

VETUS TESTAMENTUM

QUARTERLY PUBLISHED BY THE
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR THE
STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

Vol. XX	JANUARY 1970	No. 1
CONTENTS		
R. G. HAMERTON-KELLY, The temple and the origins of Jewish apocalyptic		1
T. JANSMA, "And the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters", some remarks on the syro-hexaplaric reading of Gen. I 2		16
E. LIPÍŃSKI, Recherches sur le livre de Zacharie		25
SHIRLEY LUND, An argument for further study of the paleography of codex Neofiti 1		56
J. WORRELL, עצה: "Counsel" or "council" at Qumran ?		65
G. R. H. WRIGHT, The mythology of pre-israélite Shechem		75
SHORT NOTES		83
P. C. CRAIGIE, An Egyptian expression in the Song of the Sea (Exodus XV 4)— A. EHRMAN, A note on Micah II 7. — J. GEYER, קצות הארץ — Hellenistic ? — F. GOLKA, Zur Erforschung der Ätiologien im Alten Testament. — J. P. HAYES and J. HOFTIJZER, Notae Hermopolitanae. — J. HELLER, Die Symbolik des Fettes im AT. — G. HOWARD, Some notes on the Septuagint of Amos. — A. A. MACINTOSH, A note on Proverbs XXV 27. — S. C. REIF, A note on a neglected connotation of <i>ntn</i> . — R. SAYED, Tefnakht ou Horus SL-(B). — G. SCHWARZ, „... einen Tisch angesichts meiner Feinde“ ?		
REVIEWS		121
Gilbert Brunet, Les Lamentations contre Jérémie (H. CAZELLES). — E. Cassin, La Splendeur divine (H. CAZELLES). — B. J. Malina, The Palestinian Manna Tradition (J. C. H. LEBRAM).		
BOOKLIST		128



LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1970

VETUS TESTAMENTUM

QUARTERLY PUBLISHED BY THE
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR THE
STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

Editorial Board

G. W. ANDERSON, 51, Fountainhall Road, Edinburgh 9, Scotland U.K.
P. A. H. DE BOER, Hofdijk 35, Oegstgeest, near Leiden, The Netherlands
G. R. CASTELLINO, Via Marsala 42, Rome, Italy
Henry CAZELLES, 21 Rue d'Assas, Paris VI, France
E. HAMMERSHAIMB, Jens Munksvej 25, Aarhus, Denmark
H. G. MAY, Divinity School of Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, U.S.A.
W. ZIMMERLI, Herzberger Landstrasse 26, Göttingen, Germany

All manuscripts and books for review should be addressed to Professor P. A. H. DE BOER, Hofdijk 35, Oegstgeest, near Leiden, The Netherlands.

Advisory Committee

W. F. ALBRIGHT (Baltimore), W. BAUMGARTNER (Basel), M. BIČ (Prague), J. BOWMAN (Melbourne), M. BURROWS (Winter Park, Flor.), J. COPPENS (Louvain), A. DíEZ MACHO (Barcelona), G. R. DRIVER (Oxford), A. DUPONT-SOMMER (Paris), O. EISSFELDT (Halle/Saale), Joh. LINDBLOM (Lund), S. MOSCATI (Rome), J. MUILENBURG (San Anselmo, California), A. PARROT (Paris), Johs PEDERSEN (Copenhagen), J. B. PRITCHARD (Philadelphia), L. ROST (Erlangen), R. B. Y. SCOTT (Princeton), I. L. SEELIGMANN (Jerusalem, Isr.), R. DE VAUX (Jerusalem, Jord.), E. VOGT (Rome), D. WINTON THOMAS (Cambridge), J. ZIEGLER (Würzburg).

The publisher of the quarterly *VETUS TESTAMENTUM* is E. J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands, to whom subscriptions may be sent. Each annual volume contains approximately 512 pages.

The price of Volume XX (1970) is f 52.— (52 Dutch guilders) or US \$ 14.60 *plus postage and packing*.

Application to mail at second-class postage rates is pending at Jamaica, N.Y.

c
h
f
ti

It
in

thi
of
reig
26-
the

1)
H.-W
Neue
2)
Messa
The
A. an
Vetus

VOL XX
JAN 1970
No 1

THE TEMPLE AND THE ORIGINS OF JEWISH APOCALYPTIC

BY

R. G. HAMERTON-KELLY

Scripps College, Claremont, Calif., U.S.A.

There is in apocalyptic literature a clear tradition of hostility to the temple of Jerusalem, coupled with a great concern for the temple as a religious idea. The Qumran sectaries, for instance, abhorred the corrupt shrine in Jerusalem, yet they understood their community to be a temple. ¹⁾ If one follows this theme of hostility and fascination back to the time of the return from Babylon, it provides a useful guide to the religious history of that period, and casts light on the origins of apocalyptic thought. We hope to show that there were two dominant attitudes to the temple in the early theocracy, represented by Ezekiel and P respectively, and that the apocalyptic tradition derives from the Ezekelian attitude. We begin by tracing the tradition about the temple in apocalyptic literature.

1.

The temple as an idea plays an important role in apocalyptic thought. It is the center of the promised new creation, and an eternal reality in the divine world. The following survey confirms this judgement.

For the writers of Jubilees (c. 150),²⁾ the consummation of all things occurs when God builds His temple on Mount Zion, the navel of the earth and hub of the new creation (viii 19, iv 26), and comes to reign as "King on Mount Zion" in full view of all the nations (i 17. 26-28). The present earthly temple has been defiled (xxiii 21), and the new temple must replace it. Jubilees implies that the eschatological

¹⁾ See B. GÄRTNER, *Temple and Community in Qumran and the New Testament*, 1965; H.-W. KUHN, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil*, Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testament, Band 4, 1966, pp. 182ff.

²⁾ The dating of these sources is according to D. S. RUSSELL, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic*, 1964, pp. 37-38. Texts are cited from R. H. CHARLES, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, Vols. I and II, 1913 (cited *A. and P.*).

temple exists in heaven before it is revealed in the Last Days, as the following reference to the heavenly cultus shows:

And may the Lord give to thee (i.e. Levi) and thy seed greatness and great glory, and cause thee and thy seed from among all flesh, to approach him to serve in his sanctuary *as the angels of the presence and as the holy ones.*

I Enoch vi-xxxvi (c. 160 B.C.) gives an elaborate description of the heavenly house of God (xiv 8ff.) where His throne is set and His glory dwells. His earthly throne is Zion, the high mountain upon which God will sit when He "visits the earth with goodness" (xxiv 1-glory dwells. His earthly throne is Zion, the high mountain upon which God will sit when He "visits the earth with goodness" (xxiv 1-xxv 4). Although these chapters of Enoch emphasize the present existence of the heavenly temple rather than its eschatological manifestation, it is clear that the heavenly temple will replace the present earthly temple in the eschaton.

I Enoch lxxxiii-xc (c. 150 B.C.) is a recital of the history of Israel and Judah in which the various participants are symbolized by animals, as in Ezek. xxxiv 3, 6, 8. According to this writer, the temple of Zerubbabel was ritually polluted: they tried to offer bread on the altar "but all the bread on it was polluted and not pure" (lxxxix 72ff.). In the Future Age, the "Lord of the Sheep" takes away the old house and brings a larger and more glorious one in its place, and takes up his abode in it (xc 28-29).¹ The new temple is apparently brought from heaven. There is theological hostility to the temple in Jerusalem, combined with an interest in the heavenly, eschatological temple.

According to I Enoch xci-civ (mid first century B.C.), every generation since the exile has been apostate (xciii 9), because "there is no one who can discern the things of heaven". But in the Future Age, a house worthy of the "Great King" will be built (xci 13) and the "Great Glory" will be revealed (cii 3).

I Enoch xxxvii-lxxi (late first century B.C. or early first century A.D.) tells of a heavenly house which Enoch saw in the "heaven of heavens" (lxxi 5ff.) and looks forward to the time when "the Righteous and Elect one shall cause the house of his congregation to appear." There are also several details in these chapters which recall the book

¹ Reading the variant, "and the Lord of the sheep was within it" in verse 29C, according to *A. and P.* II, p. 259, n. 29.

(
v
ti
(i
th
ne
st:
aft
—
y
and
"Cr
espe
mea

of Ezekiel: the hills are to be "as a fountain of water" in the Future Age (lii 7) and heaven and earth shall be shaken (lx 4ff.). The theme of measuring the eschatological realities also occurs (lxi 1ff.).

"The Testament of Levi" (*Test. XII Patriarchs*, first century B.C. to first century A.D.) opens with the following echo of Ezekiel xl 1-4:

I beheld a high mountain (in a dream) and I was upon it. And behold the heavens were opened, and an angel of God said to me, Levi, enter.

In answer to this invitation, Levi goes into heaven and learns that the "Great Glory" dwells in the highest heaven of all, and that in the heaven second from the top the heavenly worship is carried on (iii 4-5). v 1 seems to begin again to describe Levi's vision of heaven as follows:

And thereupon the angel opened to me the gates of heaven and I saw the heavenly temple, and upon a throne of glory the most high. And he said to me: Levi, I have given thee the blessings of the priesthood until I come and sojourn in the midst of Israel.

Thus the ideas of the heavenly temple and the eschatological presence of God are closely associated.

There is another important theme in this work, namely, that the priests of the restoration were evil (xvii 10ff.). But in the Last Days a new priest shall arise,

And the angels of the glory . . . shall be glad in him
The heavens shall be opened
And from the temple of Glory shall come upon him sanctification.

In the *Assumption of Moses* (early first century A.D.), the same themes occur. Jerusalem, and therefore the Temple on Zion,¹⁾ is "the place which he made from the beginning of the creation of the world, that his name should be called upon until . . . the consummation" (1:18, cf. Ezek. xxxviii 12, I Enoch xxvi 1, xc 26, Jub. viii, Yoma 54b), the navel of the present created world and the starting point of the new creation. However, the temple of the Restoration which now stands on Zion is polluted, and so no real sacrifices could be offered after the Exile (iv 1ff.). The temple must be replaced.

¹⁾ Loren FISHER has shown that **יְרֵמֹ** in Hebrew can mean both 'temple quarter' and 'city', "The Temple Quarter", *J.S.S.* 8 (1963, pp. 34-41. Cf. L. FISHER, "Creation at Ugarit and in the Old Testament", *V.T.* XV (1965), pp. 313-324, especially p. 319, n. 2, where he points out that Josephus is aware of this double meaning in *Ant.* XII, 11, 145-6.

II Baruch, from the latter part of the first century A.D., argues that the present temple and its cultus are inadequate when compared with the eschatological temple. In iv 2-7 it begins by pointing out the inferiority of the earthly Jerusalem: "This building now built in your midst is not that which is revealed with me . . ."; it tells of the heavenly Jerusalem kept by God until the Final Age when

They shall behold the world which is now invisible to them
And they shall behold the time which is now hidden from them
(li 8, cf lxviii 7)

On Sinai God showed Moses the "pattern" of Zion and the "pattern" of the sanctuary (lix 1 ff. Ex. xxv 9, 40). The temple of Zerubbabel is not adequate (lxviii 1).

Finally, IV Ezra (late first century A.D.) contains a vision of the heavenly Jerusalem (x 25 ff.) in the course of which it becomes clear that the writer symbolically identifies the city and the temple—the one is a symbol of the other (x 46-49, 55). In the eschaton the "hidden" city shall appear (vii 26, cf. viii 52).

There are three emphases in the passages we have examined: the present existence of the heavenly temple; its centrality in the events and institutions of the eschatological age, and, consequently, hostility to the second temple because it suffered by comparison with the heavenly temple. I Enoch lxxxiii-xc xci-civ, Test. Levi and II Baruch contain all three ideas, showing that they did occur as a pattern. Each of the other apocalypses we examined contained at least two of the three characteristic ideas, and so may be used as secondary confirmation of the existence of a point of view by these three ideas. confirmation of the existence of a point of view controlled by these three ideas.

2.

Ezekiel and P are the earliest sources for an understanding of the theological significance of the second temple.

Ezekiel's famous vision in chapters xl-xlvi of his book portrays the true temple in heaven, where it will remain until the time appointed for its manifestation. In the eschatological age it will descend on mount Zion, and the glory of God will once again take up a permanent dwelling there (xliii 1-7).

This interpretation of the vision—that the heavenly temple will descend to earth in the eschaton—is an inference from the fact

that no instructions are given to the prophet to build the temple. The only instruction he receives is to tell the people about the heavenly temple (xl 4, xliii 10-11). Kurt GALLING also understands the matter in this way when he writes:

Wenn man also fragt, wer den neuen Tempel so bauen soll, wie er beschreiben wurde, so muss man antworten: niemand, denn er ist ja schon da! Die Heimkehrer sollen ihn als Wunderwirklichkeit vorfinden: ihnen obliegt es dann nur, die heiligen Ordnungen des Kultus zu bewahren'.¹⁾

The place of Ezekiel's vision in the history of the traditions about the temple is problematic. VON RAD argues that chapters xl-xlviii did not originate during the exile but were written some time later as part of a tradition about the 'new Jerusalem' which prevailed late in the Persian period. They belong to the latest stage of the "Zion-tradition" in post-exilic prophecy, and should be set alongside Zech. xiv 10, where the city is set aloft (cf. Ezek. xl 2) and its gates are mentioned.²⁾ H. GESE's careful literary analysis, however, has enabled us to detach xl 1-19, xl 47-xli 4 from the rest of xl-xlviii, and to identify these sections as the core of a vision seen and recorded by the original prophet himself.³⁾ Following GALLING and GESE, therefore, we believe that Ezekiel himself presented the exiles with a vision of the heavenly temple which would be manifested on Zion, in the eschatological age—which may have been identified with the time of their return to Jerusalem. The history of this tradition will be treated later. At this point we must turn to P.

P also contains traces of a belief in the heavenly temple.⁴⁾ In Ex. xxiv 15 ff. P tells of Moses' ascent into the mountain to be instructed by God (cf. Ez. xl 2). There Moses is told how to construct the sanctuary and how to regulate its ceremony (25-31). The instructions concerning the building of the tabernacle are punctuated by injunctions

¹⁾ G. FOHRER, *Ezechiel*, mit einem Beitrag von K. GALLING, H.A.T., 1955, pp. 221.

²⁾ G. VON RAD, *Old Testament Theology*, vol. 2, E.T. 1965, p. 296, n. 23.

³⁾ H. GESE, *Die Verfassungsentwurf des Ezechiel (Kap. 40-48)*, 1957, especially pp. 31-33. This view is supported by G. FOHRER, *Die Hauptprobleme des Buches Ezechiel*, 1952, pp. 95 ff.; K. GALLING in FOHRER, *Ezechiel*, H.A.T., *op. cit.*, p. 220; J. LINDBLOM *Prophecy in Ancient Israel*, 1962, p. 264.

⁴⁾ K. KOCH, in *Die Priesterschrift von Exodus 25 bis Leviticus 16*, 1959, has shown that the *Grundlage*, which comprises most of the present P, was influenced by the ideology surrounding the temple in Jerusalem (see pp. 98-99 especially). For the limits of the P source see M. NOTH, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch*, 1948, pp. 29-35.

to make it according to the "model" (תבנית)¹⁾ which he sees on the mountain (xxv 9, 40; cf. xxvii 8 and xxvi 30). These injunctions are strikingly similar to those we have noted in Ezekiel.²⁾ They are as follows:

xxv 9 According to everything which I am causing you to see, namely the model (תבנית) of the tabernacle and the model (תבנית) of all its furniture, thus shall you make it.

The LXX translates תבנית here παράδειγμα

xxv 40 And see that you make them according to their model (תבניתם) which is being shown you on the mountain. (LXX τύπος)

Cf. xxvi 30 And you shall raise up the tabernacle according to its regulation (משפטו) which you were shown on the mountain. (LXX εἶδος)

Cf. xxvii 8b As he has shown you on the mountain so shall you make it.

תבנית is derived from בנה "He built". In Deut. iv 16-18 it refers to idols, in 2 Kings xvi 10 to the shape of an altar, in Jos. xxii 28 and Ps. cxliv 12 to the structure of a palace. In 1 Chron. xxviii 11-19 and Num. viii 4 it occurs with a meaning similar to Ex. xxv 9 and 40. The LXX equivalents παράδειγμα and τύπος are used by Plato and Aristotle to refer to the transcendent ideas.³⁾ It seems likely, therefore, that we have in these texts the idea of actual heavenly models on which the earthly structures are to be patterned.

The similarity between P's idea of the heavenly models of the tabernacle and Ezekiel's idea of the heavenly temple is clear; but there is an important difference between the two accounts in which the ideas occur. Whereas in P Moses is commanded to build a sanctuary on earth corresponding to the heavenly model, there is no such command in Ezekiel. All that Ezekiel must do is recount what he has seen. For Ezekiel God Himself will establish the sanctuary, whereas for P it must be built by Moses.

3.

The tradition of the heavenly temple and its relationship to the temple on Zion reaches far back into the history of Israel and of the

¹⁾ This translation of תבנית is supported by S.R. DRIVER, *The Book of Exodus*, 1911, p. 267; A.H. MCNEILE, *The Book of Exodus*, 1917, p. 159; G. VON RAD, *Die Priesterschrift im Hexateuch*, 1934, p. 215; K. GALLING, in G. BEER, *Exodus*, mit einem Beitrag von K. GALLING, 1939, p. 130; M. NOTH, *Das Zweite Buch Moses, Exodus*, A.T.D., 1959, *ad loc.*

²⁾ Compare especially Ex. xxv 9 and Ez. xl 4.

³⁾ E.g. Plato, Rep. 592E; Rep. 396E; Rep. 397A; Aristotle, Metaph. 991A 21, 1013 A27.

ancient Near East. The temple of Solomon inherited the mythology which attached to Zion when it was the holy place of the Jebusite cult. In this mythology mount Zion corresponded to Zaphon, the mountain abode of the gods. Zion was, therefore, God's earthly abode, a copy of the heavenly palace.¹⁾

The earliest testimony to this idea is the famous Sumerian inscription of Gudea of Lagash which recounts how he saw in a vision the goddess Nina, her brother Ningiran and her sister Nindub. The first of these orders him to build a temple, the second shows him the heavenly temple he is to copy, and the third gives him a plan of the temple.²⁾ The vision of Moses in Exodus xxv is similar to this account in structure. He too is shown the heavenly archetype and commanded to copy it. Ezekiel's vision is different in that he is not commanded to build a copy of what he sees.

In Enuma Elish VI 50 ff. we are told how the Annunaki build a house for Marduk. The action seems to be taking place in heaven until, suddenly, in line 71 we are told, "This is Babylon, the place that is your home." The piece goes on to describe how the gods take up their abode there. Lines 106 ff. contain a liturgy, one of whose members reads:

May he cause incense to be smelled . . . their spells.

A likeness on earth of what he has wrought in heaven. (lines 112-3.)

Here we have a situation which is closer to Ezekiel than to P. By the device of assimilating earth to heaven the impression is given that the earthly temple was constructed by the gods themselves, and that there is an essential continuity between the earthly liturgy and the heavenly liturgy.³⁾

Therefore, Ezekiel and P share the priestly tradition of the heavenly temple, which is ultimately derived from the mythology of the ancient Near East, and apply it to the new temple of the Return. But they diverge in their interpretations of the tradition. Ezekiel sees the new temple as the work of God Himself—a manifestation on

¹⁾ R. E. CLEMENTS, *God and Temple*, 1965, is a valuable treatment of this subject. See pp. 65 ff., 68, 81-2. Cf. G. B. GRAY, *Sacrifice in the Old Testament*, 1925, pp. 148-167.

²⁾ Text in A. JEREMIAS, *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients*, 1906 p. 353.

³⁾ Text in J. PRITCHARD, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament*, 1955, pp. 68-9. Cf. Ugaritic Poems about Baal and Anat AB, v, lines 62 ff. (*Ibid.*, pp. 133-4), Akkadian Temple Program for the New Year's Festival, lines 374-380 (*ibid.*, pp. 333-334); cf. also, Psalms xi 4, xiv 2, 7 xx 3, 7 lxxvi 3, 9; lxxx 2, 15.

earth of the heavenly house of God, while P sees the new temple as the work of men in conscious imitation of the heavenly model. Ezekiel's interpretation is eschatological. He sees the new temple as the removal of the barrier between heaven and earth, and the beginning of the new age. P's interpretation may be called hieratic. It preserves the distinction between heaven and earth and limits contact between the two realms to the duly constituted sacred place and priestly order.¹⁾

The subsequent history of these divergent traditions illuminates the origins of Jewish apocalyptic. We shall attempt to follow each one in its complexity. For the success of this attempt it is important to recognize that we are dealing not with two separate traditions, but with divergent interpretations of one, essentially priestly, tradition. The themes we are tracing are therefore two sides of a priestly debate, and are dialectically related.

We shall consider Ezekiel's tradition first, then that of P, and conclude with an attempted reconstruction of the relationship between the two, which we believe throws light on the origins of apocalyptic.

4.

Our investigation of the history of Ezekiel's tradition about the temple depends on G. VON RAD's analysis of the traditions in exilic and post-exilic religion. The effect of our discussion is to propose certain modifications and to answer certain questions in his analysis, but we should not obscure the fact that VON RAD's work has made this investigation possible.

The vision of the heavenly temple is the climax of the book of Ezekiel, coming after the promises of restoration in chapters xxxiv 11-37, and the great eschatological battle against Gog of Magog in chapters xxxviii-xxxix. The battle ends with an invitation to a sacrificial feast upon the mountains of Israel (xxxix 17-20) and the promise to restore the divine presence to Israel. (xxxix 21-29.) The temple is the place of sacrifice and the place of the divine presence, and so the description of the new temple is a necessary climax to these oracles. The context shows clearly that the temple is an eschatological reality.

The oracles of restoration in Ezek. xxxix 21-29 and the vision of the temple in xl ff. belong to the tradition of the restoration of

¹⁾ Cf. K. Koch, "Die Eigenart der Priesterschriftlichen Sinaigesetzgebung", *Z. Th. K.* 55 (1958), pp. 36-51.

Zion which played an important role in exilic prophecy (cf. Is. xli 19, xlix) ¹⁾. VON RAD detects two themes within the tradition. The first is the failure of the hostile attack on Zion, which is part of the oldest traditions of pre-exilic Jerusalem. It occurs in Ezekiel xxxviii-xxxix, Joel iv 9-17 (iii 9-17) and Zechariah xii and xiv. The second theme is the pilgrimage of the nations to the city on Zion. The oldest version we have, Is. ii 2-4, tells of a miraculous heightening of mount Zion so that all the nations will see it and come to it. ²⁾

In Deutero-Isaiah the restoration is part of the eschatological event, and will occur when the exiles return, with God accompanying them (Is. lii 11-12, xlvi 20;). ³⁾ Is. lii 7-9 the restoration of Jerusalem is explicitly promised. Jeremiah also represents this hope (Jer. xxiv 5ff., xxxiii 4 ff., xxx 18 ff.). VON RAD explains this emphasis in Jeremiah, Deutero-Isaiah and Ezekiel as a response by these prophets to scepticism about Yahweh's ability or willingness to act in history in a time of crisis. When the great Mesopotamian powers were making ominous moves against Palestine (c. 600 B.C.), there were those in Jerusalem who said that "Yahweh does neither good nor evil" (Zeph. i 12). ⁴⁾ The exile obviously promoted such scepticism, and the tradition of the eschatological restoration of Zion was developed by Jeremiah, Deutero-Isaiah and Ezekiel to combat it.

These prophets emphasized the newness of the expected act of God. Yahweh would make a new covenant with his people (Jeremiah, *supra*; Ezek. xxxvi 25 ff., Is. lv 3) ⁵⁾ Deuteronomy however looked forward to a restoration of the old covenant (Deut. xii 7, 12, 18; xiv 26; xv 11). ⁶⁾ This difference between the prophets and the nearly contemporary Deuteronomy is important for the thesis of this paper, and we shall return to it. The insistence on the "newness" of God's saving act marked off that act from the previous history and institutions of salvation (Jer. xxxi 32, Isaiah xliii 18). Jeremiah opposes the building of a new ark because the new age would have no need of it (Jer. iii 16ff.). VON RAD asks rhetorically, "how could the prophet's hearers countenance such words, which blasphemously challenged everything that they held most sacred?" Referring to Ezek. xxxvii, he continues, "Theologically speaking, they consigned their audience, and all their

¹⁾ VON RAD, *Theology* II, pp. 239-240.

²⁾ *Ibid.*, pp. 292-297.

³⁾ *Ibid.*, pp. 244-5.

⁴⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 263.

⁵⁾ *Ibid.*, pp. 270-1.

⁶⁾ *Ibid.*

contemporaries, to a kingdom of death where they could no longer be reached by the salvation coming from the old saving events. In this state, nothing remained for them but to cast their whole being on the future saving act which was already imminent".¹⁾ The new would be related to the old typologically; a new Exodus, a new covenant, a new David and, we may add, a new Temple, would occur in correspondence with the old.

The Return was not accompanied by eschatological miracles. Deutero-Isaiah's prophecy of the restoration of Zion remained unfulfilled. It did not die, however (e.g. Trito-Isaiah, lxii, lxvi 7 ff., cf. xlix 21). Whereas in Deutero-Isaiah Zion was the climax of the prediction of restoration, in Trito-Isaiah Zion, unredeemed and expectant, is the starting point.²⁾ The tradition reaches a new climax in Is. lx, with a lyrical description of the new Jerusalem. Along with these positive notes, there is in Trito-Isaiah a strong negative note. He judges their cultic piety to be vain (lviii 1 ff.); he suggests that their sin has prevented Yahweh from acting for their salvation (lix 1 ff.); but Yahweh will come as a warrior to Zion, to judge and restore (lix 158-20, cf. Ezekiel xxxviii-xxxix); he paints a picture of lurid rituals which provoke Yahweh continually (lxv 1-7); finally he condemns the whole existing system of temple, ritual and cult:

1. Thus saith the Lord:
Heaven is my throne
and earth my footstool;
what is the house which you would build for me,
and what is the place of my rest?
2. All these things my hand has made,
And so all these things are mine, says the Lord.
But this is the man to whom I will look,
He that is humble and contrite in spirit,
and trembles at my word.
3. He who slaughters an ox is like him who kills a man;
He who sacrifices a lamb, like him who breaks a dog's neck,
like him who offers swine's blood;
He who makes a memorial offering of frankincense,
like him who blesses an idol.
These have chosen their own ways,
and their soul delights in their abominations;
4. I also will choose affliction for them. . .

¹⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 272.

²⁾ *Ibid.*, pp. 280-1.

6. Hark, an uproar from the city!
 A voice from the temple!
 The voice of the Lord,
 Rendering recompense to his enemies.

(Isaiah lxvi 1-6).

In this passage Yahweh condemns the existing cultus (verses 1-5) and acts to destroy it (verse 6). The following verses (7-9) express how sudden this coming of God to Zion will be: "like giving birth before labor". This is the same note that we detected in the later apocalyptic passages concerning the temple in Jerusalem: hostility to the earthly temple and the hope that God would act soon to remove it and replace it with His eschatological presence. The coming of the new temple is the result of God's work and not of man's.

5.

The failure of the prophecies about the Return left the initiative with the group which subscribed to P. Their intention was to restore the old ways. Deuteronomy served as a support for this point of view. They set about rebuilding the temple and the city wall and after many vicissitudes succeeded in establishing what WELLHAUSEN called "the post-exilic theocracy". Their chief support came from the Persian crown (Ezra i 2). Zerubbabel, Ezra and Nehemiah were appointees of the Achemenids and, as Ezra ix 8 ff. shows, these leaders of the Restoration were politically subservient to Persia.

The document P provided the inspiration for the rebuilding of the temple. It was probably rebuilt on the same site, following a custom of Mesopotamia and Palestine.¹⁾ There is some debate whether the structure described in P could have been built at all. GALLING calls it a "grotesque" construction.²⁾ G. AHARONI and Ruth AMIRAN, however, believe that they have discovered the remains of a building which corresponded to P's tabernacle at Arad, dating from the first quarter of the first millenium B.C. AHARONI believes that it was a style of frontier temple.³⁾ Therefore there is no reason to assume

¹⁾ K. GALLING, "Zerubbabel und der Hohepriester beim Wiederaufbau des Tempels" in *Studien zur Geschichte Israels im persischen Zeitalter*, 1964, pp. 127-148, especially pp. 129-138.

²⁾ K. GALLING, in G. BEER, *Exodus*, 1939, pp. 131, 133 ff.

³⁾ G. AHARONI, "The Excavations of Tell Arad, Preliminary Report," *B.I.E.S.* XXIII (1963), p. 217 ff. (Hebrew), and *I.E.J.*, XIV (1964), p. 131 ff.; and *Archaeology* XVII (1964), p. 43 ff., cited by B. MAZAR, "The Sanctuary of Arad and the Family of Hobab the Kenite," *J.N.E.S.* XXIV (1965), p. 297 ff., especially p. 297 n. 2.

that the second temple was not built according to the description in P.

6.

We must now consider the historical evidence for the rebuilding of the temple. The strongest themes in the evidence are opposition and disappointment. Haggai tells of the neglect of the temple by those who returned from the exile, and in Ezra iii 12-13 we are told how the elders wept so loudly at the modesty of the second temple by comparison with the first, that their wailing rivalled the sound of the trumpets. Zechariah speaks of the "despisers of small things" (Zec. iv 9-10).

Not only the officials of Samaria sought to hinder the work of rebuilding, but also certain prophets, whom Nehemiah accused of being in the pay of the Samaritans (Neh. vi 14). The Persian delegate does not seem to have had loyal support even amongst those who helped him set up the new cultus, for when Nehemiah returned from a visit to his sovereign he found that the temple had been polluted in his absence (Neh. xiii 10). How is one to explain this opposition to the re-establishment of the Temple and cultus?

It is not sufficient to accuse those who braved the hardship of the Return of laziness and indifference towards the sacral institutions. Rather, there is a theological explanation for their refusal to build the temple. The opponents of re-building were those who subscribed to the view of Ezekiel that the new temple would be revealed by God Himself. For them, rebuilding was a betrayal of the eschatological hope. The structure which took shape before their eyes, according to the plans of P, was indeed "grotesque", when compared with the vision of Ezekiel. No wonder they wept at its inauguration, at the humiliation of political subservience which it symbolized, and at the travesty of their faith in God's eschatological redemption.

Otto PLÖGER ¹⁾ has argued recently that apocalyptic arose in circles that were theologically estranged from the post-exilic theocracy because its constitution left no room for eschatological hope. ²⁾ It

¹⁾ O. PLÖGER, *Theokratie und Eschatologie*, 1962.

²⁾ The judgement that P has no eschatology goes back to M. NOTH, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 2, 1957, pp. 180 ff. PLÖGER (*op. cit.*, p. 48) describes P as a massive "aetiology" of the community founded by Moses, vaguely historical, but chiefly concerned to define what Israel is. K. ELLIGER, "Sinn und Ursprung der priesterlichen Geschichtserzählung," *Z.Th.K.* 49 (1952), pp. 120-143, argues that there is a certain historical expectation in P, which was fulfilled in the return of the exiles to Jerusalem.

is true that P has no eschatology; with the erection of a sanctuary fit to hold the occasional visitations of the "glory" of God P has realized its hope. Our investigation has shown that another point of divergence between the theory and these eschatological circles was the theology of the temple.

If PLÖGER's thesis explains the importance of eschatology in apocalyptic, our thesis explains the importance of its transcendentalism. The true temple, to be revealed at the eschaton, was present in heaven. It had been seen by Ezekiel. Its eternal presence was a judgement on the temple of Zerubbabel. As they fixed their hope on the final act of God, so these circles lifted their minds to the heavenly reality of the true temple, awaiting its manifestation. The tradition of opposition to the temple of Jerusalem and interest in the pre-existent temple of the eschaton, which we have traced in the apocalyptic literature, derives, therefore, from the vision of Ezekiel.

There is much more to the heavenly world of apocalyptic than the temple. We do not argue that all interest in transcendental reality derives from Ezekiel. However, it is necessary to have an impetus from one's own tradition in order to borrow from others. The heavenly temple of Ezekiel generates an initial interest in the world above, leading the apocalyptists to develop their extended speculations on the dimensions and inhabitants of heaven.

7.

There remains for our consideration one other tradition about the second temple. Haggai and Zechariah represent an attempted compromise between P and Ezekiel. They argued the rebuilding of the temple, and believed that its completion would inaugurate the eschatological age. VON RAD describes their message as follows:

The prophetic message of Haggai and Zechariah also culminates in the approaching advent of Jahweh and the imminent establishment of his kingdom, but, to the great embarrassment of not a few of the commentators, this message is linked most closely to the rebuilding of the Temple . . . the link is, indeed, so close that for these two prophets the rebuilding of the Temple is actually the necessary precondition of Jahweh's advent and of his kingdom.¹⁾

He explains that their interest in the temple derives from "the . . . condition of the people".²⁾ We have attempted to provide a more

¹⁾ VON RAD, *Theology II*, *op. cit.*, p. 281.

²⁾ *Ibid.*

precise description of this condition, namely, a theological stalemate between the theocrats and the eschatologists.

We can only assume that the demand of Haggai and Zechariah that the Temple be rebuilt comes from the circles of P. There is evidence, however, that their eschatological hopes were influenced by Ezekiel. In Haggai the completion of the Temple would herald the last days when God would shake heaven and earth (Hag. ii 6-9); the same expectation occurs in Ezekiel (xxvi 15 b, 19c, 20b, cf. xxxi 6). God will also destroy the heathen enemies of Israel by setting them against one another (Hag. ii 21-23); this, too, is found in Ezekiel (xxxviii 19-23). There will be prosperity for Israel (Hag. ii 9, 19) and a Davidic prince to rule the people for ever (Hag. ii 21-23) as Ezekiel also promises (xxxvi 8-11, xlvi 1-12, xxxvii 24-25, 26b, xlv 7 ff.). These echoes of Ezekiel suggest that Haggai stood in the eschatological tradition. He may also have used Ezekelian imagery deliberately because it would have been influential amongst those who, out of loyalty to Ezekiel's hope, opposed the rebuilding which Haggai sought to promote.

The similarities between Zechariah and Ezekiel are even more striking than those found in Haggai. (Zec. ii 5b, 10-11, 13 par. Ezek. xliii 1-9, Zec. viii 3, par. Ezek. xxxvii 21, Zec. viii 12 par. Ezek. xlvi, Zec. iii 8 par. Ezek. xii 11, xxiv 24). Zechariah comes very close to Ezekiel's view that the temple must be built by Yahweh himself when in iv 6 he proclaims that the strength to perform the task comes from Yahweh alone: "Not by might and not by power, but by my Spirit, says Yahweh of hosts". The visions of Zechariah are parallel in form to the vision of Ezekiel. In the third vision (ii 5-9) the prophet sees a man with a measuring line preparing for the building of the walls of Jerusalem. An angel recalls him, for the new city is to be without defences, protected by God alone. Like Ezekiel's vision of the temple, this vision of the walls was ignored and the walls were built (Ezra iv 6 ff., Neh. iii). The total effect of Zechariah's visions is precisely the same as the effect of Ezekiel's. VON RAD summarizes this well.¹⁾

The compromise attempted by Haggai and Zechariah failed. The priestly theocracy triumphed and the eschatological hope for the new temple and the new Zion disappeared from the official theology of Jerusalem. It was nurtured in circles which eventually produced the apocalyptic literature.

¹⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 288.

8.

The thrust of our argument is to suggest that what VON RAD calls "certain ideas common to the whole of the east",¹⁾ namely, the ideas of heavenly entities, are of central importance in the origin and constitution of apocalyptic thought. We have suggested that apocalyptic arose in circles estranged from the theocracy by the temple—as well as by eschatology; and if this theory is sound, then we must take seriously the role of the ancient priestly tradition of the heavenly sanctuary in apocalyptic theology. This element adds yet another dimension to the discussion about the origins of apocalyptic. Traditionally it was believed to have derived from prophecy. VON RAD argues for its origin in Wisdom circles.²⁾ We suggest that the priestly tradition, as interpreted by Ezekiel, also played a dominant role.

The importance of this tradition in apocalyptic was recognized long ago by E. STAUFFER.³⁾ He took the Qumran texts as his point of departure. Indeed, it is only on the basis of a priestly-eschatological tradition such as we have attempted to identify that a phenomenon such as Qumran can be explained. There is also much in the New Testament which can be illuminated from this tradition.

¹⁾ *Ibid.*

²⁾ *Ibid.*, pp. 300-308.

³⁾ E. STAUFFER, *New Testament Theology*, 1955, pp. 21-25; "Probleme der Priestertradition", in *T.L.Z.* 81 (1956), pp. 135-148.