Eric W. Baker

The Eschatological Role of the Jerusalem Temple

An Examination of the Jewish Writings dating from 586 BCE to 70 CE

Anchor Academic Publishing

disseminate knowledge

Baker, Eric W.: The Eschatological Role of the Jerusalem Temple: An Examination of the Jewish Writings dating from 586 BCE to 70 CE, Hamburg, Anchor Academic Publishing 2015

Buch-ISBN: 978-3-95489-427-7
PDF-eBook-ISBN: 978-3-95489-927-2
Druck/Herstellung: Anchor Academic Publishing, Hamburg, 2015

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek:
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über http://dnb.d-nb.de abrufbar.

Bibliographical Information of the German National Library:
The German National Library lists this publication in the German National Bibliography. Detailed bibliographic data can be found at: http://dnb.d-nb.de

All rights reserved. This publication may not be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publishers.

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar. Dies gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und die Einspeicherung und Bearbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

Die Wiedergabe von Gebrauchsnamen, Handelsnamen, Warenbezeichnungen usw. in diesem Werk berechtigt auch ohne besondere Kennzeichnung nicht zu der Annahme, dass solche Namen im Sinne der Warenzeichen- und Markenschutz-Gesetzgebung als frei zu betrachten wären und daher von jedermann benutzt werden dürften.

Die Informationen in diesem Werk wurden mit Sorgfalt erarbeitet. Dennoch können Fehler nicht vollständig ausgeschlossen werden und die Diplomica Verlag GmbH, die Autoren oder Übersetzer übernehmen keine juristische Verantwortung oder irgendeine Haftung für evtl. verbliebene fehlerhafte Angaben und deren Folgen.

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

© Anchor Academic Publishing, Imprint der Diplomica Verlag GmbH
Hermannstal 119k, 22119 Hamburg
http://www.diplomica-verlag.de, Hamburg 2015
Printed in Germany

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 and started the next life. I miss you, Lu.

PREFACE

When trying to switch advisors on this work because my first advisor hindered my investigation,[1] my next advisor, who was in the Old Testament department, directed me, an Old Testament Ph.D. candidate in second temple Jewish studies to "commit not to doing exegesis of the biblical material."[2] This would be equivalent to an advisor in the biology department directing a student not doing any biological investigation in getting a biology Ph.D. This was because my draft contained conclusions that the future temple as presented in Ezekiel, Haggai, Zechariah, and Trito-Isaiah affected the speed at which the new age would come. The Academic Dean of the Seminary also weighed in on the topic because I presented the data supporting this idea. This prompted a complaint about my methods (i.e., because I concluded that the future temple affected the new age somehow, my methods must be flawed because of my conclusion). Considering that my methods passed three Comprehensive examinations on 50 chapters (each) of the Hebrew Bible without a single comment on my methodology,[3] any comment on my methods does appear to be quite vacuous. The Dean asserted that "[y]our decision to join our program indicated to us that you were willing to work and to pursue your studies within these

---

[1] In trying to switch to a committee that would help me, the director of the Ph.D. department threatened me that "this is the last change for you to bring your work to completion." Tom Shepherd, Director, PhD in Religion and ThD Programs, to Eric Baker, 16 September 2011. This threat was to keep all money and time that I put into the program and leave me with nothing. It would be nice to have at least one good chance to conclude this work.

[2] Roy Gane, "your committee regarding moving on," February 24, 2011.

[3] All Ph.D. classes within the program were completed with an A grade except for one A-. Thus my methods in my coursework did not indicate any problem with my exegetical methods.

Adventist limitations and parameters."[1] Regarding "Adventist limitations and parameters," this is untrue as no limitations or parameters were ever placed before me at any time in the program. The Academic Dean in the position when I joined the program was interested in the academic freedom needed to pursue a degree, not limiting conclusions.

An important experience that echoes my own experience on working on a future Jerusalem temple in Scripture is the experience John Randall Price had when he was working on his Ph.D. at Texas A&M. He noted what he observed about the topic of the temple and the church and his experience when writing a later book after he completed his degree.

> "For the past 2,000 years, Christendom has generally viewed the Old Testament prophecies concerning a future Temple as a symbolic prefigurement of the church, rejecting any idea of rebuilding a physical structure and restoring sacrifices as Judaistic and non-Christian. One reason for this is that from the earliest disputations between Christianity and Judaism a central tenet of the Christian argument has been that the Temple's destruction proved not only Jesus' status as a prophet (see Matthew 23:38; Luke 19:43-44), but also the superior status of Christianity. This gave rise to the belief that the church superceded or replaced Israel as the final fulfillment of God's divine design, and that Christians rather than Jews were now the chosen people of God. Although these tenets were contested in Scripture (see Romans 11:11-12, 15, 25-32), they became so dogmatically established in many denominations that to challenge them in any part has invited the charge, even in this age of tolerance, of blasphemy or worse. This was brought home to me when I wrote my doctoral dissertation on the Temple in prophecy at a secular university under an Orthodox Jewish advisor. With genuine concern for my future in light of my defense of the Temple's restoration, he cautioned me that I 'would never get a job in a Christian institution!'"[2]

---

[1] Denis Fortin, "New dissertation committee," October 19, 2010.

[2] John Randall Price, *The Coming Last Days Temple* (Eugene: Harvest House, 1999), 10-11.

My work on the future Jerusalem temple in second temple Jewish documents, canonical or otherwise, leads me to a similar experience as noted by John Price above. I would clearly and passionately advise any student thinking of investigating the future Jerusalem temple in any canonical writings to cease and desist from such an investigation. The bitterness that will be experienced will be severe and is not worth the end result of the work. If I had known ten years ago what I know now, I would not have pursued a Ph.D. in Religion at all. It is the bitterness of the experience of this work that I hope serves as a warning others to avoid such an endeavor completely.

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
1 Enoch 313
1 Enoch 90:20-31 314
1 Enoch 91:12-14 318
Third *Sibylline Oracle* 320
Jubilees 321
Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum 326
The *Apocryphon of Ezekiel* 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

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

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

"In the history of the Temple there are no coincidences, only narratives fraught with symbolic significance."[1] 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 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.

---

[1]Simon 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.

[3]While 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

---

[4]Knowles 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.

[5]Steck 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

---

[6]Barker 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.

[9]Neher 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

---

[10]Shemaryahu 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.

[11]Wardle 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).

---

[12]The 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.

[13]The 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.

[14]Clements 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

[15]Philo, *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]

---

[16]No 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).

[17]By 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).

[18]Tuell 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

---

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

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

[21]There 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.

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

[23]John 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 *1 Enoch*. Analysis of Sirach is not dependent on the analysis of Tobit. Going beyond proto-canonical, deutero-canonical, 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]

---

[24]Ibid.

[25]For 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.

[26]It 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

---

[27]Joel 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 שׁכן, 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.

[28]The 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).

[29]The 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 *1 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), הֵיכָל (palace or temple), and צִיּוֹן (Zion). This last appellation, Zion, refers to the temple mount, the specific location of the temple. References to גִּבְעָתִי (my hill), הָרַי (my mountains), הַר־קָדְשִׁי (my holy mountain or the mountain of my holiness), as well

---

[30] *1 Enoch* was composed in Aramaic.

[31] Eleazar 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.

[32] No 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 כָּבַד (to be glorified or to appear in glory) in the *Nip ʿal* 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 רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ (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]

---

[33]Humanity, 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.

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

[35]George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Eschatology (Early Jewish)," *ABD*, 2:580.

[36]Block 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.

[37]David 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."

[39]S. 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.

[40]John 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.

[41]See 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 בְּאַחֲרִית 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]

---

[42]Ryken, *Biblical Imagery*, s.v. "End Times."

[43]Even 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.

[44]This 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. Jiři 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.

[45]Gordon 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 שָׁלוֹם), (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 עוֹלָם or וְעַד עוֹלָם "forever" or "forever and ever," הַיּוֹם, הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה, הַיּוֹם הַהוּא, "the/this/that day," as well as מוֹעֵד "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

---

[46]This 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.

[47]Paolo 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).

[48]Gabriele 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.

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

[50]Donald 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.

---

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

[52]Shozo 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.

[53]In 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 Criticsm 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

[54]See 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

[1]Wallace 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.

[2]See 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

---

[3]Barker, *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.

[4]Ward 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.

[5]Wright 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.

[6]Byron 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.

[7]Henri 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.

[10]To 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.

[11]Many 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.

[12]Victor 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.

[13]In 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 הַיָּם (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

---

[14]Karl 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.

[15]Beale 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.

[16]Bähr 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.

[17]Bloch-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.

[18]Jacques 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.

[19]Hurowitz, "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.

---

[20]Beverley 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.

[21]This 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.

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

[24]The *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

---

[25]Carol Meyers, "Temple, Jerusalem," *ABD*, 6:360.

[26]Clements 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.

[27]Levenson 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.

[28]Barker, 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.

[29]Bähr 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.

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

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

[32]J. 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.

[33]Hardy 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 Dogmatic*s*, 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.

[34]Bell 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. Vermeylen 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 people et retrouvent les énergies nécessaires à la vie." Vermeylen, *Jérusalem*, 30.

[35]Westermann 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.

[36]Leppäkari 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.

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

[38]Hartman, "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]

---

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

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

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

[42]Craig 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.

[43]The 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.

[45]This 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 9:1-1 culminating in the covenant of God.

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

[47]Marvin 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.

[48]Westermann 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.

[49]Moltmann 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

---

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

[51]Pannenberg 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.

[52]Both 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.

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

[54]Jones 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.

[56]Levenson 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]

---

[57]Anderson 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.

[58]Aune 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.

[59]Aune 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.

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

[61]Cohn 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