, the heavenly temple, the Qumran site as tabernacle/temple, and the temple not made with hands.

⁹⁸Molly M. Zahn, "New Voices, Ancient Words: The *Temple Scroll's* Reuse of the Bible," in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*, ed. John Day (New York: T. & T. Clark, 2005), 435-458.

⁹⁹Clements notes that the temple became a symbol of future hope. Clements, *God and Temple*, xi.

¹⁰⁰Price comments on Haran's idea. "What these 'new principles' might be, what 'earlier features' were disappearing, and how the Temple served as an 'eschatological symbol,' need to be determined."

Many authors and writings are not covered in this review. This review required at a minimum two things to be included: that the secondary source covered the physical Jerusalem temple to come after the destruction of the first physical Jerusalem temple and that it covered the new order or eschatological age. For example, Steven S. Tuell wrote his doctoral dissertation on the last vision of Ezekiel.¹⁰¹ In his work, Tuell argues that “Ezekiel 40–48 is the religious polity of the Judean Restoration, a present-tense description of the author’s self-conception and their conception of God.”¹⁰² He is clear that the vision of Ezek 40–48 is not eschatological.¹⁰³ Thus, his work may be used in an Ezekiel section when presenting the current status of research in that he does not see Ezekiel as eschatological.

However, since the scope of this research is on the eschatological role of the Jerusalem temple, his work is out of the scope of this research and, therefore, not included in this review. He specifically locates Ezek 40–48 as referring to the time of Darius I.¹⁰⁴ Therefore, Tuell clearly eliminates his work from this review in that he does not view the biblical text as eschatological, but as pertaining to the polity of the Persian period.

However, an eschatological context is only one of the two criteria used to determine the works that are included in this review of the analyses of the second temple Jewish documents. The other criterion is that the writing assesses the physical Jerusalem temple. For this consideration it is important to note that Tuell separates Ezek 43 into two

Price, “Desecration and Restoration,” 124. Indeed, how the temple served as an ‘eschatological symbol’ is the focus of this current work.

¹⁰¹Steven S. Tuell, *The Law of the Temple in Ezekiel 40–48* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992).

¹⁰²*Ibid.*, 14.

¹⁰³*Ibid.*, 13.

¹⁰⁴*Ibid.*, 14.

sections with the first section ending at v. 9 and the second section beginning at v. 10.¹⁰⁵ This split breaks the command to make the temple form and all its structures (Ezek 43:11) away from the reference to the ground plan of the temple. In this way, he can note that making all the forms of the temple refers to the following polity and not the structure itself, although the sacrifices that follow the vision of the temple would still require the physical temple.

Tuell postulates that the temple presented in Ezek 40–42 is a verbal icon.¹⁰⁶ He speculates,

By means of Ezekiel's report of his vision the exiles could share in this extraordinary experience, seeing in their mind's eye the heavenly temple that Ezekiel saw. Though the earthly temple was no more, the heavenly temple would stand forever. Through Ezekiel's words the community of exiles was given access to this eternal, cosmic reality. Indeed, the reader in any time or place can marvel at this temple, and experience thereby the connection with the sacred that Ezekiel experienced.¹⁰⁷

Thus, Tuell puts forth the idea, on his analysis of Ezek 40–48, that the vision is not depicting a physical Jerusalem temple, but a heavenly temple.

Thus, Tuell's work does not meet either of the major criteria used to narrow the secondary literature down to a corpus that is roughly pertinent to this topic. This exemplifies why many of the authors and works dealing with the proto-canonical writings, deuterocanonical writings, and the other second temple Jewish writings were not included in this review.

The process used here to include works by no means excludes works that give opposing views. Quite the opposite, as can be seen by how out of all of the works here, none of the works reviewed here posit any eschatological role for the temple. The criteria

¹⁰⁵Ibid., 35-73.

¹⁰⁶Tuell, "Verbal Icon," 649-664.

¹⁰⁷Ibid., 664.

used here were established to expand, not reduce, the number of secondary sources in this literature review.

On the other hand, criteria are needed to reduce all of the works on all religions and constructs of philosophy to something less than the complete library listings on religion and philosophy. The criteria used here, hopefully, have narrowed the list down to a manageable number, while keeping enough peripheral works to show the state of research on what eschatological roles have been put forth for the Jerusalem temple.

CHAPTER 4

ESCHATOLOGY AND THE JERUSALEM TEMPLE IN THE EXILIC AND POST-EXILIC HEBREW SCRIPTURES

Ezekiel

Introduction

Both the temple and the restoration of the house of Israel and the land of Israel are important aspects of eschatology within the book of Ezekiel. This is an investigation into the connection between eschatology of Ezekiel and the Jerusalem temple, the actual building put forth in the book of Ezekiel. This investigation examines the restoration passages throughout the book of Ezekiel, searching for any connections between the Jerusalem temple and the anticipated restoration.

The investigation into the structure of the Jerusalem temple leads naturally into an examination of the structure of the first Jerusalem temple. This analysis of Ezekiel's examination of the first temple helps set the proper understanding of how any future Jerusalem temple, from the perspective of the book of Ezekiel, differs from the past temple.

Besides an investigation into the presentation of the temple in the restoration passages throughout the whole book of Ezekiel, an in-depth exegetical examination of 43:1-12, which addresses key initial eschatological issues, is performed to determine insights into the relationship between eschatology and the Jerusalem temple. The effects of the presence of the glory of the Lord in Ezek 43 are examined showing important information about the intersection of the topics of the Jerusalem temple and the eschatology of the book of Ezekiel. The theme of the Jerusalem temple is shown to hold

specifics regarding the restoration of the house of Israel and the land of Israel and proves to hold insight into the prophecies regarding the next age made throughout Ezekiel.

Ezekiel is twice called upon to be a sentinel: He is called upon to give sign-acts, and he is called to relate and describe past, present, and future events to the house of Israel. God never addresses Ezekiel by name; “[t]he reason may be that in his career, more than in other prophetic careers, it is the office or function rather than the person which is important.”¹ The function that Ezekiel performs for the house of Israel centers around the temple, as it is the central thrust of his message. Ezekiel may have been influenced by the tradition of pre-exilic writings, but he forged a new path and new understanding about the temple. The book of Ezekiel presented to the exiles the pathway to complete restoration from their predicament and restoration of their land. It is to address their predicament that Ezekiel brings this message as a sentinel, a prophet, and a priest.

Restoration in the Book of Ezekiel

The book of Ezekiel contains some harsh and gracious words to its audience. There are instances of the wrath of the Lord being poured out on the house of Israel (e.g., chap. 5). However, the book puts forward many promises of the restoration, which are located throughout the book from beginning to end. The subject of restoration in Ezekiel is presented in ten pericopes. These pericopes are Ezek 11:16-21, 16:53-63, 17:22-24, 20:40-44, 28:25-26, 34:10-31, 36:1-38, 37:1-28, 39:25-29, and chaps. 40–48.

The first words of restoration in the book for the exiles come in Ezek 11:16-21, where the Lord has the prophet proclaim how the Lord has been like a sanctuary for them in exile.² The sanctuary in this pronouncement has the adjective, מִקְדָּשׁ, where it can be

¹Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Ezekiel* (Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1990), 24.

²Ackroyd notes how restoration is integral to the book, starting early, with the beginnings of restoration found here in chap. 11. Ackroyd, *Exile*, 110.

taken to refer to a small amount of time or measure. If it is taken as temporal, the translation would indicate that the Lord has been a sanctuary for a little while.³ If it is temporal in nature, then it implies that while the exiles are in a foreign land, the Lord has been a sanctuary for them until they return to their land, which then assumes a return. The text would be foreshadowing the eventual return from exile.

If מִעַט is taken as referencing the measure or degree with which the Lord has been with the exiles, the translation would indicate that the Lord has been a sanctuary in small measure compared to how the Lord will be with the people when dwelling in the temple.⁴ Although these two understandings do not exhaust the ways in which מִעַט is understood,⁵ the debate on this phrase can miss the point of the verse.

The key word is not מִעַט, but מִקְדָּשׁ (sanctuary or holy place). The meanings of temporal or measure for מִעַט do not have to conflict; yet in either case the Lord has been as a temple or a sanctuary, to some degree or for some period of time, while the exiles are away from Jerusalem.

Therefore, the nature of this passage in relation to the temple is often overlooked.

³Fujita understands the adjective in this manner and notes how Smend and Lofink agree with him. Fujita, “Temple Theology,” 35. Clements also understands the text this way. Clements, *Ezekiel*, 49. Cooke also sides with temporal. G. A. Cooke, *The Book of Ezekiel* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1951), 125. Hummel understands this temporally as well. Horace D. Hummel, *Ezekiel 1–20* (St. Louis: Concordia, 2005), 320.

⁴Joyce notes the possibility of time or degree and favors degree because he maintains v. 16 is independent of 17 and the use of the word elsewhere of degree can be made to fit here. Paul M. Joyce, *Ezekiel: A Commentary* (New York: T. & T. Clark, 2007), 113. Block, Tuell, and Odell also understand the text as pointing to degree. Block, *Ezekiel*, 2:341; Steven S. Tuell, “Divine Presence and Absence in Ezekiel’s Prophecy,” in *The Book of Ezekiel: Theological and Anthropological Perspectives*, ed. Margaret S. Odell and John T. Strong (Atlanta: SBL, 2000), 107; Margaret S. Odell, *Ezekiel* (Macon, GA: Smyth and Helwys, 2005), 123. Allen understands this text as pointing to degree, yet translates it somewhat differently. He chooses the idea that the Lord has “partially taken the place of their sanctuary.” Leslie C. Allen, *Ezekiel 1-19*, Word Biblical Commentary 28 (Dallas, TX: Word, 1994), 1:118. Fredenburg notes the understanding of the text as the Lord “being among them in a diminished manner as compared to what they were used to.” Brandon L. Fredenburg, *Ezekiel*, College Press NIV Commentary (Joplin, MO: College Press, 2002), 109.

⁵Zimmerli writes, “What is in mind here is undoubtedly the limited forms of a worship practiced far from the sanctuary.” Walther Zimmerli, *A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*, trans. James D. Martin (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979-1983), 1:262.

The passage starts out, as mentioned above, referring to the temple, מִקְדָּשׁ, v. 16. The Hebrew מִקְדָּשׁ is the common word for temple in Ezekiel. Beyond that, the word מִקְדָּשׁ is used more in Ezekiel than anywhere else in the Hebrew Scriptures.⁶

The Lord has been in some manner or for some time as a temple to the people. The Lord will assemble the people (v. 17), return the people to the land (v. 18), and will make it so the people walk in the statutes of the Lord (v. 20). This passage is about restoration and the time when the Lord will again be with the people in a covenant relationship, v. 20, which would include a future temple for God in covenant relationship.⁷

These issues are set in the larger context of the glory leaving the Jerusalem temple. The Lord becomes a temple in the interim before the restoration from exile. This shows, in the very first restoration passage in Ezekiel, a link between the temple and the restoration of the house of Israel.

At first glance, the temple seems to play no part in the second passage of restoration in the book of Ezekiel. Ezekiel 16:53-63 mentions the return from exile and a renewed everlasting covenant,⁸ but does not mention the temple explicitly. However, this is only at first glance, as the temple plays an important part here in the restoration of the relationship between God and people. The verb כָּפַר is used six times in the book of

⁶The word מִקְדָּשׁ is used 31 times in Ezekiel out of the 75 times in all the Hebrew Scriptures. The word is used at the highest rate in Ezekiel out of all of the Hebrew Scriptures as well. It occurs in 2.28% of the verses of the book, compared to the second highest, Lamentations at 1.95% of the verses and compared with the average rate of .31% of the verses of the Hebrew Scriptures. It is important to understand the word for sanctuary as consecrated space, which the word literally implies and upon which the book focuses.

⁷Vawter and Hoppe remember the focus of the passage. “Until God establishes the new Israel and the people build a new temple, this is the only presence that Israel-to-be can count on. Still, it is a presence in a mitigated sense.” Bruce Vawter and Leslie J. Hoppe, *A New Heart: A Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991), 76.

⁸Blenkinsopp calls this passage “[t]he concluding promise of restoration.” Blenkinsopp, *Ezekiel*, 79. There can be no doubt that this is a restoration passage.

Ezekiel and all of them are in cultic settings.⁹ The verb is used here in 16:63, twice in chap. 43 and three times in chap. 45.¹⁰ The idea is not forgiveness, although many English translations use the verb forgive here.¹¹ In Ezek 16:63, the verb is speaking of cultic activity at the temple.¹² Here, Galambush clarifies the interpretation of the actions of the Lord: “ritual ‘cleansing’ of the woman thus seems to be another allusion to Jerusalem as the locus of the temple. For Ezekiel, the sign of Jerusalem’s restoration is not Yahweh’s forgiveness of the people per se, but his cleansing of the holy place.”¹³

Block denies that this passage is eschatological in nature because the eschatological covenant was “not made in the time of Israel’s youth.”¹⁴ Block avers this is either referring to the covenant with Abraham or a covenant not mentioned in Scripture.¹⁵ This clearly cannot hold. Block notes the one use of Abraham in Ezek 33:24 where it is linked with an apostate people.¹⁶ The name preferred in Ezekiel is Jacob.

Jacob is used four times in Ezekiel with three of those times in restoration

⁹Schwartz clarifies that commentators correctly insist that all uses of כִּפֶּר in priestly literature are in fact cultic. Baruch J. Schwartz, “The Bearing of Sin in the Priestly Literature,” in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom*, ed. David P. Wright, David N. Freedman, and Avi Hurvitz (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 18.

¹⁰The uses in Ezek 43 refer to the cleansing of the altar. The uses in Ezek 45 refer to sacrifices at the altar to cleanse the people. The use here in Ezek 16 refers to a time when the Lord cleanses the people from all that they have done.

¹¹The NRSV, NJPS, NAS, and NJB all use “forgive” and the KJV uses “pacify.” Joyce notes the temporal nature of the clause, when I make atonement, and correctly notes that the verb “to forgive” never occurs in Ezekiel. Joyce, *Ezekiel*, 135.

¹²Schwartz observes that “[t]he purgation of which Ezekiel speaks here is not forgiveness but ritual expiation (כִּפֶּר pi.). This expression is used in its precise priestly sense.” Baruch J. Schwartz, “Ezekiel’s Dim View of Israel’s Restoration,” in *The Book of Ezekiel: Theological and Anthropological Perspectives*, ed. Margaret S. Odell and John T. Strong (Atlanta: SBL, 2000), 49.

¹³Julie Galambush, *Jerusalem in the Book of Ezekiel: The City as Yahweh’s Wife* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 109.

¹⁴Block, *Ezekiel*, 1:516.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, 517.

¹⁶Block, *Ezekiel*, 2:418.

passages (Ezek 28:25, 37:25, and 39:25) and the last in a covenantal passage (20:5).¹⁷ Jacob, or the house of Israel, is the name the book of Ezekiel uses for the people. Chapter 16 is referring to the people breaking the covenant (16:8 and 16:59) made in the desert (Exod 24:7-8), at the time when they wandered in the desert before they got to the Promised Land.

The descendants of Jacob were in their youth with respect to their covenant with the Lord as compared to the later times when the descendants of David were on the throne of Israel. This covenant was established between the descendants of Jacob and God, but the people did not keep the statutes in the Law of the Covenant (Exod 24:7, Ezek 16:59). Yet, God will make an eternal covenant, בְּרִית עוֹלָם, with Israel (Ezek 16:60). The usage of עוֹלָם in Ezekiel is an indicator of the eschatological nature of the act of God in the passage.¹⁸ Chapter 16 is indeed implying an eschatological act of restoration performed by God, though the act of God is only hinted at, but not clearly addressed in this passage.

Ezekiel 17:22-24 is a messianic restoration passage that presents the Lord taking a young twig, a metaphor for a new leader of Israel, and planting it.¹⁹ The context of this restoration passage is an analogy referring to the historical punishment of Zedekiah. The physical location where the Lord will establish the new leader is הַר-גְּבוּהַ וְהַתֵּל וְיָל (17:22) and בְּהַר מְרוֹם יִשְׂרָאֵל (17:23). This high, exalted, and lofty mountain of Israel refers to

¹⁷The Temple Scroll links the eschatological covenant with the covenant made with Jacob at Beth-El, 11QT 29:10.

¹⁸Jenni shows the development of the word in the Scriptures. In Ezekiel, עוֹלָם is one of the concepts newly won by the prophetic experience, more and more to the code word for eschatological action of God. Jenni's own words are "der durch das prophetische Erleben neu gewonnenen Begriffe immer mehr zum Kennwort für das eschatologische Handeln Gottes." The "Kennwort" i.e., code word, usage here in Ezekiel indicates the eschatological nature of this passage. Ernst Jenni, "Das wort 'olam' im Alten Testament," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 64 (1952): 14.

¹⁹Fujita notes how this passage belongs with the restoration proclamations of Ezekiel. Fujita, "Temple Theology," 62.

the temple mount,²⁰ where the king would dwell. It also points to the place of the temple in the restored Israel where the Lord would dwell;²¹ both use the verb שָׁבַן. The reference to the noble cedar, the fruit, and dwelling in the shade (17:23) all show an allusion to a time of peace and dominion; this passage is revealing information about an eschatological time frame.²²

Ezekiel 20:40-44 is an eschatological passage of restoration. In this passage, the entire house of Israel is gathered from the nations and lands where they had been scattered and brought to the land of Israel in order to worship the Lord at the rebuilt temple on Mount Zion through sacrifices.²³ The temple mount is clearly intended through use of the phrases בְּהַר־קֹדֶשׁ, my holy mountain, and בְּהַר מְרוֹם יִשְׂרָאֵל, the mountain of the height of Israel.²⁴ Worship at the temple mount is indicated through the use of the verb עָבַד. The verb is used in v. 39 referring to the worship of idols, but here in v. 40 it is

²⁰Block notes that this is clearly a reference to Mt. Zion. Block, *Ezekiel*, 1:551. Regarding Ezek 17:22-24, Levenson declares that “a high and eminent mountain” in the context of the passage must be Mt Zion. J. D. Levenson, *Program of Restoration*, 7.

²¹Fujita notes that Ezek 17:22-24 is set in the context of the restoration of the Jerusalem temple upon the temple mount where the entire house of Israel is influenced. Fujita, “Temple Theology,” 62.

²²Allen ties this proclamation to 20:40-44, 34:14, and 40:2, showing its eschatological nature. Leslie C. Allen, *Ezekiel 20–48*, Word Biblical Commentary 29 (Dallas, TX: Word, 1990), 2:260.

²³Tooman clarifies that this passage means that the Jerusalem “temple will be restored, enabling the people to secure divine pardon (20.40-44).” William A. Tooman, “Waiting for God: Condition for Restoration of the Divine Presence in Ezekiel” (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, San Francisco, CA, November 20, 2011). This is from p. 18 of Tooman’s presentation. Blenkinsopp describes this passage in terms of a reconciled house of Israel, anticipating the description of the temple laid out in the vision of 40–48. Blenkinsopp, *Ezekiel*, 91. Noting the tie between the high mountain of 20:40 and 40:2, Fredenburg observes: “This language refers to the location of the renewed temple described in chaps. 40–48.” Fredenburg, *Ezekiel*, 189. Jenner goes further and states the goal of this passage is that all the Israelites serve the Lord. Konrad D. Jenner, “The Worship of YHWH on the Holy Mountain in Light of the Idea of the Return: A Short Note on the Confrontation of Theology on the Old Testament and Comparative and Applied Science of Religion,” in *The New Things: Eschatology in Old Testament Prophecy Festschrift for Henk Leene*, ed. F. Postma, K. Spronk, and E. Talstra (Maastricht, Netherlands: Uitgeverij Shaker, 2002), 132.

²⁴Zimmerli notes that 20:40 indicates clearly that the place is the temple mount. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 1:417. Greenberg states that the meaning of these two phrases is Jerusalem as he links the high mountain of Israel to chap. 17. Moshe Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20: A New Translation* (New York: Doubleday, 1983), 375. Tuell holds that these phrases are referring to the temple mount, which is Zion. Steven S. Tuell, *Ezekiel* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009), 134-135.

used of worship of the Lord at the temple.²⁵ The worship at the temple is also implied through the use of the phrase נִיחֵהוּ אֶת־רֵיחַ, pleasing aroma, which is used only in Ezekiel outside of the Torah and describes the offerings on the temple altar.

This passage links the temple to the eschatological deliverance and worship in the land of Israel.²⁶ It presents the temple as corrective in nature to all the gathered ones of the house of Israel.²⁷ A vague timeline of the upcoming eschatological events is described: first, there is a gathering of the people back into the land of Israel.²⁸ There will be a new temple on the temple mount of Jerusalem, just outside the city, where the house of Israel gathers to worship the Lord.²⁹ Through this worship at the Jerusalem temple, the Lord will become apparent to the nations of the world (20:41), using the verb וַיִּקְרַךְ שָׁמַיִם. This concluding passage of chap. 20 is set after the conditional way of life presented earlier in the chapter.³⁰ The oath and acceptance lead to the eschatological time. However, the implied temple of the passage is important as it makes the worship of the Lord possible for the house of Israel, even though it is not mentioned specifically.

²⁵Allen also notes this meaning of the verb and location at the temple in this passage. “And as divine Lord he would receive their pure worship at—it is implied—a reconstituted temple.” Allen, *Ezekiel 20–48*, 2:16. With the analysis of the temple in the text of Ezekiel, it is important to note that the verb to worship, עָבַד, is not an emphasized word in the text. Ezekiel ranks sixteenth in the Hebrew Scriptures in the use of the verb עָבַד with a rate of .707% compared to the average rate of 1.12% in all Scripture. These statistics place Ezekiel closer to the bottom of the list of those books that use this verb than the top of the list, as only 25 books use the verb.

²⁶Zimmerli makes it clear that the text makes the connection with the eschatological salvation, but “the future glory is specifically connected, as in 20:40, with ‘the high mountain of Israel.’” Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 2:278.

²⁷Greenberg notes that my holy hill in this verse is in contrast to every high hill and it refers to the temple mount “rather than the mountainous land of Israel in general.” Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 374. Block also notes that the holy mountain of the Lord is the proper corrective to previous abominable practices on every high hill. Block, *Ezekiel*, 1:656.

²⁸Fredenburg notes this is an exodus to judgment, not deliverance. Fredenburg, *Ezekiel*, 188.

²⁹Duguid mentions the link between this text and the end-time worship in the vision of Ezek 40–48. “This looks forward in seed form to the full description of the renewed Israel at worship on a high mountain in chaps. 40–48.” Iain M. Duguid, *Ezekiel* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1999), 264.

³⁰Allen links the conditional promise from the Lord to the way of life the people are to lead in 20:35–38 to 34:17–22. Allen, *Ezekiel 20–48*, 2:163.

Another piece of Ezekiel's restoration is given in the last two verses of chap. 28. This passage discusses the gathering of the house of Israel from the nations where they are scattered and the passage contains elements that are eschatological in nature.³¹ The notion of dwelling securely is used in other restoration passages in Ezekiel and the picture of building houses and planting vineyards is opposite that of the texts of oppression.³²

The backdrop of the temple in this passage is somewhat ambiguous,³³ though the use of שָׁדַק in the *Niphal* stem (Ezek 28:25) again highlights the Lord being manifested as holy before the people. The *Niphal* of שָׁדַק is seen in Ezek 20:41 in the context of sacrifices at the temple, as well as Ezek 36:23 where the temple is important, and further in Ezek 39:27 where the Lord will not leave or hide from the house of Israel again.³⁴ All three of these other uses of שָׁדַק in the *Niphal* in Ezekiel are in restoration passages. The meaning of the verb in these contexts is to be consecrated through the glory of the Lord inhabiting the Jerusalem temple.³⁵

Starting with chap. 34 of Ezekiel, the chapters are even more focused on restoration and the Jerusalem temple. The restoration of chap. 34 begins with the Lord

³¹Cooke notes this passage has the concept of dwelling, “[a] feature emphasized in pictures of the coming age.” Cooke, *Ezekiel*, 322.

³²This is the opposite of passages like the curse of Deut 28:30, as well as the prophetic pronouncements of Amos 5:11 and Zeph 1:13.

³³This may be a late redactional unit, according to Allen, in which case the redactor has missed the need for the temple to be the center of this type of unit. Allen, *Ezekiel 20–48*, 2:98. Zimmerli calls this passage, 28:20-26, an expansion from a later redactor as well. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 2:101. Block gives an alternative. He notes that vv. 25-26 “are a fragment of Ezekielian proclamation editorially inserted here to expand on the good news for his people.” Block, *Ezekiel*, 2:127. Whatever the editorial decisions that caused these verses to be inserted here, these decisions were probably not dictated by any temple theology.

³⁴Over half of the uses of שָׁדַק in the *Niphal* stem are in Ezekiel. The acts of the Lord that manifest the holiness of the Lord are the acts that are emphasized in the restoration passages of Ezekiel.

³⁵Compare this idea with Exod 29:43. Tuell refers to the glory of the Lord inhabiting the temple in Ezek 43 as “the sanctification of this space.” Tuell, *Ezekiel*, 294.

seeking the people, something quite unusual in the Hebrew Scriptures.³⁶ This is unlike the exodus where the Lord was with the people. Darr's idea, that the covenant of peace, *בְּרִית שְׁלוֹם*, is more like the exodus covenant than the covenant in Ezek 16, seems contrary to the chapter's context of the Lord seeking the people when the exodus experience had no such seeking.³⁷

The phrase "covenant of peace" occurs twice in Ezekiel: 34:25 and 37:26. In Ezek 37:26, the phrase is followed by the apposition, eternal covenant, *בְּרִית עוֹלָם*. This phrase is also used only twice in the book of Ezekiel: 16:60 and 37:25. These unique phrases and similar ideas, all within restoration passages, lead to the understanding that they are tied together to present a unified position,³⁸ which is a covenant established at the temple leading to an eternal time of peace.

Block denies that the use of the phrase 'my hill' in Ezek 34:26 refers to the temple or temple mount and claims it refers generally to the entire countryside of Israel.³⁹ This notion ignores the ideas presented above, including the language of the text of Ezekiel itself. Ezekiel uses the name "Jerusalem" 26 times in all. Once out of all these times, it could be said to be used in a neutral sense, just drawing the crowds of Jerusalem to their memory (Ezek 36:38).

However, even here in Ezek 36:38, the reference is to the sheep of Jerusalem at festivals, which will be destroyed; thus, even this usage could be considered a negative context. Besides Ezek 36:38, every other time the name "Jerusalem" is used, it appears in

³⁶Only in Ezek 34 and Ps 119 does this concept of the Lord seeking out the people occur, whether in the shepherd/sheep metaphor or not. Though in a different manner, Allen draws parallels between the exodus and this return to the promised land. Allen, *Ezekiel 20–48*, 2:162.

³⁷Darr notes the phrase and posits that "[t]he equation of this passage's covenant of peace with the eternal covenant of Ezek 16:60 seems strained." She links it with the covenant at Sinai. Kathryn P. Darr, "The Book of Ezekiel," *NIB*, 6:1472.

³⁸Fujita notes similar implications of *בְּרִית שְׁלוֹם* and *בְּרִית עוֹלָם*. Fujita, "Temple Theology," 59.

³⁹Block, *Ezekiel*, 2:305.

a negative context, so that the name itself is negative in Ezekiel, and therefore, the name “Jerusalem” is avoided in the restoration passages.⁴⁰

Ezekiel never uses the term Zion in a positive sense either.⁴¹ The phrases “My hill,” “My holy mountain,” and “a high mountain” become the positive epithets used to refer to the temple or the place of the temple.⁴² Darr notes the implications of the hill and observes, “The fact that Ezekiel has not (and will not) use the name ‘Zion’ does not rule out that possibility, since Jerusalem and its Temple are often his focus.”⁴³ Block shows the parallels between Ezek 34:14-15 and Mic 4:6-8,⁴⁴ where the Micah passage speaks of the Lord at Mount Zion ruling the people. Clearly, the text in Ezek 34:26 does indeed refer to the temple on Mount Zion.

This restoration passage expands the focus after the initiation of eschatological events.⁴⁵ The last verses of chap. 34 describe events in a time after God’s covenant of peace has begun.⁴⁶ The mention of David may signal a messianic age, though the messiah

⁴⁰Not one of the 25 negative uses of Jerusalem occur in a restoration passage, though one occurs in 11:15 just before the verse proclaiming that the Lord is in some way a sanctuary for the people in exile.

⁴¹Gowan, *Eschatology*, 9.

⁴²Jerusalem, completely defiled (Ezek 22:5), “will cease to be mentioned.” Moshe Greenberg, “The Design and Themes of Ezekiel’s Program of Restoration,” *Interpretation* 38 (1984): 202. Note that in some Psalms, Mount Zion is associated with Mt Zaphon (Ps 48:2) in the north, regarded as the highest mountain on earth (Pss 2:6, 68:19, 87:1, 99:9).

⁴³Darr, “Ezekiel,” 6:1472. Darr and this present work show that Zion is the focus here, contra Hummel who claims that although one would expect to have the temple mount or Zion highlighted, one does not see it (whatever the epithet) highlighted in Ezekiel. Hummel, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 15.

⁴⁴Block, *Ezekiel*, 2:290.

⁴⁵Wright calls this section an eschatological circle of ideas using sheep as a metaphor. Christopher J. H. Wright, *The Message of Ezekiel* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2001), 278. Hummel notes that this section’s scope is eschatological. Horace D. Hummel, *Ezekiel 21-48* (St. Louis: Concordia, 2007), 998.

⁴⁶Blenkinsopp notes that it is here in these verses that the restored world of nature and restored justice unite in the eschatological time. Blenkinsopp, *Ezekiel*, 160.

is not the focus of Ezekiel's restoration passages.⁴⁷

Ezekiel 36 presents a prophecy of restoration to the land of Israel and then to the house of Israel.⁴⁸ The prophecy of restoration to the house of Israel has two important aspects that need examination.

The first of these aspects is the meaning of the sprinkling of pure water that brings cleansing from the contamination of idols (36:25). Regarding this sprinkling, the verb used is קָרַן , which is used mostly in cultic settings, including later in Ezek 43:18 upon the temple altar.

The meaning in chap. 36:22-32 is about purification, using the verb קָדַשׁ .⁴⁹ God acts to consecrate God's name (v. 23), changing the people (vs. 26-27) and taking them out of the impurities (v. 29); it does not have explicit forgiveness language. Even though there were cultic manipulations at Sinai without a temple, it is important to note that this cultic purification in Ezek 36:25 is not done outside of the land of Israel, as with Sinai; it is after the Lord has gathered the house of Israel into the land of Israel in Ezek 36:24. This cultic reference implies the consecration and beginnings of the new Jerusalem temple.⁵⁰ Notice that the cleansing comes directly from the Lord;⁵¹ this can be seen as

⁴⁷Block and Cooper call this a vision of the messianic age. Block, *Ezekiel*, 2:307; Lamar E. Cooper, *Ezekiel* (Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1994), 303. Perhaps more appropriately, Wevers calls this "the Paradisiac age." John W. Wevers, *Ezekiel* (London: Nelson, 1969), 263.

⁴⁸However, it is important to note that the heights of the world in Ezek 36:2 refer to the most important mountains on earth centered on the temple mount. This is similar to other references to the temple mount in Ezekiel.

⁴⁹Gowan claims it is forgiveness in ritual terms, but the ritual is about purity, not forgiveness. Gowan, *Eschatology*, 74. Tuell notes how this "reflects priestly ideas of washing with water as a means of removing ritual uncleanness." Tuell, *Ezekiel*, 247. The Hebrew verb for forgiveness, סָלַח , has the idea "to be indulgent towards, forgive." Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament (HALOT)* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), s.v. "סָלַח." The verb סָלַח does not occur in the entire book of Ezekiel. Ezekiel is a priestly perspective (Ezek 1:3). Purifying from iniquity is not forgiveness. It is important to note that the verb סָלַח does not occur in Lev 16. This is not to say that relationship is not restored when impurities are removed; the people seemed to be changed by God, not forgiven by God. However, the text of Ezekiel has obviously avoided the verb סָלַח and stressed priestly cleansing.

⁵⁰Haag connects this cultic act with the ritual of the Day of Atonement. "Auf den großen Versöhnungstag Lv 16 macht uns auch noch der folgende Ausdruck $\text{בְּיָמֵינוּ יִכָּפֵר}$ aufmerksam. Dieser der

anticipating the eschatological vision of 40–48.⁵²

It is also important to note that this restoration of creation and humanity ends in a clearly eschatological tone. Creation seems to become as Eden was;⁵³ even beyond, this eschatological time surpasses the splendor of Eden (Ezek 36:11). The clause of verse Ezek 36:33, בַּיּוֹם טָהַרְתִּי אֶתְכֶם, shows a temporal clause, *on the day when I cleanse you*. This refers to the time of purification coming from the Lord’s action upon the people in ritual fashion.⁵⁴ This clause uses the same verb, טָהַר, as in v. 25,⁵⁵ linking this idea to the

Priestersprache eigene Terminus kommt im Plural nur Lv 16, 16. 19 und Ez 36, 25. 29 vor!” Herbert Haag, *Was lehrt die literarische Untersuchung des Ezechiel-Texts? Eine philologisch-theologische Studie* (Freiburg in der Schweiz: Verlag der Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1943), 38. Clements compares this cleansing and sprinkling to the former temple cultic service. Clements, *Ezekiel*, 163. Block notes this “description mixes priestly cleansing rituals and blood sprinkling ceremonies.” Block, *Ezekiel*, 2:354. However, Block fails to note that twice in Num 19:13-20, the verb זָרַק is used with sprinkling water on the people. This water, in Numbers, as well as possibly in Ezekiel, is מַיִם חַיִּים, living/running waters. Blenkinsopp notes the complete change from the past and the new cultic beginning that this sprinkling implies. “The symbolic cleansing with water is not just a routine ritual act. It signifies the end of a period of disorder (dirt) and the beginning of a new phase of existence.” Blenkinsopp, *Ezekiel*, 167. Contra Cooke, who maintains that the sprinkling refers to “an inward, spiritual purification of the entire people.” Cooke, *Ezekiel*, 390. Although this cleansing by sprinkling may be different from cleansing prescriptions in the Torah, Milgrom notes that these waters, in Ezek 36:25, when mixed with ashes from the red heifer purify Israel “from all your impurities and fetishes.” He further notes that Ezekiel distinguishes between impurities and fetishes (Milgrom’s translation of זָלַל in this verse), “though elsewhere he regards idolatry as a source of impurity (e.g., Ezek 22:3, 4).” Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 3:2360. Here, Milgrom notes that Ezekiel includes impurity from idolatry in a way of keeping true to Numbers “in which impurity is always of a ritual nature.” Ibid.

⁵¹This does not mean that it physically comes from the Lord, but it may be from the Lord through the priests at the temple. The text is far from clear regarding who does this sprinkling and how it is accomplished, yet in all three uses of the verb זָרַק in Ezekiel (10:2, 36:25, and 43:18), the objects sprinkled do appear to be physical entities and therefore one can suppose that this is a physical sprinkling here in 36:25.

⁵²Hummel notes the mix of priestly metaphors behind the sprinkling of pure water here and highlights the fact that this sprinkling is in an eschatological context. Hummel, *Ezekiel 21-48*, 1051-1053.

⁵³Block notes the tie between Ezek 36:11 and Gen 1. Block, *Ezekiel*, 2:334.

⁵⁴Most of the uses of טָהַר are in ritual impurity cases involving a person, a house, the temple, the altar, the land, cities, or even the tribe of Levites. The verb is linked with כִּפַּר (Lev 12:7, 8; 14:19, 20, 29, 31, 53; 16:30; Num 8:21; Ezek 43:26) and is noted as the opposite of טָמֵא (Lev 11:32, 13:59, 17:15, 22:4, Num 19:19, Ezek 37:23). However, Maass notes that “one may infer from the texts that the post-exilic community’s refined and controlling awareness of sin stands behind the purity laws. This promulgation of law was conditioned by the struggle against the danger of a new apostasy of God’s people and by the endeavor to maintain distance from the pagan-impure. One should not undervalue the naïve faith in the efficacy of the mere formal execution of the rite. The knowledge that purification (just like forgiveness) is exclusively God’s decision and is a wonder effected and bestowed by God permeates both the eschatological witnesses (Jer 33:8; Ezek 36:25, 33; 37:23; Mal 3:3) and this legalism.” F. Maass, “טָהַר,” *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997), 482. Maass highlights

sprinkling of pure water upon the people in v. 33.⁵⁶

The other aspect of restoration in chap. 36 that needs further illumination is the meaning of Ezek 36:26-27. The new heart and spirit that the Lord will give to the house of Israel has provoked the idea that the new heart and spirit will provide humanity with the necessary impetus to be able to follow the Lord's commands.⁵⁷

An important fact about this idea is that the heart and spirit, which are given, are both singular and the recipient (i.e., the object), "you," is plural. The book of Ezekiel uses the plural pronoun at other times like this usage.⁵⁸ This plural pronoun refers to each and every individual of the community.⁵⁹ A single heart and a single spirit will be given to the house of Israel; this foreshadows the return of the glory described in Ezek 43, as the pouring of the spirit described later ties in with the sound of water in the return of the glory of the Lord.

multiple important points. First, in what would appear to be a non-literal use (dealing with sin), purity laws still add to the community. Second, the faith in the efficacy of the purity rites is an important driving force in the post-exilic community. Third, purification, which is different from forgiveness, is effected and given by God, obviously even when this is done in priestly ritual. Finally, Maass notes the importance of purity in the eschatological testimony and specifically cites the two uses under discussion above (36:25, 33).

⁵⁵This verb is used predominantly in Leviticus with 35 out of the 79 uses of the verb in the Hebrew Scriptures. It is used nine times in Ezekiel.

⁵⁶Contra Price, who argues against the idea of a day or time when God purifies here in v. 36:33. Price argues for the idea of an indefinite period of cleansing, which the Lord is going to accomplish in the eschatological period. However, the day refers to the time of purgation that can be (and will be according to the text) done at a specific moment. He failed to take the temporal construction of v. 33 in combination with the physical act in v. 25 into account. Price, "Desecration and Restoration," 284.

⁵⁷Fredenburg holds that it is the new heart and new spirit that prompt the people to follow God's commands. Fredenburg, *Ezekiel*, 320. Gowan claims the new spirit in humanity allows humanity to follow God's ways. Gowan, *Eschatology*, 2, 75. Joyce describes the meaning of the new heart and new spirit as meaning both "moral will" and "essentially synonymous" and that this moral will is the Lord's way of causing Israel to obey. Paul Joyce, *Divine Initiative and Human Response in Ezekiel* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 108-111.

⁵⁸See Ezek 18:31; 37:5, 6, 14.

⁵⁹The plural pronoun does not refer to only one individual, but refers to the collection of individuals and, in Ezekiel, it refers to the house of Israel. It would be quite rare, if it occurs at all, that a plural pronoun refers to a single noun (although the single pronoun in the collective may represent plural nouns).

The giving of the heart and spirit are not the only actions accomplished by the Lord here in these two verses. A third action is that the Lord will make it so that the house of Israel will be able to walk in the statutes of the Lord. This subsequent action is in addition to the giving of the heart and spirit to the house of Israel. How the house of Israel will accomplish the statutes and ordinances in Ezek 36:27 is echoed again in Ezek 43:11.⁶⁰ The Lord's action here is a gift, not a way of forcing humanity to observe the statutes.⁶¹

Chapter 37 has the restoration of dry bones into a great army, the restoration of the people into a unified house of Israel, and the restoration of the covenant of peace with the Lord dwelling in the Jerusalem temple. The order of the chapter is that the people are infused with the spirit of God (37:14),⁶² they are gathered back to the land of Israel (37:21), they are unified (37:22), they are purified (37:23), they will have a leader to direct the people to follow the Lord's ordinances (37:24), the people have a covenant of peace and the Lord dwells in the temple forever (37:26-7), then the surrounding nations will know that the Lord is the one making Israel holy (37:28).⁶³

This passage builds in renewal intensity, climaxing with the idea that the Lord

⁶⁰The common language is important in seeing the ties between 36:27 and 43:11. Both verses use the verbs אָשַׁח and אָמַר as well as the noun דָּבָר .

⁶¹Joyce notes that the understanding that God will cause the house of Israel to become obedient is, in itself, a promise from God. Joyce, *Ezekiel*, 205. This appears to be a gift in the context of the passage, as there is no adversative marker in the Hebrew. Contra Block and Schwartz who maintain that this passage is about forced compliance. Block, *Ezekiel*, 2:334; B. Schwartz, "Dim View," 60. Galambush seems closer to the text as she describes the need for God to remake the people in 36:26-27, "literally have to reconstruct them, to make them able to choose obedience." Galambush, *Jerusalem*, 157. This reconstruction of the people comes about in chap. 43 and is not deconstructive in nature, but constructive, resulting from the presence of the glory of the Lord.

⁶²Nickelsburg comments on Ezek 37 and the raising of the dry bones as a "metaphor for the restoration of Israel." George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972), 151.

⁶³Duguid states an obvious, yet an important and vital point, that the ingathering of the exiles is an indispensable first step in order to present the temple building plan of 40–48. Duguid, *Ezekiel*, 437. In fact, Price calls Ezek 40–48 an extension of this restoration passage. Price, "Desecration and Restoration," 292.

will dwell in the temple, מִקְדָּשׁ, in the land of Israel.⁶⁴ The last verse of the chapter makes it clear that it is when the Lord is in the temple that the surrounding nations will know of the Lord,⁶⁵ indicating the eschatological nature of the event.⁶⁶

Ezekiel 37 highlights three important uses of the Hebrew regarding the restoration of the covenant, the Jerusalem temple, and the eschatological period. First, the Hebrew word עוֹלָם is used five times in chap. 37, but its eighteen uses in the whole book sets this chapter's future-looking context.⁶⁷ Jenni notes how Ezekiel advances a new usage of the word, which becomes an eschatological indicator.⁶⁸ Second, the land of Israel is important to the book of Ezekiel. In fact, the phrase אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל occurs seventeen times

⁶⁴Greenberg notes the climax in 26b^b-28 specifically noting the Lord in the temple. Moshe Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21-37: A New Translation* (New York: Doubleday, 1997), 758. Blenkinsopp notes the temple as the climax of the promise to the house of Israel which is then clearly presented in 40-48. Blenkinsopp, *Ezekiel*, 177. Block notes that this passage displays the glory's presence in the temple as the ultimate display of the bond between God and people. Block, *Ezekiel*, 2:421. Zimmerli notes that the temple among the people is clearly the climax of the promise of restoration. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 2:276.

⁶⁵The temple must be built by the people (see below for the assertion that the people will build the temple in Ezekiel). Thus, certain events may happen before the temple is built. The exile must end and the house of Israel must be gathered to Jerusalem from wherever they have been scattered. Although perhaps not all texts use such a timeline, the temple is often built before the people have had their cleansing/sanctifying experience producing righteousness (e.g., Tob 14:5-7, 1 En. 90:13-17, Hag 2:17-19). However, Ezekiel is unclear on whether the temple is built before or after the cleansing/sanctifying experience. The sound of the Lord coming to the temple in Ezek 43:2 could be the cleansing, a pouring of the new spirit (Ezek 36:25-28). There is no clear timeline giving which of these events comes first in Ezekiel. The ingathering, the building of the temple, the restoration of relationship between God and Israel are all clearly there in Ezekiel, but no text details the timeline and therefore no one can say for certain in which order they come.

⁶⁶The nations surrounding Israel now know the Lord shows a clear change of order in the region. This caps off many factors that indicate an eschatological context including the gathering, the covenant of peace, the purification, as well as the people following ordinances. This is not a contentious point; however, the issue is important in acknowledging Ezekiel's emphasis on the temple and its connection to the eschatological time. Zimmerli notes that the temple among them is the one important event in which the Lord is recognized throughout the earth. Ibid., 2:277. Block observes that the sanctuary, the Lord's temple of Jerusalem among the house of Israel, shows the nations the power of the Lord. Block, *Ezekiel*, 2:421. Duguid states clearly that the permanent restoration of the Jerusalem temple precipitates the nations knowing the Lord has given the house of Israel a new holiness. Duguid, *Ezekiel*, 436.

⁶⁷The word עוֹלָם also occurs twice in the first half of chap. 43, which is also about the Jerusalem temple.

⁶⁸Ernst Jenni, "עוֹלָם," *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997), 859. Hummel notes that the uses of עוֹלָם here imply for eternity, though in other uses it does not always imply forever. Hummel, *Ezekiel 21-48*, 1092.

in the book and is unique in all the Hebrew Scriptures to the book of Ezekiel. The other phrase that is often translated the land of Israel is אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל and occurs twelve times in the Hebrew Scriptures, with three of them being in Ezekiel.⁶⁹

The predominance of these phrases, twenty of twenty-nine times in all the Hebrew Scriptures, occurring in Ezekiel shows the importance of the land to the future of the house of Israel. Third, the terminology of the book of Ezekiel is important. As noted above, Ezekiel never uses the terms Jerusalem or Abraham in a positive sense, and the term Zion does not occur in the book. Instead, Ezekiel refers to Jacob as the ancestor of the covenant.⁷⁰

The Jerusalem temple in Ezek 37 must be understood plainly. However, Beale believes that the physical temple is not in view in this chapter.⁷¹ He takes the clause וְהָיָה מְשָׁכְנֵי עַל יְהֵם from 37:27 to be some type of dwelling other than a temple because of the preposition, עַל.⁷² He understands this use of the preposition to imply that the

⁶⁹The phrase “land of Israel” occurs four times in Tobit, with three of them in the passage Tob 14:4-5, which focuses on the future Jerusalem temple and the eschatological future.

⁷⁰Jacob is used in the context of restoration in 28:25, 37:25, and 39:25. Furthermore, Jacob is used in 20:5 in the context of the Lord choosing and covenanting with the house of Israel, which is Jacob’s name. This usage of Jacob brings the audience back to the beginnings of the relationship between God and Israel. It is further solidified by the understanding of the relationship beginning in their “youth” as is pointed out in 16:22, 43, 60; 23:3, 8, 19, 21. Contra Patton, as she said, “The covenant of God with Jacob at Bethel has no reflex in the biblical tradition of the temple of Jerusalem.” Patton, “Blueprint,” 122. As mentioned above, this text clearly refutes Block’s view that Jacob was not the youth of Israel. Block, *Ezekiel*, 1:516. Clorfene maintains that although Abraham is said to have gone to Mt. Moriah, that is, the temple mount, for the sacrifice of Isaac (Gen 22; cf. 2 Chr 3:1), it was Jacob who called the temple mount a house of God (Gen 28:17; assuming that בֵּית אֱלֹהִים “house of God” in this context refers to the temple mount). Chaim Clorfene, *The Messianic Temple: Understanding Ezekiel’s Prophecy* (Jerusalem: C. Clorfene, 2005), 35. It is the story of Jacob at Beth-El that Turner notes is the typical case of sacred space. Turner, *From Temple to Meeting House*, 17. Sacred space, as opposed to profane space, is at the heart of the message Ezekiel is focusing on in the restoration and temple passages.

⁷¹Beale, *Church’s Mission*, 111-2. Congar also evaluates Ezek 37 and concludes that “[t]he temple whose plan Ezechiel draws is not an architectural project, it has a prophetic meaning.” Yves M.-J. Congar, *The Mystery of the Temple, or, The Manner of God’s Presence to His Creatures from Genesis to the Apocalypse*, trans. Reginald F. Trevett (London: Burns and Oates, 1962), 69.

⁷²Beale uses Woudstra for the Hebrew understanding. Marten H. Woudstra, “The Tabernacle in Biblical-Theological Perspective,” in *New Perspectives of the Old Testament*, ed. J. Barton Payne (Waco, TX: Word, 1970), 98; Beale, *Church’s Mission*, 339.

dwelling is metaphysically “over” all the people; thus, it is not a physical building, implying that the physical temple is not meant in this passage.⁷³ Beale leans away from a physical temple in Ezek 37 to a situation without a temple, just the presence of God filling the earth.⁷⁴ However, this preposition *עַל* can mean “on,” “over,” “in front of,” or “before” in the spatial sense.⁷⁵ Perhaps the best translation of this preposition is “together with” rendering the phrase: My dwelling will be together with them.⁷⁶ The verse before and after makes use of the phrase *מִקְדָּשִׁי בְּתוֹכְכֶם לְעוֹלָם*, and Beale fails to deal adequately with this phrase. It is here in vv. 26 and 28 that the term *מִקְדָּשׁ*, the common name in Ezekiel for temple, is used.⁷⁷ Ezekiel 37:27 has the only use of *מִשְׁכָּן* for the temple (if it is referring to the temple rather than the dwelling aspect), or more accurately dwelling place, in the book of Ezekiel. The root *שָׁכַן*, from which *מִשְׁכָּן* gives meaning to the relationship of the future,⁷⁸ implies that God and people will live together, creating the necessity for all the purity regulations of the vision in 40–48. Therefore, the form may not be a name for a metaphysical temple as Beale maintains. Beale’s understanding of this passage cannot be correct; the passage refers multiple times to the physical temple.⁷⁹ Even Tuell, who does not see a physical temple in the vision of 40–48, acknowledges that

⁷³Beale, *Church’s Mission*, 339.

⁷⁴Ibid., 111.

⁷⁵Koehler and Baumgartner, *HALOT*, s.v. “עַל.”

⁷⁶Ibid.

⁷⁷The term *מִקְדָּשׁ* is used 29 times in Ezekiel, 13 times before chap. 40. Kutsko notes that *מִקְדָּשׁ* is the preferred term for the temple in 40–48. John F. Kutsko, *Between Heaven and Earth: Divine Presence and Absence in the Book of Ezekiel* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000), 100. Haran notes that the phrase *בַּיַּת מִקְדָּשׁ* becomes the common term for the temple in post-biblical Hebrew. Haran, *Temples*, 15.

⁷⁸Fredenburg notes the sanctuary reinforces the aspect of covenant between God and people. Fredenburg, *Ezekiel*, 332.

⁷⁹Clements holds that the understanding of God dwelling with the people means clearly that a new physical temple is to be built. Clements, *Ezekiel*, 169. Price also notes that the leader spoken of in Ezek 37:25-28 establishes a new temple. Price, “Desecration and Restoration,” 99.

this passage may refer to the rebuilding of the temple.⁸⁰ This passage anticipates a physical temple for a dwelling place of God.

The last restoration passage before the vision in Ezek 40–48 is the preceding paragraph in Ezek 39:25–29. This passage highlights familiar themes of the Lord gathering the exiles, the bearing of shame by the people, the uniting of the house of Israel, the Lord being made holy before the eyes of the nations, and the house of Israel dwelling securely on their land. This passage sets the stage for the vision of the temple in 40–48 to follow.

The use of the verb **יָשַׁבְתִּי** in Ezek 39:27 ties in with its use in other restoration passages (Ezek 20:41, 28:25, and 36:23). The use in 39:27, as well as two of these other uses, is connected directly to the Jerusalem temple (Ezek 20:41 and 28:25). This use in 39:27 alludes to the beginning of the ministry of the rebuilt Jerusalem temple.⁸¹ Another allusion to the temple in this passage is the verb **יָצַשׁ** in Ezek 39:29. This verb is used in Ezekiel to describe only five things, four of which are commonly used (an assault ramp, wrath, lusts, and blood) and the fifth is the unique use here of the spirit of the Lord. The pouring out of the spirit of the Lord seems to allude to the sound of water in Ezek 43:2 (cf. Ezek 1:24) where the glory of the Lord comes to inhabit the Jerusalem temple and the relationship with the house of Israel is sealed into eternity.⁸²

The last restoration passage in Ezekiel is the last vision, chaps. 40–48, which

⁸⁰Tuell, “Divine Presence,” 114.

⁸¹Zimmerli makes note of the fact that the battle with Gog is left out of this consideration where the Lord is consecrated before the eyes of the nations. Also, he maintains that as the battle with Gog fades, it is the most decisive action of history that takes place: the beginning of a new phase in the relationship between God and the chosen people. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 2:320, 324. Contra van der Meer who sees the return of the people as rehabilitating the reputation of the Lord. Michaël N. van der Meer, “A New Spirit in an Old Corpus? Text-Critical, Literary-Critical and Linguistic Observations regarding Ezek 36:16–38,” in *The New Things: Eschatology in Old Testament Prophecy Festschrift for Henk Leene*, ed. F. Postma, K. Spronk, and E. Talstra (Maastricht, Netherlands: Uitgeverij Shaker, 2002), 147.

⁸²Zimmerli describes the pouring of the spirit as “the final irrevocable union.” Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 2:321.

shows the audience of the text how the restoration is to be pictured.⁸³ It is often depicted as a vision of the messianic age,⁸⁴ although the head of the people is titled a leader, מְשִׁיחַ, not necessarily a king, מֶלֶךְ.⁸⁵ In any case, the vision is of the future with eschatological elements.⁸⁶ The vision starts with the prophet being taken in a vision to the temple mount.⁸⁷ This last restoration passage declares the necessity of the Jerusalem temple;⁸⁸ however, it merely restates what has already been presented in terms of the centrality of the temple to the restoration of the earth, people, and worship of the Lord.⁸⁹ The vision of the temple in 40-42 gives no indication of describing the restored Israel.⁹⁰ The restoration

⁸³Clements summarizes this vision as a long, meticulous prophecy of what the restoration will be like. Clements, *Ezekiel*, 176.

⁸⁴Clorfene titles his text on the temple showing his hypothesis. Clorfene, *Messianic Temple*. Fisch and Rosenberg write that “[t]he allusion is to the final deliverance of Israel and the restoration of the Temple in the Messianic age (Kimchi).” Solomon Fisch and Avraham J. Rosenberg, *Ezekiel: Hebrew Text and English Translation with an Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Soncino, 1994), 296.

⁸⁵Tuell regards chap. 37, which labels the Davidic ruler a king, as the product of a later editing of the book. Tuell, *Ezekiel*, 256.

⁸⁶Stuart notes that this section is meant to portray the key realities of the *eschaton*. Douglas Stuart, *Ezekiel* (Dallas, TX: Word, 1989), 367.

⁸⁷Observe the connection with Ezek 17:22 where the mountain is Zion and is the source of peace and fruitfulness. Also, the reference in Mic 4:1 shows the mountain of the house of the Lord as the head of the mountains, a thought similar to Ezekiel. The exilic text of Isa 40:9 shows a similar idea and wording, הַר גְּבוּרָה, explicitly referencing Zion as the mountain. Greenberg also notes an important reason why the text declares that this is a high mountain connected with Jerusalem: It balances the earlier events in 8-11, the prophet’s transportation to Jerusalem. Greenberg, “Program of Restoration,” 190. Some have held that the high mountain here is either an ideal or some other mountain, but Zimmerli summarily dismisses these unfounded arguments for the clear meaning of the text, which refers to Jerusalem. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 2:347. Himmelfarb also notes that “[t]he ‘very high mountain’ of 40:2 on which Ezekiel sees the restored Temple is clearly Mt. Zion.” Himmelfarb, “Garden of Eden,” 64.

⁸⁸Schmid and Steck declare that the return of the Lord to Jerusalem “naturally stands in the center (Isa 40:3-5; 52:7-10; Ezek 43:1-4). To this aspect belongs the reconstruction and majestic outfitting of the temple (Isa 44:26-28; Hag 1-2; Ezek 40-43; cf. also Isa 60:1-16, as well as 66:1-4!).” Konrad Schmid and Odil H. Steck, “Restoration Expectations in the Prophetic Tradition of the Old Testament,” in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*, ed. James M. Scott (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 53.

⁸⁹Showing the relationship between Ezek 40–48 and the other eschatological passages within Ezekiel, Levenson notes that “chs. 40–48 constitute a more detailed and normative exposition of the eschatology outlined in the earlier chapters.” J. D. Levenson, *Program of Restoration*, 75.

⁹⁰Hiers makes this point perfectly with the idea that the new temple is the focus and transforming entity of the coming eschatological reconstitution of Israel. Richard H. Hiers, “Purification of the Temple: Preparation for the Kingdom of God,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 90 (1971): 86. The temple is not constructed after the reconstitution of Israel. Collins disagrees entirely, maintaining that the vision is

of Israel does not occur until the glory inhabits the temple in chap. 43.⁹¹

All the restoration passages in the book of Ezekiel present a coherent description and unite to present the restorative focus of the book. There are many common issues presented in these restoration passages. These issues are the heart and spirit given to the people, the house of Israel, the observance of the Lord's decrees and statutes, the assembly of the people to the land of Israel, the secure and bountiful dwelling upon that land, the knowledge of the Lord, the covenant with Jacob, a Davidide to lead the people, and the shame of the people.

All of these issues appear multiple times in the restoration passages of the book of Ezekiel and are important. However, the only one that can be said to be in all of the restoration passages of Ezekiel is the Jerusalem temple.⁹² Tooman notes, "The central concern of Ezekiel's visions is restoration of the Temple and the divine presence."⁹³ Sometimes, the temple is the focus or climax of the passage, such as in 20:20-44, 34, 36, 37, and 40-48. Other times, the temple is one of a number of important issues in the passage, such as in 11:16-21, 16:53-63, and 17:22-24.

Sometimes, the temple plays an important part in a subtle manner to show the Lord as holy to the people or nations or in the covenant between God and people, such as

entirely eschatological. John J. Collins, *Jerusalem and the Temple in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature of the Second Temple Period*, International Rennert Guest Lecture Series 1 (Jerusalem: Ingeborg Rennert Center for Jerusalem Studies, 1998), 7. Collins does not address how chaps. 40-42 are eschatological.

⁹¹The climax of the vision takes place when the Lord returns to the temple. Before that instant in time, the temple is an empty ground plan in an unrestored land. Levenson views the return of the Lord as the vision's climax. J. D. Levenson, *Program of Restoration*, 10.

⁹²Levenson notes that the salvation of Israel is "centered on the rebuilt Temple." *Ibid.*, 33. Tuell writes that the Jerusalem temple is not merely the heart of any one vision, but stands at the center of the prophet's world. Tuell, *Law of the Temple*, 178. Contra Stevens who claims that once the temple was destroyed it "was now a memory, resurfacing as a vision in Ezekiel's prophecy (Ezek 40-48)." Marty E. Stevens, *Temples, Tithes, and Taxes: The Temple and the Economic Life of Ancient Israel* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2006), 19.

⁹³Tooman, "Waiting for God," 18.

in 28:25-26 or 39:25-29.⁹⁴ It is important to notice the sacrifices or cultic ministrations of the temple in these restoration passages, perhaps even more than in the passages that stress the temple as the focus or climax of the restoration passages. This is because these ministerial actions show the thorough pervasiveness of the temple in the restoration of the entire house of Israel to her God within the book of Ezekiel.⁹⁵

Yet another aspect of the Jerusalem temple important to the restoration of the house of Israel is where the new temple is placed in the restoration in these passages.⁹⁶ The beginning stages of all these passages start with the Lord gathering the people back to their land.⁹⁷ All of the passages, either explicitly or implicitly, imply that the ending of the restoration will be a secure dwelling with knowledge of the Lord in a covenant relationship on a fruitful land.

In the middle, vague agreement exists with the passages leaving out specifics on the steps leading from the exile to the *eschaton*.⁹⁸ The passages tend to get more specific

⁹⁴McKelvey points out that the new Jerusalem temple would be the center of worship not just of Israel but of the nations as well. McKelvey, *New Temple*, 9.

⁹⁵The temple is indivisible from the Lord's presence on the chosen mountain in the land of Israel. Vawter and Hoppe, *New Heart*, 76.

⁹⁶Greenberg points out that Ezek 36:24-32 is a timeline for God recreating the house of Israel. He also highlights an aspect of this timeline, in which purgation (i.e., cultic ministrations at the temple) comes immediately after the gathering of the house of Israel. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21-37*, 734. Cooper's timeline also shows that cleansing comes after the ingathering. Cooper, *Ezekiel*, 316-317. Cooper reiterates this same fact regarding chap. 37 as well. *Ibid.*, 327.

⁹⁷The only passage where this is not stated is Ezek 17:22-24. In that short passage about the restoration, it does seem implied that the people would be gathered if a king is to be a leader over them. In all the other passages it is overtly described. Gaines notes that "[o]nly at the dawn of the new age will the diaspora be gathered from the far corners of the earth and the prophetic vision of the eschatological Jerusalem realized for all generations." Gaines, "Jerusalem," 344. Allen notices that six of ten of the restoration passage contain the promise of the return of the house of Israel to the land of Israel. Allen, *Ezekiel 20-48*, 2:214.

⁹⁸It is important to see and to attempt to understand this timeline in order to understand the restoration that Ezekiel presents, although Block is correct in advising caution in this endeavor: "One is cautioned against using the details in his descriptions to construct a sequential calendar of eschatological events." However, the eschatological events are presented repeatedly in sequence, showing the importance of the sequence and since the temple is in that sequence, the investigation into the sequence adds detail that is important for understanding the temple within the book. Block, *Ezekiel*, 1:57.

and more detailed as the book progresses to the final vision of restoration. Some of the passages mention a leader. Some mention that the Lord will make it so that the house of Israel is obedient, and some refer to a new heart and spirit, both in the singular, that will be poured upon the people. The temple's place on the timeline is after the gathering of the house of Israel, that is, quite early in the timeline.

The Critique of the Solomonic Temple

Before investigation of Ezekiel's critique of the first Jerusalem temple, this critique may need some preliminary semantic clarifications.⁹⁹ The details in 1 Kgs 6 and Ezek 40-41 show the floor plan of the temple (not the ground plan, as ground plans focus more on the building in relation to other structures) to hold the same dimensions. The Holy of Holies is twenty cubits long by twenty cubits wide. The Holy place is forty cubits long by twenty cubits wide. The outside dimensions of the temple building are one hundred cubits long by fifty cubits wide.

Thus, when the layout of the temple of Solomon is critiqued by Ezekiel, as noted in this work, it is obvious to even the casual reader that this critique is not assessing anything from the exterior walls of the temple building proper and inward (i.e., again, the inside is the floor plan). The temple critique in Ezekiel is assessing the ground plan from the walls outward (i.e., the ground plan, the relationship between a building and other structures).

If the interiors of both temples are the same (such as the mathematical statement that $2=2$), one could not be greater or better (such as the mathematical statement that

⁹⁹Some readers may bristle at the semantic choice of the word "critique" here. Some might prefer to note this is a change (from God in the prophetic text) for the time after the destruction of the first temple. This is a change in the temple's sacred ground layout to avoid the profane acts (e.g., building a palace next to the temple on the temple's sacred ground). There is no difference between these two assertions except the semantic choice of "critique," which is due to the fact that the change admits the past sacred ground layout led to God leaving the first temple, so change to a new, ideal temple inherently invites comparison with the old temple that places the latter in a negative light. This is what this work calls a critique, but if one wants to call it a change from God, that is acceptable.

2>2). As noted, this is obvious; yet, in order to clearly preempt any possible confusion when evaluating the critique in Ezekiel regarding the temple walls and outward, perhaps an absolutely precise term for this ground plan is needed.

Any term used should come from the text of Ezekiel, so the term עֵיר הַמִּקְדָּשׁ used by the Temple Scroll would be a poor choice. Not only does this not come from Ezekiel, but the term means something different in the Temple Scroll. A modern designation, such as “temple court layout,” would also not be the best choice, as this expression is not used in Ezekiel, and the temple, kitchens, quarters, courtyards, and open areas are combined in the ground plan for the area, so that the ground plan goes beyond a “temple court layout.”

The term “holy of holies” in Ezek 43:12 is closer, but this would be confusing as the inner room of the temple is the holy of holies in Ezek 41:4. Also, in Ezek 45:3 the portion of land that measures 25,000 cubits by 10,000 cubits and is set aside for the sanctuary is also called a holy of holies. Yet, in Ezek 45:4, there is a term that will suffice to preempt any confusion in assessing what the critique in Ezekiel is addressing in the first temple. This term, מִקְדָּשׁ לְמִקְדָּשׁ, is “sacred ground for the temple.” Using the term “the temple’s sacred ground layout” contains within it all the area that the text of Ezekiel addresses as well as all the area that the text of Ezekiel critiques of Solomon’s temple grounds.¹⁰⁰

Important declarations come from the Lord in Ezek 43:7b-8. One declaration is that “the house of Israel will not profane, again, my holy name.” This declaration goes to the people and “their kings with their fornication and the corpses of their kings, their cult places.”¹⁰¹ These acts originated “when they set their threshold with my threshold and

¹⁰⁰Therefore, either this arcane, but accurate, term, “the temple’s sacred ground layout,” is used or the modern English term, “temple ground plan,” is used. This work considers these two terms interchangeable.

¹⁰¹The translation of מִבְּמִקְדָּשׁ as “cult places” results from the work of Milgrom. Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 3:2316.

their doorpost near my doorpost and a wall between me and them.”¹⁰² The verb that the text uses for the Lord’s command that the people not profane or defile God’s name is **טמא**.¹⁰³ This verb, **טמא**, means to become unclean in the *qal* stem and to defile or profane in the *pi□el* stem. This is a common verb in Ezekiel as it is used third most in the Hebrew Scriptures when considering the number of verses where it occurs, normalized by the number of verses in the book.¹⁰⁴

In Ezek 43:8b, there is another declaration using this same verb: “[T]hey profaned my holy name with their abominations.” The actions in Ezek 43:8a clearly raise issues involving the temple’s sacred ground layout issues.¹⁰⁵ First, the threshold of the people or king is too close to the threshold of the Lord. Second, the doorpost of the people or king is too near the doorpost of the Lord. Third, there is only a wall to separate the temple from the people or king.

These three issues are clearly presenting faults in the physical sacred ground layout of Solomon’s temple. The issue in Ezek 43:8b is somewhat less clear with the accusation of abominations. However, Koehler and Baumgartner note that this use

¹⁰²O’Hare notes that “[t]he external motivation for Ezekiel’s vision is also supplied in the prophet’s polemic against the **פגרי מלביהם** in Ezek 43:7-9, which was separated from the temple only by a wall, and so did not properly respect the sacredness of the temple complex.” Daniel M. O’Hare, *Have You Seen, Son of Man? A Study in the Translation and Vorlage of the LXX Ezekiel 40–48* (Atlanta: SBL, 2010), 158. The encroachment of the profane to the ground where the temple of the Lord resided defiled the temple itself merely by its location.

¹⁰³This verb is the opposite of **טהר**, which was noted in the last section as referring to cultic purity or cleanness. This opposite nature of these two verbs can be seen in Ezek 37:23.

¹⁰⁴The verb occurs most in Leviticus at a rate of 8.265%, second most in Haggai at a rate of 2.632%, and third most in Ezekiel at a rate of 2.2%. The verb occurs 30 times in Ezekiel’s 48 chapters. The uses in Ezek 43:7-8 are in the *pi□el* stem. When analyzing the *pi□el* and *pu□al* stems that mean to profane or defile, the verb occurs most in Leviticus at a rate of 1.863% and second most in Ezekiel at a rate of 1.178%, with 15 uses of these two stems in Ezekiel.

¹⁰⁵O’Hare details this plainly as a polemic in Ezekiel. “Considering the polemic against the royal proximity to the sanctuary in Ezek 43:7-8 and the need for intervals in the wall of the sanctuary itself (Ezek 41:6-8), it is most unlikely that any structure would be allowed to come in contact with the holiest building of Ezekiel’s vision (cf. 1 Kgs 6:6).” O’Hare, *Have You Seen*, 145.

describes “their abominations (with reference to the temple).”¹⁰⁶ References to great abominations at the temple are in Ezek 8:6-13.¹⁰⁷ These actions may be some of the abominations referred to in 43:8b.

In Ezek 43:8, the text indicates that the first temple and palace layout allowed the defilement to intrude upon the holy space of the temple, profaning it.¹⁰⁸ Patterson and Austel, citing 1 Kgs 7:12, note that “the temple and the palace were included in one large complex and were enclosed within one courtyard.”¹⁰⁹ Although 1 Kings is not the subject of this investigation, the description of the temple and palace at the time of Ezekiel and how the text of Ezekiel reacts to this description are vital to understanding the book of Ezekiel. The temple’s sacred ground layout added to the reasons why the glory of the Lord left the temple (Ezek 10:18). Thus, it is possible that 43:8a and 8b are both taking issue with the temple.

These issues in 43:8 are referred to in 43:10 as גַּזְזָה and, therefore, the concept implied by this term needs general clarification. Considering the 230 uses of גַּזְזָה in the Hebrew Scriptures, including the use in Ezek 43:10, most carry the understanding of a mark, stain, or load that someone carries or bears after committing an act that God or people consider wrong. Koehler and Baumgartner call this an “act, or mistake, which is not right, unjust.”¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁶Koehler and Baumgartner, *HALOT*, s.v. “ גַּזְזָה .” The abominations could be referring to practices that are attacked within the text of Ezekiel, as a whole or specifically in 43:7b, or they could refer to the temple’s sacred ground layout, but more probably the abominations refer to both as all the things that were done wrong leading to the people profaning God’s name. In regarding an inclusive nature to this term, Koch notes the parallels between גַּזְזָה and הוֹעֵבֵבוֹת in Ezek 36:31. Klaus Koch, “ גַּזְזָה ,” *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, ed. G. Johannes Botterweck et al. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999), 10:556.

¹⁰⁷The same Hebrew term, הוֹעֵבֵבוֹת , is used in 8:6-13 as in 43:8.

¹⁰⁸Therefore, this layout, which caused this to happen, can be considered an abomination in and of itself, regardless of the subsequent actions.

¹⁰⁹Richard D. Patterson and Hermann J. Austel, “1 & 2 Kings,” *Expositor’s Bible Commentary*, ed. Frank E. Gaebelin (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1988), 4:69.

¹¹⁰Koehler and Baumgartner, *HALOT*, s.v. “ גַּזְזָה .”

There are over seventy-nine different main verbs in clauses where עֹן is the subject or object,¹¹¹ and most of these verbs are used only one time with this noun. The seven verbs used more than five times with עֹן in the Hebrew Scriptures are: נָשָׂא (carry), הָיָה (to be), בָּקַר (visit), זָכַר (remember), מוֹת (die), סָלַח (forgive), and כִּפֶּר (cleanse). However, when assessing how עֹן is used in Ezekiel, there are a few verbs that are striking in their absence. First, the verb סָלַח never occurs in the text of Ezekiel, so obviously never combines with עֹן. Next, the verb בָּקַר occurs twice in Ezekiel, but never with עֹן.¹¹² Also, the verb כִּפֶּר occurs six times in Ezekiel, but never with עֹן.¹¹³

Ezekiel's three primary verbs used with עֹן are: נָשָׂא (carry), הָיָה (to be), and מוֹת (die). The verbs in Ezekiel that are used with עֹן show that it is something that the people will carry as a result of their actions,¹¹⁴ or the prophet will carry for them.¹¹⁵ In Ezekiel, it is common that people will die in or with their עֹן, since it is a mark, stain, or load and one could actually die bearing it.¹¹⁶

To further refine this concept, the uses of עֹן with חַטָּאת (sin) show distinctions between the two, which illuminate the concept of עֹן. There are forty verses where עֹן

¹¹¹Some clauses have more than one verb and this analysis tried to analyze the main verb controlling the noun.

¹¹²The two uses in Ezekiel (23:21, 38:8) do not have God as the subject and are used in rare ways of “longing for” and “being summoned.”

¹¹³Five of these uses are in chaps. 43 and 45 describing cleansing the altar, cleansing with burnt offerings and peace offerings, and unintentional actions. The use in 16:63 has the Lord cleansing the people in a restoration passage, but עֹן is not addressed specifically, but the cleansing is from all that Israel had done, which would include עֹן, but not be limited to it. Many other verbs are used in the Hebrew Scriptures, but the only other use in Ezekiel along this line is in Ezek 36:33 with the verb טָהַר. This cleansing, according to Ezek 36:33, occurs on one day, “on a day when I cleanse you.”

¹¹⁴The people carry their עֹן in Ezek 14:10. Each individual carries their עֹן, as shown in Ezek 18:18, 20. The Levites also have to carry their עֹן, as shown in Ezek 44:10, 12.

¹¹⁵These uses are shown in Ezek 4:4, 5, and 6.

¹¹⁶These uses are shown in Ezek 3:18, 19; 18:17, 18, 20; 33:8, 9. The people die or מָקַח (rot, shown in Ezek 4:17, 24:23) in their עֹן if they do not change their wicked ways.

and **תטס** occur,¹¹⁷ and most show these two are different concepts.¹¹⁸ Although some of the verses using both concepts are vague, they do seem to imply that **ע** is a mark, stain, load carried by the person due to an act committed, whereas **תטס** is an action committed, sometimes **בשגגה** (unintentionally). Looking specifically at the one verse in Ezekiel where both concepts occur (21:29 [Eng. 24]),¹¹⁹ Zedekiah's **ע** (mark or stain) was remembered when Israel's **בשגגה** (rebellions) were revealed, in order to show the **תטס**, the actions that Israel did.

Taking the general idea of **ע** and the illumination added from distinguishing it from **תטס**, Ezekiel presents this concept as something to be carried by the people, or in chap. 4 by the prophet, who performed certain actions. The mark will be carried while living, the person will die with this mark, and it is still upon the bones long after death (Ezek 32:27).

Although there is a semantic range for the word, one can see that a mark or stain suffices for every occurrence of the word in the book of Ezekiel. This would include the concept of existing, dying, rotting, being ashamed of, or stumbling about with one's mark or stain (usually with the **ע** preposition).¹²⁰ A similar concept would be the idea of lifting or bearing the mark or stain.¹²¹ Some verses comment on the size or quality of the stain or

¹¹⁷These are Exod 34:9, Lev 10:17, 16:21, Deut 19:15, 1 Sam 20:1, Neh 3:37, 9:2, Job 10:6, 13:23, Pss 32:5, 38:19, 51:4, 85:3, 109:14, Prov 5:22, Isa 6:7, 27:9, 40:2, 43:24, 59:2, 59:12, Jer 5:25, 14:10, 16:10, 16:18, 18:23, 30:14, 30:15, 31:34, 36:3, 50:20, Lam 4:6, 4:13, 4:22, Ezek 21:29, Hos 4:8, 8:13, 9:9, 13:12, Mic 7:19.

¹¹⁸In Lam 4:6 the concepts are used in synonymous fashion as well as possibly in Jer 50:20.

¹¹⁹Ezekiel ranks last of all 14 books of the Hebrew Scriptures where the two concepts occur in a verse in terms of how many verses where the word occurs compared to how many verses are in the book. This could show further evidence that the two concepts are different enough in that they do not even need to be compared to each other.

¹²⁰See Ezek 3:18, 19; 4:17; 7:13, 16, 19; 14:3, 4, 7; 16:49; 18:17, 18, 19, 20, 30; 24:23; 32:37; 33:6, 8, 9; 36:31; 39:23; 43:10; 44:12a.

¹²¹See Ezek 4:4, 5, 6; 14:10; 44:10, 12b.

mark.¹²² Some are assertions of remembering the mark or stain.¹²³ There is a final mark or stain referenced.¹²⁴ The mark or stain can be cleaned off the bearer.¹²⁵ The mark will not be forgiven. The mark will be removed only on one future day when the Lord will clean it off. The mark is different from a sin, but comes from an action performed by the one carrying the mark.¹²⁶ Yet, the mark or stain put forth in the meaning of the word עֲוֹן clearly means, from a priestly point of view, the mark or stain from an action.

The actions described in 43:7b-8 are referred to in 43:10 using the word עֲוֹן. The description of the temple's sacred ground layout in chaps. 40-42 is expected to make the people ashamed from the marks of their wrong actions, מַעֲוֹנוֹתֵיהֶם. The three wrong actions in 43:8a can be considered “an act, or mistake, which is not right, unjust,” which is within the semantic range of meaning for the word.¹²⁷

The reference to their wrong actions in 43:10 is not exclusively referring to the three temple sacred ground layout issues of 43:8a, but includes them as part of all their wrong actions.¹²⁸ Gane notes that “עֲוֹן can represent any part of the process of wrongful

¹²²See Ezek 9:9 and 28:18.

¹²³See Ezek 21:28, 29; 29:16.

¹²⁴See Ezek 21:30, 34; 35:5.

¹²⁵See Ezek 36:33.

¹²⁶In Ezekiel, these actions are wicked ways (3:19), bloody acts and perversity (9:9), implied taking of interest, not observing ordinances, and not following statutes (18:17), doing what is not good, exploiting the oppressed, and robbing people (18:18), wicked trade and making holy places common (28:18), when the people looked behind themselves for help (29:16), violating their covenantal obligations (39:23), wrong action illuminated by the correct pattern of the temple (43:10), and going away from God (44:10).

¹²⁷This understanding is from Koehler and Baumgartner as an introduction for the word עֲוֹן. The translations the lexicon gives are “misdeed, sin,” “guilt caused by sin,” and “punishment (for guilt).” Koehler and Baumgartner, *HALOT*, s.v. “עֲוֹן.”

¹²⁸However, this work is seeking to explore the physical temple's sacred ground layout which would emphasize the three layout issues of 43:8a and the abominations done at the temple in 43:8b if they are a layout issue and not just wrong practices done at the temple.

act-blame-punishment, whether the act is intentional or not.”¹²⁹ In Lev 1-16, Gane restricts the sense of the word to “culpability.”¹³⁰ Here in Ezek 43, this culpability or responsibility is for the acts at the temple and its environs, but more important for this work is the culpability for the specific issues with the temple’s sacred ground layout.¹³¹ To defile the temple is what is addressed in Ezek 43:8, as well as defilement that comes from the profane invading the temple’s sacred ground.¹³² The temple is invaded by the profane resulting in impurity because there is no distance between the profane and the holy (also explicitly addressed in 43:9). This illustrates the understanding of Koch here in Ezekiel and is consistent with the assignment of the concept of ׁוּׁׁ in 43:10 to the temple’s sacred ground layout issues of 43:8a, as well as 43:9, and possibly also the issues described in 43:8b.¹³³

¹²⁹Roy E. Gane, *Cult and Character: Purification Offerings, Day of Atonement, and Theodicy* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 294.

¹³⁰Ibid.

¹³¹The fact that Ezekiel identifies himself as being from a priestly family (Ezek 1:3) and the priestly references in the book (e.g., bearing the ׁוּׁׁ) probably indicates that it is safe to use priestly terminology similar to Leviticus. Milgrom makes the conclusion that “is inescapable: Ezekiel had all of P and nearly all of H (see comment E) before him, the language and ideas of which he refashioned in novel ways.” Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 3:2362. Eisemann includes an appendix (IV) at the end of his commentary titled “Similarities between Leviticus and Ezekiel.” Eisemann, *Yechezkel*, vii.

¹³²The text of Ezekiel contains 57% of all the uses of the word ׁוּׁׁ , “profane,” in the Hebrew Scriptures. Furthermore, the text of Ezekiel contains 40% of all the uses of the verb ׁוּׁׁ , “to profane” in the Hebrew Scriptures. This verb means: “to be defiled,” “to profane,” or “to pierce,” which renders a thing or a female profane. Koehler and Baumgartner, *HALOT*, s.v. “ׁוּׁׁ.” In Ezekiel, this verb is used to declare that God (13:19; 22:26 [this use in the *Nip̄al*, which the lexicon asserts, means “to be defiled” and therefore the verse can be seen as asserting that God is defiled from Israel’s actions]), God’s name (e.g., 20:9; 36:20, 21, 22, 23), God’s holy things (22:26), God’s sanctuary (e.g., 23:39; 25:3; 44:7), God’s treasured place (7:22), God’s Sabbaths (e.g., 20:13, 16, 21) and many other things and peoples are profane. Ezekiel, like no other book in the Hebrew Scriptures, is focused on the profane and the effects of profaning actions. Ezekiel 44:23 explicitly declares that the priests “will teach my people the difference between the holy and the profane and inform them between the defiled and the clean.” The abundant uses of this concept in Ezekiel show how important the topic is to the prophet’s message. Milgrom and Block posit that the reason for the new design of the sanctuary is “to distance the holy from the nonholy.” Jacob Milgrom and Daniel I. Block, *Ezekiel’s Hope: A Commentary on Ezekiel 38-48* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2012), 43.

¹³³Koch notes that ׁוּׁׁ in Ezekiel has meanings such as “idolatry,” false prophecy,” “disregard for the poor,” “dishonesty,” “other misdeeds that fill the land with blood,” or acts that “profane the central sanctuary.” Koch, “ׁוּׁׁ,” *TDOT*, 555. Koch notes that, from Qumran, the more mundane can be referred to as ׁוּׁׁ such as “illegal accumulation of wealth or persecution of the Teacher of Righteousness,” or “a neglected chance to rebuke or admonish a fellow member of the community.” Ibid., 561.

The command in 43:9 that the people “will distance their fornication and the corpses of their kings from me” is clearly delineated in 43:8. Zimmerli clarifies that 43:8 shows that the people must “[s]eparate cleanly the sacred from the profane, separate clearly God’s sphere of ownership from the sphere of human, even royal claims.”¹³⁴

Ezekiel 43:7-9 makes it clear that the royal claims to the temple mount are voided; the profane shall not invade the sphere of the holy.¹³⁵ The invasion of the profane into the realm of the holy in the past with the Solomonic temple’s sacred ground layout, where the royal palace was constructed too close to the temple, was wrong as this layout (not just the human actions caused by human nature that were committed there) led to the defiling of God’s name (Ezek 43:8a) and is described with the term ׁוּׁׁ (Ezek 43:10).

It is important to note regarding the building of the temple’s sacred ground layout in the book of Kings, no matter when one dates this material,¹³⁶ that although the palace construction (1 Kgs 7:1-12) is placed after the construction of the temple (1 Kgs 6:1-38), the palace construction is placed before furnishing the temple (7:15-50) as well as the dedication of the temple (1 Kgs 8:1-66).¹³⁷ Therefore, the building of the palace next to the temple would be dated to the same time as the temple itself. From the initial construction of the palace near the beginning of the reign of Solomon,¹³⁸ when the king set this temple’s sacred ground layout (Ezek 43:8a), the layout was accomplished by the king as an incorrect act, ׁוּׁׁ . Greenberg comments on the book of Kings that “[b]y the

¹³⁴Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 2:418.

¹³⁵Ezekiel 43:12 proclaims that the entire top of the temple mount is most holy.

¹³⁶There may be a need for a study on sacred ground layout in relation to the palace in 1 Kings.

¹³⁷“Inserted between the building and furnishing of the temple, this palace construction story shows that Solomon’s secular interests never cease and that these interests cost more than his religious one. The palace takes nearly twice as long to finish. Presumably it is also larger and more costly. Some of these differences are natural, given the constant use of the royal residence and hall of justice. Still, the close proximity of 6:37-38 and 7:1 makes the contrast quite obvious, even startling.” Paul R. House, *1, 2 Kings* (Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 2003), 130.

¹³⁸This layout may have been further complicated by other expansions by later kings.

standard of the Book of Kings, Israel's age of sin began with the erection of the temple."¹³⁹

In Ezek 43, the prophet addressed matters to the house of Israel due to their misdeeds (v. 10). Yet, this is not the only place in the book where the prophet does this. The phrase, עֹן בַּיַּת יִשְׂרָאֵל (the mark of misdeed of the house of Israel), occurs three times in the book (Ezek 4:4, 5; 9:9).¹⁴⁰ In chap. 4, the acts that the prophet was commanded to perform were to be a sign to the house of Israel.

The phrase, house of Israel in Ezekiel, has been taken to mean the Northern Kingdom, the Southern Kingdom, as well as all of Israel.¹⁴¹ Analyzing the phrase "house of Israel" in Ezekiel and in all the Hebrew Scriptures gives clear indication what is meant here in chap. 4.

The phrase is used eighty-three times in Ezekiel compared to 147 times in all the Hebrew Scriptures. With over half of the uses of the phrase in all the Hebrew Scriptures, it becomes apparent that the term is important in the book of Ezekiel. An examination of the eighty-three uses of the phrase in Ezekiel shows that whether addressing the past events or the future restoration, the book consistently uses the term inclusively. There is no support for understanding the phrase in Ezekiel as the Northern Kingdom.¹⁴² The

¹³⁹Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 125.

¹⁴⁰The reference in 9:9 is not addressed here because it is referring to many things, including the temple layout, which are not a part of this analysis.

¹⁴¹Block, Zimmerli, and Greenberg are a few of those who interpret the 390 years to concern all Israel. Block, *Ezekiel 1–24*, 178; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 1:166; Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 105. Weavers and Stuart are two of those who interpret the 390 to be regarding the Northern Kingdom. Weavers, *Ezekiel*, 61; Stuart, *Ezekiel*, 57.

¹⁴²Even in Ezek 37:16, the reference is to all or any of the House of Israel allied with the tribe of Joseph, not the Northern Kingdom. Greenberg notes about the 390 years in Ezek 4:5, that relating it only to the Northern Kingdom is unintelligible. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 105. Fisch and Rosenberg do equate this to the years from the Northern Kingdom split to the fall of Jerusalem, which is not even close to 390 years. Fisch and Rosenberg, *Ezekiel*, 20–21. Jensen maintains that the exile of the Northern Kingdom is to last 390 years from its fall in 722. Robert W. Jensen, *Ezekiel* (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2009), 56. The time frame around 332 might indicate the fulfillment by Alexander. This seems hard to imagine, given that one could view the Hellenistic age as the freedom of the Northern Kingdom from the eastern power.

phrase is not used in chap. 16 or chap. 23 of Ezekiel, where the Divided Kingdom is addressed in parable form.¹⁴³

With the understanding of the phrase “house of Israel” referring to all Israel in Ezekiel, the issue of the meaning and time frame of the trespass becomes important to the interpretation of the sign-act in Ezek 4.¹⁴⁴ The term, יָעוּב , is singular in Ezek 4:4-5, in contrast to the plural עוֹבֵי־טָוֶה uses in Ezekiel (i.e., 24:23; 28:18; 32:27; 36:31, 33; 43:10), but this could be merely the collective use of the noun. The two uses of יָעוּב in Ezek 4:4-5 carry a plural suffix: “their misdeed.”¹⁴⁵

In addition to the meaning of the word יָעוּב , which has been reviewed above in detail, a piece of information that is important for assessing the understanding of their misdeed is that Ezekiel is to lie on his side, a day for every year of the 390 years of their misdeed. The most obvious understanding of the phrase is what has been done (past tense), as opposed to a prophetic futuristic understanding.¹⁴⁶

Although this sign-act is not dated, it is early in the book and before the fall of Jerusalem. Therefore, it can be confidently dated (or at least presented in the book as dated) to the period between the first Babylonian exile, 597 BCE, and the fall of

¹⁴³Regarding a limited meaning for the phrase, house of Israel, Joyce shows that “wider usage of the word ‘Israel’ in Ezekiel suggests that this is incorrect, for wherever else Israel and Judah are found together in Ezekiel they are used interchangeably (e.g., 8:6, 17) and where the two kingdoms are contrasted a term other than ‘Israel’ is used for the north as in 23:4 ‘Samaria’ and 37:16, ‘Joseph/Ephraim.’ Israel here, then should be taken to refer to the people.” Joyce, *Ezekiel*, 85-86.

¹⁴⁴Block holds that יָעוּב “should be interpreted as a designation for Israelite behavior, viz., ‘iniquity,’ not as the punishment for that behavior, and the computation should be retrospective rather than forward looking.” Block, *Ezekiel*, 1:178.

¹⁴⁵Summarizing the above information on the uses of this word in Ezekiel, this could be the stain or mark caused by (or given because of) a misdeed.

¹⁴⁶Cooper interprets these years as looking forward in time. He adds the 390 and the 40 years together and takes the 430 from the year 597 to get to the Maccabean revolt in 167. Cooper, *Ezekiel*, 95. Translating יָעוּב punishment, would help this understanding, although adding the two time spans together stretches the meaning of the different sides upon which the prophet is to lie, and the short span of Maccabean independence seems to belittle the importance of the text. Talmon notes that many “have found it difficult, if not impossible, to make heads or tails of the figure 390.” Shemaryahu Talmon, *The World of Qumran from Within: Collected Studies* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1989), 28.

Jerusalem, 586 BCE. The 390 years before this would date the commencement of their misdeed to the beginning of Solomon’s reign. Zimmerli is not alone when he equates the 390 years of trespass to the years of existence of Solomon’s temple.¹⁴⁷ Greenberg notes, “Counting back from Ezekiel’s time 390 years brings one to the beginning of the tenth century BCE, roughly when the temple was built—perhaps the start of an era for Ezekiel; this era, then, was (on this interpretation) all sin.”¹⁴⁸

Even though some interpreters have had difficulty with the number of years,¹⁴⁹ the 390 should be interpreted within the main thrust of the book of Ezekiel: the temple.¹⁵⁰ This is not to say that there were not other actions, intentional and unintentional, that were יָזָו in the view of Ezekiel, yet the fact that the 390 has a specific chronological starting point does seem to indicate a specific action associated with the beginning of the Jerusalem temple.¹⁵¹

The prophet’s actions address the whole house of Israel in order to present a

¹⁴⁷Many see this 390-year reference as referring to the time span starting from the dedication of the first Jerusalem temple until its destruction. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 1:166; Peter C. Craigie, *Ezekiel* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983), 31; C. Wright, *Ezekiel*, 78; Block, *Ezekiel*, 1:178; Allen, *Ezekiel 1-19*, 1:66; Fredenburg, *Ezekiel*, 64; Tuell, *Ezekiel*, 26. Joyce and Odell fit the time period more generally to the time from the beginning of the united monarchy down to Ezekiel’s time. Joyce, *Ezekiel*, 86; Odell, *Ezekiel*, 63. Stuart understands the 390 to start from the beginning of the divided monarchy to the decree from Cyrus. Stuart, *Ezekiel*, 57. However, he fails to explain how the Assyrian exiles are equated with this timeline or to analyze how the phrase “house of Israel” is used in the book.

¹⁴⁸Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 105.

¹⁴⁹The Septuagint has 190 years, instead of 390 years of the Masoretic Text of Ezekiel, thereby showing early difficulty with the number.

¹⁵⁰Concluding his investigation on this point, Allen makes the issue clear, musing that even though an alternative rendering might give a better solution to the exact number, it would be “at the cost of losing a reference to a primary concern in the book.” Allen, *Ezekiel 1-19*, 1:67.

¹⁵¹If this is the case, then what is the יָזָו of the house of Judah (40 days for years) mentioned in Ezek 4:6? Although this challenging question is a good one, this work must leave it for another to examine. The forty years would put the time span from the middle of the reign of king Josiah to destruction of the temple. What happened in the middle (approximately 633 BCE) of Josiah’s reign in Judah that Ezekiel is alluding to here is not obvious. Also, no obvious connection with the temple’s sacred ground layout appears present and, thus, any research on that question must be left out of this work.

critique of Solomon's temple.¹⁵² Ezekiel might be seen here to address the failure of the monarchy by bringing on the catastrophic events of 722 and 586,¹⁵³ but this overlooks the importance of the temple to the book of Ezekiel. The sign act of bearing the misdeed for the house of Israel is reminiscent of the mediatorial function of the high priest (e.g., Exod 28:38).¹⁵⁴ By bearing the misdeed of the 390 years of Solomon's temple, Ezekiel represents the critical assessment of that temple to the house of Israel.

Greenberg's evaluation of the cultic worth of Solomon's temple encapsulates the view presented in Ezekiel: "The vehicles and guardians of God's indwelling presence—the Temple, its rites, and its personnel—had proven inadequate."¹⁵⁵ The temple was not only inadequate to keep God dwelling with Israel (as God left this temple as described in Ezek 10:18), but the יָבֹרֵךְ of Israel that Ezekiel is to bear started from the very dedication of the temple (as depicted in this sign-act of Ezek 4:4-5).¹⁵⁶

The critique of Solomon's temple comes to the forefront in the last vision of the book.¹⁵⁷ However the text was composed,¹⁵⁸ it presents an important response to the

¹⁵²Barker notes that the temple is the key feature not only for its proponents, but also for its critics. Ezekiel was a critic of Solomon's temple, but the focus was, nevertheless, on the temple. Barker, *Gate of Heaven*, 13. Vermeulen notes that many of the prophets including Hosea, Isaiah and Micah, Zephaniah, Jeremiah "et Ézéchiél sont, sur ce point au moins, les héritiers d'Amos; quand ils parlent du Temple, du culte ou de la liturgie, c'est presque toujours pour émettre une critique." Vermeulen, *Jérusalem*, 227.

¹⁵³Clements notes that "Ezekiel's message contains little overt condemnation of the policies that brought about the calamitous events of 588-587." Clements, *Ezekiel*, 3.

¹⁵⁴As mentioned above, Gane restricts the implication of יָבֹרֵךְ in Lev 1-16 to culpability and Ezekiel has many similarities to Leviticus. Now in combination with those two items, Schwartz shows that the meaning of יָבֹרֵךְ in P is of "[a] deed has been done that cannot be undone; it will be 'borne' thereafter." B. Schwartz, "Bearing of Sin," 15.

¹⁵⁵Greenberg, "Program of Restoration," 183.

¹⁵⁶Clements notes how the plan of the temple may have been wrong from the start. "It has even been suggested that, in Solomon's original plan, the temple was little more than a royal chapel. This is certainly an overstatement, but it indicates how closely the civil and religious aspects of the old Israelite state were intertwined." Clements, *Ezekiel*, 189. "The first temple was a part of the palace complex built by Solomon and for four centuries the kings in Jerusalem were central to its cult." Barker, *Gate of Heaven*, 5.

¹⁵⁷Klawans notes that this final vision is not merely a vision of the future, but a vision of what should have been built from the beginning and therefore is a strong critique of Solomon's temple. Jonathan Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 96.

former temple.¹⁵⁹ The plan of the temple's sacred ground layout differs from what had come before it.¹⁶⁰ Solomon's vast array of cultic accoutrements is not mentioned in the new temple's sacred ground layout. Whatever the eventual fate of these articles,¹⁶¹ it is God who will provide the correct temple with holiness.¹⁶²

This critique of the former temple is important. In view of Ezek 43 (see above), it appears that the criticism in chap. 4 may be directed at the temple's sacred ground layout, which the text of Ezekiel calls *תִּבְעָרָה*, the stain of the misdeed, of the house of Israel.¹⁶³

Even temples with identical floor plans (not that Solomon's temple and Ezekiel's temple

¹⁵⁸The structural analysis and layered composition of chaps. 40–48 have been thoroughly shown by Zimmerli. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 2:329-553.

¹⁵⁹Blenkinsopp states a point that is important when analyzing the book as a whole. "While this last vision has a character all its own, there can be no doubt that it is structurally and thematically an integral part of the book." Blenkinsopp, *Ezekiel*, 193.

¹⁶⁰Galambush observes the text of Ezekiel's new temple and surmises the difference. "The new temple is unlike the old precisely in its freedom from defilement. Both its architecture and its laws are designed to ensure a degree of holiness even greater than that prescribed for the former temple." Galambush, *Jerusalem*, 148-149. The holiness of the temple in Ezek 40–48 surpasses that of the holiness of Solomon's temple. Blenkinsopp comments that the whole temple of this vision has become a holy of holies compared to the inner sanctum of the former temple. Blenkinsopp, *Ezekiel*, 223.

¹⁶¹Block details the differences between the Torah of Moses and the Torah of Ezekiel. He points out differences in the priesthood, from Aaronic to Zadokite, and the missing furnishings such as the ark, lampstand, show-bread table and oil. Block, *Ezekiel*, 2:501. Haran also notes the radical change from P. Whether the tabernacle is a retrojection of Solomon's temple or a predecessor of the temple, which influenced the temple of Solomon, the comparison between P and Ezekiel shows an important critique to the Solomonic temple as well as to any cultic space which preceded it. Haran notes that "Ezekiel's temple differs very much from that of P, not only in its solid structure and architectural complexity, but also in that there are virtually no traces in it of all those appurtenances that furnish P's tabernacle and are the subject of cultic sanctity. There is neither ark nor cherubim in the inner sanctum of Ezekiel's temple, neither table for the show-bread nor lampstand in its outer sanctum, no anointing oil within the temple or in the court." Menahem Haran, "The Law-Code of Ezekiel XL-XLVIII and Its Relation to the Priestly School," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 50 (1979): 61.

¹⁶²The holiness of the temple comes from God. It also may be of some note that whatever holiness the first temple had, even with a different layout, it also came from God.

¹⁶³Regarding chap. 4, Block maintains that the text makes no hint of the manner of the trespass of the house of Israel, missing the critique shown above and here in the vision of chaps. 40–48. Block, *Ezekiel*, 1:178. However, Milgrom does not miss the critique against the temple of Solomon. He maintains that "Ezekiel is a religious conservative whose view represents a continuing polemic against the prevailing practice of the Jerusalem Temple." Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 1:453. This comment by Milgrom no doubt attacks the cultic practices at the temple, but also seems to include the temple structure itself. This is because of his choice of phrasing "of the Jerusalem Temple" and not "at the Jerusalem Temple."

are identical) with different sacred ground layouts would be different temples as location affects function.¹⁶⁴ The last vision of the book details the return of the glory of the Lord to an ideal temple,¹⁶⁵ which is different from its predecessor in that it allows glory of the Lord to return and stay forever.¹⁶⁶ In chap. 43, it is the improper structure, most specifically the temple's sacred ground layout, of the former temple that is cited as a factor in defiling the name of the Lord.¹⁶⁷ Clearly, the idea of the king's palace defiling the temple of the Lord is a radical critique of Solomon's temple.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁴With Ezek 43:13 explaining that the cubit is a different length, although perhaps this is only for the altar, Peterson writes that "while the size of Solomon's temple may be the same number of cubits in width and length, the actual dimensions based upon the older cubit are much smaller." Brian Peterson, "Ezekiel's Rhetoric: Ancient Near Eastern Building Protocol and Shame and Honor as the Keys in Identifying the Builder of the Eschatological Temple," *Journal of Evangelical Theological Society* 56 (2013): 726.

¹⁶⁵Oswalt calls the temple in Ezek 40–48 "a perfect temple." John N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: chaps. 40-66* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 550. Schiffman calls the layout in the last vision of Ezekiel an "ideal construct." Schiffman, *Courtyards*, 226. Maier claims that this last vision of Ezekiel "reflects the basic characteristics of a sanctuary as it should be." Johann Maier, "The Temple Scroll and Tendencies in the Cultic Architecture of the Second Commonwealth," in *Archeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 69. The understanding of how the temple should be critiques both Solomon's temple and, for later documents, the second temple. Hummel even states that Ezekiel's ground plan attests to a deficiency in Solomon's temple, "a deficiency the temple in Ezekiel's vision rectifies." Hummel, *Ezekiel 21-48*, 1241. Ezekiel's vision became a critique of the second temple as well. McKelvey notes the great pain and disappointment in looking upon the completed second temple because it was compared to the ideal temple anticipated in Ezekiel. McKelvey, *New Temple*, 23. Citing the work by Yom-Tov Lipmann Heller *tzurath habayith* from 1602, Clorfene relays that the Great Assembly knew "the Second Temple was destined for destruction" as it was not Ezekiel's temple's sacred ground layout. Clorfene, *Messianic Temple*, 5.

¹⁶⁶Price notes that the temple of Ezek 40–48 "is ultimately a reversal of the corruptible Sanctuary of the pre-exilic experience." Price, "Desecration and Restoration," 295. Corbin also states that Ezekiel's temple was not understood as a rebuilt or restored first temple, which was completely profaned by the people. Henry Corbin, *Temple and Contemplation*, trans. Philip Sherrard (London: KPI, 1986), 294. McKelvey misses the point of the critique in Ezekiel and other exilic and second temple writings suggesting that this new temple of Ezekiel was essentially the old temple restored in glorious form. McKelvey ignores the facts that the building layout, furnishings, cultic ministrations, and cultic personnel are substantially different. McKelvey, *New Temple*, 14.

¹⁶⁷Fujita clarifies the sense of Ezek 43:7-10 in his comment that it is the improper structure of the palace and temple combination that is a problem. He points out how the layout is one of the sins of the people in the book of Ezekiel. Fujita, "Temple Theology," 22-23.

¹⁶⁸Zimmerli explains, "The most revolutionary element of the temple description in the great guidance vision consisted precisely in the clear separation of the temple from the palace complex." Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 2:418. However, this revolutionary element only adds to the detailed description of the temple in chaps. 40-42 that critique Solomon's temple.

The temple pattern given in the vision of the Lord in chaps. 40-42 is reminiscent of how Moses received the tabernacle pattern from the Lord (starting in Exod 25:9). Scripture presents a united front that the correct temple pattern comes from the Lord; but here, Ezekiel presents an argument against the temple's sacred ground layout.¹⁶⁹ Patton, investigating temple patterns, notes that here in Ezekiel is the only ancient Near Eastern account where such a pattern is given to a prophet.¹⁷⁰

The temple described in Ezek 40-42 is not Solomon's; it is a holy temple with no access for the profane nature of human society.¹⁷¹ Beale notes how neither the first temple nor the second temple fulfilled prophecies of Scripture's ideal temple.¹⁷² Holiness is a vital issue for the temple of Ezekiel. In Ezekiel, the common name for the Jerusalem temple (both former and future) is *בְּמִקְדָּשׁוֹ*.¹⁷³ The flow of holiness is an important

¹⁶⁹First Kings seems to credit King Solomon and the king of Tyre with the temple building. First Chronicles 28:11-19 was another second temple Jewish writing that held that the layout was not Solomon's layout, but given by God through David. Kings does not have this explicit reference that the pattern came from the Lord. "The authenticity of the Chronicler's version has been questioned. In light of the known tendency of Chronicles to aggrandize both David and the cult, linking these two key areas of the Chronicler's interest might be construed as a feature of his manipulation of historical data." Carol Meyers, "Temple, Jerusalem," *ABD*, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 6:355. Meyers further notes differences between crediting David and Solomon and the Phoenicians in the Kings and Chronicles accounts. *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁰Patton reports the striking anomaly: "In fact, until Ezekiel, every Near Eastern text that described the building or restoration of a temple attributed the project to the glorification or shame of the reigning king. Not once in Mesopotamian literature does a priest or prophet receive the plan for the temple." Patton, "Blueprint," 180. Even though Moses is a prophet and receives the pattern for the tabernacle, the tabernacle cannot be seen as a permanent temple. Stevens notes that building the temple was one of the most important duties of a king in the ancient Near East. Stevens, *Temples, Tithes, and Taxes*, 28.

¹⁷¹Tuell notes how completely different Ezekiel's temple is from that of Solomon's temple. The massive size of the temple structure in the vision of Ezekiel is an indicator to Tuell that these chapters are not blueprints: the building is too big. Tuell, *Law of the Temple*, 23. His assessment on whether or not the chapters lay out a temple blueprint does not follow from the chapters of Ezekiel. Tuell's conclusion based on its size ignores the assertion in the vision that the people are to build this temple (Ezek 43:11). However, its size does show Tuell that the temple design is substantially different from the first temple.

¹⁷²Beale, *Church's Mission*, 110. He cites Exod 15:17-18 and 2 Sam 7:10-16 and subsequent prophets for his support.

¹⁷³The term is more prevalent in Ezekiel than any other book in the Hebrew Scriptures: over 41% of all uses of the term are in Ezekiel. The emphasis on the holiness of the temple in Ezekiel is a key to understanding the critique of the Solomonic temple, which is considered profaned (Ezek 43:7b-8).

difference between the temple of Solomon and Ezekiel's temple.

Schiffman observes that in Ezekiel, "[t]his Temple plan was based on the assumption that the courtyards would be arranged concentrically, with the Temple building itself in the middle. By contrast, in Solomon's Temple as well as that of Herod, the courtyards were arranged sequentially."¹⁷⁴ In the temple of Ezekiel, when the glory of the Lord dwells within the correct, holy temple, holiness and its effect radiate outward.¹⁷⁵ The detail of the vision in chaps. 40-42 is hard to avoid. There are descriptions of gates, walls, rooms, pillars, entrances, doors, steps, halls, windows, paneling, cherubs, and more. There are eighty-eight individual measurements apart from the repetitions of similar measurements for other areas.¹⁷⁶ There are descriptions of how one area adjoins another. There are descriptions of how many rooms are in an area of the temple complex. This detail has sparked investigation as to what it means.¹⁷⁷ Tuell is correct in noting the

¹⁷⁴Lawrence H. Schiffman, "Community Without Temple: The Qumran Community's Withdrawal from the Jerusalem Temple," in *Gemeinde ohne tempel: Community without Temple: Zur substituierung und transformation des Jerusalemer tempels und seines kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*, ed. Beate Ego, Armin Lange, and Peter Pilhofer (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 277.

¹⁷⁵Renz notes how the temple's "description moves out from the center, the house of the Lord (the holy place) with the altar as the exact center." Thomas Renz, *The Rhetorical Function of the Book of Ezekiel* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 123. Ezekiel seems to tie the Deuteronomic cause-and-effect eschatology (e.g., the cause and effect shown by the two ways in Deut 28) with the glory of the Lord dwelling in the temple. Eichrodt ties Deuteronomic language to the priestly idea of the glory dwelling in the temple. Walther Eichrodt, *Ezekiel*, trans. Cosslett Quin (London: SCM Press, 1970), 554-555. Allen notes the Deuteronomic language at the end of Ezek 20, which is a passage about the Lord dwelling in the temple. Allen, *Ezekiel 20-48*, 2:14. The Septuagint preserves Deuteronomic language in Ezek 43:1-12 as well. This passage in Ezekiel seems to unite the priestly idea of the glory of the Lord physically dwelling among the house of Israel and the Deuteronomic idea about the temple and cause-and-effect nature of the Deuteronomic eschatology of Deut 28 as well as the Deuteronomistic notion of the temple in 1 Kgs 9:1-9. Block notes how Ezekiel reinterprets Deuteronomistic ideas. Block, *Ezekiel*, 1:616. Causse writes that "La plupart de ces motifs remontent à une mythologie déjà ancienne, et nous les avons trouvés fragmentairement dans les bénédictions et les malédictions des prophètes du VIII^e et du VII^e siècle." Antonin Causse, "Du groupe ethnique à la communauté religieuse: Le problème sociologique du Judaïsme," *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 14 (1934): 304. The thrust of this work seems to support the idea that the cause-and-effect process of the glory's dwelling in Ezekiel is connected to a very important part of the restoration of the land and house of Israel.

¹⁷⁶Niditch calls these measurements "detailed architectural measurements." Susan Niditch, "Ezekiel 40-48 in a Visionary Context," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 48 (1986): 217.

¹⁷⁷Tuell notes most scholars interpret these chapters as either a blueprint or a proposal for a restored temple. Tuell, "Verbal Icon," 649. For example, Talmon and Fishbane present Ezek 40:1-43:12 as the blueprint of the Temple. Shemaryahu Talmon and Michael Fishbane, "The Structuring of Biblical

assurance that this vision would give to a Jewish audience longing for restoration of the temple.¹⁷⁸

At a bare minimum, it is important to recognize that the text of Ezekiel clearly presents the physical structure of the temple just outside of the city as crucial to the restoration of Israel and that this last vision of the book reminds the audience of that fact. However, these details perform a more important task than remembrance; they are the temple's sacred ground layout of the ideal temple for the dwelling of the glory of God.¹⁷⁹

Books: Studies in the Book of Ezekiel," in *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute*, ed. Bengt Knutsson (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 10:139. Wright is of the opinion that the measurements are not for building but for adding to the experience of the tour, although he notes that the importance for the vision is the restoration of the dwelling of God among the people. C. Wright, *Ezekiel*, 329. Tuell and Stevenson rule out the use of these chapters as a blueprint for a temple on the basis that the vertical dimensions are lacking. Tuell, "Verbal Icon," 650-651; Stevenson, *Transformation*, 106. Tuell adds two other reasons why the specifications for the temple are not a blueprint: its impractical size and its deviation from the layout of Solomon's temple. Tuell sees the event represented by the temple as having occurred: "Ezekiel 40-48 is the religious polity of the Judean Restoration, a present-tense description of the authors' self-conception and their conception of God." Tuell, *Law of the Temple*, 14. Like Tuell, who holds that this vision is a verbal icon, Duguid denies that these measurements are for a blueprint or a prediction of a future temple, but sees them as a symbol to the exiles of Babylon that addresses their need. Duguid, *Ezekiel*, 490. Block alleges that the temple vision is not meant as a blueprint. He changes the nuance of the use of the vision proposed by Stevenson—"territoriality"—to "ideationally," putting the temple vision in the realm of a spiritual metaphor. Block, *Ezekiel*, 2:505. However, those who interpret the vision symbolically do not seem to take note of a point made by Hullinger: 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)." Jerry M. Hullinger, "A Proposed Solution to the Problem of Animal Sacrifices in Ezekiel 40-48" (ThD dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1993), 18. With Block, Tuell, and Stevenson being strong dissenters of a blueprint interpretation by its early audience, the main point of contention is the lack of vertical dimensions. Yet, the surrounding wall is given a vertical measurement. However, this misses the focus of the text. Zimmerli points out that "[w]ith almost ascetic severity the text concentrates on the exact description of a ground plan." Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 2:344. It is important for those not seeing a blueprint of the temple in the text to make some connection to the temple as Blenkinsopp does. Although ruling out a blueprint for a new temple, he writes that "the measurements are part of a symbolic structure of meaning which transcends without entirely leaving behind the physical and historical reality of city and temple." Blenkinsopp, *Ezekiel*, 199.

¹⁷⁸Although not accounting for the abundant measurements, the instructions to write the vision down, and provision of a new Torah, Tuell does capture one helpful idea: Ezekiel 40-42 gave the people "the assurance that the true home of YHWH remained intact, unpolluted by Israel's sin." Tuell, "Divine Presence," 114. The text of Ezekiel posits that it remains intact because it has not been built, but is built in the future.

¹⁷⁹Darr explains that these detailed dimensions are what give the temple the necessary potential to house the presence of God. Darr, "Ezekiel," 6:1534. Patton also shows that "the correct temple layout, which only God could provide, was the necessary pre-condition before the *kabod* would return." Patton, "Blueprint," 151-152. Bogaert holds that Ezek 43:1-12 is the return of the glory of God "du temple idéalement reconstruit." Pierre-Maurice Bogaert, "La demeure de Dieu selon Jéré et Ézéchiél: La maison, l'exil, ou la ville," in *Quelle maison pour Dieu?* ed. Camille Focant (Paris: Cerf, 2003), 213.

Chapters 40-42 of Ezekiel present the temple's sacred ground layout, a two-dimensional layout, in painstaking detail by a messenger of God to the prophet, so that he can relay this layout to the children of Israel. Thus, it is hard to escape the impression that this is presenting the ideal plan for a physical Jerusalem temple.¹⁸⁰ Regarding mostly horizontal measurements and not enough of those, Konkel shows that "[t]he focus is on the distinction of separate areas of holiness (cf. 42:20). Only the horizontal and vertical dimensions that serve this issue are mentioned. Everything is focused on the architectural separation of the temple building and especially the holy of holies."¹⁸¹ Thus, the new sacred ground layout emphasizes separation between the holy and the profane.

Regarding the text of Ezek 40-42, Patton maintains that "the primary purpose of the narrative of the temple plan is to relate the one true form of a sanctuary that can house an eternally present God."¹⁸² The completion of this true temple will make possible the ample blessings and the protection from the surrounding nations that the former temple did not accomplish, as it was not the correct temple's sacred ground layout.¹⁸³

¹⁸⁰Cooke observes that in these chapters, "Ezekiel has portrayed his ideal of the coming age." Cooke, *Ezekiel*, 425. Smith writes that Ezek 40-48 delves into the "ideal cultic place." Jonathan Z. Smith, *To Take Place: Toward Theory in Ritual* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1987), 48. Craigie also calls it an ideal temple. Craigie, *Ezekiel*, 294. Fredenburg describes the layout in 40-48 as the "extensive description of the ideal temple." Fredenburg, *Ezekiel*, 332. Talmon points out that the temple was to be an actual physical temple as the exiles in the east never built another temple unlike those in Elephantine. They truly expected a restored temple." Talmon, "Exile and Restoration," 128.

¹⁸¹Michael Konkel, "The System of Holiness in Ezekiel's Vision of the New Temple (Ezek 40-48)" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, San Francisco, CA, November 17, 2011). This is from page 7 of Konkel's presentation.

¹⁸²Patton, "Blueprint," 187. Notice the Christian bias that Cooper puts forth with the question "Why a temple?" Cooper, *Ezekiel*, 353. A temple is necessary for the dwelling of God, but not any temple: only the correct, true temple for the dwelling of God.

¹⁸³Zimmerli states plainly that "[w]e cannot fail to see that in this commissioning the new structural plan for the temple complex wants to stress the radical change in thinking as regards the earlier temple structure." Walther Zimmerli, *I Am Yahweh*, trans. Douglas Stott (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982), 117. Clements explains that "the prophet is assured that a new temple will make possible the blessing and protection that Israel's sins denied to the old building." Clements, *Ezekiel*, 189. Even though Tuell does not see this text as presenting the blueprint for the temple, he does indicate the goal of this text when he notes that the text is used to show society's end, that is "right worship in the right Temple." Tuell, *Law of the Temple*, 14. Fujita recognizes that the vision of the new temple in 40-48 reveals both judgment and restoration from God. Fujita, "Temple Theology," 29.

Further presentations in Ezek 40-42 add to the layout description, which further distance the profane from the temple and must be addressed in relation to the critique of the former layout, which did not distance the profane from the temple. In Ezekiel, there are descriptions of how the מִקְדָּשׁ or temple (Ezek 45:1-4, 48:8-11) is to be located upon the land in relation to the Zadokite (Ezek 44:15) priests (Ezek 48:10-12), the Levites (Ezek 48:13-14), the שֹׁשֶׁבֵי or leader (Ezek 48:21), the city proper (Ezek 48:15-20), and the tribes (Judah in Ezek 48:7 and Benjamin in Ezek 48:23).

In Ezek 45:1, the verse starts with the clause, וּבְהַפִּילְכֶם אֶת־הָאָרֶץ בְּנִחְלָהּ, “when you cause the lots to fall regarding the land as an inheritance,” is to explain how the layout is to be accomplished. Since it is quite different from what had been the layout before, it inherently critiques the layout that existed before the destruction of the first temple. This new layout, given by the prophet, is to ensure the holiness of the temple at the heart of the layout and, thus, to ensure the permanent dwelling of the Lord in this temple (Ezek 43:7-9).

The new layout serves a gradation of holiness that can be seen starting from the first verse of Ezek 45, where the sacred portion, set aside to the Lord,¹⁸⁴ is to be holy in its entire area all around.¹⁸⁵ The sacred portion, which is 250 million square cubits (25,000 cubits by 10,000 cubits; Ezek 45:1), is to be a thousand times the area of sanctuary, which is 250 thousand square cubits (500 cubits by 500 cubits). This holiness by a factor of a thousand shows the extreme holiness of this new temple’s sacred ground layout compared to the old one that had the temple and the palace sharing a wall (Ezek 43:8). The priests who are holy to the Lord are kept, while they are not serving at the temple, at a buffer distance of fifty cubits from the temple (Ezek 45:2). Thus, even the

¹⁸⁴Note that this is designated as a contribution, which is an offering that is for the Lord. Koehler and Baumgartner, *HALOT*, s.v. “הִרְוָה.”

¹⁸⁵Note that the temple mount is to be the holy of holies (Ezek 43:12) and the rest of this entire sacred portion is to be holy (Ezek 45:1).

daily profane life of the priests is kept at a distance from the temple within the sacred portion for the Lord as it contains the houses of the priests as well as the holy ground for the sanctuary, **וּמִקְדָּשׁ לְמִקְדָּשׁ**.¹⁸⁶ In Ezek 48, there is additional distancing of the profane from the holy sanctuary, **מִמִּקְדָּשׁ**; the temple is further separated from the area of the Levites (Ezek 48:13-14).¹⁸⁷ Beyond these, the leader is further away still (Ezek 48:21).¹⁸⁸ Finally, the city proper, with all the people and the obvious profane actions of daily life, is kept at the far side of the Levite area (Ezek 48:15-20).

Examination of Ezekiel 43:1-12

The vision of Ezek 40–48 starts off with the prophet being taken in the spirit to the temple mount,¹⁸⁹ where he is shown the layout and dimensions of the temple that is present in the vision. Since the temple exists in the vision, there is some debate whether the text contains a command to build the temple,¹⁹⁰ but the clear assertion that the people are to build the temple is in Ezek 43:11 and this verse uses exactly the same verbal form, **וַיֵּשֶׁב**, as the assertion (not in the imperative, but still an assertion, just as in Ezek 43:11)

¹⁸⁶It is important to note the parallel relationship in Ezek 45:1-4, but especially in 45:4, between the dwelling of the Lord on this sacred portion set aside from the land (**קִדְשׁ מִן־הָאָרֶץ**), the temple (**מִקְדָּשׁ**) and the houses (**בָּתֵּי**) for the priests on **וּמִקְדָּשׁ לְמִקְדָּשׁ**, the sacred portion for the Lord, which is where His holiness dwells. Both the Lord and the priests dwell on the holy land showing a parallel relationship for the holy ones: the Lord and the ministers of the Lord. Yet, as mentioned above, this passage shows a gradation in holiness. The Lord and ministers dwell on the holy portion from the land (i.e., a parallel relationship), yet the priests are separated a distance (i.e., showing degrees of holiness).

¹⁸⁷Block notes that there is no description of what the Levites perform, but that they are subordinated from the priests. Block, *Ezekiel*, 2:730.

¹⁸⁸The leader is placed outside the length of the sacred portion; whereas the Levites are south of the width which is the shorter measurement of the sacred portion.

¹⁸⁹Clearly Zion or the temple mount is intended. Tuell, *Ezekiel*, 284. Contra Hummel who sees Zion absent in the vision of the eschatological temple. Hummel, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 15.

¹⁹⁰Allen notes there is no command to build the temple because it has already been built in the vision. He understands that the temple was built for the people, which is a claim without foundation in the vision of the prophet. Allen, *Ezekiel 20–48*, 2:214. Kasher also claims, “The role of the people in the Temple is not made sufficiently clear in Ezek 43:10-12. At any rate neither here nor elsewhere in the book is there an injunction to build the Temple.” Rimon Kasher, “Anthropomorphism, Holiness, and Cult: A New Look at Ezekiel 40–48,” *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 110 (1998): 205. Fisch and Rosenberg note that the temple is in the process of being built. Fisch and Rosenberg, *Ezekiel*, 265.

that the people will build the tabernacle in Exod 25:8.¹⁹¹

The fact that the temple in 40-42 is completely bare does not seem to indicate that the temple is already built in a restored Israel; the vision relayed to the prophet focuses on the temple's sacred ground layout.¹⁹² With the temple's sacred ground layout already constructed in the vision, opinions, ancient and modern, differ on who will build the temple.¹⁹³ The verb בָּנָה (build) never occurs in the vision of Ezek 40–48. This vision does not address that point except to present the purpose of the vision for the prophet to relay the information to the house of Israel so that they can make it so. Some actions of restoration are credited to God in the book of Ezekiel. Yet, God's actions can and do use human agents in the book, as well as throughout the Hebrew Bible.¹⁹⁴

The detail of the description indicates the importance of relaying data for use in some manner, probably a practical building project.¹⁹⁵ The rest of the vision depends

¹⁹¹See further below. The command to accomplish all the Torah of the Temple, which clearly would include the temple, as the temple is absolutely vital in order to be able to perform all the offerings and rituals, is given in Ezek 43:11 and uses the verb עָשָׂה (make or do) just as in Exod 25:8. No claim that God builds or creates this temple is found here.

¹⁹²Contra Craigie, who interprets 40–42 as the temple in the restored Israel. Craigie, *Ezekiel*, 274-275. This is not a description of a temple that is in the restored Israel, it is only a vision of a temple's sacred ground layout to be accomplished, whether in a restored Israel or merely at a later time.

¹⁹³The Temple Scroll is also ambiguous; *Jubilees* has been understood to lean more towards God as the builder and Tobit notes that it is a human-built temple. Allen notes that the temple is a creation of God built for the people, not by the people. Allen, *Ezekiel 20–48*, 2:214. Clements notes that the measurements are clearly a call to build the Jerusalem temple. Clements, *Ezekiel*, 179. Fredenburg maintains that this temple was built by someone besides the Israelites. This seems to imply humanity as God is not a "someone." Fredenburg, *Ezekiel*, 377.

¹⁹⁴Odell notes the idea of God as builder in the Tanakh. Odell, *Ezekiel*, 527. Psalm 127:1 shows the understanding of mutual building, not solely God or humanity. In Ezek 24:21, God profanes the sanctuary; yet it is Nebuchadnezzar who accomplishes the actions on earth. Schmidt argues strongly against any human participation. "So zeigt der endzeitliche Tempel an: daß Jahve allein sein Werk vollendet; daß diese Vollendung bei aller Ausschaltung menschlicher Hilfe ganz real ist; daß diese reale Erneuerung als vollkommene, wunderbare Erneuerung und dabei als reale Erneuerung das ganze Leben des Volkes Israel, ja seines Landes durchdringt." M. Schmidt, *Prophet*, 171.

¹⁹⁵The differing opinions on 40–42 have been reviewed above. However, the detail here and the instructions in Ezek 43:10-11 clearly speak of relaying the information to be used. Levenson notes this as well with the observation that "[t]he highly specific nature of the description of the Temple, its liturgy and community bespeaks a practical program, not a vision of pure grace." J. D. Levenson, *Program of Restoration*, 44. Patton goes beyond the text of the vision, though bringing a touch of reality into her analysis and postulates that the temple was not to be built, "not only was not, but should not have been

upon first having a temple building with the temple's sacred ground layout that is specified in chaps. 40–42.¹⁹⁶

Ezekiel 43:1-12 is an important transition that is often overlooked.¹⁹⁷ There is no indication that the restoration has begun in the land of Israel. Chapters 40–42 present the temple's sacred ground layout, but do not describe a finished complete building built on the temple mount of Jerusalem. There is no indication in 40–42 that the children of Israel have returned to their land. Chapters 40–42 are only the vision of the correct sacred ground layout for the temple, shown in a vision to the prophet in order that the prophet can report it to the house of Israel (Ezek 40:4). Ezek 43:1-12 is linked to what has preceded it. However, the prophet is told to write this down before their eyes (Ezek 43:11), and report the correct form or pattern to them (Ezek 43:10).

This section is a transition between the vision of the temple's sacred ground layout in 40–42 and description of the ministries of the temple and societal plan for the house of Israel in what follows.¹⁹⁸ This transition highlights the change that is taking place in this passage; the land of Israel is starting out with the temple's sacred ground

built. It could not be built, not at any level of the text." Patton, "Blueprint," 188. Without the physical temple building, however, the rest of the vision becomes moot. As has been shown above, the restoration passages focus on the physical temple and the restoration is based upon the temple and its effects.

¹⁹⁶Gese notes the necessary reality of having the temple building come to reality first before the rest of the vision. He writes, "der Tempel muß erst noch in der irdischen Welt gebaut werden." Hartmut Gese, *Der Verfassungsentwurf des Ezechiel (Kap. 40–48)* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1957), 39.

¹⁹⁷There is debate on the limits of this section. Haran understands the end of the section at 43:27. Haran, "The Law-Code," 49. Tuell understands the end of the section at 43:9. Tuell, *Law of the Temple*, 20. However, Block notes the passage's interdependence with the illustration of the inclusio (43:3-4 and 43:10-11). Block, *Ezekiel*, 2:576. Zimmerli catches the important transition of this section beginning with 43:1 as he notes that "formally it constitutes a new beginning," breaking with chap. 42. Zimmerli, *I Am*, 117.

¹⁹⁸Allen sees a limited aspect of the section as he notes that it may have been a climax at an earlier stage in textual development, yet writes that this section introduces the following material, which notes the transitional nature of the text. Allen, *Ezekiel 20–48*, 2:256. He notes that the temple of 40–42 stands lifeless until it is brought to life in this section showing the transitional nature of this text. *Ibid.*, 212. Vawter and Hoppe note that Ezek 43:1-7 is at the core of the importance to the vision of 40–48 and marks a transition from the end of the Exile and the beginning of the new covenantal relationship between God and the house of Israel. Vawter and Hoppe, *New Heart*, 194. This passage locates itself, in the vision, at the fulcrum or pivot point of history in this new relationship.

layout and ends up with the Lord consecrating the temple with the indwelling glory.

Ezekiel 43:1-5 is perhaps the most important passage in the book of Ezekiel.¹⁹⁹ The preceding chapters lay out the temple's sacred ground layout of an empty, lifeless temple. It is these verses that give the temple's sacred ground layout meaning.²⁰⁰ It is this proper sacred ground layout on this holy mountain.²⁰¹ This holy mountain allows the glory of the Lord to dwell in the temple.²⁰² Eichrodt notes this important aspect of the passage by alleging that this temple and section mark the final stroke of God's work in this age with the glory coming to dwell in the temple.²⁰³

The return of the glory of the Lord to the temple is the ultimate achievement in

¹⁹⁹Craigie avers that the significance of this passage of the last vision cannot be overestimated. Craigie, *Ezekiel*, 288. Duguid notes that this passage is the heart of the vision. Duguid, *Ezekiel*, 38. Cody notes that 43:1-7 is the most important section in the vision of 40–48. Aelred Cody, *Ezekiel: With an Excursus on Old Testament Priesthood* (Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1984), 218. Cody underestimates this section when he limits it to this vision; clearly it is the most important section of Ezekiel. The return of the Lord to the temple is the pinnacle of the restoration theme in Ezek 40–48. J. D. Levenson, *Program of Restoration*, 10. Yet, 40–48 is clearly the ultimate restoration vision in Ezekiel, so the restoration visions of Ezekiel lead to this very point, the return of the glory to the proper temple as laid out in the vision of 40–48, yet advanced in all the restoration visions of the book. Craigie notes that “the new vision was that of the return of God's glory to its earthly dwelling.” Craigie, *Ezekiel*, 288.

²⁰⁰Blenkinsopp describes this consecration of the rebuilt temple as the climactic point that ties together the themes of restoration and worship. Blenkinsopp, *Ezekiel*, 212.

²⁰¹Of 43:5, McKeating calls the temple on the Lord's holy mountain its “proper place.” Henry McKeating, *Ezekiel* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 102.

²⁰²Tuell does note the similarity between the 1 Kings account with the verb סָבַח as the Lord fills the temple. Tuell, *Law of the Temple*, 37. However, this temple as described above is not like Solomon's temple and the book of Ezekiel critiques the sacred ground layout of Solomon's temple.

²⁰³Eichrodt concludes, “Die hier vorausgesetzte Gabe eines neuen Tempels, offenbar das abschließende Zeichen der Heilswirklichkeit weil Verbürgung wirklicher Gottesnähe, umschreibt in eigentümlicher Weise die unentbehrliche Wichtigkeit und besondere Würde dieses Heiligtums: Nicht das in ihm beschlossene Geheimnis der göttlichen Herrlichkeit (*kabôd*) steht im Mittelpunkt, sondern die in ihm Wirklichkeit gewordene Vergebung und Neuschaffung des Gottesvolkes zu einer im Licht der neugeschenkten Gottesgnade sich dankbar freuenden Gemeinde.” Walther Eichrodt, “Der neue Tempel in der Heilshoffnung Hesekiels,” in *Das ferne und nahe Wort*, ed. Fritz Maass (Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1967), 43. Contra Schmidt who fails to note the transitional nature of this passage by claiming that there is no role for the temple, just the final mark of God's true salvation. “Der Tempel ist in keiner Weise Instrument der Heilsverwirklichung, sondern abschließendes Zeichen der Heilswirklichkeit.” M. Schmidt, *Prophet*, 161. In his examination, Schmidt does note that the temple plays the obvious role of signifying the presence of God in the temple visions. *Ibid.*, 130.

temple restoration, which this passage declares is fulfilled, given the correct temple.²⁰⁴

Clements notes this with the fact that “[t]he crowning hope of the future is the re-establishing of the divine presence in Jerusalem which will make possible all those other blessings which Israel desired, and which set this nation apart from all others.”²⁰⁵

After the return of the glory to the temple in Ezek 43:1-5, the voice of God speaks to the prophet and gives the ramifications of the glory indwelling this temple. This temple is important; the temple’s sacred ground layout has been given in meticulous detail in chaps. 40-42. This place is important: $\square\text{קִדְשׁ}$ is repeated twice in 43:7 and following these uses is the relative pronoun אֲשֶׁר ; here, the pronoun clearly means “where.”²⁰⁶ Stevenson avers that this temple, this physical place upon the earth, “is a liminal place, a place where the energy of one world encounters and transforms the energy of the other.”²⁰⁷

The understanding that the temple is a place of threshold is important. Yes, the temple is a place of transformation of the world as explored below, but perhaps more importantly, the temple is a place of transformation in a real temporal sense. This physical place, Jerusalem, with this physical layout of the temple, as described in chaps. 40-42, creates a threshold in time between exile and ingathering on the one side and living in relationship between God and people on the other side.²⁰⁸ Once the glory dwells

²⁰⁴Clorfene comments on Ezek 43:7, that “[w]hen the Temple is built according to Ezekiel’s design, it will never be removed.” Clorfene, *Messianic Temple*, 131.

²⁰⁵Clements, *God and Temple*, 105.

²⁰⁶The vision of Ezek 40–48 ends with the new name of the city, the Lord is there (48:35). This is further evidence that the temple, that specific place on the earth, is the actual place where the Lord will dwell. Zimmerli misses the nuances of the Hebrew relative pronoun when he holds that nothing is mentioned about dwelling in the temple, but dwelling in the midst of his people. The temple is the place *where* the Lord will dwell forever and the temple is in the midst of the people. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 2:416. Chance shows that after the glory of the Lord has returned in chap. 43, the Lord “dwells in this city (46:35) only because he has established his presence in the temple.” Chance, “Jerusalem,” 101.

²⁰⁷Stevenson, *Transformation*, 153.

²⁰⁸Although Beale argues against the idea of God dwelling in the temple, he notes that the idea of Ezekiel’s temple is not about the consummated eschatological age, but about the inaugurated eschatological age. Beale, *Church’s Mission*, 359. It is not about the eschatological age of peace as much as it is about how the transition is made.

in this temple,²⁰⁹ Ezek 43 proclaims, from this moment on, things will be different.²¹⁰

This passage shows that this temple is different. The fact that this temple will be the dwelling place of the Lord forever shows the results of this temple as compared to the temple that Solomon built.²¹¹ It is the new order of things that this temple, with its unique temple sacred ground layout, brings;²¹² its results distinguish it from Solomon's temple, which did not bring about this new world order.²¹³ Brought about by the temple's sacred

²⁰⁹Kasher postulates that Ezekiel deliberately avoids stating that God ascended to Heaven to emphasize that God's place is in the earthly Jerusalem temple. Kasher, "Anthropomorphism," 196.

²¹⁰As Zimmerli avers relating to the glory's return to the temple, the text "certainly proclaims the quite inevitable consequence of the event." Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 2:418.

²¹¹In 1 Kings, the first temple was approved by God even with the palace next to it (for the understanding that the palace was next to the temple, see the examination below on Ezek 43:8). 1 Kings extols the first temple. However, this book may have been written, at least in part, before the destruction of the first temple, even if it was edited after the destruction of the first temple. This would clearly explain why the book extols the temple. However, after the destruction of the first temple, the nature of prophecy changed. A review of how prophecy changed with the destruction of the first temple has been noted. Even with the sympathetic perspective of the temple before its destruction, notice that 1 Kgs 9:3 has the Lord sanctifying "the temple that you built to set my name there forever." There is no assertion or implication that the Lord would dwell in this place forever. In fact, if one examines the 1 Kgs 9:1-9 pericope, it is very conditional. Furthermore, there is no assertion of the Lord dwelling in the surrounding passages at all either. In 1 Kgs 8:11 the glory fills the temple (2 Chr 5:14), though in 1 Kgs 8:12 (2 Chr 6:1) Solomon notes how the Lord "dwells in darkness." It is Solomon in 1 Kgs 8:13 who claims that this place is to be "a place for your throne forever." It is important to note that even here, it is a *מָקוֹם* (i.e., "place" from the root *מָקַם*, not *שָׁבַע*). The Lord never makes that declaration in the book of Kings. Yet, even if there are different claims from the books of Kings and Ezekiel, it is important to remember that this work is only investigating texts from the period between the destructions of the first temple and the second temple. Moreover, this work is evaluating each book on its own merit and letting each book present its own message. It does not matter if the books of Kings and Ezekiel completely agree or completely disagree on everything. This analysis attempts to find the message of each book on its own. With the assessment that major parts of the book of Kings preserve writing of the period before the destruction of the first Jerusalem temple, that book is outside the scope of this work and, therefore, is not analyzed here in this work. However, 2 Chronicles repeats the narrative of 1 Kings and is a writing within the chronological scope of this work. However, 2 Chronicles does not place the temple in eschatological circumstances, which would bring that work into this research. The book of Chronicles focuses more on the Davidic line or "the eschatological David," as Stinespring labels the idea, and the temple, though playing an important role in Chronicles, does not play an eschatological role. William F. Stinespring, "Eschatology in Chronicles," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 80, no. 3 (1961): 219. Chronicles, a second temple Jewish writing, takes a different view of the first Jerusalem temple than Ezekiel does (Ezek 10:4 and 2 Chr 5:14, 7:2; both have God's glory in the first Jerusalem temple; however, the focus of the two books is different). However, this does not change Ezekiel's perspective on the first temple, which is analyzed here.

²¹²Niditch recognizes the cosmogonic nature of the vision of 40–48, which is how this vision deals with the correct ordering of the world. Niditch, "Visionary Context," 216.

²¹³Eichrodt notes this important aspect as follows: "So ist in dieser ersten Ankündigung einer wieder erstehenden Heiligtum der neue Tempel nicht einfach Wiederholung des ältern, sondern trägt die Züge der Neuordnung aller Dinge durch die Verwirklichung des göttlichen Weltziels an sich." Eichrodt,

ground layout in chaps. 40-42 and further elucidated in Ezek 43:9, it is this eternal dwelling of the glory of the Lord in the temple that the text requires as the vital element in the new order of the world.²¹⁴

In vv. 7 and 9 of Ezek 43, clear pronouncements exist that the Lord will dwell forever in the temple; yet this verb has produced differing ideas. The idea of the Lord dwelling at the Jerusalem temple, that is, among the people and not far off where the Lord is remote, is the central notion that this text is depicting.²¹⁵ This verb, יָדָוּ, denotes a different idea than is presented in Ezek 11:16, where the Lord is a sanctuary in some small way. This dwelling of the Lord offers the people a full measure of relationship with the Lord.²¹⁶ This temple presents the highest degree of interaction. Ezek 43:7 uses physical, anthropomorphic objects to present the strongest possible assurance that this place, the actual physical temple, will be a physical dwelling place for the Lord.²¹⁷ The

“Der neu Tempel,” 44. This has been seen to critique the second temple as well, as it did not produce the results detailed in the text of Ezekiel. Beverley notes that the second temple is “to be polluted no more; That Temple hath been long since defiled, and destroyed by the Abomination of Desolation by the Romans.” Beverley, *Pattern*, 4.

²¹⁴There are four declarations from the Lord in Scripture where the Lord states to dwell forever. The first chronologically is Jer 7:7. This occurrence in the temple prophecy of Jeremiah puts a conditional statement that if the people change their ways in many areas (Jer 7:5-6), then the Lord asserts to dwell in the temple forever. This is never quite stated in 1 Kgs 8-9. The Lord is said to dwell in darkness (1 Kgs 8:12) and Solomon has built the temple to be a throne (or place of enthronement) forever (1 Kgs 8:13). The Lord claims the temple to be a place for the Lord’s name forever (1 Kgs 9:3). Isaiah 57:15 has the Lord dwelling forever, but also is with the despondent and lowly. The other two times of the Lord stating to dwell forever are here in Ezek 43:7, 9. One claim centuries later by the chronicler in 1 Chr 23:25 has the idea that the Lord would dwell forever in Jerusalem. This claim by the Chronicler argues against Ezekiel’s claim that the Lord left the city (Ezek 11:23).

²¹⁵Here, Wright demonstrates that the idea of the Lord being in the temple is the heart of the new creation presented in this last vision of the book. C. Wright, *Ezekiel*, 334.

²¹⁶Clorfene notes that this dwelling is “just as a husband intimately dwells with his wife in their home.” Clorfene, *Messianic Temple*, 35.

²¹⁷Eichrodt notes the objects and the mode of speech in the text to show how the text presents the supernatural dwelling within the physical space of the temple. Eichrodt, *Ezekiel*, 554-555. Contra Ackroyd who maintains that this dwelling is “not indicating a physical presence.” Ackroyd, *Exile*, 28. Also, Haran stresses the presence of God in noting that “[t]he throne and footstool indicated God’s actual presence in that very place; they are therefore the very essence of the House of God.” Menahem Haran, “The Ark and the Cherubim,” *Israel Exploration Journal* 9 (1959): 90.

idea in Ezek 43:7-9 is different from that of Solomon's temple; it is this physical dwelling forever in this temple that is the difference.²¹⁸

In order to understand the idea in Ezek 43:7, it is necessary to examine the verbs that are rendered "to dwell" in English translations of the Hebrew and how the Hebrew Scriptures utilize these verbs with different connotations with the Lord as the subject. These different connotations are important to explain the meaning of the implications here in Ezek 43. The main two verbs, although there are more, are **יָשַׁב** and **יָשָׁב**. These verbs are sometimes used in parallel, synonymous fashion (e.g., Isa 18:3, 32:16, 33:24). In comparisons between **יָשַׁב** and **יָשָׁב**, it is commonly noted that **יָשַׁב** is the more common verb, meaning to dwell, as it occurs more times in the Hebrew Scriptures.²¹⁹ The verb **יָשַׁב** is used 1,087 times in 971 verses whereas **יָשָׁב** is used 130 times in 124 verses, but this superficial count should not dominate the analyses, although it most certainly has. However, the analyses should focus on the verbs when the Lord is their subject.

In sifting through the Hebrew Scriptures, the Lord is the subject of the verb **יָשַׁב** in twenty-six independent instances,²²⁰ and an additional nine more dependent times (i.e., parallel uses in the books of Samuel, Kings and Chronicles).²²¹ The word form **יָשָׁב** is used ten times as a noun and once as an infinitive construct (though some group all uses as an infinitive).²²² The Lord is the subject of the verb **יָשָׁב** thirty-two independent times

²¹⁸Greenberg writes that "[u]nlike 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 his sanctuary amidst his people." Greenberg, "Program of Restoration," 182.

²¹⁹When comparing the two verbs, Clements holds that "the normal verb 'to dwell' in Hebrew means literally 'to sit down' (Heb. *yāšab*)." Clements, *God and Temple*, 116.

²²⁰The independent uses for **יָשַׁב** with the Lord as the subject are: 1 Sam 4:4; 2 Sam 6:2; 7:6; 1 Kgs 8:27; 22:19; 2 Kgs 19:15; Isa 6:1; 37:16; 40:22; Joel 4:12; Pss 2:4; 9:5, 8, 12; 22:4; 29:10 (twice); 47:9; 55:20; 80:2; 99:1; 102:13; 123:1; 132:14; Lam 5:19; 2 Chr 18:18.

²²¹The dependent uses for **יָשַׁב** with the Lord as the subject are: 1 Chr 13:6; 17:4, 17:5; 2 Chr 6:2, 18, 21, 30, 33, 39. All but three of these are nouns or infinitives used as a noun.

²²²The uses for **יָשָׁב** that have been referred to as an infinitive reference to the Lord are: Exod 15:17; 2 Sam 7:5; 1 Kgs 8:13, 30, 39, 43, 49; Pss 33:14; 68:17; 113:5. These uses are the feminine singular

with an additional one more dependent time.²²³

With **יָשַׁב**, seven occurrences are not included due to the use of the *Hip*□*il* stem where the Lord is the subject of the verb, but not the subject of the dwelling, and two occurrences of **יָנַח** are not included for this same reason.²²⁴ Material subjects are also excluded, such as the ark of God with **יָשַׁב** and the tabernacle and the tent of meeting with **יָנַח**.²²⁵

This analysis points out that the verbs are used about the same number of times in the Hebrew Scriptures with the Lord as the subject; thus, with this relative parity of occurrences, it is important to understand the different nuances implied between the verbs. Besides the analyses that interpret **יָנַח** as rare, most also identify the verb with a temporary meaning.²²⁶ To reinforce this idea of a temporary nature to **יָנַח**, scholars have

noun and the best translation of all of these is “throne.” In Isa 40:22, the infinitive is used and is governed by a prepositional phrase and should be translated as a verb.

²²³The independent uses for **יָנַח** with the Lord as the subject are: Exod 24:16; 25:8; 29:45, 46; 40:35; Num 5:3; 9:17, 18, 22; 10:12; 35:34 (twice); Deut 33:16; 1 Kgs 6:13; 8:12; Isa 8:18; 33:5; 57:15 (twice); Ezek 43:7, 9; Joel 4:17, 21; Zech 2:14, 15; 8:3; Pss 68:17; 74:2; 78:60; 85:10; 135:21; 1 Chr 23:25. The dependent use for **יָנַח** with the Lord as the subject is 2 Chr 6:1.

²²⁴Jer 32:37; Ezek 26:20; 36:11, 33; Hos 11:11; Ps 113:9; and Lam 3:6 have uses of **יָשַׁב** in the *Hip*□*il* stem where the Lord is causing the dwelling, but they are not included where the Lord is the subject of the action (of dwelling). Jer 7:3, 7, Ezek 32:4, and Ps 78:55 have uses of **יָנַח** in the *Hip*□*il* stem and are similarly excluded from the analysis.

²²⁵These examples are taken from 2 Sam 7:2, Josh 22:19, and Lev 16:16 respectively.

²²⁶Clements maintains that this verb is used to show how the glory of the Lord is not permanently bound to any place, because this verb, according to Clements, means that one settles impermanently. Ibid., 117. Kutsko argues for the temporary nature of the verb **יָנַח** in Ezekiel. “A particularly important term for the argument of the *kabod*’s impermanence is the verb *shakan*.” Kutsko, *Between Heaven and Earth*, 84. Sarna calls **יָנַח** rare and that it “conveys the idea of temporary lodging in a tent and characterizes the nomadic style of life.” Sarna is comparing these two verbs in the very similar setting of dwelling in the tabernacle and the necessity of building the tabernacle, so that God can dwell among the Israelites as in Ezekiel and the temple. Nahum M. Sarna, *Exodus* (Philadelphia: JPS, 1991), 158. Currid agrees strongly with Sarna. “The purpose of the tabernacle was not to provide a place for God to dwell. God dwells in heaven (Ps. 11:4). The verb for ‘dwell’ used here is not the common Hebrew verb meaning ‘to abide’. Rather, the verb, *shākēn*, ‘conveys the idea of temporary lodging in a tent and characterizes the nomadic style of life.’ The tabernacle actually symbolizes the presence of God ‘in their midst’ – that is, the fact that he is their God and they are his people.” John D. Currid, *A Study Commentary on Exodus* (Darlington, UK: Evangelical, 2001), 2:150. Currid’s citation of Ps 11:4 shows a misunderstanding on these two Hebrew verbs. Neither verb is used in Ps 11:4, and the idea is not a dwelling in heaven, but that is where God’s throne is (i.e., from where God reigns, not lives).

made an issue of the pairing of לָהֹלֵךְ and יָבֹשֶׁת .²²⁷ However, the opposite may be true; this pair indicates that יָבֹשֶׁת implies a longer period.²²⁸ For example, Gen 9:27 implies that Japheth will more permanently reside in the “tents” of Shem, longer than a tent would last. Additionally, Ps 15:1 equates גִּוּר with inhabiting in tents and יָבֹשֶׁת with dwelling on the Lord’s mountain.

This point can be seen again in Isa 13:20, “It will never be inhabited [יָבֹשֶׁת] or lived in [יָבֹשֶׁת] for all generations; Arabs will not pitch their tents [לָהֹלֵךְ] there, shepherds will not make their flocks lie down there” (NRSV). The text indicates that יָבֹשֶׁת involves a longer dwelling time than pitching one’s tent, לָהֹלֵךְ , as well as implying a synonymous relationship between יָבֹשֶׁת and יָבֹשֶׁת . Genesis 13:12 may also posit a synonymous relationship between יָבֹשֶׁת and לָהֹלֵךְ , “Lot settled [יָבֹשֶׁת] among the cities of the Plain and moved his tent [לָהֹלֵךְ] as far as Sodom” (NRSV).²²⁹

It is necessary to investigate the context of each of these uses of the verbs יָבֹשֶׁת and יָבֹשֶׁת when the Lord is the subject of the verb in order to understand their meaning, contradistinction, and necessary translation. As both of these verbs have been translated “live” or “dwell,” it is necessary to understand the contrasting qualities so that each verb can be understood for what it is and is not asserting.

²²⁷Sarna notes that these two words often appear together and that this pair is attested in Ugaritic “to designate the abode of the gods (UT, 128, iii:18f; 2 Aqht v:32f).” Nahum M. Sarna, *Exploring Exodus* (Philadelphia: JPS, 1991), 197. Regarding לָהֹלֵךְ compared to יָבֹשֶׁת , Haran writes that “[t]he tabernacle is the more stable structure of the two, and yet it is also a typical habitation of nomads.” Haran, *Temples*, 195. This fact does not contradict Sarna; yet it witnesses against the fact that the יָבֹשֶׁת is a temporary structure, even though it is portable. In fact, *1 En.* 89:36 calls the tabernacle the house of the Lord. “Of central importance for the Priestly traditionists is the idea that the tabernacle serves as the dwelling place of” the Lord and “it is the means by which” the Lord will be among Israel. Frank H. Gorman, Jr., *The Ideology of Ritual: Space, Time and Status in the Priestly Theology* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), 48.

²²⁸It is important to note that לָהֹלֵךְ is used almost exclusively in noun form, as the verbal forms are rare in Scripture (Gen 13:12, 18; Job 25:5; Isa 13:20).

²²⁹This is true to a certain extent of Gen 13:18 and Isa 13:20 as well, three of the four uses in Scripture.

The verb **יָשַׁב**, with the Lord as the subject, is used to assert enthronement in different ways. The Lord is said to be enthroned above the Cherubim using **יָשַׁב**,²³⁰ as well as seated upon a throne, which is clearly to be enthroned.²³¹ These uses are all placed within contexts that are clearly enthronement. Another location where the Lord is enthroned using **יָשַׁב** is in Zion.²³² Zion is seen as the place God rules from, using **יָשַׁב**, and these contexts speak of judgment and the actions of a powerful king ruling there. Furthermore, the Lord sits enthroned in the sky watching over, judging, and foiling plans of the powerful from the sky.²³³ The enthronement is also described as being located on the earth in the temple (i.e., **בַּיְתוֹ**),²³⁴ or the valley of Jehoshaphat.²³⁵ The enthronement can be on more meta-physical entities such as the praises of Israel,²³⁶ or time.²³⁷

The infinitive of **יָשַׁב** is **יִשְׁבֵּן**. Koehler and Baumgartner call this form either a “verbal noun of **יָשַׁב**,”²³⁸ or “as a substantivised infinitive of **יָשַׁב**.”²³⁹ According to Brown, Driver, and Briggs, it is a feminine singular noun which they have translated as “seat, dwelling, place.”²⁴⁰ Waltke and O’Connor explain: “The infinitive construct is a true infinitive, a verb and a noun, and thus a form with necessary restriction as to agency.

²³⁰This can be seen in 1 Sam 4:4; 2 Sam 6:2; 2 Kgs 19:15; Isa 37:16; Ps 80:2, and 99:1.

²³¹This can be seen in 1 Kgs 22:19; Isa 6:1; Pss 9:5, 8; 47:9; Lam 5:19; and 2 Chr 18:18.

²³²This can be seen in Ps 9:12 and 132:14.

²³³This can be seen in 1 Kgs 8:27 (over the earth, i.e., the sky); Isa 40:22 (twice); Pss 2:4, 29:10 (at or over the flood, i.e., from the sky), and 123:1.

²³⁴This can be seen in 2 Sam 7:6.

²³⁵This can be seen in Joel 4:12.

²³⁶This can be seen in Ps 22:4.

²³⁷This can be seen in Ps 55:20 and 102:13.

²³⁸Koehler and Baumgartner, *HALOT*, s.v. “יִשְׁבֵּן.”

²³⁹*Ibid.*

²⁴⁰Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon* (BDB) (1906; repr., Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997), s.v. “יִשְׁבֵּן.”

As a verbal noun the infinitive may function where a nominal constituent might be expected or as a verbal predicator; it may function in both ways at the same time.”²⁴¹

They further note that “it is best construed as a verbal predicator (36.3) if it governs an object or prepositional phrase.”²⁴² This form appears one time as a verb (Isa 40:22; as discussed above) and eleven times as a noun. All of these uses (the noun) of **רָבַחַ** are the “seat/throne” upon which God is enthroned (or “sitting/enthronement if one were to argue this form is an infinitive).²⁴³

The verb **רָבַחַ** with the Lord as subject refers to the idea of this taking place at a house (2 Sam 7:6; 1 Kgs 8:27), in which case some interpreters render **רָבַחַ** in terms of “dwelling/residing.”²⁴⁴ As a single more detailed example to illustrate use of **רָבַחַ**, including at a house, when the Lord is the subject, the context of 2 Sam 7:6 is analyzed here. “For I have not been enthroned in a temple from the day I brought up the children of Israel from Egypt until this day. I have been traveling in a tent and a tabernacle” (2 Sam 7:6). The translation of “**רָבַחַ**” in this verse as “enthroned” was chosen because of the context of this verse. The word **בַּיִת** in this verse can be translated “house,” “palace,” “temple,” or other English translations. The king needs a place of residence and an administrative headquarters, where the two may or may not be one and the same building. However, the decision in translating this word must be based upon the context of the passage in which the verse is set. If one were to blindly use “house” as a translation, then

²⁴¹Bruce K. Waltke and Michael P. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 600.

²⁴²Ibid.

²⁴³The independent uses are Exod 15:17; 2 Sam 7:5; 1 Kgs 8:13, 30, 39, 43, 49; Pss 33:14, 68:17, 113:5. The dependent uses repeating the 1 Kings uses are 1 Chr 17:4; 2 Chr 6:2, 21, 30, 33, 39. The noun, “throne,” seems to be used metaphorically. The Lord reigns in Zion (Ps 9:12) and the Lord reigns from a throne (Ps 9:5, 8: these uses are ambiguous as to whether this throne is in the temple or in the sky); the use of **רָבַחַ** seems to be equating the temple with the place from where the Lord is enthroned or seated on the throne. There does seem to be a connection between the throne in the sky and the temple (Ps 11:4), and therefore, the temple as the place of God’s throne or God’s enthronement should not be considered surprising.

²⁴⁴The NRSV uses “live” and “dwell” in these two verses.

one would be misleading the reader. If this pericope is dealing with the king reclining, eating, sleeping, or some other mundane human necessity, then the translation of “house” or “residence” could be justified. However, if the king is performing tasks of ruling like discussing business of the kingdom with a servant or judging, then the translation of “palace” in the sense of “administrative headquarters” where God is enthroned is clearly warranted. There are clear differences between the two locations in terms of their respective functions, so the choice in translating the word is important to the understanding of the verse. Thus, the context of the pericope determines the correct translation of בַּיִת.

The same holds true for a בַּיִת for God. If this is a place where God relates to the people and rests within it, then rendering it in the sense of “residence” is warranted. If, on the other hand, this is a place where God rules from, grants favors from, judges from, or conducts other divine business, then rendering it in the sense of “administrative headquarters” may very well be preferable.

The use of the Hebrew word בַּיִת is one factor in translating this verse, but the contextual setting of this pericope far outweighs the use of this one word. This pericope starts explicitly noting that this was “after the king was settled into his palace (בַּיִת)” (7:1). The choice of “palace” for בַּיִת here is because the king is performing business of the kingdom as detailed in the following verses. Note, that it is not asserting that David has settled into a house (בֵּית), as this would have different contextual implications. In 7:2, it is the king, מֶלֶךְ, not called by name, who addresses Nathan explicitly, keeping this a very formal and state function, not a situation like David dwelling in his house (cf., 2 Sam 11:2-4). Nathan responds to “the king,” not to “David” in 7:3, keeping the context very formal and official business of the realm, not describing living conditions.

The Lord, while speaking to Nathan in the pericope, addresses David as “my servant” (7:5, 8). The passage identifies David as king and now the king is spoken of as a servant. This is clearly placing the Lord in a position of authority over the king, which is

a description of the Lord being enthroned in a higher position over the king. The Lord does not assert to have dwelt with the children of Israel in a tent and a tabernacle in a physical or social sense here. The Lord was residing in this location to reign and lead the people (i.e., be enthroned). Again, the context is about ruling, as the passage asserts the Lord has “brought up the children of Israel from Egypt.” Here, the Lord is clearly in a place of leadership, even over the king. The Lord’s hypothetical question would have been placed to “the leaders of Israel” (7:7), not to the children of Israel. It is the Lord asserting “I have appointed to shepherd My people Israel” in 7:7 claiming the high position or authority due one who is enthroned. The Lord claims the title, “the Lord of armies” (7:8). In 7:8-11, the passage refers to the Lord eleven times with personal pronouns, combined nominative and accusative, to express the Lord’s control over the affairs of the king and his subjects, clearly claiming authority. The Lord expressly declares to make David’s “kingdom firm” (7:12). There is no assertion, explicitly or contextually, that this temple, **בְּיָמֵינוּ**, is for the Lord to live in, as no living functions or societal functions are addressed or implied in this entire pericope regarding the Lord.

This survey of **בָּשַׁב** when the Lord is the subject of the verb has found that its occurrences are set within contexts that exclusively or predominantly concern enthronement. Therefore, **בָּשַׁב**, when the Lord is the subject of the verb, can best be translated by the English verb “enthroned.”

In order to accurately understand the meaning of **יָשַׁב** when the Lord is the subject of the verb in contradistinction to the verb **בָּשַׁב** when the Lord is the subject, it is necessary to understand the contexts in which **יָשַׁב** is used, and therefore, how its nuances should affect the translation. The Lord is said to dwell or reside in a very social sense on Mt. Sinai,²⁴⁵ Mt. Zion,²⁴⁶ or a thorn bush.²⁴⁷ The Lord is said to dwell in a relational sense

²⁴⁵This can be seen in Exod 24:16.

²⁴⁶This can be seen in Isa 8:18; 33:5; Joel 4:17, 21; Pss 68:17; and 74:2.

in a human city, such as Jerusalem,²⁴⁸ or Shiloh,²⁴⁹ or the Promised Land.²⁵⁰ The Lord is said to live with the people in a temple (or house),²⁵¹ or in a tabernacle (or tent).²⁵² The Lord is said to live among the people in a clear social relationship,²⁵³ as well as being described as living forever.²⁵⁴

The examination of ׃׃׃ when the Lord is the subject of the verb has found that the verb is set either exclusively or predominantly within contexts of social or physical existence. Therefore, ׃׃׃ , when the Lord is the subject of the verb, can best be translated by the English verb “live.”

As a single more detailed example to illustrate the verb, the context of ׃׃׃ in Zech 8:3 is analyzed here. “The Lord said ‘I have returned to Zion and I will live in the midst of Jerusalem and Jerusalem will be called the city of truth, the mountain of the Lord of armies, the mountain of the holy.’” The translation of “ ׃׃׃ ” in this verse as “will live” was chosen because of the context of this verse. The Lord has chosen Zion. The Lord in this passage is zealous for Zion (8:2). The assertion that the Lord has returned to Zion here is a claim that the Lord has come back, physically, to the city. The Lord has always been mindful of Zion, but here the return of the Lord is important to understanding the verb ׃׃׃ . With the return of the Lord, the Lord will then live on the temple mount, which is given three appellations in this verse. This place, where the Lord

²⁴⁷This can be seen in Deut 33:16.

²⁴⁸This can be seen in Zech 2:14, 15; 8:3; Ps 135:21; and 1 Chr 23:25.

²⁴⁹This can be seen in Jer 7:12 and Ps 78:60.

²⁵⁰This can be seen in Num 35:34 and Ps 85:10.

²⁵¹This can be seen in 1 Kgs 6:13; 8:12; 1 Chr 6:1; Ezek 43:7, and 43:9.

²⁵²This can be seen in Exod 40:35.

²⁵³This can be seen in Exod 25:8; 29:45, 46; Num 5:3; 9:17, 18, 22; 10:12; and 35:34.

²⁵⁴This can be seen in Isa 57:15.

will live, is the location in Israel that allows the social interaction between God and humanity again.

The next verse asserts that the city, Jerusalem, will again be a community with the old and the young alike. Just as the Lord has returned, the remnant will return to Jerusalem (8:6). In Zech 8:8, the verse notes that the Lord will not only bring the remnant to Jerusalem, but they will live וַיֵּשְׁבוּ there. In v. 8 there is also a declaration of relationship: “They will be a people to me and I will be a God to them.” The use of pronouns in this declaration of relationship is telling of a true relationship. This is a relationship between the human and divine; this is not an assertion of the enthronement of God over the people.

This analysis found consistent meanings for both וַיֵּשְׁבוּ and וַיֵּשְׁבֵנוּ. The verb וַיֵּשְׁבוּ means to live in location including both physical and social aspects. The verb וַיֵּשְׁבוּ is quite anthropomorphic and is highly relational, many times with the Lord explicitly declared to be “in the midst of” or “among” a group of other humans (e.g., Zech 8:3). When וַיֵּשְׁבוּ is used with the Lord as the subject, it conveys or emphasizes the concept of being enthroned.²⁵⁵ This verb carries the notion of sit or dwell when humans are the subject (though here as well the idea of kings, prophets, or elders sitting to exercise a function is often put forth in Scripture), but not when the Lord is the subject; with the Lord as its subject, it conveys the concept of being enthroned.²⁵⁶ This analysis could not find one

²⁵⁵Clements notes this is the verb used for enthronement, but points to 2 Sam 7 and 1 Kgs 8 as originally implying to dwell. Clements, *God and Temple*, 116. However, when evaluating these two uses, they too seem to imply the idea of enthronement, not dwelling.

²⁵⁶Görg agrees with the understanding of the verb with respect to humanity and does see the verb, to some extent, bridging the gap between the two meanings. However, he fails to see the thoroughness of the enthronement/reign concept when the Lord is the subject. M. Görg, “וַיֵּשְׁבוּ,” *TDOT*, ed. G. Johannes Botterweck et al. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990), 6:421-438. Other standard lexicons agree with Görg that this verb means “to dwell” even though the physical and social aspects of living are not clearly given: *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, trans. Mark E. Biddle, ed. Ernst Jenni and Claus Westermann (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997), s.v. “וַיֵּשְׁבוּ” and Koehler and Baumgartner, *HALOT*, s.v. “וַיֵּשְׁבוּ.” Wilson comments regarding וַיֵּשְׁבוּ that, “[i]n reference to God, the vb. normally indicates heaven rather than earth as a place of God’s dwelling.” Gerald H. Wilson, “וַיֵּשְׁבוּ,” *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*, ed. William A. VanGemeren (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1997), 551. This verb, וַיֵּשְׁבוּ, is seen to imply “sit,” “dwell,” “remain,” “endure,” as well as “be enthroned.” David J. A. Clines, ed., “וַיֵּשְׁבוּ,” *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 4:317-

instance where it could not be more satisfactorily translated in terms of the verb enthronement. Even in the instances with the Lord as subject where some scholars have interpreted the verb as "dwell" (in a "יָשַׁב"; every independent use of the combination is in 2 Sam 7:6 and 1 Kgs 8:27), the emphasis seems to be on God's reign from a palace or temple (the place where God is enthroned), rather than mere dwelling in the physical or social sense.

Frank Moore Cross may have been the one who originally stressed the notion of the temporary nature or impermanence of the verb יָשַׁב when the Lord is the subject.²⁵⁷

Cross understands יָשַׁב as a denominative verb from the noun for tent showing a depiction of "nomadic life, and clearly with the meaning 'to encamp' or 'to tent.'"²⁵⁸

Cross observes how the Priestly stratum intentionally made a distinction between יָשַׁב and יָשַׁב.²⁵⁹ This distinction, in tandem with the impermanent nature of יָשַׁב, is to demonstrate that the Lord wanders with the people and does not dwell in any one location.²⁶⁰

328. Clines does give a partial list of this verb meaning enthronement when the Lord is the subject: 1 Sam 4:4; 2 Sam 6:2; 1 Chr 13:6; 2 Kgs 19:15; Isa 37:16; 40:22; Pss 2:4, 9:11, 22:3, 29:10 (twice), 47:9, 55:20 80:2, 99:1, 102:13, 113:5, 123:1; Lam 5:19. However, Kaiser notes the exclusivity of this verb when relating to the Lord by commenting: "In places where the Lord is said to dwell in heaven or in Zion, the thought is that he is enthroned." Walter C. Kaiser, "יָשַׁב," *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, ed. R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke (Chicago: Moody, 1980), 1:411-413. Although limited in scope of Scriptures, Mettinger is correct when assessing יָשַׁב with the statement that it "is not used as a theological term for expressing the presence of God in either Ezekiel or the P-materials." Tryggve N. D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies* (Lund, Sweden: CWK Gleerup, 1982), 115.

²⁵⁷He avers that this verb does not mean that God "dwells" on earth. Rather he "'tabernacles' or settles impermanently as in the days of the portable, ever-conditional Tent." Frank M. Cross, "The Tabernacle: A Study from an Archaeological and Historical Approach," *Biblical Archaeologist* 10 (1947): 68.

²⁵⁸*Ibid.*, 66.

²⁵⁹Frank M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973), 245, 298-299.

²⁶⁰Cross presents this and goes further. He argues that one should not understand the יָשַׁב and the use of יָשַׁב as the "concrete abode" of the Lord in his tent as this could not be further from the meaning implied in Priestly stratum. *Ibid.*, 299. Price does not consider the temple to be a place where God will dwell. He maintains that "the Tabernacle and Temple were not considered even temporary dwellings" for the Lord "but rather representatively localized His divine presence among men by the manifestation of the *Shekinah*." Price, "Desecration and Restoration," 77. These notions argue against Ezekiel and the uses of יָשַׁב in Scripture.

These ideas do not hold up in the light of how יָדַשׁ is used in the Hebrew Scriptures when the Lord is the subject.²⁶¹ A consistent meaning becomes clear with יָדַשׁ when the Lord is the subject. This meaning is that the Lord lives, dwells, or resides in a specific location. This verb does not contain any temporary nature or impermanence of itself; any temporary nature must be determined from the context of any specific use.

The location may be the wilderness, Sinai, Jerusalem, or the Land, but the location is always with Israel.²⁶² The Lord never dwells, using יָדַשׁ, in a far off land, the sky,²⁶³ or in remoteness. The understanding of יָדַשׁ as an impermanent type of dwelling ignores the fact that this verb is used of the Lord dwelling in the temple, a permanent home (1 Kgs 6:13), and the claim that the Lord will dwell, using יָדַשׁ, permanently.²⁶⁴

Examining the Akkadian background of the Semitic roots of יָדַשׁ and יָדַשׁ reveals corroborating evidence for the similarities and differences between them. The Akkadian verb (*w*)*ašābu* has a semantic range of sit, reside, or to be present, and the verb is used of gods, kings, humans, soldiers, and inanimate things.²⁶⁵ The range of meaning for (*w*)*ašābu* can vary from people residing in a house to the idea of staying somewhere temporarily.²⁶⁶ The Akkadian *šakānu* does carry much of this same idea of reside, but the

²⁶¹Haran also disagrees with Cross and Clements, noting that it is wrong to assume the priestly source insinuates in any way a temporary nature of the tabernacle. Cross and Clements err in assuming that because the shrine is not made of stone, it is temporary. An impermanence of place does not necessitate impermanence in time. Menahem Haran, "Divine Presence in the Israelite Cult and the Cultic Institutions," *Biblica* 50 (1969): 261.

²⁶²The view, of Clements, of the Priestly writer's theology shows that the dwelling presence of the glory of the Lord must be continually present in the midst of Israel in order to maintain Israel's true existence. Clements, *God and Temple*, 115.

²⁶³Kasher notes how the book of Ezekiel never indicates that God resides permanently in the heavens. Kasher, "Anthropomorphism," 195.

²⁶⁴This is shown in Isa 57:15 and Ps 68:17, as well as in Ezek 43:7, 9.

²⁶⁵A. Leo Oppenheim, ed., *Assyrian Dictionary* (Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1989), s.v. "(*w*)*ašābu*."

²⁶⁶*Ibid.*

emphasis of this root is to put or place, establish, and to be located at a certain spot.²⁶⁷

The main difference between the Akkadian verbs is the nature of the place where one dwells. For *(w)ašābu* the idea is more centered on the idea of sitting in order to exercise a function (e.g., kings, judges, witnesses, and gods), whereas with *šakānu*, the idea is that the residing will occur at the specified location where one is to be available, to set up camp, or to place something there for a particular purpose. Enough overlap is present in the meaning of these two verbs that there should not be any argument that one carries with it a longer span of residence.²⁶⁸ However, the Akkadian background does give enough evidence for the idea of enthronement evident in the Hebrew Scriptures for **שָׁבַת**, as well as the idea of a specific location of availability for **שָׁבַת**.

Previous analyses on the comparisons between **שָׁבַת** and **שָׁבַת** have missed the point. With **שָׁבַת**, the idea of being enthroned comes not only from the scriptural uses of the verb, but also from the linguistic background of the verb. The background of **שָׁבַת** conveys the importance of the place where the subject is put, is placed, or dwells. This is reinforced by the uses within the Hebrew Scriptures, where all the uses point to the dwelling with Israel. Psalm 68:17 shows this comparison perfectly with the place God desired for a throne (**שֵׁבַת**, a feminine singular noun) and will dwell (**שָׁבַת**) forever at the specific location, the mount of God.²⁶⁹

It is important that the meaning of Ezek 43:7 be taken in light of the above discussion. The relative pronoun preceding the verb and the adverb following need to be

²⁶⁷Erica Reiner, ed., *Assyrian Dictionary* (Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1989), s.v. “*šakānu*.”

²⁶⁸In the Hebrew Scriptures, the use of **שָׁבַת** with both **שָׁבַת** and **שָׁבַת** evenly shows this point as well. Neither verb can be said to indicate a longer period of dwelling over the other.

²⁶⁹Haran states the obvious when he notes that the understanding of the house of God implies precisely what its function is, a dwelling place for God. Haran, “Temple and Community,” 18. However, even Haran, when explaining that the temple is the house of God, a dwelling place, still maintains that God does not dwell in the temple, alone, and that the Lord’s “chief dwelling place is imagined to be in heaven.” Haran, *Temples*, 257. Kang holds that the Temple was understood as the earthly replica of the Lord’s home in heaven. Seung Il Kang, “Creation, Eden, Temple, and Mountain: Textual Presentations of Sacred Space in the Hebrew Bible” (PhD dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 2008), 101-148.

translated “where I will dwell there.”²⁷⁰ “There” is in the temple, so the location is important and the nature of the dwelling is the physical residence in that location.²⁷¹ Furthermore, this verse reinforces the relational type of dwelling that יְשֹׁבֵת implies: dwelling with the children of Israel.²⁷² Also, there is absolutely no temporary nature embedded in the understanding of the verb יְשֹׁבֵת and this is explicit, with the verse stating that the Lord will dwell forever in this location upon earth.²⁷³

The uses of עוֹלָם in Ezekiel give indications of the focus on informing the house of Israel about the future. Half of the uses of עוֹלָם in Ezekiel are in the restoration passages, showing the text’s leaning toward matters of eschatology.²⁷⁴ Twice in chap. 37 and twice here in chap. 43, the temple itself or the dwelling of the Lord in the temple is

²⁷⁰This spatial emphasis may be seen earlier in the verse as well. The phrase אֶת־מְקוֹם כִּסְאוֹ is translated by Joüon as “here is the place of my throne.” Paul Joüon and Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2000), 447.

²⁷¹The text of Ezekiel here is quite anthropomorphic in its description of the relational dwelling of God with the children of Israel. Knohl describes how the Priestly writer of the Torah wrestles with anthropomorphic images of God and “prefers to use the verb עָדָה rather than יָשַׁב to refer to the presence of the divinity in the Tent of Meeting” for this very reason. Israel Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School* (1995; repr., Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 131. Haran notes the physical nature of this dwelling as well with the idea that the throne and footstool designate the place as a physical house. Haran, “Ark,” 90. Clowney stresses the real, actual, physical presence of God in the Jerusalem temple of Ezek 40–48 with his italics. He writes that “[t]he temple symbolizes the reality of God’s presence with His people.” Edmund P. Clowney, “The Final Temple,” in *Prophecy in the Making: Messages Prepared for Jerusalem Conference on Biblical Prophecy*, ed. Carl F. H. Henry (Carol Stream, IL: Creation House, 1971), 72. Kasher observes that Ezekiel’s God is more corporeal than other biblical prophets. Kasher, “Anthropomorphism,” 192.

²⁷²Tuell explains that “God is present and accessible in the midst of God’s people, and will ever be so.” Tuell, *Ezekiel*, 294.

²⁷³This is presented elsewhere in Ezekiel as well; however, Ezek 43:7, 9 clearly makes this statement. Hals, Patton, Clements, Vawter and Hoppe substantiate this claim by citing Ezek 44:1-3, where they note that the door is permanently shut as the Lord will never leave. Ronald M. Hals, *Ezekiel* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1989), 313; Patton, “Blueprint,” 159; Clements, *God and Temple*, 106; Vawter and Hoppe, *New Heart*, 198.

²⁷⁴Jenni cites Ezekiel and Jeremiah in establishing an understanding of עוֹלָם as an indication of God’s final act in history that begins eschatological events. Jenni, “עוֹלָם,” *TLOT*, 859. Contra Block, who maintains that the uses in Ezek 43:7, 9 are because of traditional formulation and are not indicating any eschatological nature in the text. Block, *Ezekiel*, 2:504. However, Block is somewhat inconsistent on the issue as he maintains that the text has the Lord promising eternity and stresses that the Lord “will dwell in the midst of his people forever” (his italics). Block, *Ezekiel*, 1:55.

described with an understanding of forever.²⁷⁵ This return to the temple is not like the glory filling Solomon's temple; it is eschatological in nature.²⁷⁶ Ezekiel presents the new idea that the Lord will dwell in the temple, forever.²⁷⁷

This temple, divinely inhabited, affects the people and the relationship with their God.²⁷⁸ Although no statement exists that the people will never sin again,²⁷⁹ Ezek 43:9 does declare that the people will distance their actions from the Jerusalem temple.²⁸⁰ The proximity of the temple to humanity is a solution to the relationship between God and people (Ezek 43:7-12).²⁸¹

The new relationship, one in which the people's idolatry and the corpses of their kings are far away from the temple and the people no longer defile the name of their

²⁷⁵It is the temple. Tuell notes that the eternal promise of the presence of God is not dependent upon the ark, imagery, or symbolism associated with the temple. Tuell, *Ezekiel*, 291.

²⁷⁶Price calls Ezek 43:1-12 an eschatological return. Price, "Desecration and Restoration," 79. Jensen observes that "Ezekiel 40-42 is devoted to the plan of an envisioned eschatological temple." R. Jensen, *Ezekiel*, 299.

²⁷⁷Isaiah 2 and Mic 4 present a picture of the future and the importance of the temple on the mountain of God, but here in Ezekiel, it is specifically declared that the Lord will dwell forever and the temple will be there forever. It is an important nuance to this understanding and a further development of the prophetic understanding of the Jerusalem temple. Craigie notes this new idea here in Ezekiel, showing that the idea of the Lord as king is not new, but that the kingship will be based there in the Jerusalem temple forever is new. Craigie, *Ezekiel*, 291.

²⁷⁸Cooper holds that 43:7-12 summarizes the prophet's temple theology and highlights the concept that the temple is a sign of both God's election and of a new relationship. Cooper, *Ezekiel*, 377-379.

²⁷⁹After Ezek 43:1-12, the זָבַח־חַטָּאת or sin offering is mentioned 12 times. Perfection is not anticipated, but walking in the statutes and ordinances of this new Torah is expected. Yet, Petersen claims that Ezekiel's vision presents the idea of a human society without religious error. David L. Petersen, "Zechariah's Visions: A Theological Perspective," in *Prophecy in the Hebrew Bible: Selected Studies from Vetus Testamentum*, ed. Dave E. Orton (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 191.

²⁸⁰Ezekiel 42:12 contains no verbs; it is a statement of being. The statement is enclosed between two identical phrases, "This is the teaching of the temple." The statement of being is that all the area surrounding the top of the temple mount is most holy. Clorfene also states that "[t]he entirety of these teachings may be reduced to a single principle: this Temple is most holy." Clorfene, *Messianic Temple*, 134.

²⁸¹Cody notes how the temple is the cure for humanity's iniquities and how it seems odd to the modern reader, yet this was the idea being presented in Ezek 43. Cody alludes to the importance of the temple built according to the ground plan shown in the vision in order to effect this cure. Cody, *Ezekiel*, 220.

Lord, is made possible because of the temple.²⁸² The declaration in Ezek 43:7, that the house of Israel shall not defile the Lord's name is linked with the idea in Ezek 23:48 that the Lord will cause a cessation of wickedness, **וְיִמְחָק**. This willful sinning is different from the inadvertent offense, **וְשָׁגָה**, which requires a sin offering.

Because many have overlooked the commands and outcomes in Ezek 43:10-12, it is important to go to the text in order to examine it closely. The following is a clause-by-clause evaluation of the material in Ezek 43:10-12.

Ezekiel 43:10 can be broken up into three sections, each of which performs an important role. The first section, “You, mortal, tell the house of Israel about the temple,” commands the prophet to tell or illustrate, **וְיִגְדַלְתָּ**, the temple's sacred ground layout to the people. The second section of v. 10 provides the purpose as to why the prophet is commanded to tell the temple's sacred ground layout to the house of Israel; it is “so that they are ashamed because of all their iniquities.”

The physical description of the temple structures, all the walls, courtyards, and the layouts associated with the temple should make the people ashamed. The physical description of the temple is told “so that” the people will be ashamed. Why should the house of Israel be ashamed when they have the new temple structures described to them? This is covered in Ezek 43:7b-8 right before this verse under investigation. There are three actions or behaviors detailed in 43:7b, their fornication (**בְּזוּהָם**), the corpses of their kings (**וּבְפִגְרֵי מַלְכֵיהֶם**), and their cult places (**בְּמִזְבְּחֵיהֶם**). The first of these three, their

²⁸²Eichrodt observes that “the temple makes possible that fellowship between God and man which can never again be imperiled, in which the fulfillment of his commandment is taken for granted as one element of the life of faith; and God's lordship on earth is thus effectualized.” Eichrodt, *Ezekiel*, 555. Levenson notes that it is the temple service that provokes the new relationship between God and people. J. D. Levenson, *Program of Restoration*, 8. Schwartz is somewhat more pessimistic in his assessment that it is due to the proximity of God and that the divine supervision, therefore, will be more aggressive. Yet, even here, Schwartz's argument makes sense only because of the temple. B. Schwartz, “Bearing of Sin,” 62.

fornication,²⁸³ should be seen as actions by the people,²⁸⁴ but are probably not layout issues of the physical temple.²⁸⁵

This issue in Ezek 43:7b may be idolatry involving the temple or its layout (cf., 2 Kgs 16:17-18), although it is far from clear and could be sexual behaviors or idolatry without referring to the temple building. The second in the list from 43:7b, the corpses of their kings,²⁸⁶ may be worship at the memorials for the kings or a criticism of the location of the corpses or memorials. The last of the three in this verse of Ezekiel, their cult places, is a common theme in Ezekiel,²⁸⁷ though many emend the Hebrew pointing, to change the text to mean “when they die.”²⁸⁸ However, the emendation does not take into

²⁸³The word means “fornication” or “unfaithfulness towards God” and Koehler and Baumgartner interpret the Ezek 43 citations using the understanding of “fornication.” Koehler and Baumgartner, *HALOT*, s.v. “זָנָה.”

²⁸⁴These actions are the fornication that is translated “whoring(s)” by the ESV, NJB, and the NRSV, “whoredom” by the KJV, “prostitution” by the NIV.

²⁸⁵Thus, the ideas like the “spiritual prostitution” by the NET, “apostasy” by the NJPS, and “adulterous worship” by the NLT should be avoided.

²⁸⁶Here, Milgrom notes that the Hebrew term means “lifeless mass” though it also can denote “memorial stele or stone heaps.” Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 3:2318. Block notes that no graves or tombs have been found near the temple precinct. Block, *Ezekiel*, 2:584. Thus, this does not seem to be a layout issue with the corpses, though it could be an issue with the presence of memorials, whether close to the temple or not.

²⁸⁷The cult places are criticized in Ezek 6:3, 6; 16:6; 20:29; 36:2 in addition to here in 43:7.

²⁸⁸The word in the Masoretic Text, בְּמָוְתָם, “their cult places,” which some emend to read in their death, בְּמָוְתָם, is a form used only in Num 6:7 in the Masoretic Text. This preposition is not a common preposition on this verb but it can be seen six times in the Hebrew Scriptures: Num 6:7; 26:10, 33:39; Deut 34:7; Judg 2:19; and 1 Kgs 13:31. These uses in the Scripture do not carry enough force to change the Masoretic Text in the prophetic writings such as Ezek 43:7. The Septuagint reads this as בְּתוֹכָם, which is translated as ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν. *Biblia Hebraica* comments that בְּמָוְתָם should be deleted as it is a scribal error. *Biblia Hebraica* further notes that Theodotian and Targumic citations agree with the emendation of the Masoretic Text, as well as the Septuagint interpretation noted above, as well as the addition of the conjunction and preposition in the Vulgate. Rudolf Kittel et al., ed., *Biblia Hebraica* (Stuttgart: Privileg Wuerttembergischer Bibelanstalt, 1937), 884. Many see the Targumic evidence as enough to view the Masoretic Text as incorrect; however, this is far from certain as the use of בְּמָוְתָם with this verbal form would be unique and redundant. The common critique of the people’s cult places, בְּמָוְתָם, in Ezekiel is more likely what is being addressed here in Ezek 43:7.

account the tie between corpses and cult places linked in Lev 26:30, which is alluded to in Ezek 6:3-6.²⁸⁹

It is uncertain that any of the three issues dealt with in Ezek 43:7b—their fornication, the corpses of their kings, and their cult places—directly concerns the temple’s sacred ground layout.²⁹⁰ However, it must be noted that the temple’s sacred ground layout distances the people and leaders from the grounds so that they will not defile the Lord’s name again (Ezek 43:7).

Yet, in Ezek 43:8a three temple sacred ground layout issues exist. These three sacred ground layout issues regarding the temple are (1) the sill or threshold of the people or king with or adjacent to the sill or threshold of the Lord, (2) the doorpost of the people near the doorpost of the Lord, and (3) only a wall between the people or king and the Lord. The translation of the first word of 43:8 correctly aids the interpretation of these layout issues. The clause “when they set” is the translation of כִּשְׁבֵּתוּ ,²⁹¹ which describes

²⁸⁹Milgrom notes the tie between these words in Leviticus and Ezekiel. Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 3:2318-2319.

²⁹⁰The prostitution is behavior probably not associated with the temple layout, but it might pollute the sanctuary as Milgrom notes that behaviors in the land, though not at the sanctuary, pollute the sanctuary. Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 1:1011. Milgrom and Block note that the three demands are in 43:7b “so that the sanctuary (or the divine name) will remain holy.” Milgrom and Block, *Ezekiel’s Hope*, 109. The corpses of the kings could be considered a temple sacred ground layout issue, as a grave or a stele should not be in such close proximity to the temple. However, as Block has noted (see above), graves near the temple would be unlikely, though this could possibly be referring to a layout issue, especially if it refers to stela. The cult places, if this word is original to the Hebrew text behind the Masoretic Text, are noted in Ezek 6 as located in places besides the temple. Any of the issues not dealing with the temple’s sacred ground layout are outside the scope of this work, since this work deals with the temple building and not the practices at the temple or anywhere else in the land of Israel.

²⁹¹Waltke and O’Connor note: “[M]ost infinitive clauses are as noted, temporal, involving כִּ .” Waltke and O’Connor, *Syntax*, 604. They do note a causal use of the preposition, but not an instrumental use. Ibid. Joüon and Muraoka note the temporal use with this preposition attached to an infinitive. Joüon and Muraoka, *Grammar*, 625. They also note the causal use but hold that “with an infinitive, we rarely have the causal sense.” Ibid., 640. Van der Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeze maintain that the construction of this preposition with an infinitive is temporal simultaneous action and should be translated “‘as’, ‘when’ or ‘while’.” Christo H. J. van der Merwe, J. A. Naudé, and Jan H. Kroeze, *Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 157. Yet, although this is correctly translated as a temporal clause by many English translations such as the New Revised Standard version, Jewish Publication Society, New International Version, New English Translation, and the New King James Version, this is erroneously translated as instrumental, using “by,” by a few English translations including the New American Standard Version, New Jerusalem Bible, and the English Standard Version.

the temple's sacred ground layout issue. The object of this temporal clause is עֲצָוָה (their sill or threshold). Although this noun may mean “bowl,” the context in v. 8 indicates a sill or a threshold of a building.

Although this verse does not mention the palace of the king and therefore could be another building (it cannot mean the three practices dealt with above that do not have a threshold),²⁹² the most probable understanding of this condemnation is associating it with the palace (see 2 Kgs 11 for the best description of how close the palace was to the temple).²⁹³ It was “when they set their sill,” the sill of the palace was now אֶת־עֲצָוָה־יְיָ “beside my sill,”²⁹⁴ meaning God's sill. With the clear meaning of sill meaning the sill of a building, “my sill” can only mean the sill of the temple. Therefore, the issue here with this first part of the clause is on the temple's sacred ground layout. Additionally, with the

²⁹²Practices such as these three might allude to such actions as done by Manasseh (2 Kgs 21:1-7), yet these practices were clearly not dealing with buildings that have a “threshold” or a “wall” and thus do not seem to be addressing the temple's sacred ground layout. They were merely done in the land of Israel (some even on the temple's sacred ground) which defiles the name of the Lord. They are אֲשֵׁרָה but do not appear to be addressing a layout of any building near the temple (even though these do address altars, cultic places, and asherahs).

²⁹³Block denies the literal meaning here and calls the layout issues here “hyperbolic figures of speech” regarding buildings “within the temple courtyard.” Block, *Ezekiel*, 2:585. Yet, even as Block denies the literal reading, he admits with this assertion about the temple's sacred ground layout that there are buildings, initiated by the king, that are within the space of the temple's sacred ground layout. Fisch and Rosenberg note that this “reference is to King Solomon's palace, one side of which was virtually enclosed by the south wall of the Temple court (cf. 1 Kgs 7:8).” Fisch and Rosenberg, *Ezekiel*, 295. Zimmerli notes that this verse clearly explains the layout issue. “The fact with which the Israelites and, first of all, their kings in the pre-exilic period are reproached is stated in v. 8. In a characteristic tripartite sentence it is stated that in the old temple the palace bordered on the temple, threshold to threshold, doorpost to doorpost so that only a wall separated temple and palace. This corresponds to the description of 1 Kings 6f. The temple was built as one element of the total Solomonic palace complex. The close juxtaposition of temple and palace can be made very clear by means of a narrative such as 2 Kings 11.” Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 2:416. Kraeling also describes and illustrates the layout issue with the temple and palace. “In effect, therefore, the Temple was originally an appendage to the palace and a private sanctuary of the Davidic kings and their retainers.” Emil G. Kraeling, *Bible Atlas* (New York: Rand McNally, 1962), 217. Kraeling goes on to address 2 Kgs 11 and 2 Chr 23, and there he notes, “Here we learn that there was a wall between the palace and the Temple.” *Ibid.*, 218. Pritchard notes the layout and order of the temple mount where “the building activities in 1 Kgs 9:15 proceeded in geographical order from north to south: the house of the Lord, the house of the King, the Millo and the city wall.” James B. Pritchard, ed., *The Harper Atlas of the Bible* (New York: Harper and Row, 1987), 86.

²⁹⁴For the meaning of אֶת־עֲצָוָה as “beside,” see Koehler and Baumgartner, *HALOT*, s.v. “אֶת־עֲצָוָה.”

temporal clause feature of this context, this refers to the time of building (i.e., when the palace was first built next to the temple).

Furthermore, the phrase **וּמְזוּזָתָם אֶצְל מְזוּזָתִי**, “and their doorpost near my doorpost,” is the next of the three issues in this verse. This part of the clause clearly deals with **מְזוּזָה** (a doorpost). The doorposts of the original temple are explicitly mentioned in 1 Kgs 6:31, 33 as a doorpost refers to the doorposts of a substantial structure (the doorposts of the new temple are explicitly mentioned in Ezek 41:21). “Their doorpost” here means the doorpost of a building of the king or people, which, again, from the layout of the palace detailed above, seems to indicate the doorpost of the palace. The doorpost of the palace is next to “my doorpost,” meaning God’s doorpost (obviously, the doorpost of the temple). This issue is dealing with the layout of buildings near the temple; the temple’s sacred ground layout is being addressed by this part of the clause of Ezek 43:8.

Even further, the third element mentioned in v. 8 is **וְהַקִּיר בֵּינִי וּבֵינֵיהֶם**, “and the wall was between me and them.” The issue here is that there is only one wall between their building and God’s building, the temple. This building, again probably the palace, was built way too close to the temple. The idea that this building with a wall, doorpost, and a threshold adjacent to the temple was some small building and not the palace seems hard to fathom. What was this unimportant building and why would it not be described in other narratives such as 2 Kgs 11? Although not specifically stated as the palace in Ezek 43:8, the implications here all point to the problem that the palace was too close to the temple.

With the original layout of the temple’s sacred ground being quite different from the temple’s sacred ground layout described by the prophet as relayed to the people as described in the first part of 43:10,²⁹⁵ this difference clearly could cause shame. By the

²⁹⁵This temple’s sacred ground layout described by the prophet is the temple’s sacred ground layout of Ezek 40-42, which contains much more than the temple edifice; it contains the walls, courtyards, and the position of other buildings that are allowed on the temple mount. The term **מִקְדָּשׁ**, the common

prophet relaying the information contained in Ezek 40-42 to the people, the first temple's sacred ground layout, including the palace complex and the other buildings, did not measure up to the standard set by this new temple's sacred ground layout in order to allow the Lord to dwell forever within the structure.²⁹⁶ This is why Ezek 43:10 indicates "that the people should be ashamed because of all their iniquities." Then, if the people were ashamed when hearing the description of the temple,²⁹⁷ the last section of v. 10 indicates "they will measure the ideal design."

The ideal design, תִּבְנֶיֶת,²⁹⁸ has been seen by some as a haplography scribal error with the defective form, where this defective form would be translated: its layout, תִּבְנֶיֶתוֹ,²⁹⁹ as the original word.³⁰⁰ However, the defective form does not appear anywhere

name in Ezekiel for temple, is not just the temple building, "but refers to the sacred precincts, the *temenos*, in which the building and its cultic installations are located." Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 3:2317.

²⁹⁶This new layout, with the previous comments on the תִּבְנֶיֶת of the old layout, does, in fact, establish a change that is designed to produce a different result. It is not just a different design for the new time. This new layout is designed for the Lord to dwell there forever, which could not and did not occur in the old layout because of the profane invading the sacred.

²⁹⁷This work is not arguing against the spiritual dimension or the spiritual relationship issues that are most commonly made in the literature. These issues have been repeatedly emphasized more than the temple's sacred ground layout issues. This work posits that the spiritual issues of Ezekiel are not the only important issues to be addressed here. This work leaves the common focus alone in order to emphasize another very important issue.

²⁹⁸Koehler and Baumgartner suggest translations of "example, perfection" or "ideal, normality" for this word. In Ezek 43:10, specifically, they note that it might convey the meaning of "a quality of the temple which has been correctly constructed (*conformataest*) in all its detailed measurement, which is close to meaning a beautiful and exemplary appearance." Koehler and Baumgartner, *HALOT*, s.v. "תִּבְנֶיֶת." It is important to note why the word תִּבְנֶיֶת is probably not used here in Ezek 43 as it is used in Exod 25:9 and 1 Chr 28:11. The word is given a decidedly negative connotation when used in Ezek 8:10.

²⁹⁹This is the defective form of תִּבְנֶיֶתוֹ and this full form does appear in Ezek 43:11, as well as Job 23:3. This form also appears without the suffix in Nah 2:10 in the form, תִּבְנֶיֶת. With the repeated usage in v. 11, the emendation should be rejected.

³⁰⁰See Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 2:410. *Biblia Hebraica (BHK)* notes that 20 Hebrew manuscripts have תִּבְנֶיֶת, yet suggests a reading of תִּבְנֶיֶתוֹ. Kittel et al., *Biblia Hebraica*, 884. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* does cite the few manuscripts and suggests the emendation given above by Zimmerli. Rudolf Kittel, Wilhelm Elliger, and Wilhelm Rudolph, eds., *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1967-1977), 978. There are versions of the ancient documents that agree with the Masoretic Text with a suffix showing the word might not need such emending: the Septuagint, Latin, and Targums in *BHK* and the Vulgate and Targums in *BHS*.

in the Hebrew Scriptures.³⁰¹ The conjectural reading of the word *תִּכְנִיתוֹ* as *תִּכְנִיתוֹ* does not have enough evidence to justify the changing of the consonantal text. The ideal design describes what is to be measured, the ideal temple's sacred ground layout.

An important distinction is to be noted between the proposed emendation and the word given by the Masoretic Text. The emendation keeps the idea that it is a layout, or in essence a design, that needs to be measured. However, the emendation loses the idea that the design is the ideal. This word *תִּכְנִיתוֹ* could be translated “perfection,”³⁰² which might be better in order to illustrate what this word actually connotes in the text. It is not just another design or layout to be measured; it is the perfect, ideal design. Once the people feel ashamed,³⁰³ they are then to measure the ideal design.

This prescription to measure what has not been accomplished is common in the Hebrew Scriptures.³⁰⁴ Note that over 69% of all the uses of *מָדַד* in the Hebrew Scriptures are in Ezekiel.³⁰⁵ In fact, the three chapters that contain the most uses of the verb *מָדַד* are Ezek 40, Ezek 41, and Ezek 42, in that order.³⁰⁶ The measuring of the ideal design of Ezek 43:10 alludes to the measuring that the house of Israel will have to perform in order to make or build the temple,³⁰⁷ as is explicitly stated in the next verse.³⁰⁸

³⁰¹This word also does not occur in the defective form in all of the non-biblical Qumran scrolls as well even though *תִּכְנִיתוֹ* is a common word in the Qumran scrolls.

³⁰²Koehler and Baumgartner, *HALOT*, s.v. “תִּכְנִיתוֹ.”

³⁰³Again, this is not meant to be a balanced presentation of all the things done that should cause the people shame. This work is highlighting the temple and its layout (the ground plan or the sacred ground layout, not, as is clearly obvious, the floor plan of the temple). However, this work is not arguing that the layout is the only thing that should cause shame, but it is one of those things.

³⁰⁴The prescription to measure what has yet to happen or be built is commanded in Num 35:5, Deut 21:2, Isa 65:7, Ezek 45:3, 47:18, Pss 60:8, 108:7. This would include measuring distances for cities, crimes, and areas.

³⁰⁵The verb occurs 36 times in Ezekiel and 52 times in the Hebrew Scriptures.

³⁰⁶There are 16 occurrences in Ezek 40, 7 occurrences in Ezek 41, 6 occurrences in Ezek 42, 4 occurrences in Ezek 47. There are no other chapters in the Hebrew Scriptures that contain more than one occurrence of the verb.

³⁰⁷The verb *מָדַד* occurs only once in 1 Kings and that is in the Elijah narrative (1 Kgs 17:21). The verb is never used in the account of building the temple other than in Ezekiel. This further clarifies the need

Ezekiel 43:11 is a conditional sentence with a protasis and an apodosis that contains two parts. The protasis will be examined first. Ezekiel 43:11 has the protasis “if they are ashamed because of all that they have done.”³⁰⁹ It is important to remember in the preceding verse, the description of the ideal temple’s sacred ground layout, given to the readers in chaps. 40-42, is what caused the house of Israel to be ashamed, not a lengthy description of all their actions and behaviors that is quite common in the text of Ezekiel.³¹⁰ Along with this fact, it is important to note that the verb at the end of the protasis of Ezek 43:11 is אָשָׁמוּ .

Therefore, these two verses present the idea that after the prophet describes the new Jerusalem temple, the people are to be ashamed because of all that they have “done,” “made,” or “built,” as these are all translations for אָשָׁמוּ , before the prophet causes the people to know (אָמַרְתִּי) the temple’s sacred ground layout. The first temple, obviously, was not this ideal layout that the prophet had been shown in the vision of Ezek 40-42, as it allowed the profane to encroach upon the holy.³¹¹ The description of the temple by the prophet is done to induce shame by the people and, in turn, this shame is meant to induce the people to measure the ideal design.

for the people to measure this ideal design correctly as the measurements are important in chaps. 40-42, as well as the command to measure the ideal design here in 43:10.

³⁰⁸The demand is for the people to do (אָשָׁמוּ) the statutes for building the temple (v. 11), but this does not posit that God has no part in this process.

³⁰⁹This section is preceded by the layout of the temple in Ezek 40-42. This wording in Ezek 43:11, “if they are ashamed because of all that they have done,” does not exclude the rest of the book (and therefore all the things railed against in the book), yet does seem to be concerned primarily with the temple vision in chaps. 40-42, because the last clause of v. 10 commands them to calculate (or measure) the temple’s design.

³¹⁰However, as detailed above, this would include the great abominations (referred to in 43:8, as well as any that were temple related in 43:7) done at or on the temple as depicted in Ezek 8:6-13, which was caused by the original temple’s sacred ground layout that allowed the profane to transgress in the sphere of the holy.

³¹¹This section of Ezek 43 contains some of those design flaws, at least from the viewpoint of the prophet’s vision. These design flaws are part of the actions that the text of Ezek 43:10 labels אָשָׁמוּ as detailed above.

The apodosis of Ezek 43:11 has two major parts, each of which contains three sections, which need investigation. The first section of the first part of the apodosis has the command that the prophet must “inform them,” that is, the people, when the people have met the criteria of the protasis. In the last section of the first part of the apodosis, there is a command to “write before their eyes.” This command to write it before the eyes of the people shows how the prophet is to inform the people, or in other words, the clause has an instrumental syntax.

The central section of the first major part of the apodosis of Ezek 43:11 has a list of all that the prophet is to inform the people. This list is in three divisions, each of which uses the term *צִיּוֹרָה*, or plan. The three divisions of the central section of the first part of the apodosis are “the plan of the temple” and then the phrase, “all of its plans,” occurs twice. This section stresses the plans of the temple as well as the accompanying “statutes: and “instructions.” The plans have the design, “including all the exits and entrances.”³¹²

The second and last major part of the apodosis of Ezek 43:11 is the causal part of the apodosis and is also composed of three sections. The first section of the last part of Ezek 43:11 contains the reason why the prophet is to inform the people, “so that they will keep” or guard the information. The second section of the second part of the apodosis is an overview of the central section of the first part of the apodosis, stating that the information to be kept and guarded is “the entire plan and all its statutes.” Its entire plan includes “the plan of the temple including its arrangement, including its exits and its entrances,” mentioned in the first part of the apodosis.

The last section of the verse informs the people how they will comply with the other sections of this part of the apodosis. This third section of the second part of the apodosis, like the third section of the first part of the apodosis, is instrumental in its

³¹²This layout is obviously more than merely the temple building, but includes its surroundings and how the temple is positioned compared with its surrounding buildings and walls. “The general outline of the Temple area within the surrounding wall.” Fisch and Rosenberg, *Ezekiel*, 295-296.

syntax. It is how the people will guard or keep all this vision; “they will do” all that it involves, which would include building the structure as well as performing the statutes.

The verb in this section of v. 43:11 is וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ . This is the same verb as used in Exod 25:8, directing the building of the tabernacle as a dwelling for the Lord;³¹³ in fact, the verbal form is exactly the same as in Exod 25:8 as they both are *vav*-consecutive perfects in the third person plural, וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ .³¹⁴ This is not an imperative form but a prescriptive instruction that “they will build.”³¹⁵ It is not a suggestion; they are commanded to build the structure. There is little doubt, whether in Exod 25:8 or Ezek 43:11, that the people are to (they will, no other option is given) build the dwelling (the tabernacle in Exod 25:8 and the ideal temple in Ezek 43:11).³¹⁶

Since this part of the apodosis with its instrumental syntax has not been investigated fully, it is important to examine it. What is the object of this verb, that is, what is the verse depicting as having to be accomplished? “The entire plan and all of the statutes” of Ezek 43:11c refer to the plans of the temple including its arrangement, exits, and entrances along with the plans of the statues and teachings that go along with the

³¹³Block notes the parallels between the Exodus narrative and the Ezekiel restoration oracles in tabular form and ties Exod 25-40 to Ezek 40:5-43:27. Block, *Ezekiel*, 2:499.

³¹⁴The Masoretes may very well have understood the similarity between these two words as they both have the same conjunctive accent mark, a *merka*.

³¹⁵Waltke and O'Connor call this a “legislational” sense. Waltke and O'Connor, *Syntax*, 527.

³¹⁶The whole thrust of Peterson’s article on who is to build the temple centers on this verb and what it means, as he claims Ezekiel never has any command to build the temple and his analysis of it could generously be called sparse at best. However, his analysis on this verb presents how “the verb עָשָׂה (‘to do’) governs the list of nouns preceding it. Note, however, it is doubtful that the temple was to be ‘done’ (i.e., constructed by them). What this verb best reflects is the idea of ‘observing’ such as is seen throughout the Torah where the people are to ‘observe’ (עָשָׂה).” Brian Peterson, “Ezekiel’s Rhetoric,” 728. He does not note any similarities with Exod 25:8 or the verb in the *Temple Scroll*. The use in Exod 25:8, the clearest parallel in the Hebrew Scriptures, is not mentioned. Furthermore, he does not even note how the people are “to do” its entire layout and all its statutes if they do not build the layout and its buildings required by its statutes. His list of scriptural citations of the verb does have the people actually completing the tasks that they are instructed to perform. Yet, here, he anticipates that the people are not to complete the tasks they are instructed to perform or build.

temple explicitly stated in 43:11b.³¹⁷ Therefore, if the people are to accomplish the temple's sacred ground layout, they must build the temple with all of the walls that will make the exits and entrances as well as the walls that will make the courtyards and the gates to get into the courtyards.

This is explicitly asserted in v. 11 with the phrase **וַיַּעֲשׂוּ אֹתָם** (“and make them”). The object of the verse noted with the direct object marker and the plural pronominal suffix clearly refers to the plans explicitly given in 43:11c in shortened form and in 43:11b in longer form. This verb makes it clear that the people are to make or build all of the forms and cannot be limited to later statutes as the temple building is required in order to perform the statutes and teachings of the temple.

Thus, the object of the verb in Exod 25:8 and the object of Ezek 43:11c are functionally similar. The object is the dwelling place for the Lord to allow the Lord to dwell in the midst of the people. Just as the curtains surrounding the tabernacle were included in the plan of the tabernacle, the surrounding building and temple walls of the vision in chaps. 40-42 are included. The only difference between the objects in Exod 25:8 and Ezek 43:11 is that the verse in Ezekiel also includes all the statutes and teachings that are to go along with this ideal design (these statutes and teachings are given following this pericope).

Ezekiel 43:12 contains an inclusio, which highlights the material within the inclusio. Ezekiel 43:12 contains the phrase “this is the teaching of the temple” at both the beginning and the end of the verse.³¹⁸ This inclusio brackets the middle of the verse giving it a frame that highlights this material. The section of the verse highlighted is

³¹⁷Sweeney notes that Ezek 43:10-12 expects the prophet to teach the people the plan of the new temple. Marvin A. Sweeney, “Ezekiel,” *Jewish Study Bible*, ed. Adele Berlin and Marc Z. Brettler (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 1126.

³¹⁸The Septuagint aids the interpretation of the idea contained in Ezek 43:12. The translation of the word **תְּוַרְתֵּי** in Hebrew is *διαγραφήν* in the Greek. This Greek word means “plan” or “scheme” or “diagram” and clearly refers to the plans laid out in Ezek 40-42.

“upon the top of the mountain, all its territory all around is most holy.” This new design feature again refers to this new sacred ground layout of the temple,³¹⁹ differing from the layout of the first temple, where the entire top of the temple mount is holy and the profane palace of the king or any other structure shall not be near the holy structures.

There are three things given to the prophet in Ezek 43:10-11 to do, explicitly detailing what is expected of the prophet.³²⁰ Gese interprets these actions to pass on the knowledge of temple building.³²¹ These two verses detail what information the prophet is to relay, the expectations of the prophet are placed in order that he may relay them to the house of Israel.³²² Stevenson notes, about 43:10-11, that “[t]he verb is *Hip*□*il* of ׀׀׀. The root meaning of the verb is to make *conspicuous*. The lexica translate variously as ‘show,’ ‘tell,’ ‘declare.’ In 40:4, RSV has translated as ‘declare,’ while in 43:10, it translates as ‘describe.’ I have translated both as ‘describe’ to indicate that the primary mode is visual rather than oral.”³²³

The prophet is to show the house of Israel precisely (note all the measurements) the proper sacred ground layout for the Jerusalem temple they are to make, ׀׀׀׀׀, when they are gathered onto the land of Israel.³²⁴ The prophet is to go beyond writing all the

³¹⁹Fisch and Rosenberg present this concept regarding this last vision in Ezekiel. “The fundamental principle of Ezekiel’s vision of the restored Temple with all its implications is holiness, as indicated in xlv. 23, *They shall teach My people the difference between the holy and the common.*” Fisch and Rosenberg, *Ezekiel*, xviii.

³²⁰They are ׀׀׀׀׀ in v. 10 and ׀׀׀׀׀ and ׀׀׀׀׀ in v. 11. Fredenburg notes that the main aim for the vision of chaps. 40–48 is given in 43:10-11. Fredenburg, *Ezekiel*, 359.

³²¹Gese notes that “die zweite ist eine Aufforderung an den Propheten, den Tempelbau den Israeliten mitzuteilen.” Gese, *Ezechiel*, 34.

³²²Duguid observes that the prophet needs to relay the necessary information about the Jerusalem temple to the people; the relaying of information is the rationale for the prophet being given this vision in the first place. Duguid, *Ezekiel*, 490.

³²³Stevenson, *Transformation*, 14. This visual description of the temple’s sacred ground layout, as described above, allows the people to see or picture the differences between what had been done, made, or built on the site and what the prophet visually describes, in order that the people will be ashamed of it.

³²⁴Hummel agrees with Stevenson regarding “describe” as a good translation of the Hebrew, but notes that it means to tell, to narrate. “How does one ‘narrate’ or even ‘preach’ a building? Part of the answer lies in connecting the sanctuary’s structure with the history of salvation of which it is a part.”

measurements down; he is to draw them so that they may see.³²⁵ The outcome of these actions is that the house of Israel would measure (מָדַדוּ), keep (שָׁמְרוּ), and do (עָשׂוּ) all that the prophet conveyed to them.³²⁶ These actions, given to the prophet, are issued to ensure that the house of Israel receives the necessary information and so that they do all of it.³²⁷ The vision is not of some temple to be revealed at the *eschaton* already built and in heaven, as Hamerton-Kelly posits;³²⁸ the text in no way gives any indication of such and counters it with the idea that the vision is already set on the temple mount. This temple in the sky would give little or no hope to the house of Israel, as there would be no way of knowing how far off in time that would be and no direction for the near future in how to get there. Also, there is no precedence in the antiquity of this time for a temple to descend, completely built from the sky.³²⁹ There is evidence for visions of the temple's

Hummel, *Ezekiel 21-48*, 1242. Hummel's point of the building, the actual structure, and its part in salvation of the children of Israel is an important idea in Ezekiel's understanding of what a temple building is.

³²⁵Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 2:419.

³²⁶Joyce writes the obvious from these commands and outcomes, that this vision plans and expects that the people would build the temple based upon the ground plan presented in this vision. Paul M. Joyce, "Temple and Worship in Ezek 40–48," in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*, ed. John Day (London: T. & T. Clark, 2005), 156. Wright notes that the expectation of this passage is indeed that the Jerusalem temple would be built according to the vision. He also notes that the second temple did not correspond to this ground plan. C. Wright, *Ezekiel*, 338. Tobit 14 also includes some of this surprise, written while the second temple was standing, yet claiming that the temple would be rebuilt according to what the prophets have said about it. Aune and Stewart note the impact this last vision of Ezekiel had on apocalyptic conceptions in subsequent second temple Jewish writings. David E. Aune and Eric Stewart, "From the Idealized Past to the Imaginary Future: Eschatological Restoration in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature," in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*, ed. James M. Scott (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 163.

³²⁷This verb, שָׁמְרוּ, is an imperfect aspect and therefore could be a jussive in force. However, the Septuagint translates שָׁמְרוּ with φυλάξονταί. This future indicative does not indicate that the translators understood jussive force in the Hebrew. No jussive indicators exist, besides the imperfect aspect of the verb. Context provides no indication that this verb contains any volitional force and seems to indicate a declarative statement, "they will keep." The imperfect paired with the *vav*-consecutive perfect verb in parallel, עָשׂוּ, also argues against a volitional translation. Contra Block, Zimmerli, Allen, the KJV, NAB, NAS, NET, and the NIV. Block, *Ezekiel*, 2:587; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 2:411; Allen, *Ezekiel 20–48*, 2:238.

³²⁸R. G. Hamerton-Kelly, "The Temple and the Origins of Jewish Apocalyptic," *Vetus Testamentum* 20 (1970): 13.

³²⁹Although in the twelfth century CE, Ravad (Abraham ben David), citing Exod 15:17, avers that the temple descends fully built from heaven. Clorfene, *Messianic Temple*, 7. Zimmerli declares that the Lord has mysteriously formed the temple himself. Zimmerli, *I Am*, 115. Even in modern times this belief is

sacred ground layout given in order for the temple to be built.³³⁰

Expectations are given to the house of Israel in Ezek 43:10-11 detailing what is expected to happen in response to the prophet's actions. The outcomes of the vision are the people's response to the orders (though not all are in the imperative) issued to the prophet. In general, the outcomes lead to the life, relationship, and wellness with God coming to the people from the temple.³³¹ This vision leads to the correct temple and thereby to the right relationship as promised throughout the book of Ezekiel in its restoration passages in order to correct the wrongs of the past.³³²

The outcomes of this whole section, Ezek 43:1-12, are distorted if this part of the section, Ezek 43:10-11, is moved to the next pericope; this would move these verses from being part of the climax of this whole vision to prologue of the legislation.³³³ At the end of v. 11, there is an assertion that the house of Israel will do them (or make), referring to all the forms, entrances, exits, and arrangement of the new temple.³³⁴ This vision is not a vision of the restored Israel, it is a vision of what Israel will build, **וְעָשׂוּ**.³³⁵

still apparent as noted by Price. John Randall Price, *The Battle for the Last Days Temple* (Eugene, OR: Harvest House, 2004), 254.

³³⁰Gudea of Lagash is a well-known early example.

³³¹Tuell declares that the purpose of the Torah in this vision is life and wholeness, which both come from the temple, the navel and source of meaning of the world. Tuell, *Law of the Temple*, 174.

³³²Odell, *Ezekiel*, 498.

³³³Tuell breaks this section, taking away its power and outcomes. Tuell, "Divine Presence," 115. Therefore, it is easier to see how the outcome of this vision, the Jerusalem temple built correctly, fades for him as he does not consider this passage to be about building the correct temple. Tuell, *Law of the Temple*, 19-20, 74-75.

³³⁴Levenson notes how this vision contains a program that the house of Israel is to build. J. D. Levenson, *Program of Restoration*, 44. Odell shows that once the house of Israel is ashamed from what the prophet has relayed to them, then they are ready to see this temple and build the temple to conform to it and observe its customs. Odell, *Ezekiel*, 499-500.

³³⁵Clements notes that the vision "is not just a vision of a new and restored Israel but a practical 'renewal program' for national reorganization." Clements, *Ezekiel*, 178. Obviously, the vision requires that the people will build the temple, **וְעָשׂוּ** (this verb is in the plural, not the singular), but this does not mean the Lord will not aid, support, or be behind this effort. Psalm 127:1 reminds all those who examine Scripture, that unless the Lord supports or is behind the effort, that effort is in vain.

Another expectation of the house of Israel is that they would feel shame for what they have done. However, an important issue in this passage (i.e., to provoke shame) is often overlooked. In Ezek 43:10, the house of Israel is to be ashamed, using the verb כָּלַם, of all their trespasses, using the noun עֲוֹן. This noun is used many times in the book as shame is an important issue addressed, but the passage should be understood in its context. Clearly, the main issue addressed in Ezek 43:10b-11 is the form, pattern, and layout of the temple.

One trespass of the house of Israel is about the temple's sacred ground layout and what they have done.³³⁶ The trespass of the temple is not the only thing that is to evoke shame, yet it is to evoke shame.³³⁷ The prophet is to show them the temple, and the house of Israel is to be ashamed; and if they are ashamed,³³⁸ then the prophet is to show them all of the temple's arrangement, its forms, and its laws. These verses indicate that the people should be ashamed about the incorrect pattern that was built, so that they will build with the correct pattern in the future. Ezekiel's next instructions are about the operation of that future temple.

In examining the temple vision of Ezek 40–48 in general and Ezek 43:1-12 specifically, the writing's end goal has shown itself. The temple theology of Ezekiel contains the hope of the return of the presence of God.³³⁹ The presence of God in Ezekiel

³³⁶Odell writes that it is about what they have done and, therefore, it is “that Ezekiel’s preaching should not result in the people’s shame, but that it cannot be taken to heart until and unless the people are ashamed.” Odell, *Ezekiel*, 499.

³³⁷Greenberg notes that the prophet is to tell Israel the plan of the temple and that they should be ashamed. Although linking their shame more to the behavior of the people, Greenberg notes that they are to execute this new plan of the temple. Greenberg, “Program of Restoration,” 192.

³³⁸Lapsley understands this shame privately as well. “The Israelites need this solitary experience of shame, where one is aware of the gaze of the Other, but the active participation of the Other is not required.” Jacqueline E. Lapsley, “Shame and Self-Knowledge: The Positive Role of Shame in Ezekiel’s View of the Moral Self,” in *The Book of Ezekiel: Theological and Anthropological Perspectives*, ed. Margaret S. Odell and John T. Strong (Atlanta: SBL, 2000), 159.

³³⁹Klein notes that in looking in detail at the temple measurements and ground plan, the vision presents the hope of the presence of God and the subsequent transformed future with God. Ralph W. Klein, *Ezekiel: The Prophet and His Message* (Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1988), 189.

is the source of deliverance not only from captivity, but also from the improper current world order.³⁴⁰ The temple theology of Ezek 43 is clearly “prophetically revolutionary.”³⁴¹ “The temple constitutes the center of God’s work in history—His work of both judgment and salvation at the eschatological time.”³⁴²

In Ezek 40-42, the temple’s sacred ground layout defined by the vision shows criticisms of the past and expectations for the next temple.³⁴³ The temple, though currently debated, seems in the vision to be “a goal to be effected through human striving and was understood as such by the tradition.”³⁴⁴ The correct temple as defined by the vision brings the eternal dwelling of God within it.³⁴⁵ The dwelling brings the new

³⁴⁰Eichrodt claims that “this is the object of the divine economy of salvation. In this way the outward forms of temple worship are to be penetrated, and their inward meaning laid bare. This is the purpose of this sober yet irresistibly logical structural outline of the buildings of the temple.” Eichrodt, *Ezekiel*, 555. One of the understandings of a temple, as presented by Lundquist, is that “[t]here is a close interrelationship between the temple and law in the ancient Near East. The building or restoration of a temple is perceived as the moving force behind a restating or ‘codifying’ of basic legal principles, and of the ‘righting’ and organizing of proper social order.” John M. Lundquist, “What Is a Temple?” in *The Quest for the Kingdom of God: Studies in Honor of George E. Mendenhall*, ed. H. B. Huffmon, F. A. Spina, and A. R. W. Green (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983), 217.

³⁴¹Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 2:416.

³⁴²Fujita, “Temple Theology,” 83.

³⁴³Even after the rebuilding of the second temple was realized, Clements notes that “[t]he promise of the fullness of the divine presence on earth remained a central feature of the eschatological hopes of the post-exilic community.” Clements, *God and Temple*, 125. Stemming from Ezekiel, the correct temple must be built according to the temple’s sacred ground layout given in order to realize this hope. Clements notes that the second temple was thought to bring the supernatural blessings, but that this hope was thought to be delayed. *Ibid.*, 126. Though Torrey thought Ezekiel was pseudepigraphic and written in the late third century BCE, he saw that Ezekiel was the foundation of the line of thought that was promulgated in other second temple Jewish writings. C. C. Torrey, *Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy* (1930; repr., New York: KTAV, 1970). The Temple Scroll of Qumran seemed to focus on the correct ground plan in order to bring these blessings. Greenberg notes that “[w]herever Ezekiel’s program can be checked against subsequent events it proves to have had no effect. Their return and resettlement of post-exilic times had nothing in common with Ezekiel’s vision.” Greenberg, “Program of Restoration,” 208. The failure of the temple building to match this prophecy and the subsequent events told the people that perfection had not come, which is why the idea of the ideal temple changing creation did not die.

³⁴⁴J. D. Levenson, *Program of Restoration*, 46. Another basic principle of a temple presented by Lundquist is that “[t]he plan and measurements of the temple are revealed by God to the king, and the plan must be carefully carried out.” Lundquist, “What Is a Temple?” 211.

³⁴⁵The vision of Ezek 40–48 is to be understood in terms of a real reconstruction effort as well as a future assurance that God would be with the house of Israel. Joyce, *Ezekiel*, 221. It must be said that nowhere else in the Hebrew Scriptures does a text offer the temple’s sacred ground layout that is connected to the eschatological age, except in Ezekiel. Even in pre-exilic texts, the layout of the tabernacle in Exod

relationship as made possible by a God who truly dwells in the temple, like humanity dwells on earth.³⁴⁶ The temple itself, as laid out in chaps. 40-42, is in the end not for the benefit of God, but truly for the house of Israel.³⁴⁷

Ezekiel 47:1-12: The Effects of Ezekiel 43:1-12

Although all that follows after Ezek 43:12 can be argued to be about the temple and its place in society, one specific passage needs to be addressed because it follows directly from the glory of the Lord inhabiting this temple, explaining the effects of what happens when the glory dwells there, Ezek 47:1-12.³⁴⁸ The stream, which flows out of the temple, comes from under the building because the glory of the Lord actually dwells there, since the return described in chap. 43.³⁴⁹ Even though the stream flows out of the

25-26 and the layout of Solomon's temple in 1 Kgs 6 do not appear to be layouts for structures that are connected to eschatological events, as presented in those texts. However, this could be a further area of study. Although he refutes the position, Feinberg notes that some argue that the Mosaic tabernacle does not hold an eschatological role by claiming that "[t]here is no essential feature of the Mosaic covenant, a noneschatological and conditional contract, which remains to be fulfilled." Charles L. Feinberg, "The Rebuilding of the Temple," in *Prophecy in the Making: Messages Prepared for Jerusalem Conference on Biblical Prophecy*, ed. Carl F. H. Henry (Carol Stream, IL: Creation House, 1971), 103.

³⁴⁶Notwithstanding the new heart promised by the Lord in Ezek 36:26, the house of Israel "cannot neglect the correct design of the temple, even down to the measurements for its construction." Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 2:345.

³⁴⁷Stevenson summarizes, "This spatial arrangement is a profound acknowledgement that the true beneficiary of the House is not YHWH but Israel, and through Israel, both heaven and earth, cosmos and society." Stevenson, *Transformation*, 41.

³⁴⁸Haran correctly shows that it is after the glory dwells in the temple that the temple can fulfill its role. Haran, "Law-Code," 55. Corbin sees this role eschatologically. The "culmination is a vision of the New Temple the building of which is the prelude to the apotheosis of a cosmic restoration." Corbin, *Temple*, 284.

³⁴⁹Zimmerli explains that the holiness of God "flows out from the sanctuary into the dried up, salty region of mysterious curses without there being given the least hint of ritual protection from the stream which emerges from the realm of the holy. Out there it heals what is sick. The full beneficent effect of God's taking up residence in his people's midst, which was spoken of in 43:1ff, is here unfolded." Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, 2:509. Block notes that the stream in chap. 47 can exist only because the Lord resides in the temple among the house of Israel. Block, *Ezekiel*, 2:701. Allen notes this stream is like a vein of blessing made possible by the fact that the Lord dwells in the temple. Allen, *Ezekiel 20-48*, 2:212-213. Wright notes a key point in understanding this new temple. "The most important fact about the river is its source. It comes directly from the presence of God." C. Wright, *Ezekiel*, 357. Clorfene declares it is possible that Ezekiel's guide "led him all the way to the entrance of the Holy of Holies, for it is from there that the first trickle of water emerges." Clorfene, *Messianic Temple*, 206. Kang misses the connection with

temple because the glory of the Lord in residence, the importance of the temple building should not be lost or underestimated. It is only this temple, the one with the proper sacred ground layout given at the beginning of the vision,³⁵⁰ which brings the glory of the Lord into residence.³⁵¹ The temple is the place where the glory dwells upon the earth.³⁵²

The book of Ezekiel stresses the importance of the temple, both in its former trespasses,³⁵³ which was where the judgment of the Lord started,³⁵⁴ and in its proper design, which is where the restoration of the Lord begins.³⁵⁵ In referring to Ezek 47:1-12, Clements notes that “[t]he importance of the temple is everywhere assumed, and this is now explained and reaffirmed in a remarkable visionary picture of what it will mean for the land and the people who reside there.”³⁵⁶ The stream from the temple, due to the dwelling of the glory of the Lord in this temple, is a visual summation of the focus of the book, declaring the supreme importance of the temple and what happens when the glory dwells within it.³⁵⁷

The stream comes due to the presence of the Lord because the proper sacred

the river coming from the presence of God, maintaining the river source is underneath the temple similar to the *Apsu*. Kang, “Creation,” 148.

³⁵⁰It is important to note that no such river came out from the first temple, even if the glory of the Lord did dwell there.

³⁵¹The stream in chap. 47 shows the importance of this temple. “It regards the temple as essential to life, so that the restoration of the building in Jerusalem and its services heads the list of tasks that can turn hope into reality.” Clements, *Ezekiel*, 205.

³⁵²Contra Vawter and Hoppe, who see the significance of the temple as a sign of restoration, and fail to see the temple as enabling or hastening the restoration. Vawter and Hoppe, *New Heart*, 194.

³⁵³These trespasses would be both in its design and in idolatrous practices occurring there.

³⁵⁴The children of Israel are called rebellious in chap. 2, but it is in chap. 4 that the first judgment and condemnation begins and, as detailed above, the judgment is against the temple’s sacred ground layout.

³⁵⁵Fujita, “Temple Theology,” 151.

³⁵⁶Clements, *Ezekiel*, 203-204. Clements explains even further that not only is the temple of the utmost importance, the source of life itself; the temple allows the worship of God to occupy the paramount importance in the land. *Ibid.*, 205.

³⁵⁷*Ibid.*

ground layout for the temple allows the glory to dwell within it (Ezek 43:1-12); yet, the text notes the effect of the presence of the Lord in the Jerusalem temple (Ezek 47:1-12). The river is a conduit from the temple to the land of Israel.³⁵⁸ The river affects the land, making it a fruitful paradise.³⁵⁹ The use of ארץ in Ezek 47:1 and the use of שְׂדֵה אֲרָץ in 47:12, forming an inclusio of sorts, emphasize the effect on the land originating from this temple,³⁶⁰ radiating out into the land.³⁶¹ This passage of Ezek 47 stresses the restorative power of the temple on the land,³⁶² not the power of the stream by itself.³⁶³ There is some connection between this river and the rivers of Eden.³⁶⁴ However, the correct temple of Ezek 40–48 affects the land,³⁶⁵ enabling a paradise even beyond the Garden of Eden.³⁶⁶

The transformation of the land depicted in Ezek 47:1-12 goes beyond a restoration back to pre-exilic time, or the golden age of Israel under the united monarchy; the land

³⁵⁸It is important to remember that the phrase, the land of Israel, is used more in Ezekiel than in the rest of the Hebrew Scriptures combined. The land is restored as the house of Israel is restored from the presence of God in this temple.

³⁵⁹Duguid notes this river affects the creatures' fertility as in Gen 1. Duguid, *Ezekiel*, 531. Although the date of the *Apocalypse of Moses* may date after the fall of the second temple, notice that chap. 22 has the presence of the Lord causing the blooming of the flowers in Eden.

³⁶⁰Tuell is correct in noting that "[t]he Bible also associates abundance with God's presence in the temple." Tuell, *Ezekiel*, 333.

³⁶¹Both Joyce and Blenkinsopp note the nature of this diffusion of holiness into the land of Israel. Joyce, "Temple and Worship," 156; Blenkinsopp, *Ezekiel*, 222.

³⁶²Barker equates Eden and the temple. Barker, *Gate of Heaven*, 70.

³⁶³Block appears to stress the revitalizing power of the stream. Yet, it is the temple's power through the indwelling presence of God that brings the stream. Block, *Ezekiel*, 2:695.

³⁶⁴Hurowitz, "Exalted House," 80. Levenson writes that this river shows "[t]he Temple vision in Ezekiel 40–48 results, then in more than simply a reconstructed Temple and a reconstituted Israelite policy centered upon it. It results as well in a vision of the redeemed life that has striking points in common with notions of paradise that appear (inter alia) in the story of Garden of Eden in Genesis 2-3." J. D. Levenson, *Resurrection and Restoration*, 89-90.

³⁶⁵"In a final vision Ezekiel is shown the abundance of blessing which the new Temple will bring to the people of Israel." Fisch and Rosenberg, *Ezekiel*, 323.

³⁶⁶Himmelfarb observes that "Ezekiel's eschatological Eden at Zion surpasses the Eden of the past. And it is the Temple that is the source of the wonderful powers of the stream as the angel tells the prophet quite clearly (v. 12)." Himmelfarb, "Garden of Eden," 65. This comment notes the crucial dependence of the restoration on the temple and superlative results this temple brings to the land.

undergoes a transformation of epoch proportions, showing that a new age has begun; the prophetic eschatological days have begun.³⁶⁷ This proper temple is present as the eschatological transformation of the land of Israel in this vision occurs.³⁶⁸ The transformation depends on the temple's construction according to the measurements of 40-42 further elucidated by the temple's sacred ground layout instructions of Ezekiel 43:7-9.³⁶⁹ With this temple,³⁷⁰ the city of Jerusalem has been transformed from the city of

³⁶⁷Martínez reports how the vision of 40–48 was interpreted in the second temple period. Martínez notes that “l’oracle d’Ézéchiél a été transposé à la réalité des jours derniers, au présent de la Communauté.” Florentino García Martínez, “L’interprétation de la Torah d’Ézéchiél dans les Mss. de Qumran,” *Revue de Qumran* (1988): 444. Schmidt notes that this passage is eschatological. “Hier zeigt sich ganz deutlich die eschatologische Seite der Tempelschau: Die Wiederherstellung des Tempels fällt mit der Wiederbringung des Paradieses zusammen.” M. Schmidt, *Prophet*, 170. Hamerton-Kelly notes that “Ezekiel’s interpretation is eschatological. He sees the new temple as the removal of the barrier between heaven and earth, and the beginning of the new age.” Hamerton-Kelly, “Jewish Apocalyptic,” 8.

³⁶⁸Petersen interprets that it is the temple that is the prerequisite to the restoration of Israel in Ezekiel. David L. Petersen, *Haggai and Zechariah 1-8: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1984), 117. Fredriksen notes that “[t]he relevant Temple theme in other Jewish writings—the Dead Sea Scrolls, various other Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha—is the expectation that, in the new age, in God’s kingdom, God would splendidly renew the current Temple or establish a new and more glorious one (‘a glorious building for all generations,’ Tob 14:5). . . . The current Temple was soon to be destroyed (understood: not by Jesus, nor by invading armies, but by God), to cede place to the eschatological Temple (understood: not built by the hand of man) at the close of the age.” Paula Fredriksen, *Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews* (New York: Random House, 1999), 210. Fredriksen’s statement is not necessarily new; yet, it is the seemingly contradictory nature of the statement that shows the temple is at the initiation of the eschatological age. She notes that actions happen in the new age, yet, it is at the close of the old age. The statement is not contradictory if, and only if, the temple and the indwelling of the glory of the Lord happen at the fulcrum point in history. The fulcrum point belongs to both the past and the future age. Stevenson notes the temple as the focal point (a different, but similar metaphor) with the view that “[t]he function of the temple as the mediator between the social and the cosmic, between the earthly and the heavenly, between the actual and the symbolic, makes the House of YHWH the focal point of the new society.” Stevenson, *Transformation*, 153. This function, to bring one age to a close and to begin the new age, seems to be a function of the temple in eschatological affairs in Ezekiel.

³⁶⁹Fujita notes how the basis of this transformation is the temple. Fujita, “Temple Theology,” 73. Fujita likens this time to a temple-centered world that would eternally flourish. *Ibid.*, 148. Ezek 40:1-43:7 indicates that the correct temple will bring the glory of the Lord to dwell with the house of Israel and in the land of Israel and this dwelling will change humanity and the land forever. Clements also addressed this concept. “From being the basis of a future hope, the belief in the divine presence has become an object of that hope itself. The promises of cult-festivals have been transformed into an eschatology.” Clements, *God and Temple*, 106.

³⁷⁰The proper temple’s sacred ground layout is connected with eschatological actions. This idea is rooted in the idea of what temples were in the Ancient Near East (as presented above) and may be echoed as well with the temple of Baal. Here, a writing ties the temple to the desire for a new season (i.e., a new order of things). “Let a house be built for Baal like the gods and a court like the children of Asherah’s! Quoth Lady Asherah of the Sea; Art great indeed, O El, and wise, Thy beard’s gray hair instructs thee. . . . Now, too, the seasons of his rains will Baal observe.” Here, Baal will give and observe the needed seasons of rain solely because the correct temple has been built and Baal now dwells in the temple. James B.

David into a brand-new city and its new name is “the Lord is there” (Ezek 48:35). It is not just the land and the city, even the social institutions have been forever transformed.³⁷¹ This complete and everlasting transformation will be that way forever because the Lord actually dwells in this temple forever (Ezek 43:7, 9).³⁷² When the Lord physically dwells in this temple, the Lord intervenes in a great, grand, and frightening way so as to powerfully reorder the land.

Haggai

The Timeline to Blessing in Haggai

The text of Haggai presents a detailed, specific timeline to future events. This timeline, starting from the text’s present day to a future day not far off, is presented in remarkably specific detail. The frequent repetition of specific words in the text (many examined below), seen by ranking the books of the Hebrew Scriptures by the number of verses in the book where a given word occurs normalized (or divided) by the number of verses in that book, aids this obvious conclusion. The word “this” (זֶה) occurs more in Haggai than anywhere else in the Hebrew Scriptures.³⁷³ The word “this” modifies the nouns: temple (הַמִּזְבֵּחַ), day, people, place, and nation. The use of this demonstrative adjective shows the important role of specificity within the text.

Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (Princeton, NJ: University Press, 1969), 133.

³⁷¹Ezekiel keeps social institutions, but orders the universe to make it ideal. Eichrodt, *Ezekiel*, 530.

³⁷²Contra Vos who holds that this restoration only presages a fuller restoration to come. Vos and Dennison, *Eschatology*, 85. Additionally, Clements maintains that although the presence of God is an important aspect of the *eschaton*, he holds that this temple is just a symbol of future hope. Clements, *God and Temple*, xi. Ezekiel presents an eschatological connection that goes beyond merely a symbol. “The Lord is there” is the name of the city because the temple is the residence of God.

³⁷³The statistics on this search show Haggai has the word זֶה in over 23% of the verses where Ecclesiastes, in second place among all the Hebrew Scriptures, has 16% of the occurrences of the word. This comparison alone, which is between the first and second ranking books, shows that Haggai uses the word about 50% more than does Ecclesiastes, after normalizing for size of the texts.

Another key word is “time” (זמן). Haggai’s use of this word ranks third most, using the same normalized statistics as above, behind Ecclesiastes and Zephaniah.³⁷⁴ The book of Haggai calls the audience to recognize that the “time” is now (Hag 2:15). This leads to another key word in the text’s depiction of a specific timeline, “now.” The word “now” (עַתָּה) occurs more in Haggai than anywhere else in the Hebrew Scriptures, using the same normalized statistics as above.³⁷⁵ Recognizing the urgency and expectancy of this book is crucial in understanding its meaning.

Adding to the understanding of time in the book of Haggai are the six date citations given in the book.³⁷⁶ The date citations are vital in giving the text of Haggai firm footing not only for when the prophetic declarations occurred, but showing the complete immersion of the text in the unfolding of the events of time, including the events of Haggai’s present and future. Patrick notes that these date citations “exhibit a specificity rarely found in the Hebrew Bible.”³⁷⁷ Compounded with the date citations and the text’s immersion in a timeline are the reference points to the day when events will change.³⁷⁸

The time and timing of events is a theme in Haggai. As mentioned above, the word “time” is an important repeated indicator within the text, but there are other aspects

³⁷⁴The statistics on this search show that Ecclesiastes has the word זמן in 8.1% of the verses, Zephaniah has the word in 5.7% of the verses, and Haggai ranks third using the word in 5.3% of the verses.

³⁷⁵The text of Haggai uses the word עַתָּה more than any other book in the Hebrew Scriptures when using the same normalized statistics as above. It is the only book that has the word in over 10% of the verses (10.53% compared to the average rate for the books in Scripture that contain the word of 1.81%). This is without considering the recommendations of *BHK* and *BHS* to read the word also in Hag 1:2. The word is often used with a conjunction, setting off the word as an interjection. The phrase עַתָּה־ occurs more in Haggai than anywhere else in the Hebrew Scriptures, using the same normalized statistics. This phrase occurs in about 7.9% of the verses of the text of Haggai.

³⁷⁶These citations are in Hag 1:1, 15; 2:1, 10, 18, 20. Kessler notes that the date format of Haggai has precedent in Ezekiel. John A. Kessler, *The Book of Haggai: Prophecy and Society in Early Persian Yehud* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 48-49. This link between Haggai and Ezekiel has implications for Haggai’s temple’s sacred ground layout and how this new temple compares to the first temple.

³⁷⁷Frank Y. Patrick, “Haggai and the Return of YHWH” (PhD dissertation, Duke University, 2006), 45.

³⁷⁸Beyond the six date citations, five additional days are mentioned in Hag 2:15, 18, 19, and 23.

to this theme of the book. The presentation of the events that have happened, juxtaposed with the idea of when those events should have happened, is another aspect of time, specifically the proper unfolding of time, in Haggai. The proper timing of events is at the heart of Hag 1:2-3. The people have said that the time has not yet come to build the temple; yet, this is followed by a question where the answer is an obvious “no.” Yet, the people have most certainly built houses for themselves, which the oracle implies is out of order with the proper events. The house of the Lord comes first is the implied priority with the question about the houses of the people.

The order of events is crucial to the text of Haggai. The phrase “from before a stone is set to stone at the temple of the Lord” in Hag 2:15 describes events occurring in the proper order. A similar textual construct occurs in 2:18 where the phrase “from the day when the sanctuary of the Lord is founded” also describes the proper order of events.³⁷⁹ The order of events, laid out in Haggai, specifically points to this one day.

Sykes summarizes this order that is dependent upon this one specific day by noting how Haggai claims “that this particular day marked the beginning of a new era of blessing and salvation for the survivors of the exile who had returned to Judah.”³⁸⁰ It is from this day and following,³⁸¹ from before the stone is set to stone, and from the day the sanctuary is founded that events must change.³⁸² These declarations again show the

³⁷⁹The translation given was done interpreting the verbal form בְּיָמָיו as a *pu*al infinitive construct which matches the infinitive construct in Hag 2:15 that is in quite a similar setting within this same pericope. Thus, it follows the context of the text of Haggai. With the relative pronoun following the temporal prepositional phrase here in 2:18, the translation, even if the verbal parsing is a *pu*al perfect, would probably best be as it is above rather than “from the day when the sanctuary of the Lord was founded.” This is because the sanctuary is not built and the focus on the oracles in the book, in general, and this pericope, specifically, is to build the sanctuary of the Lord, not that it has already been founded or built.

³⁸⁰Seth Sykes, *Time and Space in Haggai-Zechariah 1-8: A Bakhtinian Analysis of a Prophetic Chronicle* (New York: Peter Lang, 2002), 30.

³⁸¹This phrase, $\text{בְּיָמָיו הַזֵּה וְיָמֵינוּ הַזֵּה}$, is unique to the text of Haggai. It occurs twice in chap. 2, those occurrences are in 2:15 and 2:18.

³⁸²This specific day is examined in more detail below.

emphasis on the events and the order of events as an important theme in the text of Haggai.

Petersen observes, “No other prophetic book evinces such a distinctive chronological ordering of a prophetic activity.”³⁸³ Petersen’s choice of verb here is quite accurate. “Evince” means to show convincingly, and the text of Haggai shows convincingly a timeline that is provided to show the order of events that, according to the presentation of the prophet, will lead the people to the future full of blessings.

The timing of the events and order of events revolve around the temple in Haggai. Clines observes, “There is another dimension to Haggai’s construction of the temple, though. It is that there is an urgency about rebuilding the house.”³⁸⁴ The double use of the word “time” in Hag 1:2 “magnifies the importance of the notion of ‘time’ in relationship to the rebuilding of the temple.”³⁸⁵ Meyers and Meyers also note how the double use of the word in Hag 1:2 “calls attention to the passage of time in relationship to the temple.”³⁸⁶ These textual indications of the relationship between the future existence of the Jerusalem temple and the timing of that temple in Haggai illuminate the message of the text.

The specific, detailed timeline within the text of Haggai presents a future of blessing to the leaders and people. Both chapters of Haggai present blessings to be harvested for the people. The only blessing that could be considered in the present of the time of the text is the blessing that the word of the Lord is still with the people. The very first verse of the text declares that the word of the Lord has come by the hand of Haggai,

³⁸³Petersen, *Haggai*, 32-33.

³⁸⁴David J. A. Clines, “Haggai’s Temple: Constructed, Deconstructed, and Reconstructed,” *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 7 (1993): 56.

³⁸⁵Patrick, “Haggai,” 62.

³⁸⁶Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 1987), 20.

the prophet. Although this is presented in the present time-frame in the context of the book, the word of the Lord is directed toward a new future; thus, even the word of the Lord is presented as a future blessing for the leaders and the people.³⁸⁷

The word of the Lord is centered on the temple, which is the focus of both chapters of the text of Haggai.³⁸⁸ The next promised future blessing is that the Lord will be pleased with the temple that the people are commanded to build (Hag 1:8). The *vav*-conjunctive imperfect of this verb, וַיִּשְׂמַח, clearly implies a future favorable disposition toward or pleasure with the Jerusalem temple that is yet to be built, as the current temple site is uninhabited (Hag 1:4).

The blessing of the Lord's favorable disposition toward the temple and, therefore, the ministry offered at that place will be when this temple is built. Patrick points out that the verb, וַיִּשְׂמַח,³⁸⁹ "is used in worship texts to describe the acceptance of a sacrificial gift in the temple."³⁹⁰ This verb, וַיִּשְׂמַח, in all of its uses in the Hebrew Scriptures, depicts favor in the temple (or tabernacle) by the Lord only here in Haggai,³⁹¹ showing how important this notion is in and to this prophetic declaration.³⁹²

³⁸⁷First, it is important to note that the coming of the word of the Lord through the prophet, although given at the text's present time, presents future and not present blessings. Therefore, the word of the Lord is a future blessing, not primarily a present blessing for the people. Second, even though the audience of Hag 1:1 is explicitly directed to the governor and high priest, the people are addressed by the word of the Lord (Hag 2:2, 4, cf. Hag 1:12).

³⁸⁸This issue is covered above and below as it is central to the prophetic text and is shown in the message of both chapters as seen in Hag 1:8 and 2:9.

³⁸⁹This verb occurs in Haggai second most in the Hebrew Scriptures behind only Malachi and ahead of Leviticus. It occurs in 2.6% of the verses.

³⁹⁰Patrick, "Haggai," 124.

³⁹¹Meadowcroft notes that this is the only usage where the verb וַיִּשְׂמַח is linked to the verb בָּבֵר by a shared grammatical object: the temple in Jerusalem. Tim Meadowcroft, *Haggai* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2006), 125.

³⁹²David speaks of having pleasure or favor (וַיִּשְׂמַח) in the temple project. This usage in 1 Chr 29:3 is the closest comparison to the concept in Haggai.

The next promised future blessing is that when the temple is built, the Lord will appear there (Hag 1:8). The verb in this verse, **וַיֵּאָרָא**, means to “appear in one’s glory.”³⁹³ The verb in this case has a *qere*, which explicitly shows the cohortative form with the normal cohortative ending. Yet, Waltke and O’Connor note that “the *waw* is normally prefixed to the short prefix-conjugation form, where available.”³⁹⁴ Thus, it is important to understand this verb as a cohortative as preserved not only by the *qere*, but also by the consonantal text. The volitive form shows the wish or the will of the speaker; in Hag 1:8, the volitive form is used of the Lord.

The text expresses the Lord’s desire to appear and be glorified, if only the people would build the temple. Thus, the three blessings of the first chapter of the text are future oriented. The word of prophecy, although coming through Haggai, was oriented toward future action. The future blessing of favorable disposition toward the temple and the blessing of the Lord appearing in glory are both conditional upon the future action of building the temple.

The next blessing described in the text of Haggai is the assurance of future action by every other nation. “The treasure of every nation will come” to the temple (Hag 2:7). The *vav*-consecutive perfect gives the assurance that even though it is a future action,³⁹⁵ it is as certain as a past event that has already taken place. This blessing goes beyond the assurance of valuable offerings at the temple; the posture of all nations bringing forth these precious offerings is just as important as the offerings themselves. None of the

³⁹³Koehler and Baumgartner cite this understanding for the meaning of this word in this use in Hag 1:8. Koehler and Baumgartner, *HALOT*, s.v. “**וַיֵּאָרָא**.” Among other sources, Clements and Terrien translate the verb in this manner. Clements, *God and Temple*, 124; Samuel Terrien, *The Elusive Presence: Toward a New Biblical Theology* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1978), 395.

³⁹⁴Waltke and O’Connor, *Syntax*, 543.

³⁹⁵The *vav*-consecutive perfect retains the ideas of complete action like the perfect. Waltke and O’Connor, *Syntax*, 523-525. Quoting Bo Johnson, they note “the *wə* + perfect and the perfect have the character of complete, concluded action, an action which is seen from without as something whole.” *Ibid.*, 523.

other nations will be oppressing Israel if they are bringing the precious offerings to Jerusalem, to the temple itself. The blessing is quite encompassing; it promises that there will not be a nation left to oppress Israel as every nation, כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם, will have a new posture toward Israel, Jerusalem, and especially the temple.³⁹⁶

The next blessing is the act of filling this new temple gloriously. The word כָּבוֹד in Hag 2:7 probably has a double meaning. The first meaning is the obvious implication on how the Lord will fill this temple; the usage here is as an adverb. The temple will be filled in a glorious manner made possible by the precious offerings of every nation. The use of the *vav*-consecutive perfect, וַיִּמַּל אֱתֵי, assures completion. A second subtle meaning is shown by the choice of the verb in this pronouncement of the word of the Lord of hosts. A possible allusion to 1 Kgs 8:10 is shown through the use of the verb מָלָא. The cloud filled the temple in 1 Kgs 8:10; in Hag 2:7, it is the Lord who will fill the temple with glory, (or the) כָּבוֹד, which includes the glory of the Lord.

This leads to the next blessing, the blessing of a temple that will exceed the past glorious temple in glory. The temple mount is presented in the text as uninhabited (Hag 1:4) and as nothing for the eyes to behold (Hag 2:3), but the future temple will be blessed abundantly such that this future temple will be more glorious for the eyes to behold than the first temple, which was built in the time of the united monarchy, the glory days. This

³⁹⁶Verhoef notes how some in the past have favored a view that this refers to Jesus, but notes how “[t]his interpretation is now generally abandoned, for it is clear from v. 8, as Calvin already pointed out, that the ‘glory,’ ‘wealth’ of the last clause of v. 7 is that of silver and gold, thus it is not a delightful or desired person but precious things that are destined to come to the new sanctuary.” Pieter A. Verhoef, *The Books of Haggai and Malachi* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987), 104. A few current-day commentators and past Christian traditional interpreters try to tie the “delight of nations” coming to the temple as Jesus of Nazareth. This can only be done in hindsight and requires eisegesis, putting ideas in the text that are not there. One cannot get this from exegesis, examining what the text actually asserts. For more review of messianic claims from Haggai, see below. *Rashi* does note that the delight of nations coming to the temple is the gold and riches that Herod the Great brought in building the temple. Yitzchok Stavsky, *Trei Asar: The Twelve Prophets* (Brooklyn, NY: Mesorah, 2009), 2:182. Yes, gold did come to the temple, but not from the offerings of all the nations, and the rest of the predictions in Haggai did not come true during the days of Herod the Great. Meyers and Meyers detail this and show that this is how all the nations “will send tribute through their ambassadors and emissaries.” Meyers and Meyers, *Haggai*, 53.

future blessing of a more glorious Jerusalem temple is fundamental to the text of Haggai, as has been seen in the blessings reviewed so far as well as the blessings below.

The next blessing is the claim that in that place, that sacred space,³⁹⁷ the Lord would give or settle שָׁלוֹם (Hag 2:9). The meaning of this word is multivalent with a general understanding of peace, prosperity, and well-being. However, the meaning here seems more specific to the context of Haggai. Koehler and Baumgartner delineate the meaning here more specifically to the understanding of the context, choosing the nuance of “deliverance, salvation.”³⁹⁸ The future giving of salvation is done after the temple is built and that salvation is given to that special place.

The next idea of blessing from the text of Haggai is more general. The prophetic pronouncement is that the Lord will bless the people (Hag 2:19). In chap. 1, the Lord called a drought upon the land, mountains, grain, new wine, olive oil, all the produce of the land, humanity, domesticated animals, and upon the works of human hands. This explains the condition of the people at the time. However, the future will be different. The Lord blessing the people means that the Lord will provide the people with a special power or ability,³⁹⁹ so the people will be able to influence a new state of affairs. From “this day” the Lord will bless the people; the time frame of Hag 2:15-19 clearly indicates the day when the Jerusalem temple is established or completed in its allotted space on the temple mount.⁴⁰⁰

The next blessing presented in the text of Haggai is the destruction of all the enemies of the people. The Lord will, after “this day,” overthrow the thrones, or seats of

³⁹⁷Walton notes about ancient temples that “[t]he residence of the deity in the temple required the recognition of sacred space.” John H. Walton, *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2006), 118.

³⁹⁸Koehler and Baumgartner, *HALOT*, s.v. “שָׁלוֹם.”

³⁹⁹*Ibid.*, s.v. “בָּרַךְ.”

⁴⁰⁰This link between completing the temple and the Lord blessing the people is dealt with below in detail. It is required here to complete the idea that the text of Haggai presents blessings for the people.

power, of the kingdoms as well as exterminate the armies of the kingdoms of the nations, overturning the mighty chariots, and her riders, as well as the cavalries, both horses and riders, and the infantries will kill each other with the sword (Hag 2:22). This dramatic blessing will rid the land of Israel and her people of enemies and cease the oppression on the “remnant of the people.” This blessing is to undo the oppression that left only a “remnant of the people.”

This phrase, שְׁאֵרֵי יְהוּדָה, “remnant of the people,” occurs more in Haggai than anywhere else in the Hebrew Scriptures, ranking the books of the Hebrew Scriptures by the number of verses in the book where it occurs normalized by the number of verses in that book.⁴⁰¹ The oppression that left only a “remnant of the people” will be removed from the land and there will be no army that will come and oppress the people; this removal of oppression is the blessing for the people from the text of Haggai that will come after “this day,” the day when the temple is founded or completed.

The next blessing, the last given in the text of Haggai, is that Zerubbabel will be set, again in the *vav*-consecutive perfect, as the seal (Hag 2:23). This seal, or “lock,”⁴⁰² seals or locks the finishing touches on this new future. This is a blessing because the text declares that the Lord will place the seal of the Lord upon all the blessings mentioned above, a pledge from the Lord that all this will be assured. The Lord ensures that these blessings will occur because the Lord has given the blessing of a “lock” or the stamp of a signet ring upon all these blessings.

The specific timeline and the blessings given within the text of Haggai lay out a plan to the future. It is important to determine whether this text is presenting

⁴⁰¹This phrase occurs in about 8% of the verses of the text of Haggai, more than eight times higher than Zechariah, where it occurs less than .95% of the verses, though Zechariah is where the phrase occurs second most in Scripture. This phrase occurs more times in Haggai than in any other book, no matter how long that book is. The phrase occurs in only four books of the Hebrew Bible, with Nehemiah and Jeremiah being the other two.

⁴⁰²Koehler and Baumgartner, *HALOT*, s.v. “חֹתָם.”

eschatological blessings or not. These future blessings are described in very explicit and quite encompassing language. Therefore, the language within the text of Haggai must be investigated to ascertain whether these blessings are to be given in this age while continuing the issues of this age (and, therefore, the text is not eschatological), or whether the language is presented in eschatological language leading to a new state of being, age, or order.

The Eschatological Blessing and the Temple in Haggai

The most important aspect of the effect of the coming of “this day” is not merely that it will bring peace and blessings; the text of Haggai holds that the events following “this day” are of a new age. The events to come are not merely reform;⁴⁰³ von Rad comments on God about to shake the heaven and earth, how Haggai expects “a radical overturning of the entire cosmic order.”⁴⁰⁴ The concept in Hag 2:7 is that the treasure of every nation will come (כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם) to the temple, fitting better into the idea of an entirely new age than a greatly restored kingdom.⁴⁰⁵

It is important to note the universal scope of this declaration. It is not merely the nations near Israel that will bring the things that bring delight to them; it is all of the nations or every nation, with the clear implication that it is every nation of the world that will bring the things that delight them to the temple in Jerusalem. The shaking of the earth and sky, as well as the nations, in Hag 2:6-7 indicates more than a reversal of

⁴⁰³Here, March is clearly in the minority. He comments that Hag 2:6-9 “is not anticipating eschatological ‘the day of the Lord.’” March, “Haggai,” 7:723. The detail given in this section clearly points to an eschatological period.

⁴⁰⁴“In a short while God will shake heaven and earth. The prophet seems to expect a radical overturning of the entire cosmic order.” Von Rad, *Hexateuch*, 240. Redditt also notes that the early events in Hag 2 are eschatological, and so do Meyers and Meyers. Redditt, *Haggai*, 25; Meyers and Meyers, *Haggai*, 66.

⁴⁰⁵Scherman describes these items as offerings to the temple. Nosson Scherman et al., *Tanakh: Torah, Nevi'im, Ketuvim = Tanach: the Torah, Prophets, Writings: The Twenty-Four Books of the Bible, Newly Translated and Annotated* (Brooklyn, NY: Mesorah, 1996), 1404.

fortune; the shaking of the earth and sky clearly indicates an upheaval of cosmic proportions.⁴⁰⁶

In examining Hag 2:6, the verse includes the sky and the land, as well as the sea and the desert. This implies not only everywhere between the land and the sky, but also everywhere between the dry land and the water of the sea. There is absolutely nowhere on earth that is not included in these pronouncements. This might best be described as a double merism.⁴⁰⁷ Clines notes the verse's effect on the whole passage by writing: "[T]he eschatological framework is quite clearly signaled by the language of cosmic upheaval we already met with at 2.6."⁴⁰⁸

Universal inclusiveness is emphasized by the use of the word "all." The word is used in the phrases "all the people" and "all the remnant." These two phrases, as well as "all the nations," are used most frequently in Haggai.⁴⁰⁹ This universal language is accompanied by language of restoration. The text maintains that the Lord will fill the new temple gloriously, when it is built. If the silver and gold are under the Lord's control as Hag 2:8 avers, then the Lord's kingdom has come to Israel.

The setting of salvation at the temple in Hag 2:9 shows that restoration has come to the land and the turnaround in agriculture will begin, as well as the blessing of the

⁴⁰⁶Tollington sees this shaking of the nations as the eschatological judgment against the nations of the earth. Janet Tollington, "Readings in Haggai: From the Prophet to the Complete Book: A Changing Message in Changing Times," in *The Crisis of Israelite Religion: Transformation of Religious Tradition in Exilic and Post-Exilic Times*, ed. Bob Becking and Marjo C. A. Korpel (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 231.

⁴⁰⁷The phrase *כָּל־הַשָּׁמַיִם וְכָל־הָאָרֶץ* is used 13 times in all of Scripture. The uses in Gen 1:1; Exod 20:11, 31:17; 2 Kgs 19:15; 2 Chr 2:12; Isa 37:16; and Jer 32:17 all describe the entirety of what the Lord has created. The three uses in Deuteronomy (4:26, 30:19, and 31:28) all refer to bringing all the rest of creation into witness against Israel. Jeremiah 23:24 describes the Lord filling all creation. This leaves just the two uses in Haggai (2:6, 21), which describe the Lord about to shake all of creation. All 13 uses show the merism to refer to everything the Lord created.

⁴⁰⁸David J. A. Clines, *Interested Parties: The Ideology of Writers and Readers of the Hebrew Bible* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 64.

⁴⁰⁹Overall, the use of "all" in Haggai ranks fourth using the same normalized statistics as above, but still above the average scriptural rate. Most of the uses in Haggai occur in 2:7-23, which describes the transition from one age to the next.

people (Hag 2:19). With the declaration that “the glory of this latter temple will be greater than the glory of the first temple,” the restoration will surpass the grandest period in Israel’s history. This declaration about the future temple, specifically called a declaration of the Lord, displays a new ideal temple, grander than even Solomon’s temple. The text of Haggai contains “the eschatological element which had been introduced by Ezekiel.”⁴¹⁰ Yet, with salvation for the people and the land of Israel comes terror to all the other nations. The repetition of the merism, shaking everything from the sky to the land in Hag 2:21, is followed by destruction of enemies of Israel.

The destruction of the kingdoms’ thrones and the extermination of the armies of the nations including the chariots, horses, and their riders, as well as the people of the army as they will kill each other by the sword, show the vast terror that will occur after the Jerusalem temple is built. “Oracles of future redemption envisioned not only the restoration of national strength and status but also the establishment of an era of everlasting peace and blessing . . . but later prophets hinted that it might yet do so if the Jewish people would rebuild the Temple (Hag 2; Zech 3:6-4:14).”⁴¹¹ The text of Haggai presents the start of a new age with ideal restoration and cosmic reach accompanied by the terror of all the armies that would oppress the people or the land. This matches the semantic understanding of what is meant by the coming eschatological time period.

Accurately assessing the type of eschatological language in Haggai is essential in order to understand the presentation and expectation of the temple structure. Baldwin comments that the people “are experiencing in a small measure ‘realized

⁴¹⁰Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 246. Fujita notes how the hope for the restoration of the Jerusalem temple became strong in prophetic texts after Ezekiel. Fujita, “Temple Theology,” 5. Mitchell notes that the Psalter “originated within an eschatologically conscious milieu.” David C. Mitchell, *The Message of the Psalter: An Eschatological Programme in the Book of Psalms* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 82.

⁴¹¹Richard H. Hiers, “Eschatology,” *Harper’s Bible Dictionary*, ed. Paul J. Achtemeier (New York: HarperCollins, 1985), 276.

eschatology.”⁴¹² This misses the mark if one understands realized eschatology as not pertaining to the future, but being fulfilled in the present or past of the author’s point of reference.⁴¹³ The presentation of the new age in Haggai is future oriented, although it is clearly the immediate future.⁴¹⁴ However, Jenni notes that Haggai and Zechariah present “a strongly actualizing eschatology.”⁴¹⁵ Actualized eschatology, similar to realized eschatology, though made actual or real by an internal or external factor, is closer, but still does not quite accurately describe the immediate, but still future, nature of the text of Haggai.⁴¹⁶ Tinker explains that “the limits established by notions of ‘realized eschatology,’ ‘actualized eschatology,’ ‘immanent eschatology,’ or ‘future eschatology,’ each of which addresses merely a different perspective on the WHEN question.”⁴¹⁷

Clearly, with the focus of Haggai on the building of the temple, the ‘when’ of

⁴¹²Joyce G. Baldwin, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi: An Introduction and Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1972), 33.

⁴¹³Donald K. McKim, *Westminster Dictionary of Theological Terms* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), s.v. “eschatology, realized.” Inaugurated eschatology denotes an eschatology containing realized and future components. Grant Macaskill, *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 24. Even inaugurated eschatology misses the mark as it merely separates parts of events of the author time frame and parts are left for the future. There is nothing viewed in the text of Haggai as belonging to the future age that had already partially been established.

⁴¹⁴Here, Kessler misses the nuance of the Hebrew. He holds that Hag 2:6-9 and 20-23 are “set in a more distant, eschatological context.” John A. Kessler, “Tradition, Continuity, and Covenant in the Book of Haggai: An Alternative Voice from Early Persian Yehud,” in *Tradition in Transition: Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 in the Trajectory of Hebrew Theology*, ed. Mark J. Boda and Michael H. Floyd (New York: T. & T. Clark, 2008), 37. The immediate nature of the context of Hag 2 is misinterpreted. The immediate nature of the transition is dealt with below.

⁴¹⁵Ernst Jenni, “Eschatology of the Old Testament,” *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible* ed. George A. Butrick (Nashville: Abingdon, 1962), 131.

⁴¹⁶Patterson notes about the Gospel of Thomas: “[N]or is it realized eschatology, if one means by this an end that is ‘already, but not yet.’ Eschatology in Thomas is ‘now or never.’ ‘The kingdom is within you and it is outside you (Thom 3:3).’ But if it is not realized inside of you, it will not exist outside of you. This is not realized eschatology, it is *actualized eschatology*. If the kingdom is to exist at all, it is up to Thomas Christianity to make it exist.” Stephen J. Patterson, *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1993), 210. Although this concept is about a different writing, the understanding of actualized eschatology still separates it from the declarations in Haggai.

⁴¹⁷George E. Tinker, *Spirit and Resistance: Political Theology and American Indian Liberation* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2004), 94.

Haggai is right after the temple is built. Finitsis asserts that Haggai is presenting a “restoration eschatology.”⁴¹⁸ This is no doubt true, yet it does not address the time issue evident within the text of Haggai that is being addressed by these other attempts to define Haggai’s eschatology. Therefore, the assessment by Finitsis is too incomplete to be left as definitive. Collins observes that “Haggai expected the rebuilding of the Temple to be the catalyst for a new age.”⁴¹⁹ The use of the term “catalyst” by Collins bridges the concepts of actualized eschatology and immanent eschatology and keeps the focus of the temple in the coming new age of Haggai.

The Timeline to Eschatological Blessing in Haggai

The central importance of the Jerusalem temple in the text of Haggai must be recognized as beyond question. The word “sanctuary” (הַיְיָכֵל) occurs more in Haggai than anywhere else in the Hebrew Scriptures, ranking the books of the Hebrew Scriptures by the number of verses in the book where it occurs normalized by the total number of verses in that book.⁴²⁰ The use of the term when combined with notions about the temple (הַיְיָכֵל) keeps the attention on the Lord’s sanctuary, which Haggai proclaims is vital.

The frequent use of the expression “the house of the Lord” in Haggai ranks the book third most using the same normalized statistics as above behind only 2 Chronicles and 2 Kings.⁴²¹ The house, or probably more accurately translated “temple,” is the most important theme of the book.

⁴¹⁸Antonios Finitsis, *Visions and Eschatology: A Socio-Historical Analysis of Zechariah 1-6* (New York: T. & T. Clark, 2011), 125.

⁴¹⁹John J. Collins, “From Prophecy to Apocalypticism: The Expectation of the End,” in *The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*, vol. 1 of the *Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism*, ed. John J. Collins (New York: Continuum, 1998), 132.

⁴²⁰The statistics on this search show that Haggai has the word ‘הַיְיָכֵל’ in over 5.2% of the verses where Jonah ranks second at 4.2% and Zechariah ranks third at 2.4%. Thus, Haggai has more than twice the frequency of Zechariah, after normalizing for size of the texts.

⁴²¹This particular phrase (in the Hebrew) occurs in 5.8% of the verses of 2 Chronicles, 5.1% of the verses of 2 Kings, 2.6% of the verses of Haggai.

These facts about the text of Haggai counter Napier's claim that "Haggai sought to shift Israel's preoccupation away from a magnificent temple and focus it on a renewed expectation of" the Lord's and the Messiah's return.⁴²² Zerubbabel is called a governor in Hag 1:1, 14; 2:2, 21 and a seal or signet ring in Hag 2:23. There is no clear expectation of a new king or messiah in the text of Haggai, which discounts Napier on this issue.⁴²³

As for the expectation of the return of the Lord, this is expected in Haggai and is dealt with below; however, the return is to the temple that is to be built. The focus is on the temple as the place where the Lord will appear (Hag 1:8), which again discounts

⁴²²John G. Napier, "The Historical and Biblical Significance of the Messianic passages in Haggai," (ThD dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1984), 136.

⁴²³Is this declaration in Haggai messianic? There is no clear answer. Meadowcroft plainly asserts that "Zerubbabel is not seen by Haggai as a messianic figure." Meadowcroft, *Haggai*, 207. However, Stuhlmueller sees the text as proclaiming Zerubbabel as messiah. Carroll Stuhlmueller, *Rebuilding with Hope: A Commentary on the Books of Haggai and Zechariah* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1988), 38. Some warn against seeing Zerubbabel as the messiah because of the contradiction so soon in Zechariah 6:11-13. Herbert Wolf, *Haggai and Malachi* (Chicago: Moody, 1976), 54. Rose cautions against interpreting this claim in Haggai as messianic. W. H. Rose, *Zemah and Zerubbabel: Messianic Expectations in the Early Postexilic Period* (Sheffield: Sheffield, 2000), 249-250. The title of "My servant" is also used of Abraham (Gen 26:24), Moses (Exod 14:31), and David (2 Sam 3:18), so this title, in and of itself, is not messianic. The proclamation of Zerubbabel as the Lord's signet ring is seen by Kelley as making Zerubbabel God's "vice-regent." Page H. Kelley, *Layman's Bible Book Commentary: Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1984), 114. Taylor and Clendenen use the term "the Lord's coregent." Richard A. Taylor and E. Ray Clendenen, *Haggai, Malachi* (Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 2004), 198. Bullock ties the signet ring with "the symbol of Davidic sovereignty." C. Hassell Bullock, *An Introduction to the Old Testament Prophetic Books* (Chicago: Moody, 1986), 308. Floyd interprets the signet ring as showing that "Zerubbabel's governorship can signify something similar to what the Davidic monarchy once signified." Michael H. Floyd, *Minor Prophets: Part 2* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 300. With a wide range of outliers, most note that Zerubbabel is a Davidic scion and "Haggai's expectation of and support for the restoration of the Davidic monarchy." Marvin A. Sweeney, *The Twelve Prophets* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000), 2:555. Nogalski notes that "Haggai's promise comes close to stating that Zerubbabel would soon function as king." James D. Nogalski, *The Book of the Twelve: Micah-Malachi* (Macon, GA: Smyth and Helwys, 2011), 796. Verhoef notes that "Zerubbabel will become the messianic king." Verhoef, *Haggai*, 146. The common idea of messiah and kingship is given as McComiskey asserts that Zerubbabel is messianic. Thomas E. McComiskey, *The Minor Prophets: An Exegetical and Expository Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1998), 1001-1002. Yet, he notes that "identification of king with Messiah was made in relation to every king." *Ibid.*, 1002. Redditt sees the signet ring as reversing the prophecy of Jer 22:30 and that Zerubbabel was political and theological and he was a king. Paul L. Redditt, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995), 32. If he was king, as Redditt asserts, then he was a messiah. However, with the ambiguity of this passage in Haggai, one should not take this passage to proclaim the coming of the messiah. It is more important to note the focus on the connection between Zerubbabel and the temple.

Napier on his allegation of a shift away from the temple.

The presence of the Lord of Hosts is crucial in the text of Haggai and supplements the focus on the temple. The presence of God in the temple is understated, though present, in the book of Haggai.⁴²⁴ The *Niphal* verbal form in Hag 1:8 is best translated “that I may appear in glory.” This makes the temple a necessity as it is the Lord who has made the announcement (Hag 1:8) about appearing at the temple.⁴²⁵

The declaration in Hag 1:8 is that the people must (the verbal form is an imperative) build the temple so that the Lord may appear in glory there.⁴²⁶ The stress on building the temple is balanced by the idea in Hag 1:9, where the Lord calls the temple, “my temple.”⁴²⁷

The three uses of glory, *כְּבוֹד*, in Haggai do appear to imply, at least partially, something other than the glory of the Lord. All of the uses of the word appear in the second chapter. In Hag 2:3, it refers to the glory or magnificence of Solomon’s temple. In Hag 2:7, the Lord will fill the temple with glory after shaking the nations, apparently shaking loose the silver, gold, and precious items from them; however, Vera notes that this is secondary to the obvious filling of the temple with the glory of the Lord.⁴²⁸

⁴²⁴Ackroyd notes that “[t]he new age as it is understood by Haggai is centered upon the Temple because that is the place in which God chooses to dwell and to reveal his blessing.” Ackroyd, *Exile*, 162.

⁴²⁵The Aramaic Targum of Haggai has the statement in 1:8 that the Shekinah glory would dwell in this new Jerusalem temple.

⁴²⁶Blenkinsopp maintains that the temple is required to be built here so that the glory of the Lord can be made manifest in the temple. Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56–66: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 2003), 211.

⁴²⁷Taylor and Clendenen aver that for Haggai, the temple was crucial because of the fact that the temple was indeed the Lord’s house. Taylor and Clendenen, *Haggai*, 75.

⁴²⁸Vera notes that “[t]he intermediate passage (v. 7) gives the reason for the change: YHWH will fill the new Temple with the divine glory, not only because God will make the riches of the nations flow—although that may seem to be the most obvious reason—but also because God will dwell in it.” José L. Vera, “Haggai,” *International Bible Commentary: A Catholic and Ecumenical Commentary for the Twenty-First Century*, ed. William R. Farmer (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998), 1184. See the comparison above between 1 Kgs 8 and Hag 2, which can be understood as implying the Lord fills the temple with the glory of the Lord.

In Hag 2:9, the splendor of this latter temple will exceed the glory or splendor of Solomon's temple. The verb **כָּבֹד** does appear in Hag 1:8, which claims that the Lord will appear in glory there. Glory in Haggai does imply splendor; yet, the impact of the Jerusalem temple shows the effect of the power of the Lord's glory.⁴²⁹ The temple provides the means for the glory of the Lord to act decisively on behalf of Israel against all the nations.⁴³⁰

Clines postulated that the Lord does not need the temple structure as the Lord is already with the people (Hag 1:13).⁴³¹ This postulation is incorrect. The Lord is not dwelling with the people relationally, as **יָשָׁב** is not used.⁴³² The phrase in Hag 1:13 claims that the Lord is with the people (not dwelling with them) only so that they can build the temple and not be afraid of any who would oppose them. The Lord was with them so as to arouse the leaders and people so that they would come and build the temple (Hag 1:14).

Hurowitz notes that the importance of the temple in the text of Haggai was that "God needed a home or a locus of presence, and without a temple there could be no imminent divine presence and God could not be worshipped properly."⁴³³ Clines neglects

⁴²⁹Meyers and Meyers note that "God's 'glory,' as distinct from his 'name,' appears to represent an extraordinary and dramatic manifestation of God's presence and power." Meyers and Meyers, *Haggai*, 28. The **כָּבֹד** of the Lord indicates the "power, authority and honour of God" and implies an "essence and power in a broader sense." Koehler and Baumgartner, *HALOT*, s.v. "**כָּבֹד**." Greenberg explains that the **כָּבֹד** of the Lord is "used for the visible manifestation of God." Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20*, 51.

⁴³⁰Von Rad writes that the Lord "will glorify by his own eschatological act this temple of the new Jerusalem, which as yet presents to the prophet's contemporaries so discouraging and poverty-stricken a spectacle." Von Rad links Hag 2 with Isa 25:6, Zech 14, Pss 46 and 48, as well as Tob 13:9, 14:5-7, showing a second temple Jewish theme explored in this work. Von Rad, *Hexateuch*, 241.

⁴³¹Clines, "Haggai's Temple," 51.

⁴³²This distinction is clear in the Targum of Haggai. *Memra*, not *Yekara*, is used in the Aramaic of Hag 1:13 and 2:4, whereas *Shekinah* is used in Hag 1:8. *Memra* equates to "word" in Aramaic. The Aramaic acknowledges the presence of the Lord, but distinguishes it from the glory of the Lord, either the Aramaic "*Yekara*" or the Hebrew "*Shekinah*."

⁴³³Victor A. Hurowitz, review of *Temple Restoration in Early Achaemenid Judah*, by Peter R. Bedford, *Jewish Quarterly Review* 93 (2003): 584. Notice the use of "imminent" in the quotation. The word is well used for Haggai. It could have been "immanent" as well with the need for a physical dwelling, but

the fact that it is the Lord who has commanded the temple to be built through the prophet (Hag 1:8 and 2:4) in order that the Lord could appear there.

The people cannot behold the Lord in their midst (Hag 1:13); it is the prophet telling them that the Lord is in their midst so that they will be capable of building the temple. The text of Hag 1:13 does not indicate that the Lord has appeared in glory among the people, just the opposite.

There is nothing in the text that supports the postulation by Clines that the Lord does not need the temple, but many issues in the text press the need for the temple. The absence of the Lord from the temple or the temple site is painfully indicated in the Hebrew. The adjective **בְּרֵקָה** means desolate in the Hebrew, though “not primarily in dryness but in being uninhabited.”⁴³⁴ Besides this explicit reference, the appellation, the Lord of Hosts, is so prevalent in Haggai that this phrase occurs in Haggai second most within the Hebrew Scriptures behind only Malachi when ranking using the same normalized statistics as above.⁴³⁵ The appellation calls the listener or reader to remember the power and majesty of the Lord,⁴³⁶ who is to dwell in the temple. This name is “the solemn, cultically legitimate name of the God who was present in the sanctuary of Jerusalem and honored there.”⁴³⁷

the imminent divine presence indicates an immanent divine presence presented in a timely manner as the text of Haggai argues for throughout.

⁴³⁴F. I. Andersen, “Who Built the Second Temple?” *Australian Biblical Review* 6 (1958): 24.

⁴³⁵This particular name of God occurs in 41.8% of the verses of Malachi, in 31.6% of the verses of Haggai, and in 21.3% of the verses of Zechariah. The book that ranks fourth (Jeremiah) has an occurrence of only 5.2%.

⁴³⁶Smith notes the high frequency of this appellation and notes how this emphasizes the great power of the Lord. R. Smith, *Micah-Malachi*, 153.

⁴³⁷Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Theology of the Psalms*, trans. Keith Crim (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1986), 17. Mettinger also notes “we must in any case describe the mainstream of the Jerusalem cultic tradition as a ‘Zion-Sabaoth theology.’” Mettinger, *Dethronement*, 15.

The focus of Haggai on the temple is also addressed with the text's theme of the holy in contrast to the unclean.⁴³⁸ The work of daily existence is compared to the work of the Lord.⁴³⁹ The tension, of which work should come first, the work on human residences or the divine residence, is discussed in Hag 1:2-4. The houses of the people are paneled or covered, **סָפְּוּנִים** (Hag 1:4), as well as inhabited (Hag 1:4, 9), whereas the house of the Lord is uninhabited and desolate, **בְּרָחָה**. Questions of uncleanness are also addressed to the priests, who would be ministers at the temple.

The text addresses impurity issues to both the leader of the people of the land and the leader of the consecrated priests.⁴⁴⁰ The address of the word of the Lord goes multiple times to both the governor, the ruler of the people; and the high priest, the leader at the temple, if there was a temple.⁴⁴¹ In Hag 2:11-14, the word from the Lord is a question to the priest about what is holy and what is impure. The question goes to the priests, the consecrated ones, about what will consecrate items and what will make items impure.⁴⁴²

Both questions lead to the same result. The items will not be made holy, thus leaving them impure in the first instance, and the items will be made impure in the second instance. This leads to the conclusion in Hag 2:14 that the people, the nation, and every work of their hand is unclean; that is, they are not consecrated.

⁴³⁸There are verbal and adjectival forms used for both roots: **שָׁקַד** and **טָמֵא**. The root **כִּפֵּר** does not appear in any form in Haggai. The message is not about cleansing; it is about the impurity of the people without the temple.

⁴³⁹This can be seen in Hag 1:2-13, where the phrase “work of the Lord” is used only once in all of Scripture and it is this instance in Hag 1:13.

⁴⁴⁰Patrick notes that throughout the text of Haggai there are interactive engagements between the word of God as given through the prophet and the people. Patrick, “Haggai,” 59.

⁴⁴¹See Hag 1:1, 12, 13; 2:2, 4.

⁴⁴²The *Masorah parva* notes in these two cases (Hag 2:12, 13) how these constructed words (**שָׁקַדְתִּי** and **טָמְאִיתִי**), with the interrogative **הֲ**, are used only here in the whole Masoretic Text. Each question is unique and the combination of the unique questions highlights the theme of holy versus impure all the more.

The temple is the source for consecrating the people and the land.⁴⁴³ However, the temple was not a high priority for the people, so that the text of Haggai makes the dichotomy clear between the holy and the impure. Regarding Haggai, Schmidt notes, “[w]hat the prophet teaches here is that for holy things a sanctified space, separate from the profane, is needed. The walls of the sanctuary materialize this separation. In the absence of such a separation, it can only be impurity that is propagated, and not holiness. From the undifferentiated and from mixing only profanation can be born.”⁴⁴⁴

The call for the temple in Haggai makes it plain that whatever they offer at the site, טִמְאָה (Hag 2:14) is unclean.⁴⁴⁵ This is due to the fact that the temple has not been built. The impurities, טִמְאָה, are generally not sinful, not permanent, and can be unavoidable.⁴⁴⁶ Yet, those with severe impurities generally need a sacrifice at the temple altar to cleanse themselves (cf. Lev 12, 14-15). Therefore, the proper, ritually clean temple is the presented solution not only to these impurities, but to the general state of affairs of the land and the people.

In Hag 2:10-19, the case is made how the Lord cannot dwell with Israel if the requisite cleansing has not been done. “This is remedied when the temple is ceremonially purified and ‘reconnected’ with its earlier counterpart. From this moment, says the prophet, things will be very different.”⁴⁴⁷ The crops that are not producing enough to provide for the people (Hag 1:6) are also affected by the people’s impurities. This cultic

⁴⁴³Though one could perhaps argue that God is the ultimate source, this distinction is not made in the text of Haggai. The temple is the focus. The offerings that the people bring to the temple site, without a temple there, are impure even though they are brought to the Lord (Hag 2:14).

⁴⁴⁴Francis Schmidt, *How the Temple Thinks: Identity and Social Cohesion in Ancient Judaism* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 89.

⁴⁴⁵This is declared in Hag 2:14.

⁴⁴⁶Jonathan Klawans, “The Impurity of Immorality in Ancient Judaism,” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 48 (1997): 2.

⁴⁴⁷Kessler, *Haggai*, 216.

system of holy and impure depends upon the condition of the temple to counterbalance the impurities of life. “Therefore, the prophet’s comments in 2:14 suggest that until the people address the unclean condition of the temple, then their crop yields will continue to be insufficient.”⁴⁴⁸ The temple is at the center of this holiness system; this system does show a cause-and-effect scheme.⁴⁴⁹

Another supporting element in the focus of Haggai on the temple is the text’s theme of a cause-and-effect nature of events.⁴⁵⁰ The first word of prophecy within the text is that the people have said it is not the time to build the temple of the Lord (Hag 1:2). The prophecy starts with the temple and the refusal to build it upon returning. This refusal is an action that started the chain of events addressed in Haggai. The next word of prophecy comes with a question. Has the time come for the people to dwell in covered houses when the temple of the Lord is in ruins (Hag 1:4)? However, the people were wrong on both accounts for they did have houses to go to (Hag 1:9) and they did err in not building the temple, which caused events to unfold in a specific order.

The command, used as an *inclusio* in the pericope Hag 1:5-7, to “set your mind upon your ways,” highlights the ways of the people, each running to his own house and not building the temple. These are the wrong ways, for these ways have led to the conditions present in the text in this pericope. The people sow, eat, drink, dress, and work but to insufficient ends. The insufficiency, looking for much and finding little where even

⁴⁴⁸Patrick, “Haggai,” 194.

⁴⁴⁹The people building their houses does hint at the idea that the people need to come to a spiritual revival. However a spiritual revival is clearly not the focus of the text. Haggai 2:15 and 2:19 state clearly that *מִיּוֹם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה וְעַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה* from this day and onward, meaning the day the temple is consecrated, *יְבָרֵךְ* the Lord will bless the people. No indication of the cohortative exists here, that the Lord may bless or desires to bless the people, but “from this day I will bless” (Hag 2:19). This is doubled in the text of Haggai because it is also presented in the negative (in addition to the positive assertion detailed here). Haggai 1:9-10 asserts that because the temple is not built the Lord has restrained blessings from the people.

⁴⁵⁰Taylor and Clendenen also claim that the prophecy of Haggai contained a cause-and-effect nature to it showing that the actions of the people caused the oppressive events that had happened. Taylor and Clendenen, *Haggai*, 133.

that little seems to go away, is explained in Hag 1:9. The word **וְעַיִן**, “because,” occurs twice in Hag 1:9.⁴⁵¹ This verse makes a causal relationship between the meager existence of the people and their failure to build the temple.⁴⁵²

Furthermore, since these conditions have not caused the temple to be built, more consequences of the actions of the people are compounded upon them, with more cause and effect. In Hag 1:10, the verse starts out clearly indicating the cause-and-effect nature of the situation.⁴⁵³ The failure of the people to build the temple has directly caused the sky and the land to restrain their dew and produce. Explained further, the Lord called a drought upon land, mountains, grain, wine, oil, everything that the land produces, humanity, the domesticated animals, and all the labor of their hands (Hag 1:11). This inclusive list links the effects on all creation to the failure to build the temple.

The obvious wordplay in this pericope must not go unnoticed as it emphasizes the poorly prioritized actions. First, the temple is desolate, **וְהַיְדֻלָּה**, and the drought, **וְהַיְדֻלָּה**, is upon all creation. This wordplay is intentionally placed, and points to a direct link between the drought and the uninhabited temple site. Second, the warning is an imperative, a command to set your mind upon your ways (Hag 1:5, 7), but the people are running to their own houses (Hag 1:9). This indicates that the people’s way is incorrect.

Third, the passage contrasts the covered house of the people with the temple, which is explicitly referred to as the house of the Lord and is not habitable. The link between the houses of the people and the house of the Lord again links the people to the

⁴⁵¹The word **וְעַיִן** occurs in Haggai second most in the Hebrew Scriptures, second to only the text of Ezekiel at a rate of 2.6% of the verses and this counts only one of the two, because they occur in the same verse. This word does help explicitly show the causal nature of the text.

⁴⁵²The text is absolutely clear. The clause **וְעַיִן בֵּיתִי אֲשֶׁר־הָיוּ הָרִבּוּ** shows that the conditions were caused by the actions of the people in leaving the temple uninhabitable; the clause makes the conditions a direct consequence of the people and leaders (i.e., their refusal to build the temple).

⁴⁵³The interjection and prepositional phrase are best translated: therefore, on account of you.

temple. This striking wordplay is meant to be noticed.⁴⁵⁴ The text makes it explicit in multiple ways that the temple's condition affects the condition of all creation. However, the cause-and-effect nature of the text works the other way as well. If the people will go up the temple mount and bring wood so as to build the temple, then the Lord will be well disposed toward the temple (Hag 1:8) as the Lord is to appear and to be glorified in this way. His pleasure with the temple would then lead to blessings for all creation.⁴⁵⁵

The Lord standing in the midst of the people and the fear of the people are dealt with below, yet the issue illuminates the present theme as well. The people should not be afraid, according to the admonition of Hag 2:5, because the Lord is standing in their midst.

There is a causal relationship between the understanding that the spirit of the Lord is standing in their midst and the admonition not to be afraid.⁴⁵⁶ Do not be afraid to do what pleases the Lord and work on building the temple because the spirit of the Lord is standing in your midst to judge, condemn, or attack any who would stand against you.

The cause-and-effect chain is emphasized in the expected unfolding of events. The shaking of all creation in Hag 2:6-7 is what brings the delight of all the nations, cause and effect. Yet, this effect, the bringing of the delight of all the nations, is how the Lord will gloriously fill the new Jerusalem temple, cause and effect. When “the glory of

⁴⁵⁴Calvin notices another play on words here in the Hebrew. The verb בָּנִי in Hag 1:8 is played off against the verb בָּנִי in Hag 1:9. John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Twelve Minor Prophets*, trans. John Owen (Edinburgh: T. Constable, 1848), 336. This wordplay contrasts what the people are doing compared to the priority of the temple to the Lord.

⁴⁵⁵This has been explored above to some extent and it is explored below, but Hag 2:9 and 2:19 clearly relate this effect.

⁴⁵⁶The fear of the Lord is expected and declared in the text (Hag 1:12). Here, the admonition is not to fear others while working on the temple (Hag 2:4-5), so the fear of the Lord is quite appropriate.

this latter temple will be greater than the glory of the first temple,” then the Lord will give prosperity or set salvation in that place, cause and effect.⁴⁵⁷

The teaching questions of 2:12-13 emphasize cause and effect. What is the effect of touching consecrated flesh to things? There is no effect. What is the effect of someone impure touching an item? The effect is that they are rendered impure. The system is a simple cause-and-effect system. The text exhibits surprise that the cause and effect is not working as it should. In Hag 2:17, the scorching wind, blight, and hail brought, surprisingly, no great effort to build the temple, as indicated by the observation that there is no one coming to the Lord. The Septuagint has “you did not return to me” stressing return that would have been expected in a normal cause-and-effect system.⁴⁵⁸

Even near the end of the book, the meager agricultural produce is again linked to the temple in a cause-and-effect system. In Hag 2:19, agricultural bounty is linked to the temple with the phrase “from this day” (Hag 2:15 and 2:18 also link the day with the temple).⁴⁵⁹ This is a simple, but profound, declaration of cause and effect. On that day, the day of upheaval among the kingdoms, according to Hag 2:23, there is another effect. Zerubbabel will be set as a seal, cause and effect. The cause-and-effect system laid out in the text of Haggai is focused on the establishment of a new Jerusalem temple.⁴⁶⁰

⁴⁵⁷“The text emphasizes again that an effective Temple is a precondition for prosperity of the people and land (cf. 1.2-11).” Ehud B. Zvi, “Haggai,” *Jewish Study Bible*, ed. Adele Berlin and Marc Z. Brettler (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 1247.

⁴⁵⁸The lack of a verbal form in the Hebrew of this clause is not a problem. The verb “to be” inserted in such cases often means “to come,” which is the best translation of that verb in Hag 1:1. However, the LXX translation may have had a Hebrew scroll of Haggai that had a verbal form from the root בָּשַׁע .

⁴⁵⁹Note, it is not from today or from now on; it is linked to a specific day.

⁴⁶⁰An example from an earlier scriptural narrative might be how Joshua presented the timeline for crossing the Jordan River. In Josh 3:13, the timeline is that as the soles of the feet of the priests touched the waters of the Jordan, then the waters were cut off. God had laid out a cause-and-effect scenario. It is not just a prerequisite step to wade into the waters. Through the power of God, one action causes the next.

The language of cause and effect in Haggai is highly suggestive of Deut 28, the blessings and curses section of the covenant formulation. There are parallels in language between Deut 28 and Haggai. Sowing crops and harvesting little is shown in Deut 28:38 and Hag 1:9. Restraining the rain so that the land restrains produce is shown in Deut 28:24 (as well as Deut 11:17) and Hag 1:10. The scorching heat and mildew are shown in Deut 28:22 and Hag 2:17. Even though the work done by human hand is a more common phrase in Scripture, the commonality between Deut 28:12 and Hag 2:14, 17 shows a parallel in language.⁴⁶¹

Beyond these language commonalities, the theme of being blessed with a reward for obedient behavior or being cursed with a punishment for disobedient behavior is present in both Deut 28 and Haggai. However, the covenant curses in Deuteronomy are part of a larger presentation of the covenant. In Haggai, they are not. Patrick writes that these “numerous allusions to covenant language in Hag 1:9-11 highlight the covenant perspective of the prophet’s argument in the first chapter.”⁴⁶² This covenant perspective, as he calls it, is not supported in his work. This idea assumes a covenant perspective in Haggai that cannot be supported by the text of Haggai. Yes, events in Haggai are governed by a cause-and-effect system—a system in which no randomness is involved in the development of future events. However, the covenant is not the focus and is only peripherally alluded to in only Hag 2:5. Covenantal language of “I am your God and you will be my people” is alien to Haggai. Yes, Haggai reflects a Deuteronomistic influence in the text.⁴⁶³ Prokurat notes even that Haggai was edited by the Deuteronomistic school.⁴⁶⁴

⁴⁶¹The concept of work of the human hand shows up in 53 verses in the Hebrew Scriptures, including nine times in Deuteronomy. The phrase is most prevalent in Haggai, normalized for the size of text as presented above, at over 20 times the average rate in the Scriptures (5.26% compared to .23%).

⁴⁶²Patrick, “Haggai,” 135.

⁴⁶³Rainer Albertz, *From the Exile to the Maccabees*, vol. 2 of *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period*, trans. John Bowden (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994), 455.

With the Deuteronomic influence acknowledged, there is much to be noted of the differences between the covenant language of Deuteronomy and the language of Haggai. Weinfeld notes that Deuteronomic phraseology revolves around a few basic theological tenets: the struggle against idolatry, the centralization of the cult, the Exodus, covenant, and election, the monotheistic creed, the observance of the law and loyalty to the covenant, the inheritance of the land, the retribution and material motivation, the fulfillment of prophecy, and the election of the Davidic dynasty.⁴⁶⁵ Of all of this phraseology, the cause-and-effect language, which is encapsulated in the negative and positive inducements to actions, is the only deuteronomic tenet that stands out as characteristic of Haggai.⁴⁶⁶ The call to build the temple is not the same as the centralization of the cult. The choice of Zerubbabel is not the same as the election of Israel.

Although both Deuteronomy and Haggai address covenantal faithfulness in their own ways, the issue that is at the center of Haggai is building the temple. This issue is not addressed in Deuteronomy. The six times that Deuteronomy affirms that God will choose a place for God's name to dwell are never accompanied by any indication that the people are to build the temple.⁴⁶⁷ Kessler seems much closer to the text of Haggai when he concludes that Haggai's oracles "display Deuteronomistic and priestly affinities."⁴⁶⁸

By assessing the events happening to the people in Haggai, Petersen notes that events were not developing in a satisfactory manner.⁴⁶⁹ The text of Haggai does not hinge

⁴⁶⁴Michael Prokurat, "Haggai and Zechariah 1-8: A Form Critical Analysis" (PhD dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, 1988), 178, 355.

⁴⁶⁵Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 1. See the appendices as well in this text that illuminate differences in language.

⁴⁶⁶Patrick does note that "Haggai links obedience and blessing." Patrick, "Haggai," 136.

⁴⁶⁷See Deut 12:11; 14:23; 16:2, 6, 11; 26:2.

⁴⁶⁸Kessler, *Haggai*, 54.

⁴⁶⁹Petersen, *Haggai*, 63.

on obedience to the commandments that the people are being commanded to perform, as is affirmed thirteen times in the book of Deuteronomy (three of these occurrences in chap. 28),⁴⁷⁰ which shows that the motivation behind the obedience in Deuteronomy is different from that in Haggai, where this idea never occurs. “Haggai holds a different view, however, interpreting the curses to be the direct result of the rejection of the recent call to rebuild the temple.”⁴⁷¹ Hanson notes that “the removal of the curse and the ushering in of the blessings tied to the temple program.”⁴⁷² This link between altering the condition of the land and people and building the temple must be examined.

The eschatological divine blessing in Haggai’s vision is directly linked to the future Jerusalem temple. The repeated phrase, מִן־הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה וְמֵעַתָּה (Hag 2:15, 18), which is unique to this pericope in Haggai, shows a specific change occurring. This phrase should not be translated “from today on,” which would not have the demonstrative pronoun, but “from this day on.”

In Hag 2:19, there is also the statement that מִן־הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה אֲבָרֶכְךָ, from this day, this specific day, I will then begin to bless you. A specific time frame is referenced. The designation, this day,⁴⁷³ refers to a specific day three times in the text of Haggai. It alludes to a time before a stone is set to stone at the Lord’s temple, and it alludes to the day when the Lord’s temple is founded.⁴⁷⁴ What is about to happen after that day, according to Haggai? The first thing mentioned is that the Lord is about to shake the sky and the land (Hag 2:6-7, 21). The phrase, אֲרָדָה וְאֲרָדָה אֶת־הָאָרֶץ, is used to express the

⁴⁷⁰See Deut 4:40; 6:2; 8:11; 10:13; 11:27, 28; 13:18; 27:10; 28:1, 13, 15; 30:8, 16.

⁴⁷¹Peter R. Bedford, *Temple Restoration in Early Achaemenid Judah* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 172.

⁴⁷²Hanson, *Dawn*, 175.

⁴⁷³This phrase occurs more times in Haggai than anywhere else in Scripture when considering the verses with the phrase normalized by the number of verses in the book. This is the only book where it occurs more than ten times the average rate in Scripture (7.9% compared to 0.6%).

⁴⁷⁴These two times come from Hag 2:15, 18.

entirety of creation. The glory of this Jerusalem temple will exceed that of the first Jerusalem temple, showing that this new age will be more glorious than the former age. After this day, the Lord will bless rather than strike the crops with heat, blight, and hail. Next, the Lord will overturn the throne of kingdoms. Next, the Lord will destroy the military power of the kingdoms of the nations. This military might would include chariots and their riders, horses and their riders, who would destroy each other (Hag 2:22).

This all-inclusive upheaval in world order is depicted as imminent,⁴⁷⁵ right after the day, this day, which is referred to multiple times in the text. It will be after this day that the delight of all the nations, or perhaps better described as the delight of every single nation, is brought to gloriously fill the Jerusalem temple, as this is after the day that the temple of the Lord is founded.⁴⁷⁶ The universal shaking, the filling of the temple with the delight of all of the nations, the Lord blessing people and land, and the giving of salvation do not happen until the Jerusalem temple is built. For this new age to come, there will have to be the founding of the new Jerusalem temple.

The text of Haggai makes it clear that the eschatological divine blessings are an imminent expectation. The eschatological divine blessing in Haggai's vision is presented as imminent after the building of the future Jerusalem temple.⁴⁷⁷ Investigating the Hebrew phrase of Hag 2:6, עוֹד אֶהְיֶה מְעַמְּ הַיֵּשׁ, Ackroyd notes that Haggai presents these earth-shaking events taking place immediately, not much into the future.⁴⁷⁸ This time

⁴⁷⁵Haggai 2:6 notes that it will be in one small moment.

⁴⁷⁶This passage is about the new age, but the emphasis is on the transition to the new age rather than on living in the new age. The description of living in the new age is noted by the use of prosperity in Hag 2:9 and the blessing provided from the day the temple is established in 2:19. However, the prosperity or salvation, שְׁלוֹמִים, is localized or focused on the temple mount (the place in 2:9 and the time of the temple establishment in 2:19) where the locus of salvation begins in this new age.

⁴⁷⁷This work does not attempt to determine how long a period of time is imminent. As Scripture clearly portrays, the Lord's time is different from human reckoning.

⁴⁷⁸Ackroyd notes that according to the context of the passage, the shaking is in the immediate future. Ackroyd, *Exile*, 154.

frame can be misinterpreted because of the participle in 2:6, מְרַעֵשׁ. This participle is translated into a future tense in many of the English versions.⁴⁷⁹ Yet, the anticipatory participle in Hebrew is commonly used and it is in use here, reinforced by the use of the particle עַד.⁴⁸⁰ Kessler notes how the “converted perfects following a participial *futurum instans* frequently describe actions resulting from and flowing out of the action of the participle.”⁴⁸¹ Haggai anticipates the new age soon.⁴⁸² The Lord “would soon intervene in the affairs of humanity and bring about the full blessings of a new age.”⁴⁸³

The completion of the temple was an event linked to the beginning of the new age for the prophet Haggai.⁴⁸⁴ It was on the temple that Haggai placed an expectation for change. Here, Wolff notes the important triggering event of building the temple and the timing of the events. He uses עַד in 2:15 and conjectures that it “takes on a new meaning, as the reversal point, or pivot, between yesterday and tomorrow. From today

⁴⁷⁹This would include the KJV, NKJV, NRSV, NIV, NET, NJB, NLT, and ESV. It is translated woodenly into an English participle, ‘am going,’ in the NAS and CSB. Yet, all of these translations seem to miss the syntax of the participle.

⁴⁸⁰The particle reinforces the imminence of the participle by asserting “yet,” “still,” “again” in just one little moment. The phrase with this particle ends the clause in Hag 2:6 and the next clause has the participle. On the issue of the anticipatory participle, Waltke and O’Connor stress that Hebrew participles that are future oriented have implied certainty or imminence, which is true to this use in Hag 2:6 in both respects. They use the term “*futurum instans* participle” instead of anticipatory participle. Waltke and O’Connor, *Syntax*, 627. Joüon and Muraoka present the same idea when explaining participles used with a future implication. They explain that a “future action, mainly an approaching action, is represented as being already in progress.” Joüon and Muraoka, *Grammar*, 410. Van der Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeze give two syntactical types of action with Hebrew participles, continuous and imminent. This shows the imminent action here in Hag 2:6. Van der Merwe et al., “Grammar,” 162. Motyer labels this participle as “a participle *futurum instans*.” Motyer, “Haggai,” 990.

⁴⁸¹John A. Kessler, “The Shaking of the Nations: An Eschatological View,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 30 (1987): 163.

⁴⁸²R. Smith, *Micah-Malachi*, 149.

⁴⁸³Patrick, “Haggai,” 47.

⁴⁸⁴Goldingay summarizes the importance of building of the temple and its role as presented in Haggai: “This event was of key significance for the development of the Judean community after the exile as a community centered on the temple, and thus of key significance for the achievement of God’s purpose through Israel. The book in its entirety focuses on the temple and points to a sequence of motivations for taking on and persisting in the building project.” John E. Goldingay and Pamela J. Scalise, *Minor Prophets II* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2009), 145.

on, something is to come about that never was before.”⁴⁸⁵ Stuhlmüller comments that “Haggai was insisting that the rebuilding of the material temple was crucial for the survival of Israel and for the coming of the final age of the world.”⁴⁸⁶

As noted above, the word “time” plays a key role in the text of Haggai. Referring to three uses of the word in chap. 1, Stuhlmüller places instigation of eschatological intervention in the temple, not with the actions of the Lord as in the writings of some other prophets.⁴⁸⁷ Amos prophesied about the day of the Lord, a phrase used by five of the twelve Minor Prophets. However, Haggai does not use the phrase or the concept. The book does not have the notion of a time for the restoration, other than now.⁴⁸⁸ Von Rad avers that Haggai and Zechariah have the idea that the temple, the structure, brings the dawning of a new time for the people of God, a time of salvation.⁴⁸⁹ The book of Haggai notes the conditions of the people, citing the need for restoration. Petersen notes how “one thread links Deutero-Isaiah with Haggai. Both focus on the *beginnings* of restoration.”⁴⁹⁰ Petersen’s italics stress what the book of Haggai stresses, the very

⁴⁸⁵Hans W. Wolff, *Haggai: A Commentary*, trans. Margaret Kohl (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1988), 67. Trito-Isaiah, Haggai, and Zechariah kindled a hope of restoration based upon the temple. Fujita, “Temple Theology,” 5. Schmid and Steck accurately elucidate this hope, calling the prophetic perspective on the current time to be one in which “[t]he present is qualified as a time of a completed turning point of salvation, but one which still precedes the completion of salvation and contains an eschatological proviso.” Schmid and Steck, “Restoration Expectations,” 57. Koch maintains that some of the prophetic writings, such as Haggai and Zechariah, hold that the eschatological hour has come upon the completion of the Jerusalem temple, but other prophetic writings, such as Amos and Isaiah, claim that the eschatological hour had not come. Klaus Koch, *The Babylonian and Persian Periods*, vol. 2 of *The Prophets*, trans. Margaret Kohl (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 2:164-165.

⁴⁸⁶Stuhlmüller, *Rebuilding*, 31-32.

⁴⁸⁷*Ibid.*, 22.

⁴⁸⁸Haggai notes that the time to build or rebuild the house of the Lord has come (if not passed). Tollington notes that “Hag 1:2 might suggest that they were waiting for a specific time, although it is unclear how it would be identified.” The book does not know of a specified day or hour to start building the temple, which would even argue against the case made by the book. The time is now, not later. It is not a specific time that is required to come for Haggai, but an event that is required to come, as specified in Hag 2:15-18. Tollington, “Haggai,” 197.

⁴⁸⁹Von Rad, *OT Theology*, 2:286.

⁴⁹⁰Petersen, “Temple,” 135.

beginning of restoration, the beginnings of a new age.

A comparison between the descriptions of events before the temple is built in Haggai compared to events after the temple is built in Haggai shows the effect of the temple. Beale describes Haggai as calling for the building of an end-time temple, showing the pivotal nature of the temple.⁴⁹¹ Building an end-time temple involves both normal and eschatological time frames. “Rarely has the temple been so clearly linked to cosmic notions.”⁴⁹² In Hag 1:10, the text shows that creation is affected by the state of the temple. Clements explains how Haggai presented the idea that once the temple was built, the high hopes of the people would be fulfilled.⁴⁹³ The coming reign of the Lord is linked to the necessary temple where the Lord will reign, as shown in how Meyers and Meyers present the important tie of Haggai’s understanding of the temple construction with the initiation of the eschatological reign of the Lord.⁴⁹⁴

Haggai presents a strong case for the building of the temple: It is to initiate the beginning of *shalom* in great measure. This *shalom* is “a state of well-being which is a direct result of the beneficent PRESENCE of God.”⁴⁹⁵ Pazdan, tying Haggai with Ezek 36:22-23 as well as Ezek 43:1-9, maintains that “[w]hen the temple is restored, God’s presence will fill the temple with glory and renew the community.”⁴⁹⁶ For too long the

⁴⁹¹Beale, *Church’s Mission*, 116.

⁴⁹²Petersen, *Haggai*, 54. Feinberg explicitly describes chap. 2 of Haggai by showing that the text implies a cause-and-effect relationship. The lack of work on the temple brings discipline and the constructive work on the temple brings blessing. Charles L. Feinberg, *The Minor Prophets* (Chicago: Moody, 1977), 245.

⁴⁹³Clements, *God and Temple*, 125.

⁴⁹⁴Meyers and Meyers, *Haggai*, 68.

⁴⁹⁵John I. Durham, “קִיּוּם and the Presence of God,” in *Proclamation and Presence: Old Testament Essays in Honour of Gwynne Henton Davies*, ed. John I. Durham and J. R. Porter (London: SCM Press, 1970), 276-277.

⁴⁹⁶Mary M. Pazdan, *Joel, Obadiah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1986), 55.

magnificent effects of the temple, as presented by Haggai, have been treated contemptuously.⁴⁹⁷ Nevertheless, Sweeney observes that Haggai contends that only once the temple is built can the Lord bring the treasure of the nations to it in order to acknowledge the Lord as king, and the building of the temple is to inaugurate the age of peace.⁴⁹⁸ The building of the Jerusalem temple, the physical structure, is the event that Baldwin interprets as “the event of crucial importance.”⁴⁹⁹

The crucial importance of the Jerusalem temple, according to Haggai, is that, starting from the first day of the temple of the Lord, the temple will have effects on all creation. Smith notes how Haggai presents a clear timing sequence in that the restoration of the temple is required before the Lord’s blessings can be given to the people.⁵⁰⁰ Boda recognizes that Haggai “identifies the rebuilding project as the key initial step that will

⁴⁹⁷Perhaps this is why the current work is proposing a new look at these Scriptures. Achtemeier is too cavalier with the statement that “Haggai actually has no thought that God will reward the Judeans with prosperity if they build him a temple—sort of ‘you-be-nice-to-me and I-will-be-nice-to-you’ religion. Human beings cannot buy the favor of the Lord of the universe. Rather, God yearns to return to this people and to dwell in their midst. The temple is symbolic of that dwelling; and if the Judeans rebuild the temple, their efforts will signal that once more they have turned toward God as he has now turned toward them. The temple will be sign and seal of their renewed hearts’ devotion—the evidence that they have finally come to terms with reality.” Elizabeth Achtemeier, *Nahum-Malachi* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1986), 99. Brown essentially agrees with this thrust of Achtemeier, using some of the same imagery. William P. Brown, *Obadiah through Malachi* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 124. The building of the temple is not something done to gain favor for future gifts, but it is the only way to truly have a dwelling place for God. Without the dwelling place, God is marginalized. The bounty from the dwelling of God on the temple mount is unrealized and the new age is therefore delayed. Smith seems to agree with Achtemeier by stating that Hag 2:10-19 means that “Haggai seems to be saying that just restoring the temple building is not enough. The temple was no fetish. Its presence did not guarantee God’s blessings.” R. Smith, *Micah-Malachi*, 160-161. Clearly the temple is no fetish. However, Haggai presents it as the only way to overcome the difficulties of the people. Haggai proclaims that the Lord dwelling in the Jerusalem temple, this unique combination of human handiwork and Divine presence, brings forth *shalom*, which is a blessing from God.

⁴⁹⁸Sweeney, *Twelve Prophets*, 2:532-533.

⁴⁹⁹Baldwin, *Haggai*, 52. Verhoef also notes that the construction of the temple is of crucial importance. Verhoef, *Haggai*, 129.

⁵⁰⁰R. Smith, *Micah-Malachi*, 149. The temple is not magic. However, the text affirms that for the blessings of the Lord to come, the Lord must dwell in the temple. If there is no temple, the Lord cannot dwell within it. However, this is the negative formulation of the declaration. The positive statement that Haggai is making is that the Lord will dwell in the temple if the people build it, and this dwelling in this structure will yield blessings from the Lord (Hag 2:19).

transform the past of curse to the future of blessing flowing from God's renewed presence."⁵⁰¹ It is important to understand Haggai's presentation of the temple, which is a call to build the temple that is linked to a transition to a thoroughly renewed age.

When commenting on Hag 2:1-9, Kessler notes that the text presents a "transitional nature of the present moment."⁵⁰² Plöger observes that Haggai "made the coming of salvation dependent on the erection of the Temple."⁵⁰³ Westermann observes that in Hag 2:19, salvation is entirely dependent on building the new temple.⁵⁰⁴ In Hag 2:18, salvation is from the day of the reestablishment of the temple. The connection to the ceremonial investiture of the temple of the Lord, with the new conditions to follow that ceremony, clearly indicates the radical nature that the Jerusalem temple will have on creation. Kessler recognizes that Hag 2:10-19 (along with Zechariah) proposes "the radical transformation of the people's fortunes which will follow upon the temple refoundation ceremony."⁵⁰⁵ Redditt also notes the prophet's expectation of blessing starting from the founding ceremony of the temple.⁵⁰⁶ Mitchell translates a key phrase in Hag 2:18 as "*from the time when the temple hath been founded*, that is, now that the temple has been founded."⁵⁰⁷ The great expectation alluded to in 2 Macc 2:16-18 with the

⁵⁰¹Mark J. Boda, *Haggai, Zechariah* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2004), 47-48.

⁵⁰²Kessler, "Tradition, Continuity and Covenant," 33.

⁵⁰³Plöger, *Theocracy*, 33.

⁵⁰⁴Claus Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary*, trans. David M. G. Stalker (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969), 413.

⁵⁰⁵Kessler, "Tradition," 29. The temple dedication is the turning point between this age and the age of great future bounty. Petersen notes the dedication ceremony is to be the turning point in history. David L. Petersen, "Zerubbabel and Jerusalem Temple Reconstruction," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 36 (1974): 369.

⁵⁰⁶Redditt, *Haggai*, 31.

⁵⁰⁷The italics are his own translation. Hinckley G. Mitchell, John Merlin Powis Smith, and Julius A. Bewer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi and Jonah* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912), 71.

purification ceremony of the temple may be an echo of Hag 2:10, 18.⁵⁰⁸

Petersen recognizes that expectations of blessing and peace are presumed to begin with the founding of the temple within Hag 2:7b-9a. “Moreover, such bounty is not something Haggai associates with the far distant future. Rather, beginning with the day upon which the temple was ritually re-dedicated, one may expect radical blessing, which Haggai describes using the vocabulary of marvelous fertility (2.18-19).”⁵⁰⁹ As with most theological points of interpretation over the millennia, not all interpreters see this starting from when the temple is founded as presented in Hag 2:18. Some see this as only a prerequisite event that is not linked to anything in particular but merely precedes the coming transition to a new age.⁵¹⁰ Even though Mason disregards the effect of the temple, he does note that “the significance of the Temple is *eschatological*.”⁵¹¹

Yet, with the implications that the transition will not happen until the foundation of the new temple as well as the immanent nature of the new age after the temple is founded, the idea of a prerequisite ignores any role that the temple has in the coming new age. This idea goes against the text’s presentation of the imminent events unfolding after

⁵⁰⁸Sweeney places the date in the text of Hag 2:10 as the 24 of Kislev, the day prior to Hanukkah later in 164 BCE referred to in 2 Macc 2. Sweeney, *Twelve Prophets*, 2:550. This does not mean one is necessarily dependent upon the other, only that there is a great expectation of what a pure Jerusalem temple will do for the people and the land in both of these texts.

⁵⁰⁹Petersen, “Temple,” 135.

⁵¹⁰Baldwin is the closest of those who call the temple a necessary prerequisite or preparation for events to follow it. At least she notes the link not just to salvation, but to the dawning of the new era. Baldwin, *Haggai*, 21. Carroll is correct, but too weak in his understanding that “the rebuilding of the temple had become a prerequisite for the expected event of salvation.” Robert P. Carroll, *When Prophecy Failed: Reactions and Responses to Failure in the Old Testament Prophetic Traditions* (1979; repr., London: Xpress Reprints, 1996), 161. Mason understands the glory of God as presence in worship, which is why he places emphasis on temple completion and, therefore, observes that Haggai “sees no ‘magical’ effect in the building and its worship for its own sake.” Mason is not correct as his view is opposite the sense of the text. Yet, Mason goes on to affirm that “Haggai sees the presence of God in the midst of the community’s life as the only hope for its renewal.” Rex Mason, *The Books of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi* (Cambridge: University Press, 1977), 16. Mason ignores the fact that the Jerusalem temple is the only way to get the presence of God into the midst of the community.

⁵¹¹Rex Mason, “The Prophets of the Restoration,” in *Israel’s Prophetic Tradition: Essays in Honour of Peter R. Ackroyd*, ed. Richard Coggins, Anthony Phillips, and Michael Knibb (Cambridge: University Press, 1982), 143.

the temple is founded. The status as a prerequisite misses the mark as it loses the meaning of the certainty of the subsequent events. A prerequisite does not necessarily link it with the subsequent events; it must merely precede, by any measure of time, the following events, which ignores the role that the temple has in the text of Haggai, as the subsequent events are to follow imminently after the establishment of the temple. A prerequisite event does not ensure that the subsequent event, which had this prerequisite, even occurs. Building the temple is not merely a prerequisite, it is the event on the basis of which things will be different from this time onward (Hag 2:15, 18). Sweeney notices that Hag 2:6-9 “employs the theophanic imagery of an earthquake that encompasses all of creation to express the cosmic implications of the reconstruction of the Temple.”⁵¹²

An issue that has clouded the understanding of the temple in Haggai is the understanding of Zerubbabel as a (or the) messiah, though more accurately stated as a signet ring (Hag 2:23). Clines gives too much weight to this idea and claims that Haggai makes an announcement about Zerubbabel that is a “quite remarkable one, designating him as nothing less than the universal and eschatological ruler.”⁵¹³ Clines interprets the phrase **סִגְנוֹן יְהוָה בְּיָמָיו** by maintaining the assertion that “Zerubbabel’s appointment will take place ‘on that day’, which (even if we did not recognize the phrase already as the technical term for the eschaton) must be the eschatological time.”⁵¹⁴

The Hebrew phrase alludes to the *eschaton*, but the text seems to refer to the time after the temple is built and consecrated. ‘On that day’ is when Zerubbabel will be the signet ring of the Lord. Accordingly, Kessler interprets Haggai as presenting “prophetic-eschatological scenarios.”⁵¹⁵ Yes, this last section emphasizes Zerubbabel, but it is only

⁵¹²Sweeney, *Twelve Prophets*, 2:548.

⁵¹³Clines, *Interested Parties*, 64.

⁵¹⁴*Ibid.*

⁵¹⁵Kessler, “Tradition,” 30.

because he is about to orchestrate the construction of the Jerusalem temple. The same participle from 2:6, מְרַעֵי־שָׁמַיִם, appears again in 2:21, showing that the Lord is about to shake all of creation.⁵¹⁶ The day is about to come when the Lord will bless creation (Hag 2:19).

Does the book of Haggai critique the past Solomonic temple structure? Of those who venture an opinion on this matter, most say no.⁵¹⁷ Kessler notes, “For Haggai, these are various states of the same temple, not a comparison between various edifices.”⁵¹⁸ Kessler overstates his case. Probably the most one can say on this side of the argument is that Haggai does not propose a plan different from what the first temple used. However, Haggai presents no plan at all,⁵¹⁹ so the argument from silence does not carry much weight on this question. Mitchell uses Hag 2:9 to declare that the temple was “regarded as having a continuous existence (Pres), in spite of its ruined or unfinished condition.”⁵²⁰

The Masoretic Text of this verse argues against Mitchell’s opinion. Haggai 2:9 proclaims that “the glory of this latter temple will be greater than the glory of the first temple.”⁵²¹ The comparative מִן distinguishes between two different temples in the verse,

⁵¹⁶Motyer notes concerning this use of the participle that the Lord will act not on a small scale, but on a cosmic scale. J. Alec Motyer, “Haggai,” *Minor Prophets: An Exegetical and Expository Commentary*, ed. Thomas E. McComiskey (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1998), 3:1001.

⁵¹⁷Price stands out as one who does maintain that the text of Haggai contrasts the second temple to the first temple. Price, “Desecration and Restoration,” 322.

⁵¹⁸Kessler, “Tradition,” 25.

⁵¹⁹Smith believes that Ezekiel’s ground plan was known. R. Smith, *Micah-Malachi*, 149. Schmidt views the call to build the temple in Haggai as referring to the construction of the temple after the plan laid out starting in chap. 40 of Ezekiel. M. Schmidt, *Prophet*, 194.

⁵²⁰Mitchell, Smith, and Bewer, *Haggai*, 63.

⁵²¹Rashi notes that “[t]he return to Israel in the days of Ezra could have been like the first time that the Jewish people entered Israel in the days of Yehoshua. . . . However, sin prevented this, for their repentance was imperfect. Hence, they could have built the Temple, and their redemption could have been eternal, had they been worthy. But since they were not worthy, they did not have permission to build the Temple which was designated as the Temple designated for the eternal redemption, for when it will be built according to this design, the [divine] glory will rest upon it forever. Nevertheless, they built it similar to Yechezkel’s building, since his prophecy could have been fulfilled in that generation. Thus it was a partial preparation.” This is Rashi as quoted by Steinberg. Shalom D. Steinberg, *The Third Beis HaMikdash: The*

and the latter temple is modified by the demonstrative pronoun “this” having a *mehuppak* conjunctive Masoretic accent with “latter,” הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה הָאֲחֵרִי. This shows a distinction with the glory of the former temple,⁵²² which is modified by the definite article, הַקֶּדְמֹנִי.

Petersen appears to be unfair to Haggai by accusing the prophet of dodging the issue by presenting the idea that the glory will become greater rather than critiquing the plan of the temple.⁵²³ Again, silence on the plan of the temple should not be inferred against the prophet’s understanding of what this latter, new temple will do for the people. In fact, in Hag 2:9, the latter temple will be more glorious than the Solomonic temple. This declaration shows a critique of the former temple, as it had insufficient glory to produce the blessings described in the text of Haggai.⁵²⁴ In Hag 2:3, the text as much as admits that the former glory was substantial; however, this latter temple will exceed the Solomonic temple in glory.⁵²⁵ This is not an argument from silence; the former temple of the celebrated united monarchy days will not be as glorious as this temple that Haggai is calling on the people to build.

Third Temple according to the Prophecy of Yechezkel following Rashi and Tosafos Yom Tov, trans. Moshe L. Miller (Jerusalem: Moznaim, 5753 [1993]), 20.

⁵²²Joüon translates this clause of 2:9 as “the second glory of this house” in section 139a.1. Jouion and Muraoka, *Grammar*, 517. Although Joüon and Muraoka allow for an exception to the order of the demonstrative pronoun in section 143h, they claim that there is only one exception to their rule. *Ibid.*, 533. If there is one exception, then there could be a second exception to their postulated rule which would change the translation from the proposed translation of Joüon to one that looks like Scherman’s given next. The claim of only one exception is neither explained nor defended at all, and it is broken by this verse. The Stone edition of the Hebrew Tanach translates this clause, “The glory of this latter Temple will be greater than [that of] the first.” Scherman et al., *Torah*, 1405. This translation of the Hebrew sticks closer to the Hebrew than the postulation by Joüon and Muraoka.

⁵²³Petersen notes that “[i]t was apparently easier for Haggai to propose a remedy in regard to the splendor of the temple than in regard to the essential size or style of the structure itself.” Petersen, *Haggai*, 64.

⁵²⁴The flat assertion that the latter temple will have more glory than the first is a statement that the first temple did not have the glory that the latter will have. This assessment of the first temple gives constructive criticism (or a critique).

⁵²⁵In fact, Schmidt comments that God will complete or glorify this latter temple in a way that God did not do for Solomon’s temple. M. Schmidt, *Prophet*, 196.

Hanson notes that “because the people had not carried out Ezekiel’s temple program, the blessings bound up with the temple were countermanded by the covenant curses.”⁵²⁶ This suggestion is that Haggai did not propose a new temple plan different from Solomon’s temple because it assumed the ground plan that Ezekiel put forward. This would be different from the ground plan of Solomon; therefore, the layout assumed by Haggai might be different from that of the first temple. Hanson understands Haggai as an enthusiastic spokesman for the temple proposed in Ezek 40–48.⁵²⁷ Anderson also notes that Haggai, as well as Zechariah, “required a language more general in scope which would achieve the same political and religious ends” as Ezekiel’s restoration program.⁵²⁸ Whether or not Haggai had the ground plan of Ezekiel in mind when putting forth the prophecy that is recorded in his name is uncertain.⁵²⁹

It is highly doubtful that Haran is correct in claiming that since Herod the Great improved the temple structure, this fulfills the prophecy of Haggai.⁵³⁰ The blessings detailed above, which would follow this great temple according to the prophecy of Haggai, were not fulfilled; thus, Herod’s temple could not have fulfilled the prophecy of

⁵²⁶Hanson, *Dawn*, 174. Here, Hanson proposes that Haggai is putting forth a “program developing the features of Ezekiel 40–48.” Ibid.

⁵²⁷Ibid., 176.

⁵²⁸Gary A. Anderson, *Sacrifices and Offerings in Ancient Israel: Studies in Their Social and Political Importance* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 96.

⁵²⁹Haggai does inherently contain a concept in regard to the proper temple structure. Regarding the Lord being honored or glorified in Haggai, Ackroyd shows that “[w]ithout a properly built temple, that is a ritually correct place for the worship of God, such worship is impossible.” Ackroyd, *Exile*, 160. Though a correct ground plan would have settled the matter, perhaps the ground plan of the last nine chapters of Ezekiel was known to those who had returned. On a different point, Ezra is much later writing and the claims of the book do not affect this work on Haggai in the slightest, one way or the other. Ezra can claim that the temple was built with the prophetic work of Haggai, but Ezra does not claim that the design and condition of the temple has the blessing of Haggai. Ezra cannot speak for Haggai, and it is important to not let a discipline such as canonical criticism warp the interpretation of Haggai. The two books are different. Although Ezra is a second temple Jewish writing, there appears to be no mention of the temple in an eschatological context within Ezra and therefore it is not treated in this work.

⁵³⁰Haran, *Temples*, 45.

Haggai.⁵³¹ Besides the greater glory of the latter temple, Haggai affirms that when the people build this new temple, the Lord will appear in glory (Hag 1:8). Late Jewish sources agree that the glory of the Lord did not dwell in the second temple,⁵³² which also argues against Haran. The cosmic nature of Hag 2 does not equate to the time of Herod as the oppression of Israel was still ongoing, counter to the prophecy of Haggai; this, also, argues convincingly against Haran.

Pressing Haggai's comparison with, or critique of, the first temple further, the glory of the Lord that filled the first temple (1 Kgs 8:11) was not accompanied by earth-shaking events. Yet, the temple in Haggai will be followed by the Lord shaking all of creation so as to bring the delight of every nation to the temple, which far exceeds the events and foreign nations' offerings of the first temple. As the book focuses on the temple itself and not on aspects of the cult,⁵³³ the greater glory of this temple is not because of the priests or cultic rituals. Haggai does not attack the priestly class or the cultic rituals much at all,⁵³⁴ but he does say that there were offerings at the site of the former, less glorious temple (Hag 2:14). Furthermore, the Lord commands Haggai to ask the priests, the cultic leaders, for a teaching, acknowledging their position as cultic teachers and leaders. Haggai 2:9 declares that the Lord will settle *shalom* in this place, that is, the place of the temple.⁵³⁵ *Shalom* had been missing for a long time even when the former temple still stood. Thus, the text of Haggai does indeed contain areas where the

⁵³¹Chisholm notes that some view Herod's building project in relation to the Haggai prophecy. "However, the glorification of the temple predicted by Haggai is associated with universal judgment and the ingathering of the nations' tribute, not with the self-glorifying efforts of a godless ruler." Robert B. Chisholm, Jr., *Interpreting the Minor Prophets* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1990), 223.

⁵³²The Talmud records this in Yoma 21b.

⁵³³Tollington, "Haggai," 134.

⁵³⁴Tollington notes how the text does not condemn the priests. Ibid.

⁵³⁵Verhoef notes this peace refers to an eschatological peace. Verhoef, *Haggai*, 107.

comparison between Haggai's temple and the first temple where the first temple comes up lacking, thereby showing inherent critique.⁵³⁶

The temple to be built was to affect the people and land with *shalom*.⁵³⁷ This is quite different from the first temple. From the day of dedication, the Lord will bless the people (Hag 2:19). This also seems to contrast itself against the first temple, which if it did bless the people, the blessing has faded from the people. These issues with the future Jerusalem temple declared in the text of Haggai indicate that the text is presenting a new temple that will have greater effect on the people and the land than the former temple, thus critiquing the former temple's effects by comparison.

It is important not to diminish the cosmic actions resulting from the completion of the new Jerusalem temple by alleging that the temple is only a symbol of the renewed covenant relationship between the people and God. Even though Patrick accepts that the language of the text of Haggai suggests a reading that this new temple will assure great agricultural prosperity,⁵³⁸ he goes on to posit that since there is a high amount of covenantal language,⁵³⁹ the position must be nuanced to reflect this fact.⁵⁴⁰ He then concludes that "the rebuilt temple symbolizes both the restored covenant relationship . . . and the glorious return of the deity."⁵⁴¹

⁵³⁶Haggai does inherently contain a concept in regard to the proper temple structure. Regarding the Lord being honored or glorified in Haggai, Ackroyd shows that "[w]ithout a properly built temple, that is a ritually correct place for the worship of God, such worship is impossible." Ackroyd, *Exile*, 160. Though a correct ground plan would have settled the matter, perhaps the ground plan of the last nine chapters of Ezekiel was known to those who had returned.

⁵³⁷Petersen also holds that Haggai presents the temple as the origination of *shalom*. Petersen, *Haggai*, 69.

⁵³⁸Patrick, "Haggai," 144.

⁵³⁹Ibid.

⁵⁴⁰Ibid., 145.

⁵⁴¹Ibid., 146.

Three important problems must be pointed out in this claim by Patrick. First, the covenant relationship is not the focus of Haggai, as examined in depth above. Second, the temple does not symbolize the covenant relationship. The temple is declared to be the place where the Lord will appear (Hag 1:8) and where the Lord of hosts will reside (Hag 1:4). “Covenant is not an ‘idea’ to be embraced in the mind, and therefore religious community cannot be defined with respect to ‘orthodox’ appraisals of that idea. Covenant is an ‘enacted reality’ that is either manifested in the concrete choices individuals make, or not.”⁵⁴² Thus, it is the action, the actual physical response, which makes a covenant.

Given this understanding, the actual building of the temple might be a covenantal action, but it most assuredly is not symbolic of the relationship. Not a symbol, but it is a choice to follow the word of the Lord of Hosts, as Haggai presents it, and to enact a new reality from the one in which the people are living. Deuteronomic language of cause and effect mentioned above is not necessarily covenantal language, but if one would define it as such, then the actions of building the temple would become the covenantal actions; the action of building the temple is still real, not symbolic. The physical temple could be a symbol, but the text of Haggai calls it the actual location where the Lord will appear (Hag 1:8). Thus, the text emphasizes the physicality of the temple over any postulation that the temple was a symbol, an idea to which it does not seem to even allude.

The third problem with Patrick’s theory is that the temple is not meant to symbolize the return of the Lord, it is meant for the Lord to appear there gloriously (Hag 2:7), to settle prosperity there (Hag 2:9), and to bless the people from there (Hag 2:19). The claim that the temple is merely a symbol for restored relationship, or dwelling, diminishes and dismisses the true nature of the temple that is offered in Haggai.

The text of Haggai proclaims that the new temple will be the place where the Lord will appear, and the lack of recognition of the importance of the physical structure

⁵⁴²George E. Mendenhall and Gary A. Herion, “Covenant,” *ABD*, 1:1201.

(not that of merely a symbol) of the temple to the presence of the Lord misrepresents the text. Utilizing Meyers and Meyers, Patrick denies the physical establishment that is the founding of the temple. Patrick notes that it is merely a symbolic act, not a physical building of the structure.⁵⁴³ Yet, this ignores how Haggai “was centrally concerned with the restoration of the temple as the essential means of preserving the covenant.

Once the house had been built, the curse would be ended, and the blessings of the covenant would return to the land.”⁵⁴⁴ The text of Haggai is not a call to the commandments, but a call to build the temple (Hag 1:8; 2:4). The text mentions once that the leaders and people listened to or obeyed the word from the prophet (Hag 1:12), but the focus on this obedience was on the working on the temple. “In summary, both Haggai and Zech 1-8 understand the temple to be the center of” the Lord’s universal reign.⁵⁴⁵ This is why the text focuses on building the temple as it is the center of this new worldwide order. Patrick’s claim of the symbolic nature of the new temple cannot be maintained in light of numerous declarations in the text of Haggai.

Clines notes that the text “of Haggai becomes coherent when we recognize how Haggai constructs the temple. How rebuilding the temple connects with ‘glory’, how ‘glory’ connects with silver and gold, how silver and gold connect with world upheaval, and, especially, how world upheaval connects with the ‘right time’ for rebuilding the temple.”⁵⁴⁶ The order of events, covered above, all hinge upon the day when the temple is completed. Andersen notes how “the day of foundation is the day of completion, since the building is only really established when it is securely finished.”⁵⁴⁷ The temporal

⁵⁴³Patrick, “Haggai,” 197.

⁵⁴⁴Hanson, *Dawn*, 248.

⁵⁴⁵Sykes, *Time and Space*, 34.

⁵⁴⁶Clines, “Haggai’s Temple,” 56.

⁵⁴⁷Andersen, “Who Built?” 19.

clause in Hag 2:18 uses the verb תָּצַד , which conveys “the notion of securing the strength of a building by imposing the determined building specifications.”⁵⁴⁸ This day, again a temporal marker detailed above, is the turning point for the leaders, people, and land.⁵⁴⁹

The text of Haggai stresses the link of the temple to the new age. In Hag 2:19, the temporal clause declares that from this day, the day that the temple is complete, the Lord will bless the people. There is no conditional marker in the text, at all. Anderson notes that the point of the text of Haggai is claiming that the new temple, along with its cult and a leader of the people, could inaugurate the new age.⁵⁵⁰ Haggai’s call to build the temple so that the fertility of the land will ensue is highly formulaic with specific images.⁵⁵¹ Carroll demonstrates that the text puts forth “the temple project as a necessary stage in the realization of the expected salvation.”⁵⁵² Carroll calls the temple the key that transitions creation from the current age to the next age, noting how the text gives the impression that the blessings of the new age were guaranteed with this temple.⁵⁵³

Hanson, also, uses the idea of a key to describe how Haggai proclaims the new Jerusalem temple, using the detail of Ezek 40–48, which will unlock the blessings of all creation in the *eschaton*.⁵⁵⁴ Smart uses the metaphor of a promise, noting that if the community will build the temple, then they would receive the promise of a better time.⁵⁵⁵

⁵⁴⁸Ibid., 17.

⁵⁴⁹Patrick notes the importance of this day. “Thus the events of one day, ‘this day,’ provide the turning point for the people of Yehud.” Patrick, “Haggai,” 233.

⁵⁵⁰G. Anderson, *Sacrifices*, 124.

⁵⁵¹Ibid., 97. Anderson notes that for Haggai and Zechariah, “these prophets are most emphatic in their belief that the physical reconstitution of the Temple building will assure new vigor for fertility in the agricultural sphere.” Ibid., 93.

⁵⁵²R. Carroll, *Prophecy*, 159.

⁵⁵³Ibid., 162.

⁵⁵⁴Hanson, *Dawn*, 174.

⁵⁵⁵James D. Smart, *History and Theology in Second Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 35, 40-66* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965), 284.

Boda uses the metaphor of a linchpin, which describes the most central and cohesive part of the plan. “Most emphasis, however, is placed on the significance of the present day which functions as a linchpin between a past of curse and future of blessing and calls the people to reflect deeply upon this thought.”⁵⁵⁶ Albertz observes that for Haggai “the temple was above all the guarantee of blessing, and he indefatigably pointed out to his fellow-citizens that their bleak economic situation was a consequence of the fact that the temple was lying in ruins.”⁵⁵⁷ Ackroyd thought that, perhaps, the people might still be able to frustrate the initiation of the new age somehow by human nature or human actions,⁵⁵⁸ yet the text of Haggai makes no mention of any actions that the people could take, other than not building the temple, that would frustrate this new age. Without any evidence that could support Ackroyd’s proposition, the proposition should be abandoned in the text of Haggai and left for other parts of second temple Jewish writings.

With the analysis of the text of Haggai and review of secondary literature on Haggai’s understanding of the temple, showing it to be a necessary stage, key to transition, guarantee of blessings, promise to the people, and linchpin in highly formulaic language, Hanson raises the intriguing point that Haggai has the equation: “[b]uild the house’ and ‘I will give prosperity,’ an equation springing from a view of cultic orthopraxy which seems to threaten the doctrine of divine sovereignty at the heart of the visionary program.”⁵⁵⁹

⁵⁵⁶Mark J. Boda, “Haggai: Master Rhetorician,” *Tyndale Bulletin* 51 (2000): 303.

⁵⁵⁷Albertz, *History*, 2:452.

⁵⁵⁸Ackroyd disagrees with the text of Haggai, writing that “God’s presence and blessing, which have been assured so vividly in 2.6-9, do not automatically guarantee that the people are in a fit condition to worship. The people who are called to be the community of the new age can nevertheless frustrate that new age by their own condition. There is no automatic efficacy in the Temple, no guarantee that by virtue of its existence it ensures salvation.” Ackroyd, *Exile*, 169.

⁵⁵⁹Hanson, *Dawn*, 177.

Could the idea that the building of the temple guarantees the eschatological age threaten divine sovereignty? No, it cannot. It cannot, because Haggai relays the prophecy as the word of the Lord. It is not a human idea to build the temple here in Haggai, as is completely obvious in the whole text of Haggai, but it is exactly the opposite in Hag 1:2.⁵⁶⁰ The Lord declares that the Lord will bless the people (Hag 2:19); it is not an idea that the people can obtain a blessing on their own work or their own plan. The blessing from the Lord is given based upon actions of the people; this concept is the same idea as relayed in Deut 28. The Lord, in a plan given by the Lord, will bless the people as clearly laid out by the Lord.⁵⁶¹

The false dichotomy posed by Hanson can be refuted easily upon even a brief examination of the text of Haggai. The word **דְבַר** (word, matter, or thing) occurs in Haggai second most within the Hebrew Scriptures behind only Esther when ranking using the normalized statistics.⁵⁶² The text of Haggai shows the importance of the word, issue, or matter that Haggai presents from the Lord. The phrase, the word of the Lord, occurs in Haggai in two different forms, using **דְבַר** and **דְבַר**. The phrase using **דְבַר** occurs more in Haggai than in the rest of the books of the Hebrew Scriptures, using the same normalized statistics as above.⁵⁶³ The phrase using **דְבַר** occurs more in Haggai than

⁵⁶⁰Taylor and Clendenen observe that the people “must give to the task of rebuilding the temple in Jerusalem the priority that the Lord through his prophet Haggai attached to it.” Taylor and Clendenen, *Haggai*, 136.

⁵⁶¹The tetragrammaton occurs second most in Haggai in all the Hebrew Scriptures, second to only Malachi. The name of God occurs in over 63% of all the verses of the book, plus another eleven occurrences that are in verses that are already counted in the 63% of the verses of the text. Thus, when calculating the number of times the name occurs in the book normalized by the number of words in the book, the word occurs in the Hebrew Scriptures most in Haggai at a rate of almost 5.8% of all the words in the book.

⁵⁶²The statistics on this search show that the word ‘דְבַר’ occurs the most in Esther where it occurs in 21% of the verses and in Haggai it occurs in 18.4% of the verses. The word occurs at an average frequency of 5.7% of the verses in Scripture, showing the Haggai usage as over three times that average rate.

⁵⁶³Haggai ranks first at 13.16% with Zechariah second at 6.16%.

in the rest of the books of the Hebrew Scriptures using the same normalized statistics as above.⁵⁶⁴ Additionally, the subject and verb combination of the “the Lord said” occurs in Haggai second most within the Hebrew Scriptures behind only Malachi when ranking using normalized statistics as above.⁵⁶⁵

When combining all three of these facts (the two phrases of the word of the Lord and the subject and verb combination explicitly asserting that “the Lord said”) Haggai ranks first at 52.63% (not including an extra five times that are in verses where the result already occurs and therefore is not counted) with Malachi at 43.64%. The average rate is 3.73% for the combination of these three textual markers, including other prophetic material. Therefore, not only is this book more dependent upon the utterance of the Lord than all other books from a textual standpoint, including all other prophetic books, it displays this dependence in over half of the verses in the text!

This shows the very strong textual evidence that this plan, whatever the text of Haggai contains, is directly from the Lord and there is absolutely no indication that the building of the temple would or could threaten divine sovereignty because the text itself holds to divine sovereignty over all of creation and presents the plan as from the Lord, not a human plan that would rival divine power. The proposals in Haggai are manifested through divine sovereignty, so it would be illogical to postulate that the Lord’s plan in Haggai could go against divine sovereignty.

The Actions of Humanity and the Temple in Haggai

The text of Haggai declares that the leaders and people must accomplish a necessary task before this eschatological time can begin.⁵⁶⁶ The imperative to set their

⁵⁶⁴Haggai ranks first at 21.05% with Jeremiah second at 11.88%.

⁵⁶⁵Haggai ranks second at 21.05 with Malachi first at 41.82%.

⁵⁶⁶The prophets present humanity’s part in this restoration. They are to build the temple or to make it pure so that the presence of God can dwell within it. Regarding Haggai and Zech 6:12, a son of David is assigned or expected to build the temple; it is of human construction.

will to perform the actions commanded by the prophets occurs in two different forms in Scripture: **שִׁמּוּ לְבַבְכֶם** and **שִׁמּוּ נַאֲ לְבַבְכֶם**. This command occurs six times in all of Scripture, with five of them in the book of Haggai.⁵⁶⁷ These five commands in the text of Haggai emphasize the importance of change. The text makes it clear that now is the time for the people to change their (plural pronoun) mind-set (singular noun).

The text is a call or command for action in a new direction. The text of Haggai has many verbal imperatives.⁵⁶⁸ The five commands to set your mind in Haggai show intent within the text to change the actions of the people and leaders. The current actions of the people are addressed. The actions of sowing, eating, drinking, dressing, working, seeking much, reaping, and the labor of your hands are all in the text of Haggai.⁵⁶⁹

Although plenty of work and effort are ongoing, the problem addressed by the text is that it is out of sync with the priorities of God as given through the prophet. The five uses of the phrase “set your mind” in the text of Haggai are a call to change the objective of the people. Instead of engaging in fruitless work,⁵⁷⁰ they should work on the temple of the Lord.⁵⁷¹ The change is not about a change in crops, even though agricultural work is mentioned; the change is about the establishment of the temple of the Lord.⁵⁷² It is from this time, when the temple is established, and onward (**מֵעַל**, onward

⁵⁶⁷The six occurrences are in Deut 32:46; Hag 1:5, 1:7; 2:15, and twice in 2:18.

⁵⁶⁸Haggai ranks behind only Joel in the percentage of imperatives in the verses of the text. At almost 24% of the verses in the book with an imperative, the text is over twice the average of the Hebrew Scriptures.

⁵⁶⁹See Hag 1:6-11.

⁵⁷⁰See Hag 1:6, 9, 11.

⁵⁷¹See Hag 1:8, 1:14, 2:4.

⁵⁷²The verbal form **שָׁאֵ** is used four times in Scripture. The uses in 1 Kgs 6:37, Hag 2:18, Zech 8:9, and Ezra 3:6 all relate to the foundation of the temple of the Lord. There is also a connection between Zech 8:9 and Hag 1:2 which the *Masorah parva* notes. The verbal form **לְהַבְנוֹתָ** is used only in these two verses, with both referring to building the temple. The command in Hag 1:8 is clear: go up the temple mount, bring wood, and build the temple. The command to change, according to Hag 2:15, starts at the time that the word of the Lord is given to the people.

used twice with the directional \uparrow particle).⁵⁷³ The power and great events after the temple is established originate with God, but are, at least in part, dependent upon human obedience to the task of God laid out in the prophetic word.⁵⁷⁴ Levenson correctly notes humanity's role in the prophets' presentation. "In other words, man can hasten the eschatological era by his deeds. It is this concept which came to underlie Haggai and Zechariah's insistence that the Temple be started. They are a later statement of the theology of the School of Ezekiel."⁵⁷⁵ The temple is not a magic talisman; that is not the concept of this work or the prophetic writings over which this work has examined.⁵⁷⁶

Another word that is important to the book of Haggai is "to build" (בָּנָה). In terms of the normalized usage of the verb "to build" in the Hebrew Scriptures, Haggai ranks fourth behind 2 Chronicles, 1 Kings, and Nehemiah.⁵⁷⁷ The building of the Jerusalem

⁵⁷³The fact that the form בָּנָה is used twice does not convey its importance clearly. It is used more in Haggai than anywhere else in the Hebrew Scriptures, ranking the books of the Hebrew Scriptures by the number of verses in the book where it occurs normalized by the number of verses in that book. It is used at a rate nearly eight times that of the average usage in the Hebrew Scriptures. Beyond that, the meaning has been distorted in Brown, Driver, and Briggs. In this reference, the uses in Haggai are separated out so that they can mean the opposite of other temporal uses. Brown, BDB, s.v. "בָּנָה." The point of these uses is not the past, but the future time. It is from this time and onward (Hag 2:15, 18).

⁵⁷⁴Sykes, *Time and Space*, 136. The text shows the view that the Jerusalem temple is linked to the coming of God to dwell. Hoppe notes that for some of the period after the destruction of the first temple, the construction of the Jerusalem temple was "an essential component of Jerusalem's restoration." Leslie J. Hoppe, *The Holy City: Jerusalem in the Theology of the Old Testament* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000), 128.

⁵⁷⁵J. D. Levenson, *Program of Restoration*, 48.

⁵⁷⁶The Jerusalem temple that the prophets prophesied would come was with the understanding of prophecy. "Jusque dans ses variantes les plus intimes, le prophétisme biblique est, en permanence, le dialogue de Dieu et de l'homme." Neher, *L'Essence*, 7. The interaction in prophecy between God and humanity shows that both God and humanity have symbiotic roles; expectation of prophecy fulfillment is not like the use of a talisman in magic. The expectation of prophecy shows that "l'originalité de ce *temps biblique*, sa fonction mouvante, génératrice d'un devenir." Ibid. This future orientation, within the dialogue that is prophecy, manifests itself in eschatological events with respect to the Jerusalem temple in the second temple Jewish writings considered in this work. Neher writes, "Par la parole prophétique, Dieu continue à créer." Ibid., 114. The eschatology of the prophetic word is creative in nature, as this investigation into the prophecies regarding the Jerusalem temple and the *eschaton* have shown.

⁵⁷⁷The statistics on this search show that 2 Chronicles has the verb בָּנָה in 6.6% of the verses, 1 Kings has the word in 6.5% of the verses, Nehemiah has the word in 5.4% of the verses, and Haggai ranks fourth using the word in 5.3% of the verses.

temple by the people is a common focus in these four books. The call to build (or rebuild, although this distinction cannot be determined in the Hebrew text of the book) the temple in Haggai focuses more on the impact the temple would have on the people, the land, and the other nations and less on the actual construction and layout compared to the three books that rank above Haggai in usage of the verb “to build.”⁵⁷⁸ In addition to the verb בָּנִי, the verb פִּשְׁעֵי occurs twice in Haggai.⁵⁷⁹ The first use in the text of Haggai shows that the people began to accomplish “the work on the temple of the Lord.” The second use in Hag 2:4 is an imperative form, showing that the work had not been accomplished, as one might have surmised by the *vav*-consecutive imperfect form of 1:14, but this narrative verbal form was probably an inceptive verbal form syntactically.

Both uses of the verb פִּשְׁעֵי in Haggai, which describe and implore the leaders and people to act, express action on building the temple of the Lord on the temple mount. The uses of the verb פִּשְׁעֵי are in passages in order to advocate the building of the temple.⁵⁸⁰ Sweeney notes, “This command to work constitutes the primary rhetorical goal of the passage and indeed of the entire book, to call upon the parties addressed to undertake the construction of the new Temple.”⁵⁸¹ Sykes notes that the text of Haggai states “that the dawning of this new era of blessing depends upon the people obeying the prophetic word.”⁵⁸² In fact, Patrick shows the existence of a chiasm in chap. 1 of Haggai with Hag

⁵⁷⁸Clines notes that “you can’t rebuild a new building, only an old one” in commenting on Hag 1:2; however, this is his misreading of the *Niphal* infinitive as “to be rebuilt” rather than “to be built” or reading only the English and disregarding the Hebrew. Clines, *Interested Parties*, 47.

⁵⁷⁹This verb occurs in Hag 1:14 and 2:4.

⁵⁸⁰This is the same verb, פִּשְׁעֵי, as used in Exod 25:8 and Ezek 43:11, which also command the people to accomplish the necessary work to build and worship at the tabernacle or temple.

⁵⁸¹Sweeney, *Twelve Prophets*, 2:546. The ideal temple built by humans became the center of faith for some in second temple Judaism. Brueggemann observes that Haggai “regarded the temple and its rebuilding as the quintessential act for the faith of Judaism.” Walter Brueggemann, *Isaiah 40-66* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998), 252. Von Rad notes that “under the influence of the prophets the rebuilding of the temple nevertheless became for the people the touchstone of faith.” Von Rad, *Hexateuch*, 240.

⁵⁸²Sykes, *Time and Space*, 30.

1:8 at the center of the chiasm, highlighting the prophet's message that the people are to build the temple so that the Lord can appear in glory.⁵⁸³ Hanson notes that the message of Haggai was attractive because "it offered the wonders of the eschaton now, if only the people rallied behind the hierocratic program."⁵⁸⁴

The posture of God and God's people is also an important theme within the text of Haggai and adds insight into the necessary action required by the leaders and people. The first understanding of posture is in Hag 1:4 where, embedded within a question, is that the people are dwelling within covered houses.⁵⁸⁵ However, the house of the Lord is desolate (Hag 1:4, 9). Because the people are dwelling in their houses, it is the Lord who has to arouse them (Hag 1:14). The Lord is not in a house, for the temple is uninhabited (Hag 1:4, 2:5). The Lord is not dwelling with the people or reigning among the cherubim,⁵⁸⁶ the Lord is standing (Hag 2:5) without a temple in the midst of the people.⁵⁸⁷ The notion of the Lord standing is not a common one in Scripture. Of the six times in the Torah, it refers to the cloud standing in their midst or standing in front of the rock before the water came out.⁵⁸⁸ Of the three times in the Psalms, it refers to the Lord enduring or the psalmist wonders why the Lord stands far off.⁵⁸⁹ The seven remaining

⁵⁸³Patrick, "Haggai," 106, 121. Patrick notes that the second chapter of Haggai presents the idea that if the people build the temple, it would be followed by divine activity that would usher in the new age. Ibid., 69. Patrick details this combination of actions as the actions of the people to build, which results in a glorious response by the Lord. Ibid., 124.

⁵⁸⁴Hanson, *Dawn*, 245-246.

⁵⁸⁵The verb here is נִשְׁבַּר . This is the same verb used when it is said that God reigns in Zion (Ps 9:12), reigns among or above the cherubim (Pss 80:2, 99:1), or from the place for God's throne (Ps 68:17, cf. 2 Sam 7:5).

⁵⁸⁶The declarations that the Lord is with the people (Hag 1:13, 2:4) are not presenting the same concept as the Lord dwelling with the people.

⁵⁸⁷One could easily maintain that the Lord is standing homeless while the people have homes.

⁵⁸⁸See Exod 14:19, 17:6, 33:10; Num 12:5, 14:14; Deut 31:15.

⁵⁸⁹See Pss 10:1, 102:27, and 109:31.

examples come from the prophetic writings and all, with the possible exception (although probably not) of Hag 2:5, refer to the Lord standing to give judgment or condemnation.⁵⁹⁰

The Lord is standing because there is no temple to dwell within it. Regarding the “standing” of the Lord, the rest of the prophetic uses show that this posture is not a boon for the people. There are two declarations that the Lord is with the people and leaders; these are not declarations of dwelling with the people. In Hag 1:13, the Lord is with the people in the work of the Lord that they are to be doing. Similarly in Hag 2:4, the Lord is with them in their work, which is an imperative for what they are to be doing. With the Lord standing, the people are afraid (Hag 1:12) and for good reason. In Hag 2:5, the command not to be afraid follows the declaration that the Lord stands with the people in their work on the temple, as fear would be the normal reaction. With the people attempting to build the temple, they should not be afraid of others who would oppose the building, whether inside or outside of Jerusalem, for the Lord is standing ready to oppose all who would hinder the work. The fear in this passage is of what the Lord will do if the people and leaders do not build the temple. It is only in this work of the Lord on the temple that the Lord is with them, according to the text of Haggai.

The actions of the people, in building the temple, will allow the indwelling of the temple and the subsequent outpouring of blessings. Sykes notes the dependence of the submission of the people to the obedience of the word of the Lord as put forth by Haggai to the return of the divine king to Jerusalem as well as the dependence of the return of God to the prosperity and blessing to follow.⁵⁹¹ In describing this aspect, Ackroyd shows that “the people, by rebuilding the Temple, open the way for the giving of divine

⁵⁹⁰These references are in Isa 3:13, Ezek (although all Ezekiel references describe the glory of the Lord) 3:23, 10:18, 11:23; Hab 3:6; Hag 2:5; Zech 14:4.

⁵⁹¹Sykes, *Time and Space*, 120.

blessing.”⁵⁹² In this metaphor of opening a way, the people are the ones who open the way to the new age;⁵⁹³ it is God who blesses the people when they have built the temple. God does not open the way without human action (that is, build the temple or make a dwelling place); it is the people who build the temple, making a way into the world for God, allowing God to come through it.

This idea, a “way” metaphor, is quite similar the metaphor of a catalyst offered by Collins shown above. Walton gives great insight into the ancient Near Eastern background into the idea of God and people depending on each other. Walton notes that “the temple existed as a fulcrum of mutual dependence. The gods had their needs met through the temple and their image was resident in its midst, and the people had their needs met by the beneficence of the contented deity.”⁵⁹⁴ The imperative to build the temple in Hag 1:8 is combined with the declaration that God will appear in glory,

וַיִּבְנֶה. ⁵⁹⁵ The text claims that there is a tie between building the temple and effects upon

⁵⁹²Ackroyd claims this without reference to the *eschaton*; however, he notes that when the people build the temple, they become a new people of God and get the blessing of God because of it. Ackroyd, *Exile*, 162. However, he also claims that “[t]he dawn of the new age must not then be hindered by any human failure.” *Ibid.*, 154. Here, he draws attention to the necessary actions of humanity to build the temple in order that the new age can come.

⁵⁹³Here, the Lord is with the people in the work, but it is the people who are commanded to build the temple for God. They do not have to do it alone, but they have to do it.

⁵⁹⁴Walton, *Ancient Thought*, 128.

⁵⁹⁵This is the *ketiv*; however, the *qere* has a cohortative aspect. The imperfect *Niphal ketiv* better suits the context of when the temple is built: the Lord can be glorified by consecrating the temple with God’s glory or glorified by the offerings brought to the temple. The *Niphal* often includes a reflexive component holding, as is appropriate, that the Lord is also partially declaring in the first person that I will glorify myself in this temple that the people will build. Waltke and O’Connor call this a double-status use as it incorporates both nuances, passive and reflexive, at the same time. Waltke and O’Connor, *Syntax*, 380. The tie between וַיִּבְנֶה and וַיִּקְדֹּשׁ is shown in Ezek 28:22 and is followed by the restoration passage in Ezek 28:25-26. These two *Niphal* verbs can allude to the consecration of the temple; however, more importantly, they both are passive indicating that events or human actions are what bring the holiness or glorification to the Lord. McFadyen notes that v. 1:8 holds that “the glory of the Messianic age would begin when, but not until, the Temple was erected.” Joseph F. McFadyen, “Haggai,” *Abingdon Bible Commentary*, ed. Frederick C. Eiselen, Edwin Lewis, and David G. Downey (New York: Abingdon, 1929), 817.

creation, such as the rain of the sky and the produce of the land.⁵⁹⁶ The coming new age of Haggai links the human actions of building the temple with reciprocal actions from God that will bring greater consequences. Meyers and Meyers note regarding Hag 1:10-11 “that the causality he sees between the people’s behavior and God’s blessing cannot be ignored.”⁵⁹⁷ Abarbanel, the Jewish scholar, notes that the people have the opportunity to initiate the final age with their actions.⁵⁹⁸ O’Brien notes that the building of the temple is the action that leads or induces God to greater action.⁵⁹⁹ Haggai stresses the imperative of humanity’s actions.⁶⁰⁰

The action of building the temple is absolutely necessary in bringing restoration.⁶⁰¹ Rather than a mere building project, Haggai is widening the understanding of the temple and its relationship within God’s reality for the people.⁶⁰² It is the temple through the efforts of the people that is linked to the new age and to the pleasure of the Lord with it, involving glorification in it, and blessing after it. Stuhlmüller recognizes the human effort in the coming new age. “The rebuilding of the temple was leading Israel quickly to the verge of an eschatological finale, a total fulfillment of promises.”⁶⁰³ The

⁵⁹⁶Mitchell comments on this passage and maintains that God’s glorification in the temple is the initiation of the new age. Mitchell, Smith, and Bewer, *Haggai*, 48.

⁵⁹⁷Meyers and Meyers, *Haggai*, 43.

⁵⁹⁸The Jewish scholar Don Yitzchak Abarbanel (1437-1508) is cited by Stavsky. Stavsky, *Twelve Prophets*, 170, 181.

⁵⁹⁹Julia M. O’Brien, *Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2004), 149.

⁶⁰⁰*Ibid.*, 150. Also, the note above on the high number of imperative verbal forms in the text of Haggai makes this an obvious conclusion.

⁶⁰¹Mitchell avers a strong statement that is, in effect, the contrapositive here. He notes how the people have “neglected to rebuild the temple and thus prevented the return of Yahweh and the introduction of the Messianic era.” Mitchell, Smith, and Bewer, *Haggai*, 68-69.

⁶⁰²Schmidt claims that especially stressed in Haggai is “daß Haggai, wenn er Israel vor das Problem des Tempels stellt, dessen Blicke nicht verengt, sondern weitet, statt der kleinen Möglichkeiten der Menschen die große Wirklichkeit Gottes anruft.” M. Schmidt, *Prophet*, 197.

⁶⁰³Stuhlmüller, *Rebuilding*, 26.

message of Haggai attempts to stir the people to action. Kessler notes that the Lord could not complete the task alone; it took the prophet to stir the leaders to build the temple and then the temple would allow the relationship between God and people to advance.⁶⁰⁴ This understanding of Haggai's initiation of a new age focuses the central theme of the book, which is the necessity to build the temple in order to allow the blessings that will follow,⁶⁰⁵ rather than Wolff's understanding of the driving question in Haggai being: "How can the devastated temple in Jerusalem be rebuilt?"⁶⁰⁶

The text of Haggai confirms that if the people build the temple, this action opens the way for the new age to come. "It is clear that the Temple restoration affects not only Israel's life (2:19), but the course of human events (2:22). The idea of 'shaking' heavens and earth in 2:21 (cf. 2:6) is used to portray God's entrance into the sphere of human history in a final act of judgment and salvation."⁶⁰⁷ The text presents a near Deuteronomistic cause-and-effect theology where "Haggai similarly draws on the motifs found in the traditional blessings and curses passages but is prepared to broaden the application of such material to situations beyond strictly covenantal obligations which are nevertheless displeasing."⁶⁰⁸ This broadening is best described as the blending of a cultic focus with the cause-and-effect manner of Deuteronomy. The traditional blessings and

⁶⁰⁴Kessler, "Tradition," 36. Schmid and Steck fail to recognize the necessary part played by the actions of humanity in bringing the new age. They hold that the Lord will cause the events of salvation; humans cannot "actively cause it. They can only impede it or conform to it." Schmid and Steck, "Restoration Expectations," 57.

⁶⁰⁵Coggins supports this conclusion with the statement that "[j]ust as current troubles were due to its neglect (2:15-17), so future blessing could be guaranteed if rebuilding was taken seriously in hand (2:8f.)." Richard J. Coggins, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987), 34.

⁶⁰⁶Wolff, *Haggai*, 22.

⁶⁰⁷Beth Glazier-McDonald, "Haggai," *Women's Bible Commentary*, ed. Carol A. Newsom and Sharon H. Ringe (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992), 229. LaSor, Hubbard, and Bush claim that this declaration of shaking the nations is an eschatological promise. William S. LaSor, David A. Hubbard, and Frederic W. Bush, *Old Testament Survey: The Message, Form, and Background of the Old Testament*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996), 394.

⁶⁰⁸Tollington, "Haggai," 214.

curses have been broadened to include the cause-and-effect of the proper temple in the role of the lives of the people.

Finitsis addresses this cause-and-effect nature of the book of Haggai, noting that “[t]he logical inference seems to be that the difficulties the people face can be overruled, and the sure way to achieve this is to build the Temple.”⁶⁰⁹ Too often, the building of the temple in Haggai has been seen merely from the practical dimension.⁶¹⁰ The temple in Haggai appears to have a role that becomes possible only after the fall of Solomon’s temple.⁶¹¹ “The prophet Haggai has emerged as an eschatological prophet, who saw the rebuilding and consecrating of the new Temple as necessary to bring in the new age.”⁶¹²

⁶⁰⁹Finitsis, *Visions*, 115.

⁶¹⁰On the one hand, there are scholars like Wolff who miss the point and believe that the prophet was trying only to bring about the building of the temple with no expectations of a new age with the temple at all. Wolff, *Haggai*, 54. This may be supported by Ezra-Nehemiah, which mentions Haggai (Ezra 5:1) and the prophecy of Haggai (Ezra 6:14). Groves notes how “[a]gainst the backdrop of a hopeful, eschatological future as articulated in the prophetic and psalmic Zion traditions, the Historical Books of Ezra and Nehemiah give a much more sober-minded picture of the future.” J. A. Groves, “Zion Traditions,” *Dictionary of Old Testament Historical Books*, ed. Bill T. Arnold and H. G. M. Williamson (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2005), 1025. On the other hand, there are scholars like Clines who note that the temple is for the glory or prestige of the elite or the priests and the people have little to gain (as well as the possibility of losing ground, freedom, or status) from rebuilding the temple. Clines, *Interested Parties*, 70. The failure to acknowledge any link between the temple and the new age has clouded the post-exilic understanding of the Jerusalem temple.

⁶¹¹Solomon’s temple is presented, before and after the fall of Jerusalem in 586, as a glorious temple. However, after 586 BCE, there is a link between the temple and the new age. “It would be hard to deny that there is a link here of a kind which would have been inconceivable to some of the pre-exilic prophets.” Coggins, *Haggai*, 34.

⁶¹²Redditt, *Haggai*, 33. However, Redditt misses the point when he writes that “[a]s a prediction of things about to happen in the sixth century, the book of Haggai seems to have been too optimistic.” *Ibid.*, 34. Here, Redditt is judging the prophecy of the text of Haggai by the outcome of latter events. One cannot presume to claim that the latter second temple construction is what Haggai prophesied. The glory of the second temple did not exceed the former in glory; all nations did not come to the temple bringing their delight, all armies were not overthrown. Redditt criticizes Haggai for being too optimistic, but how can this be proven until the first part of the prophecy within Haggai is realized? At this moment, one can merely declare that the prophecy of Haggai has not been realized, not that it was too optimistic. It is because of the fact that the Jerusalem temple was finished and the *eschaton* did not come that later writings were brought into the debate, such as the Temple Scroll from Qumran, with a new ideal temple ground plan to bring the *eschaton*. What temple ground plan did Haggai intend? Some, as has already been mentioned, propose that it was the temple of Ezek 40–48. This temple has yet to be built; if this is true, any pronouncement on the optimism of the text is premature until that temple is built.

This message is central to the message of the book of Haggai.⁶¹³ Carroll notes that the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah were composed of exhorting the people of Judah “to seize the opportunity of creating the new age.”⁶¹⁴ “They were staking their reputations on that project and until it was built they were able to account satisfactorily for the non-appearance of the new age.”⁶¹⁵

Zechariah

Because of the important roles it performed for the people and cult, it is hard to overestimate the importance of the temple in the book of Zechariah, or in many of the other books in the Hebrew Scriptures, for that matter. The text of Zechariah shows that the temple must be built.⁶¹⁶ Throughout the book of Zechariah, the temple is an important

⁶¹³“Again, we see the centrality of eschatological hope to the preaching of Haggai. He has no other message.” Mason, “Prophets,” 144. Verhoef introduces Haggai with three main themes: God, the temple, and eschatology. Verhoef, *Haggai*, 33-39. Here, it can be seen that the three themes are actually one. The theme of Haggai is that the presence of God in the Jerusalem temple is linked to the new age.

⁶¹⁴R. Carroll, *Prophecy*, 158.

⁶¹⁵*Ibid.*, 162. Even when the second temple had been built and the new age did not come to be, it is important to note that people continued to hope as well as postulate what might have deferred the coming of the new age. Was it that the temple’s sacred ground layout was not right, or was it something else? “The failure of God to inaugurate his own eschatological realm may have discouraged Haggai and Zechariah and their followers, but it did not convince them, or at least all of them, that their only hope was to wait for what had been deferred.” J. D. Levenson, *Program of Restoration*, 162. The questions of why it did not come continued to produce different Jewish writings of the second temple period. The ideal Jerusalem temple that would fulfill the prophecies covered above became stronger in later second temple Jewish writings. Plöger notes, “A substantial contribution of the unrest was probably made by the restoration eschatology, which in the dark years of the exile had been the hope and mainstay of the ‘Pious’ and which had certainly not been silenced by the rebuilding of the Temple, as some of the Diaspora may have hoped; in fact, it had perhaps even gained in strength.” Plöger, *Theocracy*, 109. Beale reflects upon the writings and proposes that Judaism waited for a future eschatological temple because of the lackluster temple compared to the description of Hag 2:3-9 and the failure of the temple of Ezek 40–48 to materialize. Beale, *Church’s Mission*, 116. While they waited, other calls for the temple came and further critiques of the second temple came in later second temple Judaism. “Entre cette eschatologie et les oracles des anciens prophètes, il y a cette différence capitale: chez les anciens prophètes, la matière eschatologique traditionnelle restait plus ou moins à l’arrière-plan.” Causse, “Le mythe,” 328. Eschatology came to the foreground and the Jerusalem temple carried expectations of blessings with it.

⁶¹⁶O’Brien notes how vitally important the building of the temple is to God in Zechariah. O’Brien, *Nahum*, 176. Finitsis concludes that “[t]he goal of his visions was to show that his audience is presented with a singular opportunity to rebuild the temple.” Finitsis, *Visions*, 172.

backdrop to the claims within the text.⁶¹⁷ The temple symbolism, throughout the book, dictates aspects of the visions and concepts.⁶¹⁸ Right up front in Zech 1:16, the text has the Lord asserting that the temple will be built in Jerusalem.⁶¹⁹

At the outset of this investigation into the Jerusalem temple in the book of Zechariah, the obvious must be noted. As in Haggai, Zechariah does not present a ground plan of the temple, which the text asserts will be built. However, *מִדָּה* (a measuring line) in Zech 2:5 indicates the importance of the correct form, as Jerusalem is the place to be measured.⁶²⁰ Peckham notes the dependence of Zech 2:4-5 upon the measuring in Ezek 40-42.⁶²¹ It is important to note that the verb to measure, *מָדַד*, does not show up in the 1 Kings temple building narrative, the Exodus tabernacle building narrative, or the later Ezra and Nehemiah temple building narrative. Yet, the verb *מָדַד* does show up in

⁶¹⁷This is seen in chaps. 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, and 14 as is shown in this analysis.

⁶¹⁸Seybold notes that, in Zechariah, “die Tempelsymbolik beherrscht die Wahl der Begriffe und Vorstellungen.” Klaus Seybold, *Bilder zum Tempelbau: Die visionen des Propheten Sacharja* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1974), 108. Meyers and Meyers note that the focus of chap. 8 is the temple and its leadership. Meyers and Meyers, *Haggai*, lv.

⁶¹⁹Floyd comments that this reference here in 1:16 “makes clear that this is a fundamental goal of the return” of the Lord. Floyd, *Minor Prophets*, 335.

⁶²⁰Although the phrase *מִדָּה* is used only here in the Hebrew Scriptures, the idea of measured portions is quite important; this idea includes the understanding of a portion for the Lord and the measured portion for the Lord’s people. The use of *מִדָּה* in Job 21:17 shows the desire to let the Lord apportion correctly. The use of *מִדָּה* in Ps 78:55 shows a predominate idea within the Hebrew Scriptures that the Lord apportioned, by casting lots, the Promised Land for the Hebrew tribes. The Lord measures to take away portions even from the chosen people when they are unfaithful, as shown by the uses in Amos 7:17 and Mic 2:5. In 2 Sam 8, a measuring line (*מִדָּה*) is used to decide who lives and who dies. The pleasant portions (*מִדָּה*) fall to the Lord’s favored (Ps 16:6). Furthermore, this measuring line in Zech 2:5 clearly indicates that the pleasant lot is measured for the Lord’s portion, building the Jerusalem temple. R. Smith, *Micah-Malachi*, 195. Carl F. Keil and Franz Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament*, trans. James Martin (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993), 10:242. The idea of stretching a line, though using *מָדַד*, shows up in a creation context in Job 38:5. The link to creation, as well as the temple, may point to the new age.

⁶²¹Brian Peckham, *History and Prophecy: The Development of Late Judean Literary Traditions* (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 777. Again, Ezra may have a different idea. However, since the books are not contemporary, there is no insight on how (or if) Zechariah agrees with Ezra. The two books do not necessarily agree. Notwithstanding any disagreement, the methodology of this investigation is to examine each text individually on its own terms. Thus, the disagreement between Zechariah and Ezra is of no consequence. This methodology is vital to present an accurate description of each text, rather than to present an inaccurate harmonized description.

measuring Jerusalem in Zech 2:6.⁶²² Both the declaration in Zech 4:7 that the cornerstone (this phrase could also be translated “top stone” or “first stone”) will be placed to cheers of the people and the possible plumb line of 4:10 remind the reader that the correct form (i.e., ground plan, floor plan, and location) is important.⁶²³ The implications within Zechariah inform the understanding that the temple will lead to blessing the people (Zech 8:9-17), whereas the first temple was destroyed and lay in ruins and ended with the people being oppressed, as now they were under Persian rule.⁶²⁴

When considered as a whole, the force of the temple imagery in Zechariah places great importance upon the Jerusalem temple, which Zechariah affirms will soon be built.⁶²⁵ The declaration in 1:16 maintains the temple will be built. There is the measuring of Jerusalem in 2:5-7 as well as a declaration in 2:9 that the Lord will be in her midst. Zechariah 2:14-17 tells of the Lord dwelling in Zion.⁶²⁶ Chapter 3 has a vision of a satan accusing the high priest of the temple. Chapter 4 depicts a menorah, probably referring to the temple, and notes the importance of the cornerstone of the temple. The call to build the temple in 6:12-15, the understanding of the temple in 8:1-17, and the future of the temple depicted in chap. 14 all demonstrate that the temple is central to the message of the book of Zechariah with great expectations upon it.⁶²⁷

⁶²²This verb is prominently used in the temple vision of Ezek 40-42.

⁶²³The phrase *הַבַּיִת יִבָּנֶה בְּיָדֵינוּ* could be plumb line, stone of distinction, tin stone, or plummet. Rashi here notes that the cheers are because the plumb line will help correct the cornerstone. Stavsky, *Twelve Prophets*, 223.

⁶²⁴Price goes further, noting that the second temple “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.” Price, “Desecration and Restoration,” 322.

⁶²⁵Most of the ideas come from what is called first Zechariah or Zech 1-8. Although as the context and presentation in chap. 14 shows, not all the temple imagery and importance are from first Zechariah alone.

⁶²⁶This numbering is the Hebrew text, the English numbers the verses as 2:10-13.

⁶²⁷“The prophets Haggai and Zechariah, who supported the building of the temple with prophetic oracles and admonitions, give us deep insight into some of what I call temple ‘typology,’ that is the

The call in Zechariah to build the Jerusalem temple is tied to the new eschatological age of blessing and salvation for Israel (Zech 8:3-8).⁶²⁸ Zechariah makes a connection between the new temple and the new age for creation (Zech 8:9-17).⁶²⁹ The temple has more than just a connection to a new age; Zechariah posits that the building of the temple is an event that is connected to expectations of an imminent new age (Zech 1, 2, 4, 6, and 8).⁶³⁰ The call is specific to Zion, the Jerusalem temple.⁶³¹ This new age is not merely the Davidic state resurrected;⁶³² Zechariah “looks for the imminent eschatological saving event.”⁶³³ The world as depicted in Zechariah is on the verge, the cusp, of this new

theological, symbolic, and ‘cosmic’ ideas behind temple building in general.” John M. Lundquist, *The Temple of Jerusalem: Past, Present, Future* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2008), 76.

⁶²⁸Redditt notes that the call to build the temple was indeed eschatological, ushering in the new age of blessing especially focused upon Israel. Redditt, *Haggai*, 44.

⁶²⁹Ackroyd notes, “The interconnection between the rebuilding of the Temple and the establishment of the new age is brought out in 1.16, and also in 8.9ff. . . . This interconnection is also implied in other sections where the place of the ‘Branch’ is indicated, or where the restoration of Jerusalem—of which, as we may see in the opening of ch. 8, the Temple is the centre—is promised as the indication of the beginnings of that change of fortune which was to follow on the fulfillment of the seventy-year prophecy.” Ackroyd, *Exile*, 175.

⁶³⁰O’Brien notes that “First Zechariah makes clear that the current, historical event of rebuilding the Temple is itself inaugurating a new era. The coming of an idyllic future is envisioned not as a radical disruption of current events, but as an unfolding of them.” O’Brien, *Nahum*, 221. The inclusion of the temple and the sacrifices on the day which the new age begins in chap. 14 would also maintain that this would hold for Second Zechariah as well.

⁶³¹Zion and Jerusalem are prominent in Zechariah, which is important although it can be easily overlooked. Redditt notes of Zechariah, as well as Haggai, that Zion is the particular place for initiating the *eschaton*. Redditt, *Haggai*, 44. The uses of the terms Zion or Jerusalem occur the most in Zechariah of all the Hebrew Scriptures when considering the number of verses where either occur normalized by the number of verses in the book. The terms occur in Zechariah 19.431% of the verses compared to the average of 2.95% of the verses.

⁶³²When Meyers and Meyers maintain that the temple will bring Jerusalem’s centrality within a Davidic nation, one must be wary of such a concept. Meyers and Meyers, *Haggai*, 161. The people living to old age shows that it does indeed go beyond the Davidic nation restored (Zech 8:4-6). This does not imply anything adverse to a new Davidic ruler, but that this new state will be unlike the previous Davidic nation. However, they also note “[t]he building of this temple is a future and probably eschatological event.” *Ibid.*, 356.

⁶³³Von Rad, *OT Theology*, 285.

age.⁶³⁴ As depicted in the text of Zechariah, the temple takes on a vital task in the visions within the book.⁶³⁵ Walton notes that the building of the temple in Zechariah “is promoted on the premise that when God again takes up his residence among his people, he will be able to establish justice in their land, protect them from enemies, and resume the fulfillment of the long-term plan for his people that had been temporarily interrupted by the exile.”⁶³⁶ In chap. 6, the understanding that the temple would be built is the prelude to a plan of peace (6:13). This narrative shows that the new age would not begin until the Jerusalem temple was built.⁶³⁷ Zechariah 1:16 shows that the temple building will begin as the Lord either has, or will, return. The verb *וַיִּבְנֶה*, a perfect, may posit that Zechariah had already believed the Lord had returned; however, a prophetic perfect is much more likely, since the verb is followed by the imperfect *וַיִּבְנֶה*, indicating a future tense or unfinished aspect and thus implying that the temple, the subject of this *Niphal* verb, will be built in some future time.⁶³⁸ Zechariah held that the imminent return of the Lord was a certainty with the perfect aspect and creation would be changed due to the presence of the Lord. Rost comes to the unavoidable conclusion from Zechariah that the temple construction is a must if restoration and salvation are to be realized for all creation.⁶³⁹

⁶³⁴Note the anticipatory participle *וַיִּבְנֶה* in 2:13, *about to wave* my hand, indicating an imminent event. This is quite a turnaround; the Lord is about to give the nations, who had been the victors, to oppressed Israel, who had been servants.

⁶³⁵Petersen observes, “It is clear that Zechariah’s visionary world presumes the existence of a rebuilt temple (cf. Zech. 3.7).” Petersen, “Temple,” 136.

⁶³⁶Walton, *Ancient Thought*, 129.

⁶³⁷Redditt notes this about Zech 4. Redditt, *Haggai*, 69.

⁶³⁸Mason notes this possibility as well. Mason, *Haggai*, 38.

⁶³⁹Rost argues that “[s]ollte der Bau des Tempels und die Einrichtung und Durchführung des Kults wirklich nötig sein, um die Leuchtkraft der Augen Jahwes zu sichern? Es scheint mir unausweichlich zu sein, dies als Meinung des Sacharja herauszustellen.” Rost goes on to comment that entry into the eschatological (he uses messianic) kingdom is dependent only upon the temple construction after which the promised new creation would begin. Leonhard Rost, “Bemerkungen zu Sacharha 4,” *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 63 (1951): 220-221.

Although present in Haggai, Zechariah stresses the presence of God in the Jerusalem temple more than Haggai. In chaps. 2, 4, and 8 of Zechariah, important declarations about God dwelling in the temple are made.⁶⁴⁰ Starting in chap. 2, the presence of God in the Jerusalem temple is strongly proclaimed. The emphatic first-person singular pronoun is used in conjunction with a first-person singular verb to produce an emphatic declaration from God that God will indeed be a wall for Jerusalem, combined with the understanding that God will be in her midst, that is, in Jerusalem (2:9 [2:5 Eng.]). Also in chap. 2 are two announcements (2:14, 15 [2:10-11 Eng.]) that God will dwell, יָבֹשֶׁבֶת, in Jerusalem.⁶⁴¹

The rousing from the holy abode in Zech 2:17 (2:13 Eng.) is probably not from the Jerusalem temple.⁶⁴² However, the *Niphal* verb נִעוֹר in Zech 2:17 requires some attention. With the imperative in the previous clause along with the *vav*-consecutive perfect verbal forms of the Zech 2:14-17 passage, the context of the verb נִעוֹר shows that the event is about to happen,⁶⁴³ not that it already has occurred as would be normal for a

⁶⁴⁰Boda notes the obvious fact in Zechariah's perspective that "[t]he rebuilding of the temple will be useless if God does not bless the structure and community with his manifest presence." Boda, *Haggai, Zechariah*, 238.

⁶⁴¹It is on chap. 2 that Petersen has conflicting statements about the presence of God in the Jerusalem temple. Petersen takes the statement that God is a wall for Jerusalem, proposing that "Jerusalem was to be a city without discrete boundaries and without Yahweh's being localized in the temple." Petersen, *Haggai*, 172. However, he takes the uses of יָבֹשֶׁבֶת in chap. 2 to be a proposal that the wording makes it clear that the Lord's "presence will dwell in the temple." *Ibid.*, 180. Both cannot be correct, yet, there is no need to see a contradiction between God being a wall for Jerusalem as well as dwelling within her. In fact, the two are naturally complementary. Ackroyd states how the two concepts complement each other. He states that "the nature of the new city, which will spread abroad in the land, protected by the presence of God himself, who being in the city—in the Temple which is his dwelling—gives glory to it, that is, he makes of it a place in which the glory of his presence is known." Ackroyd, *Exile*, 179.

⁶⁴²Redditt notes this as well as Baldwin, Boda, and others. Redditt, *Haggai*, 62; Baldwin, *Haggai*, 112; Boda, *Haggai, Zechariah*, 239. However, Sweeney notes that this is the Jerusalem temple. Sweeney, *Twelve Prophets*, 2:592.

⁶⁴³Note the combination of particle and participle, אֲנִי נִעוֹר, in Zech 2:14 at the beginning of this passage, which also implies the event is imminent.

perfect aspect.⁶⁴⁴ The text of Zech 2 declares that the glory of the Lord is about to return to the temple, when it is built.⁶⁴⁵ In chap. 4, the vision of the menorah puts the presence of the Lord in the temple as vital to the renewal of Israel.⁶⁴⁶ In chap. 8, the verb יָשָׁב is used twice to claim that the Lord will dwell among Israel.⁶⁴⁷ Kodell notes how the Lord “promises to ‘dwell’ in the midst of Jerusalem (v. 3). The verb used to express God’s settling down with his people is rich with biblical memories. It is the Hebrew *shakan*, the word used to express God’s presence with his people in a tent in early nomadic days (Exod 25:8; 29:46). Now it has the sense of messianic completion and finality.”⁶⁴⁸ The dwelling of the Lord in the temple in Zech 8:3 leads to a new outcome, where the old men and women of Jerusalem will live in the streets safely,⁶⁴⁹ with the streets being full

⁶⁴⁴Though none seem to view this word as a participle, there are textual and contextual indications that this is a participle. Most view it as the perfect tense such as Beall, Banks, and Smith. Todd S. Beall, William A. Banks, and Colin Smith, *Old Testament Parsing Guide: Job-Malachi* (Chicago: Moody, 1990), 290. Gesenius calls this verb a perfect and compares it to the root יָשָׁב . Wilhelm Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A. E. Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910), 199. This comparison is not a good fit because the י at the beginning of the root יָשָׁב prefers a different class of vowel than the י . There is an issue with the Masoretic pointing. In looking at hollow verbs in the *Niphal*, the pointing on this verb in Zech 2:17 should be different. In all the hollow verbs that begin with an י , like in Zech 2:17, the root יָשָׁב in Prov 12:8 has a *patah* as the leading vowel pointing for a *Niphal* participle and Isa 21:3 also has a *patah* as the leading vowel pointing for a *Niphal* perfect. Although there is no rule that יָשָׁב and יָשָׁב (the only two hollow roots that begin with an י) must have the same vowel pointing scheme, the difference is a noted deviation from what would be expected. Also, it is important to note that this is the only use of יָשָׁב in the *Niphal* perfect (or *Niphal* participle if it is in fact a participle) in the Hebrew Scriptures. Contextually, an anticipatory participle would make better contextual sense as this verse is saying the Lord is about to be roused, not that the Lord already has been roused.

⁶⁴⁵Peckham ties this passage to Ezek 43:1-5 and Hag 2:14 with the return of the glory to Jerusalem. Peckham, *History*, 778.

⁶⁴⁶Sweeney observes: “[T]he explanation that these are the eyes of YHWH clearly presupposes that the seven lamps of the menorah must represent the presence of YHWH in the Temple.” Sweeney, *Twelve Prophets*, 2:612.

⁶⁴⁷Mitchell et al. stress the nature of יָשָׁב by noting that “this is to be a final reunion between him and his people, for he is careful to say that he will *abide*, make his permanent home, *in Jerusalem*.” Mitchell, Smith, and Bewer, *Haggai*, 206.

⁶⁴⁸Jerome Kodell, *Lamentations, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Obadiah, Joel, Second Zechariah, Baruch* (Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1982), 85.

⁶⁴⁹In Zech 8:4-5, as well as Isa 65:20, both texts hold to an understanding that long life is a blessing of this new age. “The new age as it is understood by Haggai and Zechariah is marked by the expectation of divine presence and blessing.” Ackroyd, *Exile*, 154.

of children (8:5).⁶⁵⁰ The presence of God in the temple starts the flow of blessings to the people.⁶⁵¹

Zechariah presents the presence of God dwelling in the Jerusalem temple as the source of national restoration, international transformation, and cosmic re-creation.⁶⁵² Within Israel, the declaration in Zech 8:4-5 shows that the people will live longer, be prosperous, and dwell in safety.⁶⁵³ Glazier-McDonald notes that Zechariah “saw the completion of the Temple as the decisive turning point that would inaugurate the new age of Yahweh’s salvation, of well-being and prosperity, of military and political deliverance, of the ingathering of God’s still-scattered people (8:7-8).”⁶⁵⁴ God could dwell in the

⁶⁵⁰Zechariah 8:3 and Isa 62:2b-4, along with Ezek 48:35, show a coherent picture where the new age brings a new name for Jerusalem. Smith links the naming of Zech 8:3 with Ezek 48:35 and Isa 62:2b-4. R. Smith, *Micah-Malachi*, 232. The new outcomes mentioned in this verse illustrate why a new name is needed for Jerusalem.

⁶⁵¹Baldwin notes that the presence of the Lord is the means to unlocking blessings that are to follow for all the people. Baldwin, *Haggai*, 150. Petersen notes that the presence of the Lord in the temple produces miraculous effects. Petersen, *Haggai*, 180. The eschatological age, the new creation of God, comes from God’s presence on earth and in history in a physical sense. Kraus notes that newness and renewal come from God. Kraus, *Psalms*, 105. De Young notes that the presence of God, in a complete sense, is found in the eschatological contexts of texts in Zechariah and Joel and that this presence will only be fully complete in the new Jerusalem. J. C. De Young, *Jerusalem in the New Testament: The Significance of the City in the History of Redemption and in Eschatology* (Kampen, Netherlands: Kok, 1960), 45.

⁶⁵²Brown stresses the fact that it is God’s presence in the temple within the community of Israel that produces the international and cosmic events. M. Brown, *Gate of Heaven*, 127.

⁶⁵³Here, Brown notes that “God’s return will recapture Jerusalem’s former integrity and status as a center of worship. . . . God’s restorative grace casts a net of protection and prosperity upon the struggling community, wherein all, particularly the aged and the very young, shall sit and rest out in the open.” *Ibid.*, 161. Sweeney ties Zech 8:7 to Ezek 40–48 with the promise of salvation. Sweeney, *Twelve Prophets*, 2:649. It is important to notice the anticipatory participle *בְּשׂוֹמְרֵי* here, adding to the intense imminent context of the coming new age.

⁶⁵⁴Beth Glazier-McDonald, “Zechariah,” *Women’s Bible Commentary*, ed. Carol A. Newsom and Sharon H. Ringe (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992), 230. Contra Boda, who claims the restoration of the people is typified by the restoration of the temple. Boda misses the important point that the restoration of the people is affected by the temple restoration. Mark J. Boda, “Hoy, Hoy: The Prophetic Origins of the Babylonian Tradition in Zechariah 2:10-17,” in *Tradition in Transition: Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 in the Trajectory of Hebrew Theology*, ed. Mark J. Boda and Michael H. Floyd (New York: T. & T. Clark, 2008), 185. Tollington notes that this passage in Zechariah shows Jerusalem’s society will be transformed by the presence of the Lord. Tollington, “Haggai,” 232. The eschatological thrust of some prophetic texts is upon the turning point in history. Jenni notes that Haggai and Zechariah are in feverish expectation of the turning point in history as he notes “[n]och deutlicher als bei Kyros ist hier die eschatologische Erwartung das vorgegebene Primäre. In der fieberhaften Erwartung der letzten Wendung der Geschichte.” Ernst Jenni, *Die politischen Voraussagen der Propheten* (Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1956), 103-104. “For Haggai and Zechariah then the temple was the key to the transition from the old age to the

temple after it is built, and God’s presence would provide the impetus for blessings upon the people.⁶⁵⁵ Zechariah posits these blessings in clear eschatological language. The blessings of old age and safety in 8:4-5, safety under one’s own vine and fig tree, the nations desiring to attach themselves to Israel in order to worship the Lord in 2:15 and 8:23, the bounteous prosperity in 2:8 and 14:21, judgment against the wicked in 5:3-8, and action against the nations in 2:13 are all indicative of eschatological language.

The eschatological language presents the new age looming close to the present time, as seen with the anticipatory participle in Zech 2:13, **וְהָיִיתִי**.⁶⁵⁶ This verse clearly redefines international relations, presenting this fact as an eschatological blessing to Israel. It is for protection against the nations that the Lord will be a wall for Jerusalem (2:9). The Lord is a wall of fire for Jerusalem, greater than a common wall of stone to protect the city. This wall of fire is because the Lord is in the midst of Jerusalem (2:9), indicating a new age.⁶⁵⁷ Creation itself is changed. In Zech 3:9, it is affirmed that the iniquity of the land will be removed in one day, **בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא**, the day the glory of the Lord first resides in the Jerusalem temple. In Zech 2:16, the ground itself becomes holy,⁶⁵⁸

new age.” R. Carroll, *Prophecy*, 162. Plöger notes that the events of the time of Haggai and Zechariah were considered both eschatological and normal with the statement that “prophetic interpretation of contemporary events on the lips of Haggai and Zechariah, i.e. by an interpretation which may be regarded as preserving the old order but at the same time as eschatological.” Plöger, *Theocracy*, 33. Von Rad understands the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah on the rebuilding of the temple to be “wholly within the perspective of a great eschatological event.” Von Rad, *OT Theology*, 297. Haggai, Zechariah, and Trito-Isaiah use language of new creation to depict events which they believed to be imminent upon rebuilding of the Jerusalem temple. Nickelsburg, “Eschatology,” 2:582. Price notes that Haggai and Zechariah urge the building of the Jerusalem temple with the imminent result that the eschatological era would begin. Price, “Desecration and Restoration,” 322.

⁶⁵⁵Gowan remarks that “the source of the good life in Zion is the presence of the Lord in its midst.” Gowan, *Eschatology*, 6.

⁶⁵⁶Tollington notes how Zech 2:13 is eschatological. Tollington, “Haggai,” 231. Notice also the phrase in v. 2:14, **וְהָיִיתִי וְאֶדְבֹּק אֵת הַיָּדָיִם**, I am about to come and I will dwell. The phrasing, with the anticipatory participle and the *vav*-consecutive perfect, seems to indicate imminent events in an eschatological setting.

⁶⁵⁷Meyers and Meyers note that this wall bridges between the current existence and the eschatological reality. Meyers and Meyers, *Haggai*, 161.

⁶⁵⁸Ackroyd notes that once the Lord is “present in his Temple in Zion, the whole land—the actual ground itself—becomes holy.” Ackroyd, *Exile*, 181. This could be linked to Ezek 43:2, with the land

though only after the Lord has come to dwell in the temple (2:15).⁶⁵⁹ The Hebrew phrase in Zech 2:16, אֲדָמַת הַקֹּדֶשׁ, is similar to only Exod 3:5 in the Scriptures, where אֲדָמַת הַקֹּדֶשׁ occurs. The localization of Exod 3:5, where the ground itself becomes holy and Moses must remove his sandals, seems dwarfed by the new holy land, which refers to all the territory of Judah in the book of Zechariah.

Isaiah 56–66

Although the book of Isaiah as a whole centers on Jerusalem as the chosen city of God,⁶⁶⁰ throughout the last eleven chapters of Isaiah there is an emphasis on the Jerusalem temple,⁶⁶¹ which is presented as a crucial place within creation and is connected to the eschatological events about to unfold.⁶⁶² In this last section of Isaiah, it

shining from the presence of the Lord, or it could be expressing the change in creation when the Lord is present.

⁶⁵⁹Contra Peckham who maintains that Zechariah differs from Haggai here and requires more than the temple completion to bring the Lord to the temple. He maintains that the land must be restored first, before the Lord returns. Peckham, *History*, 787. Zech 2:15-16 argues against this idea. The key idea in this passage is that things will be different because of the temple. The key idea is that the people “now must set your heart from this day on, before stone is set to stone at the temple of the Lord” (Zech 2:15). The text argues that things are to be different after the temple. The fact that there is no other requirement of the text shows Peckham’s argument is without foundation.

⁶⁶⁰Von Rad, *Hexateuch*, 232. Blenkinsopp notes the use of the phrase ‘the holy mountain’ in Trito-Isaiah commenting that it is “the Jerusalem temple. Whereas the city was the focal point in chs. 49-55, in this last section, chs. 56–66, concern converges from different quarters on the temple.” Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56–66*, 140.

⁶⁶¹Yet even with this temple emphasis acknowledged by scholars, Middlemas is unfortunately absolutely correct when she highlights that the temple’s role in these chapters is “a topic hitherto regrettably unexamined.” Middlemas, “Divine Reversal,” 165.

⁶⁶²There are many anticipatory participles in critical places throughout these chapters. Some refer to the ones *about to be* gathered, those *about to be* ministers, salvation *about to* come, those *about to* inherit, the Lord is *about to* create, the Lord is *about to* complete recompense, the Lord is *about to* enter into judgment, the one *about to* come (56:8; 57:19; 61:6; 62:11; 63:1; 65:9, 17, 18; 66:6, 16, 18). Rendtorff proposes that this section of Isaiah posits “the promise of imminent salvation (chs. 60-62; 64f.)” Rolf Rendtorff, *The Old Testament: An Introduction*, trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 197. Levenson refers to the coming new heavens and new earth in Isa 65:17 as “the future one dawning just now.” J. D. Levenson, *Creation*, 90. The temple is then to become the center of a new creative process. Middlemas writes that “[t]he Temple, linked to the advent of divine intervention, becomes the place from which the radical reversal of the present distress stems.” Middlemas, “Divine Reversal,” 181.

is only at the Jerusalem temple where the one true God will be found and worshiped.⁶⁶³ Priests and ministers to the Lord are crucial to this coming change of Israel and the nations in Trito-Isaiah, and where there are priests, the text clearly implies that there is a Jerusalem temple.⁶⁶⁴ This section of Isaiah focuses not only upon the temple but eschatological restoration;⁶⁶⁵ this is an investigation of the interplay between these two themes in Isa 56–66.⁶⁶⁶

The last eleven chapters of Isaiah present the dwelling of God, the Jerusalem temple, as important to the beginning of salvation to Israel, the nations, and creation.⁶⁶⁷ The hope presented within this section for Israel and the nations is dependent upon the advent of God coming into the temple.⁶⁶⁸ Isaiah 56:1 demonstrates from the very

⁶⁶³Odendaal acknowledges that Trito-Isaiah, as well as Deutero-Isaiah, affirms that the nations will come to believe that only in Jerusalem can the only true God be found. Dirk H. Odendaal, *The Eschatological Expectation of Isaiah 40-66 with Special Reference to Israel and the Nations* (Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1970), 175. Only at Jerusalem can comfort, rest, and refuge be found. *Ibid.*, 172. Childs notes that the themes of the restoration of Jerusalem and the nations worshiping God at the Jerusalem temple are extensively used in Isa 56–66. Brevard S. Childs, *Isaiah* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 447.

⁶⁶⁴This can be seen in Isa 56:6; 60:7, 10; 61:6; 66:21 at a minimum. Westermann states that “Trito-Isaiah’s message of salvation assumes that in the era of salvation there will be worship and sacrifice.” Westermann, *Isaiah*, 298. Whybray claims, without any foundation, that the call for there to be priests (61:6) is metaphorical. This ignores the repeated calls for and about worship on the holy mountain of God in these chapters. Whybray, *Isaiah*, 243.

⁶⁶⁵Blenkinsopp notices that this theme of eschatological restoration is presented in different ways throughout Isa 56–66. Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56–66*, 215.

⁶⁶⁶Westermann notes that “there is more about the state of things in the era of salvation than about the event which inaugurates it.” Westermann, *Isaiah*, 299. This common understanding is why an investigation is important. This investigation tries to show what the second temple Jewish texts posit on the subject of inauguration of the new age and whether the Jerusalem temple is connected to that subject.

⁶⁶⁷Much of this section of Isaiah speaks of the coming of God into creation and the effects occurring upon this entry into creation in an overt, physical manner. The temple is needed as the dwelling place of God (Isa 57:15). No indication exists that God ever dwells anywhere other than the holy mountain, the temple mount, in Jerusalem. Blenkinsopp sees Isa 60 as agreeing with Haggai that there must be a temple on Mount Zion before God comes to dwell on earth. Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56–66*, 211. Beuken notes that “the temple plays a substantial role in TI’s expectation of salvation.” Wim Beuken, “Does Trito-Isaiah Reject the Temple? An Intertextual Inquiry into Isa. 66:1-6,” in *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersel*, ed. Sipke Draisma (Kampen, Netherlands: Uitgeversmaatschappij J. H. Kok, 1989), 64.

⁶⁶⁸Oswalt notes that “[t]he only hope for Israel and for the human race is in the ‘coming’ of God.” Oswalt, *Isaiah*, 537. Westermann notes that “Trito-Isaiah equates God’s advent with the advent of salvation (56.1; 59.11; 60.1; 62.11; 63.4; 66.15; cf. in Deutero-Isaiah, 40.10 and 50.2), but leaving it in the air

beginning of Trito-Isaiah that actions are important in regard to the nearness of salvation.⁶⁶⁹ It is important to understand the sense of this call to action; Childs observes, “The linkage between Israel’s response and God’s deliverance is not conditional but causal: do righteousness that deliverance will come.”⁶⁷⁰ There is a direct link between ingathering of the exiles and worship at the temple.⁶⁷¹ Trito-Isaiah also links the temple and temple worship with the new creation to come.⁶⁷² There are direct affirmations within the text where God claims the temple as ‘my house.’⁶⁷³ The nations are assembled in order to come up to the altar at the temple.⁶⁷⁴ The nations come to God at the temple (Isa 60:4). However, as this section notes (Isa 60:13-15), the temple, God’s sanctuary, must

without firmly fixing it in history.” Westermann, *Isaiah*, 358. Here, Westermann notes correctly the effect of God’s advent. Yet, he fails to note the importance of building the temple, the dwelling for God here on earth, in the advent of the coming of God. Here, von Rad errs when he holds that there is no idea that the rebuilt temple is a precondition for the advent of the kingdom in Isaiah. Von Rad, *OT Theology*, 281. In Isaiah, the coming of God into the world to God’s temple (Isa 56:7; 57:13; 62:9; 65:9, 11, 25; 66:20) is the advent of the kingdom.

⁶⁶⁹The imperative is to do right actions, righteousness. This imperative, along with the guarding of justice, is because salvation is near. Westermann notes that it is because of this nearness to salvation that new things must begin. Westermann, *Isaiah*, 316.

⁶⁷⁰Childs, *Isaiah*, 456. Westermann also notices this aspect in 61:4, where rebuilding the ruins is how the change is accomplished. Westermann, *Isaiah*, 369.

⁶⁷¹Jenner, “Worship,” 132.

⁶⁷²Berges introduces the relationship between the temple and the expectation of the new creation, but does not complete the connection. He notes, “Jahrhunderts sind die Kapitel 65-66 zu verstehen mit ihrer Zuspitzung auf die Verhältnisbestimmung von Tempel und Tempelstadt zur Erwartung eines neuen Himmels und einer neuen Erde.” Ulrich Berges, “Der neue Himmel und die neue Erde im Jesajabuch: Eine Auslegung zu Jesaja 65:17 und 66:22,” in *The New Things: Eschatology in Old Testament Prophecy Festschrift for Henk Leene*, ed. F. Postma, K. Spronk, and E. Talstra (Maastricht, Netherlands: Uitgeverij Shaker, 2002), 11-12. Kurz observes the role for the temple and for Jerusalem where “Isaiah 56:7 promises that the restored temple on ‘my holy mountain’ (Zion) will benefit all nations. . . . As later Old Testament and New Testament prophets and apocalyptic writers imagine the end times, a glorified picture of Zion repeatedly plays a major role. Zion often symbolizes the new creation at the end of time.” William Kurz, *What Does the Bible Say about the End Times? A Catholic View* (Cincinnati, OH: Servant Books, 2004), 43.

⁶⁷³The three occur in Isa 56:5, 7. Ackroyd notes about 56:7 that the Jerusalem temple will be central for all peoples. Ackroyd, *Exile*, 229. Brueggemann relates how Isa 56:7 shows that the temple was the residence of God as the king of the land. Brueggemann, *Theology*, 658.

⁶⁷⁴Haran, “Temple and Community,” 20. Westermann notes how this section of Isaiah continues to praise the sacrificial system. Westermann, *Isaiah*, 361. Childs observes how Isa 60:7 stresses “the point of acceptable sacrifice in the restored temple of the future.” Childs, *Isaiah*, 497.

be built first.⁶⁷⁵ It is only then that God can return or, as is presented in 60:13, God will bring it glory (אֶצְבֵּר).⁶⁷⁶ In the age of peace (60:17), Jerusalem takes precedence.⁶⁷⁷

The divine presence in the Jerusalem temple is stressed as the key in relation to the change of creation.⁶⁷⁸ It is the temple as described above that is the dwelling for the presence of God on earth. Therefore, it is the coming of the divine presence that Trito-Isaiah stresses as an event that affects history. The phrase הַר קְדֹשִׁי could be translated my holy mountain, the mountain of my holiness, or the mountain of my sanctuary. The phrase occurs six times in Isaiah with only one outside of Trito-Isaiah.⁶⁷⁹ The preeminence of the temple on the temple mount is clear within Trito-Isaiah. Isaiah 57:13 declares that those seeking refuge in God will inherit and possess God's holy mountain.⁶⁸⁰ Isaiah 60:19 illustrates this divine presence with the light that replaces

⁶⁷⁵Oswalt notes the restored temple descriptions here. Oswalt, *Isaiah*, 550. Childs maintains this is not about rebuilding material for the temple, but referring to the new paradise within creation. Childs, *Isaiah*, 498. This ignores the statement in 60:13 that it is to be for the sanctuary, the footstool of God. With Childs neglecting this important statement, his suggestion cannot carry weight as the passage goes on to detail a glorified Zion only after the return of God to the temple. Regarding the new heavens and earth of Isa 65:17 and 66:22, Gowan writes: "The transformation of the wilderness was not an important expectation in its own right, but it became an appropriate accompaniment to the announcement of a triumphant return of exiles to their homeland and to the glorification of Zion." Gowan, *Eschatology*, 113. The idea of an accompaniment misses the connection that the text posits. The timetable of the text is that the exiles return, they build the temple, the glory of God returns and the transformation of creation occurs. Yes, it accompanies the return of God to the temple, but the link between the two is important in understanding the text.

⁶⁷⁶Von Rad notes that Isa 60:1-22 closely agrees with earlier understandings presented in the book though it broadens the scope. Von Rad, *Hexateuch*, 237.

⁶⁷⁷See Isa 65:18 as well.

⁶⁷⁸Middlemas notes that Trito-Isaiah proclaims the temple is the source and center of God's creative act of reversal of current circumstances. Middlemas, "Divine Reversal," 182.

⁶⁷⁹The phrase occurs in 11:9; 56:7; 57:13; 65:11, 25; 66:20. The phrase "my holy mountain" is clearly an emphasis of Trito-Isaiah, not Proto-Isaiah or Deutero-Isaiah.

⁶⁸⁰Of the ten books in the Hebrew Scriptures that use the verb קָדַשׁ, half have only one occurrence and the only book that has more than four uses of the verb is Psalms. In Psalms, the 25 uses of the verb show that it is used in seeking refuge in God, God's shade, on God's tent. All three of these refuges point to the temple. Tate notes that the tent and the shade point to the dwelling of God in the temple. Tate, *Psalms*, 114. Here in Trito-Isaiah, it is clear that those seeking refuge must go to the temple mount which is where they will dwell. More than primarily about those who are seeking refuge, Westermann notes that Isa 60:1 is "a summons to Zion." Westermann, *Isaiah*, 357.

sunlight.⁶⁸¹ Isaiah 62:9 refers to celebrating the harvest in the temple courtyards with God. Not only does Trito-Isaiah claim that the chosen of God will dwell, יְדַבֵּר, on the holy mountains,⁶⁸² God will dwell, יְדַבֵּר, in the temple forever.⁶⁸³ God's glory in the temple is light for the people (60:19), but this glory causes creation to luminesce (60:1).⁶⁸⁴ The presence of God on the holy mountain changes the wolf, lion, and lamb that reside on the holy mountain as well (65:25).⁶⁸⁵ This presence changes the name of the city as its new name becomes the city of the Lord (60:14, see also 62:4).⁶⁸⁶ The nations will observe the glory of the Lord at the Jerusalem temple (66:18).⁶⁸⁷

The important aspect of the presence of God in the Jerusalem temple is that Trito-Isaiah understands this presence as an integral part of eschatological changes upon all creation.⁶⁸⁸ The eschatological ramifications of God dwelling in the Jerusalem temple

⁶⁸¹Causse notes that "Jérusalem-Sion seule est dans la lumière parce que le kebôd Yahvé repose sur elle." Causse, "Le mythe," 382. Indeed, God comes like fire, with chariots and a storm wind as described by Isa 66:15, similar to Ezek 1 and the light that replaces sunlight is similar to the illumination of the ground in Ezek 43:2.

⁶⁸²This is from Isa 65:9. The chosen of God and God will יְדַבֵּר together.

⁶⁸³This is from Isa 57:15. Beale calls Isa 57:15 "part of an eschatological prophecy about the temple (developing 56:3-8)." Beale, *Church's Mission*, 134. Childs notes that "[v]erse 15 makes it clear that the eternal God actually dwells (skn) in his holy place." Childs, *Isaiah*, 471. Watts reads the participle as "Dweller Forever." Watts, *Isaiah*, 262. However, this could be another anticipatory participle compounded with the imperfect of the same root in the same verse implying that God is about to come and dwell forever. This may be why Whybray vacillates on whether God dwells in the temple. Regarding Isa 60:13, he holds that the temple is only the footstool, God dwells in heaven. Whybray, *Isaiah*, 235. Yet, regarding Isa 66:18, he holds that the glory of God referred to in the verse has a very restricted and intensive meaning signifying the presence of God in the temple. *Ibid.*, 289.

⁶⁸⁴Westermann observes that this imperative to shine has no parallel. Westermann, *Isaiah*, 357. However, perhaps creation luminescing is the same as Ezek 43:2 where the land, which could include people, glowed or luminesced. Baruch 5:9 states that the light of God will lead Israel with joy to Jerusalem.

⁶⁸⁵There is a redeemer in Zion (Isa 59:20), and that redeemer in Zion is the Lord (Isa 60:16).

⁶⁸⁶Ezekiel 48:35 has the name become "the Lord is there" for Jerusalem. Jeremiah 33:16 has the name "the Lord is our Righteousness" as the new name of Jerusalem.

⁶⁸⁷Rendtorff notes that the glory of the Lord is an idea that links all parts of Isaiah; however, he notes that the glory of the Lord is given special emphasis in Trito-Isaiah. Rolf Rendtorff, *Canon and Theology: Overtures to an Old Testament Theology* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993), 166.

⁶⁸⁸Oswalt sees 56–66 in a chiastic arrangement that puts eschatological hope at the center of the chiasm. Oswalt, *Isaiah*, 465. The center of this section is chap. 60 which exhibits the understanding of the presence of God: eschatological events unfolding upon the coming of God to the temple in stark fashion.

are presented throughout Trito-Isaiah beginning with chap. 56. In Isa 56:5, the reward given the eunuchs, those who cannot have offspring and would be cut off in the future, is that they will never be cut off and they will have an eternal name. The eternal reward is given at the temple when God is there; both the eternal nature and the divine presence point to the eschatological nature of the verse. In Isa 56:7, the reward given to the foreigners who worship God is that they will be brought to the temple, they will be gladdened, and their offerings will be accepted at the temple.⁶⁸⁹ The expansion of the worship of God at the Jerusalem temple signifies an eschatological time;⁶⁹⁰ it is now the other nations as well, no longer just the children of Israel who will worship the one true God in the Jerusalem temple.⁶⁹¹

The center of Trito-Isaiah proclaims that the nations will be included when the glory of the Lord comes to the temple (Isa 60:1-4). It is by the light of the Lord that nations will walk (Isa 60:3). This eternal light (Isa 60:20) is from the Lord, who has entered into creation in a new way by dwelling in the temple.⁶⁹² The mention of this eternal light, the gates being eternally open (Isa 60:11), and there being an endless peace (Isa 60:17-18) all point to the eschatological implications of God in the temple.⁶⁹³ Israel

⁶⁸⁹De Young notes the meaning of this declaration is eschatological. De Young, *Jerusalem*, 62. The context of this verse, Isa 56:7, posits no messianic claims. However, Taylor notes that *Pss. Sol.* 17:30-31 expects this to be done by a messiah. Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (London: Macmillan, 1952), 463. Here, it is important to let the original text's context take precedence for its own implications. Taylor applies this to the Gospel of Mark. This shows the eschatological nature in Isaiah that later writers noted.

⁶⁹⁰Oswalt writes: "This is the ultimate end of Israel's religion, that everyone should have the opportunity of joining Israel in worshiping the one God (cf. Zech. 14:16-21)." Oswalt, *Isaiah*, 691.

⁶⁹¹Childs notes that "the context of the divine oracle is explicitly eschatological. The promise of universal acceptance into the worshipping community is set by God's bringing them to his 'holy mountain' (v. 7), which is an intertextual play on the promise of the assembly of the nations in Isa. 2:1ff." Childs, *Isaiah*, 458.

⁶⁹²This could be taken as a critique of the first Jerusalem temple. The first Jerusalem temple did not have this effect on creation.

⁶⁹³Contra Watts, who reads this as marking "long periods of time." Watts, *Isaiah*, 296.

is to be an eternal pride throughout their generations following the indwelling of the temple (Isa 60:15). Whybray notes that the peace and righteousness of Isa 60:17 “symbolize the character of the state of perfection of the coming new age.”⁶⁹⁴ This new age will be hurried in by God (Isa 60:22); however, this does not mean that the temple, which is to be the dwelling of God, has nothing to do with the hurrying of the new age as the connections between the temple and the new age attest.⁶⁹⁵ Israel, as ministers and priests of God, will be eternally glad (Isa 61:6-7). There will be a בְּרִית עוֹלָם (eternal covenant) made between God and Israel (Isa 61:8).

In Isa 65-66, the end of Trito-Isaiah is presented in a strikingly eschatological tone.⁶⁹⁶ Here, the heavens and the earth, a merism denoting everything in creation, will be renewed with God dwelling in the Jerusalem temple (Isa 65:17, 66:22).⁶⁹⁷ The former things will not be remembered in this new age.⁶⁹⁸ Blenkinsopp writes that this is the “language of endings and new beginnings.”⁶⁹⁹ The long life in Isa 65:20 alludes also to

⁶⁹⁴Whybray, *Isaiah*, 236. Childs also maintains the eschatological nature of what Jerusalem will become after God dwells within her. “Clearly the language has become hyperbolic in projecting the new, eschatological city of God.” Childs, *Isaiah*, 498.

⁶⁹⁵Contra Hanson, he notes that according to Trito-Isaiah, “[n]either the new temple nor the cultic practices which fill it will hasten the day” of the Lord. Hanson, *Dawn*, 180.

⁶⁹⁶Whybray notes that the final section, Isa 66:18-24, is completely eschatological. Whybray, *Isaiah*, 288. Jenner also notes that Isa 66:18-23 “has unmistakably an eschatological tenor.” Jenner, “Worship,” 131. This is also clearly true of Isa 65:13-25.

⁶⁹⁷Aune holds that Isa 65:17 and/or 66:22 anticipate “the miraculous eschatological renewal of heaven and earth.” Aune and Stewart, “Idealized Past,” 173. Westermann notes that this is a divine renewal, not a complete destruction of the old replaced by the new in apocalyptic style. Westermann, *Isaiah*, 408. Goldingay notes that the description “of a new heavens and a new earth (v. 17) would sound like an abandonment of this cosmos for the creation of a new one, but vv. 18-25 make clear that the language refers to a radical transformation of this cosmos, specifically of the city in which the people live. ‘Creating a new...’ suggests ‘re-creating.’” John Goldingay, *Isaiah* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2001), 368. The root חָדַשׁ, whether in adjective or verbal use, means “to make anew, restore” or to be “new, fresh.” Koehler and Baumgartner, *HALOT*, s.v. “חָדַשׁ.” Even the use of חֹדֶשׁ, new moon, in Isa 66:23 shows the idea from each new moon, not an entirely new moon created each month. Levenson postulates that the new heaven and earth of Isa 65:17 is “functioning as a name for the Jerusalem Temple.” Jon D. Levenson, “The Temple and the World,” *Journal of Religion* 64, no. 3 (1984): 295.

⁶⁹⁸Levenson refers to the former things as “the present world order.” J. D. Levenson, *Creation*, 90.

⁶⁹⁹Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56–66*, 286. Whybray notes that this is a brand-new beginning using the language of creation as in Gen 1:1. Whybray, *Isaiah*, 276.

the new eschatological age that reminds the reader of the longevity before the flood.⁷⁰⁰ The people will build houses and live in them and plant vineyards and eat from them, both of which signal a new age that is different from the present one (Isa 65:21). The imagery of Isa 66:7-9 points to new things in this age that have never been heard of before. This follows the sound of the Lord's retribution upon enemies from the temple.⁷⁰¹ These eschatological effects show how God's dwelling in the Jerusalem temple affects all of creation.⁷⁰²

Of those commenting on the understanding of Isa 66:1-4, many, if not most, claim that there is a polemic against the building or rebuilding of the Jerusalem temple.⁷⁰³ Blenkinsopp notes that in this passage, there may be some questioning of Haggai and others who see "the link between temple-building and political emancipation (Hag 2:6-9, 20-23), and the idea that, once the temple is built, peace and prosperity will automatically and, as it were, magically be brought about (Hag 2:9, 19)."⁷⁰⁴ Barker avers that "Third

⁷⁰⁰Ibid., 277. The three uses of the phrase *בְּשָׁרָא בְּבָרָא* in Isa 66 point to the recreation story of the flood in Gen 6-9.

⁷⁰¹Whybray notes that these events presuppose the existence already of the Jerusalem temple. Whybray, *Isaiah*, 283.

⁷⁰²Perhaps, because this did not happen with the second temple in Jerusalem, Petersen notes that "the temple did not embody the full scale of values which had been anticipated for it." Petersen, "Temple," 138.

⁷⁰³This would include Whybray, Hanson, Zimmerli, Watts, Achtemeier, and Clements. Whybray, *Isaiah*, 279; Paul D. Hanson, *Isaiah 40-66* (Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1995), 199, 250; Walther Zimmerli, *Old Testament Theology in Outline*, trans. David E. Green (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978), 226; Watts, *Isaiah*, 358; E. Achtemeier, *Nahum-Malachi*, 95; Joseph Blenkinsopp, *A History of Prophecy in Israel* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 219; Clements, *God and Temple*, 57. It is important to note that Stephen in Acts 7:46-50 critiques the idea of a temple as well. Beuken notes about Stephen's speech, "For Stephen this meant the end of God's presence in the midst of Israel, because 'the Most High does not dwell in houses made with hands.' With this conception he puts Solomon's building of the temple on one line with the making and worshiping of gods, because *χειροποίητός* in LXX means idols." Beuken, "Trito-Isaiah," 53. Beuken's assertion is different from the idea Solomon is said to have said in 1 Kgs 8:27. Solomon wonders whether the Lord will dwell in the temple he built, not that the temple he built was an idol. On the point of the text here, Beuken himself does not see 66:1-2 as against the temple, "but the notion is turned down that He needs the temple and owes it to a benevolent initiative from Israel." Ibid., 63.

⁷⁰⁴Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56-66*, 294. It is important to note that Blenkinsopp here is claiming that there are second temple Jews or Jewish writers who are postulating that there is a direct correlation between a new Jerusalem temple and the coming of the eschatological age. This is why he claims that Trito-Isaiah

Isaiah questioned the value of any temple (Isa. 66.1).”⁷⁰⁵ Brueggemann claims that “[t]he purpose of this statement, however, concerns neither God in heaven nor earth as footstool. Its purpose, rather, is to minimize the importance of the Jerusalem temple as an artifact that can hardly mean much to such a great and awesome God.”⁷⁰⁶ Paul notes that these verses are “a scathing theological polemic against those who wish to build an earthly sanctuary for God.”⁷⁰⁷ If these comments were true, they would have to refer to Isa 66:1-2 in complete isolation, but even then, these comments prove unsustainable.⁷⁰⁸ As noted above and below, the temple is important to Trito-Isaiah, both before and after these few verses. Goldingay notes this high view of the temple, but sees Isa 66:1 as a counterbalance to the high view of the temple in the rest of Trito-Isaiah lest the temple “should be overestimated it is here put in its place.”⁷⁰⁹ Goldingay interprets this verse as asserting that God actually sits on the throne in the sky with God’s feet resting on the earth, which he asserts is a fact that makes “a laughing-stock of the notion that people will build a **house** where this God can relax.”⁷¹⁰ Whatever the original meaning of Isa 66:1-2, though explored below, these commentators have missed the meaning of these verses in the context.

The first of three insights that shed light on the meaning of Isa 66:1-4 in context is

here is countering that notion. This work seeks to explore and to illuminate the connection between the temple and the new age presented in second temple Jewish writings. Collins also sees Isa 66:1-2 as contradictory to Haggai in this respect. J. Collins, “From Prophecy,” 132.

⁷⁰⁵Barker, *Gate of Heaven*, 11.

⁷⁰⁶Brueggemann, *Isaiah*, 252.

⁷⁰⁷Shalom M. Paul, *Isaiah 40-66* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2012), 608.

⁷⁰⁸Middlemas notes that scholars delineate this section differently and astutely observes that “the thrust of the passage is misunderstood.” She goes on to write that this section notes that “the Temple is the locus for the intervention of the divine in history.” Middlemas, “Divine Reversal,” 180.

⁷⁰⁹Goldingay, *Isaiah*, 369. He sees this verse as a way to keep the text in balance similar to 1 Kgs 8.

⁷¹⁰*Ibid.*, 370.

the actions that are addressed in the passage. The questions ask where the temple will be built. The first question uses **וְיִבְנֶנּוּ**; the use of the imperfect shows that the temple has not been built.⁷¹¹ Looking at Isa 66:3, the issue deals with different problems regarding the offerings that were offered at the first temple (“one who slaughters an ox,” “one who offers a sheep,” “one who brings up a meal offering,” and “one who brings a frankincense remembrance” all refer to offerings), not the building of that temple.⁷¹² The natural break in this passage actually comes after v. 4,⁷¹³ which makes it clear that incorrect practices were done at the temple: “They did what was wrong in My eyes” (Isa 66:4).⁷¹⁴ The purpose of this passage is not to stop the temple construction, but to stop the ones offering sacrifices from corresponding wrong behaviors,⁷¹⁵ or to stop temple personnel from incorrect practices.⁷¹⁶ The polemic could not be against the structure of a Jerusalem temple yet to be built, when Isa 66:1 acknowledges that God has a footstool on

⁷¹¹Fishbane notes the historical setting of Isa 66:1-24. “More precisely, the period in question may be closer to 520 BCE, when discussions of rebuilding the Temple intensified within the postexilic community (see Hag 1–2). Visions of the future shrine also preoccupied Ezekiel’s attention (Ezekiel 40–48), and specific guidelines are found there (chap. 44) regarding the role of priests and foreigners in the cultic worship to be reestablished.” Michael Fishbane, *Haftarot: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation* (Philadelphia: JPS, 2002), 325.

⁷¹²As mentioned above, most see this as a polemic against building the temple. The temple is not yet built, so the attack on the offerings is similar to the attack on the practices of the first temple as in Ezek 8-11. Blenkinsopp notes that the force of this passage is to prevent incorrect syncretistic practices. Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56–66*, 278. Although Hanson believes that the passage is polemical against the building of the temple, he at least acknowledges that Isa 65:1-66:4 raises issues dealing with proper actions of the priests. Hanson, *Isaiah*, 200.

⁷¹³Isaiah 66:1 starts with **יְהוָה אָמַר יְהוָה** and Isa 66:5 starts with **שָׁמְעוּ דְבַר יְהוָה**.

⁷¹⁴Isaiah 66:4 attacks the former priests and offerers, who did what was wrong before the Lord and the former practices that were wrong in the Lord’s eyes.

⁷¹⁵The participles in Isa 66:3 address the one who offers the gift to the Lord. This could be the non-priest.

⁷¹⁶Blenkinsopp notes that “the speaker’s animus is directed more against temple personnel than against the temple itself.” Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56–66*, 296. Watts notes that “[t]he emphasis in using these participles is on the one doing these things. Either the pairs express identification (the one doing this also does that) making these an accusation of syncretism (which is not really credible here) or the one doing legal sacrifices is portrayed as no more acceptable to God than one who is doing the illegal and abhorrent things. The latter seem most fitting: a heavy insult heaped on the practicing priests.” Watts, *Isaiah*, 356.

earth.⁷¹⁷ The word בְּיָדָי when pertaining to the Lord always refers to the temple as a place of worship or the place where the ark of the covenant resides (here in Isa 66:1 and in Ps 99:5, 132:7, Lam 2:1, and 1 Chr 28:2) and never to another place or article.⁷¹⁸ Linking the footstool to the temple in Isa 66:1a illuminates a link between the temple and the throne in the sky. Isaiah 66:3-4 does not address the temple, but addresses the offerings and intent behind the offerings.

The second insight into Isa 66:1-4 is that the content is often overlooked. First, there are two questions posed by the Lord in 66:1 and both use the Hebrew phrase אֵיךְ יִבְנֶה. There are seventeen uses of this phrase in the Hebrew Scriptures and all of them ask about location.⁷¹⁹ Apparently missing this understanding, some English translations go beyond the semantic limits and err when they translate this phrase as “what.”⁷²⁰ Oswalt translates this phrase in these two questions as “what sort,” leading him to question what kind of temple could humanity truly build for God.⁷²¹ However, the text is asking the

⁷¹⁷According to Whybray, this footstool refers to “the Ark, or Zion, or the Temple.” Whybray, *Isaiah*, 280. Stuhlmüller notes that “[t]he prophetic crusade against formalism in worship is taken up again (Am 5:21-25; Hos 6:6; Mi 6:6-8). The Prophet is not rejecting the Temple—a conclusion reached by Stephen (Acts 7:48-50)—for it is God’s footstool.” Carroll Stuhlmüller, “Deutero-Isaiah,” *Jerome Biblical Commentary*, ed. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmeyer, and Roland E. Murphy (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1968), 385.

⁷¹⁸In case one were to doubt that this reference in Trito-Isaiah refers to the temple, Isa 60:13-14 makes it clear that it is to the temple that the oppressor’s descendants will come to “prostrate themselves to the soles of Your feet” (Isa 60:14). The bringing of “honor to the place of My feet” is put in parallel to “glorify the place of My sanctuary” (Isa 60:13) showing that the temple is considered the place of God’s feet (i.e., footstool).

⁷¹⁹These occur in 1 Sam 9:18; 1 Kgs 13:12, 22:24; 2 Kgs 3:8; Isa 50:1, 66:1; Jer 6:16; Job 28:12, 28:20, 38:19, 38:24; Eccl 2:3, 11:6; Esth 7:5; 2 Chr 18:23 with two occurrences in both Job 38:19 and Isa 66:1. The two uses in Ecclesiastes are somewhat more metaphysical, yet imply “where.” Ecclesiastes 2:3 asks where is the good(ness) for humanity. Ecclesiastes 11:6 states that you don’t know where your work will be successful. The rest of the uses seek where a way, person, house, scroll, or a place is located. The meaning in all of these uses concerns location.

⁷²⁰This would include the NRSV, NJB, ESV, Holman Christian Standard. The KJV, NAS, NET, and NIV correctly translate this as “where.”

⁷²¹John N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah Chapters 40-66* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 663. However, Oswalt does note that the literal translation of the Hebrew here is “where.” Ibid. Oswalt’s choice of “what sort” influences how he interprets this verse. In his analysis, he asks “What kind of resting place could we offer him?” Ibid., 667. Yet, the quality or kind of temple is not asked in Isa 66:1, it is about

question, “Where is the temple you will build for Me?” The use of the imperfect in this question, **וְהִבְנֵה**, clearly indicates that it is not built. “Where is the location of my resting place?” This question, which is essentially the same as the first, reiterates the idea that the temple is not built.⁷²² The word **בַּיִת** in Isa 66:1 is used of a temple for God. This word is also used in Isa 56:5, 7; 60:7 and 66:20 for the future Jerusalem temple as well as in Isa 64:10 (64:11 in the English) for the past Jerusalem temple. In three of these occurrences in Isa 56-66, the word **בַּיִת** is used in parallel with **הַר קְדֹשׁ**. Two of these verses are Isa 56:7 and 66:20. The third is Isa 66:1, this present verse, as the ending clause of Isa 65:25 is “they will not destroy in all My holy mountain says the Lord” (where My holy mountain can also be translated the mountain of My sanctuary) and Isa 66:1 has the topic of God’s **בַּיִת**.⁷²³ The end of 65:25 has the verb **אֶסְמַךְ** as does the beginning of 66:1 and

location. Oswalt notes that the first half of Isa 66:1 has a theme of “transcendent sovereignty.” Ibid., 666. Beyond this, Oswalt asserts that God is not a God “who could be housed in some structure made with human hands.” Ibid. His idea is that if God is the God of Gen 1, then “Where could we humans ever expect to build a house” for God?” Ibid., 667. Oswalt misses the point of these two questions because it does not fit his idea of this present verse. These questions ask about location assuming the reader would know the kind of temple to be built on earth. Oswalt does not see this verse as against building the Jerusalem temple upon return from exile. Ibid. He sees this as attacking an attitude that building the temple is how the cult will “curry favor with God.” Ibid. There is no basis for this interpretation of Isa 66:1. Oswalt has some good points to make on this topic and cites Pss 51 and 57 on this point. Ibid. However, importing the psalms into an interpretation of Isa 66:1 is not helpful to the understanding of this verse. Blenkinsopp sees Isa 66:1-4 as “the Deuteronomistic rejection of the materialistic and superstitious idea that a temple is quite literally the house of a deity. In place of this ancient, persistent, and widely held belief, the Deuteronomists substituted the idea of the temple as the location of the divine Name.” Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56–66*, 295.

⁷²²Fishbane correctly comments that these two questions are asking the same thing. Fishbane, *Haftarot*, 328.

⁷²³There are some who see some relationship between these verses. Motyer notes the literary structure of Isa 65 links with the structure of Isa 66 with a “stress on making one’s own citizenship of the new Jerusalem a certainty.” J. Alec Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah: An Introduction & Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity, 1993), 531. Emmerson also notes a link between these verses. “Finally, the expression ‘my holy mountain’ in 65.25, although probably signifying here the land of Israel, is used elsewhere frequently as a designation of Mount Zion, and so provides a link with 66.1 which is concerned with the true nature of God’s dwelling place.” Grace I. Emmerson, *Isaiah 56-66* (Sheffield: Sheffield, 1996), 18. Watts deals with this section, Isa 65:17-66:5, as one section with the topic of the Lord finishing the New Jerusalem. Watts, *Isaiah*, 349-358. Oswalt calls 65:17-66:24 the “final section of the book.” Oswalt, *Isaiah*, 665. Newsome, as well, notes the interior elements that tie this section together. James D. Newsome, Jr., *The Hebrew Prophets* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1984), 174. Many, if not most, commentators do not address whether or not there is any relationship between Isa 65:25 and 66:1 (e.g., Westermann, *Isaiah*; Hanson, *Isaiah*; Brueggemann, *Isaiah*; John Scullion, *Isaiah 40-66* [Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1982]; Homer Hailey, *A Commentary on Isaiah with Emphasis on the Messianic Hope*

both have the Lord as the subject. However, some might hold that 66:1 begins a new divine speech with the words, “Thus says the Lord ...” If this is true, then 65:25 and 66:1 are in separate divine speeches, which could mitigate the connection between them.⁷²⁴ The end of 65:25 and the beginning of 66:1 have the Lord speaking about the holy mountain and the temple and resting place. These two verses have the same speaker, the same verb, and the same topic, showing continuity between these two verses in this passage. The chapter break occurs as the Lord is speaking about the location הַר קְדֹשׁ in 65:25 and בַּיַּת אֲשֶׁר תִּבְנֶה לִּי, the temple which you will build for Me, in 66:1. The use of the word בַּיַּת in Isa 56-66, when it is God’s, always refers to either the past or the future temple.⁷²⁵ The two questions in Isa 66:1 that ask where the temple will be built also show that the location is what the author considers as important. This can be clearly seen from the beginning particles of both questions, in addition to the repetition of the particles, and the use of מְקוֹם which means location.⁷²⁶ The imperfect aspect of the verb in the first question makes it clear that the temple has not yet been rebuilt. There is no command or insinuation that a physical temple will not be built in Jerusalem in the future.⁷²⁷ There

[Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1985]; I. W. Slotki and A. J. Rosenberg, *Isaiah* [New York, NY: Soncino, 1983]; Goldingay, *Isaiah*). Although Paul details many links between chaps. 65 and 66, he has no comment on whether or not there is a relationship between these two verses (although he notes the topic of My holy mountain in 65:11, 25 and 66:20, but does not mention this location in association with 66:1): Paul, *Isaiah 40-66*, 608-610. Many see Isa 66 as a collection of unconnected passages. Whybray suggests that “[m]ost commentators agree that this chapter is a collection of disparate elements with a minimum of editorial links.” Whybray, *Isaiah*, 279. McKenzie asserts that Isa 66:1-4 “is not only unconnected with the preceding one, it stands by itself in the collection in Third Isaiah.” John L. McKenzie, *Second Isaiah: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (New York, NY: Doubleday, 1968), 203. Yet even among these assertions, there is absolutely no comment on why verses 66:25 and 66:1 are put back to back.

⁷²⁴I, personally, do not believe this is true.

⁷²⁵Blenkinsopp notes that “it is extremely unlikely that the passage refers to any cult center other than Jerusalem.” Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56–66*, 294.

⁷²⁶The emphasis is on location in this verse.

⁷²⁷In 2 Sam 7:5, the Lord asks הֲאֵתָהּ תִּבְנֶה לִּי בַיַּת (Will it be you that builds a temple for Me?). Here, the question obviously asks about building the temple which is answered later in the passage. In 2 Sam 7:13, there is clear indication that David would not build the first temple. This Isaiah passage is not about whether or not the temple will be built, but “where” the temple will be built. How can the priest, mentioned later in this passage, minister if there is no temple at which to minister.

may be some disagreement between Isa 66:1 and Ezek 43:7 on the idea of a throne,⁷²⁸ but there is no disagreement within Trito-Isaiah on the need for a temple.

The last insight into Isa 66:1-4 examined here is the cumulative effect of the expectations of the following material of this chapter. If these verses were meant as a polemic against the building of the temple, then the following material would not advocate for a temple. However, the opposite is clearly true. The arrival of the Lord in Jerusalem and the sounds from the temple (Isa 66:5-6) clearly counter any idea that Isa 66:1 would proclaim the opposite.⁷²⁹ In Isa 66:20, 21, and 23, the future temple is depicted as in use as the dwelling of God and the place of offerings, where priests and Levites work. The context of Isa 66 shows that the temple will not only be in use, but it will be vitally important, as this is where the events start, and this is where the nations come to worship God.⁷³⁰ This echoes all of Trito-Isaiah in demonstrating the important interaction between the temple and the divine presence of God in the temple, so that ministry at the temple by the priests, both Israelite and non-Israelite, in the new age can begin.

Micah 4:1-7/Isaiah 2:1-4

The passage preserved in Mic 4:1-7 and Isa 2:1-4 is of disputed origin and date. However, the scope of this present work is the Jerusalem temple limited to the period after the first destruction of the temple in 586 BCE and before the destruction of the temple in 70 CE. Micah and Proto-Isaiah are confidently dated to the time before the

⁷²⁸Ezekiel 43:7 asserts that the future temple is the place of God's throne and the place of God's footstool. Here in Isa 66:1, the sky is God's throne and the earth is God's footstool.

⁷²⁹Oswalt, *Isaiah*, 667.

⁷³⁰Vermeulen rightly understands that the nations will come up to the temple, not merely to Mt. Zion. "[I]l appartient à une petite série de textes des livres prophétiques où l'on rencontre l'idée d'une montée pacifique des nations vers le mont Sion et, plus précisément, vers le Temple." Jacques Vermeulen, "La lumière de Sion: Isaïe 60 et ses redactions successives," in *Quelle maison pour Dieu?* ed. Camille Focant (Paris: Cerf, 2003), 177.

destruction of the first Jerusalem temple; however, both of these passages are debated and many allege that they come from the post-exilic time frame.⁷³¹ Newsome notes that the oracles in Mic 4-5 come from a later hand than the prophet; Sweeney shows that Isa 2:2-4 likely comes from the time of King Cyrus.⁷³² Blenkinsopp notes that the tone of the passage reflects the attitude of the early post-exilic period.⁷³³ The texts that do have the attitude of this Isa 2:2-4 passage in the proto-canonical texts are Ezekiel, Haggai, Zechariah, Trito-Isaiah, which have been covered above, as well as the deuterocanonical texts of Tobit, Sirach, and Second Maccabees. Williamson notes that “a later post-exilic date (without more precise agreement) remains the majority opinion.”⁷³⁴

Von Rad calls Isa 2:2-4 “a belief in the eschatological glorification of the holy mountain and of its significance for the redemption of the entire world.”⁷³⁵ Further, Levenson notes that this “passage from Isaiah would seem to expect some kind of

⁷³¹Mays notes the debate and the issues, but leans toward a post-exilic date in the late sixth century. James L. Mays, *Micah: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976), 96. With regard to the Micah passage, Wolff observes that “the dating of the passage in preexilic times has become more and more unlikely.” Hans W. Wolff, *Micah: A Commentary*, trans. Gary Stansell (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1990), 117. However, some such as Wildberger still favor a pre-exilic date. Hans Wildberger, *Isaiah 1-12: A Commentary*, trans. Thomas H. Trapp (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1991), 87. Tollington notes the Isa 2:2-4 and Mic 4:1-3 debate on whether it is pre-exilic or post-exilic and she favors the latter. Tollington, “Haggai,” 237. Frost assesses scholarship and also concludes that these are exilic at the earliest. Frost, “Eschatology and Myth,” 80. Kaiser notes, “The theological revision brought about by the exile, which provided the background to the expectation of a new divine act leading to salvation through a renewed judgment, was responsible for the incorporation of the prediction into the two prophetic books.” Otto Kaiser, *Isaiah 1-12: A Commentary*, trans. John Bowden, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983), 51. Kaiser favors a dating of the end of the fifth century for the material in these passages. *Ibid.*, 52. Childs notes the debate on the dating and editing of this material without conclusion. However, he does note that “[t]here is every indication that the passage has been shaped editorially to function specifically within the book of Isaiah.” Childs, *Isaiah*, 29.

⁷³²Newsome, *Hebrew Prophets*, 48. Sweeney holds that the Isa 2:2-4 passage, which is inextricably linked to the Mic 4:1-7 passage, came from the time of Cyrus. Sweeney, *Twelve Prophets*, 2:98.

⁷³³Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1-39: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 190.

⁷³⁴H. G. M. Williamson, *Isaiah 1-27: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary* (London: T. & T. Clark, 2006), 1:174. This is the majority opinion with other options also including a post-exilic date. *Ibid.*

⁷³⁵Von Rad, *Hexateuch*, 233.

revelation at Zion, of universal scope, to compare with, but not replace, the more particular revelation at Sinai.”⁷³⁶ The temple is front and center in these passages with the same expression **הַר הַיְהוָה**, the mountain of the temple of the Lord, in both Isa 2:2 and Mic 4:1.⁷³⁷ The expectation of these passages is that in the new time, **בְּיָמֵי הַיְהוָה**, the new order of things will be established, causing the Lord to be exalted, so that even the nations will come to this temple. Blenkinsopp notes that Micah “adds the prospect of the eschatological abolition of fear, with everyone sitting under the proverbial vine and fig tree.”⁷³⁸ In the Isa 2 passage, the understanding of the importance of the Jerusalem temple is that it is the dwelling of God; the temple is a house, and the presence of God is what lifts the temple mount to supremacy, established as the head of the mountains.⁷³⁹ Both of these passages present the Jerusalem temple as the source of the peace that streams out to all the nations at an eschatological time.⁷⁴⁰

Malachi

The book of Malachi presents a strong attack on the cultic wrongdoings of second temple Judaism, though at the same time, the book presents a strong eschatological hope for the people.⁷⁴¹ It is in chap. 2 that Malachi presents an anti-cult polemic, where the

⁷³⁶J. D. Levenson, *Program of Restoration*, 42. Levenson notes how absurd it is to think of the temple mount as the highest of mountains in Palestine. He notes that this assertion “is a prediction of the eschatological transformation of nature at the hand of its creator.” *Ibid.*, 41.

⁷³⁷Blenkinsopp notes that the phrase, house of Jacob, became popular in the second temple period and is in Isa 2:3, as well as Isa 58:1 and in many Psalms. Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1-39*, 191.

⁷³⁸*Ibid.*, 190.

⁷³⁹Watts, *Isaiah*, 262. Keil and Delitzsch note that this exaltation is not a physical one, but a spiritual exaltation. Keil and Delitzsch, *Commentary on the OT*, 1:456.

⁷⁴⁰Kaiser notes regarding this prophecy, “if eschatology is understood as referring to expectations of a fundamental change in earthly conditions in the future, regardless of whether they take place within or outside history, then the prophecy we are discussing must be regarded as eschatological in the best sense.” Otto Kaiser, *Isaiah 1-12: A Commentary*, trans. R. A. Wilson (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1972), 29.

⁷⁴¹Floyd notes that the critique and issues of the temple addressed in the text of Malachi show that the book was written after the rebuilding of the temple (Floyd, *Minor Prophets*, 575) putting it solidly in the period under examination in this work.

offerings, the priests, and the Levites are rejected by the Lord.

The absence of the Lord from the temple shows an overt critique of the second temple.⁷⁴² Nevertheless, it is the Jerusalem temple that plays an important role in Malachi. Through the temple theme, Malachi combines concern for the priests' cultic rituals, though in need of correction and for the eschatological dream for the future.⁷⁴³

Regarding the theology of Malachi, Price notes, "The Temple will be the site of the demonstration of eschatological restoration to the world."⁷⁴⁴ It is the coming of the Lord's presence into the temple that presents an eschatological element in the text of Malachi.⁷⁴⁵

However, it must be understood that before the Lord can come into the temple,⁷⁴⁶

⁷⁴²In Mal 3:1, the declaration that the Lord will come to the temple clearly shows that the text assumes that the Lord does not dwell in the current second temple structure. The last verse of the book ends with the threat: "lest I come and strike the land with utter destruction," which again critiques the current temple if the Lord is coming to the temple. The tie between this verse and 3:1 is that both could portray the Lord as coming to the temple and not dwelling in the temple. Obviously, utter destruction in this verse is a threat against creation, though not all creation, and is not a good event for the part of creation that would be utterly destroyed. Although there may be a purifying effect of this destruction, it portends woe for people on earth. If the Lord is coming to the temple (Mal 3:1 and possibly the last verse of the chapter as well), the Lord is not at the temple, which is a critique of the current temple.

⁷⁴³Mason, "Prophets," 151.

⁷⁴⁴Price, "Desecration and Restoration," 340.

⁷⁴⁵Noting Mal 3:1 in comparison with Hag 1:8, 2:3-9, Vos maintains the eschatological element in the coming of the Lord into the Jerusalem temple. Vos and Dennison, *Eschatology*, 161.

⁷⁴⁶What is meant by "the Lord" in Mal 3:1. Baker notes that the Lord here "seems here to be represented by a semi-divine/angelic or human (4:5; NIV, NRSV) messenger who prepares the way for the holy God. This may be a messianic reference." David W. Baker, *Joel, Obadiah, Malachi* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2006), 270. There is some vagueness to the reference. Sweeney sees this as an "emissary or representative" of the Lord. Sweeney, *Twelve Prophets*, 2:740. Wolf sees "the Lord" as Jesus of Nazareth, though he gives no exegetical evidence for his assessment. Wolf, *Haggai*, 98-99. *Kimchi* sees "the Lord" as a Messianic king. Abraham Cohen and Avraham J. Rosenberg, *The Twelve Prophets: Hebrew Text and English Translation* (New York: Soncino Press, 1994), 349. *Radak* sees it as a Messianic king; yet, *Rashi* sees "the Lord" as God. Stavsky, *Twelve Prophets*, 327. Yet, even with this diversity, most see this reference as God. Kelley sees "the Lord" in Mal 3:1 as God. Kelley, *Layman's Bible*, 156. Redditt asserts of this reference, "it is difficult to see the Lord as anyone but God." Redditt, *Haggai*, 176. Floyd sees "the Lord" as God. Floyd, *Minor Prophets*, 619. Bullock notes of the reference that it implies God would appear at the temple. Bullock, *Introduction*, 341. Noting the use of the definite article in the Hebrew, Hill sees Lord in Mal 3:1 as referring to the Lord. Andrew E. Hill, *Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi: An Introduction and Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2012), 333. Hill clarifies that "the definite article is always paired with YHWH indicating that this is whom Malachi has in mind." Andrew E. Hill, *Malachi: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 268. Nogalski notes three possibilities (earthly person, heavenly messenger, the Lord) and that it probably refers to God. James

something with the temple must change; this could be with proper cultic action or possibly something more structural.⁷⁴⁷ It is important to stress the connection of the Jerusalem temple to the coming events, or the temple can be seen as glorified after the initiation of the coming new age, which is clearly not the case.⁷⁴⁸ The coming of the Lord into the changed temple will bring about judgment (3:5); the abiding of the Lord in the temple will change Jerusalem.⁷⁴⁹ In Malachi, the Jerusalem temple takes on renewed meaning to creation once the Lord has come to dwell within it.⁷⁵⁰ In this renewed

D. Nogalski, *The Book of the Twelve: Micah-Malachi* (Macon, GA: Smyth and Helwys, 2011), 1049. Verhoef notes that “it is clear that God himself is also meant in v. 1.” Verhoef, *Haggai*, 289. Schuller notes: “The identity of these various figures remains vague and does not seem to be the main focus of the passage.” Eileen M. Schuller, “The Book of Malachi: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections,” *NIB*, 7:868. She notes an important focus of the temple in the book: “the focus on the Temple as the place of theophany.” *Ibid.*, 869. Scalise notes that though the reference is somewhat ambiguous, “the Lord” here is best seen as God. Goldingay and Scalise, *Minor Prophets*, 349-350. Scalise does mention the traditional Christian interpretation, but does not exegete this passage as McComiskey does. McComiskey presents opposing views on this verse. He asserts that it is “overtly messianic,” though noting that the Lord in Mal 3:1 “typically indicates God.” McComiskey, *Minor Prophets*, 1351-1352. McComiskey continues this with comments that the “speaker chooses to envision a human messiah or a deity (a distinction unnecessary for Christians, of course.)” *Ibid.* This distinction is quite necessary for Christian exegetes who do not want to insert later Christian texts or theology into this ancient text, which would be known as eisegesis. It is important to keep the context of the text of Malachi in mind when analyzing it. A messiah would be a human king; clearly a messiah could not be God! Even Christian scholars recognize this fact! McComiskey further confuses the analysis by equating the day of the Lord in Malachi with the second coming of Christ. *Ibid.* This also is eisegesis. The day of the Lord is never confused with the second coming of Christ in any of the Hebrew texts. Although McComiskey stands by these insertions into the text, exegesis cannot be done this way. Thus, with all the analysis, this reference could be to a human, as a king (messiah) or a messenger, but as most note, it most probably refers to God.

⁷⁴⁷Ezekiel 40–43:12 presents the idea that the correct temple must be built before the Lord can dwell there. Haggai 1:8 also calls for the temple to be built before the Lord can appear in glory there. Ezekiel 43:19 calls for the cultic purity of the Zadokite line of priests to purify the altar and officiate at the temple. Price notes the priority of preparing the temple for the Lord in this passage of Malachi. Price, “Desecration and Restoration,” 341.

⁷⁴⁸Clearly, it is true that the temple will be glorified in the new age, but the coming of the Lord at the transition of the age is more important in understanding the statements in Malachi. McKelvey misses this point as he stresses the end result of the exaltation of the Jerusalem temple in the new age, regarding Mal 3:1-4. McKelvey, *New Temple*, 14.

⁷⁴⁹Clements notes that “[t]he presence of God will mean the purging of the people from sin.” Clements, *God and Temple*, 126.

⁷⁵⁰Peckham observes that “Malachi’s interest was in ritual traditions and the actual management of the temple. He was eager to remove the cult from the perennial pressure of the natural cycles and insisted instead on the meaning of sacrifice and its relationship to the levitical vocation. He was intent on freeing the temple from its purely local and national significance and on establishing the international status of its God.” Peckham, *History*, 793-795.

meaning of the Jerusalem temple in the book of Malachi, it is the time of the Lord's coming to the Jerusalem temple that Malachi stresses (e.g., the day is coming in Mal 3:19) as the time when the great changes will occur on earth and the ramifications of this coming combine in a new age.

The Psalms

The Jerusalem temple in the Psalms is described by various declarations that are broad and not overtly eschatological, though building on prophetic eschatology.⁷⁵¹ Yet, the theology of the Jerusalem temple in the book of Psalms supports and propagates the concept of eschatological salvation and aid that comes from the Jerusalem temple because the temple is the dwelling of the God of Israel.⁷⁵²

The temple is referred to by many appellations in the Psalms, and it is significant that the preposition “from,” מִן, is attached to many of them, indicating the expectation of salvation “from” the temple.⁷⁵³ Kraus observes that “[t]he distinctive designation of the Jerusalem sanctuary, however, is the name *Zion*.”⁷⁵⁴

⁷⁵¹The prophetic eschatology after the destruction of the first Jerusalem temple lays the foundation and “the eschatology of the psalms presumes the prophetic proclamation about the future and shows itself to be dependent upon that proclamation.” Hermann Gunkel and Joachim Begrich, *Introduction to the Psalms: The Genres of the Religious Lyric of Israel*, trans. James D. Nogalski (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1998), 276.

⁷⁵²Psalms 20:3 asks for aid from the sanctuary, from the temple mount of Zion. In the Psalms, Culley notes that the temple provides deliverance. “In other words, the rescue is to enter the sphere of the Temple.” Robert C. Culley, “The Temple in Psalms 84, 63, and 42-43,” in *Où demeures-tu? Jn 1,38: La maison depuis le monde biblique: En hommage au professeur Guy Couturier à l'occasion de ses soixante-cinq ans*, ed. Guy Couturier et al. (Saint-Laurent, QC: Fides, 1994), 197.

⁷⁵³These would include מִצִּיּוֹן (Ps 14:7), מִקֹּדֶשׁ (Ps 20:3), מִהַר קָדְשׁוֹ (Ps 3:5), מִמְּכוֹן־שִׁבְתּוֹ (Ps 33:14), מִהַיְבֵלֶיךָ עַל־יְרוּשָׁלַם (Ps 68:30), מִעִיר־יְהוּדָה (Ps 101:8), מִבֵּית יְהוּדָה (Ps 118:26) as a minimum, but the appellations of the temple are numerous in the Psalms. The sky is also noted in the Psalms, but this should not dominate the analysis as the references to the temple are commensurate with the references to the sky as a location for God.

⁷⁵⁴Kraus, *Psalms*, 73. Hoppe also notes the distinction that “Zion’s fame, however, derived from its identification as the place where the Temple stood.” Hoppe, *Holy City*, 40. Gillingham concludes that in the Psalms, the term Zion became equated with the temple. Susan Gillingham, “The Zion Tradition and the Editing of the Hebrew Psalter,” in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*, ed. John Day (London: T. & T. Clark, 2005), 312.

Although there has been much debate with little consensus on the nature of eschatological material within the Psalter and eschatological editing of it, its eschatology is widely noted.⁷⁵⁵ Treating the Psalms as a whole,⁷⁵⁶ the eschatology has been seen as encompassing the return of the exiles and the crowning of God as king in Jerusalem.⁷⁵⁷ There are references to a set time and fixed program in the Psalter. The plan for the coming of the future eschatological time is tied to the works of God with humans in the past.⁷⁵⁸ Gunkel explains that the eschatology of the Psalms does not have a messianic component,⁷⁵⁹ yet Schaper notes that the translators of the Septuagint tied the interest in the temple to messianic expectations.⁷⁶⁰ The Septuagint adds references to the temple not shown in the Masoretic Text, indicating second temple Judaism's understanding that the temple is apparently connected to the events of the hoped-for new age.⁷⁶¹ Gillingham

⁷⁵⁵Gillingham reviews the eschatological and didactic schools of thought on the editing of the Hebrew Psalter. *Ibid.*, 308-312. Gunkel maintained that eschatology in the Psalms was extensive. Gunkel and Begrich, *Psalms*, 252. Cox argues for a historical orientation, going so far as to write, "The people of God were primarily related to the history of God's mighty deeds, not to a return to mythical time." Claude E. Cox, "Schaper's Eschatology Meets Kraus's Theology of the Psalms," in *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma*, ed. Robert J. V. Hiebert, Claude E. Cox, and Peter J. Gentry (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 305. Mitchell argues against the historical interpretation, maintaining that the agenda is eschatological. D. Mitchell, *Psalter*. There is no evidence to ascertain that the Psalms contain absolutely "no great eschatological vision" as Dow claims. Lois K. F. Dow, *Images of Zion: Biblical Antecedents for the New Jerusalem* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2010), 82.

⁷⁵⁶The dating of any individual Psalm is done on a case-by-case basis; however, "the compiling of the Hebrew Psalter, we may assume that this collection of hymns and prayers belongs to the period of the second Jerusalem temple." Klaus Seybold, *Introducing the Psalms*, trans. R. Graeme Dunphy (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1990), 14.

⁷⁵⁷Emil G. Hirsch, "Psalms," *The Jewish Encyclopedia: A Descriptive Record of the History, Religion, Literature, and Customs of the Jewish People from the Earliest Times to the Present Day*, ed. Isidore Singer (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1907), 10:242. Vos cites only a couple of psalms and comes to the same conclusion. "The eschatology of the Psalter is apparent in the restoration of the theocracy and the return of the captivity (Pss 60; 111:6)." Vos and Dennison, *Eschatology*, 143. Schmid and Steck note that the prophets proclaim that the Lord is the center of this new orientation, when reigning "from Zion as king of the world." Schmid and Steck, "Restoration Expectations," 59.

⁷⁵⁸Vos and Dennison, *Eschatology*, 140.

⁷⁵⁹Gunkel and Begrich, *Psalms*, 252.

⁷⁶⁰Joachim Schaper, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 129.

⁷⁶¹Schaper notes that "[t]he temple obviously was of heightened importance to the translators, since they made reference to it wherever the Hebrew text seemed to allow for that." Two instances that

comments how even the superscriptions of the Psalms can convey the idea of “the Temple as the focal point for the good life and future hope. In an eschatological sense, God returns to his Temple as king.”⁷⁶² The eschatology of the Psalms is founded upon the presence of the Lord in the Jerusalem temple.⁷⁶³ The temple is a source of security when the presence of the Lord is there, in whom Israel can seek refuge.⁷⁶⁴

Using the references to the Lord’s holy mountain, starting in the second psalm and recurring frequently throughout the Psalter, deClaissé-Walford notes, “The psalmist knows from past experience that YHWH dwells in Zion and that deliverance comes from Zion and from nowhere else.”⁷⁶⁵ The eschatological thrust of the Psalter manifests itself in the return of God to Zion in a physical sense that introduces the eschatological rule of God in the world.⁷⁶⁶ Furthermore, Ollenburger writes, “The Jerusalem tradition, on the other hand, is cosmic in character: it centers on the creation of the world, and on the establishment of Zion as the site of Yahweh’s dwelling.”⁷⁶⁷ The Jerusalem temple in the Psalms ties both creation and the physical presence of God together in a way that presents

Schaper observes of added temple theology in the Greek are Ps 95:1 (96:1 in the Hebrew) and Ps 118:139 (Ps 119:139 in the Hebrew). Ibid.

⁷⁶²Gillingham, “Zion Tradition,” 334.

⁷⁶³This can be seen in many of the psalms. In three psalms, Pss 46, 48, and 76, which Gunkel calls “eschatological Zion songs,” the presence of God in the temple plays a prominent role with the people. Gunkel and Begrich, *Psalms*, 251. However, Holtz notes that in the Psalms, the temple as well as the deity in the temple may have provided an apotropaic role. Shalom E. Holtz, “God as Refuge and Temple as Refuge in the Psalms,” in *The Temple of Jerusalem: From Moses to the Messiah in Honor of Professor Louis H. Feldman*, ed. Steven Fine (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 26.

⁷⁶⁴Ollenburger holds that “Zion is a symbol of security in the first instance because Yahweh is present there.” Ben C. Ollenburger, *Zion, the City of the Great King: A Theological Symbol of the Jerusalem Cult* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987), 69.

⁷⁶⁵Nancy L. deClaissé-Walford, *Reading from the Beginning: The Shaping of the Hebrew Psalter* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997), 52.

⁷⁶⁶Gillingham, “Zion Tradition,” 311.

⁷⁶⁷Ollenburger, *Zion*, 152. He goes on to postulate that “[i]f I have interpreted the Zion symbolism of the Jerusalem’s cult tradition correctly, it is fundamentally a theology of creation.” Ibid., 161.

the hope for creation,⁷⁶⁸ when God returns to or dwells in the temple.⁷⁶⁹

⁷⁶⁸Culley reports on the importance of the spatial relationship to the people and how the temple's physical space is important to the relationship between God and creation. Culley, "Temple," 191, 193, 197.

⁷⁶⁹Note the inherent critique of the current Jerusalem temple, whether the first or the second temple, in that the real physical presence of God is not there or the eschatological time frame would have started.

CHAPTER 5

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL ROLE OF THE JERUSALEM TEMPLE IN THE DEUTERO-CANONICAL WRITINGS

Introduction

In translating the Scriptures into Latin for the work that would come to be known as the Vulgate, Jerome made distinctions between writings for which he had access to a Hebrew *Vorlage*,¹ and those for which he did not have access to a Hebrew *Vorlage*. This early grouping of texts sets the precedent for dealing with these writings separately.² This work evaluates second temple Jewish writings in order to ascertain whether these texts, now referred to as deutero-canonical writings, contain an emphasis on the future Jerusalem temple and what role this future temple is to perform for the people in these texts. Many texts of the period emphasize the temple;³ however, it is important to assess what role the temple has in the timing or initiating of the eschatological age. Although the past or the existing Jerusalem temple is mentioned in most of the deutero-canonical writings, three of these texts may show a role for the future Jerusalem temple in the area of eschatology. The Jerusalem temple is tied to the complete gathering of all Israel back to the Promised Land where the people may live in peace and security once all the

¹This is not to say there was no Hebrew *Vorlage*, but that Jerome had no access to a Hebrew *Vorlage* for these texts.

²This body of work is composed of at least 13 works found in three Greek Codices (Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and Alexandrinus) but not found in the Masoretic text. James H. Charlesworth, "Old Testament Apocrypha," *ABD*, 1:292.

³In examining the literature of the second temple period, Cohen calls the temple a "focal point of the religion." However to Cohen the temple is just one of three focal points. Shaye J. D. Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*, 2nd ed. (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006), 101, 126.

surrounding nations know and revere the God of Israel. The role for the future Jerusalem temple in three of the deuterocanonical writings is analyzed below. These three are Tobit, the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sirach, and Second Maccabees.

Tobit

Introduction

There are many important ideas within the book of Tobit, which was probably written in the late third or early second century BCE.⁴ One of the main themes of the book is the Jerusalem temple.⁵ The Jerusalem temple is mentioned at the beginning (1:4) and at the end (14:5) of the book. These two references are to the times when Tobit is a young man and when he is near death, respectively. This *inclusio* shows the importance that the author ascribes to the Jerusalem temple throughout Tobit's life.⁶ The significance of the temple in the book of Tobit has not been explored, and any role the text ascribes to the temple has been left unexamined. This work presents an exploration of one aspect of

⁴Tobit is a text with many of its ideas presented as instruction to the people of the time on their actions or ethics. "Ethics is developed in a way that directs the reader particularly toward the strengthening of the law-observant Jewish community through endogamy (marrying within one's people, within one's tribe if possible), charitable support of the righteous poor, duty toward one's parents and kin, and giving the dead a proper burial." David A. deSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2002), 63. Teaching on the temple is addressed below. Tobit "was intended to provide religious and moral instruction in the form of an adventure story." Bruce M. Metzger, *An Introduction to the Apocrypha* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1957), 30. Giffin notes how obviously the character of the book of Tobit is didactic. P. Giffin, "Tobit," *A New Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*, ed. Reginald C. Fuller (Nashville: Nelson, 1975), 399.

⁵Regarding the Jewish literature of the Maccabean age, Gärtner notes regarding their authors that "they comforted themselves with the thought of a new temple of glory in Jerusalem, built by men for God." Bertil Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament: A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament* (Cambridge: University Press, 1965), 16. Levine notes the ritual purity concerns of Tobit. Amy-Jill Levine, "Diaspora as Metaphor: Bodies and Boundaries in the Book of Tobit," in *Diaspora Jews and Judaism: Essays in Honor of, and in Dialogue with A. Thomas Kraabel*, ed. J. Andrew Overman and Robert S. MacLennan (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 115. Levine's comment emphasizes the importance of the temple to the author as it is the source of purity on earth from the Holy God.

⁶Koester notes the integral nature of the temple in relation to the future hopes of the people in Tobit. Craig R. Koester, *The Dwelling of God: The Tabernacle in the Old Testament, Intertestamental Jewish Literature, and the New Testament* (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1989), 24.

the understanding of the Jerusalem temple in the book of Tobit: What eschatological role is assumed or maintained in the book of Tobit?⁷ A role for the temple in regard to initiating the anticipated eschatological age of worshipping God, both by Israel and the surrounding nations, in this second temple work shows continuity with other exilic and post-exilic Jewish writings.

Chapters 13 and 14 give the main praise and prophecy for the Jerusalem temple, in addition to the less detailed description of the temple in Tob 1:4.⁸ Some have doubted that Tob 13-14 were a part of the original text, but since pieces of these chaps. have been found at Qumran, there can be little doubt that these two chapters were part of the book of Tobit in the second temple period and were probably a part of the original book.⁹ These chapters are crucial to understanding the temple in Tobit since the *inclusio*, mentioned above, shows a focus important to the book and the *inclusio* would be

⁷Eschatology is the starting point for this work in Tobit because of the lack of previous investigation into the eschatological role of the temple. Eschatology in Tobit is a point of teaching emphasis. Fitzmyer notes that one of the themes of religious teaching in Tobit is eschatology. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Tobit* (New York: Gruyter, 2003), 48. Nickelsburg stresses the fact that Tobit “has a significant orientation toward the future.” George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Tobit and Enoch: Distant Cousins with Recognizable Resemblance,” in *George W E Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning*, ed. Jacob Neusner and Alan J. Avery-Peck (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 1:226.

⁸DeSilva notes that “Tobit’s final psalm and testament contain the book’s eschatology.” DeSilva, *Apocrypha*, 79.

⁹Zimmermann uses the material about the temple in 14:5 to postulate a post-70 CE date. Frank Zimmermann, *The Book of Tobit: An English Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Harper, 1958), 25-26. Collins notes the possible secondary addition, but argues for unity of authorship. John J. Collins, “The Judaism of the Book of Tobit,” in *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology*, ed. Geza G. Zeravits and Jozsef Zsengeller (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 25. Although there is some small question as to whether chaps. 13 and 14 are original to the text of Tobit, the dating of the eschatological material shows this is a second temple Jewish document and it adds to the message of the book and presents an eschatology centered on the temple of Jerusalem. Zsengeller notes that the eschatology of Tob 14:5 is the focus of the edited work. Jozsef Zsengeller, “Topography as Theology,” in *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology*, ed. Geza G. Zeravits and Jozsef Zsengeller (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 181. From the Qumran fragments, deSilva notes that chaps. 13 and 14 have been included in the book since at least 100 BCE. DeSilva, *Apocrypha*, 66. Soll concludes that the “presence of these chapters at Qumran conclusively refutes views such as Zimmermann’s, who dates these chapters after 70 C. E.” Will Soll, “Misfortune and Exile in Tobit: The Juncture of a Fairy Tale Source and Deuteronomic Theology,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 51 (1989): 230. Parts of all fourteen chapters have been found in one or more of the Qumran manuscripts of Tobit. George W. Nickelsburg, “Stories of Biblical and Early Post-Biblical Times,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, ed. Michael E. Stone (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 40.

nonexistent without chaps. 13 and 14.¹⁰ This investigation will examine chaps. 1, 13, and 14 of the book of Tobit that each presents a part of the role of the temple put forth within the book.

The Jerusalem Temple in Tobit

The mention of the temple in Tob 1:4 is not set within an eschatological context. “When I was in my own country, in the land of Israel, while I was still a young man, the whole tribe of my ancestor Naphtali deserted the house of David and Jerusalem. This city had been chosen from among all the tribes of Israel, where all the tribes of Israel should offer sacrifice and where the temple, the dwelling of God, had been consecrated and established for all generations forever” (Tob 1:4).¹¹ The temple is already pivotal to the narrative this early in Tobit as Tob 1:4 presents the fact that the tribe of Naphtali, Tobit’s tribe, was apostate because of the desertion from the temple.¹² Tobit, however, did not desert the temple with the rest of his tribe; he kept all the festivals at the temple in Jerusalem (Tob 1:6). This is because of the eternal nature of the temple. The book of Tobit asserts that the temple was chosen and the festivals were prescribed forever.¹³

The eternal nature of the temple presented in chap. 1 not only anticipates what is to come at the end of the book, but sets the foundation for the understanding of the temple in the book. In the context of the book of Tobit, including chap. 1, the temple is

¹⁰Di Lella notes the importance of the temple and the *inclusio* here in Tobit. Alexander A. Di Lella, “The Deuteronomic Background of the Farewell Discourse of Tob 14:3-11,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 41 (1979): 385. This *inclusio* is also noted in Carey A. Moore, *Tobit* (New York: Doubleday, 1996), 291.

¹¹A side note that leads to later issues in Tob 13-14 is the divine passive in the Greek. There are three divine passive verbs in Tob 1:4, all pointing to Jerusalem as the city chosen, consecrated, and established by God. Notice how Vaticanus and Alexandrinus avoid the use of θεοῦ in the verse.

¹²Levine notes that “improper respect for the Temple caused the exile of Naphtali.” A. Levine, “Diaspora,” 117.

¹³Fitzmyer notes the apostasy of Naphtali alluded to in Tob 1:4, as it is at Jerusalem where the dwelling place of the Lord is. Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 105-106.

considered outside the bounds of human strife and turmoil. Chapter 1 notes that Tobit, alone from the tribe of Naphtali, went up to Jerusalem, showing the understanding that even amidst political turmoil between the northern kingdom of Israel and the southern kingdom of Judah, the temple transcends the needs, the politics, and the time frame of this world.

The book of Tobit calls for the Jewish people to act in order to bring about their salvation and to bring about their eschatology. Chapter 13 is an eschatological teaching in the form of a psalm or prayer.¹⁴ There is a Deuteronomic influence that urges the people to turn to God with all their heart and soul (13:6), so that God will gather the people to Jerusalem again.¹⁵ There is a call to acknowledge God (13:6, 11, 17) in order to bring about a change that will allow God to not only look upon the people with favor,¹⁶ but so that the temple may be built using the verb οἰκοδομηθήσεται.¹⁷ There is a call to bless the Lord (13:1, 6, 15, and 17). This call to bless indicates that the people are to declare that God is the source of the power to rebuild the temple. The call also indicates that the

¹⁴Flusser categorizes Tob 13 as an eschatological psalm. In this grouping, he also places Tob 14 and Sir 36:1-17. “Here as in the other examples, we find the main motifs of the genre: the deliverance of Israel from their foes, the gathering of the dispersed and the future glory of Jerusalem and the temple.” David Flusser, “Psalms, Hymns, and Prayers,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, ed. Michael E. Stone (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 556-557. Moore agrees that Tob 13 meets the criteria for an eschatological psalm. C. Moore, *Tobit*, 284. Nickelsburg also calls chap. 13 an eschatological psalm. Nickelsburg, “Tobit and Enoch,” 227. Jensen fails to see the eschatological emphasis of the book and argues for a different emphasis, that this chapter goes astray from the bulk of the teaching of Tobit. “In his great prayer in ch. 13, Tobit is overwhelmed by eschatological visions and sees many nations coming to Jerusalem with gifts to the king of heaven. He may be pronouncing orthodox theology, but this theology is different from which the book has drawn its main inspiration.” Hans J. Lundager Jensen, “Family, Fertility and Foul Smell: Tobit and Judith,” in *Studies in the Book of Tobit: A Multidisciplinary Approach*, ed. Mark Bredin (London: T. & T. Clark, 2006), 130. Here Jensen failed to see and understand the importance of the temple throughout the book of Tobit.

¹⁵Weitzman has suggested that the hymn in Tob 13 alludes to the Song of Moses in Deut 32. Steven Weitzman, “Allusion, Artifice, and Exile in the Hymn of Tobit,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115 (1996): 50. Weitzman goes further and notes that Tob 13 comes from the eschatological Jerusalem of Deut 32 and Isa 54. *Ibid.*, 54. Jensen notes the “Deuteronomistic eschatological theology about the return and gathering of everybody in Jerusalem.” H. Jensen, “Family, Fertility,” 138.

¹⁶Note the particle ὅτι in Tob 13:17, which should be translated “in order that.”

¹⁷Tobit 13:11 has the phrase ἡ σκηνή σου οἰκοδομηθήσεταιί.

people wish, hope, and expect that God will ensure that the temple is rebuilt, as is shown by the fact that the call to bless the Lord (or the author's acknowledgment that the Lord is blessed) is repeated throughout this eschatological prayer (Tob 13:1, 6, 11, 16, 18), and this blessing of God, meaning that God is to be filled with power, is tied to the expectation of a new eternal Jerusalem temple (Tob 13:17). In Tob 13:11, the tabernacle of God refers to the temple that is explicitly located in Jerusalem and is not a call for the resumption of the tabernacle.¹⁸ Within the text, there is no call for the portable sanctuary to come among the people as in ancient days because the city of Jerusalem has already been chosen (1:4, 13:11). With the city chosen, this passage is focused on the return of God to Jerusalem (13:10-17, [Eng 13:9-16]).¹⁹

It is not just about human actions, though those are vital to the events to come as described by the text of Tobit. As is common with second temple Jewish writings, God and humans work together, each accomplishing important aspects of events on the timeline of history. The understanding of humans and God working together in order to accomplish the correct path, or God's plan, is explicit within the book of Tobit. "In God's providence, a man's cooperation with God (in this case, Tobiah's obeying his father and his courageous following of the advice of Raphael) can bring the entire matter to a successful resolution."²⁰

The book of Tobit presents a petition to God to have mercy on God's people, gathering them completely back to their land, and to inhabit the rebuilt temple, so that

¹⁸Note that Tob 13:17 (v. 16 in the English) calls this "ὅτι ἱερουσαλημ οἰκοδομηθήσεται τῇ πόλει οἶκος αὐτοῦ," his house. The permanent house that will be built, οἰκοδομηθήσεται, clearly describes the city as well as the Jerusalem temple.

¹⁹Citing 2 Macc 2:18 and Tob 13:9-18, Moore shows how second temple Judaism had a deep belief in restoration and that the Scriptures bore witness to God's restoration. George Foot Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim* (Cambridge: University Press, 1927), 2:366-367. Helyer rightly observes that "[t]he centerpiece of restoration in Tobit is a rebuilt Jerusalem and temple." L. R. Helyer, "Tobit," *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, ed. Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000), 1240.

²⁰C. Moore, *Tobit*, 32.

this world may be forever changed. This post-exilic book is placed in the time of exile for the Northern Kingdom (Tob 1:2) where Jerusalem is far away and seems to be only a hope. However, Jerusalem is more than just a hope. Levine perceives the underlying textual understanding. She notes the bulk of the story in Tobit is about exile, making Jerusalem of marginal aid; however, “Jerusalem represents the real.”²¹ Thus, Tobit was written in the second temple period but the idea of exile is the perceived state of the people. Therefore, the second temple did not seem to comfort the author of Tobit; by contrast, the future Jerusalem temple as described in Tob 13 and 14 represents real aid to the people. Tobit does not have a call for God to inhabit the second temple, but to take up residence in the temple that will replace the second temple, as discussed in chap. 14 below.²²

Chapter 13 starts with the claim that everything is under the power of God and God is capable of all things, as is shown by this declaration: “For he afflicts, and he shows mercy; he leads down to Hades in the lowest regions of the earth, and he brings up from the great abyss, and there is nothing that can escape his hand” (13:2, NRSV). Verse 1 affirms that God lives forever. Chapter 13 of Tobit contains an eschatological timeline, parts of which are detailed below. This is an acknowledgment of the facts at the beginning of the eschatological timeline, but the initial action is that the people must acknowledge God in their present circumstances among the nations where they have been dispersed (13:3). They must exalt God among the nations, showing their distinction from the nations (13:4). The people must turn to God and trust God completely to do what is right, even while God’s face is turned away from them (13:6). It is this acknowledgment

²¹A. Levine, “Diaspora,” 106.

²²The text is pointing to the temple and a situation beyond the author’s present reality. On Tob 13:16-18, Grabbe notes the text “uses it as an anticipation of an eschatological building still in his own future.” Lester L. Grabbe, “Tobit,” *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible*, ed. John W. Rogerson (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), 746. Grabbe links 13:17-18 and 14:5, showing not only the importance of the temple, but the hope for the future temple beyond the temple of the author’s experience.

and praise of God among the nations that may sway God's favor (13:3, 6, 11).

The hope and expectation in the text point to the time that a change of favor will lead God to gather the people of Israel from all the nations of exile and scattering (13:5).²³ Only when the gathered nation is at Jerusalem may the proper temple be built within Jerusalem (13:11).²⁴ Volz centers his understanding of Tobit's end of the age with the returning to the land and rebuilding Jerusalem and the temple; only then does idolatry end and all of the nations are converted.²⁵ It is this correct Jerusalem temple and God's dwelling within that temple that bring cheer to the returned captives and love for the dispersed ones of Jerusalem (13:15).²⁶ The scenario in the text is that this goodness will be forever, thus clearly implying an eschatological setting.

It is the temple that brings changes in the scenario within the text of Tobit. There is a distinct change in the tone of the rest of this chapter. A curse against those who do not revere God eliminates them from the setting and allows the following text to concentrate on the prosperity and everlasting nature of God in the temple. The fact that

²³Tobit 13 is an eschatological psalm, but the prophecies hold the hope for which the text here is thankful. Metzger calls Tob 13 a "psalm of thanksgiving." Metzger, *Apocrypha*, 36.

²⁴The importance of the temple in the text of Tobit, which is central to the book and its eschatology, is highlighted here in 13:10. On 13:10, Moore notes that "[t]he restoration of the Temple, like the restoration of Tobit's sight, is central to the narrator's concern and not a pious afterthought." C. Moore, *Tobit*, 280. Nowell clearly distinguishes the importance of Jerusalem and the temple here and cites it as the central concern for the passage. Irene Nowell, "Tobit," *NIB*, 3:1064.

²⁵Volz details the eschatological timeline of Tob 13 and 14, showing "den Wiederbau des Tempels in Herrlichkeit 13, 10 14, 5; es ist Freude über das Glück Jerusalems 13, 14, und die Völker eilen herbei zum Namen Gottes 13, 11 (codex \aleph zu dem heiligen Namen Jerusalems, Name = Temple?); alle Götzendiener bekehren sich 13, 11 14, 6f., sie haben auch ihre Freude am Heil 14, 7 13,6, 12. Die Heilszeit wird ewig dauern 13, 10ff. 14, 5. All dies tritt nach 14, 5 ein, wen die Weltzeiten erfüllt sind. Es treibt den Sänger zu unermüdlichem Lobpreis, zu dem er auch die andern auffordert 13, 1ff. Die Eschatologie ist rein national, vom Individuum, von Auferstehung ist nicht die Rede." Paul Volz, *Die eschatologie der jüdischen gemeinde im Neutestamentlichen zeitalter nach den quellen der rabbinischen, apokalyptischen und apokryphen literatur dargestellt von* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1934), 26.

²⁶Chilton refers to Tob 13 and 14 as a "sanctuary-centered theology of restoration." Bruce D. Chilton, *The Glory of Israel: The Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1982), 21.

God is in the temple in Jerusalem changes God's people as well as the nations.²⁷ In the remainder of this timetable, everything is greatly affected by the glory-filled temple. This presence shines upon all on earth, upon every nation (13:11).²⁸ Nations will come from far away to worship God and present offerings at the Jerusalem temple (13:12). The understanding that the correct, future, glorious temple will bring universal worship of Israel's God implicitly critiques the second temple, because it was standing at the time of the writing, as the incorrect (as the second temple did not bring this universal worship), present (as it was standing, thus the call for the temple to be built must apply to a future temple), ignominious,²⁹ temple.³⁰ Every generation into eternity will praise God. God's

²⁷Chapters 13 and 14 address the timing of salvation coming to Jerusalem, the restored Jerusalem, and the world, but the temple is the mechanism that the text presents. "Heilszeitide Herrlichkeit des Tempels ebenso mehren werde wie die Schönheit u. Pracht Jerusalems, vgl. Tob 13,9 ff.; 14,4 f." Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament* (Munich, Germany: C. H. Beck, 1922), 1:1003. There has been less emphasis placed on the temple and more placed on Jerusalem, such as by Bauckham. He notes "the centrality of Jerusalem to Tobit's eschatological expectation." Richard Bauckham, "Tobit as a Parable for the Exiles of Northern Israel," in *Studies in the Book of Tobit: A Multidisciplinary Approach*, ed. Mark Bredin (London: T. & T. Clark, 2006), 153. It is important to understand that this viewpoint errors in its deviation from the centrality of the temple in order to focus on Jerusalem, as has often been the case.

²⁸Referring to Tob 13:11, Bauckham vaguely notes that the temple will be built in the eschatological age, which seems to imply after the conversion of the nations, which runs counter to the text. Richard Bauckham, "James and the Gentiles (Acts 15.13-21)," in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts*, ed. Ben Witherington III (Cambridge: University Press, 1996), 158. Modern-day analyses of the temple in the text of Tobit are far too sparse, incomplete in scope (as this present eschatological nature has yet to be recommended, let alone approached), and do not seem to take the whole book into account.

²⁹In examining Tob 13, it becomes clear that the future temple will be a part of things that the present temple is not or cannot be a part of so that a clear distinction is made. The future temple will be "the bright light that shines to the ends of the earth" (Tob 13:12). The future temple has people come from the farthest part of the world to offer offerings to God there (Tob 13:12). There, at the temple will the people be gathered and rejoice (Tob 13:15). There will the people be happy if this new temple is built to replace the present one (Tob 13:17). At this new future temple the people will bless the God of Israel (Tob 13:18), not the current temple. These descriptions of the future temple clearly lay out a picture lacking in the present second Jerusalem temple. Here, the disgrace of the present temple can aptly be described as "ignominious," that is, deserving of shame. Shame is the feeling brought about from being unworthy. The second temple, clearly from this passage in Tobit, as well as the context of the entire book considering when it is written, is unworthy, that is, not deserving or lacking worth. The worth of the second temple is dismissed entirely in Tobit. Tobit 14 merely states that the second temple will be built. It is an institution that will exist, but that is merely a fact of its existence and the following temple is the temple that is "not like the first one" (Tob 14:5, meaning the second temple) that will be deserving of worth, specifically described as "splendor" (Tob 14:5). The present second temple is in an insufficient state that must be replaced by a new future temple that will be sufficient. The future temple brings promises of forever (Tob 13:14, 15, 17, and 18) ensuring that the present temple is temporary and will be replaced. Confer with *1 En.* 89:73, which asserts that the offerings on the table were polluted and impure, showing how other second temple Jewish writings spurned the second temple.

people are happy and blessed as they are a witness to the divine dwelling of God in the temple. Jerusalem is described in language like that of the prophets.³¹ The end of chap. 13 presents assurances of the eternal nature of the change to Jerusalem.

“Generation after generation” (13:12) shows that the *eschaton* has begun in earnest. The name or reputation of God’s chosen city will endure forever (13:12). Jerusalem will be built gloriously in order to be the home of the temple of God. The temple is the dwelling place of God forever (13:17).³² The gathered remnants of all the people will witness the glory of God there forever, just as in the last verse of the text of Ezekiel: “The Lord is there.”

Chapter 14 not only follows the prayer or psalm of chap. 13, it reiterates the same eschatological timeline in detailed fashion; yet, this time the presentation is in the form of

³⁰The Jerusalem temple, implied in Tob 13:11, might allude to the rebuilt second temple; however, this building is not the one that brought the nations streaming to it in order to worship the God of Israel. The temple referred to in this verse is a later eschatological temple. Roger A. Bullard and Howard A. Hatton, *A Handbook on Tobit and Judith* (New York: UBS, 2001), 205. The context of Tob 13, in its entirety, shows that God will forever be praised and worshiped at the temple described in Tob 13:1-18. The second temple period, with the existing second temple and incomplete return of the exiles, is addressed. The temple, with all of its references in this chapter, is spoken of in eternal dimensions (see footnote above) as well as in language of the prophets that addresses the eschatological period (see above), clearly indicating that this temple is an eschatological temple.

³¹Nowell notes that the psalm of Tob 13 “echoes the prophetic descriptions of the new Jerusalem (Isa 54:11-12; 60:1-14; 66:10-14; Mic 4:2; Zech 8:22).” Irene Nowell, “Tobit,” *New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, ed. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1999b), 571. The precious stones of Isa 54:12 are similar language to that of Tob 13:17. The glory will be seen at the temple (Isa 60:2; Tob 13:17) and offerings to the Lord at the temple will come from the far, remote places (Isa 60:9; Mic 4:2; Zech 8:22; Tob 13:12). The people in Jerusalem will rejoice and be happy (Isa 66:10; Tob 13:15).

³²These circumstances have led some falsely to group this writing with apocalyptic writings. Fitzmyer categorizes Tob 14:7 as apocalyptic. Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 324. There are some similarities, as the *eschaton* is ushered in by the temple and the concept of the end times is a common topic in apocalyptic writings. Tobit has even been compared to Rev 21, even though there is no temple seen in Rev 21:22. On Tob 13:21-22, DeVine writes that “the earthly Jerusalem would be a type of the heavenly Jerusalem, much as in the strikingly similar passage of Apoc 21:2, 18ff.” C. F. DeVine, “Tobit,” *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*, ed. Bernard Orchard et al. (New York: Nelson, 1953), 402. Simpson avoids this error and could be correct in his assessment regarding Tobit that “in relation to the nation, however, he stands possibly almost on a threshold of the Apocalyptic tendency.” D. C. Simpson, “Tobit,” in *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, ed. R. H. Charles (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), 197.

a testament.³³ The timeline starts with God’s mercy again being extended to the people, bringing them back to Jerusalem. Once the people are back, then the people can rebuild. Jerusalem and the temple come first.³⁴ Then, at the appointed time in the future, the temple will be built again, more gloriously than either time before (14:5).³⁵ The text is clear that the temple will be rebuilt twice before the *eschaton*.³⁶ The complete gathering and the second rebuilding of the temple are mentioned in 14:5. The following verse declares that the nations will be converted and they will all fear the God of Israel.³⁷

Immediately after the building of this temple, events have completely changed; the world is no longer the same as the world to which Tobit is accustomed. This is easily noticed upon reading the text of Tob 14. In 14:6-7, after the temple is rebuilt for the second time, “the nations in the whole world will all be converted and worship God in

³³Harrington detects the timeline and notes that “God will bring the people back to Jerusalem where they will rebuild the temple, which will attract in turn all the nations.” Daniel J. Harrington, *Invitation to the Apocrypha* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999), 24. The understanding of an established eschatological timeline in Tobit is important in understanding the text of Tobit as a whole. The underpinnings of the text of Tobit use the knowledge of the known timeline that eschatological events are unfolding within as factual, so that the text can teach how this timeline is to unfold. Tobit 14 has an explicit salvation laid out by the prophetic writings. “The unfolding of that fulfillment is spelled out in the succession of events in 14:4-7.” Nickelsburg, *Ancient Judaism*, 124.

³⁴Nickelsburg lays out a very similar timeline without highlighting the role the rebuilding of the temple plays in the eschatological timeline. Nickelsburg’s timeline of Tob 14 is “Babylonian captivity, the return, the rebuilding of the temple, and then in a kind of consummation, the rebuilding of a glorious Jerusalem and the conversion of the Gentiles.” Nickelsburg, “Stories,” 43.

³⁵This is the declaration of Hag 2:9.

³⁶Tobit 14:5 clearly states that the temple will be rebuilt and then the temple will be rebuilt after this time. There are clearly two temple rebuildings mentioned in this verse.

³⁷Although the text is clear, opinions vary and the eschatological time frame of Tobit has been vaguely assessed. It is deSilva’s assessment that “[t]his is itself a process, since the temple will be rebuilt in a lackluster way until the final age, when it will be restored to its full splendor (14:5).” DeSilva, *Apocrypha*, 80. The “until” here in his assessment implies that in the new age the temple of full splendor will be built. However, this runs counter to the text and does not reflect the timeline in Tob 13 and 14. The temple in Tobit’s timeline is restored in this age (twice) just before the final age begins (Tob 14:5). Nickelsburg also notes the eschatological nature of the verse and presents a blurred timeline of return, rebuilding, and Gentile conversion. George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981), 33. The timeline, especially regarding Tob 14:5 that depicts the fulcrum of time at the end of this age, must be examined carefully or what the text depicts as happening in this age (the rebuilding of the temple) may be erroneously attributed to the final age.

truth. They will all abandon their idols, which deceitfully have led them into their error; and in righteousness they will praise the eternal God.” Furthermore, “[a]ll the Israelites who are saved in those days and are truly mindful of God will be gathered together; they will go to Jerusalem and live in safety forever in the land of Abraham, and it will be given over to them. Those who sincerely love God will rejoice, but those who commit sin and injustice will vanish from all the earth” (Tob 14:7). Tobit is from the tribe of Naphtali of the Northern Kingdom; when the northern kingdom was separate, Naphtali did not go up to Jerusalem at all (Tob 1:4). The description given in Tob 14:6-7 truly shows a complete transformation of all the nations of the world and a significant transformation in the people of Israel.

Tobit prefaces his testament by referring to the period when God’s people were in exile, the Assyrians were in control, and safety was an issue (14:3-4). This scenario could imply Tobit’s present circumstances, when his people were subject to foreign domination by the Ptolemaic empire or the Seleucid Empire.³⁸ After the second rebuilding of the temple, the glorious temple,³⁹ Tobit prophesied that “the temple of God will be rebuilt just as the prophets have said concerning it” (Tob 14:5).⁴⁰

Every nation in the world will acknowledge the God of Israel and will worship God as Israel does. The change from domination of Israel to worldwide acknowledgment

³⁸The text was probably written before the Maccabean Revolt as this is not mentioned or referred to in the text of Tobit. DeSilva estimates that Tobit was written between 250–175 BCE. DeSilva, *Apocrypha*, 69. Thus, it is possible that the foreign domination depicted in the text of Tobit is actually describing the author’s situation, where it would be Ptolemaic or Seleucid domination of the land of Israel.

³⁹The future temple of Tobit could be linked to the Temple of Ezekiel as Casciaro has postulated. Jose Maria Casciaro, ed., *The Navarre Bible: Chronicles-Maccabees* (New York: Scepter, 2003), 339. See also J. C. Dancy, *The Shorter Books of the Apocrypha* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 65. Fröhlich not only notes the parallels between the temple in Tobit and Ezek 40–48, but also links these two texts to the Temple Scroll, col. 29. Ida Fröhlich, “Tobit against the Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology*, ed. Geza G. Zeravits and Jozsef Zsengeller (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 67.

⁴⁰Otzen calls Tob 14:4-8 a prophetic writing. Benedikt Otzen, *Tobit and Judith* (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 53.

shows the impact of the temple for the text of Tobit.⁴¹ The empty idols of the nations will be abandoned. Correct posture with the God of Israel will be adopted by all (14:6). Thus, Tob 14:5-7 depicts the correct temple as the center of the eschatological space-time continuum where and when all the prophesied events will unfold.⁴² Tobit is a text that “can be re-read in the horizon of the, temporal and spatial, eschatology as reflected in Tob 13–14.”⁴³ Fitzmyer shows that “Jerusalem will not only be rebuilt and become the focal point of the returning Jews, but it will also become a center to which people of all nations will flock.”⁴⁴ In addition to this worldwide change in the attitude and behavior of all the nations, Israel will be different as well. Indeed, no one among God’s people will be seen who does not worship in a sincere manner, as circumstances will be so different that unrighteous behavior towards God will vanish (14:7). This does not mean the people who do such things will be removed, but that Israelites themselves will be different so that such things will not occur. The worship of God will be universal.

The eschatology of chap. 14 also claims that the people of God will be safe. They will live in safety; they will live in the chosen city, Jerusalem (Tob 14:7).⁴⁵ Jerusalem, the

⁴¹Flusser delineates the category of eschatological psalms and observes that they “spring from Israel’s longing for deliverance from the foreign yoke and from the eschatological hopes connected with Jerusalem.” Flusser, “Psalms,” 556. Moore notes that this is not merely about Assyrian domination, but emphasizes the idyllic outcome pointing toward Jerusalem and the temple. C. Moore, *Tobit*, 296.

⁴²The assertion here of the “correct temple” is supported in two different ways in the text of Tob 14:5-7. First, it is not the first or second temple that is the center of the eschatological space-time continuum; it is this next temple. Clearly, this temple must be different in some way that makes it the correct temple. Second, regarding this latter temple, it is said in Tob 14:5, “the temple of God will be rebuilt, just as the prophets of Israel have said concerning it.” This text is clear that the second temple (at least) is not “as the prophets of Israel have said.”

⁴³Stefan Beyerle, “‘Release Me to Go to My Everlasting Home ...’ (Tob 3:6): A Belief in an Afterlife in Late Wisdom Literature,” in *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology*, ed. Geza G. Zeravits and Jozsef Zsengeller (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 87.

⁴⁴Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 315.

⁴⁵The people of Israel will live in safety in the land (Deut 12:10) and it is reported that they do live in safety (Deut 33:12, 28). The place the Lord will choose is also a thread of Deuteronomy (Deut 12:5, 11, 14, 18, 21, 26; 14:23, 24, 25; 15:20; 16:2, 6, 7, 11, 15, 16; 17:8, 10; 18:6; 26:2; 31:11). This place is clearly the Jerusalem temple at the city, Jerusalem. Di Lella equates v. 7’s declaration that sin will vanish to “the great Deuteronomomic equation.” Di Lella has examined the Deuteronomomic nature of chap. 14. Di Lella,

city that was destroyed (14:4), will be the safe residence for Israel. Notice that this comes from a member of the tribe of Naphtali. Israel will be unified again.⁴⁶ No more will the political situation affect the place where God's people will worship God. Politics, safety, and righteousness of the people will be radically transformed after "the temple of God will be rebuilt, just as the prophets of Israel have said concerning it" (Tob 14:5).⁴⁷ The temple in Tob 14:5 changes the assembled people and rulers from a situation in which they are surrounded by hostile nations to vastly different circumstances, where the attitude of every nation toward God will be like that of Israel. Here, the temple has initiated a sequence that has resulted in eschatological harmony.

The last two chapters of Tobit present a teaching on the temple.⁴⁸ This teaching is based in the prophets.⁴⁹ The prophetic foundation of chap. 13 is implied with the allusion

"Background," 384. Fitzmyer has also noted that "[t]he farewell discourse of Tobit in vv. 3b-11 is heavily influenced by Deuteronomic theology of retribution." Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 324.

⁴⁶Jerusalem, the chosen place in the unified Israel, will again be back in its rightful place. Fitzmyer notes that "Jerusalem is again understood as the ideal dwelling" of the Lord. Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 316.

⁴⁷There is no messianic figure in Tobit. The text in no way indicates any concept that a messiah changes the world, people, or its orientation. Tobit presents the temple as the crucial instrument. Tobit 13 and 14 are linked by some to the days of the Messiah even though there is no messiah. Strack and Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, 1:799. Giffin is unable to divorce messiah and temple alleging that "in future ages there will be a yet more glorious Temple—in the time of the Messiah—having in mind e.g. Is 2:2-3; Hag 2:6-9 and resuming the theme of Tb 13:11 whose passing reference to the nations is here enlarged." Giffin, "Tobit," 402.

⁴⁸Note the parallel with Ezek 43:12.

⁴⁹DeSilva goes further and notes that the eschatology here is restating the prophetic eschatology. DeSilva, *Apocrypha*, 80. Nickelsburg understands that the meaning in Tob 14:4-7 is a restatement of what the prophetic books proclaim. "Elements in this scenario are predicted in the books of the prophets, notably Isa 40-66, but the best parallel is *I En.* 91:11-14." George W. Nickelsburg, "Tobit," *HarperCollins Study Bible*, ed. Wayne A. Meeks (New York: HarperCollins, 1993), 1457-1458. However, Skemp maintains that Tob 14:4-5 is *ex eventu* prophecy. Perhaps the first rebuilding of the temple can be prophecy looking backwards, but Skemp's assessment deals incorrectly with the third rebuilding (the second after the first temple) or treats the third rebuilding as Herod's temple, which did not accomplish what 14:5 declares (thus making Tobit false), but would also date Tobit's *ex eventu* prophecy to the time of Herod's rebuilding. The first rebuilding of the temple was accomplished before the text of Tobit was written and, therefore, the text of Tob 14:5 in the first of two rebuilding declarations could be *ex eventu* prophecy (and probably was), but in order for the second rebuilding of the temple mentioned in Tob 14:5 to be *ex eventu* prophecy, the text would have had to be written after Herod's rebuilding, which would place the writing of the text in the first century of the Common Era. However, Qumran evidence proves this to be incorrect as fragments of Tobit have been found at Qumran that predate Herod's temple. Vincent Skemp, "Avenues of Intertextuality

of the glorious Jerusalem based upon Isaiah, Micah, and Zechariah as noted above. However, chap. 14 is explicit. The prophets, Nahum explicitly,⁵⁰ are referred to in vv. 4 and 5. The testament is a teaching from father to son; the text is presenting this eschatological teaching as being founded upon the prophets.⁵¹ The reference to the prophet's words in these verses not only bases the words of the testament upon the ancient prophecies, but lends authority to the testament of Tobit.⁵² The references to the appointed time (14:4) and the fulfillment of the prophecies (14:5) accentuate the eschatological timeline in the text, detailed above. Although these last two chapters cover a few details, they do not focus on what the *eschaton* will be like, but how and when it will occur. The timeline has been foretold and the timeline will come to fruition at the appointed time.⁵³

This section addresses the second temple that was the established temple at the time of the writing of this text and many of its implications, detailed below, critique this temple.⁵⁴ It was not the correct temple in terms of opulence or purity,⁵⁵ but it also did not

between Tobit and the New Testament," in *Intertextual Studies in Ben Sira and Tobit*, ed. Jeremy Corley and Vincent Skemp (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 2005), 68.

⁵⁰This may be "Jonah" instead of Nahum, depending on which Greek manuscript is used. Codex Vaticanus has Jonah; Codex Sinaiticus has Nahum.

⁵¹The past, present, and future of the temple is important to the text. Although the temple is clearly important to the text, the text is not merely writing about the temple. It is a teaching document. Fitzmyer notes that "the purpose of the book of Tobit is clearly didactic edification." Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "Tobit," *The Oxford Bible Commentary*, ed. John Barton and John Muddiman (London: Oxford University Press, 2001), 627.

⁵²This teaching document, as mentioned above, not only builds upon the earlier prophets, but owes much of its teaching authority to the foundation built by the prophets. Many prophetic works emphasize the temple, eschatology, and restoration. Here the text of Tobit uses the hope built by predecessors to add more credence to its own teaching. "Tobit's description of Jerusalem as the hope of the future reflects the vision of Israel's prophets." Nowell, "Tobit," 3:1062.

⁵³Fitzmyer's literal translation of the key passage of 14:5 is "until the time, when the time of (its) critical periods shall be complete." Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 328.

⁵⁴Referring to Tob 14:5, Knibb states that this "is a clear statement of the view that the Second Temple only had a provisional character, and this no doubt reflects the critical attitude towards the Second Temple that we have seen in *I En.*" Michael A. Knibb, "Temple and Cult in Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal Writings from Before the Common Era," in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*, ed. John Day (New York: T. & T. Clark, 2005), 409.

occur at the correct time.⁵⁶ It is important to note that there is one thing that the text does not critique about the temple. The returned exiles rebuilt the temple. The text states explicitly the first time in v. 5 that the returnees rebuilt the temple and then, later in the same verse, the text states that the temple will be rebuilt (the passive syntax of Tob 14:5) when referring to the glorious temple. It is hard to believe that a passive syntax of οἰκοδομηθήσεται alludes to God's rebuilding the temple after the people are described in the first rebuilding of the temple. The three assertions that the temple will be built,⁵⁷ in the Greek, are in the passive, but they are not occurrences of the divine passive.⁵⁸ The natural implication of the text is not that the people should not have built the second temple. Quite the contrary, the people should have rebuilt the temple, as was done, and

⁵⁵Barker compares the Enoch and Tobit temple stories and notes this important nuance in the text. "Tobit speaks of two rebuilt temples: one that was less glorious than the first temple, and then another when the 'times of the age are completed' (Tob. 14.5). This is like the Enoch tradition, which knew that the Second Temple had been built, but thought it impure and looked forward to its destruction and to a more glorious temple in the future (1 En. 89:73; 90:28-9)." Margaret Barker, "The Archangel Raphael in the Book of Tobit," in *Studies in the Book of Tobit: A Multidisciplinary Approach*, ed. Mark Bredin (London: T. & T. Clark, 2006), 118.

⁵⁶Note the important parallel with *L.A.B.* 56:2 on the timing needed when building the correct temple. In both Tobit and *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* the time for the future temple is addressed. The initial rebuilding of the temple, the second temple, is presented in Tobit as occurring at the wrong time as the temple will need to be rebuilt again even though it was just rebuilt. In *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*, the author also notes that the time is wrong to build the future temple.

⁵⁷These three are from Tob 13:11 (13:10 Eng), 13:17 (13:16 Eng), and 14:5.

⁵⁸Bailey notes about the divine passive that "Literature shows that the **passive** is not used to avoid God's name so much as to emphasize process and destiny." Kenneth E. Bailey, *Jesus through Middle Eastern Eyes: Cultural Studies in the Gospels* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press), 109. These three occurrences do not seem to emphasize the process, but seem to be acknowledgments that the temple will be built (even in the English, this idea is presented in the passive). Wallace notes the important aspect of the definition of the divine passive. "The passive is also used when *God is the obvious agent*. Many grammars call this a *divine passive*." Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996), 437. The emphasis in this quote is from Wallace. God may have been behind the effort to build either the first or second Jerusalem, but without a doubt, humans built the two Jerusalem temples. There is no possible way God is the "obvious agent" in these three occurrences. However, there are instances of the passive alluding to God in these Tobit passages (e.g., Tob 1:4 "was chosen," "been consecrated," "been established," Tob 13:5 "have been scattered," Tob 13:15 [13:13 Eng] "be gathered," Tob 14:4 "will be overturned"). Contra Schiffman, who groups Tob 14:5 with 4Q174, *Jub.* 1, and the Temple Scroll 29:7-10. He contends that these texts argue for divine construction of the Jerusalem temple. Lawrence H. Schiffman, "Jerusalem in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Centrality of Jerusalem: Historical Perspectives*, eds. Marcel Poorthuis and Chana Safrai (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996), 85.

acknowledged God. However, when the appointed time has come, that is at the correct time, the temple will need to be rebuilt by the people in order to affect the people and the nations in the new and all-encompassing manner that is described in the prophetic writings and in this prophetic writing.⁵⁹

Conclusion

The book of Tobit is a second temple Jewish text that informs its audience of eschatological realities and calls the audience to necessary foundational actions.⁶⁰ Though an entertaining tale, teaching is at the heart of what the book of Tobit was intended to accomplish. The book describes how life is meant to be lived in the face of suffering.⁶¹ The book also describes the eschatological timeline, which is given in the face of suffering to assure the audience of the great things to come.⁶² The fact of future tidings for God's people assures hope and teaches perseverance in the face of troubled times. More than passive perseverance, Tobit calls the audience to acknowledge and praise God in the midst of hard circumstances and to unite around the chosen city (14:8). The text calls for the rebuilt second temple to be rebuilt again in splendor, passive though

⁵⁹Craghan also sees a Deuteronomic influence here encompassing reward and retribution that goes beyond the land and people of Israel, reaching out into the world to the nations. John Craghan, *Esther, Judith, Tobit, Jonah, Ruth* (Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1982), 160.

⁶⁰Charles considered the eschatology of Tobit to be minimal, missing the importance of its eschatological teaching and the role the temple plays in Tobit. Robert Henry Charles, *Eschatology: The Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, Judaism and Christianity: A Critical History* (New York: Schocken, 1963), 170.

⁶¹Note Nickelsburg's opening sentence on Tobit. "God is with us, even in the midst of trouble and suffering!" Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 30. Suffering is an important theme in Tobit as Nickelsburg draws out; however, the presence of God is important as well. God's presence and its effects upon Israel are at the heart of what Tobit conveys to its audience.

⁶²This timeline, as has been shown, is founded upon other prophetic writings. This fact adds authority not only to its own revelation, but authority and trustworthiness to the previous writings and to the faith of Israel itself. The reliance on the prophets "illustrates the trustworthiness of Israel's ancient faith." D. Dumm, "Tobit (Tobias), Book of," *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 2nd ed. (Detroit, MI: Gale, 2003), 1:97.

not a divine passive.⁶³ At the appointed time, the people and God will perform important actions that bring about changes in Israel and the other nations.

An important implication of the book of Tobit is that the Jerusalem temple affects many aspects of human life. Starting in chap. 1 of Tobit, the case is made for the preeminence, the chosenness, and the importance of the Jerusalem temple.⁶⁴ The temple affects and transcends human politics. The temple and the indwelling God give protection to the completely gathered nation of Israel. The temple initiates the events that change human proclivities to rebel against God and attracts all the nations to worship the God of Israel.

The understanding in Tobit that the correct temple initiates radically new circumstances in creation is a critique of the current temple. Although Tobit was written while the second Jerusalem temple was standing, this second temple is presented in the book as only a temporary measure until the correct temple is built to replace it. This critique of the author's current temple is based on the confidence in the ancient prophecies about the Jerusalem temple.⁶⁵ There is a call for the people to change their actions (Tob 13:11 [13:10 Eng], 14:7). The author's critique of the current temple is not clearly delineated and left open to conjecture (e.g., wrong size, wrong layout, wrong magnificence, something else, or all of these). Yet, the critique comes from what "the prophets of Israel have said concerning it" (Tob 14:5). The prophetic writings give the author of Tobit the foundation to issue his own prophecy regarding the correct temple, clearly critiquing the second temple. The timing and effects of the temple of the author's

⁶³Corbin heightens this splendor to idealization with the longing for the perfect temple. The ideal, perfect, magnificent temple is to be longed for and built in the future. Corbin, *Temple*, 293-294.

⁶⁴The temple's characteristics are vital to the narrative of Tobit. Moore notes "very strong emphasis on cultic concerns" of chaps. 1, 13, and 14. C. Moore, *Tobit*, 27.

⁶⁵Mottolèse notes that projections of second temple period writings contain "a reaction to the unworthy status of the Second Sanctuary." Mottolèse, *Analogy*, 75.

time did not match expectations or desires. It is the next temple, in the prophecy of Tobit, that ushers in eschatological events for Israel and creation.⁶⁶

Sirach

Introduction

The book called Sirach, or the Wisdom of Ben Sira, was written “to strengthen the faith and confidence of his fellow Jews.”⁶⁷ Deuteronomic influence is evident in the eschatology of chap. 36 and throughout Sirach.⁶⁸ The positive view of the temple and its priesthood is well known.⁶⁹ However, the temple and the role it plays in the prayer in the middle of Sirach have not been fully examined. This investigation into the temple and its role in Sirach is needed in order to understand the eschatology of Sirach. The prayer of chap. 36 shows important similarities to other second temple Jewish writings on the subject of the temple and eschatology. Though only one small passage in a large text that deals with many practices and issues, the temple theology and eschatology of chap. 36 shine through in harmony with the practical theology of how to live life for God.

The Prayer for the Future

The pericope of Sir 36:1-22 has been called both a lament and prayer of petition.⁷⁰

⁶⁶Moore correlates the events following the temple in Tobit to *1 En.* 90 and 91 with both voicing similar hope. He observes that the actions of the nations in Tobit are more expansive than have occurred either with the second temple or Herod’s temple. C. Moore, *Tobit*, 291.

⁶⁷Alexander A. Di Lella, “Wisdom of Ben Sira,” *ABD*, 6:933.

⁶⁸Di Lella notes that “Ben Sira subscribes to the great Deuteronomic equation: to fear God = to love him = to keep his commandments = to walk in his ways (cf. Deut 10:12-13; 30:16).” Di Lella, “Wisdom,” 6:941. Beentjes uses the phrase מְבֹרָךְ שֵׁבֶטְךָ (place of your throne) as a Deuteronomistic indicator. Pancratius C. Beentjes, “The Book of Ben Sira and Deuteronomistic Heritage: A Critical Approach,” in *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*, ed. Hanne von Weissenberg, Juha Pakkala, and Marko Marttila (Berlin: Gruyter, 2011), 283.

⁶⁹Knibb evaluates the relationship Sirach has with the temple. “Sirach, as is well known, takes a very positive view of the Temple and the cult in Jerusalem.” Knibb, “Temple,” 402.

⁷⁰Skehan calls 36:1-22 a prayer, a lament. Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (New York: Doubleday, 1987), 420. DeSilva calls 36:1-22 a corporate lament.

The historical events of the land of Israel in the second century BCE explain the reason for lament or petition.⁷¹ The Seleucid Empire ruled the region. However, there are many different reactions to the foreign domination in second temple Jewish documents. This pericope is a prayer to God concerning changing the appointed time when circumstances surrounding the Jewish people would change and what those changes would be.⁷²

First, it is important to note that this passage indicates an eschatological timeline embedded in the author's eschatological prayer. The petition starts by asking for God to be against the enemies of the Jews. This shows obviously that there are enemies of the Jews at the time of the writing.⁷³ Then the petition goes on to seek a more complete ingathering of the Jews of the Diaspora. The historical circumstances of the second century show that there already has been a return of some exiles to the land of Israel and the temple had been rebuilt. Sirach chap. 50 praises Simon, the high priest, and thus, again it is clear that there has been a return and a rebuilding of the temple. However, here the author is calling for a complete gathering of the tribes of Jacob into the allotted inheritance, a new beginning for the people of Israel. The petition goes on to ask for a restored Jerusalem and finally a restored temple, that is, with the glory of the Lord

DeSilva, *Apocrypha*, 164. DeSilva also calls this a lament psalm. David A. deSilva, "Sirach," *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, ed. Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000), 1119. Di Lella calls 36:1-22 a prayer of petition. Skehan and Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 28.

⁷¹Coggins dates the main body of Sirach to 190-180 and the prologue to 132 BCE. Richard J. Coggins, *Sirach* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 18.

⁷²This appointed time could come any time. Although it is difficult to predict when Sirach thought the appointed time would come, Snaith argues that this passage hopes for deliverance for the Jewish people from the Seleucid empire. He notes that "[t]he appointed time' (v. 10) is probably the moment of deliverance from Syrian overlordship." John Snaith, "Tobit," *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible*, ed. John W. Rogerson (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), 792. Any oppression, including that of the Seleucids, held the Jewish people brought on the longing for the future when conditions would be different.

⁷³Porter describes Sirach's theology of suffering to be not only disciplinary, but also temporary. Porter summarizes Sirach's eschatology showing that "Sirach insists that all will be straightened out in the end." Frank C. Porter, "The Religious Ideas of the Book of Ecclesiasticus. II," *The Old and New Testament Student* 13, no. 2 (August 1891): 89. The temporary, disciplinary understanding of the sufferings is illustrative of Deuteronomic theology (e.g., Deut 30:1-2).

inhabiting the Jerusalem temple. This is to be done to “[b]ear witness to those whom you created in the beginning, and fulfill the prophecies spoken in your name” (Sir 36:14 [36:20 Eng.]).⁷⁴ This passage has no messianic figure bringing about eschatological conditions; the temple is the focus in the passage that postulates these new conditions.⁷⁵ Second temple writings have called for the glory of the Lord to inhabit the temple, bringing events of the new age. Here in this second temple writing, the event to happen after the indwelling of the glory of the Lord in the Jerusalem temple is that all the world will know God, “the God of the ages,” implying that they will know God forever (36:16 [36:22 Eng.]). This phrasing indicates a universal knowledge of the God of Israel and a permanent situation. The declaration that the people will have knowledge of God is an eschatological event common in second temple prophetic writings.⁷⁶

Second, this petition in Sir 36 shows an eschatology that has been predetermined. The petition seeks to “hasten the day” (Sir 36:7 [36:10 Eng.]).⁷⁷ This future day of the Lord may have evolved from the concept of “the day of the Lord” common in the prophets.⁷⁸ If so, this petition has been transformed into asking for a day when specific

⁷⁴Sirach does not cite any specific prophets here at this point, but the second temple prophets who speak of building the temple or its magnificence such as Ezekiel, Haggai, Zechariah, and Trito-Isaiah should be considered as potential prophets that the author could be citing here. Mack does not see the temple referred to here even though it is specifically mentioned in the preceding verse; he regards this reference to prophecies (specifically cited as prophets in the next verse) as only Jeremiah. Burton L. Mack, “Sirach,” *HarperCollins Study Bible*, ed. Wayne A. Meeks (New York: HarperCollins, 1993), 1587.

⁷⁵Contra Kearns, who understands this passage, v. 14 specifically, to allude to Hag 2, which he holds to be messianic and he holds to include the conversion of the Gentiles. C. Kearns, “Ecclesiasticus, or the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach,” *A New Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*, ed. Reginald C. Fuller (Nashville: Nelson, 1975), 557.

⁷⁶For an example, see Isa 66:23.

⁷⁷As mentioned above, it is important that this passage has no messianic figure, though Peters stresses the clarity of the messianic era in this passage. “V. 10 meint zweifellos die glückliche messianische Endzeit, vor der man zu stehen glaubte, ebenso die Sammlung der Versprengten Israels in v. 13 (vgl. 51, 12 [6], wie auch v. 18-19 auf das Erscheinen der messianischen Herrlichkeit im zweiten Tempel gehen.” Norbert Peters, *Das Buch Jesus Sirach oder Ecclesiasticus* (Münster in Westf.: Aschendorff Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1913), 295. It often appears that the glorious temple that initiates these events has been overlooked in favor of a messiah.

⁷⁸The phrase “the day of the Lord” occurs 15 times in the Prophets: Isa 13:6, 9; Ezek 13:5 (cf. Ezek 30:3); Joel 1:15; 2:1, 11; 3:4, 4:14; Amos 5:18 (twice), 20; Obad 15; Zeph 1:7, 14; Mal 3:23.

actions regarding the temple (Sir 36:12, 13 [36:18-19 Eng.]) have become the focus of the day of the Lord, changing these ancient prophecies. The prayer includes calls for mercy upon Israel (Sir 36:11 [36:17 Eng.]) and anger against the enemies of Israel (Sir 36:8 [36:11 Eng.]). There is the idea that the “appointed time” (Sir 36:7 [36:10 Eng.]) had been set and events were unfolding toward that predetermined point in time. An important idea behind this time to come is the idea of a reward for God’s people (Sir 36:15 [36:21 Eng.]). The expectant use of the themes of reward and re-creation of ideal situations shows important eschatological outcomes (Sir 36:10 [36:16 Eng.]). From these predetermined eschatological events on the eschatological timeline, the petition asks for important predetermined, prophesied benchmarks to occur.⁷⁹ A casual reading of this section will show that benchmarks or signs of this transforming period include the call to put all the nations in fear of God (Sir 36:1).

Next, there is a call to destroy the adversary and wipe out the enemy (Sir 36:6 [36:9 Eng.]). Then, the tribes of Jacob are to be gathered (Sir 36:10 [36:13 Eng.]) as well as giving their inheritance to them as at the beginning (Sir 36:10 [36:16 Eng.]). The last of these benchmarks to occur in the petition, before reward and universal knowledge of God that can be ascribed to events of the *eschaton*,⁸⁰ is the glory of the Lord to fill the Jerusalem temple (Sir 36:13 [36:19 Eng.]),⁸¹ a pivotal event in this chapter in Sirach.

After God has had mercy on the city (Sir 36:12 [36:18 Eng.]) and fills the temple with God’s glory, there are further important benchmarks. A call to fulfill the prophecies

⁷⁹Mack notes that the prayer of Sir 36:1-17 is about struggle and the request for help from God that “pivots on a moment of rescue.” Mack, “Sirach,” in *The Books of the Bible: The Apocrypha and the New Testament*, ed. Bernhard W. Anderson (New York: Scribner, 1989), 74.

⁸⁰Crenshaw positively avers this passage is depicting the eschatological era. James L. Crenshaw, “The Book of Sirach,” *NIB*, 4:801.

⁸¹There are textual differences and variants in Sir 36 and especially here at 36:13-14. For an explanation of some of the different orders of these texts here and the different contents see the apparatus of the Septuaginta. Robert Hanhart and Alfred Rahlfs, eds., *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta 70 interpretes: Duo volumina in uno* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006), 438.

that have been prophesied about this time (Sir 36:14 [36:20 Eng.]) may be vague. However, these prophecies seem to be alluding to eschatological events that come after God is dwelling with the people. Next, a call for the people to get a reward, which again appears with reference to prophets being found trustworthy, seems to be a reward that can be understood as an eschatological reward (Sir 36:15 [36:21 Eng.]). This can be thought of as an eschatological reward because the next benchmark mentioned is that all the earth will know the God of all the ages (Sir 36:16 [36:22 Eng.]). This is cosmic in scope and eternal in nature.

The events on the timeline in Sirach show a distinct difference between those before the temple is filled with the glory of God that involve an enemy and gathering Israel to their land and those after the glory has filled the temple that concern cosmic eternal events and the reward for Israel according to the prophets' predictions. This difference shows the important role the correct or modified temple plays in this petition. Baumgarten is correct in asserting that Ben-Sira did not call for a new or rebuilt temple;⁸² yet, he overlooks the fact that Ben-Sira calls for a change in the temple itself. The call to glorify the temple is a recognition that the temple is lacking in some way. Thus, Ben-Sira is indeed critical of the existing temple, noting its inferior nature (i.e., its glory).

Lastly, it is important to understand the critique of the current temple, which Sirach praises,⁸³ and the expected role of a renewed temple to come. This pericope overtly indicates that the present temple, no matter how glorious the text presents it, is inadequate.⁸⁴ The indwelling glory is not there, for why would the prayer ask for

⁸² Albert I. Baumgarten, "The Role of Jerusalem and the Temple in 'End of Days' Speculation in the Second Temple Period," in *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, ed. Lee I. Levine (New York: Continuum, 1999), 78.

⁸³See Sir 24:11, 47:13, or 49:12.

⁸⁴Contra Knibb, who maintains: "[I]t is significant that there is no suggestion in Sirach that the rebuilt Temple was unclean or in any way provisional." Knibb, "Temple," 403. Yet in chap. 36, there is a cry to have pity with Jerusalem and the petition to fill the temple with the glory of the Lord (36:18-19). Although Knibb might see this as a call for more glory to be added to the temple, this inherently is a flaw or

something already given rather than praise God for the indwelling?⁸⁵ The request to God is for a change that will bring or allow the glory to inhabit the Jerusalem temple. The existing temple is insufficient to bring about the desired effects that are requested of the temple in this petition. The temple lacks something, or else the glory of the Lord would be there already, as this passage does not seem to be merely a call for the glory of the Lord to fill the temple. This passage calls for a change in the temple; the passage calls for the Lord to have pity on the city of your sanctuary, not just to fill the temple.⁸⁶ The new, corrected, or modified temple, with the indwelling of the glory of the Lord, will bring about the reward for the descendants of Jacob. This new, corrected, or modified temple will also spread word and knowledge of God throughout the world.

The temple in this passage of Sirach is an important eschatological entity that affects people, space, and time, unlike the existing form of the second temple at the time of the book. However, the temple affects creation only in the manner described after the glory of God dwells there. The passage indicates that it is the presence of God that affects creation, yet it is the temple that allows God to dwell on the earth. If one were to not see a critique of the temple here in Sirach, then one would see the text as claiming the Lord is already in the temple.⁸⁷ Then that position would have to explain why there is a claim to

somehow inadequate, since God must pity the temple and change the status of the current temple to fill it with the glory of God.

⁸⁵Contra Aitken who holds that, here, Sirach is speaking of a realized picture of the temple. James K. Aitken, "Apocalyptic, Revelation, and Early Jewish Wisdom Literature," in *New Heaven and New Earth Prophecy and the Millennium: Essays in Honour of Anthony Gelston*, ed. P. J. Harland and C. T. R. Hayward (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 189. Aitken's view that Sirach believes that the temple is filled with the glory in his day belies the imperative of v. 19, *πλησον*, pleading to God for the fulfillment to occur.

⁸⁶Beentjes notes that "Ben Sira deliberately belittles King Solomon's contribution to the Jerusalem cult and worship – and therefore very consciously *deviates* from traditional and familiar image – to the best of my belief is closely connected with his theological view on Israel's history, as set forth in the *Praise of the Famous* (Sir 44-50)." Beentjes, "Ben Sira," 284.

⁸⁷Construction of the Tabernacle and temple show that the Lord's glory fills the temple when constructed according to plan. There is no call to fill a temple that has been built in Scripture. Clearly, here in Sirach who cites most every book of Scripture, the book is not calling for the Lord to accept the temple as built (though it is clearly lacking). Sirach is calling for a change in status of the temple so that the Lord

glorify a temple where the Lord already dwells. This position opposes the imperative in the text that calls for a change. Recognition of the temple and where it is in the eschatological timeline shows that this passage does indeed contain some eschatological role of the temple in this passage.

Conclusion

Many of the Jewish writings mention the coming future time when a gathered people will reside with the presence of their God; Sirach mentions it and prays that this eschatological timeline will hasten to come upon the people. Sirach looks to the future with longing for this eschatological timeline, to a time when Israel and God will be together again in close relationship and this relationship will affect the land and the people, as well as all nations. Although Sirach esteems the temple and priests, the text acknowledges that the current temple is lacking the most important function: It is not the dwelling of the glory of God. The return and dwelling of the glory of God will yield reward for Israel and knowledge of Israel's God throughout the nations. Thus, Sirach directs the focus of the eschatological timeline to the temple.⁸⁸ Once the temple is full of the glory of God, the appointed time will be manifested. This appointed time, when God will fill the temple, is described in order to teach the audience that the end is predetermined. The predetermined end also adds to the understanding of the eschatological timeline in the text. Although Sirach does not call for a new temple building, the current temple is not filled with the glory of God, showing a call for a

can dwell within it. This call for a change shows that there is some aspect of the temple that is lacking and must be changed. This call for a change is the subtle critique that is being noticed in this analysis.

⁸⁸Argall has also taken notice of the tie between the receipt of eschatological rewards and the temple. "Rather, the people who receive God's eschatological mercy (36:17) are immediately related to city and temple which experience the same mercy (36:18)." Randal A. Argall, *I Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative Literary and Conceptual Analysis of the Themes of Revelation, Creation, and Judgment* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 218. Notice that the text, and Argall here, tie the eschatological mercy to the temple and not to the covenant or actions of the covenant (cf. Deut 28).

change in the existing temple so that the glory of the Lord will dwell within it.⁸⁹

Therefore, Sirach calls out for a correction to the existing temple so that the glory of the Lord will fill it in this pericope in Sirach and this temple will lead to great change.⁹⁰

Second Maccabees

Introduction

Second Maccabees is a second temple Jewish document that is a condensation of a longer history of the period (2:23). The theological relationship of the temple to the history in 2 Maccabees has been examined to some extent.⁹¹ The book presents an eschatology dependent upon the temple, which has been cursorily noted but not examined in depth.⁹² The study of eschatology in 2 Maccabees has focused on social revolution, resurrection, and judgment after death, which could result in eternal reward for a righteous life or punishment for the wicked.⁹³ However, in stressing the temple, the book indicates how God interacts with Israel. Although, there is little detail on the nations' actions in the *eschaton*, the text presents expectations and hopes based upon the relationship between God and God's people, Israel.

In the fifteen chapters of the text, there are thirty-seven verses with direct

⁸⁹DiSilva writes that "Ben Sira passionately hopes for the gathering of the exiles of Israel, the restoration of their inheritance and the elevation of Zion to the glory that is its due as the dwelling place of the one God (Sir 36:13, 16-19)." DeSilva, "Sirach," 1120.

⁹⁰These calls are in the imperative from the author to God, and therefore, they are not divine passive forms.

⁹¹See Doran's monograph on the temple in 2 Maccabees. Robert Doran, *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees* (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1981). Harrington notes: "The major theme of 2 Maccabees is the Jerusalem temple." Daniel J. Harrington, "2 Maccabees," *HarperCollins Study Bible*, ed. Wayne A. Meeks (New York: HarperCollins, 1993), 1692.

⁹²This can be seen in how DeSilva posits the eschatological nature of the early letter within 2 Maccabees. He notes, "The theme of the eschatological ingathering recurs throughout the earlier letter like a refrain (1:27; 2:7, 18), giving a strongly nationalistic coloring to the eschatology of the book as a whole." DeSilva, *Apocrypha*, 278.

⁹³These three among others are discussed by and about the books of the Maccabees as well as other second temple texts. Albertz, *History*, 2:563-597.

references to the Jerusalem temple using: ἱερόν (sanctuary, temple), ναός (temple, shrine), νεώς (temple, shrine), τόπος (place), and οἶκος (house). Most of these references refer to the events unfolding around the temple in the time period of the book. However, the reference to the temple in chap. 2 has the theme of future expectation at its core, rather than historical reflection.⁹⁴ It is important to examine this chapter in terms of the eschatological expectation surrounding the historical events at the temple in Jerusalem.

The Eschatological Expectation of the Temple

As a preface to the expectation of the coming temple and events that will hopefully follow, the text depicts Jeremiah hiding the tent, ark, and altar (2:1-8). The text declares that these physical items are to remain hidden “until” God gathers the people and shows mercy to them. This temporal marker, ἕως (till, until) in 2 Macc 2:7, shows the belief in a future event that will change the circumstances of the temple and people. This expectation revolves around the temple. The temple is implied as the tent and the ark

⁹⁴Doran understands that “the purification of the temple is an important event, but not the climactic end of history.” Robert Doran, “I and II Maccabees,” in *The Books of the Bible: The Apocrypha and the New Testament*, ed. Bernhard W. Anderson (New York: Scribner, 1989), 106. Doran stops short of using this reference to the temple as the initiation of the *eschaton*. However, the importance of the purification or the correction to the temple shows the text’s understanding of the critical role of the temple in unfolding events between humanity and God. It is important to understand the text of Second Maccabees in the context of the second temple literature, which is its milieu. Then the radical change would be more apparent. A radical change specifically mentioned is “will gather us from everywhere under the sky into his holy place” (2 Macc 2:18). There seems to be a radical change hoped for with a purification of the temple, although it is not specifically illuminated, which is the dwelling of the glory of God in this now pure temple. Comparing 2 Maccabees to many of the Qumran texts shows that in the Qumran the actions of the people that are not related to the temple take precedence (cf. 1QS, 1QM, or CD). Second temple documents such as Chronicles (e.g., 2 Chr 19, 2 Chr 34:29-33, and especially 2 Chr 36, which emphasizes the line of David), Ezra-Nehemiah (e.g., Ezra 9:5-15, Ezra 10:10-44, Neh 9:38-10:39), or Judith (e.g., Jdt 8:4-6, 13:1-9) emphasize correct actions of the people and ignore the role the temple plays in eschatological matters. Perez notes the relationship between this text and texts of the Christian Scriptures, showing the eschatological relationship. Perez notes, “In like manner the relationship established in 2:18 between the purification of the Temple and the action of God helps to uncover the eschatological meaning behind the gestures of Jesus during the purification of the Temple (John 2:13-22). The one time that the feast of the Dedication is mentioned in the Christian Scriptures (John 10:22-24) serves as context for openly posing the question of whether or not Jesus is the Messiah and to offer Jesus himself the opportunity to reveal himself as the Son of God, one with the Father (John 10:30, 38).” Gonzalo A. Perez, “2 Maccabees,” *International Bible Commentary: A Catholic and Ecumenical Commentary for the Twenty-First Century*, ed. William R. Farmer (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998), 743. If Perez is correct, then Jesus cleansing the temple might have been intended as an eschatological action.

mentioned in 2 Macc 2:4 and the altar of incense in 2 Macc 2:5 are all being saved and hidden for a correct temple in the future (cf. 2 Macc 2:16-18). The text is describing the sacred items needed for a temple at some time in the future (the future relative to the time of Jeremiah). The text also describes the initial divine indwelling of the Solomonic temple and tabernacle that Moses guided into being (2 Macc 2:8).

The important initial events—the coming of the glory of God and the cloud of smoke that will appear when God inhabits the temple—are key indicators within the text to the importance of the temple to the future of the people and to the manner in which the events are expected to unfold.⁹⁵ These initiating events of the indwelling of the temple are highlighted in the text because of the importance of the temple to the text of Second Maccabees. The importance of the temple and the manner in which the events unfold are mentioned in concert with the return of the exiles to the land of Israel and anticipation of mercy from God, so that a new beginning will be able to start.

With this preface in chap. 2, the text moves on to make its point. God has shown mercy. This mercy entailed God's divine protection over the Maccabean revolt. It is God who saved the people (2:17), although the author details the human actions that have led to the events under investigation. This anticipates the dual nature of the eschatological events, both human and divine. The humans are about to celebrate the purification, and there is expectation in the upcoming human events that will hopefully influence God to change events even further. It is because of the human actions about to take place (note the question, charge, and encouragement to the recipients of this text to completely keep the days of purification, 2 Macc 2:16) that God is expected (the hope proclaimed in 2 Macc 2:18) to do great things in response.

Notice also the actions ascribed to God in 2 Macc 2:17 that were accomplished by

⁹⁵Hellerman states that "Second Maccabees focuses repeatedly on the importance of Israel's sacred space." Joseph Hellerman, "Purity and Nationalism in Second Temple Literature: 1-2 Maccabees and Jubilees," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 46, no. 3 (September 2003): 407.

human actions: “returned the inheritance to all, and the kingship and the priesthood and the consecration.” The encouragement of v. 16 shows that the author believes that the expectation has a better chance of taking place with the complete devotion of God’s people. The point of this pericope is that because the temple has been purified, God is about to gather all God’s people to Jerusalem. This expectation is because these events have been detailed in the teachings from the books, the Torah and Prophets, which are referred to multiple times in 2 Macc 2.

God will keep the promises that are recorded in the sacred books that have been preserved through the war (2:14, 18). There is a promise of gathering in all the exiles and the ones dispersed from all creation, that is, “under the sky” (2 Macc 2:18).⁹⁶ This complete ingathering, which is a common prerequisite event to the end of the exile and the beginning of the *eschaton* in second temple Jewish texts,⁹⁷ indicates that the *eschaton* is imminent. The eschatological timeline of Second Maccabees follows from its crucial event, the purifying of the temple. The temple must be the correct one that was purified after the revolt and subsequent observances (as shown in consecration mentioned in 2 Macc 2:17 and the call to observe the days of purification in v. 16).

The purifying of the temple is important to the text, because it is the event that is hoped to finally bring about the complete inheritance of the people, the complete ingathering of those dispersed in the world, and the fulfillment of the promises kept in the sacred books because this purified temple can now be the dwelling of God.⁹⁸ The understanding of v. 2:18 was that the purifying of the temple was hoped to be the initial

⁹⁶Collins emphasizes the definitive nature that this verse claims: “This passage reflects the hope for a definitive Jewish restoration around the temple in Jerusalem.” J. Collins, *Athens*, 81.

⁹⁷See Tob 13, 14 and Sir 36 in this section alone for confirmation of this fact.

⁹⁸Sweeney notes the possibility that “the Maccabean rededication of the temple altar on the twenty-fifth of Kislev was somehow understood as a fulfillment of Haggai’s prophecy.” Sweeney, *Twelve Prophets*, 2:550.

or initiating eschatological event.⁹⁹ The temple is the foundation of the hope for the future of the people and land of Israel. The temple is not the end in itself; the hope and expectation is that it will initiate a new beginning.¹⁰⁰

Conclusion

Second Maccabees does not present a detailed timeline of the events just prior to the *eschaton*. In fact, there are no clear references to times of eternal peace, dwelling with God, or the nations worshiping the God of Israel. However, there is hope for the future, as the story of Jeremiah hiding the tent, ark, and the incense altar indicates. These items will be hidden only for a period of time, which implies that the items will be used again. This background introduces the material on the temple dedication later in chap. 2.

Chapter 2 has shown important eschatological implications. There will be a complete gathering of all the dispersed people of Israel. All from “under the sky” will be gathered, not merely the ones who have returned already to the ancestral lands, the inheritance of God’s people. God will gather the people and show mercy. The indwelling of the glory of God in the temple is anticipated, not just a temple for the name of God, but as the text proclaims, the cloud will appear. The temple indwelling will soon precipitate important events for the people. The use of *ταχέως* (quickly) in v. 18 shows that the author expects an important change soon as a result of the temple purification.

The call to keep the purification festival days shows the author’s understanding of

⁹⁹Doran notes the eschatological nature of the intent in 2:18. “This prayer, which resonates with that of the priests at the miraculous rekindling of the temple fire (1:26-29), has eschatological overtones, especially given the concern that the Jews of the diaspora return to the holy land.” Robert Doran, “The Second Book of Maccabees: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections,” *NIB*, 4:184.

¹⁰⁰Deines notes not only the importance of the temple in eschatological matters, but also the transition between this epoch and the *eschaton*. “The high point and culmination of this first epoch of religious reconstitution was the reintroduction of the” Lord’s temple. Roland Deines, “The Pharisees Between ‘Judaisms’ and ‘Common Judaism,’” in *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*, vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*, ed. D. A. Carson, Peter T. O’Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2001), 457.

the festival (the first Hanukkah festival) and its eschatological implications. “We have hope in God that he will soon have mercy on us and will gather us from everywhere under heaven into his holy place, for he has rescued us from great evils and has purified the place” (2 Macc 2:18, NRSV). The “place” is the temple, which has been purified. That is where the people will be gathered. The correctness and completeness of keeping the festival (2 Macc 2:16) bring about the hope that the author maintains in v. 18.

The particle that starts off the idea in v 16, οὖν (therefore, since), directs the complete observance of the purification days of the temple leading to the hope expressed in v. 18. Also, the call for human action in keeping the festival shows the necessity of human actions in the impending events. This hope for the future is the rescue, gathering, and renewed mercy, which are presented as contingent upon the temple. The rededicated temple is the important decisive entity that heightens the anticipation of events that are seen as about to unfold.

Although Second Maccabees does not contain a specific eschatological timeline, it does contain an important implied role of the Jerusalem temple in the timing of the coming eschatological matters. The correction of impurities is what gives hope. Based upon the hope because of a purified temple, the text implores the recipients of the book to keep the days of purification.

Conclusion

The three second temple Jewish documents that have later been labeled as deuterocanonical, examined above, show similarities in their eschatological outlook on the future time when God will decisively act in human affairs. Tobit and Sirach were written to teach their audience about religious ideals and they both include eschatological teaching. Second Maccabees also includes an eschatological teaching within its historical/theological representation of the events of its time. The eschatological teachings in all three of these documents are based upon prior prophetic writings, which

add authority and shape these teachings in similar ways. Tobit and Sirach present quite similar eschatological timelines.¹⁰¹

All three documents present demands for human actions that are necessary prior to the eschatological culmination.¹⁰² The commands to recount the deeds of God (Sir 36:10), to celebrate the purification of the temple (2 Macc 2:16), or to acknowledge and bless God (Tob 13:10) place requirements of righteous actions upon humanity in order to allow God to reward right action with mercy (Tob 13:2, 5, 6, 9, 14:5; Sir 36:1, 17; 2 Macc 2:7, 18). It is important to note that none of these texts presents an eschatology based upon a messiah.¹⁰³

The understanding that human action is important and part of the eschatological timeline is balanced by the focus on the temple as the fulcrum between the current age and the next. The importance of human action in these three texts can be categorized as almost Deuteronomic in character. All three books have been assessed as containing Deuteronomic theology.¹⁰⁴ However, the temple foci of Tobit and Sirach are more

¹⁰¹There may not be one standard checklist that makes up the timetable of events on which all second temple Jewish writings agree. However, Baumgarten appears to be misleading the reader when he asserts: "Jews did not have a standard checklist of events which were to occur at the time of the redemption, which would prove that the end was at hand." Baumgarten, "Role," 78.

¹⁰²God's actions and human actions are understood in different ways from Second Maccabees. Humans are the ones who purified the temple and not God in v. 2:18. "Surely the author knew that not God, not even a wondrous petroleum fire, but pious priests purified the temple!" Jonathan A. Goldstein, *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 1983), 188. However, the text can be read in the opposite manner as well. DeSilva argues that the text of Second Maccabees is arguing for God's hand in salvation through the actions of God in restoring the temple purity and sanctity. The text of Second Maccabees gives credit "for the deliverance God wrought on behalf of the whole Jewish nation in the restoration of the temple." DeSilva, *Apocrypha*, 266-267. These viewpoints show the dual nature of Second Maccabees in relation to the temple. Both human and divine actions are perceived as necessary.

¹⁰³Nickelsburg notes that Tob 13 and Sir 36:1-17 show that God is acting alone, "without any indication that God will accomplish this through a divine or a human agent." Nickelsburg, *Ancient Judaism*, 90. This has not stopped the eschatology from being described as messianic. "Ben Sira 36:1-17 & Tobit 14:5-7 are called messianic movements even though they do not promote a specific person as their candidate for the role of Messiah." Albert I. Baumgartner, "The Pursuit of the Millennium in Early Judaism," in *Tolerance and Intolerance in Early Judaism and Christianity*, ed. Graham Stanton (Cambridge: University Press, 1998), 51.

¹⁰⁴For example, on Tobit see Alexander A. Di Lella, "Background." On Sirach, see Gerald T. Sheppard, "Wisdom and Torah: The Interpretation of Deuteronomy underlying Sirach 24:23," in *Biblical*

priestly theology than Deuteronomic, and Second Maccabees' purity focus also seems to contain a priestly theology. However, the Deuteronomic theology and priestly perspective are not mutually exclusive. In fact, these two different theologies have merged into an eschatological understanding that contains both the necessary human actions and the Jerusalem temple as the vital elements in the eschatological timetable.

The priestly focus of the passages studied above shows an inherent critique of the current Jerusalem temple. A correct or pure future temple will bring hope of a complete gathering of the Jewish people to Israel and the knowledge of God to the nations. Second Maccabees expects great things, since the past impurities were removed from the temple. Sirach's eschatological timeline is possible only with God inhabiting the Jerusalem temple and there is acknowledgment that there is something missing from the current temple. Tobit acknowledges the need for an entirely new temple that Israel must build according to the prophets. Tobit and Sirach show an eschatological role for the Jerusalem temple as a catalyst, presenting what I would term "precipitated eschatology."¹⁰⁵ The temple is to be the catalyst that hastens the beginning of the new eschatological age.

and Near Eastern Studies: Essays in Honor of William Sanford LaSor, ed. Gary A. Tuttle (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978). On Second Maccabees, see Daniel R. Schwartz, "On Something Biblical about 2 Maccabees," in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12-14 May 1996*, ed. Michael E. Stone and Esther G. Chazon (Leiden: Brill, 1998).

¹⁰⁵In the chemical equation, $N_2 + 3H_2 \xrightarrow{\text{iron}} 2NH_3$ it is important to note that this reaction "does not take place at a useful rate without a catalyst." Jean B. Umland and Jon M. Bellama, *General Chemistry*, 2nd ed. (St. Paul: West, 1996), 189. A catalyst is the "material that makes a reaction take place faster without being used up in the reaction." Ibid. Catalysts that speed up the reaction are usually very particular. Ibid., 687. The concept of precipitated eschatology uses chemical terminology. In the theological equation, $\text{Human} + \text{God} \xrightarrow{\text{Jerusalem Temple}} \text{new Human God relationship}$, the existence of the Jerusalem temple enables God to dwell on earth and changes the bond between humanity and God, enabling God to rule on earth and a new age to come. The effects of the eschatological age are similar to the solid substance that falls out of liquid reactants. The effects of the eschatological age occur when the correct events occur, just like a solid falls out of the correct liquid reactants. Often the reactants need a catalyst to speed up the reaction rate of the reactants. Therefore, the meaning of a precipitated eschatology is a process that can be made to precipitate (i.e., hasten) the eschatological age and, in this understanding, the Jerusalem temple acts as a catalyst hastening the reaction rate. It is the building of the Jerusalem temple by humanity that hastens or precipitates the *eschaton*.

CHAPTER 6

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL ROLE OF THE JERUSALEM TEMPLE IN THE TEMPLE SCROLL OF QUMRAN

Introduction

The Temple Scroll, one of the largest documents preserved by the Qumran community, gives important insights into second temple Judaism. The dominant theme of the temple and the sheer volume of material on the temple convinced Yadin to name this document, which he recovered, the Temple Scroll.¹ The size and the number of copies of the Temple Scroll found at Qumran show how important this document was to the Qumran community.² The Temple Scroll weaves together commandments in the Torah, a temple vision, and a prophecy of the land's future into an important teaching, יהוה יהוה, presented as a divine revelation.³ The largest portion of the Temple Scroll pertains to the festivals, sacrifices, and layout of a new Jerusalem temple. The temple's ground plan differs substantially from past temples; thus, it is important to characterize this temple as a new Jerusalem temple. An inconsequential point to the thrust of this research on the

¹Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll: The Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect* (New York: Random House, 1985), 112.

²Yadin considers the Temple Scroll to be a sectarian writing, which is possible though not assured. His assessment that it was possibly the most important document to those at Qumran appears to be correct. Yadin, *Hidden Law*, 232. Riska records the length of 11Q19 at 8.14 meters long at this time, although it was somewhat longer originally. Magnus Riska, *The House of the Lord: A Study of the Temple Scroll Columns 29:3b-47:18* (Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2007), 5.

³Yadin calls this the true teaching of God. Yadin, *Hidden Law*, 109. Martínez notes that the tetragrammaton is written in the Herodian period texts as it is written in scriptural texts. Florentino García Martínez, "The Temple Scroll and the New Jerusalem," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 2:439. This manner of presenting the tetragrammaton by the copyist shows that the Temple Scroll was maintained like the scriptural texts and was probably regarded as on par with the scriptural texts by the copyist.

Temple Scroll, though informative as background to this material, is that the temple description in the Temple Scroll has some relationship to the last temple vision of Ezekiel, as well as to the layout of the Tabernacle in Exodus.⁴

The Temple Scroll uses commandments of the Torah, though rewording and reshaping them, to lay out a new teaching for the people to go along with the new temple that it proposes. By setting the context of the Temple Scroll in the time of Moses on Mount Sinai, the future of the land is addressed to the people of the land as though they were still yet to cross into the Promised Land.⁵ The claims for the future of the land are made at a time when Israel, though back in the land of Israel, still considers itself in slavery or exile.⁶ The future, one where God dwells in the new temple and Israel is at peace on their land with the ability to ward off any nation that comes against the land, is best understood as a future time in a new age that is described in the Temple Scroll.

⁴Patton notes how the Temple Scroll “recalls in tone, form, and even, at times, specific detail the descriptions of Israelite sanctuaries in Exod 25-40 and Ezek 40-48.” Patton, “Blueprint,” 112. Wacholder stresses that “the degree of the scroll’s dependence on Ezekiel 40-48 still remains an unsettled problem. What cannot be questioned, however, is that along with Exodus 25-30 and 35-40, Ezekiel 40-48 forms the closest scriptural model for cols. 3-13 and 30-42 of the Qumranic Torah.” Wacholder, *Dawn*, 215. Eybers also notes the influence of Ezekiel on Qumran theology. I. H. Eybers, “The Book of Ezekiel and the Sect of Qumran,” in *Studies on the Book of Ezekiel: Papers Read at 4th Meeting Held at Bloemfontein, 31 January-3 February 1961*, S.A. Society for the Study of the Old Testament (Potchefstroom: Pro Rege, 1961), 9. Block notes similarities and vision connections between Ezek 40-48 and the Temple Scroll. Block, *Ezekiel*, 2:502. Fujita goes the furthest in his concept of the link between Qumran and Ezekiel. “It now seems quite clear how extensively the sectarians utilized the Ezekielien theological ideas, images, and literary expressions concerning the temple.” Fujita, “Temple Theology,” 322. Yadin makes an important observation that the tribes of the wives of Jacob are given precedence over the tribes of their maids (Yadin, *Hidden Law*, 109), which also can be seen in the land distribution in Ezek 47-48.

⁵There are clearly indications that the Promised Land here would refer to the people returning to the Promised Land after the exile. Referring to the Temple Scroll, as well as other Qumran texts, Schiffman notes: “In most of these texts, there is a fundamental assumption that the restoration is not an event that took place in the Persian period. Rather, it is a still awaited event to take place as part of the unfolding of the eschaton and the ensuing escape from the limitations and imperfections of history. Effectively, the sectarian point of view saw the period of the Second Temple as a continuation of the period of exile, and so the restoration was still to come.” Schiffman, “Restoration,” 220.

⁶The concept of exile is prevalent in the post-exilic writings in the Bible, Pseudepigrapha, Dead Sea Scrolls, and Josephus as synopsized in T. R. Hatina, “Exile,” *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, ed. Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000), 348-349. Ezra declares this slavery when he and the people, though back in the land, hope that the Lord will spare a remnant to build a temple (Ezra 9:8-9).

The present research seeks to explore what eschatological role this new Jerusalem temple of the Temple Scroll was understood as performing for Israel in second temple Judaism. The Deuteronomic background and nature of the Temple Scroll are examined in order to understand the setting of the temple in the Temple Scroll.⁷ In examining this temple, column 29 is investigated thoroughly in order to fully understand any role of this new temple. The eschatology of the Temple Scroll, more in line with the eschatology of the Torah than the eschatology of the prophetic corpus, is scrutinized so that the eschatological role of the temple can be firmly established.

The Teaching of the Temple Scroll

The Temple Scroll presents the ways for righteous living in the land of Israel.⁸ The Temple Scroll presents a calendar for the year in relation to God and activities at the Jerusalem temple.⁹ Regarding the Temple Scroll, it is important to note that “obvious effort has been made to systematize, harmonize, and reinterpret the laws” of the Torah.¹⁰ Moses issued the second presentation (Deuteronomy) of the law at Mount Nebo, but here in the Temple Scroll, the presentation is directly from the mouth of God, thus presenting the perfect Torah.¹¹ Scholars have proposed different theories regarding the intended

⁷Although Mink does not see much Deuteronomic material in the columns 3-45, this present work shows the Deuteronomic influence throughout the document from the place where the name of God will dwell to the human obedience that Deuteronomy commands. Hans-Aage Mink, “The Use of Scripture in the Temple Scroll and the Status of the Scroll as Law,” *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 1 (1987): 31.

⁸Neusner states that “the text is a collection of *halakhot* (laws)” on areas that other commentators describe, simply, as the contents of the Scroll. *Dictionary of Judaism in the Biblical Period: 450 B.C.E. to 600 C.E.* (1996), s.v. “temple scroll.” Since the term *halakhot* does not appear in the Temple Scroll, Neusner’s description may be overstated.

⁹In Deut 16:1-17 is a calendar for the people in relation to the “place where the Lord will choose.”

¹⁰Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (New York: Penguin, 1997), 191.

¹¹The changes in the scroll edit Moses out of the role of presenter or law giver, to become the law receiver. The Temple Scroll’s “engagement with the biblical text in the service of improving upon it is not limited to large-scale rearrangements of law or changes of voicing. It permeates the scroll to its very language and syntax. In presenting what purports to be the direct discourse of God, the redactor makes regular inroads into the text to systematize its order and syntax, to rearrange its sequence, and to re-voice or

purpose of the body of teaching embodied in the Temple Scroll. Levinson and Zahn note that this presentation is, in fact, an “attempt to create a more perfect Torah.”¹² Barker, on the other hand, avers that it was to supplement the Torah: “This text was written to be a sixth book of Moses, forming a logical sequel to Deuteronomy and describing how the temple was to be built once Israel had reached the promised land.”¹³

However, when the Scroll does not agree with the presentations of the laws in the Torah, it edits, revises, and combines the Torah commands. These changes to Deuteronomy and other texts from the Hebrew Scriptures in the second half of the Temple Scroll do not support Barker’s idea that it is a “logical sequel” to Deuteronomy, as a sequel continues the narrative rather than changes it.¹⁴ Wise claims that the Temple Scroll was to be a new law, specifically, an eschatological Deuteronomy.¹⁵ Levinson and Zahn would put this a little differently by noting that the Temple Scroll commitment to the existing Torah gave it “the mandate to develop a coherent system.”¹⁶ This “new” system “resolved the inconsistent systems of legal syntax employed by the Covenant Code, on the one hand, and Deuteronomy, on the other.”¹⁷ Wacholder holds that the author of the Temple Scroll “found the Book of Deuteronomy the least interesting of the five Mosaic books.”¹⁸

to ‘de-voice’ texts originally attributed to Moses.” Bernard M. Levinson and Molly M. Zahn, “Revelation Regained: The Hermeneutics of ׀ and ׀N in the Temple Scroll,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 9 (2002): 308.

¹²Ibid., 307.

¹³Barker, *Gate of Heaven*, 11.

¹⁴As the Temple Scroll diminishes Moses’ role at Sinai, this could hardly be considered a sixth book in the series, especially since Moses dies at the end of Deuteronomy.

¹⁵Wise, *Critical Study*, 200. The Temple Scroll has many verses with the noun ׀W in it. The idea of causing the name to dwell in the temple (3:4; 29:4; 30:4; 45:12; 47:4, 11; 52:16, 20; 53:0-3, 9; 56:5; 60:14) shows that the Temple Scroll uses Deuteronomic name theology throughout the document.

¹⁶Levinson and Zahn, “Revelation,” 334.

¹⁷Ibid., 320.

¹⁸Wacholder, *Dawn*, 15.

The Temple Scroll is a work that incorporates biblical laws (e.g., Exod 24 and 11Q19 col 2, Lev 2-3 and 11Q19 col 14, Num 30 and 11Q19 col 54, Deut 17 and 11Q19 col 56),¹⁹ though it presents its own message.²⁰ The authoritative laws for righteous living are the rule for the land when the righteous control of the land allows the temple to be built (11Q19 col 30).²¹

An important feature in the eschatology of the Temple Scroll, by contrast to the eschatology of the book of Deuteronomy, is the absence of blessings and curses. The world reversal promised upon obedience to the commandments laid out in Deut 28:1-14 shows that, in Deuteronomy, the new world order can be described as eschatological. The blessings and curses of Deut 28 provide two paths to two different future national (as well as universal) outcomes.²² In Deut 28:1, Israel can “be made supreme over all the nations of the earth.”²³ Eschatology in the Torah has its foundation in the possession of

¹⁹It differs from a text like *Jubilees*, which takes the narratives or stories of Genesis and explains how the laws interact with these stories.

²⁰Schiffman, *Courtyards*, 468.

²¹Mink posits that “[t]he Temple Scroll is therefore also to be regarded as the ‘constitution’ of the new Israel of which the community understood itself to be the first seed, and which prepared itself in the desert to bear fruit in the fullness of time.” Mink, “Use of Scripture,” 50.

²²Weinfeld notes the Blessings and Curses in the Hittite and Assyrian treaties. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomistic School*, 66, 116-146. However, the Hittite and/or Assyrian treaty format for a covenant is used no longer between humans, but between God and Israel. This changes the idea of treaty compliance in the future of the relationship into eschatology. Petersen notes this change from treaty to eschatology: “These alternate future possibilities were spelled out in the treaty’s blessings and curses. Should the people follow the treaty’s dictates, then a blessed existence and proper relationship with the Deity would ensue (see Deut 28:1-14). Conversely, should the people not follow the treaty’s dictates, then a cursed existence and an improper relationship would eventuate (see Deut 27:16-46) . . . expectation which could be discussed in terms of a blessed and/or a cursed existence in the future.” Petersen, “Eschatology,” 2:577. These blessings and curses present “two possible futures.” Bruce C. Birch et al., *A Theological Introduction to the Old Testament* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1999), 152. It is important to note that these blessings and curses do in fact make up an eschatology.

²³Wright places the context of chap. 28 in immediate circumstances as well as having an eschatological perspective. Christopher J. H. Wright, *Deuteronomy* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996), 281. Michelsen notes that Deut 28 is about the future, though in a conditional way as it depends upon the obedience of Israel. Leif M. Michelsen, “Deuteronomy 28: A Bible Study,” *Themelios* 7 (1970): 5. Clements notes the use of tragic events in Israel’s history that have been presented in Deut 28 as a great hope for a future restoration. Ronald E. Clements, *The Book of Deuteronomy* (London: Epworth, 2001), 126. Nickelsburg also notes the conditional paths of Deut 28 as foundational to eschatology. Nickelsburg, “Eschatology,” 2:580. Harton notes the future orientation of Deut 28 and observes “that the ultimate

the land of Israel. Weinfeld sees the possession of the land in Deuteronomy as the peaceful end goal, “the background of an idyllic scene in which the Israelite is depicted as dwelling tranquilly on his ancestral estate undisturbed by alien factors.”²⁴ “Both blessing and curse in the chapter are tied to the land. The land will or will not yield life to Israel according to their obedience.”²⁵ No “end of days” concept exists in Deut 28, but the new order brought on by the blessings that will overtake Israel is completely different from the previous situation and is cosmic in scope.

No section of blessings and curses exists in the Temple Scroll.²⁶ The lack of the

fulfillment of God’s promise to bless in Deut 28 and 30 will be eschatological.” George M. Harton, “Fulfillment of Deuteronomy 28-30 in History and in Eschatology” (ThD dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1981), 55, 239. The key with the Lord’s commandments is not any one blessing given as a result of obedience, but rather that obedience to the commandments leads to blessing. The people hold the power over the future. They choose the path by means of obedience to the commandments. The obedience of the people to the commandments will lead to the fulfillment of God’s promises to Israel. Jocz notes that the basis for eschatology is the belief that God will fulfill promises. Jakob Jocz, *The Covenant: A Theology of Human Destiny* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1968), 69. Thus, utilizing Joca’s view, it can be said that obedience of Israel leads to fulfillment of God’s promises and it is this hope that is the basis for eschatology.

²⁴Weinfeld, *Deuteronomic School*, 315. Here, he notes that Deuteronomy uses *וְיָרַשׁ אֶת הָאָרֶץ* meaning to conquer and possess the land, being free from foreign influence, so that the peaceful end can come. *Ibid.* Weinfeld also notes an important difference between the eschatology of Deuteronomy and that of the prophetic writings. “The concept of the ‘end of days’ in Deuteronomy contains not a trace of the splendour which surrounds it in prophetic literature.” *Ibid.*, 294.

²⁵Clifford comments on Deut 28. Richard Clifford, *Deuteronomy with an Excursus on Covenant and Law* (Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1982), 147. The land, and possession of it, is of vital importance to Deut 28. Michelsen, “Deuteronomy,” 7.

²⁶Contra Schiffman, Kaufman, Wise, Fraade, and Swanson. Schiffman claims column 59 preserves some of the theology of the blessings and curses of Deut 28. Schiffman, *Courtyards*, 31, 501. Kaufmann also holds that column 59 preserves the theology of the blessings and curses. Stephen A. Kaufman, “The Temple Scroll and Higher Criticism,” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 53 (1982), 39. Wise cites column 59 as curses to a disobedient people and a disobedient king, as well as blessings on an obedient king. Wise, *Critical Study*, 230-231. Wise also describes column 59 as a midrash of Deut 28. Wise, “Eschatological Vision,” 160. Fraade, though acknowledging that 56:12-59:21 is an expanded paraphrase of Deut 17:14-21, claims that the Temple Scroll has a large section of blessings and curses. Steven D. Fraade, “Rhetoric and Hermeneutics in *Miqsat Ma’se Ha-Torah* (4QMMT): The Case of the Blessings and Curses,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 10 (2003): 154. Swanson claims, “Deuteronomy 28 is the base text for this section, both opening and closing it.” Dwight D. Swanson, *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodology of 11QT* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 158. The argument for the idea that blessings and curses and their accompanying theology are within the text of the Temple Scroll falls apart when examining the text of the Temple Scroll. A foundational argument for this conclusion is the command to keep and do all of God’s commandments (Deut 28:1). Yet, details of the text of the Temple Scroll are completely overlooked in tying this to Deut 28. The textual issue missed by those who tie the ‘statutes’ and ‘commandments’ of column 59:16-20 to Deut 28:1 is the suffixes attached. In Deut 28 the suffixes are third masculine singular (his) and in the Temple Scroll the suffixes are first common singular (my) which better

blessings and curses in the Temple Scroll indicates the lack of the unique eschatology that is embodied by the two possible future outcomes of the blessings and curses, which make up Deuteronomy's eschatology.²⁷

However, an important part of Deuteronomy that is retained and utilized in the Temple Scroll's eschatology is the place that God has chosen for God's name to dwell.²⁸ The place, the site of the Jerusalem temple, is crucial to Deuteronomy;²⁹ the place is just

equates to 1 Kgs 9:6 (and the Temple Scroll's presentation of the commandments by God, not Moses). Column 59 starts out with two important words (שניניה and מושל) perhaps from 1 Kgs 9:7 (written שניניה and מושל), which set the stage for what is to come later in this column. In the Temple Scroll, the Hebrew words for blessed and cursed are not used, never, not once. It is important to note ארור is used four times in Deut 28 and only 32 times in all of Scripture. It is used 26 times in all of the non-biblical scrolls of Qumran, never in the Temple Scroll. Also, ברוך is used four times in Deut 28 and 154 times in all the non-biblical scrolls, with not one occurrence in the Temple Scroll. The blessings and curses to a very great extent actually do depend on very specific terms used in the text. Obviously, the stark absence of the terms here in the Temple Scroll, generally and column 59 specifically, leads to the conclusion that there is no section of blessings and curses in the Temple Scroll. The third person masculine verb of 59:16 (לך) is laying out rules for the king, rather than rules for the people of Israel. Deuteronomy 28 is addressed to all Israel and the future depends on their obedience. Michelsen, "Deuteronomy," 7. The 'lands of their enemies' of 59:5 seems to equate better to 1 Kgs 8:48 as the dittography error in the column 59:10 (ל בבמה) also seems to come from 1 Kgs 8:48. This section is closer to 1 Kgs 8-9 than Deut 28 (cf. 59:14, 17 to 1 Kgs 8:25). Weinfeld and Beckwith maintain that this section of the Temple Scroll is adapted from Deut 17, the law of the king. Moshe Weinfeld, *Normative and Sectarian Judaism in the Second Temple Period* (New York: T. & T. Clark, 2005), 158-185; Roger T. Beckwith, "The Temple Scroll and Its Calendar: Their Character and Purpose," *Revue de Qumran* 18 (1997): 12. Yadin notes this is a section which lays out the benefits to the king who follows the Lord's way as laid out in the Temple Scroll. Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977-1983), 1:346. Even Swanson notes, "Deut 17 is therefore designated by 'U', for 'Underlying Base' as opposed to particular base text for each paragraph." Swanson, *Temple Scroll*, 160. The focus of this section of the Temple Scroll is the king instead of a law for the people of Israel as it seems more focused on the throne than on land or prosperity. Thus, it does not contain the Deuteronomic eschatology of the two ways. This section contains merely stipulations and warnings for the king.

²⁷The word על יון does not appear in the Temple Scroll. An important aspect of the eschatology of Deut 28 is contained in the promise to be supreme over every other nation of the earth. The Temple Scroll deals with the land of Israel, not with the comparisons between Israel and other lands. This could be, as Wacholder noted and cited above, because Deuteronomy is the least important part of the new Torah. As explored below in column 29 of the Temple Scroll, the eschatology of this teaching is quite different from Deuteronomy and is opposed to the eschatology of the blessings and curses.

²⁸The phrases מקום אשר יבחר, מקום אשר אבחר, and מקום אשר בחרתי occur a total of 9 times in the non-biblical scrolls at Qumran and 5 of these are in the Temple Scroll. The non-reconstructed occurrences are 4Q375 1:8; 11Q19 52:9, 16; 56:5; 60:13 and the reconstructed occurrences are found in 4Q364 32:1, 3; 4Q397 3:5; 11Q19 53:0-3. The phrase can be found 23 times in Scripture: 21 times in Deuteronomy, once in Joshua, and once in Nehemiah.

²⁹Pitkänen argues: "[T]he choice of the 'place' and the bringing of offerings there is in the future for Deuteronomy, to be effected only after the people have settled in the land and achieved rest from their enemies so that they live in security." Pekka Pitkänen, *Central Sanctuary and the Centralization of*

as crucial to Temple Scroll theology.³⁰ Yet the Temple Scroll differs from Deuteronomy even on the effects of this place. The Temple Scroll posits that the temple is where the land of Israel's purity is centered and the purity there causes effects upon the land, which are radially outward in form, when Israel securely rules the land and God dwells in the temple. In Deuteronomy, the concept of purity is not the focus that it is in the Temple Scroll. Additionally, the purity of Deuteronomy is portrayed as coming from obedience to the commandments rather than from the temple, as the Temple Scroll emphasizes.³¹

The Temple Scroll focuses on the purity of the land, people, king, and, of course, the Jerusalem temple.³² The Temple Scroll prohibits defiling (טמא) the land (48:10-11, 64:12), doing as the Gentiles do on their land (51:19), or allowing a foreign enemy on the land (58:6-9). It also requires the burning of a city that worships another god (55:9-10) to keep the land pure (cf. 47:16-17). The people are to be kept pure by not bowing to another god (2:11), by the cleansing of the Day of Atonement (26:7),³³ and by eliminating evil (הרע) from Israel (56:10). The king is kept from every sinful matter

Worship in Ancient Israel: From the Settlement to the Building of Solomon's Temple (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2003), 99.

³⁰In addition to the description of the temple and festivals, and focus on the place chosen by God, the Temple Scroll has the idea that it is 'there' (שם) that the name will reside (52:20; 53:0-3, 9; 60:14). This is quite similar to Ezek 43:7. Levine notes while discussing the different groups of second temple Judaism that the site was "[r]evered as Judaism's single holy site by an ever-growing population in Judaea (partly by natural increment, partly by forced conversions), the Temple was also the subject of much attention and debate among the newly established sects, each emphasizing, in its own way, the centrality of Jerusalem's sacred site. For all their differences, no group ever denied the sanctity of this site, even though some might have been critical about the way in which the Temple was being run." L. Levine, *Jerusalem*, 134.

³¹The verb טָהַר never occurs in Deuteronomy and the adjective טָהוֹר is equated with following certain commandments (Deut 12:15, 22; 14:11, 20; 15:22; 23:11) unrelated to the temple. The verb כִּבֵּר is used three times in Deuteronomy, but seems focused on the land and people without specific reference to the temple (Deut 21:8 and 32:43).

³²Wise notes that the Temple Scroll is dominated by the idea of purity. Wise, "Eschatological Vision," 169.

³³In columns 26 and 27, the Temple Scroll specifically mentions the cleansing of the assembly of people (26:9 וּכְפַר בּוֹ עַל כּוֹל עַם הַקְּהָל), but the temple or sanctuary is not mentioned here, though perhaps the damaged top of column 27 originally had that reference. This cleansing of the people may be equated with the altar sacrifices of Lev 16:24 of the day of purgation ritual. Wise ties 27:3-4a of the Temple Scroll to Lev 16:24. Wise, *Critical Study*, 237.

(57:10). The king cannot marry a woman from another country, but the king may only marry a woman from his father's house (57:15-17).³⁴

The purity of the city of the temple,³⁵ the temple mount, and the temple are paramount.³⁶ The temple and its surroundings shall not be defiled (טמא) by the people (3:6; 45:10, 17; 45:10, 18; 47:10, 13; 51:7). The people shall not profane (לכלל) the temple (35:7, cf. 46:13). Even animals shall not defile the temple, as unclean birds will not sit upon the temple complex and unblemished animals will be eaten at a distance (46:2-4; 52:17). The Lord will sanctify (שקד) the temple (29:8; 47:4) and the people will sanctify (שקד) the temple (46:11; cf. 35:8-9). The temple is the center of the purity.³⁷

The teaching of the Temple Scroll, whether this is a sectarian Torah or a new updated Torah or a third presentation of the Torah (which, perhaps, could be called, Tritonomy) or a new Deuteronomy, puts the temple as the foremost institution in Israel.³⁸

³⁴This is a critique of Solomon; purity of the king affects the purity of the temple.

³⁵Barker notes how the massive size of the courtyards around the temple indicates that the city is seen as an extension of the temple itself. Barker, *Gate of Heaven*, 68.

³⁶Harrington adds that the laws in the Temple Scroll show an emphasis on the protection of the holiness of the divine precincts. Hannah K. Harrington, "Biblical Law at Qumran," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 1:182.

³⁷Fisdell shows that the presence of God is the center and source of the holy land, guiding the land into purity. Steven A. Fisdell, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Understanding Their Spiritual Message* (Northvale: Jason Aronson, 1997), 179-180. Schiffman notes the degrees of purity and holiness, starting from the temple but affecting the entire land of Israel, are like concentric cylinders. Schiffman, *Courtyards*, xxviii. These concentric cylindrical ordinances of the Temple Scroll are similar, though not exact, to the last vision in the book of Ezekiel. Both Ezekiel and the Temple Scroll critique the layout of Solomon's temple and the Temple Scroll critiques the second temple as well. Schiffman notices this critique as he observes that the ground plan of the Temple Scroll "was based on the assumption that the courtyards would be arranged concentrically, with the Temple building itself in the middle. By contrast, in Solomon's Temple as well as that of Herod, the courtyards were arranged sequentially." Schiffman, "Community," 277.

³⁸Stegemann recognizes that the temple is the main institution of Israel according to the Temple Scroll. Hartmut Stegemann, "The Institutions of Israel in the *Temple Scroll*," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, ed. Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1992), 161.

This temple, its sacrifices, and its priesthood are established unconditionally and eternally.³⁹

For example, the Temple Scroll asserts that the high priest is holy for the Lord for all time (16:5). The king's council is made up of twelve nobles, twelve priests, and twelve Levites (57:11) ensuring the religious dominance over earthly matters. The king must consult the high priest before going to war, showing that the temple through the Urim and Thummim controls the king (58:18-19). The Temple Scroll declares that "the king is not only deprived of all cultic functions, but also he must obey the priests."⁴⁰

The Temple of the Temple Scroll

The most important passage of the Temple Scroll for examining the eschatological role of the Jerusalem temple is column 29.⁴¹ This section is at the conclusion of sections regarding festivals and offerings and before the presentation of the ground plan of the temple to be constructed.⁴² Column 29 comes at the transition of what is to be done at the temple and the necessary temple ground plan of the temple that must be built in order to allow those actions to be accomplished. This helps the section convey a message, which is that sacrificing and offering at the temple must conform to the pattern presented in the Temple Scroll. The first few rows of the column are fragmentary, but starting with row five the passage is quite well preserved. The Hebrew and my English translation of 29:5-10 are given in table 1.

³⁹Column 29 establishes the temple and its sacrifices eternally, whereas column 56 establishes the priesthood eternally. There are no conditions placed upon the temple such as shown in 1 Kgs 8-9. The offerings and priesthood are also given no conditions for acceptance.

⁴⁰Ibid., 180.

⁴¹Wise calls this passage "perhaps the single most important passage in the TS, 29:2-10." Wise, *Critical Study*, 18. Callaway writes, "Kolumne XXIX beschäftigt sich mit dem Kern der Tempelrollentheologie." Phillip R. Callaway, "Exegetische erwägungen zur tempelrolle XXIX, 7-10," *Revue de Qumran* 14 (1985): 95.

⁴²Wacholder holds that this piece of column 29 summarizes the main points of the 18 columns pertaining to sacrifices and includes the command to build the temple. Wacholder, *Dawn*, 18, 22. However, it is also important to see this as introducing the section on the ground plan of the temple.

Table 1. Temple Scroll 29:5-10

Hebrew	Baker Translation
<p>5תמיד מאת בני ישראל לבד מנדבותמה לכול אשר יקריבו</p>	<p>5continually from the children of Israel alone, from their voluntary offerings to all which they will bring near</p>
<p>6לכול נדריהמה ולכול מתנותמה אשר יביאו לי לרצון לה[מה]</p>	<p>6for all their vows and for all their gifts which they will bring to me so as to favor them.</p>
<p>7ורציתים והיו לי לעם ואנוכי אהיה להם לעולם ושכנתי</p>	<p>7Then I will favor them and they will be a people for me but I, I will be for them forever and I will dwell</p>
<p>8אתמה לעולם ועד ואקדשה [את מ]קדשי בכבודי אשר אשכין</p>	<p>8with them forever and ever so that I may sanctify my sanctuary with my glory when I will cause</p>
<p>9עליו את כבודי עד יום הבריה אשר אברא אני את מקדשי</p>	<p>9my glory to dwell upon it during the day of creation^a when I, I will create my sanctuary</p>
<p>10להכינו לי כול הימים כברית אשר כרתי עם יעקוב בבית אל</p>	<p>10to establish it for myself for all time just as when I cut the covenant with Jacob at Beth-El.</p>

^aThe reading of this word differs as the script of the ancient manuscript is not clear. In one dependable reference work, the reading is הבריה. Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 1250. In another dependable reference work, the reading is הברכה. Martin G. Abegg, Jr., “The Qumran Sectarian Manuscripts (with Morphological Tags),” 2001, *BibleWorks 6.0.009i* (Norfolk, VA: BibleWorks, 2003).

There are three main disagreements in current scholarship regarding this passage. First, the English translation of the Hebrew word בְּ in row nine is debated. The translation “during,” in agreement with Wacholder, Callaway, and Wentling,⁴³ has drawn considerable opposition.⁴⁴ Yadin first translated this word into English as “until,” which presents a considerable problem to be addressed. The use of “until” in the English translation requires that this passage refer to two temples, the one before and the one after this use of “until.” Since the temple ground plan in the Temple Scroll does not match that of the second temple, the text must be presenting a third temple to be built before the fourth temple comes afterward. Given this understanding, the fourth temple would presumably be the eschatological temple.⁴⁵ The notions of a third and fourth temple do not constitute the problem in themselves. However, this passage claims that the Lord will be with Israel forever during the time of the third temple (29:7) and that the Lord will

⁴³Wacholder, Callaway, and Wentling agree with the use of “during” to translate בְּ in this passage. Wacholder, *Dawn*, 22; Callaway, “Erwägungen,” 97; Judith L. Wentling, “Unraveling the Relationship between 11QT, the Eschatological Temple, and the Qumran Community,” *Revue de Qumran* 14 (1985): 72. Wacholder notes the crucial importance of this word in understanding this portion of the Temple Scroll. Wacholder, *Dawn*, 22.

⁴⁴Yadin first used “until” in his translation and Vermes, Milgrom, J. Collins, A. Collins, Maier, Riska, Schiffman, Fujita, Perrot, Crawford, VanderKam, Wise, van der Woude, Brooke, Broshi, Beckwith, Martínez, and Tigchelaar have argued for its use. Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 1:183; Vermes, *Complete*, 200; Jacob Milgrom, “The Temple Scroll,” *Biblical Archaeologist* 41 (1978): 108; John J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 58; Adela Y. Collins, “The Dream of a New Jerusalem at Qumran,” in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 3 of *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Waco, TX: Baylor, 2006), 241; Johann Maier, *The Temple Scroll: An Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 86; Riska, *House*, 131; Schiffman, *Courtyards*, 39; Fujita, “Temple Theology,” 306; Charles Perrot, “La ‘Maison de Dieu’ à l’époque intertestamentaire,” in *Quelle maison pour Dieu?* ed. Camille Focant (Paris: Cerf, 2003), 244; Crawford, *Temple Scroll*, 57; James C. VanderKam, “The Theology of the Temple Scroll: A Response to Lawrence H. Schiffman,” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 85 (1994b): 135; Wise, *Critical Study*, 18; Adam S. van der Woude, review of *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness*, by Ben Z. Wacholder, *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 17 (1986): 120; Brooke, “Ten Temples,” 425; Magen Broshi, “The Gigantic Dimensions of the Visionary Temple in the Temple Scroll,” in *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reader for the Biblical Archaeology Review*, ed. Hershel Shanks (New York: Random House, 1992), 114; Beckwith, “Temple Scroll,” 12; Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1251.

⁴⁵This understanding of the fourth temple being an eschatological temple was proposed by Yadin, and is accepted by Wise as he summarizes the purpose of the Temple Scroll as a whole to be a new Deuteronomy, “one for the eschaton.” Wise, *Critical Study*, 200.

dwell in this temple, that is, the third temple, forever (29:8).⁴⁶

The Lord's dwelling, ׀כּוּ, "forever" (or at least for a long period of time) in this third temple, which is exactly what is declared in 29:8, cannot stand if the Lord will dwell in it only "until" the Lord will dwell in a subsequent temple. Wacholder pointed out these opposing claims (opposing only if the translation is maintained to be "until") that the Lord will dwell forever cannot mean what it says if it "refers only to the time up to the eschaton, when the structure so amply elaborated in our text will disappear to make way" for the new temple.⁴⁷

Wise accuses Wacholder of presenting "a chimerical antithesis."⁴⁸ He does this by claiming that the "forever" applies not to dwelling in the temple, but to being with the people.⁴⁹ He claims this, overlooking that there are two claims of forever. There is a claim to be with the people forever (line seven), as well as to dwell in the temple forever (line eight). This attack on Wacholder's claim that the Lord will dwell forever in the temple by claiming that the "forever" deals with being with the people either falsely represents Wacholder's claim or fails to deal with the fact that the scroll actually supports Wacholder's claim.⁵⁰ Any theory that hypothesizes that this passage is presenting two

⁴⁶Wentling notes that the context of this passage before the ׀כּוּ in 29:9 parallels the passage in Ezek 37, showing an eschatological context before the possible "until" in 29:9, which is seen as the beginning of the eschatological context if "until" is used in translation. She notes how the "two passages present a most interesting correspondence." Wentling, "Unraveling," 68. As Wentling notes, both passages have the Lord consecrating in Ezek 37:28 and 11Q19 29, 8b. The striking contrast in the two passages that she notes is that whereas in the Temple Scroll the Lord consecrates the temple, in Ezek 39:28 the Lord consecrates Israel. This parallel in language that Wentling explores shows that the Temple Scroll highlights the temple's importance even more than Ezek 37.

⁴⁷Wacholder, *Dawn*, 23.

⁴⁸Wise, *Critical Study*, 18.

⁴⁹Ibid. However, he forgets that the dwelling of the Lord is in the temple, unless he wants to posit an argument of the glory of the Lord dwelling somewhere besides the temple. This would not only be without foundation in the Scroll, but this concept would run opposite to the declarations made in the scroll about the dwelling of the Lord.

⁵⁰Wise leans on van der Woude for support in his argument against Wacholder. Ibid. However, this review of Wacholder's work on this point is near unintelligible. He claims that if the preposition means "during" then one would have to translate this passage as "God was going to create *constantly* ('during') a

temples, one “until” the other, must deal with the claim that the first of these two temples is the only one that has the claim of eternal dwelling (29:8), but the reference to the subsequent temple lacks even a declaration of dwelling (using ׀כׁ or any other verb). Holding to two temples goes against the proclamations of eternal sanctity of the temple that is presented in the scroll.

Note that the Temple Scroll describes the Lord consecrating the temple, which would be the third of four temples for those who hold that ׀ means “until.”⁵¹ In effect, using “until” for ׀ might allege that the Lord would not dwell in the later, or fourth, temple, as the verb כׁ (be firm or be established) does not imply dwelling in the slightest. Note that the second temple was held, by the later Talmud, as not having the dwelling of the *Shekinah* of the Lord (Yoma 22b), showing that there can be assertions of a temple without being a dwelling for the glory of the Lord.

With the interpretation of one temple or two temples depending on the meaning of the use of ׀ in 29:9, it is important to understand what this word means. Schiffman holds that Wacholder’s translation of ׀ is incorrect because Wacholder “requires the translation of Hebrew ׀ as ‘during,’ a meaning otherwise unattested.”⁵² Schiffman’s comment is not correct. Wacholder’s presentation, which Schiffman is critiquing, includes a review of many lexicons, all of which agree that it does in fact carry the meaning of “during” within its semantic range.⁵³ Other resources, in addition to those

new sanctuary.” Van der Woude, review of *The Dawn*, 120. This completely mistranslates the section, breaking clauses of the Hebrew in order to make Wacholder look bad. For those following a good translation of the Hebrew, the relative adverb would not allow a translation as van der Woude posits. If the preposition is “during,” as van der Woude accepts in his review, the object of the preposition would immediately follow, not a word from much later in the sentence in another clause entirely.

⁵¹According to Wentling, the idea “that *11QT* 29:7-10 describes two temples demands a utilization of language and ideas that deviates from the biblical models from which this community derived its self understanding.” Wentling, “Unraveling,” 72.

⁵²Schiffman, *Courtyards*, 215.

⁵³Endnote 137 on Wacholder’s first chapter has a list of four lexicons. Wacholder, *Dawn*, 239.

referenced by Wacholder, one of which came out after the publication of his work, also show that עַד can mean “during.” Examples given by Koehler and Baumgartner within the Hebrew Scriptures where עַד carries the concept of “during” are 2 Kgs 9:22, Job 20:5, Judg 3:26 and Jonah 4:2.⁵⁴ *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* specifically notes the use of עַד in 11QT 29:9 as meaning “during.”⁵⁵

Going beyond the general uses of עַד that mean “while” or “during,” it is also important to recognize the meaning of prepositions in the Masoretic Text specifically with the noun אִי, as in column 29 of the Temple Scroll. Before looking at עַד exclusively, it is important to note that twelve different prepositions are used with אִי in the Masoretic Text.⁵⁶ Analyzing all the prepositions that mean “while” or “during” is important in analyzing whether or not an idiom that holds the preposition עַד with the noun אִי must mean “until” (or more specifically, cannot mean “during”). This analysis is crucial to find the preposition or idiom that does mean “during,” if in fact there is internally consistent evidence against using the preposition עַד in these cases. Five of these prepositions are used with the noun אִי and mean “during” or “while” in the Masoretic Text. Four of these prepositions are בְּ (e.g., Gen 30:35, Judg 8:28, and Judg 15:20), מִן (e.g., Judg 11:40, 1 Sam 1:3, and 1 Sam 25:28), עַל (e.g., Lev 12:2 and Deut 32:25), and אֶת (e.g., Neh 13:17).⁵⁷ The final preposition that conveys the meaning of

⁵⁴Koehler and Baumgartner, *HALOT*, s.v. “עַד.”

⁵⁵Clines, “עַד,” *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, 6:255. Clines even notes that this word can be used as a conjunction and in that instance it can mean “while” or “when,” further illustrating that the meaning here can be transitional in nature. *Ibid.*, 251. Shultz also holds to “during” as within the semantic range of meaning for עַד. Carl Shultz, “עַד,” *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, ed. R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke (Chicago: Moody, 1980), 646. As Wacholder notes BDB in his list of lexicons, one must be aware that even Gesenius back in the nineteenth century held to the understanding of “during” as within the semantic range for this word. Wilhelm Gesenius and Samuel P. Tregelles, *Gesenius' Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament Scriptures* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1957), 606-607.

⁵⁶These prepositions, in order of frequency, are: בְּ, עַל, מִן, אֶת, אֵל, בְּ, לְ, מִן, עַד, בְּ, and אֶת.

⁵⁷Some might consider the particle אֶת to be the direct object marker of Hebrew, but in this case it does appear to be a preposition. The context of the clause has the accusation that some are actively doing

“while” or “during” with the noun יום in the Masoretic Text is עד.

Three specific uses that will be addressed are Num 11:20, Judg 18:1, and 1 Kgs 3:2. Numbers 11:20 starts עד חודש ימים עד אשר יצא מאפכם (during a whole month, until what time it comes out from your nose). The understanding here must mean “during” or “while” for the first preposition or else the clause does not make sense. This usage cannot mean “you will eat it (Num 11:19) . . . until a month” or else the people would not begin eating the meat until a month from the time these words were spoken, thus they would not have it coming out of their nose because they would not have eaten it yet. This usage does not mean “until completion of a month of days” either as the phrase קץ ימים, common in the Masoretic Text,⁵⁸ would probably be used in this case. The emphasis is on “during” this time, the people will be eating this food. Furthermore, the noun חודש (month) does not invalidate this comparison to the Temple Scroll. The construct chain, which is the object of the preposition here, is a temporal expression just like the temporal expression that is the object of the preposition in the use within the Temple Scroll 29:9. The noun יום (day) is in the construct chain that is the object of the preposition in both Num 11:19 and 11Q19 29:9. This noun does not always mean one day (24 hours); it can be understood as daylight (e.g., Hos 4:5, Neh 4:16) or it can mean a period of time (e.g., Obad 12-14, Job 1:6, or 2 Sam 18:20). Therefore, this use in Num 11:20 is a valid comparison to the day of creation of the Temple Scroll (29:9) and shows

things; note the participle עשׂה, to pierce or profane the time “during” the day. This verse (Neh 13:17) is the only time this verb is used with this particle and this noun. This clause does not seem to be treating the day as an entity that has no time, or duration, associated with it. As the day of cessation clearly has time when people can do things during (that time), this usage does indicate that the particle הנה here is a preposition. Furthermore, the idea of profaning the Sabbath, or day of cessation, is asserted without the noun יום. Profaning the Sabbath is mentioned in Ezek 20:13, 16, 21, 24; 22:8; 23:38; as well as the following verse which was used in this analysis: Neh 13:18. Besides the nouns יום (only here in Neh 13:17) and שבת (listed above), the verb הלל is used in the *pi*el, *pu*al, or *hitpa*el with the direct object marker in the Masoretic Text with the nouns שבת (Lev 18:21; 19:21; 20:3; 22:2, 32; Jer 34:16; Ezek 20:39; 36:20, 23), בַּת (Lev 19:29), אֵם (Lev 21:9), מִקְדָּשׁ (Lev 21:12, 23; Ezek 24:21), בַּיִת (Ezek 44:7), קִדְשׁוֹ (Lev 22:15; Num 18:32), אֶרֶץ (Jer 16:18), צַפּוֹן (Ezek 7:22), and twice with a pronominal suffix (Ezek 13:19; Mal 1:12). All the other nouns are entities that can be pierced (or profaned), rather than a time span like a day, week, or year that has a duration associated with it.

⁵⁸This phrase is used in Gen 4:3, 2 Sam 14:26, 1 Kgs 17:7, Jer 13:6, and Neh 13:6.

that עַד is used to express the idea of “during” with the noun יוֹם.

Another example of עַד with the noun יוֹם that illuminates the usage in the Temple Scroll is Judg 18:1. The usage in Judg 18:1 does not deal with the division of the land but notes כִּי לֹא־נִפְלָה לּוֹ עַד־הַיּוֹם הַהוּא (for the inheritance for him [the Danites] had not fallen during that time). The context is clearly not “until” because the inheritance of the land of Israel is not given by lot in the entire book of Judges. The context shows that this usage means “during.” If it did have the understanding of “until then” (NRSV), the text would include the events that are implied with the “then” here. The inheritance of the Danites would not only be in the passage (which it is not), it would be an emphasis of the passage, depicting what happened before (the true meaning and emphasis of “until”) the event being described (the inheritance of the Danites).⁵⁹ The use of the word “until” means “before a condition” that changes.⁶⁰

In Judg 18:1, it is obvious that there is no such change in the division of the land. There is no inheritance before or after this passage. The inheritance is set at a much later date. The use of “until now” could be suggested,⁶¹ where the meaning might extend “thus far” or “up into the present time.”⁶² Yet, the lexicon makes it clear that this implication is actually the translation of the phrase עַד־כֹּה. If one wants to stretch the meaning of “until” to include the text’s present time, then this meaning would be synonymous or near

⁵⁹It is important when dealing with the English word “until” to note that as a preposition and a conjunction, it carries the understanding of “before.” *Webster’s II New Riverside University Dictionary* (1984), s.v. “until.”

⁶⁰These changes are highlighted in the uses under the meaning of “until” in the lexicon. Koehler and Baumgartner, *HALOT*, s.v. “עַד.”

⁶¹Ibid.

⁶²These suggestions allow the change to be early in the time period discussed and not at the very beginning. However, the context of this passage does not have the change at all. Thus, this idea would have to be stretched even farther (e.g., up through the present and beyond). However, this goes beyond the meaning of the English word “until” and becomes more of a nuanced position of the English word “during,” which this analysis is asserting. The idea of “up through the present” is the same as “during, as well as before.”

synonymous with the meaning of “during” no matter what English word is used in the translation. However, this stretched position would attempt to add the idea of “before” to “during.” The idea of “before” is present with the use of “during” in this context because if the land was not given yet “during” that time, it clearly had not been given before that time. An emphasis of “before” is not in this passage, as is seen by the participle מְבַקֵּשׁ (seeking); the verse is not asserting that they had sought land in the past. The context of the verse is the text’s present and immediate future. The text is explaining why “during that time” and beyond the Danites are wandering. The Hebrew text does not have the phrase עַד אַחֲרָיִם (until after), as in Neh 13:19, where the Hebrew of the Masoretic Text shows how this stretched meaning of “until” is demonstrated in the Hebrew. It is not with the preposition עַד in this verse. The condition that changes, which is the point of using the English word “until,” is not in this passage, so it is best to go with a translation that makes better contextual sense.

The absence of the description of the inheritance of the Danites shows that the meaning of this usage in Judges is what was occurring “during that day” or “at that time” (NET).⁶³ The translation of “during that time” for the use in Judg 18:1 gives meaning to the whole chapter. It was because the inheritance had not been secured (i.e., the land where the Danites would dwell) that the Danites are wandering (see the entire chapter for the wanderings of the Danites). If the Danites had their land (i.e., their inheritance) as would be asserted if the preposition meant “until that day,” then the wanderings of the whole chapter would not make sense. However, the meaning of this preposition is “during,” as is shown by the context of the passage explored above.

In 1 Kgs 3:2, the usage is similar to Judges, with the temple of the Lord not being

⁶³It is not just the NET that conveys this meaning. Other English translations use “at” or “in” that equate to the meaning of “during” as well (e.g., CEV, Message). Also, there are many agreeing by using only the English adverb “yet” (CJB, ESV, NIV, NJB, NLT, RSV/NRSV, Stone); clearly, if the inheritance temple had not been given yet (during that time), it was not there at that time (which is the opposite of what “until” asserts).

built **בְּיָמֵי הַבְּנֵי** (during those days). The context of this passage needs to be understood in order to correctly translate this phrase. A translation using “until” asserts that the people had been sacrificing before this time and have since stopped. A translation using “until” would lose the implications that the verse is trying to elucidate, which is why the people were sacrificing at the high places. It was in the absence of the permanent, centralized temple institution located at Jerusalem, because it had not been built yet, that the people were using other alternatives.

Again, as with the Judg 18:1 usage, the meaning of “until” would imply what happened before those days. However, the temple was not built in (or “during”) those days (note the *Niphal* perfect). The temple was built later. “During those days,” not “until those days,” the people were still actively sacrificing (note the *piel* participle), not just before the time that this verse is describing, as would be implied with the use of “until.” Another preposition may be used instead of “during,” although it needs to stress that same nuance and oppose the implications of “until,” such as “in those days” (NET). After this verse (1 Kgs 3:2), many issues are described in the following chapters,⁶⁴ one of which is the date citation when Solomon starts to build the temple in the fourth year of his reign (1 Kgs 6:1). In 1 Kgs 6:38, the narrative notes that the temple was not finished until the eleventh year of his reign, which shows the passing of time before the temple is built. It is important to notice the noun **שִׁבְעָה** (1 Kgs 6:38), and not **שִׁבְעִים**. The seven years of building the temple was after the time frame depicted by the phrase “during those days” in 1 Kgs 3:2. Otherwise, the more than seven years later would need to be understood as only in the beginning of “those days” of 1 Kgs 3:2 for the translation of that phrase to be correctly understood and intended to be “until those days.”

The Masoretic Text demonstrates that five prepositions are used to convey the

⁶⁴This would include Solomon’s prayer for wisdom, the problem solved by Solomon of the two women and one baby, Solomon’s ministers, Solomon’s regional commissioners, the extent of Solomon’s kingdom, Solomon’s vast wealth, and Solomon’s entering into negotiations with Hiram to build the temple.

meaning of “while” or “during” in the Masoretic Text with the noun ׀ו, including עד. This analysis with the noun ׀ו goes beyond the uses of עד meaning “while” or “during” with other nouns shown by Koehler and Baumgartner, which were pointed out above.

The occurrences of עד in the Masoretic Text as well as the non-biblical Qumran writings with עול show another important aspect in this analysis. The prepositional phrase עד עול carries the understanding of “during eternity.” This phrase is used seventy-three times in the Masoretic Text and thirty-two times in the non-biblical Qumran writings that include the Damascus Document 3:13, the Hymns 1QHa 8:14, *Jubilees* 4Q214 4:5, as well as once in the Temple Scroll 11Q19 53:6.⁶⁵ If this phrase is translated “until forever” or “until eternity” in these uses, the meaning would be opposite and not accurately convey the actual meaning of the texts. This phrase, עד עול, needs to be translated “during forever” or “throughout eternity.” The meaning is for all time, not to begin at some time much later, which would be the implication if the translation used “until.”

The meaning of “during” or “while” for the preposition עד can be seen in the Temple Scroll. In 42:16, the chiefs sit there (שמד) in the huts (לסוכות) from line 12) upon the roofs (לגג) from line 9) during (עד) the burnt offering. The meaning of this context is not that they go up and sit there (for an unspecified time) “until” the burnt offering. Another example in the Temple Scroll is the declaration that the vessels cannot be purified again עד לעול “during all time” (50:18).⁶⁶ A translation of “until” in this passage would contradict itself, implying that the vessels cannot be purified “until” some later time, when they could be purified. For further instances of where עד must convey the idea of “while” or “during” in the Temple Scroll, see 59:9, 63:14, and 63:15.

⁶⁵This phrase occurs in 18 different books in Scripture as well as 23 different writings at Qumran.

⁶⁶The ל preposition on עול is normal and is used over 100 times in the Masoretic Text. Koehler and Baumgartner note that this preposition can indicate for a period of time. Koehler and Baumgartner, *HALOT*, s.v. “ל.” Thus the literal translation of this phrase is “during for eternity.”

On the basis of the linguistic and contextual evidence, it is not necessary to require the use of “until” in column 29 of the Temple Scroll. This evidence would include the context of the Temple Scroll that appears to present only one eternal third temple, not the third and fourth temples which are asserted with the translation “until.” In reviewing the Hebrew preposition עַד, this analysis has shown that this preposition can mean “during.” This preposition has been shown to carry this meaning of “during” with nouns other than אָיִן as well as that noun.

The argument over the English translation of the Hebrew preposition עַד has overlooked the possibility that the word could be a noun, as in 29:8. Generally in biblical Hebrew, the noun has an attached preposition or conjunction (i.e., לְעַד or וְעַד). However, two biblical examples show that the word can be a noun. First, Hab 3:6 shows that the noun is used in the absolute state at the end of a construct chain (הַרְרֵי־עַד), eternal mountains. This use in Hab 3:6 has a disjunctive accent (*pashta*) followed by a verb without a conjunction, showing that the following word, which needs to be translated as the verb of the following clause, need not have a conjunction preceding it in order to be separated from עַד by a break between clauses, just as אָיִן of the Temple Scroll 29:9 does not have a conjunction on it. The use in Hab 3:6 has a nuance of describing a kind of mountains (eternal mountains) in a construct chain that, translated literally, is mountains of forever or mountains of eternity. This usage of the noun עַד in Hab 3:6 has an adjectival quality to it. However, it must be noted that the use in the Temple Scroll is not in a construct relationship, although, notwithstanding, there is a small possibility that it might have an adjectival relationship to “my glory” (כְּבוֹדִי), which precedes it.

Second, the use in Isa 57:15 has the noun alone in the absolute state with a disjunctive accent (*zaqef*). The noun is followed by a conjunction marking the transition to the next clause. The noun follows a participle and the phrase עַד שָׁכֵן עַד conveys the idea of one who dwells forever. The use in Isa 57:15 puts the noun עַד in relationship to the verbal root שָׁכַן, which is the same verbal root that the noun would be linked to, although

in the *Hip□il* stem, in the Temple Scroll (29:8). This noun in Isa 57:15 describes how long one dwells. This usage of the noun עַד in Isa 57:15 has an adverbial quality to it.

Both of these examples show that it is possible that the Temple Scroll could have used the word עַד as a noun and not a preposition in 29:9. These examples, and this proposal, are not meant to prove that this is the case, merely to suggest that the use of עַד here could be a noun. In the Masoretic Text, עַד followed by two nouns (the first of which is יוֹם) occurs eight times and all with the understanding of a preposition meaning “until,” and never as the noun עַד.⁶⁷ If the usage in 29:9 were a noun, the text would yield the following translation: “I will cause my glory to dwell upon it forever, the day of creation when I, I will create my sanctuary.” The latter half of this line, mostly a relative clause does become almost incomplete and this roughness in the Hebrew may signal that this word is not a noun. The comma inserted after “forever” (עַד) shows the disjunctive nature when it stands alone, and the use could be characterized as adverbial, not much different from Isa 57:15 in both respects (disjunctive and adverbial). The use in the Temple Scroll would also have a disjunctive aspect similar to Hab 3:6, if it were a noun. The Hebrew of the Temple Scroll shows no reason why עַד cannot be a noun in this instance. However, in comparing the translation of עַד as a noun with the meaning of “forever” to that as a preposition with the meaning of “during,” the meanings are basically equivalent.⁶⁸

Yet, if one were to compare the use as a noun to the use as a preposition that has the understanding of “until,” the meanings do not convey the same sense. With the

⁶⁷These eight citations are Judg 13:7, 1 Sam 13:5, 2 Sam 6:23, 2 Kgs 15:5, 2 Chr 26:21, Neh 12:23, Jer 52:11, and 52:34. Seven of these eight are followed by the noun “death.” None of these biblical examples give much light on this pericope in the Temple Scroll. This does show that this usage of עַד in 29:9 might be different from that of the Masoretic Text, especially if it is a noun. If עַד is a preposition here, the lack of light provided by the examples in the Masoretic Text demonstrates nothing conclusive.

⁶⁸The translation of this line if עַד is a preposition is: my glory to dwell upon it during the day of creation when I, I will create my sanctuary. The translation of this line if עַד is a noun is: my glory to dwell upon it forever, the day of creation when I, I will create my sanctuary.

meaning of “until” vastly different from the meaning as a noun, the case for a noun usage must be considered since it better fits the context than the preposition with a meaning of “until.” There is a very small possibility that the use of עַד in 29:9 is a noun. The noun עַד (“forever”) is used later in the Temple Scroll: לְעוֹלָם וְעַד כּוֹל הַיָּמִים אֲשֶׁר (46:3b-4). This use, with its proximity to כּוֹל הַיָּמִים (all the days), just as seen in this context of 29:9-10, indicates that the use in 29:9 could be the noun and not the preposition. With the possibility that the word is a noun, combined with the understanding that the semantic range of the preposition עַד does in fact include a concept of “during,” then rigidly insisting that the preposition must be translated as “until” is inappropriate.

The analysis of this first issue of column 29 has led to three possibilities of translation; yet the context of its surroundings, both in this immediate passage as well as the context of the book as a whole, must also be evaluated to determine the best English translation of the Hebrew in this instance. Perhaps contextual usage goes beyond the context of the whole book to the context of the Qumran community that kept the text. The Qumran community held to an expectation that the end of days was imminent, an expectation that the use of “until” argues heavily against as the Lord would dwell in the temple that the community is commanded to build forever (11Q19 29:7-8), or at least for a very long time.

This dwelling in an interim temple for a long time before the end of days would come is clearly opposite to the context of the Qumran community. “After all, the ‘end of days’ hoped for by the sectarians did not refer to the distant future but rather to immediate events.”⁶⁹ The main difference in translation is that if “until” is truly implied, the passage must indicate an interim temple. With the size and configuration differences between the temple as laid out in the Temple Scroll and Solomon’s temple, the second temple, or even Herod’s temple, it must be concluded that the temple of the Temple

⁶⁹Wacholder, *Dawn*, 23.

Scroll is another version of the Jerusalem temple that again will be insufficient, if it is to be replaced by a later temple (assuming that “until” is what is meant by עַד in 29:9).

Brooke ignores the inherent critique of the second temple presented in the layout of the temple in the Temple Scroll when he notes that “the problem of the Second Temple rested with those who were running it.”⁷⁰ Stegemann also notes that the Temple Scroll does not critique the second temple structure.⁷¹ Stegemann sees all of the critique focused on the first temple period.⁷² It is true that many authors of second temple Judaism had serious problems with those running the temple. However, the main issue with Jerusalem presented in the Temple Scroll is the incorrect layout of the temple complex. Clearly, the ground plan of the second Jerusalem temple differs from that of the temple as laid out in the Temple Scroll.⁷³ It seems that only Stegemann has pointed out the obvious issue, which those who hold to the translation of “until” for עַד must explain. Stegemann notes that no one “has yet sufficiently explained why there must be this change in the future.”⁷⁴ This is no simple change. It goes against everything within the Temple Scroll.⁷⁵ The Temple Scroll presents only one layout for the temple, the one claimed to be an interim

⁷⁰Brooke, “Ten Temples,” 424.

⁷¹Stegemann, “Institutions,” 162.

⁷²Ibid., 177.

⁷³Although, similar to Ezekiel’s restoration passages, the name “Jerusalem” never occurs in the Temple Scroll. This may be due to the fact that Jerusalem is never mentioned in the Torah, which the Temple Scroll is replacing or correcting in part. The common reference in the Temple Scroll is to the city where the Lord dwells (47:10-11) or the city of my temple (47:13). However, history teaches that the two are forever bound together. “The image of the Temple is virtually impossible to separate from the concept of Jerusalem.” Mintz and Deitsch, *Eternal Center*, 7.

⁷⁴Stegemann, “Institutions,” 164.

⁷⁵Burgmann goes so far as to note that 29:7-10 is unlike the contents in the rest of the Temple Scroll and concludes that this passage must be an interpolation. Hans Burgmann, “11QT: The Sadducean Torah,” in *Temple Scroll Studies: Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll, Manchester, December 1987*, ed. George J. Brooke (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 258. This perceived understanding of the text is only due to the idea that עַד in 29:9 must mean “until,” which misses the meaning of the passage; the passage concludes the section on the importance of the temple and the offerings there at the temple but before describing the temple in fine detail.

temple by those who hold to the translation of “until” for עַד.⁷⁶ As noted above, the idea of an interim temple is clearly opposed by the illogical idea of dwelling forever in an “interim” temple (29:8-9).

There are two other key features within the Temple Scroll that are opposed to the concept that this temple is temporary. The first key feature is that the verb, שָׁכַן, used frequently, is an important concept in the Temple Scroll. This key verb regarding the temple can be found fifty-six times in all the Qumran non-biblical documents with twenty-five uses (i.e., over 44% of all uses of the verb in the entire collection of the Qumran non-biblical documents) being in the three Temple Scroll copies (11Q19, 11Q20, and 11Q21), where they show the strong understanding that the Lord will dwell among Israel. In 11Q19 alone, the verb is used at least thirteen times (29:7, 8; 45:12, 13, 14; 46:12; 47:4, 11, 18; 51:7; 53:9; 56:5; 60:13) with probably three more uses where partial reconstructions have been offered (29:3; 46:4; 47:3). The use in 29:3-4, near the pericope under examination here, has בְּבֵית אֲשֶׁר אֶשְׁכְּנֶנָּה שְׁמִי עַל יוֹ (in the house where I will cause my name to dwell).⁷⁷

There are three main claims in the Temple Scroll that are crucial in understanding the use of this verb in the Scroll. These three claims from the uses of שָׁכַן in the Temple Scroll are: that the Lord will dwell in the midst of Israel, that the Lord will dwell in the temple, and that the Lord will dwell there forever. Elaborating on the dwelling that is in all three of these claims, four uses of the verb שָׁכַן show that the temple is the place

⁷⁶This interim temple must be flawed in some way if it is to be replaced as Stegemann has noted. However, no exegesis of the scroll has led to any conclusions why this plan must be replaced, if in fact it is an interim temple. If this temple, as described in the Temple Scroll columns 30-42, is superseded then the Lord will not dwell there forever. Clearly, the requirement for a temple as a dwelling place is firmly established by the Temple Scroll, unlike some later documents, with the Lord creating (probably through human hands) a sanctuary, which is the common word for a temple in the Temple Scroll.

⁷⁷Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1250. Riska reconstructs these verses to include the verb שָׁכַן, the same as Martínez and Tigchelaar. Riska, *House*, 11.

where the Lord will cause the name to dwell,⁷⁸ reflecting some Deuteronomic theology embedded in the text of the Temple Scroll. Wacholder notes the importance of this verb in his presentation on the Temple Scroll and its understanding of the future Jerusalem temple: “What is beyond doubt in 11Q Torah is the ultimate reward: God promises to dwell (יָדַבֵּר) in Israel. This verb appears nearly a dozen times, almost always in places original to the author.”⁷⁹ Schiffman also recognizes this verb as an important theme of the document. “According to many passages throughout the text, God is to dwell in the Temple among the children of Israel forever. This motif, expressed in all of the possible sources for the scroll, is among its most dominant themes.”⁸⁰ The temple is the place where the Lord will dwell.⁸¹ In 29:7-9, the verb occurs twice; however, it does not occur in this passage after the debated use of יָדַבֵּר in 29:9. If the idea of an interim temple were in the passage, it would be most important to stress the eternal dwelling in the later temple as opposed to the interim temple. If indeed there are two temples, just the opposite is the case in this passage. There are no claims of dwelling used after יָדַבֵּר in this pericope.

The second key feature of the Temple Scroll that is opposed to the idea of an interim temple is the presentation of the ground plan of an ideal, or utopian, temple which follows this passage.⁸² This ideal ground plan carries inherent critiques against all other

⁷⁸These four uses are 29:3-4, 45:12, 53:8-9, and 56:5.

⁷⁹Wacholder, *Dawn*, 12.

⁸⁰Schiffman, *Courtyards*, xxx.

⁸¹The physical dwelling in the physical temple is critical to understanding the proposals of the Temple Scroll. “God will not dwell in the Torah, in a community, in synagogues, or in the hearts of pious people, but He will dwell once more in a real temple building.” Stegemann, “Institutions,” 164.

⁸²This idea brings as close to universal agreement as can be expected in reviewing scholarship on second temple Jewish documents. Patton observes that “[t]he purpose of the scroll, therefore, is to present a utopian form of the Temple fully in line with Israelite tradition.” Patton, “Blueprint,” 141. Schiffman calls this layout, the ideal temple. Schiffman, *Courtyards*, xxi. Schiffman goes even further, claiming that the temple description “of the Temple Scroll represented Utopia—not reality.” *Ibid.*, 187. However, Schiffman notes that there is “a mixture of restoration, reform and utopia.” Schiffman, “Restoration,” 216. Maier notes that the description of the temple in the Temple Scroll “is certainly an idealistic one.” Maier, *Temple Scroll*, 77. Collins notes that temple is the ideal temple as well. J. Collins, “Apocalypticism,” 417. Martínez notes that this temple is the only correct prescription for building the temple. Martínez, “Temple Scroll,” 457.

past and present layouts of the Jerusalem temple. Zahn writes that in this light, the Temple Scroll implies that “the First Temple was fundamentally flawed from the start, since it did not correspond to divine intention.”⁸³ The Temple Scroll claims to present the ideal temple layout directly from God on Mt. Sinai, the layout to which the first Jerusalem temple did not adhere. Nor did the second Jerusalem temple, in existence at the time of the writing of the Temple Scroll, follow the Temple Scroll’s ideal temple layout.

The Temple Scroll’s ideal temple layout does not present the concept that the first Jerusalem temple proved to be inadequate in its later years. The Temple Scroll makes the assertion that the first Jerusalem temple was in error from its very origin, because it did not follow the Temple Scroll’s ideal temple layout, this divine plan, from the very beginning. If the document were attempting to declare that the first Jerusalem temple proved inadequate sometime after it was built, then the ideal temple layout of the Temple Scroll would not be presented at a time period before the first Jerusalem temple, but the Temple Scroll would have presented the new temple layout as a correction to what proved to be inadequate.⁸⁴

Betz notes the description of the temple in the Temple Scroll is the ideal sanctuary. Otto Betz, “Jesus and the Temple Scroll,” in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 91. Crawford notes that the ground plan is an ideal plan. Crawford, *Temple Scroll*, 28. Zahn notes how the ground plan is “describing the version of the First Temple that he thought should have existed.” Zahn, “New Voices,” 449. Barker notes that the ground plan of the temple in the Temple Scroll is “the pattern for the ideal temple.” Barker, *Gate of Heaven*, 24. Harrington maintains that “the Temple Scroll sets forth an eschatological ideal.” Hannah K. Harrington, *The Impurity Systems of Qumran and the Rabbis: Biblical Foundations* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 49. Flusser notes repeatedly that the temple of the Temple Scroll is ideal and utopian. David Flusser, *Judaism of the Second Temple Period*, trans. Azzan Yadin (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007), 207-213. Riska notes that there are “‘ideal’ structure principles” in the layout of the temple and courtyards of the Temple Scroll. Riska, *House*, 181. There are no ideas that the Temple Scroll is simply presenting an option for building the temple; the presentation at Sinai and the details themselves show that this is to be the ideal ground plan for the Jerusalem temple. Brooke presents the weakest statement on the matter. He notes that the ground plan presented in the Temple Scroll is the one that should have been built, but never was built. Here, Brooke acknowledges some critique of the layout of the Jerusalem temples that were built. However, he does not explicitly state, like many others, that this ground plan, presented in detailed fashion, is an ideal layout presented to Moses at Mt. Sinai by the Lord himself. Brooke, “Ten Temples,” 425.

⁸³Zahn, “New Voices,” 450.

⁸⁴Barker correctly goes beyond Zahn’s comment given above, noting that the “Temple Scroll, in giving instructions for building a temple different from any other known temple, implies that the existing

How can the ideal ground plan for the Jerusalem temple be replaced by another ground plan? If the ideal plan is replaced, would it be replaced by one that is inferior? Can God make a temple superior to God's ideal temple layout as given in the Temple Scroll? No! The understanding of an interim temple is coupled with the idea of God creating another temple that will replace the interim temple. Does the Temple Scroll maintain that God will create an inferior temple as compared to the ideal one presented at Sinai (if the עַד of 29:9 is translated "until")? Perhaps. For the temple that will replace the interim temple (if the עַד of 29:9 is translated "until"), does God create a new temple exactly like the one described in the Temple Scroll that some assert is to be an interim temple? No! This logic issue exists only if עַד of 29:9 is translated "until."

These important issues, identified above, arise when the translation of עַד in 29:9 leads to the idea of two temples. Furthermore, one would expect that if there were to be two temples, the Temple Scroll would mention this important idea elsewhere, but it does not.⁸⁵ The idea of two temples is entirely dependent on the interpretation of the Hebrew word עַד as a preposition that means "until."

If עַד is a preposition that means "during," or if it is a noun that means "forever," then there is only one temple, the one prescribed in the Temple Scroll. In that case, the Temple Scroll would present rules for the festivals to be performed at this one temple of the Temple Scroll. The dwelling (דְּבַר) of the Lord would also be in this one temple. In

temple, because it was incorrectly constructed, was not capable of fulfilling its sacred role." Barker, *Gate of Heaven*, 12. Here, even Schiffman calls the Temple Scroll "a reformist document, which calls for major changes in the architecture of the Temple." Schiffman, "Restoration," 212. Concerning the question of critique against Solomon's temple, Schiffman notes that the Temple Scroll maintains that the Solomonic temple used the wrong ground plan. Schiffman, *Courtyards*, 224. Martínez notes how "this shows up the inadequacy of the existing temple and cult in relation to the revealed text and assumes that, circumstances permitting, the existing temple and cult should be adapted to this revealed model." Martínez, "Temple Scroll," 455. Betz notes that the Scroll is presenting the fact that other Jerusalem temples did not have the correct measurements and layout. Betz, "Jesus," 91.

⁸⁵Levine correctly brings the Qumran focus into view when he notes the history of the sect. "The Qumran sect also focused on the future eschatological Temple. The Temple Scroll and the New Jerusalem text record the elaborate speculation developed within the sect, or those close to it, in this regard." L. Levine, *Jerusalem*, 136.

other words, there would be no conflict between column 29 and the rest of the document. To conclude this analysis, it is not only the Hebrew of column 29 that affirms there is only one temple; the context of the column and the rest of the Temple Scroll affirm that there is only one temple. It is not just in 29:8 that the Temple Scroll declares that the Lord will dwell forever in this temple, the one regarded as an interim temple by some scholars. In 45:14, the Lord **שוכן בתוך בני ישראל לעולם ועד** (is about to dwell among the children of Israel forever); obviously, this dwelling is in the temple. It is not simply that the Lord will “be” with Israel forever; the Lord will “dwell” forever, requiring the dwelling place described in the Temple Scroll. This dwelling place is the place where the Lord will dwell forever (29:7).

Any translation of “until” for **עד** in 29:9 must declare there to be a new dwelling place after some time, at which point the Lord would break this declaration to dwell eternally (29:7) in the temple prescribed in the Temple Scroll. Thus, there is no way to translate **עד** with “until” and keep the meaning and context of the rest of the Temple Scroll. The idea that the Temple Scroll has an interim temple before a final eschatological age is the product of an erroneous English translation and must be rejected.

The second key disagreement or point of divergence on this passage in column 29 is the reference to the covenant cut with Jacob and how this covenant is linked with the ideal temple of the Temple Scroll.⁸⁶ The specific Hebrew phrasing of the Temple Scroll is **כברית אשר כרתתי עם יעקוב בבית אל**. The reference alludes to the future presence of God in this temple, which will be analogous, comparable, or the same as how the divine presence was with Jacob. Clorfene analyzes Gen 28 and maintains that, although tradition claims that Abraham is the one who first went to Mt. Moriah when God called him to sacrifice Isaac, it was Jacob who called the same place **בית אל**, a house of God (Gen

⁸⁶Wacholder notes that the reference to a covenant cut with Jacob “remains obscure.” Wacholder, *Dawn*, 28. Yadin declares there is no mention of this covenant in Genesis. Yadin, *Hidden Law*, 114

28:17).⁸⁷ Whether references to Beth-El in Gen 12:8 and Beth-El in Gen 28:17 are in reality the same location or different locations does not alter the fact that Jacob's recognition that the place was the house of God in Gen 28:17 is fundamental to its use here in the Temple Scroll.⁸⁸

An additional implication of the use of Jacob is seen when examining the name Jacob in second temple Jewish writings. In Ezekiel,⁸⁹ the prophet uses "Jacob" (eschewing the name "Abraham") for the Jewish people as a whole. The same is the case here in the Temple Scroll.⁹⁰ Earlier in the Temple Scroll (23:7), it is the twelve sons of Jacob who represent the twelve tribes of Israel, encompassing all the people. Thus in

⁸⁷Clorfene does not see the text referring to Bethel, but to Beth-El, the house of God. This special place in Judaism is the Temple Mount, not the location of Bethel north of Jerusalem. Clorfene, *Messianic Temple*, 35. This citation references tradition that is later than the corpus examined in the present research, but the dwelling issue of the house of God was within second temple Judaism. Rashi also notes that this place is Mt. Moriah, holding that the reference to Luz in Gen 28:19 is explained by the fact "that Mount Moriah was uprooted and came here." Isaiah and Sharfman, *The Pentateuch*, 278. Scherman also notes that the place where Jacob dreamed was not the place of Bethel, but Beth-El, the house of God at Mt. Moriah. Scherman et al., *Torah*, 67. Ginzberg notes that Jacob went from "Beer-sheba to Mount Moriah" as the Lord led Jacob to the place of the future Jerusalem temple. Louis Ginzberg, *Bible Times and Characters: From the Creation to Jacob*, vol. 1 of *The Legends of the Jews*, trans. Henrietta Szold (1907; repr., Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1998), 349-350. To some extent this can be seen from the text of Genesis, as Bethel was a location named in Gen 12:8 and 13:3. Therefore, if Jacob named a place Beth-El, "house of God," it was not already named that, so it probably was not the location previously called Bethel.

⁸⁸Blenkinsopp notes a more detailed point about second temple Judaism, and even though it stems from Isaiah, it is relevant here. The phrase, house of Jacob, "became popular in the Second Temple period and is well represented in Isaiah (e.g. 46:3; 48:1; 58:1), even more so in liturgical hymns (Psalms 20, 46, 75, 76, 81, 84, 94)." Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1-39*, 191. He goes on to note that in Isa 2:3 it "refers to the temple." Ibid. In the second temple period, Jacob, not Abraham, is linked to the Jerusalem temple. For biblical texts of the second temple period, Jacob is linked more to the temple (Pss 14:7, 53:7, 87:2, 135:5, Isa 59:20, Ezek 28:25, 35:25-26, Obad 1:17, Mic 4:2, Sir 24:8) than Abraham (Tob 14:7). The name Jacob appears twice in the Temple Scroll (23:7, 29:10) whereas the name Abraham does not appear in the Temple Scroll at all. In general, Jacob appears 134 times in the non-biblical Qumran texts, whereas the name Abraham appears 59 times. This tally does not include the name Israel, which occurs quite often and should diminish the use of the name Jacob because of his name change to Israel, but the data clearly show that Abraham is the name that is diminished.

⁸⁹These four uses are Ezek 20:5, 28:25, 37:25, and 39:25. Three of the four of these references are in Ezekiel's restoration passages.

⁹⁰Yadin boldly claims that "[t]here is no such direct mention in the biblical narrative of Jacob at Bethel" of any covenant similar to the one mentioned by the Temple Scroll. Yadin, *Hidden Law*, 114. This statement distorts the picture and ignores Ezekiel. Jacob is important in Ezekiel (cf. Ezek 20:5, 28:25, 37:25, and 39:25) and Yadin notes that the author of the Temple Scroll "was without doubt intimately familiar with the Book of Ezekiel." Ibid., 165.

column 29, the covenant is with the people, represented by their ancestor: Jacob.⁹¹

The importance of the verb שָׁכַן is also relevant for the reference to Jacob in this passage, showing the physical need for God to dwell in this holy place (29:7, 8). This establishment of the Lord's sanctuary (29:9-10) as the place for the Lord to dwell (29:9) uses the common term for the residence of God in Ezekiel: מִקְדָּשׁ, "sanctuary" (i.e., holy place). This term appears many times in the non-biblical Qumran writings, including the Temple Scroll.⁹² מִקְדָּשׁ equates the purity of God with the separateness of the temple and the temple precincts. The term מִקְדָּשׁ is a nominal or participial form from the root קָדַשׁ, which can mean "subject to special treatment."⁹³ The purity of the temple is fundamentally about the presence of God dwelling in the temple. The center of the Temple Scroll's concentric temple layout is the holy of holies where God's presence is.⁹⁴

The presence of God is the key factor in column 29 of the Temple Scroll.⁹⁵ This presence of God in the Jacob account of Gen 28 is also the key factor and it is the reason behind the name: house of God.⁹⁶ Taking the presence of God (explicitly called כְּבוֹד

⁹¹The uses of "Jacob" in the Temple Scroll are in 23:7 and 29:10.

⁹²In the Qumran non-biblical documents, מִקְדָּשׁ is a common term for the temple, as it is used 138 times. The term is used 36 times in the Temple Scroll (11Q19): 3:11; 16:11; 29:8, 9; 30:2; 35:7; 43:12; 45:8, 10, 12, 17; 46:2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11; 47:4, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18; 52:14, 15, 17, 18, 20. Kutsko notes that מִקְדָּשׁ is the preferred term for the temple in Ezek 40–48. Kutsko, *Between Heaven and Earth*, 100.

⁹³Koehler and Baumgartner, *HALOT*, s.v. "קָדַשׁ."

⁹⁴The temple layout's center is not the altar as it is with Ezekiel's temple layout in chaps. 40–48. Riska details it somewhat differently, showing that it is the entrance to the holy place that is the dead center. Riska, *House*, 168. This slightly different diagram of Riska may be due to the different readings made possible due to the ravages of time on the Temple Scroll's parchment. However, the center according to Riska is the entrance into the dwelling of God, which shows no significant difference in theological meaning to the holy of holies.

⁹⁵The word כְּבוֹד occurs in the Temple Scroll column 29, in rows eight and nine. Additionally, Abegg holds that the word occurs in 30:2 as well. Abegg, Jr., "Manuscripts." These three occurrences are the only ones in the entire Temple Scroll. This tight grouping of the only uses of כְּבוֹד gives insight into the meaning and context of the passage. The physical presence of the Lord, as at Beth-El, is the highlighted aspect of the text.

⁹⁶Regarding the Jacob story in Gen 28, Wénin notes that "le contact avec le divin, qui est effectivement au cœur du rêve." André Wénin, "Jacob découvre la maison de Dieu," in *Quelle maison pour Dieu?* ed. Camille Focant (Paris: Cerf, 2003), 27. Kang notes from the story of Jacob at Beth-El how "the notion of sacredness of space was contingent upon divine manifestation." Kang, "Creation," 183. One

[my glory] in the passage) into account, the Temple Scroll states in 29:10 that God's presence will be present in the house of God, the temple, just as the presence of God was present when God cut a covenant with Jacob at Beth-El.⁹⁷

Since no promise of a temple exists in the Gen 28 narrative, the temple of the Temple Scroll could not be "according to the covenant which I made with Jacob at Beth-El" (29:10).⁹⁸ This comparison is equating the presence of God in the future temple with the presence of God when God promised to be with Jacob at Beth-El.⁹⁹ With this connection between Gen 28 and this translation of 29:10, the full implications of the reference to Jacob in 29:10 add to the background of events that happen when the presence of God comes to the dwelling place of God on earth.¹⁰⁰ The Temple Scroll (29:10) identifies the presence of God "during" the day that God comes as the presence

might interpret the promise that God gave to Jacob at Beth-El as that the presence of God would go with Jacob on his travels. "Behold, I am with you. I will guard you everywhere you go and I will return you to this ground, for I will not forsake you until I have done what I have spoken about you" (Gen 28:15). Then, with most modern translations of the Temple Scroll 29:10 having something similar to: "to establish it for myself for all time according to the covenant that I cut with Jacob at Bethel," the relative pronoun, "that," could be understood as the promise (or covenant) of the presence of God with Jacob in his travels. This presence would be with Jacob so that God would guard his life (keep him alive), return him to his land (Israel), and not abandon him so that he would prosper (wives and flocks), as it explicitly states in Gen 28:15. Thus, whether one translates 29:10 as most do or whether one translates the relative particle as "when" as I do, both can be seen as emphasizing the presence of God. However, with the differences between ׀כּשׁ (as in the Temple Scroll) and ׀ה׀ה (as in Gen 28), I find this comparison between the presence of God in Genesis 29-34 to the dwelling presence of God in the Temple Scroll 29 tenuous. The dwelling presence is noticed by Jacob at "the house of God" (בֵּית אֱלֹהִים); this presence did not go with him to Haran.

⁹⁷The translation of the Hebrew preposition כּ in 29:10 should be understood as a statement of equivalence. Koehler and Baumgartner note that this preposition not only means conformity (as most translate this preposition "according to" here in the passage), but it also expresses identity. Therefore, "as," "just as," "like," or "exactly like" convey the meaning of this preposition in many cases and especially in this case. Koehler and Baumgartner, *HALOT*, s.v. "כּ."

⁹⁸This is a quote of one translation of 29:10 and is common to other translations as well. Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1251; Wacholder, *Dawn*, 22; Vermes, *Complete*, 200; Maier, *Temple Scroll*, 32.

⁹⁹Brueggemann notes that the promise made to Jacob is "about a *presence*." The emphasis on presence is Brueggemann's. Walter Brueggemann, *Genesis* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982), 245.

¹⁰⁰It is this presence of God that changes all things. Fisdell notes that in "the Temple Scroll, the sense of the sacred is closely tied to the reality that contact with God, directly and on an ongoing basis, is not only possible, but necessary and imperative. What makes the people of Israel a holy nation, the Land of Israel a holy land, and Jerusalem the Holy City is the Indwelling of God." Fisdell, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 180.

that came to Jacob at the house of God, Beth-El, בֵּית אֱל (29:10),¹⁰¹ and this presence will dwell eternally in the temple.¹⁰² Therefore, this glory of God in the ideal temple of the Temple Scroll will be just as it was with Jacob.

This identification between Gen 28 and the Temple Scroll 29:10 further addresses the debate on the preposition עַד in 29:9 by showing what happens “during the day of creation” (29:9). The “day of creation,” the transformative change from a time when God is enthroned above the world to a time when the presence of God is present in this world, is during the time when the presence of God comes. The presence of God is not at a date afterwards when God creates another sanctuary (if one translates עַד with “until”). The glory in the temple of 29:7-8 is before that of 29:9 and shows that the glory is in this world before what would be a later date (again, if one translates עַד with “until”). The translation of “until” for עַד would require a lesser glory of God in the interim temple.

A final point necessary in the meaning of the Temple Scroll 29:10 illuminated by Gen 28 is the duration of the promise, or covenant, in Gen 28. The promise in Gen 28 by God is specifically given until specific conditions occur. The promise to Jacob is to last for a limited time, only עַד אֲשֶׁר אֶמְעַשְׂתִּי אֵת אֲשֶׁר-דִּבַּרְתִּי לְךָ (until I have done what I have spoken to you) in Gen 28:15.¹⁰³ The promises made to Jacob in Gen 28:13-15 are

¹⁰¹Koehler and Baumgartner have “expressing identity” as the first definition and translation listed for the עַד particle. Koehler and Baumgartner, *HALOT*, s.v. “ב.” This meaning shows through in this case and justifies the verb use of “identifies” in this present research.

¹⁰²Wénin describes the Jacob narrative in Genesis, noting the importance of transformation and how the narrative relates that transformative nature. He concludes, “De la sorte, l'endroit du rêve nocturne est caractérisé par le récit comme un lieu de plusieurs transformations présentes et à venir : transformation de l'endroit lui-même qui devient Beth-Él . . . du moins potentiellement; de la pierre dressée en stèle de mémorial en attente de devenir un sanctuaire; de Jacob qui devient le partenaire d'Adonai par une parole échangée dont la réalisation permettra d'approfondir leur relation; d'Adonai lui-même qui s'est engagé vis-à-vis de l'élu dont il a en quelque sorte confirmé les désirs enfouis.” Wénin, “Jacob,” 36. He ends by commenting that “[l]e lieu d'une telle transformation est lui-même affecté par le processus qui s'y enclenche.” *Ibid.*, 37.

¹⁰³This idea is kept in the following translations: ASV, CJB, CSB, ESV, JPS, NJPS, KJV, NKJV, NAB, NAS, NET, NIV, NJB, NLT, RSV, and NRSV.

fulfilled in Genesis.¹⁰⁴ As even Jacob's offspring are numerous (Gen 46:8-26), this narrative is clear (expressed in the preposition עַד "until" in Gen 28:15) that the promise at Beth-El is not eternal. A condition of "until" is the opposite of an eternal duration.

In the clause of Temple Scroll 29:9-10 immediately prior to the clause mentioning Jacob is the promise to establish the temple for all time, explicitly stating כּוֹל הַיָּמִים "all time." This shows that the words כְּבֵרִית אֲשֶׁר עִם יַעֲקֹב בְּבֵית אֵל in 29:10b do not make a comparison with the preceding clause (with the כּ preposition expressing identity), which would contradict the Jacob account,¹⁰⁵ but the clause before that ends with עַד יוֹם הַבְּרִיאָה "during the day of creation" (29:8-9). This illuminates how this final clause of 29:10 is equating the events during the day of creation with the events that happen when God and Jacob met at Beth-El. When the relative particle אֲשֶׁר refers to a day, it can be translated as "when."¹⁰⁶ With 29:10b equating, as the כּ preposition here is expressing identity, the presence of God (כְּבוֹד, 29:9) during the day of creation with the presence during the time when God promised Jacob at Beth-El (with the actual text containing an ellipsis, and necessary rearrangement, but understood as something like ...כִּיּוֹם הַבְּרִיאָה אֲשֶׁר כְּרַתִּי...), the last clause of 29:10 is best understood as a relative clause with a temporal meaning. This conveys the understanding that "on the day of creation . . . just as when I cut the covenant with Jacob at Beth-El."

¹⁰⁴Brueggemann notes how "the narrative moves toward its fulfillment in chaps. 31-33, it is clear that God does watch over his word and bring it to fulfillment." Brueggemann, *Genesis*, 246.

¹⁰⁵The duration of the matter is addressed in the previous paragraph in the main text. Also, no temple is mentioned in the Jacob narrative in the MT, which is also addressed in the text above. Thus, in both duration of the promise and the lack of temple in the details of the MT, one arguing that the Temple Scroll is stating that 29:10b is referring to the preceding material, one would have to have a different version of the Jacob account. Note, if one holds that the Temple Scroll is citing a different version of Genesis than the Masoretic Text, then one would have to hold that this different version actually contradicts the version of Genesis of the Masoretic Text, not merely that it proclaims the promise made to Jacob a בְּרִיאָה, even though the word is not used in the text. Current biblical scrolls data show no evidence of such a different version. Martin G. Abegg Jr., Peter Flint, and Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time into English* (New York: HarperCollins, 1999). Eugene C. Ulrich, Frank M. Cross, and Maurice Baillet, *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls Transcriptions and Textual Variants* (Leiden: Brill, 2010).

¹⁰⁶Waltke and O'Connor, *Syntax*, 334.

The last area of disagreement over column 29, though it includes other passages of the Temple Scroll, is whether Israel or God will build this temple and whether it is accomplished in the pre-eschatological era or the post-eschatological era. There are three main positions. Wacholder holds to a divine creation or building of the temple in eschatological time.¹⁰⁷ Wise contends that it is a human building of the temple in eschatological time.¹⁰⁸ Crawford maintains that it is a human building of the temple in historical time when Israel has control over the land.¹⁰⁹ This last position was originally presented by Yadin, but he emphasized two stages in the coming *eschaton*. The first stage is when Israel takes control of the land and builds a temple, with the fully realized *eschaton* starting only when God creates another temple.¹¹⁰

Column 29 of the Temple Scroll is not the only pericope that must be examined when determining who will build the temple and whether it will be eschatological. The whole Temple Scroll supports the idea of humans building the new Jerusalem temple. The common verb used for building the temple, other buildings, walls, and structures in the Temple Scroll, as in Ezek 40–48, is עָשָׂה, “do or make.”¹¹¹ This is also the same verb used in Exod 25:8 when God commanded the building of a מִקְדָּשׁ, the common word for

¹⁰⁷Wacholder, *Dawn*, 27.

¹⁰⁸Wise holds that the temple described in the Temple Scroll is eschatological, but that it is not eternal, as he holds to the translation of “until” for עַד in 29:9. Wise, “Eschatological Vision,” 161.

¹⁰⁹Crawford, *Temple Scroll*, 28.

¹¹⁰Yadin believes that the temple of the Temple Scroll is the humanly built temple, followed by the temple of Ezek 40–48, which is the temple that the Lord will create. Yadin, *Hidden Law*, 166. Wise holds that these two time periods can be thought of as a two-staged *eschaton*. Wise, “Eschatological Vision,” 161. Again, this position is only possible when the translation of עַד in 29:9 is held to be “until.”

¹¹¹The verb עָשָׂה occurs 135 times in the Temple Scroll and, in 46 uses, it is employed to have the temple surroundings, portico, veil, menorah, gate, altar, columns, doors, stairways, laver building as well as other buildings, channel, places around the temple, temple courtyards, rooms, windows, steps, and many more items and places made. Apart from these uses, the verb is also used to describe the building of a new house (65:5). The verb בָּנָה occurs only seven times in the Temple Scroll. These statistics are somewhat proportional to those of Ezekiel’s last vision in 40–48. In Ezek 40–48, the verb עָשָׂה occurs 32 times and the verb בָּנָה does not occur. It is humanity that is commanded and described as constructing (עָשָׂה) the dwelling in the Temple Scroll, Exod 25:8, and Ezek 43:11.

the temple in the Temple Scroll.¹¹² In column 56 of the Temple Scroll, this verb עשה is used four times to command that the people act and do all of “the judgment” (המשפט) 56:5-6) and do “the teaching” (התורה) 56:7) of the Temple Scroll.

The important issue for the Temple Scroll is to accomplish actions according to the Torah (or teaching) of this judgment, בתורת המשפט הזה, a phrase that Wacholder highlighted as significant in 29:4, so much so that he left the phrase in transliterated form in his translation of column 29.¹¹³ Wacholder’s view is that “‘The Temple Scroll’ is an inappropriate title for this manuscript” and his subtitle calls it *The Sectarian Torah*.¹¹⁴

The commands of column 56 to do (עשה) this judgment and act (עשה) according to this teaching, using the same words as column 29, show the expected behavior and preconditions that are expected of Israel in the Temple Scroll.¹¹⁵ These preconditions include the ground plan of the ideal temple for Israel to build, with detailed measurements presented in columns 3-4 and 30-45.¹¹⁶

The concept that God would build the temple stems from 29:9, where the text has

¹¹²This same command may very well have been in the beginning of the Temple Scroll though it has been lost because of the effects of time on the document. Riska does link column 29:8-9 of the Temple Scroll to Exod 24:16a as well as 29:43b, possibly linking the presence of God dwelling on Mt. Sinai and the tabernacle to this text, at least to some extent. Riska, *House*, 150.

¹¹³Wacholder notes that this phrase in 29:4 “whose antecedent includes the prescriptions to make a sanctuary and introduce the proper rite, serves as a precondition of what God expects Israel to fulfill in eschatological times.” Wacholder, *Dawn*, 24.

¹¹⁴Ibid., xiii. Wacholder posits that this work is “the Qumranic or sectarian Torah.” Ibid.

¹¹⁵Wacholder observes that the Temple Scroll maintains that Israelite observance of this new teaching (or the correct revelation from Mount Sinai) is a precondition for God dwelling in the new Jerusalem temple. Ibid., 21. Though obvious, it must be stated that God cannot dwell in this temple until Israel builds this temple.

¹¹⁶García Martínez notes that not only is this a blueprint for rebuilding, but that the Temple Scroll is presenting a normative temple by divine revelation. Florentino García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 205. VanderKam notes that the ground plan of the Temple Scroll is different from Solomon’s temple, the second temple, or even Herod’s temple. James C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1994a), 59. Patton holds that the Temple Scroll lays out the ground plan that “correctly fulfills the decrees given by God to Moses at Sinai.” Patton, “Blueprint,” 142. Crawford notes that the ground plan of the temple in the Temple Scroll is the ideal plan that will correct the errors of the second temple and its cult. Crawford, *Temple Scroll*, 28.

the idea that God will create (בָּרָא) the temple. However, the partnership between God and Israel is well attested both in the Hebrew Scriptures and in the Temple Scroll.¹¹⁷ It is true that 29:9 has the claim that God would create the temple, yet it is also true that God commands Israel to build the temple (30:4, and perhaps 3:4 as well).¹¹⁸ Israel is commanded to build the buildings surrounding the temple as well (33:8, 35:10).

While the Temple Scroll presents a temple of divine and human origin,¹¹⁹ the Temple Scroll presents God sanctifying the temple (29:8), as well as Israel sanctifying the temple surroundings (35:8). This partnership in building shows up in Scripture, such as Ps 127:1, where the Lord builds and the builders also build.¹²⁰ In fact, the Lord is credited as being the builder of all Jerusalem (Ps 147:2). Ezekiel 43:1-12, Hag 2:1-9, and Zech 2:1-9 also speak of such a partnership between God and Israel in building the temple.¹²¹

¹¹⁷Some follow the 19th-century analysis that asserts that this root בָּרָא refers “always of divine activity.” Brown, BDB, s.v. “בָּרָא.” Wentling arrives at a similar understanding based upon different evidence. “Perhaps, corresponding to the Rabbinic notion of man’s partnership with God in the act of creation, the future *miqdash* would be built by those in whom the spirit of God already dwelled.” Wentling, “Unraveling,” 72.

¹¹⁸The debate over who will build the eschatological temple in Ezekiel is entrenched in Judaism as Rashi holds that God will create it and Maimonides holds that Israel will build it. See *Sukkah* 41a for Rashi and see *Hilchot Melachim U’Milchamoteihem* 11:1, 4 for Maimonides. Even though these texts date after the fall of the second Jerusalem temple, they show an analogous debate that modern scholars have in interpreting the Temple Scroll, as well as Ezekiel, which are both second temple texts.

¹¹⁹To some extent, the belief that the second of the temples in the Temple Scroll (the fourth temple, or fifth temple if Herod’s temple is counted) is solely a divine work is why Yadin and those who have followed him support the idea of two temples.

¹²⁰In context of Egyptian theology, Frankfort observes the crux of the matter when determining when a deity wants a temple rebuilt. “If the decay of the sanctuary was considered punishment from the gods and the existing of a well-functioning shrine a sign of their good will, then the rebuilding of a temple could not be started lightly. Imagine a man’s presuming to begin the work before the divine interdict had expired! This indeed would be *hubris* and a certain cause of calamity.” Frankfort, *Kingship*, 269. Hurowitz also notes that Gudea, the builder of the Eninnu temple “is pictured as a ruler who tries with all his might to perform the will of his god, and there is no sign of any personal initiative or independence.” Victor A. Hurowitz, *I Have Built You an Exalted House: Temple Building in the Bible in Light of Mesopotamian and Northwest Semitic Writings* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 144.

¹²¹Ackroyd notes that Haggai and Zechariah claim that although Israel is to build the temple, it is brought about by God. Ackroyd, *Exile*, 177. Clements notes that Ezek 43:10-12 also presents human effort with divine origin for the building of the future Jerusalem temple. Clements, *Ezekiel*, 190.

Eschatology and the Temple Scroll

With the Jerusalem temple in the Temple Scroll exceeding the size, scope, and impact of any Jerusalem temple of Israel's past, the ramifications of this temple in the theology and eschatology of the Temple Scroll should not be underestimated.¹²² The eschatology of the Temple Scroll is most visible with the expression *יום הברכה* (the day of blessing) or *יום הברייה* (the day of creation) in 29:9. These phrases undoubtedly point to the beginning of eschatological times.¹²³ There is no way to interpret this new age, day of blessing or day of creation, when God dwells with the people as God was present with Jacob at Beth-El, as anything but eschatological. The presence of God dwelling with the people is a common theme of the new age in canonical texts.¹²⁴ The uses of “forever” in column 29 clearly indicate a new time period, starting with this day of creation, and this new age will be “all the days” (line 10).

The new age is also indicated in 45:14, where the text claims that in those days the Lord “will dwell in the midst of the children of Israel for ever and always.” In 46:4, it is “for all the days, for I am about to dwell in their midst.” The new time is signaled by the use of the phrase “in those days” (56:1, 61:9). The new order is clear, with the people having a king again (57:2). This new king in this new time with a new order will have the Lord keeping him and his sons on the throne as long as they keep the ordinances of the Lord (59:17-21). Perhaps too obvious to note, column 59 comes after column 29 with the assertion of dwelling forever in the temple that Israel will build (column 30). The phrase “the end of days” only adds to the eschatological assertions of a new order because of the new political order of the Scroll as well as the new purity of the land of Israel. The

¹²²Fujita notes that “Ezekiel provided them a welcome scriptural source and basis for the formulation and presentation of their ideas concerning the temple in its eschatological dimension.” Fujita, “Temple Theology,” 3.

¹²³Schiffman, *Courtyards*, 27.

¹²⁴Ezekiel 40–48, Haggai, Zechariah, and Isa 56–66 would all echo this theme among others.

phrase, “day of creation,” also reinforces the eschatological nature of the temple in column 29 as investigated above.¹²⁵ Although other Qumran writings reflect a realized eschatology,¹²⁶ the Temple Scroll does not reflect a realized eschatology, as the temple described in the Temple Scroll obviously had not yet been built, and no other event in the Temple Scroll had already come to be realized.¹²⁷

As explored above, the Temple Scroll presents its teaching as a divine revelation utilizing and correcting the Torah;¹²⁸ and “the teaching” (הַתּוֹרָה)¹²⁹ of the Temple Scroll removes the eschatology characterized by blessings and curses of Deuteronomy,¹³⁰ but

¹²⁵Knibb refers to the end of column 29 when he describes the section as containing eschatological concepts. Michael A. Knibb, “Eschatology and Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 2:318.

¹²⁶“The sense of immediacy and direct revelation found in the Scrolls goes hand in hand with a partially realized eschatology: the belief that some of the things promised by the prophets and apocalyptic writers were already present even if the final dénouement of history had not yet come.” John J. Collins, “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, 2:426.

¹²⁷These facts run contra Deurloo, who claims that the Temple Scroll does indeed contain a realized eschatology. Darel A. Deurloo, “King and Temple: David in the Eschatology of the Prophets,” in *The New Things: Eschatology in Old Testament Prophecy Festschrift for Henk Leene*, ed. F. Postma, K. Spronk, and E. Talstra (Maastricht, Netherlands: Uitgeverij Shaker, 2002), 59-60.

¹²⁸This new teaching is a correction to the Torah. The understanding that the Temple Scroll corrects the Torah is not new and would not surprise critical scholars. For example, Johnstone observes of the literary strands of the Torah that P attempts to correct D and D attempts to correct P in a polemical battle. William Johnstone, “The Two Theological Versions of Passover Pericope in Exodus,” in *Text as Pretext, Essays in Honour of Robert Davidson*, ed. Robert P. Carroll (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 169. The Temple Scroll is a combination of Priestly and some Deuteronomic theology.

¹²⁹There are 11 uses of the word תּוֹרָה in the Temple Scroll and all are definite nouns, with four uses of the phrase הַתּוֹרָה הַזֹּאת. The uses of “this teaching,” “my teaching,” “the teaching,” or “the teaching according to this judgment” show the reader that the Temple Scroll is the genuine recitation of God’s teaching.

¹³⁰Why are the blessings-and-curses eschatology of Deuteronomy removed? The Temple Scroll changes the eschatology to a different form, which conflicts with blessings-and-curses eschatology. This different form is detailed below.

keeping the chosen place of God, the Jerusalem temple.¹³¹ This place is where both God's name and glory (כבוד) dwell.

The tie between actions of Israel and eschatology is important in Deuteronomy. The actions of humanity determine "the future of the entire creation."¹³² Von Rad notes that "the divine proclamation of salvation has occasionally a certain conditional note in it, too, in Deuteronomy; then, the realization of the salvation, especially the promise of the land, is certainly not independent of the accomplishment of obedience."¹³³ This conditional note can be found in Deut 11:27; 13:18; 15:5; 28:1, 2, 13, 15; 30:16. The eschatology of Deut 28, though not found in the Temple Scroll, is an eschatology established upon the obedient actions of Israel. In this respect the eschatology of Deuteronomy and the Temple Scroll are similar, with both based upon the obedience of Israel. The obedience of the children of Israel (Jacob), who are called to build the temple as presented in the Temple Scroll, provides a holy separate place for God to dwell.¹³⁴

With this similarity, it is important to recognize the main difference between Deuteronomic eschatology and that of the Temple Scroll. The blessings and curses of Deut 28 have Israel's obedience to the commandments of Deuteronomy, as given by

¹³¹However, this is not merely a place for the name of God to dwell, as is exclusive in Deuteronomy. Barker notes the battle between Deuteronomic name theology and an anthropomorphic understanding of God dwelling in the temple. "The Deuteronomists had no place for the literal presence of God." Barker, *Gate of Heaven*, 135. The temple and the literal dwelling of God in that temple are crucial in the Temple Scroll's theology as well as eschatology.

¹³²Birch et al., *Introduction*, 148.

¹³³Gerhard von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy* (London: SCM Press, 1956), 73.

¹³⁴Pitkänen shows a parallel thought that when the Lord dwells in the land, "both Deuteronomy and the Priestly material advocate a similar view of an ideal Israel. Both see a situation where the people of Israel are encamped around the central sanctuary." Pitkänen, *Central Sanctuary*, 104-105. As Weinfeld aptly notes, the Glory of the Lord is key to the Priestly school, whereas the Name of the Lord supplants the Glory in the Deuteronomic school. Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 37. With both Name and Glory theologies included, the Temple Scroll shows evidence of both theologies. It is also important to note that both theologies lead to eschatologies that are based more on possession of and dwelling in the land. Neither eschatology emphasizes the Edenic conditions prophesied by Ezekiel (47:6-12).

Moses, leading to possession of and safe dwelling in the land.¹³⁵ However, the Temple Scroll presents directions to build the temple, emphasizing the temple structure, not just the place, as in Deuteronomy, for the divine כבוד to dwell, and not just for the name.

Conclusion

The Temple Scroll presents the ideal ground plan for the Jerusalem temple.¹³⁶ The stress is on the correct form, which is done to distinguish this ideal from any incorrect form. Forms other than this ideal form do not agree with the directions given by God to Moses on Mt. Sinai. These other forms, from the perspective of the Temple Scroll, would include Solomon's temple and the second temple. This document calls for the temple to be built and for obedience to this new teaching. The effects of these actions are explored below. The measurements differ from those of other Jerusalem temples, even from those of the ideal future temple in Ezek 40–48. Differences extend to the festivals at the temple, such as the fact that the Temple Scroll calls for two new festivals, one for wine and one for oil.¹³⁷ The temple ground plan is to be implemented by both human and divine effort. Both God and Israel will take actions to consecrate the temple and its surroundings. The ideal ground plan and obedience to all the appointed festivals affects purity within the holy land (some of the references mentioned above are: 2:11; 3:6; 26:7; 35:7; 45:10, 17-18; 46:2-4, 13; 47:10, 13, 16-17; 48:10-11; 51:7, 19; 52:17; 55:9-10; 56:10; 57:10, 15-17; 58:6-9; 64:12). Human obedience is important, but it is God dwelling in the temple that effects holiness (and therefore, purity) outward from this structure to affect actions of people and animals, so that all Israel will follow the teaching

¹³⁵Weinfeld notes that “[a]t the core of deuteronomic literature lies the concept of national reward, the chief incentive employed by the deuteronomic school to induce the nation to observe its teaching.” Weinfeld, *Deuteronomic School*, 307.

¹³⁶The presentation in the Temple Scroll is from God, it is not from Moses nor is it in the third person as an author presenting hopes and dreams to come, contra Schiffman. Schiffman, *Courtyards*, 300.

¹³⁷These festivals are laid out in column 21.

of the instruction contained in the Temple Scroll. Although the purity laws are an important aspect of the scroll, they are not its central teaching. Rather, the central teaching concerns the nature and effects of the temple structure itself,¹³⁸ as shown in columns 3-11, 29-48, which is not only about half of the entire Temple Scroll; it is the central section of this second temple Jewish writing. Furthermore, other portions of the Temple Scroll include many topics that are dependent on the temple building, such as the many different festivals and offerings at that structure.¹³⁹

The Temple Scroll lays out a new teaching to be carried out. The Temple Scroll presents the call to build the temple structure, along with the effects of this structure. The Jerusalem temple, as presented in the Temple Scroll, is the necessary catalyst that hastens the *eschaton*. A catalyst accelerates actions. This can be seen from the extensive investigation above on the word **כִּי** (“during” or “while”) in 29:9. The Lord will dwell with the people forever (29:7-8). The Lord will dwell forever in this temple (29:9) that the people are to build (30:4) with help from the Lord (29:9). The phrase “day of creation” in 29:9 refers to the day when the Lord causes the glory to dwell in this temple. This new creation depicted in the entire Temple Scroll, described above, is a new order with pronounced purity radiating outward from this new temple where the glory dwells. This new order will have the presence of God in the midst of the people, just as when God was present with Jacob. This presence will dwell in this temple as described in the Temple Scroll. “When” is an important concept in 29:8-10. The three relative particles

¹³⁸In a sense, the instructions for the temple structure are a massive segment of the purity law because the architecture is designed to ensure purity.

¹³⁹Lundquist notes that the Ancient Near Eastern view of a temple is that the temple “allows for the transformation of a chaotic universe into a cosmos.” John M. Lundquist, “Temple, Covenant, and Law in the Ancient Near East and in the Old Testament,” in *Israel’s Apostasy and Restoration*, ed. Avraham Gileadi (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1988), 299. Fisdell understands the Temple Scroll to be about transformation. If Israel were to accomplish instructions of the Temple Scroll, beginning with the temple, then it would lead to an eschatological redemption for Israel as well as for the world. Fisdell, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 181-182.

around the phrase “during the day” emphasize the events that happen “when” the Lord dwells in this new temple.

The eschatology of the Temple Scroll is not like that of Deut 28, where blessings and curses are motivators persuading the people to follow the instructions given by Moses. The Temple Scroll abandons the focus on obedience leading to blessings or disobedience leading to curses. Instead of this focus of Deut 28, the Temple Scroll focuses on the ideal temple where the Lord can dwell. It is after the Lord dwells in this ideal temple that Israel is described as ruling of enemies in 59:19 (as reviewed above), rather than merely being set as supreme over all the nations (Deut 28:1). The eschatology of the Temple Scroll is not a realized eschatology; it is presented as imminent, pending a crucial catalyst.¹⁴⁰ The imminent nature of the coming new age can be seen in the anticipatory participle, יָשַׁב (about to dwell), in 46:4. It is this temple that acts as a catalyst that hastens the eternal dwelling of the God of Israel, which neither Solomon’s temple nor the second Jerusalem temple could accomplish.¹⁴¹ It is the construction of this temple that brings the glory (כְּבוֹד) of God to dwell in Jerusalem with the children of Israel, which affects the purity of the land of Israel.¹⁴²

The transformation of the land starts with the temple.¹⁴³ The transformation is not

¹⁴⁰Thiering notes that this temple of the Temple Scroll is linked to the day of blessing in 29:9 and that this time equates to the future eschatological time in other Qumran scrolls. Barbara E. Thiering, “*Mebaqer and Episkopos in the Light of the Temple Scroll*,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100 (1981): 60-61. Price also links the new temple with the eschatological age. Price, “Desecration and Restoration,” 483. However, there has been no investigation into the detail of the eschatological timeline or identification of the event that begins the final eschatological timeline before this work.

¹⁴¹Schiffman acknowledges that “[t]his new Temple, the fulfillment of God’s command in Deuteronomy, is to be even more perfect than the Temple of Solomon. It is this Temple alone that will be appropriate for the indwelling of God’s presence.” Schiffman, *Courtyards*, xxvi.

¹⁴²Wacholder agrees that it is the construction of this temple that leads to God dwelling in the midst of Israel forever. Wacholder, *Dawn*, 31.

¹⁴³Fujita notes that “the sect-temple was believed to be the starting point of a cosmic restoration.” Fujita, “Temple Theology,” 322. He also states that the people of Qumran believed that “the temple should be fulfilled by their hands.” *Ibid.*

a renewal that starts elsewhere and leads to the building of the temple. The transformation starts with the building of the temple, the singularly required entity that brings the **כבוד** of God. Only after this catalyst is accomplished can the temple usher in an ever-present purity and restore the originally divinely desired blessing to Israel intended at Sinai.¹⁴⁴ It is true that, if not for “the Indwelling of God, without His immediate Presence, all of the outward manifestation would be meaningless.”¹⁴⁵ However, the temple is what brings the eternal dwelling of God, which then brings eternal, eschatological relationship between God and Israel.¹⁴⁶ Thus, the Temple Scroll displays a precipitated eschatology, with the catalyst being the creation of the ideal Jerusalem temple. This concept merges the understandings of Wacholder, Wise, and Crawford above on their different understandings of whether Israel or God would make the temple and whether it would be in historic or eschatological time. Crawford is correct: The temple will be built in historical time. Wise is correct in that once the Lord dwells in the temple, the *eschaton* arrives and it is an eschatological temple. Wacholder is correct in that the Lord makes the temple, though with human agents.

¹⁴⁴First, it is important to note that this is not the blessings described in Deuteronomy before the people enter the Promised Land. Second, Zahn notes that the passage of column 29 examined above implies that “if the construction and sacrificial plan of *TS* had been implemented from the start, God’s blessing would have been assured (11QT 29).” Zahn, “New Voices,” 450.

¹⁴⁵Fisdell, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 180.

¹⁴⁶The relationship between God and Israel is vital and life giving. The Jerusalem temple in the Temple Scroll attempts to establish “the creation of conditions of holiness that will result in a renewal of the covenant between Israel and God so that God will fulfill His promise of the ultimate redemption of Israel.” Wacholder, *Dawn*, 13.

CHAPTER 7

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL ROLE OF THE JERUSALEM TEMPLE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT PSEUDEPIGRAPHA AND THE QUMRAN SCROLLS

The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha

The writings within the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha (OTP) cover not only a span of hundreds of years, but come from different geographic locations, different social positions, and different schools of thought. Thus, when examining one topic within all these documents, the results of the examination can be complex and have a variegated outcome. Considering the different causes that originated these documents and how these documents have different purposes behind them, there can be few absolutes in assessing any single issue within the corpus of texts that make up the OTP. However, one can assess how the individual documents present any particular topic. Then, after individually examining how each document presents the topic, a comparison of the individual resultant understandings of the documents can be shown.

By examining the OTP on the topic of the temple, the analysis shows that many temples are mentioned, both in the sky and on land, in other countries, and in Israel in general, as well as the temple specifically in Jerusalem. Narrowing the topic down exclusively to the physical Jerusalem temple and examining what, if any, role the temple plays eschatologically presents a much more well-defined and manageable project. Most of the documents of the OTP are silent on the Jerusalem temple.¹ Even many of the documents that mention the Jerusalem temple focus more on either the grandeur of

¹The Jerusalem temple is mentioned in 27 of the 63 documents in Charlesworth's work. James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (New York: Doubleday, 1983).

Solomon's temple or of Herod's temple, or on the destruction of Solomon's temple, with a few alluding to the destruction of Herod's temple. Therefore, only a few writings remain that speak about the Jerusalem temple in the future.² Using the winnowing process mentioned above on the OTP leaves only eight documents that discuss the future Jerusalem temple: *1 Enoch*, the Third and Fifth of the *Sibylline Oracles*, the *Apocryphon of Ezekiel*, *2 Baruch*, *Jubilees*, *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*, and the *Testament of Benjamin*, which refers to a *1 Enoch* passage.³ Since the *Testament of Benjamin* passage refers to *1 Enoch*, it will not be addressed; its primary source, the passage in *1 Enoch*, will be addressed. One last factor to consider is the date of writing. This examination is focused on documents written between the destruction of the first Jerusalem temple and the destruction of the second Jerusalem temple. This factor eliminates the Fifth *Sibylline Oracle* and *2 Baruch* because they were written after the destruction of the second Jerusalem temple. Therefore, only five different sources are left for consideration after starting with the entire OTP.

1 Enoch

The book that has come down to present day as *1 Enoch* is a collection that is assembled together into one text. Within *1 Enoch*, there are two references to the future Jerusalem temple: 90:20-31 and 91:12-14. These two references are from two different "books" within the library of *1 Enoch*. The chap. 90 passage comes from early

²This is a subjective assessment to some extent. This assessment depends on the date of the writing and statement presented. For example, an angel declaring that the temple will be built on the spot of the ladder in the *Ladder of Jacob* is not considered futuristic because of the date when it was written. Also, Hare notes that *Lives of the Prophets* 12:12-13 "prophesies that the capitals of the pillars of the second Temple will be restored at the commencement of the age to come." This may be true, but it is a subjective assessment of 12:13 that only has: "And by means of them the Lord will be recognized at the end." The present research attempts to be less speculative and focus on how the temple is presented in the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. D. R. A. Hare, "The Lives of the Prophets: A New Translation and Introduction," in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charleworth (New York: Doubleday, 1985), 2:383.

³Nickelsburg understands the *Apocalypse of Abraham* as presenting an eschatological temple in chap. 29. The hypothesis has merit, but remains unclear. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 298.

Maccabean work, Dream Visions.⁴ The chap. 91 passage is from the pre-Maccabean work, the Apocalypse of Weeks.⁵ These pericopes will each be examined separately in the order in which they appear in the text of *1 Enoch*.

***1 Enoch* 90:20-31**

The first passage, 90:20-31, begins with an end-time judgment scene.⁶ Nickelsburg observes that the end-time judgment scene is not in heaven, but on earth.⁷ Nickelsburg's observation would also apply to all the end-time passages addressed here as the earthly temple is crucial to understanding these passages and therefore, it is necessary for the scenes to take place on the earth, as it is obvious that the Jerusalem temple is actually on earth.⁸ In this scene, the Lord is executing judgment on those who have harmed the people of Israel. Clearly, this scene is depicting a pre-*eschaton* scene if one understands the *eschaton* to be a peaceful dwelling with God; the existence of enemies within the pericope ensures that this is prior to the advent of the *eschaton*. The wicked are still living within Israel and they are just beginning to be punished.

In vv. 28-29, the Jerusalem temple is transformed.⁹ Explicitly, v. 28 states this

⁴E. Isaac, "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch: A New Translation and Introduction," *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charleworth (New York: Doubleday, 1985), 7.

⁵Ibid.

⁶VanderKam notes how this passage describes the end of this age, redemption of the just, as well as a renewed Jerusalem. James C. VanderKam, *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 294.

⁷Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 403.

⁸In *1 En.* 90:20, the text specifically addresses a time in a pleasant land, not the sky. Then, the judgment is addressed in 90:24. The "pleasant land" is clearly the land of Israel as the Animal Apocalypse section of *1 En.* 85-90 also refers to this land as "a very pleasant place and in a land beautiful and glorious; I saw those sheep being satiated; and that house was in their midst in the beautiful land" (*1 En.* 89:40). This description in *1 En.* 89:40, which describes the people entering into the promised land, must refer to the land of Israel. Nickelsburg summarizes this verse by noting that the phrase "a good place and a sweet and glorious land" (*1 En.* 89:40) "probably reflects traditional descriptions, as in Exod 3:8, 'a good and broad land, a land flowing with milk and honey.'" Ibid., 271.

⁹Stone maintains that the setting up of a temple was an eschatological conviction of *1 Enoch*. Michael E. Stone, "Apocalyptic Literature," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, ed. Michael E. Stone (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 404. Tiller's note that the tower is not specifically mentioned

fact. “Then I stood still, looking at that ancient house being transformed.”¹⁰ The transformation has the pillars, columns, and the ornaments being removed and taken south in *I En.* 90:28. The new temple is described as being set up or constructed in *I En.* 90:29. This new, or renewed, temple allows the gathering of the remnant of Israel. The temple is set up at the location of the first, acknowledging it as the Jerusalem temple (*I En.* 90:29). This temple is “greater and loftier than the first one” (*I En.* 90:29).¹¹

This temple begins a transformation of the situation.¹² The temporal particles of “then” and “thereafter” in vv. 30 and 31 are particles that Isaac, in his translation, chose to indicate the change that has taken place in the narrative at this point in the text.¹³ It is only after this new, or renewed, temple is set up that the people, animals, and birds are put on the correct path.¹⁴ Notice that *I En.* 90:33 describes how they “rejoiced with great

is correct, but not the assumption that there is no temple in the renewed Jerusalem. Tiller first has to presume the removal of the temple with the city, followed by the rebuilding of the city without rebuilding of the temple, clearly a big leap. The rebuilt Jerusalem within the vision in the text includes the temple because of the actions afterward in the text. All come to the house (dwelling) of the Lord, 90:33, into the presence of the Lord, 90:34. The rebuilt Jerusalem would include the temple because the critical comments made about the temple in 89:73 show the importance of having a temple. In fact, the idea of a rebuilt glorious Jerusalem without a temple or with a dilapidated temple is not in the context of the vision in this passage. Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 20-51. J. Chr. K. von Hofmann, *Der schriftbeweis: Ein theologischer versuch* (Nördlingen: C. H. Beck, 1857), 1:423. Nickelsburg understands the text here to announce a temple and that the “higher” of v. 29 denotes the new temple to be higher than the old temple, which was referred to as a tower. Nickelsburg, *Commentary*, 404-405. McKelvey reviews the importance of the temple in this passage and holds to a rebuilt temple here in *I En.* 90:28. McKelvey, *New Temple*, 23. Barker notes that the tower may refer to the holy of holies, a part of the temple. Barker, *Temple Theology*, 28.

¹⁰All citations of *I Enoch*, unless otherwise specified, come from Isaac’s translation in Charlesworth’s edition of the *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*.

¹¹This is comparable to Hag 2:9.

¹²Nickelsburg calls vv. 26 and 27 the last of the judgment. Beginning in v. 28 then, the text describes the beginning of the *eschaton*, where the temple is renewed, restored, or rebuilt. He addresses v. 28 as introducing the next age. Nickelsburg, *I Enoch*, 404.

¹³Charles translated the text that Isaac has translated “then” as a more stilted “and.” Robert Henry Charles, *I Enoch* (Oxford: University Press, 1912), 214; Nickelsburg, *I Enoch*, 402.

¹⁴Bauckham indicates that the *eschaton* has begun at least by v. 33, where he cites the universal nature of the eschatological age. Richard Bauckham, “Apocalypses,” in *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*, vol. 1 of the *Justification and Variegated Nomism*, ed. D. A. Carson, Peter T. O’Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 147.

joy because they had become gentle and returned to his house.” The following verse tells the reader that “they had laid down that sword which was given to” them, showing the transition to the new age. In *1 En.* 90:35, “they saw beautiful things; not a single one existed among them that could not see,” again, showing clearly that a new age has begun.

Regarding the temple, v. 28 asserts that it “was being transformed.” The temple is further described as being disassembled and moved. Although *1 En.* 90:28 is vague as to who is disassembling and moving the parts of the temple, it would be more than odd that these movements were not being performed by humans. If the actions were being performed by the glory of the Lord or by angels, one cannot imagine that the author would not mention this important fact. If the actions are being performed by humanity, then it would not necessarily be odd to omit this fact as it was the normal manner of the day for humans to build the temple for the deity. After this, the Lord brings about the new temple. Is there human involvement? The fact that the text describes the old temple being at least somewhat disassembled appears to show human involvement. There is no statement that the Lord disassembled the temple.

In addition, the claim that the Lord “brought about” (*1 En.* 90:29) the new temple does not exclude human involvement. In fact, one could conclude from reading this passage that the Lord commanded this rebuilding through prophets or prophetic oracles. Human labor and human prophets show human involvement.

Whether the Lord or humanity will do the physical construction in *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* is an issue that deserves some attention. Safrai notes that the two divergent origins of the temple can be traced to the different “individual characters of the authors of the dicta and the sources from which they derived their traditions.”¹⁵ Stopping short of concluding that the older tradition has the human construction of Jerusalem and its temple, Safrai notes that the Merkaba tradition has divine construction and the Tannaim

¹⁵Shmuel Safrai, “The Heavenly Jerusalem,” *Ariel* 23 (1969): 16.

as well as the Amoraim have the human construction.¹⁶

The background temple construction in these second temple Jewish writings starts well before the first of any one of the Hebrew Scriptures was written; the background is preserved in Sumerian, Akkadian, and ancient northwest Semitic writings that predate the Hebrew Scriptures. Hurowitz details texts relating to the creation of temples for gods, starting with a Sumerian text depicting Gudea receiving a divine order in a dream to build a temple for Ningirsu many centuries before these second temple Jewish writings under consideration.¹⁷ Yet, in these ancient writings, ancient even for the authors of *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*, there is background that informs and influences the early Hebrew writings, which then, in turn, inform and influence second temple Jewish writings.

Besides Gudea of Lagash, Hurowitz goes on to demonstrate that the command or impetus for temple building is of divine origin in many temples in Mesopotamian and northwest Semitic writings. For example, Enlil instructs Ur-Nammu to build his temple,¹⁸ Nintu commands the king to restore her temple,¹⁹ Enlil commands the king to build Sippar and the Ebabbar temple,²⁰ there is a divine instruction to restore the Shamash temple in Sippar,²¹ Sin commands the king through Nabonidus to rebuild the Sin temple in Harran,²² and Il orders that a palace be built for Baal.²³

Beyond these ancient background texts, there are also precedents for divine origin

¹⁶Ibid.

¹⁷Hurowitz, *Have Built*, 48.

¹⁸Ibid., 59.

¹⁹Ibid., 62.

²⁰Ibid., 64.

²¹Ibid., 86.

²²Ibid., 88.

²³Ibid., 102.

(i.e., by divine decree) of sanctuaries in the Hebrew Scriptures as well. Divine origin or decree for the tabernacle is given in Exod 25:8-27:19. Divine origin or decree for Solomon's temple is given in 2 Sam 7:13. Divine origin or decree to build a temple in Haggai is given in Hag 1:8. Divine origin or decree to build a temple in Ezekiel is given in Ezek 43:11. Divine origin or decree to build the second Jerusalem temple is given in Ezra 6:14.²⁴ Second temple Jewish texts are clear to demonstrate that God is intricately involved in human affairs. Human actions, such as building a temple, could be seen as God building the temple. Human agents of divine action are common in both canonical and other Jewish writings, and this can be seen even in the temple's destruction as Ezek 24:21 reports that the Lord declares "I will profane my sanctuary;" yet it was Nebuchadnezzar who profaned and destroyed the temple (2 Kgs 25:8-9).²⁵ The new temple plays a part in the turn of the course of human events from a pre-eschatological period to an eschatological period.²⁶ This precipitated eschatology shows that the Jerusalem temple plays the crucial role in the hastening of a new age.

1 Enoch 91:12-14

The second passage of *1 Enoch*, which is earlier chronologically, also starts in pre-eschatological circumstances. The material immediately preceding v. 12 discusses

²⁴Regarding Ezra 6:14, Japhet notes that "the order for building the Temple is the command of the Lord God of Israel and of the kings of Persia all mentioned by name. In this way the author endeavors to emphasize that all of the actions and decrees of the kings of Persia are according to the command of the Lord, and that this is the way in which He chose to guide the destiny of His people." Sara Japhet, "Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel: Against the Background of the Historical and Religious Tendencies of Ezra-Nehemiah," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 94 (1982): 73-74.

²⁵From a writing just after the time of *1 Enoch*, *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* rewrites the Judges account of Sisera's death in Judges "because it did not make sufficiently clear that Sisera's demise at the hand of woman was an act by which *God* saved Israel. Our author, on the other hand, is quite clear in that regard." Frederick J. Murphy, "God in Pseudo Philo," *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period* 19 (June 1988): 6.

²⁶Nielsburg notes that this passage is at the turn of history. "With the great judgment indicating a conclusion to the second era, the remainder of the Vision's narrative depicts the beginning of a third era." Nielsburg, *1 Enoch*, 404.

sinner, the wicked, and the oppressors being killed. The context is a passage that is moving towards the end time; the time is close to the end, but it is not the end yet. Verse 12 discusses judging the sinners, without revealing the judgments or executing them. After these judgments, v. 13 states that “the house shall be built for the Great King in glory for evermore.”²⁷

It is important to note, for timing reasons, that the beginning of the verse says “at its completion.”²⁸ This puts the temple being built right at the climax of this age and the start of a new age.²⁹ This temple brings highest glory to God.³⁰ Verse 14 has the consequences of this house: Judgments are revealed and the sinners depart. What is it about the *eschaton* that makes it the *eschaton*? Is it peace? Is it long life? Is it dwelling with God? Obviously, all these things comprise a part of the answer; however, the elimination of enemies must be accomplished before all of these other conditions of the *eschaton* come to be. This passage, like the passage in *I En.* 90, places the building of a new temple as a defining moment ushering in the *eschaton*.³¹

²⁷Stuckenbruck also holds that this description in *I En.* 91 is best understood that “the writer holds the view that the eschatological temple will be built rather than that it is a heavenly structure which, in an ideal form, has always been in existence.” Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *I Enoch 91-108* (Berlin: Gruyter, 2007), 139.

²⁸Nickelsburg translates this “And at its conclusion.” Nickelsburg, *I Enoch*, 434. Later, Nickelsburg writes that “[h]ere we see the culmination of the apocalyptic’s accumulated references to the Israelite sanctuaries.” *Ibid.*, 449.

²⁹“The location of this Temple in week eight suggests that it must be in place before the final judgment extending to the entire cosmos can be carried out.” Stuckenbruck, *I Enoch*, 139. Stuckenbruck goes on to summarize this section of *I Enoch*. “Whereas the eighth week is concerned with the righteous of Israel and the establishment of the Temple cult, the ninth week takes up eschatological events on a broader stage.” *Ibid.*, 141.

³⁰Here, Nickelsburg notes “the language that describes the temple, its significance, and its duration has been intensified beyond any of the previous references to the sanctuary.” Nickelsburg, *I Enoch*, 449.

³¹Knibb notes that this part of *I Enoch* takes a position on the second temple. “What is striking about the *Apocalypse of Weeks* is that the return and the rebuilding of the Temple under Joshua and Zerubbabel are passed over completely, and the whole of the post-exilic period is condemned as one of apostasy.” Michael A. Knibb, *Essays on the Book of Enoch and Other Early Jewish Texts and Traditions* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 377.

Third *Sibylline Oracle*

The text of the Third *Sibylline Oracle* is not as explicit as *I Enoch*; however, the text has three important references to the future Jerusalem temple and to the time of a new age where the nations come to the Jerusalem temple to worship God.³² First, in vv. 290-294, the passage shows that humanity will renew the temple and that this temple will be as it was before, meaning that it will be as glorious as Solomon's temple in Jerusalem.³³ Second, in v. 575 there is a reference to the return of the pious Jews to the temple and the offering of sacrifices at that temple. Third, in v. 774, the text states that at a future time nations bring gifts to the Jerusalem temple. These eschatological sections in the text of the third *Sibylline Oracle* "serve as a frame for the religious and ethical message of the book."³⁴

The ideas within the third *Sibylline Oracle* do not present a clear eschatological role for the Jerusalem temple; the text does not refer to a transition to a new age.³⁵ However, no ideas in the third *Sibylline Oracle* contradict a precipitated eschatology

³²Collins maintains that the "exaltation of the Temple" is a main part of the Third *Sibylline Oracle's* eschatological construct. John J. Collins, "Sibylline Oracles: A New Translation and Introduction," in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983), 1:357. Collins maintains that the Third Book of *Sibylline Oracles* supports the Jerusalem temple because of the Jewish group of Leontopolis. John J. Collins, *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1974), 48-55. In both the Third and Fifth *Sibylline Oracle*, the temple is presented as crucial. Andrew Chester, "The Sibyl and the Temple," in *Templum Amicitiae*, ed. William Horbury (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 37.

³³Nickelsburg believes that vv. 211-294 describe the rebuilding of the temple after the exile. However, he can hardly claim that this temple was as glorious as Solomon's temple. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 163. Collins notes that although this passage does refer to Cyrus, it was written in the second century and provides an eschatological typology. John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, 2nd ed. (Livonia, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 122.

³⁴J. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 123.

³⁵Collins writes that "[t]he Jerusalem temple is of vital importance for the true religion and should become a place of worship for all nations." Collins summarizes the text of the third *Sibylline Oracle* to posit the future perfect temple in the restoration of creation. Ibid. Causse points out, "C'est là le moment principal du message qu'elle annonce, et la parole décisive qu'elle apporte aux peuples: Jérusalem-Sion, centre du monde, les Juifs se rassemblant sur the terre sainte pour honorer le temple du grand Dieu. . . . Après cela, ce seront les temps nouveaux, le royaume éternel." Causse, "Le mythe," 408-409. The text of the third *Sibylline Oracle* hints more strongly at the eschatological role than is claimed.

based upon the Jerusalem temple. These texts can be seen as supporting or implicitly presenting the notion of such a stance about the new Jerusalem temple, without advocating it explicitly. The third *Sibylline Oracle* presents a Ptolemaic king facilitating an ideal Jewish state centered on the Jerusalem temple.³⁶

Jubilees

The first chapter of *Jubilees* lays out important issues regarding the coming temple and its ramifications.³⁷ In *Jub.* 1:17, the Lord will build the temple, will dwell there among the people, and will never forsake them.³⁸ This verse presents a picture of eternal togetherness with God in an eschatological age. In *Jub.* 1:26, the text reiterates that the Lord will come down and dwell in the temple. This passage makes it explicit that the future dwelling will extend into the *eschaton* with the declaration that “I shall descend and dwell with them in all the ages of eternity.”³⁹ *Jubilees* describes history as running from creation until the temple is built, the temple that will be there forever.⁴⁰

³⁶J. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 124.

³⁷Hayward shows how *Jubilees* is presenting a supernatural dimension for the temple and temple service. Hayward, *Jewish Temple*, 2. Davenport states of the theology of *Jubilees* that the temple will have an essential part in the renewed land of Israel. Gene L. Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees* (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 15.

³⁸Charles considers this temple the second temple. Charles, *Jubilees*, 5. In this, it would seem that Charles has no problem with humans building a temple that the book states that God will build, as humans built the second temple. However, the idea that this temple is the second temple is improbable. As the text states that Israel will be God’s people in truth and righteousness (*Jub.* 1:17), this statement does not seem to be alluding to the author’s immediate time frame of the second century, even if the text was written after the rededication of the temple as described in 2 Maccabees. The text is alluding to a future time frame, although how far in the future is not certain. Knibb notes the idea of Charles, but writes that it is “clear that what is really in mind is the Temple of the new age.” Knibb, *Essays*, 380.

³⁹This is Wintermute’s translation of *Jub.* 1:26b. O. S. Wintermute, “*Jubilees: A New Translation and Introduction*,” in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1985), 2:54. All quotes from *Jubilees*, unless otherwise stated, use Wintermute’s translation. Volz maintains that this is the eschatological temple, whereas to Charles this text refers to the second temple. Volz, *Eschatologie*, 28; Charles, *Jubilees*, 12.

⁴⁰At the closing of the book, *Jubilees* presents the idea that jubilees will pass until Israel is purified (*Jub.* 50:5), which can only be done with a temple.

The book of *Jubilees* is clearly presenting eschatology.⁴¹ Though most of the book deals with the right calendar and the right times for the feasts, it is important to note that the temple is also important to the author.⁴² In *Jub.* 1:17, the text states, “I shall build my sanctuary in their midst.” Yet, ten verses later, the text states “until my sanctuary is built in their midst forever and ever.” This passive verb (“is built”) may or may not be indicating exclusively divine activity, but this verse could very well have God as the ruler and humanity as participants in building the temple. The claim in *Jub.* 1:17 from the Lord that I will build should in no way be taken to mean that the Lord, or glory of the Lord in a more physical form, will do the physical work to construct a sanctuary.

VanderKam disagrees with humanity having a part in the building of the eschatological temple in *Jubilees*.⁴³ He sees the citation in *Jub.* 1:17 that has the Lord declaring “I shall build my sanctuary in their midst” as claiming that the Lord, or the glory of the Lord, will physically build a new temple on the temple mount.

⁴¹In fact, Davenport holds that this passage was written in order to teach correct eschatology. Davenport, *Jubilees*, 19.

⁴²Ruiten “shows that the author of *Jubilees* speaks in a negative way of the Temple, whether it be the first or the second.” J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, “Visions of the Temple in the Book of *Jubilees*,” in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: Community without Temple: Zur substituierung und transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*, ed. Beate Ego, Armin Lange, and Peter Pilhofer (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 218. *Jubilees* 30:15 calls for a curse upon any who would defile the sanctuary. This curse is important to the understanding of the dwelling of God in *Jubilees*. Eden is depicted as a sanctuary in *Jub.* 3:13, 27; 8:19. The dwelling of God at Beth-El is called the house of God (*Jub.* 27:25). The call for the temple to be built in *Jub.* 25:21, while the second temple was in existence, could be construed as a critique on the second temple. These references in *Jubilees* show that the correct temple, undefiled, is important to the author as it is a dwelling place (*Jub.* 25:21) for God as Eden was a dwelling place for God. Van Ruiten notes how the people abandoned the temple of the Lord, they defiled the place where God’s name was to dwell, and the activities at the temple did not follow the prescribed statutes. *Ibid.*, 216. Van Ruiten goes on to note that the author of *Jubilees* identifies only three past holy places: Eden, Sinai, and Zion. Yet, Van Ruiten notes how only with regard to Eden and the future temple does the author of *Jubilees* speak about the actual dwelling of God. *Ibid.*, 218.

⁴³VanderKam agrees with Yadin that the temple in 11QT 29:8-10 is an eschatological temple built by humans; however, he believes the *Jubilees* temple is constructed by God. Therefore, he distinguishes between the two temples of these two texts on that basis. VanderKam, “The Scroll,” 232. Dimant goes beyond VanderKam asserting that God will actually construct the temple in *Jubilees* and the Temple Scroll: “God will build the eschatological Temple himself (11Q Temple 29:8-10; cf. *Jub.* 1:15-17, 26-29, and *1 En.* 90:29.” Devorah Dimant, “Qumran Sectarian Literature,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, ed. Michael E. Stone (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 530. Perrot writes that “[l]e vrai Sanctuaire est celui que Dieu construira au temps de la nouvelle création.” Charles Perrot, “La ‘Maison de Dieu’ à l’époque intertestamentaire,” in *Quelle maison pour Dieu?* ed. Camille Focant (Paris: Cerf, 2003), 240-241.

This modern interpretation is out of place in this second temple Jewish writing. There is no further detail to support such an interpretation, and *Jub.* 1:27 and 25:21 clearly announce that the temple will be built with no claim of divine building. As detailed above, human building was normal, although most assuredly with divine protection and guidance. Exclusively divine building would be as implausible in the time frame of the author as it is today.⁴⁴ What was detailed above in the *1 Enoch* section on human involvement in temple building applies to the book of *Jubilees* as well; it is clear that the background of this text shows that temples are indeed built with and by divine decree, but with human labor and involvement.

There might be some who would interpret this idea to mean that the Lord would have a fully built sanctuary descend from the sky,⁴⁵ but this is just as far-fetched as the Lord physically constructing or building a temple on the temple mount in Jerusalem. The reference to the temple being built in v. 1:27 may give more meaning to v. 1:17 that the Lord will direct its building, without supernaturally building it.⁴⁶ In 1:27, the reference that the sanctuary will be built should clearly be taken to mean human building, though with help and direction from the Lord,⁴⁷ and not that the sanctuary is to be physically

⁴⁴Clifford notes how in Canaan, “[n]o temple is built without El’s decree.” Richard J. Clifford, *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972), 57. The human-built temples are built with El’s decree.

⁴⁵Perhaps Rev 21:2-3 is where this idea may have had its origin, although that was after the destruction of Herod’s temple in Jerusalem and that text describes an entire city descending. Also, it is important to realize this singularity, as Aune notes, “In no other early Jewish or early Christian texts is the heavenly city said to ‘descend from heaven,’ but the city is variously described as ‘coming,’ ‘appearing,’ or ‘is revealed’ (4 Ezra 7:26; 13:36; 10:54).” David E. Aune, *Revelation 17-22* (Nashville: Nelson, 1998), 1121. Peterson explains that “[c]alling the word *heaven* a metaphor does not make it less real; it simply recognizes that it is a reality inaccessible at this point to any of our five senses.” Eugene H. Peterson, *Reversed Thunder: The Revelation of John & the Praying Imagination* (New York: HarperCollins, 1991), 169. Peterson reminds the reader that “[h]eaven in the vision, remember, *descends*. The consequence is that ‘the dwelling of God is with men.’” *Ibid.*, 185.

⁴⁶Here, the differences between the two verses in chap. 1 are attributed to different redactions by Davenport. Davenport, *Jubilees*, 19. This does not change this analysis. This would only change whom to credit with the eschatological declarations of the writing, the author or the redactor.

⁴⁷See the evaluation of the ancient Near Eastern background and these second temple Jewish writings above.

built by the Lord.⁴⁸ In fact, in *Jub.* 25:21, there is a call to have “his sanctuary be built among them into all ages.” This is not a call for the Lord to build the sanctuary among them, clarifying the position of the author, or at least the final redactor, of *Jubilees*. To further refine and clarify, v. 1:28 makes it clear that this is the temple in Jerusalem.

A major portion of the first chapter of *Jubilees* describes the order of events leading to a new age. In the middle of this chapter of *Jubilees*, there is a prediction that the people will be restored to a covenant relationship with the Lord. In 1:23, the people will return to the Lord and will be purified. In 1:24, the people will now cling to the commandments of the Lord, so that the divine-human relationship would be like that of a father and son. In 1:25, there is a declaration that “every angel and spirit will know and acknowledge that they are my sons and I am their father.” The present age in history, as relayed by God to Moses concerning “what will happen in all of the division of the days which are in the Law and testimony and throughout their weeks (of years)” (1:26), runs only until the Lord “shall descend and dwell with them in all the ages of eternity” (1:26). This age in history goes “from first creation until my sanctuary is built in their midst forever and ever” (1:27). There is an explicit eschatological declaration of forever with the Lord dwelling in the sanctuary of the Lord in the text of *Jubilees*, when the sanctuary is created in Jerusalem upon Mount Zion (*Jub.* 1:27-28).

VanderKam sees the fulcrum of history differently, as he interprets: “The great turning point comes about when ‘the children will begin to study the laws, to seek out the commandments, and to return to the right way’ (v. 26).”⁴⁹ The turning to the laws and the construction of the temple clearly have to be done prior to having the temple operational.

⁴⁸However, if the author of *Jubilees* would have meant that the temple would literally descend from the sky rather than be built by humanity, one would think that the author (as in Rev 21:2-3) would mention this fact, which would most clearly posit that the temple was of divine origin, much more than how the text currently stands.

⁴⁹James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 134.

However, after the return to God's path, the *eschaton* has not begun. It is the temple that provides this impetus. As cited above, both v. 26 and v. 27 of chap. 1 of *Jubilees* explicitly say: "until I shall descend and dwell with them in all the ages of eternity" and "from the first creation until my sanctuary is built in their midst forever and ever."

VanderKam is correct that the people have to return to God (1:23) and be purified by God (1:23) before the people can walk in commandments of the Lord (1:24) and the human-divine relationship will be changed (1:25); however, the current age is in effect "until my sanctuary is built in their midst forever and ever."

The text explicitly presents the new temple as the defining moment in history, as shown by the fact that God tells the angel in Moses' presence to write from the first creation until the time when the temple is built (v. 27). It is the Jerusalem temple that brings the indwelling of the Lord, to be followed by the renewal of all of creation. Therefore, *Jub. 1* is a second temple period text that clearly presents a precipitated eschatology. The only portion of this text that is less than clear and therefore debatable is whether humanity builds this Jerusalem temple. The text does state in 1:17 that the Lord will build it, but v. 27 states that the temple is built. The Lord has a clear part in this temple building emphasized by *Jubilees* in this chapter, but to say that humanity does not play a part would be stronger than this text allows. *Jubilees* and *1 En. 90* may lead one to conclude that the Lord, not humanity, builds the temple;⁵⁰ yet, as detailed above, this idea of humanity not building the temple was not the background or normal expectation of the author's time period.⁵¹ The divine order to build that lies behind human endeavors should

⁵⁰Wacholder presents an analysis of this issue in *Jubilees* and he concludes that "'the sanctuary of the Lord shall be made in Jerusalem' refers to a human construction." Wacholder, *Dawn*, 24.

⁵¹One must consider not only other temples in Jewish writings, but the statement in Ps 127:1, "Unless the LORD builds the house, those who build it labor in vain" (NRSV). This understanding shows a duality in building for the Lord; the Lord builds, yet with human labor. Also, Isa 66:2 depicts a situation where God is said to have made all that is upon the earth and sky, so any human building project could be construed as something the Lord has made. Zechariah 4:6 also addresses the concept that it is only through the power of the Lord that key human endeavors are accomplished. Levenson also notes Ps 90:17 when he

be understood to be in view within *Jub.* 1. Both *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch* indicate the sovereign nature of God as well as humanity serving God, placing humanity's actions of building a temple for God, yet still under God's sovereign power.

The fact that the temple is the physical dwelling of God may explain why God is the founder of the new correct temple, as God was seen as the creator of Eden, which *Jubilees* describes using sanctuary ordinances and the designations: "the holy of holies" and "the dwelling of the Lord" (8:19). A curse is called upon any who would "defile the sanctuary of the Lord" (30:15). Davenport notes the corruption of the temple as the reason the true sanctuary must be of divine origin.⁵² The book of *Jubilees* proclaims that Zion will be made holy for this new creation. This emphasizes the Lord's presence and the effect that the temple will have on earth, one of eternal cleansing from sin.⁵³

Liber antiquitatum biblicarum

The dating of *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* has been demonstrated to be in the first century of the Common Era. Harrington shows evidence that suggests a date before the temple fell as well as some evidence that suggests a date after the destruction of the temple in the first century. After reviewing many different issues and how these issues affect the dating of the material, he takes into account the attitude toward the temple and shows how they lead to the conclusion that it was written in the early first century.⁵⁴

The first of the passages showing the nature of the temple within *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* is in 19:12-13. In this passage, God is showing Moses future and

addresses the topic of the interplay between human endeavor and divine action. J. D. Levenson, *Program of Restoration*, 47.

⁵²Davenport, *Jubilees*, 30-31. Israel is seen as the people centered around the temple and focused there, not particularly around the Torah, as in other works. *Ibid.*, 75.

⁵³See *Jub.* 4:26.

⁵⁴D. Harrington, "Pseudo-Philo," 299. Jacobson dates the text very late, leaning toward a second century date. Howard Jacobson, *Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 2:209.

unseen things before he will die. He is shown the temple, “the place of sanctification.”⁵⁵

Moses is to sleep and be buried, which is a clear reference to his impending death.

However, he will be raised with the others who sleep, so that he may live at the temple.

The temple is the place where he will “dwell in the immortal dwelling place that is not subject to time.” This demonstrates how the message of the temple in *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* is linked with the *eschaton*.⁵⁶ The dead will rise and an eternal dwelling is initiated. The focus of this passage is regarding the temple’s future existence and the eternal nature of the temple, where the dead are raised to live forever. These are two important aspects regarding the temple in this text.

However, there is a third important aspect about the temple in this passage. The text gives detail about building the temple in this passage as well. It is important to note that Moses was shown “the place of sanctification,” but he was also shown the measurements of the temple, v. 19:10. The measurements in this portion of the text point to the correct temple necessary to be built in the future, from the perspective the time of Moses. This temple building and the time for it to be built will be addressed below when investigating chap. 56 of *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*.

The temple is presented as the dwelling of God, rather than the place where God has chosen for God’s name to abide. This is detailed especially in 21:10. “May the covenant of the Lord remain with you and not be broken, but may there be built among

⁵⁵All quotes from *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* are from Harrington’s translation. D. Harrington, “Pseudo-Philo,” 328. Jacobson understands this place as a celestial Jerusalem, though he notes the similar language used with respect to the earthly temple. Jacobson, *Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, 2:645. Murphy notes an uncertainty in the location of the end mentioned in v. 13, suggesting that it might be paradise. Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 94.

⁵⁶Hayward summarizes *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*’s understanding of how important the temple is to the whole world. “Almost everything which this author has to say about the Temple is attested in earlier writings. What comes clearly to the fore, however, is the importance of this institution for preserving and guaranteeing the continuing order of the world known to the writer and his contemporaries—all of them, Jew and non-Jew alike. The end of the Temple would mean the end of the world as they knew it: while it stands, and the Service is maintained, Jews provide for non-Jews an order providing the food and sustenance without which human life would be impossible.” Hayward, *Jewish Temple*, 167.

you a dwelling place for God.” The vision in *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* reveals an actual dwelling place for God that is stressed perhaps even more than keeping the commandments, which is a feature added to a document that may be Deuteronomistic in style.⁵⁷ When Joshua encourages Israel to follow the covenant in *L.A.B.* 21, the text adds a future side-by-side dwelling of God with Israel. This joyful side-by-side dwelling presented here in *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* is quite different from Deuteronomy or Joshua. The reference to a dwelling place for the Lord in Deuteronomy is always associated with the name of God.⁵⁸ Additionally, there is no reference to a joyful side-by-side dwelling in Joshua.⁵⁹ The Joshua text does not allude to the temple, which is the focus of this portion of *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*.⁶⁰ The insistence to obedience is to prepare the people and land so that the Lord would abide with Israel in a temple, in order to fulfill the happiness the Lord swore to their ancestors, alluding to an eternal nature of the abiding of the Lord in the Jerusalem temple.⁶¹

Even though *I Enoch* and *Jubilees* are clear in their claims of an eschatological

⁵⁷Steck sees *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* immersed in the Deuteronomic understanding of history. “Schon dies verweist auf die Tradition des dtrGB; tatsächlich ist das Werk schon in seinem erhaltenen Umfang durch und durch von dieser Tradition geprägt.” Steck, *Israel*, 173-174.

⁵⁸This idea in Deuteronomy occurs only in 12:11; 14:23; 16:2, 6, 11; 26:2. None of these references are similar in nature to *L.A.B.* 21:10.

⁵⁹The closest associated reference occurs in Josh 9:27, but the idea of dwelling does not occur there or anywhere else in Joshua. This reference is quite different from *L.A.B.* 21:10.

⁶⁰Vogel notes, regarding *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*, that the temple and the covenant with the ancestors are tied together in its theology. “Der Bau des Tempels wird zum Erweis für das Fortbestehen des Bundes.” Manuel Vogel, “Tempel und tempelkult in *Pseudo-Philos Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*,” in *Gemeinde ohne tempel: Community without Temple: Zur substituierung und transformation des Jerusalemer tempels und seines kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*, ed. Beate Ego, Armin Lange, and Peter Pilhofer (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 260.

⁶¹“This heilsgeschichtlich sweep draws a single line which extends from the ancestors through Horeb to the temple, well into the future!” John R. Levenson, “Torah and Covenant in *Pseudo-Philo’s Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*,” in *Bund und Tora*, ed. Friedrich Avemarie and Hermann Lichtenberger (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 114. Murphy holds that the author believes that given Israel’s faithfulness to the covenant, Solomon’s temple would bring full establishment of the covenant between God and Israel. Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 104. However, considering the text of *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* that survives to present, one should understand this dwelling place as the temple of Jerusalem, rather than Solomon’s temple.

role for the Jerusalem temple, the most unambiguous, apologetic declaration of an eschatological role for the Jerusalem temple in the OTP is in *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*.⁶² The text of 56:2 reads, “And when Samuel heard talk of a kingdom, he was very sad in his heart and said, ‘Behold now I see that it is not yet the time for us to have an everlasting kingdom and to build the house of the Lord our God, for these people are seeking a king before the proper time.’” The people were calling for a king, not the temple.

Indeed, the temple was not mentioned in the preceding material or in the parallel biblical narrative to *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*. It is the author of the text here that maintains a strong connection by linking the kingdom of the *eschaton* and the temple needed to bring the *eschaton*.⁶³ The text indicates that the proper time for the eternal kingdom must be after the Jerusalem temple is built.⁶⁴ It is only then that the *eschaton* will come when the Lord will be the king or will appoint a king at that time.⁶⁵

⁶²Murphy notes how striking the connection with the temple is here, but fails to focus on this important second temple concept. Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 203. In addition to this, it is Harrington who notes how rare it is that *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* even refers to the temple, giving even more meaning to the oddity, which Murphy and all others overlook. Daniel J. Harrington, “The ‘Holy Land’ in *Pseudo-Philo*, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch,” in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, ed. Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Draft, Lawrence H. Shiffman, and Weston W. Fields (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 663.

⁶³It is important to understand the text’s meaning of “kingdom” here. This is not referring to the coming kingdom of Saul or David. The kingdom here is God’s eternal kingdom. *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* depicts the present age as temporal and the age to come as eternal. Ferch concludes regarding *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*’s kingdom theology that it “clearly presents two aeons separated by the day of judgment. This age is transient; the age to come is everlasting.” Arthur J. Ferch, “The Two Aeons and the Messiah in *Pseudo-Philo*, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch,” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 15 (1977): 141.

⁶⁴Feldman understands the implied order here as teaching that the primary duty of the people is to build the temple; to seek the appointment of the king is of secondary concern. Louis. H. Feldman, “Prolegomenon,” in *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo*, ed. M. R. James (New York: Ktav, 1971), cxxxv.

⁶⁵Jacobson muses over the options and notes that the text suggests “that it is God’s eternal rule that is in question” but eventually sides with the view that the Davidic kingdom is meant here. This misses the point mentioned in the verse that this will be an everlasting kingdom. If this text is written in the first century, it would be hard, though not completely impossible, to claim that the Davidic kingdom is everlasting after the Hasmonean dynasty, a non-Davidic kingdom, has fallen, given the text’s perspective on temporal and eternal kingdoms. Jacobson, *Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, 1150. The text is far from clear, but the meaning here should be taken that it is God’s everlasting kingdom, when God dwells in the temple.

In *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*, the temple is put forth in an eternal manner. The temple is crucial in the text of *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*, as in most second temple Jewish texts, but there is a more coherent focus on the Jerusalem temple within the eschatological time line. The dwelling of God is lifted above the realm of historical facts and presented in an eternal domain.

The text of *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* tells history.⁶⁶ In the telling of history, it highlights the chosen nature of God's people in a way that shifts the temple to a point at the edge of history.⁶⁷

The Apocryphon of Ezekiel

The only OTP text remaining that has a reference to the coming temple is the *Apocryphon of Ezekiel*. However, it is inconclusive in developing independent theological statements concerning any eschatological role of the Jerusalem temple. This short fragment found in *Paedagogus* by Clement of Alexandria summarizes that the Lord will be near the people "as the garment to their skin."⁶⁸ This text presents a time when the Lord will be intimately involved with Israel. The text has the Lord declaring: "I will feed

⁶⁶Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 265.

⁶⁷The only explicit mention of Jerusalem is in *L.A.B.* 22:9. This acknowledges that the temple was built, past tense, in Jerusalem and that Jerusalem is the place of the temple. Shiloh is an allowed cultic place until the temple is built. The use of the past tense here is somewhat out of character with all the other citations of the Jerusalem temple, as it is mentioned at the time of Joshua that the temple was built later. Yet, in 56:2 during the narrative of Samuel, the temple is not mentioned as having been built in the future. However, these two are not as troublesome as they appear, since the text of *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* was written centuries after the fall of the first Jerusalem temple and the past tense usage in 22:9 merely acknowledges that the temple was built in the history of Israel. Yet, the manuscript of *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* that has survived to the present day ends with the death of Saul in chap. 65. Therefore, the history of the construction of the first temple is not included, yet not denied by the author. This history does not change the fact that the temple in the text of *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* is treated as a matter of eschatological importance. On the other hand, the text does indeed acknowledge that Jerusalem was the place of the temple.

⁶⁸J. R. Mueller and S. E. Robinson, "Apocryphon of Ezekiel: A New Translation and Introduction," in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1985), 1:495. All quotes from the *Apocryphon of Ezekiel* use the translation by Mueller and Robinson.

them on my holy mountain.”⁶⁹ There is no description of the temple building in this text. Yet, this text depicts a future time when the Lord will bind the lame, return Israel to their land, and will take care of Israel.

Even though the temple building is not mentioned in this text, this is not to say that this text presents a depiction of the temple that is incompatible with *I Enoch*, *Jubilees*, or *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*. The *Apocryphon of Ezekiel* shows that the Lord will feed Israel on the holy mountain of God.

This depiction of the Lord returning to the temple mount and being with Israel in a very intimate sense, aiding the people and caring for them on the holy mountain, certainly implies the Lord dwelling on the temple mount in the temple, even without an explicit reference to the temple building. This is a prophecy regarding the future and can be viewed as supporting the eschatological role of the Jerusalem temple given by *I Enoch*, *Jubilees*, and *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* above, but such an eschatology could not be garnered from the *Apocryphon of Ezekiel* alone. An important thing to note about this reference is that it does not counter any detail presented in the rest of the OTP about the eschatological role of the Jerusalem temple; however, it can be seen as supporting other second temple understandings regarding the Jerusalem temple’s eschatological role.

The *Apocryphon of Ezekiel* states that the Lord will bind the lame, heal the troubled, return what is astray, feed the people on the Lord’s mountain, be their shepherd, and be near the people. These statements taken as a whole in such a short pericope imply a new state of affairs indicating that a new age will begin when the Lord and people will be in a new intimate relationship. Furthermore, this new intimate relationship will be centered around the Lord dwelling on the temple mount in the Jerusalem temple, with the

⁶⁹This text may be a rewording of Ezek 34:14. The Masoretic Text has a plural noun here when referring to the temple mount, **וּבְהָרֵי מְרוֹם יִשְׂרָאֵל**. This citation is singular in Septuagint, showing an explicit reference and a movement in the text of Scripture to one mountain, the temple mount, in this second temple Jewish writing. The *Apocryphon of Ezekiel* also has the singular, my holy mountain.

people coming to the Lord there at the Jerusalem temple.

The Qumran Scrolls

The temple, sanctuary, and inner sanctum are commonly mentioned in the Qumran documents. The Qumran documents are a more consistent group of texts than the OTP, although the texts present a wide range of ideas. In many of the fragments, the context of the temple reference is uncertain due to the effects of time on the documents. In many, there are warnings about proper practices to be done at the temple, as well as purity, and concerns over the proper calendar that was to be used. With reference to Solomon's temple, the documents present how God withdrew favor and allowed the temple to be destroyed, as in canonical literature (Ezek 8-11). This investigation turns now to exploring the non-biblical Qumran documents, excluding 11QT, to understand whether any eschatological role for the Jerusalem temple is present in these texts.

The first important observation is that two of the passages discussed above are attested among the Qumran documents. In 4Q212, the *I En.* 91:12-14 passage is preserved. Also, the first chapter of *Jubilees* is partially preserved in 4Q216. These two texts show that the Qumran community preserved the documents that contained an eschatological role of the Jerusalem temple. Outside of these citations, 4Q174 shows similar eschatology and must be examined.

4Q174

This Qumran document mentions a temple of humanity, **מִקְדָּשׁ אָדָם**. This phrase has been the impetus for much speculation.⁷⁰ This phrase seems to be a distinctive way to imply a human-built temple. The Lord commands that this temple be built (6). This refers to either the previous temple or the future temple. Although the previous temple is one

⁷⁰Betz understands this phrase as “a sanctuary (consisting) of human beings” where the text is not referring to a structure, but a community. Betz, “Jesus,” 95. Gärtner, Gaster, and others have also espoused this view. See Wise, “4QFlorilegium,” 103-132, for a synopsis.

way to interpret this passage, the idea that foreign countries will not destroy the temple again as in the past (5-6) makes it natural to understand this passage as referring to a future temple that is to be built.⁷¹ Therefore, when this temple is built by humanity, there will be offerings of incense and thanksgiving offerings presented to God within it.⁷² The days in which the temple is built are not the *eschaton*, because the sons of Belial still torment Israel. However, the temple is the place where the Lord will reign forever (5). The reference to Exod 15:17-18 here speaks of Jerusalem.⁷³ The Lord will give Israel rest from her enemies.

This temple will be established for God in the last days (2), and it leads to the judgment of the enemies of Israel and rest for Israel (7-8). This is an eschatological rest. In summary, this human-built temple in Jerusalem brings the indwelling of the Lord, enables the judgment of Israel's enemies, and precipitates an eschatological rest for Israel. Although the document is fragmentary because of the effects of time on the document, it seems to contain the same eschatological role of the Jerusalem temple that is present in *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, and *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*.

Conclusion

This analysis finds and illuminates multiple examples within the Qumran documents and the OTP that seem to display an eschatological role for the Jerusalem temple. These documents, individually and cumulatively, show that the Jerusalem

⁷¹From the very beginning, this text was seen as compiling and presenting eschatological beliefs. J. M. Allegro, "Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrāšīm," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 77 (1958): 350-354. Lane, though critical of some of Allegro's work, also maintained that this fragment has an eschatological orientation similar to many of the documents at Qumran. William R. Lane, "A New Commentary Structure in 4Q Florilegium," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 78 (1959): 343-346.

⁷²Allegro originally translated this clause as follows. "And he purposed to build for him a man-made sanctuary in which sacrifices might be made to him." Allegro, "Fragments," 352.

⁷³Dimant sees this as a reference to the eschatological temple; however, this is one of three temples Dimant understands to be described in this short text. Dimant, "Qumran," 519.

temple's role is to be a catalyst that will enable the coming of an eschatological age. That is, the temple will hasten the coming of the new age. If humanity builds this correct temple in Jerusalem,⁷⁴ then the Lord will dwell within it and the eschatological judgment and the eschatological rest will soon come. These documents present the correct, pure temple as the turning point in history. They are remarkably unified, considering such a diverse group of texts written over a large period of time. It is important to notice the lack of multiple eschatological roles, merely the one hastening the *eschaton*. The hope inspired by the correct temple in these texts shows how second temple Judaism focused on the temple and what it would do for the people and the land.

⁷⁴There was an understanding of the idea of a correct pure temple. Brooke notes how all the earthly temples fell short of being the correct temple and none satisfied God. He goes on to say that Qumran considered the first temple "essentially flawed." Brooke, "Ten Temples," 417, 422.

CHAPTER 8

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL ROLE OF THE JERUSALEM TEMPLE IN THE CHRISTIAN SCRIPTURES OF THE SECOND TEMPLE PERIOD

Introduction

This is an investigation into the Christian Scriptures written before the destruction of the Jerusalem temple to understand if any of these writings present an eschatological role of the Jerusalem temple. Since the Gospels, the book of the Acts of the Apostles, and the Revelation to John are predominantly, though not unanimously, dated to 70 CE and after, these writings will not be investigated.¹

Even though many, if not most, of the other writings in the Christian Scriptures spark heated debate over their dates of composition, only one of all of these writings could be taken to describe the physical Jerusalem temple in an eschatological context: Second Thessalonians.² Even a cursory search for references to the temple or sanctuary (using ἅγιος,³ ναός,⁴ οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ,⁵ and ἱερόν⁶) shows that temple references in

¹These writings are dated to 70 CE and after. Mark is dated to 70. Paul J. Achtemeier, "Mark, Gospel of," *ABD*, 4:543. Matthew is dated to the 80s. John P. Meier, "Matthew, Gospel of," *ABD*, 4:624. Luke-Acts is dated to the 80s. Luke T. Johnson, "Luke-Acts, Book of," *ABD*, 4:404. John is dated to the early 90s. Robert Kysar, "John, The Gospel of," *ABD*, 3:919. The Revelation to John is dated to 95-96. A. Collins, "Revelation," 5:700.

²Most scholars date the book of Hebrews to between 60-90 (not 60-70). Even if this book was written before 70 CE, Heb 9 discusses the tabernacle and a temple in the sky, but not the physical Jerusalem temple (cf. Heb 9:1-3, 9:24).

³These references are Heb 8:2; 9:1, 2, 3, 8, 24, 25; 10:19; 13:11. None of these references to the sanctuary are set in a clear eschatological context and some depict the sanctuary in the sky.

⁴These references are 1 Cor 3:16, 17; 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16; Eph 2:21; and 2 Thess 2:4. The uses in the Corinthian correspondence describe the believer's body as a temple. The use in Eph 2:21 describes the church as a temple. The use in 2 Thess 2:4 is examined below.

⁵This reference is from Heb 10:21, where the context is not eschatological.

general, let alone the physical Jerusalem temple in particular, are not common in the Christian Scriptures of the second temple period.

Second Thessalonians 2:1-12

Introduction

There are difficulties with this passage of Second Thessalonians.⁷ Holmes notes that 2 Thess 2:1-12 is “by common consent one of the most obscure in the Pauline corpus.”⁸ Many believe that this letter is from Paul.⁹ The events described in this passage have brought scrutiny due to apparent conflicts within Pauline eschatology. “Paul, it is said, held to an imminent coming of the Lord in the first letter (1 Thess 4:15, 17; 5:1-5; cf. Rom 13:11-12; 1 Cor 7:29, 31; Phil 4:5), whereas in 2 Thessalonians the author holds an opposite view.”¹⁰ This conflict on the timing of the coming day of the Lord is at the

⁶This reference is from 1 Cor 9:13 and discusses those involved in temple service.

⁷“Exegesis of this chapter must proceed with special caution since it is amongst the most disputed of Paul’s writings.” A. L. Moore, *1 and 2 Thessalonians* (London: Nelson, 1969), 99.

⁸Michael W. Holmes, *1 and 2 Thessalonians: From Biblical Text . . . to Contemporary Life* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1998), 228.

⁹The following citations are a selected sample of works present on 2 Thessalonians. David J. Williams, *1 and 2 Thessalonians* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992), 11-13; F. F. Bruce, *1 and 2 Thessalonians* (Waco, TX: Word, 1982), xxxiii; Leon Morris, *The Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians: An Introduction and Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1984), 31; A. Moore, *Thessalonians*, 11; Gary W. Demarest, *1 & 2 Thessalonians, 1 & 2 Timothy, Titus* (Waco, TX: Word, 1984), 105; Hans-Andreas Egenolf, *The Second Epistle to the Thessalonians* (New York: Crossroad, 1981), 90; Ronald A. Ward, *Commentary on 1 and 2 Thessalonians* (Waco, TX: Word, 1973), 130; Witherington, *Thessalonians*, 29-36; Gordon D. Fee, *The First and Second Letters to the Thessalonians* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009), 241; Abraham J. Malherbe, *The Letters to the Thessalonians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 349; Earl F. Palmer, *1 and 2 Thessalonians* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1983), xv; James M. Reese, *1 and 2 Thessalonians* (Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1979), xv; James E. Frame, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1953), 39.

¹⁰Malherbe, *Thessalonians*, 368. Witherington explains that “[n]o part of 2 Thessalonians has received more attention than 2:1-12, and understandably so.” Witherington, *Thessalonians*, 207. In 1 Thess 4:13-5:11, the passage presents the view the coming of Christ as imminent. However, in 2 Thess 2:1-12, the view is quite different as it presents events that must come first. Bruce notes that Lindemann also holds that this reference in 2 Thessalonians rejects 1 Thess 5:1-11. Bruce, *Thessalonians*, 164. Regarding the phrase of 2:2 “by letter, as though from us,” Bassler notes that 2 Thessalonians “may intend to discredit 1 Thessalonians with this phrase.” Jouette M. Bassler, “Second Thessalonians,” *HarperCollins Study Bible*, ed. Wayne A. Meeks (New York: HarperCollins, 1993), 2227.

heart of the dispute on whether this is a genuine letter from Paul.¹¹ Second Thessalonians 2:1-12 explains why the day of the Lord had not come at that time as certain events had not yet happened. Since this letter is depicted as from Paul,¹² it is possible that Paul changed his mind in the time between the two letters to the Thessalonians.¹³ No matter which side of the authorial dispute of Second Thessalonians is correct, the letter may date to the second temple period and therefore is included as a part of this analysis.

Second Thessalonians is a pastoral letter meant to encourage (1:5, 7, 11-12; 2:2, 13-17; 3:4-5, 13), clarify (2:2-3, 4-12; 3:7, 14), and teach (1:5, 9; 2:4-12; 3:6) the recipients of the letter.¹⁴ Paul asserts, or it is asserted about him, that he is an apostle (Rom 1:1, 1 Cor 1:1, 2 Cor 1:1, Gal 1:1, Eph 1:1, Col 1:1, 1 Tim 1:1, 2 Tim 1:1, Titus 1:1) in other letters, though no such assertion is contained in letters to the Thessalonians.

¹¹Malherbe details that, in the two letters to the Thessalonians, a “major theological difference between the two letters, to the mind of those who reject the genuineness of 2 Thessalonians, is to be found in their eschatologies.” Malherbe, *Thessalonians*, 368. Koester clarifies the issue in his work. “There is no evidence from the genuine Pauline letters that the problem of the delay of Parousia ever arose during Paul’s lifetime (not even in 1 Thessalonians; see §9.2d). But Paul had criticized the foreshortening of the apocalyptic expectation in a realized eschatology (see 1 Corinthians, §9.3c). It is virtually certain that the expectation of Jesus’ coming continued to be a vital element of Christian faith in the churches of Paul after his death. The problem was therefore unavoidable: either this eschatological expectation had to be renewed, or the delay of the Parousia had to be explained.” Helmut Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982), 2:242. Serious doubt on the authorship of 2 Thessalonians by Paul can be attributed to J. E. C. Schmidt in 1798. Bruce, *Thessalonians*, xxxiii. In fact, Fee asserts about the dispute over the authorship of 2 Thessalonians that “it becomes quite clear that had this letter not contained the material in 2:1-12, this view would not have arisen at all.” Fee, *Thessalonians*, 238. If Paul did not write this letter, then as Furnish notes, “[t]he author of 2 Thessalonians has masked his identity with Paul’s; this letter provides no direct evidence about the date and place of its composition or the intended recipients. Firm conclusions on these points are, therefore unattainable.” Victor P. Furnish, *1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2007), 139.

¹²See 2 Thess 1:1.

¹³It is even possible that this is a genuine letter and that Paul changed his mind on these eschatological events. Mearns takes 2 Thessalonians to mean that Paul changed his mind. Bruce, *Thessalonians*, 164.

¹⁴The form with salutation (1:1-2), thanksgiving (1:3-4), final greeting and benediction (3:16-17), along with the body and tone of the letter from one group to another all point to the fact that this writing is a letter. “2 Thessalonians is a tightly organized deliberative letter with a combination of reproof, denial and encouragement that reveals a complex situation of misunderstanding a previous piece of correspondence that had attempted to deal with apocalyptic confusions and congregational disorders.” Robert Jewett, *The Thessalonian Correspondence: Pauline Rhetoric and Millenarian Piety* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 87.

Paul never claims to be a prophet.¹⁵ There is no prophetic language (“a declaration of the Lord,” “a word of the Lord,” or “the Lord says that”) here in 2 Thess 2:1-12.¹⁶ The passage under consideration, 2 Thess 2:1-12, does not present prophecy or even predictions,¹⁷ but seems to present the author’s response to events in the community.¹⁸ The passage contains the author’s teachings on upcoming events.¹⁹ This new teaching (or possibly a reiteration of an oral teaching, cf. 2 Thess 2:5) is an attempt to correct a wrong perception regarding upcoming events.²⁰

The Gathering during the Day of the Lord

In 2 Thess 2:1-12, different characteristics seem to indicate that this passage’s context is, in fact, eschatological in nature.²¹ The ‘day of the Lord’ was a phrase that

¹⁵Although Boring argues that Paul is a prophet, he acknowledges that “Paul insists so adamantly on his apostleship and thus does not refer explicitly to himself as a prophet.” M. Eugene Boring, “Early Christian Prophecy,” *ABD*, 5:498. Here, Boring cites three passages (1 Thess 4:15-17; Rom 11:25-26; and 1 Cor 15:51-52) that he asserts are prophetic. However, even if Pauline works might contain some prophetic passages (although this is by no means clear), obviously they are not all prophetic works.

¹⁶One would have to prove that 2 Thess 2:1-12 is a prophetic passage, which it clearly does not seem to be.

¹⁷“This section is the heart of the letter. It is the most likely reason for the letter.” Demarest, *Thessalonians*, 116. Esler notes that 2 Thess 2:1-12 “is called in epistolary nomenclature the ‘body’ of the letter.” Phillip F. Esler, “2 Thessalonians,” *The Oxford Bible Commentary*, ed. John Barton and John Muddiman (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 1216.

¹⁸The author sets out to explain “the dangerous eschatological message of his opponents (2:1-2) and to explain his own eschatological schedule in order to refute their message (2:3-12).” Koester, *Introduction*, 2:245.

¹⁹This section is not prophecy. Smith calls this section “hortatory appeals against apocalyptic enthusiasm.” Abraham Smith, “The Second Letter to the Thessalonians: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections,” *NIB*, 11:754. Marshall notes this section forms “a section of teaching.” I. Howard Marshall, *1 and 2 Thessalonians* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1983), 184. Furnish notes that “[t]he writer has marshaled various apocalyptic traditions to instruct his audience about the true character of the present time.” Furnish, *Thessalonians*, 161. The text gives no origin on how Paul has come to believe this teaching, so this analysis does not speculate on the origin of Paul’s belief in this teaching.

²⁰Fee summarizes the emphasis here to show “what was intended by Paul to be corrective of a false eschatology.” Fee, *Thessalonians*, 296. Furnish similarly explains the passage’s aim. “The aim is neither to describe the end-time events nor to forecast when they will take place. It is to show that the day of the Lord cannot possibly have arrived.” Furnish, *Thessalonians*, 155.

²¹Moore notes that Paul is addressing the community’s idea about the eschatological event and Paul’s message about this eschatological event. A. Moore, *Thessalonians*, 98-99.

became eschatological after the destruction of the first temple.²² The Christian Scriptures appropriated this phrase to mean the day of Christ's return (1 Cor 5:5, 2 Cor 1:14, 1 Thess 5:2, 2 Pet 3:10, besides the use here in 2 Thess 2:2). The use in 2 Thess 2:2 follows and appears to be equivalent to the understanding of "the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ" (2 Thess 2:1).²³ Fee notes how this coming will be obvious. "Christ's Parousia will be openly manifest to all, both those who await his coming and those who will be 'abolished' when he comes."²⁴

The author is asking the audience not to be alarmed (θροεἰσθαῖ) about the 'day of the Lord' (2 Thess 2:2). More specifically, 2 Thess 2:1 mentions the coming of Jesus and the gathering to him explicitly in order to clarify the meaning of the concept of the 'day of the Lord.' As Williams notes, both "nouns, **coming** (παρουσία, see disc. on 1 Thess 2:19) and **being gathered** (ἐπισυναγωγή), are governed by the one article and are thus depicted as the one (complex) event. The gathering is that spoken of in 1 Thessalonians 4:17. Therefore, those who use this verse to make a distinction between the time of the so-called Rapture of the saints and the Parousia, do so in defiance of the syntax."²⁵ The idea of gathering goes back to the idea of God gathering the exiles in from all the nations

²²In older Hebrew texts, such as Amos, the phrase was used of God instead of Jesus, and also became eschatological (cf. Mal 3:23). Citing wide agreement, Hiers notes that the day of the Lord indicated a time when the Lord "would punish not only his people's enemies, but also his people (Israel, Judah, or the Jewish people) for breaking the covenant. Then, either through a new Davidic king or messiah or by acting directly" he would rule over all creation. Richard H. Hiers, "Day of the Lord," *ABD*, 2:83. Cathcart notes that eschatology proper arose in the exile at the earliest and any eschatological aspects of 'the day of the Lord' belong to later prophecy. K. J. Cathcart, "Day of YAHWEH," *ABD*, 2:84.

²³Menken notes that Paul refers here "to Jesus' eschatological coming in glory." Maarten J. J. Menken, *2 Thessalonians* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 96.

²⁴Fee, *Thessalonians*, 292.

²⁵Williams, *Thessalonians*, 122. This refutes the idea that the rapture and the second coming of Jesus are two distinct events as introduced by Darby and held by dispensationalists. "J. N. Darby, around 1830, introduced the idea that those two phrases refer to two different events. Thus, there came into his interpretation the scheme in which there is a 'rapture' portrayed in the second phrase which occurs before the Second Coming. This view of the rapture, Jesus coming *for* His own, followed (perhaps much later) by the Second Coming, Jesus coming *with* His own, became the cornerstone of a school of thought called dispensationalism." Demarest, *Thessalonians*, 118.

where they were scattered.²⁶ The combination of the idea of the ‘day of the Lord’ and this gathering to Jesus seems to be eschatological.²⁷ In addition, this eschatological indication is strengthened by a linguistic connection in the text. The use of ἐπισυναγωγῆς in 2 Thess 2:1 is theologically connected to later uses of ἐπισυνάγω in Matt 24:31 and Mark 13:27, which have Jesus speaking of the coming of the son of man and angels being sent to gather the elect.

There is another linguistic connection to eschatological passages. The word θροεῖσθαι, excited, is used three other times in Scripture (Song 5:4, Matt 24:6, and Mark 13:7). The two uses of θροέω in the Gospels are in contexts dealing with signs of the end of the age, showing that later first-century writings used this verb in eschatological contexts.²⁸

In addition to the eschatological indications listed above, the rest of the passage (2 Thess 2:3-12) describes events that also imply an eschatological perspective. The lawless one, Hendriksen notes, is “definitely an eschatological person.”²⁹ Menken notes that the terms apostasy and man of lawlessness “indeed belong to the usual elements of apocalyptic eschatology.”³⁰ In fact, the actions and reactions described in this passage

²⁶Wanamaker expands on this idea. “The concept of an eschatological gathering goes back to the OT. The exilic prophets looked forward to God reassembling the nation of Israel after the exile in Babylon.” Charles A. Wanamaker, *The Epistles to the Thessalonians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990), 238. Holmes notes that the term, ἐπισυναγωγῆς, “used here echoes the Old Testament motif of the scattered exiles being gathered together again, as in Isa. 43:4-7; 56:8; Jer. 31:7-8; 2 Macc. 2:7; cf. Matt. 23:37; Mark 13:27.” Holmes, *Thessalonians*, 228-229. Bruce makes a connection between this gathering and 1 Thess 4:17. Bruce, *Thessalonians*, 163.

²⁷Aus notes that the Christians’ “assembling” to meet him is an eschatological term. Roger Aus, *II Thessalonians* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1984), 206.

²⁸Neil notes this connection between Mark 13 and 2 Thess 2. “The same word for **excited** occurs in an eschatological context also in Mark xiii.” William Neil, *The Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians* (New York: Harper, 1950), 157.

²⁹William Hendriksen, *Exposition of I and II Thessalonians* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1955), 171.

³⁰Menken, *Thessalonians*, 102.

seem to offer the author's anticipated timetable of future events.³¹ The setting of the return of Jesus, the gathering to Jesus, the lawless one and his removal and destruction, as well as the condemnation of the unrighteous (2 Thess 2:12) seem to indicate that this passage is eschatological.

The Temple of 2 Thessalonians 2:4

The use of ναός in 2 Thess 2:4 has brought many suppositions regarding what is meant by this word that are quite speculative in nature. The word, ναός, is used 162 times in the Greek, both the Septuagint and the Christian Scriptures. Of these uses, 110 clearly are used of the Jerusalem temple, with 6 more used of the Jerusalem temple in the last vision of Ezekiel. Other uses of ναός in the Septuagint are the shrine near Shiloh,³² the temple in Babylon,³³ palaces of the king,³⁴ the temple of Bel,³⁵ the body of a Christian,³⁶ Jesus' body,³⁷ the Christian church (Eph 2:21), twice in the book of Acts (17:24, 19:24) that depict pagan shrines, 16 times in the book of Revelation, besides this use in 2 Thess 2:4. Most uses of ναός depict a physical place or a physical building. The word can be used in a metaphorical sense; but in these uses, the meaning is clearly metaphorical within the language and the depiction of the text. In all Pauline literature (in the absolute broadest sense, this could mean 14 books to some) there are only eight uses of ναός (1

³¹Hughes comments on the "eschatological timetable," as he calls it, of vv. 3-4. Frank W. Hughes, *Early Christian Rhetoric and 2 Thessalonians* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 59. Fee calls vv. 5-7 "eschatological details." Fee, *Thessalonians*, 284.

³²These can be seen in 1 Sam 1:9, 3:3; and 2 Sam 22:7.

³³These can be seen in 1 Esdr 1:39, 6:17 and Ezra 5:14.

³⁴These can be seen in Ps 44:16 (45:16 Heb), Ps 143:12 (144:12 Heb), Amos 8:3, Joel 4:5, Jer 37:18 (30:18 Heb), Dan 4:29 (4:26 Heb).

³⁵These can be seen in Bel 1:11, 14.

³⁶These can be seen in 1 Cor 3:16, 17; 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16.

³⁷These can be seen in John 2:19, 21.

Cor 3:16, 17; 6:16; 2 Cor 6:16; Eph 2:21; and here in 2 Thess 2:4). Besides 2 Thess 2:4, all the uses in Pauline literature refer to the body of a Christian and the Christian church. These metaphorical uses are explained clearly by noting that the spirit of God dwells in you (the Christian) or that all is growing into a $\nu\alpha\acute{o}\varsigma$ (the church).

There are those who understand the use of $\nu\alpha\acute{o}\varsigma$ here in 2 Thess 2:4 as metaphorical. Hendriksen asserts plainly: [T]he term $\nu\alpha\acute{o}\varsigma$ is here clearly used metaphorically.”³⁸ Esler explains how many who see this use of $\nu\alpha\acute{o}\varsigma$ as metaphorical interpret the use in light of many past details regarding the temple. Esler notes regarding v. 4 that “[t]he details in v. 4 show how this mythopoiesis was able to draw upon existing aspects in Israelite tradition in describing how the lawless person would behave. He will be like Antiochus IV Epiphanes, who tried to extirpate Israelite religion and identity (in the period 167–164 BCE), as described in 1 Macc 1:16-64 and Dan 11:36-7, Pompey (who entered the temple in Jerusalem; see Pss Sol. 17:11-15) and Caligula who wanted to install statues of himself in the temple (Jos. J. W. 2:184-185).”³⁹

Fee asserts that since the Jerusalem temple was not important to Paul except as a symbol of God’s presence with Israel in the past, it is, to Fee, more likely that Paul “was simply using well-known ‘anti-Christ’ events to describe the Rebel’s self-deification.”⁴⁰ Bruce, Kelcy, and Demarest also posit that here in 2 Thess 2:4, the wording is best understood in a metaphoric sense. Bruce notes that even though “the picture here is of a material shrine,”⁴¹ he posits that

³⁸Hendriksen, *Thessalonians*, 178. Williams also distances his understanding from the physical temple. The man of lawlessness “is described in the language of the OT as setting **himself up in God’s temple**, not literally, but in a figure. But this is not a figure of the church, which is sometimes called the temple (cf. 1 Cor. 3:16; Eph. 2:21).” Williams, *Thessalonians*, 125.

³⁹Esler, “2 Thessalonians,” 1217, 1213-1220.

⁴⁰Fee, *Thessalonians*, 283-284.

⁴¹Bruce, *Thessalonians*, 168.

It may be best to conclude that the Jerusalem sanctuary is meant here by Paul and his companions, but meant in a metaphorical sense. Had they said, ‘so that he takes his seat on the throne of God,’ few would have thought it necessary to think of a literal throne; it would simply have been regarded as a graphic way of saying that he plans to usurp the authority of God. This is what is meant by the language actually used here, although the sacral associations of *ναός* imply that he demands not only the obedience but also the worship due to God alone.⁴²

Here Bruce errs in asserting that when the text describes the lawless one as taking his seat in the temple, this only means that he *plans* to usurp God’s position. Second Thessalonians 2:4 is absolutely clear. The verse states the lawless one “opposes and exalts himself above every so-called god or object of worship, so that he takes his seat in the temple of God, declaring himself to be God” (NRSV). The verse is clear that the lawless one sits in the temple. The infinitive, *καθίσαι*, does not have the tendential syntax that Bruce is positing. Because Bruce holds that the use of *ναός* here is the Jerusalem temple, yet in a metaphoric sense as shown above, this is why Bruce inserts into the Greek of the text a tendential verb (the imperfect tense in the Greek, which is not in this verse).⁴³ This is how Bruce avoids a clear contradiction in his logic with the text asserting the lawless one takes a seat and Bruce’s idea that this seat is God’s throne. If the lawless one takes a seat in the holy of holies, plainly stated in this verse, this action would clearly usurp (not merely plan to usurp) the authority of God as Demarest notes.⁴⁴ To follow

⁴²Ibid., 169.

⁴³It may be useful to note the rest of the uses of this infinitive in Scripture. It is used 17 times in Scripture (1 Sam 2:8; 1 Kgs 16:11; 1 Chr 28:5; Neh 11:1, 2, 13:27; Ps 112:8; Isa 47:14; Matt 20:23; Mark 10:40; Acts 2:30, 8:31; 2 Thess 2:4; Rev 3:21; 1 Macc 2:7, 29; Ode 3:8). In none of these times does it carry tendential syntax. Note even the parallels to what Bruce is asserting in this passage with Matthew and Mark, with the question of who is to sit beside Jesus. Since it is possible to take a seat in the temple and that is what the verse explicitly states, Bruce is incorrect in his interpretation of the Greek. He appears to be using theology and events that occurred after the writing of this passage to eisegete his idea into the text.

⁴⁴This is the very conclusion that Demarest takes, which is the logical conclusion to this argument. “Does this mean the literal temple in Jerusalem (later destroyed by the Romans under Nero)? Or is this a metaphor, meaning that he usurps the very authority of God? The latter seems to be preferable.” Demarest, *Thessalonians*, 120.

Bruce's logic, one must assume that the lawless one actually does usurp God's position in the temple, not merely planning to do so. Yet, this is opposite to what Bruce states.

Clearly there is some error. Bruce may argue for some idiomatic use of the notion to sit in the temple, but the text has no indications of such a use here.⁴⁵ Wanamaker notes that “ναός may refer to a temple in general, as does ἱερόν, but in the present context it probably refers to the inner sanctuary where the deity was thought to reside. The inner sanctuary in question is almost certainly the Holy of Holies in the Jerusalem temple where God was thought by the Jewish people from OT times to dwell.”⁴⁶ Kelcy posits, “It seems more satisfactory to regard the expression as meaning that he intrudes himself into the place or position which rightfully belongs to God alone. He occupies the position only in a manner of usurpation and not in fact or by right (cf. Ezek. 28:2).”⁴⁷ Bruce's positing that “it may be best,”⁴⁸ Demarest's positing that the metaphorical view “seems to be preferable,”⁴⁹ and Kelcy's positing that the metaphorical view “seems more satisfactory to regard”⁵⁰ all indicate their personal preference rather than any metaphorical indications from the text itself.⁵¹ The language points in another direction.

Morris notes, “Some have understood this to refer to the setting up of an image within the shrine, and have instanced Caligula's attempt to do just this. This is not

⁴⁵See Matt 23:2, where the idiom is clear. “The scribes and Pharisees sit on Moses' seat” clearly is not physically possible at one time aside from the fact that there is no “physical” Moses' seat to actually sit on. This usage in Matthew shows a clear idiomatic use; there is clearly no indication of such a usage in 2 Thessalonians.

⁴⁶Wanamaker, *Thessalonians*, 246.

⁴⁷Raymond C. Kelcy, *The Letters of Paul to the Thessalonians* (Austin, TX: Sweet, 1968), 153.

⁴⁸Bruce, *Thessalonians*, 169.

⁴⁹Demarest, *Thessalonians*, 120.

⁵⁰Kelcy, *Thessalonians*, 153.

⁵¹The modern authors seem to be trying to protect Paul. If the physical temple was meant in this verse, Paul would have been wrong. Thus, to try and preserve this passage for future fulfillment, the modern commentators attempt to find an interpretation which could keep Paul from being incorrect in this passage.

impossible; but the language indicates rather that he will sit in the holy place in person.”⁵² This personal action leads away from a metaphorical understanding of the text. Additionally, with the definite article in the Greek, “this reference makes it impossible to believe that either the creator of the scenario, whether Paul or another, or the original readers of the letter would have understood the reference metaphorically. . . . While this explanation provides us with a way to maintain the abiding relevance of the passage today, it can hardly be taken as definitive for its interpretation during the lifetime of Paul.”⁵³

Wanamaker here attacks the heart of why a metaphoric interpretation is offered (echoed by Bruce, Demarest, and Kelcy as noted above): the modern personal preference, rather than the text or its meaning to the author or first-century audience. Bruce, Demarest, and Kelcy offer no textual support for their extreme claims, only hope that the change they offer will support a different end to this teaching. The clarity of the metaphorical understanding of *ναός* in the Greek of the Corinthian epistles contrasts sharply with this use in 2 Thessalonians, if one examines the texts. In the 2 Thess 2:1-12 passage, there are no signs that point to a metaphorical usage of *ναός* and this metaphorical interpretation should be discarded.

Similar to the metaphorical interpretation examined above, the use of *ναός* in 2 Thessalonians is understood by some to refer to the temple in the sky, not on the earth. Neil explains how this view is understood. “It is indeed not likely that the actual Temple at Jerusalem is in Paul’s mind at all, but that he is thinking rather in the sense of Ps 11:4 (LXX x. 5) of the Temple of God in heaven.”⁵⁴

⁵²Morris, *Epistles*, 128.

⁵³Wanamaker, *Thessalonians*, 247.

⁵⁴Neil, *Thessalonians*, 164.

The view that the temple in 2 Thessalonians is describing the temple in the sky, not on earth, is similar to the metaphorical interpretation as Richard explains. “The author therefore employs temple imagery as symbol for the site of God’s power and the phrase ‘taking his seat’ to represent the ancient theme of human aspirations to divinity.”⁵⁵ Yet, Ps 11:4 is not clearly asserting that the temple is in the sky. There is parallelism in this verse as noted by Dahood (among many).⁵⁶ There is a tie in Ps 11:4 between “the Lord is in the holy temple” (whether in Jerusalem or in the sky, the verse is not clear) and “the Lord on the throne in the sky,” although there is no clear equivalency between the two in this verse. Craigie, for one, notes that the psalmist is saying that “[t]he Lord is in his holy temple,’ symbolizing his presence amongst his people, but his ‘throne is in the heavens,’ signifying transcendence and might greater than that of any human enemy.”⁵⁷ This difference between the location of the temple (הַיְהוָה בְּבֵיתוֹ, ναός) and the throne (כִּסֵּא, θρόνος) in Ps 11:4 (Ps 10 in the Greek) appears to be present.⁵⁸

Regardless of whether the temple of Ps 11:4 is in the sky or in Jerusalem, there is no reference to the “sky” (οὐρανός) in 2 Thess 2:4 as is explicitly stated in the text of Ps 11:4 (both the Hebrew and the Greek). It is important to note that the only use of οὐρανός in 2 Thessalonians is in 1:7. Thus, it would be reckless of anyone to imply that the temple in 2 Thess 2:4 is a temple in the sky. Besides this obvious fact, if 2 Thess 2:4 referred to a temple in the sky, then this supposition is easily refuted by the obvious error in this position, which Kelcy points out about the lawless one: “It seems impossible to regard

⁵⁵Earl J. Richard, *First and Second Thessalonians* (Collegeville: Liturgical, 1995), 329.

⁵⁶Mitchell Dahood, *Psalms I, 1-50: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 1966), 70.

⁵⁷Peter C. Craigie, *Psalms 1-50* (Waco, TX: Word, 1983), 133.

⁵⁸In Brenton’s translation of this verse, the difference seems to be apparent. “The Lord is in his holy temple, as for the Lord, his throne is in heaven.” Lancelot C. L. Brenton, *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1998), 704.

temple as a reference to heaven itself for surely he would not succeed in such.”⁵⁹ Yet, the text makes it absolutely clear that the lawless one does in fact succeed in sitting in the ναός, 2 Thess 2:4. With no explicit or implicit indication that this temple of 2 Thess 2:4 is in the sky and no possible way the lawless one could take his seat in such a temple, as the text explicitly asserts that he does in fact take a seat in this temple, the view that the temple of 2 Thess 2:4 is in the sky must be rejected.

Another specific metaphorical supposition of the use of ναός in 2 Thess 2:4 is that the idea of a temple here is used metaphorically to mean the Christian church. Milligan notes that some early Christian theologians, including Chrysostom, held this position.⁶⁰ Although not many hold this position today, it is still put forward as a valid possibility.⁶¹ However, in comparing this use of ναός in 2 Thess 2:4 to the use of ναός in Eph 2:21 (where the meaning is clearly the Christian community), the two uses are quite different from one another. In Ephesians, the metaphor is laid out explicitly in the passage (2:11-2:18) before it is used. Also, the metaphor is buttressed by many building analogies within the passage.⁶² In 2 Thess 2:1-12, there are absolutely no textual indicators that this use of ναός in 2 Thess 2:4 is a metaphor describing the Christian church.⁶³ This abstract

⁵⁹Kelcy, *Thessalonians*, 153.

⁶⁰George Milligan, *St Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians: The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1952), 99-100.

⁶¹Giblin notes that the reference to the temple in 2 Thessalonians may refer to the Christian community. Charles H. Giblin, “The Second Letter to the Thessalonians,” *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, ed. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990), 874.

⁶²These are obvious and clear. The community is called a household (Eph 2:19). The church is “built upon the foundation” (Eph 2:20). The church is a structure that is joined (Eph 2:21). The church is “built together spiritually into a dwelling place for God” (Eph 2:22).

⁶³Wanamaker evaluates the possibility, but concludes that “[a]lthough it is true that in 1 Cor. 3:16f. Paul employs ναός in a metaphorical sense to refer to the Christian as a temple of God (cf. 1 Cor. 6:19), in the present context where no mention is made of the believer and the indwelling of the Spirit of God as in 1 Corinthians, such an interpretation is highly unlikely.” Wanamaker, *Thessalonians*, 246.

metaphor for the temple in 2 Thess 2:4 must be rejected as it is without any textual foundation.⁶⁴

There are those who understand the use of ναός in 2 Thess 2:4 as a physical temple, but not specifically the Jerusalem temple. Marshall notes that the claim to sit in the temple (2 Thess 2:4) is to claim to be god in the imagery of that day.⁶⁵ Then Marshall goes on to note that 2 Thess 2:4 has no specific temple in mind.⁶⁶ Morris is clear that ναός means an actual physical building,⁶⁷ yet, Morris is clear that Jerusalem is not specified here. “Attempts have been made to identify this shrine, but Paul gives us no clue to it whereabouts.”⁶⁸ However, the Jerusalem temple is the common understanding of most of the uses of ναός in the Greek.⁶⁹

Although there are other temples in second temple Jewish writings, clearly the temple of Israelites, of which Paul is proudly one (even if this is a Deutero-Pauline writing, the author would certainly keep this aspect of Paul),⁷⁰ is the Jerusalem temple.⁷¹

⁶⁴“But we cannot apply this ‘Temple language’ to the church.” Witherington, *Thessalonians*, 220.

⁶⁵“To sit **in the temple** is tantamount to claiming that one is a god, worthy of worship. Behind the imagery may lie the accusation of Ezekiel against the ruler of Tyre (Ezek. 28:2) and the stories of Antiochus who himself entered the temple in Jerusalem, of the Roman general Pompey who made his way into the holy of holies, and perhaps also of Caligula, the Roman emperor who attempted to set up an image of himself in the temple in AD 41 (Jos. Ant. 18:261-309).” Marshall, *Thessalonians*, 190.

⁶⁶*Ibid.*, 192.

⁶⁷Leon Morris, *1 & 2 Thessalonians* (Dallas, TX: Word, 1989), 64.

⁶⁸*Ibid.*

⁶⁹The details of all the uses of ναός in the Septuagint and the Christian Scriptures are given above.

⁷⁰Romans 11:1 and Phil 3:5 have this proud assertion.

⁷¹This use of ναός clearly means the Jerusalem temple. However, some may wonder what part of the temple. Wanamaker highlights the fact that “ναός may refer to a temple in general, as does ἱερόν, but in the present context it probably refers to the inner sanctuary where the deity was thought to reside. The inner sanctuary in question is almost certainly the Holy of Holies in Jerusalem temple where God was thought by the Jewish people from OT times to dwell. ναόν is made definite by the article and the possessive genitive of (‘of God’), indicating that a specific building was intended.” Wanamaker, *Thessalonians*, 246. The distinction between the building, the holy place, or the holy of holies is not necessary for this analysis. The clear meaning of the building, or part thereof, is what is necessary and that meaning is beyond doubt.

Pauline literature makes a point of the crucial place Jerusalem holds in his work as an apostle.⁷²

For current-day scholars to hedge on what physical structure Paul, or a Deutero-Pauline author, would call “the temple of God” is disingenuous.⁷³ The idea that 2 Thess 2:4 meant a physical temple other than the Jerusalem temple as the temple of God must be abandoned.

There are those who understand the use of ναός here in 2 Thess 2:4 as the Jerusalem temple, but not the Jerusalem temple of Paul’s day. This supposition holds that the temple of 2 Thess 2:4 is a future Jerusalem temple that would be built after the destruction of the Jerusalem temple in 70 CE. Thomas definitively asserts that the temple of 2 Thess 2:4 “evidently is a Jewish temple to be rebuilt in Jerusalem in the future.”⁷⁴ Malherbe notes, “The destruction of the temple in AD 70 has also posed problems for interpreters who think that Paul had the Jerusalem temple in mind. Patristic commentators overcame the problem by claiming that the temple would be rebuilt.”⁷⁵ The concept that the temple would be rebuilt at the end of the age “is still defended by adherents of the dispensationalist school of interpretation.”⁷⁶ Yet, Ryrie, in his apologetic

⁷²The claim in Rom 15:19, “by the power of the Spirit of God, so that from Jerusalem,” shows that Jerusalem is a key place of origin as well as a key place for God. Paul will approve and help those who are approved “with letters to take your gift to Jerusalem” (1 Cor 16:3), which shows his concern for the city that holds the Jerusalem temple. Although written after the fall of the temple in 70 CE, the book of Acts asserts that Paul had purified himself before going to the Jerusalem temple (Acts 21:17-26).

⁷³The definite article in the prepositional phrase, εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, clearly alludes to a specific temple to this Israelite. For any to claim that for Paul the temple of God might not be the Jerusalem temple is being too ambiguous for some unknown reason.

⁷⁴Robert L. Thomas, “2 Thessalonians,” *Expositor’s Bible Commentary*, ed. Frank E. Gaebelein (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1978), 11:322.

⁷⁵Malherbe, *Thessalonians*, 420.

⁷⁶Marshall, *Thessalonians*, 191.

writing on dispensationalism, notes that dispensationalists claim to use literal interpretation “*consistently in all his study of the Bible*” (his emphasis).⁷⁷

Lindsey, a graduate from the School of Theology at Dallas Theological Seminary that has dispensational theological positions in its statement of faith, holds that prophecy demands the temple be rebuilt, citing Dan 9:27 and 2 Thess 2:4.⁷⁸ However, 2 Thess 2:1-12 has no indications that it is prophecy (as shown above) and this passage has not one indication that it is suggesting a future rebuilt temple and not the temple in existence at the time of the letter. The text of 2 Thess 2:4 contains the definite article, indicating the temple in existence. There is no word in the passage that one could use to support the idea that a future temple is meant here in this passage (e.g., future, later, rebuilt, next, etc.). The only reason this peculiar idea even is put forward as a possible interpretation of the term ναός in 2 Thess 2:4 is to try to protect the reputation of the author. The supposition that the temple in 2 Thess 2:4 refers not to the Jerusalem temple of that time but a different, future Jerusalem temple must be rejected as it is without any textual or contextual intimations and goes against the natural reading of the text.

The use of ναός in 2 Thess 2:4 can be plainly understood to be the Jerusalem temple in existence at the time of the writing.⁷⁹ The clarity of the passage is remarkable, even though the opposite has been asserted.⁸⁰ “‘The temple of God’ refers to the temple

⁷⁷Charles C. Ryrie, *Dispensationalism* (Chicago: Moody, 2007), 93.

⁷⁸Hal Lindsey and Carole C. Carlson, *The Late Great Planet Earth* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1970), 55-56.

⁷⁹This use of ναός “can most naturally be taken as a reference to the Jewish temple in Jerusalem, rather than to the church as God’s temple (cf. 1 Cor. 3:16-17) or to a rebuilt temple (so Thomas 322).” Jacob W. Elias, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, Believers Church Bible Commentary (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1995), 280. Bicknell also notes that the natural meaning of this reference is the Jerusalem temple. E. J. Bicknell, *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians* (London: Methuen, 1932), 75. Early interpretation also noted the natural meaning of this verse as referring to the Jerusalem temple. “These words were understood of the actual temple at Jerusalem by Irenaeus (adv. Haer v. 30. 4).” Milligan, *Thessalonians*, 99-100.

⁸⁰What Paul “means by ‘temple,’ or more precisely ‘shrine,’ (*naos*) is not clear.” Malherbe, *Thessalonians*, 420. Something like “Moses’ seat” in Matt 23:2 might be said to be unclear, but the temple is clear. This verse clearly indicates a place where the lawless one will sit. This verse does not point to a

in Jerusalem; it is clear that, following an ‘object of worship’, a material temple has to be in view, and only in a material temple does it make sense to say that a human being ‘declares himself to be God’. The historical events in the background of these words also suggest that the Jerusalem temple is meant.”⁸¹

If the Jerusalem temple was in existence at the time of this writing,⁸² “Jewish Christians as well as Gentile Christians undoubtedly would have understood it as a reference to the one true temple of God in Jerusalem.”⁸³ Not only is the Jerusalem temple far and away the most common referent of ναός in the Septuagint (in many different contexts), the use of the definite article in the Greek unambiguously references the Jerusalem temple.⁸⁴ However, the Greek is more unambiguous and more explicit than merely using the definite article. The full Greek wording has “εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ.”⁸⁵ This phrase, without the preposition, occurs four times in the second temple Jewish writings of the Septuagint besides the metaphorical use in 1 Cor 3:17: 1 Esdr 5:52, 55; Jdt 5:18; and Dan (Theodotion) 5:3. All of these references are to the Jerusalem temple.⁸⁶

metaphor of authority, like “Moses’ seat.” “Moses’ seat” is an abstract concept; the temple in this verse is clearly not abstract. There are no indications in this passage that would lead one to that conclusion. This verse talks about the temple, not an abstract place of enthronement of God (e.g., enthroned upon the praises of Israel in Ps 22:4, enthroned over the flood in Ps 29:10).

⁸¹Menken, *Thessalonians*, 105.

⁸²Furnish notes that even if it were written after 70 CE, it could be a “part of the fiction created by the post-Pauline writer.” Furnish, *Thessalonians*, 139.

⁸³Wanamaker, *Thessalonians*, 246. Witherington explains the clear context of 2 Thess 2:4. “Paul is speaking in a largely Gentile context, and his audience will surely hear him as referring to an actual temple, in this case the Temple of the one true God that still stood in Jerusalem. Paul nowhere in 1 and 2 Thessalonians refers to the church as ‘the Temple of God.’” Witherington, *Thessalonians*, 220.

⁸⁴“The definite article before the *naos* makes it clear that Paul is referring to a particular Temple.” Witherington, *Thessalonians*, 218. “The definite article **the** implies that Paul has a particular shrine in mind. This immediately suggests the Jerusalem temple.” Ernest Best, *A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians* (New York: Harper and Row, 1972), 286.

⁸⁵Milligan notes that “the nature of context, the use of such a local term as καθισαι, and the twice-repeated def. art. (τον ναον του θεου) all point to a literal reference in the present instance.” Milligan, *Thessalonians*, 100.

⁸⁶The reference in Daniel is to the first Jerusalem temple, and all the other references are to the second Jerusalem temple.

The Greek of 2 Thess 2:4, the context of the passage, and the context of the writing as a part of the Pauline epistles all clearly show that the temple, ναός, in this verse is referring to the existing, physical Jerusalem temple.

The Eschatological Role of the Temple

Since the Jerusalem temple is mentioned in what seem to be eschatological contexts in 2 Thess 2:1-12, further assessment is required in order to ascertain whether or not the physical Jerusalem temple has any eschatological role for the author or audience of this letter. The Jerusalem temple is in the passage and is the seat of action for the lawless one. However, the actions in this passage are focused on the lawless one (2:3, 4, 7, 8, 9), the one restraining the lawless one (2:7), and Christ (2:1, 2, 8). The Jerusalem temple exists,⁸⁷ but only seems to be the holy space of God, which the lawless one will violate and within which the lawless one will take a seat.

The Jerusalem temple, which was destroyed in 70 CE, had but one eschatological role in this passage, to be in existence. In order for the lawless one to take his seat in the Jerusalem temple, the Jerusalem temple must be in existence,⁸⁸ before the eschatological time of the coming of the Lord would occur.⁸⁹ Therefore, besides merely existing at this

⁸⁷Ellul notes that “Jerusalem is a holy city, holy because of the Temple and the ark. There is an absolute unity, an absolute bond, between the city and the Temple. Each exists only by the other.” Jacques Ellul, *The Meaning of the City*, trans. Dennis Pardee (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1970), 96. Ellul goes on to say of this city/temple unity, that she has a role. “She is like a catalyst: because she is there, things change. She is like a road sign, changing the route of those who observe her.” *Ibid.*, 107.

⁸⁸Who the lawless one was to be does not affect this analysis.

⁸⁹“There is no indication that the writer contemplates a prolonged period of apostasy before the Lord’s return.” Furnish, *Thessalonians*, 162. Yet, if this timetable of the letter is correct, there have been many centuries since any lawless one (Titus, perhaps, either forward looking or if written afterward, looking backward) has been near that temple. The lawless one came, or was to come, before the Jerusalem temple was destroyed. Clearly, the lawless one is not still to come as the Jerusalem temple is destroyed and he cannot take a seat within it.

important eschatological time, the Jerusalem temple appears to have no further eschatological role in 2 Thess 2:1-12.⁹⁰

⁹⁰The lack of any eschatological role for the Jerusalem temple may agree with Furnish's comment above regarding a Pauline fiction after the events of 70 CE. Grey notes that the Jerusalem temple's eschatological role was superseded with the advent of Jesus. Timothy C. Gray, *The Temple in the Gospel of Mark: A Study in Its Narrative Role* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2010). This book notes an eschatological role for the Jerusalem temple in its destruction. Jesus is the cornerstone of a new temple that succeeds where its predecessor failed. Ellul also understands how Jesus supersedes the physical Jerusalem temple. "Jerusalem played a double role: her meaning was both political and spiritual. But with the appearance of Jesus, she no longer has this double function. She is no longer the center of the kingdom, for Jesus is himself the kingdom. No longer is she the foundation, no longer the cornerstone, and now one can perceive that she was all this only while waiting for *the* stone to be laid." Ellul, *Meaning*, 135. Ellul uses John 2:19 to defend the idea that Jesus' body is substituted for the physical Jerusalem temple. *Ibid.*, 138-139.

CHAPTER 9

EPILOGUE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATION

Summary

This investigation into the eschatological role of the Jerusalem temple began with an examination into how eschatology and the Jerusalem temple became linked in the understanding of second temple Judaism. It became clear that the destruction of the first Jerusalem temple and the exile were events that sparked prophecy toward a new direction. This new prophetic direction produced the great vision of a restored Jerusalem temple in Ezek 40–48.¹

The creation symbolism of the tabernacle and first temple, maintained in Ezekiel’s vision of the temple to come, firmly established the temple as a microcosm of creation. The temple’s link to creation coupled with an understanding of the congruence between protology and eschatology illuminated the bond between the Jerusalem temple and eschatology. The underlying connections between the temple and eschatology led to the obvious question of how second temple Judaism understood this bond.

The survey of how modern investigations explored the bond between eschatology and the Jerusalem temple in the second temple period found a void. This void in the exploration into the relationship between eschatology and the temple may stem from a predominant belief that Woudstra elaborates. Now, after “Christ’s death the tabernacle

¹Abadie notes that the temple destruction and exile helped produce a profound temple vision, which was the most important symbol leading Israel into a new era. Philippe Abadie, “Le temple de Jérusalem au retour d’exil: Entre histoire et symbolique,” in *Quelle maison pour Dieu?* ed. Camille Focant (Paris: Cerf, 2003), 144.

and the temple as such had served their God-appointed purpose. The temple continued to function for a while, but then it ceased to play a role in the Christian faith.”²

Peripheral areas in second temple Judaism that have been examined are eschatology, the temple service or cultic ritual, the symbolism of New Jerusalem or the Eschatological Jerusalem, and the presence of God in the eschatological age. Some investigations have claimed that Judaism had transferred the hope for a temple into the idea that the temple is only a symbol of hope for the future; yet, this claim is a modern construct and would be foreign to second temple Judaism.

The importance of the physical structure in the lives of people belonging to second temple Judaism has been demeaned by reducing the temple to a symbol. The lack of focus on not only the temple building, the actual physical structure, but also the perceived ideal layout of the temple building has greatly hindered further investigation into the temple building’s expected role in the affairs of the people of the second temple period.³ Therefore, this investigation started with the earliest writing in the time period

²Woudstra, “Tabernacle,” 100. This was not the case for later Jewish tradition. However, later Jewish tradition’s exploration went into the mystical realm. Classic works of Kabbalah such as *Miskane Elyon* by Moshe Chaim Luzzatto and *Ohr HaMikdash* by Raphael Moshe Luria show how Judaism explored the meaning of the Jerusalem temple in light of creation and restoration.

³The eschatological role of the Jerusalem temple for modern times, not for the second temple period, has been noted by a few. “There remains but one more event to completely set the stage for Israel’s part in the last great act of her historical drama. That is to rebuild the ancient Temple of worship upon its old site.” Lindsey and Carlson, *Planet Earth*, 55-56. Citing different premillennialists, Gorenberg notes that the premillennial faction links “the Temple and the Last Days literally.” Gershom Gorenberg, *The End of Days: Fundamentalism and the Struggle for the Temple Mount* (New York: Free Press, 2000), 69. Addressing the timeline, Gorenberg writes, “When the Temple’s rebuilt, it ushers in the Second Coming.” Ibid., 174. Citing an oral presentation by Dov Lior, Gorenberg quotes him as saying that “the Temple will bring peace, will bring security, will cure all the ills of society!” Ibid., 179. Jeffery interprets Haggai as a prophet declaring “that the Temple would be rebuilt and would play a significant role in the events of the last days.” Grant R. Jeffery, *The New Temple and the Second Coming* (Colorado Springs, CO: Waterbrook Press, 2007), 87. It would bring the messianic era. Ibid., 165. Price has noted that prophetic restoration “revolves around ascent to the rebuilt Temple in the Messianic age (Isaiah 2:2-3; 56:6-7, 60:3-7; Micah 4:1-2; Haggai 2:7; Zechariah 14:16).” Price, *Coming*, 22. Ice and Demy hold that the future “temple will play a central role in end-time events relating to Israel’s national restoration during her final seven years of history (Daniel 9:24-27).” Thomas Ice and Timothy J. Demy, *The Truth About the Last Days’ Temple* (Eugene, OR: Harvest House, 1996), 22.

after the destruction of the temple in 586 to focus on the temple and layout: Ezekiel.⁴

The book of Ezekiel shows a pronounced emphasis on the Jerusalem temple as a means of restoration of the people and the land, with the temple having an important part in all ten of the restoration passages of the book. Ezekiel 43:1-12 describes how Ezekiel's temple vision is to be shown to the people,⁵ including all the measurements, instructing the people how the temple is to be built.

An investigation of the eschatology of the book of Ezekiel shows that constructing the Jerusalem temple stands at the fulcrum of history between the current situation of the people and the eschatological blessings to come after the temple is completed. The eschatological dwelling of the Lord, which is the Lord dwelling relationally with the people (יְדֹשֵׁן), brings the river that changes the dry land into Eden, yet this physical dwelling is in the temple described in Ezek 40-42.

A critique of the first temple is displayed in Ezekiel, displaying an understanding that the first Jerusalem temple had the incorrect temple's sacred ground layout, as opposed to the correct temple's sacred ground layout given in Ezek 40-42. With Ezekiel beginning the connection between eschatology and the Jerusalem temple, other exilic and post-exilic writings were investigated to determine if they followed Ezekiel and posited a relationship between the Jerusalem temple and eschatology.

The Jerusalem temple is shown to be connected to eschatological constructs in the second temple period within Haggai, Zechariah, and Trito-Isaiah. In Micah, Proto-Isaiah, Malachi, and the Psalter, the temple is presented as an important source of peace, and although these texts are not as specific as the prophetic books listed above, they do

⁴Odendaal notes that Ezekiel is the starting point for later eschatological expectation. Odendaal, *Expectation*, 16.

⁵This is explicitly stated in Ezek 43:10 with the verbal root נגד, meaning to show, relate, or tell in descriptive fashion. This vision, which would include all the measurements of Ezek 40-42, is a teaching of the temple to the people, as Ezek 43:12 twice explicitly calls it תּוֹרַת הַמִּבְיָתָה.

contain a theology that supports, if not outright declares, a connection between the temple and eschatology. The presence of God with Israel is described in these writings to be dependent on the temple as a dwelling place.⁶ The temple is called to be built for the dwelling presence of God. The connection between God and creation is depicted as being contingent upon God entering into creation and dwelling in that particular place, Mount Zion, and that particular structure, the Jerusalem temple. Even with the diversity of contexts and content of the writings in Hebrew Scriptures, the connection between eschatology and the Jerusalem temple occurs in books other than Ezekiel.

In texts of the Greek Bible such as Tobit, Sirach, and Second Maccabees, there is a call for the correct pure temple in Jerusalem to usher in a new age. Tobit and Sirach have strong calls for a new or renewed temple. Tobit holds to a timeline that has the temple, which will enable the presence of God to return to Israel, built at the fulcrum of history between the present time of exile and the future time when the whole world will be converted (Tob 14:6). Tobit refers to the temple being built as the prophets have said (Tob 14:5), referring possibly to the proposals of Ezekiel, Haggai, Zechariah, Trito-Isaiah, as well as other prophetic writings. Sirach calls for the day to be hastened (Sir 36:10) when the temple will be renewed or rebuilt so that God will dwell within it. It is only at this time when the reward for Israel will be granted (Sir 36:21) and the whole world will know God (Sir 36:22).

Tobit and Sirach contain a precipitated eschatology with the temple as the catalyst in hastening the beginning of the new age. Second Maccabees holds to eschatological expectations with a newly purified second temple. This purity (or correctness) of the temple is the catalyst that provides the hope that God will have mercy on Israel (2 Macc 2:18). Thus, Second Maccabees supports and may even posit the idea of a precipitated

⁶It is the hope for the presence of God dwelling in the land of Israel that is kindled in writings of the second temple period, spreading to widespread development in the following years. Ackroyd, *Exile*, 251.

eschatology, although it is not completely clear on the matter.

The Temple Scroll of Qumran presents the divinely revealed, ideal ground plan of the Jerusalem temple that will bring the dwelling of God and radically affect a new purity of the entire land of Israel. The Temple Scroll does indeed display a precipitated eschatology with the divinely revealed temple as the catalyst that will enable a new era to begin. The Temple Scroll presents a teaching for the new era when the new Jerusalem temple is built (עשי). The human-built Jerusalem temple that precipitates a new era may stem from the precipitated eschatology of the prophetic writings or from Deut 28, though the absence of the blessings and curses is striking.⁷ The temple precipitates this new era as the temple will bring the presence of God just like the presence was with Jacob when God stood with him (Gen 28:13, 11Q19 29:10).⁸

The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha contains a variety of texts, of which only a few discuss any features of the future Jerusalem temple; yet, a few do contain ideas regarding an eschatological role for the future Jerusalem temple. In *1 Enoch*, there are two passages that declare that the temple is built or renewed at the transition to the eschatological age. The same declaration can be said of the book of *Jubilees*. Because the Jerusalem temple existed at the time when these documents were written, they must be understood as calls to build the temple that will fulfill the events about which these documents write.

These documents are not just detailing that at the beginning of the *eschaton* there is a Jerusalem temple. The point in these texts is that a new Jerusalem temple will be the

⁷The precipitated eschatology of Deut 28 does not have the construction of the Jerusalem temple as the catalyst. Deuteronomy 28 is a precipitated eschatology based upon Israel following all the commandments of God as given in Deuteronomy. The precipitated eschatology may very well originate from the prophetic writings of the Hebrew Bible as reviewed above.

⁸Wénin notes with the Jacob story that the house of God is “[c]’est qu’il se trouvait à son insu en un endroit où Dieu habite et se manifeste, un lieu où terre et ciel communiquent—lieu de passage, de rencontre.” Wénin, “Jacob,” 28. It is this place, the Jerusalem temple like Beth-El to Jacob, that is to be the place of meeting God because the presence of God will dwell in this correct temple.

catalyst that speeds up the initiation of the eschatological age. *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* apologetically maintains that the building of the Jerusalem temple will be the catalyst that enables the precipitation of the *eschaton*.

In 4Q174, there also appears (as it is fragmentary) to be present a precipitated eschatology with the new Jerusalem temple as the catalyst. Although 4Q174 is not in the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, it is a similar second temple Jewish document. The *Apocryphon of Ezekiel* and the third *Sibylline Oracle* do not contradict a precipitated eschatology with the temple as the catalyst, yet they do not clearly delineate such expectations of the temple.

Conclusion

This investigation into the eschatological role of the Jerusalem temple in exilic and post-exilic documents before the Roman destruction of the temple has yielded results.⁹ This investigation specifically focused on those documents that dealt with the Jerusalem temple and examined what eschatological role the temple was expected to perform for the benefit of the people.¹⁰

Some writings of this time period were found to be supportive of a connection between eschatology and the Jerusalem temple. This group would include the *Apocryphon of Ezekiel*, the third *Sibylline Oracle*, and 2 Maccabees. However, there is a group of texts that goes beyond such support to present a precipitated eschatology, with

⁹Lundquist notes the pervasiveness of the Jerusalem temple as it can be concluded “that the Temple of Jerusalem, from its beginnings, is embedded within, represents, and evokes a symbolism that permeates all aspects of biblical teaching and doctrine, both within the Hebrew Bible, within the New Testament, within the Dead Sea/Qumran community, and within the vast Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical scriptural literature.” Lundquist, *Jerusalem*, 76.

¹⁰This investigation looked at the actual tasks expected of the new temple, not how it might have functioned as a symbol or a hope. Porteous errs in his conclusion regarding “the process in the Old Testament by which Jerusalem, the chosen city of God, not just the chosen city of David, gradually gave its name as a symbol of the transcendent action of God in creating a people for himself in the world, that is, in bringing in his Kingdom.” Porteous, “Jerusalem-Zion,” 250.

the eschatological role of the Jerusalem temple being the catalyst that enables the eschatological age to begin. This group would include Tobit, Sirach, *I Enoch*, *Jubilees*, *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*, 4Q174, and 11Q19.

With Sirach, *I Enoch*, and *Jubilees*, there is debate over whether this is a human-built temple and therefore a human-precipitated action or a temple built by God and therefore a divinely precipitated action. Either way, the temple is the catalyst in the precipitated eschatological scenario that appears to hasten the new age. The Temple Scroll presents the most detailed precipitated eschatology. This text includes detailed measurements of the ideal temple, proclaiming that it presents the specific, correct, ideal temple that is the exact catalyst that will precipitate the eschatological age.

Recommendation

This investigation into the eschatological role of the Jerusalem temple has shown that between 586 BCE and 70 CE some Jewish writings maintain that the Jerusalem temple is the catalyst precipitating eschatological events, but are there other writings that contain similar ideas? Was this idea in existence before the destruction of the first Jerusalem temple?¹¹ Römer observes something of the contrapositive with the understanding that constructing the temple for the Lord outside of Jerusalem brings destruction.¹² Is there any eschatological role of the Jerusalem temple in the writings before the destruction of the temple or is the eschatological role made manifest in some other way besides that of a catalyst?

¹¹Mottolèse, citing 1 Kgs 6:12-13, holds that for some writings before 586 BCE, there was an idea “already in biblical texts, the nexus between the divine presence and the sanctuary depends on the proper behavior of the people of Israel.” Mottolèse, *Analogy*, 112.

¹²“Le péché impardonnable du Royaume d’Israël n’est pas en premier lieu le culte de Ba’al (celui-ci existe aussi dans le royaume de Juda), mais c’est la construction des temples yahwistes à Béthel et à Dan. Cette insistance sur le seul temple légitime de Yhwh peut néanmoins paraître étonnante dans la mesure où la finale des Rois (2 R 24-25) relate la destruction de ce temple.” Thomas Römer, “Une seule maison pour le Dieu unique? La centralisation du culte dans le Deutéronome et dans l’historiographie deutéronomiste,” in *Quelle maison pour Dieu?* ed. Camille Focant (Paris: Cerf, 2003), 52.

Trajectories of this role for the temple also exist in writings after the Roman destruction of the second Jerusalem temple.¹³ The Targums may contain an eschatological role for the Jerusalem temple.¹⁴ The Christian Scriptures probably do not contain an eschatological role for the Jerusalem temple, though this may deserve attention.¹⁵ Do the Christian Scriptures contain their own catalyst in a precipitated eschatology?¹⁶ Later Rabbinic tradition may hold to some eschatological role for the Jerusalem temple, meriting research.¹⁷ “The third Temple, according to orthodox Jews,

¹³The obvious texts for this research would be *4 Ezra*, *2 Baruch*, and the Apocalypse. In *2 Baruch*, there may very well be an eschatological role for the Jerusalem temple, although it is not strongly proclaimed.

¹⁴Chilton notes that a “picture of the Temple as the place of eschatological restoration in the *Isaiah Targum* finds resonance in the other prophetic Targumim.” Bruce Chilton, “Temple Restored, Temple in Heaven: Isaiah and the Prophets in the Targumim,” in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*, ed. James M. Scott (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 349.

¹⁵Townsend notes a vague reference to some eschatological emanation from Zion in Rom 11:26. John T. Townsend, “The Jerusalem Temple in the First Century,” in *God and His Temple: Reflections on Professor Samuel Terrien’s The Elusive Presence: Toward a New Biblical Theology*, ed. Lawrence E. Frizzell (South Orange, NJ: Seton Hall University, Institute of Judaeo-Christian Studies, 1981), 56. However, Witherington explains, “Paul shows little or no interest in either the future of cultic religion in Jerusalem or Jewish territorial theology.” Ben Witherington III, *Jesus, Paul, and the End of the World: A Comparative Study in New Testament Eschatology* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1992), 51. Price seems to agree that this area will not yield results, as he notes, “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.” Price, “Desecration and Restoration,” 559. Although Davies understands 2 Thessalonians to show the Jerusalem temple to be standing at a pivotal eschatological time, he concludes his investigation into Paul and the Jerusalem temple with the idea that “Paul’s attitude to the Jerusalem temple concludes, therefore, with ambiguities and possibilities only.” W. D. Davies, *The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine* (Berkeley: University of California, 1974), 194. De Young maintains that the Christian ideas went the opposite direction. “It has been shown that the New Testament, unlike ancient Judaism, turns the faith and hope of the Christian away from the earthly Jerusalem, and for that matter, away from all earthly cities, hence from any eschatological hope or religious interest in a rebuilt temple and city.” De Young, *Jerusalem*, 117. Rowland notes that the relationship between the Church and the Jerusalem temple was ambivalent. Christopher Rowland, “The Temple in the New Testament,” in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*, ed. John Day (New York: T. & T. Clark, 2005), 469. Wardle interprets 1 Cor 3:16-17 so as to illuminate “the Christian community as a new, eschatological temple is deeply embedded in early Christian tradition and appears throughout the New Testament.” Wardle, *Jerusalem Temple*, 2.

¹⁶Witherington makes the point of precipitated eschatology in the Christian Scriptures. “Though the closure is in divine hands, the implications are that preparation for it to a large extent rests in human hands.” Witherington, *Jesus*, 180. What hastens the day in 2 Pet 3:12? If something is “hastening the coming day of God,” then there may be a different catalyst in the Christian Scriptures.

¹⁷There seem to be some lines of thought that Kabbalah does contain an eschatological role. Alemanno holds that the temple works as a giant talisman drawing down spiritual power. Moshe Idel, “The Magical and Neoplatonic Interpretations of the Kabbalah in the Renaissance,” in *Jewish Thought in the*

will be built only when the Messiah comes, and when God orders it; for many Christians this will herald the Second Coming. For both groups it will mark the End of Days.”¹⁸

Sixteenth Century, ed. Bernard D. Cooperman (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983), 203. Goldish phrases this postulation as that he understood the “Temple as a sort of astral magnet, a giant Talisman designed to draw down the beneficent divine efflux.” Matt Goldish, “Some Trends in Temple Studies from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment,” in *The Temple of Jerusalem: From Moses to the Messiah In Honor of Professor Louis H. Feldman*, ed. Steven Fine (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 312. Mottolose notes of Alemanno that he “often emphasized the astral, magical and talismanic functions of the tabernacle and the temple, endowing their rituals with the power to ‘guard’ and ‘cause the descent’ of spiritual forces.” Mottolose, *Analogy*, 207. Lesley is more specific in interpreting Alemanno’s work. Lesley notes that Alemanno held that “King Solomon sought to make the Temple a microcosm that imitated the macrocosm and thereby to draw the *Shekhina*.” Arthur M. Lesley, “*The Song of Solomon’s Ascents* by Yohanan Alemanno: Love and Human Perfection According to a Jewish Colleague of Giovanni Pico della Mirandola” (PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1976), 149. Idel notes that “*Shir ha-Ma’alot* contains another description of the Tabernacle that emphasizes the magical character of the Temple institution.” Idel, “Kabbalah,” 205. Mottolose notes similar lines of research and conclusions. “The most various types of Jewish literature, both ancient and medieval, preserved a stark memory of the past religious institutions (as perennial themes in prayer and exegesis), projected them in the future (as a pivotal part of eschatological expectations).” Mottolose, *Analogy*, 267. However, Mottolose deals more with the eschatological role in how the earthly sanctuary aligns with the supernal sanctuary, rather than specifically and exclusively with the physical sanctuary as the present research has done. Yet, his work notes that “different wholes of the Jewish High-Middle Ages already re-emphasized the eschatological or celestial reality of the Temple and Jerusalem.” *Ibid.*, 189. Wolfson notes that the synagogue has “a sacredness that was characteristic of the Temple. Indeed, the role of the latter in this process is still much in evidence even after it has been physically destroyed.” Elliot R. Wolfson, “Sacred Space and Mental Iconography: *Imago Templi* and Contemplation in Rhineland Jewish Pietism,” in *Ki Baruch hu: Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Judaic Studies in Honor of Baruch A. Levine*, ed. Robert Chazan, William W. Hallo, and Lawrence H. Schiffman (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999), 615.

¹⁸Goldhill, *Temple*, 59.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abadie, Philippe. "Le temple de Jérusalem au retour d'exil: Entre histoire et symbolique." In *Quelle maison pour Dieu?* edited by Camille Focant, 143-175. Paris: Cerf, 2003.
- Abegg, Martin G., Jr. "Exile and the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*, edited by James M. Scott, 111-125. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- _____. "The Qumran Sectarian Manuscripts (with Morphological Tags)," 2001. *BibleWorks 6.0.009i*. Norfolk, VA: BibleWorks, 2003.
- Abegg, Martin G., Jr., Peter Flint, and Eugene Ulrich. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time into English*. New York: HarperCollins, 1999.
- Achtemeier, Elizabeth. *Nahum-Malachi*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1986.
- Achtemeier, Paul J. "Mark, Gospel of." *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992. 4:541-557.
- Ackroyd, Peter R. *Exile and Restoration: A Study of Hebrew Thought of the Sixth Century B.C.* Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968.
- Aitken, James K. "Apocalyptic, Revelation, and Early Jewish Wisdom Literature." In *New Heaven and New Earth Prophecy and the Millennium: Essays in Honour of Anthony Gelston*, edited by P. J. Harland and C. T. R. Hayward, 181-193. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Albertz, Rainer. *From the Exile to the Maccabees*. Vol. 2 of the *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period*. Translated by John Bowden. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994.
- Allegro, J. M. "Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrašim." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 77 (1958): 350-354.
- Allen, Leslie C. *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, and Micah*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1976.
- _____. *Ezekiel 1-19*. Word Biblical Commentary 28. Dallas, TX: Word, 1994.

- _____. *Ezekiel 20–48*. Word Biblical Commentary 29. Dallas, TX: Word, 1990.
- Andersen, F. I. “Who Built the Second Temple?” *Australian Biblical Review* 6 (1958): 1-35.
- Anderson, Bernhard W. “Creation and Ecology.” In *Creation in the Old Testament*, edited by Bernhard W. Anderson, 156-167. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- _____. *Understanding the Old Testament*. 4th ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1986.
- Anderson, Gary A. *Sacrifices and Offerings in Ancient Israel: Studies in Their Social and Political Importance*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Argall, Randal A. *1 Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative Literary and Conceptual Analysis of the Themes of Revelation, Creation, and Judgment*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Asher ha-Levi, Eleazar ben, Jerahmeel ben Solomon, and Pseudo-Philo. *The Hebrew Fragments of Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum Preserved in the Chronicles of Jerahmeel*. Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature, 1974.
- Aune, David E. “Eschatology (Early Christian).” *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992. 2:594-609
- _____. *Revelation 17-22*. Nashville: Nelson, 1998.
- Aune, David E., and Eric Stewart. “From the Idealized Past to the Imaginary Future: Eschatological Restoration in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature.” In *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*, edited by James M. Scott, 147-177. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Aus, Roger. *II Thessalonians*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1984.
- Bähr, Karl C. W. F. *Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus*. Vol. 1. Heidelberg: Mohr, 1837.
- Bailey, Kenneth E. *Jesus through Middle Eastern Eyes: Cultural Studies in the Gospels*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2008.
- Baker, David W. *Joel, Obadiah, Malachi*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2006.
- Baldwin, Joyce G. *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi: An Introduction and Commentary*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1972.
- Barker, Margaret. “The Archangel Raphael in the Book of Tobit.” In *Studies in the Book of Tobit: A Multidisciplinary Approach*, edited by Mark Bredin, 118-128. London: T. & T. Clark, 2006.

- _____. "Enthronement and Apotheosis: The Vision in Revelation 4-5." In *New Heaven and New Earth Prophecy and the Millennium: Essays in Honour of Anthony Gelston*, edited by P. J. Harland and C. T. R. Hayward, 217-227. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- _____. *The Gate of Heaven: The History and Symbolism of the Temple in Jerusalem*. London: SPCK, 1991.
- _____. *Temple Theology: An Introduction*. London: SPCK, 2004.
- Bassler, Jouette M. "Second Thessalonians." *HarperCollins Study Bible*. Edited by Wayne A. Meeks, 2225-2228. New York: HarperCollins, 1993.
- Bauckham, Richard. "Apocalypses." In *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*, vol. 1 of the *Justification and Variegated Nomism*, edited by D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid, 135-188. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- _____. "James and the Gentiles (Acts 15.13-21)." In *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts*, edited by Ben Witherington III, 154-184. Cambridge: University Press, 1996.
- _____. *New Testament Theology: The Theology of the Book of Revelation*. Cambridge: University Press, 1993.
- _____. "Tobit as a Parable for the Exiles of Northern Israel." In *Studies in the Book of Tobit: A Multidisciplinary Approach*, edited by Mark Bredin, 140-164. London: T. & T. Clark, 2006.
- Baumgartner, Albert I. "The Pursuit of the Millennium in Early Judaism." In *Tolerance and Intolerance in Early Judaism and Christianity*, edited by Graham Stanton, 38-60. Cambridge: University Press, 1998.
- _____. "The Role of Jerusalem and the Temple in 'End of Days' Speculation in the Second Temple Period." In *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, edited by Lee I. Levine, 77-89. New York: Continuum, 1999.
- Beale, G. K. *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004.
- Beall, Todd S., William A. Banks, and Colin Smith. *Old Testament Parsing Guide: Job-Malachi*. Chicago: Moody, 1990.
- Beckwith, Roger T. "The Temple Scroll and Its Calendar: Their Character and Purpose." *Revue de Qumran* 18 (1997): 3-20.
- Bedford, Peter R. *Temple Restoration in Early Achaemenid Judah*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

- Beentjes, Pancratius C. "The Book of Ben Sira and Deuteronomistic Heritage: A Critical Approach." In *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*, edited by Hanne von Weissenberg, Juha Pakkala, and Marko Marttila, 275-296. Berlin: Gruyter, 2011.
- Bell, Lanny. "The New Kingdom 'Divine' Temple: The Example of Luxor." In *Temples of Ancient Egypt*, edited by Byron E. Shafer, 127-184, 281-302. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997.
- Berges, Ulrich. "Der neue Himmel und die neue erde im Jesajabuch: Eine Auslegung zu Jesaja 65:17 und 66:22." In *The New Things: Eschatology in Old Testament Prophecy Festschrift for Henk Leene*, edited by F. Postma, K. Spronk, and E. Talstra, 9-15. Maastricht, Netherlands: Uitgeverij Shaker, 2002.
- Best, Ernest. *A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.
- Betz, Otto. "Jesus and the Temple Scroll." In *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by James H. Charlesworth, 75-103. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Beuken, Wim. "Does Trito-Isaiah Reject the Temple? An Intertextual Inquiry into Isa. 66:1-6." In *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersel*, edited by Sipke Draisma, 53-66. Kampen, Netherlands: Uitgeversmaatschappij J. H. Kok, 1989.
- Beverley, Thomas. *The Pattern of the Divine Temple, Sanctuary, and City of the New Jerusalem Measured according to Ezekiel's Last and Greatest Vision, Chap. 40 to the End*. London: John Salusbury, 1690.
- Beyerle, Stefan. "'Release Me to Go to My Everlasting Home . . .' (Tob 3:6): A Belief in an Afterlife in Late Wisdom Literature." In *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology*, edited by Geza G. Zeravits and Jozsef Zsengeller, 71-88. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Bicknell, E. J. *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*. London: Methuen, 1932.
- Birch, Bruce C., Walter Brueggemann, Terence E. Fretheim, and David L. Petersen. *A Theological Introduction to the Old Testament*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1999.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Ezekiel*. Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1990.
- _____. *A History of Prophecy in Israel*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.
- _____. *Isaiah 1-39: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday, 2000.

- _____. *Isaiah 56–66: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday, 2003.
- Block, Daniel I. *The Book of Ezekiel*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Bloch-Smith, Elizabeth. “‘Who Is the King of Glory?’ Solomon’s Temple and Its Symbolism.” In *Scripture and Other Artifacts: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Honor of Philip J. King*, edited by Michael D. Coogan, J. Cheryl Exum, and Lawrence E. Stager, 18-31. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Boda, Mark J. “Haggai: Master Rhetorician.” *Tyndale Bulletin* 51 (2000): 295-304.
- _____. *Haggai, Zechariah*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2004.
- _____. “Hoy, Hoy: The Prophetic Origins of the Babylonian Tradition in Zechariah 2:10-17.” In *Tradition in Transition: Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 in the Trajectory of Hebrew Theology*, edited by Mark J. Boda and Michael H. Floyd, 171-190. New York: T. & T. Clark, 2008.
- Bogaert, Pierre-Maurice. “La demeure de Dieu selon Jéré et Ézéchiél: La maison, l'exil, ou la ville.” In *Quelle maison pour Dieu?* edited by Camille Focant, 209-228. Paris: Cerf, 2003.
- Boring, M. Eugene. “Early Christian Prophecy.” *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992. 5:495-502.
- Brenton, Lancelot C. L. *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1998.
- Briant, Pierre. *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2002.
- Bright, John. *A History of Israel*. 3rd ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1981.
- Bromiley, Geoffrey W. “Eschatology: The Meaning of the End.” In *God and Culture: Essays in Honor of Carl F. H. Henry*, edited by D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge, 67-84. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Brooke, George J. “The Ten Temples in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” In *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*, edited by John Day, 417-434. New York: T. & T. Clark, 2005.

- Broshi, Magen. "The Gigantic Dimensions of the Visionary Temple in the Temple Scroll." In *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reader for the Biblical Archaeology Review*, edited by Hershel Shanks, 113-115. New York: Random House, 1992.
- Brotzman, Ellis R. *Old Testament Textual Criticism: A Practical Introduction*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1998.
- Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*. 1906. Reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997.
- Brown, Matthew B. *The Gate of Heaven: Insights on the Doctrines and Symbols of the Temple*. American Fork, UT: Covenant Communications, 1999.
- Brown, William P. *Obadiah through Malachi*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.
- Bruce, F. F. *1 and 2 Thessalonians*. Waco, TX: Word, 1982.
- Brueggemann, Walter. *Genesis*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982.
- _____. *Isaiah 40-66*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998.
- _____. *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1997.
- Brunner, Emil. *The Divine Imperative*. Translated by Olive Wyon. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1947.
- Bullard, Roger A., and Howard A. Hatton. *A Handbook on Tobit and Judith*. New York: United Bible Societies, 2001.
- Bullock, C. Hassell. *An Introduction to the Old Testament Prophetic Books*. Chicago: Moody, 1986.
- Burgmann, Hans. "11QT: The Sadducean Torah." In *Temple Scroll Studies: Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll, Manchester, December 1987*, edited by George J. Brooke, 258-263. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- Callaway, Phillip R. "Exegetische erwägungen zur tempelrolle XXIX, 7-10." *Revue de Qumran* 14 (1985): 95-104.
- Calvin, John. *Commentaries on the Twelve Minor Prophets*. Translated by John Owen. Edinburgh: T. Constable, 1848.
- Carroll, John T. "Eschatology." *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000. 1:420-422.

- Carroll, Robert P. *When Prophecy Failed: Reactions and Responses to Failure in the Old Testament Prophetic Traditions*. 1979. Reprint, London: Xpress Reprints, 1996.
- Casciaro, Jose Maria, ed. *The Navarre Bible: Chronicles-Maccabees*. New York: Scepter, 2003.
- Cathcart, K. J. "Day of YAHWEH." *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992. 2:84-85.
- Causse, Antonin. "De la Jérusalem terrestre à la Jérusalem celeste." *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuse* 18 (1938): 12-36.
- _____. "Du groupe ethnique à la communauté religieuse: Le problème sociologique du Judaïsme." *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 14 (1934): 285-335.
- _____. "Le mythe de la nouvelle Jerusalem du Deutero-Esaie à la IIIe Sibylle." *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 18 (1938), 377-414.
- Chance, James B. "Jerusalem and the Temple in Lucan Eschatology." PhD dissertation, Duke University, 1984.
- Chapra, Steven C., and Raymond P. Canale. *Numerical Methods for Engineers with Personal Computer Applications*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1985.
- Charles, Robert Henry. *1 Enoch*. Oxford: University Press, 1912.
- _____. *Eschatology: The Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, Judaism, and Christianity: A Critical History*. New York: Schocken, 1963.
- _____. *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902.
- Charlesworth, James H. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- _____, ed. *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- _____. "Old Testament Apocrypha." *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992. 5:292-294.
- Chester, Andrew. *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Crossroad, 1990.
- _____. "The Sibyl and the Temple." In *Templum Amicitiae*, edited by William Horbury, 37-69. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Isaiah*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- Chilton, Bruce D. *The Glory of Israel: The Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1982.

- _____. "Temple Restored, Temple in Heaven: Isaiah and the Prophets in the Targumim." In *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*, edited by James M. Scott, 335-362. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Chisholm, Robert B., Jr. *Interpreting the Minor Prophets*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1990.
- Clements, Ronald E. *The Book of Deuteronomy*. London: Epworth Press, 2001.
- _____. *Ezekiel*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.
- _____. *God and Temple*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.
- Clifford, Richard J. *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972.
- _____. *Deuteronomy with an Excursus on Covenant and Law*. Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1982.
- Clines, David J. A., ed. *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. Vol. 4. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- _____, ed. *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. Vol. 6. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2007.
- _____. "Haggai's Temple: Constructed, Deconstructed, and Reconstructed." *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 7 (1993): 51-77.
- _____. *Interested Parties: The Ideology of Writers and Readers of the Hebrew Bible*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Clorfene, Chaim. *The Messianic Temple: Understanding Ezekiel's Prophecy*. Jerusalem: C. Clorfene, 2005.
- Clowney, Edmund P. "The Final Temple." In *Prophecy in the Making: Messages Prepared for Jerusalem Conference on Biblical Prophecy*, edited by Carl F. H. Henry, 71-88. Carol Stream, IL: Creation House, 1971.
- Cody, Aelred. *Ezekiel: With an Excursus on Old Testament Priesthood*. Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1984.
- Coggins, Richard J. *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987.
- _____. *Sirach*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Cohen, Abraham, and Avraham J. Rosenberg. *The Twelve Prophets: Hebrew Text and English Translation*. New York: Soncino Press, 1994.

- Cohen, Shaye J. D. *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*. 2nd ed. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006.
- Cohn, Norman. *Cosmos, Chaos, and the World to Come*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993.
- Collins, Adela Y. "The Dream of a New Jerusalem at Qumran." In *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 3 of *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, edited by James H. Charlesworth, 231-254. Waco, TX: Baylor, 2006.
- _____. "Revelation, Book of." *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992. 5:694-708.
- Collins, John J. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. 2nd ed. Livonia, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- _____. "Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1999. 2:403-430.
- _____. *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- _____. *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000.
- _____. "Eschatology." *Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010. 594-598.
- _____. "From Prophecy to Apocalypticism: The Expectation of the End." In *The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*, vol. 1 of the *Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism*, edited by John J. Collins, 129-161. New York: Continuum, 1998.
- _____. *Jerusalem and the Temple in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature of the Second Temple Period*. International Rennert Guest Lecture Series 1. Jerusalem: Ingeborg Rennert Center for Jerusalem Studies, 1998.
- _____. "The Judaism of the Book of Tobit." In *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology*, edited by Geza G. Zeravits and Jozsef Zsengeller, 23-40. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- _____. "Sibylline Oracles: A New Translation and Introduction." *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983. 1:317-372
- _____. *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism*. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1974.

- Congar, Yves M.-J. *The Mystery of the Temple, or, The Manner of God's Presence to His Creatures from Genesis to the Apocalypse*. Translated by Reginald F. Trevett. London: Burns and Oates, 1962.
- Cooke, G. A. *The Book of Ezekiel*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1951.
- Cooper, Lamar E. *Ezekiel*. Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1994.
- Corbin, Henry. *Temple and Contemplation*. Translated by Philip Sherrard. London: KPI, 1986.
- Cornelius, I. "Paradise Motifs." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 14 (1988): 41-83.
- Couturier, Guy, Jean-Claude Petit, André Charron, and André Myre. *Où demeures-tu? Jn 1,38: La maison depuis le monde biblique: En hommage au professeur Guy Couturier à l'occasion de ses soixante-cinq ans*. Saint-Laurent, QC: Fides, 1994.
- Cox, Claude E. "Schaper's Eschatology Meets Kraus's Theology of the Psalms." In *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma*, edited by Robert J. V. Hiebert, Claude E. Cox, and Peter J. Gentry, 289-311. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Craghan, John. *Esther, Judith, Tobit, Jonah, Ruth*. Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1982.
- Craigie, Peter C. *Ezekiel*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983.
- _____. *Psalms 1-50*. Waco, TX: Word, 1983.
- Crawford, Sidnie W. *The Temple Scroll and Related Texts*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Crenshaw, James L. "The Book of Sirach." *New Interpreter's Bible*. Edited by Leander E. Keck et al. Nashville: Abingdon, 1994. 4:603-867.
- Cross, Frank M. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of Religion of Israel*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- _____. "The Tabernacle: A Study from an Archaeological and Historical Approach." *Biblical Archaeologist* 10 (1947): 45-68.
- Culley, Robert C. "The Temple in Psalms 84, 63, and 42-43." In *Où demeures-tu? Jn 1,38: La maison depuis le monde biblique: En hommage au professeur Guy Couturier à l'occasion de ses soixante-cinq ans*, edited by Guy Couturier et al., 187-197. Saint-Laurent, QC: Fides, 1994.
- Currid, John D. *A Study Commentary on Exodus*. Vol. 2. Darlington, UK: Evangelical Press, 2001.

- Dahood, Mitchell. *Psalms I, 1-50: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday, 1966.
- Dancy, J. C. *The Shorter Books of the Apocrypha*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- Darr, Katheryn P. "The Book of Ezekiel." *New Interpreter's Bible*. Edited by Leander E. Keck et al. Nashville: Abingdon, 2001. 6:1073-1607
- Davenport, Gene L. *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- Davidson, Richard M. "The Eschatological Literary Structure of the Old Testament." In *Creation, Life, and Hope: Essays in Honor of Jacques B. Doukhan*, edited by Jiří Moskala, 349-366. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2000.
- _____. *Flame of Yahweh: Sexuality in the Old Testament*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007.
- Davies, W. D. *The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.
- Day, John, ed. *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*. London: T. & T. Clark, 2005.
- DeClaissé-Walford, Nancy L. *Reading from the Beginning: The Shaping of the Hebrew Psalter*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997.
- Deines, Roland. "The Pharisees Between 'Judaisms' and 'Common Judaism.'" In *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*, vol. 1 of the *Justification and Variegated Nomism*, edited by D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid, 443-504. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2001.
- Demarest, Gary W. *1 & 2 Thessalonians, 1 & 2 Timothy, Titus*. Waco, TX: Word, 1984.
- DeSilva, David A. *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2002.
- _____. "Sirach." *Dictionary of New Testament Background*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter, 1116-1124. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000.
- DeVine, C. F. "Tobit." *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*. Edited by Bernard Orchard et al., 393-402. New York: Nelson, 1953.
- De Young, J. C. *Jerusalem in the New Testament: The Significance of the City in the History of Redemption and in Eschatology*. Kampen, Netherlands: Kok, 1960.

- Deurloo, Darel A. "King and Temple: David in the Eschatology of the Prophets." In *The New Things: Eschatology in Old Testament Prophecy Festschrift for Henk Leene*, edited by F. Postma, K. Spronk, and E. Talstra, 49-60. Maastricht, Netherlands: Uitgeverij Shaker, 2002.
- Di Lella, Alexander A. "The Deuteronomistic Background of the Farewell Discourse of Tob 14:3-11." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 41 (1979): 380-389.
- _____. "Wisdom of Ben Sira." *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992. 6:931-945.
- Dictionary of Biblical Imagery*. Edited by Ryken, Leland, Jim Wilhoit, Tremper Longman, Colin Duriez, Douglas Penney, and Daniel G. Reid. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1998.
- Dimant, Devorah. "Qumran Sectarian Literature." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, edited by Michael E. Stone, 483-550. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Doran, Robert. "I and II Maccabees." In *The Books of the Bible: The Apocrypha and The New Testament*, edited by Bernhard W. Anderson, 93-114. New York: Scribner, 1989.
- _____. "The Second Book of Maccabees: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections." *New Interpreter's Bible*. Edited by Leander E. Keck et al. Nashville: Abingdon, 1994. 4:181-299.
- _____. *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees*. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1981.
- Doukhan, Jacques B. "The Literary Structure of the Genesis Creation Story." ThD dissertation, Andrews University, 1978.
- _____. *Secrets of Revelation: The Apocalypse through Hebrew Eyes*. Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 2002.
- Dow, Lois K. F. *Images of Zion: Biblical Antecedents for the New Jerusalem*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2010.
- Duguid, Iain M. *Ezekiel*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1999.
- Duling, Dennis C. *The New Testament: History, Literature, and Social Context*. 4th ed. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth, 2003.
- Dumm, D. "Tobit (Tobias), Book of." *New Catholic Encyclopedia*. 2nd ed. Detroit, MI: Gale, 2003. 1:95-97.

- Dunn, James D. G. *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Durham, John I. “אלהים and the Presence of God.” In *Proclamation and Presence: Old Testament Essays in Honour of Gwynne Henton Davies*, edited by John I. Durham and J. R. Porter, 272-293. London: SCM Press, 1970.
- Egenolf, Hans-Andreas. *The Second Epistle to the Thessalonians*. New York: Crossroad, 1981.
- Eichrodt, Walther. “Der neue Tempel in der Heilshoffnung Hesekiels.” In *Das ferne und nahe Wort*, edited by Fritz Maass, 37-48. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1967.
- _____. *Ezekiel*. Translated by Cosslett Quin. London: SCM Press, 1970.
- Eisemann, Moshe. *Yechezkel: The Book of Ezekiel: A New Translation with a Commentary Anthologized from Talmudic, Midrashic, and Rabbinic Sources*. Brooklyn, NY: Mesorah, 2009.
- Eliade, Mircea. *The Sacred and the Profane; The Nature of Religion*. Translated by Willard R. Trask. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1959.
- Elias, Jacob W. *1 and 2 Thessalonians*. Believers Church Bible Commentary. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 1995.
- Ellul, Jacques. *The Meaning of the City*. Translated by Dennis Pardee. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1970.
- Emmerson, Grace I. *Isaiah 56-66*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Esler, Phillip F. “2 Thessalonians.” *Oxford Bible Commentary*. Edited by John Barton and John Muddiman, 1213-1220. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Evans, Craig A. “Aspects of Exile and Restoration in the Proclamation of Jesus.” In *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*, edited by James M. Scott, 299-328. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Evans, Craig A., and Peter W. Flint. *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Eybers, I. H. “The Book of Ezekiel and the Sect of Qumran.” In *Studies on the Book of Ezekiel: Papers Read at 4th Meeting Held at Bloemfontein, 31 January-3 February 1961*, S.A. Society for the Study of the Old Testament, 1-9. Potchefstroom, South Africa: Pro Rege, 1961.
- Fee, Gordon D. *The First and Second Letters to the Thessalonians*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009.

- Feinberg, Charles L. *The Minor Prophets*. Chicago: Moody, 1977.
- _____. "The Rebuilding of the Temple." In *Prophecy in the Making: Messages Prepared for Jerusalem Conference on Biblical Prophecy*, edited by Carl F. H. Henry, 91-112. Carol Stream, IL: Creation House, 1971.
- Feldman, Louis. H. "Prolegomenon." In *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo*, translated by M. R. James, ix-clxix. New York: Ktav, 1971.
- Ferch, Arthur J. "The two Aeons and the Messiah in *Pseudo-Philo*, 4 *Ezra*, and 2 *Baruch*." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 15 (1977): 135-151.
- Finitsis, Antonios. *Visions and Eschatology: A Socio-Historical Analysis of Zechariah 1-6*. New York: T. & T. Clark, 2011.
- Fisch, Solomon, and Avraham J. Rosenberg. *Ezekiel: Hebrew Text and English Translation with an Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Soncino Press, 1994.
- Fidell, Steven A. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Understanding Their Spiritual Message*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, 1997.
- Fishbane, Michael. *Haftarot: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2002.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "Tobit." *Oxford Bible Commentary*. Edited by John Barton and John Muddiman, 626-632. London: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- _____. *Tobit*. New York: Gruyter, 2003.
- Flint, Peter W., and James C. VanderKam, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1998-1999.
- _____. *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, and Christianity*. San Francisco: Harper, 2002.
- Floyd, Michael H. *Minor Prophets: Part 2*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Flusser, David. *Judaism of the Second Temple Period*. Translated by Azzan Yadin. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007.
- _____. "Psalms, Hymns, and Prayers." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, edited by Michael E. Stone, 551-577. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Fraade, Steven D. "Rhetoric and Hermeneutics in Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah (4QMMT): The Case of the Blessings and Curses." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 10 (2003): 150-161.

- Frame, James E. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1953.
- Frankfort, Henri. *Kingship and the Gods: A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Integration of Society and Nature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.
- Frankfort, Henri. *Ancient Egyptian Religion*. 1948. Reprint, New York: Harper & Row, 1961.
- Fredenburg, Brandon L. *Ezekiel*. College Press NIV Commentary. Joplin, MO: College Press, 2002.
- Fredriksen, Paula. *Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews*. New York: Random House, 1999.
- Fröhlich, Ida. "Tobit against the Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology*, edited by Geza G. Zeravits and Jozsef Zsengeller, 55-70. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Frost, Stanley B. "Eschatology and Myth." *Vetus Testamentum* 2 (1952): 70-80.
- Fujita, Shozo. "The Temple Theology of the Qumran Sect and the Book of Ezekiel: Their Relationship to Jewish Literature of the Last Two Centuries B. C." ThD dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1970.
- Furnish, Victor P. *1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians*. Nashville: Abingdon, 2007.
- Gage, Warren A. *The Gospel of Genesis: Studies in Protology and Eschatology*. Winona Lake, IN: Carpenter Books, 1984.
- Gaines, Elizabeth A. "The Eschatological Jerusalem: The Function of the Image in the Literature of the Biblical Period." PhD dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1988.
- Galambush, Julie. *Jerusalem in the Book of Ezekiel: The City as the Lord's Wife*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Gane, Roy E. *Cult and Character: Purification Offerings, Day of Atonement, and Theodicy*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005.
- Gärtner, Bertil. *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament: A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament*. Cambridge: University Press, 1965.
- George, A. R. *House Most High: The Temples of Ancient Mesopotamia*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1993.

- Gese, Hartmut. *Der Verfassungsentwurf des Ezechiel (Kap. 40–48)*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1957.
- Gesenius, Wilhelm, E. Kautzsch, and A. E. Cowley. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.
- Gesenius, Wilhelm, and Samuel P. Tregelles. *Gesenius' Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament Scriptures*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1957.
- Giblin, Charles H. "The Second Letter to the Thessalonians." *New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Edited by Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990. 871-875.
- Giffin, P. "Tobit." *A New Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*. Edited by Reginald C. Fuller. Nashville: Nelson, 1975. 397-402.
- Gillingham, Susan. "The Zion Tradition and the Editing of the Hebrew Psalter." In *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*, edited by John Day, 308-341. London: T. & T. Clark, 2005.
- Ginzberg, Louis. *Bible Times and Characters: From the Creation to Jacob*. Vol. 1 of *The Legends of the Jews*. Translated by Henrietta Szold. 1907. Reprint, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- Glazier-McDonald, Beth. "Haggai." *Women's Bible Commentary*. Edited by Carol A. Newsom and Sharon H. Ringe. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992. 228-229.
- _____. "Zechariah." *Women's Bible Commentary*. Edited by Carol A. Newsom and Sharon H. Ringe. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992. 230-231.
- Goldhill, Simon. *The Temple of Jerusalem*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005.
- Goldingay, John E. *Isaiah*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2001.
- Goldingay, John E., and Pamela J. Scalise. *Minor Prophets II*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2009.
- Goldish, Matt. "Some Trends in Temple Studies from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment." In *The Temple of Jerusalem: From Moses to the Messiah in Honor of Professor Louis H. Feldman*, edited by Steven Fine, 303-327. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Goldstein, Jonathan A. *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday, 1983.

- Gorenberg, Gershom. *The End of Days: Fundamentalism and the Struggle for the Temple Mount*. New York: Free Press, 2000.
- Görg, M., “צִיּוֹן.” *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren, John T Willis, Heinz-Josef Fabry, David E Green, and Douglas W Stott. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974. 6:421-438.
- Gorman, Frank H., Jr. *The Ideology of Ritual: Space, Time, and Status in the Priestly Theology*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.
- Gowan, Donald E. *Eschatology in the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2000.
- Grabbe, Lester L. “Tobit.” *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible*. Edited by John W. Rogerson. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003. 736-747.
- Gray, Timothy C. *The Temple in the Gospel of Mark: A Study in Its Narrative Role*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2010.
- Greenberg, Moshe. “The Design and Themes of Ezekiel’s Program of Restoration.” *Interpretation* 38 (1984): 181-208.
- _____. *Ezekiel 1–20: A New Translation*. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- _____. *Ezekiel 21-37: A New Translation*. New York: Doubleday, 1997.
- Groves, J. A. “Zion Traditions.” *Dictionary of Old Testament Historical Books*. Edited by Bill T. Arnold and H. G. M. Williamson. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2005. 1019-1025.
- Gunkel, Hermann. *Schöpfung und chaos in urzeit und endzeit*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1895.
- Gunkel, Hermann, and Joachim Begrich. *Introduction to the Psalms: The Genres of the Religious Lyric of Israel*. Translated by James D. Nogalski. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1998.
- Haag, Herbert. *Was lehrt die literarische untersuchung des Ezechiël-Texts? Eine philologisch-theologische studie*. Freiburg in der Schweiz: Verlag der Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1943.
- Hailey, Homer. *A Commentary on Isaiah with Emphasis on the Messianic Hope*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1985.
- Hals, Ronald M. *Ezekiel*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1989.
- Hamerton-Kelly, R. G. “The Temple and the Origins of Jewish Apocalyptic.” *Vetus Testamentum* 20 (1970): 1-15.

- Hanhart, Robert, and Alfred Rahlfs, eds. *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta 70 interpretes: Duo volumina in uno*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.
- Hanson, Paul D. *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.
- _____. *Isaiah 40-66*. Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1995.
- Haran, Menahem. "The Ark and the Cherubim." *Israel Exploration Journal* 9 (1959): 30-38, 89-94.
- _____. "Divine Presence in the Israelite Cult and the Cultic Institutions." *Biblica* 50 (1969): 251-267.
- _____. "The Law-Code of Ezekiel XL-XLVIII and Its Relation to the Priestly School." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 50 (1979): 45-71.
- _____. "Temple and Community in Ancient Israel." In *Temple in Society*, edited by Michael V. Fox, 17-25. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1989.
- _____. *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel*. 1978. Reprint, Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995.
- Hardy, Daniel W. "Creation and Eschatology." In *The Doctrine of Creation: Essays in Dogmatics, History and Philosophy*, edited by Colin E. Gunton, 105-133. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1997.
- Hare, D. R. A. "The Lives of the Prophets: A New Translation and Introduction." *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, edited by James H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1985. 2:379-399.
- Harrington, Daniel J. "2 Maccabees." *HarperCollins Study Bible*. Edited by Wayne A. Meeks. New York: HarperCollins, 1993. 1691-1722.
- _____. "The 'Holy Land' in *Pseudo-Philo*, *4 Ezra*, and *2 Baruch*." In *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, edited by Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Draft, Lawrence H. Shiffman, and Weston W. Fields, 661-672. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- _____. *Invitation to the Apocrypha*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999.
- _____. "*Pseudo-Philo*: A New Translation and Introduction." *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1983. 2:297-378.
- Harrington, Hannah K. "Biblical Law at Qumran." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, vol. 1, edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam, 160-185. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

- _____. *The Impurity Systems of Qumran and the Rabbis: Biblical Foundations*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.
- Hartman, Louis F. "Eschatology." *Encyclopaedia Judaica*. 2nd ed., vol. 6. Edited by Fred Skolnik. Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 2007. 489-500.
- Harton, George M. "Fulfillment of Deuteronomy 28-30 in History and in Eschatology." ThD dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1981.
- Hatina, T. R. "Exile." *Dictionary of New Testament Background*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000. 348-351.
- Hayward, C. T. R. *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook*. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Hellerman, Joseph H. "Purity and Nationalism in Second Temple Literature: 1-2 Maccabees and Jubilees." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 46, no. 3 (September 2003): 401-421.
- Helyer, L. R. "Tobit." *Dictionary of New Testament Background*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000. 1238-1241.
- Hendriksen, William. *Exposition of I and II Thessalonians*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1955.
- Hess, Richard S. "Eden: A Well-Watered Place." *Bible Review* 7, no. 6 (1991): 28-33.
- Hiers, Richard H. "Day of the Lord." *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992. 2:82-83.
- _____. "Eschatology." *Harper's Bible Dictionary*. Edited by Paul J. Achtemeier, 275-277. New York: HarperCollins, 1985.
- _____. "Purification of the Temple: Preparation for the Kingdom of God." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 90 (1971): 82-90.
- Hill, Andrew E. *Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi: An Introduction and Commentary*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2012.
- _____. *Malachi: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday, 1998.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. "The Temple and the Garden of Eden in Ezekiel, the Book of Watchers, and the Wisdom of ben Sira." In *Sacred Places and Profane Spaces: Essays in the Geographics of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, edited by Jamie S Scott and Paul Simpson-Housley, 63-78. New York: Greenwood Press, 1991.

- Hinze, Bradford E. "Eschatology and Ethics." In *The Praxis of the Reign of God: An Introduction to the Theology of Edward Schillebeeckx*, edited by Mary Catherine Hilker and Robert J. Schreier, 167-184. New York: Fordham University Press, 2002.
- Hirsch, Emil G. "Psalms." *The Jewish Encyclopedia: A Descriptive Record of the History, Religion, Literature, and Customs of the Jewish People from the Earliest Times to the Present Day*. Edited by Isidore Singer. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1907. 241-248.
- Hoerth, Alfred J. *Archaeology and the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1998.
- Hoffman, Yair. "Eschatology in the Book of Jeremiah." In *Eschatology in the Bible and in Jewish and Christian Tradition*, edited by Henning G. Reventlow, 75-97. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Holmes, Michael W. *1 and 2 Thessalonians: From Biblical Text . . . to Contemporary Life*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1998.
- Holtz, Shalom E. "God as Refuge and Temple as Refuge in the Psalms." In *The Temple of Jerusalem: From Moses to the Messiah in Honor of Professor Louis H. Feldman*, edited by Steven Fine, 17-26. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Hoppe, Leslie J. *The Holy City: Jerusalem in the Theology of the Old Testament*. Collegetown, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000.
- Horbury, William, ed. *Templum Amicitiae*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- Hornung, Erik. *Idea into Image: Essays on Ancient Egyptian Thought*. Translated by Elizabeth Bredeck. New York: Timken, 1992.
- House, Paul R. *1, 2 Kings*. Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 2003.
- Howard, David M., Jr. *Joshua*. Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1998.
- Hughes, Frank W. *Early Christian Rhetoric and 2 Thessalonians*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
- Hullinger, Jerry M. "A Proposed Solution to the Problem of Animal Sacrifices in Ezekiel 40-48." ThD dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1993.
- Hummel, Horace D. *Ezekiel 1-20*. St. Louis: Concordia, 2005.
- _____. *Ezekiel 21-48*. St. Louis: Concordia, 2007.

- Hurowitz, Victor A. *I Have Built You an Exalted House: Temple Building in the Bible in Light of Mesopotamian and Northwest Semitic Writings*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.
- _____. Review of *Temple Restoration in Early Achaemenid Judah*, by Peter R. Bedford. *Jewish Quarterly Review* 93 (2003): 581-591.
- _____. "YHWH's Exalted House: Aspects of the Design and Symbolism of Solomon's Temple." In *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*, edited by John Day, 63-110. London: T. & T. Clark, 2005.
- Ice, Thomas, and Timothy J. Demy. *The Truth About the Last Days' Temple*. Eugene, OR: Harvest House, 1996.
- Idel, Moshe. "The Magical and Neoplatonic Interpretations of the Kabbalah in the Renaissance." In *Jewish Thought in the Sixteenth Century*, edited by Bernard D. Cooperman, 186-242. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983.
- Isaac, E. "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch: A New Translation and Introduction." *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charleworth, 1:5-89. New York: Doubleday, 1985.
- Isaiah, Abraham Ben, and Benjamin Sharfman. *The Pentateuch and Rashi's Commentary: A Linear Translation into English*. Brooklyn, NY: S. S. & R., 1976.
- Jacobson, Howard. *A Commentary on Pseudo-Plilo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Japhet, Sara. "Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel: Against the Background of the Historical and Religious Tendencies of Ezra-Nehemiah." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 94 (1982): 66-98.
- Jeffery, Grant R. *The New Temple and the Second Coming*. Colorado Springs, CO: Waterbrook Press, 2007.
- Jenner, Konrad D. "The Worship of YHWH on the Holy Mountain in Light of the Idea of the Return: A Short Note on the Confrontation of Theology on the Old Testament and Comparative and Applied Science of Religion." In *The New Things: Eschatology in Old Testament Prophecy Festschrift for Henk Leene*, edited by F. Postma, K. Spronk, and E. Talstra, 129-133. Maastricht, Netherlands: Uitgeverij Shaker, 2002.
- Jenni, Ernst. "Das wort 'olam' im Alten Testament." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 64 (1952): 1-35.
- _____. *Die politischen voraussagen der propheten*. Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1956.

- _____. "Eschatology of the Old Testament." *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by George A. Buttrick. Nashville: Abingdon, 1962. 126-133.
- _____. "עֹלָם." *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Edited by Ernst Jenni and Claus Westermann. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997. 852-862.
- Jenni, Ernst, and Claus Westermann, eds. *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated by Mark E. Biddle. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997.
- Jensen, Hans J. Lundager. "Family, Fertility, and Foul Smell: Tobit and Judith." In *Studies in the Book of Tobit: A Multidisciplinary Approach*, edited by Mark Bredin, 129-139. London: T. & T. Clark, 2006.
- Jensen, Robert W. *Ezekiel*. Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2009.
- Jewett, Robert. *The Thessalonian Correspondence: Pauline Rhetoric and Millenarian Piety*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
- Jocz, Jakob. *The Covenant: A Theology of Human Destiny*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1968.
- Johnson, Luke T. "Luke-Acts, Book of." *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992. 4:403-420.
- Johnstone, William. "The Two Theological Versions of Passover Pericope in Exodus." In *Text as Pretext, Essays in Honour of Robert Davidson*, edited by Robert P. Carroll, 160-178. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
- Jones, Joe R. *A Grammar of Christian Faith: Systematic Explorations in Christian Life and Doctrine*. 2 vols. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002.
- Joüon, Paul, and Takamitsu Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2000.
- Joyce, Paul M. *Divine Initiative and Human Response in Ezekiel*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- _____. *Ezekiel: A Commentary*. New York: T. & T. Clark, 2007.
- _____. "Temple and Worship in Ezekiel 40–48." In *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*, edited by John Day, 145-163. London: T. & T. Clark, 2005.
- Kaiser, Otto. *Isaiah 1-12: A Commentary*. Translated by R. A. Wilson. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1972.
- _____. *Isaiah 1-12: A Commentary*. Translated by John Bowden. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983.

- Kaiser, Walter C. “כֹּהֵן.” *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. Edited by R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke. Chicago: Moody, 1980. 1:411-413.
- Kang, Seung Il. “Creation, Eden, Temple, and Mountain: Textual Presentations of Sacred Space in the Hebrew Bible.” PhD dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 2008.
- Kaplan, Aryeh, and Abraham Sutton. *Innerspace: Introduction to Kabbalah, Meditation, and Prophecy*. Jerusalem: Moznaim, 1990.
- Kasher, Rimon. “Anthropomorphism, Holiness, and Cult: A New Look at Ezekiel 40–48.” *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 110 (1998): 192-208.
- Kaufman, Stephen A. “The Temple Scroll and Higher Criticism.” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 53 (1982): 29-43.
- Kearney, Peter J. “Creation and Liturgy: The P Redaction of Ex 25-40.” *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 89 (1977): 375-387.
- Kearns, C. “Ecclesiasticus, or the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach.” *A New Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*. Edited by Reginald C. Fuller, 541-562. Nashville: Nelson, 1975.
- Kehm, George H. “The New Story: Redemption as Fulfillment of Creation.” In *After Nature’s Revolt: Eco-Justice and Theology*, edited by Dieter T. Hessel, 89-106. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1992.
- Keil, Carl F., and Franz Delitzsch. *Commentary on the Old Testament*. 10 vols. Translated by James Martin. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Kelcy, Raymond C. *The Letters of Paul to the Thessalonians*. Austin, TX: Sweet, 1968.
- Kelley, Page H. *Layman’s Bible Book Commentary: Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1984.
- Kelly, Anthony. *Eschatology and Hope*. New York: Orbis, 2006.
- Kessler, John A. *The Book of Haggai: Prophecy and Society in Early Persian Yehud*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- _____. “The Shaking of the Nations: An Eschatological View.” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 30 (1987): 159-166.
- _____. “Tradition, Continuity, and Covenant in the Book of Haggai: An Alternative Voice from Early Persian Yehud.” In *Tradition in Transition: Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 in the Trajectory of Hebrew Theology*, edited by Mark J. Boda and Michael H. Floyd, 1-39. New York: T. & T. Clark, 2008.

- Kilgallen, John J. *The Stephen Speech: A Literary and Redactional Study of Acts 7, 2-53*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976.
- Kittel, Rudolf, Wilhelm Elliger, and Wilhelm Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1967-1977.
- Kittel, Rudolf, Paul Kahle, Albrecht Alt, Otto Eissfeldt, and Walter Baumgartner, eds. *Biblia Hebraica*. Stuttgart: Privileg Wuürtt Bibelanstalt, 1937.
- Klawans, Jonathan. "The Impurity of Immorality in Ancient Judaism." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 48 (1997): 1-16.
- _____. *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Klein, Ralph W. *Ezekiel: The Prophet and His Message*. Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1988.
- Knibb, Michael A. "Eschatology and Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam, 2:379-402. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- _____. *Essays on the Book of Enoch and Other Early Jewish Texts and Traditions*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- _____. "Temple and Cult in Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal Writings from Before the Common Era." In *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*, edited by John Day, 401-416. New York: T. & T. Clark, 2005.
- Knierim, R. "יָצָא." *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Edited by Ernst Jenni and Claus Westermann. Translated by Mark E. Biddle. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997. 2:862-866.
- Knohl, Israel. *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School*. 1995. Reprint, Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007.
- Knowles, Melody D. *Centrality Practiced: Jerusalem in the Religious Practice of Yehud and the Diaspora in the Persian Period*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Koch, Klaus. *The Babylonian and Persian Periods*. Vol. 2 of *The Prophets*. Translated by Margaret Kohl. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- _____. "יָצָא." *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren, John T. Willis, Heinz-Josef Fabry, David E. Green, and Douglas W. Stott. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999. 10:546-562.

- Kodell, Jerome. *Lamentations, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Obadiah, Joel, Second Zechariah, Baruch*. Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1982.
- Koehler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner, eds. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. 5 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1995-2000.
- Koester, Craig R. *The Dwelling of God: The Tabernacle in the Old Testament, Intertestamental Jewish Literature, and the New Testament*. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1989.
- Koester, Helmut. *Introduction to the New Testament*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.
- Konkel, Michael. "The System of Holiness in Ezekiel's Vision of the New Temple (Ezek 40-48)." A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, San Francisco, CA, November 17, 2011.
- Kraeling, Emil G. *Bible Atlas*. New York: Rand McNally, 1962.
- Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Theology of the Psalms*. Translated by Keith Crim. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1986.
- Kurz, William. *What Does the Bible Say about the End Times? A Catholic View*. Cincinnati, OH: Servant Books, 2004.
- Kutsko, John F. *Between Heaven and Earth: Divine Presence and Absence in the Book of Ezekiel*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000.
- Kysar, Robert. "John, The Gospel of." *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992. 3:912-931.
- Lapsley, Jacqueline E. "Shame and Self-Knowledge: The Positive Role of Shame in Ezekiel's View of the Moral Self." In *The Book of Ezekiel: Theological and Anthropological Perspectives*, edited by Margaret S. Odell and John T. Strong, 143-173. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.
- Lane, William R. "A New Commentary Structure in 4Q Florilegium." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 78 (1959): 343-346.
- LaSor, William S., David A. Hubbard, and Frederic W. Bush. *Old Testament Survey: The Message, Form, and Background of the Old Testament*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Leppäkari, Maria. *The End Is a Beginning: Contemporary Apocalyptic Representations of Jerusalem*. Turku, Finland: Åbo Akademi Förlag, 2002.

- Lesley, Arthur M. “*The Song of Solomon’s Ascents* by Yohanan Alemanno: Love and Human Perfection according to a Jewish Colleague of Giovanni Pico della Mirandola.” PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1976.
- Levenson, John R. “Torah and Covenant in *Pseudo-Philo’s Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*.” In *Bund und Tora*, edited by Friedrich Avemarie and Hermann Lichtenberger, 111-127. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996.
- Levenson, Jon D. *Creation and the Persistence of Evil*. New York: Harper & Row, 1985.
- _____. *Resurrection and the Restoration of Israel: The Ultimate Victory of the God of Life*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006.
- _____. *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible*. Minneapolis, MN: Winston Press, 1985.
- _____. “The Temple and the World.” *Journal of Religion* 64, no. 3 (1984): 275-298.
- _____. *Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40–48*. Cambridge: Scholars Press, 1976.
- Levine, Amy-Jill. “Diaspora as Metaphor: Bodies and Boundaries in the Book of Tobit.” In *Diaspora Jews and Judaism: Essays in Honor of, and in Dialogue with, A. Thomas Kraabel*, edited by J. Andrew Overman and Robert S. MacLennan, 105-117. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Levine, Lee I. *Jerusalem: Portrait of the City in the Second Temple Period (538 B.C.E.-70 C.E.)*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2002.
- Levinson, Bernard M., and Molly M. Zahn. “Revelation Regained: The Hermeneutics of ׀ and ׀ in the Temple Scroll.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 9 (2002): 295-346.
- Lindsey, Hal, and Carole C. Carlson. *The Late Great Planet Earth*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1970.
- Lodahl, Michael. *God of Nature and of Grace: Reading the World in a Wesleyan Way*. Nashville: Abingdon, 2003.
- Long, Stephen. *Divine Economy: Theology and the Market*. New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Luc, Alex. “׀.” *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. Edited by Willem A. VanGemeren. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1997. 3:351.
- Lundquist, John M. “Temple, Covenant, and Law in the Ancient Near East and in the Old Testament.” In *Israel’s Apostasy and Restoration*, edited by Avraham Gileadi, 293-305. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1988.
- _____. *The Temple of Jerusalem: Past, Present, Future*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2008.

- _____. "What Is a Temple?" In *The Quest for the Kingdom of God: Studies in Honor of George E. Mendenhall*, edited by H. B. Huffmon, F. A. Spina, and A. R. W. Green, 205-219. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983.
- Maass, F. "מִתְּהַר." *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997.
- Macaskill, Grant. *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Mack, Burton L. "Sirach." *HarperCollins Study Bible*. Edited by Wayne A. Meeks. New York: HarperCollins, 1993. 1530-1616.
- _____. "Sirach." In *The Books of the Bible: The Apocrypha and The New Testament*, edited by Bernhard W. Anderson, 65-86. New York: Scribner, 1989.
- Maher, Michael. *Genesis*. Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1982.
- Maier, Johann. *The Temple Scroll: An Introduction, Translation, & Commentary*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.
- _____. "The Temple Scroll and Tendencies in the Cultic Architecture of the Second Commonwealth." In *Archeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*, edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, 67-82. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- Malherbe, Abraham J. *The Letters to the Thessalonians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- March, W. Eugene. "The Book of Haggai: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections." *New Interpreter's Bible*. Edited by Leander E. Keck et al. Nashville: Abingdon, 1996. 7:707-732.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *1 and 2 Thessalonians*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1983.
- Martínez, Florentino García. "L'interprétation de la Torah d'Ézéchiél dans les Mss. de Qumran." *Revue de Qumran* 13 (1988): 441-452.
- _____. *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran*. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- _____. "The Temple Scroll and the New Jerusalem." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1999. 2:431-460.
- Martínez, Florentino García, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

- Mason, Rex. *The Books of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi*. Cambridge: University Press, 1977.
- _____. "The Prophets of the Restoration." In *Israel's Prophetic Tradition: Essays in Honour of Peter R. Ackroyd*, edited by Richard Coggins, Anthony Phillips, and Michael Knibb, 137-154. Cambridge: University Press, 1982.
- Mays, James L. *Micah: A Commentary*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976.
- McComiskey, Thomas E. *The Minor Prophets: An Exegetical and Expository Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1998.
- McFadyen, Joseph F. "Haggai." *Abingdon Bible Commentary*. Edited by Frederick C. Eiselen, Edwin Lewis, and David G. Downey. New York: Abingdon, 1929. 815-818.
- McKeating, Henry. *Ezekiel*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- McKelvey, R. J. *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament*. Oxford: University Press, 1969.
- McKenzie, John L. *Second Isaiah: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1968.
- McKim, Donald K. *Westminster Dictionary of Theological Terms*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.
- Meadowcroft, Tim. *Haggai*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2006.
- Meier, John P. "Matthew, Gospel of." *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992. 4:622-641.
- Mendenhall, George E., and Gary A. Herion. "Covenant." *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992. 1:1179-1202.
- Menken, Maarten J. J. *2 Thessalonians*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Mettinger, Tryggve N. D. *The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*. Lund, Sweden: CWK Gleerup, 1982.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *An Introduction to the Apocrypha*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957.
- Meyers, Carol L. "Temple, Jerusalem." *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992. 6:350-369.
- Meyers, Carol L., and Eric M. Meyers. *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday, 1987.

- Michelsen, Leif M. "Deuteronomy 28: A Bible Study." *Themelios* 7 (1970): 4-8.
- Middlemas, Jill. "Divine Reversal and the Role of the Temple." In *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*, edited by John Day, 164-187. London: T. & T. Clark, 2005.
- Milgrom, Jacob. *Leviticus: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. 3 vols. Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday, 1991-2001.
- _____. "The Temple Scroll." *Biblical Archaeologist* 41 (1978): 105-120.
- Milgrom, Jacob, and Daniel I. Block. *Ezekiel's Hope: A Commentary on Ezekiel 38-48*. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2012.
- Milligan, George. *St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians: The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1952.
- Mink, Hans-Aage. "The Use of Scripture in the Temple Scroll and the Status of the Scroll as Law." *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 1 (1987): 20-50.
- Mintz, Sharon L., and Elka Deitsch. *Towards the Eternal Center: Israel, Jerusalem, and the Temple*. New York: Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1996.
- Mitchell, David C. *The Message of the Psalter: An Eschatological Programme in the Book of Psalms*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Mitchell, Hinckley G., John Merlin Powis Smith, and Julius A. Bewer. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, and Jonah*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912.
- Moltmann, Jurgen. *The Future of Creation*. Translated by Margaret Kohl. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- Monson, John M. "The Temple of Solomon: Heart of Jerusalem." In *Zion, City of Our God*, edited by Richard S. Hess and Gordon J. Wenham, 1-22. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Moore, A. L. *1 and 2 Thessalonians*. London: Nelson, 1969.
- Moore, Carey A. *Tobit*. New York: Doubleday, 1996.
- Moore, George Foot. *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim*. Vol. 2. Cambridge: University Press, 1927.
- Morris, Leon. *The Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians: An Introduction and Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1977.
- _____. *1 & 2 Thessalonians*. Dallas, TX: Word, 1989.

- Mottolese, Maurizio. *Analogy in Midrash and Kabbalah: Interpretive Projections of the Sanctuary and Ritual*. Los Angeles: Cherub Press, 2007.
- Motyer, J. Alec. "Haggai." *Minor Prophets: An Exegetical and Expository Commentary*. Edited by Thomas E. McComiskey. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1998. 3:963-1002.
- _____. *The Prophecy of Isaiah: An Introduction & Commentary*. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity, 1993.
- Mowinckel, Sigmund. *He That Cometh*. Translated by G. W. Anderson. Oxford: Blackwell, 1956.
- Mueller, J. R., and S. E. Robinson. "Apocryphon of Ezekiel: A New Translation and Introduction." *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1985. 1:495.
- Murphy, Frederick J. "God in Pseudo-Philo." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period* 19 (June 1988): 1-18.
- _____. *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible*. New York: Oxford, 1993.
- Napier, John G. "The Historical and Biblical Significance of the Messianic Passages in Haggai." ThD dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1984.
- Neher, André. *L'Essence du Prophétisme*. Paris: Universitaires de France, 1955.
- Neil, William. *The Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians*. New York: Harper, 1950.
- Neusner, Jacob, ed. *Dictionary of Judaism in the Biblical Period: 450 B.C.E. to 600 C.E.* New York: Macmillan, 1996.
- Newsome, James D., Jr. *The Hebrew Prophets*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1984.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. *Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins: Diversity, Continuity, and Transformation*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2003.
- _____. *A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1-36; 81-108*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2001.
- _____. "Eschatology (Early Jewish)." *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992. 2:579-2:594.
- _____. *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.
- _____. *E. Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972.

- _____. "Stories of Biblical and Early Post-Biblical Times." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, edited by Michael E. Stone, 33-87. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- _____. "Tobit and Enoch: Distant Cousins with a Recognizable Resemblance." In *George W. E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning*, vol. 1, edited by Jacob Neusner and Alan J. Avery-Peck, 217-239. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- _____. "Tobit." *HarperCollins Study Bible*. Edited by Wayne A. Meeks. New York: HarperCollins, 1993. 1437-1458.
- Niditch, Susan. "Ezekiel 40–48 in a Visionary Context." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 48 (1986): 208-224.
- Nogalski, James D. *The Book of the Twelve: Micah-Malachi*. Macon, GA: Smyth and Helwys, 2011.
- Nowell, Irene. "Tobit." *New Interpreter's Bible*. Edited by Leander E. Keck et al. Nashville: Abingdon, 1999. 3:975-1071.
- Nowell, Irene. "Tobit." *New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Edited by Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1999. 568-571.
- O'Brien, Julia M. *Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*. Nashville: Abingdon, 2004.
- Odell, Margaret S. *Ezekiel*. Macon, GA: Smyth and Helwys, 2005.
- Odell, Margaret S., and John T. Strong. *The Book of Ezekiel: Theological and Anthropological Perspectives*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.
- Odendaal, Dirk H. *The Eschatological Expectation of Isaiah 40-66 with Special Reference to Israel and the Nations*. Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1970.
- O'Hare, Daniel M. *Have You Seen, Son of Man? A Study in the Translation and Vorlage of the LXX Ezekiel 40–48*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.
- Ollenburger, Ben C. *Zion, the City of the Great King: A Theological Symbol of the Jerusalem Cult*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987.
- Oppenheim, A. Leo, ed. *Assyrian Dictionary*. Vol. 1, pt. 2. Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1989.
- Oswalt, John N. *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40-66*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.

- Otzen, Benedikt. *Tobit and Judith*. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. 3rd ed. Edited by F. L. Cross. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Palmer, Earl F. *1 and 2 Thessalonians*. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1983.
- Pannenberg, Wolfhart. *Systematic Theology*. 3 vols. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Patrick, Frank Y. "Haggai and the Return of YHWH." PhD dissertation, Duke University, 2006.
- Patterson, Richard D., and Hermann J. Austel. "1 & 2 Kings." *Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Vol. 4. Edited by Frank E. Gaebelin. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1988.
- Patterson, Stephen J. *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus*. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1993.
- Patton, Corrine L. "Ezekiel's Blueprint for the Temple of Jerusalem." PhD dissertation, Yale University, 1991.
- Paul, Shalom M. *Isaiah 40-66*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2012.
- Pazdan, Mary M. *Joel, Obadiah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1986.
- Peckham, Brian. *History and Prophecy: The Development of Late Judean Literary Traditions*. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- Perez, Gonzalo A. "2 Maccabees." *International Bible Commentary: A Catholic and Ecumenical Commentary for the Twenty-First Century*. Edited by William R. Farmer. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998. 739-750.
- Perrot, Charles. "La 'Maison de Dieu' à l'époque intertestamentaire." In *Quelle maison pour Dieu?* edited by Camille Focant, 229-254. Paris: Cerf, 2003.
- Peters, Norbert. *Das buch Jesus Sirach oder Ecclesiasticus*. Münster, Germany: Aschendorff, 1913.
- Peterson, Brian. "Ezekiel's Rhetoric: Ancient Near Eastern Building Protocol and Shame and Honor as the Keys in Identifying the Builder of the Eschatological Temple." *Journal of Evangelical Theological Society* 56 (2013): 707-731.
- Petersen, David L. "Eschatology (OT)." *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992. 2:575-579.

- _____. *Haggai and Zechariah 1-8: A Commentary*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1984.
- _____. "The Temple in Persian Period Prophetic Texts." In *Second Temple Studies: 1. Persian Period*, edited by Philip R. Davies, 125-144. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- _____. "Zechariah's Visions: A Theological Perspective." In *Prophecy in the Hebrew Bible: Selected Studies from Vetus Testamentum*, edited by Dave E. Orton, 188-199. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- _____. "Zerubbabel and Jerusalem Temple Reconstruction." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 36 (1974): 366-372.
- Peterson, Eugene H. *Reversed Thunder: The Revelation of John and the Praying Imagination*. New York: HarperCollins, 1991.
- Philo. *De Abrahamo*, 14.64.
- Pitkänen, Pekka. *Central Sanctuary and the Centralization of Worship in Ancient Israel: From the Settlement to the Building of Solomon's Temple*. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2003.
- Plaut, W. Gunther. *The Torah: A Modern Commentary*. New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1981.
- Plöger, Otto. *Theocracy and Eschatology*. Translated by S. Rudman. Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1968.
- Porteous, Norman W. "Jerusalem-Zion: The Growth of a Symbol." In *Berbannung und heimkehr: Beiträge zur geschichte und theologie Israels im 6. und 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr. Wilhelm Rudolph zum 70 geburtstage*, edited by Arnulf Kuschke, 235-252. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1961.
- Porter, Frank C. "The Religious Ideas of the Book of Ecclesiasticus, II." *Old and New Testament Student* 13, no. 2 (August 1891): 89-97.
- Prenter, Regin. *Creation and Redemption*. Translated by Theodor I. Jensen. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.
- Price, John Randall. *The Battle for the Last Days Temple*. Eugene, OR: Harvest House, 2004.
- _____. *The Coming Last Days Temple*. Eugene, OR: Harvest House, 1999.
- _____. "The Desecration and Restoration of the Temple as an Eschatological Motif in the Tanach, Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and the New Testament." PhD dissertation, University of Texas-Austin, 1993.

- Pritchard, James B. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton, NJ: University Press, 1969.
- _____, ed. *The Harper Atlas of the Bible*. New York: Harper and Row, 1987.
- Prokurat, Michael. "Haggai and Zechariah 1-8: A Form Critical Analysis." PhD dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, 1988.
- Rahner, Karl. *Theological Investigations*. Vol. 4. Translated by Kevin Smyth. London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1966.
- Redditt, Paul L. *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Reese, James M. *1 and 2 Thessalonians*. Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1979.
- Regev, Eyal. "Priestly Dynamic Holiness and Deuteronomistic Static Holiness." *Vetus Testamentum* 51, no. 2 (2001), 243-261.
- Reiner, Erica, ed. *Assyrian Dictionary*. Vol. 17, pt. 1. Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1989.
- Rendtorff, Rolf. *Canon and Theology: Overtures to an Old Testament Theology*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993.
- _____. *The Old Testament: An Introduction*. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
- Renz, Thomas. *The Rhetorical Function of the Book of Ezekiel*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Reymond, Eve A. E. *Mythical Origin of the Egyptian Temple*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1969.
- Richard, Earl J. *First and Second Thessalonians*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1995.
- Riska, Magnus. *The House of the Lord: A Study of the Temple Scroll Columns 29:3b-47:18*. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2007.
- Römer, Thomas. "Une seule maison pour le Dieu unique? La centralization du culte dans le Deutéronome et dans l'historiographie deutéronomiste." In *Quelle maison pour Dieu?* edited by Camille Focant, 49-80. Paris: Cerf, 2003.
- Rose, W. H. *Zemah and Zerubbabel: Messianic Expectations in the Early Postexilic Period*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Rost, Leonhard. "Bemerkungen zu Sacharja 4." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 63 (1951): 216-221.
- Rowland, Christopher. "The Temple in the New Testament." In *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*, edited by John Day, 469-483. New York: T. & T. Clark, 2005.

- Ryrie, Charles C. *Dispensationalism*. Chicago: Moody, 2007.
- Sacchi, Paolo. *The History of the Second Temple Period*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Safrai, Shmuel. "The Heavenly Jerusalem." *Ariel* 23 (1969): 11-16.
- Sailhamer, John H. *The Pentateuch as Narrative: A Biblical-Theological Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1992.
- Sarna, Nahum M. *Exodus*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1991.
- _____. *Exploring Exodus*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1991.
- _____. *Genesis: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989.
- Schaper, Joachim. *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995.
- Scherman, Nosson, Yaakov Blinder, Avie Gold, and Meir Zlotowitz. *Tanakh: Torah, Nevi'im, Ketuvim = Tanach: the Torah, Prophets, Writings: The Twenty-Four Books of the Bible, Newly Translated and Annotated*. Brooklyn, NY: Mesorah, 1996.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. "Community Without Temple: The Qumran Community's Withdrawal from the Jerusalem Temple." In *Gemeinde ohne tempel: Community without Temple: zur substituierung und transformation des Jerusalemer tempels und seines kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*, edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange, and Peter Pilhofer, 267-284. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- _____. "Jerusalem in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *The Centrality of Jerusalem: Historical Perspectives*, edited by Marcel Poorthuis and Chana Safrai, 73-88. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996.
- _____. "The Concept of Restoration in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*, edited by James M. Scott, 203-221. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- _____. *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord: Studies on the Temple Scroll*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- _____. "The Sacrificial System of the Temple Scroll and the Book of Jubilees." Edited by K. J. Richards. *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 24 (1985): 217-233.

- Schmid, Konrad, and Odil H. Steck. "Restoration Expectations in the Prophetic Tradition of the Old Testament." In *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*, edited by James M. Scott, 41-81. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Schmidt, Francis. *How the Temple Thinks: Identity and Social Cohesion in Ancient Judaism*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Schmidt, Martin. *Prophet und Tempel: Eine Studie zum Problem der Gottenähe im Alten Testament*. Zurich: Evangelischer, 1948.
- Schmidt, W. H. "מִבְּרָא." *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Edited by Ernst Jenni and Claus Westermann. Translated by Mark E. Biddle. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997. 253-256.
- Schmitt, John W., and J. Carl Laney. *Messiah's Coming Temple: Ezekiel's Prophetic Vision of the Future Temple*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, 1997.
- Schuller, Eileen M. "The Book of Malachi: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections." *New Interpreter's Bible*. Edited by Leander E. Keck et al. Nashville: Abingdon, 1996. 7:841-877.
- Schultz, Carl. "עֲוֹן." *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. Edited by R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke. Chicago: Moody, 1980. 1:650-651.
- Schuurman, Douglas J. *Creation, Eschaton, and Ethics: The Ethical Significance of the Creation-Eschaton Relation in the Thought of Emil Brunner and Jürgen Moltmann*. New York: Peter Lang, 1991.
- Schwartz, Baruch J. "The Bearing of Sin in the Priestly Literature." In *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom*, edited by David P. Wright, David N. Freedman, and Avi Hurvitz, 3-22. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995.
- _____. "Ezekiel's Dim View of Israel's Restoration." In *The Book of Ezekiel: Theological and Anthropological Perspectives*, edited by Margaret S. Odell and John T. Strong, 43-67. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. "On Something Biblical about 2 Maccabees." In *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12-14 May 1996*, edited by Michael E. Stone and Esther G. Chazon, 223-232. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Schwarz, Hans. *Eschatology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Scott, James M., ed. *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*. Vol. 56. Supplement to the Journal for the Study of Judaism. New York: Brill, 1997.

- Scott, Peter. "The Future of Creation: Ecology and Eschatology." In *The Future as God's Gift: Explorations in Christian Eschatology*, edited by David Fergusson and Marcel Sarot, 89-114. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2000.
- Scullion, John. *Isaiah 40-66*. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1982.
- Seybold, Klaus. *Bilder zum Tempelbau: Die visionen des Propheten Sacharja*. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1974.
- _____. *Introducing the Psalms*. Translated by R. Graeme Dunphy. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1990.
- Shafer, Byron E. "Temples, Priests, and Rituals: An Overview." In *Temples of Ancient Egypt*, edited by Byron E. Shafer, 1-30. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997.
- Sharon, Diane M. "A Biblical Parallel to a Sumerian Temple Hymn? Ezekiel 40-48 and Guda'e." *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 24 (1996): 99-109.
- Sheppard, Gerald T. "Wisdom and Torah: The Interpretation of Deuteronomy underlying Sirach 24:23." In *Biblical and Near Eastern Studies: Essays in Honor of William Sanford LaSor*, edited by Gary A. Tuttle, 166-176. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Shultz, Carl. "תּוֹבִיִּת." *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. Edited by R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke, 645-646. Chicago: Moody, 1980.
- Simpson, D. C. "Tobit." In *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, edited by R. H. Charles, 174-241. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Skehan, Patrick W., and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*. New York: Doubleday, 1987.
- Skemp, Vincent. "Avenues of Intertextuality between Tobit and the New Testament." In *Intertextual Studies in Ben Sira and Tobit*, edited by Jeremy Corley and Vincent Skemp, 43-70. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 2005.
- Slotki, I. W., and Avraham J. Rosenberg. *Isaiah*. New York, NY: Soncino, 1983.
- Smart, James D. *History and Theology in Second Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 35, 40-66*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965.
- Smith, Abraham. "The Second Letter to the Thessalonians: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections." *New Interpreter's Bible*. Edited by Leander E. Keck et al. Nashville: Abingdon, 2000. 11:741-772.

- Smith, Jonathan Z. *To Take Place: Toward Theory in Ritual*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1987.
- Smith, Ralph L. *Micah-Malachi*. Waco, TX: Word, 1984.
- Snaith, John. "Tobit." *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible*. Edited by John W. Rogerson, 779-798. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Soll, Will. "Misfortune and Exile in Tobit: The Juncture of a Fairy Tale Source and Deuteronomic Theology." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 51 (1989): 209-231.
- Stager, Lawrence E. "Jerusalem as Eden." *Biblical Archaeology Review* 26 (2000): 36-47, 66.
- Stavsky, Yitzchok. *Trei Asar: The Twelve Prophets*. Vol. 2. Brooklyn, NY: Mesorah, 2009.
- Steck, Odil H. *Israel und das gewaltsame geschick der propheten: Untersuchungen zur uberlieferung des deuteronomistischen geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, spätjudentum und urchristentum*. Wageningen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967.
- _____. *Old Testament Exegesis: A Guide to the Methodology*. Translated by James D. Nogalski. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- _____. *The Prophetic Books and Their Theological Witness*. Translated by James D. Nogalski. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2000.
- Stegemann, Hartmut. "The Institutions of Israel in the *Temple Scroll*." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, edited by Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport, 156-185. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1992.
- Steinberg, Shalom D. *The Third Beis HaMikdash: The Third Temple according to the Prophecy of Yechezkel following Rashi and Tosafos Yom Tov*. Translated by Moshe L. Miller. Jerusalem: Moznaim, 5753 [1993].
- Stephenson, John R. *Eschatology*. Vol. 13 of the *Confessional Lutheran Dogmatics*. Edited by Robert D. Preus. Fort Wayne, IN: Luther Academy, 1993.
- Stevens, Marty E. *Temples, Tithes, and Taxes: The Temple and the Economic Life of Ancient Israel*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2006.
- Stevenson, Kalinda R. *The Vision of Transformation: The Territorial Rhetoric of Ezekiel 40-48*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Stinespring, William F. "Eschatology in Chronicles." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 80 no. 3 (1961): 209-219.

- Stone, Michael E. "Apocalyptic Literature." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, edited by Michael E. Stone, 383-341. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- _____. ed. *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Strack, Hermann L., and Paul Billerbeck. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*. Munich, Germany: C. H. Beck, 1922.
- Stuart, Douglas. *Ezekiel*. Dallas, TX: Word, 1989.
- _____. *Old Testament Exegesis: A Primer for Students and Pastors*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1984.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. *1 Enoch 91-108*. Berlin: Gruyter, 2007.
- Stuhlmüller, Carroll. "Deutero-Isaiah." *Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Edited by Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmeyer, and Roland E. Murphy. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1968. 366-386.
- _____. *Rebuilding with Hope: A Commentary on the Books of Haggai and Zechariah*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Swanson, Dwight D. *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodology of 11QT*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Sweeney, Marvin A. "Ezekiel." *Jewish Study Bible*. Edited by Adele Berlin and Marc Z. Brettler. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004. 1042-1138.
- _____. *The Twelve Prophets*. Vol. 2. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000.
- Sykes, Seth. *Time and Space in Haggai-Zechariah 1-8: A Bakhtinian Analysis of a Prophetic Chronicle*. New York: Peter Lang, 2002.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. "'Exile' and 'Restoration' in the Conceptual World of Ancient Judaism." In *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*, edited by James M. Scott, 107-146. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- _____. *The World of Qumran from Within: Collected Studies*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1989.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu, and Michael Fishbane. "The Structuring of Biblical Books: Studies in the Book of Ezekiel." In *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute*, edited by Bengt Knutsson. Leiden: Brill, 1976. 10:129-153.
- Tate, Marvin E. *Psalms 51-100*. Dallas, TX: Word, 1990.

- Taylor, René. "Architecture and Magic: Considerations on the *Idea* of the Escorial." In *Essays in the History of Architecture Presented to Rudolf Wittkower*, edited by Douglas Fraser, Howard Hibbard, and Milton J. Lewine, 81-109. London: Phaidon, 1967.
- Taylor, Richard A., and E. Ray Clendenen. *Haggai, Malachi*. Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 2004.
- Taylor, Vincent. *The Gospel according to St. Mark*. London: Macmillan, 1952.
- Terrien, Samuel. *The Elusive Presence: Toward a New Biblical Theology*. San Francisco, Harper and Row, 1978.
- Thiering, Barbara E. "Mebaqqer and Episkopos in the Light of the Temple Scroll." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100 (1981): 59-74.
- Thomas, Robert L. "2 Thessalonians." *Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Edited by Frank E. Gaebelein. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1978. 11:301-337.
- Tiller, P. A. *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.
- Tinker, George E. *Spirit and Resistance: Political Theology and American Indian Liberation*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2004.
- Tollington, Janet. "Readings in Haggai: From the Prophet to the Complete Book: A Changing Message in Changing Times." In *The Crisis of Israelite Religion: Transformation of Religious Tradition in Exilic and Post-Exilic Times*, edited by Bob Becking and Marjo C. A. Korpel, 194-208. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Tooman, William A. "Waiting for God: Condition for Restoration of the Divine Presence in Ezekiel." A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, San Francisco, CA, November 17, 2011.
- Torrey, C. C. *Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy*. 1930. Reprint, New York: Ktav, 1970.
- Towner, W. Sibley. *Genesis*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- Townsend, John T. "The Jerusalem Temple in the First Century." In *God and His Temple: Reflections on Professor Samuel Terrien's The Elusive Presence: Toward a New Biblical Theology*, edited by Lawrence E. Frizzell, 48-65. South Orange, NJ: Seton Hall University, Institute for Judaeo-Christian Studies, 1981.
- Tov, Emanuel. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1992.

- Travis, S. H. "Eschatology." *New Dictionary of Theology*. Edited by Sinclair B. Ferguson, David F. Wright, and J. I. Packer. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1988. 228-231.
- Tuell, Steven S. "Divine Presence and Absence in Ezekiel's Prophecy." In *The Book of Ezekiel: Theological and Anthropological Perspectives*, edited by Margaret S. Odell and John T. Strong, 97-116. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.
- _____. *Ezekiel*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2009.
- _____. "Ezekiel 40-42 as Verbal Icon." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 58 (1996): 649-664.
- _____. *The Law of the Temple in Ezekiel 40-48*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Turner, Harold W. *From Temple to Meeting House: The Phenomenology and Theology of Places of Worship*. The Hague: Mouton, 1979.
- Ulrich, Eugene C., Frank M. Cross, and Maurice Baillet. *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls Transcriptions and Textual Variants*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Umland, Jean B., and Jon M. Bellama. *General Chemistry*. 2nd ed. St. Paul, MN: West, 1996.
- VanderKam, James C. *The Book of Jubilees*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- _____. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1994.
- _____. "Exile in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature." In *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*, edited by James M. Scott, 89-109. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- _____. *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- _____. *An Introduction to Early Judaism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2001.
- _____. "The Scroll and the Book of Jubilees." In *Temple Scroll Studies*, edited by George J. Brooke, 211-236. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
- _____. "The Theology of the Temple Scroll: A Response to Lawrence H. Schiffman." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 85 (1994): 129-135.
- Van der Meer, Michaël N. "A New Spirit in an Old Corpus? Text-Critical, Literary-Critical and Linguistic Observations regarding Ezekiel 36:16-38." In *The New Things: Eschatology in Old Testament Prophecy Festschrift for Henk Leene*, edited by F. Postma, K. Spronk, and E. Talstra, 147-158. Maastricht, Netherlands: Uitgeverij Shaker, 2002.
- Van der Merwe, Christo H. J., J. A. Naudé, and Jan H. Kroeze, eds. *Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

- Van Dijk, Jacobus. "Myth and Mythmaking in Ancient Egypt." In *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*, edited by Jack M. Sasson, 3:1697-1709. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2000.
- Van Ruiten, J. T. A. G. M. "Visions of the Temple in the Book of *Jubilees*." In *Gemeinde ohne tempel: Community without Temple: Zur substituierung und transformation des Jerusalemer tempels und seines kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*, edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange, and Peter Pilhofer, 215-227. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- Van der Woude, Adam S. Review of *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness*, by Ben Z. Wacholder. *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 17 (1986): 120-124.
- Vawter, Bruce, and Leslie J. Hoppe. *A New Heart: A Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Vera, José L. "Haggai." *International Bible Commentary: A Catholic and Ecumenical Commentary for the Twenty-First Century*. Edited by William R. Farmer. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998. 1181-1185.
- Verhoef, Pieter A. *The Books of Haggai and Malachi*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Vermes, Geza. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. New York: Penguin, 1997.
- Vermeulen, Jacques. *Jérusalem centre du monde: Développements et contestations d'une tradition biblique*. Paris: Cerf, 2007.
- _____. "La lumière de Sion: Isaïe 60 et ses redactions successives." In *Quelle maison pour Dieu?* edited by Camille Focant, 177-208. Paris: Cerf, 2003.
- Vogel, Manuel. "Tempel und tempelkult in *Pseudo-Philos Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*." In *Gemeinde ohne tempel: Community without Temple: Zur substituierung und transformation des Jerusalemer tempels und seines kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*, edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange, and Peter Pilhofer, 251-263. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- Volf, Miroslav. "A Rhythm of Adoration and Action: A Response to Jürgen Moltmann." In *All Together in One Place: Theological Papers from the Brighton Conference on World Evangelization*, edited by Harold D. Hunter and Peter D. Hocken, 38-45. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Volz, Paul. *Die eschatologie der jüdischen gemeinde im Neutestamentlichen zeitalter nach den quellen der rabbinischen, apokalyptischen, und apokryphen literatur dargestellt*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1934.

- Von Hofmann, J. Chr. K. *Der schriftbeweis: Ein theologischer versuch*. 2 vols. Nördlingen, Germany: C. H. Beck, 1857.
- Von Rad, Gerhard. *Old Testament Theology*. Vol. 2. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. 1960. Reprint, Peabody, MA: Prince Press, 2005.
- _____. *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*. Translated by E. W. Trueman Dicken. London: Oliver and Boyd, 1965.
- _____. *Studies in Deuteronomy*. London: SCM Press, 1956.
- Vos, Geerhardus, and James T. Dennison, Jr. *The Eschatology of the Old Testament*. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2001.
- Wacholder, Ben Z. *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness*. Cincinnati, OH: Hebrew Union College, 1983.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996.
- Wallace, Howard N. "Eden, Garden of." *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992. 2:281.
- Walls, Jerry L. *The Oxford Handbook of Eschatology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Waltke, Bruce K., and Michael P. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Walton, John H. *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2006.
- _____. *Genesis: From Biblical Text . . . to Contemporary Life*. NIV Application Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2001.
- Wanamaker, Charles A. *The Epistles to the Thessalonians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990.
- Ward, Ronald A. *Commentary on 1 and 2 Thessalonians*. Waco, TX: Word, 1973.
- Ward, William A. "Temples and Sanctuaries: Egypt." *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992. 6:369-372.
- Wardle, Timothy. *The Jerusalem Temple and Early Christian Identity*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Watts, John D. W. *Isaiah 34-66*. Waco, TX: Word, 1987.
- Webster's II New Riverside University Dictionary*. Boston: Riverside, 1984.

- Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- _____. *Deuteronomy 1-11: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday, 1991.
- _____. *Normative and Sectarian Judaism in the Second Temple Period*. New York: T. & T. Clark, 2005.
- Weitzman, Steven. "Allusion, Artifice, and Exile in the Hymn of Tobit." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115 (1996): 49-61.
- Wenham, Gordon J. *Genesis 16-50*. Dallas, TX: Word, 1994.
- _____. "Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story." In *I Studied Inscriptions from before the Flood: Ancient Near Eastern, Literary, and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1-11*, edited by Richard S. Hess and David T. Tsumura, 399-404. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1994.
- Wénin, André. "Jacob découvre la maison de Dieu." In *Quelle maison pour Dieu?* edited by Camille Focant, 7-37. Paris: Cerf, 2003.
- Wensinck, A. J. "The Semitic New Year and the Origin of Eschatology." *Acta Orientalia* 1 (1923): 158-199.
- Wentling, Judith L. "Unraveling the Relationship between 11QT, the Eschatological Temple, and the Qumran Community." *Revue de Qumran* 14 (1985): 61-72.
- Westermann, Claus. *Beginning and End in the Bible*. Translated by Keith Crim. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972.
- _____. *Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary*. Translated by David M. G. Stalker. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969.
- Wevers, John W. *Ezekiel*. London: Nelson, 1969.
- Whybray, Roger N. *Isaiah 40-66*. London: Oliphants, 1975.
- Wildberger, Hans. *Isaiah 1-12: A Commentary*. Translated by Thomas H. Trapp. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1991.
- Wilkinson, Richard H. *The Complete Temples of Ancient Egypt*. Hong Kong: Thames and Hudson, 2000.
- Williams, David J. *1 and 2 Thessalonians*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992.
- Williamson, H. G. M. *Isaiah 1-27: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*. Vol. 1. London: T. & T. Clark, 2006.

- Wilson, Gerald H. “צֶבֶד.” *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. Edited by William A. VanGemeren. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1997. 550-551.
- Wintermute, O. S. “*Jubilees*: A New Translation and Introduction.” *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1985. 2:35-51.
- Wise, Michael Owen. *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1990.
- _____. “The Eschatological Vision of the Temple Scroll.” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 49 (1990): 155-172.
- _____. “4QFlorilegium and the Temple of Adam.” *Revue de Qumran* 15 (1991): 103-132.
- Witherington, Ben, III. *Jesus, Paul, and the End of the World: A Comparative Study in New Testament Eschatology*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1992.
- _____. *1 and 2 Thessalonians: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Wolf, Herbert. *Haggai and Malachi*. Chicago: Moody, 1976.
- Wolff, Hans W. *Haggai: A Commentary*. Translated by Margaret Kohl. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1988.
- _____. *Micah: A Commentary*. Translated by Gary Stansell. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1990.
- Wolfson, Elliot R. “Sacred Space and Mental Iconography: *Imago Templi* and Contemplation in Rhineland Jewish Pietism.” In *Ki Baruch hu: Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Judaic Studies in Honor of Baruch A. Levine*, edited by Robert Chazan, William W. Hallo, and Lawrence H. Schiffman, 593-634. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999.
- Woudstra, Marten H. “The Tabernacle in Biblical-Theological Perspective.” In *New Perspectives of the Old Testament*, edited by J. Barton Payne, 88-103. Waco, TX: Word, 1970.
- Wright, Christopher J. H. *Deuteronomy*. New International Biblical Commentary. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996.
- _____. *The Message of Ezekiel*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2001.
- Wright, G. Ernest. “The Significance of the Temple in the Ancient Near East: Part III, The Temple in Palestine-Syria.” *Biblical Archaeologist* 7 (1944): 65-77.

- Yadin, Yigael. *The Temple Scroll*. 3 vols. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977.
- _____. *The Temple Scroll: The Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect*. New York: Random House, 1985.
- Zahn, Molly M. "New Voices, Ancient Words: The *Temple Scroll*'s Reuse of the Bible." In *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*, edited by John Day, 435-458. New York: T. & T. Clark, 2005.
- Zimmerli, Walther. *A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*. Translated by James D. Martin. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979-83.
- _____. *I Am Yahweh*. Translated by Douglas Stott. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982.
- _____. *Old Testament Theology in Outline*. Translated by David E. Green. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978.
- Zimmermann, Frank. *The Book of Tobit: An English Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Harper, 1958.
- Zsengeller, Jozsef. "Topography as Theology." In *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology*, edited by Geza G. Zeravits and Jozsef Zsengeller, 177-188. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Zvi, Ehud B. "Haggai." *Jewish Study Bible*. Edited by Adele Berlin and Marc Z. Brettler. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004. 1243-1248.

VITA

My whole life has been filled with studying.