



Type: Journal Article

---

## Christian Envy of the Temple

Author(s): Hugh Nibley

Source: *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, Vol. 50, No. 2 (October 1959),  
pp. 97-123

Published by: University of Pennsylvania Press

---

**Abstract:** No abstract available.

---

## CHRISTIAN ENVY OF THE TEMPLE

By HUGH NIBLEY, Brigham Young University,  
Provo, Utah

### THE QUESTION

IN his justly celebrated work on the fall of Jerusalem, S. G. F. Brandon comments on the “truly amazing” indifference of Christian writers to the importance of that event in the history of the Church.<sup>1</sup> But if the fall of the city meant for the Christians much what it meant for the Jews, i.e. “the sudden removal of the original source of authority”,<sup>2</sup> the loss of the Temple, which was the central episode of the catastrophe, could hardly have been of less significance; yet Brandon himself, though by comparison with other scholars a positive enthusiast for the Temple, minimizes its importance for the Christians as consistently as he accuses others of playing down the importance of Jerusalem.<sup>3</sup>

Why is this? Long ago Adam of St. Victor observed with wonder that the Christian fathers had always gone out of their way to avoid any discussion of the Tabernacle of God, in spite of its great popular interest and its importance in the divine economy.<sup>4</sup> The reason for this strange attitude is, as Adam and

<sup>1</sup> S. G. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church* (London, 1951), pp. 10–11.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 250.

<sup>3</sup> While opposing the usual tendency to minimize the Temple in the economy of the early Church, e.g. pp. 263, 29, 39, 164–5, Brandon bestows upon the city of Jerusalem the laurels that rightfully belong to the Temple, e.g. pp. 19–21.

<sup>4</sup> . . . mirum est quod omnes praetergressi sint . . . , Adam of St. Victor, *De tripartito tabernaculo*, Prooemia, ii, in Migne, *Patrolog. Latina*, vol. 198, col. 625. Richard of St. Victor writes on the same subject by popular demand—rogatus ab amicis, in *De tabernaculo*, Tract. I, in Migne, *P.L.* 196. 211 f.

his fellow Richard explain, that the very thing which makes the Temple so attractive to many Christians, i.e. the exciting possibility of a literal and tangible bond between heaven and earth, is precisely the thing that most alarms and embarrasses the churchmen.<sup>5</sup> Again, why so? Can it be that the destruction of the Temple left a gaping void in the life of the Church, a vacuum that the historians and theologians have studiously ignored, exactly as they have ignored such other appalling reverses to the Church as the fall of Jerusalem and the cessation of the spiritual gifts?<sup>6</sup> If the loss of the Temple was really a crippling blow to the Church, the fact can no longer be overlooked in the interpretation of Church history.

But was it such a blow? The purpose of this paper is to consider three facts that strongly support an affirmative reply, namely: (1) that many Christian writers have expressed the conviction that the Church possesses no adequate substitute for the Temple, and have yearned for its return; (2) that determined attempts have been made from time to time to revive in the Church practices peculiar to the Temple; and (3) that the official Christian position, that Church and Temple cannot coexist and hence the latter has been abolished forever, has always been weakened by a persistent fear that the Temple might be restored. These three propositions reflect in the Christian mind a sense respectively of loss, inadequacy, and misgiving. What they all share in common is envy of the Temple. But before the significance of that becomes apparent, we must consider the three points in order.

<sup>5</sup> Adam, *loc. cit.*; Richard, *loc. cit.* and *ibid.* 223 ff., cf. 306.

<sup>6</sup> Of the latter calamity Bishop John of Bristol writes: "The silence of ecclesiastical history respecting the cessation . . . is to be ascribed . . . to the combined operation of prejudice and policy—of prejudice which made them reluctant to believe, of policy which made them anxious to conceal the truth", *Eccles. Hist. of the Second and Third Centuries* (London, 1894), p. 50.

## I

## GOOD RIDDANCE OR TRAGIC LOSS?

Whatever the conflicting views of the earliest Christians may have been,<sup>7</sup> the perennial controversy regarding the Temple in later times is well illustrated by the Battle of the Books that began in the third century when Bishop Nepos attacked the “allegorists” with a book in defense of a literal and earthly Millennium; in reply to this “unhealthy” teaching, Dionysius, the sophisticated Bishop of Alexandria, wrote what Jerome calls “an elegant book, deriding the old fable about the thousand years and the earthly Jerusalem with its gold and jewels, the restoration of the Temple”, etc.<sup>8</sup> This in turn brought forth a two-volume counterblast in Jerome’s day by one Apollinarius, who “not only speaks for his own following but for the greater part of the people here as well, so that I can already see”, says Jerome, “what a storm of opposition is in store for me!”<sup>9</sup> Jerome frankly admits that the opposition represents the old Christian tradition, his own liberal “spiritualizing” interpretation running counter to the beliefs of such eminent earlier authorities as Tertullian, Victorinus, Lactantius, and Irenaeus. This puts him in a dilemma: “If we accept these things literally we are judaizers, if spiritually, as they were written, we seem to be contradicting the opinions of many of the ancients.”<sup>10</sup> From personal experience, furthermore, Jerome can tell us how the old-fashioned

<sup>7</sup> Discussed by Brandon, *op. cit.*, pp. 262–4, 39, 127. See below, note 66.

<sup>8</sup> Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vii. 24, 1 ff., quoting Dionysius at length. Jerome, *Comment. in Isaiaem*, 18, in *P.L.* 24. 627.

<sup>9</sup> . . . quem non solum suae sectae homines, sed et nostrorum in hac parte dumtaxat plurima sequitur multitudo, ut praesaga mente jam cernam quantum in me rabies concitanda sit, Jerome, *loc. cit.*

<sup>10</sup> *Loc. cit.* The case for the literalists is stated by Cyril of Jerusalem, who insists that Jesus meant the real Temple when he spoke of his Father’s House: τῷ Χριστῷ πεισθησόμεθα τῷ λέγοντι περὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ [i.e. Luke 2. 49, John 2. 16] . . . δι’ ὧν σαφέστατα τὸν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις πρότερον ναὸν οἶκον εἶναι τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ Πατρὸς ὁμολόγει, *Catechesis*, vii, *De Patre*, c. 6, in Migne, *Patrolog. Graeca*, 33. 612.

Christians in Jerusalem insist on pointing out the very plot of ground on the Mount of Olives "where they say the sanctuary of the Lord, that is, the Temple, is to be built, and where it will stand forever", that is, "when, as they say, the Lord comes with the heavenly Jerusalem at the end of the world".<sup>11</sup>

Professor Cadbury, in a study in which he suggests that the earliest Christians may well have believed "that this site [the Mount of Olives] is to be the site of the *parousia*", concludes that "if other Christians, ancient and modern, have found the primitive emphasis on such a literal future event embarrassing, Luke gives no real countenance to any of their ways of avoiding it".<sup>12</sup> Which means that Jerome's dilemma remains unresolved to this day. Through the years the doctors have continued to dismiss a literal Temple as an old wives' tale only to find all their arguments against it offset by arguments at least as potent in its favor.

First and foremost was the philosophical plea against a physical Temple (supported by endless repetitions of Isa. 66. 1), that God is not to be contained in any crass material structure.<sup>13</sup> The fact that the invisible incorporeal God needs no visible corporeal Temple "was grasped by no man at any time, either Greek or Barbarian, except by our Savior alone", writes Eusebius, forgetting in his tendentious zeal that this had been a stock theme of the schools for centuries, and that Christian Clement, speaking

<sup>11</sup> *Comm. in Jerem.* xxxi. 37, in *P.L.* 24. 886, . . . Judaei videlicet et nostri judaizantes, conantur ostendere ibi dicunt sanctuarium Domini, id est templum esse condendum, mansurumque in perpetuum, etc., cf. col. 516.

<sup>12</sup> H. J. Cadbury, in W. D. Davies and D. Daube (eds.), *The Background of the NT and Its Eschatology* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1956), p. 309.

<sup>13</sup> Therefore even Solomon's Temple was neque legitimum neque devotum, according to Zeno, *Tract.* I, xiv, in *P.L.* 11. 355, since God reprobat tam immensum, tam insigne, tam opulens templum, etc., *ibid.* 356-8. The same argument is used by Hilary, *Tract. in Ps.* 126, in *P.L.* 9. 694-9; Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* vi. 25, in *P.L.* 6. 728 ff.; Isidore, *Epist.* iv, no. 70, in *P.G.* 78. 1132-3, cf. *Epist.* i, no. 20, *ibid.* 196; Procopius, *Comm. in Is.*, ch. vi, v. 5, in *P.G.* 87. 1937.

with the pagan voice of Alexandria, had given it his eloquent best with supporting quotations from Plato, Zeno, and Euripides.<sup>14</sup> The main objection to this view, however, was not its heathen coloring but the idea, pointed out later by Aquinas, that the Temple was not built for God but for man, who needs a tangible image of celestial things and “special times, tabernacles, vessels, and ministers” to inculcate understanding and reverence.<sup>15</sup> “It cannot be too often emphasized”, writes Canon Phythian-Adams, “that the belief in the Presence is not to be described as ‘unspiritual’ simply because Its ‘tabernacle’ was material.” And the same scholar, who represents a surprising but unmistakable tendency of recent years to view the Temple with a new sympathy and understanding, rebukes the hitherto common practice in Christian theology “of confusing a belief or doctrine with low and materialistic interpretations of it”.<sup>16</sup> Certainly the Jews themselves were well aware of the limitations of physical buildings, and needed no Greek schoolmen, levied as spokesmen for a new religion, to tell them what Solomon had said long before: “The heaven of heavens cannot contain thee, how much less this house which I have built!”<sup>17</sup>

Apart from its gross and earthly substance, the Temple has always been criticized by the churchmen as symbolic of a narrow, selfish, tribal world-view, incompatible with the grandiose concept of a universal Church.<sup>18</sup> Again the answer was clear: What

<sup>14</sup> Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* iii. 13 *fin.*, in *P.G.* 21. 220. Clement of Alexandria, *Stromat.* v. xi, in *P.G.* 9. 112 ff.; vii. v, *ibid.* 436 ff. Theodoret, in *P.G.* 83. 885, quotes Zeno and Plato in this connection.

<sup>15</sup> Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Quaest. cii, Art. iv.

<sup>16</sup> W. J. Phythian-Adams, *The People and the Presence* (New York, 1942), p. 60.

<sup>17</sup> 2 Chron. 6. 18.

<sup>18</sup> So Irenaeus, *Contra haeres.* iv. xxxiv. 4; Hilary, *Prolog. in Cant.*, in *P.L.* 9. 643; Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* iv. 14; John Chrysostom, *De s. Pentecoste*, Homil. i. i, in *P.G.* 50. 453, etc. A favorite theme with the moderns who feel that the liquidation of the Temple was indispensable to “the absolution

could proclaim the oneness of God's rule and the universality of true religion more eloquently than the Temple itself, "a house of prayer for all nations", "the spiritual metropolis of all lands"?<sup>19</sup> Some scholars protested that the authority of the Temple had been virtually abolished by the Exile and the diaspora,<sup>20</sup> but others pointed out with equal assurance that those misfortunes actually had the opposite effect: "Dispersion . . . increased the significance and the fascination of the Temple", while the Exile "only strengthened the universal love for it".<sup>21</sup> Actually the limiting of the great central rites and ordinances to one spot was the very thing that recommended the Temple so strongly to the Christian schoolmen, enthralled as they were by "the withering pressure of an omnipresent and monotonous idea"—the passion for Oneness.<sup>22</sup> Nothing on earth represented the oneness of God, his worship, and his people more perfectly than the Temple had, and the Church sorely missed just such a centralizing force.<sup>23</sup> Thus Peter Cantor in the twelfth century deplors the multiplication of Christian shrines and

of God's worship from all bonds of time and nationality", Bern. Weiss, *Life of Christ* (Edinburgh ed., 1883 f.), iii. 261.

<sup>19</sup> J. S. Raisin, *Gentile Reactions to Jewish Ideals* (New York, 1953), p. 225, cf. pp. 15 f., 34, 94.

<sup>20</sup> So J. E. Renan, *Antichrist* (Boston, 1897), pp. 187 f.; A. S. Peake, *The People and the Book* (Oxford, 1925), p. 281.

<sup>21</sup> Quotes resp. from A. J. Fairbairn, *Philosophy of the Christian Religion* (New York, 1902), p. 487, and A. T. Olmstead, *Jesus in the Light of History* (New York, 1942), pp. 69–70; cf. S. A. Cook, *The Old Testament* (New York, 1936), p. 130.

<sup>22</sup> Quote from J. B. Bury. From early times Christians debated the cosmic significance of the oneness of the Temple: Clement of Alex., *Stromat.* v. ix, in *P.G.* 9. 112: Πάλιν ὁ Μωϋσῆς . . . ἕνα δ' οὖν νεῶν ἱδρυσάμενος τοῦ Θεοῦ, μονογενῆ τε κόσμον . . . καὶ τὸν ἕνα, ὡς οὐκ ἔτι τῷ Βασιλείδῃ δοκεῖ, κατήγγελε Θεόν . . . .

<sup>23</sup> "The purpose (*ratio*) of the unity of the temple or tabernacle . . . was to fix in men's minds the unity of the divine faith, God desiring that sacrifice be made to him in one place only", Thos. Aquinas, *Sum. Theol.*, Q. cii, Art. iv. On the lack of a centralizing force, L. Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church* (London, 1931), ii. 521 ff. Cf. above, note 2.

invites the Church to “note that in all Israel there was but one Temple, one Tabernacle, one Altar . . .” and to follow that example as “the only remedy” for “this *morbum multiplicem*”.<sup>24</sup>

How was such simplification to be effected? Peter and his fellows know nothing of the later device by which in theory there is only one central Mass in the Church “in which all the Church was thought to participate”.<sup>25</sup> Instead he suggests a compromise that had been recommended long before: “Following the example of the *one* Temple, there should be in every city but one church, or, if it is a very large city, but a few, and those duly subordinated to the one principal church.”<sup>26</sup> The objection to this, of course, is that the few fall as far short of the perfection of the Monad as do the many. Christian apologists had never tired of pointing out to the heathen the absurdity of their many gods and temples; how, then, were they to answer heathen and Christian criticism of the endless multiplication of Christian temples of which they first boasted<sup>27</sup> and which they then tried to explain away?<sup>28</sup>

The standard explanation was that since the Church was mystically the Temple, and, being universal, was *one*, it followed

<sup>24</sup> Peter Cantor, *Verbum abbreviatum*, c. 29, in *P.L.* 205. 104, 106–7. The historian Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 22, made the same observation in the 5th century.

<sup>25</sup> This is the “messe publique”, the oldest exemplar of which L. Duchesne calls “un cérémonial fort postérieur à l’âge antique”, *Origines du culte chrétien* (Paris, 1898), p. 154.

<sup>26</sup> Peter Cantor, *loc. cit.*; so also Hilary, *Tract. in Ps.* 14. 3, in *P.L.* 9. 301.

<sup>27</sup> Hilary, *loc. cit.*; Eusebius, *Praep. evang.* v. i, in *P.G.* 21. 312; Jerome, *Comment. in Is.* 13, in *P.L.* 24. 471–2; Leo, *Serm.* liv. 8, in *P.L.* 54. 341; John Chrys., *Contra Jud.* 12, in *P.G.* 48. 829 f., cf. 49. 409, 52. 410.

<sup>28</sup> See the discussion by A. le Nourry in *P.G.* 900–2. A writing attributed to Athanasius admits that the multiplication of shrines presents a strange and paradoxical problem—ξένον καὶ παράδοξον τὸ ἐπερώτημα—to which the author gives an even stranger solution. See *Quaestiones ad Antiochum Ducem*, Q. 26, in *P.G.* 28. 613.



that the Temple was still one.<sup>29</sup> Because Christians do all things in common, it was argued, they may be considered *as* one single Temple.<sup>30</sup> But this was putting the cart before the horse, for, as Thomas Aquinas observes, the Temple was introduced in the first place to achieve that unity—it is not the mystical result of it. But having praised the Temple as the perfect expression of God's unity and of the *unitas et simplicitas* of the worship he requires, Thomas lamely adds: "But since the cult of the New Law with its spiritual sacrifice is acceptable to God, a multiplication of altars and temples is accordingly acceptable."<sup>31</sup> Here the word "spiritual" is expected to answer all questions and silence all objections, but Thomas's own insistence on the unique significance of the Temple as a *locus electus*, a tangible center of worship for the benefit of mortal man, makes demands that abstract terminology cannot satisfy.<sup>32</sup> What is everywhere is nowhere, and for the very reason that God and his Church *are* everywhere, there must be some special point of contact, Stephen VI is reported to have argued, around which the Church might like Israel center its activities.<sup>33</sup>

Still, the idea of a spiritual temple was made to order for the schoolmen, who from the first took to it like ducks to water. The

<sup>29</sup> The Temple represents the world—ὁ ναὸς δὲ ὡς οἶκος Θεοῦ ὄλον τὸν κόσμον τυποῖ, and since there is but "one world, above and below . . . analogous to the order of the Church", the Church itself is one Temple which ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς μόνος συν τοῖς ἱερωμένοις εἰσέρχεται, Symeon Thessal., *De sacro templo*, c. 131, in *P.G.* 155. 337–40. Cf. Leo, *loc. cit.*, Hilary, *In Ps.* 121, in *P.L.* 9. 662 f., and Theodoret, *Graec. affect. curat.*, Sermon vi, in *P.G.* 83. 989.

<sup>30</sup> Fulgentius, *Contra Fabianum*, frg. 34, in *P.L.* 65. 811 f.; Photius, *Epist.* i. viii. 31, in *P.G.* 102. 665; Wolbero, *In Cant.* iii. 15, in *P.L.* 195. 1203.

<sup>31</sup> Thos. Aquinas, *Sum. Theol.*, Q. cii, Art. iv: Et ideo ut firmaretur in animis hominum fides unitatis divinae, voluit Deus ut in uno loco tantum sibi sacrificium offerretur. . . . Sed cultus novae legis . . . Deo acceptus, etc.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, Arts. iv and v. Thomas himself at the beginning of Art. iv refutes the common doctrine of a purely spiritual Temple.

<sup>33</sup> Anastasius Bibliothecarius, *De vitis Rom. Pont.*, no. 112, Steph. VI, in *P.L.* 128. 1399.

supplanting of a stone Temple by “a spiritual edifice” is for Neander nothing less than “the mightiest achievement in the History of humanity”.<sup>34</sup> It is a simple, eloquent formula: “The Messiah’s kingdom would supplant the outworn system of the past. He would raise up a temple of the spirit.”<sup>35</sup> . . . *lugeat carnalis Judaeus, sed spiritualis gaudeat Christianus!*<sup>36</sup> Again the argument falls flat, for the spiritual and carnal are not neatly divided between Jews and Christians, but “were to be found in both religions, and are still to be found in them”.<sup>37</sup> If the Christian doctors knew how to spiritualize the Temple, the rabbis had done a good job of de-eschatologizing long before them, and even the old-fashioned literalists knew the danger of “putting their trust in a building rather than in the God who created them”.<sup>38</sup> In the end it was not a question of Temple *versus* no Temple but, as Irenaeus pointed out, one of proper values and emphasis.<sup>39</sup>

An inevitable corollary of the spiritual Temple was the purely intellectual Temple: *Templum Dei naturaliter est anima rationalis*, the human breast wherein “the rational and intellectual and impolluted and external unutterable nature of Divinity resides”, that higher, purer Temple built of abstract virtues, etc.<sup>40</sup> But

<sup>34</sup> A. Neander, *The Life of Christ* (4th ed., New York, 1858), p. 180.

<sup>35</sup> C. M. Laymon, *Life and Teachings of Jesus* (New York, 1955), p. 280.

<sup>36</sup> St. Leo, *Serm.* iii, in *P.L.* 54. 145.

<sup>37</sup> F. C. Grant, *An Introduction to NT Thought* (New York, 1950), p. 14.

<sup>38</sup> *Epist. Barnab.*, c. 16; cf. Yeb. 6b: לא ממקדש אתה נתיירא אלא ממי שהוהיר על המקדש: “While the Temple was still standing the principle had been established that the efficacy of every species of expiation was morally conditioned”, W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (London, 1948), p. 257.

<sup>39</sup> . . . neque enim domum incusabat [Jesus] . . . sed eos, qui non bene utebantur domo . . ., Irenaeus, *Contra haeres.* iv. ii. 6. Even Stephen’s sermon (Acts 7), usually viewed as an attack on the Temple, is rather an appeal for a proper sense of values. See W. Manson, *Epistle to the Hebrews* (London, 1951), pp. 30, 28, 34.

<sup>40</sup> Quotes from Origen, *Comm. in Mt.* xiv. 22, in *P.G.* 13. 1452–3, and *Comm. in Joan.*, T. x, 16, in *P.G.* 14. 349. The Temple is built of simplicity,

aside from the fact that such ideas bore the trademark of the schools and were far over the heads of the general public,<sup>41</sup> there was no reason why an “intellectual” Temple should not coexist with a real one: while the Lord referred to the Temple as his body, the Church, Israel, and even the dry bones of Ezekiel, Origen observes, the real Temple was still standing.<sup>42</sup> Why not? The early fathers found “nothing absurd in saying that God’s dwelling is in heaven and at the same time on the earth . . .”<sup>43</sup> and scholastic philosophers have no difficulty in viewing the Temple under various mystic, moral, and material aspects without the least sense of contradiction.<sup>44</sup>

Along with their philosophical and moral condemnation of the Temple, the doctors never tired of laboring the historical argument—the cold fact that the Temple had actually been destroyed, that God had allowed its destruction and the prophets foretold it.<sup>45</sup> But that had happened before, following a well-established eschatological pattern which saw in the destruction itself an earnest of restoration;<sup>46</sup> and while in the divine plan

intellect, veritas, pudicitia, continentia humana, etc., Zeno, *Tract.* I, xiv, in *P.L.* 11. 361 f. The theme is extremely popular with theologians.

<sup>41</sup> Jewish and Christian doctors alike “spun out abstract doctrines far beyond the ken of the common folk, and insisted that these are the truths of religion and morality. Nor are we closing the gap today . . .”, M. Kadushin, *The Rabbinic Mind* (New York, 1952), pp. 87–88. “The fathers”, says Gibbon, “. . . deem themselves secure and invulnerable behind the ample veil of allegory, which they carefully spread over every tender part of the Mosaic dispensation”, *Decline and Fall*, Vol. I, ch. ix, at note 31.

<sup>42</sup> Origen, *Comm. in Joan.*, T. x, 20, in *P.G.* 14. 369 f.: . . . Ἀμφότερα μέντοιγε, τὸν τε ἱερόν καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ—it is quite possible for it to be two or more things at once.

<sup>43</sup> Cyril of Alex., *Comm. in Mich.* iv, in *P.G.* 71. 644. Cf. Symeon, *De sacro templo*, in *P.G.* 155. 336, Photius, *Contra Manich.* ii, in *P.G.* 102. 108.

<sup>44</sup> Thus Rupert, *Reg. lib.* iii. 6–29, in *P.L.* 167. 1147–75; Hugo of St. Victor, *Alleg. in Vet. Test.* iii. 9, in *P.L.* 175. 661–3, and *De claustrum anim.* iii. 17, *ibid.* 176. 1118 ff.; Alan of Lille, *Sententiae*, no. 11, in *P.L.* 210. 236–7, 240; Garner., *De templo*, in *P.L.* 193. 398 ff.; Adam of St. Victor, *Serm.* xl, in *P.L.* 198. 364 ff., etc.

<sup>45</sup> See below, notes 152–7.

<sup>46</sup> Hilary, *Tract. in Ps.* 126, in *P.L.* 9. 694 f. Cf. A. T. Olmstead, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

the Temple was to have its ups and downs (the Jews themselves anticipating the worst),<sup>47</sup> there was no doubt in the minds of Jewish and Christian “fundamentalists” that the story would end on a note of eternal triumph for the Temple, whose glory was eternal, pre-existent, and indestructible.<sup>48</sup> And if the Jews looked forward to a dark interim between the fall of the Temple and the “Return and Restoration [which] were an integral part of the divine plan”,<sup>49</sup> so no less did the first Christians: “For the scripture says,” writes one of them, “showing how the City and the Temple and the People of Israel were to be taken away, ‘It shall come to pass in the last days, that the Lord will give over the sheep of his pasture, and their sheepfold and their tower to destruction.’”<sup>50</sup> The fathers of the fourth century were uncomfortably aware of this tradition, and Hilary states his own conviction that because of the wickedness of the times “there has for a long time been no Mountain of the Lord’s House upon the earth”.<sup>51</sup> Later churchmen are haunted by a suspicion that the Church is not really the equivalent of the Temple at all, but rather of the Tabernacle wandering in the wilderness, while the stable and enduring Temple is still to come.<sup>52</sup>

<sup>47</sup> “From the beginning the destruction of the Temple and the eventual cessation of the sacrifices had been anticipated”, F. C. Grant, *op. cit.*, p. 14. As early as 587 B.C. “the old dogma that it was blasphemy even to speak of the destructibility of the temple was shattered”, J. Raisin, *Gentile Reactions*, p. 82.

<sup>48</sup> In the Odes of Solomon the Temple is “preexistent au monde et, de plus, il subsiste hors du monde . . .”, P. Batiffol, in *Revue Biblique*, 8 (1911), 40. Est ergo altare in coelis, et templum . . ., Irenaeus, *Contra haeres.* iv. 18. Cf. W. E. Davies, *op. cit.*, p. 162, n. 2.

<sup>49</sup> L. J. Liebereich, “Compilation of . . . Isaiah”, *JQR*, 46 (1956), 272. See *Testament of Levi*, 14–18, *Benjamin*, 9, *Naphthali*, 4.

<sup>50</sup> *Epist. Barnab.*, c. 16. That παραδώσει here means “remove”, “take out of circulation”, is clear from parallel passages in Matt. 24. 9, and Didache, xvi. 4; cf. R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (Oxford, 1912), pp. 198–204.

<sup>51</sup> Hilary, *Tract. in Ps.* 14, in *P.L.* 9. 301–2: Sed mons Domini nullus in terra est: omnis enim terra jam pridem per vitia hominum maledictis obnoxia est.

<sup>52</sup> Athanasius (?), *Quest. in Ep. Pauli*, 127, in *P.G.* 28. 769; Peter Damian,

A favorite symbol of the transition from crass Jewish materialism to the Christian Temple of the Spirit has always been the New Testament episode of the driving out of the money-changers.<sup>53</sup> Yet how much this “obvious transfer” (as St. Leo calls it)<sup>54</sup> left to be desired is apparent from many a bitter comment that the Church itself was as much “a den of thieves” as ever the Temple was, with the obvious difference, already voiced by Origen, that “today Jesus comes no more to drive out the money-changers and save the rest!”<sup>55</sup> Furthermore, it has often been pointed out that the purging of the Temple, far from being its death-sentence, was rather “a demonstration by the Lord that he would not tolerate the slightest disrespect for his Father’s House”.<sup>56</sup>

In the same way the other classic scriptural arguments against the Temple have either backfired or proven highly equivocal. The famous prophecy that not one stone should remain upon

*Dial. inter Jud. et Christ.*, in *P.L.* 145. 60 f.; Rupert, *De trin. in Num.* ii. 21, in *P.L.* 167. 901; Richard of St. Victor, *De tabern.* i, in *P.L.* 196. 306, 860; Thos. Aquinas, *Sum. Theol.*, Q. cii, Art. iv, conclusion; Andrew of Caes., *In Apoc.* xxi. 3 f., in *P.G.* 106. 425; Wolbero, *Comment. in Cant.* iv, in *P.L.* 195. 1275.

<sup>53</sup> For Tertullian the glory of the Temple was extinguished by the mere declaration of the Lord that it was a den of thieves, *De pudicitia*, i, in *P.L.* 2. 1033 f. It was not the money-changers as such, but really the Jews, that Christ was expelling forever, according to Cyril Alex., *Comment. in Amos* 19, in *P.G.* 71. 444; St. Leo, *Serm. attrib.* xiv, in *P.L.* 54. 507; Rupert, *Comm. in xii Proph. Min.*, *P.L.* 168. 735 f., and *Comm. in Amos* ii. 3–4, in *loc. cit.* 301. For E. W. Hengstenberg, *Christology of the OT* (2nd Edinburgh ed., 1856–8), iv. 248, the “den of thieves” verdict “rendered the continuance of the former [Temple] absolutely impossible”.

<sup>54</sup> . . . evidens translatio . . ., *Sermo lxxviii.* 3, in *P.L.* 54. 374.

<sup>55</sup> *Nυν δέ . . . εἰσὶ οἱ πωλοῦντες καὶ ἀγοράζοντες ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ . . . καὶ οὐδαμοῦ Ἰησοῦς ἐπιφαίνεται ἵνα ἐκβαλῶν σώσῃ τοὺς λοιπούς*, Origen, *Comm. in Mt.* xvi. 21, in *P.G.* 13. 1444–5, cf. 348, 1418, 1448; *Ἄλλ’ εἶθε εἰσελθῶν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ Πατρὸς . . . καταβάλλοι Ἰησοῦς τὰς . . . τραπέζας . . .* Cf. Greg. Mag., *Epistolarum Lib. XI*, *Epist.* 46, in *P.L.* 77. 1166; Theophylact., *Enarr. in Mc.* xi. 15–18, in *P.G.* 123. 616; Photius, *Contra Manich.* iv. 23, in *P.G.* 102. 229; Alcuin, *Comm. in Joān.* ii, ch. iv, 14 f., in *P.L.* 100. 773.

<sup>56</sup> Photius, *loc. cit.*; so Cyril Jerus., *Catech.* vii, in *P.G.* 33. 612.

another, hailed by the churchmen as a guarantee of eternal dissolution,<sup>57</sup> contains nothing to confirm or deny a future restoration, and may well have been spoken “with the sorrow of a patriot rather than the wrath of an iconoclast”.<sup>58</sup> If the rending of the veil has been treated as a symbol of irreversible eradication,<sup>59</sup> it has suggested with equal force a broadening and expanding of revelation.<sup>60</sup> Jesus’ invitation to “destroy this Temple” and his conditioned promise to rebuild the same are often taken—but only by a liberal revamping of the text—to mean the opposite, namely, that he will destroy the Temple himself, and instead of rebuilding it bring something totally different in its place: “‘Finish then’, he might have implied, ‘this work of dissolution: in three days will I . . . restore . . . not a material Temple, but a living Church.’” Dean Farrar’s interpretation is typical, resting as it does not on what Jesus said but on what “he might have implied”.<sup>61</sup>

## II

### . . . TAMEN USQUE RECURRET

The Temple was driven out with a fork by Jerome and his

<sup>57</sup> Thus Hippolytus, *Adv. Judaeos*, vii, in *P.G.* 10. 792; Juvenius, *Evang. Hist.* iv. 78 ff., in *P.L.* 19. 286 f. This prophecy was “the final ‘Let us depart hence’ of retiring Deity”, according to Dean Farrar, *Life of Christ* (New York, 1903), ii. 255, who notes that 35 years *later* Deity finally departed! “Those few words completed the prophecy of Israel’s desolation . . .”, I. O’Brien, *Life of Christ* (Paterson, N.J., 1937), p. 418.

<sup>58</sup> V. Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice* (London, 1937), p. 71.

<sup>59</sup> So Jerome, *Comm. in Is.* xiv. 52, in *P.L.* 54. 374; Theophanes, *Homilia*, 27, in *P.G.* 132. 600. A. Feuillet, in Davies and Daube, *op. cit.*, p. 268.

<sup>60</sup> Cassiodorus, *Expos. Ps.* 21, in *P.L.* 70. 158; Rupert, *In Apoc.* ix. 15, in *P.L.* 169. 1111; Jerome, *In Is.* xiv, cap. lii, in *P.L.* 24. 498; Thos. Aquinas, *Sum. Theol.*, Q. cii, Art. iv (13th Paris ed., iii. 458, 454). C. T. Craig, *Beginning of Christianity* (New York, 1943), p. 183.

<sup>61</sup> F. W. Farrar, *op. cit.* i. 194 f. Some scholars find the passage too hot to handle and declare it to be “not in the original utterance of Jesus”, but “the travesty of the false witness”, B. W. Robinson, *Jesus in Action*, p. 77.

intellectual friends. On one thing all the spiritual children of Alexandria—Greek, Jewish, Christian, and Moslem—have always seen eye to eye, and that is the conviction that the old eschatology with its naïve literalism and its millennial Temple was unworthy of thinking men, “repugnant to every principle of faith as well as reason”.<sup>62</sup> Of these intellectuals none have been more dedicated to the party line than the Christian schoolmen, whose opinions inevitably became the official doctrine of a Church which drew its leaders almost exclusively from their ranks. Yet they were not the only force to be reckoned with, and by the time St. Augustine’s *City of God* had come to replace millennialism as the “official doctrine of the church”,<sup>63</sup> the more tangible and sensuous aspects of the Temple, enhanced by time and legend, were exercising their powerful attraction on two highly susceptible and influential bodies—a spectacle-hungry public and a power-hungry government.

As to the first of these, it is apparent from Jerome’s experience that a large part of the Christian society did not lose sight of the Temple after its destruction but spoke longingly of its return. Students today are more inclined than they have been in the past to concede to the Temple a high place in the estimation of Jesus,<sup>64</sup> of the prophets before him,<sup>65</sup> and of the Apostles and the Church after him.<sup>66</sup> “The ethical monotheism of the Wellhausen era”, that made short work of the Temple and its

<sup>62</sup> E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, Vol. II, ch. xv, at note 31; cf. J. Raisin, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

<sup>63</sup> Quote from G. Leff, in *Past and Present*, 13 (Apr. 1958), 92.

<sup>64</sup> Many writers present Jesus as a would-be restorer of Temple-worship, with the Temple as his headquarters. Thus A. C. Headlam, *Jesus Christ in History*, pp. 137–9; R. Bultmann, *Theology*, i. 17; B. W. Bacon, *Studies in Matthew* (New York, 1930), pp. 242 f.

<sup>65</sup> “Recent research has shown that prophets had a regular part in the temple cults”, M. Burrows, *Outline of Biblical Theology*, p. 225.

<sup>66</sup> For a comprehensive statement, see Hastings, *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church* (New York, 1916–22), ii. 556 f., and S. G. F. Brandon, *Fall of Jerus.*, pp. 21, 29, 39, 127, 263, even vindicating Stephen’s position, pp. 263, 89, 127–9.

ritualism, now yields to recognition of the importance of the ritual drama of the Temple not only as “a basic component of Israel’s religion”, but of early Christianity as well.<sup>67</sup> For both the way to heaven led through the Temple, and if that was but an intermediate step in the salvation of the race, it was none the less an indispensable one.<sup>68</sup> It was all very well for the orators of the fourth century to declaim that in the Church “the goal of all Old Testament hopes had now come”, that “the religion of promise and pilgrimage” had given way to “one of achievement and fulfilment”—the simpler Christians knew better: “Christians have not yet attained their goal; they too must run their course (Heb. xii. 1).”<sup>69</sup> The Christian still needed the Temple, and always remained a pilgrim to Jerusalem in a very literal sense. Even the learned doctors of the second and third centuries “were unable to resist the fascination of the holy places”, and came with the rest to see the spot where the Lord had left the earth and where he would return to his Temple.<sup>70</sup> In vain did the great fathers of the following centuries protest against the silly custom, clearly pointing out that it was in direct conflict with the official doctrine of the spiritual Temple: the pilgrimage went right on.<sup>71</sup>

The Emperor Constantine’s plan “to legislate the millennium in a generation” called for the uniting of the human race in the

<sup>67</sup> See N. A. Dahl, in W. D. Davies and D. Daube, *Background of the NT*, pp. 430 f., 424. Quote is from K. Stendahl, in *JBL*, 77 (1958), 36 f.

<sup>68</sup> For closely parallel Jewish, Christian, and Classical concepts see B. Kötting, *Peregrinatio Religiosa* (Münster, 1950), pp. 57–69, 287–8. The familiar Temple imagery in Christian liturgy was disseminated directly by pilgrims coming from Jerusalem, A. Baumstark, *Abendländische Palästina-pilger*, etc. (Köln, 1906), pp. 80–83, 31.

<sup>69</sup> So C. K. Barrett, in Davies and Daube, *op. cit.*, p. 382.

<sup>70</sup> N. Leclercq, in F. Cabrol and H. Leclercq, *Dictionnaire d’archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, vii. 2311; cf. Sulpicius Severus, *Historia Sacra*, ii. 148, and above, note 10.

<sup>71</sup> Greg. Nyssen., *Epist.* II. iii, in *P.G.* 46. 1012 f., 1016; Basil, *Moralia*, *Regul.* 67, in *P.G.* 31. 808; John Chrys., *Ad pop. Antioch.* 17, in *P.G.* 49. 177 ff., *De s. Pentecoste*, I, *ibid.* 50. 453 ff.



bonds of a single religion, under a single holy ruler, administered from a single holy center.<sup>72</sup> It was the old "hierocentric" concept of the sacral state, represented among others by the *Roma aeterna* of which Christian Rome claimed to be the revival,<sup>73</sup> but also typified from time immemorial in the temples of the East, each a scale-model of the cosmos, which was thought literally to revolve around it.<sup>74</sup> Constantine's architectural projects proclaim his familiarity with the idea of a *templum mundi* as the physical center of the universe,<sup>75</sup> just as clearly as his panegyrists hail him in the role of Solomon the Temple-builder.<sup>76</sup> "It is our most peaceful Solomon who built this Temple . . .", cries the orator at the dedication of one of Constantine's vast "cosmic" rotundas, "and the latter glory of this House is greater than the former." Just as Christ transferred "from sordid flesh to a glorified body", so the Church now has a much more glorified body than before.<sup>77</sup> Let no one mistake this for the incorporeal Temple of the doctors, who protested briefly and ineffectively against all this materialism;<sup>78</sup> this really fulfils the

<sup>72</sup> Quote is from C. N. Cochrane, *Christianity and Classical Culture* (Oxford, 1940), p. 211; for the concept, Eusebius, *De laude Constantini*, iv-vi, x, in *P.G.* 20. 1332-52, 1372 ff.

<sup>73</sup> For a recent discussion, M. Seidlmayer, "Rom u. Romgedanke im Mittelalter", in *Saeculum*, 7 (1956), 395-412.

<sup>74</sup> See our article, "The Hierocentric State", in *Westn. Polit. Quart.* 4 (1951), 226 ff. Prof. W. F. Albright sees in Solomon's Temple "a rich cosmic symbolism which was largely lost in later Israelite and Jewish tradition", *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* (Baltimore, 1942), pp. 154 f., cf. 88 f., 167.

<sup>75</sup> Eusebius, *loc. cit.*, and *Vita Constantini*, iii, 33 ff., in *P.G.* 20. 1093 ff., iv, 60, *ibid.* 1209-12.

<sup>76</sup> Contemporaries hail him as "the new Bezeliel or Zerubabel, who builds blessed temples of Christ", Antiochus Monach., *Ep. ad Eustath.*, fin., in *P.G.* 89. 1428.

<sup>77</sup> Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.* x. iv. 45 f.

<sup>78</sup> So Zeno, *Tract.* I, xiv, in *P.L.* 11. 354 ff.; Jerome, *Comm. in Is.* i, cap. ii, 9, in *P.L.* 24. 49, *In Is.* xvii, *ibid.* 593, and *Epistles*, lii, 10; cxxx, 14, in *P.L.* 22. 492, 535, 1119.

prophecy (Hag. 2. 9), no longer in words only but in deeds.<sup>79</sup> The same rhetorical license that had vaporized the Temple of Jerusalem by its appeal to higher things was now employed to justify its very solid successors, and before a rapt audience the great Christian orator could convert a monster pile, window by window and stone by stone, “into a spiritual temple structure” by the bewitching power of allegory.<sup>80</sup>

Immediately after his return from the Council of Nicea, Bishop Macarius of Jerusalem, by authorization of the Emperor, demolished the Temple of Jupiter that the Romans had “built on the very spot where formerly the Temple of God had stood”, and in the process discovered the crypts of the Cross and the Holy Sepulchre, “and”, Eusebius significantly adds, “the Holy of Holies crypt”, which was identical in form with the latter.<sup>81</sup> Over the holy spot the Emperor and/or his mother had built the wonderful structure which they called “the New Jerusalem, having erected it in the place of the ancient one that had been abandoned”, the Holy Sepulchre serving as the pivot and center of the whole sacred complex.<sup>82</sup> The Temple complex was supplanted by Christian buildings. Theodoret pointedly compares the churches of the Crucifixion, Resurrection, and

<sup>79</sup> Euseb., *loc. cit.*: . . . ὡς μηκέτι λόγον, ἀλλ’ ἔργον γεγονέναι τὴν ἀνω λεχθεῖσαν προφητείαν [Hag. 2. 9], γέγονεν γὰρ καὶ νῦν ὡς ἀληθῶς ἐστίν.

<sup>80</sup> See the editor’s enthusiastic comment on the oratory of Paulinus in *P.L.* 61. 929, and 248.

<sup>81</sup> F. M. Abel, in Cabrol and Leclercq, *Dict.* vii. 2312, for the timing. It is Zonaras, *Annales*, xi. 23, in *P.G.* 134. 996, who locates the Roman temple, following Socrat., *Hist. Eccl.* i. 17. Euseb., *De laud. Const.* iii. 30, in *P.G.* 20. 1088 f., as the digging proceeded, τὸ σεμνὸν καὶ πανάγιον τῆς σωτηρίου ἀναστάσεως μαρτύριον παρ’ ἐλπίδα πᾶσαν ἀνεφαίνετο, καὶ τὸ τε ἅγιον τῶν ἁγίων ἄντρον τὴν ὁμοίαν τῆς τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἀναβιώσεως ἀπελάμβανεν εἰκόνα. That this is not a mere parallelism is indicated by the καὶ . . . τε and ὁμοίαν.

<sup>82</sup> Euseb., *Vit. Const.* iii. 33, in *P.G.* 20. 1093: καὶ δὴ τοῦ παντός ὡσπερ τινὰ κεφαλὴν, πρῶτην ἀπάντων τὸ ἱερόν ἄντρον, etc., noting that this was the very New Jerusalem that had been foretold by the prophets—an eschatological structure. Cf. Socrat., *Hist. Eccl.* i. 17.

Ascension with the ruined Temple, and asks how the Jews in the face of that can have the effrontery even to remain in the city: "The Babylonians never came to worship at *their* Temple", he argues, "while all the world flocks to our churches", thus proving that the true House of God that draws all nations to Jerusalem is not their Temple but our Church.<sup>83</sup> Chrysostom draws a like conclusion as he ecstatically views those vast panegyris, those gorgeous year-assemblies at the shrines of the martyrs that represent the brilliant wedding of Christianity with the ever-popular pagan cults with their feasts and markets at holy tombs: "What does this all mean?" he asks, and the answer is clear: "It means that the Temple has been abolished."<sup>84</sup> We don't need to go to Jerusalem any more, John assures his people, just as his friend Gregory of Nyssa can announce that the Church can "supplant the faded antique glory of our cities by our own Christian glory".<sup>85</sup>

Of the many duplicates of Constantine's New Jerusalem the most ambitious was Justinian's "mighty glorious Temple, the Temple of the Lord, a heaven here below which I ween amazes even the Seraphim. If God should ever condescend to abide in a house made with hands", the panegyrist continues, "this surely is the House!"<sup>86</sup> As a crowning gesture, the Emperor had

<sup>83</sup> Theodoret, *In Ezech.* xlvi. 35, in *P.G.* 81. 1253.

<sup>84</sup> John Chrys., *Sermo post redit.* 2, in *P.G.* 52. 440; *Ubi aedificabo?* *Absolutum est templum.* . . . He is rejoicing that the growth of the Church has burst all old and traditional bounds such as the limitations of the Temple. Cf. *In Is.* ii. 3, in *P.G.* 56. 30, 97; *In S. Ignat. Mort.*, in *P.G.* 50. 595 f.; Basil, *Regul. fid. tract.*, Qu. 40, in *P.G.* 31. 1020; Theodoret, *Ep.* 67 and 68, in *P.G.* 83. 1236 f.; Zeno, *Lib. II, Tract.* lxvi, in *P.L.* 11. 520 f. Significantly, the most brilliant of these gatherings is for the feast of the Maccabees, i.e. to commemorate the rededication of the Temple, John Chrys., *Homil. in Ss. Maccab.* i, in *P.G.* 50. 617 ff.

<sup>85</sup> John Chrys., *Ad pop. Ant.* xvii, in *P.G.* 48. 177 f., and *Contra Jud.* 9, *ibid.* 48. 825 f.; Greg. Nyssen., *Epist.* xvii, in *P.G.* 46. 1064.

<sup>86</sup> Constantine Manass., *Compend. chron.* v. 326 ff., in *P.G.* 127. 342 f. It was a conscious imitation of Constantine's "New Jerusalem", Procopius, *De aedific.* i, discussed in *P.G.* 20. 1098 f.

fetched from Carthage the very vessels that the Roman soldiers had plundered from the Temple of Jerusalem long before. But then in an even more significant gesture, the haughty Justinian for the only time in his life heeded the advice of the hated Jews and in superstitious dread ordered the vessels returned “in haste to Jerusalem, where he had them deposited in a church”.<sup>87</sup> It was all very well to set up a new and holier Rome on the Bosphorus, but when it came to a showdown not even a Justinian dared to arrogate the authority of the House of God at Jerusalem.<sup>88</sup>

The man who dared most was Pope Leo. Behind him he had the tradition of the Empire, now Christian, with Rome “holy among cities” (Pliny) as the center of the world.<sup>89</sup> But how could the Church have two centers? The churchmen displayed considerable ingenuity in their arguments to show how a large number of churches could carry on the tradition of a single Temple,<sup>90</sup> but by the time of Constantine it was recognized that if there was ever to be peace in the Church what was needed was not a vague universality and equality, but a highly centralized authority.<sup>91</sup> Leo, who did more than any other man to transform the old universal *devotio Romana* into a new *devotio Christiana*,<sup>92</sup> clearly saw in the Temple at Jerusalem his most serious opponent.<sup>93</sup> His sermons bristle with barbed and

<sup>87</sup> The story is told in J. Raisin, *Gentile Reactions*, p. 361.

<sup>88</sup> On Constantinople as the New House of God, A. Alföldi, *The Conversion of Constantine and Pagan Rome* (Oxford, 1948), p. 110.

<sup>89</sup> M. Seidlmayer, in *Saeculum*, 7 (1956), 400–3. Quote from Pliny, *Ep.* 8. 24. 3.

<sup>90</sup> See above, notes 26–28. For some amusing arguments, Rupert, *De victoria Verbi Dei*, x. 10, in *P.L.* 169. 1430; Peter Damian, *Dial. inter Jud. et Christ.*, *ibid.* 145. 60 f.

<sup>91</sup> Euseb., *Vit. Const.* iv. 24 (*P.G.* 20. 1172); iv. 42 (*ibid.* 1189 f.).

<sup>92</sup> So Seidlmayer, *op. cit.*, pp. 402 f.

<sup>93</sup> Thus in *Serm. attrib.* xiv. 4–5, in *P.L.* 54. 507, Leo says that the *cathedra* occupied by Moses has been torn down *mystice* and become a *pestilentiae Cathedram*, the change occurring at the moment Jesus drove the money-changers from the *Temple*.

invidious remarks that betray his touchiness on the subject. In Leo's Rome, as Seidlmayer puts it, "die christliche Kirche steht auf dem Fundament des heidnischen Tempels".<sup>94</sup> Leo explains this away by appealing to the well-established Roman doctrine of *renovatio* with a new twist: Rome has died pagan and been resurrected Christian.<sup>95</sup> The tomb of Peter now performs the function that once belonged to the *templum* of Hadrian, the great round tomb by the Tiber that was designed to draw all the world to it, while Hadrian's image now stands in the Temple of Jerusalem—the roles of the two cities have been neatly reversed.<sup>96</sup>

Leo freely admits the debt of Christian Rome to pagan Rome,<sup>97</sup> and sees in the great Easter and Christmas congregations of his people both the old Roman national assembly and the gathering of Israel at the Temple: "Here you see the heavenly Jerusalem, built of all nations," he cries, addressing such assemblies, "purged of all impurity on this day, it has become as the Temple of God!"<sup>98</sup> "Now a new and indestructible Temple has been erected," with Leo himself presiding in it, "ordained in honor of Christ, the prophet after the order of Melchizedek, not after the order of Aaron whose priesthood . . . ceased with the Law of the Old Testament."<sup>99</sup> Rome has not abolished the rites of the Temple, however, but simply taken them over,

<sup>94</sup> Seidlmayer, *op. cit.*, p. 402.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 409. See C. N. Cochrane, *Christianity and Class. Culture*, chap. v.

<sup>96</sup> Leo, *Serm. attrib.* xvi, xvii. 1–2, in *P.L.* 54. 511–13; Jerome, *In. Is.* i. ii. 9, in *P.L.* 24. 49: Ubi quondam erat templum et religio Dei, ibi Adriani statua et Jovis idolum collocatum, which many Christians regard as literal fulfilment of Mark 13. 14.

<sup>97</sup> . . . partim ignorantiae vitio, partim paganitatis spiritu . . ., *Sermo*, 27. 4, in *P.L.* 54. 218 f.; cf. *Serm.* 89. 4, *ibid.* 446.

<sup>98</sup> Leo, *Sermo*, 40. 5, in *P.L.* 54. 271; *Serm.* 48. 1, *ibid.* 298; *Serm.* 49. 1, *ibid.* 301; *Serm.* 60. 3, *ibid.* 344; *Serm.* 21. 3 and 22. 1–2, *ibid.* 192–5; *Serm.* 23. 5, *ibid.* 203; *Serm.* 88. 4–5 and 89. 1–2, *ibid.* 442–6.

<sup>99</sup> *Id.*, *Serm.* 3. 1–3, *ibid.* 145 f.; *Serm.* 5. 3, *ibid.* 154.

every particle of the ancient ordinances and imagery having been absorbed by the Christian sacraments: "Ours today is the circumcision, the anointing of priests, etc. . . . Ours is the honor of the Temple!"<sup>100</sup> Thanks to the ministrations of Peter and Paul, the people of Rome are now "a holy generation, a chosen people, a priestly and royal city". In a word, Rome was now Jerusalem.<sup>101</sup>

But Leo protests too much. His Easter sermons, like Hilary's Tract on the Psalms, Ambrose's *De Sacramentis*, Jerome's letters from Bethlehem, and Chrysostom's great work on the Priesthood, breathe less of pious conviction than of envy. The first of these displays a positive phobia of a literal Temple, against which it wages truceless war.<sup>102</sup> "We admire the mysteries of the Jews, given to our fathers, first for their antiquity, and then for their sanctity", says Ambrose, reassuring his followers, "But I can promise you that the Christian sacraments are both holier and older. . . ." For the former rites go back only to Moses, while Melchizedek is the author of the latter. *Quis est Melchisedek?* Who but the Justice, Peace, and Wisdom of God—is there anything more timeless or holy than a pure abstraction?<sup>103</sup> Jerome, explaining to a friend that the Temple was always exclusively reserved to the Christians, concedes that the Holy of Holies was a wondrous thing, and promptly adds: "But doesn't the Sepulchre of the Lord appear more worshipful to you? As often as we enter it we see the

<sup>100</sup> . . . nihil legalium institutionum, nihil propheticorum resedit figurarum, quod non totum in Christi sacramenta transierit. Nobiscum circumcisio . . . nobiscum puritas sacrificii, baptismi veritas, honor templi . . ., *Serm.* 66, in *P.L.* 54. 365 f.; cf. *Serm.* 30. 3, *ibid.* 229. It was all too good for the Jews.

<sup>101</sup> *Id.*, *Serm.* 4. 1–2, *ibid.* 149. E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums* (Tübingen, 1930), i. 403; Seidlmayer, *op. cit.*, p. 403.

<sup>102</sup> The Hauptthema of this long writing is that the House of God is *non terrena et caduca*, *Ps.* 121. 2, in *P.L.* 9. 661 f.; in fact, if one accepts the Temple passages literally, then *inanis est psalmus, et mendax Propheta!*, *Ps.* 124. 2, *ibid.* 9. 680.

<sup>103</sup> Ambrose, *De sacram.* i. iv, in *P.L.* 16. 438 f.; iv. iii, *ibid.* 457, cf. 421. Ch. iv is intensely invidious.

Lord lying there . . . and the Angel sitting at his feet. . . .”<sup>104</sup> Chrysostom, constantly approached by disillusioned Christians wanting to know what has happened to the ancient glories of Israel, is able to reply with stirring rhetoric: In ancient times only Moses could approach God, but now we all see Him face to face. Moses feared God—but no one fears Him today. Israel heard the thunder and trembled—we hear God’s actual voice and are not afraid.<sup>105</sup> We have angels all around us in the church today—you can see them if only you will open your mental eyes.<sup>106</sup> The priest ministering at our altar is a more awesome object than the High Priest in the Temple, since “he casts aside all carnal thought and like a disembodied spirit views celestial things by pure mind alone”.<sup>107</sup> The Jewish Temple was a mere shadow, the churchmen repeat, *we* have the real thing, “they had the Tabernacle, *we* see Truth face to face!”<sup>108</sup> Do we? Yes, indeed, “but in a higher and hidden sense”.<sup>109</sup>

Leo’s imagery manifests an awareness that in snubbing the Temple the Church would be missing a good thing. Actually the fathers of the preceding generation had fumbled the ball badly when they threw out the Temple. But before the Church could recover, a new and formidable player, Islam, had snatched it up and run the whole length of the field.

When Omar conquered and entered Jerusalem in 638 he asked first of all to be shown “the glorious Temple that Solomon had built”, only to discover that the Christians had converted the

<sup>104</sup> Jerome, *Epist.* 46, in *P.L.* 22. 486.

<sup>105</sup> John Chrys., *Ep. ad Heb.* 12, *Homil.* 32, in *P.G.* 63. 221.

<sup>106</sup> *De Ss. Martyr.* i, *P.G.* 50. 646, cf. 582. A favorite theme with Chrysostom.

<sup>107</sup> John Chrys., *De sacerdot.* iii. 4. C. Seltmann in his ed. (Münster, 1887), pp. 83 f., raises the knotty question of just how *literal* all this is supposed to be.

<sup>108</sup> Methodius, *Conviv.* 7, in *P.G.* 18. 109.

<sup>109</sup> . . . ubi mentis oculos fingimus . . . superiora et coelestia in aenigmate conspiciere, etc., Garner, *Gregorianum*, xiii. 7, in *P.L.* 193. 397, cf. 936; Zeno, *Lib.* II, *Tract.* 63, in *P.L.* 11. 518 f.; Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.* x. iv *passim*.

place into a garbage dump.<sup>110</sup> The treasure that the churchmen had so foolishly thrown away the Moslems were quick to exploit, promptly rebuilding the Temple and restoring it to its prestige as a center of world pilgrimage.<sup>111</sup> They had already harnessed its unique powers by “transferring to Mecca the cosmological ideas in vogue among the Jews and Christians concerning the sanctuary at Jerusalem”,<sup>112</sup> and though the legends of the Kaaba, of its founding and refounding by Adam and Abraham as an earthly replica of the eternal pre-existent heavenly prototype, etc., were borrowed freely from Jerusalem, there is no long history of bitter rivalry between the two.<sup>113</sup> For Islam Jerusalem remained *par excellence* the City of the Holy House, and as late as the eleventh century anyone who could not make the Hajj to Mecca was instructed to go to the great feast at Jerusalem instead.<sup>114</sup> The Moslem intellectuals, exactly as the Jewish and Christian doctors before them, protested against the glorification of a mere building, and campaigned vigorously against the pilgrimages,<sup>115</sup> but the Temple had a powerful advocate in Christian jealousy. Like children fighting for a toy, each faction came to prize the Temple more highly when it saw how much the other wanted it.

This jealous rivalry became apparent on the very day Omar entered Jerusalem and visited the Temple ruins “in all humility and simplicity”. The Christians, who saw in his unassuming manner “only a Satanic hypocrisy”, were piously horrified at

<sup>110</sup> A. Müller, *Der Islam* (Berlin, 1885), i. 285; J. Raisin, *op. cit.*, p. 370.

<sup>111</sup> Euty chius, *Annales*, in *P.G.* 111. 1100.

<sup>112</sup> G. E. Von Grunebaum, *Muhammadian Festivals* (New York, 1951), p. 20.

<sup>113</sup> “If Islam substituted the Kibla of Mecca for that of Jerusalem, on the other hand it renders the greatest honor to the site of the temple . . . and pure monotheism rebuilt its fortress on Mt. Moriah”, wrote Renan, quoted in Raisin, *op. cit.*, p. 389.

<sup>114</sup> A. Mez, *Renaissance des Islams* (Heidelberg, 1903), p. 302.

<sup>115</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 302 ff.



the sight, and the Patriarch Sophronius cried out: "This, surely, is the Abomination of Desolation in the Temple, of which David [*sic*] prophesied."<sup>116</sup> For the Christians it was *their* Temple now, though they had turned it into a dungheap.<sup>117</sup> Such horror the Jews of old had expressed at the sight of profane feet in the Temple, and presently the Moslems took up the refrain, banishing Christians and Jews on pain of death from the sacred precincts "where the Saracens believe, according to their law, that their prayers are more readily answered than anywhere else".<sup>118</sup> The only genuine religious clashes between Christians and Moslems, Müller informs us of the Crusades, were the two fights for the Temple, when the Christians took it in 1099 and the Moslems got it back in 1187—"und damit war die Geschichte des Glaubenskrieges als solches ziemlich aus".<sup>119</sup> Solomon's Temple was in each case, as it had been in Jewish times, the last redoubt; there alone neither side gave or asked for quarter; it was the ultimate all-out objective, and each conqueror in turn entered the holy place with songs of apocalyptic joy.<sup>120</sup>

Actually the possession of the Temple complex was more

<sup>116</sup> Müller, *op. cit.* i. 285.

<sup>117</sup> Just as the Christians turned the Temple site into a *sterquilinum* (below, note 161), so the Moslems just as childishly called the Holy Sepulchre church not الْقِبَابَةُ, but الْقَمَامَةُ, i.e. *sterquilinum*!, E. Rosenmüller, ed., Idrīsī's *Syria* (Leipzig, 1828), p. 10, n. 36. Though at the end of the 10th century Christians still execrated the Temple site, Eutyech., *An.*, in *P.G.* 111. 1100, in the 13th a friend of the Sultan was rudely barred from the place, being told: ". . . such things are not revealed to such as you. Do not insult our Law! . . ." مثل هذه الأمور لا تخفى على أمثالك لا تبطل . . . ناموسنا, etc., Qazwīnī, *Cosmography*, ed. F. Wüstenfeld (Göttingen, 1848), ii. 109.

<sup>118</sup> Fulcher, *Hist. Hierosolymitana*, i. xxvi. 9, with H. Hagenmeyer's discussion, in his ed. (Heidelberg, 1913), pp. 290 f.

<sup>119</sup> Müller, *op. cit.* ii. 135.

<sup>120</sup> Guibert, *Gesta Dei per Francos*, vii. 10, in *P.L.* 156, 795; Fulcher, *op. cit.* i. xxvii. 12-13. See below, note 133. For the Moslem reaction, Müller, *op. cit.* ii. 157.

than a mere matter of prestige. In the endless rivalries of the Christian sects there was just one claim to supreme authority that could neither be duplicated nor matched: "Those who cannot be reached by scriptural and doctrinal arguments", says a writing attributed to Athanasius, are bound to credit the claims of that Church which holds the holy places, including "Zion, where the salvation of the world was worked out. . . . And if the opposition say that we hold those places by the brute force of Imperial arms, let them know that . . . Christ has never allowed His Places to fall into the hands of heretics." It was a strong argument until Islam took over.<sup>121</sup>

From the fourth century on Christians were taught to view the Holy Sepulchre rather than the Temple as the religious center of the universe. But in supplanting the Temple its Christian counterpart could never escape the claims and traditions of its predecessors—in Jerusalem the pilgrim was never out of the shadow of the Temple, as is strikingly illustrated in the lady Aetheria's (Silvia's) full description of the Easter celebration at Jerusalem at the end of the fourth century.

According to Aetheria, the great culmination of the pilgrimage was the *dies enceniarum* commemorating the dedication of the great churches of the Cross and the Holy Sepulchre *and* of the Temple of Solomon. The supreme consummation and fulfillment of all the pilgrim's toil and yearning, as the lady describes it, was that moment when he was permitted to come forward and kiss the true Cross on Golgotha, "*at the same time* kissing the ring of Solomon and the horn with which the kings of Israel were anointed".<sup>122</sup> Again, the great annual sermon attended by all the clergy and the pilgrims, the only universal compulsory assembly, had to be delivered "always in that

<sup>121</sup> Athanas. (?), *Quaest. ad Ant.*, no. 44, in *P.G.* 28. 625.

<sup>122</sup> Aetheria (Silvia), *Peregrinatio ad Loca Sancta* (4th ed., W. Heraeus, Heidelberg, 1939), xlvi. 1-2; xlix. 1; xxxvii. 3.

place . . . to which on the 40th day Joseph and Mary brought the Lord in the Temple",<sup>123</sup> Silvia's pilgrim is never allowed to forget that he is a pilgrim to the Temple.<sup>124</sup> Indeed, whatever was holy about the Holy City was made such by contact with the Temple, which, as Photius observes, "has the power to sanctify other things . . . a sort of divine grace to make holy".<sup>125</sup> Thus "the temple consecrated the city", and progressively sanctified the holy mountain, the Holy City, the Holy Land, and ultimately the whole earth;<sup>126</sup> "the Eternal Presence renders the new Jerusalem one vast *naos*", where John saw no Temple, not because there was none, but because it was all Temple.<sup>127</sup>

In the reports of both Eastern and Western travellers the various holy places of the Temple complex are constantly confused and identified with each other.<sup>128</sup> Especially common is the locating of the Holy Sepulchre, the Holy of Holies, and the Cross of Golgotha (directly over the skull of Adam) at one and the same spot.<sup>129</sup> In old maps and drawings the Temple and

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.* xxvi.

<sup>124</sup> She compares the pilgrims to those who anciently came to Jerusalem to hear the Law (*ibid.* xxvii. 1, 6), and notes that fasting was forbidden on the Temple Mount and there only (*ibid.* xlv. 1), rather than at NT shrines. An even earlier pilgrim, Melito of Sardis, describes a strictly *Old Testament* pilgrimage to the East, frg. in *P.G.* 5. 1216.

<sup>125</sup> Photius, *Contra Manich.* ii. 11, in *P.G.* 102. 109; cf. Raisin, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

<sup>126</sup> E. Hoskyn and F. Davey, *The Fourth Gospel*, i. 202 f.; Phythian-Adams, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

<sup>127</sup> H. B. Swete, quoted by C. K. Barrett, in Davies and Daube, *Background of the NT*, p. 383. Rev. 21. 21 ff.

<sup>128</sup> T. Tobler, *Zwei Bücher Topographie von Jerusalem* (Berlin, 1853 f.), i. 540 ff. Origen, *Comm. in Joan.* x. 22, in *P.G.* 14. 377 f., comments on the "inconsistency and confusion" of the records. Cf. Socrat., *Hist. Eccl.* i. 17; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 1; Euseb., *Vit. Const.* iii. 28. Even the holy sites of Galilee had been transported to Jerusalem at an early time, Brandon, *Fall of Jerus.*, pp. 197 f.

<sup>129</sup> ". . . the place where the dream of Jacob occurred is the place where Adam was created, namely, the place of the future Temple and the center of the earth . . .", A. Altmann, in *JQR*, 35 (1945), 390 f. But "the Midrash also

the Holy Sepulchre are depicted alike, as a circular structure marking the exact center of the earth, with its four shrines marking the points of the compass. The two are virtually identical.<sup>130</sup>

(to be continued)

teaches . . . that Adam dwelt on Mt. Moriah and there 'returned to the earth from which he was taken'", R. Eisler, *Iesus Basileus ou Basileusas* (Heidelberg, 1929), i. 523. Yet the place where Adam sleeps is Golgotha, the foot of the cross resting on his skull, Epiphan., *Adv. haeres.* II. i. 4, in *P.G.* 41. 844, and many others. Christian and Moslem traditions place the Holy of Holies on the rock on which Abraham offered Isaac (Rupert, *In Gen.* vi. 28 f., in *P.L.* 167. 427 f.), making it the logical spot for the supreme culminating sacrifice of the Cross. Cf. Thos. Aquinas, *Sum. Theol.*, Q. cii, Art. iv. 2: Et tunc primo aedificatum fuit templum, in loco quem designaverat Abraham . . . ad immolandum, etc. Both Fulcher and Saewulf, quoted in Hagenmeyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 287 f., report as eye-witnesses that the original Ark of the Covenant reposed directly in the center of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. The Arabic writers are equally confusing: Qazwinī, ed. Wustenfeld, ii. 107-9; Ibn Ajas, *Geog.*, in F. Arnold, *Chrestom. Arab.* i. 63-65; Idrisi, *Syria*, ed. Rosenmüller, pp. 9-12; Ibn Batuta, *Rihlah* (Cairo, 1938), i. 33 f.

<sup>130</sup> See "The Middle of the World, in the Holy Sepulchre", in *Palest. Explor. Fund Quart.*, 1888, pp. 260 ff.; *ibid.*, 1910, p. 209; 1913, pl. iii, opp. p. 28. The seal of King Baldwin I of Jerusalem shows the two buildings as almost identical domes, side by side within a single walled enclosure.