

This is an electronic reprint of the original article. This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Understanding the Spiritual Meaning of Jerusalem. A Religious Historical and Theological Overview

Laato, Antti; Laato, Antti

Published in:

Understanding the Spiritual Meaning of Jerusalem in Three Abrahamic Religions

DOI:

[10.1163/9789004406858](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004406858)

Published: 01/01/2019

Document Version

Accepted author manuscript

Document License

Publisher rights policy

[Link to publication](#)

Please cite the original version:

Laato, A., & Laato, A. (Ed.) (2019). Understanding the Spiritual Meaning of Jerusalem. A Religious Historical and Theological Overview. In *Understanding the Spiritual Meaning of Jerusalem in Three Abrahamic Religions* (pp. 3–40). Brill. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004406858>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

CHAPTER ONE

UNDERSTANDING SPIRITUAL MEANING OF JERUSALEM – A RELIGIOUS HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL OVERVIEW

ANTTI LAATO

In the Hebrew Bible Jerusalem and Zion are mentioned 660 and 154 times respectively. In its texts the city of God is related to different spiritual concepts and images. Several of these concepts and images have been developed in the Hebrew Bible and in subsequent Jewish, Christian and Islamic writings.¹ In this article, I use the term “Jerusalem-related” text or theology to denote a written text or theological construction which in some way deals with Jerusalem or Zion. The formation and development of the idea of “the spiritual meaning of Jerusalem” in the Hebrew Bible and Jewish, Christian and Islamic writings can be seen from two different perspectives. The first perspective consists of important historical events which have given

¹ Good overviews of the images of Jerusalem in the three different monotheistic Abrahamic religions are the following studies: Lee I. Levine, ed., *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (New York: Continuum, 1999); Oleg Grabar and Benjamin Z. Kedar, eds., *Where Heaven and Earth Meet: Jerusalem's Sacred Esplanade* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press and Austin: University of Texas Press, 2009). See further the history of Jerusalem in the First and Second Temple periods in Othmar Keel, *Die Geschichte Jerusalems und die Entstehung des Monotheismus Teil 1 und 2* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007). For some studies related to the Zion-related theologies in the Hebrew Bible note especially Richard S. Hess and Gordon J. Wenham, eds., *Zion, City of Our God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999); Corinna Körting, *Zion in den Psalmen* (FAT 48; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006); Fredrik Poulsen, *Representing Zion: Judgement and Salvation in the Old Testament* (Copenhagen International Seminar; London: Routledge, 2015). Concerning early Jewish writings and the New Testament, note especially John J. Collins, *Jerusalem and the Temple in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature of the Second Temple Period* (International Rennert Guest Lecture Series 1; Israel: Bar-Ilan University, 1998); Lois K. Fuller Dow, *Images of Zion: Biblical Antecedents for the New Jerusalem* (New Testament Monographs; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2010).

impulses to the formation of the spiritual meaning for Jerusalem,² while the second consists of Jerusalem-related ideological or theological concepts which have been developed in new religious, theological or social contexts. While the historical perspective can be described in some measure, the second perspective is much more difficult to study. Many important concepts are deeply rooted in history and subsequently developed throughout the centuries in Jerusalem-related writings. It is not always easy to depict the different lines of development of ideas without making a detailed analysis of each one.³ Therefore, my aim in this introduction is a modest one. I try to present the ways in which some historical epochs have given impulses to the development of a spiritual meaning for Jerusalem. I believe that such an overview gives an idea of how complicated the development of the spiritual meaning of Jerusalem is but, nonetheless, also helps readers to systematize some Jerusalem-related themes.

My aim is to show that some aspects of the spiritual meaning of Jerusalem were developed or emphasized in certain historical periods. I will show these lines of development by putting texts of the Hebrew Bible as well as Jewish, Christian and Islamic texts in a timeline.⁴ I have, therefore, structured this article chronologically. I go through the development of Jerusalem-related theology in fifteen different historical periods which, in my view, have left traces on the spiritual meaning of Jerusalem. At the end of each section, I summarize the most important theological topics or themes for the spiritual meaning of

2 Cf. Georg Fohrer, *History of Israelite Religion* (London: S.P.C.K 1973), where the development of the Israelite religion is related to influences imparted from important historical epochs.

3 A good example is the concept Shekinah which is rooted in the Hebrew verb *šākan*, “live (in the tent)” which has been used in many different texts of the Hebrew Bible. First, the verb was understood very concretely so that Jerusalem is Yahweh’s dwelling-place. The Deuteronomistic concept was then developed according to which Yahweh’s Name dwells in Jerusalem. Was this concept already a version of Shekinah theology? Or was the idea of Shekinah developed from the Deuteronomistic Shem-theology? Concerning this problem, see Tryggve N.D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies* (ConBOT 18; Lund: Gleerup 1982); Bernd Janowski and Enno Edzard Popkes, eds., *Das Geheimnis der Gegenwart Gottes: Zur Schechina-Vorstellung in Judentum und Christentum* (WUNT 318, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014).

4 My readers are certainly aware of the fact that scholars do not always agree in the dating of texts. Space does not permit me to study these problems in detail here.

UNDERSTANDING SPIRITUAL MEANING OF JERUSALEM

Jerusalem.

1 The Formation of Zion Theology in the Reigns of David and Solomon

According to the Hebrew Bible Jerusalem became a central religious city in Israel during the time of David (2 Sam 5-7) and Solomon (1 Kings 6-11). However, any attempt to penetrate the religious milieu of Jerusalem during the reigns of David and Solomon is complicated owing to fundamental problems concerning historical, archaeological and religious-historical investigation.⁵ I have recently published a monograph on the formation of early Israelite Zion theology,⁶ and offer a brief summary of this study with reference to some scholarly literature.

The fundamental question today concerns the historical nature of the reigns of David and Solomon as depicted in the Deuteronomistic History.⁷ A central tendency in the Deuteronomistic History is to argue

⁵ There are many good presentations of the outcome of the Zion theology in the reign of David and Solomon. They include Jimmy J. M. Roberts, "The Davidic Origin of the Zion Tradition," *JBL* 92 (1973): 329-344; idem, "Zion in the Theology of the Davidic-Solomonic Empire," in: Tomoo Ishida, ed., *Studies in the Period of David and Solomon and Other Essays* (Tokyo: Yamakawa-Shuppansha, 1982), 93-108; idem, "Solomon's Jerusalem and the Zion Tradition," in: Andrew G. Vaughn and Ann E. Killebrew, eds., *Jerusalem in Bible and Archaeology: The First Temple Period* (SBLSS 18; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 163-170; Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*; idem, "YHWH SABAOTH – The Heavenly King on the Cherubim Throne," in: Ishida, *Studies in the Period of David and Solomon*, 109-138; idem, "The Elusive Essence: YAHWEH, El and Baal and the Distinctiveness of the Israelite Faith," Erhard Blum et al. eds., *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte: Festschrift für Rolf Rendtorff zum 65. Geburtstag* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1990), 393-417; idem, *Reports from a Scholar's Life: Selected Papers on the Hebrew Bible* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2015); Choon L. Seow, *Myth, Drama, and the Politics of David's Dance* (HSM 44; Atlanta: Scholars Press 1989); Wolfgang Zwickel, *Der salomonische Tempel* (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1999); Othmar Keel, *Die Geschichte Jerusalems und die Entstehung des Monotheismus Teil 1 und 2* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), esp. 147-337. See also Peter Dubovsky, *The Building of the First Temple* (FAT 103; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015).

⁶ See Antti Laato, *The Origin of Israelite Zion Theology* (LHBOTS 661; Bloomsbury T&T Clark & Bloomsbury 2018).

⁷ What follows is a summary of my ideas presented in *The Origin of Israelite Zion Theology*. Because historical sources are few and archaeological material needs interpretation there are many other alternatives to understand the biblical description of the United Monarchy. See for example Thomas L. Thompson, *Early History of the Israelite People: From the Written and Archaeological Sources* (Studies in the History

that David and Solomon managed to establish something which could be called “an Israelite Empire.” In my monograph, I have suggested another kind of historical and political scenario in the Land of Canaan during the time of David and Solomon; namely that the policy of David and Solomon was mainly one of diplomacy and not imperialism. By means of diplomatic treaties David and Solomon managed to establish good contacts with their neighboring nations, and also with Egypt.⁸ David, for example, used Philistine soldiers in his army, had Kerethites and Pelethites as his personal guardians, and his earlier visit to Gath caused six hundred Gittites under the leadership of Ittai to follow him (2 Samuel 16). This shows that the Deuteronomistic picture of David subjugating the Philistines is one-sided. David managed to realize *divide et impera* policy among the Philistines. Similarly, David had good contacts with some Moabites (implied in 1 Sam 22:3-4; reflected later in the Book of Ruth) and Ammonites (implied in 2 Sam 10:1-2; 17:27).⁹ David and Solomon’s friendship with Hiram, the king of Tyro, gave them the opportunity to prosper by establishing central economic routes in Canaan. Solomon’s wives – for which he was blamed by the Deuteronomist (1 Kgs 11:1-8) – *de facto* indicated his clever foreign policy. David and Solomon – according to my tentative hypothesis – managed to establish a *status quo* in the Land of Canaan which was accepted by Egypt. This is indicated by the marriage between Solomon and the daughter of the Pharaoh. The situation was apparently politically acceptable for Egypt which had its own share of problems in foreign and domestic affairs.

By interpreting the biblical data in this way, it is clear that the

of the Ancient Near East; Leiden: Brill, 1992); Ernst Axel Knauf and Philippe Guillaume, *A History of Biblical Israel: The Fate of the Tribes and Kingdoms from Merneptah to Bar Kochba* (Worlds of the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean; Equinox Publishing, 2016).

⁸ I have argued that Abraham traditions were used for these purposes. See Antti Laato, “The Abraham Story in Genesis and the Reigns of David and Solomon,” in Lukas Bormann, ed, *Abraham’s Family: A Network of Meaning in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (WUNT 415; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018), 33-58.

⁹ It is worth noting that the mother of Rehabeam was an Ammonite woman, Naamah (1 Kgs 14:21). This indicates that Solomon and apparently already David (after the crisis of the Ammonite war) maintained good contacts with the Ammonites. It was David who arranged the marriage of Solomon with an Ammonite princess. For this see Abraham Malamat, “Naamah, the Ammonite Princess, King Solomon’s Wife,” *RB* 106 (1999): 35-40.

UNDERSTANDING SPIRITUAL MEANING OF JERUSALEM

Deuteronomist's characterization of the so-called "Israelite Empire" must be re-evaluated. It was not simply a constitution of the Israelite tribes which managed to subjugate neighboring peoples under the yoke of Israel, but rather a diplomatic agreement which David managed to create using his good contacts with Philistia, Moab, Ammon and Tyro, and which Solomon later further developed by establishing a good relationship with Egypt. According to 1 Kgs 9:16, the Egyptian Pharaoh conquered Gezer and gave it to Solomon. This indicates the limits of the military power which David earlier and Solomon after him had to consider in order that the *status quo* situation remained undisturbed.

The Temple which Solomon built was made according to the West-Semitic model where Yahweh was depicted by means of Storm God imagery.¹⁰ This imagery is most visible in Ugaritic Baal texts where the god receives its temple on Saphanu after having defeated the powers of chaos, Yammu (waters) and Naharu (rivers). Not only is the Mediterranean geography used in Psalms 48 and 29 but different metaphors related to the architectural details of the Temple also speak in favor of this hypothesis. Yahweh was depicted as the Great King enthroned on the Cherub throne and therefore new cultic symbols, the massive Cherubim, were constructed in the *Debir* of the Temple, while the older cult symbol the Ark of Covenant became Yahweh's footstool and was used in cultic processions. Like Baal, Yahweh uses two clubs of wars, Boaz and Jachin, in his struggle against the powers of chaos (Psalm 93). This being the case, the kingship of Yahweh was an essential element in the Zion theology from the beginning.

10 There are many important studies where the Jerusalemite Temple theology is related to West-Semitic religious traditions. See especially Mark S. Smith's influential monographs *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism: Israel's Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001); *The Early History of God: Yahweh and the Other Deities in Ancient Israel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002); *God in Transition: Deities in Cross-Cultural Discourse in the Biblical World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 2010). See further Nick Wyatt, *Myths of Power: A Study of Royal Myth and Ideology in Ugaritic and Biblical Tradition* (UBL 13; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1996); Alberto R. Green, *The Storm-God in the Ancient Near East* (Biblical and Judaic Studies from the University of California, San Diego 8. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2003); Reinhard Müller, *Jahwe als Wettergott: Studien zur althebräischen Kultlyrik anhand ausgewählter Psalmen* (BZAW 387; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008).

Jerusalem was identified as the divine Mount Saphon, and the divine council under the leadership of 'Ēl 'Elyôn (identified as Yahweh) was also relocated there. Other members of the divine council were revered outside the city (cf. the tradition behind the tendentious Deuteronomistic account in 1 Kgs 11:1-8), and Psalm 29 was related to this religious-political reality in Jerusalem. Zion was identified as the place where Paradise once existed, and the living waters (Ps 46:5) from the spring of Gihon were identified as one of the rivers in Paradise (Gen 2:10-14). In later eschatological texts this imagery was developed into the idea that wide living waters would flood from Jerusalem towards the Dead Sea and subsequently transform that lake into a source of fresh water (Ezek 47:1-12; Joel 4:18; Zech 14:8). A replica of the divine forest of Lebanon was also placed in Jerusalem, and the Lebanon Forest House built by Solomon was an indication of this imagery.

Further, I argued that the Storm God imagery was insufficient to explain the depiction of Yahweh in old Zion-related traditions. He was clearly identified with 'Ēl, too. I argued that David and Solomon used the Shiloh traditions to maintain a good relationship with the tribe of Ephraim. In this way they wanted to make the new political city of Jerusalem the religious center of the Israelite tribes. After the collapse of the United Monarchy, the positive Shiloh traditions were interpreted in a negative way and what was emphasized instead was that Yahweh rejected Shiloh and elected Jerusalem (Psalm 78).

Yahweh-'Ēl was worshipped in Shiloh, which indicates the early nature of the Israelite religion – something which is also related to the theophoric name of Israel. I argued that the anti-Baal tendency was strong in early Israel, and this is hinted at in the imagery of the Storm God used in some Psalms. The imagery of the Storm God adopted in Yahwism was an example of religious occupation.¹¹ Psalm 68 is an example of a religious tradition which originated in the Transjordan area and which was later recontextualized in Jerusalem.¹² In this psalm,

11 Cf. other views presented, for example, in Marjo C. A. Korpel, *A Rift in the Clouds: Ugaritic and Hebrew Descriptions of the Divine* (UBL 8; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1990); James S. Anderson, *Monotheism and Yahweh's Appropriation of Baal* (LHBOTS 617; London: Bloomsbury, 2015).

12 See further Johannes C. de Moor, *The Rise of Yahwism: The Roots of Israelite Monotheism* (BETL 91; Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1997).

UNDERSTANDING SPIRITUAL MEANING OF JERUSALEM

an anti-Baal trend is visible. I explained this phenomenon as the worshippers of 'Ēl at the end of the Late Bronze Age reacting to the popular myths that 'Ēl allowed Baal to take care of the lower heaven and have responsibility for the rains and fertility. Psalm 68 contains primitive rhetorics. It describes the theophany of Elohim by means of the Storm God imagery and then identifies this Elohim with Yahweh or 'Ēl.

When exilic and postexilic theological perspectives are eliminated from traditions that are connected with an early form of Zion theology, three important cornerstones illustrating the form of the Israelite religion during the reigns of David and Solomon remain.

Firstly, Zion was regarded as the dwelling-place of Yahweh. This was interpreted as Yahweh manifesting his power inside the Temple building where his Cherub throne was constructed, as presented in Isaiah 6, for example. In the exilic and early postexilic periods correctives in the form of the Shem and Kabod theologies were formulated (see section 6), the aim of which was clearly to avoid the cognitive dissonance which existed between the idea that the Temple – which had now been destroyed – was Yahweh's dwelling-place. In the old Ark Narrative (representing the religious policy of David and Solomon) the Ark was still regarded as being so powerful that its capture created a disaster among the Philistines.¹³ Therefore, its reinstallation in the tent sanctuary of David (2 Sam 6) and later in the Temple of Solomon was justified. However, during the exilic period the Ark as a symbol for the presence of Yahweh was simply forgotten after the destruction of the Temple (see Jer 3:16).

Secondly, Zion was understood as the place of the divine council with Yahweh as the leading god 'Ēl Elyôn. The existence of other deities was understood in a tolerant way as the deities for other peoples but Yahweh was regarded as the god of Israel. Deuteronomy 32 is a good example of this early theology. It contains a monolatrous

13 See e.g. Antony F. Campbell, *The Ark Narrative (1 Sam 4-6; 2 Sam 6): A Form-Critical and Traditio-Historical Study* (SBLDS 16; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975); Patrick D. Miller and Jimmie J. M. Roberts, *The Hand of the Lord: A Reassessment of the 'Ark Narrative' of 1 Samuel* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1977); Choon-Leong Seow, *Myth, Drama, and the Politics of David's Dance* (HSM 44; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989).

understanding of Yahwism, but allows for the existence of other deities in a positive manner. They were gods of the other people under the leadership of Yahweh or 'Ēl Elyôn. Assuming that monolatry was the main trend in the early Israelite understanding of Yahwism, the concept of the divine council fostered a policy tolerant towards other deities. In the exilic situation, this fundamental concept was dismantled as becomes clear from many texts in Isaiah 40-55 (see section 7). Other deities of the divine council are then judged in the heavenly court as being nothingness. There was also another alternative way to understand these foreign deities in the divine council: they were degraded to angels as becomes clear from the Book of Daniel and early Greek translations (e.g. LXX ad Deut 32:8-9).

Thirdly, Deuteronomistic retribution theology has made it difficult to evaluate the content of older sources. For example, the tradition behind 1 Kgs 11:1-8 was interpreted by the Deuteronomist as Solomon being disloyal to Yahweh. However, in its historical context the tradition illustrated how the theology of the divine council was realized in Jerusalem in a tolerant way. Solomon's marriages were political, and they were also related to religious life in Jerusalem so that Israel's God was the leader of the gods. The great Temple was built for him and other deities were worshipped outside the Temple which demonstrated the greatness of Yahweh. Thus, for example, the wording of Psalm 29 makes sense in such a historical scenario. According to this psalm, other deities outside the Temple area are exhorted to glorify Yahweh in his Temple. The situation was different in the exilic and postexilic period when deities in the divine council were discredited or degraded to the status of angels, and the Yahweh monolatry was developed in a direction which was intolerant towards other deities – something that later led to full-blown monotheism. In this scenario, the tradition of 1 Kgs 11:1-8 was interpreted in such a way that Solomon rejected Yahweh by allowing the worship of other deities in Jerusalem, and so Yahweh punished Solomon. Was the Chronicler familiar with the older tradition behind 1 Kgs 11:1-8 and its historical context? At least he did not accept the Deuteronomistic interpretation.

Important topics for the spiritual meaning of Jerusalem: Jerusalem was related to ancient Near Eastern (especially West-Semitic) mythical motifs. Yahweh was regarded as the divine King and Warrior who had

UNDERSTANDING SPIRITUAL MEANING OF JERUSALEM

control over the powers of chaos. Many mythical motifs were related to architectural details of the Temple, and subsequently also reflected in the texts of the Book of Psalms. Many ancient mythical motifs have been used in later Jewish apocalyptic literature¹⁴ and this is also one reason why these motifs reappear in these late texts. For example, the Temple Mount was related to Paradise. It was situated beside life-giving waters and divine trees. God himself was regarded as protecting his divine Mount.

2 Purification of the Sinful City – The Message of Isaiah

When a religious ideal meets reality there is always some sort of tension. In the case of Jerusalem this tension becomes particularly visible in the prophetic proclamation. One of the earliest exponents of the Zion theology was the 8th century prophet Isaiah.¹⁵ In discussing the redactional nature of the Book of Isaiah scholars meet several problems which are impossible to discuss in detail in a short article such as this. However, as we shall see, many important topics related to spiritual images of Jerusalem are presented in the Book of Isaiah, especially in Isaiah 40-66.

One topic which can be related to the historical prophet Isaiah is the topic of purification of the sinful city. This theme is presented in Isa 1:21-26:¹⁶

21 How the faithful city has become a whore!
She that was full of justice,
righteousness lodged in her

14 H. S. Kvanvig, *Primeval History: Babylonian, Biblical, and Enochic: An Intertextual Reading* (SupJSJ 149, Leiden: Brill 2011).

15 Recently the importance of the Zion theology in the proclamation of Isaiah has been emphasized in J. J. M. Roberts, *First Isaiah: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015).

16 Concerning the interpretation of these verses in relation to the historical prophet, see Hans Wildberger, *A Continental Commentary: Isaiah 1-12* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1991); Willem A. M. Beuken, *Jesaja 1-12* (HThKAT; Freiburg: Herder, 2003), 60-87, esp. 81-84; Hugh G. M. Williamson, *Isaiah 1-5: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary* (ICC; London: Bloomsbury & T. T. Clark, 2014), 120-146; Roberts, *First Isaiah*, 28-32. Williamson thinks that Isa 1:26 probably is a later redactional commentary on Isa 1:21-25.

ANTTI LAATO

- but now murderers!
- 22 Your silver has become dross,
your wine is mixed with water.
- 23 Your princes are rebels and companions of thieves.
Everyone loves a bribe and runs after gifts.
They do not defend the orphan,
and the widow's cause does not come before them.
- 24 Therefore says the Sovereign, Yahweh Sebaot, the Mighty One of Israel:
Ah, I will pour out my wrath on my enemies,
and avenge myself on my foes!
- 25 I will turn my hand against you;
I will smelt away your dross as with lye
and remove all your alloy.
- 26 And I will restore your judges as at the first,
and your counselors as at the beginning.
Afterward you shall be called the city of righteousness,
the faithful city.

According to Isaiah, the time of David and Solomon was seen as an ideal period of Zion in this text. Zion had been the city of righteousness but in Isaiah's time it had become "a whore". It needed purification (Isa 1:25) and that would occur in the form of political catastrophes (cf. Isa 1:24) – a topic which is visible in other texts of Isaiah 1-39 as, for example, in Isa 10:5-15. Through this purification, it became possible to call Jerusalem the city of righteousness or the faithful city once again.

Good parallels to Isa 1:21-26 are the texts of Isa 29:1-8; 30:27-33; 31:4-9 and Isaiah 33 which could be labeled "Ariel songs."¹⁷ The basic idea in these texts is that God would create chaos in Jerusalem by mustering an enemy army against it. Suddenly the army summoned from afar by Yahweh (Isa 30:27-33) surrounded Jerusalem, the

17 For these connections, see A. Laato, *Who Is Immanuel? The Rise and the Foundering of Isaiah's Messianic Expectations* (Diss. Åbo Akademi University, 1988), 210-247; idem, "Understanding Zion Theology in the Book of Isaiah," in: G. Andersson, T. Wasserman & D. Willgren, eds., *Studies in Isaiah: History, Theology, and Reception* (LHBOTS, Edinburgh: T&T Clark & Bloomsbury 2017) 22-46.

UNDERSTANDING SPIRITUAL MEANING OF JERUSALEM

inhabitants of the city were in great distress (Isa 29:1-8); this led to panic and consequently sinners escaped and left the city (Isa 33:14): “The sinners in Zion are afraid; trembling has seized the goddess: ‘Who among us can live with the devouring fire? Who among us can live with everlasting flames?’” At the same time righteous people who put their trust in Yahweh and believed that the Lord would protect his city against all enemies (Isa 8:5-10; 17:12-14) remained in the city. In the Book of Isaiah this theme is then interconnected with the topic of the Assyrian invasion (Isaiah 36-37) as we shall see in section three.

Important topics for the spiritual meaning of Jerusalem: The Book of Isaiah indicates that at the time of David and Solomon Jerusalem or Zion was regarded as an ideal city where righteous order existed. Such a theological ideal then met a later political, social and religious realism which caused dissonance with the previous religious ideal concerning Jerusalem. Isaiah’s proclamation is one exponent of this dichotomy. The ideal position of Jerusalem at the time of David and Salomon was presented in many later texts as, for example, in the Book of Chronicles.¹⁸ However, as in Isaiah’s proclamation so also in the Chronicler’s theology, the main focus in post-Solomonic period was that Jerusalem became corrupt and was polluted. Finally, Yahweh had to purify his city Jerusalem (cf. 2 Chr 36:17-21). It is clear that the Book of Isaiah also inspired the later Jewish apocalyptic thinking according to which Jerusalem became polluted after the reigns of David and Solomon and the state of pollution even continued in the postexilic period until Yahweh finally purified his city. Such an interpretive scenario was presented in the Animal Apocalypse (1 Enoch 85-90) which was influenced by the texts of the Book of Isaiah.¹⁹

18 For this see Hugh G.M. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles* (NCBC, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1982); Sara Japhet, *I & II Chronicles: A Commentary* (OTL, Louisville: Westminster/John Knox 1993).

19 P.A. Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* (SBL Early Judaism and Its Literature 4, Atlanta: Scholars Press 1993); George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 2001); D.C. Olson, *A New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch: “All Nations Shall be Blessed”*. *With a New Translation and Commentary* (SVTP 24, Leiden: Brill 2013); Antti Laato, “Rewriting Israel’s History in the Apocalyptic Context: Animal Apocalypse in First Enoch,” *SEÅ* 82 (2017) 28-51.

3 *The Inviolability of Jerusalem in the Historical Test*

2 Kings 18-19 and its parallel version in Isaiah 36-37 contains a story according to which the Assyrian king Sennacherib attempted to conquer Jerusalem in Hezekiah's 14th regnal year but failed to do so. This event has parallels in Sennacherib's own inscriptions and is related to the historical invasion that took place in 701 BCE. I have earlier devoted a special study to Sennacherib's inscriptions *circa* 701 BCE and their relationship to biblical texts.²⁰ I argued that Sennacherib's inscriptions contain interpretive problems which indicate that he was probably forced to retreat from Jerusalem because of bubonic plague. The question of how Sennacherib's invasion ended and why the rebellious Hezekiah was not dethroned has subsequently been handled in several other studies.²¹ Especially important is Cogan's study where he has argued that it is crucial to base historical evaluation of Sennacherib's expedition on the Rassam Cylinder.²²

As presented in my article of 1995, I agree with the majority of scholars who regard 701 BCE as having been a year of great catastrophe for Judah. However, I interpreted the historical

20 A. Laato, "Assyrian Propaganda and the Falsification of History in the Royal Inscriptions of Sennacherib," *VT* 45 (1995), 198–226. Cf., similar historical conclusions made in Richard S. Hess, "Hezekiah and Sennacherib in 2 Kings 18-20," in Richard S. Hess and Gordon J. Wenham, eds., *Zion: City of Our God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 23-41.

21 See especially W.R. Gallagher, *Sennacherib's Campaign to Judah* (SHCANE, 18; Leiden: Brill, 1999); L.L. Grabbe (ed), *'Like a Bird in a Cage': The Invasion of Sennacherib in 701 BCE* (JSOTSS, 363; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2004); P.S. Evans, *The Invasion of Sennacherib in the Book of Kings: A Source-critical and Rhetorical Study of 2 Kings 18–19* (SupVT, 125; Leiden: Brill, 2009); I. Kalimi & S. Richardson (eds), *Sennacherib at the Gates of Jerusalem: Story, History and Historiography* (Leiden: Brill, 2014). In the last volume mentioned, F.M. Fales ("The Road to Judah: 701 B.C.E. in the Context of Sennacherib's Political-Military Strategy," 223–248) gives misleading information about my article in *VT* 1995 (p. 237 n. 47). He claims that I could not be familiar with the fact that Assyriologists have treated Assyrian inscriptions critically. However, in my article as well as in my doctoral dissertation (see e.g. *Who Is Immanuel?* 263 n. 17) referred to in the aforementioned article I cite several experts in Assyriology since Olmstead, who deal with Assyrian royal inscriptions critically.

22 See M. Cogan, "Cross-Examining the Assyrian Witnesses to Sennacherib's Third Campaign: Assessing the Limits of Historical Reconstruction" in I. Kalimi & S. Richardson (eds), *Sennacherib at the Gates of Jerusalem: Story, History and Historiography* 51-74.

UNDERSTANDING SPIRITUAL MEANING OF JERUSALEM

circumstances so that pestilence had finally forced the Assyrian retreat from Jerusalem; an event which is echoed in the angel motif of Isa 37:36 as well as in the mice-army destroying the Assyrian weapons in Herodotus' *History* 2.141. My explanation was that there were two fundamentally different traditions which developed from the events of 701 BCE. According to the first tradition, Sennacherib's invasion was a great catastrophe in Judah. This tradition is emphasized in the prophet's own proclamation, illustrated in Isa 1:4-9; 22:1-14.²³ However, another tradition was developed mainly in conjunction with Isaiah's expectations that in the end Yahweh would protect his city from enemy attacks and take care of the dynasty of David. This stream of tradition was developed in the redaction process of the Book of Isaiah and in it Hezekiah would have been the righteous king who was saved from the clutches of Sennacherib by Yahweh.

It is clear that such a "miraculous" event gave new impulses to Zion theology. This is visible in particular in Psalms 46 and 48 as I have argued in my recent study.²⁴ It seems to me that this inviolability is particularly visible in prophecies of the Book of Isaiah (Isa 7:17-25; 8:5-10; 10:5-19; 10:24-27; 14:24-27; 17:12-14; 29:1-8; 30:27-33; 31:4-

23 Assuming that Isa 1:8 is from the 8th century prophet Isaiah then the passage (together with other Isaiah passages in Isa 10:32; 16:1) is one of the earliest passages in the Hebrew Bible which contains the expression "Daughter Zion." This personification of Jerusalem with the words "daughter" or "virgin" are common in the Hebrew Bible and help us to understand many passages where the city of Jerusalem has been personified as a female person. For the full treatment of these passages in the Hebrew Bible, see Magnar Kartveit, *Rejoice, Dear Zion! Hebrew Construct Phrases with "Daughter" and "Virgin" as Nomen Regens* (BZAW 447, Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012). The personification of Zion as a female figure is popular in the Hebrew Bible and in postbiblical Jewish texts. See especially the articles in Mark J. Boda, Carol J. Dempsey, and LeAnn Snow Flesher, eds., *Daughter Zion: Her Portrait, Her Response* (SBL Ancient Israel and Its Literature 13; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature 2012). In the Book of Lamentations Zion is depicted as a female figure in dialogue with God. See further Carleen R. Mandolfo, *Daughter Zion Talks Back to the Prophets: A Dialogic Theology of the Book of Lamentations* (SBL Semeia Studies 58; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007); Christl M. Maier, *Daughter Zion, Mother Zion: Gender, Space, and the Sacred in Ancient Israel* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008). This female picture of Zion has also inspired later Jewish poets in classical *piyyutim* as well as the poets in al-Andalus to depict Jerusalem as a woman. See Meret Gutmann-Grün, *Zion als Frau: Das Frauenbild Zions in der Poesi von al-Andalus auf dem Hintergrund des klassischen Piyyuts* (Judaica et Christiana 23; Bern: Peter Lang, 2008).

24 Laato, *The Origin of Israelite Zion Theology*.

9 and Isaiah 33) which in its present form are connected with Isaiah 36-37.²⁵ There are several important topics which interlink the fate of Zion and Isaianic proclamation in the Book of Isaiah and which I have analyzed more closely in my study *“About Zion I Will Not Be Silent”*.

Important topics for the spiritual meaning of Jerusalem: The Sennacherib invasion demonstrated that Jerusalem was the city of the Great God and could therefore oppose strong political powers. In the Book of Isaiah, the Assyrian invasion in Judah and its failure to conquer Jerusalem was seen as a paradigm for God’s power to protect his city. This means that Yahweh was able to realize the utopian vision in Jerusalem once all peoples and nations made pilgrimage to Zion to learn the Torah of God (Isa 2:2-4). Yahweh himself guarantees the inviolability of Zion. Invasion of nations against Jerusalem became a popular theme in late eschatological and apocalyptic literature (Ezek 38-39; Joel 4; Zech 12 and 14; Dan 9:24-27), and therefore, in later Jewish texts, it was possible to relate many other theological topics (such as the remnant, hardening of the people²⁶) to the theme of enemy invasion against Jerusalem.

4 Deuteronomic Criticism against the Temple and the Book of Jeremiah

Sennacherib’s invasion was a great catastrophe for Judah (cf. Isa 1:4-9) even though Jerusalem was saved. Therefore, Jerusalem’s fate was also seen from another theological perspective, one which was critical of the leaders of the city and their way of handling the political situation at the end of the 8th century BCE. Subsequently in the 7th century a new form of theology was developed in Judah, and which finally led to the formation of the Deuteronomic theology. While the precise beginning of this theological movement is difficult to determine, it probably

²⁵ For this see especially B.S. Childs, *Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis* (Studies in Biblical Theology 2:3; London: SCM, 1967); A. Laato, *“About Zion I will not be Silent”: The Book of Isaiah as an Ideological Unity* (ConBOT 44, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1998). In addition, in the article “Understanding Zion Theology in the Book of Isaiah” I discussed how Isaiah’s proclamation about Zion and the House of David was related to the Assyrian crisis in Judah.

²⁶ These topics and their relation to Sennacherib’s invasion in the Book of Isaiah are discussed in my *“About Zion I will Not Be Silent”*.

UNDERSTANDING SPIRITUAL MEANING OF JERUSALEM

began to take form during the reign of Manasseh.²⁷ In Josiah's reign the Deuteronomic reform was realized.²⁸ According to its basic religious view, Jerusalem was seen in a new theological framework. The relationship between Yahweh and the cultic community of Jerusalem (Deut 12) was presented in the form of a vassal treaty with its conditional elements. This connection implied that the city of Jerusalem could be abandoned by Yahweh and could be destroyed by enemy forces if the people of Israel did not follow the commandments of Yahweh. This theology is well-illustrated in the prayer of Solomon in 1 Kings 8.²⁹ This prayer opens the history of the Temple in the Deuteronomistic History and, according to 1 Kings 8:46-53, the destruction of the city was possible if the people were disloyal to the Lord. In the Deuteronomistic theology there are many typical phrases which are used to illustrate the divine punishment meted out by Yahweh against the people and Jerusalem.³⁰ This new trend in Deuteronomistic theology had drastic consequences on the earlier form of Zion theology. The inviolability of Zion emphasized in the proclamation of the Jerusalemite prophet Isaiah was no longer self-evident. This new trend became visible in the prophetic proclamations of the 7th and 6th century BCE.

The Book of Jeremiah is an excellent example of the consequences to classical Zion theology owing to the introduction of the

27 See especially Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (Leiden: Brill 2003) 16-20, 39-40; Ziony Zevit, "Deuteronomy in the Temple: An Exercise in Historical Imagining," in Nili Sacher Fox and David A. Glatt-Gilad, eds., *Mishne Todah: Studies in Deuteronomy and Its Cultural Environment in Honor of Jeffrey H. Tigay* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 201-218.

28 See the discussion of the historical background of Josiah's reform in Antti Laato, *Josiah and David Redivivus. The Historical Josiah and the Messianic Expectations of Exilic and Postexilic Times* (ConBOT 33; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1992); Erik Eynikel, *The Reform of King Josiah and the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* (Leiden: Brill, 1996); Marvin A. Sweeney, *King Josiah of Judah: The Lost Messiah of Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001); Juha Tanska, *Changing Paradigms in Biblical Criticism: 2 Kings 22:1-23:30 in the Flux of Discourses* (Diss. University of Helsinki 2011).

29 See, for example, Eep Talstra, *Solomon's Prayer: Synchrony and Diachrony in the Composition of 1 Kings 8, 14-61* (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 3; Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993).

30 See this phraseology in Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 346-349.

Deuteronomic program. Jeremiah 7 – with its parallel in Jeremiah 26 – indicates in a representative way how the prophet opposed classical Zion theology by emphasizing loyalty towards the covenant which Israel was required to show towards its God (Jer 7:3-7):³¹

3 Thus says Yahweh Sabaoth, the God of Israel: Amend your ways and your doings, and let me dwell with you[a] in this place. 4 Do not trust in these deceptive words: “This is the temple of Yahweh, the temple of Yahweh, the temple of Yahweh.”

5 For if you truly amend your ways and your doings, if you truly act justly one with another, 6 if you do not oppress the alien, the orphan, and the widow, or shed innocent blood in this place, and if you do not go after other gods to your own hurt, 7 then I will dwell with you in this place, in the land that I gave of old to your ancestors forever and ever.

The parallel passage in Jeremiah 26 recounts that Jeremiah came close to being killed by the people because of his message against the Temple of Jerusalem (Jer 26:11): “Then the priests and the prophets said to the officials and to all the people, ‘This man deserves the sentence of death because he has prophesied against this city, as you have heard with your own ears.’” Interestingly, Jeremiah was saved from the death sentence because some leaders compared his message with Micah’s proclamation (Mi 3:11) and argued that Hezekiah repented after having heard Micah’s doom prophecy (Jer 26:16-19):

16 Then the officials and all the people said to the priests and the prophets, “This man does not deserve the sentence of death, for he has spoken to us in the name of the Lord our God.” 17 And some of the elders of the land arose and said to all the assembled people, 18 “Micah of Moresheth, who prophesied during the days of King Hezekiah of Judah, said to all the people of Judah: ‘Thus says the Lord of hosts, Zion shall be plowed as a

31 Scholars have extensively discussed the nature of the so-called Deuteronomic sermons in the Book of Jeremiah and their relation to the historical Jeremiah. The most important study is Helga Weippert, *Die Prosareden des Jeremiabuches* (BZAW 132; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1971). Without taking a stand on the question of whether or not these texts go back to Jeremiah it is clear that they constituted an important part in the Deuteronomistic redaction. In this redaction arguments were put forward that Jerusalem could be abandoned if the people did not respect the covenant stipulations.

UNDERSTANDING SPIRITUAL MEANING OF JERUSALEM

field; Jerusalem shall become a heap of ruins, and the mountain of the house a wooded height.’ 19 Did King Hezekiah of Judah and all Judah actually put him to death? Did he not fear the Lord and entreat the favor of the Lord, and did not the Lord change his mind about the disaster that he had pronounced against them? But we are about to bring great disaster on ourselves!”

These examples from the Book of Jeremiah illustrate that the inviolability of Jerusalem was no longer self-evident. Everything depended on the people’s attitude toward Yahweh and his covenant.

Important topics for the spiritual meaning of Jerusalem: Through the Deuteronomic programme the theological meaning of Jerusalem was combined intimately with the exodus tradition and the conditional covenantal relationship with Yahweh. This implied that the Temple and the city could be destroyed if the people did not act according to Yahweh’s stipulations. Deuteronomic and Deuteronomistic theology also justify critical statements against Jerusalem – a topic which becomes visible in many later Jewish writings.

5 The History of Fall and Total Recall – The Book of Ezekiel

The Book of Ezekiel contains a new radical alternative to understanding the religious history of Jerusalem.³² This becomes visible in Ezekiel 16. According to this chapter, the whole history of Jerusalem went in the wrong direction from the very beginning. The spiritual roots of the city were in the Canaanite and Amorite religious milieu and traditions (Ezek 16:3). Precisely when Jerusalem managed to get into relationship with God is not clearly attested in Ezekiel’s metaphoric treatment of the city’s history, but it seems that God showed his mercy on the city and saved it from total destruction. However, the city abandoned Yahweh quite soon afterwards and began to worship other deities. The whole history would finally end in the

³² The basic discussion of the Zion tradition in the Book of Ezekiel is Thomas Renz, “The Use of the Zion Tradition in the Book of Ezekiel,” in Richard S. Hess and Gordon J. Wenham, eds, *Zion, City of Our God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 77-103. I am approaching the problem from the Prophet’s rhetorics and ask in which ways the positive picture of David and Solomon are visible in his proclamation.

destruction of the city. However, there would also be a new beginning (Ezek 16:59-63).

A similar story – this time concerning both Samaria and Jerusalem – is presented in Ezekiel 23. Even in this chapter there is no clear reference to a period when the relationship between Yahweh and Jerusalem would have been harmonious. The history of Jerusalem is simply that of religious fall and iniquities. There is no room for a positive relationship between Yahweh and Zion. The prophetic message gives only the alternatives “on” or “off”, and because the relationship is now “off” it means – in terms of the prophetic message – that the history of the relationship has always been “off.”

Ezekiel 20 reveals why Ezekiel describes the relationship between Yahweh and Zion as being negative from the very beginning. The chapter indicates that the relationship between Yahweh and Israel began in the Land of Egypt from where God led his people to freedom. After this event, however, the whole history of Israel was that of fall. This also includes the period when Jerusalem became the center of the worship of Yahweh. From the perspective of Ezekiel’s proclamation of doom, there was no positive period of Zion in either the reigns of David or of Solomon. This can be explained as the unconditional promise concerning the eternal dynasty of David and inviolability of Zion (as indicated in 2 Sam 6-7 and some Psalms 46; 48 and 76) violating the conditional promises in the covenantal theology. The prophet wanted to transform the unconditional promises into a conditional relationship between Yahweh and Israel, and therefore emphasis was shifted onto the exodus event. The sinful behavior of the people towards the Lord now threatened the existence of Jerusalem.

Even though Ezekiel 16, 20 and 23 must be taken as rhetorical passages³³ they indicate a new trend in presenting the history of Jerusalem. The positive starting-point between the relationship of Yahweh and Israel was fixed in the event of the exodus and the subsequent history post exodus changed everything. There is no period (like that of David and Solomon, for example) in the history of Jerusalem which could be characterized as positive. Such a treatment

³³ For example, when Ezekiel sees that the Glory of Yahweh leaves the Temple (Ezekiel 8-11) the presupposition is that earlier the Glory of Yahweh had regarded the city as being worthy of presence.

UNDERSTANDING SPIRITUAL MEANING OF JERUSALEM

of the history of Jerusalem dismantles all positive aspects of early Zion theology which in a Jerusalemite tradition was related to David and Solomon.

However, in the present form of the Book of Ezekiel the influence of the traditional Zion theology becomes visible when the restoration of Jerusalem is under discussion. Ezekiel 40-48, in particular, is rooted in the mythical imagery of Zion by the life-giving waters of Gihon (Ezek 47:1-12). Ezek 17:22-24; 34:23-30 and 37:15-28 as well as Ezekiel 40-48 relate Zion theology to the dynasty of David indicating that the principal fundament of the Zion theology was accepted in the redaction of Ezekiel.³⁴

Important topics for the spiritual meaning of Jerusalem: The Book of Ezekiel emphasizes the diametrical contrast between the present Jerusalem (full of godlessness) and the coming Jerusalem (full of righteousness) which Yahweh would establish. Such a diametrical contrast is accepted in later Jewish writings even though the beginning of the sinful Jerusalem may have been fixed in a different way. For example, in the Animal Apocalypse the history of Jerusalem in the post-Solomonic period was regarded as a history of abandonment until the establishment of righteousness in the eschatological endtime. A similar negative attitude toward Jerusalem, with its prevailing priestly aristocracy, has been presented in the Qumran writings.³⁵

6 The Crisis of the Zion Theology – Shem and Kabod Theologies

The exile was a great catastrophe for the Jerusalemite Zion theology. The traditional concept of the Zion theology, which emphasized that Yahweh was enthroned on the Cherub throne in the Temple, fell into crisis. It was necessary to emphasize other modes of representing

³⁴ It is difficult to evaluate how the rhetorics of the prophetic doom proclamation in Ezekiel 16, 20 and 23 should be related to this positive fundament of the Zion theology related to David. Are they incompatible with each other? Or are they two different aspects in prophetic proclamation which are emphasized depending on to whom the proclamation was addressed? Concerning this problem in the Book of Ezekiel and the Book of Jeremiah see especially Thomas M. Raitt, *A Theology of Exile: Judgment/Deliverance in Jeremiah and Ezekiel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977).

³⁵ Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Qumran and Jerusalem: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the History of Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 303-318.

Yahweh's presence in the Temple. Principally, the Hebrew Bible contains two different ways of representing the theology of the presence of Yahweh in the Temple: The Deuteronomistic Shem theology and the Priestly Kabod theology.³⁶ According to the former theological concept, the Temple of Jerusalem was built to the Name (Shem) of Yahweh (see e.g. Deut 12; 2 Sam 7:13; 1 King 8:27-30). In the latter theology, mainly represented in the Priestly source and in the Book of Ezekiel, the Temple was the abode for the glory (Kabod) of Yahweh (Ex 33:7-11; Num 11:14-17, 24-30; Ezek 1:28; 3:12,23; Ezek 8-11).

The outcome of Shem and Kabod theologies at the time of crisis did not eliminate the traditional way of speaking about Yahweh Sabaoth as the dwelling in Zion. It can be shown that in later postexilic texts this old-fashioned way of speaking about Yahweh's dwelling was used.³⁷ In order to understand this phenomenon we can compare it with how anthropomorphic expressions about God were treated. At the beginning, there was a theological emphasis which avoided anthropomorphic expressions and a desire to explain or translate such expressions in a non-literal way. When the theological trend to explain anthropomorphic expressions in a non-literal way became well-known, there was no longer any strict need to avoid such expressions. In the long run, the antipathy towards anthropomorphism was reduced and it became possible to speak about God in an anthropomorphic way again. However, in this new situation the old-fashioned anthropomorphic way of speaking about God was understood according to a theological mode: Anthropomorphic expressions were no longer primitive attempts to speak about God but rather a way of presenting his nearness and loving kindness. This is exactly what happened with the traditional theology which emphasized Yahweh's enthronement in Jerusalem.³⁸ When the acute crisis was over, once again it became unproblematic to speak about Yahweh's dwelling and presence in the Temple. Everyone knew that the expression "Yahweh dwells in Zion" should not be taken literally, so that the Second Temple would have been taken as

³⁶ For this, see especially Tryggve N. D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies* (ConBOT 18; Lund: Gleerup, 1982).

³⁷ For this see Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 110-115.

³⁸ Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 134.

UNDERSTANDING SPIRITUAL MEANING OF JERUSALEM

Yahweh's living quarters. This also explains why the Hebrew Bible in its present form has preserved language according to which Yahweh *dwells* in Zion.

Important topics for the spiritual meaning of Jerusalem: During the crisis new theological concepts illustrating the presence of Yahweh in Jerusalem were developed. Once such a new trend was recognized in theology, it was followed by many other expressions which aimed at referring to the presence of Yahweh in the Temple and Jerusalem. Perhaps one of the most important concepts, which became popular in later Rabbinical writings in particular, was Shekinah.³⁹

7 The Formation of Zion Theology in the Exile

Jerusalem-related texts in Isaiah 40-55 contain many good parallels to the Zion theology of the Book of Psalms.⁴⁰ This indicates that many traditional themes of the ancient Zion theology have been preserved or modified in Isaiah 40-55. Some of the most important modifications of the elements of the traditional Zion theology in Isaiah 40-55 are as follows:

Firstly, the concept of the divine council is presupposed in many of the Isaiah 40-55 texts but in a new radical transformation. Isa 40:3-8 describes a scene where the prophet is allowed to attend the divine council and urged to proclaim.⁴¹ The imagery that a prophet can visit

³⁹ See the collection of many important studies concerning the Shekinah in Bernd Janowski and Enno Edzard Popkes, eds., *Das Geheimnis der Gegenwart Gottes: Zur Schechina- Vorstellung in Judentum und Christentum* (WUNT 318, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014).

⁴⁰ These parallels between Isaiah 40-55 and the Book of Psalms have been presented in commentaries. A good example is Shalom M. Paul, *Isaiah 40-66: Translation and Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012). See further John H. Eaton, *Festal Drama in Deutero-Isaiah* (London: SPCK, 1979).

⁴¹ Concerning the divine council in Deutero-Isaiah see Frank M. Cross, "The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah," *JNES* 12 (1953): 274-278; idem, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 186-190; Roger N. Whybray, *The Heavenly Counsellor in Isaiah xl 13-14: A Study of the Sources of the Theology of Deutero-Isaiah* (SOTSMS 1; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971); Kee, "Heavenly Council," 269-270. For Isa 40:1-11 and the connection of this text to the idea of the heavenly court see Christoph R. Seitz, "The Divine Council: Temporal Transition and New Prophecy in the Book of Isaiah," *JBL* 109 (1990): 229-247; Brevard S. Childs, *Isaiah* (OTL; Westminster: John Knox, 2001), 294-303.

the divine council is also attested elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible:⁴² 1 Kings 22:19-23, Isaiah 6 and Jer 23:18, 22-24. In Isaiah 40-55 the imagery of the divine council takes a new direction. In Isa 40:12-26 Yahweh challenges the whole universe and other deities, and reveals himself as the true God who dictates the course of history.⁴³ Westermann identifies the trial speeches in Isaiah 40-55 (Isa 41:1-5; 41:21-29; 43:8-15; 44:6-8, 21-22; and perhaps also 45:11-13) where “Yahweh and the gods of the nations confront one another in a legal process, the purpose of which is to decide who is truly God.”⁴⁴ The imagery in these texts is derived from the divine council where Yahweh questions the gods concerning future events (cf. also Psalm 82). In Isaiah 40-55 other deities are regarded as futile. There is only one true God.

Secondly, Yahweh’s power to control history is related to his kingship. He provides power to the Persian king Cyrus, who comes to destroy Babylonia and release the people of Judah from bondage (Isa 41:25-29; see also Isa 41:1-7; 44:24-45:7; 45:9-13; 46:8-11; 48:11-16). The destruction of the Babylonian Empire (and its gods) is seen in Isaiah 40-55 as proof that all other gods are powerless. The only real king is Yahweh who destroys Babylonia and allows his people to return to Jerusalem. Yahweh’s kingship is manifested in Isa 52:7: “How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of the messenger who announces peace, who brings good news, who announces salvation, who says to Zion, ‘Your God reigns.’” God’s kingship will be revealed

42 For this see Martti Nissinen, “Prophets and the Divine Council,” in: Ulrich Hübner and Ernst A. Knauf, eds., *Kein Land für sich allein: Studien zum Kulturkontakt in Kanaan, Israel/Palästina und Ebirni für Manfred Weippert zum 65. Geburtstag* (OBO 186; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002), 4-19.

43 See arguments in Whybray, *Heavenly Counsellor*. See further Jan L. Koole, *Isaiah. Part 3 Volume I: Isaiah 40-48* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1997), 80-117. He writes (p. 81): “Now the interrogative ‘who’ is mentioned six times. Who is this Yahweh, to whom such exalted terms are applied? It is His Majesty! Compared with him, what do the nations signify (vv. 12-17), the idols (vv. 18-20), the mighty of the earth (vv. 21-24), the deified stars and planets (vv. 25-26)?”

44 Claus Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary* (OTL; London SCM Press, 1969), 15. See also Claus Westermann, *Grundformen prophetischer Rede* (Munich: Kaiser, 1960); idem, “Sprache und Struktur der Prophetie Deuterocesajas,” *Forschung am Alten Testament* (Munich: Kaiser, 1964), 92-170, esp. 124-134; Joachim Begrich, *Studien zu Deuterocesaja* (BWANT 4/25; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1938), 42-47. For trial speech and its connection to the heavenly council, see Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 176-190.

UNDERSTANDING SPIRITUAL MEANING OF JERUSALEM

in the political agenda, and this topic was further developed in later apocalyptic texts so that Yahweh's sovereign rule became manifest through powerful events (e.g. the destruction of the enemy army attacking Jerusalem, Ezekiel 38-39).

Thirdly, Yahweh's powerful actions in historical events are related to his sovereignty as the sole Creator. The one who created the world also has the power to redeem his people from Babylonia through historical processes. We could speak about creative redemption in Isaiah 40-55.⁴⁵

Fourthly, connecting the Creator and the Redeemer Yahweh's earlier actions both in creation and in historical events provides typological examples of forthcoming wondrous acts in the world. A good example of this is the exodus tradition used in Isaiah 40-55 to describe the return of the exiles from Babylonia to Zion.⁴⁶ This implies that old historical events can be used to describe the typological fulfilment of Yahweh's marvelous acts in Zion. Such an event is, for example, Sennacherib's failed attempt to conquer Jerusalem (Isaiah 36-37) which clearly provides a paradigm for Yahweh's marvelous acts for Zion in the future.⁴⁷ Another aspect is developed especially in Isaiah 65-66 where Jerusalem becomes the center of the new creation. In his article in this volume, **Stefan Green** analyzes more closely the process in which the prophetic genre in Isaiah 65-66 was developed to an apocalyptic mode of thinking in 1 Enoch.

45 This concept was labeled in Caroll Stuhlmueller, *Creative Redemption in Deutero-Isaiah* (AnBi 43, Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1970) where the texts of Isaiah 40-55 were also carefully analyzed. Stuhlmueller describes the concept as follows (p. 233): "Dt-Is announced to the exiles a redemption, so new and so stupendous, that he frequently (68 X) entitled it 'creation.' This *creative aspect* of redemption has been the focal point of our research. Though always subsidiary, this idea of creation served to enhance many features of the prophet's concept of redemption, transforming it into an *exceptionally wondrous* redemptive act, performed with personal concern by Yahweh for his chosen people, bringing them *unexpectedly* out of exile, into a *new and unprecedented life of peace and abundance*, with repercussions even upon the cosmos and world inhabitants."

46 B. Anderson, "Exodus Typology in Second Isaiah," B. Anderson and W. Harrelson, eds., *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962), 177-195. For another, in my view not convincing, view, see Hans M. Barstad, *A Way in the Wilderness* (JSSM 12, Manchester: University of Manchester 1989), 21-36.

47 For this see Laato, "About Zion I will Not Be Silent".

Important topics for the spiritual meaning of Jerusalem: Texts in Isaiah 40-55 provide important evidence pertaining to how traditional Zion theology was modified during the crisis of the exile. Yahweh was no longer the leader of other deities in the divine council but rather the sole God in the world, the one who had created it and who governs its history, and who especially looks for the coming glory of Zion. The monotheistic emphasis made other deities futile and introduced a new page in religious expectations where the God of Israel began to play an important role in universalistic expectations: Other nations will attend to the worship of Yahweh after they have been subjugated under His power. A new exodus from the countries where Israelites were deported to came to denote a decisive eschatological turning point – a topic which plays a significant role in subsequent Jewish eschatological writings.

8 Postexilic Restoration and Disappointment

The rebuilding of the Second Temple was made in a historical and religious milieu where great expectations relating to Jerusalem and its Temple were dominant in the Jewish society. Zechariah 1-6, which contains the prophet's nightly visions and Haggai's religious expectations related to the rebuilding of the Second Temple, illustrate this religious milieu well.⁴⁸ Expectations concerning Zerubbabel, who was not only responsible for the building project of the temple but also represented the Davidic dynasty (Zech 4:6b-10a; Hag 2:23), ran high. After the completion of the building of the temple, however, nothing more was heard of Zerubbabel. We can only see that the social situation in Judah and Jerusalem became difficult and was affected by the many internal conflicts as indicated in Zechariah 7-8 and 9-14, Isaiah 56-66 and the Book of Malachi. These three corpuses of texts contain criticism against the Temple and especially its priestly aristocracy,

⁴⁸ See Willem A. M. Beuken, *Haggai-Sacharja 1-8: Studie zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der frühnachexilischen Prophetie* (SSN 10; Assen: van Gorcum, 1967); Christian Jeremias, *Die Nachtgeschichte des Sacharja* (FRLANT 117; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977); Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8* (AB 25B; Garden City: Doubleday, 1987); Mark J. Boda, *Exploring Zechariah, Volume 1-2: The Development of Zechariah and Its Role within the Twelve* (Ancient Near East Monographs 16; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017).

UNDERSTANDING SPIRITUAL MEANING OF JERUSALEM

indicating that the Second Temple did not fulfill prophetic expectations.

Interestingly, in late Jewish apocalyptic texts there are references to the whole period of the Second Temple being more or less against the will of Yahweh.⁴⁹ I shall discuss these texts in the next chapters but here I present two attempts to depict the Second Temple institution as legitimate: 1) the Book of Ezra and Nehemiah, and 2) Chronicles.

The Book of Ezra and Nehemiah seems to contain a rather problematic historical presentation of the events concerning the postexilic restoration of Jerusalem. The Book begins with the edict of Cyrus concerning the rebuilding of the Temple of Jerusalem and the return of Sheshbazzar (Ezra 1). However, in Ezra 2, reference is made not to Sheshbazzar but rather to Zerubbabel and Jeshua under whose leadership many Jews returned to Jerusalem and Judah. Why did the author or the editor of the book end the story of Sheshbazzar by introducing the exodus led by Zerubbabel?⁵⁰ The story continues by relating how Zerubbabel laid down the foundation of the Temple and repudiated co-operation with the people of the land (Ezra 3:1-4:5). What follows next is not logical in terms of a historical timeline. The building of the Temple was interrupted because of accusations made by the administrators of Samaria during the reigns of Xerxes and Artaxerxes (Ezra 4:6-23). After these documents are presented, the editor of Ezra-Nehemiah jumps back to the reign of Darius and begins writing about the building of the Second Temple (Ezra 5-6).

The rebuilding of the Temple was finished in the sixth regnal year of Darius, but this is stated in Ezra 6:14-15 in quite a curious way: “So

49 In his *Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), Paul D. Hanson attempts to divide the texts of the Hebrew Bible between the temple aristocracy group and the visionary group. In my view, he goes too far in this distinction but nevertheless I agree with him that the building of the Second Temple divided the Jewish society in a deep way and this dichotomy continued in later periods and got its expression in different Jewish apocalyptic writings.

50 Some scholars have argued that in the present form of the Book of Ezra and Nehemiah, Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel are regarded as the same person. For this discussion, see Magne Saebøe, “The Relation of Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel Reconsidered,” *SEÅ* 54 (1989) 168-177. I do not think that they are the same person in the Book of Ezra and Nehemiah. In Ezra 5, it is noted that Zerubbabel continued the building project of Sheshbazzar in the reign of Darius and with the permission given earlier by Cyrus.

the elders of the Jews continued to build and prosper under the preaching of Haggai the prophet and Zechariah, a descendant of Iddo. They finished building the temple according to the command of the God of Israel and the decrees of Cyrus, Darius and Artaxerxes, kings of Persia. The temple was completed on the third day of the month Adar, in the sixth year of the reign of King Darius.” The Temple was finished in Darius’s reign but it was built also in the reign of Artaxerxes who was the successor of Darius’ successor! How should we understand such a historical presentation which seems to jump forwards and backwards in time? It seems to me that the solution is found in the editor’s deliberate rhetorical strategy.

The content of the Book of Ezra and Nehemiah indicates that after their return to Jerusalem and Judah Jews had many political issues relating to other peoples. The restoration of Jerusalem was no easy task because of these challenges in foreign affairs. On the other hand, Zechariah 1-8 and the Book of Haggai also indicate that there were many internal problems between the Jews in Judah and Jerusalem which made the restoration of Jerusalem and Judah problematic. From Isaiah 56-66 and the Book of Malachi it becomes clear that the subsequent history of the Jewish people in the reigns of Darius, Xerxes and Artaxerxes was full of internal problems. It is worth noting that the editor of the Book of Ezra and Nehemiah does not emphasize the intensive struggles inside the Jewish community. Rather, he has chosen a strategy of blaming Samaria and the people of that land for the many problems with which the Jewish people had to struggle. There were Samaritans who attempted to prevent the rebuilding of the Temple and the walls of Jerusalem, and other peoples had attempted to gain influence in Jerusalem through mixed marriages resulting in foreigners gaining access to the holy Temple area (see Neh 13:4-5, 28).

It seems to me that the illogical chronology laid out in Ezra 1-6 can be explained from the perspective of the editor’s deliberate rhetorical strategy.⁵¹ He aimed at presenting the history of the restoration of Jerusalem so that all the problems from the reign of Cyrus until the

⁵¹ It is worth noting that Ezra 1-6 is the compilation of the editor made up by different sources available to him. For this see especially Hugh G. M. Williamson, “The Composition of Ezra i-vi,” *JTS* 34 (1983) 1-30; idem, *Ezra, Nehemiah* (Word Biblical Commentary 16, Waco: Word Books 1985) xxiii-xiv.

UNDERSTANDING SPIRITUAL MEANING OF JERUSALEM

reign of Artaxerxes as accounted in Ezra 1-4 were recounted first. Only then was the question of how the Jewish society managed to restore things in Jerusalem and Judah according to the will of Yahweh dealt with: First the rebuilding of the Temple (Ezra 5-6), then the reform of Ezra (Ezra 7-10) and finally the mission of Nehemiah (Neh 1-13). This being the case, the Book of Ezra and Nehemiah emphasizes that the cult in the Temple of Jerusalem is legitimate because of the righteous acts of Zerubbabel, Ezra and Nehemiah.

The Chronicler's way of describing the building process of the Temple follows an old tradition where David and Solomon are depicted as righteous kings who organized and realized everything that was needed for the Temple. A peculiar aspect in the Chronicler's presentation was that he accepted new trends in the Jerusalemite temple theology where Mosaic traditions about the Tabernacle were applied to the worship of Yahweh. Williamson has noted that the Chronicler does not seem to emphasize the exodus tradition – something that is done in Ezra—Nehemiah. According to Williamson, this is one important difference between the two books.⁵² I would like to see this difference from another perspective. The Chronicler was well aware that the exodus tradition introduced in the reign of Josiah in the Jerusalemite temple theology made the traditional Zion theology conditional and placed the real beginning of the worship of Yahweh in the exodus event. The apparent shortcomings of David and Solomon were that they did not consider the Mosaic traditions. This made their efforts in building of the First Temple more or less fruitless – something that was presented, for example, in the proclamation of Ezekiel. The Chronicler was aware of this shift from David and Solomon to Moses, and wanted to modify the traditional Temple theology so that even David and Solomon respected Mosaic stipulations. On the other hand, because the Chronicler wanted to emphasize the important role of David and Solomon he did not emphasize the exodus tradition even though he clearly did not abandon it – something that Williamson also notes in several places in his commentary.⁵³ This being the case, the Chronicler

52 Hugh G.M. Williamson, *Israel in the Books of Chronicles* (Cambridge, 1977); idem, *1 and 2 Chronicles* (Grand Rapids and London, 1982); idem, *Ezra, Nehemiah* (Word Biblical Commentary; Waco, 1985).

53 Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 137, 216-217, 219-220, 296.

minimized the exodus tradition but emphasized the Mosaic tradition which he related to the First Temple worship. In this way, the Chronicler wanted to offer an apology for David and Solomon by emphasizing that they respected Mosaic tradition and therefore their building project had divine legitimation because the Mosaic Torah was followed in the Temple of Jerusalem from the very beginning. The Chronicler simply updated the traditional Zion theology in a framework of the Mosaic covenant – something that was called into question in the exilic literature (the Deuteronomistic theology, the Books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel).

Important topics for the spiritual meaning of Jerusalem: The postexilic reconstruction of the Second Temple divided Jewish society in a fundamental way as far as the Temple theology is concerned. In some traditions – established later in the Hebrew Bible – the traditional Zion theology was formed in a Mosaic framework. Nevertheless, from this period onwards there were Jewish groups who apparently regarded the Second Temple as being more or less polluted. Even though it is impossible to describe this dichotomy clearly by dividing texts of the Hebrew Bible between the Temple aristocracy and the visionary religious group, it seems to me that the fundamental dichotomy in the Jewish society concerning the legitimacy of the Second Temple became visible in the early postexilic period.

9 Intra-Jewish Struggles and Apocalyptic Visions about Jerusalem

In the postexilic period the hopes of the great prophetic expectations concerning the rebuilding of the Temple and re-establishment of the cult in Jerusalem led to apocalyptic visions where these prophetic expectations received renewed expressions. The earthly Jerusalem was related in a positive or negative way to the coming eschatological Jerusalem predicted in the prophetic texts.⁵⁴ New eschatological and

⁵⁴ For the postexilic texts see especially the articles published in Maria Häusl, ed., *Tochter Zion auf dem Weg zum himmlischen Jerusalem: Rezeptionslinien der „Stadtfräu Jerusalem“ von den späten alttestamentlichen Texten bis zu den Werken der Kirchenväter* (Dresdner Beiträge zur Geslechterforschung in Geschichte, Kultur und Literatur 2; Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 2011); and Ruth Henderson, *Second Temple Songs of Zion: A Literary and Generic Analysis of the Apostrophe to Zion (11QPsa XXII 1-15); Tobit 13:9-18 and 1 Baruch 4:30-5:9* (Deuterocanonical

UNDERSTANDING SPIRITUAL MEANING OF JERUSALEM

apocalyptic trends became visible in the following ways, among others:

Firstly, the whole city of Jerusalem – not only the temple area – was regarded as a holy place (Neh 11:1; Jer 31:23; Isa 27:13; 48:2; 52:1). In Zech 2:14-17 the holiness of Jerusalem is even related to the whole country of Judah. During the Maccabean period the holiness of the Temple was tested in a very concrete way when Antiochus IV Epiphanes attempted to introduce his Hellenized religion in Jerusalem. The Maccabean revolt was a concrete example of how important the topic of the holiness of Jerusalem was in Jewish religion at that time.⁵⁵ The holiness of Jerusalem was a self-evident topic and is visible in many Jewish writings. For example, in the Book of Jubilees Noah blesses Shem (by words taken from Gen 9:26-27) and relates this blessing to the holy city of Jerusalem (Jub 8:18-19):

He recalled everything that he had said in prophecy with his mouth, for he had said: “May the Lord, the God of Shem, be blessed, and may the Lord live in the places where Shem resides.” He knew that the Garden of Eden is the holy of holies and is the residence of the Lord; (that) Mt. Sinai is in the middle of the desert; and (that) Mt. Zion is in the middle of the navel of the earth. The three of them—the one facing the other—were created as holy (places).

It was precisely this lack of holiness in the current Jerusalem and its Temple which led to the formation of the Qumran community. The unholy status of Jerusalem of that time was also reflected in the interpretation of the Mosaic Torah in the Qumran community. It was not possible to perform Mosaic sacrificial rituals at the Temple and the community waited for the decisive eschatological turn which would allow the practice of the Mosaic Torah in Jerusalem once more.⁵⁶ In this volume, **Jutta Jokiranta** analyzes an interesting topic in Qumran writings which is related to the holiness of Jerusalem: was it allowed

and Cognate Literature Studies 17; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014).

⁵⁵ See the First and the Second Book of Maccabees in particular, as well as the Book of Daniel.

⁵⁶ See Schiffman, *Qumran and Jerusalem: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the History of Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 303-318; Emanuel Tov, “Jerusalem und Zion in den Qumrantexten,” in Tanja Pilger and Markus Witte, eds., *Zion: Symbol des Lebens in Judentum und Christentum* (Studien zu Kirche und Israel NF 4; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2013), 65-86; Andrew Teeter, “Zion und Tempel in Qumran,” in Pilger and Witte, *Zion: Symbol des Lebens*, 87-105.

to have sex in Jerusalem?

Secondly, the criticism against the Temple of Jerusalem and its priestly aristocracy in Isaiah 56-66, Zechariah 9-14 and Malachi led to the emphasis that the relationship between Yahweh and his loyal people could be established without the earthly temple. Isa 66:1-5 gives a good example of this when it criticizes the disloyal priestly aristocracy not understanding that Yahweh did not need the Temple. In Isa 66:1-2 the earthly Jerusalem was regarded as the footstool of Yahweh, while the heavenly divine abode was seen as the real dwelling-place of God. Such an idea was developed from an old religious historical tradition according to which the earthly temple was only a replica of the heavenly one (Ps 11:4).⁵⁷ Such a tradition was known also in Ex 25:1,9 according to which Moses received a heavenly model (*tabnît*) from Yahweh in order to build the Tabernacle. This criticism against the earthly Temple combined with an emphasis that the true Temple existed in heaven opened a new interesting topic concerning Jerusalem in Jewish apocalyptic literature: The eschatological and idealized Zion on earth was represented already now in the heavenly sphere. This becomes clearly visible in the Animal Apocalypse (1 Enoch 85-90).

Thirdly, Jerusalem was regarded as the center of the whole world⁵⁸ a place to where all nations would make pilgrimage and show homage to God of Israel.⁵⁹ Tobit 13 illustrates this well when it describes how the nations' treasures will be brought to the city – a theme often expressed in the Hebrew Bible (e.g. Isa 49:22-23; 60:1-22; 62:1-2; 66:23; Zech 14:16-19). In Ben Sira Jerusalem became the abode of the divine Wisdom (Sir 24) which mediates between Heaven and earth and is manifested in the office of the High Priest in particular (Sir 50). In Baruch 4:5-5:9 the humiliation of Zion is contrasted with its coming glory. The same expectations are even presented in the Qumran writings. The Apostrophe to Zion (11QaXII,1-15) depicts the coming

57 For this see the Babylonian stele, see Christopher E. Woods, "The Sun-God Tablet of Nabû-apla-iddina Revisited." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 56 (2004): 23-103. See further Mettinger, *Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 29-32.

58 See the roots of this theology and its development in later times in Philip S. Alexander, "Jerusalem as the Omphalos of the World: On the History of Geographical Concept," in Levine, ed., *Jerusalem*, 104-119.

59 See especially Henderson, *Second Temple Songs of Zion*.

UNDERSTANDING SPIRITUAL MEANING OF JERUSALEM

glory of Jerusalem.

In the exilic and early postexilic period two fundamentally different concepts of Zion theology were developed, one which emphasized universalistic aspects (based on the Book of Isaiah) and a second which presented more particularistic ideas (based on Ezekiel 40-48). In his article in this volume, **Juho Sankamo** analyzes these two theologies and their reception history in early Jewish writings as well as their relation to the expectations of the historical Jesus in Mark 11.

Important topics for the spiritual meaning of Jerusalem: The concept of the heavenly Jerusalem in a vertical dimension and the coming Jerusalem in a horizontal dimension will meet each other in the eschatological future when God manifests his power. At this point all nations will be subjugated under the rule of God. This relationship between the heavenly and earthly Jerusalem justifies the holiness of Jerusalem.

10 Intensifying Criticism of the Second Temple – Hasmonean Period

The crisis of the Maccabean period led to a new religious-political constellation in the temple area. The Hasmonean dynasty was established in Jerusalem and kings began to perform priestly functions. This new political constellation in the Temple of Jerusalem received strong opposition from different Jewish groups including the Qumran community (see section 9).

The rise of different Jewish groups such as the Qumran sectarians and Pharisees as well as the religious group behind the Animal Apocalypse each had their own critical attitudes in understanding the role of Jerusalem and its temple. As already noted the Qumran community regarded the temple rituals as impure and, therefore, could not take part in them. In the Animal Apocalypse the cult of the Second Temple was regarded as having been impure since the days of David and Solomon and this state of impurity continued for the whole of the Second Temple period. For example, in 1 Enoch 89:73 the rebuilding of the Second Temple and its ritual are dealt with:

And they began again to build as before and they raised up that tower and it was called the high tower [= Second Temple]. And they began again to

place a table before the tower, but all the bread on it was polluted and not pure.

The background of such statement concerning the polluted nature of the sacrificial cult is the emphasis of the Mosaic Torah and its implications on the life of Jews living in Jerusalem. This criticism of the Temple service may also be partly related to the increased influence of the Hellenistic culture in Jerusalem.⁶⁰

The Pharisaic movement and its influence in Temple matters are documented in different ways in the Second Temple period.⁶¹ The characteristic tendency in the Pharisaic opinions was to emphasize the holiness of the Temple and organize everything in the sanctuary according to the Mosaic Torah. At the same time evidence also indicates that the Pharisaic movement had a positive attitude toward the temple. Without attempting to propose that there was a direct line of development from the Pharisaic movement to later rabbis, it can be noted that even rabbis held a positive attitude towards the Temple and emphasized its holiness.⁶² For example, the Talmud (Baba Batra 4) contains an often quoted passage: “He who has not seen the Temple of Herod has never seen a beautiful building.”

Important topics for the spiritual meaning of Jerusalem: Formation of different Jewish religious movements began to emphasize Jerusalem as the holy place. This led to more critical voices about the present status of Jerusalem and raised eschatological expectations about the holy Jerusalem.

60 For this, see, especially Lee I. Levine, “Second Temple Jerusalem: A Jewish City in the Graeco-Roman Orbit,” in Levine, *Jerusalem*, 53-68.

61 For general view of Pharisees and their theological attitudes, see Anthony J Saldarini, *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark 1988); Günter Stemberger, *Jewish Contemporaries of Jesus: Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press 1995).

62 For the rabbinical memories about the temple, see especially Robert Kirschner, *Baraita de-Melkhet ha Mishkan: A Critical Edition with Introduction and Translation* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press 1992); Naftali S. Cohn, *Memory of the Temple and the Making of the Rabbis* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013).

UNDERSTANDING SPIRITUAL MEANING OF JERUSALEM

11 The Rise of the Synagogue Institution and the Destruction of the Second Temple

The development of the Jewish synagogue institution was an important historical and sociological process which predated the destruction of the Second Temple and helped Judaism to survive through that crisis.⁶³ Metaphorically speaking, one may say that the synagogue institution was a blood circulation network which was connected to the heart i.e. the Temple of Jerusalem. When in 70 CE the heart received its blow, the network was able to bear the hope that the temple would be rebuilt again.⁶⁴ On the other hand, the synagogue institution also diminished the meaning of the temple institution in the everyday life of Jews. Many Jews were able to practise the Jewish way of life and the Mosaic Torah without the Temple. This means that when the temple was destroyed it was not a fatal blow to Judaism.

It is impossible to describe the central position of Jerusalem in the halakic discussion,⁶⁵ Jewish liturgy,⁶⁶ in Jewish exegetical tradition,⁶⁷ medieval Jewish texts and poems. However, the central position of Jerusalem in Judaism is the common nominator in all these discourses. The people who lived in the diaspora waited eagerly to have the

63 See the evidence of the synagogue institution in Anders Runesson, Donald D. Binder, and Birger Olsson, eds., *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins to 200 C.E.: A Source Book* (AGJU 72; Leiden: Brill, 2014). See further, Lee I. Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* (New Haven : Yale University Press, 1999); Lynn H. Cohick and Howard Clark Kee, *Evolution of the Synagogue: Problems and Progress* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International 1999); Anders Runesson, *The Origins of the Synagogue: A Socio-historical Study* (ConBNT 37; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International 2001); Birger Olsson and Magnus Zetterholm, eds., *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins until 200 C.E.: Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14-17, 2001* (ConBNT 39; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International 2003).

64 See Jon D. Levenson, "The Jerusalem Temple in Devotional and Visionary Experience," in Arthur Green, ed., *Jewish Spirituality From the Bible through the Middle Ages* (SCM Press, 1989), 32-61, esp. 57-58.

65 David Golinkin, "Jerusalem in Jewish Law and Custom: A Preliminary Typology," in Levine, *Jerusalem*, 408-423. Note what Golinkin writes on p. 419: "Jewish tradition has always stressed that Torah study and theory must be grounded in practice. The Jewish attitude towards Jerusalem is in keeping with this approach."

66 Stefan C. Reif, "Jerusalem in Jewish Liturgy," in Levine, *Jerusalem*, 424-437.

67 Burton L. Visotzky, "Jerusalem in Geonic Era Aggadah," in Levine, *Jerusalem*, 438-446; Haggai Ben-Shammai, "Jerusalem in Early Medieval Jewish Bible Exegesis," in Levine, *Jerusalem*, 447-464.

opportunity to return to Jerusalem. While “waiting for the miracle to come” (Leonard Cohen) they dealt with Jerusalem in different metaphorical and mysterious ways while never forgetting that the day was coming when the sound of the great shofar would be heard for the freedom of the Jewish people, and the banner bringing the exiles together to the Land of Israel and Jerusalem would be raised, as is expressed in the Amidah.

The meaning of the synagogue institutions in the formation of Christianity with its decentralized view on the geographical Jerusalem cannot be overestimated either. The New Testament evidence shows that Christianity spread across the Roman Empire by means of the network of synagogues. Many impulses from synagogue architecture⁶⁸ and service⁶⁹ were adopted into the building of the Christian Church and service.

Important topics for the spiritual meaning of Jerusalem: The centrality of Jerusalem was diminished because of the synagogue institution – a trend which had an important affect on the survival of Judaism in the crisis of 70 CE. It also gave a structure for the Christian congregation network which was connected with the heavenly Jerusalem (see section 12). The Jewish hope “next year in Jerusalem” became a significant element in Jewish eschatological expectations.

12 The Jesus Movement – From the Shadow of the Temple to Universal Church

Christian theology can be analyzed from different perspectives. One possibility is to see its development in relation to the theological concepts centered around the Temple, which was a *unifying* symbol in Judaism.⁷⁰ Of course, Christians were well-aware of the fact that

68 For this, see John Wilkinson, *From Synagogue to Church: The Traditional Design* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2012).

69 For this, see Eugene J. Fischer, *The Jewish Roots of Christian Liturgy* (New York: Paulist Press, 1990); Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy* (London: SPCK/New York: OUP 1992, 2002); idem, *Early Christian Worship: A Basic Introduction to Ideas and Practice* (London: SPCK/Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1996, 2010); idem, *Reconstructing Early Christian Worship* (London: SPCK, 2009; Collegeville: The Liturgical Press 2010).

70 Cf. Oskar Skarsaune, *In the Shadow of the Temple: Jewish Influences on Early*

UNDERSTANDING SPIRITUAL MEANING OF JERUSALEM

Judaism was not monolithic in Jesus' day, but had splintered into different groups. The New Testament recognizes two influential groups: the Sadducees and the Pharisees, and it can be assumed that the Christians also knew the Essenes from the Jewish historian Josephus' presentation as well as some Jewish apocalyptic groups and of course Philo from Alexandria. The Christians developed a theology which emphasized the unity of the Church, and the spiritual Temple of Jerusalem became a metaphoric symbol for that unity (Eph 2:19-21).

Jerusalem's urban plan was marked by the grand temple complex and the shrine at its center. It was a visible landmark of the existence of the Jewish religion and Judaism was mostly recognized from this building. In the temple, the daily *sacrifices* were carried out. The Christian religion was concentrated around the death and resurrection of Jesus. The death of Jesus, in particular, was understood in terms of atonement according to the model of Mosaic sacrifice stipulations; and both the baptismal ritual (Rom 6) and Holy Communion (1 Cor 11:23-26) emphasized the sacrificial aspects of the death of Jesus and made Christians participants in this sacrifice. In this way, the Jesus-centered belief could connect a Christian to the heavenly Jerusalem where Jesus Christ, the heavenly High Priest, was sitting on the Father's right side.

In terms of content, many *Psalms* sung in the Temple were related to Jerusalem. The Book of Psalms was soon adopted as a central prayer book in Christianity and its many theological emphases on Jerusalem were understood as referring to the ecclesia of Jesus Christ. The earthly Christian Church was regarded as having contact with the heavenly Jerusalem (Gal 4:26; Hebr 12:22-24).⁷¹ *Pilgrimages* were made to the temple, especially at the great holidays of Passover, Sukkot, Shavuot. In the early period of Christianity there was no great interest in pilgrimage either to Jerusalem or to the Holy Land.⁷² Christians mainly emphasized the role of the heavenly and eschatological Jerusalem which would descend from Heaven. Alternatively, some Christian groups (mainly on the periphery) could represent *translatio*

Christianity (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2002).

⁷¹ See Paul F. Bradshaw, "The Influence of Jerusalem on Christian Liturgy," in Levine, *Jerusalem*, 251-259.

⁷² However, the situation changed radically when Constantine and his mother Helene began building projects in Jerusalem. See section 14.

Hierosolymae where this heavenly Jerusalem would descend in some place other than in the geographical location of the earthly Jerusalem.⁷³

Anni Maria Laato's article in this volume illustrates some interesting aspects of this *translatio Hierosolymae*. Another variation of Jerusalem-centered theology was to emphasize Jerusalem and its Temple from a historical perspective. Everything took place in Jerusalem, and from there the Gospel began its victorious march all over the world. In this volume, **Lukas Bormann** analyzes how the concept "Jerusalem" has been treated in Luke-Acts.

The temple of Jerusalem was a place for *encountering God*. Christians developed a theology where the relationship to Jesus emphasizes the real encounter with God. The Word of God was incarnated in the world and "lived among us" (*eskēnōsen en hēmin*) like God in the tabernacle (John 1:14). Therefore, meeting Jesus means that one has found the real Bethel, the house of God (Joh 1:50-51). Encountering God was related to the imagery of the heavenly Jerusalem (see Gal 4:26; Hebr 12:22-24).

The Jerusalemite *priesthood*, which was an essential part of the temple worship, became a divisive factor of unity. As revealed by the surviving documents, the Qumran community criticized the Sadducees and the Pharisees, and the latter two were also at theological odds with each other. The Pharisees tried (and succeeded) to get more influence amongst the people and finally over the proper officiating of cultic acts in the temple. The critical points were the passages in the Pentateuch that obligated priests to *sanctify themselves* in the proper manner and to perform the sacrifice specifically according to the ordinances of God. Christian theology strongly emphasized sanctification which could be achieved through the Holy Spirit (1 Peter 1:15-16) and the holy priesthood (1 Peter 2:9-10) is thus constituted by all Christians.

If the temple mainly served as a symbol of Jewish unity, then its architecture exemplified *particularism* or the visible difference between Jews and other pagan nations. A 1.5 meter high wall was built around the sanctuary, through which no stranger (i.e., gentile) could

⁷³ For this see Guy G. Stroumsa, "Mystical Jerusalems," in Levine, *Jerusalem*, 349-370, esp. 352-358; idem, "Christian Memories and Visions of Jerusalem in Jewish and Islamic Context," in Grabar and Kedar, *Where Heaven and Earth Meet*, 321-343, esp. 325.

UNDERSTANDING SPIRITUAL MEANING OF JERUSALEM

pass without the temple area becoming contaminated. There was a warning plaque that hung at the gates: "No stranger may pass through the wall surrounding this temple. Anyone found in violation of this shall be condemned to death." The women's forecourt was separated from the rest of the temple area. The temple building thus manifested spiritual inequality. According to Christian theology, the borderlines between Jews and Christians were removed through Jesus' acts of salvation (Eph 2:11-22). Therefore holding fast to boundaries between Jews and Greeks, those who are free or enslaved, or man and woman (Gal 3:28; Col 3:11) is no longer needed.

The temple had also an *economic* significance. Jews were obligated to pay a temple tax. Christians adopted first an idea of eschatological Jubilee (Isa 61:1-3; cf., 11QMelch) according to which God would take care of the poor. In the early Jerusalem congregation some Christians were willing to sell their property in order to realize this idea. However, the situation soon changed when the Christian message began to spread rapidly throughout the Roman Empire. Nevertheless, the idea of assisting the poor and taking care of them became one of the essential parts of Christian charity.

Finally, the whole Temple had an important *political* status, and therefore the high priest had political power too. The office of high priest became *politicized* during the Maccabean period and the office holder wielded political power. Religion and politics were mixed, which inspired strong criticism from those Jews who took the strictures of the holy texts seriously. These Jews include the Qumran community, the Pharisees, and Jesus and his disciples. Christianity adopted a non-political attitude toward governing authorities (Romans 13).

Important topics for the spiritual meaning of Jerusalem: Christians developed their theology in the shadow of the temple but the geographical Jerusalem did not play a significant role (as far as the New Testament writings are concerned). The Heavenly Jerusalem and its connection to the Christian congregation became central. Many concepts related to the Temple were interpreted spiritually as concerning the Christian Church.

13 *The Constantine Turn and the Byzantine Jerusalem*

The Constantine turn radically changed the Christian attitude toward Jerusalem and the Holy Land.⁷⁴ This is well-illustrated in Eusebius' changed attitude towards the interpretation of Isa 2:2-4. Before the Constantine turn Eusebius interpreted this passage as being fulfilled only in the eschatological era. However, in his commentary on Isaiah, he wrote that this text would be fulfilled so "that we may see with our own eyes."⁷⁵

The Madaba map,⁷⁶ Eusebius' *Onomasticon* and its "copy and paste" edition by Jerome,⁷⁷ many pilgrimage stories⁷⁸ as well as archaeological excavations⁷⁹ in the old city of Jerusalem illustrate well

74 Nevertheless, there was discussion among the Church Fathers as to how Christians should orientate themselves towards the earthly Jerusalem. For this, see Brouria Bitton-Ashkelony, "The Attitudes of Church Fathers toward Pilgrimage to Jerusalem in the Fourth and Fifth Centuries," in Levine, *Jerusalem*, 188-203.

75 For Eusebius' Isaiah commentary, see Joseph Ziegler, *Eusebius Werke neunter Band: Der Jesajakommentar* (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte; Berlin: Akademie Verlag 1975), 14-17; and translation in Jonathan J. Armstrong, *Eusebius of Caesarea: Commentary on Isaiah Translated with an Introduction and Notes* (Ancient Christian Texts; Downers Grove: IVP Academic 2013), 10-12. See further Michael J. Hollerich, *Eusebius of Caesarea's Commentary on Isaiah: Christian Exegesis in the Age of Constantine* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1999), 59-60.

76 See Michael Avi-Jonah, *The Madaba Mosaic Map* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1954); H. Donner and H. Cüppers, *Die Mosaikkarte von Madaba* (Abhandlungen des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins 5.1; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1977); H. Donner, *The Mosaic Map of Madaba* (Kampen: Pharos, 1992).

77 See e.g. G. S. P. Freeman-Grenville, *Palestine in the Fourth Century A.D.: The Onomasticon by Eusebius of Casarea* (Jerusalem: Carta 2003). Freeman-Grenville gives also a parallel translation of Jerome.

78 See E. D. Hunt, *Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire AD 312-460* (Oxford: Clarendon 1984); R. Ousterhout, ed., *The Blessings of Pilgrimage* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990); J. Wilkinson, *Jerusalem Pilgrims before the Crusades* (Oxford: Aris & Phillips, 2011). Especially important are the pilgrimage story of Egeira (*Itinerarium Egeriae*, SC 296) and the so-called letter Nr 46 among Jerome's letter which, in fact, is written by Paula and Eustochium, the friends of Jerome. For this, see especially Anni Maria Laato, "What Makes the Holy Land Holy? A Debate between Paula, Eustochium, and Marcella (Jerome, *Ep.* 46)," in Erkki Koskenniemi and J. Cornelis de Vos, eds, *Holy Places and Cult* (SRB 5, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2014), 169-199.

79 A good overview can be seen, for example, in Nahman Avigad, *Discovering Jerusalem* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1980), 208-246; Oren Gutfeld, "The Urban Layout of Byzantine-Period Jerusalem," in Katharina Galor and Gideon Avni,

UNDERSTANDING SPIRITUAL MEANING OF JERUSALEM

the importance of the Byzantine Jerusalem and the Holy Land for the Christian Church. In particular, the Holy Sepulchre became a significant symbol for Christian belief and its meaning was visible even in Jerome's translation of Isa 11:10 where the Hebrew *mēnūḥātō* was translated as *sepulcrum* referring to the Holy Sepulchre.

A significant element in Byzantine Jerusalem was leaving the Temple area unbuilt.⁸⁰ The aim of this was to give credence to Jesus' words about the destruction of the temple (Mt 24:2). Seen from this perspective, Julian's attempt to allow the rebuilding of the Jerusalem Temple was a serious threat to the Christian theological and architectural construction in Jerusalem.⁸¹ A continuous discussion in rabbinical circles as to the ways in which certain halakhic rules could be followed outside of Jerusalem and without the Temple shows that the destruction of the Temple was a serious but not decisive blow for Judaism. Combined with Christian anti-Jewish rhetorics that the temple area would remain unbuilt and the new structure of the Christian Byzantine Jerusalem with its many churches must have left a deep trauma in the Jewish mind.

Nevertheless, the Byzantine Jerusalem also promoted Christian theological discourses. In his article in this volume, **Serafim Seppälä** discusses the liturgical meaning of Jerusalem in Byzantine sources. It is worth noting that in spite of Christian rule in Jerusalem during the Byzantine period Christian theology continued to emphasize a spiritual understanding of the heavenly Jerusalem. In his article, **Martin Tamcke** analyzes some aspects of Makarios' teaching about Jerusalem. The centrality of Jerusalem was not a self-evident factor in eastern Christianity. In his article, **Catalin-Stefan Popa** discusses Jacob of Sarug's opinion that Edessa is superior to Jerusalem. Nevertheless, many monks living in Palestine spoke warmly about the

eds., *Unearthing Jerusalem: 150 Years of Archaeological Research in the Holy City* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 327-350.

80 Concerning the history of the temple-less mountain, see Yoram Tsafrir, "70-638: The Temple-less Mountain," in Oleg Grabar and Benjamin Z. Kedar, eds., *Where Heaven and Earth Meet: Jerusalem's Sacred Esplanade* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2009), 43-99.

81 For a critical evaluation of different mainly Christian sources of this event, see Günter Stemberger, *Jews and Christians in the Holy Land: Palestine in the Fourth Century* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 185-216, esp. 201-216.

earthly Jerusalem thus emphasizing that loving heavenly Jerusalem deepens one's love towards an earthly Jerusalem.⁸²

Important topics for the spiritual meaning of Jerusalem: Pilgrimage to Jerusalem and other holy places became important aspects of Christian liturgy. The spiritual meaning of Jerusalem received deep impulses from the fact that the Holy Sepulchre and other churches existed in Jerusalem.

14 The Rise of Islam

Archaeologically seen, the Christian presence in Jerusalem continued after the Muslim conquest and there is evidence of continuity from the Byzantine period to the early Islamic period.⁸³ The long Christian tradition of neglecting the Temple area and leaving it unbuilt gave early Muslims the chance to develop that area. The building of the Dome of the Rock (introduced by Mu^cawiya, completed by Abd al-Malik) in 692 CE made Jerusalem an important city for Islam.⁸⁴ In this volume, **Jaakko Hämeen-Anttila** analyzes more closely the political and religious reasons behind the process when Jerusalem became a central city in Islamic tradition.

Historically as well as theologically, the Muslim conquest of Jerusalem opened a new page in the history of Jerusalem. From that time onwards, there were three religions which regarded Jerusalem as the holy city. During this period there were intensive reflections of apocalyptic hopes and expectations not only for Jews and Christians,⁸⁵ but also for Muslims. In his article in this volume, **Ilkka Lindstedt** analyzes these hopes and expectations mainly from Christian and Islamic perspectives.

82 For this see Robert L. Wilken, "Loving the Jerusalem Below: The Monks of Palestine," in Levine, *Jerusalem*, 240-250.

83 For this see Gideon Avni, "From Hagia Polis to Al-Quds: The Byzantine-Islamic Transition in Jerusalem," in Galor and Avni, *Unearthing Jerusalem*, 387-398.

84 See Andreas Kaplony, "635/638-1099: The Mosque of Jerusalem (*Masjid Bayt al-Maqdis*)," in Grabar and Kedar, *Where Heaven and Earth Meet*, 101-131. Concerning the archaeology see Donald Whitcomb, "Jerusalem and the Beginnings of the Islamic City," in Galor and Avni, *Unearthing Jerusalem*, 399-416.

85 For this see especially Günter Stemberger, "Jerusalem in the Early Seventh Century: Hopes and Aspirations of Christians and Jews," in Levine, *Jerusalem*, 260-272.

UNDERSTANDING SPIRITUAL MEANING OF JERUSALEM

The spiritual meaning of Jerusalem in Hadiths is analyzed by **Mustafa Abu Sway** in this volume. He shows how Jerusalem became an important city for Islam.

Important topics for the spiritual meaning of Jerusalem: Jerusalem became an important city for the new religion Islam, and thus created the situation visible in modern times where Jerusalem is a center for the three Abrahamic religions Judaism, Christianity and Islam. Jerusalem's position was interpreted in different eschatological and apocalyptic scenarios which had clear political dimensions.

15 The Crusade Period

The Crusade period resulted in a new Christian interest towards to the Holy City of Jerusalem.⁸⁶ Theologically, the recapture of Jerusalem was justified by the medieval apocalyptic views that the new world would be established under papal guidance. The forceful military expansion of Christendom would be the driving force of history and Jerusalem, in addition to Rome, would be an important center in this religiously justified political ideology.⁸⁷ The crusade period showed – in a concrete way – how Jerusalem's spiritual meaning could be manipulated politically in order to justify a certain religious ideology. It may be good to compare these triumphal theological concepts of Christianity with those of Jews who suffered greatly not only in the Rhineland but also in Jerusalem. The sacrifices once performed in the Temple of Jerusalem became a spiritual symbol for the self-sacrifice of Jewish martyrs in this period.⁸⁸ This corroborates well with the famous

86 See Benjamin Z. Kedar and Denys Pringle, "1099-1187: The Lord's Temple (Temple Domini) and Solomon's Palace (Palatium Salomonis)," in Grabar and Kedar, *Where Heaven and Earth Meet*, 133-149.

87 For this see Brett Edward Whalen, *Dominion of God: Christendom and Apocalypse in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009).

88 Robert Chazan, "Jerusalem as Christian Symbol during the First Crusade: Jewish Awareness and Response," in Levin, *Jerusalem*, 382-392. See further the symbolism of Jerusalem Temple sacrifices in the Hebrew Chronicle, attributed to Solomon ben Simson, and its English translation given in Shlomo Eidelberg, *The Jews and the Crusaders: The Hebrew Chronicles of the First and Second Crusades* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1977) 21-72, esp. 57; Robert Chazan, *European Jewry and the First Crusade* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), 243-297, esp. 281.

interpretation of Isaiah 53, made by Rashi after the massacre of the Jews in Rhineland, according to which the suffering servant of the Lord describes the Jewish martyrs as those who were killed by German crusaders.⁸⁹ About one hundred years later, i.e. 1187, it was the turn of Christians to mediate the loss of the then Christian Jerusalem to the troops of Saladin. This recapture of Jerusalem by the troops of Saladin resulted in many reflections in the Christian liturgy.⁹⁰

The Crusade period intensified the question of ownership of Jerusalem at a new level. Religious feelings were deeply interconnected with political aims and could even justify religious violence. Nevertheless, it is significant that all three Abrahamic religions managed to maintain their religious traditions in the geographical and topographical landmarks of Jerusalem. This is presented in a clear way in Jewish, Christian and Muslim pilgrim stories in the 12th century CE.⁹¹

Important topics for the spiritual meaning of Jerusalem: Jerusalem was intensively related to apocalyptic scenarios and concrete political plans, even to military efforts.

16 Conclusions

This survey indicates that spiritual concepts regarding Jerusalem have been formed and developed throughout the centuries. Different spiritual aspects have been included in Jewish, Christian and Islamic writings, and it is difficult to describe the historical development of all

⁸⁹ For this interpretation see the discussion in Christopher R. North, *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah: An Historical and Critical Study* (Oxford University Press 1963) 17-20; Herbert Haag, *Der Gottesknecht bei Deuterjesaja* (EdF 233, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1985) 51-58, and H. Sicherman & G.J. Gevaryahu, "Rashi and the First Crusade: Commentary, Liturgy, Legend," *Judaism* 48 (1999) 181-197; Antti Laato, *Who Is the Servant of the Lord? Jewish and Christian Interpretations on Isaiah 53 from Antiquity to the Middle Ages* (SRB 4; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2012), 315-321.

⁹⁰ For the way of how this loss is dealt with in Medieval Christian liturgy, see Amnon Linder, "The Loss of Christian Jerusalem in Late Medieval Liturgy," in Levine, *Jerusalem*, 393-407.

⁹¹ For the stories of Al-Harawi, Rabbi Benjamin Tudela and Theoderic, see the discussion and analysis in Myriam Rosen-Ayalon, "Three Perspectives on Jerusalem: Jewish, Christian, and Muslim Pilgrims in the Twelfth Century," in Levine, *Jerusalem*, 326-346.

UNDERSTANDING SPIRITUAL MEANING OF JERUSALEM

different ideas without making several detailed monographs on these ideas. This survey has its endpoint in the Crusade period, even though some significant new spiritual traditions were developed after this period. A good example is the *Via Dolorosa* tradition which has played a significant role in the annual Christian celebration of Easter. Another example is the political agreements which allowed the formation of modern political entities in the area.⁹²

This volume also contains two articles where the focus is on the present political and religious situation of Jerusalem. **Yvonne Margaretha Wang** deals with modern peacebuilding processes in Jerusalem⁹³ and **Mia Anderssén-Löf** discusses religious ideas related to the concrete plans of some Jewish groups which aim to rebuild the third Temple in Jerusalem.⁹⁴

By concluding with these articles, the present volume gives some ideas as to why the spiritual meaning of Jerusalem is a multifaceted phenomenon in the context of the three Abrahamic religions Judaism, Christianity and Islam. As such, this volume may give good inspiration and fresh impulses for further studies in theological, religious, cultural, social and political matters.

92 For this see, e.g., Walter Laqueur and Barry Rubin, eds, *The Israel-Arab Reader: A Documentary History of the Middle East Conflict* (Seventh Revised and Updated Edition; London: Penguin Books, 2008).

93 See further her detailed study: Yvonne Margaretha Wang, *How Can Religion Contribute to Peace in the Holy Land? A Study of Religious Peacework in Jerusalem* (Oslo: University of Oslo, 2011) which is available online: <https://www.duo.uio.no/bitstream/handle/10852/37783/dravhandling-wang.pdf?sequence=1>.

94 See further her detailed study: Mia Anderssén-Löf, *May He Speedily Come: A Comparative Study on Haredi and Haredi Understandings of Exile and Redemption* (Åbo: Åbo Akademi University Press, 2017), available online: <http://www.doria.fi/handle/10024/146968>