



Type: Journal Article

Christian Envy of the Temple

Author(s): Hugh Nibley

Source: *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, Vol. 50, No. 3 (January 1960),
pp. 229–240

Published by: University of Pennsylvania Press

Abstract: No abstract available.

CHRISTIAN ENVY OF THE TEMPLE*

By HUGH NIBLEY, Brigham Young University,
Provo, Utah

UPON taking Jerusalem in 1099 the Crusaders moved straight to the object of their desire, the Holy Sepulchre, and then proceeded directly to Solomon's Temple: *ad dominicum sepulchrum, dehinc etiam ad Templum*.¹³¹ As they marched they sang apocalyptic hymns of joy hailing the millennial day and the New Jerusalem.¹³² The Crusades are a reminder that Christianity was never able to settle for a spiritual Temple or forget the old one: "It is foolish and unmeet", writes an indignant churchman, "for Fulcher to distort utterances applying to the spiritual reign and to spiritual things in such a way as to make them apply to buildings or earthly localities, which mean nothing at all to God." But Fulcher knew what he was doing: ". . . at the time", our critic confesses, "everybody was sunk in the error of that kind of gross darkness, clergy and laity, learned and military alike".¹³³ To explain away the disturbing veneration of the Crusaders for the Temple, scholars have argued that they were really confusing it with the Holy Sepulchre;¹³⁴ but they could hardly have confused the most sacred object on earth with anything but another very sacred object, and it is absurd to suppose that when they spoke of the Temple of Solomon they had no

* Continued from the preceding issue.

¹³¹ Fulcher, *Hist. Hierosolymitana*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1913), i. 30. 4.

¹³² "It was another, a new creation!" cries Raimund, *Hist. Franc.* 330 f., cit. Hagenmeyer, *op. cit.*, p. 305; so also Fulcher, *Hist. Hierosol.* i. xxix. 1 f.

¹³³ J. Casper Barth (1720), quoted by Hagenmeyer, *op. cit.*, p. 287.

¹³⁴ The materials are given and discussed in Hagenmeyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 285 ff., 304 ff.

idea of what they were talking about.¹³⁵ Typical of modern prejudice is the naïve insistence that the Knights Templars took their singular title from their street address, their headquarters being by the merest coincidence near the site of Solomon's Temple. But if the title *Pauperes commilitione Christi templique Salomoniaci* means anything, it means that these gentlemen fought for Christ *and* the Temple of Solomon, and were perfectly aware that the institution of the pilgrimage, which it was their special office to render secure, went back to the days of the Temple.¹³⁶

Though freely admitting the liturgical indebtedness of the Church to the Synagogue, students of ritual and liturgy have displayed singular reluctance to concede anything at all to the Temple.¹³⁷ Yet if the Church of the fourth and fifth centuries, while embracing popular heathen cult practices everywhere, also aped the Synagogue with a zeal that was almost comical,¹³⁸ we must not forget that "the worship of the early Synagogue was based on the Temple liturgy".¹³⁹ Nay, the fathers, early and late, derive Christian worship directly from the Temple,

¹³⁵ The treaty of 1229 allowed the Christians possession of the Sepulchre, while the Moslems retained the *Templum Domini*, i.e. the distinction was clearly preserved, C. Diehl, *Le Monde oriental de 395 à 1081* (Paris, 1936-45), ii. 462.

¹³⁶ See the long article in the *Enciclopedia Ilustrada*, T. lx. 727 ff. The rules of the order closely resemble those of some Jewish sectaries, Daniel-Rops, *L'Église de la Cathédrale et de la Croisade* (Paris, 1952), pp. 145, 718, 720, 730. It is not surprising that the order was accused of heresy, since it "urged emigration to Palestine to help prophecy to become fulfilled", E. Kautzsch, cit. by E. Kracling, *The OT Since the Reformation* (New York, 1955), p. 133.

¹³⁷ See, for instance, L. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien* (Paris, 1898), p. 45.

¹³⁸ S. Kraus, "The Jews in the Works of the Church Fathers", *JQR*, 6 (1893), 238, who quotes Rufinus, *Invect.* i. 5 and ii. 589: "If a Jew were to institute new rites, the Church would have to follow suit and immediately adopt them."

¹³⁹ W. Oesterley and T. Robinson, *An Introdn. to the Books of the OT* (New York, 1934), p. 194; cf. S. Zeitlin, "The Origin of the Synagogue", *Am. Acad. Jewish Res., Proc.*, iii (1930), 72-81.

though like Hilary they may make a hair-splitting distinction between Jewish worship *in templo* and Christian worship *ad templum*.¹⁴⁰ They boast that the Church possesses all the physical properties of the Temple—the oil, the myrrh, the altar, the incense, hymns, priestly robes, etc., everything, in fact, but the Temple itself, for “in the place of the tangible Temple we behold the spiritual”.¹⁴¹ Strange, that the solid walls should vanish and all the rest remain! Even the unleavened bread was retained in the West as an acknowledged heritage of the Temple, in spite of the much more appropriate spiritual symbolism of the leavened bread preferred by the Eastern churches, “. . . for we do not reject all the practices of the Old Law”, says Rupert in explaining this, “We still offer incense daily, anoint the holy oil, have bells in the place of ancient trumpets, and many such-like things.”¹⁴² So we find “veils of the Temple” in Christian churches,¹⁴³ inner shrines called tabernacles, awesome Holies of Holies entered only by prince and patriarch for the Year-rite,¹⁴⁴

¹⁴⁰ Hilary, *Tract. in Ps.* 127, in *P.L.* 9. 787. Symeon, *Expos. de div. templo*, 2, in *P.G.* 155. 701 ff., describes the Mass in terms of the Temple. Mal. 1. 11, the chief scriptural support for the Mass (G. Oehler, *Theol. of the OT*, pp. 519 f.), deals only with the Temple. Daniel-Rops, *op. cit.*, pp. 542 f., points out that the round churches of Europe, revived at the time of the Crusades, were direct imitations of the Temple at Jerusalem.

¹⁴¹ John Chrys., *Ep. II Cor.*, Homil. xi. 2, in *P.G.* 61. 476; Epiphanius, *Adv. haeres.* lxi. 8, in *P.G.* 41. 1049.

¹⁴² Rupert, *De div. offic.* ii. 22: *De azymo*, in *P.L.* 170. 48–50; cf. Epiphanius, *Adv. haeres.* xxx. 16, in *P.G.* 41. 432. Cf. Leo, *Sermo xcii* (xc), in *P.L.* 54. 453.

¹⁴³ C. Sagittarius, in J. G. Graevius, *Thesaurus Antiquitatum Romanarum* (1697), vi. 465 ff., 492 f., noting that the Christian veils “procul dubio imitati sunt morem in templo Salomonis . . .”.

¹⁴⁴ The place of the altar is a *terribilis locus*, Rupert, *In Gen.* vii. 23 f., in *P.L.* 167. 468 f., “inaccessible and terrible”, Symeon, *Dial. contra haeres.*, c. 21, in *P.G.* 155. 108, and *Expos. de div. templo*, 2, *ibid.* 701, citing the case of Ambrose in the West, who barred even the Emperor “both from the naos and the altar”. Cf. Greg. Theol., *Poemata moralia*, 34. 220 ff., in *P.G.* 37. 961; Pachymeros, *De Andronico Palaelol.* i. 5, in *P.G.* 144. 25. In the East only the Emperor could enter the Tabernacle and only at Easter and his

buildings and altars orientated like synagogues—which imitated the Temple in that respect,¹⁴⁵ dedication rites faithfully reproducing those of Solomon's Temple,¹⁴⁶ and a body of hymns “so obviously sung in the Temple that there is no need for any words to prove this”.¹⁴⁷ In ritual texts priests are regularly referred to as Levites, and the Bishop, though his office and title derive from the Synagogue and not the Temple, is equated with Aaron the high priest. Rabanus Maurus leaves us in no doubt of what his people were thinking when they hailed their fine church with *templum Domini, templum Domini, templum Domini est!*¹⁴⁸

III

THE DREAD AND ENVY OF THEM ALL

Though it did not need to be pointed out to them, the Jews were ever reminded by Christian theologians that without their Temple they were helpless.¹⁴⁹ On the other hand, the churchmen recognized with a shudder that if they ever got their Temple back again the same Jews would be very dangerous indeed.

coronation, Codinus, *De offic. Cp.* 17, in *P.G.* 157. 109 f., cf. Cantacuserus, *Hist.* i. 41, in *P.G.* 153. 280 f.; Ivo, *Sermo iv*, in *P.L.* 162. 532 f. At Constantinople and the Vatican there was even a mark on the pavement, as there had been in the Temple court of Jerusalem, to show the point beyond which the vulgar might not pass, Constantine Porphy., *De caerem. aul. Byz.* i. 10, in *P.G.* 112. 161, see especially the editor's note on this.

¹⁴⁵ Clem. Alex., *Stromat.* vii. vii, in *P.G.* 9. 461, with long note by Le Nourry, *ibid.* 462-3; Hippolytus, *Frg. in Jerem.*, in *P.G.* 10. 632. Other and later sources given by Gronovius, in Graevius, *op. cit.* vii. 160.

¹⁴⁶ Ivo, *Sermo iv*, in *P.L.* 162. 527-35.

¹⁴⁷ W. K. L. Clarke, *Liturgy and Worship* (New York, 1932), pp. 55-59.

¹⁴⁸ Raban. Maur., *Expos. super Jerem.* iv. 7, in *P.L.* 111. 858.

¹⁴⁹ Origen, *Comm. in Ep. Rom.* vi. 7, in *P.G.* 14. 1073; Zeno, *Tract. I, Tract.* 66, in *P.L.* 11. 520 f.; Methodius, *Conviv. dec. virg.* ix. i, in *P.G.* 18p, 177; Paulinus, *Poema*, 34. 337-48, in *P.L.* 61. 683. With the fall of the Temple “a stupor seems to have settled upon the Jews . . .”, Brandon, *Fall of Jerus.*, p. 165.

“If the Jews had their ancient institutions”, Athanasius observes, “then they could deny that Christ had come; but now all is sealed, and their gift of prophecy, their holy city, and their Temple are taken away—forever.”¹⁵⁰

That ringing “forever” is the key to the whole problem. The joy of the clergy, some of whom take genuine pleasure in reporting every fresh disaster and indignity to the Temple, would be cold comfort indeed were this Banquo ever to rise and push them from their stools. The most disturbing aspect of the Temple was the apocalyptic assurance of its restoration, and every device of rhetoric and logic (in the absence of a single verse of scripture to support the thesis and a great many to refute it) was employed to convince the world that the prophetic “forever” applied not to the *restoration* of the Temple, but to its *destruction*.¹⁵¹ The strongest argument was the historical one, the case stated by Hippolytus, that since the Temple *has* never been restored it should be plain to all “by now” that it never *will* be. The greatest comfort Origen can muster for the future is the fact that in his day the Temple cult had been interrupted for a longer period than ever before. True, the suspended rites have always been resumed in the past, but in this case enough time has passed to warrant one in being so bold as to express an

¹⁵⁰ Athanas., *Orat. de incarn. Verbi*, 40, in *P.G.* 25. 165.

¹⁵¹ For Eusebius the mere statement that Jerusalem will be trodden under foot “shows that the Temple shall never rise again”; he admits that the text adds “. . . until the time of the Gentiles be fulfilled”, but when is that? Eusebius has the answer: It means *never!* *De theophania*, viii, in *P.G.* 24. 649. Athanasius is even more naïve: We know (he argues) that Christ was a true Prophet, because Jerusalem will never rise again. And how do we know that? Because since all has been fulfilled in the coming of the true Prophet, it *cannot* rise again! *Orat. de incarn. Verbi*, 39, in *P.G.* 25. 165. Jerome, *Comm. in Is.* i. 5, in *P.L.* 24. 29, insists that the words *Non est in eo veritas* (Isa. 1. 5) refer to the time of Titus and absolutely prove that the Temple can never be restored. Even more far-fetched is Eusebius’s demonstration from the 30 pieces of silver, *Demonstr. evang.* x, in *P.G.* 22. 745.

opinion that they will *never* be restored.¹⁵² Later theologians built the feeble argument into their chief bulwark against the Temple, Chrysostom reinforcing it with the observation that while Josephus describes the destruction of the Temple, he has nothing to say of its restoration, which proves “that he did not dare predict that it would be restored again”, which in turn proves that it never can be!¹⁵³ Actually “the remorseless logic of history”, far from “confuting” early Christian hopes for the Temple,¹⁵⁴ has seriously confuted the opposition, whose program has always called for a complete transfer of the ancient heritage to the new Church, a transfer which “the continued existence of the Jewish nation and cult” has rendered desperately overdue.¹⁵⁵

How touchy an issue the Temple has always been is shown clearly enough by the extreme reluctance of the churchmen to talk about it. Anything that even reminds them of it seems to rub them on a raw place. The mere sight of its ruins, instead of providing the eyes of the monks of Palestine with a gratifying spectacle and an edifying object-lesson as the pagan ruins did, drove them wild with fury—“a detestable thing that causes appallment to the worshippers of Christ”.¹⁵⁶ The Jews had to pay a heavy tariff for the luxury of mourning at those ruins, for their

¹⁵² Origen, *Contra Cels.* iv. 22, in *P.G.* 11. 1056 f.: *Θαροῦντες δ' ἐροῦμεν, ὅτι οὐδ' ἀποκαταστήσονται . . .* The same argument is employed by Jerome, *Comm. in Is.* i. 1, in *P.L.* 24. 20, and Hippolytus, *Frg. in Dan.* 8 ff., in *P.G.* 10. 648 ff.

¹⁵³ John Chrys., *Orat. 5 Adv. Jud.*, in *P.G.* 11. 1057, with a long discussion *ibid.* 1056–60, telling how Grotius developed the argument. E. W. Hengstenberg, *Christol. of the OT*, iii. 291 f., makes this the official Protestant party line, cf. F. W. Farrar, *op. cit.* ii. 255 f.: “Neither Hadrian nor Julian, nor any other, were able to build upon its site”, etc.

¹⁵⁴ So Hastings, *Dict. of the Apostol. Church*, ii. 557.

¹⁵⁵ M. Simon, *Verus Israel* (Paris, 1948), pp. 118 ff., noting, p. 120, that in spite of all efforts to explain it away the danger remains real.

¹⁵⁶ J. Raisin, *Gentile Reactions*, p. 370. On the usefulness of pagan ruins as object-lessons, Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* i. 16.

mourning was not only a reminder of what the Temple *had* been, but also of what it *would* be.¹⁵⁷ No wonder the exasperated fathers ask the Jews why they insist on hanging around Jerusalem after their Temple has been destroyed, and bid them take the hint and be gone: “Everything you treasured in Jerusalem now lies in ruins, and your world-renowned Temple is now the city dump of a town called Aelia.”¹⁵⁸ On the other hand, Theophylactus reports that people even in his day tried to prove from the presence of ruins on the holy mount “that Christ was a liar”.¹⁵⁹

This last point, and the fundamental insecurity which underlay it, is illustrated by one of the most dramatic Christian legends, in which the mere report of the Emperor Julian’s intention to assist in rebuilding the Temple was magnified into the greatest crime, and its failure into the greatest miracle, of post-Apostolic history.¹⁶⁰ The story begins with the Jews announcing to the monarch that they are paralyzed without their Temple: “We cannot worship without it.”¹⁶¹ The wily Emperor sees that the Christians will be equally paralyzed by its restoration, and plans in the rebuilding of the Temple to deliver the *coup de grâce* to Christianity by demonstrating once for all that Jesus was a false prophet.¹⁶² For the Christians the whole issue of the truth and

¹⁵⁷ S. Kraus, in *JQR*, 6 (1894), 227.

¹⁵⁸ Jerome, *Comm. in Is.* 17. 64, in *P.L.* 24. 626, and *ibid.* 498, citing Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* vi. 12, to prove that the Temple will never return. Theodoret, *In Ez.* 48, in *P.G.* 81. 1252–3 and 1760, and John Chrys., *loc. cit.*, express the same impatience. See S. Kraus, *op. cit.*, pp. 240 ff., 90–91, for others.

¹⁵⁹ Theophylact., *Enarr. in Mc.* xiii. 1–4, in *P.G.* 123. 633: . . . ὥστε πειρῶνται ψευδῆ τὸν Χριστόν.

¹⁶⁰ The story is fully treated by M. Adler, “The Emperor Julian and the Jews”, *JQR*, 5 (1893), 615–51.

¹⁶¹ Rufinus, *Hist. Eccl.* i. 37, in *P.L.* 21. 505; Theodoret, *Eccl. Hist.* iii. 15, in *P.G.* 82. 1112.

¹⁶² So Theodoret, *loc. cit.*; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* v. 22; Philostorgius, *Eccles. Hist.* vii. 14, in *P.G.* 65. 552.

survival of their religion hinges on the rebuilding of the Temple. To make this clear to all the Bishop of Jerusalem, we are told, had gone about preaching that in Daniel and the Gospels the Lord had predicted that the Jews would never to the end of time be able to place one stone of the Temple upon another.¹⁶³ Since the Bishop (whose extensive writings make no mention of our story) preached no such thing,¹⁶⁴ since no such prophecy exists in the Scriptures, and since the restoration of the Temple would not confute a single recorded utterance of Jesus, it is plain that the churchmen themselves have chosen to make an issue of the Temple, and thereby rendered coexistence of Church and Temple impossible.¹⁶⁵ In this case only one solution was possible: a succession of stunning and theatrical miracles in the best fourth-century tradition (but also of a type of miracle-story that had been growing up around the Temple for many centuries)¹⁶⁶ frustrated the evil project at every step. Day after day the stubborn Jews persisted, and day after day great balls of fire chased them all over the Temple rock, consuming them like flies, while the earth shook and the heavens gave forth with a succession of super-spectacular displays. Among all the conflicting accounts, Adler had no difficulty finding the most probable source of the legends, which grow like a snowball;¹⁶⁷ yet to this day Christian scholars cite the fantastic and contradictory stories not only as actual fact, but also as positive proof that Jerusalem and the Temple can never be restored.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶³ Rufin., *loc. cit.*; Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 20.

¹⁶⁴ Adler, *op. cit.*, p. 649. On the Temple as a test case, John Chrys., *Adv. Jud.* v, vi, in *P.G.* 48. 888, 909.

¹⁶⁵ A blunt and recent statement is that of D. M. Stanley, "Kingdom to Church", *Theological Studies*, 16 (1955), 26: ". . . the definitive coming of the Church . . . terminates the existence of the Temple."

¹⁶⁶ Joh. Hempel, *Althebräische Literatur* (Potsdam, 1930), p. 92. A significant point overlooked by commentators.

¹⁶⁷ Adler, *op. cit.*, pp. 637-51.

¹⁶⁸ F. Prat, *Jesus Christ* (Milwaukee, 1950), ii. 230, hails the fire-ball story

When Athanasius assures us that no crime can be more monstrous than that of converting a church into a synagogue, he makes it clear that that is not because one poor synagogue more or less makes so much difference, but because such a gesture “prepares the way” for the sitting of the Antichrist in the Temple.¹⁶⁹ The Antichrist-in-the-Temple prophecy has always cast a dark shadow over the pages of the fathers, and though most of them prefer an allegorical interpretation, a large and influential number of them insist on taking the thing literally, however terrible the prospect. It is *deffinitive templum Dei*, whether we like it or not, they assure us, and before the Adversary can usurp his place in the Temple, that Temple must be rebuilt.¹⁷⁰

Church writers have done their best to brighten the gloomy picture. They have reassured us that the only really *literal* aspect of the Temple was its destruction;¹⁷¹ they have told comforting stories of frustrated attempts to rebuild it;¹⁷² they report with a great sigh of relief the collapse of the Montanist project

as conclusive proof that Jesus’ prophecy of “not one stone upon another . . . has been fulfilled to the letter”. The learned M. le Nourry argues that while the destruction of Jewish and pagan temples by fire, especially lightning, is a sure sign of divine wrath, a like fate suffered by Christian buildings is without significance, since Christians do not believe that God dwells in houses made with hands. Note in *P.G.* 9. 899–901.

¹⁶⁹ Athanasius, *Hist. Arian. ad Monach.* 71, in *P.G.* 25. 777: “. . . a new defilement, a prelude and a preparation (προοίμιον καὶ παρασκευή) for the Antichrist.” Cf. *ibid.* 781, 789.

¹⁷⁰ Quote from Irenaeus, *Contra haeres.* v. 25, in *P.G.* 7. 1189. Cyril of Jerusalem says it is a dreadful thing to think of, but cannot for that reason be denied, *Catach. xv, de secundo Christi adventu*, 15, in *P.G.* 33. 889–92.

¹⁷¹ Basil, *Comm. in Is.* iii. 110, in *P.G.* 30. 296, who for the rest is very partial to a spiritual and intellectual Temple, *ibid.* 289, 233, etc.

¹⁷² See above, notes 165–70. In one attempt the workers unearthed a stone bearing the inscription: In the beginning was the Word. “This was proof positive that it is vain ever to try to rebuild Jerusalem—evidence of a divine and irrevocable decree that the Temple has vanished forever!” Philostorgius, *Eccl. Hist.* vii. 15, in *P.G.* 65. 552 f.

for rebuilding the New Jerusalem;¹⁷³ and, as we have seen, they taxed the resources of exegesis to discover a ray of hope in the Scriptures. Yet all this but betrays rather than allays their misgivings: towards the Jews and their Temple their words and deeds remain those of men haunted by a sense of insecurity.¹⁷⁴ Why otherwise would they forbid the Jews even to imitate the architecture of the Temple in their synagogues?¹⁷⁵ The intellectuals who liquidated the Temple once for all in the economy of the Church fondly supposed that their own eloquence could more than take its place: while the emperors have taken upon themselves the expense and responsibility of erecting the physical edifice, Jerome assures us, it is *eloquentia* that warrants the tabernacling of the Spirit therein.¹⁷⁶ If the Temple of the Spirit was built without hands, human tongues worked overtime on the project, and the finished structure remains a typically unconvincing production of the age of Rhetoric.¹⁷⁷

The Reformation as a reaction against ritualism could hardly be expected to capitalize on the Christian need for the Temple or its equivalent, and indeed leading Protestant scholars confess that vagueness and uncertainty in ritual matters was perhaps the most serious defect in the work of the Reformers.¹⁷⁸ Yet the Protestant experience seems simply to be repeating the cycle, for we have seen how the doctors of ancient times condemned the Temple and its rites with over-hasty zeal, and how their successors, seeking like Esau to mend the damage and “inherit the blessing” when it was all too late, introduced into the vacuum

¹⁷³ Even Eusebius had his doubts and wondered if the Montanists might be right, W. Völker, in *Vigiliae Christianae*, 4 (1950), 170.

¹⁷⁴ Well expressed in M. Simon's *Verus Israel*, pp. 118 ff.

¹⁷⁵ See H. Rosenau, in *Palest. Expl. Fund. Quart.*, 1937, p. 200.

¹⁷⁶ Jerome, *In Is.* 17. 40, in *P.L.* 24. 593 f.

¹⁷⁷ See our discussions, in *Western Polit. Quart.* 6 (1953), 652–5, and “Victoriosa Loquacitas”, *Western Speech*, 20 (1956), 68–72.

¹⁷⁸ H. Bornkamm, *Grundriß zum Studium der Kirchengesch.* (Gütersloh, 1949), pp. 112 ff.

a botched and hybrid ritual. It was the pagan element in that ritual which the Reformers found so objectionable and exposed so skilfully.¹⁷⁹ Neither group has grounds for complacency, and it would be hard to determine which of the two condemns the Temple with greater vigor.

By loosely and inaccurately equating the Temple with the Synagogue, it has been possible for Christian scholars in the past to claim victory for the Church without the painful necessity of mentioning the Temple too much or even at all, the assumption being that the Church's triumph over the Synagogue answereth all things.¹⁸⁰ But with the current emphasis on eschatology and ritual, the Temple can no longer be kept in the background. *Eschatologie hat über uns keine Macht mehr!* has been the common creed of the clergy,¹⁸¹ but eschatology now returns like an unwelcome ghost, and with it comes the Temple. So while some Christian scholars still denounce the Temple with surprising vehemence,¹⁸² others are markedly hesitant,¹⁸³

¹⁷⁹ While F. Cabrol, *Origines liturgiques*, pp. 48 ff., strenuously denies that "toute cette splendeur dont le culte fut entouré" was of any but the purest Hebraic origin, such eminent Catholic authorities as J. Lechner and L. Eisenhofer, *Liturgik des röm. Ritus* (Freiburg, 1953), pp. 5–6, think otherwise.

¹⁸⁰ T. Livius, *St. Peter of Rome* (London, New York, 1888), while boasting (p. 521) that his church alone in Christendom possesses a Holy City, just like the Jews and Moslems, never mentions the Temple, but always puts the Synagogue in its place, e.g. "The divinely appointed Aaronical high-priesthood . . . was in the Synagogue the fountainhead of all other priesthood" (p. 523), "The once-favored Synagogue . . . has become a widow . . . without altar or sacrifice . . ." (p. 527). Only once does he let slip the ugly little word, and that in a footnote (p. 527), but it is enough to show that he knows better and is deliberately avoiding the embarrassing word, as Christian scholars consistently do.

¹⁸¹ So the Rev. Gust. Wingren, in *Studia Theologica*, 5 (1951), 111 f.

¹⁸² "Le Temple est mort à jamais" is the cry of M. Simon, in *Mélanges Goguel*, p. 252, cf. 253, 257. An interesting development is the admission that the original Christians were devoted to the Temple, coupled with a rebuke for their foolishness; so R. Bultmann, *Theologie*, i, 54, 57; I. O'Brien, *Life of Christ*, p. 418. Cf. C. A. Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy*, p. 289.

¹⁸³ C. H. Dodd, *Fourth Gospel*, pp. 300 f.; C. K. Barrett, in Davies and Daube, *Background to NT*, pp. 374 ff.; M. Burrows, *Outline*, p. 276. Even

and still others have reached the point of unabashedly accepting “the literalness of the future temple and its sacrificial system”.¹⁸⁴ All three of these attitudes bespeak a sense of insecurity and inadequacy.

The moral of our tale is that the Christian world has been perennially haunted by the ghost of the Temple—a ghost in which it does not believe. If the least be said for it, the Temple has never lost its power to stir men’s imaginations and excite their emotions, and the emotion which it has most often inspired in Christian breasts has certainly been that of envy, a passion the more dangerous for being suppressed. The Temple has cast a shadow over the claims and the confidence of the Christian Church from early times, a shadow which is by no means diminishing in our own day. If we seem to have labored the obvious in pointing this out, it is only because the obvious has been so long and so resolutely denied or ignored in high places.

Dean Farrar was very cautious in condemning the Temple, *op. cit.* i. 192–3. W. J. Phythian-Adams’s whole book, *The People and the Presence*, belongs in this hesitant and compromising group.

¹⁸⁴ J. F. Walvoord, “The Doct. of the Millennium”, in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 115 (1958), 106 ff. “The entire sacrificial system of the OT, while perhaps incongruous with western civilization aesthetics, was never-the-less commanded by God Himself. . . . If a literal view of the temple and sacrifices be allowed, it provides a more intimate view of worship in the millennium than might otherwise be afforded . . .”, *ibid.*, pp. 107 f.