Claremont Colleges
Scholarship @ Claremont

Scripps Senior Theses | Scripps Student Scholarship

2012

The Sacred State: Religion, Politics and the Jerusalem Temple

Rebecca M. King
Scripps College

Recommended Citation
King, Rebecca M., "The Sacred State: Religion, Politics and the Jerusalem Temple" (2012). *Scripps Senior Theses.* Paper 92.
http://scholarship.claremont.edu/scripps_theses/92

This Open Access Senior Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Scripps Student Scholarship at Scholarship @ Claremont. It has been accepted for inclusion in Scripps Senior Theses by an authorized administrator of Scholarship @ Claremont. For more information, please contact scholarship@cuc.claremont.edu.

THE SACRED STATE:
RELIGION, POLITICS AND THE JERUSALEM TEMPLE

by:

REBECCA KING

**SUBMITTED TO SCRIPPS COLLEGE IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF ARTS**

**PROFERROR GILBERT
PROFESSOR MHETA
PROFESSOR EISENSTADT**

APRIL 20, 2012

Table of Contents

Introduction....3

A Brief History: The Jerusalem Temple's Construction, Destruction, Reconstruction, Renovation and Final Destruction 8
- The Beginning: David and Solomon's Temple 8
- Solomon's Temple as a Political Institution 13
- Kings of the First Temple 14
- The First Destruction and Hopes of Rebuilding 18
- Persians, Greeks, Romans and the Temple of Herod....19
- The Destruction....24

Temple Legacy in Jewish Thought and Imagination 28
- Immediate Aftermath of the Destruction 28
- How will the Jews Respond? 29
- Response: Abandon the Temple 30
- Second Response: Rebuild the Temple....30
- Third Response: Memorialize the Temple....32
- Medieval Judaism and the Temple 39

The Temple in the Modern Period 43
- Jews in Europe 43
- Early Hints of Zionism: Hess, Kalischer, Pinsker 47
- Zionist thinking about the Temple....50
- Political Changes of 1948 and 1967: Transition in Zionist Thinking 55
- The Temple as used in Contemporary Politics 62

Conclusion 66

Work Cited....68

Introduction

In 1967 Israel gained control of one of the most sacred and contested spaces on earth, the Temple Mount or Haram al-Sharif as it is known to Muslims. This date marked the beginning of a period largely defined by a delicate arrangement that allowed the Waqf, an Islamic trust, to administer the space and other holy sites in the Old City of Jerusalem, while the Israeli government took the responsibility of policing the area and providing security. October 8, 1990, proved to be a day where this arrangement would be sorely tested. On that day Dr. Gershon Salomon and members of the Temple Mount Faithful made their way through Jerusalem to the Temple Mount, intending to lay a cornerstone to mark the beginning of the construction of the Third Temple. Their plan sparked intense debated, but that did not deter them. What followed, whether intended to or not, set off a wave of violence, death, and injury, all the result of rioting infused with religious and political fear of the other.

The Temple Mount Faithful was a messianic group established on the fourth day of the Israel's Six Day War in 1967. Its main goal was to convince the Jewish population in Jerusalem and around the world that the Third Temple needed to be built. In their opinion, the recapture of the Temple Mount in 1967 was evidence of God's hand in Israeli's destiny and evidence of a coming messianic age. Drawing from Psalm 118:22 which states, "The stone which the builders rejected has become the chief cornerstone", the Temple Mount Faithful went in search of a stone fit to be the cornerstone of the new Temple. The stone they chose was found in Negev because it was "known that the stones of the Temple [after its destruction] were taken by the Romans into Negev for disposal. According to tradition, when Herod remodeled the Temple, extra stones and rejected

stones were also taken to Negev".[1] With the stone chosen, the divine mission could begin and October 1990 brought their most significant action to the general public. However, rumor had reached the Muslim community by October 5 and a campaign was called to "gather on the Mount to prevent the stone-laying ceremony and to 'defend the mosques'".[2] Arabs were quick to respond and by October 7 piles of stones, sticks and metal bars were gathered as defense weapons. Although the "police informed Muslim officials that no Jews would be allowed onto the Mount", anxiety and concern remained. [3]

The morning of October 8 began with about 30,000 Jews gathered in the Western Wall plaza for the festival of Sukkoth. There were forty-four "border policemen inside the compound, whose job was to protect the Jewish worshipers below".[4] Chaos was almost expected. Soon, with no real known cause, crowds of Arabs that had gathered at the Mount to defend their mosques began pushing towards the policemen. There are claims that a policemen "accidentally dropped or deliberately lobbed a tear-gas grenade" or that "Arab children on the Mount began throwing stones at the border policemen inside the compound".[5] No matter what triggered the crowd's anger, there was no denying that a riot had begun. Stones were thrown and tear-gas was in the air. Eventually border police regained control but not until about twenty Arabs were killed and another four wounded as well as thirty-four Israelis—civilian and policemen—were slightly

---

[1] Schmitt, John, and J. Carl Laney. *Messiah's Coming Temple: Ezekiel's Prophetic Vision of the Future Temple*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 1997.p.62.
[2] Morris, Benny. *Righteous Victims: A History of the Zionist-Arab Conflict, 1881-1999*. New York: Knopf, 1999.p.584.
[3] Morris, 585.
[4] Morris, 585.
[5] Morris, 585.

injured.[6] This event spurred many other smaller violent attacks from Arabs who were "avenging the Temple Mount Massacre".[7]

What is most interesting about this event is the political response. The government investigated the riots and set up a commission of inquiry. They interviewed Israeli civilian and policemen, although almost no Arabs. They concluded that,

> The fault for the incident lay wholly with the Arabs and that the Jewish authorities were blameless, though it mildly criticized some of the police commanders' tactical decisions. The Muslim authorities rejected these findings, and the Supreme Muslim Council published a report of its own, saying that the massacre had been preplanned by the police, had been unprovoked, and was wholly the Israelis' fault. A third investigation, by a Jewish Jerusalem district court judge, ruled that no policeman involved in the incident should be charged, but that the police had been "too quick on the trigger" and that not all the firing had been justified by "clear and imminent danger".[8]

Clearly, no one agreed upon the cause or who was at fault. As was standard in this political climate, someone of religious or political origin had sparked violence and now authorities from each power group in Jerusalem would spin the situation in such a way as to favor and further their objectives in the city.

In many ways the ideologies that prompted the action of the Temple Mount Faithful were nothing new. Indeed, the space itself and the temples that once existed there are a microcosm of the complex association between religion and politics that has long informed Jewish thought. This thesis examines how previous centuries of Jewish thinking about the Temple as a symbol of Jewish religious and political identity contributed to the events in 1990. How is it that in 1990 and at various other times in its history an ostensible religious site, the Temple Mount, has become such a point of

---

[6] Morris, Benny. *Righteous Victims: A History of the Zionist-Arab Conflict, 1881-1999*. New York: Knopf, 1999.p.585.
[7] Morris, 585.
[8] Morris, 586.

political contention? How have the religious values of the Temple been used to advance decidedly political agendas? My aim is to show how the Temple/Temple Mount has been projected through a lens of political objectives and thus brings about new ideas to justify Jewish right to Jerusalem. These ideas draw on longstanding themes and traditions in Jewish history and thus trigger incredible passion from those who invest in these various causes. Having a greater understanding of Jewish history will contribute to the understanding of the current political situation that Jerusalem finds itself in today.

I will begin at the beginning, the original construction of the Temple by Solomon and will examine the political nature the Temple achieved even before the first stone was placed. From there the Temple goes through a phase of destruction, rebuilding and destruction again. Each of these phases has political undertones that are important to understand in light of the religious ones. Jewish identity comes into question and the Temple becomes a tool by which to gain legitimacy in the political realm. However, once the Temple is destroyed a second time Jews have to accommodate themselves to a reality in which they no longer have control of space where the Temple stood. Repeated conquests over Jerusalem keeps the Jews either in Jerusalem but under foreign control, or out of Jerusalem and living in the Diaspora. Jews are forced to deal with these changes and to form their responses. Their political authority diminishes and their religious life attempts to deal without the Temple. What comes of this is years of struggle and formations of religious and/or political movements in order to ultimately accomplish one of two things; either to return to Jerusalem and establish a Jewish state, or to return to Jerusalem and rebuild the Temple. A continuous thread that runs through much of Jewish history is how the Temple, as both a religious symbol and a political tool, has shaped

Jews thought about themselves as a people with both religious and political values and aspirations. Having a greater understanding of Jewish history will contribute to the understanding of the current political situation that Jerusalem finds itself in today.

I. A Brief History: The Jerusalem Temple's Construction, Destruction, Reconstruction, Renovation and Final Destruction

The Beginning: David and Solomon's Temple

The history of the Temple begins in the time of King Solomon who built the first Temple around the tenth century B.C.E. Solomon's father, David, had decided to move the capital to Jerusalem after fighting and winning a civil war against the Jebusites. David brought the Ark of the Covenant, the center piece of Israelite worship, into the city. The Ark contained the tablets on which were inscribed the Ten Commandments. The Ark of the Covenant, "Israel's most sacred relic", was placed inside the Holy of Holies where God was thought to manifest Himself in the Tabernacle.[9] When King David brought the Ark to the city of Jerusalem it was placed in the Tabernacle which was a portable tent that housed the Presence of God.

It was David's hope to build a permanent resting-place for the Ark of the Covenant. David thought it unfair that he was "living in a house of cedar, while the ark of God remain[ed] in a tent". [10] So David sought to build a permanent building in the name of God. However, the plan came to naught as, "Nathan the prophet arrives and declares that this is not the will of God…the Lord did not need a fixed house [when the Israelites were wondering in the desert] and so he does not need one now, but he will establish a house of David, the dynasty from which the Messiah will come".[11] According to 2 Samuel, David's *successor* was to "build a house for [God's] Name, and [God would]

---

[9] Hamblin, William James., and David Rolph. Seely. *Solomon's Temple: Myth and History*. London: Thames & Hudson, 2007. p. 20.
[10] 2 Samuel 7:2 (New International Version-NIV).
[11] Goldhill, Simon. *The Temple of Jerusalem*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2005. p. 20, 22.

establish the throne of his kingdom forever".[12] Later Jewish texts, for example Chronicles, attempts to explain why David could not be the one to build this building for God. According to Chronicles, David was "a man of battles and had shed blood" and thus had blood on his hands and was not fit to build a house for God.[13] Victor Avigdor Hurowitz, writes that "it is not clear whether 2 Samuel 7 faithfully reflects religious, social and political situations at the time of David, or whether the chapter is the product of speculation of later scribes who tries to explain after the fact how it came to be that Solomon, rather than David, was the one privileged to build a temple".[14] Historical reasons why David could not build the temple are not clear, but whatever the reason, God promised instead that He would build a *dynasty* through David and that eventually the Messiah would come through this line.

David did not build a *bayit,* or temple, out of respect for God's desires, but he did receive a *bayit,* or house/dynasty.[15] The play on words in this context begs the question "how should the building of the Temple be related to the building of a dynasty?"[16] In the past, Israelites had not been ruled by a king. There was now a shift in politics. Now, instead of wondering the wilderness following God, a kingdom had to be run in accordance with the desires of God. This shift in ruling becomes important. The Israelite religion, too, was also shifting. The Israelites would soon have to understand that the portable nature of their relationship to God would soon change and worshiping God at a

[12] 2 Samuel 7:13 (NIV)
[13] 1 Chron. 28:4 (NIV).
[14] Hurowitz, Victor. *I Have Built You an Exalted House: Temple Building in the Bible in Light of Mesopotamian and Northwest Semetic Writings*. Sheffield Academic, 1992. p.135.
[15] Goldhill, Simon. *The Temple of Jerusalem*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2005. p. 21-22.
[16] Goldhill, 22.

particular place would become the norm. This now permanent place of worship would prove to have major effects on the Israelites political scene and their religious practices.

After David learned of God's desires for His house, David decided to go ahead and secure the site on which his successor, Solomon, would build the temple in the future. David knew that "monumental temples were both expressions of a community's religion and a statement of the community's power and status" so the placement of the Temple was going to be important.[17] Therefore, David chose a mountain as the future building site. Later Jewish tradition believes that this mountain was called Mount Moriah and was where Abraham showed his obedience to God by nearly sacrificing Isaac[18] and was also believed to be where David himself had once encountered God.[19] Later Jewish tradition claimed that his mountain was Mount Moriah in order to further the holiness and great significance of the mountain and to help make sense of why the Temple was built there. In texts written closer to David's time, however, a name is not mentioned or given to the mountain so scholars do not know for sure whether or not it was really called Mount Moriah. After establishing a building place, David began to collect the necessary materials that would be used to build the temple.

When David grew old and was in need of a successor he appointed his son Solomon the new King of Israel. Solomon was not guaranteed the position. Bathsheba, Solomon's mother, had to plead Solomon's case in order for David to appoint him king.[20] Eventually, however, Solomon succeeded David. David hands Solomon the throne and

---

[17] Goldhill, Simon. *The Temple of Jerusalem*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2005. p. 23.
[18] Genesis 22 (NIV).
[19] 1 Chron. 3:1 (NIV).
[20] 1 Kings 1 (NIV).

says, "Long live King Solomon…for I have appointed him ruler".[21] And with that Solomon was king.

As king, it now fell on Solomon to build the temple and expand the city of Jerusalem. According to the Tanakh[22], Solomon began building the temple four years into his reign as king. Solomon recalls that,

> Because of the wars waged against my father David from all sides, he could not build a temple for the Name of the LORD his God until the LORD put his enemies under his feet. But now the LORD my God has given me rest on every side, and there is no adversary or disaster. I intend, therefore, to build a temple for the Name of the LORD my God, as the LORD told my father David, when he said, 'Your son whom I will put on the throne in your place will build the temple for my Name'.[23]

Since David had already been collecting materials for the temple, much of Solomon's task was already laid out in detail. Hiram, the king of Tyre, had agreed to help with the building of the Temple. He and David maintained peaceful relations and so when Solomon reached out for supplies and laborers, Hiram was eager to help. Solomon's correspondences with Hiram were "trade agreements…made in the ancient Near East…through exchange of letters".[24] Hiram agreed to provide Solomon with cedar and logs as well as men to work. In exchange, Solomon was to provide food to Hiram's royal household.[25]

As far as structure, the temple was to be a proportionally larger version of the Tabernacle made of stone overlaid with gold, beams, and planks of cedar. It was "a rectangular building roughly 105ft long, 30ft wide and 45ft high" containing three rooms

---

[21] 1 Kings 1:34-35 (NIV).
[22] The Hebrew Bible.
[23] 1 Kings 5:3-5 (NIV)
[24] Hurowitz, Victor. *I Have Built You an Exalted House: Temple Building in the Bible in Light of Mesopotamian and Northwest Semetic Writings*. Sheffield Academic, 1992. p. 190.
[25] 1 Kings 5:8-9 (NIV)

which mirrored the rooms of the Tabernacle: the Holy of Holies, the Holy Place, and the porch or foyer area.[26] The temple was a reflection of Near Eastern architecture. The basic design and construction of the temple could be "considered quite typical of the region".[27] Temples found in northern Syria[28] mirror Solomon's temple in regards to floor plan and a placed marked as the holy of holies. Scholars hypothesize that these similarities are found in temples because Solomon outsourced much of his labor from surrounding regions.

The function of the temple was to allow the Israelites to continue the same worship they had been doing in the Tabernacle, but now in a permanent building. Through this temple, God promised the Israelites that He would be present with them always. God's promise from 1 Kings states,

> The word of the LORD came to Solomon: "As for this temple you are building, if you follow my decrees, observe my laws and keep all my commands and obey them, I will fulfill through you the promise I gave to David your father. *And I will live among the Israelites and will not abandon my people Israel*".[29]

For the people of Israel, what God said to Solomon in this passage marks the beginning of God's unadulterated presence with His people through a physical structure. It is through the temple that Israelites interacted with God and remember that God is with them. Sacrifices were made at the temple in order to connect with God. Sacrifice was central to all occasions and served as "sin offerings to expiate transgressors, to fulfill vows, or [to offer thanksgiving]" as a way of interacting with the divine.[30]

---

[26] Hamblin, William James, and David Rolph Seely. *Solomon's Temple: Myth and History*. London: Thames & Hudson, 2007. p. 25.
[27] Hamblin, 30.
[28] Tell Tayinat and Ain Dara. (Hamblin, 30).
[29] 1 Kings 6:11-13 (NIV).
[30] Goldhill, Simon. *The Temple of Jerusalem*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2005. p. 72.

The temple became the "symbol of the presence of God" that lived in and among the people of Israel.[31] The Tanakh reports that a "cloud had filled the House of the Lord…for the Presence of the Lord filled the House of the Lord".[32] This structure housed the Name of the Lord and all of Israel witnessed Solomon's building and heard of God's promise. As long as the temple stood, nothing could separate them from their God. After the temple's completion, Solomon praised God in the presence of the whole congregation of Israel. The Israelite people now had a new land, a new king and a temple which they now had to protect. This desire to protect the temple would become a theme for the Israelite/Jewish people throughout the rest of history.

Solomon's Temple as a Political Institution

Simon Goldhill, the author of *The Temple of Jerusalem,* suggests that before its construction the Temple enjoyed an interesting religious/political connection. Goldhill argues that, 'the five books of Moses had no place for a king for the Israelites, but now we are entering a new period of Jewish history, where kings and dynasties indeed dominate the political landscape. The pun on *bayit* [meaning both temple and dynasty] marks the necessary gap between the house of God and the house of a political ruler".[33] Goldhill suggests that there is already tension between the temple and the surrounding politics before the temple was built. David's hands were already too bloody to even be the one to build it. God instead gave him a dynasty. Thus it was his son Solomon's responsibility to build the temple, while also carrying on the dynasty. In order to do this,

---

[31]Hamblin, William James., and David Rolph. Seely. *Solomon's Temple: Myth and History*. London: Thames & Hudson, 2007. p. 24.
[32] 1 Kings 8:10-11 (NIV).
[33] Goldhill, Simon. *The Temple of Jerusalem*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2005. p. 22.

Solomon built his palace close to the temple. That way he could rule his kingdom and watch over temple practices simultaneously.

Often in other ancient societies, a temple was not just a religious site but an institution within the city. Temples were "often deliberately constructed next to the palace in order to represent the shared interlocking authority of god, king, and priest".[34] Solomon's temple, too, operated as a central institution and was built next to the royal palace. King David had moved the capital from Hebron to Jerusalem in order to make Jerusalem the center of political life as well as religious life. Religious life in the city of Jerusalem begins to revolve around Solomon's Temple while political life remains in close proximity.

After Solomon's death around 931 B.C.E., the kingdom split in two. The split resulted in Israel to the north and Judah to the south, each kingdom with its own king. Jerusalem was now part of the Judean kingdom. For the remainder of the Israelite rule of this land area, "a king's reign [was] defined according to whether he followed the ancestral religion of the Temple and maintained the Temple as the sole place of sacrifice".[35] Solomon's temple had become what Goldhill calls the *yardstick* by which generations to follow were measured. After Solomon's death, many kings followed that each impacted temple order. I am going to highlight a few of them.

Kings of the First Temple

One such king was, Jeroboam I (931-910 BCE) who was the first ruler of the northern kingdom of Israel. He made Shechem the capital of his kingdom and fortified it

---

[34] Hamblin, William James., and David Rolph. Seely. *Solomon's Temple: Myth and History*. London: Thames & Hudson, 2007. p. 10.
[35] Goldhill, Simon. *The Temple of Jerusalem*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2005. p. 34.

"in the hill country of Ephraim and lived there".[36] He branched away from Solomon's Temple life and built his own smaller temples which he filled with golden calves where he encouraged people to offer sacrifices. Jeroboam I actually encouraged his kingdom not to worship at Solomon's temple because he wanted to create a further division between the two kingdoms. Jeroboam was threatened by the ruler of the southern kingdom, Rehoboam. Jeroboam believed that if his kingdom reverted back to the ways of the house of David and offered "sacrifices at the temple of the Lord in Jerusalem, they [would] again give their allegiance to their lord, Rehoboam king of Judah. They [would] kill me (Jeroboam) and return to King Rehoboam".[37] The temple, and the way of life surrounding it, was not just a religious decision but also a political one. Worshiping at the temple in Jerusalem appears to be in direct correlation to which king you following. The conflict produced by Jeroboam led to constant tension between the northern kingdom and the southern kingdom.

Prophets played a big role in the politics of the time as well. They spoke out about the way kingdoms were being ruled and what should be different. Elijah, one of the Biblical prophets, spoke out against the sacrifices going on in other temples such as the temples of Jeroboam. He harkened back to Solomon's temple and desired people to worship only the God of Israel.[38] He and others charged Jeroboam I with worshiping idols. One's religious affiliation also reflected a political affiliation as well.

What appeared to be idol worship continued to infest Jewish life through many kings until King Hezekiah[39] became ruler and King of Judah. 2 Kings describes Hezekiah

---

[36] 1 Kings 12:25 (NIV).
[37] 1 Kings 12:26-27 (NIV).
[38] 1 Kings 18-19 (NIV).
[39] 715-687 BCE

as a man who "trusted in the Lord, the God of Israel… there was no one like him among all the kings of Judah, either before him or after him…the Lord was with him and he was successful in whatever he undertook".[40] Hezekiah was responsible for sweeping religious reform in the area. He swept the land destroying "all other alters, high places, pillars, and temples devoted to Yahweh or other gods, both in Jerusalem and outside".[41] Archeologists have been debating Hezekiah's reforms trying to figure out the Bible's accuracy in its accounts of the King of Judah. Neil Asher Silberman and Israel Finkelstein agree that "the archaeological evidence for the elimination of countryside shrines seems to mesh with the biblical report that in his days Judah went through a sweeping cult 'reform'".[42] Hezekiah sought to unify the land of Israel again and planned to do so through the Temple. Silberman and Finkelstein also say that "the centralization of the cult in the Jerusalem Temple was a step taken to strengthen the central authority of the emerging state over the local, clan-base power hubs, which must have necessarily been connected to countryside shrines"[43] Hezekiah's religious reform was not merely of religious purpose, but of political one as well. He wanted to rid the land of Assyrian domination and centralize the power of Judah. Hezekiah used the Temple as the focus of his plan for the reunification of Israel. According to Diana Edelman, "Hezekiah is made a second Solomon in his economic and military actions of establishing treasuries, storehouses, and livestock stalls".[44] Edelman is skeptical of the historical accuracy of

---

[40] 2 Kings 18:5-7 (NIV).
[41] Hamblin, William James., and David Rolph. Seely. *Solomon's Temple: Myth and History*. London: Thames & Hudson, 2007. p. 37.
[42] Finkelstein, Israel, and Neil Asher Silberman. "Temple and Dynasty: Hezekiah, The Remaking of Judah and the Rise of the Pan-Israelite Ideology". *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 30.3 (2006): 259-285. *Academic Search Premier.* Web. 10 Dec. 2011. p. 274.
[43] Finkelstein, 274-275.
[44] Edelman, Diana. "Hezekiah's Alleged Cultic Centralizaion." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 32.4 (2008): 395-434. *Academic Search Premier.* Web. 10 Dec. 2011. p. 399.

some of the Biblical writings, but writes that Hezekiah appears to have introduced "reforms that restored Solomon's original plans for the operation of the temple, including the observance of Passover and the support of the Lévites".[45] How accurate claims are about Hezekiah's reign are uncertain, however, it appears that Hezekiah focused on bringing his kingdom back to the ways of Solomon's Temple order and practice.

Later, Josiah[46] became the King of Judah and furthered Hezekiah's goals to centralize worship in Jerusalem again. After Hezekiah's reign, many of the things he had worked for returned to their previous state, so Josiah began again to institute religious reform. Josiah, like Hezekiah, "destroyed all the high places and other cultic shrines outside of Jerusalem, and cleansed and purified the Temple in the city itself".[47] During Josiah's reign, Jeremiah, another prophet, brought cautionary messages to the kingdom of Judah. Jeremiah was "so sure of future consolation…that when Nebuchadnezzar did attack, he advised offering no resistance".[48]

Many of the great prophets towards the end of the first-Temple period "are reported as men fully engaged in the political turmoil of their own times" and they try desperately to convince the Jewish people of their wrong doings in order to protect their people and their temple.[49]

Due to the behavior of the Jews and their leaders following Solomon's reign, the security of the two kingdoms were rarely peaceful. The Jews were constantly threatened

---

[45] Edelman, Diana. "Hezekiah's Alleged Cultic Centralizaion." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 32.4 (2008): 395-434. *Academic Search Premier.* Web. 10 Dec. 2011. p. 399.
[46] 640-609 BCE
[47] Hamblin, William James., and David Rolph. Seely. *Solomon's Temple: Myth and History*. London: Thames & Hudson, 2007. p. 38.
[48] Goldhill, Simon. *The Temple of Jerusalem*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2005. p. 43.
[49] Goldhill, 42.

by the Assyrians to the north who eventually came to power. The safety of the Jewish people was at stake and their political instability began to show.

The First Destruction and Hopes of Rebuilding

All through this time prophets continued to speak out about the future of the Temple and its role in society. They played a significant role in the tension between religion and politics at the time. Prophecies, particularly by Ezekiel, began to address and predict the future destruction of the temple. These prophecies were not purely negative but were followed by a promise of restoration. The first part of Ezekiel's prophesies came true in 586 BCE when Nebuchadnezzar and the Babylonians burned the temple to the ground.

After the destruction, Ezekiel was exiled to Babylon where he continued to prophesy. One of Ezekiel's main concerns now that the Temple was gone was to rebuild it. Goldhill comments, "as with so many of the illustrations in this book [the Book of Ezekiel], they testify to the power of the *idea* of the Temple: through architecture there emerges again and again an image of an ideal order".[50] Ezekiel's writing consists of descriptions of the new temple and the necessity for its rebuilding. Ezekiel, like other prophets like Jeremiah had predicted the Temples unfortunate and devastating destruction. What came next according to these prophets was a seventy year exile followed by an eventual return and rebuilding of their temple. However, the Jews would have to go seventy years without their religious center (i.e. the center of their religion).

As time went on, the image of the Temple became a powerful tool and image for the Jews. It became this due to its "intense combination of glorious idealism constantly

[50] Goldhill, Simon. *The Temple of Jerusalem*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2005.p. 46.

haunted…by man's inability to live up to it".[51] Political standards were measured by the Temple's image and legacy. Individuals were measured by the Temple's image and legacy. Judaism was measured by the Temple's image and legacy. The Temple, through the work of Solomon and kings to follow, began to define a people. To quote Goldhill yet again, "the Temple [was] not just a building, but a way of expressing the hopes of religious idealism, and of constructing a picture of humanity's relation to the divine".[52] Now that the Temple was gone, the Jews would have to decide what their relationship to God had been, and what their community was going to look like in the years to follow.

Persians, Greeks, Romans and the Temple of Herod

In 539 BCE Cyrus the Persian conquered Babylon and a key decision was made concerning the Jewish people. Cyrus decided to allow the Jews to travel back into their land. In addition, he gave them permission to rebuild the Temple. Cyrus, obviously caring about the project, "even provided funds from the royal treasury" to build the Temple, crossing his political power into the religious realm.[53] The Temple would be rebuilt with political funds under royal patronage, thus entering the political realm. Some Israelites returned to the land under the rule of King Sheshbazzar in 538 BCE. They "immediately erected an alter, offered sacrifices, and began preparations for rebuilding the Temple".[54] This attempt to build the Temple failed for various reasons. Another group of Israelites came into the picture during Darius' reign. These Israelites were under the direction of Zerubbabel and the High Priest Joshua. Zerubbabel laid foundations and the work began. He "started to bring cedars from Lebanon, as had Solomon. But almost

---

[51] Goldhill, Simon. *The Temple of Jerusalem*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2005. p. 34.
[52] Goldhill, 41.
[53] Goldhill, 46.
[54] Hamblin, William James., and David Rolph. Seely. *Solomon's Temple: Myth and History*. London: Thames & Hudson, 2007. p. 41. (references Ezra 3:1-7).

immediately trouble broke out again".[55] Yet another group of Israelites had come into the picture and wanted to help with the construction. Zerubbabel refused to accept their help so a heated conflict ensued. Due to this conflict, a royal decree was declared and the building was forced to stop. Only later, when Darius issued another royal decree, could the building start again. This allowed the Temple to be finished in 515 BCE.[56] The politics at this time under Persian rule allowed the Jews to worship in peace. Goldhill explains that during this time the "Temple was central to the financial, religious and social fabric of the community, and that the authority of the religious law of the Torah played a major role both in the everyday lives of the inhabitants of Judea and especially in the milieu of the educated elite".[57] This modest temple had yet again resumed the religious and political tone during this period and was deeply entwined in the everyday functions of society whether it be political or religious.

When Alexander the Great came into power, things continued to operate peacefully. Hamblin cites that "Jewish legends remember Alexander as honoring the high priest and Temple" and presenting himself to the priest at the Temple as a political figure paying respects to a religious site.[58] Religiously and politically the Jews were experiencing harmony and Alexander's action towards the Temple was an indication of that. Their temple had been rebuilt and they were once again free to worship as they pleased. It was after Alexander's death that the land of Judea began to experience some more turmoil. After his death, Alexander's empire was divided amongst his generals. Eventually the Seleucids came to power in Judea and in 175 BCE Antiochus IV assumed

---

[55] Goldhill, Simon. *The Temple of Jerusalem*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2005. p. 46.
[56] Goldhill, 47.
[57] Goldhill, 48.
[58] Hamblin, William James, and David Rolph Seely. *Solomon's Temple: Myth and History*. London: Thames & Hudson, 2007. p. 41.

the thrown of the Syrian Seleucid kingdom. At this point, tremendous Greek influence continued to spread in Jerusalem. Greek was the spoken language in the city and "Greek thought, especially a proper education in literature and philosophy, defined sophistication and cultivation" in Jerusalem. "Its influence was pervasive, even in the Talmud, which tried hard to turn its back on the values of Hellenism".[59] Jews may or may not have noticed Greek influence in their culture and tradition but when Antiochus IV took the thrown, they noticed.

In 167 BCE Antiochus IV attempted to ban the observance of the Torah as well as other practices. The deal breaker came when he dedicated the Temple to Zeus Olympus. Some Jews complied with the royal demands but other Jews were outraged. The very essence of Jewish tradition was being discouraged, destroyed or dishonored. For example, circumcision was disallowed, the Law was collected and burned and "the Temple [was] to be desecrated by foreign worship...Antiochus understood neither the attachment with which the bulk of the nation regarded their ancient Law, nor the stubborn courage and endurance of which the Jews were capable".[60] Here again, religion and politics meet at the Temple. Many of those Jews rose up under the leadership of Judas Maccabeus, or Judah the Maccabee, from the Hasmonean family. Judas was known as "the hammerer" and possessed war skills. Judas led those who followed him into a revolt against the royal leadership determined "not only to resist the tyranny of Antiochus, but to free their brethren from both the Greeks and the Hellenistic Jew, and to re-establish the independence of the nation".[61] The Maccabean revolt, as it is now known, resulted in

---

[59] Goldhill, Simon. *The Temple of Jerusalem*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2005. p.49.
[60] Conder, C. R. *Judas Maccabaeus and the Jewish War of Independence,*. London: M. Ward &, 1879. p.80.
[61] Conder, 89.

Judas and his followers taking back the Temple and reinstituting its ritual practices. Judas and his men "set about cleansing the sanctuary, rebuilding the altar and the wall, and making new vessels in preparation to restore Temple sacrifices".[62] In 164 BCE Judas Maccabeus rededicated the Temple and institutes *Hanukkah* as a celebration of this rededication. Judas is highly celebrated in the Jewish community still because he was the "first dared to withstand the foreign tyranny which threatened to annihilate the Jewish faith, and it was the genius of Judas which first pointed out the measures, military and political, by which independence might best be preserved".[63] Through these events, Jewish identity clung to tradition, law and the Temple. Different sects of Judaism began to emerge after this point, "the Pharisees and Sadducees in particular".[64] Judaism was beginning to take on many changes while still trying to hold onto its core beliefs.

Judas' family, the Hasmoneans, now gain prominence and power as a military force as well as a political force. The Hasmoneans, however, were not of high priestly lineage. They could find priestly connections, but not lineage connecting them to a high priestly bloodline. This was a problem because the authority of the time was either through a king or high priestly bloodline and the Hasmoneans had no connection to either form of authority. This hurt them because in order to gain legitimacy as a leader, it was necessary to have a connection to the Temple and to control it. At this time, Rome took the Hasmonean kingdom as a partner and things began to change. This partnership began to show that the "Hasmonean kings were unreliable clients, and Rome replaced them with

---

[62] Hamblin, William James., and David Rolph. Seely. *Solomon's Temple: Myth and History*. London: Thames & Hudson, 2007. p.42.
[63] Conder, C. R. *Judas Maccabaeus and the Jewish War of Independence,*. London: M. Ward &, 1879.p.10.
[64] Goldhill, Simon. *The Temple of Jerusalem*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2005. p.51.

a royal vassal, Herod the Great, who would play a decisive role in the history of the Temple".[65] The Hasmonean dynasty then collapsed due to the encroachment of Rome.

Herod I became king around 37 BCE and had political backing by the Romans. Herod had vast wealth and liked to put his money into projects. As king he "made alliances with both Jews and pagan grandees across the region. It was thanks to Roman patronage that he became king".[66] Herod's projects offered great improvements to Jerusalem but also carried with it a sort of political agenda. Herod "rebuilt the harbor of Caesarea according to the latest architectural principles, fortified the kingdom's borders and reorganized its institutions to centralize his own power…and restricted the position of High Priest of the Temple…appointing HP for an irregular period" and leaving the appointing up to the king himself.[67] Herod's rule was far from perfect. With personal insecurities and family problems, Herod sought to make up for his insecurities through his spectacular buildings and projects. Herod single handedly put Jerusalem on the map. His most famous impact on Jerusalem came when he decided to renovate the Temple which Hamblin says was Herod's goal not of "piety but politics".[68] Previous to the renovations, the Temple was fairly unimpressive. It fulfilled its purpose but it was not a building of great stature or impressive architecture. Herod changed the status of Jerusalem through this project. It was only after "his policies of reconstruction that the Roman scholar Pliny the Elder could describe Jerusalem as 'by far the most famous city

---

[65] Hamblin, William James, and David Rolph Seely. *Solomon's Temple: Myth and History*. London: Thames & Hudson, 2007. p. 42.
[66] Goldhill, Simon. *The Temple of Jerusalem*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2005. p. 57.
[67] Goldhill, 58.
[68] Hamblin, William James, and David Rolph Seely. *Solomon's Temple: Myth and History*. London: Thames & Hudson, 2007. p. 43.

of the East'. And the Temple he built was a truly remarkable construction".[69] Historians believe that Herod's renovations doubled the size of the Temple. Jews were ambivalent at first of Herod's plan and requested that he not begin reconstruction of the Temple until all the building supplies were gathered. Herod agreed and did not begin building until everything was in place. After this, the Jews appear to have "no nostalgia for Zerubbabel's shrine…and [were full of] awe-struck wonderment at the completed building".[70] Their gratitude towards Herod gave him furthered authority and respect.

Josephus reports that the finished building was completed as an example of pious architecture. The walls were made of limestone (the smallest blocks weighing between two and five tons[71]) and gold and silver trimmed the doors! As grand as it was, the Temple still had all the necessary parts (holy of holies, altars etc.) in order to serve the Jewish religion like it always had. The Temple allowed sacrifices to remain at the center of Jewish religious practice so that Jews could continue using sacrifice as their way to communicate with God. Sacrifices "celebrated and honored the divine, and marked the covenant between God and his people Israel" and Herod's temple still allowed these necessary functions to take place.[72]

The Destruction

The Temple became the center of Jewish identity under Roman rule. When King Herod dies in 4 BCE, the Temple is still not fully finished. The Temple construction isn't completed until 63 CE. At this point, conditions are worsening in Judea. Herod's kingdom is split in three. Worsening conditions eventually lead to a Jewish revolt and the

---

[69] Goldhill, Simon. *The Temple of Jerusalem*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2005. p. 58.
[70] Goldhill, 60.
[71] Goldhill, 61.
[72] Goldhill, 79.

First Jewish-Roman War in 66 CE. The Jewish historian, Josephus, took it upon himself to write an account of it. Scholars continue to debate what parts of Josephus' eye witness account can be trusted. Josephus, according to Martin Goodman[73], was too deeply involved in the war "to be objective. In A.D. 66 he had been elected as one of the leading generals of the Jewish rebels. In A.D. 67 he had changed sides, becoming first a Roman captive and then an honored friend of Titus, the destroyer of the Temple".[74] Goodman goes on to say that there were many reasons for the Jews to harbor ill will towards the Romans at this time. Roman taxation of the Jews was not looked upon kindly. According to Goodman, "the whole notion of efficient Roman taxation ruthlessly exacted was anyway deeply objectionable".[75] Moreover, ruler's decisions concerning the Temple also contributed greatly to Jewish dissatisfaction and anger towards the Romans. For example, "greater anti-Roman sentiment was probably caused…by the Jews' shock at Caligula's plan to desecrate the Temple with his statute…though [this plan] was never fulfilled" it revealed obvious impiety of the Roman rulers over Judea and contributed to revolt reasoning.[76]

Jewish feelings of dissatisfaction and concern, particularly from a group now called the Zealots, were at an all time high at this time and as a result, war broke out in 66 CE. The Zealots lead the revolt from 66-70 CE. The Romans "responded with overwhelming military force, devastating the countryside; under Titus they besieged Jerusalem. Upon their defeat, the Jews were enslaved, the city destroyed, and the Temple

[73] Historian, writer and professor of Jewish Studies.
[74] Goodman, Martin. *The Ruling Class of Judaea: the Origins of the Jewish Revolt against Rome*, A.D. 66-70. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987. Print. p. 6.
[75] Goodman, 10.
[76] Goodman, 11.

burned to the ground".[77] The Temple, which had already endured so much defeat, was once again destroyed. Goldhill writes that because the "Temple has a monopoly on sacrifice in the Jewish kingdom, the destruction of the Temple by the Romans meant that the heart was ripped out of Jewish practice. The political, social and religious order which the Temple had provided was lost. What it meant to be a Jew—to live the life of a Jew—was no longer clear".[78] Jewish life was now up for reconfiguration. One critical consequence of the revolt raises the question whether or not Jerusalem would retain its cultural place in Jewish life.

In addition, the Jews would now have to reevaluate their relationship to the divine. Sacrifices could no longer be offered like they had been when the Temple still stood. Sacrifices were thought to express "a sense of the order of the world" and now this intimate interaction with God was unable to be experienced again.[79] The Temple was gone but not forgotten. Their society had once thrived on an intertwining of religion and politics centered on the Temple. The destruction of the Temple was not only a religious catastrophe but a political one as well. How were politics and religion supposed to look now? Some Jews refused to give up on the Temple. Bar Kochba led his famous revolt against the Romans as an attempt to reclaim Jerusalem. After Bar Kochba and his rebel group were defeated, the Romans renamed their city Aelia Capitolina and banned Jews "by imperial decree from entering Jerusalem".[80] Jews lost both religiously and politically.

From a political standpoint, Jewish leaders could no longer use the Temple to advance their political power. Religious leadership would, also, would have to be based

---

[77] Hamblin, William James, and David Rolph Seely. *Solomon's Temple: Myth and History*. London: Thames & Hudson, 2007. p. 49.
[78] Goldhill, Simon. The Temple of Jerusalem. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2005. p. 80.
[79] Goldhill, 79.
[80] Goldhill, 81.

on a different foundation. Questions, both of religious and political concern, arose about why God's house was able to be destroyed. A new framework began to emerge; the Temple and the land surrounding belonged to the Jews through divine decree and eventually they would get it back. Many Jews began to fixate on the eventual return of the Jews to Jerusalem. This mindset would carry the Jews throughout the rest of history. Their fixation on the Temple will prove to define them as a people. The Jews made religious and political adjustments due to the Temple's destruction, but they refuse to give up the hope that they would eventually return. The destruction of the Temple was not only a religious catastrophe but also a political upheaval. Jews were forced to rethink not only their religious life, but also their identity as a people which had for centuries included a political dimension. Jews would have to rethink their political identity, and come to grips with the absence of the institution upon which that identity had previously been established.

II. Temple Legacy in Jewish Thought and Imagination

Immediate Aftermath of the Destruction

In 70 CE, Jerusalem became a victim of war and the Temple took the brunt of the beating. For centuries thereafter, the city no longer functioned as the center of Jewish life and practice. Jerusalem became a Roman city. Jews entered a period of deep lament. God had promised to be with them, but now the Temple, the symbol of His presence with them, was gone. What would become of the relationship of God to the Jews? It was unclear what form Judaism would take without the Temple and without Jerusalem. Jews could choose to forget the Temple and be forced to redefine their relationship to the divine. They could fight to rebuild it so that their status as God's chosen remains intact. Or finally, they could retain an attachment to the Temple but transform in various ways in Jewish thought and imagination by incorporating its memory into daily life. The themes and ideas that come out of this period in Jewish history will inspire Jews in later generations and allow them to draw upon this reservoir of images and hopes in the contemporary political debate.

Immediately after the destruction Romans granted Jews limited autonomy in the city. The Jews were permitted to retain their religious practices, although absent the Temple. In other words, changes made to Jewish practice were due to the destruction of the Temple, and less to do with restrictions imposed by the Romans immediately after the revolt. One of the most immediate changes to Jewish life was a financial change imposed by the Romans.

A Jewish tax, or *Fiscus Iudaicus*, was to be paid to Rome by Jews. Vespasian, the Roman ruler at the time, decided to tax "the privilege of religious freedom and required

all Jews, both in Palestine and the Diaspora, to pay this tax to Rome, ostensibly for the benefit of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus who presumably had triumphed over the God of Israel".[81] The God of the Jews "had allowed [the] Temple to be destroyed, the explanation must lie in the sins of the Jews" and the Temple tax only added to this feeling.[82] For Jews, the tax was a constant reminder of "Judea's national humiliation and served as an irritant that prevented the sores of defeat from healing".[83] It was a constant reminder of Jewish failure during their revolts. Through the tax, Jews became one of a number of people subject to Rome. By diverting funds that once had been contributed to the Temple and now helped to fund the rebuilding of a Roman sanctuary, the tax stood a very real reminder that the Jews lost their political uniqueness and now paid a tax along with everyone else. Jews no longer had the Temple to define them and protect them. The tax also put stress on Jews relationship with the Romans. This stress would increase as the Jews began to fully form their responses to the destruction of the Temple.

How will the Jews Respond?

A turning point was emerging for the Jewish community. The dust was beginning to finally settle from the Temple destruction and Jews began to look for a direction to take their religion. Were they to cling to ways of old? Were they to forget the Temple completely? Or was there a way to incorporate the Temple into their daily lives without having to reclaim Jerusalem and rebuild it? Questions like these began to emerge and

---

[81] Sicker, Martin. *Between Rome and Jerusalem: 300 Years of Roman-Judaean Relations*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2001. p. 170.
[82] Goodman, Martin. *Rome and Jerusalem: The Clash of Ancient Civilizations*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2007.p. 424.
[83] Sicker, Martin. *Between Rome and Jerusalem: 300 Years of Roman-Judaean Relations*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2001. p. 170.

Jews began to mobilize their responses. The following pages highlight three possible responses.

First Response: Abandon the Temple

For at least some Jews the Temple's destruction led to the abandonment of Temple practices all together. Although it may not have been widely adopted, this response seems logical. The Temple is no longer standing so the Jews needed to figure out a way to move forward. Many Jews were already living in the Diaspora and were used to living as Jews and in a Jewish community without the Temple. With its recent destruction, the memory of the Temple would now only bring pain and lament. Jews in the "Mediterranean diaspora had tried to avoid engagement with the dangerous politics of Jerusalem" surrounding the Temple.[84] Forgetting or avoiding the conflict was the easiest option. Moving forward without the Temple appeared to be a viable option.

Second Response: Rebuild the Temple

The second response to the Temple destruction was to reestablish a national identity through the rebuilding of the Temple. This seemed to be a popular goal in the immediate aftermath of the destruction. Jews hoped that the Romans might allow them to rebuild their sanctuary. The Romans had taken every precaution to make sure the Jews would not revolt again. Moreover, the Jews were still too scattered and had not fully recovered from their last revolt. For this reason, relations between Romans and Jews at this time were relatively calm and the Romans may have some to the conclusion that Jews could remain calm and peaceful, even without their Temple.

---

[84] Goodman, Martin. *Rome and Jerusalem: The Clash of Ancient Civilizations*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2007.p. 439.

Jewish-Roman relations, however, took a turn for the worse under Domitian (81-96). During his reign Jews were persecuted severely and Domitian specifically was blatant in his "continuing refusal…to contemplate the rebuilding of the Jerusalem Temple".[85] Any chance the Romans had to instill favor in the Jews was gone. The "glorification of the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple remained integral to the public persona of each emperor in the following decades…such glorification led, more of less directly, to the Jewish frustration".[86] Jewish hatred of the Romans was carried into the Diaspora and Domitian's rule only made matters worse. Inconsistent Roman treatment of Jews continued through Emperor Hadrian's rule beginning in 118 CE. By this time, Jewish feelings about rebuilding the Temple and reestablishing a national identity were stronger than ever. In the early time of Hadrian "there [had been] an abortive attempt to rebuild the Jerusalem Temple, believed by some scholars to have had Hadrian's support".[87] This promise was never kept so in addition to the Jewish tax, Hadrian was adding to the overall Jewish dislike of the Romans. He furthered this by also prohibiting circumcision. Roman dislike continued to grow. The animosity against Rome culminated under the leadership of Simon Bar Kokhba. He drew upon Jewish hatred of the Romans as well as Jews hope for a messiah and began preparing for a revolt. Many Jews were in support of his "rebellion, others not. Those who supported him saw him as a messianic figure".[88]

---

[85] Goodman, Martin. *Rome and Jerusalem: The Clash of Ancient Civilizations*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2007. p. 442.
[86] Goodman, 443.
[87] Schiffman, Lawrence H. *From Text to Tradition: A History of Second Temple and Rabbinic Judaism*. Hoboken, NJ: Ktav Pub. House, 1991.p. 173.
[88] Schiffman, 173.

The initial success of the Bar Kokhba Revolt was a surprise to the Romans. They had underestimated the power and desire the Jews had to reclaim Jerusalem. What began as a guerilla struggle became a legitimate battle. By the end of this war, many Jews and Romans alike had been killed and the land in and around Jerusalem had been devastated. After the final revolt in 132 Jews were banned by imperial decree from entering Jerusalem. Once again, the Jews had failed in their attempt to reclaim their city.

The Temple was still deeply on the mind of the Jews and nationalism remained strong regardless of the aftermath of the Bar Kokhba revolt. However, it became clear to many Jews that reclaiming Jerusalem was not an attainable dream. This idea of nationalism got Jews through much of the Roman rule including the final Bar Kokhba revolt but after this revolt, "Jewish nationalism, as a viable political movement…[would] not re-emerge until the later part of the nineteenth century".[89] How Jews would now define themselves would reshape their religious practice, scripture, and leadership and ultimately paved the way for the future of Judaism. They once again had to reface the question of how to respond to a world with no Temple and no Jerusalem. Here is where the third and final response to the destruction emerges.

Third Response: Memorialize the Temple

The first response of forgetting the Temple proved unpopular. The second response of rebuilding the Temple proved to be impossible at this time. So finally, many Jews decided adapting to their situation was the only option. Jews were going to have to rebuild and restructure their religious practices and did so in large part by incorporating Temple language and images into their culture, rituals and institutions. The Temple

---

[89] Sicker, Martin. *Between Rome and Jerusalem: 300 Years of Roman-Judaean Relations*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2001. p. 186.

would not be forgotten. In fact, its memory would prove to be prominent in various aspects of Jewish life, including prayer, religious ceremonies, synagogues and scripture thus providing Jews an outlet for their continued desire to remember and honor the Temple. It would also provide Jews a way never to forget the Temple and to keep the desire for rebuilding ignited and forever in their minds. In addition these memories would provide a reservoir that would allow Jews to retain a latent hope for a renewed future that would reestablish Jews to their former political status and well as reestablishing their religious life.

Remembering the Temple and the Elimination of Sacrifice

Despite the lack of contact with Jerusalem, most Jews "never lost touch with their memories of the city or with the longing to return one day and restore their national and religious presence".[90] In the minds of many Jews, the Temple still informed Jewish hopes and aspirations. Even in their exile, Jews were "loyal to the one-sanctuary law", meaning that they refused to be influenced or distracted by other religions, regimes, practices etc. and that they remained dedicated to the legacy of the Temple and the law it protected.[91] However, the reality was that the Temple was gone. Changes were going to have to be made because Judaism could not continue as if nothing had happened. In terms of religious practice, some practices could be maintained, but others needed to be changed to fit a new religious life post-Temple. For example, without a Temple, religious sacrifice ended. Sacrifice was historically a way for Jews to communicate with God and atone for sins. Without sacrifice Judaism was essentially stripped of the core tool used to connect to God. Much debate surrounded whether or not sacrifice could happen outside the

[90] Mayer, Tamar, and Suleiman Ali. Mourad. *Jerusalem: Idea and Reality*. London: Routledge, 2008. p. 40.
[91] Deuteronomy 12:2 (NIV), Leaney, Alfred Robert Clare. *The Jewish and Christian World: 200 BC to AD 200*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Pr., 1984. p. 145.

Temple, or 'the place' as it was often referred. Jews had come to understand the alter of the Temple to be the only place where sacrifice could be offered. As a result, it was eventually determined that sacrifice would not continue without the Temple. Due to the sacredness of the Temple and the importance of sacrificing only on that alter, sacrifice had to be eliminated from Jewish practice and "was not again performed: that means of communication between man and God was silenced".[92] Sacrifice as a means of atonement, or communicating with God was now not an option. It now became important to find a replacement form of communication. One of the main ways the Temple's memory was maintained was through prayer. As Jews accepted this change in practice and began to look forward, prayer became one way to link God and humans; "prayer became the new type of worship, repentance the new source of atonement".[93] Prayer had always been a part of Judaism but now took on a new level of importance.

Prayer

The focus of prayer was on the hope of returning Jews to Jerusalem and rebuilding the Temple. One of the most basic and most often recited prayers in Jewish liturgy is the *'Amidah,* or *Shemoneh Esrei,* which is usually recited three times a day during services.[94] One of the main focuses of this prayer is on the restoration of the land of Israel and the reestablishment of the Davidic dynasty. The prayer includes subjects such as "the ingathering of the exiles, the establishment of national institutions, the removal of groups that threaten national unity, the welfare of scholars, the rebuilding of

[92] Goldhill, Simon. *The Temple of Jerusalem*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2005. p. 87.
[93] Goldenberg, Robert. "The Broken Axis: Rabbinic Judaism and the Fall of Jerusalem."*American Academy of Religion*. Web. 22 Feb. 2012. <http://jaar.oxfordjournals.org/content/XLV/3/353.short>
[94] Mayer, Tamar, and Suleiman Ali. Mourad. *Jerusalem: Idea and Reality*. London: Routledge, 2008. p. 40.

Jerusalem, and the restoration of the Davidic dynasty".[95] These hopes are recited traditionally by men three times a day, almost one thousand times a year, and reflect what is at the heart of Jewish thought.

The Temple remained in the hearts of Jews through prayer. As time went on, "the proper posture for Jewish prayer or orientation of synagogue buildings [was] toward the Temple Mount even though it then stood empty".[96] Prayer was not only a way to communicate with God but also to remember the Temple and what had taken place there.

Ceremonies

Ceremonies too included in them memories and references to the Temple. For example, at the end of a Jewish marriage ceremony a glass is broken "in memory of the destruction of Jerusalem, reminding all present that even in times of great happiness, the sorrows and misfortunes of the past should not be forgotten".[97] Often Psalm 137:5-6 is recited at weddings as well:

> If I forget you, O Jersualem,
> Let my right hand wither;
> Let my tongue cleave to my palate
> If I cease to think of you,
> If I do not keep Jerusalem in memory
> Even at my happiest hour.

Often grooms will place ashes on their heads in memory of the Temple and brides will wear large elaborate rings that represent the Temple, etc.[98] Regardless of which rituals are done during ceremonies, all point to the common theme of the importance to remember the Temple and Jewish history.

---

[95] Mayer, Tamar, and Suleiman Ali. Mourad. *Jerusalem: Idea and Reality*. London: Routledge, 2008. p. 40.
[96] Goldenberg, Robert. "The Broken Axis: Rabbinic Judaism and the Fall of Jerusalem."*American Academy of Religion*. Web. 22 Feb. 2012. <http://jaar.oxfordjournals.org/content/XLV/3/353.short>
[97] Mayer, 42.
[98] Mayer, 43.

Funerals were also an arena through which Jews chose to remember the Temple. Jews are often buried with their feet facing Jerusalem so that when the Messiah comes they can rise and walk directly towards Jerusalem and the Temple.[99]

Synagogues

As Jews saw that religious life was going to have to change, Jews began to establish an "extensive network of symbols and customs" that were used to preserve tradition, mainly through scripture and prayer.[100] It was these aspects of Jewish life that brought prominence to the synagogue. It still maintained a sense of holiness and was considered sacred space but was nowhere near the holiness of the Temple. With the Temple now destroyed, the synagogue would now serve as its temporary replacement. Through synagogues the Jewish people were now "equipped with a portable system of worship which it could carry throughout its wanderings, and which would preserve the closeness to God that had once been symbolized and embodied in the Jerusalem Temple".[101]

In seems that synagogues were also meant to be miniature versions of the Jerusalem Temple. The synagogue served as a protector of Jewish tradition, memory and custom while also mirroring the now destroyed Temple. For example, "synagogues in hilly Palestine [were to be] built at the 'high point' of the town in a manner similar to the Jerusalem Temple".[102] Further, the "use of the 'holy ark' to connote the Torah shrine" is seen in Babylonian literature.[103] Essentially, it is thought that the Torah shrine was used

---

[99] Mayer, Tamar, and Suleiman Ali. Mourad. *Jerusalem: Idea and Reality*. London: Routledge, 2008.p.43.
[100] Mayer, 40.
[101] Schiffman, Lawrence H. *From Text to Tradition: A History of Second Temple and Rabbinic Judaism*. Hoboken, NJ: Ktav Pub. House, 1991.p.166.
[102] Fine, Steven. *This Holy Place: On the Sanctity of the Synagogue during the Greco-Roman Period*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame, 1997.p.132.
[103] Fine, 134.

in place of the Ark of the Covenant in synagogues as a way of replicating the Jerusalem Temple within the smaller space of a synagogue. This *temple-ization* of the synagogue, particularly through the Torah, made the synagogue holy in the minds of Jews. As Jews, particularly in the Diaspora, had to adjust to life without the Temple they began to "set their attention upon their own cult objects, the scroll of the 'Sacred Scriptures'".[104] The synagogue was then accepted as the sacred institutions that would bridge the gap between the destruction of the Temple and the coming of the messianic age of reconstruction. It was understood that "on the model of the Temple, synagogues became places where through liturgy Jews could encounter the Divine".[105] By applying Temple concepts to a smaller, more manageable community space, the synagogue became the new space of worship and study in Judaism.

Rabbinic Judaism

As synagogues became more accepted into Jewish life, the role of rabbis became more important. Without Temple authorities, rabbis were needed to help answer the pressing questions of *what it now meant to be a Jew.* The rabbi became an essential figure in regular Jewish life. Historically, Rabbi means 'my lord' in Hebrew and is "not a priestly role but an address which indicates someone who has the authority to make religious judgments and who teaches religious law".[106] Only after Jewish life became centered on the synagogue did the rabbi gain prominence, particularly in the public sphere. It is important to note, however, that the transition from Temple to rabbinic Judaism was not immediate or instantaneous; unlike the end of the priestly rule.

---

[104] Fine, Steven. *This Holy Place: On the Sanctity of the Synagogue during the Greco-Roman Period*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame, 1997. p. 159.
[105] Fine, 160.
[106] Goldhill, Simon. *The Temple of Jerusalem*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2005. p. 88.

Josephus, who reviewed Jewish history after the destruction, concluded that the high priest system came to an end almost immediately after the Temple's destruction. Scholars find there is a lack of references to "any high priest after 70" and therefore conclude that this system ended with the Temple.[107] Rabbis, however, gained religious power slowly as Jews began looking for another form of authority.

Rabbis were particularly important in a political sense. Before the destruction, "the entire communal administrative and judicial structure [for Jews] was based on the Temple…with its destruction and the conversion of Judea into a standard Roman province, it was to be expected that the Jews become increasingly acclimated to the Roman political and cultural environment. The rabbis, however, intervened to prevent this from happening".[108] For example, Jews were encouraged to stay out of Roman courts and to instead use Jewish ones. Jewish separation under Roman rule became a top priority for rabbis. They spent much of their time teaching and studying in order to better inform their public.

Study

The Talmud begins to take shape in this difficult time. The Talmud consists of rabbinic debates and discussions and is meant to be read as a dialogue. It emerges under the rabbinic desire to find something to replace the Temple. This book focuses on collaborative study of the Hebrew Bible and of hashing out issues that arise from it. Study, mainly collaborative study, "becomes a cultural ideal. In rabbinic idealism studying the Talmud *replaces* the Temple: the proper service of God is to be found in the

---

[107] Leaney, Alfred Robert Clare. *The Jewish and Christian World: 200 BC to AD 200*. Cambridge U.a.: Cambridge Univ. Pr., 1984.p.121.
[108] Sicker, Martin. *Between Rome and Jerusalem: 300 Years of Roman-Judaean Relations*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2001. p.180-181.

study-hall".[109] Study was something that, despite the state of the Temple, Jews could take part in. The power and importance of study only grew with time and eventually, "study even challenge[d] prayer as the primary religious activity. As the synagogue became the hub of public religious expression, prayer became increasingly extended, significant – and discussed".[110] It is through the debates written in the Talmud that sacrifice is put to rest and prayer comes to the forefront. For example:

> When Rav Sheshet (a Jewish scholar) was engaged in a fast, he spoke thus after praying: 'Master of the Universe, it is revealed before You that at the time when the Holy Temple stood a person who sinned would offer a sacrifice, and he would offer from it only its fat and blood, and that alone would atone for him. And now, when there is no Temple, I have engaged in fasting and my own fat and blood have been diminished. May it be Your will that my fat and blood that are diminished be regarded as if I have offered them before You on the Altar, and may You do me favour.'[111]

The rabbis were continuously trying to find ways to replace the traditions that were performed in the Temple, and find other ways to accomplish the same things outside the Temple. Here, Rav Sheshet was seeking to replace sacrifice but in a way that still mirrored sacrifice. He sacrificed his own nourishment as a way of supplementing the traditional Temple sacrifice. The Temple came alive on the pages of the Talmud. It became understood that "to study [was] to memorialize the destroyed Temple".[112] It was widely accepted that communication with God had changed. The idea of sacrifice still remained, however it was altered to fit the current situation Jews found themselves in; without Temple. Fasting, prayer and study were now at the center of Judaism. The

---

[109] Goldhill, Simon. *The Temple of Jerusalem*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2005. p.91.
[110] Goldhill, 91.
[111] Goldhill, 91.
[112] Goldhill, 94.

Temple, however, was not forgotten but instead woven into these new ideas and new practices and kept alive through memory and ritual.

Medieval Judaism and the Temple

As Judaism entered the Middle Ages the language and image of the Temple remained in the hearts and minds of Jews. The most accepted view was that no action needed to be taken but that in the future, the Temple would be rebuilt and the Jews would return to Jerusalem as part of the messianic age. Judaism turned towards a state of waiting as opposed to a state of action and war. As was the case after the destruction and now into the Middle Ages, the center of Jewish life was the synagogue. The synagogue tended to "absorb and to develop the social life of the community…and held undisputed sway in all the concerns of Jews".[113] Jews clung to the synagogue and built their communities around them. This allowed Jews to venture even farther into the Diaspora and away from the city.

There were individuals Jews during this time, however, that couldn't help but long for the "spiritual homeland"[114] of Jerusalem and its Temple. While others continued on with the basic perspective of waiting on God to bring the messianic age and rebuild the Temple, people like Judah Halevi were thinking about Jerusalem differently. Halevi, a Jewish philosopher and poet, thought about Israel as more than just a future aim. Havlevi was "the exception, not the norm" in medieval Judaism in terms of his thinking

[113] Abrahams, Israel. *Jewish Life in the Middle Ages.* New York: Meridian and the Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, 1958.p.1-2.
[114] Ehrlich, Carl S. *Understanding Religions: Judaism.* Rosen Group, 2009.p.76.

about the Temple.[115] He wrote religious poetry agonizing over Jews inability to rebuild and be reunited with the Temple. He wrote,

> My heart is in the east, but I am at the farthest reaches of the west—
> How can I taste what I eat; and how can it agree with me?
> How can I fulfill my vows or my pledges, while Zion is in the territory of Edom, and I am chained to the west?
> It could be easy for me to renounce all the good of Spain, as
> It would be precious for me to see the dust of the ruined sanctuary.[116]

Halevi felt chained in the west and unable to get to Jerusalem. He was so sickened by his grief that even eating disturbed him. His feelings did not match with what the rest of the medieval Jewish world had accepted. Halevi did not want to wait even though the most dominate view of Jerusalem at the time was a lady in waiting. Halevi desired to get back to Israel, his spiritual homeland, and never have to leave again. The elite Spanish Jewry did not accept these ideas, in fact, "they ridiculed his God-consciousness, or *devekut*, and his efforts to return himself as well as his fellow Jews to God and to Zion".[117] Halevi even went as far as to say "it is better to dwell in the Holy Land, even in a town mostly inhabited by heathens, than abroad in a town chiefly peopled by Israelites; for he who dwells in the Holy Land is compared to him who has a God, whilst he who dwells abroad is compared to him who has no God".[118] Judah Halevi truly believed that the city of Jerusalem and the Temple that once stood there had such divine properties that the messiah would come only if the Jews were in Israel.

---

[115] Schmidt, Gilya G. "The Soul, God, and Zion in the Poetry of Yehuda Halevi." *Mystics Quarterly* 22.4 (1996): 144-62. p. 144.
[116] Ehrlich, Carl S. *Understanding Religions: Judaism*. Rosen Group, 2009.p.76. (My Heart is in the East by Judah Halevi, translated by Carl S. Ehrlich)
[117] Schmidt, Gilya G. "The Soul, God, and Zion in the Poetry of Yehuda Halevi." *Mystics Quarterly* 22.4 (1996): 144-62. p. 144.
[118] Schmidt, 146.

Although this was a minority view, the hope of returning to Israel and rebuilding the Temple was still present even in medieval Judaism. This thread, sometimes nothing but a faint line, remained throughout Jewish history and refused to fade completely. The Temple could never be forgotten. The Temple was either going to come back at the hands of God via the messianic age, or the Jewish people were to take action to reclaim it. Either way, the Jews remained united in their hopes that Jerusalem would one day belong to them and when it did the Temple would be rebuilt and enjoy a central role in the life of the city and in the identity as a people.

However, in the coming years, Jews would live their lives under the domination of two major religious societies, Christianity and Islam, and various political entities. While Jews were after communal autonomy, their political status was controlled by these larger religious and political systems. Jews had no independent political identity. The memorialization of the Temple, however, creates a memory of a time where such a political identity once existed and points to a future, however indeterminate, where that identity might reemerge.

III. The Temple in the Modern Period

Jews in Europe

Emancipation and the Reform Movement

At the beginning of the Modern period, the majority of Jews continued to live under conditions that had defined them throughout the Middle Ages. This meant that Jews lived in semi-autonomous communities, largely dependent on legal recognition and physical protection (or lack thereof) provided by local and state authorities. Despite various forms of involvement in early modern society, Jews largely remained a people set apart, with a distinct religious and legal status. The 18th century brought with it hopes of change through emancipation and new opportunities for Jews to define themselves and their aspirations. For the Jews, emancipation brought "profound shifts in ideas and conditions wrought by the Enlightenment and its liberal offspring: religious toleration, secularization, scientific thought, and the apotheosization of reason, individualism, the law of contract and choice".[119] Jews were trying to find ways to "both take up the offer of citizenship and remain meaningfully Jewish".[120] Despite the language of equality circulating Europe, Jews struggled to gain acceptance in societies. One of the consequences of the political changes at this time was for Jews to redirect their political identities and loyalties. In an age when Jews were given (however tentatively or reluctantly) recognition in the states in which they lived, their political allegiance often shifted from the local semi-autonomous Jewish communities that had governed their lives up to that point to the more modern nation-states. The state became their new authority and their religion was to be what they made of it.. In order to gain European acceptance

[119] Birnbaum, Pierre, and Ira Katznelson. *Paths of Emancipation: Jews, States, and Citizenship*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1995.p. 4.
[120] Birnbaum, 5.

they were going to have to shed their separate political identity. Europeans fueled this shift by expecting sometimes even demanding that Jews shed their distinct identities, and most Jews accepted this bargain. Jews found themselves in lands where "both the supporters and opponents of emancipation–despite their differences—possessed complementary expectations from the grant of Jewish rights: the Jews, as a people, should disappear".[121]

With Jews being more and more exposed to European cultures, attitudes towards religious observance began to shift. Jews became more open to new ideas as contact between Jew and Gentile increased. Gradually a "more positive attitude toward the study of secular disciplines" began to emerge.[122] As Jewish desire for equality heightened, their tolerance of secularism increased. In Germany in particular, a growing percent of the Jewish population were pushing aside religious interests for secular ones.[123] The nineteenth century not only brought ideas of assimilation to the Jewish community, it also brought religious reform that can be seen particularly in the Reform movement. A new form of rabbinic leadership was emerging as "men appeared, combining the traditional education gained in youth with years spent in German university…they had no choice but to undertake the lonely and difficult task of attempting to synthesize themselves" and find a way to bring the religious and secular together.[124] Rabbinic leadership was not limited to the influence of secular education, however. Even very traditional rabbis "lent their

[121] Vago, Bela. *Jewish Assimilation in Modern times*. Boulder, CO: Westview, 1981. p. 6-7.
[122] Meyer, Michael A. *Response to Modernity: A History of the Reform Movement in Judaism*. New York: Oxford UP, 1988. p. 12.
[123] Meyer, 12.
[124] Meyer, 102.

support to modernization as long as it did not involve outright violation of Jewish law".[125]

Rabbi Samson Wolf Rosenfeld (1780-1862) was one of these who refused to violate traditional Jewish law while at the same time embraced modernization. For example, he began "giving regular edifying sermons in the German language…he edited a German-language weekly Jewish newspaper called *Das Fullhorn* (The Horn of Plenty), which included sermons, poetry on Jewish themes, popular theology, and news reports of Jewish interest from all over Europe".[126] Rosenfeld was not the only rabbinic leader to make these sorts of changes. Rabbi Samuel Levi Eger (1769-1842) who was more traditional refused to "tamper with customs…considered it permissible and desirable to make the religious service more attractive through increased solemnity and heightened aesthetic appeal".[127] These types of reforms were happening all over Europe. It was understood that the religious leadership was not only to lead their congregation but to also be "loyal servants of the state".[128] In many places, the rabbi "was expected to advance public morality, preach law abiding religiosity, and generally serve the states interests. Jewish spiritual leaders were especially exhorted to encourage occupational integration and cultural Germanization, to help 'raise' the level of fellow Jews to where they might be worthy of civic equality".[129] As the Reform Movement took off, a small Orthodox population stood its ground. The Jews in Europe found themselves divided over the need and legitimacy of change due to modernization.

---

[125] Meyer, Michael A. *Response to Modernity: A History of the Reform Movement in Judaism.* New York: Oxford UP, 1988. p. 102.
[126] Meyer, 102.
[127] Meyer, 102.
[128] Meyer, 103.
[129] Meyer, 103.

As the Reform Movement grew throughout Europe, Jews began to develop an attachment to their local lands. Many of their hopes usually expressed through their ritual prayers, were now seemingly empty of significance. For example, like their counterparts in Germany, "French Jews—even the more conservative among them—denied they were in exile and evidenced little longing for Jerusalem".[130] In 1843, many of the most influential Jewish leaders in France expressed new ideas about Jerusalem and the Jews as a whole. Lazare Wogue, a French rabbi expressed his thoughts by saying, "We are not a people, we are a religion".[131] Samuel Cahen, a French journalist and expert in Hebrew, said more pointedly, "Jerusalem is no longer for us anything but a memory; it need no longer be a hope".[132] Jews were denying their historical narrative and claiming a new one. These reform Jews no longer felt an attachment to Jerusalem but now felt that their new lands were sufficient. The idea of a messianic age was no longer tied to "a special dynasty of Israel…French Jews (like their counterparts in the east) believed in the mission of Israel in the Diaspora. In propagating a purer faith, they were convinced, Jews helped bring nearer the messianic goal".[133] Jews continued to desire for a messianic age, however, for many Jews it was no longer tied to a particular land (i.e. no longer tied to Jerusalem). Jews were content in their local lands in Europe as long as they were able to continue to work towards fuller assimilation and social advancement. Jews still held on to the hope that they would one day be fully integrated into the states where they lived.

Not all of Jewish traditional values concerning Jerusalem were forgotten, however. There were still Jews dedicated to their religious history and traditions. For

---

[130] Meyer, Michael A. *Response to Modernity: A History of the Reform Movement in Judaism*. New York: Oxford UP, 1988. p. 170.
[131] Meyer, 170.
[132] Meyer, 170.
[133] Meyer, 170.

example, Jewish elderly would travel to Jerusalem in their final days in order to be in their sacred city when they died.[134] No matter how few these traditions or memories of the Temple and Jerusalem were, many Jews still felt ties to the Holy Land. These few Jews who held onto this memory would soon become the majority as Jews began to experience persecution and cultural decline under Europe's modernist project.

Assimilation under Question

Regardless of the rhetoric surrounding emancipation, Jews were still experiencing harsh discrimination. After leaving the ghetto and entering European society, many Jews entered occupations they had never been in before. As a result, "the Jew was considered a competitor—all the more so since some had grown quite rich after leaving the ghetto".[135] Jews found themselves still separate from society no matter how hard they tried.

Assimilation appeared to be more difficult than had originally been thought. Anti-Semitism emerged "out of a disjunction between the rhetoric of emancipation and the social reality of emancipated Jews—that is, out of a growing sense that political emancipation was, at best, an incomplete means of Jewish assimilation".[136] Life for the Jews in European countries was becoming more unstable and painful. Assimilation wasn't working and out of this anti-Semitism established itself. Anti-Semites claimed that "the presence and prosperity of Jews were antithetical to German national development".[137] Despite Jew's attempts to assimilate, anti-Jewish sentiment remained. Because of anti-Semitism, assimilation comes into question. Jews needed solutions to their suffering in Europe. At this time, several Jewish thinkers began to reconsider the

---

[134] Laqueur, Walter. *A History of Zionism*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972. p. 42.
[135] Laqueur, Walter. *The Changing Face of Antisemitism: From Ancient times to the Present Day*. New York, NY: Oxford UP, 2006. p. 77.
[136] Lupovitch, Howard N. *Jews and Judaism in World History*. London: Routledge, 2010. p. 180.
[137] Lupovitch, 181.

value much less the success of emancipation of Jewish life in the age of the modern nation-state. For a growing number of Jews, the hope that assimilation and acculturation could bring about an answer to the long-standing Jewish Question now seemed dubious at best if not an outright failure. Protection from physical danger and social atrophy would need to come from a different source.

Early Hints of Zionism: Hess, Kalischer, Pinsker

The modern Zionist movement grew from a belief that nationalism was the solution to their suffering, and in order to survive as a people Jews needed a state of their own. From this idea, Zionists sparked a desire to return to Jerusalem and regain a land they saw as once theirs. By the turn of the nineteenth century, the Jewish population in Palestine "numbered roughly 5,000…nearly forty years later, the British vice-consul estimated that approximately 10,000 Jews lived there. Within another forty years, that is by 1880, the Jewish population more than doubled, reaching 25,000…from 1874 onward [Jews] constituted a residential majority".[138]

Moses Hess, a Jewish philosopher, lived in Germany for two years in the 1860's and became acquainted with German anti-Semitism. Hess is considered one of the first to push Zionism's ideals although it was not called Zionism yet. For Hess, "a Jewish state was not an end in itself but a means towards the just social order to which all peoples aspire".[139] His ideas were not articulated as successfully as he had hoped. However, his book *Rome and Jerusalem* "was bound to make little impact precisely because he was so far ahead of his time".[140] Another author writing about ideas that would eventually come to be known as Zionist ideas was Hirsch Kalischer, a rabbi in Thorn. Drawing from the

[138] Stein, Leslie. *The Hope Fulfilled: The Rise of Modern Israel*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003. p. 1.
[139] Laqueur, Walter. A History of Zionism. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972. p. 52.
[140] Laqueur, 53.

Bible, the Mishna and the Talmud, Kalischer authors a little pamphlet entitled *Drishat Zion* (Seeking Zion) that focused on his belief that:

> The redemption of Israel will not come as a sudden miracle, the Messiah will not be sent from heaven to sound a blast on his great trumpet and cause all people to tremble. Nor will he surround the Holy City with a wall of fire or cause the Holy Temple to descent from heaven. Only stupid people could believe such nonsense; wise men knew that redemption would be achieved only gradually and, above all, would come about only as the result of the Jews' own efforts.[141]

Kalischer, through his pamphlet, posed a challenge to European Jews. He challenged them to take action. Waiting on the messianic age was "nonsense" and the only way to accomplish redemption of Israel was to take up the Zionist idea and act. Like Hess' book however, this pamphlet was not widely circulated and very little came of his work until the stage of Zionism had been set completely.

In the 1880's more Zionist ideas came out of the Russian Jewry. Leo Pinsker, a physician, wrote a pamphlet after realizing that Jewish assimilation in Russia was a lost cause. His pamphlet was published anonymously in Germany and "became a milestone in the development of Zionist thought".[142] Pinsker's basic thought was that if Jews refuse to help themselves, no one else will. Pinsker's solution to the Jewish question "lay in an awakening of Jewish national consciousness, which would pave the way for the establishment of a sovereign Jewish state".[143] Pinsker's pamphlet received attention from other Jewish writers but did not affect the Jewish people for whom the pamphlet was intended as much as Pinsker had hoped. It wasn't until the 1890's, with Theodor Herzl, that Zionism began to take root with the masses.

---

[141] Laqueur, Walter. A History of Zionism. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972. p. 54-55.
[142] Laqueur, 70.
[143] Stein, Leslie. *The Hope Fulfilled: The Rise of Modern Israel*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003. p. 14.

Herzl was a well-known journalist and play writer in Austria who, in 1896 published a booklet entitled *Der Judenstaat* (The Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question). As a journalist, Herzl had seen many parts of Europe and as a result was able to observe life for Jews in different places. In 1894, while in Paris, Herzl witnesses the incredible anti-Semitism play out in the Dreyfus affair where a Jew was accused of treason. Herzl's conclusion after his experiences in Paris are that Jews are not safe anywhere. He writes, "in our native lands where we have lived for centuries we are still decried as aliens, often by men whose ancestors had not yet come at a time where Jewish sighs had long been heard in the country. The majority decides who the 'alien' is; this, and all else in the relations between peoples, is a matter of power".[144] He reflects on the fact that he has seen Jews attempt to assimilate, as he himself did. As life for the Jews got more difficult, however, Herzl began to change his mind.

Herzl blamed part of the Jewish condition on their experiences during the Middle Ages explaining that the Jewish vices were a result of their history. Jews were "forced into degrading occupations, squeezed for gold relentlessly by the powerful, Jews became 'avaricious and eager for plunder' in order to survive".[145] Herzl released the Jews from some of the responsibility for their current conditions. He wanted them to have a place of their own, a national identity and a nation in which to live. In terms of a location for this Jewish nation, Herzl recalls that "Palestine was [their] unforgettable historic homeland" and that the name itself would be a rally cry that would bring the Jewish community together.[146] He favored Palestine but also considered Argentina as a gathering place for the Jews and their new state. Herzl's plan steamed from a desire for the Jews to escape

---

[144] Laqueur, Walter. *A History of Zionism*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972. p. 86.
[145] Kornberg, Jacques. *Theodor Herzl: From Assimilation to Zionism.* American, UP 1993. p. 21.
[146] Hertzberg, Arthur. *The Zionist Idea*. 1959. p. 222.

anti-Semitism; for he believed that the formation of a Jewish state would be a conclusion of peace for the Jews.

Zionist thinking about the Temple

Political Zionism

What is striking about Herzl's Jewish state is that there is little mention of the Temple. His political movement did not encompass many religious ideas or hopes. He writes, "I consider the Jewish question neither a social nor a religious one, even though it sometimes takes these and other forms. It is a national one".[147] His greatest concern was that of a Jewish state and to bring his people out of their suffering at the hands of anti-Semitism. When he did mention religious aspects of Jerusalem he noted that the "Temple will be visible from long distances, for it is only our ancient faith that had kept us together…" however, "we shall keep out priests within the confines of their temples in the same way as we keep our professional army within the confines of their barracks".[148] Herzl knew the Temple was an important component of Jewish history, for it was part of what kept them united. However his focus was elsewhere. Herzl was saddened by the fact that "nine-tenths of world Jewry [was] literally starving, fighting for their bare existence".[149] With many Jews in this state, survival and a safe place for the Jews to live were Herzl's greatest concerns. His ideas were a response to anti-Semitism, not a response to religious persecution or religious freedom. Herzl did not want the Jews to

[147] Laqueur, Walter. *A History of Zionism*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972. p. 86.
[148] Prior, Michael. *Zionism and the State of Israel: A Moral Inquiry*. London: Routledge, 1999. p. 5.
[149] Laqueur, Walter. *A History of Zionism*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972. p. 105.

have to commit "national suicide" in order to exist. This was the main focus of Herzl's political Zionism; to make sure that the Jewish nation could prosper.[150]

Herzl, similar to others before him like Hess, "was not interested in bringing the Messiah. They were interested in using the dynamics of modern nationalism to find a non-miraculous, non-messianic resolution to the Jewish problem".[151] Many of the most radical Jews to follow Zionism after Herzl had experienced little or no Judaism in their homes growing up. The movement was becoming more about the fact that no matter how much they assimilated "the doors of university fraternities and university appointments remained closed to them".[152] For many, Zionism seemed their only hope for the life they desired and it became strictly a political tool.

Cultural Zionism

Ahad Ha'am, another major Zionist thinker, stressed a new idea called cultural Zionism. For Ha'am, the Zionist idea was "not to be found…in mass action but in the cultural revival and modernization of the Jewish people through the agency of a carefully chosen few".[153] Ha'am, was unlike Herzl and desired a slow and steady change as opposed to radical politically driven change. Ha'am used the imagery of a tree to communicate his feeling about the direction Judaism should take; strong and slow growing. He urged Jews to "revitalize the idea of the national renascence, and use every possible means to strengthen its hold and deepen its roots, until it becomes an organic element in the Jewish consciousness and an independent dynamic force. Only in this

---

[150] Kallen, Horace Meyer. *Zionism and World Politics; a Study in History and Social Psychology*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Page, 1921. p. 73.
[151] Schafler, Samuel. "Modern Zionism: An Historic Perspective." *Judaism* 30.1 (1981): 111-119. *ATLA Religion Database, with ATLA Serials.* Web. 8Apr.2012.p.113.
[152] Schafler, 114.
[153] Hertzberg, Arthur. "The Zionist Idea". 1959. p. 250.

way…can the Jewish soul be freed from its shackles…".[154] Ha'am wanted to start small. He thought that the current Zionist movement was neglecting Judaism's spiritual (or cultural) aspects. He urged people to understand that,

> [Jews do not] need an independent State, but only the creation in its native land of conditions favorable to its development: a good sized settlement or Jews working without hindrance in every branch of civilization, from agriculture and handicrafts to science and literature. This Jewish settlement, which will be a gradual growth, will become in course of time the center of the nation, wherein its spirit will find pure expression and develop in all its aspects to the highest degree of perfection of which it is capable. Then, from this center, the spirit of Judaism will radiate to the great circumference, to all the communities of the Diaspora, to inspire them with new life and to preserve the over-all unity of our people. When our national culture in Palestine had attained that level, we may be confident that it will produce men in the Land of Israel itself who will be able, at a favorable moment, to establish a State there—one which will be not merely a State of Jews but a really Jewish State.[155]

Ha'am wanted a small number of Jews to establish themselves in Palestine and build a small but strong community there in the hopes to expand steadily. Cultural Zionism was a slower trickle of Jews into Palestine than what the political Zionists had in mind.

In terms of cultural Zionists view of the Temple, once again like Herzl, very little time is dedicated to talks of rebuilding or memorializing it. This group had a little more concern with tradition and religion, but that was not its focus. There emerged a new culture not tied to the traditional religious values and practices, including the Temple. The ultimate goal was still to establish a Jewish state in order to decrease Jewish suffering around the world.

---

[154] Hertzberg, 255.
[155] Hertzberg,.267.

Religious Zionism

Not all Jews supported Zionism. There were plenty of deeply religious Jews who were in stark opposition to the Zionist movement. Herzl's friend and Vienna's chief rabbi Gudemann attacked Herzl's ideas of Zionism saying that the "Jews were not a nation, that they had in common only the belief in God, and that Zionism was incompatible with the teachings of Judaism".[156] There were however deeply religious Jews who also took on the Zionist mentality. This is where the hopes of rebuilding the Temple reemerge.

Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook (1865-1935) was a renowned Torah scholar and Jewish thinker and one of the founders of religious Zionism. He later became the first chief rabbi of Palestine after the British mandate. Kook's form of Zionism was a combination of messianic hopes and Zionist aspirations. He mandated the goal of the "reestablishment of the Temple as a key Zionist objective".[157] He therefore "both seriously prepare himself for future office as priest of the restored cult in the Temple in Jerusalem and accept all builders of Palestine, heretics included, as unwitting instruments of the even more manifest Redemption".[158] Kook was not in favor of political Zionism, but decided it was a tool God was using to bring about the eventual messianic age and the restoration of the Temple.

Kook believed that any revelations or thoughts that Jews had were significantly more pure inside the Holy Land than in the Diaspora. There was a pureness to Eretz Israel, or Land of Israel. Kook believed that "the greater one's yearning for and attachment to Eretz Israel, the purer his thoughts became, for they then live[d] in the air

---

[156] Laqueur, Walter. *A History of Zionism*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972. p. 96.
[157] Inbari, Motti, and Shaul Vardi. *Jewish Fundamentalism and the Temple Mount: Who Will Build the Third Temple?* Albany: State University of New York, 2009. p. 18.
[158] Hertzberg, Arthur. *The Zionist Idea*. 1959. p. 417.

of Eretz Israel, which sustains everyone who longs to behold the Land".[159] Everything would be better in the Holy Land. Thoughts would be clearer, and the minds of the Jews would be lucid and more susceptible to receiving revelation from God. For in Kook's opinion, Diaspora Judaism was "disintegrating at an alarming rate, and there is no hope for it unless it replants itself by the wellspring of life, of inherent sanctity, which can be found only in Eretz Israel".[160] Rabbi Kook believed that Judaism would come close to disintegrating into non-existence if it was not soon reunited with the Holy Land and its Temple. His plans for a future Jewish State included a Temple due to his belief in Jerusalem as a sacred and holy city and his hopes of the Messiah returning there. For Kook, part of the Jewish identity remained in the Temple and thus was a necessary component to the future state. He essentially made Zionism "part of God's plan".[161]

From the very beginning of the Zionist movement, around 1882, various groups of Jews began to slowly ascend (aliyah) to Jerusalem. With each movement Jewish feelings gained strength and confidence. Zionism gave Jews a platform on which to vocalize their views and change was coming. As Jews entered the early to mid-1900's change was in the air and the Temple was going to be at the forefront.

Political Changes of 1948 and 1967: Transition in Zionist Thinking

Up until 1917, Zionist thinking was largely theoretical. It wasn't until the conflict entered international debate that Zionists began to see their hopes come to life.

The Balfour Declaration (1917)

---

[159] Hertzberg, Arthur. *The Zionist Idea*. 1959. p. 420.
[160] Hertzberg, 429.
[161] Gorenberg, Gershom. *The End of Days: Fundamentalism and the Struggle for the Temple Mount*. New York: Free, 2000. p. 88.

World War I created significant change for the Jewish situation. The Ottoman Empire fell and the Sykes-Picot agreement divided much of the land between the British and the French leaving the rest of Palestine under an undefined international administration. British Prime Minister, Lloyd George decided on an advance into Palestine however and British forces captured Jerusalem on 9 December 1917. Around the time of WWI's outbreak, Jews were estimated to have made up 5-10 percent of the Palestinian population and it became clear that British support was necessary in order for the Zionists to accomplish their dream.[162]

In 1917, Zionists received their first big political backing by the British through the Balfour Declaration. The Declaration read:

> View with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, of the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in another other country.[163]

This declaration was an attempt to appease all parties. The British wanted to prevent the growth of pan-Arab nationalism in the area while also solving the problem of Jewish immigration in Britain. However, not all Jews were supporters of Zionism and there was immediate Arab opposition to the Zionist enterprise as well. Serious riots broke out as a result.

Wall Politics

Although many Zionists leaders like Herzl and Hess expressed only passing interest in the Temple, others used the remains of the temple complex, the Western Wall,

---

[162] Prior, Michael. *Zionism and the State of Israel: A Moral Inquiry*. London: Routledge, 1999. p. 12.
[163] Schneer, Jonathan. *The Balfour Declaration: The Origins of the Arab-Israeli Conflict*. New York: Random House, 2010. p. 341.

as a potent symbol of political authority. The Western Wall had become an important site of religious worship since the 16th century. For religious persons the Wall became a place to come to pray, to mourn the loss of the Temple, and seek its restoration and the coming of the messianic age. It also became an instrument to rally forces seeking to bring about political change.[164]

During 1928-1929 the Wall would be become a "microcosm of the wider contest over Palestine's future".[165] For example, in 1925 Jewish religious leaders attempted to use benches and seats during worship. This was considered a breech in the status quo which had been established and wasn't supposed to be veered from. The status quo was introduced by the Ottomans in 1852 in a "futile attempt to avoid war…[they] issued a decree freezing the rights of worship and possession of the religious communities in the Holy Places of Christendom" and these ideas have since been applied to Muslim and Jewish holy places in Jerusalem.[166] The Palestinian government ruled in agreement with Muslim objections to benches at the wall. This clash of religion in the political sphere had historically surrounded the Temple while it stood and now, even in its destruction, the Temple Mount still maintained its grasp in politics.

Furthering this clash between religion and politics, Zionist leader Menachem Ussishkin gave a speech in 1928 in a Jerusalem synagogue. Ussishkin was known for waving legitimacy from Arab demands. He said, "Let us swear that the Jewish people

---

[164] Gorenberg, Gershom. *The End of Days: Fundamentalism and the Struggle for the Temple Mount*. New York: Free, 2000. p. 84.
[165] Lundsten, Mary Ellen. "Wall Politics: Zionist and Palestinian Strategies in Jerusalem, 1928."*Journal of Palestine Studies* 8.1 (1978): 3-27.p.5.
[166] Eordegian, Marlen. "British and Israeli Maintenance of the Status Quo in the Holy Places of Christendom." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 35 (2003): 307-28, quote on p. 307.

will not rest or be silent until our national home is built on our Mt. Moriah".[167] Here, Ussishkin is harkening back in history to a Temple built by David. What Ussishkin meant by "Temple" was political independence, "but his declaration [was meant to] conjure up other associations, in the minds of Jews and Arabs alike".[168] This political, and yet deeply religious tool was used by many Zionists in order to try to mobilize support for their cause. In this way, the temple returns to its former position as an emblem of Jewish statehood.

The Western Wall, also known as the Wailing Wall, was a point of contention between Arabs and Jews but was also used as a political platform for demonstrations. Jabotinski, the leader of the Revisionists, coined the slogan "the wall is ours" as they protested injustices.[169] Vladimir Jabotinski, and his revisionist ideas made the "wall a national rather than a religious symbol".[170] His hopes for the future were based on the "possibility of creating a dedicated corps of young people capable of fighting for the Jewish state".[171] There was a delicate line being drawn between religion and nationalism and the Temple Mount was where the two come together. In this case the contemporary debate was drawing upon traditions of the Jewish past but then projecting them through a lens of political objectives; in this case to mobilize support for a national home in Palestine. These emotional ties to history are picked up by those in the political sphere when they will serve a political purpose.

---

[167] Gorenberg, Gershom. *The End of Days: Fundamentalism and the Struggle for the Temple Mount*. New York: Free, 2000. p. 89.
[168] Gorenberg, 89.
[169] Zeitlin, Irving M. *Jews: The Making of a Diaspora People*. MA: Polity, 2012. p. 272.
[170] Zeitlin, 272.
[171] Benewick, Robert, and Philip Green. *The Routledge Dictionary of Twentieth-century Political Thinkers*. London: Routledge, 1992. p. 149.

UN Partition Plan 1947

With tensions rising in Palestine, the British were looking to get out of their agreed mandate. "His Majesty's Government declared (18 February 1947) that, 'the only course now open to us is to submit the problem to the judgment of the UN'".[172] After touring the region, the General Assembly recommended a partition. This partition would give roughly half the land to Jews and half to Arabs "even though by 1948 Jews had still reached only 6.6 per cent of the total ownership of Palestine".[173] Understandably, the Arab population was not in favor of the Partition Plan for they were losing land to Jews. For some this plan seemed like "Western civilization's gesture of repentance for the Holocaust".[174] The plan, however, did not give holy places back to the Jews. The land divided excluded the Old City where religious places of importance rested. Ben-Gurion, knowing that the Jews had not been able to reclaim the Temple Mount, said, "I know of no greater achievement by the Jewish people…in its long history since it became a people".[175]

At this stage, Zionists were willing to give up the Temple in order to gain recognition of a Jewish State at an international level. Zionists had "managed to obtain an international warrant for a small piece of the earth for the Jewish people" and were willing to put aside their most sacred place in order to obtain their own state.[176] In this highly politicized period, political gain came first. Ben-Gurion "knew that there would be

---

[172] Prior, Michael. *Zionism and the State of Israel: A Moral Inquiry*. London [u.a.: Routledge, 1999. p. 23.
[173] Prior, 23-24.
[174] Morris, Benny. *Righteous Victims: A History of the Zionist-Arab Conflict, 1881-1999*. New York: Knopf, 1999. p. 186.
[175] Morris, 186.
[176] Morris, 186.

war" and that the Temple could be gained at a later time.[177] However, it is important to note that Jewish leadership at the time was willing to accept an agreement that did not include their holy Temple. Jews made a pragmatic distinction between what could be gained in the current political climate and what would have to wait. What they judged as being most important was the establishment of a legitimate state. Unfortunately, war broke out before the Partition Plan could be implemented. However, Jewish reaction clearly identifies where the Jews priorities were; the need to establish a legitimate state. They placed their desire to reclaim the Temple Mount further back because an opportunity was presented that would allow one of their other desires to be accomplished. Objectives of the Jews surfaced when the political climate was conducive to their desires. At this point, the Jews couldn't have asked for the Temple Mount. It was necessary that they take what they could get at that particular point; essentially rearranging their priorities depending on what could actually be accomplished. The Temple Mount would not bring political gains to this discussion so it was tabled for the time being.

1948 the State of the Temple in the Newly Established State of Israel

War broke out between the Israeli and Arab populations around 1948. Right away it was clear that the Arabs were no match for the Israeli guerilla warfare. Roads were fought over in order to gain access to cities like Jerusalem. Arabs began to flee. Arab towns "were emptied of their Palestinian residents, with their assets falling to the Zionists…hundreds of Arab villages were depopulated and destroyed".[178] On May 14, 1948 Ben-Gurion (soon to be Prime Minister) declared the establishment of the State of Israel. On May 28, 1948 the Jewish quarter of the Old City, where the Temple Mount

[177] Morris, Benny. *Righteous Victims: A History of the Zionist-Arab Conflict, 1881-1999*. New York: Knopf, 1999. p. 186.
[178] Prior, Michael. *Zionism and the State of Israel: A Moral Inquiry*. London: Routledge, 1999. p. 27.

stood, was taken by Jordanian troops. Strategically, the Old City wasn't that important but symbolically, "it stood for the Jewish past and hopes for the future".[179] As a result, the establishment of the Jewish State happened without its Old City or its most significant holy place.

1967 "The Temple Mount is in Our Hands"

Although 1948 was a victory for the Israeli population, tension between Israeli's and Arabs still continued. Neither side wanted to negotiate an agreement with the other. Arab discontent was still strong and Israeli's wanted to conquer the Old City and other land not under Jordanian rule. In 1948 the ceasefire had cost Jews their Holy City and they were not about to let Jordanian control remain. Colonel Mordechai Gur of the Israeli army was ordered to attack on a Wednesday morning in 1967 which began the Six-Day War. After just six days, Gur proclaimed that "the Temple Mount is in our hands!".[180] The Temple now encompassed not just the entire history of the Jews but also religious, political and national notions in the current political arena. The recapturing of the Temple Mount and Old Jerusalem was the Six-Days War's most religiously and politically charged moment and marked the Israeli success. It was recorded that "some of Gur's men flew an Israeli flag on the Dome of the Rock" as if to say that "everything had turned out impossibly better than expected" and that they were not going to give up this sacred place again.[181] However, in the aftermath "Israel created a division of holy space at the Temple Mount. Al-Haram al-Sharif remained a place of Muslim worship; it was controlled by

---

[179] Gorenberg, Gershom. *The End of Days: Fundamentalism and the Struggle for the Temple Mount*. New York: Free, 2000. p. 93.
[180] Gorenberg, 99.
[181] Gorenberg, 99.

Islamic bodies".[182] Jews expressed their ties to the Mount through the Western Wall. They also began archeological excavations next to the Mount, not on the Mount, expressing "acceptance that power had limits—that Jews were still living in history, not in the days of the messiah. The rabbinic consensus that Jews should not thread on the Mount hinted at the same message that was crucial for maintaining separation of worship".[183] Each religious group felt *enough* power over their religious space to allow the other to exist there. Essentially the "Temple Mount was in Jewish hands, yet the hands could not close around it".[184] This would eventually lead to frustrated religious Jews who had intense messianic expectations for the holy place. This frustration by the religious, as well as the political microcosm that was the Temple Mount, ultimately leads us to the current political climate in contemporary Jerusalem.

The Temple as used in Contemporary Politics

The Temple Mount today reflects 2,000 years of history starting with Herod until the present. Its existence is deeply religious as well as deeply political. It remains a point of contention today not only because of its historically religious significance but because of the political significance that has been placed on it for the sake of religion. The Mount represents the political and national clash between Muslims and Jews while individually allowing each religion to make claims to its holiness. "It's emotional, religious, symbolic, and national-political significance for Jews and Muslims—as for Israelis, Palestinians, and Muslim states—renders the Temple Mount a crucial element in any attempt to reach

[182] Gorenberg, Gershom. *The End of Days: Fundamentalism and the Struggle for the Temple Mount*. New York: Free, 2000. p. 234.
[183] Gorenberg, 234.
[184] Gorenberg, 235.

a settlement in Jerusalem".[185] The Mount is a microcosm of the overall conflict in Jerusalem. Muslim holy sites sit on the Temple Mount, but Jewish law prohibits Jews from setting foot where the Temple once was.

Today, many groups use the Temple Mount to further their political aspirations. Groups like the Temple Institute, the Temple Mount Faithful and the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA) remain influential political groups in Israel and around the world using the Temple as their main platform for political change. Rabbi Chaim Richman, head of the Temple Institute, is quoted on their website saying,

> In our time, there is a great spiritual awakening concerning the importance of the Temple. The Temple Institute views this awakening as Divinely-inspired, and actively seeks to share the desire and knowledge of the Temple with people around the world, thereby laying the foundation for the spiritual revolution that will precipitate the rebuilding of the Holy Temple...and the fulfillment of this prophecy in our time.[186]

This group put on a Temple Mount Awareness Day March 25, 2012, which featured highly esteemed speakers and live music to bring light to the current issue of freedom to worship on the Temple Mount, as guaranteed by Israeli law.

The Temple Mount Faithful, as discussed in the introduction, also has taken up forms of activism in the political scene in order to get their religious perspectives heard. The Faithful even went so far as to select the cornerstone of what they hoped to be the Third Temple in 1990. Today, Gershon Salomon and his Faithful are working on sending letters to the Pope asking for the "Holy Temple Menorah, the Vessels and the Treasures

---

[185] Ahimeir, Ora and Breger, Marshall. "Jerusalem: A City and Its Future". 2002. p. 269.

[186] "The Temple Institute: The International Department." *The Temple Institute: The Holy Temple in Jerusalem*. Web. 18 Apr. 2012. <http://www.templeinstitute.org/international.htm>.

that are presently located in the Vatican".[187] Salomon claims that they "know very well that the Menorah, the Vessels and the Treasures that were taken to Rome have remained in the vaults of the Vatican. Travelers and visitors to the Vatican throughout history have reported seeing them".[188] The Faithful are concerned about these holy treasures because they are seen as necessary items to put in the Third Temple when it is rebuilt. The Faithful are working so that in their lifetime the Holy Third Temple will be built. Calling upon the Pope is but one way that they have reached into the political and religious realms in order to accomplish their goal.

In America, the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA) had also taken up the Temple Mount in order to advance certain political objectives. The ZOA presents themselves as pro-Israel, promoting good relations between the U.S. and Israel, and fighting for the Jewish people in Israel. In February of this year the ZOA put out a press release calling for an end to police and Muslim Wakf discrimination against Jews on the Temple Mount. Their claim was that "for year, Israeli authorities have been engaging in many discriminatory practices on the Temple Mount directed against openly identifiable Jews".[189] They place blame on the Muslim Wakf and Israeli police for the discrimination

---

[187] Salomon, Gershon. "A Call to Everyone in the World to Send a Letter to the Pope." *The Temple Mount Faithful: Working to Build the Third Temple in Jerusalem*. 20 Feb. 2012. Web. 18 Apr. 2012. <http://www.templemountfaithful.org/Articles/letter-to-the-pope.htm>.

[188] Salomon, Gershon. "A Call to Everyone in the World to Send a Letter to the Pope." *The Temple Mount Faithful: Working to Build the Third Temple in Jerusalem*. 20 Feb. 2012. Web. 18 Apr. 2012. <http://www.templemountfaithful.org/Articles/letter-to-the-pope.htm>.

[189] "Zionist Organization of America - Press Releases - ZOA to Israel Gov't: End Police and Muslim Wakf Discrimination Against Jews On Temple Mount." *Zionist Organization of America.* Ed. Morton A. Klein. 13 Feb. 2012. Web. 18 Apr. 2012. <http://www.zoa.org/sitedocuments/pressrelease_view.asp?pressreleaseID=2156>.

claiming that “there is more concern for the extremist demands of the Wakf than regard for the rights of all citizens, including Jewish citizens, under Israeli law”.[190]

The ZOA’s main concern is that the rights of the Jewish people to the Land of Israel be “unquestionably superior” and that Jerusalem and the West Bank remain under Israeli sovereignty “for the sake of peace and security”.[191] By advocating for the “rights” of Jews to pray on the Temple Mount, the ZOA means to advance the claims of administrative control if not political sovereignty over the space and by extension throughout Jerusalem and the surrounding cities and villages.

These three groups are but a few examples of how the Temple Mount has been adapted in contemporary Israeli politics. Even after its destruction 2000 years ago, the Temple retains a potential source of immerse political power. The Temple Institute, the Temple Mount Faithful and the ZOA are three examples of how deeply entrenched in the political scene the Temple remains.

---

[190] "Zionist Organization of America - Press Releases - ZOA to Israel Gov't: End Police and Muslim Wakf Discrimination Against Jews On Temple Mount." *Zionist Organization of America.* Ed. Morton A. Klein. 13 Feb. 2012. Web. 18 Apr. 2012. <http://www.zoa.org/sitedocuments/pressrelease_view.asp?pressreleaseID=2156>.

[191] Burston, Bradley. "When 'pro-Israel' Means Comparing Israel to the Nazis." *Israel News*. 20 Mar. 2012. Web. 18 Apr. 2012. <http://www.haaretz.com/misc/iphone-article/when-pro-israel-means-comparing-israel-to-the-nazis-1.419769>.

Conclusion

Two thousand years ago, Jews based their political identity around a sanctuary where the God of Israel was worshipped. The sacrifices and other religious rituals performed there were meant, in part, to ensure that the presence of this deity would continue and that God would protect the land of Israel and its people from devastation. Josephus explains that the Temple's destruction was brought about by the failure of the Jews to live according to their constitution. Jews continued to think of themselves in political terms, and often used the Temple as a symbol for the future restoration of Jewish sovereignty. These hopes sometimes expressed themselves in determined acts of resistance to foreign rule and attempts to rebuild the Temple. At other times Jews transferred this thinking from present actions to future aspirations, usually with more religious undertones.

Even without the Temple, Jews maintained a latent sense of nationhood through the prayers, rituals, and institutions that evoked the memory of the Temple. Many aspects of the modern Zionist movement, while largely expressed through secular rhetoric, harkens back to these ideals. While Zionists differed over the appropriate role of a Temple in the future Jewish state, most of them were willing to acknowledge if not actually use the image of the Temple as a potent symbol that expressed and legitimized Jewish political claims. Zionists and other can use the Temple in this way because of its meaningful history and the role it has played in Jewish identity. It has proven to be a successful symbol and had mobilized Jews to various causes all throughout history, particularly Zionists.

Today the Temple Mount, the site where the Temples once stood, continues to be "the most contested piece of real estate in the world…and continues to stir political

controversy" today and will likely remain the case in the future.[192] As has been shown in this paper, employing the Temple to represent and legitimate political aspirations is nothing new. The Temple has served in this capacity from its very inception in the 10th century CE and will continue to do so. Today many Jewish nationalist groups, such as the Temple Mount Faithful and the Zionist Organization of America, evoke the image of the Temple and call for its rebuilding in large part as a way to bolster claims for the Jewish political presence if not control over Jerusalem. As has happened in the past, the Temple is used to shape political ideologies and objectives and to advance the hopes of many Jews for greater authority in Jerusalem. The Temple has been prominent in political ideology as well as political action. The contemporary debate will continue to draw upon the Jewish narrative, particularly concerning the Temple, in order to accomplish political objectives in the city. "To engage with the Temple is to engage with a long history of longing and grief, fantasy and power, artistic dreams and political machinations"[193] Even with the establishment of the State of Israel, the unfinished Temple still brings a sense of longing and religious aspiration to the city. It encapsulates political, religious, and national dreams in a way that no other structure can.

[192] Schmitt, John, and J. Carl Laney. *Messiah's Coming Temple: Ezekiel's Prophetic Vision of the Future Temple*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 1997.p.back cover.
[193] Goldhill, Simon. *The Temple of Jerusalem*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2005. p. 174.

Work Cited

Abrahams, Israel. *Jewish Life in the Middle Ages.* New York: Meridian and the Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, 1958

Ahimeir, Ora and Breger, Marshall. *Jerusalem: A City and Its Future*. 2002.

Benewick, Robert, and Philip Green. *The Routledge Dictionary of Twentieth-century Political Thinkers*. London: Routledge, 1992

Benvenisti, Meron. “City of Stone: The Hidden History of Jerusalem”. 1996.

Birnbaum, Pierre, and Ira Katznelson. *Paths of Emancipation: Jews, States, and Citizenship*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1995

Burston, Bradley. "When 'pro-Israel' Means Comparing Israel to the Nazis." *Israel News*. 20 Mar. 2012. Web. 18 Apr. 2012. <http://www.haaretz.com/misc/iphone-article/when-pro-israel-means-comparing-israel-to-the-nazis-1.419769>.

Cline, Eric H., and Rachel S. Hallote. "Where Was Solomon's Palace?." *Biblical Archaeology Review* 37.2 (2011): 44-78. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 19 Nov. 2011.

Cogan, Mordechai. “Sennacherib’s Seige of Jerusalem.” *Biblical Archelology Review*27.1 (2001):40. *Academic Search Premier.* Web. 9 Dec. 2011

Conder, C. R. *Judas Maccabaeus and the Jewish War of Independence,*. London: M. Ward &, 1879..

Dumper, Michael. *The Politics of Jerusalem since 1967*. 1997.

Dumper, Michael. *The Politics of Sacred Places: The Old City of Jerusalem in the Middle East Conflict*. 2002.

Edelman, Diana. “Hezekiah’s Alleged Cultic Centralizaion.” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 32.4 (2008): 395-434. *Academic Search Premier.* Web. 10 Dec. 2011.

Ehrlich, Carl S. *Understanding Religions: Judaism*. Rosen Group, 2009.

Eordegian, Marlen. "British and Israeli Maintenance of the Status Quo in the Holy Places of Christendom." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 35 (2003): 307-28.

Fine, Steven. *This Holy Place: On the Sanctity of the Synagogue during the Greco-Roman Period*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame, 1997

Finkelstein, Israel, and Neil Asher Silberman. “Temple and Dynasty: Hezekiah, The Remaking of Judah and the Rise of the Pan-Israelite Ideology”. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 30.3 (2006): 259-285. *Academic Search Premier.* Web. 10 Dec. 2011.

Ginsburg, Michael S. "Fiscus Judaicus." *The Jewish Quarterly Review*. University of Pennsylvania, 1931. 281-91

Goldenberg, Robert. "The Broken Axis: Rabbinic Judaism and the Fall of Jerusalem."*American Academy of Religion*. Web. 22 Feb. 2012. <http://jaar.oxfordjournals.org/content/XLV/3/353.short>

Goldhill, Simon. *The Temple of Jerusalem*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2005.

Gonen, Rivka. *Contested Holiness: Jewish, Muslim, and Christian Perspectives on the Temple Mount in Jerusalem*. Jersey City, NJ: KTAV Pub. House, 2003

Goodman, Martin. *Rome and Jerusalem: The Clash of Ancient Civilizations*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2007

Goodman, Martin. *The Ruling Class of Judaea: the Origins of the Jewish Revolt against Rome, A.D. 66-70*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987.

Gorenberg, Gershom. *The End of Days: Fundamentalism and the Struggle for the Temple Mount*. New York: Free, 2000

Grabbe, Lester L. "The Law, The Prophets, And The Rest: The State Of The Bible In Pre-Maccabean Times." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 13.3 (2006): 319-338. Academic Search Premier

Hamblin, William James., and David Rolph. Seely. *Solomon's Temple: Myth and History*. London: Thames & Hudson, 2007.

Hertzberg, Arthur. “The Zionist Idea”. 1959.

Hurowitz, Victor. *I Have Built You an Exalted House: Temple Building in the Bible in Light of Mesopotamian and Northwest Semetic Writings*. Sheffield Academic, 1992.

Inbari, Motti, and Shaul Vardi. *Jewish Fundamentalism and the Temple Mount: Who Will Build the Third Temple?* Albany: State University of New York, 2009

Kallen, Horace Meyer. *Zionism and World Politics; a Study in History and Social Psychology*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Page, 1921

Kaplan, Eran, and Derek J. Penslar. *The Origins of Israel, 1882–1948: A Documentary History*. University of Wisconsin, 2011

Katz, Jacob. *Out of the Ghetto: The Social Background of Jewish Emancipation, 1770-1870.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1973.

Kornberg, Jacques. *Theodor Herzl: From Assimilation to Zionism*. American UP, 1993.

Laqueur, Walter. *A History of Zionism*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.

Laqueur, Walter. *The Changing Face of Antisemitism: From Ancient times to the Present Day*. New York, NY: Oxford UP, 2006.

Leaney, Alfred Robert Clare. *The Jewish and Christian World: 200 BC to AD 200*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Pr., 1984.

"Live Coverage of The 3rd Annual International Temple Mount Awareness Day." *The Jewish Press*. Jewish Press, 23 Mar. 2012. Web. 18 Apr. 2012. <http://www.jewishpress.com/news/breaking-news/jewish-press-special-live-coverage-of-temple-mount-conference-sunday-march-25th/2012/03/23/>.

Lundsten, Mary Ellen. "Wall Politics: Zionist and Palestinian Strategies in Jerusalem, 1928."*Journal of Palestine Studies* 8.1 (1978): 3-27.

Lupovitch, Howard N. *Jews and Judaism in World History*. London: Routledge, 2010.

Mayer, Tamar, and Suleiman Ali. Mourad. *Jerusalem: Idea and Reality*. London: Routledge, 2008.

Meyer, Michael A. *Response to Modernity: A History of the Reform Movement in Judaism*. New York: Oxford UP, 1988.

Morris, Benny. *Righteous Victims: A History of the Zionist-Arab Conflict, 1881-1999*. New York: Knopf, 1999.

Mueller, Tom. “HEROD. (Cover Story).” *National Geographic 214.6 (2008):* 34-58. *Academic Search Premier.* Web. 11 Dec. 2011.

Prior, Michael. *Zionism and the State of Israel: A Moral Inquiry*. London [u.a.: Routledge, 1999.

Rees, Matt, Jamil Hamad, and Aharon Klein. “The Bloody Mountain.” *Time* 156.16 (2000): 70. *Academic Search Premier.* Web. 18 Nov. 2011.

Reiter, Yitzhak. “Jerusalem and its role in Islamic solidarity”. 2008.

Salomon, Gershon. "A Call to Everyone in the World to Send a Letter to the Pope." *The Temple Mount Faithful: Working to Build the Third Temple in Jerusalem*. 20 Feb. 2012. Web. 18 Apr. 2012. <http://www.templemountfaithful.org/Articles/letter-to-the-pope.htm>.

Schafler, Samuel. "Modern Zionism: An Historic Perspective." *Judaism*30.1 (1981): 111-119. *ATLA Religion Database, with ATLA Serials.* Web. 8Apr.2012.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. *From Text to Tradition: A History of Second Temple and Rabbinic Judaism*. Hoboken, NJ: Ktav Pub. House, 1991.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. *Texts and Traditions: A Source Reader for the Study of Second Temple and Rabbinic Judaism*. Hoboken, NJ: KTAV Pub. House, 1998.

Schmidt, Gilya G. "The Soul, God, and Zion in the Poetry of Yehuda Halevi." *Mystics Quarterly* 22.4 (1996): 144-62.

Schmitt, John, and J. Carl Laney. *Messiah's Coming Temple: Ezekiel's Prophetic Vision of the Future Temple*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 1997.

Schneer, Jonathan. *The Balfour Declaration: The Origins of the Arab-Israeli Conflict*. New York: Random House, 2010.

Sicker, Martin. *Between Rome and Jerusalem: 300 Years of Roman-Judaean Relations*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2001.

Stein, Leslie. *The Hope Fulfilled: The Rise of Modern Israel*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003.

"The Temple Institute: The International Department." *The Temple Institute: The Holy Temple in Jerusalem*. Web. 18 Apr. 2012. <http://www.templeinstitute.org/international.htm>.

Thompson, L. A. "Domitian and the Jewish Tax." *Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte*. Franz Steiner Verlag, 1982. 329-42.

Ussishkin, David. "Solomon's Jerusalem: the Text and the Facts on the Ground." *Jerusalem in the Bible and Archeology.* pp. 103-115.

Vago, Bela. *Jewish Assimilation in Modern times*. Boulder, CO: Westview, 1981.

Wasserstein, Bernard. *Divided Jerusalem*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2008.

Zeitlin, Irving M. *Jews: The Making of a Diaspora People*. MA: Polity, 2012.

"Zionist Organization of America - Press Releases - ZOA to Israel Gov't: End Police and Muslim Wakf Discrimination Against Jews On Temple Mount." *Zionist Organization of America.* Ed. Morton A. Klein. 13 Feb. 2012. Web. 18 Apr. 2012. <http://www.zoa.org/sitedocuments/pressrelease_view.asp?pressreleaseID=2156>.