

He became known to the Israelites. In the latter (as is also said in the Talmud) the man clothed in linen is Gabriel, who is but a faint copy of Mika'el (Michael), a Mighty One who has the same origin as Mal'ak,¹ i.e. is primarily north Arabian. And I cannot for my part suppose that such a personage, the Helper of the great God, was provided with fresh Babylonian characteristics, belonging properly to Nabû, in the time of Ezekiel. I admit, of course, the affinity of many points in the Babylonian and other Western Asiatic religions, but I do not feel it necessary to assume that when two religions have points in common one of the two must necessarily be the original of the other. Babylon may from time to time have directly influenced Israelitish religion, but upon the whole the popular religion borrowed much more from north Arabia, and the origin of north Arabian religion is not at present a subject ripe for discussion.

T. K. CHEYNE.

THE HEAVENLY TEMPLE AND THE HEAVENLY ALTAR.

II.

THE previous article closed with a survey of some Babylonian conceptions. That survey appeared to show: (1) that certain Babylonian temples were believed to have been constructed from plans revealed by the gods; (2) that the temples (in some cases at least) were regarded as a symbol of the cosmos, types, to use an older method of speech, of which the whole cosmos was the anti-type; but (3) that evidence appears to be wanting that the Babylonians believed in a temple and altar in heaven, or that the earthly temples and altars were copies of such particular heavenly originals; the anti-type of the earthly temple with its altar

¹ See EXPOSITOR, April, 1906.

was not a temple in heaven, but heaven itself or rather the entire cosmos.

If we now return to Jewish literature, we shall find close parallels to these Babylonian ideas.

Gudea's dream of the gods revealing to him the plan in accordance with which he subsequently builds his temple is paralleled in the Old Testament by the vision of Ezekiel (Ezek. xl.-xliii.) in which he is brought by the hand of Yahweh from Babylon to Mount Zion; for in this vision Ezekiel sees standing on Mount Zion "the likeness of the structure of a city,"¹ by which is meant, as the sequel shows, the likeness of the actual temple, which is in future to rise on Mount Zion, together with the enclosed temple area and the subsidiary buildings. As Gudea sees a man who proves to be a god drawing the plan of a temple on a tablet, so Ezekiel sees "a man whose appearance was like bronze," an angelic being, with a line and a measuring rod in his hand. This man exhorts Ezekiel to observe carefully what he sees that he may subsequently declare it to the House of Israel, and then proceeds to measure in detail the dimensions of the temple, the courts, the chambers for the priests and so forth. After the measurements have been completed, Ezekiel sees the glory of Yahweh advancing from the east and entering the temple, and then hears the voice of Yahweh speaking from within the temple to him; Yahweh's words close with the command, "And do thou, son of man, show the house of Israel the temple, its form and its pattern . . . describe the temple, its construction, its exits and its entrances, and make known to them all its forms, ordinances and regulations; write them down in their sight, that they may observe and perform all its ordinances."²

¹ Ezek. xl. 2, כַּמְבֹנֵה עִיר.

² Ezek. xliii. 10, 11, Toy's translation; in ver. 10 for וַיִּסְדְּרוּ אֶת־תְּבִינָתָא read (with the LXX.) וַיִּסְדְּרוּ אֶת־תְּבִינָתוֹ; and in ver. 11 for וַיִּצְדְּקָהּ read וַיִּצְדְּקוּ.

The account given in Exodus (P) of the origin of the tabernacle is similar, though in detail less clear and explicit. Moses is there said to have constructed the tabernacle and its appurtenances according to the *tabnith*, i.e. the build, pattern or plan, which Yahweh showed him while he was with Him on Mount Sinai (Exod. xxv. 9, 40). In another passage (xxvi. 30) Moses is instructed to build the tabernacle according to its *mishpat* which was "shown" him in the mountain. The *mishpat*, the common Hebrew word for custom, law, judgment, manner, etc., may *possibly* here mean something visible; but even if it does, we cannot say precisely what sort of visible thing it was. In any case the narrative, though it contains a sufficiently complete and detailed statement of what Moses was to make, that is to say, though it reports fully enough the verbal instructions of Yahweh to Moses, really leaves us in some doubt as to precisely what He showed him or how He showed it. Was it a model, as some assume, or was it rather a building-plan?

This vagueness in Exodus may perhaps be attributed to the fact that the writer is dealing with an already familiar idea; he is not the first to write of a temple constructed according to a *tabnith* revealed by God, nor does he write for those to whom such an idea is strange. How had he and his readers become familiar with the idea? Through the study of Ezekiel?

In Ezekiel we have precision where in Exodus we have vagueness or allusiveness. Ezekiel's account is so precise that it is not *necessary* to assume that he is working a long familiar idea; he presents it, as the creator of such an idea might present it. At the same time the possibility and even the probability that Ezekiel is here influenced by Babylonian ideas may be admitted on these grounds: (1) that he shows elsewhere much openness to the influence of his Babylonian surroundings; (2) that the belief in temples

built according to plans given from heaven is known to have existed in Babylon. The force of (2) would, of course, be greatly increased by the discovery of Babylonian narratives of temples so built of more recent date than Gudea's inscriptions (c. 3000 B.C.), or by proof that Ezekiel is likely to have been acquainted with statues of Gudea,¹ and the contents of the inscriptions.

One thing is clear and must be expressly noted: neither Ezekiel nor Moses is represented in the Old Testament as having seen a temple in heaven; nor are the buildings which they are bidden to have constructed represented as being earthly copies of buildings that played any part in the life and society of heaven.

The third and last Old Testament narrative that shows the influence of the particular idea with which we are at present dealing is 1 Chronicles xxviii. 11–20. According to Kings (i. v. vii. 13 ff.), Solomon constructed the temple by the help of Tyrian workmen; according to Chronicles he constructed it in accordance with plans (תבניות) given to him by David, who in turn had received them in writing from the hand of Yahweh. The interpretation of Chronicles has its own difficulties; but so much seems clear (1) whether or not the account in Exodus of the God-given plans for the tabernacle is dependent on Ezekiel, the narrative in Chronicles presupposes that of Exodus; (2) the *tabnith* or plan (and the words used in Exodus xxv. 9 and 1 Chronicles xxviii. 11, 12, 19 are the same) according to which Solomon built the temple, though shown and imparted by God, is something that passes from human hand to hand—whether model or plan matters little; it is something that may have come from heaven, but remains on earth; from which (3) we may probably infer that the Chronicler thought that the

¹ On one of these a building plan is engraved; see the reproduction in Jeremias' *Das A. T. im Lichte des Alten Orients*², p. 593, Fig. 207.

tabnith of the tabernacle was not only shown to Moses on the Mount, but that it was also brought down by him and constantly referred to in constructing the tabernacle—and in this it is not unlikely that the Chronicler interpreted Exodus correctly.

We come now to Jewish parallels to the Babylonian interpretation of temples as symbols of the cosmos.

Passing over such possibilities as that the *'ohel mo'ed*, or "tent of meeting," indicates by its name that it was originally a symbol of that chamber of assembly in the world-mountain in which the gods met to determine destinies,¹ or that the "molten sea" of the Solomonic temple which was supported on twelve oxen, three facing each point of the compass, was, like the *apsu* of the Babylonian temples, a symbol of the Deep, we find at a very much later period interpretations of the temple that unquestionably attribute to its several parts or to its contents a cosmic symbolism. The earliest of these interpretations is Philo's and the next that of Josephus. Later Jewish and Christian interpretations we may pass over; they are probably derived from Philo and Josephus, and in any case only bear fuller evidence to the extent of this interpretation.

In the course of his discussion Philo clearly indicates that this cosmic principle of interpretation was not originated by himself; for with reference to a particular detail he disputes the correctness of the way in which it has been applied. Thus speaking of the cherubim on the ark, he says: "Some say that these, in virtue of their position face to face, are symbols of the two hemispheres, of that which is under the earth and that which is above it; for the whole heaven is a winged thing. But I should say"²—and

¹ See the cautious suggestion of Zimmern in *Die Keilinschriften u. das AT.*, p. 592.

² ταυτα δὲ τινες μὲν φασιν εἶναι σύμβολα τῶν ἡμισφαιριῶν ἀμφοῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀντιπρόσωπον θέσιν, τοῦ τε ὑπὸ γῆν καὶ ὑπὲρ γῆν πτηνῶν γὰρ ὁ σύμπας οὐρανὸς ἐγὼ δ' ἂν εἶποιμι κ.τ.λ. *De Vita Moysis*, ii. (iii.) 8, Mangey, 150.

then he goes on to give his own explanation that these cherubim symbolize the creative and the royal powers of God.

Philo's interpretation extends over a large part of Book ii. (iii.) of the *De Vita Mosis*, and is far too lengthy to quote or discuss in detail here. It will suffice to note one or two points.

1. He differs entirely from the standpoint of the interpolator of the Apocalypse of Baruch (iv. 2-6) cited in the last article; for he quite definitely and categorically denies that Moses on Sinai saw any material pattern of the tabernacle. What he saw, he saw with the mind (τῆ ψυχῆ), and what he beheld was "the incorporeal ideas of the corporeal things that were to be brought to completion" (τῶν μελλόντων ἀποτελεῖσθαι σωματίων ἄσωμάτους ιδέας—Book II. c. iii., Mangey, 146). Philo obviously deduced no belief in a temple in heaven from the narrative in Exodus.

2. A passage in the *De Monarchiâ* (Mangey, 222) carries us further, and shows us that Philo had no room in his scheme of things for belief in a temple in heaven. He knows but two temples: one the temple made with hands; the other the entire universe. His mode of expression perhaps indicates that he, like the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, is in passing refuting a current belief. "It is right," he says, "to regard the entire cosmos as constituting the true and highest sanctuary of God; the holiest part of the essence of existing things is the innermost chamber of this sanctuary; the stars are its *anathemata*; the angels ministers of His power, incorporeal souls, are its priests. But the other (sanctuary) is made with hands."¹

3. In view of this last passage it is a little curious that

¹ Τὸ μὲν ἀνωτάτω καὶ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἱερὸν θεοῦ νομίζειν τὸν σύμπαντᾶ χρητὸν κόσμον εἶναι, νεῶ μὲν ἔχοντα τὸ ἀγιώτατον τῆς τῶν ὄντων οὐσίας μέρος, οὐρανόν, ἀναθήματα δὲ τοὺς ἀστερας ἱερέας δὲ τοὺς ὑποδιακόνους αὐτοῦ τῶν δυνάμεων ἀγγέλους, ἄσωμάτους ψυχάς . . . τὸ δὲ χειρόκρητον.

Philo does not explain the main divisions of the temple cosmically. His explanation of these is that the court represents the objects of sense (*τὰ αἰσθητά*), the sanctuary the objects of thought (*τὰ νοητά*). He retains the more distinctly cosmic interpretation for the accessories, especially the high priests' garment which symbolizes air, earth, water, heaven, and in particular the two hemispheres and the twelve signs of the Zodiac.

On the whole we appear to have in Philo a free and fresh use of a general principle of interpretation which he had inherited. But his attitude is of importance as showing that a cosmical interpretation of the earthly temple, so far from being intimately and necessarily connected with the belief in the existence of a temple in heaven, easily and naturally leads to the rejection of that belief if offered for acceptance.

Certain details that appear in Philo reappear in Josephus, but Josephus interprets the parts of the tabernacle also cosmically. "If any one will consider," he says, "the structure of the tabernacle . . . he will find that the several parts have been framed to imitate and represent the universe (*τὰ ὅλα*) . . . The tabernacle . . . was divided into three parts: two of these he left open to all the priests, as an ordinary and common place, and so indicated the earth and the sea, for these are accessible to all; the third portion he confined to God alone, because the heaven is also inaccessible to men." He then goes on to point out, for example, that the seven candles of the candlestick correspond to the seven planets, that the fabrics of which the veil was woven signify earth, air, fire and water; the breastplate in the middle of the ephod is the earth, "for the earth occupies the mid-most place"; the girdle the ocean, for it embraces the world, and so forth.¹

¹ *Ant.* iii. 7, 7; and similarly of Herod's temple, *Bell. Jud.*, v. 5, 4-7.

Philo the Alexandrian and Josephus the Palestinian were both apologists for their race and religion to the Græco-Roman world of their day, and it is probable that they made use of this cosmic interpretation because it served their apologetic purpose. What may have been the origin of that interpretation among the Jews, how far in principle and detail it may have been derived from Babylonian thought, it would be beyond the scope of this article to inquire further.

I have now completed the survey of the ideas that have been or might be considered to be most closely related to that idea of the temple and altar in heaven which we find fully developed in the apocalypse of John and which was the object of much interest to later Jewish thinkers. As a result of this survey it appears that Babylonian literature contains no explicit reference to an altar in heaven, and that any references which may perhaps be interpreted of a great house of the gods in heaven imply an idea which may be and possibly is radically different from that in the Apocalypse.

A favourite method with the scholars who, in spite of the failures that must beset pioneers, have done good service in seeking for Babylonian influence in Hebrew literature, is to fill up missing links in Babylonian mythology by inferences back from Hebrew thought and literature. The method in itself is not illegitimate, but needs to be pursued with caution. It cannot, I think, be safely adopted with the idea under discussion. We cannot, that is to say, safely argue: the Babylonians must have believed in a temple and an altar in heaven because the ancient and all-prevailing doctrine of correspondence of heaven and earth implies such a belief, and Jewish literature proves that this particular implication was understood and explicitly believed and stated. We cannot safely argue thus; for the fact that

the temples were built as symbols of the cosmos, or being built were so interpreted, is a *sufficient* deduction from the general principle of the correspondence of things earthly and heavenly for any one people or age to have drawn. The same general principle, it is true, might readily also lead to the argument—there is a temple on earth, and therefore there must be a temple in heaven; but this argument would only suggest itself naturally to minds which had never entertained the belief that the temple on earth, or a part of it, was a representation of heaven, or to minds in which that belief was no longer vivid. It is significant that Philo and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who interpret the earthly temple cosmically, reject the belief in a temple in heaven—the former certainly, the latter probably. This was one course to adopt when the two deductions independently made from the same general principle met, as they did in the first century A.D. in the Jewish world. The other course, so often adopted in similar cases, of harmonizing mutually incompatible or ill-fitting beliefs may have been adopted by others, but I do not think we have an actual instance of this.

Once the belief in a temple in heaven had arisen the general doctrine of the correspondence of things earthly and heavenly would tend to give colour and elaboration to the new belief, such as the later Rabbinic literature shows that it did actually receive. But we have still, if possible, to discover the genesis of the belief. Neither direct evidence nor sound inference encourages us to seek for this in Babylonia. It is therefore reasonable at least to consider how far we can explain the belief as of native Jewish origin; and here our first step is to determine the limits of time within which it originated. This brings us back to the interpretation of Isaiah chap. vi. If Isaiah refers to the heavenly temple, the idea in his day was already

a familiar one and probably long current ; but if he refers to the earthly temple, then we shall have no *evidence* of the Jewish belief in a heavenly temple earlier than the close of the second century B.C., and we shall have to consider how long the belief is likely to have existed before our earliest evidence of its existence.

To what then does Isaiah refer ? I shall content myself with indicating one or two of the chief considerations which lead me to the conclusion that Isaiah refers to the earthly temple ; and these shall be such as will retain their force even if some day we get proof direct and unambiguous that the Babylonians, or the Hebrew contemporaries of Isaiah, believed in the existence of a heavenly temple and altar.

One word first as to an intermediate interpretation. The term used by Isaiah and commonly rendered " temple " is *היכל*, which also and even primarily means " palace " ; accordingly some interpreters claim that it was not a heavenly *temple*, but a heavenly *palace* that Isaiah saw. But this will not do ; the allusion to the altar in verse 6 clearly proves that the scene of Isaiah's vision is sacred and not merely royal.

The issue then is clear : either the temple of the vision is the temple on Mount Zion,¹ or the vision of Isaiah proves that the idea of the altar and temple in heaven is eight centuries earlier than the apocalypse of John.

As a matter of fact the temple and altar of the vision are the temple and altar on Mount Zion. Even if the idea of a heavenly temple not only existed in the age of Isaiah, but was one with which he was familiar, he, as an inhabitant of Jerusalem, was far more familiar with the actual temple.

¹ This would remain true if we were to revive Rashi's interpretation of Isa. vi. 1 : " I saw Him sitting on His throne in heaven, and His feet in the *hēkal*, the footstool of His feet, i.e., in the sanctuary " (cf. Isa. lxxv. 1).

When, therefore, he speaks of "the altar" and "the temple" without any qualification or explanation, it is at the least more probable that he is referring to the more familiar objects, unless anything in the narrative unmistakably suggests the contrary. I recall here that both in the Testament of Levi and in the Apocalypse of John the writers are careful, when speaking of the temple in heaven, to make it quite clear that it is this temple and not the earthly of which they speak. It has been urged that the presence of the seraphim is a sufficient indication that the scene is in heaven; but this is by no means so; if Elisha's servant, when his eyes were opened, saw horses and chariots of fire (2 Kings vi. 17) in Dothan, Isaiah, with eyes open in vision, might well see seraphim in Jerusalem.¹ It is indeed the very fact that he sees Yahweh holding court in Jerusalem that gives full point to his alarm; it is the actual presence of the Holy One of Israel in the midst of Israel and not remote in heaven that spells doom to the unclean people; the sinners in Sion must needs be alarmed (cf. Isa. xxxiii. 4f.).

Again, the analogy of the vision of Amos favours interpreting the temple that Isaiah saw as the temple on Mount Zion. "I saw the Lord," says Amos, "standing beside the altar; and He said, Smite the chapiters that the thresholds may quake, and cut them off on to the head of them all" (Amos ix. 1). The temple whose thresholds are to quake and whose falling chapiters are to descend on the heads of the assembled worshippers is certainly not the heavenly temple, but the temple at Bethel, the great sanctuary of the kingdom whose destruction Amos has to announce. Again, in Ezekiel's vision, which it is generally admitted shows some dependence on that of Isaiah, the earthly temple is the spot where the prophet sees the glory of Yahweh revealed (Ezek. viii. 3, x. 4); though he sees heaven

¹ Cf. also Ezek. x. 3.

opened (i. 1), unlike John he sees no temple therein ; from the opened heaven he sees the chariot or moveable throne descending earthwards.

Isaiah, then, in his narrative of his vision, does not refer to a temple in heaven.

If the belief in a heavenly temple and altar could have been shown to exist in Israel in the eighth century B.C., the *origin* of the belief would remain, so far as I can see, obscure. We might *conjecture* that it came from Babylon ; but as we have seen the evidence actually offered for the existence of the belief in Babylon is invalid ; and were it otherwise, the origin of the Babylonian belief would still need to be explained. If, however, this belief arose among the Jews at a later date than Isaiah, a probable cause for it may be assigned.

From the fact that there is no direct evidence for the existence of the belief earlier than the Testaments of the Patriarchs at the end of the second century B.C., coupled with the fact that neither Ezekiel nor P nor the Chronicler refers to the heavenly temple, though it would have been exceedingly natural for them to do so if they were familiar with it, I infer that the date of origin lies between 500 and 100 B.C.

What then gave birth to the idea ? Some have traced it back to an inference or development from the narratives in Exodus, which rest on the belief, common to Babylon and Israel, that temples were built according to a ground-plan or the like received from heaven. Thus, for example, Dr. Charles writes : " Of the existence of heavenly antitypes of the Tabernacle and its furniture we are told already in the Priests' Code (Exod. xxv. 9, 40 ; cf. Heb. viii. 5). It needed only a step further to postulate the existence of the heavenly temple and city." And again : " Since, according to Exodus xxv. 9, 40 ; Numbers viii. 4, the earthly altar

and tabernacle were made after the likeness of heavenly patterns or originals . . . the idea of a sacrificial service in heaven must have been familiar to Judaism long before the composition of the Testaments.”¹

The term “heavenly pattern or original” is ambiguous; it may mean an object which remains and continues to be used in heaven, after an imitation of it has been made and is in use on earth; or it may mean a pattern, plan, model or what-not that is given from heaven to guide the construction of an object to be used on earth, a pattern, that is to say, of something that is to be made on earth, but not of anything that either has been or is to be in heaven. I believe, for reasons already given, that the *tabnith* of Exodus xxv. 9 and the *mar'eh* of Numbers viii. 4 were heavenly originals only in the latter sense. Moses on Mount Sinai saw neither altar nor tabernacle, but merely plans according to which the earthly altar and tabernacle were to be built; moreover the narrative in Exodus does not assert that Moses either ascended into heaven or saw into heaven, and the analogy of Ezekiel's vision makes it very precarious to *infer* that he did either; what he saw, he saw on the mount.

Although I do not deny that the passages in Exodus may have had *some* part in creating or fostering the belief in a heavenly temple and altar, I think it precarious to infer from them that this belief existed *long* before the time of the Testaments. So long as the *tabnith* of Exodus continued to be understood, as it apparently still was by the Chronicler,² of

¹ *Apocalypse of Baruch*, note on iv. 3, and *Test. of the Patriarchs*, note on “Levi,” iii. 5.

² And probably by the LXX, though the words used by them (*παράδειγμα* and *τύπος*) have a sufficient range of meanings in Greek to allow of the translators having understood the passages to mean rather more than, as has been argued above, they were intended to express. In Exod. xxv. 9 (8) the LXX renders *καὶ ποιήσεις μοι κατὰ πάντα ὅσα σοὶ δεῖκνύω ἐν τῷ ὄρει τὸ παράδειγμα τῆς σκηνῆς καὶ τὸ παράδειγμα πάντων τῶν σκευῶν αὐτῆς, οὕτω ποιήσεις*. In ver. 40, though the Hebrew again has *לַבְנֵי*, the Greek rendering is

a building plan, it obviously formed no suitable object for a heavenly priesthood to offer sacrifices upon, still less could it create a belief in a heavenly priesthood.

If, then, we cannot safely argue from Exodus that the belief in the heavenly altar existed “long” before the Testaments, how far can we go? It would be a reasonable inference that it existed some time before the “Testaments” (i.e., c. 107 B.C.), if that form of the text of Levi iii. 6 is earliest which reads: “In it (i.e., the highest heaven) are the archangels, who minister and make propitiation to the Lord for all the sins of ignorance of the righteous, offering to the Lord a sweet-smelling savour, a reasonable and bloodless offering.” For this piling up of sacrificial terms suggests a heavenly priesthood and a heavenly altar; the inference would be less secure, if the shorter text be original which says merely, “And the hosts of angels are ministering and praising the Lord: who also are messengers of the Godhead.” At best, then, we are only justified in placing

δρα ποιήσεις κατὰ τὸν τύπον τὸν δεδειγμένον σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει. In Num. viii. 4, where the Hebrew has מִנְיָן, the Greek gives εἶδος. Both παράδειγμα and τύπος are rare in the LXX; παράδειγμα elsewhere occurs only in 1 Chron. xxviii. (six times—4 times = Π'ΙΚΠ and twice in the same sense, where it has no equivalent in Hebrew), in Nahum. iii. 6. = 'NΓ, R.V. “a gazingstock,” and, with a similar sense, as a euphemistic rendering of מִנְיָן, “dung,” in Jer. viii. 2, ix. 22 (21), xvi. 4; it also occurs in 3 Macc. ii. 5, 4 Macc. vi. 19. Τύπος occurs again only in Amos v. 26 (= מִנְיָן) and in 3 Macc. iii. 30, 4 Macc. vi. 19. Of uses of παράδειγμα outside the LXX it is of interest to recall two; in Herod. v. 62 (τὸν τε νηὸν ἐξεργάσαντο τοῦ παραδειγματός κάλλιον), the sense must closely resemble that of παράδειγμα and Π'ΙΚΠ alike in 1 Chron. xxviii. The other use is Plato's at the end of the 9th book of the “Republic.” I cite the passage fully for its interesting though superficial resemblance to some of the Jewish ideas discussed in the article: “The man of understanding . . . will consent to interfere in politics . . . You mean, in the city whose organization we have now completed, and which is confined to the region of speculation; for I do not believe that it is to be found anywhere on earth . . . Well, said I, perhaps in heaven there is laid up a pattern of it (παράδειγμα ἀνάκειται) for him who wishes to behold it, and beholding to organize himself accordingly. And the question of its present or future existence on earth is quite unimportant, for in any case he will adopt the practices of such a city” (Davies' and Vaughan's translation).

the belief in a heavenly sacrificial service, and, by inference, the belief in a heavenly altar, *some* indefinite time before the Testaments.

If we seek an upward limit for the origin of the belief, we are reduced from the nature of the case to determining when the argument from silence acquires force. I have already suggested that the failure of the belief to appear in three writers, Ezekiel, P and the Chronicler, all of whom had good reason for betraying it if they held it, should receive due weight. Is the belief younger also than the early parts of the book of Enoch? The argument from silence in this case would be much more precarious; still it is interesting to observe that instead of the souls of the dead that cry to God lying under the heavenly altar as in John's Apocalypse, they are on earth or in Sheol (Enoch chap. ix. xxii.); and the heavenly house which Enoch describes is a *palace* rather than a *temple*: "All the portals stood open before me, and it was built of flames of fire, and in every respect it so excelled in splendour and magnificence and extent that I cannot describe to you its splendour and its extent. And its floor was fire, and above it were lightnings, and the path of the stars, and its ceiling also was a flaming fire. And I looked and saw therein a lofty throne; its appearance was as a hoar frost, its circuit was a shining sun and the voices of cherubim. And from underneath the great throne came streams of flaming fire, so that it was impossible to look thereon. And the great Glory sat thereon, and His raiment shone more brightly than the sun and was whiter than any snow."¹ This is the throne-room of the Most High in heaven—in a word His palace. We move here in that circle of ideas which led the Hebrew writers to speak of heaven itself as God's palace (דִּיכַל), or dwelling (זְבוּל), or of his palace in heaven (Ps. xi. 4, xviii. 7; Mic.

¹ Enoch xiv. 14 ff. (Charles's translation).

i. 2; Heb. ii. 20; Isa. lxiii. 15). The *היכל* in these cases has often been translated "temple," but "palace" is preferable; in Psalm xxix., for example, Yahweh sits enthroned (as in Enoch) in His heavenly *היכל* or palace, and the "sons of the gods" prostrate themselves before Him as His greatest officers prostrate themselves before an earthly monarch sitting in state.

The author of Enoch may have borrowed points in his description of the heavenly palace from the narratives of Isaiah vi. and Ezekiel i. without locating the scene of either Isaiah's or Ezekiel's vision in heaven, or locating Isaiah's there he may [have ignored the altar, just as modern commentators who have turned the temple into a palace have done. Not so later writers. For I believe that Isaiah's vision, although it does not itself refer to the heavenly temple and altar, was a main cause in producing the belief in them. If many later scholars have mistakenly interpreted Isaiah vi., it is not surprising if Jewish scholars of the second or third centuries B.C. did so. In an age when Jewish writers commonly imagined their heroes making journeys through heaven, curious to know the meaning of everything and generally finding an angel ready to satisfy their curiosity, nothing is more probable than that, as they read the story of Isaiah's vision, they imagined that he too, like one of their heroes, had been caught up into heaven. If so, sooner or later the altar of the story attracted their attention, and the belief in the heavenly altar was born; and then, if not before, the heavenly] palace became, or received as its fellow, the heavenly temple.

This influence of Isaiah vi. appears to me significantly reflected both in the Testaments and in the Apocalypse of John, our earliest documents that clearly and unmistakably refer to the temple in heaven.

“I saw the Lord sitting upon a throne high and lifted up, and His robe filled the temple”—the words are Isaiah’s. “The angel opened to me the gate of heaven, and I saw the holy temple, and upon a throne of glory the Most High”—the spectator is Levi in the Testaments. And lastly John writes: “And one of the four living creatures gave unto the seven angels, seven golden bowls full of the wrath of God. . . . And the temple was filled with smoke . . . and I heard a great voice out of the temple of God, saying, Go ye and pour out the seven bowls of the wrath of God into the earth”; and then later, “and there came forth a voice out of the temple from the throne, saying, It is done.” Additional points of contact with Isaiah in John are the house filling with smoke and the voice from the throne uttering the sentence of doom.

My conclusions on the whole matter briefly summarized are these: with the evidence at present existing it is far more probable that the idea of a temple in heaven and of an altar attached with a heavenly priesthood offering sacrifices on it is of native Jewish development than that it is of Babylonian origin; this particular development of Jewish thought took place between about 500 and 100 B.C., and probably very considerably nearer the later than the earlier limit; and in it we may see one of the early fruits of that learned and speculative exegesis of the Old Testament which is represented first in the Apocalyptic literature and later in the various Haggadic products of the Rabbinical schools.

G. BUCHANAN GRAY.