The NT assumes a close correspondence between the Holy Spirit and God’s presence in the temple. This assumption is most clearly expressed in passages such as 1 Cor 3:16; 6:19; Eph 2:22 where believers are called a “temple of the Holy Spirit.”1 This concept is alluded to in other contexts such as John 14:17 where Jesus (in fulfillment of the temple) promises to mediate God’s indwelling presence through the Holy Spirit.2 This NT concept seems to be drawing from antecedent notions concerning the temple and yet no OT Scripture explicitly refers to the Spirit indwelling the temple. Despite the lack of direct references, many scholars presuppose that the NT relationship between the Holy Spirit and the temple is based upon OT antecedents.3 The gap between the OT and NT data is often addressed by simply incorporating the NT assumption without an investigation as to how the unstated in the OT became assumed in the NT. This paper’s purpose is to address this gap through an investigation of the temple and Spirit concepts in the OT and literature of the Second Temple period.4

Starting with the OT and moving into the Second Temple period I will argue the following points. (1) One of the most important functions of the tabernacle/temple was mediating Yahweh’s presence to his people. (2) In the OT, Yahweh’s presence was depicted with the terms “cloud” and/or “glory” in the sanctuary. The term “Spirit” was usually reserved for Yahweh’s presence or empowerment among the people outside the sanctuary. Because these three terms variously denoted

---

1 O. Michel points out that in the 1 Corinthian passages, Paul “does not tell us the source of the statement, but assumes that the Corinthians are familiar with it (οἷς ὑδατέ ὅτι).” Michel, “ναός,” TDNT 4:886.
2 “Indwelling” is also prominent in Rom 8:9; 2 Tim 1:14; 1 John 3:24; 4:13.
3 For example, Gordon Fee, God’s Empowering Presence (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995) 7, states that in 1 Cor 3:16–17; 6:19 Paul picks up on the “complex of ideas and images” and the “rich history” of the divine presence in the temple. While Fee is undoubtedly correct, the gap between the NT assumption and the explicit OT data needs a fuller accounting.
4 The Spirit and the temple are both large subjects in their own right. A part of the difficulty in assessing the relationship between the temple and the Spirit is that both topics crop up in many different texts which are not necessarily relevant to the present discussion. For the purposes of this paper, many interesting aspects of pneumatology as well as the temple service will go untreated because of their lack of relevance. However, simply analyzing the (few) texts where the temple and the Spirit intersect may neglect data that is relevant. Therefore, a biblical theological approach will be used to examine the relationship throughout the canon with “historical and literary sensitivity” while assuming the progressive nature of revelation (see Desmond Alexander et al., eds., New Dictionary of Biblical Theology [Downers Grove: Intervarsity, 2000], 10–18).
Yahweh’s presence, they provided a point of overlap and intersection with one another. (3) The destruction of Solomon’s temple and exile spurred on a shift in perspective concerning God’s presence in the temple. That shift called for a depiction of God’s presence that emphasized his transcendence of the temple while still being close to his downtrodden people. The Spirit, more than the other concepts, better depicted God’s presence in the needed manner. The Spirit’s presence after the exile was not a blinding glory or cloud as much as Yahweh’s active presence in the midst of his people. God’s presence among the people was the same presence that dwelt in the holy sanctuary. The historical trajectory of the Spirit-temple relationship is corroborated by later developments in the post-AD 70 Jewish literature and the NT. The Spirit’s role in the eschatological renewal also contributed to the increased use of the Spirit to depict God’s presence. The Spirit would usher in the promised presence of God among his people as “all the earth will be filled with the glory of the Lord” (Num 14:21) in the eschatological age (Isa 6:3; Hab 2:14).5 (4) All of the above factors help explain the NT assumption that the Holy Spirit is God’s presence in the temple. In the NT, Jesus (not the temple) becomes the mediator of God’s presence and the Spirit (because of his dual function in antecedents) becomes the dominant way to express God’s presence not simply among, but in his people. The increased depiction of the Spirit as God’s presence is a necessary adaptation since the presence of God is no longer centered on the temple but is going throughout the world. Wherever Jesus’ body is present, Jesus mediates the presence of God through the Spirit.

While the thesis will not subvert scholarly assumptions, it will hopefully provide some firm data to warrant such assumptions. Many scholars have rightly intuited the correspondence between the Holy Spirit and the temple-indwelling presence of God. An investigation into the possible development of this correspondence will give historical background and perhaps further insights into NT passages.

I. THE TEMPLE AS LOCUS OF GOD’S PRESENCE

The significance of the temple for pre-exilic and Second Temple Judaism cannot be reduced to a single concept.6 Scholars have long agreed on the importance of various temple concepts but often disagree on how the concepts are relevant to other issues in Judaism. How then does one identify the most relevant aspects of the temple as they pertain to God’s Spirit? In light of the diversity of Second Temple Judaism, it is important to acknowledge the many possible points
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5 G. K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church’s Mission* (NSBT 17; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004) 25 argues that the temple was designed to foreshadow the eschatological reality of God’s presence spreading throughout the cosmos. For a biblical tracking of the “all the earth will be filled with the glory of the Lord” theme, see James Hamilton, *God’s Glory in Salvation through Judgment: A Biblical Theology* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2010) 268–69.

of contact between the temple and any issue of Judaism. For some, the temple was a symbol of national unity and the fate of the nation was bound up with the fate of the temple (2 Macc 5:17–20). The temple’s significance also owes to it being the only location where sacrificial atonement could be made (Deut 12:5–14) and forgiveness requested (2 Chr 6:21–27). Many thought of the temple (and previous tabernacle) as a place to seek divine revelation and guidance (Exod 33:9; Num 27:21; Josh 19:51; 1 Sam 3:3–4; 2 Kgs 19:14). The temple was also the place of Yahweh’s presence, where he chose his name to dwell (Exod 25:8–9; 1 Kgs 6:12–14; 8:13; 2 Chr 6:5–9; Ps 132:13–14; Jer 34:15).

All these concepts (and others not mentioned) made the temple central to Jewish society and probably intersected with pneumatology in some way. However, the aforementioned NT passages (1 Cor 3:16; 6:19; Eph 2:22) that equate the Holy Spirit in the believer with God’s presence in the temple argue that Yahweh’s presence in the temple is the most relevant for the current discussion. An analysis of the OT and Second Temple literature will bear this argument out, as the Spirit seems to be one way that the divine presence in the temple is described.

1. The temple as locus of God’s presence in the OT. Even if the concept of “presence” is the most relevant for understanding the Spirit’s relationship to the temple, the divine presence itself is a complex and multi-layered issue. Nevertheless, the belief that Yahweh was uniquely present in the temple was fundamental to Jewish belief.

Yahweh’s presence in a man-made sanctuary can be traced to the exodus—the foundational nation-creating event for Israel. Many commentators have noted that the book of Exodus presents a “theology of Yahweh present with and in the midst of his people Israel …. this theme is constantly in evidence, serving as a theological anchor and also as a kind of compass indicating the directions in which the book is to go.” Yahweh rescues Israel from Egypt and leads them to Mount
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7 Koester mentions the tabernacle as a place of revelation and also points out that most Jews saw the temple in continuity with the tabernacle. For this reason, the tabernacle and temple will not be differentiated to a great degree in this paper. Craig R. Koester, *The Dwelling of God: The Tabernacle in the Old Testament, Intertestamental Jewish Literature, and the New Testament* (Washington, DC: Catholic Bible Association of America, 1989) 73–75.

8 Without being reductionistic, one could note that many of these temple concepts are inextricably linked to the assumption that Yahweh was present in his temple. The temple is the place to appear “before the Lord” for atonement for sins because that is where Yahweh dwells (Deut 12:5–7). Lester L. Grabbe, *Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period: Belief and Practice from the Exile to Yavneh* (New York: Routledge, 2000) 130–31. Revelation and intervention from Yahweh is best sought in his presence (2 Kgs 19:14–15). It will also be shown that the concept of presence is a corollary of the temple being a gateway between heaven and earth.


Sinai where he establishes them as his special people (Exod 19:6) and reveals his presence (Exod 19:11, 17–18). That presence takes on tangible form in a cloud (Exod 19:9, 16; 24:16–18), a subject we will return to in the next section.

Yahweh’s covenant-keeping presence dwells in the midst of his people (Exod 25:8; Lev 26:11) and Israel receives instructions to make, and worship at, his dwelling (Exod 25–31). The incident with the golden calf interrupts the redemptive events but serves to clarify that Yahweh’s presence, not the law or other identity markers, is what distinguishes Israel as Yahweh’s chosen people (Exod 33:15–16).

When the construction of the tabernacle is complete, Yahweh’s presence descends upon the tabernacle (Exod 40:34–38) to mark it as his dwelling place among the people. The very real possibility of death from a holy outbreak (Exod 19:21; 28:35, 43; 33:20) demonstrates that Yahweh’s presence was not diminished as much as concentrated in the sanctuary.

A similar scene consecrates the divinely designed (1 Chr 28:19) temple (1 Kgs 8:10–13; 2 Chr 5:13–6:2; 7:1–3). The Chronicler in particular “draws numerous parallels between the building of the tabernacle and the building of the temple.”

From the perspective of the OT and Second Temple literature, Solomon’s temple was the legitimate successor to the tabernacle and served the same functions. Throughout the OT canon, Yahweh was said to dwell, cause his name to dwell, or be present in the temple (Deut 12:11; 14:23; 2 Sam 7:13; 2 Kgs 23:27; 2 Chr 33:7; Ps 132:13–14; Jer 7:10–14). Even a term like “the bread of the presence” owes its name to being set before the Holy of Holies—the place of God’s presence.

Although the tabernacle/temple was the locus of Yahweh’s presence, it was not the only place where Yahweh was present. Even in Solomon’s dedicatory prayer (1 Kgs 8:27–30; 2 Chr 6:18–21), he acknowledges the “paradox” of the Creator of the universe somehow having a home on earth. Solomon asks that God would “hear in heaven your dwelling place,” prayers uttered in “this house” (1 Kgs 8:30, 32, 34; 2 Chr 6:21). This passage reflects the “subtle equilibrium between I AM’s absolute and immutable transcendence and his facile immanence.” The temple is more descriptively an “extension or outpost of the heavens.” For this reason, many scholars consider the temple primarily as a “place for mediation between the natural and the supernatural” or the “axis of glory” between heaven and earth.
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17 Raymond B. Dillard, 2 Chronicles (WBC 15; Waco, TX: Word, 1987) 4.
18 Koester, *Dwelling of God* 73–75.
This portrayal does not diminish the temple as the place of Yahweh’s presence; it is simply a more refined way of describing how Yahweh’s presence is focused in the temple.

The tension between Yahweh’s presence in the temple and his presence/glory in heaven is most clearly seen from a diachronic view of temple theology. The establishment of the first (as well as the second) temple accords with the biblical theme of God working through a particular place and people so that his glory may one day cover the earth “as the waters cover the seas” (Hab 2:14). The spread of that glory presence is often connected to a future temple that mirrors the heavenly temple.

The idea that God’s presence dwells in a heavenly tabernacle as well as in an earthly temple is behind many OT prophetic visions. Some visions see the Lord in his heavenly temple (Eccl 5:2; Isa 6:1–6; Hab 2:20; Zech 2:13) and others foresee a future eschatological temple (Ezek 43:4–8; Hag 2:7; Zech 6:12). The prophetic trajectory is towards God’s presence permeating ever greater portions of the world as God’s true heavenly dwelling manifests itself on earth.

The above data demonstrate the ubiquitous OT concept of the tabernacle/temple as the locus of God’s presence. However, the presence of the Lord is not confined to the temple. God’s transcendence is exhibited through his presence in the heavenly temple and through Yahweh’s presence acting outside the temple (Ps 97:5; Isa 19:1; 64:1–3; Ezek 11:16; Jonah 1:3). The dual role of Yahweh’s presence in the temple as well as his active presence among his people required a term with flexibility. As will be shown, “Sprit” was the flexible (as well as eschatological) term used to describe Yahweh’s presence in the temple and his activity in the world. Before tackling that issue, the Second Temple literature’s concept of God’s presence in the temple must be examined.

2. The temple as locus of God’s presence in second temple literature. The Second Temple literature stands in continuity with the OT concept of Yahweh’s presence in the tabernacle (Jub. 1:10; Josephus, Ant. 3.100, 202–203) and Solomon’s temple (Ant. 8.106, 114). The situation is more complicated in reference to the second temple. The literature is divided with some passages suggesting that Yahweh’s presence was no longer in the second temple (1 Macc 2:7–8; Sib. Or. 4:6–31; 2 Bar. 8:2; 64:7; Jo-
Those works that portray God as no longer present in the temple generally attribute it to Israel's sin (2 Bar. 8:2; 64:6–7; CD 1:3), a concept found in OT Ezekiel. Many of these works implicitly assume Yahweh’s presence in the first temple since the absence of the presence is contrastive and/or a sign of judgment. Those that did not believe God was still present in the second temple generally looked to a future temple (Sib. Or. 3:702–9; 5:397–433) and/or conceived of God in his heavenly temple (2 Baruch 4).

God’s presence in a heavenly temple (Pr Azar 1:31; 2 Macc 3:39; 3 Macc 2:16; 2 Baruch 4; Philo, Spec. 1:66–67) and the eschatological expectation of a new temple (Tob 14:5–61; 1 En. 25:5; 11QT 29:7–10) were common concepts regardless of one’s beliefs about God’s presence in the second temple. Both of these ideas agree with the aforementioned OT beliefs concerning God’s heavenly and eschatological temples.

For the purposes of this paper the actual presence of Yahweh in the second temple is not significant. Whether God was present or not, the literature reveals an assumption that he should be present, even if his absence is a sign of judgment. Moreover, the general expectation of an eschatological temple that mirrors the heavenly temple demonstrates the centrality of God’s presence to the temple concept.

3. Summary conclusions. The OT and Second Temple literature both conceive of the temple as the locus of God’s presence. This concept is applied to the earthly sanctuaries as well as the heavenly and eschatological realms. A tension between God’s transcendent presence and his imminent presence in the temple is reflected in all the literature. This tension gave rise to the concept of God’s presence transcending space (temple in heaven) and time (eschatological temple). His presence was focused upon, but not confined, to the temple. As this paper will show, the Spirit was employed to refer to God’s temple-like presence among his people.

II. YAHWEH’S PRESENCE AS SPIRIT, GLORY, AND CLOUD

Having established the temple as the locus of God’s presence, it is now necessary to examine how that presence was described. As mentioned above, Yahweh was said to “dwell,” “cause his name to dwell,” to be “in” or “in the midst of,” and “his presence” to be in the temple. All of these terms could be given their own fruitful lexical analysis. However, the interests of this paper span the Hebrew and

30 For an analysis of the Hebrew terms used to convey God’s presence see Mann, Divine Presence 252–61.
31 A helpful chart of the various biblical references to God presence “with,” “in the midst of,” and other expressions can be found at the end of two articles: James Hamilton, “God with Men in the
Greek Testaments as well as literature extant in other languages. For this reason the examination here will focus on the general conceptual terms used to express God’s presence in the temple.

The analysis will show that Yahweh’s presence was variously described as a cloud, glory, and Spirit. The overlapping semantic range of these terms allowed them to be used in similar as well as distinct ways. “Spirit” will understandably receive further treatment once its relationship to the other terms has been established.

1. Yahweh’s presence as cloud. In the OT and Second Temple literature Yahweh’s presence was often depicted as a cloud. This depiction originated at Sinai and became paradigmatic for theophanies throughout Scripture.32 Perhaps the plainest statement equating Yahweh’s presence with the cloud is found in Exod 34:5, “Yahweh descended in the cloud and stood there with him as he called upon the name of Yahweh.” A second plain statement directly related to the temple appears in 1 Kgs 8:12, “Solomon said, ‘Yahweh has said that He would dwell in the thick cloud.’” These passages and many others clearly demonstrate that “cloud” was one way to depict God’s presence (see also Exod 14:24; 19:9; 20:21; Lev 16:2; Deut 31:15; Ps 99:7).

As already mentioned, God’s cloud presence at Sinai moves into the tabernacle (Exod 40:34–38; Num 9:15–22) and the later temple (1 Kgs 8:10–13; 2 Chr 5:13–6:2; 7:1–3). These manifestations mark these sanctuaries as places of the divine presence.

The Second Temple literature continues to conceive of God’s presence in terms of a cloud. Orphica, a Judeo-Hellenistic work written between 200 BC and AD 100, simply states, “But I do not see him [God], because around him a cloud is set up” (20). Other passages that equate Yahweh’s presence with a cloud include Josephus, Ant. 3.202–203; Sir 45:5; and Jub. 1:3.

The above references do not include those passages where the cloud depicts God’s presence via its relationship to glory (treated later). Clearly, the OT and Second Temple literature often depict Yahweh’s presence with the term “cloud.”

The NT rarely depicts the divine presence as a cloud. Matthew’s account of the transfiguration reads, “While he was still speaking, a bright cloud overshadowed them, and behold, a voice out of the cloud said, ‘This is my beloved Son, with whom I am well-pleased; listen to Him!’” (Matt 17:5; cf. parallels). Other than the transfiguration, and possibly Jesus ascension to a “cloud” (Acts 1:9) and a reference to Israel being “under the cloud” during the exodus (1 Cor 10:1–2), the NT does not usually depict God’s presence as a cloud. Instead, God’s presence is mostly depicted by “Spirit” in the NT.

2. Yahweh’s presence as glory. The term “glory” (גָּבֹה) is also used to describe God’s presence. This term has a large semantic range. It may refer to power, quantity, honor, splendor, and its Greek equivalent (glória) has incorporated the OT
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32 Jeffrey Niehaus, God at Sinai (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995).
Nonetheless, “glory” can refer directly to Yahweh’s presence, often in conjunction with “cloud.” An example of glory directly equated with God’s presence is Ps 26:8, “O Yahweh, I love the habitation of your house and the place where your glory dwells” (also Exod 29:43–45; 33:18–23; Num 16:19; 20:6; 2 Chr 7:3; Ezek 8:4; 10:18–19; 43:4–5). Not surprisingly, these juxtapositions of glory and presence appear in settings related to the holy sanctuary.

The Second Temple literature does not differ significantly from the OT conception of God’s glory-presence. A representative of the broader literature can be found in 1 En. 14:20, “And the Great Glory sat thereon, and his raiment shone more brightly than the sun and was whiter than any snow.” Here, not only is the presence of God depicted as glory, but God himself is called “the Great Glory.” Other passages which depict Yahweh’s presence as glory include Tob 12:15; 2 En. 22:1–4 (face, throne=glory); 3 En. 5:14; T. Levi 3:4–7; and 3 Macc 2:16.

Before moving on to the main concern of the divine presence as Spirit it will be helpful to tie up the relationship between cloud and glory. In addition to the aforementioned references that equate God’s presence with cloud and with glory, many references equate glory and cloud with one another. Exodus 16:10 is representative: “It came about as Aaron spoke to the whole congregation of the sons of Israel, that they looked toward the wilderness, and behold, the glory of Yahweh appeared in the cloud” (also Exod 24:15–17).

The correlation between cloud and glory is especially prevalent in the context of the holy sanctuary. A passage already mentioned, 1 Kgs 8:11, illustrates this: “so that the priests could not stand to minister because of the cloud, for the glory of Yahweh filled the house of Yahweh” (also Exod 40:35; Num 16:42; Ezek 10:4).

In agreement with this OT data, the Second Temple literature juxtaposes cloud and glory. For example, 2 Macc 2:8, states, “Then shall the Lord show them these things, and the glory of the Lord shall appear, and the cloud also, as it was shown under Moses, and as when Solomon desired that the place might be honorably sanctified” (see also Jub. 1:3–4).

These texts demonstrate that Yahweh’s presence is often depicted as glory and/or cloud. In the proper context, either of these terms can be used as a substitute term for “presence.” These contexts include the temple as well as passages where the terms appear together. Establishing the correlation between presence/cloud/glory is crucial to understanding the relationship between the Spirit and the temple. The Spirit’s relationship to the temple arises partly out of its association with these other terms.

3. Yahweh’s presence as Spirit. The term “spirit” has a broad semantic range in the OT, NT, and in Second Temple literature. This paper is most interested in the
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34 The Hebrew ruah and the Greek pneuma are similar in that they both have broad semantic ranges that overlap heavily. For the semantic range of pneuma see J. Louw and E. Nida, Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains (2d ed.; 2 vols.; New York: UBS, 1989); and BDAG. For ruah see the appendix in Hamilton, “God with Men in Torah” 131–33. Although similar, ruah and pneuma are different terms in different languages. This qualification means I will not delve into lexical issues but
occurrences of “spirit” within the semantic domain of “spirit of God” and in particular those instances related to Yahweh’s presence. Because the term can have different meanings even within the same text, caution must be exercised. In his book examining the Spirit in first-century Judaism, Jon Levison concludes, “in light of the diversity of conceptions that co-exist within the writings of individual first century authors or within a single ancient document, it is ill-advised to attempt to ascertain for each first century author one dominant conception of the spirit.”35 In light of this caution, the goal of this section is not to argue for an overarching concept of the Spirit as much as describe how the Spirit related to the temple. The data argue that the Spirit, like glory and cloud, was one way that the ancient writers depicted God’s presence. Because the Spirit was also associated with God’s power and activity among his people (and in the eschaton) the term proved useful in later conceptions of God’s focused presence apart from the temple. The relationship of these key terms can be visually represented in the following illustration:

Figure 1: The OT use of “Spirit,” “cloud,” and “glory” to depict Yahweh’s presence in the Temple

As mentioned in the introduction, no OT passage explicitly depicts the Spirit in the temple. The above figure best represents the OT use of the terms. As one moves into the Second Temple period, the usage exhibits some shift (see Figure 2 in second temple literature section). The cloud and the glory usually represent God’s presence in the sanctuary. The Spirit in the OT is more often an empowerment from God that would come upon people to achieve God’s purposes.36 However, several passages associate the Spirit with God’s presence.

The Psalms form the first cluster of passages that relate the Spirit with God’s presence. Psalm 139:7 places the “Spirit” of God (™) and the “face/presence” of God (ך) in parallel: “Where can I go from your Spirit? Or where can I flee from
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your presence? These terms also appear in parallelism in Ps 51:13 and 104:29–30. Although Ps 139:7 associates the Spirit with God’s presence, his presence throughout creation is in view more than a localized presence within the temple.

The next cluster of passages that relates the Spirit with God’s presence recapitulates the exodus event. At the exodus, God created and redeemed Israel. The prophet Isaiah yearns for a new exodus and this theme pervades his book. Isaiah 6:17–15 is a lament for Yahweh to act as he did during the exodus. Verse 11 states, “Then his people remembered the days of old, of Moses. Where is he who brought them up out of the sea with the shepherds of his flock? Where is he who put his Holy Spirit in the midst of them?” Verses 12–14 continue to refer to the guidance and deliverance through the sea, verse 14 reads, “The Spirit of Yahweh gave them rest. So you led your people, to make for yourself a glorious name.” The exodus event as described in the book of Exodus makes no mention of the Spirit, but does speak of the cloud (Exod 19:19–20) in the midst of the people guiding and protecting them. This passage, therefore, seems to equate the Spirit with God himself and/or the cloud. As Ferguson notes, “Here we come as near as the OT anywhere does to an explicit hypostatization of the Spirit.”

Isaiah makes no mention of the cloud and may simply be referring to Yahweh’s presence in general. However, Isa 4:2–5 suggests otherwise. This passage has an interesting cluster of “spirit,” “cloud” and “glory” that seems to echo the exodus/Sinai event. Verse 4 refers to making Jerusalem “holy” through “the spirit of judgment and the spirit of burning.” Could this “spirit” refer to the pillar of fire and cloud that brought judgment to the Egyptians and deliverance for Yahweh’s people? Verse 5 hints that Isaiah has this idea in mind: “Then Yahweh will create over the whole area of Mount Zion and over her assemblies a cloud by day, even smoke, and the brightness of a flaming fire by night; for over all the glory will be a canopy.” Once Jerusalem is made holy, it will experience the glory cloud and fire of Yahweh’s presence much like Sinai. If this is Isaiah’s intention, then the similarities

---


between this passage and Isaiah 63 suggest that Isaiah (like the OT and later Second Temple literature) correlates the Spirit, glory, and the cloud.\footnote{Another more contested occurrence of spirit and glory can be found in Isa 59:19, “So they will fear the name of the LORD from the west and his glory from the rising of the sun, For he will come like a rushing stream which the ruah of the LORD drives.” This verse appears in a context that describes the universal significance of God’s defeat of sin. John Oswalt notes, “God’s name and glory, both hypostases for God himself (cf. 30:27; 40:5), will be feared. His glory is his fundamental and inescapable reality, which fills the earth (6:3) …. He wants to make unclean Israel clean in order that his Spirit may take up residence there (cf. 32:15–19; 44:3–5).” John N. Oswalt, The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40–66 (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 529–32. The ruah in this verse is specifically “from the Lord” and may hint at motifs similar to Isa 4:2–5. This reading becomes more likely in light of verse 21 which promises “my Spirit” to be upon the prophet and his offspring forever. If this is the case, then the name, glory, and the ruah of Yahweh are coming upon the redeemed community.}

Another reference to the exodus event occurs in Hag 2:3–7. The prophet urges the returned exiles to take courage and rebuild the temple, “work; for I am with you” (Hag 2:4). Verse 5 adds: “As for the promise which I made you when you came out of Egypt, my Spirit is abiding in your midst; do not fear!” If the clause “the promise which I made you when you came out of Egypt” is original, this statement approximates Isa 63:11 where Yahweh’s presence is “in the midst” of Israel during the exodus.\footnote{Pieter A. Verhoef, The Books of Haggai and Malachi (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987) 99–101.} The function of the idea in Haggai is to reassure the builders that God’s promise (covenant at Sinai to dwell among them: Exod 29:45) to be in their midst is still active. Even if the clause “the promise which I made you when you came out of Egypt” is a later textual variant, the active presence of Yahweh is still strongly equated with his Spirit. Moreover, the Spirit is not bound to the temple as much as the people. As the people take courage from God’s Spirit-presence and build the temple, they will eventually see God “fill this house with glory.” This future promise as well as the past judgment concerning the temple means that Yahweh’s presence (his Spirit) is connected to, but not dependent on, the temple.

Although not directly equated with one another, Nehemiah also recalls God’s presence during the exodus in terms of both cloud and Spirit. Nehemiah 9:19–20 reads, “You, in your great compassion, did not forsake them in the wilderness; the pillar of cloud did not leave them by day, to guide them on their way, nor the pillar of fire by night, to light for them the way in which they were to go. You gave your good Spirit to instruct them, your manna you did not withhold from their mouth, and you gave them water for their thirst.” While this passage does not correlate the Spirit and cloud as explicitly as the aforementioned texts, it attests to the association after the exile.\footnote{Block groups several of the above passages, Isa 63:7–14; Ps 139:7; Hag 2:5; Neh 9:20 (and notes their relationship to the exodus event), as examples of ruah being “a synecdochic expression for YHWH himself.” Daniel I. Block, “The View from the Top: The Holy Spirit in the Prophets,” in Presence, Power and Promise 180–81.}

All of these OT passages suggest that God’s active presence was conceived of in terms of the Spirit, even when that presence was originally depicted by the glory
cloud concept.\textsuperscript{47} The cloud pillar’s role in Exodus is similar to the role assigned to the Spirit in the broader OT. Hildebrandt notes that the pillar in Exodus guides, protects, delivers, and gives revelation.\textsuperscript{48} These functions are often attributed to the Spirit.

As prophets like Isaiah look back to the exodus event as well as look forward to a “new exodus” when Israel is restored, God’s Spirit is able to function in both epochs. The eschatological outpouring of the Spirit (Isa 32:15; 44:3) will broaden Yahweh’s active presence that Israel experienced in the wilderness.

One final OT passage that needs examination, especially in light of Hag 2:3–7, is Ezek 11:16–24. This passage occurs within the depiction of Yahweh’s glory leaving the temple. Confirming that the exiles were not devoid of God’s favor, the Lord says, “Though I had removed them far away among the nations and though I had scattered them among the countries, yet I was a sanctuary for them a little while in the countries where they had gone” (Ezek 11:16). Much like the above passage in Haggai, Yahweh’s presence is connected to, but not dependent on, the temple. The Jerusalemites have nothing to boast over the exiles.\textsuperscript{49} Yahweh’s presence is not confined to the temple, especially in the midst of a sinful people. This thought also leads into the future promise (again much like Haggai) that Yahweh would again gather the people and restore the covenant relationship. This promise includes an implicit assurance of the return of the glory and an explicit promise of a new spirit within God’s people. Only when God’s Spirit of holiness indwells his people will the glory presence of the Lord return. Ezekiel 43 describes the return of the glory presence to a future temple.

Woven into this passage and into Ezekiel’s temple visions in general, is the powerful action of Yahweh’s Spirit on the prophet. The Spirit of God reveals and interprets the vision of God’s glory/throne chariot to Ezekiel.\textsuperscript{50} Despite the departure of the glory presence, Yahweh’s Spirit presence is still working in the prophet and presumably among his people.

Ezekiel establishes some points that later writers develop. God’s holy presence can leave the temple when surrounded by unholiness. God’s presence can “be a sanctuary” for his people even when outside the temple and the Promised Land. A renewed eschatological temple awaits the return of God’s presence and a corresponding invasion of God’s Spirit into the hearts of his people. The Qumran sectaries built off these concepts in Ezekiel. They saw themselves as a temple of God covered by the Holy Spirit even apart from the Jerusalem temple.

\textit{a. OT summary conclusions.} The OT sometimes refers to God’s presence as Spirit. From the parallelism in Psalms to the recapitulation of the exodus event, the Spirit is Yahweh’s presence among his people. The Spirit is not explicitly depicted


\textsuperscript{48} Hildebrandt, \textit{Old Testament Theology of the Spirit} 67–76.

\textsuperscript{49} Daniel L. Block, \textit{The Book of Ezekiel; Chapters 1–24} (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997) 350.

in the temple like the glory cloud, but appears more often among the people. For Isaiah, that meant recasting the cloud pillar of the exodus event in terms of the Spirit. Haggai and Ezekiel imply that Yahweh’s presence could be with his people apart from the temple. Haggai contends that God’s Spirit is currently in Israel’s midst and Ezekiel looks forward to a time of spiritual and temple renewal.

b. Yahweh’s presence as Spirit in the Second Temple literature. The Second Temple literature that predates the NT does not significantly develop OT pneumatology, let alone the relationship between the Spirit and temple. Nonetheless, the second temple material exhibits some developments and makes some implicit concepts more explicit. The shifts in the terminology can be represented by the following illustration (compare to figure 1 depicting the OT usage):

Figure 2: The Second Temple literature’s use of “Spirit,” “cloud,” and “glory” to depict Yahweh’s presence in the temple

Although the illustration blunts nuances, the figure accurately shows the general increase in the depiction of God’s presence as Spirit, even in the temple.

The Wisdom of Solomon develops a connection between the divine wisdom and the divine Spirit. Much like the book of Proverbs, Wisdom of Solomon personifies wisdom but goes farther in developing the divine quality of wisdom. The author goes so far as to present wisdom as an emanation of God’s glory and mind. In so doing, Wisdom of Solomon intertwines wisdom with the divine spirit.

---

51 A conclusion also reached by Fee, *Empowering Presence* 914. This statement specifically refers to the Spirit of God. If one were to include all types of “spirits” under pneumatology then some significant developments must be noted. In his discussion on pneumatology, Mark Adam Elliott, *The Survivors of Israel: A Reconsideration of the Theology of Pre-Christian Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000) 394, notes the increased dualism of second temple pneumatology as angelic and demonic spirits take on an increased role.

52 Grabbe, *Judais Religion* 227 notes, “wisdom in the Wisdom of Solomon [is] a hypostasis. That is, she is both product of God and also a manifestation of him. She represents him and she is him. Thus, many statements about God are interchangeable with statements about wisdom. The characteristics of wisdom are ultimately those we would also apply to God (7:22–25).”

Note the following passages concerning the Spirit: “The Spirit of the Lord fills the earth” (Wis 1:7) and “your incorruptible Spirit is in all things” (Wis 12:1). At the same time, wisdom is said to “reach from one end (of the sky) to the other” (Wis 8:1) and “go through all things” (Wis 7:24). Solomon asks the Lord to give him wisdom to build the temple in the likeness of the heavenly tabernacle (Wis 9:8), saying, “O send her [wisdom] out of your holy heavens, and from the throne of your glory, that being present she may labor with me, that I may know what is pleasing to you” (Wis 9:10). A few verses later, Solomon repeats the need for God to send wisdom with slightly different wording: “And who knows your counsel, unless you give wisdom, and send your Holy Spirit from above?” (Wis 9:17). Wisdom, sent from the “throne of your glory,” is placed in parallel to “Holy Spirit from above.”

This concurrence does not mean that the Wisdom of Solomon fails to distinguish between wisdom and Spirit. Rather, the lines between the divine wisdom and the divine spirit are blurred. Most significant for our purposes is the description of wisdom sitting “by the throne” (Wis 9:4) of God’s glory. Solomon needed God to send his wisdom, his “Holy Spirit from above,” to describe the heavenly tabernacle which the temple was to resemble. This passage represents a rare instance where the Holy Spirit (through the connection with wisdom) is present in the holy sanctuary (in this case the heavenly tabernacle). This develops the relationship between the Spirit and wisdom first encountered when Bezalel (Exod 28:3; 31:3) was given “the spirit of wisdom” to work on the tabernacle. Wisdom of Solomon’s description of wisdom by the throne of glory (coupled with wisdom’s close relationship to Spirit) may have inspired the Ascension of Isaiah. This third century AD work depicted the Lord (Jesus) sitting at God’s right hand and the Holy Spirit sitting on his left (Ascen. Isa. 9:40).

So far, the OT and Second Temple literature only imply a correlation between the glory cloud/presence in the temple and the Spirit. Josephus finally makes the explicit connection in his retelling of Jewish history. Josephus describes the descent of the glory cloud when the ark was placed in the temple as, “This cloud so darkened the place, that one priest could not discern another; but it afforded to the minds of all a visible image and glorious appearance of God's having descended into this temple, and of his having gladly pitched his tabernacle therein” (Ant. 8.106). Solomon’s dedicatory prayer is then described: “I humbly beseech you that you will let some portion of your Spirit come down and inhabit this temple, that you may appear to be with us upon earth. As to yourself, the entire heavens, and the immensity of the things that are therein, are but a small habitation for you, much more is this poor temple” (Ant. 8:114). The biblical accounts (1 Kings 8; 2 Chronicles 6) do not mention the Spirit. Josephus, therefore, has explicitly equated the Spirit with the glory cloud/divine presence in the temple.54 This development is not surprising in light of Isaiah 63’s equating the Spirit with the glory cloud in the

That glory cloud took up residence in the tabernacle and later temple; Josephus simply makes the assumed connection explicit.

Josephus is significant in that he demonstrates a clear correlation between the glory cloud of God’s presence and the Spirit. Here is a non-Christian document, contemporary with the NT, which depicts the Spirit as one way to describe God’s presence in the temple.\textsuperscript{55}

Whereas Josephus described the Spirit in the first temple, the Qumran sectaries developed concepts of God’s presence apart from the defiled Second Temple. As was shown earlier, Ezekiel advanced the possibility of God’s presence apart from a corrupt temple as well as a future time of spiritual restoration. The inhabitants of Qumran built on this concept.

The Qumran covenants saw their community as a type of temple. Much like in Ezekiel’s day, God had left the Jerusalem temple due to wickedness (CD 1:3).\textsuperscript{56} But God remembered his covenant and raised up a remnant in Israel (CD 1:4–7). The community at Qumran saw themselves as that righteous remnant. In contrast to the wickedness of the current temple leaders (CD 7:8–18), the community and its council followed the priestly prescriptions for holiness.\textsuperscript{57} In so doing, they fulfilled the law and became the place where God manifested himself.\textsuperscript{58}

Fulfilling the functions of the temple through holy living can be seen in 4QInstruction: “Honor him by this: by consecrating yourself to him, in accordance to the fact that he has placed you as a holy of holies [over all] the earth, and among all the [g]od[s]” (4Q418 frag. 81:4). Instruction in the community includes understanding that the community is the “holy of holies”—the place where Yahweh manifests his presence in the temple.\textsuperscript{59}

Another passage that demonstrates the covenanters’ belief that they were a type of temple is found in 4QFlor. It reads, “And he commanded to build for himself a temple of man, to offer him in it, before him, the works of thanksgiving” (4Q174 1:6–7). The community is the “temple of man” that offers proper thanksgiving to God. Although no lexical links exist, this belief approximates Ezek 11:16 where God “was a sanctuary for them a little while.” This connection is especially appropriate because those in Qumran still awaited a future, physical temple which

\textsuperscript{55} While John Levison contends that Josephus reframes the account to make God’s manifest presence more palatable to stoic philosophy, this motivation does not exclude Josephus from also following existing Jewish depictions. Even if Levison is correct about Josephus’ motivation, the passage still attests to at least one Hellenistic Jew’s comfort with equating the glory cloud with Yahweh’s Spirit. John R. Levison, “The Pluriform Foundation of Pneumatology,” in \textit{Advents of the Spirit: An Introduction to the Current Study of Pneumatology} (ed. Bradford E. Hinze and D. Lyle Dabney; Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2001) 72–73.


\textsuperscript{57} Bertil Gärtner, \textit{The Temple and the Community in Qumran and The New Testament} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965) 1–46. Gärtner’s work is outdated in some areas but still contains several enduring observations.

\textsuperscript{58} Ibidi. 42–46.

God himself would create (see 11QT, col. 29:8–10). Their “temple of men” was not, therefore, a permanent situation and differed from the NT concept.

In addition to describing the community as a type of temple, the DSS also offer insights into the Spirit’s work in the temple. The Rule of Community best describes the role of the Spirit in this temple of men:

Defiled, defiled shall he be all the days he spurns the decrees of God without allowing himself to be taught by the Community of his counsel. For it is by the spirit of the true counsel of God that are atoned the paths of man, all his iniquities, so that he can look at the light of life. And it is by the holy spirit of the community, in its truth, that he is cleansed of all his iniquities. And by the spirit of uprightness and of humility his sin is atoned. And by the compliance of his soul with all the laws of God his flesh is cleansed by being sprinkled with cleansing waters and being made holy with the waters of repentance …. in this way he will be admitted by means of atonement pleasing to God, and for him it will be the covenant of an everlasting Community. (1QS 3:5–12)

This passage depicts the community as fulfilling the functions of the temple. Defilement waits outside the holy community but heartfelt devotion to the community brings atonement from sin. Such atonement is possible because “the holy spirit of the community” is the presence of God in this temple of men.

The Holy Spirit was thought of as the presence of God at Qumran. This concept is present in 1QH, which states, “I know that no-one besides you is just. I have appeased your face by the spirit which you have placed [in me,] to lavish your [kind]noses on [your] serv[ant] for[ever,] to purify me with your holy spirit, to bring me near by your will according to the extent of your kindnesses” (1QH 8:19–20). The purification with God’s Holy Spirit is closely connected to God’s “face” and drawing “near” to him.

The DSS show the greatest similarity to the NT in explicitly considering the Holy Spirit as God’s presence in a new temple community. Qumran’s eschatological perspective may be responsible for this development. By seeing themselves as the end-times people, the covenancers appropriated eschatological passages to
themselves. Ezekiel seemed especially informative in their pneumatology and in their concept of the temple. Yahweh withdrew from the temple in Ezekiel’s day because of wickedness. The Qumran community was experiencing a similar reality and “they claimed that ‘the Holy Spirit’ had left the polluted Temple and accompanied them into the wilderness.” They also appropriated to themselves Ezekiel’s promise of a future outpouring of God’s spirit among his holy people. Those at Qumran considered themselves as God’s holy remnant, taking part in his restorative program by following the law in the power of his outpoured Spirit. In so doing, they were preparing the way for Messiah’s coming and the end of the age.

c. Second Temple literature summary conclusions. The Wisdom of Solomon depicts divine wisdom as present in Yahweh’s heavenly sanctuary. Because of wisdom’s close correspondence to the divine Spirit, there is an implicit placement of the Spirit in the heavenly temple. Josephus inserts an explicit reference to the Spirit in the temple where the biblical text has none. This insertion is the clearest evidence that the Spirit was one way to describe God’s presence in the temple. “Spirit” has moved from a term implicitly associated with the cloud presence in the temple, to a term that now explicitly includes that concept.

Qumran assumes God’s presence should be in the second temple, but wickedness has caused him to leave. That presence is now in the “temple of men” and described as the “Holy Spirit.”

III. TEMPLE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

The above data demonstrate that God’s presence in the sanctuary was depicted as cloud, glory, and eventually Spirit. While “Spirit” was one way to describe God’s presence among his people, it was used for God’s presence in the temple indirectly—through its relationship to the cloud pillar or wisdom. When the ancient authors began to conceive of the temple in more abstract (spiritual) versus physical terms, the Spirit as God’s presence in the temple became more frequent. This shift appeared in Qumran where the Holy Spirit was the divine presence in the “temple of men.”

At this point, it would be helpful to revisit the temple concept in its more abstract form. The physical temple is the locus of God’s presence and a gateway to/reflection of the heavenly dwelling. However, the destruction of the temple began a process of thinking about the temple in a more “spiritual” way (Ezek 11:16). Yet, this “spiritual” way was grounded in broader concepts of the temple already in circulation. The physical temple was not just a static location, but an “axis of glory” or gateway to heaven. The mediation of Yahweh’s presence could

---


67 Clements, God and Temple 130–33.

68 Lioy, Axis of Glory 1–4.
occur in different settings, as the pre-tabernacle exodus demonstrated. “Spiritualization” of the temple, therefore, was not about creating new concepts as much as emphasizing the non-material aspects of the temple. This spiritualization would blossom (in different ways) in the NT and at Qumran.69

Qumran was not alone in its spiritualization of the temple. Judaism of an Alexandrian flavor also thought of the temple in spiritualized terms. Philo of Alexandria conceived of the temple as a “material representation of the universe constantly presenting to God the thanksgiving due to Him …. Yet the cosmos, which is the macrocosm, finds its microcosm in human beings who themselves may function as a temple.”70 Evidence of Philo’s views can be found in various places in his voluminous writings. For example, Philo writes, “For there are two temples of God, I believe: the one is this universe in which indeed the high priest is the first-born, the divine Logos; and the other is the rational soul, whose priest is the Man-in-Reality, whose sensible copy is that one who offers the ancestral prayers and sacrifices” (Somn. 1. 215). The “rational soul” as the temple of God is also expressed earlier as, “Do you, therefore, O my soul, hasten to become the abode of God, his holy temple” (Somn. 1:149). These passages demonstrate a “spiritualization” of the temple where worship and thanksgiving to God are done on several levels that transcend the physical temple. The cosmic temple encompasses the universe (transcendence) as well as being represented in a person’s soul (imminence).

For Philo, the Jerusalem temple is important but it is more of an accommodation for flesh bound people who need concrete points of reference. He states, “We ought to look upon the universal world as the highest and truest temple of God, having for its most holy place that most sacred part of the essence of all existing things, namely, the heaven; … But the other temple is made with hands; for it was desirable not to cut short the impulses of men who were eager to bring in contributions for the objects of piety” (Spec. 1:66–67). The Jerusalem temple is a physical reflection of the true temple of heaven which has a transcendent significance.71 In typical Platonic thinking, the material earthbound temple is a shadow of a more transcendent truth that is located above and in the essence of things. Nevertheless, the material temple is necessary to accommodate earthbound worshippers.

Philo, a Jew living at the same time as the Jews in Qumran, expresses a Judaism much different than his contemporaries in Qumran. Yet, they both spiritualize the temple which allows them to conceive of a temple located within people. As was shown earlier, the soil for this kind of thinking was tilled during the exile when God’s presence among his people continued, despite the loss of the temple.72 God could still be “a sanctuary among them” (Ezek 11:16) in far off lands. The physical

---


70 Hayward, Jewish Temple 110–11. The following translation of Philo is also Hayward’s.

71 Josephus, like Philo (but without as much abstraction), also mentions the cosmic, universal significance and benefit of the temple and its service. Ibid. 142–53.

temple did not contain Yahweh, it was a gateway. He dwelt in a heavenly tabernacle and could manifest himself wherever he chose, as the pre-tabernacle wilderness wanderings proved.

The exile required a rethinking of Yahweh’s temple presence and it seems that the concept of Spirit filled the void that the glory cloud left. This development was understandable since the Spirit had long been considered as Yahweh’s active presence among his people.\textsuperscript{73} The “Spirit in the temple” concept took root in the exile then matured and flowered during the second temple period.\textsuperscript{74}

At Qumran and in the NT, God’s Spirit-presence in the temple was appropriated to their own communities. Before discussing the important eschatological assumptions that made the Spirit an especially apt depiction of God’s presence in apocalyptic communities, we shall examine how the post-AD 70 literature continues the conceptual development. The NT, Qumran, and Josephus are independent first-century witnesses to the established existence of the “Spirit presence in the temple” assumption. If the historical sketch suggested is correct, then the concept would flower even more after the second temple was destroyed. Such a phenomenon can be observed.

Much of the later second temple literature was preserved by Christians, so it is difficult to distinguish when a document is borrowing from Christian versus pre-Christian antecedents. With this caution in mind, the following originally Jewish works assume the “Spirit presence in the temple” concept.

In a section probably written around AD 100, the Martyrdom of Isaiah states, “The Holy Spirit will withdraw from many” (3:27). Just as the glory presence withdrew from the temple because of wickedness, the Holy Spirit will withdraw from many people because of their wicked ways. A similar theme is found in the Testament of Solomon (1–3d cent. AD). After falling into idolatry Solomon laments, “So the spirit of God departed from me and from that day on my words became as idle talk. She convinced me to build temples of idols. As a result I, wretched man that I am, carried out her advice and the glory of God completely departed from me” (T. Sol. 26:6–8). Not only are “spirit of God” and “glory of God” syntactically parallel, the departure of the Holy Spirit from the temple builder recapitulates the departure of the glory from the temple building.

The Testament of Levi also contains a parallelism between glory and spirit: “From the temple of glory … the glory of the Most High shall burst forth upon him. And the spirit of understanding and sanctification shall rest upon him” (T. Levi 18:6–7). Finally, a passage that may echo 1 Cor 6:19, the Testament of Isaac (2d cent. AD) states, “Guard your body, that it may be pure, for it is the temple of the Holy Spirit” (T. Isaac 4:15).

\textsuperscript{73} More specifically, the Spirit “mobilizes agents, such as the prophet and his community, Davidites, the servant(s) of the Lord, and even Cyrus,” to execute Yahweh’s plan for the nation and world. Willem VanGemeren and Andrew Abernethy, “The Spirit and the Future: A Canonical Approach,” in Presence, Power and Promise 335.

\textsuperscript{74} Although as shown above, the seeds were sown in the earlier OT documents.
The above passages, despite the possibility of Christian redaction, display the expected promulgation of the “temple of the Holy Spirit” concept. After the destruction of the second temple, God’s presence as Spirit becomes even more prominent. These passages, as well as the earlier DSS passages, show that this prominence is not limited to the Christian community. If even one of the above passages was original to its Jewish author, it provides another independent witness to the continued increase of the “temple of the Holy Spirit” trajectory. In addition to the above possibilities, the rabbinic literature provides an undisputed witness.

Unlike the above examples, the rabbinic literature was not preserved by Christians. It provides a stronger independent witness to the (post-AD 70) flowering of the “Spirit presence in the temple” concept. In the rabbinic literature the “temple of the Holy Spirit” concept becomes more pervasive. This development is expected in light of the Holy Spirit’s growing role in response to the destruction of the first, then second temple.

When studying the Spirit in rabbinic literature, reference must be made to Shechinah. Shechinah came from the Hebrew word “to dwell” and referred to God’s manifest presence. In many instances Shechinah was interchangeable with the Holy Spirit, though the former was the more common term. The difference between the terms was slight and the Holy Spirit often referred to God’s presence with the prophets whereas Shechinah was the presence of God among the Torah observant community. The similarity of the terms with their slight distinctions can be found in b. Sot. 48b where the Holy Spirit is said to have departed after the prophets Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi died. Yet the Shechinah could still come down on some worthy Rabbis (like Hillel). Nonetheless, both terms were depicted as God’s presence among the people. With these qualifications in mind, the rabbinic literature’s concept of the Spirit and Shechinah shows an increased depiction of the Shechinah Spirit as God’s presence in the temple, which is nonetheless available to the community apart from the temple.

In Schäfer’s renowned study on the Holy Spirit in Rabbinic literature, he wraps up his survey with the conclusion, “The temple is the place of the Holy Spirit.” Among the several texts cited, b. Shab. 33a serves as an apt example. It reads, “Through the crime of bloodshed the temple was destroyed and the Shechinah departed from Israel.” The Shechinah is the presence of God in the temple and previous tabernacle. Midrash Rabbah states, “When did the Shechinah rest upon the earth? On the day when the tabernacle was set up” (Mid. Song 5.1).

The Shechinah adds yet another term to describe God’s presence in the temple and its relationship with the Spirit goes beyond the scope of this paper. Nonetheless, the relationship is close enough to show that the Rabbis conceived of God’s presence in the temple in a way that could also be imminent—the Shechinah Spirit.

77 Peter Schäfer, Die Vorstellung vom Heiligen Geist in der Rabbinischen Literatur (Munich: Kösel, 1972) 136–43.
Much like Qumran and the early church spoke of the temple-presence of God working among their communities outside the temple, the Rabbis spoke of the Shechinah Spirit as the temple-presence of God among his people. This depiction agrees with the patterns and trajectory already displayed in previous literature.

The above literature suggests a historical trajectory in which the destruction of the temple(s) cultivated existing OT seeds concerning the temple and the Spirit. The necessary “spiritualization” of the temple-presence during the exile continued to echo into the first century and increased in pitch after the destruction of the second temple. That spiritualization meant that God’s presence was not confined to the temple and could invade any holy space. Because the Spirit already functioned as God’s active influence on people, “Spirit” also became a more common way to refer to God’s presence in the temple. The increase in depicting the “temple of the Holy Spirit” when the second temple was unavailable (Qumran), fulfilled (NT), or destroyed (Josephus, Pseudepigrapha, Rabbinics) confirms the likelihood of this trajectory.

IV. GOD’S WORKS IN SPIRIT

Another important factor in the increased depiction of the Holy Spirit in the temple are the eschatological functions assigned to the Spirit. The Spirit of God is often portrayed in the OT as working in leaders and prophets to establish, deliver, judge, guide, and restore the people of God.78 Not surprisingly then, the Spirit is also depicted as active among God’s people in the eschatological restoration.79 The eschatological work of the Spirit increases in scope and measure. This increase is described as a “pouring out” of the Spirit in many OT passages (Isa 32:15; 44:3; Ezek 36:25–27; 37:14; 39:28–29; Zech 12:9–10) and exemplified by Joel 2:28–31:

> It will come about after this that I will pour out my Spirit on all mankind and your sons and daughters will prophesy, Your old men will dream dreams, Your young men will see visions. Even on the male and female servants I will pour out my Spirit in those days. I will display wonders in the sky and on the earth, blood, fire and columns of smoke. The sun will be turned into darkness and the moon into blood before the great and awesome day of the LORD comes.

By twice using the verb לְשׁוֹן (“pour out”) and the threefold repetition of spiritual gifts in the following lines, Joel expresses a fullness of amount as well as fullness in scope.80 The day of the Lord, with its theophanic imagery, brings a renewal

---

78 Hildebrandt, OT Theology of the Spirit 67–150.
79 Ackroyd contends that the prophets Zechariah and Haggai (short-sightedly) considered the post-exilic time as this restoration. The work of the eschatological Spirit was therefore crucial in their depiction of the restoration of the Temple in Zech 4:6 and Hag 2:4–5. While I disagree with Ackroyd’s assessment of the prophet’s intentions, the larger point of the Spirit’s work in the promised restoration is still relevant. The Spirit of God transcends the temple and is therefore involved in its restoration. Peter R. Ackroyd, Exile and Restoration: A Study of Hebrew Thought of the Sixth Century B.C. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968) 177.
of the covenant relationship (Joel 2:27, “Thus you will know that I am in the midst of Israel, And that I am the LORD your God”) and an expansion of Yahweh’s Spirit among his people.

Passages such as Isa 32:15; 44:3 suggest the pouring out of the Spirit will extend God’s eschatological plan of salvation even to the nations. Although “the earth will be full of the knowledge of the LORD as the waters cover the sea” (Isa 11:9), the OT writers continue to connect these promises to the Spirit/divine presence in Zion. For instance, Ezek 37:27–28 frames the eschatological renewal in terms of a restored and expanded temple presence, stating, “My dwelling place also will be with them; and I will be their God, and they will be my people. And the nations will know that I am the LORD who sanctifies Israel, when my sanctuary is in their midst forever.” The renewed presence of God is then described in the familiar, concrete images of the temple.

The renewed temple presence of God goes hand in hand with the outpouring of the Spirit. Ezekiel 39:29 reflects this connection: “I will not hide my face from them any longer, for I will have poured out my Spirit on the house of Israel.” As previously mentioned “face” and “presence” are English glosses of the same Hebrew 735. God’s unveiled presence in Israel expands when the Spirit is poured out. In the eschatological renewal, Yahweh will once again be “in the midst” of his people (Isa 12:6; Zeph 3:15; Zech 2:10–11).

The same eschatological expectation of God’s presence is found in the Second Temple literature. Jubilees (2d–1st cent. BC) recasts the revelation at Mount Sinai with an eschatological perspective. Moses receives the law with an eye toward the day when “I (God) descend and dwell with them throughout eternity” (Jub. 1:26), “when the heavens and the earth shall be renewed and all their creation” (Jub. 1:29). That day of eschatological renewal will also involve a renewal through the Holy Spirit. Jubilees 1:23 proclaims, “And after this they will turn to me in all uprightness and with all their heart and with all their soul, and I will circumcise the foreskin of their heart and the foreskin of the heart of their seed, and I will create in them a holy spirit, and I will cleanse them so that they shall not turn away from Me from that day unto eternity.” In addition to the giving of (a) the Holy Spirit in the eschatological renewal, this passage also makes explicit the descent of God’s presence among his people.

The Community Rule at Qumran also depicts a renewing work of the Spirit in the end times:

On the appointed time of the visitation he will obliterate it forever … then God will refine, with his truth, all man’s deeds, and will purify for himself the structure of man, ripping out all spirit of injustice from the innermost part of his flesh, and cleansing him with the spirit of holiness from every wicked deed. He will sprinkle over him the spirit of truth like lustral water … until now the spirits

81 Ma, Until the Spirit Comes 203.
of truth and injustice feud in the heart of man .... For God has sorted them into equal parts until the appointed end and the new creation. (1QS 4:18–25)

Notice the reference to the broad eschatological “new creation” as well as the inner, victorious work that the Spirit of holiness will accomplish in individual people of God. The Spirit will be the active agent in the eschatological return to holiness that God’s presence requires.

Both the OT and Second Temple literature consider the eschaton as a time of spiritual outpouring and unveiling of God’s presence. This connection no doubt influenced the increased use of the “Spirit in the temple” concept, especially in eschatological communities like Qumran and the early church. God’s ultimate plan was to pour out his presence, formerly focused upon the temple, until his glory “extended throughout the whole earth.” The “Spirit” was already the preferred OT term to express God’s active presence among his people and in the eschaton. The second temple communities incorporated this terminology, making implicit connections more explicit.

V. SKETCHING THE BRIDGE

The above background explains the NT assumption that the Spirit was in the temple despite the lack of explicit OT antecedents. The temple was the place of God’s presence. Cloud, glory, and eventually Spirit were all terms used to depict God’s presence in the temple. Initially, the Spirit was indirectly associated with the temple. The Spirit represented God’s working presence among his people and, by implication, was related to his manifest presence in the temple.

The temple was the locus of God’s presence but not a container: “the temple symbolizes not only the dwelling of God but also the gate of God.” The wilderness wanderings demonstrated that God could be present among his people apart from the tabernacle/temple. In reflecting on the exodus, prophets like Isaiah read the typical function of the Spirit (leading/empowering God’s people) back into the event. The unity of God surely allowed this reading since God’s singular presence was not divided by being the cloud pillar or the Spirit. Because the concept of Spirit could depict both God’s presence and God’s work among his people, it had broader applicability. Whether the physical temple stood or not, whether referring to the present or to the eschaton, the Spirit provided a flexible term to depict God’s presence.

When the physical temple was destroyed, the perspective on God’s presence necessarily shifted. Although the glory cloud had departed, God could still be a sanctuary for his people. His Spirit could continue to work in their midst. This

83 Deasley, Shape of Qumran Theology 232–34. These concepts are similar to OT expectations that connect the Spirit with new creation and the restoration of the covenant. These OT hopes are treated in Robin Routledge, “The Spirit and the Future in the Old Testament: Restoration and Renewal,” in Presence, Power and Promise 348–49.
“spiritualization” represented the flowering of previously planted seeds and pointed towards a greater, eschatological flowering. God’s presence was ultimately in the heavenly tabernacle and the earthly flowering. One day, God’s presence (Spirit) would be so poured out upon his people that the nations would be filled with his glorious presence.

The historical growth of the relationship between the Spirit and temple was confirmed in the second temple literature. The increased depiction of the Spirit as God’s presence in the temple(s) when the temple was unavailable (Qumran), fulfilled (NT), or destroyed (Josephus, Pseudepigrapha, Rabbinics) corroborated the trajectory of this thinking.

These antecedents also help elucidate the increased references to the Spirit in Qumran and the NT. Readers of the Bible have often noted how the Holy Spirit is scarce in the OT but ubiquitous in the NT. Despite its shorter length, the NT employs *pneuma* four times as often as the OT employs *ruah*. Moreover, *pneuma* refers to the Spirit of God in over two thirds of its appearances, whereas *ruah* usually refers to something other than the Spirit of God. The NT, therefore, linguistically demonstrates a shift in the emphasis and concept of the Spirit.

This shift is best explained by the increased depiction of God’s presence as Spirit as well as the eschatological focus of the NT. The Spirit as God’s presence in the temple also increased in frequency, a phenomenon attested in antecedents.

VI. DOES THE BRIDGE LEAD TO THE NEW TESTAMENT?

The remaining task is to examine if the proposed bridge between OT antecedents and NT assumptions actually leads to the NT. While the construction of the bridge (hopefully) seemed solid, the bridge will not “fit” if it is not firmly planted on the other side of the gap.

Indeed, the association between God’s presence, the glory, cloud, and the Spirit continues into the NT, even if the Spirit predominates. First Peter reflects this continued association; it reads, “But to the degree that you share the sufferings of Christ, keep on rejoicing, so that also at the revelation of his glory you may rejoice with exultation. If you are reviled for the name of Christ, you are blessed, because the Spirit of glory and of God rests on you” (1 Pet 4:13–14). When Christ reveals his glory presence again, the believers who persevere will rejoice because the “Spirit of glory” already rests on them. The Spirit of glory rests upon the believing community much like the glory cloud rested upon Israel in the wilderness. In addition, the eschatological era (revelation of his glory) brings a heightened sense of God’s presence through the Spirit. These elements fit this passage into the historical development outlined above. This passage not only demonstrates the juxtaposition of the Spirit and God’s glory presence, but of the process whereby the Spirit

---

(through its association with glory) became increasingly intertwined with God’s temple presence.

The juxtaposition of glory and Spirit, observed throughout this paper, also appears in 2 Cor 3:7–18. This whole passage deals with the contrasts between the old and new covenants. Paul uses lexical links to clearly allude to the promises of Jer 31:31–33 and Ezek 36:26. These promises speak of the coming new covenant when God would write his law on human hearts and give them a new Spirit. Ezekiel 36:26 describes how God will ensure that “history does not repeat itself” after the exile. Ironically, the false teachers are advocating going back to a system that the OT prophets acknowledged could not be followed without God’s Spirit-renewing work.

Paul contrasts the veiled glory of Moses on Sinai and the old covenant with the unveiled glory of the Spirit. The argument culminates with “But we all, with unveiled face, beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are being transformed into the same image from glory to glory, just as from the Lord, the Spirit” (2 Cor 3:18). Moses experienced the glory presence of the Lord on Sinai (the same glory which would fill the tabernacle later in Exodus) and now the Corinthians experience that same glory presence, but to a greater degree. This glory is equated with the Spirit, who is received whenever anyone “turns to the Lord” (2 Cor 3:16). In this context, the Spirit aptly functions as God’s presence among his people in the eschatological age. Once again, the intersection of the key concepts of glory, presence, Spirit, and eschatology demonstrate the historical process argued for in this paper.

The above passages fit into the historical process by exhibiting more explicit and developed juxtapositions of Spirit and glory than were found in antecedents. Yet, the NT’s development of this relationship comes with distinctives. The chief

87 Ralph Martin, 2 Corinthians (WBC 40; Waco, TX: Word, 1986) 46–55.

89 A possible area of further inquiry is to investigate the remote possibility that “glory” in the NT may occasionally refer to the Spirit. The historical sketch argued for in this paper suggests that first-century thinking still could go in the “glory to Spirit” direction, especially in the presence of temple motifs. While “Spirit” seems to be a rare referent of “glory” in the NT, the above passages demonstrate its existence.

Other occurrences of glory that possibly point to the Spirit include Eph 3:16, “That he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with power through his Spirit in the inner man.” The strengthening with power “according to the riches of his glory” is related to “through his Spirit.” In John 17, Jesus refers to a gift of glory, the nature of which commentators have long debated (George Beasley-Murray, *John* [WBC 36; Waco, TX: Word, 1987] 302). Perhaps Jesus is assuming the Spirit’s unifying presence when he states, “The glory which you have given me I have given to them, that they may be one, just as we are one; I in them and you in me, that they may be perfected in unity, so that the world may know that you sent me, and loved them, even as you have loved me” (John 17:22–23). Jesus had just promised the Spirit’s abiding presence as a continuation of his own presence. This glory could be pulling in aspects of that Spirit promise.

These two examples show the possible implications of the proposed historical trajectory of the glory-Spirit relationship. If antecedent and first-century literature were increasing the connections between God’s glory and the Spirit, then perhaps some occurrences of glory maintained an implicit reference to the Spirit.
difference is the pivotal role that Christ plays in the mediation of the glory/Spirit. The NT passages that began this inquiry display this Christological difference. First Corinthians 3:16; 6:19 and Eph 2:22 assume the correspondence between the Spirit and God’s temple presence, but they do so based on Christ’s fulfillment of the former covenant (including the temple and its cult).

This inquiry began by noting that 1 Cor 3:16 clearly expresses the “Spirit=Temple presence” assumption, “Do you not know that you are a temple of God and that the Spirit of God dwells in you?” Just as the Spirit of God dwelt in the Jerusalem temple, so he now dwells in the church body. This indwelling is based upon Jesus Christ as the foundation of the temple (1 Cor 3:11). Later in the same letter, a similar occurrence of believers as a “temple of the Holy Spirit” (1 Cor 6:19) also has a specific Christological basis. Because the believer is joined to Christ through his sacrifice (1 Cor 6:10) and by virtue of sharing the same Spirit (1 Cor 6:17), the believer is to be holy. As the locus of God’s presence, the temple exemplifies holiness. Now that Christ has constituted the community into a temple, the Corinthians need to treat their bodies in a way befitting the presence of the Holy Spirit.

Ephesians 2:22 presents Jesus as the cornerstone to the new temple, with the apostles and prophets serving as the foundation. The growing and fitting together as a temple is accomplished in Christ as believers are “being built together into a dwelling of God in the Spirit” (Eph 2:22). In both these passages, Christ is the basis for the believers’ identity as the temple—the locus of God’s presence in the Spirit.

With these passages, the end of the bridge has been reached. The concept of the Spirit in the Temple created a gap between OT absence and NT assumption. The bridge was constructed over time, through the association of God’s temple presence, glory, cloud, and Spirit. The exile and eschatological expectation provided further building material. It was also demonstrated that the path of this bridge continued on into the later NT writings, rabbinic literature, and the post-AD 70 Jewish literature.

---

90 Each NT writer describes Jesus’ relationship to the temple in his own way and generalizations obscure some important aspects of each writer’s presentation. Nonetheless, Jesus is often portrayed as fulfilling the temple and its functions. Space does not permit a full accounting of the passages that present Jesus as the new locus of God’s presence and the gateway to heaven. (For a summary of such passages see Beale, Temple and the Church’s Mission 176–200.)

91 This conceptual borrowing is expected since it is “the theology of the temple not its practice, which is significant for the early church.” I. Howard Marshall, “Church and Temple in the New Testament,” TB 40 (1989) 203–22.