



THREE RIVERS FELLOWSHIP

**Did the Destruction of the Temple by
Titus the Roman in 70AD
Fulfill any Biblical Prophecy?**

**Stephen E. Rodabaugh, Circa 2001
TRF Update, March 11, 2026**

TABLE CONTENTS

ABSTRACT 3

INTRODUCTION..... 3

PART I. ANALYSIS OF "TEMPLE" AND RELATED WORDS OF MATTHEW, MARK, LUKE 5

PART II. EXTENT OF DEVASTATION: ABSOLUTE NEGATIVES AND DOUBLE NEGATIVES (in Greek)
..... 10

PART III. TEMPLE PROPHECIES N-O-T FULFILLED-THE LESSER ARGUMENT: PHYSICAL EVIDENCE
TODAY..... 13

PART IV. TEMPLE PROPHECIES N-O-T FULFILLED-THE GREATER ARGUMENT: PAUL'S
UNIQUE/DISTINCTIVE GOSPEL..... 16

PART V. REBUTTALS TO THIS OUTLINE 18

ABSTRACT

Have the "temple" prophecies of Matthew 24, Mark 13, Luke 21 been fulfilled by the Romans (under Titus the general in 70 A.D.) or later (135 A.D.).

The purpose of this outline is to rigorously apply the normative hermeneutic to these passages and document evidence relevant for testing whether these prophecies have in fact been fulfilled; we also sketch a purely Biblical argument regarding their fulfillment needing no archaeological evidence at all.

INTRODUCTION

Thorough application of the proper Biblical hermeneutic we prove the following Proposition:

PROPOSITION. The following statements hold:

1. Christ's prophecies repeatedly concern the entirety of the temple compound/precinct, including all its walls and structures.
2. Christ's prophecies repeatedly mandate that absolutely no structures be left intact in any sense for any of these structures, absolutely not one single, solitary stone be left on top of another stone.
3. The archaeological evidence, even today, shows the structures included in Christ's prophecies, including walls and stairs, with many stones still on top of each other, remain from the temple compound of Christ's day.
4. The remaining structures-with stones one upon another-and the veracity of Christ's prophecies show that fulfillment of Christ's prophecies await a future time of God's dealing with ethnic Israel, and the remaining stones are therefore silent witnesses to Israel's future as the chief, priestly, temple nation whose righteous, ethnic empire will fill the earth.
5. The structures of the temple that were utterly destroyed (including the Holy Place, the Holy of Holies, middle wall of partition) are silent witnesses to Paul's Gospel and Law in which there is no Israel distinct from the Gentiles, no priesthood, no religious symbols (so no choir robes, no WWJD bracelets) , no holydays (no Christmas nor Easter nor Sabbath), and no rituals (no Mithraic/Hindu-like communion).
6. Statements (4) and (5) together confirm not only Paul's gospel, but that Paul's gospel is UNIQUE from ALL the rest of Scripture.
7. Statements (4) and (5) together confirm that the remaining stones are REMNANT stones. These stones, along with the destruction of the interior of the Temple

compound, simultaneously testify to the fact that today there is neither Jew nor Gentile and to the fact that in the future there will be Jew and Gentile, and ethnic Israel will yet fulfill all her prophecies. Hence these stones in this dispensation are exactly like a REMNANT (Rom. 11:5) in the Body of Christ who are of Jewish stock and who testify both to the neither-Jew-nor-Gentile Pauline gospel as well to the security of Israel's yet-to-be-fulfilled prophecies.

We shall not prove all of this proposition in equal detail in this outline, but shall focus primarily on P(1), P(2), P(3). These statements roughly determine the outline of the comments below.

It behooves us to repeat that the normative hermeneutic, the hermeneutic for interpreting communication conveying information, requires that we interpret words, phrases, grammar, idioms consistent with their predominant or normative usage by the original audience unless the context of the passage in question, or the context of a passage parallel to the passage in question, should require us to do otherwise. The burden of proof is upon those claiming a minority or exceptional meaning; and this burden can only be met by compelling proof from context. A "complacent context" means that the normative or customary meaning must be adhered to. In brief,...

...customary/normative usage rules unless context overrules!

The normative hermeneutic simply reflects the fact that the Holy Spirit created language for communication and that He wrote to His original audience in a way THEY could understand, that is, in a way based on their customary usage and ability to recognize the shaping by context. It is our obligation to submit to the meaning intended for the original audience because this is the Holy Spirit's meaning.

Hence the normative hermeneutic is the only hermeneutic which respects Scripture-so today it is necessarily communicated at the indwelling; i.e. Pauline regeneration drives saints of the present dispensation to deal with the text in order to get correct information from it, deal with the text honestly, deal with the text using the normative hermeneutic, and hence to uncover Paul's gospel with its distinctive hope and calling for these saints.

Further details may be found:¹

https://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/icc_proceedings/vol1/iss1/

¹ One may have to register with the Cedarville University Website for access. In the near future, TRF will be placing an outline on hermeneutics which will address this most important issue.

PART I. ANALYSIS OF "TEMPLE" AND RELATED WORDS OF MATTHEW, MARK, LUKE

There is no single Greek word for temple, either in LXX canon or apocrypha, Greek NT, or in any other ancient Greek literature. Two primary words referring to "temple structures" are HIERON and NAOS. Both are generally rendered "temple" in most English translations, which is neither very accurate nor helpful, since we tend to associate "temple" with a specific kind of building. It is imperative that we properly understand these words and their differences accurately. It is also relevant to consider other words used to refer to areas associated with ceremonial worship, namely HAGION, HAGIA, HAGIASMA. This allows us to fully appreciate Matthew's, Mark's, Luke's choice of words in Matthew 24:1, Mark 13:1, Luke 21:5, resp.

A. HIERON: PRIEST-PLACE / SACRED COMPOUND

1. **HIERON** is the neuter noun of the "priest" word group-HIERUS (priest), HIERATEUO (to function as a priest, HIERATEUMA (priesthood), etc. Being neuter, it means "priest-thing" or "priest-place" or "sacred compound", i.e. that area of the Land under the direct control of the priesthood and for the activities of the priesthood-this is the root meaning. The lexicons consistently render it as "temple" in the broadest possible sense, namely as the temple compound or temple precinct, including the enclosure housing the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies, rooms of hospitality, living quarters, sheds for supplies, walls with gates, various courts, etc. Clearly the root/lexical meaning includes all these structures. But the acid test is not what a lexicon says, but the actual usage of the word.
2. **Greek N.T.** HIERON occurs 71 times in the Greek N.T. and its usage there shows that the lexicon got it right. Here are some sample usages, all in the context of the Herodian-Zerubbabel HIERON:

Matthew 4:5 / Luke 4:9. "Wing of the HIERON." Apparently it refers to a high point of the outermost wall. The AV renders it "pinnacle of the HIERON" but PTERUGION comes from PTERUX (wing), so the interlinears are correct to call it "wing". This confirms the root/lexical meaning.

Matthew 24:1. "Buildings of the HIERON." This shows that the whole compound is intended and refers to ALL the structures of the HIERON, especially its walls, gates, sheds. The Herodian walls were walls in the ancient semitic sense, extremely thick on top of which were plazas, cedar-roofed porticos, elaborate decorations. The network of walls were the conspicuous part of the HIERON, save for the enclosure containing the Holy Place and Holy of Holies. The gates were also elaborate structures including special rooms and special decorations. "Buildings" translates OIKODOMAS (homestead buildings) of which these special walls-featuring huge granite blocks, one upon another-were an integral part.

Mark 13:12. Cf. Matt. 24:1.

Luke 21:5. Cf. Matt. 24:1.

John 2:14. "He drove all [oxen, sheep, doves, moneychangers] out of the HIERON." This activity took place in the compound, indeed the outer court of the Gentiles, in fact much of it on the stairs of the gate of the southern wall (see TIME article discussed below for citation). Note that "house" in the context is not translated by OKIA (actual dwelling place) but rather OIKOS (household, entirety of property). This confirms the root/lexical meaning of HIERON and confirms that the walls/gates/stairs are an integral part of the HIERON since they delineate the entire property (OIKOS) of the priests.

Acts 3:2. "Gate of the HIERON." This refers to a gate in the outermost wall of the compound, and it implies that the outermost wall is part of the HIERON. Acts 3:10. "Beautiful Gate of the HIERON." This refers to a specific gate of the outermost wall of the compound, -- namely the Eastern Wall -- and it implies that the outermost wall and gates are part of the HIERON. I know of no contrary usages in the Greek N. T. for HIERON-all walls and structures overseen by the priests are intended, always. Search and see (Rom. 14:5).

LXX (Greek O.T. and Apocrypha). There are 7 occurrences in LXX canon: I Chron. 9:27; 29:4, II Chron.6:13, Exek. 27:6; 28:18; 45:19, Dan. 9:27, all of these confirm the root/lexical meaning. An example is:

Dan. 9:27. "And upon the HIERON the abomination of desolation."

But in the parallel passage of Ezek. 8:3-5 (either Hebrew canon or LXX) the abomination is at the north gate of the compound, implying that the north gate is part of the HIERON.

Additionally, there are usages in the LXX apocrypha, but these are not as accessible -- the Hatch-Redpath listing for HIERON is part of the listing of HIEROS (a masculine adjective meaning PRIESTLY or SACRED) and this requires the separation of the HIERON usage by hand. None of the usages I have checked is at variance with the root/lexical meaning given above, including those referring to pagan structures and compounds.

4. **Josephus.** Josephus is cited in [M. F. Unger, Unger's Bible Dictionary, p.1081] as referring to the outermost wall of the Herodian-Zerubbabel compound as TO DEUTERION HIERON, literally "the second HIERON", or more loosely, "the second PRIEST-PLACE". This confirms the root/lexical meaning.
5. **Papyri, Engravings, Pottery Fragments.** Moulton & Milligan refer to the "inner courts of the Temple" in reference to the Herodian-Zerubbabel HIERON in a citation warning Gentiles from going into these inner courts [Moulton & Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament, p. 300]. Generally, their citations of

HIERON (and of HIEROS for that matter) are consistent with the root/lexical meaning given above.

CONCLUSION REGARDING HEIRON. All the pertinent and available evidence has been considered. We can safely say that we understand the Holy Spirit's usage of HIERON. In the case of the Herodian-Zerubbabel HIERON, it means ALL THE STRUCTURES OF THE COMPOUND OF THE TEMPLE PRECINCT, INCLUDING ALL WALLS, GATES, STAIRS.

Indeed, the language of Matthew 24:1, ΤΑΣ ΟΙΚΟΔΟΜΑΣ ΤΟΥ ΗΙΕΡΟΥ, means precisely ALL THE STRUCTURES OF THE SACRED COMPOUND-including all walls, gates, stairs-unless the context compels otherwise, and where is such compelling, contrary evidence?

It appears that the normative hermeneutic, via straightly plowing (II Tim. 2:15 ΟΡΘΟΤΙΜΕΟ), has spoken, and we are therefore required to submit to this meaning.

B. NAOS: SHRINE / ENCLOSURE OF HOLY PLACE AND HOLY OF HOLIES

1. **NAOS** is associated with ΝΑΙΟ (to dwell) and means SHRINE in the sense of where the deity meets with the faithful or priests representing the faithful. The lexicons generally agree with this meaning. Again, the acid test is usage, and we shall see that in the case of Israel's religion, NAOS refers to the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies and the physical aspects of such, including the actual building and enclosure of such, or even just the Holy of Holies. Thus NAOS is a proper subset of HEIRON: NAOS refers specifically to the structure at the center of the sacred compound and HIERON refers to the compound and all its structures as a whole-see [J. H. Thayer, Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon, pp. 299,422 under both words, respectively] and [W. Bauer, W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, F. W. Danker, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, pp. 372, 533]. One of the claims of [BAGD, p. 533] concerning NAOS (that it can equal HIERON) is flatly contradicted by usage in the very passages they adduce (we consider one example in Matt. 23:35 below)-Thayer is much more careful and accurate regarding NAOS. Usage and context rule!
2. **Greek N.T.** NAOS occurs 46 times in the Greek N.T. and its usage shows that the lexicons got it right, including its counter distinction with HIERON. Here are some sample usages, the first two in the context of the Herodian-Zerubbabel NAOS.

Matt. 23:35. "Between the NAOS and the altar." Here the NAOS is pinned down to be the enclosure of the Holy Place and Holy of Holies, or "temple proper", for the altar is just outside this enclosure. Since both the altar and this enclosure are part of the sacred compound, this shows the distinction between HIERON and NAOS. It is a contradiction to claim, as [BAGD, op. cit., p. 533] does, that NAOS is the temple precinct in this passage, since this would put the altar outside the entire compound!! This is why usage,

concordances, and evaluation for oneself are more important than the official lexicons(!).

Matt. 27:51 / Mark 14:38 / Luke 23:45. "The veil of the NAOS was rent." The veil separated the Holy Place from the Holy of Holies. This veil was therefore in the enclosure housing such. Although the veil is ultimately part of the HEIRON as the sacred compound, it is more precisely part of this enclosure or shrine. This passage favors NAOS as this shrine and shows how it may be distinguished from HIERON.

Eph. 2:21,22. "Is-growing into an holy NAOS ... for an absolute-at-home-ment of the God in Spirit." In the second phrase, the second member of an extended hypo catastasis, Paul is saying that the Body of Christ is the absolute dwelling place of the Holy Spirit, i.e. the Body of Christ is the Holy of Holies amongst God's Elect, and by a parallelism in this hypo catastasis, calls the Body a NAOS in the first member of this hypo catastasis. This shows that people of both Jewish background (Paul) and Gentile background (recipients of Ephesian letter-namely Laodicea (but that's another issue)) understood that NAOS meant shrine in this restricted sense. Note that here NAOS is precisely restricted to the Holy of Holies.

Rev. 11:19. "There was seen in His NAOS the ark of the covenant." This shows immediately that NAOS means the shrine of the heavenly court.

Rev. 16:1,17. "A great voice out of the NAOS. In context this is the shrine of heaven."

I know of no contrary usage in the Greek N.T. for NAOS-it consistently means the building/shrine at the very center of the HIERON.

3. **LXX** (Greek O.T. and Apocrypha). There are about 69 occurrences of NAOS in LXX canon (depending slightly on which underlying manuscript is being followed). I am not aware of any significant deviation from what has been observed in the Greek N.T. Here is the first occurrence in LXX:

I Sam. 1:9. "Now Heli the priest was upon a seat by the threshold of the NAOS (Greek) of the Lord." This is consistent with the root/lexical meaning given above, referring to the doorway of the enclosure of the Holy Place and Holy of Holies. The underlying Hebrew text speaks that Eli sat on a seat by a post of the temple of the Lord, which means he was located at the doorway of the shrine proper.

4. **Papyri, Engravings, Pottery Fragments.** The evidence of [Moulton & Milligan, op. cit., p. 422] confirms the root/lexical meaning given above. They adduce several pagan examples in the support of the view that NAOS is the shrine, in the sense of dwelling place, of the deity in question. They also quote the German

scholar Wilcken's analysis of one example ["Der NAOS in Allerheiligsten ist der Schrein, in dem das Bild der Goettin steht"], which roughly translates as "The NAOS in the most-holy [sense] is the shrine in which the icon of the goddess stands." This is fully in keeping with root/lexical sense of NAOS-in the Herodian-Zerubbabel case there was simply the unseen presence of Jehovah in the holiest place, and in the Solomonic case there was the ark of the covenant with the unseen presence of Jehovah over the Mercy Seat and under the Tallith of the Cherubim wings in the holiest place. So this fits perfectly.

CONCLUSION REGARDING NAOS. Again, all the pertinent and available evidence has been considered. We can safely say that we understand the Holy Spirit's usage of NAOS. In the case of the Herodian-Zerubbabel NAOS, it means at least THAT SPECIFIC STRUCTURE HOUSING THE HOLY PLACE AND THE HOLY OF HOLIES, and in some usages, in a narrower sense, it means precisely THE HOLY OF HOLIES.

C. HAGION, HAGIA, HAGIASMA

HAGION, HAGIA, HAGIASMA are of the HAGIOS (holy, set-apart) word group and roughly mean SANCTUARY. The plural HAGIA (holies) as the plural of majesty narrows to the Holy of Holies or Most Holy Place. HAGION, HAGIA occur in the Greek N.T., and HAGION, HAGIASMA in LXX, for the sanctuary. For all intents and purposes, these words are synonymous with NAOS and refer to the enclosure of the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies, or in a somewhat narrower sense, to the Holy of Holies.

We let the reader run these down using the standard aids (for the Greek N.T., it can be done with Strong's or the Online Bible or ...).

This word group links us back to NAOS, for NAOS and HAGIA-Shrine and Holiest Place-are identified by parallelism in Eph. 2:19,21, further confirming what was said in B(2, Conclusion) above.

EPH. 2:19,21,22. "So then you are absolutely-no-more truly-sojourning strangers, but-rather you are joint-citizens OF the Holiest-Place [the choice for the genitive plural form TON HAGION is between "the saints" if masculine and "the Holiest-Place" if neuter, and "citizens of saints" is absurd; and those insisting on corrupting this genitive by the unheard-of "with" are under the curse of Deut. 4:2 as applied to Pauline Law] ... all the building being-jointly-fitted-together grows into [a] Holy Shrine in [the] Lord ... being-jointly-built-together into absolute-at-home-ment of the God in Spirit."

D. PROOF OF P(1).

We now wrap up the proof of P(1): Christ's prophecies concern the entirety of the temple compound/precinct, including all its walls and structures. Incidentally, these prophecies were given three times on three different occasions (but regarding the same subject, as we shall see).

1. First, Matthew (24:1), Mark (13:1-2), Luke (21:5) are inspired in representing in Greek whatever Christ said in Hebrew/Aramaic.
2. Second, Matthew, Mark, Luke had available FIVE words to convey what Christ intended, four of these words focusing on the sanctuary proper. They all willfully chose HIERON, the one word of the five available which ALWAYS conveys the notion of the sacred compound and all its structures and walls.
3. Third, by the normative hermeneutic, we must so interpret Christ's prophecies. The prophecies recorded in Matthew and Mark are the more emphatic of the three, Matthew, for example, indicating the OIKODOMAS TOU HIEROU, namely all the structures of the property of the sacred compound, including gates, walls, stairs (remember, the HIERON is said to have GATES, including the BEAUTIFUL, and only walls have gates; therefore, HIERON as a word includes the walls!). But all these structures are also referred to, though more implicitly, in Luke as well.

This concludes the proof of P(1).

PART II. EXTENT OF DEVASTATION: ABSOLUTE NEGATIVES AND DOUBLE NEGATIVES (in Greek)

ABSTRACT. The Matthew, Mark, Luke prophecies concerning the HIERON occurred on three different occasions on the same day. The point is that Christ said it thrice, and Luke gives the first occasion: in the context of the end of Luke 20 and 21:1-4, He is still in the HIERON, i.e. still within some court of the sacred complex; in Mark 13, He is in process of leaving the HIERON, making Mark the middle prophecy; and in Matthew 24, He leaves the HIERON before making His HIERON prophecy, so Matthew gives the third HIERON prophecy. There are other points of comparison, but this should suffice for now. (And we note, that in the harmony between Matthew and Luke, it seems Luke goes first and Matthew and Mark later: Luke 4 gives the first round of temptation and Matthew 4 the second round (yes, Satan tried it twice before giving up); Luke 22 gives the first course of the Last Passover and Matthew 26 and Mark 14 give the second course of this Passover (with John 13 at the midpoint between the courses; etc.)

A. LUKAN HIERON PROPHECY (Luke 21:14,56)

1. Occurs BEFORE Christ leaves the HIERON, while He is still WITHIN the HIERON-Verses 14.
2. Verse 5.
 - a. "Some [of the disciples] are saying (LEGO) about the HIERON." We know from our comparative word study that this refers to the entirety of the Priest-Place or Sacred Compound (including the walls).

- b. "That with beautiful stones and gifts it has been decorated." This must include the walls. According to Josephus [M.F. Unger, loc. cit], the outer wall had porticos on which were marble pillars 25 cubits, with cedar roofs, and these walls were decorated with mosaics. The eastern part of the outer wall featured the gate called Beautiful, which was made of Corinthian brass and richly decorated with precious metals [M. F. Unger, loc. cit.]. Thus we know that even the outermost walls are intended in this discussion of the HIERON.

3. Verse 6

- a. "Days will come in which ABSOLUTELY-NOT (OUK) will be left a stone upon another which will ABSOLUTELY-NOT (OU) be overthrown." The Greek has two negatives: ME, the general negative, and OUK or OU, the absolute negative. The absolute negative insists on no exceptions: this is the pattern of its usage. Therefore, we must so interpret OUK/OU in this passage unless the context should compel us otherwise-this is the mandate of the normative hermeneutic.
 - b. Christ repeats the absolute negative. This means the context must REALLY be compelling to interpret OUK/OU otherwise.
 - c. Christ's prophecy in Luke requires for its fulfillment that EVERY SINGLE STONE be cast down of the ENTIRE TEMPLE PRECINCT. This is the necessary consequence of the normative hermeneutic. This is how the original audience would understand this, therefore that is His meaning.
4. **VERIFICATION OF P(2) ABOVE.** P(2) above asserted that Christ's prophecies mandate that absolutely no structures be left intact in any sense, absolutely not one single stone be left on top of another stone.

P(2) has now been verified in the case of the Lukan prophecy. But there is much more in Mark and Matthew!

C. MARKAN PROPHECY (Mark 13:13).

This occurs WHILE Christ is leaving the HIERON (Verse 1). Apparently, Christ and the 12 are leaving the HIERON via the Beautiful Gate on the east wall, since they are going to Mount Olivette (Verse 3) which is on the east.

This implies their discussion must include the walls, gates, and their all-important stairways where much of HIERON culture flourished (see the TIME article cited below). The main points are identical with Matthew (C. below), including the same extremely intense PAIR OF DOUBLE NEGATIVES, and with the rhetorical POTAPOS ("what manner of?") playing the same role in Mark as PAS in Matthew.

It must follow that P(2) is verified in the case of Mark also.

C. MATTHEW PROPHECY (Matt. 24:13)

1. Occurs AFTER Christ leaves the HIERON. This means that He and the disciples are OUTSIDE the outer walls looking at the HIERON compound.
 - a. Apparently, Christ and the 12 are looking back at the HIERON from the east, having exited the Beautiful Gate on the east wall on their way to Mount Olivette (Verse 3) which is on the east.
 - b. This prophecy and Mark's are more intense and even more emphatic than the earlier one recorded by Luke.

2. Verse 1.
 - a. "Show Him the OIKODOMAS TOU HIERON." From the OUTSIDE of the HIERON, they are pointing to all the property-structures / homestead-structures of the sacred compound. This must include the outermost wall (among the other structures) with all its piazzas, porticos, decorations by mosaics and precious metals, marble pillars, cedar roofs, etc. It especially includes the Beautiful Gate of the east wall.
 - b. This correlates perfectly with the expression of Luke concerning decorations and beautiful stones.

3. Verse 2.
 - a. "Do you absolutely-not see ALL-MANNER-OF (PANTA) these?" A rhetorical question using the absolute negative. Now, John Owen forever established, by the normative hermeneutic, in Volume 10 of his works (The Death of Death in the Death of Christ), even by considering some 500(!) occurrences of the Greek PAS, that the basic sense of PAS is ALL MANNER OF. So Christ acknowledges their showing Him the OIKODOMAS and responds by asking them to ABSOLUTELY consider ALL MANNER OF these structures. This implies the WALLS of the HIERON are being considered, otherwise there is a kind or species of structure not being considered, and this violates the combination of OU and PAS. This is a necessary consequence of the normative hermeneutic!
 - b. "Truly, I say to you". Again, a more emphatic record than in Luke.
 - c. "ABSOLUTELY-NOT-NOT (OU ME) will be left here stone upon stone which shall ABSOLUTELY-NOT-NOT (OU ME) be overthrown." Spectacular! A PAIR of DOUBLE NEGATIVES. This Greek usage represents an extremely intense negation. In English, we view it as bad grammar to put two negatives together, but here Matthew, to convey the intensity of the prophecy of Christ, intensifies the already absolute negative with the general negative. THIS LEAVES NO

POSSIBLE WIGGLE ROOM (as if the Lukan prophecy were not already sufficiently explicit): ABSOLUTELY NOT ONE SOLITARY, SINGLE STONE WILL BE LEFT ON TOP ON ANY OTHER STONE

d. The fulfillment of Christ's prophecy as recorded in Matthew requires that EVERY SINGLE STONE OF EVERY STRUCTURE OF THE SACRED COMPOUND, including its sanctuary (NAOS), the court of Gentiles, the court of women, all sheds, all walls inner and outer, EVERYTHING OF EVERY KIND, be overthrown, NOT ONE STONE OF ANYTHING LEFT ON TOP OF ANY OTHER STONE.

4. **VERIFICATION OF P(2) ABOVE.** P(2) above asserted that Christ's prophecies mandate that absolutely no structures be left intact in any sense, absolutely not one single stone be left on top of another stone.

P(2) has now been verified in the case of the Matthew prophecy.

D. **REINFORCEMENT.** These three parallel passages reinforce each other and therefore intensify each other-there is to be left not one single stone of any structure of the Herodian-Zerubbabel complex when these prophecies are fulfilled. Christ is repeatedly teaching this over and over: within the compound, on the way out of the compound, and outside the compound.

P(2) has been verified indeed.

PART III. TEMPLE PROPHECIES N-O-T FULFILLED-THE LESSER ARGUMENT: PHYSICAL EVIDENCE TODAY.

An absolutely striking article, which everyone should go right out and purchase or at least photocopy at your library (or even download, if possible, from their website), appeared in TIME magazine very recently. Please consider:

David van Biena, "Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus", TIME 157:15(16 April 2001) 4656.

The scale models based on the latest archaeology shows the extensive way in which the walls were very much structures (OIKODOMAS) of the HIERON-chambers, stairways, extensive windows, storerooms (confirming [M. F. Unger, loc. cit]); see [van Biena, op. cit., p. 54] of this article.

But the most pertinent evidence from this article, which is simply overwhelming, are the before-drawing and after-photograph of [van Biena, op. cit., pp. 48-49] of the HIERON overall and the photograph of [van Biena, op. cit., p. 50] of the remaining steps of the stairway of the southern wall (parentheses of caption). From these evidences it is established that:

1. The Wailing Wall is indeed part of the original western wall of the HIERON, and as my daughter Rachel (William Penn Fellow in Archaeology and Egyptology at Penn starting Fall 2001) can testify from having just been there in June 2000 (and the videotape of her visit further documents this), there are MANY stones left on top of each other at the level of the Wailing Wall which corresponds to the Herodian-Zerubbabel HIERON. The upper stones of the Wailing Wall, she reports, are roughly 1000 years ago from Muslim times, but the lower stones are from the time of Christ as an intact, stone-upon-stone foundation for later additions (as the videotape makes plain).
2. The original eastern wall, with the now-blocked Beautiful Gate, is still there with MANY stones upon each other in an intact structure. The Scripture explicitly states (Acts 3:10) that this gate and its wall are part of the HEIRON. BUT THEY ARE STILL THERE.
3. Stairways were a fundamental part of the OIKODOMAS of the HIERON, and one can still see MANY stones on top of one another in the ruins of the southern steps, stairways being a critical part of Herodian HIERON life and culture [van Biena, op. cit., p. 55].
4. The written text of the TIME article states [van Biena, op. cit., p. 55]:

"Physical remains of Herod's masterpiece are scarce. But they tend to support descriptions in the four surviving written sources from from approximately the same period [Gospels, Acts, Josephus, Talmud]. ... The Western Wall where Jews pray today is a small slice of the [Herodian] platform's 16-ft.-thick side. SOME OF THE STONES ARE 30 FEET LONG AND WEIGH UP TO 50 TONS."

(Note that "scarce" does not mean "non-existent", indeed it implies "existent", as van Biena's article itself shows repeatedly.)

The conclusion is unavoidable: Christ's prophecy is true, Christ's prophecy concerns every single stone of the temple precinct-walls, gates, stairs especially included, and the evidence is stark that this prophecy has not been fulfilled.

It follows that P(3) and the first sentence of P(4) have been verified:

The physical evidence, even today, shows that structures included in Christ's prophecies, with stones still on top of each other, remain from the temple compound of Christ's day.

The fulfillment of Christ's prophecies await a future time of God's dealing with ethnic Israel.

The logic of the above is made more explicit in the next point.

4. **LOGICAL APPENDIX.** Christ has emphatically prophesied a complete destruction, a destruction which may be expressed in the form of a universally

quantified statement where A is the set of all stones in the whole sacred compound (walls especially included) and P be the predicate "shall not be left on top of another stone but shall be overturned":

[for each x in A, P(x)]

i.e.

[for each stone in the compound, that stone will not be left on top of another stone and shall be overturned]

Now the negation of a universally quantified statement uses the existential quantifier and the inference rule known as Quantifier Exchange (QE):

not [for each x in A, P(x)] \iff [there is x in A, not P(x)]

or a little more idiomatically:

not [for each x in A, P(x)] \iff [for some x in A, not P(x)]

Before we consider the negation of Christ' statement, let's try an example. Let A be a basketball team and P be the predicate of tall. Then [for each x in A, P(x)] means "each person on the team is tall". How would we deny or negate such a statement? The negation (NOT the logical "opposite") would insist that at least one person on the team was not tall, i.e. would insist that someone on the team is not tall (be careful, not tall need not be the same as short).

So the negation of Christ's statement is of the form:

[there is x in A, not P(x)]

Restated, the negation is of the form:

at least one stone in the compound is still on top of another stone or has not been overturned) where "not [will not be left on top of another stone and shall be overturned]" is the same as

"is not on top of another stone or has not been overturned"

(I have used double negation on the left conjunct, changed the conjunction to disjunction (another form of Quantifier Exchange known as deMorgan Laws), and negated the right conjunct. I have also played fast and loose with the issue of tense, which negation does not regard; but it should be clear that it does not matter.)

We are ready to logically frame sure tests for whether Christ's temple prophecies have come to pass or not.

LOGICAL TEST FOR THE PROPHECIES HAVING COME TO PASS. IF we find that every single stone of the Herodian-Zerubbabel compound has been overturned and every single stone fails to sit on top of another stone, THEN the prophecies have indeed come to pass.

LOGICAL TEST FOR THE PROPHECIES NOT HAVING COME TO PASS. IF we find AT LEAST ONE STONE still on top of another stone or which has not been overturned, THEN the prophecies have NOT yet come to pass.

Which test is satisfied? Is there any doubt? There are MANY stones in the western wall, the eastern wall, and the southern steps that are on top of other stones or which have not been overturned.

This should logically settle the matter from a Biblical and evidential point of view. Again, P(3) and the first sentence of P(4) are verified and the logic should be plain.

(As a footnote, van Biena claims that the Romans fulfilled Christ's temple prophecies in A.D. 135 [van Biena, op. cit. , p.56], but his own article, sound logic, and a rigorous exegesis of the text mandate otherwise as each of you can see for yourselves. Thus either his logic is unsound or his exegesis is unsound, possible both, probably the latter.)

PART IV. TEMPLE PROPHECIES N-O-T FULFILLED-THE GREATER ARGUMENT: PAUL'S UNIQUE/DISTINCTIVE GOSPEL

We sketch a greater and better argument, but refer to online studies for details of proof. The gospel of salvation concerning the Body of Christ was revealed by Christ TO Paul and the Pauline apostleship (Titus, Timothy, Silas, Sosthenes, etc) and ONLY TO Paul and the Pauline apostleship, directly by Christ to Paul and by the Spirit of Christ to both Paul and the other Pauline apostles. Further, that gospel describes that the Body as being "neither Jew nor Gentile".

This is a necessary consequence of a rigorous application of the normative hermeneutic to all of Scripture. This has been demonstrated sufficiently by many able students of the Word. Many demonstrations are found at the TRF website.

<https://www.7ones.org/pauline-bootcamp>

<https://www.7ones.org/day-of-the-lord>

<https://www.7ones.org/millennial-kingdom>

<https://www.7ones.org/prophetic-clocks-of-scripture>

<https://www.7ones.org/topical-studies>

The GREATER and BETTER argument is as follows: IF the gospel of salvation concerning the Body of Christ was revealed by Christ TO and ONLY TO Paul and the Pauline apostleship, and if that gospel describes that Body as being neither Jew nor Gentile, THEN, during the time that this Body is being dealt with in this life, i.e. until the Rapture/Ascension of that Body, God cannot deal with men on the basis of ethnic identity and distinction. But Christ's prophecy concerns the nation Israel ipse facto: Christ in His earthly ministry is a minister to the circumcision (Rom. 15:8) to confirm the promises made to the fathers, His Temple prophecies concern the HIERON which is a feature of Israel as the Priest-Nation, we know that Zion is purified in the Third Generation (by the 144k as the saviors of the Land-Obadiah 21 and Rev. 14:1 in that order) as a preparation for building Ezekiel's Millennial Temple, hence that the Herodian-Zerubbabel HIERON must be completely gone, every single stone, as a preparation for that new HIERON, etc. Thus the fulfillment of these Temple prophecies is connected with Israel's future ethnic empire. Therefore they cannot be fulfilled in a dispensation in which there is neither Jew nor Gentile.

Here is another tack. The fulfillment of the temple prophecies in Matthew 24, Mark 13, Luke 21 are in the context of the Israel's last days, as both Christ and the disciples make clear. Paul has explicitly stated that the day of the Body precedes the night in which comes the Day of the Lord as a thief in the night (I Thess. 5-use your study aids!). If the temple prophecies are in the Day of the Lord, then they cannot have been fulfilled during the day of the Body of Christ (which began with Paul's ministry before he wrote his first epistle and is still in place because I have not been raptured yet-and each member of the Body can say the same). Thus they have not been fulfilled yet.

These and other arguments rest only on developing from the Scriptures a theology in accordance with the normative hermeneutic and hence are superior to the partially archaeological argument; that is, they are more purely presuppositional in nature.

What happened with the Romans in A.D. 70 and 135 (Gregorian calendar) is that the Romans vindicated Paul's gospel AND the surety of God restoring Israel in the future as the Priest-Nation and ruler of the planet in accordance with all the Hebrew and non-Pauline prophets. The existence of those stones on top of each other in the walls and steps say that Christ's prophecy is yet future and that it will come to pass along with all the other prophecies, including the future HIERON which necessitates the complete removal of all the stones of the old HIERON of Israel's Second Generation. At the same time, the fact that the NAOS, and the middle wall of partition in the inner court of the HIERON were destroyed testifies to Paul's gospel of NO ETHNICITY, NO SYMBOLS, NO HOLYDAYS, NO EARTHLY PROSPECT/HOPE, NO RITUAL BAPTISM, NO RITUAL MEALS, etc.

As pointed out earlier, these remaining stones are REMNANT stones. These stones, along with the destruction of the interior of the Temple compound, simultaneously testify to the fact that today there is neither Jew nor Gentile and to the fact that in the future there will be Jew and Gentile, and ethnic Israel will yet fulfill all her prophecies. Hence these stones in this dispensation are exactly like a REMNANT (Rom. 11:5) in the Body of Christ

who are of Jewish stock and who testify both to the neither-Jew-nor-Gentile Pauline gospel as well to the security of Israel's yet-to-be-fulfilled prophecies.

In terms of the atonement which Christ made for Israel, the stones still remaining testify to the fact that Christ redeemed Israel to be the Holy Nation, the Chosen Genetic-Race, the Royal Priesthood (I Peter 2:9; Rev. 5:9,10) in the future; and in terms of the atonement which Christ made for the Body of Christ, the NAOS and middle wall of partition being broken down testify to Christ having nailed all such ceremonial and ritual and symbolic and ethnic issues to the cross for the Body of Christ (Eph. 2:11-17, Col. 2:8-23 (especially 15 in context)).

This is just a sketch of the better argument; there is much more in the online studies and other studies available from TRF.

A final comment: the better argument allows us on purely Biblical and presuppositional grounds to postdict what archaeological evidence we should find in the field, namely the existence of at least one such stone, and such evidence is in fact found, and this logically proves the lesser argument and vindicates the greater argument.

PART V. REBUTTALS TO THIS OUTLINE

Since the normative hermeneutic, or grammatico-historical method, is one of the ground rules of TRF, we only consider rebuttals to this outline based upon a good-faith attempt to apply this hermeneutic to the Scriptures. We must honor the Scriptures, and this is the only way to do it.