

**Wilderness Tabernacle and Eschatological Temple: A
Study in Temple Symbolism in Hebrews in the Light of
Attitudes to the Temple in the Literature of Middle
Judaism**

Philip Arthur Frederick Church

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

at the University of Otago

Dunedin, New Zealand

2012

Abstract

The literature of middle Judaism, including the Epistle to the Hebrews, contains considerable temple symbolism. Through a careful examination of such symbolism, this study demonstrates that the wilderness tabernacle is not seen as an inferior copy of a heavenly sanctuary in Hebrews. Rather, it prefigures the eschatological dwelling of God with his people, which is pictured in Hebrews as a heavenly temple. This eschatological reality is inaugurated with the exaltation of Jesus to God's right hand, and access to it is available proleptically to God's people in the present.

The literature of middle Judaism is explored in terms of the attitudes to the temple disclosed in the various documents. Some texts portray a positive attitude to the temple, seeing it as the dwelling place of God, a microcosm of the universe and a link between heaven and earth. Other texts portray a sense of dissatisfaction with the temple that surfaces in a variety of ways, but is nearly always resolved with reference to a heavenly temple. Such texts often ignore the Second Temple altogether.

The Qumran community's dissatisfaction with the Jerusalem temple led to a withdrawal into the Judean desert. The community compensated for the lack of a physical temple by referring to either a heavenly or an eschatological temple. Some texts anticipate the eschatological temple that God was expected to construct in the last days, while in other texts the community viewed itself as a temple. In this connection, community members believed that they were participating in angelic worship and they also envisaged angels as present with them in the Judean desert. Apocalyptic literature reports heavenly journeys and a heavenly priesthood, marginalising the earthly temple and priesthood. Some texts that respond to the fall of the temple portray a positive attitude to the temple and other texts express a negative attitude. In both cases, however, there is the anticipation of an eschatological temple to be built by God. The evidence is mixed, but in texts anticipating an eschatological temple, it seems to be conceived as a physical building in Jerusalem, sometimes of gigantic proportions.

Dissatisfaction with the Jerusalem temple also emerges in Hebrews, despite the lack of explicit reference to it. The writer claims that the wilderness tabernacle anticipates the heavenly, eschatological temple, of which Christ is a minister. The wilderness journeys of the people of God in the past are a paradigm for the pilgrimage of the people of God in the present. However, their destination is not the land of Canaan, but God's rest in the heavenly temple in the world to come. Jerusalem and temple are negated in favour of the true tent "pitched" by the Lord with the exaltation of Christ to God's right hand, the heavenly Jerusalem, the city to come, where Jesus is now enthroned.

Acknowledgements

Many people have contributed both directly and indirectly to this project. Gratitude is due to my supervisors, Dr. James Harding of the University of Otago and Dr. Chris Marshall of the Victoria University of Wellington, for their wisdom, insight and encouragement. I am also grateful to Dr. Peter Walker of Wickliffe Hall at the University of Oxford for his encouragement to pursue the project and his ongoing interest and advice.

The thesis would not have been completed without the help of my own institution, Laidlaw College. I am grateful for two semesters of study leave, as well as a weekly research day when I was freed from teaching and other duties to concentrate on my research. I have greatly valued the encouragement of my colleagues at Laidlaw

Libraries are an important part of a research project such as this, and I am grateful to the librarians and staff of the following libraries for their generous assistance. I spent several weeks in a succession of visits to Tyndale House in Cambridge and numerous single days at the Dalton McCaughey Library in Melbourne, Australia. These two libraries contain wonderful resources. During my study leave in 2006 I worked in the Leon Morris Library at Ridley College in Melbourne and was welcomed as part of the Ridley College community. Other libraries I have used include the St Paschal Library in Melbourne, the Library of the École Biblique et Archéologique Française in Jerusalem, the British Library and the Heythrop College Library in London, and the Kinder Library at the College of St John the Evangelist in Auckland. The librarians and staff of the Deane Memorial Library at Laidlaw College have been particularly helpful, and I cannot speak too highly of the Remote Library Service at the University of Otago. I am grateful to the librarians and staff there for their efficiency and helpfulness. No request was too difficult and the service I received was always exceptional.

A thesis such as this contains considerable fine detail. I am grateful to my daughter-in-law, Vicky Church for her careful proof-reading of the manuscript from beginning to end. Her efficiency, her sharp eyes and her knowledge of English grammar and punctuation are exceptional. Responsibility for errors that remain is solely mine.

The love, understanding and commitment of my wife Dorothy has been a constant inspiration as she patiently endured numerous lonely evenings while I sat tapping the keys on my computer. Thanks is also due to our daughter Joanna and her husband Geoff for their hospitality on numerous visits to Melbourne, and to our grandson Liam, who anticipated many visits from his grandparents, only to see his grandfather disappear to a library. It was always a delight to meet Dorothy and Liam at the train station at the end of the day.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|------|
| Abstract | i |
| Acknowledgements | ii |
| Abbreviations | viii |
| 1 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.2 The Argument of Hebrews | 3 |
| 1.3 Temple Symbolism | 5 |
| 1.4 Literature Review | 9 |
| 1.4.1 The Heavenly Temple/Sanctuary in Hebrews | 10 |
| 1.4.2 Literature on God's Rest in Hebrews | 16 |
| 1.4.3 Literature on Philo and Middle Platonism in Hebrews | 17 |
| 1.5 Introduction to Hebrews | 22 |
| 1.5.1 Genre | 22 |
| 1.5.2 Structure | 23 |
| 1.5.3 Authorship | 24 |
| 1.5.4 Location of Author and Recipients | 25 |
| 1.5.5 Date and Occasion | 26 |
| 1.5.6 Hebrews and the Temple | 27 |
| 1.5.7 The Relapse Theory | 28 |
| 1.6 Methodology | 29 |
| 1.7 Intertextuality | 31 |
| 1.8 Summary | 34 |
| 2 Temple Affirmed: Temple Symbolism in Texts Reflecting a Positive Attitude to the Temple | 35 |
| 2.1 Introduction | 35 |
| 2.2 Sirach | 35 |
| 2.2.1 The Praise of Wisdom (Sir 24:1-33) | 36 |
| 2.2.2 The Hymn in Praise of the Ancestors (Sir 44-50) | 41 |
| 2.2.3 Conclusion | 48 |
| 2.3 Wisdom of Solomon | 48 |
| 2.4 <i>Sibylline Oracles</i> | 52 |
| 2.4.1 <i>Sibylline Oracles</i> Book 3 | 53 |
| 2.4.2 Conclusion | 58 |
| 2.5 Philo of Alexandria | 58 |
| 2.5.1 Philo's Attitude to the Temple | 59 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 2.5.2 The Design of the Tabernacle | 61 |
| 2.5.3 Conclusion | 63 |
| 2.6 2 (<i>Slavonic</i>) <i>Enoch</i> | 64 |
| 2.6.1 Enoch and the Temple | 66 |
| 2.6.2 Enoch's Heavenly Journey | 67 |
| 2.6.3 Enoch's Ethical Instructions | 70 |
| 2.6.4 Conclusion | 70 |
| 2.7 Conclusion | 70 |
| 3 Temple Rejected: Temple Symbolism in the Dead Sea Scrolls | 72 |
| 3.1 Introduction | 72 |
| 3.2 4Q Eschatological Midrash ^a (4QFlorilegium) | 74 |
| 3.3 The <i>Temple Scroll</i> (11QT ^a) | 80 |
| 3.4 The <i>New Jerusalem</i> Scroll | 86 |
| 3.5 4QInstruction | 88 |
| 3.6 4QDaily Prayers (4Q503) | 91 |
| 3.7 The <i>Community Rule</i> (1QS) | 93 |
| 3.7.1 1QS V 1-6 | 94 |
| 3.7.2 1QS VIII 1-16a; IX 3-11 | 95 |
| 3.7.3 1QS IX 26–XI 22 | 97 |
| 3.8 The <i>Rule of the Congregation</i> (1QSa) | 98 |
| 3.9 The <i>Rule of Benedictions</i> (1QSB) | 99 |
| 3.10 The <i>War Scroll</i> (1QM) | 102 |
| 3.11 The <i>Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice</i> | 107 |
| 3.11.1 The Structure and Purpose of <i>ShirShabb</i> | 108 |
| 3.11.2 An Alternative Reading of <i>ShirShabb</i> | 110 |
| 3.11.3 Other Relevant Material in <i>ShirShabb</i> | 118 |
| 3.11.4 Conclusion | 125 |
| 3.12 4QB ^a (4Q286-290) | 126 |
| 3.12.1 4QB ^a (4Q286) | 127 |
| 3.12.2 4QB ^b (4Q287) | 129 |
| 3.12.3 4QB ^d (4Q289) | 130 |
| 3.13 <i>Songs of the Sage</i> (4Q510-511) | 131 |
| 3.14 <i>Hodayot</i> (1QH ^a) | 134 |
| 3.15 4QApocryphon of Moses ^c ? (4Q408) | 136 |
| 3.16 Conclusion | 137 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 4 Temple Contested: Temple Symbolism in Literature Reflecting Dissatisfaction with the Temple | 139 |
| 4.1 Introduction | 139 |
| 4.2 <i>1 (Ethiopic) Enoch</i> | 140 |
| 4.2.1 The Book of the Watchers (<i>1 En.</i> 1-36) | 140 |
| 4.2.2 The Animal Apocalypse (<i>1 En.</i> 85-90) | 151 |
| 4.2.3 The Apocalypse of Weeks (<i>1 En.</i> 93:1-10; 91:11-17) | 154 |
| 4.2.4 The Parables of Enoch (<i>1 En.</i> 37-71) | 158 |
| 4.3 <i>Jubilees</i> | 165 |
| 4.3.1 The Tabernacle, the Temple and the Eschatological Sanctuary | 166 |
| 4.3.2 Eden as a Sanctuary | 168 |
| 4.4 <i>The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs</i> | 169 |
| 4.4.1 The Testament of Levi | 171 |
| 4.4.2 An Eschatological Temple in the <i>Testaments</i> | 179 |
| 4.5 <i>The Testament of Moses</i> | 183 |
| 4.6 <i>The Apocalypse of Zephaniah</i> | 188 |
| 4.6.1 Zephaniah's Encounters with Angels | 189 |
| 4.6.2 The Heavenly City | 190 |
| 4.7 Conclusion | 191 |
| 5 Temple Destroyed: Temple Symbolism in Literature Responding to the Fall of the Temple | 193 |
| 5.1 Introduction | 193 |
| 5.1 <i>The Fourth Book of Ezra</i> | 193 |
| 5.2.1 The First Dialogue (3:1–5:20) | 196 |
| 5.2.2 The Second Dialogue (5:21–6:34) | 196 |
| 5.2.3 The Third Dialogue (6:35–9:25) | 197 |
| 5.2.4 The First Vision (9:26–10:59) | 198 |
| 5.2.5 The Third Vision (13:1-58) | 200 |
| 5.2.6 Conclusion | 200 |
| 5.3 <i>The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch</i> | 201 |
| 5.3.1 Section 1 (<i>2 Bar.</i> 1:1–5:7) | 202 |
| 5.3.2 Section 2 (<i>2 Bar.</i> 6:1–9:1) | 204 |
| 5.3.3 Section 3 (<i>2 Bar.</i> 10:1–12:5) | 206 |
| 5.3.4 Section 5.1 (<i>2 Bar.</i> 31–43) | 206 |
| 5.3.5 Section 6.2 (<i>2 Bar.</i> 53:1–77:26) | 207 |
| 5.3.6 Conclusion | 210 |
| 5.4 <i>The Apocalypse of Abraham</i> | 211 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 5.5 Pseudo-Philo (<i>L.A.B.</i>) | 217 |
| 5.5.1 Moses on Sinai | 218 |
| 5.5.2 The Tabernacle | 219 |
| 5.5.3 The Temple | 219 |
| 5.5.4 The Heavenly Temple | 221 |
| 5.5.5 Kenaz and the Twelve Stones | 222 |
| 5.5.6 Conclusion | 224 |
| 5.6 <i>Sibylline Oracles</i> Book 4 | 224 |
| 5.7 <i>Sibylline Oracles</i> Book 5 | 227 |
| 5.7.1 The Return of Nero | 228 |
| 5.7.2 The Eschatological Redeemer | 230 |
| 5.7.3 Conclusion | 233 |
| 5.8 The <i>Ladder of Jacob</i> | 233 |
| 5.9 Josephus | 236 |
| 5.9.1 The <i>Antiquities of the Jews</i> | 237 |
| 5.9.2 The <i>Jewish War</i> | 243 |
| 5.9.3 <i>Against Apion</i> | 246 |
| 5.10 Conclusion | 247 |
| 6 The Eschatological Orientation of Hebrews | 249 |
| 6.1 Introduction | 249 |
| 6.2 Psalm 110:1 in Heb 1:1-14 | 250 |
| 6.2.1 Psalm 110:1 | 251 |
| 6.2.2 Psalm 110:1 in Heb 1:13 | 251 |
| 6.2.3 Psalm 110:1 in Heb 1:3 | 253 |
| 6.2.4 The Catena of Quotations (Heb 1:5-14) | 260 |
| 6.3 The Dominion of Humanity over the World to Come (Heb 2:5-18) | 269 |
| 6.3.1 Psalm 8:5-7 in Hebrew and Greek | 272 |
| 6.3.2 Psalm 8:5-7 in the NT and in Hebrews | 273 |
| 6.3.3 Hebrews 2:8b-9 | 274 |
| 6.3.4 Hebrews 2:10-13 | 276 |
| 6.4 Conclusion | 282 |
| 7. The Eschatological Goal of the People of God: Temple Symbolism in Hebrews 3:1–4:11; 11:1–13:16 | 284 |
| 7.1 Introduction | 284 |
| 7.2 The House(hold) of God (Heb 3:1-6) | 284 |
| 7.3 God's Rest (3:7–4:11) | 288 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 7.3.1 God's Rest in Psalm 95 | 292 |
| 7.3.2 God's Rest in LXX Psalm 95:11 | 292 |
| 7.3.3 κατάπαυσις in the NT | 297 |
| 7.3.4 Hebrews 3:18-19 | 297 |
| 7.3.5 Hebrews 4:1-2 | 297 |
| 7.3.6 Hebrews 4:3-5 | 299 |
| 7.3.7 Hebrews 4:6-11 | 302 |
| 7.3.8 Conclusion | 305 |
| 7.4 Access to the Heavenly Temple in the Present (10:19-25) | 306 |
| 7.5 A City with Foundations (Heb 11:8-16) | 312 |
| 7.6 You have come to Mount Zion (12:18-24) | 318 |
| 7.7 A Kingdom that cannot be Shaken (12:25-29) | 326 |
| 7.8 No Continuing City (13:10-16) | 332 |
| 7.9 Conclusion | 340 |
| 8 Jesus High Priest of the Heavenly Temple: Temple Imagery in Hebrews 4:14–10:18 | 341 |
| 8.1 Introduction | 341 |
| 8.2 A Great High Priest Traversing the Heavens (4:14-16) | 341 |
| 8.3 A Stable and Reliable Hope (6:18-20) | 349 |
| 8.4 Jesus Exalted Higher than the Heavens (7:26-28) | 352 |
| 8.5 Jesus, Minister of the Sanctuary, the True Tent (8:1-13) | 355 |
| 8.5.1 The Context and Structure of Hebrews 8 | 357 |
| 8.5.2 Structure of Hebrews 8:1-13 | 357 |
| 8.5.3 Hebrews 8:1-2 | 358 |
| 8.5.4 Hebrews 8:5 | 366 |
| 8.5.5 Summary and Preliminary Conclusions | 376 |
| 8.6 Perspectives from Hebrews 9:1-28; 10:1 | 377 |
| 8.6.1 The Cult of the Old Covenant (9:1-10) | 377 |
| 8.6.2 The Heavenly Cult of the New Covenant (9:11-14) | 381 |
| 8.6.3 The Inaugural Sacrifice of the New Covenant (9:15-22) | 387 |
| 8.6.4 The Heavenly Sacrifice of the New Covenant (9:23-28) | 388 |
| 8.6.5 The Foreshadowing of the Good Things to Come (10:1) | 393 |
| 8.7 Conclusion | 397 |
| Chapter 9 Conclusion | 398 |
| Bibliography | 401 |

Abbreviations

Witness to the Text of the New Testament

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| P ¹³ | P. Oxyrhyncus 657 (3 rd -4 th century) |
| P ⁴⁶ | P. Chester Beatty II (c. 200 C.E.) |
| Ⲙ | Codex Sinaiticus (4 th century) |
| A | Codex Alexandrinus (5 th century) |
| B | Codex Vaticanus (4 th century) |
| C | Codes Ephraimi Syri rescriptus (5 th century) |
| D | Codex Claromontanus (6 th century) |
| I | Codex Freerianus (5 th century) |
| K | Codex Mosquensis (9 th century) |
| L | Codex Angelicus (9 th century) |
| P | Codex Porphyranus (9 th century) |
| Ψ | Codex Athous Laurae (8 th -9 th century) |
| d | Old Latin, Claromontanus (6 th century) |
| v | Old Latin, Parisiensis (8 th -9 th century) |
| vid | <i>ut videtur</i> (The most probable reading of a manuscript where the state of its preservation makes complete verification impossible, see NA ²⁷ , p. 20) |

Other Abbreviations

| | |
|-------|--|
| AB | Anchor Bible |
| ABD | David Noel Freedman (ed.). <i>The Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> . 6 volumes. New York: Doubleday, 1992 |
| ABR | <i>Australian Biblical Review</i> |
| ACCS | Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture |
| AcOr | <i>Acta Orientalia</i> |
| AJSJL | <i>American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature</i> |
| AJT | <i>American Journal of Theology</i> |
| ALD | <i>Aramaic Levi Document</i> |
| ANE | Ancient Near East |
| APOT | Charles, R. H. (ed). <i>The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books</i> . 2 volumes. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913 |
| ApW | Apocalypse of Weeks |
| AsTJ | <i>Asbury Theological Journal</i> |
| ASV | American Standard Version |
| ATDan | Acta Theologica Danica |
| AUSS | <i>Andrews University Seminary Studies</i> |
| BA | <i>Biblical Archaeologist</i> |
| BAR | <i>Biblical Archaeology Review</i> |
| BASOR | <i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i> |
| BBR | <i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i> |
| Bib | <i>Biblica</i> |
| BAGD | Bauer, W., W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich and F. W. Danker (eds). <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . Second edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979 |
| BDAG | Danker, F. W., W. Bauer, W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich (eds). <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . Third edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000 |
| BDF | Blass, F., A. Debrunner and R. W. Funk. <i>A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . Chicago: Chicago: University of |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| | Chicago Press, 1961 |
| BH | Biblical Hebrew |
| BHS | <i>Biblia hebraica stuttgartensia</i> . Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983 |
| <i>BibInt</i> | <i>Biblical Interpretation</i> |
| <i>BibLeb</i> | <i>Bibel und Leben</i> |
| BJRL | <i>Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester</i> |
| BN | <i>Biblische Notizen</i> |
| BP | Book of the Parables of Enoch |
| BR | <i>Biblical Research</i> |
| <i>BRev</i> | <i>Bible Review</i> |
| <i>BSac</i> | <i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i> |
| <i>BSOAS</i> | <i>Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies</i> |
| <i>BT</i> | <i>The Bible Translator</i> |
| <i>BTB</i> | <i>The Biblical Theology Bulletin</i> |
| BW | Book of the Watchers (1 En. 1-36) |
| <i>BZ</i> | <i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i> |
| BZAW | Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft |
| BZNW | Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft |
| CahRB | Cahiers de la Revue biblique |
| CBC | Cambridge Bible Commentary |
| <i>CBQ</i> | <i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i> |
| CBQMS | Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series |
| <i>CBR</i> | <i>Currents in Biblical Research</i> |
| CCS | Continental Commentary Series |
| CEJL | Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature |
| CEV | Contemporary English Version |
| CGTSC | Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges |
| <i>Chm</i> | <i>Churchman</i> |
| <i>ChrCent</i> | <i>Christian Century</i> |
| <i>CJT</i> | <i>Canadian Journal of Theology</i> |
| ConBNT | Coniectanea biblica New Testament Series |
| CRAI | Comptes rendus de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres |
| CRINT | Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum |
| CSCO | Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium |
| <i>CurBR</i> | <i>Currents in Biblical Research</i> |
| <i>CurTM</i> | <i>Currents in Theology and Mission</i> |
| DBI | Ryken, Leland, James C. Wilhoit and Tremper Longman III (eds). <i>Dictionary of Biblical Imagery</i> . Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP, 1998 |
| <i>DEJ</i> | Collins, John J., and Daniel C. Harlow (eds). <i>The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism</i> . Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans. |
| DJD | Discoveries in the Judean Desert |
| DLNT | Martin, Ralph P. and Peter H. Davids (eds). <i>Dictionary of the Later New Testament and its Developments</i> . Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP, 1997 |
| DNTB | Evans, Craig A. and Stanley E. Porter (eds). <i>Dictionary of New Testament Background</i> . Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP, 1997 |
| DSD | <i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i> |
| DSSSE | García Martínez, F. and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar (eds). <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition</i> . Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1997-98 |
| EB | Echter Bibel |
| EBib | Etudes bibliques |
| EDNT | Balz, H. and G. Schneider (eds). <i>Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich., 1990-1993 |

| | |
|---------|--|
| EKKNT | Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament |
| EDSS | Schiffmann, L. H. and James C. VanderKam (eds). <i>Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls</i> . Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000 |
| EncJud | <i>Encyclopaedia Judaica</i> . 16 volumes. Jerusalem, 1972 |
| ERT | <i>Evangelical Review of Theology</i> |
| ESV | English Standard Version |
| ETL | <i>Ephemerides theologicae Lovenienses</i> |
| ETR | <i>Etudes théologiques et religieuses</i> |
| EuroJTb | <i>European Journal of Theology</i> |
| EvQ | <i>Evangelical Quarterly</i> |
| EVV | English versions of the Bible |
| ExpTim | <i>Expository Times</i> |
| FBBS | Facet Books, Biblical Series |
| FC | Fathers of the Church. Washington D.C., 1947- |
| FF | <i>Forschungen und Fortschritte</i> |
| FO | <i>Folia orientalia</i> |
| FOTL | Forms of the Old Testament Literature |
| FRLANT | Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments |
| GCS | Die griechische christliche Schriftsteller der ersten [drei] Jahrhunderte |
| GKC | Gesenius, Wilhelm, E. Kautzsch and A. E. Cowley (eds). <i>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</i> . Second English edition. Oxford: Clarendon, 1910 |
| GNB | Good News Bible (Today's English Version) |
| GOTR | <i>Greek Orthodox Theological Review</i> |
| GRBS | <i>Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies</i> |
| GCS | Die griechische christliche Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte |
| HALOT | Koehler, L., W. Baumgartner and J. J. Stamm (eds). <i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Translated and edited under the supervision of M. E. Richardson. 5 volumes. Leiden: Brill, 1994-2000 |
| HAR | <i>Hebrew Annual Review</i> |
| HBT | <i>Horizons in Biblical Theology</i> |
| Hen | <i>Henoch</i> |
| HeyJ | <i>Heythrop Journal</i> |
| HNT | Handbuch zum Neuen Testament |
| HR | <i>History of Religions</i> |
| HS | <i>Hebrew Studies</i> |
| HSM | Harvard Semitic Monographs |
| HSS | Harvard Semitic Studies |
| HTR | <i>Harvard Theological Review</i> |
| HTS | Harvard Theological Studies |
| HUCA | <i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i> |
| HUCM | Monographs of the Hebrew Union College |
| IBC | Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching |
| IBS | <i>Irish Biblical Studies</i> |
| ICC | International Critical Commentary |
| IDB | Buttrick, G. A. (ed). <i>Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible</i> . 4 volumes. Abingdon: Nashville, Tenn. 1962 |
| IDBSup | Crim, K. (ed). <i>Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible: Supplementary Volume</i> . Abingdon: Nashville, Tenn. 1976 |
| IEJ | <i>Israel Exploration Journal</i> |
| Int | <i>Interpretation</i> |
| JAAR | <i>Journal of the American Academy of Religion</i> |
| JANES | <i>Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society</i> |

| | |
|------------------|---|
| JAOS | <i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i> |
| JATS | <i>Journal of the Adventist Theological Society</i> |
| JBL | <i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i> |
| JBLMS | Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series |
| JDS | <i>Jewish Desert Studies</i> |
| JETS | <i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i> |
| JJS | <i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i> |
| JNES | <i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i> |
| JNSL | <i>Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages</i> |
| JPS | Jewish Publication Society |
| JQR | <i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i> |
| JR | <i>Journal of Religion</i> |
| JReS | <i>Journal of Religious Studies</i> |
| JSHJ | <i>Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus</i> |
| JSHRZ | <i>Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit</i> |
| JSJ | <i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i> |
| JSJSup | Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement Series |
| JSNT | <i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i> |
| JSNTSup | Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series |
| JSOT | <i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i> |
| JSOTSup | Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series |
| JSP | <i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i> |
| JSPSup | Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series |
| JSQ | <i>Jewish Studies Quarterly</i> |
| JSS | <i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i> |
| JTC | <i>Journal for Theology and the Church</i> |
| JTS | <i>Journal of Theological Studies</i> |
| KD | <i>Kerygma und Dogma</i> |
| KEK | Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament |
| KJV | King James Version |
| L.A.B. | Pseudo-Philo's <i>Biblical Antiquities</i> |
| L.A.E. | <i>Life of Adam and Eve</i> |
| LCC | Library of Christian Classics |
| LCL | Loeb Classical Library |
| LD | Lectio divina |
| LEC | Library of Early Christianity |
| LNTS | Library of New Testament Studies |
| LQ | <i>Lutheran Quarterly</i> |
| LSTS | Library of Second Temple Studies |
| LXX | Septuagint |
| MH | <i>Museum helveticum</i> |
| MSU | Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens |
| MT | Masoretic Text |
| MTZ | <i>Münchener theologische Zeitschrift</i> |
| NA ²⁷ | <i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> (27 th edition, 1993) |
| NABPR | National Association of Baptist Professors of Religion |
| NAC | New American Commentary |
| NCB | New Century Bible |
| NEB | New English Bible |
| NedTT | <i>Nederlands theologisch tijdschrift</i> |
| Neot | <i>Neotestamentica</i> |
| NETS | Pietersma, Albert, and Benjamin Wright (eds). <i>A New English Translation of the</i> |

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| | <i>Septuagint</i> . Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007 |
| NIBCNT | New International Biblical Commentary New Testament Series |
| NIBCOT | New International Biblical Commentary Old Testament Series |
| NICNT | New International Commentary on the New Testament |
| NICOT | New International Commentary on the Old Testament |
| NIDNTT | Brown, Colin (ed). <i>New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology</i> . 4 volumes. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1975-1985 |
| NIDOTTE | VanGemeren W. A. (ed). <i>New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis</i> . 5 volumes. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1997 |
| NIGTC | New International Greek Text Commentary |
| NIV | New International Version |
| NIVAC | New International Version Application Commentary |
| NLT | New Living Translation |
| <i>NovT</i> | <i>Novum Testamentum</i> |
| NovTSup | Novum Testamentum Supplement Series |
| NRTh | La nouvelle revue théologique |
| NRSV | New Revised Standard Version |
| NT | New Testament |
| NTAbh | Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen |
| NTL | New Testament Library |
| NTOA | Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus |
| NTS | New Testament Studies |
| OBO | Orbis biblicus et orientalis |
| OBT | Overtures to Biblical Theology |
| OECT | Oxford Early Christian Texts |
| OLD | Glare, P.G. W. (ed). <i>Oxford Latin Dictionary</i> . Oxford University Press, 1968-1982 |
| OT | Old Testament |
| OTL | Old Testament Library |
| OTP | Charlesworth, J. H. (ed). <i>Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i> . 2 vols. New York, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983, 1985 |
| OtSt | Oudtestamentische Studiën |
| PG | Migne, J.-P. (ed). <i>Patrologiae Graecae</i> . 162 volumes. Paris: Migne 1857-1886 |
| PGL | Lampe G. W. H. (ed). <i>Patristic Greek Lexicon</i> . Oxford: Clarendon, 1968 |
| PL | Migne, J.-P. (ed). <i>Patrologiae Latina</i> . 217 volumes. Paris: Migne 1844-1864 |
| <i>PRSt</i> | <i>Perspectives in Religious Studies</i> |
| PrTM | Princeton Theological Monograph Series |
| PTR | <i>Princeton Theological Review</i> |
| PVTG | Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graeca |
| <i>QC</i> | <i>Qumran Chronicle</i> |
| RB | <i>Revue Biblique</i> |
| RechBib | Recherches bibliques |
| <i>ResQ</i> | <i>Restoration Quarterly</i> |
| <i>RevExp</i> | <i>Revue and Expositor</i> |
| <i>RevQ</i> | <i>Revue de Qumran</i> |
| <i>RevScRel</i> | <i>Revue des sciences religieuses</i> |
| RHPR | <i>Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses</i> |
| RHR | <i>Revue de l'histoire des religions</i> |
| RIME | The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Early Periods |
| RSR | <i>Recherches des science religieuse</i> |
| RSV | Revised Standard Version |
| RTL | <i>Revue théologique de Louvain</i> |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| RTR | <i>Reformed Theological Review</i> |
| SAOC | Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilisations |
| SBL | Society of Biblical Literature |
| SBLDS | Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series |
| SBLEJL | Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and its Literature |
| SBLGNT | Holmes, Michael W. (ed). <i>The Greek New Testament: SBL Edition</i> . Atlanta, Ga: The Society of Biblical Literature / Logos Bible Software, 2011 |
| SBLMS | Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series |
| SBLSCS | Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies |
| SBLSP | Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers |
| SBLTCS | Society of Biblical Literature Text-Critical Studies |
| SBT | Studies in Biblical Theology |
| <i>SBTh</i> | <i>Studia Biblica et Theologica</i> |
| SC | Sources chrétiennes |
| <i>ScEs</i> | <i>Science et Esprit</i> |
| <i>SE</i> | <i>Studia Evangelica</i> |
| <i>SEAJT</i> | <i>South East Asia Journal of Theology</i> |
| SJLA | Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity |
| <i>SJOT</i> | <i>Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament</i> |
| <i>SJT</i> | <i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i> |
| SNT | Studien zum Neuen Testament |
| SNTSMS | Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series |
| SP | Sacra Pagina |
| SSN | Studia semitica neerlandica |
| <i>ST</i> | <i>Studia theologica</i> |
| STDJ | Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah |
| StPB | Studia post-biblica |
| <i>StudBib</i> | <i>Studia Biblica</i> |
| SubBi | Subsidia biblica |
| SUNT | Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments |
| SVTP | Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigraphica |
| <i>SwJT</i> | <i>Southwestern Journal of Theology</i> |
| TD | <i>Theology Digest</i> |
| TDNT | Kittel, G. and G. Friedrich (eds). <i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Translated by G. W. Bromiley. 10 volumes. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1964-1976 |
| TDOT | Botterweck, G. J., and H. Ringgren (eds). <i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i> . Translated by J. T. Willis, G. W. Bromiley, and D. E. Green. 15 volumes. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1974-2006 |
| TGI | <i>Theologie und Glaube</i> |
| <i>Them</i> | <i>Themelios</i> |
| <i>ThEv</i> | <i>Theologia Evangelica</i> |
| THKNT | Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament |
| ThSt | Theologische Studien |
| <i>ThTo</i> | <i>Theology Today</i> |
| TJ | <i>Trinity Journal</i> |
| TJT | <i>Toronto Journal of Theology</i> |
| TLG | <i>Thesaurus linguae graecae: Canon of Greek Authors and Works</i> . Edited by L. Berkowitz and K. A. Squitier. Third edition. Oxford, 1990 |
| TLOT | Jenni, Ernst and Claus Westermann. <i>Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Translated by Mark E. Biddle. 3 volumes. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1997 |

| | |
|--------|---|
| TLNT | Spicq, Ceslas. <i>Theological Lexicon of the New Testament</i> . Translated and edited by James D. Ernest. 3 volumes. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994 |
| TNIV | Today's New International Version |
| TNTC | Tyndale New Testament Commentaries |
| TRE | Krause, G. and G. Müller (eds). <i>Theologische Realenzyklopädie</i> . Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1977- |
| TRENT | Traditions of the Rabbis from the Era of the New Testament |
| TRu | <i>Theologische Rundschau</i> |
| TS | Texts and Studies |
| TSAJ | Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum |
| TU | Texte und Untersuchungen |
| TynBul | <i>Tyndale Bulletin</i> |
| TZ | <i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i> |
| USQR | <i>Union Seminary Quarterly Review</i> |
| VC | <i>Vigiliae christianae</i> |
| VD | <i>Verbum domini</i> |
| VE | <i>Vox evangelica</i> |
| VT | <i>Vetus Testamentum</i> |
| VTSup | Vetus Testamentum Supplement Series |
| WBC | Word Biblical Commentary |
| WMANT | Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament |
| WTJ | <i>Westminster Theological Journal</i> |
| WUNT | Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament |
| ZAW | <i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i> |
| ZNW | <i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i> |
| ZST | <i>Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie</i> |

1 Introduction

1.1 Introduction

My initial goal in researching this thesis was to present a critique of Christian Zionism based on a reading of the Epistle to the Hebrews. By Christian Zionism I mean support for the state of Israel on Christian theological grounds. Zionist Christians argue that the land promised to Abraham and his descendants in Gen 17:8 and elsewhere is the inalienable possession of the Jewish people, whom they see embodied in that state. I chose to work with Hebrews since the expression “land of promise” (γῆ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας) appears only here in the Bible (Heb 11:9), in a text that negates the significance of the promised land in favour of a better, heavenly country (v. 16). Furthermore, neither Jerusalem nor the temple are explicitly mentioned in Hebrews, a phenomenon I will argue indicates that the significance of both city and temple is negated.

As my research progressed, my focus shifted from the role of the land in Hebrews to the place of the temple. It became increasingly clear to me that in spite of the lack of explicit reference to Jerusalem and its temple, what I refer to as “temple symbolism” contributes significantly to the argument of the epistle.¹ I also decided that it would be unduly restrictive to concentrate on a critique of Christian Zionism,² though such a critique remains as a sub-plot of the thesis, emerging in particular in Chapter 7 where I discuss the eschatological goal of the people of God. The major goal of the study now, however, is to examine the role and meaning of temple symbolism in Hebrews. The main outcome is that the heavenly temple in Hebrews is not to be read as an eternal archetype of the wilderness tabernacle. Rather the language is figurative. The heavenly temple symbolises the eschatological dwelling of God with his people in the world to come where Christ is now enthroned.

Early in my research I encountered Lincoln Hurst’s treatment of the expression ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά in Heb 8:5, words that describe the relationship of the wilderness tabernacle to the heavenly temple.³ Hurst argues that rather than a “copy and shadow” of something already existing, the expression refers to a preliminary sketch of something that will appear later. His treatment lies behind the NRSV’s translation “sketch and shadow,”⁴ a translation that differs significantly from that which has dominated English translations of the Bible at least since the

¹ I define “temple symbolism” in 1.3 (below).

² I critique different aspects of Christian Zionism in Church 2009: 375-98; 2011a: 147-57; 2011b: 45-57.

³ Hurst 1990: 13-17.

⁴ Ibid.: 136 (note 47) notes that the NRSV rendering was based on his arguments.

ASV in 1901.⁵ Nevertheless, the rendering “copy and shadow” persists. It appears in James W. Thompson’s recent commentary⁶ and is assumed (often without detailed argumentation) by several authors since then.⁷

Those who adopt this reading often suggest that that the tabernacle is to be understood as a “mere” copy, inferior to the heavenly sanctuary since it is part of the created order.⁸ This reading is tendentious. For while in Hebrews, Jesus is better (κρείττων) than the angels (1:4); the new means of approach to God is characterised as a better hope (7:19); the covenant associated with Jesus is a better covenant (7:22; 8:6); the heavenly things are cleansed with better sacrifices than the earthly sacrifices (9:23); and the heavenly country that Abraham and the patriarchs sought was better (11:16), Hebrews nowhere expresses a value judgement as to the relative merits of the wilderness tabernacle and the heavenly sanctuary/temple, and nowhere implies that the former is inferior because it is earthly.⁹

Readings such as this are usually based on perceived allusions in Hebrews to the writings of Philo, but they do justice neither to Philo nor to Hebrews.¹⁰ According to Philo, Moses contemplated an immaterial and invisible pattern (παράδειγμα). If that is what the author of Hebrews had in mind, he could not then propose that Jesus entered the heavenly temple (Heb 9:11-12), nor would it be accessible to humans (Heb 10:19-25; 12:22-24). Some other explanation must be sought. I will argue that the wilderness sanctuary in Heb 8:5 is not a copy of the heavenly sanctuary, but a pointer to the heavenly things (τὰ ἐπουράνια). The “heavenly things” are not a bicameral heavenly sanctuary,¹¹ the archetype of the wilderness tabernacle where Christ offered his blood on a heavenly altar, but a reference to God’s eschatological dwelling with his people, now come with the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God.

⁵ For “copy and shadow” see RSV, NEB, NIV (1984), CEV, NLT, ESV, TNIV, NIV (2011). KJV reads “example and shadow.”

⁶ Thompson 2008: 168.

⁷ Schiffman 2009: 166; Hooker 2009: 202; Holmes 2009: 244; Kalengyo 2009: 204. The most recent monograph arguing for this reading is Svendsen 2009: 157-68.

⁸ Thompson 2008: 168. For an earlier statement of this view from Thompson see 1982: 106. Most recently, Fuller Dow 2010: 172-73 suggests that the expression indicates that the Jerusalem temple was “just a shadow of the real Temple.”

⁹ The word κρείττων (better) also appears in Heb 6:9; 7:7; 10:34; 11:35, 40; 12:24. Of the nineteen NT occurrences of this word, only six are outside of Hebrews (1 Cor 7:9, 38; 11:17; Phil 1:23; 1 Pet 3:17; 2 Pet 2:21).

¹⁰ I discuss Philo’s writings in 2.5 (below).

¹¹ Gordon 2008: 109 uses the word “bicameral” in a discussion of Heb 8:2, as he wonders whether that text describes an inner sanctuary surrounded by an outer tent, or whether the heavenly temple is “unicameral,” with the sanctuary and tent co-extensive.

1.2 The Argument of Hebrews

Hebrews opens with a single periodic sentence (1:1-4) setting the eschatological tone of the book. The text claims that “in these last days” (ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων, 1:2) God has spoken through a Son who sat down at the right hand of the majesty in the heights, an allusion to Ps 110:1.¹² The Son’s exaltation results in him becoming superior to the angels and inheriting a name superior to angelic names. This introductory sentence is followed by a catena of OT quotations establishing these claims. Hebrews 1 ends by quoting Ps 110:1, which forms an inclusio around the chapter.

In Hebrews 2, the author draws two implications from the claim of the Son’s superiority to angels. First, since God’s word through angels was accompanied with appropriate sanctions, the readers must pay closer attention to God’s word through the Son. Second, the exaltation of the Son over the angels follows a time of him being lower than the angels. This was not for his sake alone. Rather, as Ps 8 claims, God has made the world to come subject not to angels but to humans,¹³ and while that may not be apparent in the present, what is apparent is that Jesus has been crowned with glory and honour, as the “pioneer” (ἀρχηγός, 2:10) through whom God is “bringing many heirs to glory” (πολλοὺς υἱοὺς εἰς δόξαν ἀγαγόντα, 2:10).¹⁴ The glory and honour of humanity as God’s vice-regents ruling over the works of God’s hands has its eschatological outcome in their ruling over the world to come where Jesus is now enthroned. These two chapters set the eschatological tone of the discussion that follows in the remainder of Hebrews.

Hebrews 3-4 enlarge upon the theme of the world to come in terms of the rest that awaits the people of God. This is the rest that God entered at the creation (Heb 4:4, citing Gen 2:1-3). I will argue that expressing the eschatological goal of the people of God in terms of rest, implies an understanding of the created cosmos as a temple. The rest awaiting the people of God is in the eschatological temple of the new creation, where Jesus is now enthroned, and where God will dwell with his people.

¹² The LXX reference is Ps 109:1. In this study I will use English versification unless otherwise noted. I note that the LXX Psalter would have been unnumbered when Hebrews was written.

¹³ I will defend this debated reading of Heb 2:5-10 in 6.3 below.

¹⁴ I translate υἱός (son) with “heir,” since English has no non-gender specific word to express the honorific implications of “son” in this context. These are the sons and daughters of God, the siblings of Jesus, referred to as πολλοὶ υἱοί (many sons, v. 10); ἀδελφοί (brothers, vv. 11-12); and παῖδιά (children, v. 13) – all terms that can be used for both men and women in NT Greek. See Elliott 2003: 173-210; Gäbel 2006: 153; Mackie 2007: 45. The NRSV “children” in v. 10 is inappropriate as it obscures the solidarity between the “Son” of Heb 1 and the “sons” of Heb 2:5-18 (Gäbel 2006: 153-54). The idea of “son” as “heir” appears in Heb 1:1, 4, (Hooker 2009: 199, footnote 21), and the reference to those who are about to inherit salvation (οἱ μέλλοντες κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν) in Heb 1:14 provides a transition from Heb 1 to Heb 2.

There are hints early in Hebrews that Jesus is to be understood as a priest. In 1:3, his exaltation to the right hand of God was after “making purification for sins” (καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος), and in 2:17–3:1 Jesus is called both a high priest and a priest. That he is to be understood as a priest is announced for a third time in the transitional pericope 4:14–16, which leads into the establishment of this claim from Ps 110:4 (Heb 5:1–10). After a digression encouraging the recipients to remain faithful (5:11–6:20), the text returns to the theme of the high priesthood of Jesus. The author draws out the implications of this claim in Heb 7, with a concluding summary in 7:26–28, forming an inclusio with 5:1–3.¹⁵

While Ps 110:1 is cited more often in the NT than any other OT text,¹⁶ Ps 110:4 appears only in Hebrews.¹⁷ It seems that the author understood that if Ps 110:1 applied to the exalted Christ, so too did Ps 110:4. As Son of God and priest like Melchizedek, he can be understood in terms of both the royal and cultic aspects of Ps 110. Hebrews 7 establishes that the high priest Jesus is superior to the descendants of Aaron, and Heb 9:1–10:18 establishes that his sacrifice is superior to theirs. The effectiveness of this sacrifice is evident in that its outcome is “perfection” (τελείωσις), something the former priesthood and sacrificial system could not provide (7:11–19). This enables the followers of Jesus to approach God (7:19).

The “main point” (κεφάλαιον) of the argument appears between the claims about the superior priesthood and the superior sacrifice of Jesus; that is, that Jesus has been exalted to the right hand of God and serves as a minister of the sanctuary (Heb 8:1). Hebrews 8 introduces the subject of the heavenly sanctuary and the “ministry” (λειτουργία) of Jesus, high priest of that sanctuary. The heavenly sanctuary is the true tent pitched by the Lord, and not by a human, of which the wilderness sanctuary where God dwelt with his people (Exod 25:8) is a preliminary outline (Heb 8:5). It prefigures the eschatological dwelling of God with his people.¹⁸

Hebrews 10:19–25 is a transitional pericope corresponding with 4:14–16. Just as Heb 4:14–16 is followed by a warning against falling away (5:11–6:20), so also 10:19–25 is followed by a similar warning (10:26–39). Hebrews 11 is a list of faithful people from the past who persevered and did not fall away, culminating with the example of Jesus, who endured the cross without shrinking from the shame that it entailed and is now exalted to the right hand of the throne of God (12:1–3). Hebrews 12:4–17 is an exhortation to endure suffering, recognising it as the Lord’s discipline.

¹⁵ Guthrie 1994: 82.

¹⁶ NA²⁷ lists Matt 22:24; 26:64; Mark 12:36; 14:62; 16:19; Luke 24:62; 22:69; Acts 2:34; Rom 8:34; 1 Cor 15:25; Eph 1:20; Col 3:1; Heb 1:3, 13; 8:1; 10:12. Heb 12:2 is a significant omission from this list.

¹⁷ Hebrews 5:6, 10; 6:20; 7:3, 11, 15, 17, 21. NA²⁷ identifies an allusion to Ps 110:4 in Rom 11:29, probably associating the adjective ἀμεταμέλητος in Rom 11:29 with the verb μεταμέλομαι in Ps 110:4.

¹⁸ I argue this in 8.5 (below).

The rhetorical climax of Hebrews comes in 12:18-29, which returns to the theme of the heavenly temple and the world to come. Here, the recipients are viewed as already in the heavenly temple, participating in the worship of angels and anticipating the shaking of the creation to remove what is incompatible with the world to come so that the unshakeable kingdom can remain. Hebrews 13 concludes the book with a set of ethical instructions and an exhortation to follow Jesus outside the camp (Jerusalem), seeking the city to come (the new Jerusalem).

The superiority of Christ and his sacrifice is the main theme of Hebrews. It serves a sub-theme concerning the people of God. Christ's exaltation to the right hand of God in the world to come (Heb 1:6; 2:5) is as the "pioneer" (ἀρχηγός, 2:10; 12:2) or "forerunner" (πρόδρομος, 6:19-20) of his followers who are on a pilgrimage to where he is. The recipients are encouraged to persevere to their eschatological goal, described as the world to come, God's rest, the city to come, the heavenly sanctuary, Mount Zion and the heavenly Jerusalem. I will argue that all of these expressions are coterminous, and refer to the eschatological dwelling of God with his people. The text explains how Jesus has achieved this exalted position and made it possible for the people of God to share in the glory he has attained. The readers are encouraged to persevere to reach this goal and not to shrink back, risking the loss of everything.

1.3 Temple Symbolism

In this study I use "temple symbolism" to refer to the complex set of ideas evoked by the language of temple in addition to the literal structures to which the word "temple" refers.¹⁹ The wilderness tabernacle and Solomon's temple symbolised the dwelling place of God with his people.²⁰ This is clear from such texts as Exod 25:8 where Yahweh instructs Moses to build a "sanctuary" (מִקְדָּשׁ, LXX ἁγίασμα) so that he can "dwell among them" (וּשְׁכַנְתִּי בְתוֹכָם),²¹ and 2 Chron 6:2 where Solomon declares that the exalted house he has built for Yahweh is a "place for Yahweh to reside forever" (מְכוּן לְשִׁכְתֹּךָ עוֹלָמִים, LXX κατασκηνοῦσάαι εἰς

¹⁹ See the discussion and definitions in Macky 1990: 49-56 and in *DBI* xiii - xiv, where the editors claim that "image" is a foundational term naming any object or action, that "symbol" is "an image that stands for something in addition to its literal meaning," and that "metaphor" functions much like "symbol." I use the terms "symbol/symbolism" and "metaphor" more or less interchangeably, depending on the context.

²⁰ Haran 1985: 13-15; Knipe 1988: 106, 112; *DBI* 849. Macky 1990: 95-99 discusses the symbolism of Heb 8:5 in terms of "metaphors for metaphor" (p. 95). He finds the contrasts "Copy–Original" and "Shadow–Body" to be relatively important in picturing the way that "we see through a symbol to a mysterious subject that we cannot know directly." I will argue below (8.5) that this particular set of contrasts is absent from Heb 8:5, nevertheless, Macky's analysis still stands when Heb 8:5 is read (as I will argue) as a claim that the tabernacle is a preliminary outline of the heavenly things. God's dwelling with his people in the tabernacle prefigures the eschatological dwelling of God with his people (the heavenly things).

²¹ The LXX reads καὶ ὁφθήσομαι ἐν ὑμῖν ("and I will appear among you").

τοὺς αἰῶνας).²² While these texts recognise that God dwells in the temple, they do so in tension with the understanding that God dwells in heaven. But heaven also reflects the same tension since Solomon claims in his dedication prayer that the highest heaven itself cannot contain God, much less the house that he (Solomon) has built (1 Kings 8:27; 2 Chron 6:18).²³ Thus language of both earthly and heavenly temple symbolises the dwelling place of God. It is this that I have in mind when I refer to “temple symbolism.”

Two models have generally been proposed for the relationship of the earthly to the heavenly temple.²⁴ Some scholars argue that earthly sanctuaries are copies of an archetypal heavenly sanctuary, and some of these consider that this archetypal heavenly sanctuary “is an entity located in heaven.”²⁵ In spite of attempts to establish this, it is doubtful whether it can be upheld for the OT, although it is clearer in some of the texts from middle Judaism that I discuss in Chapter 4 (below).²⁶ The other model works on the assumption that the earthly sanctuary is a microcosm of the universe, which is understood as a sanctuary/temple. In this case the temple

²² The same Hebrew words appear in the parallel text 1 Kings 8:13, but are absent from the LXX, although 3 Kgdms 8:53a refers to the temple as “an appropriate house for God himself to dwell in anew” (οἶκον ἐκπρεπῆ σαυτῷ, τοῦ κατοικεῖν ἐπὶ καινότητος).

²³ In his prayer Solomon repeatedly asks God to hear from his dwelling place in heaven (1 Kings 8:30, 32, 34, 36, 39, 43, 45, 49; 2 Chron 6:21, 23, 25, 27, 30, 33, 35, 39).

²⁴ On this relationship see Jeremias 1911: 1: 57-58, 307; Moffatt 1924: 106-107; Gray 1925: 151-57; Burrows 1935: 45-70; Wright 1944: 75; Cross 1947: 62; Eichrodt 1961-67: 1: 197; Montefiore 1964: 135-36; Habel 1964: 84-86; Clements 1965: 63-78; Fritsch 1966: 100-107; Patai 1967: 54-139 (esp. 105-17); McKelvey 1969: 6-26; Albright 1969: 85-86, 140-50; Levenson 1984: 283-98; 1985: 111-84, esp. 137-45; Attridge 1989: 222; Hurst 1990: 21-22; Bruce 1990: 184; Hayward 1996: 8-10 and *passim*; Koester 1989: 59-63; Barker 1991: 57-70; Fletcher-Louis 1997a: 156-62; 2002: 61-68; Beale 2004b: 29-80; Walton 2006: 123-28. For a contrary view see De Vaux 1997: 328. These sources date the idea of an earthly temple corresponding to the heavenly temple as far back as Gudea of Lagash (c. 3000 B.C.E.), and the Code of Hammurabi (see Hurst 1990: 21-22 for a convenient summary). See also Philo *Mos.* 2.74; *Somm.* 1.206; *Leg.* 3.96; *Jos. Ant.* 3.123; *J.W.* 5.212, 2 *Bar.* 4:2-7; *Asc. Is.* 7:10.

²⁵ De Souza 2005:18. De Souza finds this notion reflected in forty-three OT texts. He considers Gen 11:1-9; 28:10-22; Exod 15:1-18; 24:9-11; 25:9, 40; 32-34; Deut 26:15; 2 Sam 22:1-51; 1 Kings 8:12-66; 22:19-23; Isa 6:1-8; 14:12-15; 18:4; 63:15; Jer 17:12; 25:30; Ezek 1; 10; 28:11-19; Hos 5:15; Jon 2:5 [4], 8 [7]; Mic 1:2-3; Hab 2:20; Zech 2:17; 3:1-10; Ps 11:1-7; 14:1-6; 20:1-19[20]; 29:1-11; 33:1-22; 60:1-14; 68:1-36; 73:17, 25; 76:8-9; 82:1-8; 96:1-13; 102:20-21 [19-20]; 150:1-6; Job 1:6; 2:1; Dan 7:9-14; 8:9-14; 9:24; 2 Chron 30:7. See De Souza’s tables on pp. 186, 360-61, 481-82. De Souza notes that his study is not exhaustive, and on p. 23 lists twelve other passages that he does not examine (Ezek 40-48; Amos 9:6; Zeph 1:7; Zech 4; Ps 23:6; 27:4; 36:9; 47:9 [8]; 63:3 [2]; 65:5 [4]; 78:69; 104:2; 134:2; Dan 11:45).

²⁶ Alexander 2006: 54 suggests that while the roots of this idea are present in texts such as Exod 25:40, “the idea that there is a celestial temple corresponding to the earthly temple only clearly emerges in Judaism in the later postexilic period.” Newsom 1985: 60 considers that “the only clear example of the description of heaven as a temple in a pre-exilic source is Isaiah 6.” She further suggests that it is “only with the literature of the Hellenistic period that one finds clear evidence of speculation on a heavenly temple” (*ibid.*). See also Himmelfarb 1993: 10-13.

is a link between heaven and earth, and in some sense heaven on earth,²⁷ so much so, that to be in the temple is to be “in heaven.”²⁸

There is a significant difference between these two models. Those who consider that earthly sanctuaries are copies of an archetypal heavenly sanctuary concentrate on a spatial and vertical correspondence between the two. For example, de Souza concludes that in the Hebrew Bible, the heavenly sanctuary was “understood as existing in structural and vertical correspondence to the earthly counterpart,” and that it is “a place in heaven and ... should not be interpreted as ... a reality coextensive with heaven.”²⁹ Those who consider the earthly sanctuary to be a microcosm of the universe argue for a temporal and horizontal correspondence. Since a sanctuary is understood primarily as where God is encountered, the whole creation may be understood as a sanctuary. God rested in this cosmos/sanctuary on the seventh day (Gen 2:2), and his rest anticipates the new creation where God and his people will find their ultimate rest. In this schema, Eden rather than the heavenly sanctuary is the archetypal temple, and the wilderness tabernacle and Jerusalem temple anticipate the dwelling of God with his people in the eschaton.³⁰

This symbolism reaches its climax in Rev 21:1–22:5 where the new heaven and earth are pictured as an “arboreal city-temple.”³¹ Here, a loud voice from the throne announces that “the tent of God” (ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ θεοῦ) is with people and “he will live in a tent with them” (καὶ σκηνώσει μετ’ αὐτῶν). This city-temple is the new Jerusalem, appearing as a cube, an allusion to the holy of holies in the tabernacle and temple, approximately 2,400 kilometres on each plane (Rev 21:16), perhaps the size of the then known world. The nations will stream to this city (21:24), from which all uncleanness is excluded (21:27). The river of the water of life flows from the throne of God, and the tree of life is there, further echoes of the primeval Eden temple. There is no temple in this eschatological city, for God and the Lamb constitute the temple; that is, God and the Lamb are encountered directly.³² Thus, the new heaven and earth in their entirety are pictured as a temple.

²⁷ Eliade 1959: 26-27, 36-42; Lundquist 1983: 205-19; Levenson 1985: 137-45; Parry 1994: 133-37; Walton 1995: 155-75; Kline 1996; Vermeylen 2007: 14-16; Liroy 2010: 1.

²⁸ Cf. Otzen 1984: 207: “The temple is at once an *imago mundi*, ‘image of the world’, reflecting the cosmos, and is *imago coeli*, ‘image of heaven’, reflecting the heavenly world. The temple is where heaven and earth meet; indeed, the temple is heaven on earth.”

²⁹ De Souza 2005: 496-97.

³⁰ Beale 2004a: 197-200; 2004b: 25-26.

³¹ Beale 2004b: 23.

³² For discussions of this imagery see Koester 1989: 120-24; Walker 1996: 244-46; Beale 1999: 1109-11; 2004a: 191-209; 2004b: 361-73; Rowland 2007: 478; Liroy 2010: 130-32.

While the source of much of heavenly temple symbolism seems to be Ezekiel's visionary temple (Ezek 40-48),³³ Exod 15:17 is another important text.³⁴ Here "Moses" addresses God: you brought your people in and planted them on "the mountain of your inheritance" (הַר נַחֲלָתְךָ, LXX ὄρος κληρονομίας σου), "the place prepared for your dwelling" (מִכּוֹן לְשִׁבְתְּךָ, LXX ἐτοιμός κατοικητήριον σου) and "the sanctuary your hands established" (כּוֹנֵן יְדִידְךָ, LXX ἀγίασμα ... ὃ ἡτοίμασαν αἱ χεῖρές σου).

These three expressions have the same referent,³⁵ variously identified as Sinai³⁶ the cosmic mountain,³⁷ the sanctuary at Gilgal,³⁸ the land of Canaan as a whole,³⁹ Zion,⁴⁰ the Jerusalem temple,⁴¹ and God's "eternal enthronement."⁴² Any one of these options on its own is insufficient. Indeed, "the author [of the Song] anticipated a fulfilment on a larger cosmic level, a

³³ See Ezek 37:27; 40:2-3; 43:4; 47:1, 12; 48:30-34. See Koester 1989: 122-23, and the chart on p. 122.

³⁴ There seems to be no clear allusion to Exod 15:17 in the NT. It is absent from the list of allusions and citations in NA²⁷ (p. 775). It may be echoed in Eph 2:22, where the word referring to God's dwelling place in Exod 15:17 (κατοικητήριον) appears to describe the people of God being built up into a dwelling place for God (κατοικητήριον τοῦ θεοῦ), that is a temple (see Beale 2004b: 257). This word only appears elsewhere in the NT in Rev 18:2 as a dwelling place of demons. In the LXX it refers to God's dwelling place in Exod 15:17; 1 Kings 8:39, 43, 49; 2 Chron 6:30, 33, 39; 3 Macc 2:15; Ps 32:14 (EVV 33:14); 75:3 (EVV 76:2); Ode 1:17 (citing Exod 15:17). In Exod 15:17 the ultimate goal of the Exodus is the sanctuary (ἀγίασμα) that God's hands have prepared (ἐτοιμάζω). This verb is common in both the LXX and the NT in texts where temple symbolism is absent, although it appears in Heb 11:16, for the eschatological city God had prepared for Abraham and his descendants, and in Rev 21:2 where the holy city also appears as a bride prepared (ἐτοιμάζω) for her husband. Both Dimant 1984: 519 and Schwemer 1995: 289 refer to Exod 15:17 as "the *locus classicus* for the expectation of the eschatological sanctuary in early Judaism."

³⁵ Watts 1957: 377; Propp 1998: 568-69; De Souza 2005: 133; Russell 2007: 24, 158 (fn 30), and p. 80. See also the analysis of the structure of Exod 15:12-17 in De Souza 2005: 132, who relies in part on Howell 1989: 38. See the detailed bibliography in Russell 2007: 180-81.

³⁶ Freedman 1975: 6-7; 1977: 46-48; 1981:21-30, who describes it as "the only true temple of God – made not by human but by divine hands ... located on the top of the mountain sacred to the god"; and Russell 2007: 80-96.

³⁷ Clifford 1972: 138-39, who describes הַר נַחֲלָתְךָ as "the hill country of Canaan," and the מִקְדָּשׁ as "the earthly representation of the temple-palace of the God," and Durham 1987: 209, who extends the referent to ultimately include Mount Zion.

³⁸ Cross 1973: 142.

³⁹ Watts 1957: 388; Fretheim 1991: 162.

⁴⁰ Clements 1965: 52-55; Stuart 2006: 361.

⁴¹ Brenner 1991: 136-42; Fuller Dow 2010: 47-48.

⁴² Görg 1990: 422; Propp 1998: 542-43; Beale 2004b: 63, 147, 235. Propp 1998: 569-70 locates the enthronement in "Canaan or the northern highlands" or Zion, and more precisely, the Jerusalem Temple. Howell 1989: 40 distinguishes between הַר נַחֲלָתְךָ, which she identifies with Canaan, and the other two expressions, which she identifies with Zion and/or the Temple. Watts 1957: 378 rearranges vv. 14-17 and comments that, according to his arrangement vv. 17b and 17c would fill out the strophe "admirably" if it is supposed that "the taking of the land" may be viewed as including the founding of the kingdom and the temple." Davies 1998: 17 suggests that the sanctuary of Exod 15:17, is not a "physical structure on a particular mountain ... [but a] sanctuary ... coextensive with the whole of the promised land, pictured in terms of the cosmic mountain motif." He finds similar ideas in Gen 2; Ps 78:54, 68-9; Ezek 17:22-23; 28:13-14.

Steigerung.”⁴³ Ultimately, it refers to the eschatological dwelling of God with his people. Those who read the text in this way in the ancient world anticipated that in the eschaton God would dwell with his people in an eschatological sanctuary, prepared by God and not by human hands.⁴⁴

The relationship between the earthly and heavenly sanctuaries in Hebrews has been read as both vertical/spatial and horizontal/temporal, and several scholars suggest that a key to understanding the book lies in understanding the relationship between these axes.⁴⁵ Attridge suggests that neither axis can be subordinated to the other,⁴⁶ listing several scholars who have done that.⁴⁷ Nevertheless, I will argue that the temporal and horizontal correspondence predominates, and the wilderness tabernacle prefigures the eschatological dwelling of God with his people. This is a dwelling not made with hands (Heb 9:11, 24), the heavenly sanctuary of which Christ is the minister, the true tent pitched by the Lord and not a human (Heb 8:1-2), and the eschatological goal of the people of God (13:14) that they also have access to in the present (12:22-24).

1.4 Literature Review

There are no monographs specifically devoted to a study of temple symbolism in Hebrews and this in itself is a reason for the present study. However, the field is not entirely unexplored. In the review that follows, I divide the literature into works that consider the heavenly temple as part of studies of other aspects of Hebrews, works which deal with God’s rest in Hebrews, and works on the influence of Philo and middle Platonism on Hebrews.

⁴³ De Souza 2005: 149. For a similar idea see Lohfink 1969: 80-86; Ninow 2001: 130-36; Beale 2004b: 110, 147, 235. Ninow notes that in 1 Kings 8:39, 43, 49; 2 Chron 6:30, 33, 39; Ps 33:14 (MT 13); Dan 8:11 מִכּוֹן refers to God’s heavenly dwelling place. He concludes, “... the author of the song [Exod 15:1-18] anticipated as well a fulfilment that is on a larger, cosmic level.” Apart from these texts and Exod 15:17, מִכּוֹן appears in Ezra 2:68 (the Jerusalem temple); Isa 4:5 (Zion); Ps 89:14 (MT 15); 97:2 (the place of God’s throne); 1 Kings 8:13; 2 Chron 6:2 (Yahweh’s earthly dwelling place); and Ps 104:5 (the foundations of the earth). See also 2 Macc 1:29; 2:17-18. Propp 1998: 567-68 notes that while Exod 15 is now in a literary context, it was originally liturgical, and suggests that “[w]herever it is sung, there is Yahweh’s mountain.” He proposes that in its context in Exodus the referent is primarily Sinai; in the Hexateuch, Canaan; in the entire Hebrew Bible, Sinai, Canaan or Zion; and in early Jewish literature and the NT, the kingdom of heaven. In this context he also refers to “a celestial equivalent to Jerusalem and/or the Temple,” citing (among other texts) Heb 12:22-24. Rabbinic exegesis read Exod 15:17 in the same way. *Mek. de Rabbi Ishmael, Tractate Shirata* 10 indicates that the temple to be built with Yahweh’s hands would be the eschatological temple. See also *Midr. Ps* 90.

⁴⁴ 11QTemple XXIX 8-10; 4QmidrEschat^a III 3; *Jub.* 1:17, 26-29. I will argue in 2.3 (below) for an allusion to this text in Wis 9:18, following Gäbel 2006: 32-33, 101.

⁴⁵ Barrett 1954: 363-03; Williamson 1970: 144-46, 576-78; Hurst 1990: 9-11; Sterling 2001: 192; Mackie 2007: 3-8.

⁴⁶ Attridge 1989: 224.

⁴⁷ Scholars who subordinate the spatial to the temporal include Cullmann 1962: 54-55; Traub 1967: 541; Nomoto 1968: 10-25; Williamson 1970: 142-59; Hofius 1972: 72; Hughes 1979a: 45; Peterson 1982: 131; Mackie 2007: 161. Those who subordinate the temporal to the spatial include Thompson 1982: 1-7; Käsemann 1984: 222-27; Johnson 2006: 201-202.

1.4.1 The Heavenly Temple/Sanctuary in Hebrews

The only English language monograph from the twentieth century that deals with the heavenly sanctuary in Hebrews is by Aelred Cody,⁴⁸ a work written over fifty years ago. Cody did not set out to study the heavenly sanctuary *per se*; rather, his work on the heavenly sanctuary serves the second part of his study where he discusses what he refers to as the “heavenly liturgy,” that is, the ministry of Christ the high priest in the heavenly sanctuary. He deals at some length with the heavenly sanctuary, recognising that in the OT God is understood to dwell there, and that the temple was either the place where God’s name (as opposed to God himself) dwelt, as in Deuteronomy,⁴⁹ or to where God came from time to time.⁵⁰ Cody also notes that the OT anticipated a time when the Jerusalem temple would cease to exist, and the temple and the dwelling place of God would be one and the same.⁵¹

Cody suggests that the OT sees the heavenly sanctuary as the model for the earthly sanctuary not only in texts where this is explicit (Exod 25:40; 1 Chron 28:19; Wis 9:8), but in such texts as Gen 28 where Jacob saw a ladder reaching up to heaven “as a justification of the sanctity of the holy place at Bethel.”⁵² Cody places considerable emphasis on Wis 9:8, where Solomon is said to have built the temple as “a copy of the holy tent” (μίμημα σκηνῆς ἁγίας) prepared by Yahweh from the beginning. He proposes that the “holy tent” in this text refers to the heavenly sanctuary, and that this text is “the best background for an understanding of the notion of the heavenly sanctuary in the Epistle to the Hebrews.”⁵³

Cody examines other texts roughly contemporary with Hebrews, but only briefly. He pays little attention to the Pseudepigrapha, referring briefly to *1 En.* 14; 71; *T. Levi* 5:1; *2 Bar* 4:3-6; *4 Ezra* 9:26–10:57, and finding little of relevance.⁵⁴ He devotes similar space to the rabbinic literature and finds literal descriptions of the heavenly sanctuary that are quite different from the concerns of Hebrews.⁵⁵ He does devote considerable space to Philo, concluding that there are similarities and differences between the two and that Hebrews is closer to the Pseudepigrapha and Rabbinic literature. However, he argues, with reference to Heb 8:5, that Philo and the

⁴⁸ Cody 1960.

⁴⁹ Deut 12:11, 21; 14:23, 24; 16: 2, 6, 11; 26:2.

⁵⁰ Cody 1960: 9-12.

⁵¹ Ibid.: 13-14.

⁵² Ibid.: 15. See also De Souza 2005: 102-123. Beale 2004b: 100-103 discusses the view that the ladder or staircase itself functioned as a “temple,” that is, a link between heaven and earth, and the place on earth where God was encountered.

⁵³ Cody 1960: 20.

⁵⁴ Ibid.: 21-23.

⁵⁵ Ibid.: 23-26. He deals with *b. Hag.* 12b, *Gen Rab.* 1:4; 55:7, *Midr. Song* IV. iv 9, *b. Zebab.* 62a; *Sifre Num* 11:16; *Pesab* 54a, *Ned.* 39b; *Num. Naso.* 12.12; *Lam. Rab.* Proem 24.

author of Hebrews would agree that “only what is heavenly is of lasting value, and that what is earthly is of no avail.”⁵⁶ Finally, he discusses the heavenly sanctuary elsewhere in the NT, noting that in the Gospels and the Pauline letters the temple gives way to the body of Christ and individual Christians respectively.⁵⁷ He suggests that in Revelation the heavenly temple has a vertical relationship with the church in the present, but that there is also a horizontal relationship, so that the heavenly temple appears in the new heavens and the new earth.⁵⁸ Cody gives no attention to the Dead Sea Scrolls, although to be fair, Qumran studies were in their infancy when he wrote.

Cody discusses heaven and heavenly things in Hebrews under three categories: cosmological; axiological (the earthly sanctuary is inferior and of little worth when compared with the heavenly); and eschatological (when the old heaven and earth will pass away and the unshakeable heavenly things will remain).⁵⁹ When he applies these categories to the heavenly sanctuary he refers to the first (earthly, transitory, inferior) sanctuary and the second (heavenly, eternal, superior) sanctuary where salvation is carried out. Furthermore, he claims that in Hebrews, there is an “emphasis on the insignificance of the earthly, whose reality is tenuous and whose value is scant.”⁶⁰

Cody’s work is complex and he argues at length for a spatial “above and below” dualism in his reading of Hebrews. His category of “axiology,” where earthly things are devalued as inferior and transitory, is open to question. Indeed, in Hebrews there is no devaluation of earthly things simply because they are earthly.⁶¹ Rather, I will argue that they anticipate the eschatological dwelling place of God with his people, now come with the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God.

While Cody’s is the only English language monograph on the topic within the last fifty years, there has been more recent work in German. Georg Gäbel covers similar ground to Cody in that his focus is *Kulttheologie*,⁶² by which he means “the high priesthood of Christ,”⁶³ rather than the heavenly sanctuary and temple symbolism *per se*, although in the course of his work he includes a brief discussion of the heavenly sanctuary and of Heb 8:1-6 in particular.⁶⁴ Gäbel

⁵⁶ Ibid.: 36.

⁵⁷ Ibid.: 39-41.

⁵⁸ Ibid.: 41-45.

⁵⁹ Ibid.: 77-86.

⁶⁰ Ibid.: 79.

⁶¹ Laansma 2008a: 125-43; 2008b: 9-18 and Adams 2009: 122-39 both argue this point.

⁶² Gäbel 2006 (Sub-title).

⁶³ Gelardini 2007a (n.p.).

⁶⁴ Gäbel 2006: 236-254.

enquires whether the background of the temple symbolism in Hebrews is to be found in middle Platonism mediated by Philo of Alexandria and concludes that the writings of Philo and of the author of Hebrews are quite different.⁶⁵ He considers that the relationship of the earthly and heavenly sanctuaries comes from other early Jewish texts, and is shaped by the author's Christology.⁶⁶ In his discussion of Heb 8:5, Gäbel maintains that just as the earthly cult is inferior to the heavenly, so the earthly sanctuary is an "ontologically inferior copy" of the heavenly one.⁶⁷ He believes that ὑπόδειγμα (outline, pattern, example) can have the sense of "image of an archetype," although this sense is not widespread.⁶⁸ Consequently, he maintains that ὑπόδειγμα has a double sense and because the earthly sanctuary is a reflection of the heavenly one it may also serve as an "advance illustration" of it.⁶⁹ He finds this to be the primary contribution of Heb 8:1-6.

Gäbel's study is valuable for its comprehensive review of the literature of middle Judaism and he does touch on some of the concerns of this study. However his research is not a full length study of temple symbolism *per se*, but like Cody's work it serves his more comprehensive study of the priesthood of Christ.

Scott D. Mackie's recent study also touches on these concerns,⁷⁰ although he is primarily concerned with the interface between the eschatological orientation of Hebrews and its paraenetic pericopes. He includes a chapter on cosmology, where he discusses the location and nature of the heavenly sanctuary.⁷¹ He notes that the "Heavenly Sanctuary dominates the symbolic landscape of Hebrews,"⁷² and (tentatively) posits a multi-tiered heaven in Hebrews and a heavenly sanctuary that is "an actual temple" at the centre of "the heavenly realm."⁷³ He also argues that this sanctuary is a bicameral sanctuary, with a holy of holies within an outer compartment, and that Jesus "brought his own blood into the heavenly 'holy place'."⁷⁴ He disagrees with the suggestion that the heavenly sanctuary and the work of Jesus as a high priest are "sustained metaphors," proposing instead that "the Heavenly Sanctuary must be as 'real' for both author and audience as the cross where Jesus' self-offering began."⁷⁵ At the same time,

⁶⁵ Ibid.: 126.

⁶⁶ Ibid.: 17.

⁶⁷ Ibid.: 242 ("ontologisch inferiore Kopie").

⁶⁸ Ibid.: 241 ("Abbildung eines Urbildes"). I discuss ὑπόδειγμα at length in 8.5 (below).

⁶⁹ Ibid.: 242 ("Vorabbildung").

⁷⁰ Mackie 2007.

⁷¹ Ibid.: 155-68.

⁷² Ibid.: 155.

⁷³ Ibid.: 158.

⁷⁴ Ibid.: 164-67.

⁷⁵ Ibid.: 159.

however, he argues against “overly literalistic interpretations.”⁷⁶ Mackie finds “Platonic metaphysical terminology” in Heb 8:5, but suggests that those who understand that this terminology indicates that the earthly sanctuary is “an inferior ‘shadowy sketch’ of the Heavenly Sanctuary” are mistaken and that “a temporal orientation ultimately predominates.”⁷⁷

Mackie is right to see a temporal relationship between the earthly and heavenly sanctuaries. However, I will argue below that it is mistaken to read Hebrews as though the author envisaged a bicameral structure in heaven, with a heavenly holy of holies in which Jesus offered his blood in typological fulfilment of the Day of Atonement ritual.⁷⁸ Rather the heavenly sanctuary in Hebrews is to be understood as a reference to the eschatological dwelling of God with his people.

Kenneth Schenck’s recent study⁷⁹ applies insights from narrative criticism, including Greimasian theory, as an aid to reading Hebrews.⁸⁰ He identifies the use of Ps 8 in Heb 2:5-9 as foundational to the narrative substructure of the book, understanding the story of Hebrews as a story of the exaltation of Christ as God’s way of enabling humanity to achieve the glory for which it was created.⁸¹ After laying this foundation, Schenck discusses first the eschatological framework of Hebrews,⁸² followed by the cosmological framework,⁸³ including a chapter entitled “The Heavenly Tabernacle in Hebrews.”⁸⁴ Schenck argues against “any sense of a literal structure in heaven,” seeing an extended metaphor instead, although he declines to identify “any single metaphorical referent.”⁸⁵

There is much to commend in Schenck’s work, although some questions can be raised. First, Schenck has an idiosyncratic reading of Heb 8:5, suggesting that the former priests serve the heavenly sanctuary “by shadowy illustration.”⁸⁶ Schenck never gives an exegetical

⁷⁶ Ibid.: 158-59.

⁷⁷ Ibid.: 160-61.

⁷⁸ Section 8.6.2.

⁷⁹ Schenck 2007.

⁸⁰ Schenck applies the methodology developed by Richard B. Hays, who demonstrated how recognising the narrative substructure underlying the rhetorical arguments of Galatians could contribute to the understanding of these arguments. See Hays 2001: 21-31; Schenck 2007: 10-17, and for a summary of the “narrative” of Hebrews, see Hays 2008: 206-207.

⁸¹ Schenck 2007: 58-59. See the discussion in Stewart 2010: 547-48.

⁸² Schenck 2007: 51-111.

⁸³ Ibid.: 115-81.

⁸⁴ Ibid.: 144-81.

⁸⁵ Ibid.: 144-45.

⁸⁶ Ibid.: 118. This is Schenck’s rendering of the expression ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά. Schenck also reads the text in this way in 2002: 132-33 where he suggests that “[a]ll the different sacrifices of the Levitical cultus become shadowy examples of Christ’s singular sacrifice”; and in 2003: 9 and 2009: 331 where he explains that they

justification for this reading and does not explain what he understands it to mean. Nor does he explain how these former priests can be understood to serve the heavenly sanctuary.

Questionable, too, is Schenck's discussion of what he calls the spatial dualism of Hebrews.⁸⁷

Here, he argues that the author of Hebrews considers that the created realm is inferior to the heavenly realm and will eventually be removed.⁸⁸ I will argue that there is no devaluation of created things in Hebrews.

Finally, I refer to a study by King L. She, a published version of his Dallas Theological Seminary doctoral dissertation.⁸⁹ She laments the fact that scholars debate the interpretation of Heb 9:22-23, claiming that this is "a crisis of faith"⁹⁰ that he will resolve by arriving at "the correct interpretation" of this text.⁹¹ He proceeds to do this by a "prescriptive analysis" of the use of Exodus in Hebrews.⁹² His study includes a chapter on the use of Exod 25:40 in Heb

"foreshadow' Christ's heavenly service ... [and] the relationship between example and reality is shadowy because the correspondence is not exact." It is acknowledged that these priests foreshadow the work of Christ, but I am unsure how they can be understood as serving the heavenly sanctuary. It is preferable to read the words ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά as a hendiadys referring either to the location where the earthly priests serve or the means by which they serve, rather than an adverbial phrase describing their service. Λατρεύω ("to serve, minister") appears one hundred and nine times in the LXX, always with the dative of the person served, and in four instances with a prepositional phrase (ἐν with the dative) specifying either the place where the worship is carried out (Exod 3:12; 7:16; Deut 12:2) or the sacred vestments in which the priests served (Esdr A 4:54). It appears twenty-one times in the NT, frequently followed by the dative of the person served (Matt 4:10; Luke 1:74; 4:8; Acts 7:7, 42; 24:14; 27:23; Rom 1:9, 25; 2 Tim 1:3; Heb 9:14; 12:28; Rev 7:15; 22:3), but also with no direct object in Luke 2:37; Acts 26:7; Heb 9:9; 10:2. In Heb 8:4; 13:10 it is followed by a dative of the location in which they serve (Bruce 1990: 184; Ellingworth 1993: 406; Koester 2001: 374; Johnson 2006: 197; Mitchell 2007: 159, 161; O'Brien 2010: 287; Allen 2010: 443). BDAG 587 suggests that this dative refers to "the holy objects by means of which the priest renders service," a reading Ellingworth 1993: 710 adopts for Heb 13:10, but not for 8:5. In this case they serve God "by means of" the earthly sanctuary, described in Heb 8:5 as "a preliminary outline of the heavenly things" (ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά τῶν ἐπουρανίων), and in 13:10 as "the tent" (ἡ σκηνή). Some commentators waver between these two options. Attridge 1989: 216 translates Heb 8:5 "they serve a shadowy copy," but later (p. 218) states that they serve "in a shadowy copy" (emphasis added). Lane 1991a:199 similarly translates "they serve a sanctuary that is a shadowy suggestion," and later comments (p. 206) that they "performed their ministry in a sanctuary ..." (emphasis added). DeSilva 2000b: 282 has both of these options in the same paragraph in his treatment of Heb 8:5. In his treatment of 13:10 he translates "those worshipping at the tent" (p. 494, emphasis added) while later (p. 499) he encloses the expression "ministers of the tent" (emphasis added) in quotation marks to refer to the same individuals. While the precise distinction is beyond my scope I prefer to read the dative as referring to the location where these priests serve. I note that when referring to the service of Christ, Heb 8:2 uses a genitive, τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργὸς καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς ("a minister of the sanctuary and the true tent"). The text nowhere uses a dative to refer to any location in which Christ serves.

⁸⁷ Schenck 2007: 115-43.

⁸⁸ Ibid.: 142-43.

⁸⁹ She 2011.

⁹⁰ Ibid.: 4-5.

⁹¹ Ibid.: 9. She concludes (pp. 171-74) that the heavenly sanctuary is a "spatiotemporal" sanctuary, but nowhere explains why this needed to be cleansed (Heb 9:23). I will argue below (8.6.4) that the heavenly sanctuary does not feature in Heb 9:22-23. Rather, τὰ ἐπουράνια ("the heavenly things") in that verse are the good things that have come with the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God.

⁹² Ibid.: 6-7. She claims that his study goes beyond a mere "text-oriented" descriptive analysis to a "pedagogy-oriented" prescriptive analysis of the way that the author of Hebrews "uses the canonical revelation from Exodus"

8:5,⁹³ which he deals with in isolation from its context in that verse, nowhere referring to the words ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά.⁹⁴ He does deal with Heb 8:2, reading the expression τὰ ἅγια (“the sanctuary”) as a “true plural” that should be rendered “the two holy places.”⁹⁵

The outcome of his study is that the heavenly temple is a “spatiotemporal (literal and physical)” bicameral sanctuary in heaven, corresponding to the wilderness tabernacle.⁹⁶ Moreover, he proposes that there is always a “spatiotemporal sanctuary operating in history.”⁹⁷ He also notes that, “[a]fter the Ascension of Christ, the earthy (sic) holy place is no longer functional,”⁹⁸ and worship is transferred to the heavenly holy place. Then “[a]fter the Second Coming of Christ, there will be a reinstitution of sacrifices in the millennial sanctuary.”⁹⁹

Both She’s methodology and the conclusions he reaches are questionable. Moreover, he only deals with Exod 3:14 (Heb 11:6) and 25:40 (Heb 8:5), and pays no attention to the exodus motifs in Hebrews, especially in Heb 1-4.¹⁰⁰ A major weakness is his lack of attention to those parts of Hebrews that negate the land, Jerusalem and the temple, and Heb 10:1-18 where the author argues that the OT sacrificial system is abolished consequent upon the once and for all sacrifice of Christ.¹⁰¹

All of these studies impinge on the present study in that they deal in one way or another with the heavenly sanctuary in Hebrews, and all treat the *locus classicus* of the heavenly sanctuary, Heb 8:1-6. However, each one of them does so for purposes that differ from mine and they all

(p. 9). She’s treatment of the text is questionable on several fronts. He notes that one must establish “a proper hermeneutical and theological approach,” which he suggests is “a premillennial, dispensational hermeneutic” (p. 62). While he does not use the term “normal hermeneutics” favoured by dispensational readers (see Baurain 2006: 41-49 and my critique in Church 2009: 283-83), this is the approach he uses, suggesting that “[t]he scriptural text contains truth which the skilled reader discerns and must extract more or less intact” (p. 54). He also rejects any reading of the NT that takes into consideration any text other than “Scripture” (pp. 155-56). He engages with none of the texts from middle Judaism that I deal with in what follows. He also rejects the intertextual approach developed by Hays 1989 as “onto-theo-logical,” (p. 65), preferring instead his own “theo-onto-logical” method (for She’s discussion of these terms see pp. 54-60).

⁹³ She 2011: 126-47.

⁹⁴ On p. 34 She describes the wilderness tabernacle as a “dim representation” of the heavenly sanctuary, and on pp. 38-39 he uses the words “miniature model” to describe the same relationship. He is aware of Hurst’s work, referring to Hurst 1990 on p. 3, and Hurst 1987 on p. 159, but nowhere discusses Hurst’s treatment of ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά.

⁹⁵ She 2011: 128-29.

⁹⁶ Ibid.: 133.

⁹⁷ Ibid.: 141.

⁹⁸ Ibid.: 135.

⁹⁹ Ibid.: 136. See also the diagrams on pp. 134, 141, 145 and 173.

¹⁰⁰ I deal with these in chapters 6, 7 below.

¹⁰¹ She relies on Hullinger 1993 for his claims about a millennial temple and the reinstitution of the former sacrificial system in that temple. See my critique of Hullinger’s work in Church 2009: 393-95.

reach different conclusions from those that I reach. Moreover, among them there is no comprehensive study of temple symbolism in Hebrews. My study attempts to fill that gap.

1.4.2 Literature on God's Rest in Hebrews

This group of works deals with the idea of God's rest in Heb 3:7–4:11, which I will argue is the eschatological goal of the people of God.¹⁰² The new heaven and earth is pictured as a temple, symbolising the eschatological dwelling of God with his people. Ernst Käsemann, taking his departure from Heb 3:7–4:13, argued that the idea of the “Wandering People of God” is the principal motif in Hebrews.¹⁰³ Furthermore, he argued that the background of this motif was pre-Christian Gnosticism.¹⁰⁴ For Käsemann, this “rest” is the soul's final rest in God, which he understood as the cessation of activity, achieved upon leaving this evil world.¹⁰⁵ While Käsemann's work has been influential, particularly in highlighting the notion of pilgrimage in Hebrews, his suggestion of dependence upon Gnosticism has not been well received. As Hurst notes, “The existence of any first century gnosticism which could have influenced *Auctor* is not established, nor do the ideas of Hebrews conform particularly well to so-called ‘pre-gnostic’ tendencies.”¹⁰⁶

Three responses to Käsemann's work are noteworthy, those of R. J. McKelvey, Otfried Hofius and Jon Laansma. McKelvey refers briefly to Käsemann's work, noting that Hebrews refers not so much as “the general peripatetic character of Israel in its formative period but the eschatological pilgrimage to Zion.”¹⁰⁷ McKelvey deals with the heavenly sanctuary in Hebrews only briefly as part of his larger study and touches on some of my concerns. He identifies the heavenly temple with the presence of God, which he locates in heaven, but also “encompassing both heaven and earth,”¹⁰⁸ an insight he draws from Heb 10:19-20, where the people of God have confidence to enter the sanctuary in the present. He notes that Christ has entered the presence of God as “the forerunner and head of the faithful,” and suggests that this has implications for “the pilgrimage of the people of God to the heavenly Mount Zion,” something he draws from Heb 3:7–4:16; 10:19–12:39.¹⁰⁹ McKelvey discusses the “not yet—even now” eschatological tension found throughout the NT and in Hebrews (p. 154), noting the paradox that the end of journey for the people of God lies in the future, but that “they are already

¹⁰² Section 7.3 (below).

¹⁰³ Käsemann 1984: 17.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.: 67-96.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.: 73-75.

¹⁰⁶ Hurst 1990: 74.

¹⁰⁷ McKelvey 1969: 151.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.: 149.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.: 151.

enjoying God's presence and sharing in the worship of the heavenly world."¹¹⁰ McKelvey's identification of the heavenly sanctuary as a figure for the presence of God, encompassing both earth and heaven, is a useful insight, as is his recognition that the eschatological goal of the people of God is in the heavenly Jerusalem.¹¹¹

Hofius responds to Käsemann at much greater length than McKelvey, arguing that in Hebrews 3-4, *κατάπαυσις* refers to a place of rest, specifically none other than the heavenly sanctuary.¹¹² This conclusion has met with a mixed reception. Theissen suggests that the identification of God's rest with the heavenly holy of holies is possible, but unlikely.¹¹³ Then, after a thorough study of the evidence put forward by Hofius, Laansma also concludes that while this equation is possible, it is more likely that the referent in Heb 3-4 is the heavenly world in general.¹¹⁴ However, in a more recent work, Laansma comments, "I still hesitate over some of Hofius' argumentation and I am not sure I wish to make the referent as precise as he seems to do, but I am more inclined than I was then to view the heavenly temple and its Most Holy Place as included in the referent of *κατάπαυσις* in Hebrews 3-4."¹¹⁵ Given Laansma's modification of his position, the time is right for a further examination of the evidence for this identification.

1.4.3 Literature on Philo and Middle Platonism in Hebrews

There is a sense in which my reading of Heb 8:5 is foundational to this study. Since this is one text where dependence on Philo and middle Platonism raises its head, I need to review briefly the literature that posits this as a significant background to Hebrews.¹¹⁶ Here I discuss the frequent suggestion that the author of Hebrews is indebted to Philo for the idea that the earthly sanctuary corresponds to the heavenly. I note at the outset, however, that such ideas are

¹¹⁰ Ibid.: 154.

¹¹¹ McKelvey (ibid.: 149) considers that the author "reveals his indebtedness to Greek thought" in Heb 8:5 and a few other places, but makes no mention of Philo. In an appendix (pp. 205-206), he discusses the heavenly city of Plato and concludes that "there is nothing like a thoroughgoing Platonism in Hebrews or even a deliberate borrowing of key concepts," although he does admit that the author, "like Philo and others, was more or less unconsciously drawing upon the general stock-in-trade of the eclectic philosophical milieu in which he grew up" (p. 206).

¹¹² Hofius 1970c: 53-54. For a summary of Hofius' arguments against Käsemann see Laansma 1997: 12.

¹¹³ Theissen 1969: 129. Theissen considers that it is unclear in Hebrews how the heavenly city and the heavenly sanctuary and its two parts and the divine rest interrelate (p. 129). I will argue that the heavenly city and sanctuary and the world to come are coterminous.

¹¹⁴ Laansma 1997: 314-16.

¹¹⁵ Laansma 2008a: 12. For a similar judgment see Son 2005: 137-40, and Lincoln 1982: 209, 219 who refers to the association, rather than the identification, of *κατάπαυσις* with the heavenly sanctuary. Walton 2006: 157-60, 196-99 discusses the centrality of the notion of "rest" in connection with temples in the ANE, as does Beale 2004b: 66-70.

¹¹⁶ This thesis is not a study of the influence of Philo on the author of Hebrews, and therefore this review is necessarily selective. For other literature not discussed here see Burtneiss 1958: 54-55; Williamson 1970: 1-10; Hurst 1990: 7-11, and footnote 3, pp 134-35.

widespread in the ancient world, calling into question the need to posit dependence upon Philo, unless other factors make such dependence likely.¹¹⁷

The first scholar in the modern period to propose dependence upon Philo was Eugène Ménégoz,¹¹⁸ and this notion has dominated studies of Hebrews throughout most of the twentieth century, persisting until today. To be sure, Ménégoz did not see the author as a thoroughgoing Philonist and argued for other influences on Hebrews, particularly Palestinian Judaism, but he suggested that the author had received his primary education in Alexandria and had finished it off in Jerusalem or that he had been influenced in a synagogue where the theology was eclectic.¹¹⁹ About sixty years after Ménégoz, Spicq concluded that Ménégoz was correct in his suggestion that the author of Hebrews was “un philonien converti au christianisme.”¹²⁰ He speculated that the author of Hebrews probably knew Philo personally and had perhaps heard him preach in a synagogue in Alexandria.¹²¹

James W. Thompson has consistently argued for the influence of Philo on Hebrews. From his 1975 discussion of Heb 12:27¹²² to his 2008 commentary, this notion has characterised all of Thompson’s work.¹²³ Thompson does not suggest that the author was a thoroughgoing Platonist, rather he argues that he simply employs philosophical categories from middle Platonism to make sense of his world,¹²⁴ including the distinction between the true (heavenly) tabernacle and the inferior earthly copy, a distinction Thompson finds in Plato and in Philo.¹²⁵

¹¹⁷ See 1.3 (above), and esp. footnote 25. See also Williamson 1970: 563-64; Ellingworth 1993: 408.

¹¹⁸ Ménégoz 1894: 197-219. Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.* 2:17 cites Philo *Contempl.* 29, and suggests that the writings of ancient men referred to by Philo included “some expositions of the ancient prophets, such as are contained in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and in many others of Paul’s (sic) Epistles” (ET Schaff and Wace 1952: 1: 118-19, for the Greek text see Schwartz 1903: 146-48). Spicq 1952: 1: 39 suggests that Hugo Grotius in 1644 was the first in modern times to suggest the influence on Philo and Hebrews. Grotius does not argue for dependence on Philo, but does make numerous references to supposed similarities with Philo in his interpretation of Hebrews. See e.g. Grotius 1679: 1011, 21, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 38, 44.

¹¹⁹ Ménégoz 1894: 217.

¹²⁰ Spicq 1952:1: 91. Spicq marshals his arguments for dependence on Philo on pp 39-91. The quote from Ménégoz is from Ménégoz 1894: 198. See also Héring 1954: 450-54.

¹²¹ Spicq 1952: 89. See also Williamson 1970: 6; Hurst 1990: 7.

¹²² Thompson 1975.

¹²³ *Ibid.*: 2008: 23-26. A collection of Thompson’s essays published in 1982 are mostly written from this perspective, as is Thompson 2007: 579-81.

¹²⁴ Thompson 2008: 25.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*: 168-69. For a similar assessment of Hebrews and Philo, although not as thoroughgoing as Thompson, see Schenck 2003: 28-31, who considers that the author of Hebrews was a Jew from Alexandria (p. 29). Johnson 2006: 21 also posits heavy dependence upon Philo, although “stretched and reshaped by engagement with scripture, and above all, by the experience of the historical human savior whose death and resurrection affected all human bodies and earthly existence as a whole.” On Heb 8:5, Johnson suggests that the author’s Philonic worldview led him to see that the earthly sanctuary was “but a pale imitation of an ideal prototype” (p. 201).

Thompson suggests that the author “belongs to two worlds, adopting both the Jewish apocalyptic hope for a new age and the Platonic distinction between the two spheres of reality.”¹²⁶ This view is reflected in two other works that argue for the influence of both of these schools of thought. George W. MacRae makes the interesting suggestion that the recipients of Hebrews had been influenced by what he refers to as an “apocalyptic eschatological scheme,” but needed their hopes for the future strengthened by “realised eschatology expressed in language associated with the Alexandrian background.”¹²⁷ On the other hand, Gregory Sterling argues that the recipients already held to “Platonizing exegetical traditions,” and that the author, who was also familiar with such traditions, showed them that they needed “to come to grips with a temporal dimension ... showing them that the new is heavenly and the old is earthly ... [thus combining] Platonic ontology with a Christian understanding of salvation history.”¹²⁸ The common theme in all these works is that while Philo is a significant background to Hebrews, other backgrounds from elsewhere in Judaism, and in particular Jewish Apocalyptic writings, are also significant.

The suggestion of Philonic influence on Hebrews has not gone unchallenged.¹²⁹ Four significant works stand out. The first is by Barrett, published just two years after Spicq’s commentary.¹³⁰ Barrett does not refer to Spicq, but he critiques Moffatt, who suggested that the eschatological passages in Hebrews are inconsistent with the author’s “speculative theory of the eternal and material orders,”¹³¹ that he had derived from “his Alexandrian and religious philosophy.”¹³² Barrett compares Philo’s treatment of the Sabbath,¹³³ pilgrimage to the heavenly Jerusalem,¹³⁴ and the heavenly sanctuary¹³⁵ to that of Hebrews. He concludes that while the author may have been familiar with Platonism, what he writes is fundamentally different: “certain features of Hebrews which have often been held to have been derived from Alexandrian Platonism were in fact derived from apocalyptic symbolism.”¹³⁶ However, Barrett

¹²⁶ Thompson 2008: 169.

¹²⁷ MacRae 1978: 190.

¹²⁸ Sterling 2001: 210.

¹²⁹ In addition to the following four works, see the brief critique of claims of Philo’s influence on Heb 8:5 in Hanson 2002: 89-92.

¹³⁰ Barrett 1954. I also note that Caird 1959: 44-45 downplays the influence of Philo on Hebrews, although the main contribution of Caird’s essay was to discuss the exegetical method of the author of Hebrews.

¹³¹ Moffatt 1924: liv.

¹³² Ibid.: xxxii.

¹³³ Barrett 1954: 366-69.

¹³⁴ Ibid.: 377-82.

¹³⁵ Ibid.: 383-90.

¹³⁶ Ibid.: 393. What Barrett seems to mean by this expression is found on p. 386 where he suggests that “the framework of thought in Hebrews is eschatological. Apocalyptic supplies the notion of both a heavenly temple, and an eschatological temple ... normally combined in the belief that in the age to come, the heavenly temple would be

does allow that it is “not erroneous” to see the correspondence between the heavenly sanctuary and the earthly as describing “somewhat loosely a ‘Platonic’ relation.”¹³⁷ He suggests that ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά in Heb 8:5 describes the earthly sanctuary as a “copy and shadow” of the heavenly one¹³⁸ and that “the true tabernacle exists eternally in heaven.”¹³⁹

Four years after Barrett, Burtneiss issued a further critique.¹⁴⁰ Burtneiss agrees with Spicq that it is almost unthinkable that the author was not influenced by Philo. He grants that there are linguistic parallels between the writings of both authors, but argues that “Hebrews and Philo are worlds apart when one looks at the message which the words convey.”¹⁴¹ He considers “the nature of ... [Philo’s] language, the Logos doctrine, the Platonic doctrine of ideas, the concept of faith, and the use of the Old Testament” in Philo,¹⁴² and then compares these with what he finds in Hebrews. He concludes that the similarities are merely linguistic and superficial.

The first monograph entirely devoted to this issue was Williamson’s magisterial study.¹⁴³ Williamson interacts with the arguments that Spicq put forward, and in particular the linguistic evidence proposed for dependence upon Philo, the themes and ideas that seem to show similarities of thought, and the use of Scripture by both authors. Williamson concludes,

... we can only insist that in the realm of vocabulary there is no proof that the choice of words displayed in the Epistle to the Hebrews has been influenced by Philo’s lexicographical thesaurus. In the use of the O.T. made by the two writers striking and fundamental differences of outlook and exegetical method appear ... But it is in the realm of ideas ... that the most significant differences between Philo and the Writer of Hebrews emerge. On such fundamental subjects as time, history, eschatology, the nature of the physical world etc., the thoughts of Philo and the Writer of Hebrews are poles apart.¹⁴⁴

manifested and established on earth.” This sort of thinking is absent from Philo, and while it is debated whether Hebrews, like Rev 21:1-4, anticipates the manifestation of the heavenly temple on earth, in Heb 12:22-24 the readers have access to the heavenly temple in the present.

¹³⁷ Ibid.: 385.

¹³⁸ Ibid.: 384.

¹³⁹ Ibid.: 384.

¹⁴⁰ Burtneiss 1958.

¹⁴¹ Ibid.: 60.

¹⁴² Ibid.: 55-60, quotation from p. 55.

¹⁴³ Williamson 1970.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid.: 576-77. A few other studies deserve brief mention. L. K. K. Dey suggests that both the author of Hebrews and his recipients had an Alexandrian perspective (Dey 1975: 123). Dey first studies several themes in Philo (pp. 7-118) and then examines what he considers to be the main themes in Hebrews (pp. 121-233). He discerns similarities in vocabulary, and concludes that Alexandrian Judaism is the best background for the understanding of Hebrews. Neither Barrett 1954 nor Williamson 1970 appear in his bibliography, and he never considers whether there could be some other background. Dey argues for what Williamson argues against without ever interacting with Williamson. As part of his study of typology in Scripture, Richard M. Davidson (Davidson 1981) examines the word τύπος in Heb 8:5. Davidson minimises any influence from Philo on Hebrews (p. 339), although he still understands the earthly sanctuary to be an inferior shadowy copy of the true heavenly one, and

Williamson did not discuss the word ὑπόδειγμα that appears in Heb 8:5; 9:23, usually translated “copy” and often used to argue for dependence upon Philo.¹⁴⁵ Perhaps this is because this word only appears four times in the extant Philonic corpus, where it always has the sense of “example,” “specimen,” or “instance.”¹⁴⁶

After a comprehensive study, Hurst concludes that “[t]here is no instance in known Greek literature where ὑπόδειγμα can be demonstrated to mean “copy,””¹⁴⁷ and, like Williamson, argues “[t]he Platonic/Philonic background for Hebrews is ... ‘not proven.’”¹⁴⁸ The major contribution of Hurst’s study for the present thesis is the clarification of the sense of ὑπόδειγμα and in many ways he anticipates the outcomes of my study. He argues that the sense of Heb 8:5 must be that the earthly sanctuary prefigures in some way the heavenly sanctuary, “the new sanctuary, built (8:2) along with the city, by God at the end of the age (now come, Heb 1:2) and inaugurated (9:23f) by the supreme eschatological sacrifice.”¹⁴⁹ I concur with Hurst’s conclusions,¹⁵⁰ and I attempt to demonstrate that these conclusions accord with the entire argument of Hebrews from beginning to end.¹⁵¹

Stefan Nordgaard Svendsen’s monograph is the most recent work arguing for the influence of Philo on Hebrews,¹⁵² who finds Heb 8:1-6 to be “redolent with Platonic terminology,” although he does depart from the usual reading “copy and shadow” for Heb 8:5 and reads that text as claiming that the tabernacle is a “mere ‘shadowy example’ ... of its heavenly

argues that both vertical and horizontal typology are essential to understanding the verse (pp. 356-57). Davidson supervised de Souza’s study of the heavenly sanctuary in the OT, and with de Souza he considers the heavenly sanctuary to be a structure in heaven. See my discussion of de Souza’s work in 1.3 (above), and see Davidson 1981: 385. Goppelt 1982 mentions Heb 8:5 three times. On pp. 114-15 he refers to “the shadowy prototypes” that will fall away, presumably a reference to the wilderness sanctuary which anticipates the heavenly sanctuary. However, this does not line up with his discussion on p. 166 where he refers to the wilderness tabernacle as “a copy and shadow” of the heavenly archetype, and on p. 177 where he calls the earthly tabernacle a “shadow ... and copy ... of the heavenly prototype.” Goppelt seems not to have made up his mind as to whether the heavenly sanctuary or the earthly sanctuary is the prototype.

¹⁴⁵ Burtneis 1958: 58.

¹⁴⁶ *Post.* 122, *Conf.* 64, *Her.* 256, *Somm.* 2.3. See the brief discussion of ὑπόδειγμα in Philo in Gäbel 2006: 114.

¹⁴⁷ Hurst 1990:13.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*: 42.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*: 42.

¹⁵⁰ Hurst’s treatment of the supposed influence of Philo and middle Platonism was quite brief, being one of eight different proposed influences on Hebrews that he critiques. Hurst’s *Doktorvater* was G. B. Caird who first questioned the influence of Philo on Hebrews (along with several other supposed backgrounds) in Caird 1959: 44-51.

¹⁵¹ Other works supporting this understanding of ὑπόδειγμα include Lee 1961; Löhr 1993. See also BDAG 1037, s.v. ὑπόδειγμα, 2. Hanson 2002: 83-96 discusses Spicq’s arguments for Philonic influence on Hebrews and discounts them. Interestingly, he finds the “chief coincidence in vocabulary” between the two authors in Heb 8:5 and 9:23, to be ὑπόδειγμα. But, as noted above, Philo never uses ὑπόδειγμα in the sense of “copy.”

¹⁵² Svendsen 2009.

counterpart.”¹⁵³ He interacts with Williamson and Hurst, but remains unconvinced by their arguments, relying mainly on Sterling’s critique.¹⁵⁴ He has difficulties fitting the word ὑπόδειγμα into his schema, which he acknowledges has “a forward-looking nuance.” He (tentatively) resorts to the unlikely solution that the author was not so much interested in comparing sanctuaries but in comparing the priestly services, and “since these services were initiated in the heavenly sanctuary later than in the tabernacle on earth, it *may have seemed natural* to the author to connect the earthly sanctuary with a term that, like ὑπόδειγμα, has a forward-looking nuance.”¹⁵⁵ Later he argues that “unlike Philo” the author of Hebrews highlights “the *insignificance* of the earthly sanctuary, and its *inferiority* to its transcendent archetype.”¹⁵⁶

All in all, Svendsen’s reading of the text is unsatisfactory. He recognises that ὑπόδειγμα means not “copy” but “example,” but then explains it with the suggestion that it refers to the cultus rather than the shrine. He then reverts to a discussion of the shrine, which he argues the author sees as inferior to the archetype. Svendsen seems not to have solved the problems faced by those who detect Philonic influence in this part of Hebrews.

1.5 Introduction to Hebrews

The anonymous early Christian document known as ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ may be the most enigmatic in the NT,¹⁵⁷ and while questions concerning the identity of the author, the place of writing, the location and identity of the recipients, and the occasion are all shrouded in mystery, a few comments can be made without unwarranted speculation.¹⁵⁸

1.5.1 Genre

Hebrews is traditionally referred to as an Epistle, but lacks the standard features of this genre, including the customary opening greeting found, for example, in the Pauline and

¹⁵³ Ibid.: 159.

¹⁵⁴ See Sterling 2001: 190-211. I discuss this critique in 8.5.4 (below).

¹⁵⁵ Svendsen 2009: 161 (emphasis mine). I read his use of “may have” as indicating the tentative nature of his solution. That the arguments are tentative is also seen in his immediately following excursus where he deals not with Philo’s treatment of the sacrificial ritual, but of the tabernacle.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid.: 167 (italics original).

¹⁵⁷ The superscription ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ first appears in P⁴⁶ (c. 200 CE). Nevertheless, it is of very little help in ascertaining anything about the readership of Hebrews, other than that someone somewhere in the latter part of the second century understood that the addressees may have been Jewish Christians (for a discussion and critique of the term “Jewish Christianity” see Reed 2010: 810-12). Long 1997: 1 suggests that whoever affixed the superscription “was probably just speculating about its original recipients and was as much in the dark as we are.”

¹⁵⁸ Full discussions are to be found in the standard commentaries and introductory texts. See e.g. Attridge 1989: 1-13; Lane 1991a: xlvii-lxvi; Ellingworth 1993: 3-33; Trotter 1997: 27-57; Koester 2001: 41-50; Salevao 2002: 95-169; Johnson 2006: 32-44; Thompson 2008: 4-10; O’Brien 2010: 2-20. See also the brief discussion of the challenges facing readers of Hebrews in terms of its “four great unknowns” in Schenck 2007: 1-3. Care must be taken to avoid circular reasoning. For example, Lane 1991a: xlvii-lxvi concludes that it was written to Christians in Rome, suffering persecution under Nero, a conclusion that then influences his reading of the text.

Deutero-Pauline letters, although there is a brief epistolary conclusion.¹⁵⁹ Moreover, some of the rhetorical features of Hebrews indicate that it could be understood as an oral discourse,¹⁶⁰ and the frequent appeal to the LXX, with a considerable number of quotations, allusions and echoes,¹⁶¹ have led many scholars to conclude that it is a written homily, especially when the author's description of his work as a λόγος τῆς παρακλήσεως (word of exhortation, Heb 13:22) is considered.¹⁶² Gelardini even goes so far as to define the precise occasion in the liturgical calendar for its delivery, arguing that it is a sermon for *Tisha b'av*, recalling the destruction of the first and second temples.¹⁶³ Mosser has severely critiqued the depth of Gelardini's research and her calculation of the precise date, which he regards as "impossible," and concludes that her discussion is "outdated, inaccurate and inadequately researched."¹⁶⁴ Moreover, in an as yet unpublished essay, Mosser finds very limited evidence for the genre "sermon" in the first century.¹⁶⁵ It is probably best, then, to adopt the traditional description of Hebrews as an Epistle, with the rhetorical features indicating that it was intended to be read aloud to a Christian congregation,¹⁶⁶ rather than (anachronistically) referring to it as a "sermon" to be preached to a congregation.¹⁶⁷

1.5.2 Structure

While there is little consensus on the structure of Hebrews,¹⁶⁸ certain compositional features stand out. One significant feature is the alternation of genre between exposition of the OT and

¹⁵⁹ The authenticity of Heb 13 has not gone unchallenged. I discuss this in 7.8 (below).

¹⁶⁰ Swetnam 1969: 261-69; Lane 1991a: lxxv-lxxx; Ellingworth 1993: 59-62; DeSilva 2000b: 35-58; Koester 2001: 79-96; Thompson 2008: 10-13.

¹⁶¹ I define the sense in which I use these terms in 1.6.1 (below).

¹⁶² In Acts 13:15, Paul and Barnabas are invited to give a λόγος παρακλήσεως in the synagogue in Pisidian Antioch. Scholars who argue that Hebrews is a synagogue sermon include Thyen 1955: 16-18; Swetnam 1969: 261-69; Wills 1984: 280-83; Lane 1985: 13-18; Attridge 1989: 13-14; 1990: 226-27; Bruce 1990: 389; Lane 1991a: lxix-lxxv; Weiss 1991: 40; DeSilva 2000b: 57; Koester 2001: 80-81; Schenck 2003: 23; Walker 2004b: 231-49; Gelardini 2005: 107-27; 2007b: 63; Johnson 2006: 9-11; Mitchell 2007: 15-16; Mackie 2007: 24-25; O'Brien 2010: 20-22. See the cautionary remarks in Ellingworth 1993: 63.

¹⁶³ Gelardini 2005: 107-27.

¹⁶⁴ Mosser 2009b, n.p.

¹⁶⁵ This essay is available on the internet (Mosser 2011: 1-20) and is forthcoming in Stanley Porter and Andrew W. Pitts, eds., *Christian Origins and Hellenistic Judaism: Literary and Social Contexts for the New Testament* (Brill).

¹⁶⁶ Ellingworth 1993: 62.

¹⁶⁷ Mosser 2011: 5-7.

¹⁶⁸ Joslin 2007: 122. Joslin reaches this conclusion after summarising eight different approaches to the structure of Hebrews, those of Guthrie 1983: 58-59; Vaganay 1940: 269-77; Spicq 1952: 1: 27-38; Nauck 1960: 199-206; Vanhoye 1976; Bruce 1985: 6-12; Attridge 1989: 13-21; Guthrie 1994. Joslin 2008: 91-131 presents a slightly more technical survey of the same eight approaches to the structure. For other discussions of the structure see Swetnam 1972: 368-85; 1974: 333-48; Lindars 1989: 382-406; Stanley 1994: 245-71; Long Westfall 2005; Lincoln 2006: 23-33.

exhortation based on that exposition.¹⁶⁹ Other rhetorical features include the use of inclusio to delineate different sections, anticipatory announcements of the subject of following sections, and hook-words to tie different sections together.¹⁷⁰ The presence of an inclusio in 4:14-16 and 10:19-25 identifies the opening and closing of a long central section (5:1–10:18) dealing with the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God,¹⁷¹ which has enabled access to the presence of God for his followers.¹⁷² Surrounding this central section are various pericopes containing both exposition and exhortation. This inclusio indicates, at a macro level at least, a tri-partite structure for Hebrews, with major section breaks after 4:16 and 10:25.¹⁷³ I will sub-divide my exegetical work on Hebrews on this basis.¹⁷⁴

1.5.3 Authorship

While Christians in the east believed Paul to be the author of Hebrews as early as the second century, and while Pauline authorship was assumed in the pre-critical period, this is almost universally denied today.¹⁷⁵ The great majority of scholars claim that the author is unidentifiable, being content to agree with Origen that only God knows who wrote it.¹⁷⁶ However, while the

¹⁶⁹ See the chart in Guthrie 1994: 144. Whereas the Pauline Epistles usually contain theology followed by exhortation (e.g. Rom 1-11; 12-16), in Hebrews exhortations to the readers arise at key points as the work progresses. Donald Guthrie (1983:58-59) artificially separates these two genres and attempts to relegate the exhortations to Heb 10:19-13:25, but this takes no account of clear paraenetic material in (e.g.) 2:1-4 (which Guthrie does call an exhortation); 4:14-16; 5:11-20. For an early critique of the view that 1:1–10:18 contains theology and 10:19–13:25 exhortation see Vaganay 1940: 269.

¹⁷⁰ The presence of inclusios and hook-words was first identified by Vaganay 1940: 269-77, and the first book-length treatment of the structure of Hebrews using these and other rhetorical features was Vanhoye 1963 (second edition 1976, and summarised English edition 1989).

¹⁷¹ See the chart in Guthrie 1994: 79-80, reproduced in Joslin 2008: 124. This inclusio setting off the long central section was first identified by Nauck 1960: 199-206, and a tripartite structure based on this is adopted by Michel 1966: 29-35.

¹⁷² Guthrie 1994: 119-20.

¹⁷³ This tri-partite scheme is also adopted by Long Westfall 2005: 188, although Long Westfall herself splits the central section into two parts at 8:1. See also her discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of this structure on pp. 14-16.

¹⁷⁴ Chapters 7-8 (below).

¹⁷⁵ For a recent defence of Pauline authorship see Black 1999a: 32-51; 1999b: 78-86. Other recent discussions of authorship are found in Eisenbaum 2005: 217-24; Georgi 2005: 239-44; Miller 2005: 245-64; Koosed and Seesengood 2005: 272-77; Rothschild 2009. Rothschild (p. 12), explains that she aims to demonstrate that Hebrews is a Pauline “pseudepigraphon ... [a] forgery to foster perceptions of the author’s often radical views as ‘Pauline,’ situating the text within the literary framework of Paul’s ‘canon’ in order to improve it.” She deals with the self-references in 13:18-23 as part of this phenomenon, so as to “evoke Paul’s ἡθος” (p. 76). Such arguments are very difficult to counter, as they refuse to take the text at face value. For example, she argues that 13:20-25 are a genuine part of Hebrews (and not a later addition as some have argued, pp. 45-62), but that they are also central to the author’s pseudepigraphic forgery. That the author requests the recipients to pray for him in vv. 18-22, implies the readers knew his identity. If this is a forgery as Rothschild maintains, how many more of forty-nine first-person plural verbs may be relied upon?

¹⁷⁶ Eusebius records the words from Origen in *H.E.* 6.25: Τίς δὲ ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, τὸ μὲν ἀληθὲς θεὸς οἶδεν. Origen’s earlier comment is usually omitted, Ἐγὼ δὲ ἀποφαινόμενος εἶποιμ’ ἂν ὅτι τὰ μὲν νοήματα τοῦ Ἀποστόλου ἐστίν, ἡ δὲ φράσις καὶ ἡ σύνθεσις ἀπομνημονεύσαντος τινος τὰ ἀποστολικά,

identity of the author is unknown, some things can be deduced from the text. He was apparently male, as the masculine participle referring to himself in 11:32 indicates (ἐπιλείπει με γὰρ διηγούμενον ὁ χρόνος, “time would fail me to relate ...”). Furthermore, the assumed readers knew his identity, since in 13:18, he asks for prayer for a clear conscience and that he would be restored to them soon.¹⁷⁷

I decline to speculate on the identity of the author. I note, however, that the literary skill and seminal thinking evident in the text, and the fact that it was accepted into the Christian canon, albeit rather late,¹⁷⁸ would seem to indicate that it was written by some apostolic figure. The reference to Timothy in 13:23 suggests that the author may have been part of the Pauline circle.¹⁷⁹

1.5.4 Location of Author and Recipients

Hebrews 13:19, 23 imply that Hebrews was written and sent to a congregation in another location, which the author hoped to visit in the near future. The reference to Italy in 13:24

καὶ ὥσπερὶ σχολιογραφήσαντος τὰ εἰρημένα τοῦ διδασκάλου, “If I gave my opinion, I should say that the thoughts are those of the apostle, but the diction and phraseology are those of someone who remembered the apostolic teachings, and wrote down at his leisure what had been said by his teacher.” (ET Schaff and Wace 1952: 355).

¹⁷⁷ Hoppin 2004: 146-47 argues that Priscilla was the author. She proposes that the masculine participle was either originally feminine and changed to a masculine by a copyist (either in error or to suppress the real authorship), or neuter (which has the same form as the masculine) with the sentence being an abstraction (“time would fail *anyone* in telling,” see BDF 72-73, 76-77), or an “*editorial masculine*” with the author speaking “not only for herself but for others.” There is no MS evidence for any reading other than a masculine participle. Hoppin’s other two options (that the author was speaking for others rather than herself) seem to be invalidated by the opening words of the sentence (and what shall I say καὶ τί ἔτι λέγω). The suggestion that a female author used a masculine participle to mask her own identity also fails, since the author was well known enough to the readers to ask for prayer from them (13:18). The change from the plural to the singular in 13:18-19 may suggest that more than one person was involved in the writing. Since the author asks the readers to “pray for us” (Προσεύχεσθε περὶ ἡμῶν), “that he would be restored to them soon” (ἵνα τάχιον ἀποκατασταθῶ ὑμῖν). This dual (or multiple) authorship may be behind the suggestion of Clement of Alexandria recorded in Eusebius *H.E.* 6.14 (ET Schaff and Wace 1952: 345) that Paul “wrote Hebrews in Hebrew and that Luke translated it for the Greeks” (καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους δὲ ἐπιστολὴν, Ἑβραϊκῇ φωνῇ, Λουκᾶν δὲ φιλοτίμως αὐτὴν μεθερμηνεύσαντα, ἐκδοῦναι τοῖς Ἕλλησιν). On this basis, Black 1999a: 32-51; 1999b: 78-86 posits Paul as the primary author and Luke as the amanuensis. He also proposes (following Clement) that it was written to Rome, and that Paul’s identity was concealed since he was *persona non grata* in Rome and a letter from him would not be accepted. The author refers to himself and his readers (or humanity in general) in 1:2; 2:1, 3, 8, 9; 3:6, 14, 19; 3:1, 6; 4:1, 2, 3, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16; 6:1, 3, 18, 19, 20; 7:14, 19, 26; 8:1; 9:14, 24; 10:10, 15, 20, 22, 23, 24, 26, 30, 39; 11:3, 40; 12:1, 9, 25, 28, 29; 13:6, 10, 13, 14, 15, 20, 21, 23. He refers to himself over against his readers in the first person plural in 2:5; 5:11; 6:9, 11; 13:18, and in the first person singular in 11:32; 13:19, 22, 23. It seems impossible to determine whether the plurals in 2:5; 5:11; 6:9, 11; 13:18 are literary plurals (Attridge 1989: 402; Bruce 1990: 386; Johnson 2006: 353; O’Brien 2010: : 530-31), whether they indicate joint authorship, whether they refer to the author and those with him (Ellingworth 1993: 724-25; Koester 2001: 572), or whether he is identifying with the leaders he refers to in 13:17 (Lane 1991b: 556). There are also switches between what appear to be literary plurals and singulars in Col 4:3 and 1 Thess 5:25-26.

¹⁷⁸ See the discussion in Koester 2001: 19-27.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid.: 42-45; Rothschild 2009: 46-47. Rothschild concludes that “Paul lurks behind Hebrews,” even if the identity of the author is unknown (p. 217).

seems to indicate some connection with Rome, and the external evidence, where Hebrews follows Romans in leaf 21 (*recto*) of P⁴⁶,¹⁸⁰ and the allusions to Heb 1:1-4 in *1 Clem.* 36, tend to support this. However, the reference to Italy is ambiguous. It could either imply that the author was sending his Epistle from Italy (Rome), along with greetings to a congregation elsewhere; or that he was sending his Epistle to Rome, from some other location, where some from Italy were also located. This ambiguity cannot be resolved,¹⁸¹ although the external evidence is slightly in favour of locating the destination in Rome. Other locations for the author or the recipients other than Rome have been suggested, most of which should be discounted,¹⁸² although the veiled references to Jerusalem in 13:12-14 many indicate some connection with Jerusalem.¹⁸³ While certainty is not possible, an origin or destination in either Rome or Jerusalem seems most likely.¹⁸⁴

1.5.5 Date and Occasion

Recent scholarship is divided on the date of Hebrews. While most scholars adopt a date prior to the fall of Jerusalem,¹⁸⁵ a significant minority argues for a later date.¹⁸⁶ Those who prefer the earlier date point to such texts as Heb 10:1-4, which refers to temple sacrifices in the present tense, asking whether, if they could provide perfection for the worshippers, they would not have ceased being offered. It is claimed that this question could not have been framed in this way, if the temple had been destroyed.¹⁸⁷ Critics of this position point to texts in Josephus and *1 Clement* that also refer to the temple cultus in the present tense after the destruction of the

¹⁸⁰ See the photograph in Comfort and Barrett 2001: 224. For an electronic image of this leaf of P⁴⁶ see online: http://www.lib.umich.edu/papyri-king-james/05_02.jpg.

¹⁸¹ Attridge 1989: 410-11; Lane 1991b: 571.

¹⁸² See the discussion of these other locations in Salevao 2002: 118, and the recent discussion in O'Brien 2010: 14-15, who tentatively favours Rome.

¹⁸³ I discuss this in 7.8 (below).

¹⁸⁴ Lane 1991a: lviii-lxvi argues for a Roman destination, while more recently Ben Ezra 2003: 191-92 and Mosser 2009a: 397-404 argue for a Jerusalem destination. Buchanan 1972: 255-63 argued that Hebrews was written from Jerusalem to a monastic community of pilgrims who had "come to Mount Zion" (13:22), which he reads as a reference to the earthly Jerusalem. This is quite unlikely.

¹⁸⁵ Lindars 1989: 402-403; Bruce 1990: 20-22; Lane 1991a: lxii-lxvi; Ellingworth 1993: 29-33; Walker 1994: 56-66; Guthrie 1998: 22-23; DeSilva 2000b: 20-23; Hagner 2002: 25; Johnson 2006: 38-40; Mosser 2009a: 404.

¹⁸⁶ Isaacs 1992: 41-45; Eisenbaum 2005: 224-231; Aitken 2005: 133-136; Georgi 2005: 243; Mitchell 2007: 7-11. Those who argue that precision is not possible include Attridge 1989: 6-9 (somewhere in the period 60-100 C.E.); Koester 1994: 50-54 (60-90 C.E.). The *terminus ad quem* is established from the allusions to Heb 1:1-4 in *1 Clem.* 36, usually dated around 96 C.E. (Holmes 2007: 35-36), although Attridge 1989: 7-8 favours a somewhat later date for Clement, around 120 C.E.

¹⁸⁷ Hughes 1977: 30-32; Bruce 1990: 21-22; Ellingworth 1993: 31-32; Walker 1994: 58; DeSilva 2000b: 20-21; Koester 2001: 52-53 (tentatively); Johnson 2006: 38-39; Hooker 2009: 189-92; O'Brien 2010: 19. The text refers to the temple cultus in the present tense in 5:1-4; 7:21, 23, 27, 28; 8:3, 4-5; 8:13; 9:6-7, 9, 13, 25; 10:1, 3-4, 8, 11; 13:10-11. Not all of these texts carry the same implications as 10:1-4.

temple.¹⁸⁸ While this is a valid point, as Walker points out, neither Josephus nor Clement are discussing the cessation of the temple cultus as the author of Hebrews is.¹⁸⁹

1.5.6 Hebrews and the Temple

A group of scholars, including some who assign an early date, discount the implications of such texts as 10:1-4 for the date, noting that the author draws his arguments from the wilderness tabernacle, and suggest that he displays no interest in the temple.¹⁹⁰ However, two scholars in particular, have recently challenged this suggestion, arguing that while the temple is not mentioned, it lies just beneath the surface.¹⁹¹ There are several reasons for this. First, while the author's use of the concept of a heavenly temple is debated (and this thesis is part of that debate), the widespread recognition that the earthly and heavenly temples corresponded in some way indicates that discussion of a heavenly temple also implies a discussion of the earthly temple.¹⁹² And, secondly, while the arguments of Hebrews are based on the wilderness tabernacle, these arguments are applied to the readers' contemporary situation.¹⁹³ Hebrews was not written in a vacuum. Discussion of the tabernacle as the dwelling place of God, as well as the use of the present tense in discussions of the Jewish cultus, would probably have evoked in the minds of the readers the contemporary, earthly manifestation of the dwelling place of God, that is the Jerusalem temple, irrespective of whether it was still standing or had been recently destroyed. Thirdly, since the most significant feature of Jerusalem in the first century was surely the temple, so much so that Jerusalem is to be seen not so much as city with a temple within it than a temple with a small city around it,¹⁹⁴ the implicit critique of Jerusalem in the later chapters of Hebrews (11:8-16; 12:22-24; 13:11-14) also implies a critique of the temple.¹⁹⁵

¹⁸⁸ Josephus, *Ant.* 3.102-87; 224-57; *Ag. Ap.* 2.77, 193-98; 1 *Clem.* 40-41. See the brief discussion of these texts in Koester 2001: 52-53, and see 8.6.5 (below).

¹⁸⁹ Walker 1994: 58-59. Of course, had the temple fallen, the question in Hebrews would need to be entirely different, as a reference to the fall of the temple in the context in which it presently stands, could be seen to imply that the temple cultus had provided perfection for the worshippers and was therefore no longer necessary. The sentence would need to read something like: "that it is no longer standing is further evidence of its inability to provide perfection, since now God has provided something better."

¹⁹⁰ Rissi 1987: 12; Attridge 1989: 8; Lindars 1989: 395, 403; Lane 1991a: lxii-lxiii; Isaacs 1992: 41-45; Ellingworth 1993: 401, 710; Eisenbaum 2005: 225-26; Aitken 2005: 134-35; Dunn 2006: 116; Lincoln 2006: 39-40; Mitchell 2007: 7; Schenck 2007: 195-98; O'Brien 2010: 18 (although he moderates this view on p. 19).

¹⁹¹ Walker 1994: 39-71; 1996: 205-207; 2004b: 231-49; Motyer 2004: 177-89. Some earlier scholars also suggested that the tabernacle in Hebrews was a cipher for the temple. See Spicq 1952: 1: 253-61; Buchanan 1972: 256-63; Bruce 1990: 21-22.

¹⁹² Motyer 2004: 178.

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*: 178.

¹⁹⁴ Wright 1992: 225. On the centrality of the temple in Judaism in the first century, whether in Palestine or in the Diaspora see Johnson 2001: 43-46; VanderKam 2010: 58-62; Levine 2010a: 796; 2010b: 1289-91.

¹⁹⁵ Davies 1974: 152; Walker 1994: 45-50; Dunn 2006: 120.

Motyer's conclusion is that Hebrews is written to persuade the readers to distance themselves from cultic practices associated with the temple, but that this is such a massive assault on the temple, had it been made explicitly it would have been rejected. As Motyer claims, there is no reference to the Jerusalem temple in Hebrews for rhetorical reasons, so that the "profound message ... *about the Temple* may actually be heard ... and not rejected out of hand."¹⁹⁶

1.5.7 The Relapse Theory

Discussion of the temple and temple symbolism raises the issue of the so-called relapse theory, that is, that the intended recipients of Hebrews were tempted to revert to Judaism from Christianity.¹⁹⁷ While it has some validity, this theory is fraught with problems. It seems clear that from the outset there were disputes between the followers of Jesus and the Jewish authorities over the validity of the temple,¹⁹⁸ and that the followers of Jesus were sometimes excluded from synagogues.¹⁹⁹ On the other hand, the events recounted in Acts 13:14-16, which, while probably earlier than Hebrews by some decades, indicate that Paul and his companions were in the habit of attending and participating in synagogue worship. Moreover, it does seem clear that in the later decades of the first century when Hebrews was probably written, it was not yet possible to speak of two religions, Judaism and Christianity, raising the further question of how it was possible to revert from one religion (Christianity) to the other (Judaism).²⁰⁰ Additionally, this theory, and especially the way it is applied in Hebrews, raises the sensitive issue of supersessionism, inasmuch as it implies that the church (and Christianity) has replaced Israel (and Judaism) in the purposes of God.²⁰¹

¹⁹⁶ Motyer 2004: 189. Motyer suggests that Heb 8:13; 9:1-10:18; 12:18-24; 13:10-16 could have been written with explicit reference to the temple, but that this would have amounted to "a massive ideological assault on the Jerusalem temple and cultus [which would have been] wholly counter-productive." Since the temple was such a sensitive issue the author "proceeds cautiously and slowly, basing his arguments solidly on scripture, and allowing the implications to appear gradually and unobtrusively, but yet clearly" (p. 180). For similar arguments see Walker 2004b: 239-40 (Walker wrote the introduction to the volume in which Motyer's essay appeared, see 2004a: 1-10).

¹⁹⁷ This view is adopted to some degree or another by Spicq 1952: 1: 228-29; Filson 1967: 61-66; Peterson 1982: 186; Bruce 1990: 100; Lehne 1990: 15-17; Lane 1991b: 545-46; Lindars 1991: 10-12; Chester 1991a: 57-72; Ellingworth 1993: 78-80; Johnson 2001: 129; Hagner 2002: 23; Salevao 2002: 108-118; Walker 2004b: 235-46; Lincoln 2006: 57-60; Johnson 2006: 33-38; Mackie 2007: 13-15; Mitchell 2007: 11-13; O'Brien 2010: 9-13.

¹⁹⁸ In Acts 6:13 Stephen is charged with speaking out "against [this] holy place" (κατὰ τοῦ τόπου τοῦ ἁγίου [τούτου]), that is, the temple (Metzger 1994: 298). Metzger discusses the evidence for the inclusion or exclusion of τούτου (this), which, he suggests "allows (if indeed it does not require) the phrase to refer to the place of assembly of the Sanhedrin, which may have been situated on the Temple Mount on the western side of the enclosing wall."

¹⁹⁹ See among other texts, John 9:22; 12:42; 16:42.

²⁰⁰ Eisenbaum 2005: 233 probably overstates the case when she suggests that that the religions "Judaism" and "Christianity" may not have existed as separately definable identities until the fourth or fifth centuries.

²⁰¹ See my discussion of supersessionism in Church 2011a: 147-57, and 7.8 (below).

Nonetheless, James Dunn claims that “[f]or Hebrews and a Judaism still focussed on the Temple and its cult, the ways had already parted.”²⁰² Dunn’s opinion that, “the great body of Jews who continued to value and cherish the cult ... must have felt deeply alienated by such a writing,”²⁰³ makes sense. Thus, while there may have not been a final parting of the ways until much later, there were people and places where the ways seem to have already parted from the very early period.²⁰⁴ Along these lines, I propose a modified relapse theory. References to Judaism and Christianity are anachronistic in the context of Hebrews, and there is neither polemic against “Judaism” *per se*, nor any reference to an entity called “Christianity.” On the other hand, the text argues that the former covenant and its associated cultus were valid for their time as pointers to what was to come, and now that the “time of reformation” (καιρὸς διορθώσεως, 9:10) has come, these must give way to that which they anticipated. Nevertheless, the exhortation is not to follow another, new religion, but to follow Jesus (12:1-2; 13:14), one who arose from the tribe of Judah (7:14), and in whom God’s plans to set free the descendants of Abraham are centred (2:16). Jesus and his sacrifice do not so much replace the temple cult of Judaism, as bring it to its *telos* (8:13; 10:5-10). Now that this *telos* has come with his exaltation to the right hand of God (1:3; 8:1), for his followers to devote themselves to the former cultus is to run the danger of holding Jesus in contempt (6:6) and laying themselves open to the judgment of God (10:26-31).²⁰⁵

1.6 Methodology

This study culminates in an exegetical treatment of those parts of Hebrews where temple symbolism appears. In chapter 6, I discuss the eschatological orientation of Hebrews, written as it was, from the perspective of the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God “in these last days.” Through Christ God is leading many heirs to glory, thus his exaltation precedes their eschatological exaltation. In chapter 7, I discuss texts that deal with the access of the readers to

²⁰² Dunn 2006: 121 (italics original). See also the discussion of evidence for separation in Kim 2006: 49-52. Kim concludes that Hebrews “marks the stage of a maturing Christianity that is more independent from Judaism.”

²⁰³ Dunn 2006: 121.

²⁰⁴ Several scholars argue that Hebrews addressed the issue of Christian identity over against pagan Rome, “when Rome was the common enemy of Jews and believers in Jesus and before the rhetoric of Christian and Jewish leaders could construct firm boundaries between Judaism and Christianity” (Eisenbaum 2005: 237). A similar view is proposed by Käsemann 1984: 24-25 (who thinks the relapse theory is a “fantasy”); Koester 2001: 64-79; DeSilva 2000b: 2-7; Thompson 2008: 6-10. None of these scholars adequately deal with the reasons why the author almost exclusively bases his arguments on aspects of the Jewish cultus. I discuss these issues more fully in 7.8 (below).

²⁰⁵ Cf. O’Brien 2010: 13, who suggests that to return to the cultus of the former covenant is “to fail to understand how these structures pointed to Christ across the years of salvation history.” See also Kim 2006: 201 who denies any supersessionism in Hebrews, seeing rather the argument that God in his “great love for his [Jewish] people ... has provided a superior way by which his people can draw near to him” (p. 201). It is worth noting at this point that the critique of the tabernacle and temple are not on the basis that they are inferior, earthly institutions. Rather the critique is based on their having outlived their function as pointing to the eschaton, now come with the exaltation of Christ.

the heavenly temple as their ultimate goal, access they also have proleptically in the present. This is the glory to which God is leading these many heirs. Having dealt with the eschatological orientation of the book, and the eschatological implications of the temple symbolism for the readers, I turn in chapter 8 to discuss the heavenly temple in the central section of Hebrews (4:16–10:18 and especially 8:1–10:18). I argue that heavenly temple language in this part of Hebrews refers to the same realities referred to in 3:1–4:15 and 10:19–13:25. It is figurative language, symbolising the eschatological dwelling of God with his people. The heavenly temple is the world to come, where Jesus the exalted Son of God is now enthroned, the eschatological dwelling of God with his people, to which these people have access in the present, and where God and his people will ultimately dwell together.

Because there was considerable speculation about a heavenly temple in the literature of middle Judaism,²⁰⁶ it is necessary to examine texts from this period that reflect temple symbolism. This body of literature is considerable and some organisational principle is necessary. I have divided the material into four chapters, depending on the attitude to the temple reflected in the texts under discussion.²⁰⁷ In chapter 2, I discuss texts that portray a positive attitude to the temple. In chapter 3, I discuss temple symbolism in the Dead Sea Scrolls, texts used by a community that had withdrawn from the temple, believing that it and its priesthood were corrupt. Belief in a corrupt priesthood and temple seems also to be reflected in another body of texts that has much to say about a heavenly temple, mostly ignoring the Jerusalem temple.²⁰⁸ I discuss this material in chapter 4, followed in chapter 5 by a discussion of texts post-dating the fall of the temple and reacting to that event.

The justification for examining these texts is twofold. First, they represent an important part of the environment of the primitive church. Secondly, all of these texts (including Hebrews) represent varying approaches to understanding the OT, whether in Hebrew or in Greek.²⁰⁹ This examination therefore provides the necessary background to the study of Hebrews, where the community addressed seems to have a positive opinion of the temple, but where the author

²⁰⁶ I use the term “middle Judaism” to describe the period 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E., as the matrix out of which Christianity and rabbinic Judaism emerged. The term was coined by Boccaccini 1991: 24-25. This is preferable to Second Temple Judaism, as some of the texts I survey post-date the destruction of the temple.

²⁰⁷ For attitudes to the temple in the literature of middle Judaism see Rowland 1991: 175-98.

²⁰⁸ There was considerable disappointment with the second temple, even from its outset, a phenomenon reflected in such texts as Hag 2:1-3; Mal 1:6–2:9; 1 Esdr 5:63-65; *1 En.* 89:73; Josephus *Ant* 11. 80-81. This disappointment is implicit in many of the texts I will discuss in chapter 4, and leads to the idea of a heavenly temple as the true temple. See Zimmer 1975: 42-43; Segal 1986: 39-40, 80, 128-30. Rowland 1991: 194 finds this explanation for the development of a belief in a heavenly temple less convincing than the notion of a developing belief in a cosmology where God was enthroned in heaven. This grew out of speculation on Ezek 1, rather than out of any dissatisfaction with the temple. These alternative explanations are not mutually exclusive.

²⁰⁹ While the OT background is important, an examination of OT texts that have been understood as referring to the heavenly sanctuary would take me far beyond the scope of the present study. Nevertheless, the Jewish Greek Scriptures are foundational to the argumentation of Hebrews.

considered that, while the temple was valid in the past as a pointer to the eschatological events that have now come with the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God, it had now reached its *telos*, and was no longer the place where God was encountered.

1.7 Intertextuality

The word “intertextuality,” that is, the study of relationships between texts,²¹⁰ arises from time to time in this study. Although I do not make use of this to any great extent I need to clarify the sense in which I use the word. This discussion is necessary because the term is used differently in biblical studies than in literary and linguistic studies, where it is associated with poststructuralism and deconstruction. In those disciplines, the word is primarily associated with literary critics such as Roland Barthes, Julia Kristeva who coined the term,²¹¹ and Mikhail Bakhtin. Hatina defines such intertextuality as “a concept that disclosed every text’s dependence on and infiltration by prior codes and concepts.”²¹² Kristeva cites Bakhtin as situating “the text within history and society, which are then seen as texts read by the writer, and into which he inserts himself by rewriting them.”²¹³ Thus, intertextuality in these terms “concerns itself with the relations among many texts ... [and] is a synchronic, reader-oriented, semiotic method.”²¹⁴

Patricia Tull Willey demonstrates with the expression, “No text is an island,” that a text never stands alone, but is always part of an ongoing conversation.²¹⁵ In the context of this study, it is important to acknowledge that there was a continuing conversation about the temple in middle Judaism, and, since Hebrews is part of that conversation, other conversation partners need to be listened to in order to see what else was being said, without expecting the author of Hebrews to say the same things as they do and without suggesting that he was dependent upon these other works. Indeed, it is unlikely that the author of Hebrews will say the same things, since he has an entirely different starting point—the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God signalling the irruption of the eschaton into the present. Intertextuality in these terms is reflected in my

²¹⁰ Vorster 1989: 18.

²¹¹ Kristeva 1986: 36-37.

²¹² Hatina 1999: 31.

²¹³ Kristeva 1986: 36. In this quote, “history and society” are understood as texts.

²¹⁴ Sommer 1998: 7.

²¹⁵ Willey 1997: 58-60. Willey borrowed the example from Miscal 1992: 45 and Beal 1992: 23. English speaking readers will recognise the echo of a line from John Donne, “no man is an Island, intire of it selfe (sic).” Cf. also Culler 2001: 114 who refers to intertextuality as “a designation of [a work’s] participation in the discursive space of a culture.”

examination of texts other than Hebrews.²¹⁶ Moreover, whether the author of Hebrews was familiar with these texts or not is irrelevant; they reflect ideas “in the air” when Hebrews was written.²¹⁷

In biblical studies intertextuality is normally used in another sense, that is, “as a substitute category for uncovering and investigating conscious or unconscious allusions to scripture in the New Testament.”²¹⁸ In this context intertextuality refers to the way a subsequent author makes use of a previously written text.²¹⁹ This diachronic methodology, which Sommer refers to as “allusion and influence,”²²⁰ is a much narrower discipline, looking for “specific connections between a limited number of texts.”²²¹ I will mainly use the term intertextuality in this sense.²²² In some places my work depends upon the work of Richard B. Hays, who has demonstrated the value of reading OT intertextual references in the NT in the light of their wider OT context,²²³ and Craig Evans, who suggests that it is not only the OT context that needs to be considered, but also the OT text as interpreted “in late antiquity.”²²⁴

When understood in this way, intertextuality operates on a variety of levels. In Hebrews, as in other parts of the NT, there are numerous direct quotations from the OT. Some are simple to identify, especially those that appear with a citation formula, such as the appearance of some form of the word λέγω immediately prior to words that can be identified as coming from the

²¹⁶ Sommer 1998: 7 also notes that connections between texts can result from “the way that expressions in a given text reflect linguistic, esthetic, cultural, or ideological contexts of the text at hand: other texts may share those contexts, and hence links among many texts may be noticed, whether the authors of these texts knew each other or not.” I also recognise that in this discussion “text” refers to more than a written document and includes the influences that make up a written text as well as those that grow out of it as others read it.

²¹⁷ Eco 1979: 169-70 refers to intertextual echoes in Fleming’s James Bond novels as influences that “may have worked in the mind of the author without emerging into consciousness ... devices that he had smelled in the air.”

²¹⁸ Hatina 1999: 28. Whether an allusion can be “unconscious” is questionable.

²¹⁹ This approach is sometimes referred to as “inner-biblical exegesis.” Other works that exploit this kind of intertextuality include Fishbane 1985; Sommer 1998.

²²⁰ Sommer 1998: 8.

²²¹ Ibid.: 8.

²²² See the discussion in Hays 1989: 15-16, who recognises the value of investigations that use the notion of intertextuality in the wider sense, but uses the term “in a more limited sense, focusing on ... [Paul’s] actual citations of an allusions to specific texts.”

²²³ Ibid. Along the same lines Pattemore, 2004: 38 argues that since a prior text quoted in a later text is part of the “mutual cognitive environment” of the author and readers of that later text, “sensitivity to the wider context of the original setting of a quotation is ... a necessary hermeneutical strategy.”

²²⁴ Evans, 1993: 50. The term “late antiquity” normally refers to a period later than middle Judaism, the period to which I restrict this study.

LXX (e.g. 1:6, 7; 2:6, 12; 3:7). Where a citation formula is absent, substantial identity with a passage from the LXX may indicate a direct quotation (e.g. 1:19).²²⁵

In addition to quotations, scholars have identified a number of allusions to the LXX, although the identification of these is more difficult, not least because of the debate as to the amount of material to be included before one identifies an allusion.²²⁶ With Guthrie, I recognise as an allusion “an overt weaving of at least a phrase from the antecedent text into the author’s own language.”²²⁷ There is usually no formal marker in the syntax to indicate that words from another source are being used, and at times the forms of the words used are changed so as to fit the syntax in the new author’s discourse.

In addition to direct quotations and allusions, scholars also refer to echoes, the identification of which is more difficult still. Indeed, the subliminal nature of some intertextual echoes may mean that their number cannot be definitively quantified.²²⁸ In this regard Hays distinguishes “allusive echo” from quotation and overt allusion. He suggests that an allusive echo suggests to the reader that “text B should be understood in light of a broad interplay with text A, encompassing aspects of A beyond those explicitly echoed.”²²⁹ Further, since the discerning of an intertextual echo is by nature reader-oriented, it may be that the more familiar one becomes with a text and the background of the interpretive tradition in which it stands, the more echoes may be discerned. Nevertheless, it is important to be alert for echoes, for as Hays has demonstrated, they can considerably enhance the reader’s understanding of a text.²³⁰

²²⁵ See the discussion in Fitzmyer 1997: 7-14. On p. 14 Fitzmyer refers to citations with no citation formula as “virtual citations.” See also Stanley 1992: 33-37; Gheorghita 2003: 32-35.

²²⁶ Longenecker 1975: 166-167 includes single words and identifies fifty five allusions in Hebrews, two more than those identified by Westcott 1892: 472-73. Westcott classifies 7:1ff and 3:1ff as quotations, while Longenecker classifies them as allusions.

²²⁷ Guthrie 2003: 273. The distinction between a direct quotation and an allusion is clarified by comparing Heb 1:13 with Heb 1:3. In Heb 1:13 there is a quotation from Ps 110:1 that conforms precisely to the extant text of the LXX (neither Rahlfs 1931: 276-77, nor NA²⁷ note any textual variances in either Ps 109:1 (LXX) nor Heb 1:13). The quotation is introduced with a rhetorical question that serves as a citation formula. In Heb 1:3 (NRSV) the words, “he sat down at the right hand of the majesty on high,” clearly bear some relationship to Ps 110:1. But the imperative in the Psalm is expressed as an indicative, “the Lord” (Yahweh) of the Psalm is described as “the majesty on high,” and the Psalm is seen to be fulfilled in the exaltation of the Son to God’s right hand.

²²⁸ Guthrie 2003: 274.

²²⁹ Hays 1989: 20. For an example of echoes along these lines see my discussion of the influence of Balaam’s oracles on Hebrews in Church 2008: 154-57.

²³⁰ Hays 1993, *passim*. Guthrie 2003: 273 notes that the exploration of echoes (in Hebrews) is an important, but as yet “uncharted area of research.” Sommer 1998: 15-17 uses the term “echo” differently. He refers to the phenomenon where elements of an earlier text appear in a later text, but, while this “echo” may be interesting, it has little effect on the reader and does not influence the understanding of the text.

1.8 Summary

This study is concerned with temple symbolism in Hebrews. This includes explicit references to the wilderness tabernacle and the heavenly temple, implicit references to the Jerusalem temple, and the relationship between earthly sanctuaries and the heavenly temple. Many readers of Hebrews understand the text to suggest that earthly sanctuaries are (mere, inferior) copies of the archetypal heavenly sanctuary, but I propose a reading in which earthly sanctuaries anticipate the eschatological dwelling of God with his people, pictured in Hebrews as a heavenly, eschatological temple.

Before I approach the text of Hebrews, I examine the temple symbolism that appears in the literature of middle Judaism with several questions in mind. These questions include whether the heavenly temple is envisaged anywhere as a heavenly counterpart of the earthly temple, so that the notion of “copy” and “shadow” can be used of the earthly temple; whether the wilderness tabernacle is ever disparaged in this literature, as has often been proposed for Hebrews; whether the heavenly temple is anywhere understood as a place of sacrifice, especially blood sacrifice; and whether the heavenly temple is understood as the eschatological dwelling place of God with his people, and if so, whether it is accessible to the earthly community prior to the eschaton. Answering these questions will assist in the understanding of the temple symbolism in Hebrews.

2 Temple Affirmed: Temple Symbolism in Texts Reflecting a Positive Attitude to the Temple

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter I examine several texts from middle Judaism that portray a positive attitude to the temple. These texts include Sirach, where the universe appears as a temple, with the Jerusalem temple understood as a microcosm of the universe; Wisdom, where “Solomon” builds the temple as a “copy of the holy tent God built from the beginning;” *Sibylline Oracles* Book 3 where the sibyllist anticipated the rebuilding of the temple after the exile, so that everything would be “as before;” Philo, who attributed cosmic significance to the design of the tabernacle; and 2 (*Slavonic*) *Enoch*, in which Enoch begins a heavenly journey from Akhuzan (Zion), the centre of the earth, and who, in a set of ethical instructions, enjoins the proper observance of the sacrificial cultus of the temple.

An examination of these texts is warranted, as even though they show a different attitude to the temple from that evident in Hebrews, the theoretical basis of these positive attitudes can give valuable insights into the understanding of Hebrews. Moreover, like Hebrews, many of the texts I discuss in chapters 3-5 simply ignore the temple. These texts all refer to the temple and provide evidence of positive discourse about the temple.

2.2 Sirach

Ben Sira composed Sirach in Hebrew in the first quarter of the second century B.C.E., and his grandson translated it into Greek in Egypt some sixty or seventy years later.¹ Much of the work comprises thematically grouped sentence literature on a variety of ethical and religious subjects. There are several longer poems, and the final chapters comprise a hymn in praise of famous men, culminating with the high priest Simon II, Ben Sira’s near contemporary.²

¹ Nickelsburg 2005a: 62-3; Wright 2010: 436-37. Hayward 1996: 38 notes that the date of the work’s original composition in Hebrew is agreed universally, so much so that it is unnecessary to rehearse the evidence. For the evidence see Hengel 1974: 131; Gilbert 1984: 291. The history of the transmission of the text is complex (Wright 2010: 437). The Greek text exists in two versions, with the shorter version considered more original. Since the late nineteenth century parts of the Hebrew text have been discovered, including medieval manuscripts from the Cairo Genizah, and fragments from Masada and Qumran, also in two versions. About two thirds of the text is available in Hebrew. There are also Latin and Syriac versions. For discussions of the transmission history, see Box and Oesterley 1913: 271-91; Gilbert 1984: 290-92; Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 51-61; Perdue 1994: 247; DeSilva 2002: 156-57. The upheavals of 175-164 B.C.E. occurred between the original Hebrew composition and the Greek translation, but apart from the prayer in Sir 36, which is of doubtful provenance, the text seems to oblivious to these events (Collins 1997b: 25). In what follows I refer to the book as Sirach and to the author as Ben Sira. This work is unique in its time in that it gives the name of the author (50:27).

² Simon died in 196 B.C.E. VanderKam 2004: 149-57 argues that the historical detail in the book indicates that the reference is to Simon I, approximately one century earlier. This discussion is outside my scope.

Ben Sira had a positive view of the Jerusalem temple and its priesthood.³ This is especially clear in chapters 44-50, where Aaron and Phinehas feature prominently in the hymn in praise of the ancestors and Simon features in the climactic chapter 50. Temple Symbolism appears in chapter 24, a poem in praise of wisdom, not preserved in Hebrew,⁴ and in parts of the song of praise of the ancestors.⁵ There are indications that some NT writers, particularly Matthew (or perhaps Q), James and possibly the author of Hebrews were familiar with Sirach, at least in its Greek form.⁶

2.2.1 The Praise of Wisdom (Sir 24:1-33)

This chapter, perhaps a centrepiece to the book,⁷ comprises an introduction (vv. 1-2), followed by a poem of six stanzas.⁸ Wisdom speaks in the first person from vv. 3-22. Verse 23 is a prose introduction to the fifth stanza (23-39) in which Wisdom is associated with Torah. Ben Sira himself speaks in vv. 30-33, explaining his part in the transmission of Wisdom. This poem covers similar ground to Prov 8, but while the structure of the two poems is similar, there are considerable differences in content.⁹ Temple Symbolism pervades the poem, particularly in allusions to the Eden story, the wilderness wanderings, and to the priestly role of Wisdom in the Jerusalem temple.

³ Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 87-88; Wright 1997: 190-96; 2007a: 171; Boccaccini 1998: 68; Ego 1999: 205. See Sir 7:29-31; 24:10-11; 49:12. As Olyan 1987: 267-76 points out, Aaron and his descendants are true priests in Sirach. The priesthood of Levi in such texts as Jer 33: 17-22; Mal 2: 4-9, *Jub.* 32 and *T. Levi* is ignored, and Levi only appears in 45:6 as the tribal name, possibly reflecting inter-priestly conflict (Hengel 1974: 2: 38-39, note 385). For an example of such conflict see Josephus, *Ant* 20:216-18. Himmelfarb 2002: 134 suggests that Ben Sira was not “an apologist for the priestly establishment,” rather he gave an ideal picture as a way of presenting a critique of that establishment. But Himmelfarb seems to be operating on the principle that where there is no smoke there must be a well-hidden fire, as there is no critique of temple or priesthood in this text. The ideal priest in Sirach is a ruling priest, as well as “an interpreter of Torah and practitioner of wisdom,” and Ben Sira writes to encourage the acceptance of these roles for the priesthood. Of course an apologist, advocating a position, can also be a critic, see Wright 2007a: 171 (footnote 35), but this seems not to be the case with Ben Sira.

⁴ For a proposed retroversion into Hebrew see Skehan 1979: 374-79.

⁵ Sirach 24 is headed Σοφίας αἵνεσις (“Praise of Wisdom”) and 44-50 Πατέρων ὕμνος (“Hymn of Ancestors”).

⁶ Box and Oesterley 1913: 294-96. Heb 12:12 cites a line from Isa 35:3 in a form identical to Sir 25:23, but different from the LXX of Isaiah, and the verb μετατίθημι (“change”) appears with reference to Enoch in Heb 11:5 and Sir 44:16 but not in Gen 5:24. NA²⁷ (pp. 804-805) also detects an allusion to Sir 2:2 in Heb 11:27; Sir 17:17 in Heb 2:5; Sir 29:14 in Heb 7:22; Sir 33:19 in Heb 13:7; Sir 44:20 in Heb 11:17. Most of these are single words with doubtful significance. Matt 11:25-30 may reflect Sirach’s influence, with the marginal notes in NA²⁷ indicating several allusions to different parts of the book.

⁷ Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 331; Collins 1997b: 45-6; Mulder 2003: 26; Harrington 2005: 103.

⁸ The Greek text also includes verse 34, but MS E from the Cairo Genizah shows that this has been displaced from 33:18. See Skehan 1979: 375-76. Perdue 1994: 264 suggests that in this chapter “Wisdom is personified as a heavenly goddess,” and others have compared the poem with the Egyptian Aretologies of the goddess Isis, see Collins 1997b: 49-50. For a critique of this comparison see Sanders 1983: 45-50.

⁹ Skehan 1979: 375; Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 331. On the differences see Marböck 1971: 55-56; Fletcher-Louis 2004a: 72.

The introduction locates Wisdom “among her people” (ἐν μέσῳ λαοῦ αὐτῆς), “in the congregation of the Most High” (ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ὑψίστου) and “in the presence of his host” (ἐναντι δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ).¹⁰ These expressions have been understood to refer to either angels or to the human community or to both, the latter in v. 1 and the former in v. 2.¹¹

Scholars most commonly identify the people of God among whom Wisdom is located in v. 1 as Israel at worship in the temple,¹² and “the congregation of the Most High” and “his host” as locating Wisdom in the heavenly temple among the angels.¹³ While the “congregation of the Most High” (ἐκκλησία ὑψίστου, v. 2) could be identified as the heavenly council as in Ps 82:1 (συναγωγὴ θεῶν, “gathering of the gods”), or Ps 89:6 (ἐκκλησία ἁγίων, “assembly of the holy ones”), both of these expressions are subjective genitives, whereas the expression in Sir 24:2 is an objective genitive describing the congregation of God (ὁ ὑψιστος).¹⁴ While this precise expression appears only here in the LXX, God’s people are referred to as the congregation of Yahweh in several texts in the OT,¹⁵ and in several places in Sirach ἐκκλησία refers to an earthly congregation.¹⁶ The expression is therefore likely to further describe the people of God.

On the other hand, the third expression (in the presence of his host) should probably be read as a reference to the heavenly host,¹⁷ with the Hebrew *Vorlage* for δύνάμις αὐτοῦ

¹⁰ I defend this translation below. An alternative rendering could be “in the presence of his power.”

¹¹ Rickenbacher 1973: 118-19 sets out the options and lists those scholars who subscribe to them.

¹² Box and Oesterley 1913: 396; Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 331; Collins 1997a: 50; Schreiner 2002: 129. Smend 1906: 216 suggests that the people are the angels, and Rickenbacher 1973: 119 refers to Prov 30:25-6 where **נַמְר** refers to communities of ants and badgers, showing that this word (the assumed Hebrew *Vorlage* of **λαός**) need not only refer to humans. Fletcher-Louis 2002: 283 notes with reference to 4Q400 1 I 6 that “it is extremely unlikely that a group of angels would ever be called a people.”

¹³ Box and Oesterley 1913: 396; Rickenbacher 1973: 119; Snaith 1974: 120-21; Perdue 1994: 267; Schreiner 2002: 129; Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 331-2. Perdue 1977: 189 has Wisdom “hypostatized as a member of the divine court of the Most High.”

¹⁴ The term ὑψιστος seems to be the translator’s preferred epithet for God. See Sir 4:10; 7:9, 15; 9:15; 12:2, 6; 17:26, 27; 19:17; 23:18, 23; 24:2, 3, 23; 26:16; 28:7; 29:11; 33:15; 34:6, 19; 35:5, 9, 19; 37:15; 38:2; 39:1, 5; 41:4, 8; 43:2, 9, 12; 44:20; 46:5; 47:5, 8; 48:5; 49:4; 50:7, 14, 15, 16, 19, 21. Not all of these instances are preserved in Hebrew. In 37:15; 38:2; 43:12 the Hebrew simply reads **אל** (“God”); in 41:4, 8; 43:2; 44:20; 49:4; 50:14, 16 it is **עליון** (“Most High”); in 43:9 it is **אל מרומי** (“the exalted God”); in 46:5; 47:5, 8 it is **אל עליון** (“God Most High”); in 50:7 it is **המלך** (“the king”); and in 50:19 **כל עם הארץ** (“all the people of the land”) are **ὁ λαὸς κυρίου ὑψίστου** (“the people of the Lord Most High”). All Hebrew references are from Beentjes 1997.

¹⁵ Deut 23:2, 3, 4, 9; 1 Chron 28:8; Mic 2:5. See also Lam 1:10.

¹⁶ Sir 15:5; 21:17; 23:24; 26:5; 31:11; 33:19; 38:33; 39:10; 44:15; 46:7; 50:13, 20. This is not to suggest that the grandson of Ben Sira used the LXX in any consistent manner as a basis for his translation from Hebrew into Greek (Wright 1989: 173-75).

¹⁷ The NRSV reads this as a reference to the heavenly council, although it renders the singular δύνάμις (power, host) as a plural (in the presence of his hosts). Zsengellér 2008: 139 argues against this, since δύνάμις is singular and **צבאות** plural, a form that does not appear elsewhere in Sirach or in the biblical wisdom literature and suggests that these verses describe “a liturgical situation that can only exist in the

(his host) understood as **צבאו**.¹⁸ This word appears in the singular in Ps 148:2 to refer to Yahweh's "entire host" (**כל-צבאו**, LXX *πᾶσαι αἱ δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ*), and the plural appears in Ps 103:21 with the same referent, that is, angelic hosts.¹⁹ Finally, in Sir 17:32 *δύναμιν ὕψους οὐρανοῦ* ("the host of the highest heaven") seems to refer to angels over against "all people" (*ἄνθρωποι πάντες*)²⁰ in the other colon of the verse.

Thus, these verses contain two descriptions of the human community and one of the heavenly host. Sirach 24:10-11 places Wisdom in the Jerusalem temple and witnesses to an understanding of the temple as "heaven on earth." It is not that the earthly temple is below and the heavenly temple above; rather, when Wisdom speaks from the temple she speaks in the presence of both the earthly community of God's people and of the heavenly host.²¹

The opening stanza of Wisdom's speech (24:3-7), where Wisdom speaks of her origin in the mouth of God, is an allusion to the creative word of Gen 1.²² Like the *רוח אלהים* ("spirit/wind of God") of Gen 1:2 and the mist of Gen 2:6, Wisdom covers the earth like a mist (24:3), encircles the vault of heaven and "walks around" (*περιπατέω*) the depths of the abyss.²³ In v. 4 Wisdom exclaims that she has "pitched her tent in the heights" (*ἐν*

temple." Skehan 1979: 374 retroverts this expression into Hebrew with **ונגד צבאו** ("in the presence of his host"). The plural of *δύναμις* appears in the Sahidic and Armenian versions (Ziegler 1980: 237).

¹⁸ Another possibility is *חילו*, which appears in the singular with a masculine pronoun suffix in Joel 2:11, referring to God's army. Joel 1 describes a plague of locusts, but the relationship of this plague to the description of the calamity described in 2:1-11 is debated. See Thompson 1955: 53-55; Allen 1976: 64; Wolff 1977: 42; Stuart 1987: 250, who all adopt different readings of this text. Whichever reading is adopted, the reference is to invading armies sent by Yahweh to execute judgement. The word seems not to be used to refer to Yahweh's heavenly army elsewhere, being restricted to the armies of Israel's enemies, with an ironic use in Joel 2:11 inferring that the enemy's army was sent by God. See Exod 14:4, 9, 17; 15:4; 1 Kings 20:1; 2 Kings 25:1, 5; Jer 34:11; 39:1; 52:4, 8; Ezek 29:18, 19; 32:31; Ps 136:15. In Deut 3:24; Judg 5:31; 8:21; 4 Kgdms 18:20; Job 12:13; 39:19; 41:4; Ps 20 (MT 21):14; 53 (MT 54):3; 144 (MT 145): 4; Eccl 9:16; 10:17; 1 Chron 29:11. In Jer 16:21. *δύναμις* renders *גבורה* referring to might, strength or God's great deeds, but while this is a possibility for Sir 24:4 and while *δύναμις* has this sense in Sir 6:26; 7:30; 8:13; 29:20; 44:3; 46:5 (there is no extant Hebrew for any of these texts), the context in 17:32 and 24:2 seems to indicate a reference to angelic beings.

¹⁹ Weiser 1962: 663, 83.

²⁰ For the singular of *δύναμις* in the LXX referring to the heavenly host, see 2 Chron 18:18 (Heb **צבא**); Joel 2:11 (Heb *חילו*). Fletcher-Louis 2002: 283 suggests that Ben Sira displays little interest in angels. They appear in 17:32; 48:21 and perhaps 42:17; 43: 26; 45:2.

²¹ For a similar phenomenon see Solomon's dedicatory prayer in 1 Kings 8; 2 Chron 6, where there is an interplay between God's dwelling in heaven and his dwelling in the temple.

²² Sheppard 1980: 22-27; Gese 1981a: 196; Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 332-33; Fletcher-Louis 2000: 60.

²³ For echoes of the creation story here, as well as the mist of Gen 2:6 watering the earth, see Sheppard 1980: 22-27; Perdue 1994: 267; Fletcher-Louis 2004a: 80-81. Gese 1981a: 196, followed by Fletcher-Louis 2002: 77; 2004a: 83-84, points out that the vault of heaven and depth of the abyss are the upper and lower extremities of the earth as described in Gen 1:6-8. There are also a number of linguistic connections between Sir 24:3-7 and Job 38 where God interrogates Job as to his involvement in creation. The mist *ὁμίχλη* (Sir 24:3) appears in Job 38:9; the waves (Sir 38:6) appear in Job 38:11; and in Job 38:16 God asks Job if he has "traversed" (Hithpael of *הלך*, LXX *περιπατέω*) the "abyss" (*תהום*, LXX *ἄβυσσος*) as Wisdom claims for herself in Sir 24:5.

ὑψηλοῖς κατεσκήνωσα) and, in an allusion to the wilderness wanderings, claims that her “throne was in a pillar of cloud” (ὁ θρόνος μου ἐν στύλῳ νεφέλης). Like Yahweh (also enthroned in heaven), who “preceded his people” (מִיָּנִיחַ לְךָ) in the pillar of cloud and whose presence was symbolised in the cloud (Exod 40:34-38), Wisdom’s dwelling encompasses both heaven and earth.²⁴

The stanza ends with Wisdom seeking a “resting place” (ἀνάπαυσις) and an “inheritance” (κληρονομία).²⁵ While ἀνάπαυσις does not appear in Hebrews, its near synonym κατάπαυσις does, and κληρονομία appears in Heb 9:15 to refer to the promised eternal inheritance of God’s people, and in 11:8, to refer to the goal of Abraham’s journey. In Hebrews the resting place and the inheritance are where God and his people dwell together in the eschaton.

In Sir 24:8-12, however, the resting place is in a tent (σκηνή) and the inheritance is in Israel (v. 8).²⁶ Temple Symbolism becomes explicit in v. 10 where Wisdom “ministers before him in the holy tent and is established in Zion” (ἐν σκηνῇ ἁγίᾳ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐλειτούργησα καὶ οὕτως ἐν Σιὼν ἐστηρίχθην). In v. 11 God gives Wisdom “a resting place in the beloved city, and her authority is in Jerusalem” (ἐν πόλει ἡγαπημένη ὁμοίως με κατέπαυσεν, καὶ ἐν Ἱερουσαλημ ἡ ἐξουσία μου). Thus Wisdom has a central place in the cult of Israel, and carries on a priestly ministry “in the holy tent” (ἐν σκηνῇ ἁγίᾳ), that is the Jerusalem temple.²⁷ Hence, as well as echoing God’s rest on the seventh day of creation (Gen 2:1-3), the text also echoes God’s rest in the temple (2 Chron

²⁴ See Sheppard 1980: 31, “Wisdom’s encampment ... involves the old problem of where the creator of the earth can dwell—in the heavens or in the man-made temple, or both.”

²⁵ Collins 1997b: 51. Sheppard 1980: 39 compares this seeking with the wilderness wanderings of Israel looking for rest in the promised land. This is possible, but God’s rest on the seventh day is more likely, given the creation symbolism in the chapter. Moreover, it is not God’s people seeking rest, but Wisdom. See the discussion in Fletcher-Louis 2004a: 86-87.

²⁶ This is quite different from *1 En.* 42:1-2, where Wisdom finds no resting place on earth and returns to heaven. While Boccaccini 1998: 146 suggests that this is polemic against the “sapiential myth of the torah as the earthly embodiment of heavenly wisdom,” another explanation can be found in the attitudes to the temple in the two works. Dissatisfaction with temple emerges in *1 Enoch*, while Sirach reflects a positive attitude to the temple, making it quite in order for Wisdom to take up residence there.

²⁷ Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 333 claim that the tent is the tabernacle, referring to Gen 25:8-9; 26:1-37. In a sense that is correct, but the references to Zion and Jerusalem imply the temple. See Gesse 1981b: 34; Wright 1997: 195. Note the series of prepositional phrases in verses 10-12 emphasising the centrality of Jerusalem (ἐν σκηνῇ ἁγίᾳ ... ἐν Σιὼν ... ἐν πόλει ἡγαπημένη ... ἐν Ἱερουσαλημ ... ἐν λαῷ δεδοξασμένῳ, ἐν μερίδι κυρίου, “... in the holy tent ... in the beloved city ... in Jerusalem ... among an honoured people, in the Lord’s portion”). Sheppard 1980: 48-9 finds echoes of Exod 15:17; Deut 12:5-7, 11-14 (the place where Yahweh chose to set his name). See also Ps 78:60-71; 132:11-18. Ultimately, the two are not mutually exclusive and one implies the other.

6:41; Ps 132:8, 14) and the notion of the temple as a microcosm of the cosmos, as in the Priestly source of the Pentateuch.²⁸

Verse 12 provides a transition to the next stanza with the introduction of horticultural symbolism. Here, Wisdom takes on the likeness of a variety of trees: cedars, cypresses, palms, roses, olive trees and others.²⁹ That these are the trees of Eden is indicated in v. 19 where all who desire wisdom are invited to come and eat of her fruit (Gen 2:16); in the fifth stanza where Wisdom, now associated with Torah,³⁰ is likened to six rivers, including the four rivers of Eden (Pishon, Gihon, Tigris and Euphrates) the Nile and the Jordan;³¹ and in v. 28, which mentions the first man who did not fully know wisdom.³²

The trees and rivers are interrupted in v. 15 with mention of aromatic spices and “the odour of incense in the tent” (λιβάνου ἀτμὶς ἐν σκηνῇ). These spices echo the spices that were used to anoint the tent of meeting and its furnishings, as well as Aaron and his sons (Exod 30:23-38), and could only be used for liturgical purposes (Exod 33:38).³³ The poem ends with Ben Sira himself taking the part of Adam, “the gardener and guardian of the world’s irrigation system,”³⁴ spreading wisdom to future generations and ultimately to all who seek wisdom.

²⁸ Blenkinsopp 1976: 275-83; Kearney 1977: 375-87; Weinfeld 1981: 501-12; Levenson 1984: 286-89; 1985: 142-45; 1988a: 84-86; Wenham 1986: 23; Janowski 1990: 37-69; Parry 1994: 126-51; Fletcher-Louis 2000: 58-60; 2004a: 77-79; Beale 2004b: 66-75; van Ruiten 2007: 72.

²⁹ These verses echo “every kind of tree” (Gen 2:11-12), see Perdue 1994, Fletcher-Louis 2002: 77. For similar lists of trees see Hos 14:4-9; Deut 8:7-10. In Ps 92:13-14; Isa 60:13; Ezek 40:16, 22, 26; 41:18-25 trees are connected with the temple.

³⁰ Skehan and Di Lella 1987 suggest that Wisdom is identified with Torah, as do Himmelfarb 1993: 82; Fletcher-Louis 2000: 52, and Hayward 1992b: 127 (“Wisdom is none other than the Torah herself”). The relationship is more nuanced than this would suggest, see Stordalen 2000: 423. Rogers 2004: 115-17 concludes, “Law gives expression to Wisdom, and is thus in its entirety characterised by it. But Wisdom exists before and beyond Law, and is not fully exhausted by it.” That the rivers describe Torah rather than Wisdom is seen in masculine pronouns in vv 25-27, agreeing with the “book of the covenant of the Most High God” (βιβλος διαθήκης θεοῦ ὑψίστου) and the law commanded by Moses (νόμος ὃν ἐνετείλατο ἡμῖν Μωυσῆς), while Wisdom (σοφία) is feminine. Ego 1999: 208-9; and Zsengellér 2008: 140 refer to the river flowing out of the temple in Ezek 47: 1-12, and Zsengellér concludes that in this chapter of Sirach the temple is a “place where wisdom as Torah and teaching can flow out and make land and people prosper, in and outside of Israel.”

³¹ Stordalen 2000: 422-23 discusses the order of the rivers here, and the inclusion of the Jordan and the Nile. Sheppard 1980: 68-71 notes that the Edenic rivers, Pishon and the Gihon, form an inclusio around the list; Hayward 1991: 26-7. Others who make this connection include Ego 1999: 206-9; Rogers 2004; van Ruiten 2007: 70 (who suggests that “[t]he first and the last river bracket the rest of the rivers to make them appear as additional streams of paradise”).

³² Koester 1989: 25; Fletcher-Louis 2002: 75 (footnote 63). The words shame and sin in Sir 24:22 echo Gen 3.

³³ For the blending of Exod 30:23, 34 in Sir 24:15 see Sheppard 1980: 57-60. Zsengellér 2008: 139 suggests that here “wisdom is acting as the incense of the service” and takes on a priestly function.

³⁴ Fletcher-Louis 2004a: 79. Note v. 30 where Ben Sira compares himself to “a water-channel into a garden” (παράδεισος).

The combination of creation and temple themes in this poem reflects the understanding that the creation of the cosmos in Gen 1 and the construction of the wilderness sanctuary in Exod 25-30 are related. Thus, the cosmos in Gen 1 and the Garden of Eden in Gen 2 are understood as archetypal sanctuaries.³⁵ Similar imagery with trees and rivers is echoed in Balaam's fourth oracle (Num 24:5-7), where God's people are pictured encamped in an Edenic setting around the wilderness tabernacle. This text, probably echoed here,³⁶ also appears in Heb 8:2,³⁷ where the eschatological temple is described as the true tent, pitched by the Lord. This is "the place intended for Adam,"³⁸ now inhabited by Wisdom in Sirach. I will argue below that according to Hebrews it is now inhabited by Jesus the exalted Son of God.³⁹

2.2.2 The Hymn in Praise of the Ancestors (Sir 44-50)

Sirach 44-50 contains a lengthy hymn praising famous men from the past.⁴⁰ It begins with Enoch and Noah, and includes (among others) Moses, who is equal in glory to the holy ones (ἅγιοι), and Aaron, a priest with regal qualities. Aaron is given the longest and most detailed treatment and, along with Phinehas and his descendants, is given a perpetual priesthood.⁴¹ The list ends with a second reference to Enoch,⁴² followed by Joseph, Shem and Seth who are described as honoured, and Adam, who is exalted above every living being.⁴³ After referring to the superior glory of Adam, Ben Sira turns to his own near

³⁵ Koester 1989: 24-25. For the connections between creation and the tabernacle, see Blenkinsopp 1976: 280-83; Kearney 1977: 375-87; Weinfeld 1981: 501-12; Levenson 1984: 286-89; 1985: 142-45; 1988a: 84-86; Wenham 1986: 23; Janowski 1990: 37-69; Parry 1994: 126-51; Fletcher-Louis 2000: 58-60; 2004a: 77-79; Beale 2004b: 66-75; van Ruiten 2007: 72.

³⁶ Beale 2004b: 160-63.

³⁷ See Church 2008: 145-57 for a development of the argument that Heb 8:2 alludes to Num 24:6.

³⁸ Wright 1991: 25-6. Cf. Hengel 1974: 1: 157.

³⁹ For similar symbolism see 1QH XIV 18-21; XVI 5-28; Odes of Solomon 11:1-12:2, 38: 16-20, and as I will argue below (8.5.3) in Heb 8:1-2.

⁴⁰ In what follows I use the Hebrew text in Beentjes 1997: 78-91 where it can be reconstructed with any degree of certainty. I use Beentjes' marginal chapter and verse references, with comments on the Greek text in Ziegler 1980: 331-62 where appropriate.

⁴¹ Similar ideas surface in Heb 7 in connection with the exaltation of Jesus and his permanent priesthood. This is peripheral to my study, which is concerned with temple symbolism rather than priestly messianism.

⁴² Enoch appears in 44:16 and 49:14. The reference in the Greek text at 44:16 is absent from the Masada fragments and the Syriac version. Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 499 suggest that it may have been added due to Enoch's "popularity in the last centuries B.C. as the custodian of ancient lore." Mack 1985: 199-200, 238 excludes the verse as inauthentic. Wright 1997: 215-16 considers that whether or not it is authentic, "some mention of Enoch at the head of the Praise of the Ancestors is called for." Marböck 1981: 104 considers that the double mention of Enoch provides a fine inclusio around "die Frommen und Weisen Israels."

⁴³ Adam is described with the words **על כל חי תפארת אדם** ("the splendour of Adam is above every living being"). Marböck 1981: 108 notes that Enoch and Joseph are "fast unvergleichlich" and Shem, Seth and Enosh honoured, but Adam's glory is greater than all of them. Levison 1988: 44-45 discusses the uncertainties surrounding this text, concluding that this text is more about the glory of Adam as an Israelite ancestor rather than as a "glorious individual" in his own right. Mack 1985: 201 is sceptical that this statement

contemporary Simon (50:1-24). When the treatment of these earlier figures from the past texts is re-read in the light of Sir 50, it becomes apparent that they serve the larger purpose of preparing the reader to understand the treatment of Simon with whom Israelite history culminates.⁴⁴

Sirach 50 is the climax of the work, followed only by a prayer of thanks.⁴⁵ In his praise of the figures from the remote past, Ben Sira relies on the Hebrew Scriptures. Here, he draws from his own observation of Simon as he composes a hymn echoing the creation account of Gen 1.⁴⁶ There are also allusions to the praise of Wisdom in Sir 24 and to the treatment of Aaron and Phinehas, as well as to Zerubbabel, Joshua and Nehemiah who rebuilt the temple and restored the fallen walls of the city (49:11-13), something that Simon also does.⁴⁷

The exalted status of Adam described in 49:16 provides a transition to the treatment of Simon, who is described in similar words in 50:1: גדול אחריו ותפארת עמו שמעון בן יוחנן הכהן (“greatest of his brothers and the splendour of his people was Simon, son of Johanan, the priest”).⁴⁸ The repetition of תפארת (“glory, splendour”) in the descriptions of Adam and Simon make it clear that Simon is associated with Adam in glory.⁴⁹ But this is

about Adam comes from Ben Sira himself, reading 49:16 in the light of 15:14-20; 17:1-14. But these texts refer to humanity in general rather than to Adam. The treatment of Adam in 49:16 differs markedly from the remark about him in 24:28 (see 2.2.1, above).

⁴⁴ Mack 1985: 37-65; Perdue 1994: 284-86; van der Kooij 2010: 58-60.

⁴⁵ Hayward 1991: 23; Collins 1997b: 106; Fletcher-Louis 2004a: 73. An acrostic prayer preserved in 11QPs^a is regularly added as an appendix to Sirach. See Skehan 1971: 387-400.

⁴⁶ Goshen-Gottstein 2002: 260-64; Mulder 2002: 223; 2003: 52; Fletcher-Louis 2004a: 94-112.

⁴⁷ Marböck 1971: 74-5; 1999: 216-19, 223-24; Hayward 1991: 24-29; 1996: 52-55, 63-72, 83-84; Himmelfarb 2000: 97; Fletcher-Louis 2004a: 69-113; Skelton 2009: 9-10. As Skelton notes, Simon's achievements in repairing the temple in Sir 48:17-22, as well as other key characters in the “Praise of the Ancestors” reflect Hezekiah's reform. This attribution of royal attributes to the priesthood is seen in 45:6-22 with respect to Aaron and in 45:23-26 with respect to Simon. It represents Simon as the embodiment of other famous people in the list. Skelton concludes, “the ideal ruler is an Aaronide high priest from the line of Phinehas who keeps Torah, embodied quintessentially in Simeon” (p. 11).

⁴⁸ The Greek text is briefer, reading only that Σίμων Ονίου υἱὸς ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας (“Simon, son of Onias was the high priest”).

⁴⁹ For the glory of Adam see 1QS IV 23; 1QH^a IV 27; CD III 20 where the expression כּוֹל כְּבוֹד אָדָם (“all the glory of Adam”) appears. There are hints of Adam's glory in Ezek 28 (Marböck 1981: 108). See also L.A.E. 12-17, where Adam is worshipped (Levison 1988: 177; Fletcher-Louis 1997c: 142). The word תפארת appears in Sir 50:11, 50:20, in an inclusio around the description of Simon's cultic activity. It describes priestly garments in Exod 28:2, 40. Skehan 1979: 374 and Fletcher-Louis 2004a: 96-7 propose that this word is the Hebrew behind καυχάομαι (“to boast”) in 24:1. Given the connections between Sir 24 and Sir 50 this is entirely plausible, although the Greek text downplays this connection. The word δοξάζομαι (“to glorify”) appears in the previous line describing Shem and Seth, but there is no reference to the glory of Adam or Simon in 49:16 and 50:1. It also appears in 50:11 and καυχάομαι (“to boast”) in 50:20. In 45:8 Aaron is clothed in “perfect splendour” (כליל תפארת), a word that describes Wisdom in 6:31. For discussion of other texts exalting Adam see Charlesworth 1980: 137-45; Levison 1988: *passim*; Fletcher-Louis 1997c: 140-45.

more than a simple transition. The reader is supposed to recognise that Simon the priest represents Adam, the primeval priest in the garden/temple who is created in the image and likeness of God. Moreover, as Fletcher-Louis maintains, “it is Jerusalem, the Temple, its worship and, above all, the priesthood which possesses all the glory of Adam, since in this space and time the original order of creation and the harmony of Eden is recovered.”⁵⁰ The long hymn praising Simon is followed by a benediction and an epilogue in which Ben Sira adds his signature to the book.⁵¹

Different suggestions have been made as to the structure of Sir 50.⁵² I recognise three sections: Simon’s building activity (50:1-4); Simon’s cosmic priestly characteristics, seen as he emerges from the holy of holies on the Day of Atonement (50:5-10); and Simon officiating in the temple during the daily *Tamid* ceremony (50:11-21).⁵³

⁵⁰ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 97; Mulder 2003: 55. Hayward 1996: 44-46 connects this text with the creation of Adam in Sir 17:1-8, however that text is better read as referring to the creation of humanity in general (Mulder 2003: 101). In *Jub.* 3:26-27 Adam offers a sacrifice on the day that he puts on the garments made for him by God. In later Rabbinic writings there is a widespread tradition that these are Aaron’s priestly garments. See Ginzberg 1913-1967: 1: 332-33; 5: 283 (footnote 89); Hayward 1989: 16-18. See *’Ag. Ber.* 43; *Num. Rab.* 4:8; *Tanb. b. Toledoth* 6.12; *Frag. Tg.* Gen 48:22; *Targ Ps.-J.* Gen 27:15; *Gen. Rab.* 20:12; 97:6. In *y. Meg.* 1:11 “the best garments” placed on Jacob in Gen 27:15 are priestly garments since he would serve as high priest. The tradition is also recorded by Jerome. For the text see *PL* 23, and Hayward’s translation in 1995: 63 and his comments on pp. 195-96.

⁵¹ In the benediction “everyone endorses the appeal to praise Simon. Everything God does for his people Israel through Simon serves to confirm now what He once did and promised forever to do in the covenant with Phinehas,” resulting in peace among the people (Mulder 2003: 55).

⁵² Mulder (2002: 223; 2003: 59) analyses the chapter into five sections, while Fletcher-Louis 2004a: 95-6 analyses it according to the days of creation from Gen 1:1-2:3.

⁵³ Considerable debate surrounds whether Sir 50:5 refers to Day of Atonement ceremony. The Hebrew text reads **מִה נִהְדָּר בְּהַשְׁגִּיחוֹ מֵאֵהָל וּבִצְאָתוֹ מִבֵּית הַפֶּרֶכֶת**, which can be translated “how honourable he was as he gazed out of the tent, as he emerged from within the curtain.” The Greek text reads ὥς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν περιστροφῇ ναοῦ, ἐν ἐξόδῳ οἴκου καταπετάσματος (NRSV “[h]ow glorious he was, surrounded by the people, as he came out of the house of the curtain”). The major differences between the Hebrew text and the Greek translation are the word περιστροφῇ (turning around, used for the courses of the stars in Sophocles, *Fragments* 432.8, see LSJ 1389; Lloyd-Jones 1996: 222-23; Fletcher-Louis 2004a: 104, footnote 102), the substitution of ναοῦ for ναοῦ by the NRSV and the literal translation of **מִבֵּית הַפֶּרֶכֶת** with οἴκου καταπετάσματος. The expression **מִבֵּית הַפֶּרֶכֶת** is a *crux interpretum*. Traditionally it has been read as a reference to the holy of holies, from where Simon emerges on the Day of Atonement (Box and Oesterley 1913: 508; Smend 1906: 477, 481; Snaith 1974: 251-52; Collins 1997b: 90; Gurtner 2005a: 190-99. Fearghail 1978: 301 lists commentators from 1859 to 1977 who hold to this view). On this understanding, 50:5 refers to Simon looking around the temple as he emerges from the holy of holies on that day. Fearghail 1978: 301-18 vigorously challenged this view, and it has now been largely abandoned. He compares Sir 50:5-21 with *m. Tamid* 6.3-7.3 and concludes that the description of the ritual in Sir 50:11-21 accords with the Mishnaic regulations for that festival (pp. 302-306). He argues (pp. 306-313) that while the expression **מִבֵּית הַפֶּרֶכֶת** in Ben Sira’s Hebrew text may refer to the holy of holies, the sequence of events outlined in 50:5-21 require the veil to be the outer veil rather than the inner veil, and that the expression refers to the entire temple, described as “the house of the veil.” This reading is adopted by Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 546, 551-52; Hayward 1996: 42, 50-51, 73; 2007: 389; Fletcher-Louis 2004a: 95; Marböck 1999: 221; Mulder 2003: 123-125 (who reads the location as the holy of holies, but discounts any reference to the Day of Atonement in that the description in *Sir.* lacks any of the specifics of the ritual as described in *b. Yoma* 42a; 62a); Zsengellér 2008: 141-42. Fearghail’s arguments have now been challenged by Gurtner 2005a: 187-200. While Gurtner does not consider which ceremony is described in vv. 11-21, he does deal with Fearghail’s objections to

ἱεροῦ).⁵⁹ References to what is below and what is above (the foundations and the upper extremities), and the verb στερεόω, are reminiscent of the second day of creation, reflecting the notion that the temple functions as the cosmic mountain that “covers the expanse between the upper and lower realms.”⁶⁰

Sirach 50:3 refers to a “water-pool” or “reservoir” (מקוה, ἀποδοχεῖον ὑδάτων) dug out in Simon’s time,⁶¹ as a “pit” (אשׁיח, λάκκος) with its circumference “like the sea” (ὥσεὶ θαλάσσης).⁶² On the third day of creation God gathered (קנה) the sea into one place and let the dry land appear, a text echoed here.⁶³ These allusions to the creation story reflect an understanding of the cosmic significance of the temple and picture the Jerusalem temple as a microcosm of the universe.

2.2.2.2 Simon’s Cosmic Priestly Characteristics (50:5-10)

Sirach 50:5 refers to Simon emerging from the holy of holies after the Day of Atonement ceremony.⁶⁴ Verses 6-10 describe the emerging Simon with cosmic symbolism. He is “like a star of light among the clouds” (ככוכב אור מבין עבים),⁶⁵ “like the full moon” (כירח מלא), “like the shining sun” (כשמש משרכת), and “like a rainbow in the clouds” (כקשת נראתה בענן). The symbolism reflects the hymn celebrating the works of God in creation (42:15-43:33),⁶⁶ probably an extended introduction to the hymn praising

versification. The Hebrew text (MS B, Beentjes 1997: 88) reads אשר בימיו נבנה קיר (“in whose days a wall was built”).

⁵⁹ Fletcher-Louis 2004a: 98-100 refers to “Josephus’ version of Berossos’ account of the building of the so-called hanging gardens of Babylon” (*Ant.* 10.226), where ἀνάλημμα has connotations of a cosmic mountain. Hayward 1996: 73 translates ἀνάλημμα ὑψηλὸν with “high underworld.”

⁶⁰ Fletcher-Louis 2004a: 97-101, quotation from p. 97. The text echoes Sir 24:5 is where Wisdom encircles the vault of heaven and walks in the depths of the abyss (γῦρον οὐρανοῦ ἐκύκλωσα μόνη καὶ ἐν βάθει ἀβύσσων περιεπάτησα).

⁶¹ The Greek word ἐλατομήθη is the third person singular aorist passive indicative of ἐλαττώ, a word with the sense of “make lower, diminish or degrade” (BDAG 313-14). It appears in Ps 8:6 (LXX) for humanity “made lower” than the angels, quoted in Heb 2:7 and applied to Jesus in Heb 2:8. The Hebrew word is נכרה, the third person masculine singular Niphal of כרה, to hollow out or dig (*HALOT* 496).

⁶² Mulder 2003: 102 translates “on account of the waterflow.” The Hebrew text reads כּם (Beentjes 1997: 88), normally emended to בים or כים (“in” or “like” the sea, Box and Oesterley 1913: 507; Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 549; Wright 1989: 305; Hayward 1996: 44; Fletcher-Louis 2004a: 101). This may have been the way Ben Sira’s grandson read the text, given his translation ὥσεὶ θαλάσσης. Mulder 2003: 110-114 argues that the Hebrew text should stand, and that the reference is to the Pool of Bethesda, described as a “reservoir with a wall in it” (מקוה אשׁיח כּם), however, this involves reading אשׁיח (“wall,” a *hapax legomenon* in Jer 50:15) rather than אשׁיח (“pit”). This latter word does not appear in BHS, but refers to a cistern four times in the Copper Scroll (3Q15 XI V 6; VII 4; X 5; XI 12).

⁶³ Fletcher-Louis 2004a: 100-103.

⁶⁴ See footnote 53 (above).

⁶⁵ Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 552, and Mulder 2003: 126 refer to Ps 148:3 as the source of this symbolism.

⁶⁶ Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 484-87.

the ancestors.⁶⁷ That hymn refers to “the emerging sun” (שמש מופיע בצאתו),⁶⁸ reflecting the glory of God (43:1-5); the “moon governing the changing seasons” (ירח ירח עתות) and giving information about sacred seasons; the “glory of the stars” (הדר כוכב) standing in their places (43:6-10);⁶⁹ and the “rainbow” (קשת), which the readers are invited to behold and then “bless its maker” (43:11-12). Allusions to Gen 1, Ps 19 and Ezek 1:28 have been noted.⁷⁰ These heavenly creatures reflect God’s glory and move at his command. This is the context for the description of Simon in similar terms. Simon embodies them all, reflecting these, the greatest of God’s works.⁷¹

Fletcher-Louis locates the source of this imagery in the creation of the sun, moon and stars on the fourth day of creation in Gen 1. He compares Simon emerging from within the veil to the emergence of the sun on its course through the firmament (Ps 19:1),⁷² and to Ezek 1:26-28 where the glory of God enthroned in heaven is “like a rainbow appearing in the cloud on a rainy day” (כמראה הקשת אשר יהיה בענן ביום הגשם).⁷³ Thus, Simon embodies the glory of God and the text signifies the cosmic significance of the temple.⁷⁴ As the sun and the stars traverse the heavens, so Simon traverses the temple. I will argue below that Heb 4:14 refers to Jesus traversing the heavens, reflecting similar imagery.⁷⁵

2.2.2.3 Simon Officiating in the Temple (50:11-21)

⁶⁷ Mack 1985: 13-15; Wright 1997: 206.

⁶⁸ This is the marginal reading in MS B (Beentjes 1997: 75). The main text reads שמש מביע בצרתו (“the sun proclaims in its distress(?)”). שמש מביע echoes יביע (“pours forth”) in Ps 19:3. For the emerging sun see 1 En. 72:2-37.

⁶⁹ Wright 1997: 206-7 notes the way in which the moon is more important than the sun in this hymn, with the calendrical function of the moon highlighted in 43:6-8; 50:6. He claims that this is polemic against the solar year in 1 Enoch and ALD. He also notes that Ben Sira ignores the statements of Gen 1:14-15 where sun and moon govern the seasons together.

⁷⁰ Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 492-3.

⁷¹ Skelton 2009: 9-10.

⁷² Fletcher-Louis 2004a: 103-4. Fletcher-Louis refers to the LXX of Exod 30:24 (the fourth speech to Moses in the P account of the construction of the wilderness tabernacle), where the Hebrew word קדה (“cassia”) is rendered with ῥαίς (“rainbow,” see BDAG 480). ῥαίς is a *hapax legomenon* here in the LXX, but the word also appears in Rev 4:3; 10:1. This presumed intertextual echo is a bit too faint to be clearly heard. The Greek text of Sir 50:8 reads τόξον φωτίζον (“a shining bow”) and is better read as an allusion to Ezek 1:28.

⁷³ Box and Oesterley 1913: 508; Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 552; Himmelfarb 1993: 19; Fletcher-Louis 2004a: 74.

⁷⁴ Compare Weinfeld 1981: 506-7, “the high priest is depicted as the morning star, and as the sun shining on the temple.”

⁷⁵ See 8.2 below.

This section describes Simon officiating at the daily *Tamid* sacrifice.⁷⁶ Verses 11-13 echo the sixth day of creation in Gen 1:26-30, interpreted through Ps 8:3-7.⁷⁷ In Gen 1, Adam is created in God's image and given dominion over all creation. Ps 8:5-8 celebrates this in terms of the "glory and honour" (כבוד והדר) with which God has crowned humanity.⁷⁸ In Sir 50:11 Simon, wrapped in "glory" (כבוד) and clothed in "splendour" (תפארת), brings "honour" (הדר) to the sanctuary.⁷⁹ The other priests are also there in "their glory" (בכבודם).⁸⁰ This is not just humanity in general, however. Here, Simon officiating in the temple is portrayed as Adam ruling over all things in the garden.⁸¹

Psalm 8:4-6 is quoted in Heb 2:6-8, applied to humanity in general in 2:8 and then to Jesus in 2:9. He is the one who has been "crowned with glory and honour" (δόξη καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον). Moreover, like Simon bringing glory to the sanctuary, and like the sons of Aaron in their glory, God, through Jesus "brings many heirs to glory" (πολλοὺς υἱοὺς εἰς δόξαν, Heb 2:10).

Fletcher-Louis hears echoes of God's rest on the seventh day of creation (Gen 2:1-4) in Sir 50:14-21.⁸² There is an inclusio around vv. 14-19, with the Hebrew word כלותו (finished, vv 14, 19), the Greek noun συντέλεια (completion, v. 14), and the verb συντελέω (bring to completion, v. 19). Moreover the Greek expression in v. 19 is ἕως συντελεσθῇ κόσμος κυρίου ("until he completed the κόσμος of the Lord").⁸³ In Gen 2:1-2 God "finishes" (ויכלו, LXX συντελέω) the work of creation.⁸⁴ Then, just as God

⁷⁶ Fearghail 1978: 302-5; Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 532-33; Hayward 1996: 55-61, 80-81; 2007: 389-93; Instone-Brewer 2011: 306-308. Mulder 2002: 225-28 reads vv 16-19 with reference to *Rosh Hashshana*. That this is a new section is shown by the initial reference to Simon dressing himself in glorious robes, in the repetition of תפארת (splendour, see 49:16; 50:1), and in the description of the beginning of the ritual as he ascends to the altar. The movement here is towards the centre, while in v. 5 it is away from the centre. See also Fletcher-Louis 2004a: 105-106, who identifies echoes in this text of the description of Aaron officiating in the sanctuary in Sir 45:7-8.

⁷⁷ Fletcher-Louis 2004a: 105-7.

⁷⁸ Another echo of Ps 8 in the immediate context is the reference to Enoch in Sir 49:16, said to have been honoured along with Seth and Shem (ושם ושת ואנוש נפקדו). Both אנוש and פקד appear in Ps 8:5.

⁷⁹ Compare Ps 96:6 הוד והדר לפניו אז ותפארת במקדשו ("honour and glory are before him strength and splendour in his sanctuary").

⁸⁰ The words δόξα ("glory"), δοξάζω ("glorify"), στέφανος ("crown") all appear in the Greek text of Sir 50:11-13.

⁸¹ The terms rendered "humanity" here, אנוש and בן אדם can also be read with reference to Adam, the first man, ruling over all things in the garden. See Borsch 1967: 114; Fletcher-Louis 2004a: 107.

⁸² Fletcher-Louis 2004a: 107-11.

⁸³ I have left κόσμος untranslated to emphasise the connotations of creation that would not be lost on Greek speaking readers of Sirach. The Hebrew text reads לשרת מזבח ("the service of the altar"), and NRSV renders κόσμος κυρίου with "order of worship." This is appropriate; given the word for "arranging" the offerings in v. 14 is κοσμέω.

⁸⁴ Fletcher-Louis 2004a: 108 demonstrates the linguistic correspondences between the completion of the creation in Gen 2:1-3 and the completion of the sanctuary in Exod 31:18; 39:32, 43; 39:43.

“blesses” (εὐλογέω בָּרַךְ, Gen 2:3) the seventh day, so Simon “blesses” (δοῦναι εὐλογία, בָּרַךְ, Sir 50:20-21) the assembled worshippers. While the blessing is for “all the congregation of the people of Israel” (כָּל קְהֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל, πᾶσα ἐκκλησία υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ), in the Hebrew text of v. 17 these are identified as “all flesh” (כָּל בָּשָׂר) and in v. 19 as “all the people of the earth” (כָּל עַם הָאָרֶץ). The whole creation is in view. Hebrews 4:4 refers to God’s rest at the culmination of his creative activity and identifies it as the rest which God’s people must strive to enter. I will argue below that this rest is in the eschatological temple where they will enjoy a “Sabbath celebration” (σαββατισμός).⁸⁵

2.2.3 Conclusion

In Sirach there is no suggestion of a heavenly temple above corresponding with the earthly temple below. Rather, the Jerusalem temple is viewed as a microcosm of the universe and the link between heaven and earth, so that to be in the temple is to be in the presence of God in heaven. Neither does Ben Sira anticipate an eschatological temple to replace the present temple in the future. Simon, the current high priest, is the representative of God before humanity. He appears with cosmic characteristics and his movements in the temple echo the movements of the sun and the stars through the heavens. Thus the temple appears as a microcosm of the universe.

2.3 Wisdom of Solomon

The Wisdom of Solomon probably derives from Alexandria.⁸⁶ While the precise dating is debated, somewhere in the period 150 B.C.E. to 50 C.E. seems likely.⁸⁷ It was composed in Greek and probably written for the Alexandrian Jewish community, with a view to protecting the readers from the threat of attraction to the surrounding Hellenistic culture.⁸⁸ It is “an exhortation to pursue Wisdom and thereby live the righteous life that issues in immortality.”⁸⁹ Alexandrian provenance and a date somewhere around the turn of the era make the author a near contemporary of Philo. There are numerous points of contact with

⁸⁵ See 7.3 (below).

⁸⁶ Winston 1979: 25; Evans 1992: 13; Barclay 1996: 452; DeSilva 2002: 127; Nickelsburg 2005a: 211; Grabbe 1997: 90-91. Georgi 1980: 395-96 suggests Syria as an alternative, finding only superficial connections with Egypt.

⁸⁷ There is no consensus on the date. Larcher 1983: 1: 148-161 considers that it was written progressively between 30-10 B.C.E. Barclay 1996: 451 assigns a date between 100 B.C.E. and 30 C.E. Koester 1989: 58 narrows the date to the period from 30 B.C.E. to 40 C.E., while Nickelsburg 2005a: 212 narrows it even further, proposing that it was written during the reign of Caligula (37-41 C.E.), as does Winston 1979: 20-25. Grabbe 1997: 87-90 prefers a date during the reign of Augustus. Georgi 1980: 396-97 suggests a much earlier date near the End of the second century B.C.E. Winston 1979: 20-24 discusses the critical issues and argues for a first-century date on the basis of certain words that appear in Wisdom but not elsewhere in Greek literature prior to the first century, as well as historical reminiscences that seem to reflect the period of Roman rule, particularly the riots in Alexandria of 38 C.E. rather than the period of the Ptolemies. See 5:16-23; 14:16-20.

⁸⁸ Gilbert 1984: 312; Grabbe 1997: 94-95.

⁸⁹ Gilbert 1984: 306-9; Nickelsburg 2005a: 205.

Philo, as well as with apocalyptic and Stoic thought.⁹⁰ Connections with the thought world of Hebrews have been noted, and the author of Hebrews seems to have been aware of Wisdom.⁹¹

It is probably a unified composition by a single author, who may have used several sources.⁹² It is normally analysed into three parts: the book of eschatology (1:1–6:11); the book of wisdom (6:12–9:18); and the book of history (10:1–19).⁹³ In the book of wisdom, the Sage takes on the persona of Solomon and presents “the origin, character, deeds and rewards of Wisdom.”⁹⁴ He recounts the events of 1 Kings 3:5–15 and, as “Solomon,” offers a carefully structured prayer for wisdom (9:1–18).⁹⁵

The central part of the prayer (9:7–12) deals with God’s commission to Solomon to rule and judge his people (v. 7) and to build the temple (v. 8). He asks God to send him wisdom “from the holy heaven and from his throne of glory” (ἐξ ἁγίων οὐρανῶν καὶ ἀπὸ θρόνου δόξης, v. 10) to equip him for these tasks, so that his works will be acceptable and that he will be worthy of his father’s throne (v. 12).

The description of the temple in 9:8 is the only reference to any aspect of the Jewish cult in this central part of Wisdom and is almost incidental to the prayer.⁹⁶ Solomon is to build the temple and altar “in God’s holy mountain” (ἐν ὄρει ἁγίῳ) and “in the city of God’s habitation” (ἐν πόλει κατασκηνώσεώς), that is Jerusalem; and the temple is to be a “copy of the holy tent which God prepared from the beginning” (μίμημα σκηνῆς ἁγίας, ἣν προητοίμασας ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς). The text presents a positive attitude to Solomon’s

⁹⁰ Grabbe 1997: 45–46, 55–57; Burkes 2002: *passim*; Helyer 2002: 291–94; Nickelsburg 2005a: 205–7.

⁹¹ Schenck 2003: 31 lists a number of parallels between Wisdom and Hebrews. The word ἀπαύγασμα (brightness) appears in the LXX only in Wis 7:16 (referring to Wisdom) and in the NT only in Heb 1:3 (referring to the exalted Son of God). Schenck detects lexical and conceptual parallels in Wis 2:24 and Heb 2:14; Wis 3:5 and Heb 5:8; 12:4–13; Wis 9:1–2 and Heb 1:2; Wis 9:4 and Heb 1:3, 14; 8:1; Wis 9:8 and Heb 8:5; Wis 9:15 and Heb 9:14; 10:22; 12:18–24; Wis 10:19 and Heb 11; Wis 11:17 and Heb 11:3; Wis 18:15–16 and Heb 4:12. Helyer 2002: 294–300 discusses the influence of Wisdom on the NT.

⁹² Reese 1965: 391–99; 1970: 123–45; Wright 1967: 165–84; Gilbert 1984: 308–9; Collins 1977: 124; Grabbe 1997: 25–6.

⁹³ Barclay 1996: 181–82; Grabbe 1997: 18; Harrington 1999: 57–75; DeSilva 2002: 126–28; Helyer 2002: 288–90; Nickelsburg 2005a: 205. Winston 1979: 9–12 includes chapter 10 with the book of wisdom. Wright 1967: 165 proposes two parts of almost equal length (1:1–11:1 with 560 *stichoi*, and 11:2–19:22 with 561 *stichoi*) and further suggests that 10:1–11:1 provides a transition between the two parts. Wright also finds a variety of rhetorical features, including “symmetrical arrangement, announcement of subjects, *mots crochets*, and inclusions” in Wisdom, and speculates whether this might have been a feature of Alexandrian rhetoric. Since such features have also been detected in Hebrews, he surmises that this might be “another instance of Alexandrian contact in the Epistle to the Hebrews” (p. 184). Contact between Alexandria and Hebrews is generally made in connection with discussions of verbal links with Philo, which, as I argue in 2.5 (below), are superficial.

⁹⁴ DeSilva 2002: 128.

⁹⁵ Gilbert 1984: 303.

⁹⁶ Koester 1989: 64.

temple. It is commanded by God and an imitation of what was formerly prepared by God.⁹⁷

The identification of the “holy tent” is a *crux interpretum*. Osty sets out three options: (1) heaven as the true temple of God; (2) a heavenly prototype of the Jerusalem temple; or (3) the tent built by Moses on the guidance of Yahweh.⁹⁸ Cornely adds a fourth: the created universe as a prototype of the Jerusalem temple,⁹⁹ and Gäbel a fifth. Gäbel detects echoes of Exod 15:17 in Wis 9:8 and proposes that the holy tent is the sanctuary God’s hands established in Exod 15:17, in which he will ultimately reign forever, that is, the eschatological dwelling place of God with his people.¹⁰⁰

Identification with the wilderness tabernacle (option 3) is unlikely,¹⁰¹ since it was built by Moses rather than God.¹⁰² Also unlikely is the suggestion of a heavenly prototype

⁹⁷ Fuller Dow 2010 presents a tendentious reading of Wis 9:8 when she suggests that the temple is “*only* a copy of a ‘holy tent’ that has existed from the beginning in heaven” (p. 118) and that “the earthly Jerusalem and Temple are *just* copies of the originals in heaven” (p. 127, italics mine).

⁹⁸ Osty 1957: 65 (“le ciel, véritable temple de Dieu ... un prototype céleste du Temple de Jérusalem ... la Tente édifiée par Moïse sur les indications de Yahvé.”) For heaven, the dwelling place of God, Osty cites Ps 11:4; 18:7; Rev 3:12; for the heavenly prototype of the Jerusalem temple he cites Heb 8:2, 5; 9:23; Rev 8:3-4; 11:19; 13:6; 14:18; 15:5; and for the Mosaic tent he cites Exod 25:9, 40; 26:30.

⁹⁹ Cornely 1910: 348-50. Cornely finds the word προετοιμάζω significant, particularly when juxtaposed as it is with ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς, which he considers reinforces the notion that the world (*mundum*) was formed as an exemplar for the future sanctuary. Hurst 1990: 37-38, 144 notes that the expression ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς could have the sense of “from the creation,” or “before the creation,” indicating that the author of Wisdom considered this to be when the heavenly sanctuary was built. Προετοιμάζω is rare in the LXX, appearing only here and in Isa 28:24, where it refers to the preparation of soil for planting. In Rom 9:23 it refers to God preparing people for glory, and in Eph 2:10 to God preparing good works as a way of life. BDAG 869 gives the sense of “prepare beforehand.” Philo uses προετοιμάζω six times; in three of these (*Spec.* 1.165; 2.70; *Virt.* 145) it refers to the preparation of soil for planting, and the other three are used in a variety of senses for preparation in advance. In *Opif.* 77 προετοιμάζω refers to the creation of humanity at the end of God’s work of creation (with the inference that everything was already prepared for humans); in *Deus.* 96 it refers to the provision of everything Israel needed in the promised land, as in Deut 6:11; and in *Spec.* 1.262. It is used of Moses preparing ashes for use in purification rituals.

¹⁰⁰ Gäbel 2006: 32-33, 101 (footnote 359). The words κατοικητήριον, ὅρος κληρονομίας σου and ἐτοιμάζω appear in Exod 15:17; and κατασκήνωσις, ἐν ὅρει ἁγίῳ σου and προετοιμάζω in Wis 9:8. I note also the reference to God’s enduring reign in Exod 15:18, and to God’s glorious throne in Wis 9:10. Gäbel makes a further connection with Exod 25:8-9, noting the word ἁγίασμα in Exod 15:17 and 25:8, and referring to the “die Verbindung mit der Zeltradition im Sinne eines himmlischen Urbildes,” ultimately concluding that the “holy tent” is a heavenly archetype of the tabernacle and hence Solomon’s temple. Thus, he eventually settles on a heavenly prototype.

¹⁰¹ This option is adopted by Sowers 1965: 108-9, who then suggests that the Sage is thinking of “the tabernacle with its cosmic symbolism” as set out by Philo (see 2.5, below). For correspondences between Solomon’s temple and the tabernacle see Haran 1985: 189-94, and Williamson 1970: 563-64 who also favours this reading of Wis 9:8.

¹⁰² Cornely 1910: 348-50 also notes that the wilderness sanctuary was still in existence during David’s lifetime (1 Chron 21:29; 2 Chron 2:2-6), and thus there would be no need for God to give the details of the plan of the temple to David (1 Chron 28:11, 19).

(option 2), since the plan for the temple was David's plan, albeit at Yahweh's direction (1 Chron 11-19).¹⁰³ One of the remaining options or a combination of them is most likely.

That the holy tent is either heaven or the created universe (options 1 and 4) finds some support in Wis 18:24, which describes Aaron's priestly robe using the same cosmic symbolism found in Philo and Josephus:

For on his long robe "the whole world" (ὅλος ὁ κόσμος) was depicted, and the glories of the ancestors were engraved on the four rows of stones, and "your majesty" (μεγαλωσύνη σου) was on the diadem upon his head (NRSV).¹⁰⁴

This text reflects the belief that the garments of the high priest depict the cosmos and that the high priest reflects the glory of God.¹⁰⁵

On the other hand, Gäbel's insight that the text echoes Exod 15:17 (option 5) is valuable. The implication is that the Jerusalem temple to be built by Solomon is to resemble the eschatological dwelling of God with his people, prepared beforehand by God. Thus, options 4 and 5 (the created universe as a temple and the eschatological temple to be built by God in the eschaton) merge, with protology and eschatology providing different perspectives on the same reality.

Several scholars have read Wis 9:8 as referring to a heavenly archetype of the wilderness sanctuary, and seen this idea behind Heb 8:2, 5. Indeed, Cody suggests that this text is essential for understanding the heavenly sanctuary in Hebrews as a copy of this heavenly archetype.¹⁰⁶ Certainly there are connections between the two works, with the words ἅγιος, σκηνή and ὄρος common to both Wis 9:8 and Heb 8:2, 5. However, I will argue below that Hebrews is silent on the question of a heavenly archetype, instead seeing the wilderness tabernacle as a preliminary outline of the eschatological dwelling of God with his people.¹⁰⁷ If Gäbel's reading of Wis 9:8 is valid, there are indeed connections between the two texts, but not in the way normally proposed. Rather, in Wis 9:8 and, as I

¹⁰³ A heavenly model for the temple, if indeed there was one is downplayed in 1 Kings, with no plan at all mentioned in chapters 8. Fyall 2004: 49-58 notes that 1 Kings is reticent about the significance of the temple and scarcely refers to it after these chapters.

¹⁰⁴ Cornely 1910: 348-50 makes a connection with Wis 18:24, as well as with Exod 25:9, 40, and with the reference to Wisdom being with God when he made the world in Wis 9:9.

¹⁰⁵ Compare Hayward 1996: 112-13, and Barker 2004: 30. Barker claims, "[t]hus the high priest was an angel who had emerged from the holy of holies into the visible creation, and vested himself in the stuff of creation ... The vested high priest in the temple was the Glory of the Lord veiled in matter." Similar descriptions of the high priest are found in Sir 50; Philo *Spec.* 1.84-5, 93-6; *Mos.* 2.117-25; *Let. Aris.* 96-98. In Wis 18:15 Aaron has gigantic proportions.

¹⁰⁶ Cody 1960: 20. See also Moffatt 1924: 106; Montefiore 1964: 136; Nomoto 1968: 17; Héring 1970: 67; Attridge 1989: 222; Bruce 1978: 81; 1990: 184; Scholer 1991: 159-60; Ellingworth 1993: 408; DeSilva 2000b: 282; Koester 2001: 378.

¹⁰⁷ See 8.5 (below).

will argue, in Heb 8:1-2 the earthly sanctuary/temple anticipates the eschatological dwelling of God with his people. In Wis 9:8 God established this “from the beginning” (ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς), while in Hebrews it is inaugurated with the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God.

If the author of Hebrews was familiar with Wisdom, it is significant that he rejects μίμημα as a fitting word to describe the relationship between the “true tent” and the wilderness sanctuary, replacing it with a quite different expression.¹⁰⁸ Hebrews sees the wilderness tabernacle as anticipating the eschaton when God will dwell with his people, now come with the exaltation of Christ, while the Sage in Wis 9:8 sees the eschatological dwelling place of God, prepared from the beginning as the pattern for the Jerusalem temple.

2.4 Sibylline Oracles

The Sibyl is a legendary figure from ancient Greek and Roman literature, normally depicted as an old woman uttering prophecies of doom.¹⁰⁹ Sibylline prophecy was a pagan phenomenon, appropriated by Jews and Christians. The collection of Jewish and Christian *Sibylline Oracles* comprises twelve books, written over a space of around seven hundred years from sometime around the second century B.C.E. They are written in Greek hexameters and lack any of the features of Hebrew parallelism. Consequently, it is unlikely that they were composed in a Semitic language.¹¹⁰ They share some of the features of apocalyptic literature,¹¹¹ especially those parts displaying an interest in angels and the

¹⁰⁸ Adams 2009: 132-33. Cody 1960: 20-21 refers to the “views” of the authors of both Wisdom and Hebrews of μίμημα and παράδειγμα. But neither of these words appears in Hebrews, and παράδειγμα does not appear in Wisdom. The most that can be said about the view of the author of Hebrews of μίμημα is that he rejected it in favour ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά an expression reflecting the notion of “preliminary outline.” In this case, he may be reworking the ideas found in Wisdom. Μίμημα is a *hapax legomenon* here in the LXX, but appears numerous times in Philo in a variety of contexts, often with reference to earthly things as copies of heavenly things. In *Opif.* 16 the visible world is a copy of an archetypal idea; in *Opif.* 25, 139 humanity is a copy of the divine; in *Leg.* 1.43 Eden is a copy of the archetypal wisdom; in *Leg.* 1.45 earthly virtue is an imitation of heavenly virtue; and in *Aet.* 15 the world is a visible copy of an invisible archetype. Sometimes the copy appears to be inferior to the original (*Opif.* 141; *Post.* 105; *Migr.* 12), although in *Det.* 83, humanity is superior as a result of being made in the divine image. In *Plant.* 50 a similar idea is expressed with reference to the beauty of the created world. In several texts Philo mentions that the wilderness sanctuary is an imitation of the heavenly one. In *Her.* 112; *Mos.* 2.74; *Det.* 160 Moses’ tent is a copy of the divine model, although there is no sense that it is an inferior copy. *Her.* 225 and *Congr.* 8 refer to the seven-branched candlestick being a copy of heavenly light. In *Somn.* 215 the priest is a copy of the rational soul, and in *Vit.* *Mos.* 2.117, 143 the high priest’s tunic is a copy of the world. In *Spec. Leg.* 3.102 and *Somn.* 1.206 Bezalel makes the tabernacle as a copy of the archetypal form made by Moses. Winston 1979: 203 calls μίμημα a “*vox Platonica*,” arguing for the implication that [heavenly] archetype is greater than the earthly copy. Rather than this, it is more likely that imitation of the holy tent gives it dignity.

¹⁰⁹ Collins 1974c: 1; 1987a: 423-27; Barclay 1996: 216-17; Felder 2002: 363-66; Buitenwerf 2003: 92-123; Nickelsburg 2005a: 193. See *Sib. Or.* Prologue 9-90.

¹¹⁰ Nickelsburg 2005a: 194. For a full discussion of the text of *Sib. Or.* see Geffcken 1902a: XXI-LIII. Geffcken’s is the most commonly used critical edition of the Greek text (pp. 1-233). For a list of the chief manuscripts see Collins 1983b: 320-21.

¹¹¹ Rowland 1982: 20-21.

heavenly world, and in some places there is an interest in the temple.¹¹² Books 3-5 are relevant to this study. I will treat book 3 in this chapter and books 4 and 5, which post-date the fall of Jerusalem, in chapter 5.¹¹³

2.4.1 *Sibylline Oracles* Book 3

Book 3 is the longest of the collection, comprising 829 verses. Verses 1-96 appear to be from a different source,¹¹⁴ and v. 776 is probably a Christian interpolation.¹¹⁵ References to Egypt in vv. 159, 161 and to the seventh king of Egypt (vv. 193, 318, 608) are generally held to indicate Egyptian provenance.¹¹⁶ The rise of the power of Rome referred to in vv. 175-90 indicate a date for the original core of the book (vv. 97-349, 489-829) around the middle of the second century B.C.E.,¹¹⁷ making it the oldest book in the collection.¹¹⁸ The

¹¹² For introductions to *Sib. Or.* see Goodman 1986: 618-27; Collins 1983b: 317-24; 1984a: 357-62; 1987a: 421-27; 1998: 116-18; Nickelsburg 2005a: 193-94.

¹¹³ Bauckham 2001: 187.

¹¹⁴ Collins 1974c: 24-25; 1974b: 2; 1983b: 354; 2004b: 4 (who suggests that these verses conclude book 2); Goodman 1986: 639-40; Buitenwerf 2003: 60-62, 90-91 (who argues that vv. 1-92 were originally part of a book that is no longer extant, and that the start of book 3 has been only partially preserved in Fragments 1 and 3—he includes vv. 93-96 as part of book 3). Nikiprowetzky 1970: 60-66, 217-22 argues that these verses are an integral part of book 3, but there is little commonality between these verses and the rest of the book, and his arguments have not generally been accepted.

¹¹⁵ Lanchester 1913: 372; Collins 1983b: 379; Buitenwerf 2003: 289-90. As Charlesworth 1981a: 48 notes, this verse removes the focus from the temple of God to the son of God, leading to several proposed emendations. In his critical apparatus, Geffcken 1902a: 87 notes that Alexandre proposed emending the expression υἱὸν ... μέγαλοιο θεοῖο (“the son of the great God”) to ναόν ... μέγαλοιο θεοῖο (“the temple of the great God”), and that Buresch proposed οἶκον (“house”) rather than υἱόν (“son”). I have been unable to access either of these works. Goodman 1986: 635 thinks that it is “more likely that υἱὸν θεοῖο should be read as νοῖον θεοῖο.” Nikiprowetzky 1970: 234 suggests that the temple is described here “by a sort of hypallage” as “son of the Great God.” See also his translation and notes on pp. 329, 353. Given that the earliest witnesses to the text are from the fifteenth century C.E., any of these emendations could be valid, although none are supported by any witness to the text.

¹¹⁶ Lanchester 1913: 371-72; Momigliano 1980: 553; Simon 1983: 220; Goodman 1986: 638; Collins 1987a: 430-33; 2000a: 87; 2004b: 17; Gäbel 2006: 39. Against this see Buitenwerf 2003: 130-33, who argues provenance from Asia Minor, but mainly from vv. 295-488, which are quite different from the rest of the book and probably inserted from a different source. Barclay 1996: 216-18; Collins 2000a: 84 note that oracle collections such as this are often subject to interpolation.

¹¹⁷ That Book 3 is a composite work with its origins in the second century B.C.E. was apparently first argued by Geffcken 1902b (which I have been unable to access). See now Collins 1974c: 21-22, 24-33; 1983b: 354-56; 1984a: 366-67; 1987a: 430-36; 1994: 59; Goodman 1986: 633-38; Lucas 1989: 187; Barclay 1996: 218-19; Bauckham 2001: 186; Nickelsburg 2005a: 195, and the history of research in Buitenwerf 2003: 5-64. The second century date has been challenged by Nikiprowetzky 1970: 195-225 (who argues that the book is a single composition written in the first century B.C.E.); Gruen 1998: 269-79; and Buitenwerf 2003: 124-34. See the counter-arguments in Collins 2004b: 8-18 and Nickelsburg 2005a: 195, both of whom argue that vv. 350-488, comprising oracles against other nations (as compared with the remainder of the book, which deals with internal Egyptian matters), were apparently inserted at a later date, and may have pagan authorship (Collins 1983b: 357-59; Goodman 1986: 635-37; Davila 2005b: 182-83). Scholars who dispute the earlier date argue that the negative attitude to Rome portrayed in the book is more suited to the first century B.C.E. than the second. As Barclay 1996: 219 and Davila 2005b: 186 point out, either the second or first century B.C.E. fits the evidence. Josephus alludes to vv. 97-107 (*Ant.* 1.118-19), although this information could have come from Alexander Polyhistor rather than directly from *Sib. Or.* (Davila 2005b: 185).

¹¹⁸ Collins 2004b: 4.

theme of the book is that sin, usually idolatry, will lead to disaster, which will come to an end with the advent of a king or kingdom.¹¹⁹ The author, according to Collins, was “a Jewish propagandist ... interested in the glory of Judaism.”¹²⁰ Coupled with this are a missionary zeal, an appreciation of Greek culture, and an appeal to the Greeks to turn to the one true God and offer sacrifices in the temple of the great God.¹²¹ There is considerable interest in, and a positive attitude towards the temple.¹²²

2.4.1.1 *Sib. Or.* 3:213-94

The third section of *Sib. Or.* 3 (vv. 196-294) deals with the Babylonian exile, the return from exile and the rebuilding of the temple.¹²³ It begins with a series of woes against various nations (vv. 196-209), which the sibyllist declines to elaborate further. She then announces that evil is about to come upon the pious men (213) descended from righteous men (214-15) who “live around the great temple of Solomon” (ναὸν οἰκεῖουσιν μέγαν Σολομώντιον, vv. 213-14). She then digresses to outline the history of the Israelites, beginning with God’s call of Abraham (v. 218)¹²⁴ down to the giving of the law (215-64). While this early history is overwhelmingly positive, the sibyllist concludes that evil will come upon these people. Because of their wickedness and idolatry and their refusal to worship God, they will not escape (vv. 277-79).

This evil is the Assyrian exile, although it is described in terms of the Babylonian exile,¹²⁵ including, most notably, the destruction of the temple and Israel’s exile from the “holy ground” (πέδον ἁγνόν, v. 267). The temple is described as “a very beautiful shrine” (περικαλλέα σηκόν, v. 266)¹²⁶ and the “temple of the great God” (ναὸς μέγαλοιο θεοῦ, v. 274), and v. 281 refers to “the wonders of the temple” (θαύματα σηκοῦ). Verses 282-85 contain hope for the future: if God’s people continue to trust in God’s law then

¹¹⁹ Collins 2000a: 87.

¹²⁰ Collins 2004b: 18, see also 1994: 57-58; Davila 2005b: 183-84.

¹²¹ Collins 1974a: 366; 1994: 59; Chester 1991b: 44-45; Davila 2005b: 185. Collins 1974c: 47 comments that “interest in the temple ... seems to have been characteristic of the sibylline literature of Egyptian Judaism.” This interest is absent from *Sib. Or.* 4, which cannot be assigned to Egypt with any confidence.

¹²² For a summary of the material in *Sib. Or.* 3 concerning the temple, and the positive light in which it is viewed, see Chester 1991b: 38; Davila 2005b: 184; Gäbel 2006: 39. Simon 1983: 219-21 explains the missionary nature of the work.

¹²³ Buitenwerf 2003: 191.

¹²⁴ The text of this line is corrupt. See Geffcken 1902a: 59 and the discussion in Buitenwerf 2003: 198.

¹²⁵ The sibyllist regards the Assyrians and Babylonians as equivalent as v. 160 shows, referring to “Assyrian Babylon” (Ἀσσυρίης Βαβυλῶνος). See Collins 1983b: 368; Buitenwerf 2003: 205.

¹²⁶ For σηκός as “temple, shrine” see 2 Macc 14:33. The word is a *hapax legomenon* in the LXX, but refers to the temple four times in *Sib. Or.* 3 (vv. 266, 281, 290, 665), once in *Sib. Or.* 5:293 (the temple of Artemis of Ephesus), and once in *Eup.* 34:6 as part of a description of Solomon’s temple.

“God will send a king from heaven” (θεὸς οὐρανόθεν πέμψει βασιλῆα, v. 286)¹²⁷ who will judge them, and “a certain royal tribe” (τις φυλὴ βασιλῆιος, v. 288), i.e. the Jews, will begin “to raise up a new temple of God” (καὶ καινὸν σηκὸν θεοῦ ἄρξεται ἐγείρειν, v. 290). Then “the temple will again be as it was before” (καὶ τότε δὴ ναὸς πάλιν ἔσεται, ὡς πάρος ἦεν, v. 294).¹²⁸

Here Solomon’s temple is described in positive terms, highlighting its beauty, greatness and wonders. This is God’s great temple and there is no hint of any dissatisfaction.¹²⁹ The positive attitude carries over to the rebuilt temple, which will be “as it was before.” God is behind the rebuilding. He sends the king who will restore them to their land and enable it to begin.

The king of v. 286 is probably Cyrus, described in terms reminiscent of Isa 44:24–25:8.¹³⁰ This is the king whom God raised up to bring about the return from exile and the rebuilding of the temple. However, some scholars have seen a veiled messianic reference.¹³¹ This has been argued most plausibly by Nolland, who draws attention, among other things, to (1) the second person address in vv. 266–85 indicating that the sibyllist is addressing a contemporary audience; (2) the statement of v. 294 that “the temple will be as it was before,” something Nolland considers hardly describes the second temple; and (3) the judgement in blood and fire (v. 287), which sounds like the eschatological judgement predictions of Joel 2:30; 3:2 (EVV). Thus, he argues that hidden under the reference to Cyrus is a typological scheme pointing to a Davidic Messiah and an eschatological temple that this Messiah will build.¹³²

While this typological reading is possible, it is not at all certain, and Collins has mounted a strong critique against it.¹³³ First, while Cyrus is referred to in messianic terms in

¹²⁷ For the reading θεὸς οὐρανόθεν see Buitenwerf 2003: 207. Geffcken 1902a: 63 reads θεὸς οὐράνιος (“heavenly God”).

¹²⁸ Buitenwerf 2003: 208 discusses this positive attitude to the second temple compared with the first.

¹²⁹ Gäbel 2006: 39.

¹³⁰ Collins 1974c: 38–39; 1983b: 368; Simon 1983: 232; Buitenwerf 2003: 207–8. Nikiprowetzky 1970: 133–35 argues that Cyrus is a Davidide. See the critique of this view in Collins 1974c: 38–39.

¹³¹ Cf. Lanchester 1913: 384, “[t]he king is Cyrus, though possibly the writer has in mind his own times rather than the Babylonian captivity, and looks for a deliverer like Cyrus. Ewald understands the king to be the Messiah.” Barclay 1996: 220 comments, “it is the sort of prophetic oracle which takes on fuller meaning in its eschatological context.”

¹³² Nolland 1979: 158–66. He also argues that *Sib. Or.* 3 reflects “the dark days of the early Maccabean period” (p. 166), and that the royal tribe of v. 288 is the Davidic line (p. 166). On p. 158 (footnote 2) he lists earlier scholars who read this text with a messianic reference, from Castalio in 1546 to Delaunay in 1874 and Fehr in 1893 (who reached the same conclusions as Nolland, though Nolland himself came to them independently).

¹³³ Collins 1987a: 431 (footnote 43a); 2000a: 91–2.

Isa 44-45, he remains a Gentile, and can hardly be seen as a Davidide.¹³⁴ More importantly, Collins notes that “not all Jews need to have thought of the postexilic temple as inadequate.”¹³⁵ *Sibylline Oracles* Book 3 has a uniformly positive view of both Solomon’s temple and the second temple, and nowhere is there any anticipation of an eschatological temple. The Jerusalem temple in its former and current manifestations will do.

2.4.1.2 *Sib. Or.* 3:545-656

This section castigates the “Greeks” for their idolatry, contrasting them with the Jews, a holy race of pious men (v. 573). The Greeks can avoid the disaster of war by sacrificing burnt-offerings of cattle and loud-bellowing bulls “at the temple of the great God” (πρὸς ναὸν μέγαλοιο θεοῦ, v. 565),¹³⁶ as the Jews do. “They fully honour the temple of the great God” (οἱ ναὸν μέγαλοιο θεοῦ περικυδανέουσιν, v. 575),¹³⁷ with drink offerings, the odour of burnt offering and sacred sacrifices (v. 576); sacrifices of well-fed bulls, unblemished rams, and firstborn sheep (vv. 577-78); and burnt offerings of fat flocks of lambs “on a great altar, in a holy manner” (ἐπὶ μέγαλῳ ἁγίῳς ὀλοκαρπεύοντες, v. 579). Near the end of the section the sibyllist issues another appeal to the Greeks: turn

¹³⁴ Collins 2000a: 92. *Sib. Or.* 3:652-66 rests the hopes for the Jewish people in a king, “from the sun” (ἀπ’ ἡλίου ... βασιλῆα, v. 652) who will obey God and bring peace to the “entire earth” (πᾶσαν γαῖαν, v. 653). The precise source of this solar imagery is debated. Fletcher-Louis 1997c: 115 raises the possibility that if this is a Jewish messiah, then it is to be related to “Palestinian angelomorphic messiah traditions” (which he does not specify, although see 4Q541 9 I 3-4; *Apoc. Zeph.* 6:11 [Jeremiell]; *T. Ab.* A 2:4; 7:4 [Michael]; 12:5 [Abel]; 13:1, 10 [Dokiell]; 16:6; 10; 17:12 [Death]). However, none of this imagery resonates with *Sib. Or.* 3:652. Nikiprowetzky 1970: 136; Gruen 1998: 277-78, and Buitenwerf 2003: 273-75 read the text as referring to a Jewish messiah, reading “from the sun” (ἀπ’ ἡλίου) as “from the east” (see Isa 41:2, 25). Collins 2004b: 16 disputes this, pointing out that it is not valid to read “sun” as “east” (i.e. the rising of the sun) and indeed, nowhere is the messiah ever expected from the east. Moreover, in *T. Mos.* 3:1 the king from the east (*ab oriente rex*) is Nebuchadnezzar who comes to destroy Jerusalem and the temple (2000a: 93). Collins (1974c: 38-44; 1987a: 431; 1994: 59-64; 2000a: 92-95; 2004b: 15-17) has consistently maintained that the imagery has its source in Egyptian mythology where the king is seen as the son of the sun-god Re, and that this king is the seventh Egyptian king of vv. 193, 318, 608, who comes to bring peace. Bartlett 1985: 38 and Nickelsburg 2005a: 195 also adopt Collins’ position, while Momigliano 1980: 556; Chester 1991b: 41-5; Barclay 1996: 222-23; Buitenwerf 2003: 272-75 question it because they have difficulty accepting that a Gentile king would bring about the exaltation of the Jewish people. But that is precisely what Cyrus did (Isa 44:28; 45:1) and the sibyllist seems to be drawing on this tradition. The “seventh king” is the sibyllist’s chronological marker that she continues to look to as the one who will bring salvation, and it would be strange indeed if she introduced a further king, not previously mentioned, to do this. As part of his argument for a single unified first century B.C.E. composition Nikiprowetzky 1970: 215 argues that the seventh “king” of Egypt is Cleopatra (but see Collins 1974b: 3-4; 1974c: 32-33). Buitenwerf 2003: 63, following Gruen 1998: 272-77 maintains that “the seventh king” is a symbolic reference to “a certain stage in history” (but see Collins 2004b: 9-15).

¹³⁵ Collins 2000a: 92. Fundamental to the appeal to the Greeks to turn to the great God in *Sib. Or.* 3 is the appeal to offer sacrifices in the temple (3: 626-30, cf. 772-74). To downplay the temple would cut the ground from under the sibyllist’s feet.

¹³⁶ See the critical apparatus in Geffcken 1902a: 77 for the textual variants in v. 564, and Buitenwerf 2003: 257-58, who notes that “it is impossible to reconstruct the original Greek text in detail.” I have followed Geffcken’s text. None of the variant readings impact the points being made here.

¹³⁷ For the translation “fully honour” see Collins 1983b: 35. περικυδαίνω does not appear in LSJ. κυδαίνω is “to honour or glorify” (LSJ 1005), and περκυδής has the sense “very famous” (LSJ 1378).

back, be converted and propitiate God. They are to sacrifice hundreds of bulls, firstborn lambs and goats to God at the appropriate times (vv. 625-27).

While there are also ethical demands made on the Greeks, the opening and closing inclusio in this section is cultic, and the central section praises the Jews for their close attention to cultic matters. The whole section reflects a positive attitude to the temple and cultus.

2.4.1.3 *Sib. Or.* 3: 657-808

This section begins with the summary statement that the “temple of the great God will be laden with very beautiful riches” (ναὸς δ’ αὖ μέγαλοιο θεοῦ περικαλλεί (sic) πλούτῳ, v. 657).¹³⁸ While some will want to pillage it, they will fail since God will defend his temple with cosmic phenomena (vv. 669-709).¹³⁹ The reason for the great wealth is that people “from every land” (πάσης δ’ ἐκ γαίης, v. 772) will bring incense and gifts “to the houses ... of the great God” (πρὸς οἴκους ... μέγαλοιο θεοῦ, vv. 772-73,¹⁴⁰ see also v. 718), and all God’s people will live in peace around it. The conditions described reflect the eschatological pilgrimage of the nations to Jerusalem in such texts as Isa 2:3; Mic 4:2; Zech 14:16.¹⁴¹ This is a picture of the eschatological kingdom to be sure (see vv. 767-95), but it is an entirely earthly kingdom, and the temple is the second temple. There is no expectation that the Messiah will come to build an eschatological temple; the second temple is adequate.¹⁴²

¹³⁸ The Φ group of MSS read λαός at the start of this line and the ψ group read λαούς. The reading ναός was proposed by Geffcken 1902a: 82, followed by Buitenwerf 2003: 276, since the immediate context describes the wealth of the temple.

¹³⁹ Barclay 1996: 220-21; Buitenwerf 2003: 277. This section contains allusions to Ps 2 where the kings of the earth rise up against God who has set his king on the holy hill of Zion with God’s decisive response; and to 2 Macc 3 where Heliodorus plans to rob the temple and God protects it with what appear to be angelic beings (see Collins 1974c: 44, 49-50). For armies arrayed against Zion and the temple see Deut 28:49; Jer 1:11-16; Ezek 38-39; Joel 2:1-10; Zech 14:1-5. See also 1 En. 56-57; 4 Ezra 13:5, 33-34; Rev 16:12-16; 19:19. For God’s decisive response see Isa 24: 1-23; 31:4-9; 66:18-24; Zech 14:1-21; 1 En. 90:17-19; 1QM XVII 4–XVIII 8; 4Q246 II 4-9; T. Mos. 10:1-10; 4 Ezra 13:35-38; 2 Bar. 39-40.

¹⁴⁰ For the plural οἴκους referring to the temple see Buitenwerf 2003: 283, 289. οἶκος refers to the house(hold) of Solomon in v. 167, to private homes in v. 314, to the temple in vv. 328-29, 726 (plural), 772, 774 and to Noah’s Ark in v. 825.

¹⁴¹ Simon 1983: 228.

¹⁴² Collins 1974c: 45-47; Buitenwerf 2003: 291-92. Chester 1991b: 45-47 argues that the text may indicate a new temple without explicitly saying so, and that the lavish description of the new temple (vv. 657-60) “clearly reflects, *inter alia*, something of the yearning for the fulfilment of the lavish descriptions of Deutero-Isaiah [sic?] and Ezekiel and disappointment and sense of anti-climax about the form of the Second Temple that is reflected elsewhere in Jewish texts.” On the contrary, there seems to be no disappointment with the second temple, especially considering v. 294, where the rebuilt temple after the exile is predicted to be “as it was before.” Sanders 1985a: 85-88 argues that hopes for rebuilding Jerusalem must also involve hopes for rebuilding the temple. But the texts he cites that look to this are drawn from *Sib. Or.* 5 (which I discuss in 5.7, below) rather than from *Sib. Or.* 3.

2.4.2 Conclusion

Sibylline Oracles 3 reflects a clear theological commitment to and a positive attitude towards Jerusalem and the temple. Commitment to the great God and his temple, and the proper observance of cultic matters, will ensure salvation for Jew and Greek alike. There is no sense of dissatisfaction with the priesthood and the cult, and no reference to a heavenly temple. Even the eschatological kingdom seems to be centred on the existing temple. There is no suggestion that the Messiah or God will come and build an eschatological temple in the last days. In Hebrews, by contrast, there is an explicit critique of animal sacrifice in 10:1-18. Hebrews never explicitly mentions the earthly temple, although I will argue for an implicit critique of Jerusalem and the temple, with the readers encouraged to look away from these in favour of the city to come, the heavenly Jerusalem (Heb 13:13-14).¹⁴³ Attitudes to Jerusalem, the temple and the temple cultus in the *Sibylline Oracles* are diametrically opposed to this.

2.5 Philo of Alexandria

Philo was a Diaspora Jew who lived from 20-15 B.C.E. to 45-50 C.E.¹⁴⁴ He produced a considerable body of literature, much of which retells the Pentateuch.¹⁴⁵ Philo visited Jerusalem, perhaps once in his lifetime,¹⁴⁶ “to pray and sacrifice” (εὐξόμενός τε καὶ θύσων, *Prov.* 2.64). Consequently, he would not have had an intimate first-hand experience of the temple and cultus, instead gaining his understanding from the text, where he deals mainly with the wilderness tabernacle.¹⁴⁷ Philo is important to this study because a relationship, even if only superficial, exists between the writings of Philo and Hebrews. A comprehensive discussion of this relationship is beyond my scope, and indeed has been done many times.¹⁴⁸ Here I simply examine selected references to the temple and tabernacle.

¹⁴³ See 7.8 (below).

¹⁴⁴ Borgen 1984: 252; Sandmel 1984: 3-4; Hayward 1996: 108; Barclay 1996: 159; Schenck 2005: 9-14.

¹⁴⁵ Nickelsburg 2005a: 212. For a discussion of the term “rewritten bible,” or “rewritten Scripture” see Vermes 1961: 95; Harrington and Horgan 1986: 239-40; Crawford 2008: 1-15; Brooke 2010: 42-44, and for critique see Najman 2003: 7-10; Campbell 2005: 48-50; Bernstein 2005: 169-96; Petersen 2007: 285-306.

¹⁴⁶ Schenck 2005: 14; Krauter 2007: 66. Martin 2000: 237 suggests that Philo may have made more than one such pilgrimage and that the “casual manner” in which he refers to the temple here suggests that the “actual physical act of pilgrimage to the Temple does not possess a high profile in his surviving written output.” Strangely, Martin notes the one reference to pilgrimage in Philo, posits other pilgrimages, and then argues that since Philo does not mention them, they were unimportant.

¹⁴⁷ Früchtel 1968: 99; Martin 2000: 237 (footnote 76).

¹⁴⁸ Runia 1993: 74-78; Schenck 2005: 81-86. Those who conclude that the relationship has been overstated include Barrett 1954: 363-93; Burtness 1958: 54-64; Williamson 1970; Hurst 1984; 1990: 7-42. For more positive assessments see Sowers 1965; MacRae 1978; Runia 1993: 74-78; Sterling 2001; Schenck 2002. I discuss this relationship briefly in 1.4.3 (above).

2.5.1 Philo's Attitude to the Temple

Clearly, Philo had a positive view of Herod's temple. In *Flacc.* 46 he refers to the way Diaspora Jews view Jerusalem as their "capital city" (μητρόπολις), but immediately qualifies this with the remark that it is a "holy city" (ἱερόπολις) containing "the holy temple of the Most High God" (ὁ τοῦ ὑψίστου θεοῦ νεὼς ἅγιος). To Philo, the most significant aspect of the city is that it contains the holy temple.¹⁴⁹

This attitude becomes clearer when Philo describes the report he received concerning Caligula's proposal to erect a statue of himself in the holy of holies and the responses to that event (*Legat.* 186-329).¹⁵⁰ Philo was part of a delegation to Caligula to protest at the desecration of Alexandrian synagogues. While awaiting Caligula's summons the delegation was accosted by a grief-stricken man bearing a report of Caligula's proposal to erect this statue (186-88). On receiving this news they were struck with terror, recognising that the impetus for their delegation paled into insignificance in the face of the desecration of the temple. They were about to appeal to Caligula for protection of the synagogues, but concluded that the "destroyer of the all-holy" (τῷ λυμεῶνι τοῦ πανιέρου) would pay no attention to a complaint about such lesser things as synagogues.¹⁵¹ Caligula was planning to treat with contempt the "famous and resplendent temple" (τὸν περισημότατον καὶ ἐπιφανέστατον νεών), admired by all people from the east and the west, and regarded as the "sun which shines everywhere" (ἡλίου τρόπον πανταχόσε λάμποντα, 191). Nevertheless, they resolved to continue with their efforts to meet with Caligula, even if it cost them their lives (192-96). The desecration of the temple was seen as a threat to Jews

¹⁴⁹ Leonhardt-Balzer 2007: 49. It is beyond my scope to discuss Philo's attitude to the sacrificial system and to sacrifices in general, a subject that has been the subject of considerable debate. See Williamson 1970: 164-74; Fuglseth 2005: 192-93. For the view that Philo was engrossed with the cosmic symbolism, but uninterested in the actual temple, see Heinemann 1973: 45-57; Früchtel 1968: 81. Martin 2000: 209-28, 231-34 suggests on the basis of *Flacc.* 46 that "the Temple does not constitute Jerusalem's *raison d'être*." He underestimates Philo's view of the significance of the temple, since the first and only thing Philo says about Jerusalem in this text is that the temple is there.

¹⁵⁰ In what follows I depend largely on Leonhardt-Balzer 2007: 48-51; see also Fuglseth 2005: 196-98.

¹⁵¹ For the significance of synagogues as sacred space see Martin 2000: 58-62. Martin examines epigraphic and literary evidence from the Mediterranean Diaspora and in Palestine from the third century B.C.E. to the sixth century C.E. and finds synagogues referred to with Greek terms such as ἅγιος ("holy"), ἁγιάσιμος ("most holy") and also with Hebrew words associated with the root שָׁמַח. He also notes the presence of places for ritual washing associated with synagogues at Gamla, Masada and Herodium, and argues that Paul's search for a synagogue near a river at Philippi (Acts 6:13) also reflects "some association between ritual ablution in living water ... and the institution of the synagogue in the Diaspora (p. 62). See also p. 72, "[i]n the post-70 CE period, the synagogue becomes the fundamental expression of sacred space in Rabbinic Judaism." This is the place where men meet to occupy themselves with the Torah, where the *Shekinah* is present (*m. Avot* 3.2). On pp. 175-81 Martin discusses the impact of the desecration of the Alexandrian synagogues in Philo's writings, and makes it quite clear that these were not "mere synagogues." It was a serious issue; the Jews no longer had places for worship since they had been rendered unfit for this purpose. In *Flacc.* 48, Philo refers to synagogues as sacred places (ἱεροὶ περιβόλοι) and in *Mos.* 2.231 he refers to parts of the temple with the same words.

everywhere, since it was an essential sign of Jewish identity. In comparison, the desecration of synagogues was a local affair, albeit serious.¹⁵²

Philo was not alone in his esteem for the temple. The great mass of Jews in Palestine protested to Petronius, the governor of Syria (207-253), and Agrippa even went into a coma on hearing the news of the proposed desecration (263-70). Agrippa later appealed to Caligula not to carry out his threatened actions. He described himself as a Jew from the city that is home to “the holy temple of the Most High God” (ὁ τοῦ ὑψίστου θεοῦ νεὼς ἅγιος, 278). He appealed for the nation (278-80), the city (279-89) and finally (and climactically) the temple (290-320). He offered to give up everything for the sake of the preservation of the ancient customs and laws of his people (321-29).

More details of Philo’s attitude to the temple are found in *Spec.* 1.67-78. After claiming that “the highest, and in truth, the holy temple of God” (τὸ μὲν ἀνωτάτω καὶ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἱερὸν θεοῦ)¹⁵³ is “the whole universe” (τὸν σύμπαντα ... κόσμον, 66),¹⁵⁴ Philo embarks upon a description of “the temple made with hands” (τὸ δὲ χειρόκμητον, 67). This temple was necessary to satisfy human impulses for worship and, since God is one, there should only be one temple to which all people should come. This they do (67-69). In *Spec.* 1.71 he describes the costly adornment of the outer enclosure, then the outer court, which was less elaborate, and finally in 1.72 the temple itself, which was “better than words can describe” (παντὸς λόγου κρείττων). He then moves to the holy of holies (“the invisible inner parts,” τὰ ... ἔνδον ἀόρατα) and gives a brief description of the Day of Atonement ritual. He concludes by again describing the beauty of the buildings, whose magnificence is universally admired by all who see them, especially foreigners, who can compare them with their own public buildings and “be amazed at their beauty and luxury” (ἐκπλήττονται τό τε κάλλος ὁμοῦ καὶ τὴν πολυτέλειαν).

Philo appears to have no conception of an inadequate temple; rather he views it positively. It is very beautiful; it is unique; it is the defining mark of the Jewish people, and indeed, people come from everywhere with the contributions for the temple (78). Its desecration threatens all Jews. There is no suggestion of a corrupt priesthood or temple. All is as it should be.

¹⁵² See *Legat.* 191. On pp. 244-47 Martin argues that “the loss of the Temple *per se* is not characterised as a fatal blow to Jewish life.” Rather, he sees it as “the first step in the rescinding of the rights to lead a Jewish life anywhere in the world.” Thus, he reads Philo here as though the temple was the defining character of Judaism, which does not accord with his under-estimation of the significance of the temple to Philo elsewhere in his thesis.

¹⁵³ Translation from Hayward 1996: 109.

¹⁵⁴ For κόσμος as the universe see BDAG 561, s.v. κόσμος, 3.

2.5.2 The Design of the Tabernacle

Philo describes the construction of the tabernacle several times. A brief description appears in *Leg.* 3.102-3, where the influence of Plato's theory of ideas emerges.¹⁵⁵ The "idea" is the "eternal, intangible, immutable" and incorporeal reality behind the physical manifestation of an object. Philo discusses the role of Bezalel in constructing the tabernacle. He speculates that Moses "fabricated the archetypes" (τὰ ἀρχέτυπα τεχνιτεύει) of the tabernacle and its contents and that Bezalel constructed "copies of these archetypes" (τὰ τούτων μμήματα). He concludes that Moses had God as his teacher, a claim he supports with what appears to be a conflation of Exod 25:8 and 25:40, "you shall make everything according to the pattern that was shown to you on the mountain" (κατὰ τὸ παράδειγμα τὸ δεδειγμένον σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει πάντα ποιήσεις).¹⁵⁶ Since Moses was commanded to make the tabernacle and its contents, but Bezalel actually made them, Moses must have made the archetypes.¹⁵⁷

Philo describes the construction of the tabernacle at greater length in *Mos.* 2.70-108, 136-40. He rewrites Exod 25-40, omitting considerable detail and adding his own philosophical and theological interpretation. He begins by giving the rationale for the "movable temple" (φορητὸν ... ἱερόν):¹⁵⁸ the people needed to worship and to offer sacrifices while travelling. Indeed, had they been a settled people, they would have built a

¹⁵⁵ Plato discusses the way a craftsperson making something changeable keeps his eye on what is unchanging and uses that as a pattern (παράδειγμα) in *Timaeus* 28a-29b. This, he argues, is how the universe was formed. The creator had his eye on the eternal (ἄϊδιος), so that it was crafted on this unchanging pattern, and consequently is a copy of it. Following this, Plato refers to the universe as "the imitation of the pattern" (μίμημα δὲ παραδείγματος). Wolfson 1968: 200-17 describes this theory as "[t]he starting point of Philo's philosophy" (p. 200). McKelvey 1969: 38-40 and Sowers 1965: 106 detect the influence of this theory in Heb 8:5. I will argue against this below (8.5.4). See also the critique of Sowers in Williamson 1970: 560-61.

¹⁵⁶ Philo seems to rely on a Greek translation of the OT (see *Mos.* 2.26-44, where he seems to cite *Let. Aris.*), and there is no indication that he had any knowledge of Hebrew (Schenck 2005: 10). The expression τὸ παράδειγμα appears in Exod 25:8, while the remaining words in his allusion appear in 25:40 where τὸν τύπον appears in place of τὸ παράδειγμα. The word πάντα appears in neither verse, although πάντων τῶν σκευῶν appears in 25:8. Heb 8:5 quotes the same words from Exod 25:40 (with τὸν τύπον rather than τὸ παράδειγμα, also adding πάντα). Either the author of Hebrews was familiar with Philo's text or both writers relied on a tradition that included πάντα. The author of Hebrews avoids παράδειγμα, but it is impossible to tell whether this avoidance was intentional, although Williamson 1970: 112-13 thinks it was, and Schenck 2005: 84 refers to the author's avoidance of "the more explicitly Platonic *paradeigma* of Exodus 25:9."

¹⁵⁷ Hurst 1990: 140 (footnote 119) notes, "[a]t this point the distance of *Auctor* [of Hebrews] from Philo is not merely linguistic, it is strikingly conceptual." In Hebrews there is no sense of Moses making an archetype for Bezalel to copy when making the actual tent, rather Moses simply "constructs" (ἐπιτελέω) the tent.

¹⁵⁸ In 2.71 Philo explains that while Moses was on the mountain God instructed him concerning the building of a temple and its furnishings (περὶ τὴν τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ κατασκευήν). Koester 1989: 59-61 plausibly suggests that pilgrims to Jerusalem (of which Philo was one) would have learned about the cosmological meaning of the different parts of the temple and applied them to the tabernacle.

“magnificent temple” (περισημότατον νεών)¹⁵⁹ in a “holy city” (ἱερόπολις). Consequently, Moses decided to build a “tabernacle ... a most holy undertaking” (σκηνήν ... ἔργον ἱερώτατον), the details of which were given by God in precise commands. Employing Plato’s theory of ideas, Philo claims that Moses “contemplated with his soul” (τῇ ψυχῇ θεωρῶν) the “immaterial forms” (ἄσωμάτους ἰδέας) that were about to be “brought to completion” (ἀποτελεῖσθαι). “From the original draft and mental patterns” (ἀπ’ ἀρχετύπου γραφῆς καὶ νοητῶν παραδειγμάτων), he made “sense-perceptible copies” (αἰσθητὰ μιμήματα).

He explains himself more clearly in *Mos.* 2.76, which Colson translates as follows:

So the shape of the model (ὁ ... τύπος τοῦ παραδείγματος) was stamped upon the mind of the prophet, a secretly painted or moulded prototype, produced by immaterial and invisible forms; and the then resulting work was built in accordance with that shape by the artist impressing the stamping upon the material substances required in each case.¹⁶⁰

Thus, for Philo, Moses “saw” with his mind an immaterial archetypal pattern and reproduced the wilderness shrine from this. What is clear to Philo, however, is that the design of the tabernacle, which he describes in the following paragraphs, was of divine origin. Exodus 25 makes that clear, but Philo emphasises it by explaining how it took place. The divine origin of the tabernacle gives it a stamp of divine approval and great dignity.¹⁶¹

Philo’s next step is to describe in detail the different parts of the tabernacle (77-108). As he does so, he invests that with cosmological meaning.¹⁶² In paragraphs 77-83 he mentions the fifty-five pillars, of which five were in the outer court. Fifty-five is a significant number, being the sum of the digits from one to ten (79). The five in the outer court represent the five senses, leaving fifty, “a most holy number” (ἀγιώτατος πεντηκοντάδος ἀριθμός), the “symbol of a right-angled triangle ... the original source from which the universe springs” (80).¹⁶³

In 2:84-88 Philo describes the “curtains” (αὐλαία) and the “veil” (καταπέτασμα), finding significance in the numerical values of the measurements, the materials they were made of and their colours. The four materials are “fine linen” (βύσσος, bright white), representing the earth; “purple” (πορφύρα) representing water; the “dark red”

¹⁵⁹ Philo’s perspective is quite different from that expressed in 2 Sam 7:5-7, where God expresses a preference for a movable shrine over a permanent temple.

¹⁶⁰ Philo 1929-1962: 6: 487.

¹⁶¹ Koester 2001: 383. This is at variance with the theories of those who posit dependence on Philo for Heb 8:5, and then argue that in Hebrews the tabernacle is inferior because it is an earthly copy.

¹⁶² See the discussion in Goodenough 1935: 97-99; 107-9. This was not original to Philo. See Früchtel 1968: 81-88.

¹⁶³ Translation from Colson (Philo 1929-1962: 6: 489).

(ὑάκινθος, blue) denoting the air; and “scarlet” (κόκκινος) representing fire.¹⁶⁴ Thus, the curtain represents the four elements of the universe. Philo concludes that it was necessary that the “handmade temple” (ἱερὸν χειροποίητον) should be constructed of the same elements of which God made “the All.”¹⁶⁵ Furthermore, the lamp stand represents the seven planets (102-3),¹⁶⁶ and the candlestick, incense altar and incense are symbols of heaven and earth respectively (105).

Cosmic symbolism emerges elsewhere in Philo.¹⁶⁷ The ark of the covenant signifies the intelligible world, and the holy of holies the incorporeal world (*QE* 2.68-69);¹⁶⁸ the forecourt signifies heaven, earth and sea in *Her.* 221-229, and the perceptible world in *QE* 2.83; the outer court signifies the perceptible world in *Ebr.* 134; and the table and twelve loaves the twelve months of the year (*Spec.* 1.172).

Philo is convinced that the tabernacle symbolises the universe and thus has cosmological significance. Consequently, the suggestion that Heb 8:5 is indebted to Philo does justice neither to Philo nor to Hebrews. Philo says nothing about a heavenly sanctuary as an archetype of the wilderness tabernacle. Rather, the archetype is an immaterial form (ἄσώματος ἰδέα) in the mind of God. Philo’s tabernacle is a “copy” (μίμημα) of this immaterial form, not a copy of a heavenly sanctuary. Moreover, there is no spatial dualism with a heavenly sanctuary “above” and the earthly replica “below.” For Philo the wilderness sanctuary represents the universe.¹⁶⁹

2.5.3 Conclusion

This brief survey of Philo’s writings on the temple and tabernacle demonstrates his positive attitude to the temple. Using philosophical ideas drawn from Plato, he explains the divine origin of the temple, and from features of its design he extrapolates that it had cosmic significance, representing the universe. Two aspects of this are relevant to the study of Hebrews. First, Philo’s attitude to the temple was totally at odds with that found in Hebrews, where it prefigures the eschatological dwelling of God with his people, and having now reached its *telos* has no further function.¹⁷⁰ Secondly, scholars have claimed that

¹⁶⁴ Colson (Ibid.: 489-93).

¹⁶⁵ Similar ideas are expressed in *QE* 2.85, *Congr.* 116-17, see Daniélou 1957: 83-90.

¹⁶⁶ In *QE* 2.73-81 it is a symbol of heaven (73) and the planets (76-81). See also *Her.* 221.

¹⁶⁷ See the table in Koester 1989: 60. See also Laporte 1983: 111-12.

¹⁶⁸ Elsewhere the holy of holies symbolises heaven as in *Spec.* 1.66. See Daniélou 1957: 86.

¹⁶⁹ Two temples appear in *Somm.* 1.215, one being the world (ὁ κόσμος) and the other the rational soul (λογικὴ ψυχή). Colson translates *Spec.* 1. 66, “... the holy temple of God is, as we must believe, the whole cosmos, having for its sanctuary the most sacred part of all existence, even heaven ... There is also a temple made by hands” (7: 137, 39). Borgen 1984: 269 extrapolates from this that “the Temple in Jerusalem is an earthly counterpart of the cosmic heavenly Temple.” However, this is not explicated in the text. Hayward 1996: 109, more accurately, suggests, “the Temple in some manner represents the universe.”

¹⁷⁰ I discuss this reading of Heb 8:5 in 8.5 (below).

the author of Hebrews is indebted to Philo for his view of the relationship between the heavenly and earthly sanctuaries. At best, any connections between the two are superficial.

2.6 2 (*Slavonic*) *Enoch*

The often-quoted claim of Andersen that “[i]n every respect 2 *Enoch* remains an enigma. As long as the date and location remain unknown, no use can be made of it for historical purposes”¹⁷¹ has not deterred scholars from debating its date, location and provenance. Indeed, Andersen himself ventures some suggestions, proposing that it was a Jewish document, composed in Greek, late in the first century C.E.¹⁷² Orlov concurs, with the added refinement that interest in the Jerusalem cult, as well as the command to visit the temple three times each day (51:4), makes a date prior to 70 C.E. likely.¹⁷³ Charles confidently located 2 *Enoch* in Egypt, probably Alexandria, and this suggestion has generally been accepted,¹⁷⁴ although Andersen is unsure.¹⁷⁵ The work exists in a longer (J) and a shorter (A) recension, and scholars debate which of these is more likely to be original. The truth probably lies somewhere between the two, with both “expansions and compressions.”¹⁷⁶ It is now extant only in Old Church Slavonic and no manuscript can be dated prior to the fourteenth century.¹⁷⁷

¹⁷¹ Andersen 1983: 97.

¹⁷² Ibid.: 91-97. The absence of any distinctive Christian content, Enoch’s “exalted position as God’s chosen and prime agent” and details of the miraculous conception of Melchizedek and his spontaneous birth from a dead mother (71:12-23) make Christian provenance unlikely (Nickelsburg 2005a: 225; Macaskill 2007: 197-98). Furthermore, an anagram connecting the name of Adam with the points of the compass in 30:13 is only valid in Greek. On the other hand, the anagram does not appear in the short recension and the presence of numerous Hebrew words suggests a Hebrew original. For Andersen’s opinion on the date see the words “Late First Century A.D.” under the heading on p. 91. Bow 2000: 33-41 argues that it is a Christian work explaining the details surrounding the treatment of Melchizedek in Heb 7:1-10. But the exalted place given to Enoch makes Christian provenance unlikely, as does the Melchizedek story, which contains no Christian elements (Stone 1984: 408; Pearson 1998: 184). It is generally acknowledged that 2 *En.* 71:34-37; 72:6-7 referring to “another Melchisedek” are a Christian interpolation, see Andersen 1983: 208-11; and Böttrich 2001: 452-54, who also argues that 71:32-33 are interpolated, a point disputed by Orlov 2003: 275 (footnote 2).

¹⁷³ Orlov 2005a: 320-33. In footnote 82 on pp. 322-23 Orlov lists those scholars who support an early date. See also Charles 1913d: 429; Dean-Otting 1984: 225; Orlov 2004c: 176-87; Nickelsburg 2005a: 225. Milik 1976: 109-12 proposed that it was written in the ninth-tenth centuries by a Byzantine monk, but this view is no longer considered credible, see Collins 1983a: 533 (footnote 7) and Orlov 2005a: 324-26.

¹⁷⁴ Charles 1913d: 426; Nickelsburg 2005a: 225. See also Himmelfarb 1993: 38, 43-44, 84-86; Collins 1998: 246-47; Böttrich 2001: 455-56.

¹⁷⁵ Andersen 1983: 96 mentions Egypt, Syria, Palestine, Asia Minor and Iran as possible places of origin.

¹⁷⁶ Nickelsburg 2005a: 221. Nickelsburg himself favours the short recension. See the extensive discussion in Andersen 1983: 92-94 and Böttrich 1991: 35-36, 40; 2001: 448-49 (who favours the long recension). Prior to Andersen’s translation the most influential version of 2 *Enoch* was by Vaillant 1952, who favoured the shorter recension (pp. v-viii), as do Stone 1984: 406-7 and Puech 1993: 1: 176. Orlov 2005a: 148 declines to express an opinion on the priority of either recension and works with both, arguing that subscribing to the priority of either, “deceptively oversimplifies the problem” (p. 225), as do Vermes and Goodman 1987: 746.

¹⁷⁷ Andersen 1983: 91-94.

The first part (chapters 3-37) deals with Enoch's heavenly journey. It retells *1 En* 14-16; 17-36 with numerous embellishments, including a seven heaven schema. The earthly priesthood is almost entirely absent,¹⁷⁸ and Enoch's status as a heavenly priest is muted when compared with earlier Enochic literature. In the second part (38-68), Enoch returns for thirty days to give ethical instruction to his children and grandchildren, encouraging them to visit the temple three times daily and instructing them on sacrificial practices. He departs for heaven from Akhuzan (Jerusalem),¹⁷⁹ where his sons construct an altar. The third part (69-73) may be an appendix added at a very early date to explain the continuity of the priesthood from Methuselah to his grandson Nir, and then to Nir's son Melchizedek.¹⁸⁰

There is no explicit criticism of the temple or cultus in *2 Enoch*.¹⁸¹ The command to visit the temple three times daily and the instructions on sacrificial practices indicate a positive attitude to both. Moreover, the text argues for great antiquity for the priesthood, and associates it with Zion and Jerusalem (Akhuzan) from the outset. Zion and Akhuzan are located at the centre of the earth where Adam was born and from where Enoch was taken to heaven.

Since the temple was still standing, the author/editor of the third part would have been well aware of the lineage of the Levitical priesthood. But he overlooks them, tracing instead the priestly line from Seth to Melchizedek, who is taken to Paradise in Eden, where he will stay forever. From this, one could infer that the current priesthood is not legitimate and, if this part is an appendix, it may emanate from a group dissatisfied with that priesthood.¹⁸²

¹⁷⁸ Enoch counsels his sons *2 En* 2:2: "Bless the Lord with the firstborn of your herds and the firstborn of your children." This implies animal sacrifice and some form of priesthood.

¹⁷⁹ I discuss the identification of Akhuzan with Jerusalem below (2.6.1).

¹⁸⁰ It is generally acknowledged that chapter 73 is the work of a Christian reviser (Andersen 1983: 73, footnote a), and scholars have raised questions about chapters 69-72, which are absent from some MSS. Forbes 1913: 469 concluded his translation at the end of *2 En* 68, and Sacchi 1990: 233-49 argues on the basis of style, content and vocabulary that it is an appendix added at a very early date, but still an integral part of the work. See also Collins 1983a: 535; Himmelfarb 1993: 41-42; Gieschen 1997: 366-68; 1998: 173; Bow 2000: 33-35. Horton 1976: 81 declines to deal with Melchizedek in *2 Enoch* as he considers it to be a late interpolation, falling "far beyond the bounds" of his study. For a more favourable assessment see Böttrich 2001: 446-47. Even though Melchizedek appears in Hebrews, I do not deal with this part of *2 Enoch*, as it is not concerned with temple symbolism *per se*.

¹⁸¹ Himmelfarb 1993: 43; Mach 2000: 251; Carlsson 2004: 92. For a contrary view see Sacchi 1990: 243, who argues that since the binding of the legs of sacrificial animals (59:3) was not practised in Jerusalem, *2 Enoch* is "strongly critical of the Jerusalem temple." He also disputes the identification of Akhuzan with Jerusalem. He proposes a group with a different temple (Leontopolis?). The evidence for the non-binding of animals in Jerusalem is late (see *m. Tamid* 4.1), and it is just as credible to imagine that the author was a Diaspora Jew who had never visited the temple and never observed the sacrificial rituals. Himmelfarb 1993: 42-43 argues that the leg binding regulation is polemic against heathen sacrificial customs. Orlov 2000: 34 wonders if the practice of leg binding emanated from a sect whose practice differed from that of the Jerusalem temple.

¹⁸² Gieschen 1997: 368-69. This is a difficult decision to make. There is no explicit criticism of the priesthood, and it could be argued that the tracing of the priestly lineage back to Seth gives it great antiquity

2.6.1 Enoch and the Temple

The first hint of a positive attitude to the temple is in 51:4 where Enoch tells his sons that it is good to go to the Lord's temple three times daily: morning, noon and night.¹⁸³ To this, recension A adds "to glorify the Author of all things." This is complemented with references to appropriate sacrificial practices in 59:2; 61:4; and 62:1.¹⁸⁴

Enoch's departure takes place at Akhuzan (64:2), usually explained as a transliteration of the **אֶחְזָן**, which is probably related to the word **מִקְדָּשׁ**, referring to the "special property of God," that is, Jerusalem,¹⁸⁵ and Enoch's descendants farewell him from there as the one who "carries away the sin of mankind" (64:5).¹⁸⁶ In 68:5, Methuselah and his brothers construct an altar at Akhuzan, where Enoch had been taken up to heaven. They sacrifice sheep and oxen, and all the people offer sacrifices before the Lord. That the altar is built at the place where Enoch departs for the heavenly temple reflects the idea of the earthly temple as the place where heaven and earth meet.¹⁸⁷ Moreover, Enoch's exaltation to heaven precedes the eschaton, when all the righteous will be gathered together "into the great age" (65:7) and will shine seven times brighter than the sun (66:7).¹⁸⁸ The vertical axis between earth and heaven and the horizontal axis between the creation and the eschaton

and prestige; on the other hand, Melchizedek's removal to Paradise forever (72:5) could signal the end of any legitimate earthly priesthood.

¹⁸³ Andersen 1983: 179, footnote c, notes variant readings here, with some MSS reading "house of God," and others "'the Lord's church' an obvious drift to Christian terminology." He argues that the best attested reading is "the LORD'S temple." For devotion three times a day see Ps 55:17; Dan 6:10; and Acts 2:15; 3:1 and 10:9 (read together).

¹⁸⁴ In 62:1 gifts are to be brought "with faith," so as to receive remission of sins. Andersen (ibid.: 188, footnote b) identifies the reference to faith as a Christian gloss. Compare Heb 11:6 where those who approach God must believe that he is and that he rewards those who seek him.

¹⁸⁵ *HALOT* 32. See Ezek 48:20-22. See also Milik 1976: 113-14; Orlov 2000: 27 (who claims that Akhuzan is "a specific name for the hill of the Temple in Jerusalem"); 2004c: 175; 2005a: 201; Böttrich 2001: 457. For the identification of Akhuzan as Jerusalem within the text see the Christian interpolation at 2 *En.* 71:35-36. Carlsson 2004: 93 suggests that it has proved difficult to locate Akhuzan. Unless otherwise noted, all quotations of and allusions to 2 *Enoch* are taken from the longer recension (J) in Andersen 1983.

¹⁸⁶ See Andersen 1983: 190-91 for the variant readings in this verse. Recension A reads "our sins," judged by Orlov 2003: 301 to be secondary. The claim that Enoch carries away sin only appears here in 2 *Enoch* and there is no explanation given. In 53:1-2 it seems that nobody can help when it comes to dealing with sin, while in 59:2 the sacrifice of a clean animal for sin brings healing when offered properly. VanderKam 1995a: 160 and Carlsson 2004: 85 trace the ideas to the role of the suffering servant of Isa 53, although there is little else in 2 *Enoch* reflecting the Servant Songs. Orlov 2003: 299-302, following Idel 1990: 220-40, argues that it refers to Enoch removing the primordial sin of Adam by his transformation into an angel, taking over the dominion of Adam, who was created as an angel (30:11-12), while Macaskill 2007: 220-25 argues that the motif of the recovery of Adam's glory is not as "crucial and pervasive as Orlov suggests." See now Orlov's response in Orlov 2009b: 108-110. In Heb 9:11-10:18 the unique self-offering of Jesus is seen as the fulfilment of the OT sacrificial cultus, leading to its abolition (10:8-10) as the means of forgiveness for the people of God.

¹⁸⁷ Orlov 2009b: 107-8.

¹⁸⁸ Fletcher-Louis 1997c: 155.

are combined in the person of Enoch.¹⁸⁹ In this text the earthly temple is not a copy of the heavenly one, but rather where heaven and earth meet.

By this means, the text claims antiquity and prestige for the Jerusalem temple and its cultus. The attitude to the temple and its cultus reflected in Hebrews is quite different. The difference is Christological, with the perspective that Jesus, the crucified one, is the Son of God exalted to the right hand of God and that his sacrifice was superior to the temple sacrifices and does away with them. While *2 Enoch* elevates the Jerusalem temple and its cultus, Hebrews negates it.

2.6.2 Enoch's Heavenly Journey

The narrative begins with a superscription explaining what will follow: the Lord took Enoch, a wise and skilled man, away so that he might see the highest realms, the kingdom of God almighty, the station of the Lord's servants, and the Lord's immovable throne.¹⁹⁰ This is immediately followed in *2 En* 1, where Enoch himself describes how that at the age of 365 years, he was troubled by a dream in which he saw two huge men at the end of his bed sent by God to take him to heaven.¹⁹¹ He gives parting instructions to his sons in *2 En* 2, and in *2 En* 3 the journey begins.¹⁹²

Enoch passes through successive heavens. In the first he sees two hundred angels who govern the stars and heavenly combinations, and in the second he sees fallen angels who ask him to pray for them,¹⁹³ a request he refuses since he is a human.¹⁹⁴ From the third heaven, he looks down and sees the Paradise of Eden,¹⁹⁵ with luxuriant trees, both

¹⁸⁹ Collins 1983a: 536-37; Orlov 2009b: 108, "Enoch's eschatological role is tied to the idea of the earthly counterpart of the Throne, the earthly Temple. The vertical axis of the Throne and the Temple is thus explicitly reaffirmed in the text, as is the horizontal line connecting the protological and eschatological events."

¹⁹⁰ Andersen 1983: 103 suggests that the immovable throne is similar to the unshakable kingdom of Heb 12:28. Enoch's experiences in the highest heaven where he is transformed into an angel of the presence are not germane to this thesis and I will only deal with seven-heaven schema and with Enoch's vision of Paradise from the third heaven.

¹⁹¹ These "huge men" are angels (33:6) who appear to Enoch as men. For angels as men see Gen 18:2; 19:1; 2 Macc 3:26; Luke 24:4; Acts 1:10.

¹⁹² Unlike *1 En* 14 where Enoch ascends in a dream, here he is conscious and ascends bodily, culminating in physical transformation into an angel. Since he has time to inform his family (Dean-Otting 1984: 226-27), his departure is far more orderly. To return to earth he needs to have his face chilled (*2 En* 37). However, he is unable to eat, indicating that he retains angelic status (*2 En* 56:2). See Alexander 1998: 102-4; Orlov 2005b: 237.

¹⁹³ See *1 En* 13:4-7; Heb 7:25. In *2 En* 7:5 Enoch's response to the request that he prays for the fallen angels corresponds to God's word to Enoch in *1 En* 15:2. See Orlov 2009b: 138-39.

¹⁹⁴ Contrast his explanation in 18:7 to the watchers of the fifth heaven that he has prayed for their brothers in the second heaven.

¹⁹⁵ The text reads "Edem." See LXX Gen 2:8, 10. I follow Andersen 1983: 114-16 in capitalising Paradise as a proper noun, and I use the standard spelling of the various names that have divergent spelling (e.g. Noah is spelled Noe, and Methuselah, Methusalam). For Paradise in the third heaven see 2 Cor 12:2, 4.

flowering and fruit-bearing, the tree of life where God rests when he enters Paradise, and two rivers that divide into four, confirming that this is Eden (Gen 2:10). That it is where God rests indicates that it is a sanctuary (2 Chron 6:41).¹⁹⁶

The angels explain to Enoch that Paradise had been prepared for the righteous, those who live ethically proper lives, as an “eternal inheritance” (9:1). Thus, protology and eschatology are combined, with Eden being the primordial sanctuary and also the place of eschatological rest for the righteous.¹⁹⁷ The passive “has been prepared” should be read as a divine passive, suggesting that Paradise is the eschatological temple built by the Lord. Enoch then takes a detour to the north and sees the place of torment “prepared for those who do not glorify God” (10:4).

In the fourth heaven, Enoch sees astronomical phenomena (11-16) and armed troops of angels worshipping the Lord. Moving to the fifth heaven, he encounters the mournful Grigori (watchers).¹⁹⁸ In 18:6-9 Enoch tells these watchers that he has prayed for those in the second heaven, but that they had been sentenced to remain there “until heaven and earth are ended forever.”¹⁹⁹ Noting the absence of any liturgy, he recommends that they start singing lest they anger God. They do so, although when their voices rise “in front of the face of the Lord” they are “piteous and touching.”²⁰⁰

The angelic liturgy is more prominent in the sixth heaven, where Enoch encounters seven groups of angels, “brilliant and very glorious,” with faces more radiant than the sun, “sweet choral singing, and every kind of glorious praise,” and archangels harmonising all

¹⁹⁶ On Paradise as part of the heavenly temple in *2 Enoch* see Lee 2001: 74-76 and for the heavenly location of Paradise see Andersen 1983: 114-16 (footnotes b, l). Echoes of the Eden story also appear in the description of the new heaven and earth in Rev 21-22 (Beale 2004b: 23-26).

¹⁹⁷ Puech 1993: 1: 179-80 refers to “un type d'eschatologie vertical,” suggesting that “le Grand Eon [65:8] ... préexiste au siècle de la création et il appartient à la sphère céleste et ... se révélera à la fin des temps.” See also Collins 1998: 245-46.

¹⁹⁸ Andersen 1983: 130 and VanderKam 1995a: 159 suggest that Grigori is a transliteration of γρηγορέω (“to watch”). A more likely derivation is the (plural) adjective ἐγρήγοροι (“watchful”). PGL 405 notes that it is a “subst., name for angels.” The story of the fallen watchers is rehearsed in *2 En.* 18, with explicit reference to their descent to Mt Hermon and their taking wives of the daughters of men who gave birth to giants, by whose deeds the earth was defiled. Given the positive references to the temple and to cultic activity later in the book, these events are probably to be taken at face value and not related to the defilement of the priesthood as in *1 Enoch*.

¹⁹⁹ That he prays for the angels marks a step in the transformation of Enoch. He refuses to pray for those in the second heaven, in the fifth he sees himself as able to do this, and ultimately he is transformed into an angel (19:17-19). See Reed 2005:103-104.

²⁰⁰ Himmelfarb 1993: 129-30 (footnote 44) suggests that these watchers are mourning their fallen colleagues in the second heaven (7:3-5) rather than their own sin. Collins 1995a: 72 refers to these as “the nonfallen Watchers.” See also VanderKam 1995a: 159. However, 18:3 seems to indicate that there are fallen angels in both the second and fifth heavens, and indeed their leader is Satanail, the name of the devil in 31:5. Carlsson 2004: 77 describes four classes of fallen angels in *2 Enoch*. For Enoch’s role as the “celestial choirmaster” foreshadowing what becomes more prominent in *3 Enoch*, see Orlov 2004a: 21-29.

existence. Here, too, are seven phoenixes,²⁰¹ seven cherubim and seven six-winged beings, all singing in unison, “and the Lord is delighted by his footstool.”²⁰²

The climax of the heavenly journey is the seventh heaven, where Enoch sees God on his “exceedingly high throne” (20:3). Other features of this highest heaven are an exceptionally great light, fiery armies of the great archangels, incorporeal forces, dominions, authorities, cherubim and seraphim and many eyed thrones, shining *otanim* stations.²⁰³ In the long recension God appears to be in the tenth heaven called Aravoth, at the top of ten steps,²⁰⁴ where the heavenly armies stand in their ranks, doing obeisance. The angels are also singing “with soft and gentle voices” (20:4), presenting the liturgy to God, and the cherubim and seraphim, “six-winged and many eyed,” are singing the trisagion in words corresponding to Isa 6:3.²⁰⁵

In *1 Enoch* there are two houses in heaven, one more fantastic than the other; here, the temple idea is reflected in the increasing levels of holiness of the successive heavens,²⁰⁶ but even this is unclear until the sixth and seventh heavens.²⁰⁷ More significant for this study is the description of Paradise, combining protology and eschatology with the echoes of Eden and the reference to the place of eschatological rest for the righteous, their eternal inheritance. Similar phenomena to this are evident in Heb 4, where the recipients are encouraged to strive to enter God’s rest in the heavenly temple.

²⁰¹ Phoenixes appear in 12:1 as flying spirits who accompany the sun and in 15:1 they burst into song. In 19:6 they appear as angels. Dean-Otting 1984: 257 (footnote 11), following Turdeanu 1968: 53-54, suggests that “phoenixes” could be a corruption of the Hebrew *Ophanim*.

²⁰² The reference to the footstool is obscure. See Ps 97:5; 110:1; Isa 66:1; Matt 5:13; Luke 20:43; Acts 2:35; 7:49; Heb 1:3; 10:13.

²⁰³ Andersen 1983: 135 refers to “[t]he difficulties experienced by Slav. scribes with these genuine Heb. words.” See also Dean-Otting 1984: 257 (footnote 12). *Otanim* seems to be a corruption of *Ophanim*, the wheels in Ezekiel’s vision (Ezek 1:15-21; 3:13; 10:6-10; 11:22, Heb אֹפָנִים), which in some texts become another class of angels. See *1 En.* 61:10; 4Q403 1 II 15; 4Q405 20 II-21-22 3, 9. It is spelled correctly in *2 En.* 29:3.

²⁰⁴ Andersen 1983: 135 (footnote d) notes variant readings here. While the eighth, ninth and tenth heavens do not fit the seven heaven schema, they do have Hebrew names (Muzaloth, Kukhavim and Aravoth), suggesting that they are not interpolations by the Slavic scribes. See Dean-Otting 1984: 234-35; Nickelsburg 2005a: 222 (footnote 150); and Macaskill 2007: 299, who proposes that these references are expansions by Jewish mystics. For Aravoth as the name of the seventh heaven see *b. Hag.* 12b. The name seems to be derived from the Hebrew word for clouds (עֲרֵבָה), as in Ps 68:5.

²⁰⁵ Andersen’s English translation of the trisagion in 21:1 corresponds to both the MT and the LXX. Andersen 1983: 135 (footnote 2) suggests that words “many-eyed” and the trisagion are intrusions from Christian liturgy. The trisagion also appears in *1 En.* 39:12, but in slightly different words from Isa 6:3.

²⁰⁶ On the seven-heaven schema in *2 Enoch* see Mach 2000: 251, where he describes it as a late text from the diaspora.

²⁰⁷ Himmelfarb 1993: 38.

2.6.3 Enoch's Ethical Instructions

Some aspects of these instructions refer back to the heavenly journey and give extra information, and several texts indicate a positive attitude to the temple and its cultus. I am concerned with this rather than with the instructions *per se*.

In 2 *En* 42:3-5 Enoch recalls his time in Paradise in the third heaven, although additional detail is added about angelic guards at the gates who sing victory songs and rejoice at the arrival of the righteous. When the last righteous person has arrived "he" will bring out Adam and the ancestors and there will be a great celebration and "joy and happiness in eternal light and life." This theme is picked up again in 2 *En* 65, where the eschaton is anticipated. The whole of creation will come to an end and the judgement day will come. Those who escape the judgement "will be collected together into the great age," which will be eternal and in paradise, where there will be no more weariness, sickness, affliction, worry, want, debilitation, night or darkness. The righteous will enter the eternal residences.²⁰⁸ Protology is combined with eschatology in this text as also in Rev 21-22. In 2 *En* 55 Enoch anticipates his return to "the highest heaven ... the highest Jerusalem" and his eternal inheritance.²⁰⁹

2.6.4 Conclusion

A variety of material in 2 *Enoch* is relevant for this study. The first part of the book describes the heavens in detail. Enoch's view of Paradise, prepared by God for the righteous and where God rests, reflects ideas also present in Heb 3-4. The presence of liturgy in some heavens indicates that in this text, which is roughly contemporary with Hebrews, heaven is viewed as a temple where God is enthroned in the highest heaven, although the heavenly temple cannot in any way be said to resemble the Jerusalem temple. Later, a positive attitude to Jerusalem and the earthly temple is portrayed, as people are encouraged to visit it and offer sacrifices. It has cosmic features, as the intersection between earth and heaven.

2.7 Conclusion

All five texts: Sirach, Wisdom, *Sibylline Oracles* Book 3, 2 *Enoch* and parts of the Philonic corpus examined in this chapter reflect a positive attitude to the temple. Language of imitation appears in two places. In Wis 9:8 Solomon's temple is a copy of the holy tent God had prepared from the beginning, an allusion to Exod 15:17, which in several other texts refers to the eschatological dwelling place of God with his people. Solomon's temple imitates the eschatological temple and thus anticipates it. Philo also uses the language of copy. But the tabernacle is not a copy of the heavenly temple; rather, Moses saw with his mind's eye the immaterial ideas and constructed an archetype, which Bezalel copied in

²⁰⁸ Cf. John 14:1-3.

²⁰⁹ The reference to Jerusalem only appears in MS P. See Andersen 1983: 182 (footnote b).

building the tabernacle. In these texts the divine design of both temple and tabernacle invests them with great dignity. In neither text is the earthly sanctuary disparaged as an inferior copy of the heavenly.

The temple has cosmic features in Sirach, Philo and in *2 Enoch*. Allusions to the creation narrative appear Sir 24 and 50, clarifying that it is to be understood as a microcosm of the universe, a link between heaven and earth. Different parts of the tabernacle reflect cosmic symbolism in Philo, and in *2 Enoch*, Enoch's heavenly journey begins in Jerusalem.

On his heavenly journey, Enoch passes through seven (or perhaps ten) levels of heaven until he appears in the presence of God in the highest heaven. These levels indicate increasing levels of holiness, and the presence of angelic priests and liturgical activity indicate that heaven is a temple; however, there is no suggestion that the heavenly temple resembles the earthly, with an outer court and a holy of holies.

While an eschatological temple is implied in Wisdom, in *2 Enoch* the eschatological dwelling place of the righteous is Paradise, which Enoch sees on his heavenly journey. Here, eschatology reflects protology and the righteous rest in Paradise with God. Elsewhere in these texts there is no eschatological temple. This is particularly stark in *Sibylline Oracles* Book 3 where the second temple will replace Solomon's temple which had been destroyed, and everything will be as it was before, including the properly functioning cultic ritual.

Interestingly, all the texts discussed in this chapter have some connection with Egypt. This observation may or may not be significant, but could indicate that Jews in Egypt viewed the temple as an ideal, being too far removed from the reality to be aware of the difficulties recognised by Palestinian Jews.²¹⁰

²¹⁰ For the significance of Jerusalem and temple for Diaspora Jews see Gruen 2010: 91-94.

3 Temple Rejected: Temple Symbolism in the Dead Sea Scrolls

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter I examine temple symbolism in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The community known from these documents¹ was a community without a temple.² It had apparently rejected the Jerusalem temple, considering the worship carried on there to be corrupt and “an affront to the religion of Israel.”³ The people responded to this in a variety of ways. In some places there is the expectation of an eschatological temple to be built by God in the last days. Sometimes this was juxtaposed with the notion that the community itself was a temple,⁴ although interim, while they awaited the eschatological temple, with their cultic activity a substitute for temple worship in Jerusalem. Allied with this was the belief that their worship was somehow connected with the worship of angels, either in the heavenly temple or in their own liturgical practices, where angels were considered to be present with them in the Judean desert.⁵ Other texts refer to exalted individuals, considered to be already

¹ On the nature of this community see Collins 2007c: 31-52. Notwithstanding the caveats of Collins, I refer to the community reflected in the scrolls as the (Qumran) community. Collins appeals for a stop to this practice “despite the lure of convenience” (2009: 369, see his full discussion on pp. 351-69 and 2007d: 283-99). I use the term to refer to the people reflected in the scrolls who probably hid the scrolls in the caves around Qumran. I recognise that this community was probably part of “a religious association spread widely throughout the land” (Collins 2009: 369) and also recognising that different theologies are reflected the various documents. I also use the term “Qumran” for convenience, noting that the “community” may have come from elsewhere, and also that some scrolls were discovered elsewhere around the Dead Sea (see Tigchelaar 2010b: 163). The history of the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the theories that led to their identification as the library of a separatist Essene community living in the nearby Qumran settlement have been told many times. For a semi-popular, yet scholarly survey, together with discussions of the contents of the different caves and the major documents see Davies, Brooke and Callaway 2002. For a critique of some of the methods used by the scholars who have studied the scrolls and the way their conclusions were reached see Ullman-Margalit 2006.

² This claim does need to be nuanced. While the community had withdrawn from the Jerusalem temple, temple symbolism remained important. Brooke 2007: 417-34 identifies no less than ten temples at Qumran, all of which have some bearing on this study. Brooke refers to the primordial temple (i.e. the Garden of Eden), the wilderness tabernacle, Solomon’s temple, the second temple, the temple plan in the *Temple Scroll*, the community as a temple, Herod’s temple, the heavenly temple, the Qumran site itself as a temple and the eschatological temple. Most of these are symbolic “temples,” with temple symbolism applied in different ways and to different aspects of the life of the community.

³ Schiffman 1999: 267. On pp. 269-80 Schiffman documents the history of the community’s reaction to what they perceived to be the corruption of the Jerusalem temple and its worship. For similar analyses see Gärtner 1965: 16-17 and Ringgren 1995: 214-16, and for slightly more nuanced views see Nolland 1978: 55-62; Kampen 1999: 185-97; Fuglseth 2005: 219-40. The primary sources for this claim include e.g. CD IV 15-18; V 6-7; XII 1-2.

⁴ Stegemann 1992: 158.

⁵ Frennesson 1999: 26-41; Wassen 2007: 515-19. Mach 1992: 215-16 surmises that while these phenomena may have originally been connected with the loss of the Jerusalem cult on the part of the Qumran community, this is only a partial answer. These people saw themselves over against the rest of Israel as the ones who were closest to God. Their ideas of communion grew out of this. Compare Hannah 1999: 59, “the sectarians viewed this companionship with the angels as one of the outstanding characteristics which differentiated them from those outside the sect.”

present in the heavenly temple, sometimes with a (high) priestly role and perhaps an angelomorphic identity.⁶

These phenomena raise questions as to the community's understanding of the heavenly temple. Did it envisage it as a structure existing in heaven, spatially separate from the earth, where angelic worship took place in God's presence, somehow corresponding to the worship that took place on earth, in this case, in their own community?⁷ Or did they understand the temple as a microcosm of the universe, heaven on earth, "in its totality,"⁸ so that worship within the community was also understood as worship in heaven?⁹ Did this understanding carry with it the implication that the community members, or a central core of them, "functioned analogically to a community of priestly angels, officiating in the innermost sanctuary of the heavenly temple," as some have maintained?¹⁰ If so, since angels are considered to inhabit the heavenly temple, so too the members of the community, even though living in the Judean desert.¹¹ In this case, though there is some sort of elevation to heaven, no texts envisage a heavenly journey. I approach the scrolls with these questions in mind.¹²

⁶ Bauckham 2003: 79-81.

⁷ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 255 describes this understanding of the heavenly cult and heavenly beings as "qualitatively and spatially above (in a quasi-platonic sense) the real world of the Qumran community and its worshippers." He sees this understanding as mistaken.

⁸ Ibid.: 62-68.

⁹ Fletcher-Louis suggests that in temple worship "*ordinary space and time ... are transcended because the true temple is a model of the universe which offers its entrants a transfer from earth to heaven ...*" (ibid.: xii, italics original, see also pp. 61-68). For similar views see Patai 1967: 105-38; Blenkinsopp 1976: 76-83; Lundquist 1983: 207-208; Levenson 1984: 283-98; 1985: 137-42; Barker 1991: 57-70; 1995: 8-12; Walton 2006: 113-14, 123-29.

¹⁰ Dimant 1996: 98. See also Davidson 1992: 168-70; Barker 2003: 102-45. Fletcher-Louis has argued this at length. See Fletcher-Louis 1997b: 165-69; 1998: 369-72; 2002, *passim*. Charlesworth 1980: 136 suggests that "the Scrolls contain the idea that a fully initiated Essene has transcended the human level and has started to become an angel," and suggests that this is "an elevation to angelic status and not transfiguration to an angel." Fletcher-Louis 1997c: 109-215 gives a comprehensive assemblage of the wide spread of evidence for angelomorphism in the Hebrew Bible and in other literature from middle Judaism. Gieschen 1998: 169-75 discusses angelomorphic priestly figures, including Levi, Melchizedek and the priests of the Qumran literature. See especially pp. 173-75, where he discusses the Qumran literature, referring to "a functional identity between these human priests and their heavenly counterparts" (p. 174). Hannah 1999: 59-61, while noting the phenomenon of communion with angels and the angelic priesthood, comes short of explicitly claiming any identity of function between the community members and the angels.

¹¹ Alexander 2006: 102-104. Alexander draws on the work of Nitzan 1994b: 163-83 and Chazon 2003. For an early statement of the view that the community members inhabit heaven with the angels see Yadin 1962: 240-42.

¹² The study is necessarily selective. I omit from consideration texts where worship with angels is envisaged without explicit temple symbolism. While the question of exalted humans alongside God is important background to the exaltation of Christ in Hebrews, it is the subject for another study, although from time to time it impinges on the texts that I consider in this chapter. Moreover, while Melchizedek is important in Hebrews, a study of the place of Melchizedek at Qumran and in Hebrews is peripheral to this study and I exclude it from consideration. For these reasons, I have not included 4QSefer ha-Milhamah (4Q285, 11Q14), the *Self-Glorification Hymn* (4Q491^c); 4QMysteries^c (4Q301) the *Visions of Amram* (4Q543-

3.2 4Q Eschatological Midrash^a (4QFlorilegium)

Allegro assigned the *siglum* 4QFlorilegium to this scroll in 1956 when he published lines 10-13 of what is now known as Column III,¹³ and subsequently the complete column plus a few lines from the following column.¹⁴ Despite several alternative suggestions,¹⁵ the title *Florilegium* endured until 1994, when Steudel argued that 4Q174 should be combined with 4QCatena^a (4Q177), and that these two scrolls were the remains of two copies of a longer document, which she designated 4Q Eschatological Midrash^{a,b}.¹⁶ While few scholars have adopted Steudel's theory, the importance of her work is generally accepted.¹⁷

References to the “Interpreter of the Law” (דורש התורה, III 11), to the “sons of light” (בני אור, III 8-9), to the “community” (היחד, III 17), and to the “last days” (אחרית הימים) indicate that it is most likely a community composition.¹⁸ The Herodian script indicates a date sometime in the second half of the first century B.C.E., although it may have been composed earlier.¹⁹

Column II 18 to column III 13 cite and interpret 2 Sam 7:10-13. In II 18-19 the text, as reconstructed by Puech, claims that the God of Israel will be “with him” (עמו), some

4Q548), 4QDiscourse on the Exodus/Conquest Tradition (4Q374), 4QapocrPentB (4Q377); 11QMelchizedek.

¹³ Allegro 1956: 177-78. Allegro's DJD edition of 4Q174 (Allegro 1968: 53-57) has been severely criticised by Strugnell 1969-71: 220-25 and should not be used in isolation from Strugnell's comments. Other significant studies include Allegro 1958; Lane 1959; Yadin 1959; Flusser 1959; Baumgarten 1977; Brooke 1985; Dimant 1986; Wise 1991; 1994; Steudel 1994b; Brooke 1999. In what follows I use the column and line numbers assigned by Steudel (Steudel 1994b: 23-29). Steudel's column III was formerly classified as Column I (DJD V: 53), with the same line numbers.

¹⁴ Allegro 1958: 350-54. In 1956 Allegro argued that the text was concerned with “the re-establishment of the house of David in the last days,” but he only published those lines that interpret Nathan's oracle with reference to Amos 9:11. He also notes reference to two messiahs in line 11, and the identification of one of these messianic figures (“the Shoot of David”) with the son of God in 2 Sam 7:14.

¹⁵ Ibid.: 350 describes the scroll as “a collection of *midrašim* ... compiled perhaps for their common eschatological interests.” Lane 1959: 346 proposes that III 1-13 be designated a *midraš*, “understood in the Qumran rather than the rabbinic sense of the term, i.e. with the same messianic, eschatological orientation as much of the rest of their literature.” Brooke 1985: 81-83 discusses other suggested titles, and on p. 167 designates the scroll a “*Qumran Midraš*.” Campbell 2004: 37 calls it a “[t]hematic pesher.” Fitzmyer 1997: 82 considers the original title to have been “ineptly chosen.”

¹⁶ Steudel 1994b: 1-2. If Steudel is correct, 4Q174 and 4Q177 are different copies of an earlier document, since they are not from the same scroll and there is no overlap between them. Strugnell 1969-71: 236-37 first proposed that they may have been copies of a single document.

¹⁷ See Puech 1993: 573-91; Bockmuehl 1995: 429-30; Brooke 1995: 381-83; Collins 1995b: 315; Davies 1995: 238; VanderKam 1995b: 576-77; Lim 1998: 71-72; Campbell 2004: 53-54.

¹⁸ See III 2, 12, 15, 19; V 3. For the use of אחרית הימים at Qumran see Steudel 1994b: 161-63. Steudel gives other evidence for composition at Qumran on pp. 164-65.

¹⁹ Campbell 2004: 35. Brooke 2007: 426 traces the development of community's self-understanding vis-à-vis the temple. He considers that the notion of the community as a temple was the last of three stages, also arguing from this that 4Q174 was probably composed late in the first century B.C.E.

unknown person. This claim is supported in II 19 from 2 Sam 7:10.²⁰ The section ends with a *vacat* in III 13, signalling the start of a new section dealing with Ps 1:1.²¹

The scroll quotes 2 Sam 7:10-11a in II 19–III 1-2 and interprets it with reference to Exod 15:17-18 (III 3) and Deut 23:3 (III 4). Lines 7-9 read 2 Sam 7:11b to refer to the enemies of the community in the manner of a *pesher*, although without using the word פֶּשֶׁר. Lines 10-11 quote parts of 2 Sam 7:11c, 12b, 13b, 14a, and explain this text with reference to Amos 9:11, interpreted in turn with an allusion to the “sprout” of David.²²

The opening words of 2 Sam 7:10 refer to the “place” (מָקוֹם) that Yahweh will establish for his people Israel, and III 1-13 are almost solely concerned with this place. It is the eschatological dwelling place of God to be established in the last days, “the sanctuary of Yahweh which his hands will establish” (מִקְדָּשׁ יְהוָה כּוֹנֵנּוּ יְדִיכָה, III 3).²³ The “place” is also either or both of Israel’s historical temples (מִקְדָּשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל, III 6), now desolate,²⁴ which will be replaced by the sanctuary of Yahweh. Finally, the “place” is an interim “sanctuary made up of people” (מִקְדָּשׁ אָדָם, III 6), existing between the time of the desolation of the sanctuary of Israel and the inauguration of the eschatological sanctuary. The text exploits the pun on the word בֵּית (house) in Nathan’s oracle, referring first to the

²⁰ Puech 1993: 574, 76. Line 18 is badly fragmented, and nothing remains of line 19. Steudel 1994b: 29-30 adopts Puech’s reconstruction, noting (p. 41) that “Z. 19 beinhaltet sicher den Beginn von 2Sam 7,10; der von E. Puech ... ergänzte Zeilenanfang ist zwar hypothetisch, doch entspricht er formal dem zu Erwartenden und füllt gut den zur Verfügung stehenden Platz.”

²¹ While the scroll is a single document, I treat II 18–III 13 in isolation since what follows starts a new topic. II 18–III 13 deal with the “house” of Nathan’s oracle, while the following lines apply Ps 1:1 and 2:1 to the members of the community and their enemies respectively. Psalm 1:1 is introduced with the word מִדְּרָשׁ (*midrash*) in III 14, and interpreted along with Ps 2:1 using the word פֶּשֶׁר (*pesher*, III 14, 19). The words פֶּשֶׁר and מִדְּרָשׁ do not appear in II 18–III 13 (although perhaps lost in a lacuna). The material in III 1-13 differs from other *pesherim* since the comments are longer and more involved than usual, including the quotation of and allusions to other texts. For a discussion of these issues see Lane 1959: 344-46; Brooke 1985: 161-64; 1999: 286-87. Skehan 1963: 121 suggests that the “principle of unity” tying the two parts of the scroll together is that since the discussion of 2 Sam 7 “consists of promises to David, thought of as the composer of the Psalter ... [and] the material from 2 Sam is intended to introduce the running commentary on the Psalms.”

²² The “sprout” of David could be an allusion to Jer 23:5; 33:15; Zech 3:8; 6:12. Isa 4:4 refers to the “sprout of Yahweh.” For the translation “sprout” see *HALOT* 1033-34. As Brooke 1999: 286-87 points out, in this text the sprout of David does not build the temple as in Zech 6:12; rather, Yahweh builds it in the last days. Wright 1996: 483-84 argues that in this text the Davidic Messiah builds the temple, suggesting that there is no contradiction between Yahweh building the temple and the Messiah, Yahweh’s agent building the temple.

²³ The allusion is to Exod 15:17. The DJD edition (DJD V, p. 53) reads ... מִקְדָּשׁ אֲדָנִי at the start of this line, following the MT of Exod 15:17, although BHS notes MS evidence for the reading מִקְדָּשׁ יְהוָה (I discuss this evidence in 1.3, above). Steudel 1994b: 42 inserts fragment 21 (containing the single word יְהוָה) into the lacuna at the start of the line (see the photograph filed inside the back cover of Steudel’s work). This reading was suspected by Strugnell 1969-71: 225 and is adopted by Puech 1993: 573-74, 77.

²⁴ Dimant 1986: 174-75. Earlier Dimant propose that it was likely to be Solomon’s temple, “the only one desolated by foreigners at the author’s time” (1984: 519). However, given the attitude to the second temple at Qumran it could refer to either or both of these temples.

temple that David was forbidden to build (2 Sam 7:5) and then to the dynasty that Yahweh would “build” for David (2 Sam 7:11-14). Thus, the text claims that this מקום can be the “physical sanctuary” (מקדש ישראל), the “eschatological sanctuary” (מקדש יהודה) and “a sanctuary of people” (מקדש אדם).²⁵

That the מקדש ישראל refers to one of Israel’s temples is clear from its description as having been defiled by aliens and desolate (III 5-6). It is also clear that the מקדש יהודה is the sanctuary to be established by Yahweh “at the end of days” (באחרית הימים),²⁶ in which he will reign forever and ever, as Exod 15:17-18 claims. Whether it is envisaged as heavenly or earthly is unclear, as neither Exod 15:17 nor the scroll refers either to heaven or to an earthly structure.²⁷ All that is said is that certain classes of people including, but not limited to, those described in Deut 23:3 will be excluded since “God’s holy ones are there” (כיא קדושו שם).²⁸

The identification of the third sanctuary, the מקדש אדם, is debated. Since this is a construct chain, any reading such as “a sanctuary amongst men” is excluded.²⁹ However, the species of genitive is difficult to determine. Of the other two occurrences of מקדש, the first (מקדש ישראל) is a possessive genitive referring to the national shrine of Israel. The

²⁵ The word מקדש (“sanctuary”) in Ps 96:6 appears as מקום (“place”) in 1 Chron 16:17. In Jer 7:12-14 מקום refers to the sanctuary at Shiloh. See Gelston 1972: 93-94.

²⁶ In the *editio princeps* Allegro makes no attempt to fill a lacuna in line 3 where the construction of the מקדש יהודה (DJD V: 53) is described. Brooke 1985: 99 restores [וא] [יבנה] (“he will build for himself”). Dimant 1986: 166, 168, followed by Steudel 1994b: 25, 42 restores [וא] [יבין] (“he will establish for himself”). Wise 1994: 154 restores [וא] [יכוננו] (“they will establish for him”), which Steudel 1994b: 42 considers to be too long for the lacuna. Examination of the image in Reynolds et al., 1998 confirms that Steudel is probably correct. See also Tov and Pfann 1993, fiche 74.

²⁷ Flusser 1959: 99-104; Dimant 1986: 185-86; García Martínez 1992: 207-8; Wise 1994: 166; Schiffman 1999: 280 envisage an earthly sanctuary. Gärtner 1965: 30-35 seems to envisage the eschatological sanctuary as the community itself, as does Gäbel 2006: 59. Brooke 1985: 185 suggests that it is “heaven on earth.” Puech 1993: 574-90 is unsure whether the future temple to be built by God is “celestial, analogical or concrete and material” (p. 574).

²⁸ For this reading see Allegro 1968: 54; Baumgarten 1977: 66; Brooke 1985: 92, 100-107; Kuhn 1994: 203. It involves reading קדושו as a plural noun with a singular suffix, written defectively. Both Allegro (DJD V: 53) and Steudel 1994b: 25 restore קדושי (a construct plural or a first person singular pronominal suffix) rather than קדושו. Since these words do not appear to be a quotation (with God as the speaker) it is difficult to understand how a first person suffix can be construed in a context where God is consistently referred to in the third person (Brooke 1985: 105). Steudel 1994b: 31 reads a plural construct and renders the words “sondern die Heiligen des Namens (?)” (reading שם as “name” rather than “there,” although as the question mark indicates she is unsure). Puech 1993: 577 similarly reads “les saints de nom.” Wise 1994: 155 reads קדושו as a singular noun with a third person singular suffix, which he translates as “his holiness” and construes the expression as part of a new sentence. God’s holy ones could be the sanctified members of the community, angels or both. Allegro 1958: 351; Yadin 1959: 96; Brooke 1985: 181-83; Baumgarten 1988: 213 suggest that they are angels, referring to Deut 33:3. Davidson 1992: 281-82 argues that they are members of the Qumran community, while Puech 1993: 583-84 argues from his understanding of 4Q511 XXXV 1-8 that they are both angels and members of the community: “[l]es élus, des purifiés et des saints, seront associés aux anges dans le culte du temple eschatologique que la communauté préfigure et prépare dès maintenant.”

²⁹ Yadin 1959: 96; Flusser 1959: 102; Gärtner 1965: 34-35. This reading would require an expression such as מקדש באנשים.

second (מקדש יהודה) is probably a subjective genitive, the sanctuary to be established by Yahweh. For מקדש אדם the first option (“a sanctuary for humanity”) is possible, while the second (“a sanctuary built by a man/Adam”) is unlikely since line 6 implies that Yahweh will build it for himself (לבנות לוֹא).³⁰ It is probably best to read מקדש אדם, along with several scholars, as a sanctuary consisting of people.³¹

The imperfect tenses of all the verbs relating to the מקדש יהודה indicate that it is still future,³² while infinitives and a participle describe the מקדש אדם, indicating that this sanctuary, over against that of Israel in the past and the eschatological sanctuary of the future, exists in the present and is the community itself,³³ an “interim, temporary sanctuary which will stand until the Lord constructs the eschatological sanctuary for himself.”³⁴

Significantly, the expression is מקדש אדם rather than מקדש איש, a phenomenon Brooke connects with the idea of Eden as an archetypal sanctuary,³⁵ something particularly clear in *Jubilees*,³⁶ a text known to the Qumran community and authoritative there,³⁷ and also reflected in 4Q265 7 II 14. Brooke argues that this is not just a “human temple,” but “a community summoned to live out Adam’s cultic calling in the last days.”³⁸ Brooke

³⁰ Yadin 1977-1983: 1: 185; Brooke 1985: 92; 1999: 287. Steudel 1994b: 31 translates, “[u]nd er sagte, daß man ihm ein Heiligtum von Menschen bauen solle,” and Wise 1994: 155, “and he ordered that they build him a Temple of Adam.” This is possible, given that the infinitive בנות does not inflect for person, gender or number; however, as Brooke 1996: 130-31 rightly points out this sanctuary is subsumed under the citation of Exod 15:17. An ideal sanctuary replacing the defiled מקדש ישראל is unlikely to be built by human hands. See 1 En 90:28-29; *Jub.* 1:28 for ideas relating to the construction of the ideal (eschatological sanctuary). For the repudiation of temples “made with hands” in Hellenistic thought see Sowers 1965: 55-58. Allegro 1958: 352; Lane 1959: 343 translates “man-made sanctuary.”

³¹ Brooke 1985: 185; 1996: 130-33; 1999: 285-301; 2007: 427; Dimant 1986: 174-89; Schiffman 1999: 279-80; Campbell 2004: 37-38; Alexander 2006: 32, 131. Fitzmyer 1961: 314 was the first to hint that this text may envisage the notion that the sanctuary consisted of the community, although he does not develop the suggestion. He comments that that the scroll applies the sanctuary of the Lord referred to in Exod 15:17 “to the Qumran community, which is the new Israel, the new ‘house’ [of 2 Sam 7:13].” Gärtner 1965: 34-35 was the first to argue for this reading. Betz 1967: 101 identifies this temple as “the living temple of the eschatological community.” Against this, see Allegro 1958: 352; Yadin 1959: 96 (footnote 13); Flusser 1959: 100, 102; McKelvey 1969: 50-51; Schwartz 1979: 83-91; Wise 1994: 166 who imply that both the מקדש יהודה and the מקדש אדם are physical structures. Baumgarten 1977: 83 refers to a “human temple,” but later (1982: 217) changes his mind, although it is unclear just what he changes it to.

³² Dimant 1986: 177-78. Horgan 1979: 248 claims that “passages that refer to the events of the last days generally use the imperfect tense.”

³³ Dimant 1986: 177-80, 188-89.

³⁴ Brooke 1999: 287; Puech 1993: 586-87; Schmidt 2001: 141, 163-65.

³⁵ Brooke 2007: 427 argues that the text recalls “the Edenic sanctuary where Adam worshipped.” For Eden as an archetypal sanctuary see Blenkinsopp 1976: 280-83; Kearney 1977: 375-78; Wenham 1986: 19-25; Levenson 1985, 138-31; 142-45; Barker 1991: 68-103; Hayward 1992a: 6-8, 11-14; Savran 1994: 42-3; Parry 1994: 126-51; Mathews 1996: 52-3; van Ruiten 1999a: 75-9; García Martínez 1999a: 109-14; Stordalen 2000: 457-59; Beale 2004b: 66-80; 2005b: 7-10; Schüle 2005: 6.

³⁶ I discuss Eden as a sanctuary in *Jubilees* in 4.3.2 (below).

³⁷ For the influence of *Jubilees* at Qumran see Hempel 2000: 187-88, 196; Shemesh 2009: 259-60.

³⁸ Brooke 2007: 427.

develops this idea in two separate essays,³⁹ suggesting that the expression is polyvalent, referring to a preliminary eschatological sanctuary in which “[a]s with Adam in Eden ... the priesthood ... is that of humankind itself.”⁴⁰

In this sanctuary “incense sacrifices” (מקטירים) will be offered before God, that is תודה מעשי (“deeds of thanksgiving,” III 7).⁴¹ The language of sacrifice is metaphorical; the sacrifices consist of thanksgiving.⁴² Thus the community envisaged itself as a “holy house,” perhaps the priestly kingdom and holy nation of Exod 19:6, and their worship as sacral worship.

Lines 7-9 interpret the words of 2 Sam 7:11ab concerning rest from enemies as the end of Belial and his plans. Then after a *vacat* at the end of line 10, a new paragraph starts with the quotation of 2 Sam 7:11b-14 where Yahweh promises to build a house for David, that is, the Davidic dynasty. Any indication that David’s descendant (זרע, line 10) is Solomon is avoided, and the text is applied to the “last days” (אחרית הימים, line 12). It refers to the “sprout of David” (צמח דוד, line 11), a messianic figure who would stand with the

³⁹ Brooke 1996; 1999: 285-301. It was earlier suggested by both Wise and Baumgarten, apparently independently. Baumgarten 1988: 212-13 suggested that the expression מקדש אדם may reflect the notion of Eden as a sanctuary, and that 4Q174 may envisage the ultimate restoration of humanity to “the state of Adam in Paradise.” Without reference to Baumgarten, Wise 1991: 131 made a similar suggestion, although he argued that the מקדש אדם and the מקדש יהוה of 4Q174 had the same referent, that is, “the temple which Israel is to build for the first stage of the eschaton, the End of Days.” When this happened “the land would regain its Edenic luxuriance, and they would offer to God, for the first time since the beginning, a proper worship” (p. 132). This essay was reproduced in substantially the same form in 1994, the year in which Baumgarten published more detailed argumentation for his view (Baumgarten 1994: 8-10).

⁴⁰ Brooke 1996: 132. Brooke suggests that מקדש אדם conveys the double sense, both of the “sanctuary of man/men” and “sanctuary of Adam,” with the term expressing “how both the proleptic last days community-sanctuary and the divinely constructed eschatological sanctuary would be places where the intention of God in creating Eden would be restored” (1999: 288-89).

⁴¹ It is debated whether this line reads מעשי תודה (“deeds of thanksgiving”) or מעשי תורה (“deeds of Torah”). For the former reading see Strugnell 1969-71: 221; Brooke 1985: 92; Puech 1993: 578; Steudel 1994b: 31, 44; Kuhn 1994: 202-209; Nebe 1998: 583-88; Brooke 2007: 427. For the latter see Allegro 1958: 352; 1968: 53-54; Yadin 1959: 96; Lane 1959: 343; Dimant 1986: 169; Baumgarten 1994: 8-10. The reading מעשי תודה is a subtle play on the words מעשי תורה, in a similar vein to the expression מקדש אדם. Brooke 2007: 426-27 refers to the “range of wordplays” in 4Q174: “the ambiguity of the *miqdaš ’adam* is its reference both to the Edenic sanctuary of Adam and to the human sanctuary of the community, and the offering of deeds of thanksgiving allows for readers to see the requirement upon them of both right worship and right action (“deeds of the law”). Earlier (1999: 288) Brooke suggests that מעשי תודה refers in the first instance to deeds of thanksgiving, but that the audience would recognise a pun on the more common expression מעשי תורה and realise that the deeds of thanksgiving also encompassed deeds of Torah. Deeds of Torah appear in 4QMMT (4Q398 14-17 II 3; 4Q399 I 11, מעשי התורה), and 2 Bar 57:2 reads חבד מעשי כפי (מעשי בתורה). Cf. 1QS V 21; VI 18 (מעשי בתורה); CD XX 6 (מעשי כפי). 1QS IX 4 and 4QS^d VII 5-6 refer to words of praise and perfect behaviour being acceptable as a freewill offering. *Jub.* 2:22 expresses a similar notion (see Nebe 1998: 583-87).

⁴² Ps 100:4 uses similar language to refer to the people entering the temple gates and courts with thanksgiving and praise. See also Heb 13:15-16; 1QS VIII IX 4-5.

Interpreter of the Law. Then, with a further twist, this messianic figure is connected with the fallen “booth” (סוכה) of David, which according to Amos 9:11 would be rebuilt.⁴³

Numerous connections with Hebrews appear in this text. These include

1. The application of the text to the last days. Hebrews 1:2 sets the book in an eschatological context by noting that God’s definitive speech to humanity in the Son who sat down at the right hand of God has been uttered “in these last days” (ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων). This expression appears in Num 24:14 (LXX) translating the words באחרית הימים, an expression appearing in 4Q174 III 2, 12. Steudel maintains that this expression is “the theme of 4QmidrEschat^{a,b},”⁴⁴ and that it refers to the last period of history, immediately prior to the time of salvation, which has already begun.⁴⁵ The same could be said of Hebrews, written from the perspective of the exaltation of Christ “in these last days.”
2. The use of 2 Sam 7:14 (III 11) to refer to a messianic figure alongside Ps 2 (III 18-19). Hebrews cites 2 Sam 7:14 in Heb 1:5 with reference to the exalted Christ and Ps 2:7 in Heb 1:5; 5:5. As Brooke maintains, “both authors were acquainted with a tradition whereby 2 Samuel 7 and Psalm 2 belong together,”⁴⁶ although the authors do different things with these texts.
3. In Heb 13:15-16 the readers are encouraged to offer a sacrifice of praise (θυσίαν αἰνέσεως) to God, language that is similar to the “works of thanksgiving” of 4Q174. The use of the language of sacrifice involves the application of temple and cultic symbolism to the community addressed in Hebrews in a similar way that the “temple of Adam/humanity” is applied to the Qumran community in 4Q174. While explicit Edenic or Adamic symbolism does not appear in Hebrews, there are some echoes of Eden in the text.⁴⁷

⁴³ For similar ideas see CD VII 9-21, which cites a series of OT texts, including Amos 9:11 and Num 24:13, and reads the sceptre of Num 24:13 as the prince of the congregation and the sceptre as the interpreter of the law.

⁴⁴ Steudel 1994b: 161 (“das Thema von 4QmidrEschat^{a,b}”).

⁴⁵ Ibid.: 161-63. Collins 1995b: 315 disputes Steudel’s understanding of the “end of days” in 4Q174, noting that some distinctive features remain in the future. Roth 1960: 52 suggests that the “End of Days” was considered to be “a process which in the eyes of the Sect had already begun and was well advanced towards its culmination.”

⁴⁶ Brooke 2005a: 77. This connection was first noted by Bruce 1959: 80 (footnote 37) and has been mentioned by numerous scholars since then. See e.g. Attridge 1989: 53; Bruce 1990: 55; DeSilva 2000b: 96; Koester 2001: 192; Johnson 2006: 75; O’Brien 2010: 68. Allegro 1956: 177 refers to “obvious NT parallels,” but makes no reference to Hebrews.

⁴⁷ I discuss this in Church 2008: 145-57 in connection with “the true tent pitched by the Lord” in Heb 8:2. I supplement this discussion in 8.5 (below).

4. While the heavenly temple in Hebrews has normally been read as the archetypal temple, of which the wilderness tabernacle was a mere copy, I will argue below that it is the eschatological temple that Yahweh was expected to build in the last days, as anticipated in 4Q174.⁴⁸ There is, however, a significant difference. While the scroll envisages an interim “temple of men” until the arrival of the last days when God will build the eschatological temple, this notion seems to be absent from Hebrews.⁴⁹ As I note above, the eschatological temple of the last days in 4Q174 is described with verbs in the imperfect tense. In Heb 1:1-3 God has spoken (ἐλάλησεν, aorist) “in these last days” (ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων), with the implication that the last days have now arrived and the eschatological temple is now in place. It is the true tent, which the Lord and no human has “pitched” (ἔπηξεν, aorist, Heb 8:2).

3.3 The *Temple Scroll* (11QTemple^a)

Much of the *Temple Scroll* claims to be direct revelation from God concerning the design of an ideal sanctuary,⁵⁰ and the rituals to be carried out in that sanctuary, perhaps compensating for the lack of any detailed plan in the OT for Solomon’s Temple.⁵¹ The

⁴⁸ See 8.5 (below).

⁴⁹ Gärtner 1965: 88-99 detects the idea of the community as a temple in Heb 12:18-24. I will demonstrate below (7.6) that this is not quite correct. There, the community has proleptic access to the eschatological temple, but is not the temple itself. The idea may be lurking in the background of Heb 3:1-6, which I also discuss below (7.2).

⁵⁰ Zahn 2007: 435. Yadin 1967: 136 was first to suggest that was intended as direct revelation, and in 1977-1983: 1: 392 he uses the expression “a veritable Torah of the Lord.” García Martínez 1999b: 438-39 lists those scholars who see the Temple Scroll as divine revelation, although he himself nuances the view, suggesting that it represents itself as the only valid interpretation of the Mosaic Torah, as does Gäbel 2006: 54. Wise 1994: 162 favours the view that the author of the scroll believed himself to be the prophet like Moses. Swanson 1995: 6-7 suggests that the author viewed his work as “interpreting biblical traditions for a new era, with the expectation of its being accepted with the same authority as that which preceded it.” Wacholder 1983: xiii-xiv, 30-32 renames the work 11QTorah on the basis of CD V 1-5 and claims that it was intended as “a rival to the Five Books of the Torah which God had handed down to Moses.” Stegemann 1988: 236 proposes that it was intended as “a supplementary Torah to the Pentateuch and on the same level as the Mosaic Torah.” Nevertheless, on pp. 237-46 and in 1987: 28-35 Stegemann lists a number of arguments against 11QTemple being understood as “the specific law of the Qumran community.” He notes: (1) only two copies of the text were found, and these were in Cave 11 (1988: 237-38); (2) there are no quotations of the Temple Scroll in any other text identified as having been composed in the community (pp. 238-39); (3-4) there are differences in halakha and in terminology between the Temple Scroll and other community compositions (pp. 239-41); (5) there is no interest in other community compositions on the construction of the temple (pp. 241-42); (6) supposed allusions to the Temple Scroll in other community compositions can be explained in other ways (pp. 242-45). For a detailed analysis of the contents of Temple Scroll see Maier 1985: 8-19; Wise 1990a: 210-34.

⁵¹ Davies 1998: 4; Brooke 2007: 425. Zahn 2007: 435-58 argues that the Temple Scroll goes back to Sinai, and in effect usurps “the position of David’s *tabnit* [1 Chron 28:11-19] implying as a result that the First Temple was fundamentally flawed from the beginning, since it did not correspond with the divine intention” (p. 450). Yadin 1977-1983: 1: 177 and Swanson 1995: 225 relate it to the plan of the temple given by David to Solomon (1 Chron 28:11-19). Zahn’s reference to 1 Chron is noteworthy, since there is only a single fragment of Chronicles in the biblical scrolls from Qumran (4QChr, 2 Chron 28:27-29:3) and no citations from Chronicles elsewhere in the scrolls, with the implication that Chronicles was not significant at Qumran. On the other hand, Abegg, Flint and Ulrich 1999: 632 note that where 4QSam^a differs from the MT of Samuel it often agrees with Chronicles, the LXX and Josephus. This comment probably has more to say about the

instructions in 11QTemple seem to be based on the design of the wilderness tabernacle,⁵² a phenomenon Schiffman demonstrates with reference to the temple furnishings.⁵³ Thus, “the author indicated that the sanctuary was to be the legitimate *successor* of the Mosaic tabernacle.”⁵⁴ The author of Hebrews does something similar, referring to neither Solomon’s temple nor the second temple, rather drawing his descriptions of the Israelite sanctuary and cult from the Torah, and arguing that these anticipate the eschatological sanctuary.

The most complete copy (11Q19) is written in Herodian script and usually dated in the latter half of the first century B.C.E. However, since another fragmentary copy (4Q524) is written in Hasmonean script, the composition is likely to be considerably earlier, perhaps late in the second half of the second century B.C.E.⁵⁵

Significantly, the *Temple Scroll* uses the word **מקדש** (“sanctuary”) rather than some other word for temple.⁵⁶ This word appears only twice in Exodus. In Exod 15:17 it is the sanctuary that Yahweh himself will build, and in Exod 25:8 it is the sanctuary (tabernacle) Moses is to build so that Yahweh can dwell among them. The word is also frequent in

history of the text of Samuel rather than the attitude to Chronicles at Qumran, which seems to have been ambivalent at best.

⁵² Yadin 1977-1983: 1: 178. Stegemann 1992: 162 suggests that the author of the Temple Scroll had in mind “the actual temple in Jerusalem, not some utopian heavenly model of it.”

⁵³ Schiffman 1992: 621-34. Dimant 1984: 528 notes that the temple-city described in 11Q19 “is equivalent to the camp of Israel in the wilderness,” with the appropriate purity rules applied.

⁵⁴ Koester 1989: 26-33. Quotation from p. 33, italics original.

⁵⁵ Yadin 1977-1983: 1: 386-90. This date assigned by Yadin is generally accepted. García Martínez 1999b: 440-44 has a fuller discussion and assigns a date around the middle of the second century B.C.E., prior to the establishment of the Qumran community “in the priestly circles from which the community would later emerge” (p. 440). Wise 1990a: 189-94 reaches a similar conclusion. Aside from this, a wide variety of dates have been suggested, ranging from the fifth to the fourth century B.C.E. (Stegemann 1988: 246-56), right up to the “particular point when the idea was conceived of preparing a document setting out plans for a new temple” (Thiering 1989: 101), which Thiering dates in the first century C.E. (p. 115). Ideas normally associated with the Qumran community are mostly absent from the Temple Scroll, including the sons of light and darkness, angels and the two messiahs, suggesting that it was not a community composition, see VanderKam 1994: 135. Mendels 1998: 369-78 concludes after examining the section on kingship that the king referred to is Alexander Jannaeus and that this section was composed around the beginning of the first century B.C.E., allowing also that other parts of the scroll may be older, although he does not discuss this. Schmidt 2001: 178-79 reaches a similar conclusion, but also refers to “a long and complex literary history” (p. 178).

⁵⁶ **מקדש** (“sanctuary”) appears around forty times to refer to the ideal temple that the text describes throughout. It also refers to this temple with **בית** (“house”) in XXIX 3; XXX 4; LI 14, and with **קודש** (“sanctuary”) in XVII 9; XXXII 12. The word **היכל** (“temple”/“palace”) appears in XXX 5, 7, 8; XXXI 6, 7; XXXV 8, 10 referring to the inner part of the temple, perhaps the holy of holies (*DSSSE* translates “Sanctuary”). *DSSSE* reconstructs **ש[קודש] הקודש** (“holy of holies”) in XXXV 1 and translates as “Holy of Holies,” but this line is devoid of any context, and the sense could just as well be “most holy,” the sense it has in XXXV 9. In column XXIX, **בית** appears in line 3 to refer to the ideal (interim) temple and **מקדש** appears in lines 8-9 to refer to both this temple and the eschatological temple respectively.

Leviticus and Numbers describing the tabernacle,⁵⁷ but the greatest concentration is in Ezekiel, where it appears thirty-one times, describing both Solomon's temple⁵⁸ and Ezekiel's ideal temple.⁵⁹ The use of **מקדש** in 11QTemple indicates that these texts are in the frame, especially the two texts in Exodus and those in Ezek 37-48.⁶⁰ The *Temple Scroll* looks back to the promised eschatological sanctuary of Exod 15:17, the wilderness sanctuary of Exod 25:8, and anticipates the ideal, eschatological sanctuary in terms of Ezekiel's ideal temple.

The anticipation of this sanctuary is clear in XXIX 7-10.⁶¹ Several scholars have read this pericope as referring to the sanctuary described throughout 11QTemple, understanding that to be the eschatological sanctuary that Yahweh will establish for all time.⁶² Others see a different sanctuary in this pericope, noting similarities with *1 En* 90:28-29; *Jub.* 1:15-17; 26-29 and the **מקדש יהוה** of 4Q174.⁶³ On this understanding, the sanctuary described throughout 11QTemple is not the eschatological sanctuary; rather, it is an interim measure until Yahweh himself establishes the eschatological sanctuary referred to in this pericope.⁶⁴

The different readings depend upon whether the preposition **עד** in the expression **עד יום הבריה**⁶⁵ is read as “until” or “during” the day of creation.⁶⁶ Wacholder was the first

⁵⁷ Lev 12:4; 16:33; 19:30; 20:3; 21:12; 21:23; 26:2, 31; Num 3:38; 10:21; 18:1, 29; 19:20.

⁵⁸ Ezek 5:11; 7:24; 8:6; 9:6; 11:16; 21:7; 23:38, 39; 24:21; 25:3; 28:18.

⁵⁹ Ezek 37:26, 28; 43:21; 44, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 15; 16; 45:3, 4, 18; 47:12; 48:8, 10, 21.

⁶⁰ Wentling 1989: 67-69.

⁶¹ Many scholars refer to column XXIX as redactional or editorial. Davies 1998: 14 lists five “recurring redactional motifs” (God dwelling in the midst of Israel, God placing his name or glory on the city or sanctuary, God sanctifying his city or sanctuary, references to eternity and references to “this law”) that do not appear to have been in the author's original sources. All five motifs appear in column XXIX. Dupont-Sommer 1967: 618 suggested that the Temple Scroll may be made up of several sources, and Wilson and Wills analysed these, proposing that this pericope, which concludes the so-called festival calendar, “could be redactional” (Wilson and Wills 1982: 275). Their source-critical analysis has been generally accepted, although there has been some critique of their methodology (Wise 1990a: 21-23, Callaway 1989: 150-51). Those accepting their analysis include Callaway 1986-87: 215-22 (with some modification); Stegemann 1988: 247; Wise 1989: 49-50; 1990a: 21-23, 133, 157-61, 179-89; Kampen 1994: 88-89; Gäbel 2006: 55; Brooke 2007: 430. If this understanding of the composition of the *Temple Scroll* is correct, this pericope is significant for understanding the theological perspective of the author/redactor of the scroll and his own conception of the work (see Wise 1989: 49-50; Kampen 1994: 88-9).

⁶² Thiering 1981: 60; Wacholder 1983: 22; Callaway 1985: 95-99; Wentling 1989: 61-63, 71; Kampen 1994: 85-97; Davies 1998: 17-18. VanderKam 1994: 135 considers this view to be “implausible,” but offers no reason for this judgement.

⁶³ Yadin 1977-1983; García Martínez 1999b: 455; Brooke 1999: 287; 2007: 425, 30; Gäbel 2006: 55. Kampen 1994: 86-7 finds no reason to connect the sanctuary of 11QTemple XXIX 7-10 with the sanctuaries mentioned in these other texts.

⁶⁴ Milgrom 1978: 114; Maier 1985: 86; Schiffman 1992: 621; Stegemann 1992: 161-65; Wise 1994: 163; Brooke 2007: 430.

⁶⁵ Yadin 1977-1983: 129 and Maier 1985: 32 (cautiously, see p. 87) read **יום הברכה** (“day of blessing”), while Qimron 1996: 44 proposes **יום הבריה** (“day of creation”), a reading which Yadin includes in a

to propose that the preposition be read as “during” rather than “until,” since he considered that it would difficult for God to say in one line that he would dwell with his people “in a newly designed sanctuary” forever and then to “limit His dwelling with them merely ‘until’ (עד) the day of blessing.”⁶⁷ However, the text nowhere suggests that God will dwell forever with his people in the (physical) sanctuary described throughout 11QTemple. That sanctuary is more likely to be an interim sanctuary, before God comes to dwell with his people in the eschatological sanctuary he will establish for all time.⁶⁸

Along with the majority of scholars, I suggest that this pericope refers to two sanctuaries. The first is the one described throughout 11QTemple, which God will “consecrate with his glory” (ואקדשה [את מ]קדשי בכבודי, line 8), and upon which “God’s glory will dwell” (אשכין עליו את כבודי, line 8-9) “until the day of creation” (עד יום הבריה, line 9).⁶⁹ The other is the eschatological sanctuary where God “will dwell with his people forever and ever” (ושכנתי אתמה לעולם ועד, lines 7-8), “the sanctuary which he will create” (אברא אני את מקדשי אשר, line 9) on the day of creation and “establish for himself for all time” (להכוני לי כול הימים) “according to the covenant with Jacob at Bethel” (אשר כרתי עם יעקוב בבית אל כברית). It remains to consider the nature of this eschatological sanctuary, whether it is understood as a physical building, or whether it symbolises the dwelling of God with his people.

Brooke suggests that it is “heaven on earth,” a sanctuary established by God himself as the “ultimate remedy for all of Israel’s failed attempts at providing a place for the whole of

footnote (Yadin 1977-1983: 354-55). Yadin’s Plates 44 (vol. 3) and 14* (vol 3a) are inconclusive. Fletcher-Louis 2002: 65 notes that the reading **יום הבריה** is now “universally accepted.” See García Martínez 1992: 205; Wise 1994: 163-66; Spatafora 1997: 70; Davies 1998: 16; Brooke 1999: 287; 2007: 430; *DSSSE* 1250-51. García Martínez 1999b: 455 expresses no preference for either reading. For “day of creation” see *Jub.* 4:26. See also Isa 66:18-24. 4QpsJb^a 1 7 includes the same expression, although with *plene* spelling (עד יום [החדשה] הבריאה), cf. *Jub.* 1:29.

⁶⁶ For the former see Wacholder 1983: 21-32; Kampen 1994: 89-97, and for the latter see Yadin 1977-1983: 2: 129; Maier 1985: 99. *HALOT* 786, s.v. עד, III 2 a, c. clarifies that this preposition can have both of these senses, although the editors note that the sense of “during” is rare. Puech 1993: 591 notes that rendering עד with during “does not explain the idle repetition of *mqdšy* after ‘br’, and 1. 9 becomes superfluous.”

⁶⁷ Wacholder 1983: 23-34.

⁶⁸ The syntax is particularly difficult. See the succession of question marks in Maier 1985: 29.

⁶⁹ Spatafora 1997: 69-70 has the odd suggestion that this sanctuary is the Qumran community itself (the **מקדש אדם** of 4QmidrEschat^a), to be followed by the eschatological temple to be built by God himself (Col. XXIX). He cites Bissoli 1994: 43 who, he says, attributes it to Wise 1989: 49-60. I cannot find this suggestion in either work.

creation in microcosm to celebrate the sovereignty of God.”⁷⁰ Stegemann considers it to be a “real temple building, perhaps like that envisaged in *ShirShabb*, but on earth.”⁷¹

Five factors support the notion that this eschatological temple is not conceived as a physical structure on earth. These are (1) the modified covenant formula with which the pericope begins, (2) the echoes of Exod 15:17-18,⁷² (3) the allusion to the covenant made with Jacob at Bethel, (4) the accumulation of words expressing a long duration of time indicating that this sanctuary is designed to be God’s ultimate dwelling place with his people,⁷³ and (5) the establishment of the sanctuary on the day of creation. I deal with these in turn.

The addition of the word **לעולם** in the covenant formula in line 7 with which the pericope begins, “and they will be my people and I will be theirs forever” (**והיו לי לעם**), suggests that the establishment of this sanctuary is the ultimate fulfilment of the covenant ideal.⁷⁴ The covenant formula in one form or another appears numerous times in the OT,⁷⁵ but in only two of these do the words **עד עולם** (“forever”) appear, that is, 2 Sam 7:24 and 1 Chron 17:22, both of which are in David’s prayer as he responds to the oracle of Nathan concerning the building of the temple. I have already noted the wordplay on **בית** (“house”) in Nathan’s oracle and the exploitation of that in 4QmidrEschat^a, where the “house” is the eschatological **מקדש יהוה** (“sanctuary of Yahweh”). **לעולם** in this text recalls 2 Sam 7, indicating similar ideas at work here.

The appeal to Exod 15:17 shows that the editor of 11QTemple read that text as referring to an eschatological sanctuary where God would ultimately dwell with his people. This is the sanctuary God will establish on the day of creation, that is, the creation of the new heaven and earth.⁷⁶ The reference to creation is an allusion to the Eden story, recalling the sanctuary connotations of Eden, but the imperfect tense of the verb to create (**אברא**) puts this day into the future, recalling such texts as Isa 65:17-18; 66:22-23, where all flesh will come to worship Yahweh as in Eden, though there is no physical temple in which this

⁷⁰ Brooke 2007: 430; Schiffman 1992: 621; 1994: 118.

⁷¹ Stegemann 1992: 164. In my discussion of *ShirShabb* (3.11 below) I question whether the temple envisaged there is as much “in heaven” as some have proposed.

⁷² These include the first person qal imperfect of **ברא** (“to create”) spoken by God, and the use of the words **מקדש** (“sanctuary”) and **בון** (“to establish”), both of which appear in Exod 15:17. See Yadin 1977-1983: 1: 185; Dimant 1986: 168; Brooke 2007: 430.

⁷³ None of the words expressing a long duration of time qualify the other sanctuary referred to in this pericope.

⁷⁴ Gäbel 2006: 56. Compare Rev 21:3.

⁷⁵ Exod 6:7; Lev 26:12; Deut 29:12; 1 Sam 7:24; 1 Chron 17:22; Jer 7:23; 11:4; 24:7; 30:22; 31:1, 33; 32:28; Ezek 11:20; 14:11; 36:28; 37:23, 27; Zech 2:15; 8:8.

⁷⁶ Wise 1990b: 161. Compare Gäbel 2006: 55, “die universale Neuschöpfung.” Davies 1998: 16 suggests that there is no Hebrew word for “recreation,” although the expression **הברייה החדשה** conveys the idea.

worship takes place. Just as Israel's temples had cosmic implications, symbolising the universe,⁷⁷ the eschatological sanctuary is the new heaven and earth where God lives with his people.⁷⁸

Finally, the text refers to the covenant with Jacob at Bethel. Wise has examined this reference more than once, and draws attention not only to Gen 28:13-29 and Gen 35:1-15, but also to Lev 26:42, which is the only OT text to mention a covenant with Jacob.⁷⁹ As he rightly notes, all three texts are integrally connected with life in the land⁸⁰ and, although Lev 26:42 makes no mention of Bethel, the chapter does refer several times to God's dwelling with his people and to the covenant with Jacob in connection with a return from exile. Just as God promises to remember his covenant with Jacob and restore his people to his dwelling place, so too on the day of creation will God remember his covenant with Jacob and create his dwelling place with his people.⁸¹

When making this covenant with Jacob, God reiterates the land promise to Abraham, with one significant difference: the promised territory expands to include all points of the compass, without limitation, so that all the families of the earth will be blessed in Jacob and his offspring (Gen 28:14). The day of creation is the creation of the new heaven and earth. Then, the land promised to Abraham and his descendants, and by association the eschatological temple, will spread out to encompass the whole earth and all humanity.⁸²

There are oblique connections with Hebrews in this pericope of 11QTemple. The temple design is based on the tabernacle, in much the same way as in Heb 8-10. In 11QTemple the instructions for building the wilderness tabernacle are used in the design of the interim ideal temple, as though these instructions comprised the plan (תבנית) given by

⁷⁷ See the discussion of Sirach and the writings of Philo in 2.2 and 2.5 (above).

⁷⁸ Barker 1989: 65 suggests that the temple complex in the Temple Scroll may have been designed to symbolise the cosmos. If so, then the future eschatological temple can be construed as the whole cosmos, renewed "on the day of creation," an idea also found in Rev 21-22. See also Wacholder 1983: 33-40; Barker 1987: 25, 127, 236, 239-41; Davies 1998: 11-12.

⁷⁹ Wise 1989: 54-60; 1990a: 161.

⁸⁰ Wise 1990a: 160-61.

⁸¹ Wentling 1989: 67-69 draws attention to allusions to Ezek 37:26-28 in this text. There **מקדש** refers to the eschatological dwelling place of God with his people when he makes a covenant of peace with them after their restoration from the exile when he will dwell with them forever (**לעולם**).

⁸² Beale 2005b: 103 suggests that the day of creation is "a recapitulation of the primal Edenic temple within which Adam and his seed should have carried out their commission by spreading out over the earth." He sees three parts to the covenant with Jacob: that God would bring Jacob back, that Jacob would possess the promised land, and that Jacob's descendants would spread out to all points of the compass. He goes on to suggest that 11QTemple sees the establishment of the eschatological temple as the fulfilment of these three promises. VanderKam 1994: 133-35 discusses the connections with Jacob at Bethel and concludes that it seems certain that the covenant with Jacob at Bethel involved an eternal sanctuary, even if the other details are obscure. *Gen. Rab.* 69:7 makes a similar connection between Jacob and Bethel, and an eschatological temple.

David to Solomon (1 Chron 28:11-19), and by extension the תבנית of the wilderness tabernacle given to Moses (Exod 25: 9, 40). There is no hint in 11QTemple that this plan is based on any heavenly archetype; rather, it is a detailed compilation of the specifications given by God to Moses.

11QTemple XXIX 7-10 anticipates an eschatological temple to be constructed by Yahweh, in which he will live with his people forever. There is no plan in 11QTemple for this eschatological temple, since God will construct it. For similar reasons Hebrews is silent as to the shape of the eschatological temple. There it is a metaphor for God's eschatological dwelling with his people and, while 11QTemple looks to the future for the eschatological temple, the perspective of Hebrews is that it is now in place with the exaltation of Jesus at God's right hand (Heb 8:1-2). It also encompasses heaven and earth, since the readers of Hebrews already have access to it while they are earthbound (Heb 12:22-24). The day of creation in 11QTemple is in the future; in Hebrews it has come into the present in "these last days" (Heb 1:2), when Jesus took his seat at the right hand of God in the world to come (1:6; 2:5).

3.4 The *New Jerusalem* Scroll

This Aramaic text⁸³ exists in seven fragmented copies.⁸⁴ It describes an eschatological city and temple, as well as the cultus operating in it, in a manner similar to Ezek 40-48, where a guide leads a visionary around the various parts of the temple and city and permits him to watch the priests carrying out their cultic duties.⁸⁵ It has apocalyptic features.⁸⁶

Although the name Jerusalem never appears, the city contains a temple, making Jerusalem the only real candidate. The size of the city, a rectangle twenty kilometres wide

⁸³ For a list of Aramaic texts from Qumran see Tigchelaar 2010a: 158-59. That the *New Jerusalem* text is composed in Aramaic and contains no terminology specific to the Qumran community indicates that it was unlikely to have been composed within the community. García Martínez 1999b : 457-58 and Dimant 2007: 197-205 suggest that its origin lies in the same priestly circles that produced the *Temple Scroll*, prior to the establishment of the Qumran community, while Frey 2000: 807 suggests that it should be ascribed to some "apocalyptic circle," proposing a date sometime after the third century B.C.E. Puech 1995: 87-102 concludes that it was composed in the Hellenistic period, at the same time as the *Temple Scroll* (p. 102).

⁸⁴ 1Q32, 2Q24, 4Q554, 5Q554a, 4Q555, 5Q15, 11Q18. Chyutin 1997 claims to have comprehensively reconstructed the text, but nowhere explains his methodology, and his work has received severe criticism (Stuckenbruck 1999: 663-64; Patton 2000: 560-61; Frey 2000: 82). I will not refer to Chyutin's column and line numbers, rather use the fragment and line numbers in the various critical editions currently available, indicating the source in each case. Definitive editions of some manuscripts have not yet been published. See the discussion of the state of 11Q18 when found and the contents in García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1998: 305-309. For details of the different manuscripts see Crawford 2000: 688-89.

⁸⁵ Licht 1979: 45; García Martínez 1999b: 449-51; Frey 2000: 800-801; Crawford 2000: 63-64.

⁸⁶ Wacholder 1983: 96; García Martínez 1999b: 452-53. Frey 2000: 803-805 refers to this text as "a narrative description of a visionary revelation" (p. 803), noting (p. 804) that it corresponds to the definition of apocalyptic formulated by Collins 1979: 9 in that transcendent realities are revealed, mediated by an otherworldly being to a human in a narrative framework.

and twenty-eight kilometres long (4Q554 1 I 9-22),⁸⁷ indicates that it belongs to the complex of traditions where the eschatological city has enormous proportions.⁸⁸ Thus, the description appears to be of the New Jerusalem and the new temple as the first editor of 1Q32 suggested,⁸⁹ an opinion shared by several scholars who subsequently considered the manuscripts.⁹⁰ It seems clear that the city and temple are eschatological entities, but whether they are envisaged as heavenly realities or ideal or utopian earthly realities is unclear. Had the opening lines of any one of manuscripts been preserved, such questions may have been able to be answered.⁹¹

Several scholars have discussed the relationship between the New Jerusalem text and the Temple Scroll.⁹² Both describe a city and a temple, but while some of the details correspond,⁹³ the differences between the two documents lead Frey to the conclusion that they are not related.⁹⁴ Rather they depend “on a more widespread tradition in addition to or expanding the text of the Torah.”⁹⁵ Nevertheless, García Martínez is probably correct when

⁸⁷ For the conversion from the stadia (σταδία) in the manuscript to kilometres see Frey 2000: 813. Broshi 1995: 12-13 calculates the dimensions as twenty-one kilometres by thirty kilometres, an area larger than the West Bank, with space for a population of 150 million people. He also notes that the dimensions “bear very little relation to the topography and geography of Jerusalem.” For a similar judgement see Licht 1979: 58-9, and Puech 1995: 102, who refers to space for untold numbers of the elect. Puech 2009: 95-98 also discusses these measurements.

⁸⁸ See Ezek 40-48; 1 En 90:29, 36, 11QTemple LX-LXV; Rev 21:16.

⁸⁹ Milik 1955a: 134.

⁹⁰ Greenfield 1969: 132; García Martínez 1992: 180-213; 1999b: 449-51; Broshi 1995: 9-10; Chyutin 1997: 107-12; Frey 2000: 800-1; Kugler 2000: 93-4.

⁹¹ Milik 1962: 185 describes column I of the large fragment of 4QNew Jerusalem (4Q554), which starts with a description of the gates as “probablement la première colonne du manuscrit.” Wise 1990a: 65 suggests that the description moves from the outside in. Puech 1995: 88-89 suggests that 4Q554 and 5Q15 are early columns. See also Puech’s discussion in 2009: 91.

⁹² Broshi 1995: 10-11. Wacholder 1983: 96 suggests that the New Jerusalem text is dependent on the Temple Scroll, and Wise 1990a: 65-84-81 argues from a comparison of the two texts that the *New Jerusalem* text is closely related to the so-called “temple source” of the *Temple Scroll*.

⁹³ Yadin 1977-1983: 1: 216, 220, 225-26 details the common elements between the *Temple Scroll* and the *New Jerusalem*.

⁹⁴ Frey 2000: 805-807. On pp. 805-806 Frey lists the formal differences between the two texts. Licht 1979: 46 finds the *New Jerusalem* text unhelpful for clarifying the obscurities in the *Temple Scroll* since “it is concerned with contingent, but not identical subjects.” The *Temple Scroll* starts from the inside and works out, is legislation, is revealed to Moses, draws on the Torah and describes a square structure; the *New Jerusalem* text starts from the outside and works in, is descriptive rather than legislative, is mediated by an angel, draws on Ezek 40-48 and describes a rectangular structure.

⁹⁵ Frey 2000: 807. García Martínez 1992: 183 suggests that only structures or rituals common to both the *New Jerusalem* text and the *Temple Scroll* and not elsewhere attested could establish a “programmatic” relationship between them. One such instance is the agreement in the order of the gates in both texts, which differs from that in Ezekiel, although the same order also appears in *4QReworked Pentateuch* (4Q365a), which Crawford 1985: 269 and García Martínez 1992: 185 suggest may either be shorter recension of 11QTemple or a source for it. Yadin 1977-1983: 1: 20 (see also vol. 3, Plates 38* and 40*) identified this MS along with 4Q364, 4Q366 and 4Q367 as part of the Temple Scroll, although Stegemann 1988: 237 shows this to be unlikely.

he proposes that the temple and city in the *New Jerusalem* text, the eschatological temple of 11QT^a Temple XXIX 9-10, the **מִקְדָּשׁ יְהוּדָה** of 4Q174 and the temple and cult referred to in 1QM all have the same referent.⁹⁶ He concludes that just as Ezekiel's visionary temple was an ideal temple to be constructed after the exile, the city and temple of this text "comprise a blueprint of the celestial model in the hope that this will be constructed on the earth in the future."⁹⁷ The sacrificial activity proposed for the temple of the *New Jerusalem* text (11QT^a 21-29) confirms this judgement, since it is difficult to conceive of animal sacrifice in heaven, but quite conceivable in a renewed cultus in a new temple and city in the eschaton.

This is quite different from Hebrews, which does not envisage a future temple on earth where sacrificial activity will take place. Rather, the self-offering of Jesus renders such sacrifices unnecessary (Heb 10:1-18). And while the community addressed in Hebrews looks for the city to come (13:14), it is no earthly city. It is the heavenly Jerusalem, the city to which they already have access, the eschatological dwelling of God with his people.

3.5 4QInstruction

There are at least six fragmentary copies of 4QInstruction.⁹⁸ This text contains wisdom material, as well as cosmological and eschatological material.⁹⁹ Most of the manuscripts are in Herodian script and can be palaeographically dated to the latter half of the first century B.C.E.¹⁰⁰ The date of composition is considerably earlier, perhaps prior to the establishment of the Qumran community, or at least in its formative period. It was copied a

⁹⁶ García Martínez 1999b: 455. On pp 450-51 he argues for the significance of 4Q554 2 III (?) 14-22, where the enemies of Israel are said to no longer harm them, and relates this eventuality to the eschatological battle of 1QM. He also notes that the city described in the *New Jerusalem* text is devoid of inhabitants apart from officiating priests, indicating that it is not yet established. Puech 1993: 592-95 posits some connection with the eschatological battle from this fragment, but notes that the state of the text means that this cannot be elaborated further. See also Crawford 2000: 74.

⁹⁷ García Martínez 1999b: 453. See also 1992: 201, 207-11; Wise 2000: 744; Fuller Dow 2010: 135. Puech 1993: 596 asks, "The New Jerusalem and its people, are they not then the symbol of eternal life with God?"

⁹⁸ Strugnell and Harrington 1999: 1. The six manuscripts are 4Q415, 4Q416, 4Q417, 4Q418, 4Q423, 1Q26. Elgvin 1995a: 570-71 argues that 4Q418 comprises two copies, and Tigchelaar 2001a: 15-17, 61-64 argues on the basis of palaeographical, physical and textual evidence that it comprises three copies, see his discussion in 2001b: 109-26 and Goff 2003b: 1. The document was previously known as Sapiential Work A, and the editors of DJD 34 (p. 3) propose the title "Instruction for a Maven" (**מוֹסֵר לַמְבִּיחַ**). It is the longest wisdom document discovered at Qumran, although badly damaged, with over four hundred fragments (Nickelsburg 2005a: 169). The lack of distinctive Qumran themes indicates that it was probably not a community composition, although the number of copies indicates that it was an important text there. See Elgvin 1996: 133; Lockett 2005: 135; Wold 2005: 7-19; 2008: 291; Jefferies 2008: 88-89. In what follows I use the fragment, column and line numbers in Tigchelaar 2001a: 20-27, which improves on DJD XXXIV (Harrington 2006b: 122).

⁹⁹ Strugnell and Harrington 1999: 3; Goff 2003b: 216-32. The work lacks many of the characteristics of apocalyptic, such as the revelation of details of the heavenly world through angels or a famous person from the past. Visions are not a central feature of the work and it contains no dreams. See Elgvin 1995b: 451.

¹⁰⁰ Goff 2003b: 1-2. 4Q423 is in a late Herodian hand and can be dated in the first half of the first century C.E. (Elgvin 1995a: 559).

number of times right up to a late stage in the history of the community.¹⁰¹ Several parts of the text have been read as referring to angels and the relationship of the addressees to angels, but these readings have not been totally accepted by the scholarly community. It is mainly addressed in the second person singular, sometimes to a person referred to as a *mēbîn*, a word that has been interpreted in various ways.¹⁰²

Fragment 81 of 4Q418, lines 1-5,¹⁰³ claims that God has “separated the addressee from every spirit of flesh” (הבדילכה מכול רוח בשר, line 1-2); that “God is his portion and inheritance among all humanity” (הוא חלקכה ונחלתכה בתוך בני אדם, line 3); that God “has made him a holy of holies for the entire inhabited world” (שמכה לקדוש [לכול] תבל, line 4); “has cast his lot among the gods” (ובכול [א]ל[ים], line 4); “multiplied his glory exceedingly” (גורלכה הרבה, lines 4-5); has “made him for him (God?) a firstborn” (וישימכה לו בכור ב[...], line 5); and “made him for him (God?) a firstborn” (וישימכה לו בכור ב[...], line 5). A lacuna has obscured the rest of the sentence.

That God makes the addressee a “holy of holies” (לקדוש קודשים) for the entire inhabited world (תבל) has temple connotations that are significant for this study,¹⁰⁴ especially when this expression is juxtaposed with the word בכור (“firstborn,” line 5) also referring to the addressee.¹⁰⁵ These two words, along with the verb שים (“to make”) appear together in *4QPrayer of Enosh* (4Q369) 1 II 5-7, a text that Evans suggests reflects Ps 89, where both תבל (v 11, MT 12) and בכור (v 27, MT 28) appear, and where the subject of that text is a Davidic messianic figure.¹⁰⁶ On the other hand, Kugel suggests that 4Q369 should be read in connection with Exod 4:22, where Israel is Yahweh’s firstborn son. This reading is preferable, since line 1 of the same fragment refers to God distributing his inheritance (cf. Deut 32:8-9), God’s eye being on that inheritance (cf. Deut 11:12), and

¹⁰¹ Elgvin 1995a: 559, 61; 1996: 126-34; Lange 1995: 45-47; Fletcher-Louis 2002: 112; Schoors 2002: 95; Harrington 2006b: 110-12; Goff 2007: 65-67. Stegemann 1998: 100 suggests that nothing in the Wisdom texts from Qumran requires a date later than third or fourth century B.C.E., while the DJD editors are reluctant to be more precise than “between Proverbs and Sirach” (DJD XXXIV: 30-31, 36).

¹⁰² Strugnell and Harrington 1999: 3 suggest “an expert in the making”; and Nickelsburg 2005a: 169, “one who understands.” See the discussion in Tigchelaar 2000: 62-75.

¹⁰³ Most of these lines are also preserved in 4Q423 8 + 23 1-4, see Tigchelaar 2001a: 143.

¹⁰⁴ Strugnell and Harrington 1999: 305; Lange 2000: 41; Fletcher-Louis 2002: 179; Stuckenbruck 2004: 64. Tigchelaar 2001a: 231 translates לקדוש קודשים with “a most holy one,” preferring to avoid the translation “holy of holies,” since “it may suggest that the addressee is being appointed as a sanctuary.” However, this may be the precise point of the expression. Lange 2000: 40 translates “at the holiest of the holy things,” suggesting that this expression and the allusion to Num 18:20 indicates that this fragment should be describing “the election either of Aaron or Aaronite priests.”

¹⁰⁵ Elgvin 1996: 156; 1998: 122 suggests that the addressee is also called a firstborn son of God in 1Q26 3 2, but see Milik 1955f: 102, who restores י[חיד] לבן ל אתה כי in this line, and translates “car tu es mon fils unique ...” See also 4Q418 69 15 where Elgvin places a small fragment containing the word בכור. The editors of DJD XXXIV do not include this reading (p. 283), nor do Tigchelaar 2001a: 92 and Puech 2008: 157.

¹⁰⁶ Evans 1995: 198.

God's glory being seen there (cf. Isa 60:1-2).¹⁰⁷ Given the affinities between these two texts, the indications are that, as in 4Q369, the priestly figure addressed in 4Q418 represents the people of Israel as a whole. The Qumran community would have read these texts as referring to themselves, the beginning of the eschatological restoration of the community of Israel,¹⁰⁸ set apart as a temple community (a holy of holies) for the world.¹⁰⁹

While the connection Evans makes with Ps 89 may not be appropriate with reference to 4Q369 and while 4Q369 helps with the understanding of 4Q418, the possible connections with Ps 89 are relevant for the present study. In Ps 89:11 (MT 12) the "world" (תבל) and all that is in it belongs to Yahweh, and in Ps 89:27 (MT 28) Yahweh declares that "he will make" the Davidic monarch "the firstborn, the highest of the kings of the earth" (אתנהו עליון למלכי ארץ אני בכור). The LXX (Ps 88:12, 28) renders these terms with οἰκουμένη ("world") and πρωτότοκος ("firstborn"), two words that appear together in Heb 1:6 to describe the worship of angels directed to Jesus who sat down at the right hand of God (Heb 1:3-4), in the world (to come, Heb 2:5).¹¹⁰ In this part of Hebrews the exalted Son is enthroned in the world to come as a pioneer, through whom God is leading many heirs to glory (2:10). While Hebrews does not refer to Jesus as a "holy of holies" and while there is no sense in which the angels worship the addressee of 4Q418 81 as in Heb 1:6, it is clear that the addressee is an exalted figure with a priestly role, as is Jesus in Hebrews. There is, then, a sense in which both Jesus and the addressee of 4Q418 81 represent the beginnings of the eschatological dwelling of God with his people.

¹⁰⁷ Kugel 1998: 122-23. See also 4Q504 1-2 III 5-7. 4Q418 81 3 also refers to inheritance. Elgvin 1998: 122-23 refers to the traditions about both the people of Israel and the elect as God's firstborn son, but opts for Exod 4:22 as the source of this imagery in 4QInstruction.

¹⁰⁸ Elgvin 1998: 118-29; 2004: 78. 1QS VIII 5-10 expresses similar ideas. On p. 128 Elgvin claims that the community "is not described as a spiritual temple, but in 2004: 78 he suggests, "[t]his passage abounds with symbolism of Eden and Temple, which may reflect a group that sees itself as a spiritual temple." He does not elaborate on the details of this symbolism, and while there are several places where temple symbolism is present, his claim seems to be overstated. Given that the addressee is addressed as a "holy of holies" the suggestion that they saw themselves as a spiritual temple stands. They could have read the text in this way, even if not composed within the community. That it was found at Qumran indicates its relevance.

¹⁰⁹ Tigchelaar 2000: 62-75 argues that different sections of 4QInstruction are addressed to varying audiences, and in 2001a: 235-36 suggests that Fragment 81 may have been addressed to a priestly audience, perhaps the leader of a community. Given the connections with 4Q369, it seems that the addressee is a representative leader of that community with a priestly function vis-à-vis Israel and the inhabited world. Elgvin 2004: 82-84 argues on the basis that both priestly and royal language is reflected in Fragment 81 that it is symbolic language and not addressed directly to priests. This objection evaporates if we see the pericope addressed to the community with a priestly function vis-à-vis the world.

¹¹⁰ In 4QRenewed Earth (4Q475) 1 5 תבל appears in a description of the world to come, which will be restored until it is like Eden.

3.6 4QDaily Prayers (4Q503)

This liturgical text contains morning and evening prayers for each day over the course of a month.¹¹¹ Numerous fragments make reconstruction difficult.¹¹² Pertinent to this study is the evidence for the joint participation of human and angelic beings in the praise of God, which appears to take place on earth since there is no suggestion of a heavenly ascent.

The liturgy alternates between first and third person plural verbs. Fragment 4, lines 7-11 contain the liturgy for evening prayer for the sixth day of the month. It begins with a rubric for a congregation (יברכו, “they shall bless”; וענו, “they shall answer”; ואמרו, “they shall say”).¹¹³ The congregation responds in the first person plural, with words like[...ם] קודש[ם] אנו (either, “we with the holy ones” or “we are his holy people”).¹¹⁴ An abrupt transition closes each blessing, with the community addressed as Israel in the second person singular ש[לום עליך] ישראל (“peace be upon you Israel”).¹¹⁵ It appears that after the opening rubric the community recited the prayers in the first person and a priest or a group of priests said the concluding blessing.¹¹⁶

¹¹¹ The month is unspecified. Falk 1998: 21 suggests that allusions to Passover and Unleavened Bread in his reconstructed column VII indicate the first month of the year, the month also proposed by Baillet 1982: 105-106. Chazon 1992-93: 17-18 identifies Sabbath prayers on the fourth, eleventh, eighteenth and twenty-fifth days of the month. With a 364-day calendar the Sabbath would fall on these days in the first, fourth and seventh months of the year. In 1999a: 259 Chazon suggests that the liturgy is for either Nisan or Tishrei, and in 2000: 219-20, argues for Nisan on the basis of the reference to “our deliverance” (פדותנו, frag 1-6 III 8 in DJD VII: 106, and VII 8 in Falk 1998: 33-34) on the fifteenth of the month, suggesting a reference to Passover. Abegg 1999: 399 suggests either the first or the seventh month, since Pesach and Sukkot respectively are celebrated in these months and, after a comparison with 4Q317, argues for the seventh month. Baumgarten 1987: 399 also opts for either the first or the seventh month.

¹¹² Falk 1998: 21 refers to two hundred and twenty-five fragments, with the largest containing only about twenty-four words. Baillet 1982: 105-36 expressed disappointment with the results of his work (p. 105). Baumgarten 1987: 400-401 also critiques Baillet’s reconstruction. Falk suggests that a fresh reconstruction is required (p. 29), but makes no attempt, apart from column VII (pp. 33-35). Falk notes three factors that assist in the restoration of the fragments: many fragments have top or bottom margins; 4Q512 is on the other side of the scroll, thus any reconstruction must suit both documents; and there are numerous predictable formulas punctuating the text (pp. 30-31, 35-36). In what follows I refer to the fragment and line numbers used in *DSSSE* 999-1007.

¹¹³ These expressions have the appearance of a liturgical rubric. See Nitzan 2003: 124 who distinguishes this from a “literary summons.”

¹¹⁴ For the former rendering see *DSSSE* 999, and for the latter see Baillet 1982: 106-107 and Davila 2000: 213. The latter reading the suffix on קודש as a third person pronominal suffix rather than the remnant of a masculine plural suffix. The photographs in DJD VII, Plate 35 are inconclusive. Fragment 11, line 3 has קודש[ם] אנו (“we, his holy people”) as the subject of the participle מרוממים (“are exulting”). Alexander 2006: 65 refers to “angelic priests and their liturgy in the heavenly temple,” and finds a hierarchy made up of these angelic priests, the luminaries (sun, moon and stars) and the earthly community, all of whom worship God together. The former reading implies that the community participates in the worship of angels, although the damaged state of the text makes certainty impossible.

¹¹⁵ These blessings are probably recited by priests, and “perhaps antiphonally, by different groups of priests” (Nitzan 2003: 124).

¹¹⁶ Falk 1998: 54-55.

As the liturgy progresses, another designation appears. Fragments 7-9, IV 3-4 refer to **בְּרִיתֵכֶה וְאֵנּוּ** (“we, the sons of your covenant”), who bless the name of God along with **עַם כּוֹל דְּגָלִי** [אֹר] (“all the companies of light”).¹¹⁷ Fragments 13-16 also contain three references to the holy of holies: line 8 reads **[... קוֹדֶשׁ קֹדֶשִׁים בְּמִרְוֹמֵי]** (“the holy of holies in the heights”); line 10 reads **[... וְכִכּוֹד בְּקוֹדֶשׁ קוֹדֶשִׁים]** (“and glory in the holy of holies”); and line 11 refers to **עֵדִים לָנוּ בְּקוֹדֶשׁ (ש) קוֹדֶשִׁים** (“witnesses for us in the holy of holies”).¹¹⁸ The community envisages itself worshipping with the angelic beings in the “holy of holies in the heights.” But, while the holy of holies is “in the heights” (**בְּמִרְוֹמֵי**), the community is on earth, envisaged as a temple, that is, “heaven on earth.” As Rowland suggests with reference to 1QS XI 6-9, “God has ... extended the boundaries of heaven to include this haven of holiness.”¹¹⁹ The same phenomenon appears in this text.

The Hasmonian hand indicates a date around the first quarter of the first century B.C.E.,¹²⁰ which could mean that this is one of the “earliest recorded liturgies for fixed prayer times.”¹²¹ While its presence at Qumran indicates that it formed part of the resources of the community, there is some debate as to whether it originated there.¹²² If

¹¹⁷ This translation is from *DSSSE* 998-99. Davila 2000: 214-15 renders **דְּגָלִי** with “divisions of,” suggesting that it relates to “units of ‘light’ and ‘night,’” and Abegg 1999: 400 calls them “flags” of light. Chazon 2003: 39 renders the expression “troops of light,” suggesting that it “serves as an epithet for angels associated with the heavenly lights.” Baillet (DJD VII: 108) has “les troupes de [lumière...].” For a corresponding expression see fragments 29-32, line 11 **(לִילֵדָה לִילֵדָה)**, which *DSSSE* 1001 renders with “companies of the night.” See *HALOT* 213 for the use of this word in BH, where it also has both the sense of “standard” and “division.” *HALOT* assigns the sense “banner, standard” in Num 1:52; 2:2; and the sense “division of a tribe” in Num 2:3, 3, 10, 17, 18, 25, 31, 34; 10: 14, 18, 22, 25, although the NRSV has “regiment” in Num 2-3, and “standard” in Num 10. Standard is probably a metonym for regiment in these texts. In Song 2:4 *HALOT* reads the word as “banner, standard,” while NRSV paraphrases with “intention.”

¹¹⁸ Chazon 2000: 223; Davila 2000: 225. Davila renders the first two expressions with “[...]holly ones on high” (line 8); “glory in holi[ness]” (line 10), eliminating an reference to the heavenly holy of holies.

¹¹⁹ Rowland 1982: 118.

¹²⁰ Baillet 1982: 105; Baumgarten 1987: 399; Falk 1998: 21.

¹²¹ Chazon 1994: 281. On p. 283 Chazon notes that this liturgy provides “our earliest solid evidence for the *daily* recitation of praise in unison with heavenly beings and its liturgical connection with praise for the daily renewal of the heavenly lights.” It predates any other Jewish prayer book by approximately 1,000 years (p. 277).

¹²² Ibid.: 281-82 and Davila 2000: 211 suggest composition outside the community, since they find no evidence of the features normally associated with texts thought to have been composed by the community. Falk 1998: 22-29 finds that it shares certain structural and stylistic features, as well as a common vocabulary, with other texts that appear to be products of the community, and “stands in sharp contrast with other liturgical prayers found at Qumran that are probably not of Yahad origin” (p. 28). He cautiously suggests that it should be viewed as a community composition. He compares 4Q414, 4Q502, 4Q503 and 4Q512 with this text but also relates it to “a broader stream of Jewish prayer practice” (1998: 55). Sarason 2003: 162 finds Falk’s analysis “convincing.” See also Baumgarten 1987: 403; Falk 2000: 111-13. Nitzan 1994c: 56 notes similarities but also significant differences between the Qumran practices presupposed in this liturgy and the practices of “mainstream Judaism,” who recited the same blessings every day. The suggestion that there was such a thing as “mainstream Judaism” is questionable.

not, then the text is evidence that the notion of communion with angels was known elsewhere than at Qumran.¹²³

Chazon refers to “striking parallels in content, language, form and function between 4Q503 and the statutory Blessing on the Luminaries”¹²⁴ and suggests that “prayers from Qumran evidence a continuous liturgical tradition and probably also some fixed public worship during the two centuries prior to the destruction of the Second Temple, and not just among the Qumran sectarians.”¹²⁵ This phenomenon, she argues, has implications for our understanding of “the Jewish liturgical background to Christian prayer.”¹²⁶

While Hebrews has no interest in the details and content of angelic worship, apart from the suggestion of Heb 1:6 that all God’s angels are to worship the exalted Son, the reference to the community addressed in Hebrews having come to myriads of angels in joyful worship and to the church of the firstborn (12:22-23) reflects the same trajectory, for which the earliest evidence is 4Q503.

3.7 The *Community Rule* (1QS)

The *Community Rule* (*Manual of Discipline*) is a composite document regulating the life of the community¹²⁷ and giving a theological rationale for these regulations.¹²⁸ The most complete copy (1QS) dates from early in the life of the community and perhaps predates the settlement of Qumran.¹²⁹ It was probably transcribed along with the other extant manuscripts between the late second century B.C.E. and the mid first century C.E.,

¹²³ In *1 En* 61:10-12 the reference to “all flesh” seems to indicate that humans and angels will bless God together (in the eschaton). Since the Similitudes of Enoch were not found at Qumran, this indicates that joint human and angelic praise is a phenomenon wider than the Qumran community. Weinfeld 1983: 429 claims that the notion “that men join the angels in their praise is first made explicit in the writings of the Qumran sect” (underlining original), and Instone-Brewer 2004: 59, 96 notes that 4Q503 evidences similarities to prayers known only from later synagogue liturgies.

¹²⁴ For this text see *b. Ber* 11b. The connection between 4Q504 and this blessing is made by Chazon 1994: 278; 1999a: 257, and Schiffman 1987: 37-9, 45, who suggests that these parallels are most probably evidence of “elements common to the varieties of Judaism known from Second Temple times” (p. 45).

¹²⁵ Chazon 1994: 284. See also Falk 1998: 56-7.

¹²⁶ Chazon 1994: 284. 2000: 224 refers to angelic praise in Job 38:7 (a text that appears in *3 En* 38:3 in connection with angelic worship); Ben Sira 42:16 (sic, v. 17); Jub 2:2-3. See also *1 Clem.* 34:6. But none of these texts reflects human and angelic worship combined.

¹²⁷ Collins 2009: 358-61 argues that 1QS was written for multiple communities, of which that at Qumran was one example.

¹²⁸ Brooke 1996: 123; Nickelsburg 2005a: 137.

¹²⁹ Qimron and Charlesworth 1994b: 2. 1QS is normally used as a point of reference (Metso 1997: 13), but all the witnesses to the text need to be considered. Other copies were found in caves four and five, with a variety of different text forms (4Q255, 4Q256, 4Q257, 4Q258, 4Q259, 4Q260, 4Q261, 4Q262, 4Q263, 4Q264, 5Q11, 5Q13). For a history of scholarship on the development of the text of the *Community Rule* see Metso 1997: 6-11, and for descriptions of the various manuscripts see Alexander 1996: 438-447, and Metso 1997: 13-68.

indicating that it was a living document during this period.¹³⁰ It falls into two major parts: columns I–IV contain matters of principle and V–XI organisational detail. Temple symbolism appears in several places in the second part.

3.7.1 1QS V 1-6

Columns V-VI contain regulations for those who volunteer to join the community (V 1), submitting to the authority of the Zadokite priests (V 2). In lines 3-5 they are required to order their lives correctly, with the outcome of this expressed in a series of infinitive constructs (lines 5-7),¹³¹ including “making expiation for all who volunteer to be the sanctuary in Aaron and the house of truth in Israel for those who join themselves to the community” (לכפר לכול המתנדבים לקודש באהרון ולבית האמת בישראל) (line 6). Here, those who join the community are understood to form the nucleus of a renewed Israel.¹³² However, rather than offering sacrifices in the Jerusalem temple, they make expiation for those who join the community by their holy way of life.¹³³ Moreover, they replace the temple by becoming “the sanctuary in Aaron” (לבית האמת בישראל, line 6) and “the house of truth in Israel” (לקודש באהרון, line 6).¹³⁴

¹³⁰ Gagnon 1992: 61-79; Qimron and Charlesworth 1994b: 2; Alexander 1996: 448-50; Nickelsburg 2005a: 137-38. 1QS was probably copied from a defective exemplar as it contains numerous blanks and other corrections (Dimant 1984: 498). The redaction history of the *Community Rule* and its related texts, the *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa) and *Rule of Benedictions* (1QSB) is complex and beyond my scope. Some of the fragments found in other caves show that deliberate, redactional changes appear to have been introduced (Alexander 1996: 437 and *passim*; Hempel 2010: 193-208). These will be discussed where relevant. In what follows, I refer to the text in Qimron and Charlesworth 1994b, and *DSSSE*.

¹³¹ Wernberg-Møller 1957: 28 and Qimron and Charlesworth 1994b: 21 translate the infinitive constructs in lines 5 and 6 as indicatives, reading words לִיסַד מוֹסַד אֱמֶת לְיִשְׂרָאֵל in line 5 as “they shall lay a foundation of truth for Israel” and לְכַפֵּר in line 6 as “they shall atone.” For the use of infinitive constructs as indicatives at Qumran, see Qimron 1986a: 70-72; Knibb 1987: 104, and for *lamed* plus an infinitive functioning as a main verb see Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 611. Metso 1998: 229 and *DSSSE* 81 translate the first of these infinitive constructs with “so that” and the second an indicative (they shall make atonement). It is better to read both as describing the outcome of the formation of the community (expressed in lines 1-2). Garnet 1997: 70 critiques readings of these infinitive constructs as main verbs as “unfortunate,” since they give the impression that “the rule promised in A is already being delivered in the B section.”

¹³² Leaney 1966: 167-68; Wernberg-Møller 1957: 93; Metso 1997: 79.

¹³³ In 1QS II 8; XI 14 God is the subject of כָּפַר, while here it is the community members. For other uses of כָּפַר see 1QS III 6, 8 (both passives, with the unstated agent either God or the community); VIII 6, 10 (the community atones for the land); and IX 4 (the community atones for guilt without animal sacrifice). See also CD II 5; IV 6-7, 9-10, XX 34 (all with God as subject). In 1QS V 5-6 the priests make atonement for the community, but in VIII 10 the community itself atones for the land (Brooke 1996: 124-125).

¹³⁴ I have translated the expression לְקוֹדֵשׁ בְּאַהֲרֹן וּלְבֵית הָאֱמֶת בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל with definite articles, as it comprises two construct chains, the first being definite through the proper name Aaron and the second through the definite article attached to אֱמֶת (“truth”). קוֹדֵשׁ (“sanctuary”) could be translated “holiness” (Leaney 1966: 161; Knibb 1987: 107). However, the parallel expression בֵּית הָאֱמֶת (“house of truth”) makes it more likely that the sense is “sanctuary” (Wernberg-Møller 1957: 93-4). A shorter version of this material appears in the badly damaged fragment 4QSB 5 5-6, and in 4QSD 1 I 4-5. Neither of these manuscripts refer to the community members having an atoning function, and the expression “house of truth” is indefinite (בֵּית אֱמֶת) and exists *for* Israel (לְיִשְׂרָאֵל) rather than *in* Israel (בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל). See Qimron and Charlesworth 1994a: 63, 73; Metso 1998: 219. These manuscripts are dated in the second half of the first century B.C.E. (1997: 22, 36-37), maybe between 30-1 B.C.E. (see Cross 1994: 57) which is later than 1QS, although Metso suggests that they are “undoubtedly more original” copies of an older exemplar (suggested and discounted by Garnet

This community had withdrawn from the temple believing it to be corrupt. The members considered that they had replaced the temple by becoming a temple themselves and by performing the atoning functions of the priests in the temple for priesthood and laity alike.¹³⁵

3.7.2 1QS VIII 1-16a; IX 3-11

1QS VIII 1–IX 25 contain regulations for the founding of the community council (היחוד עצת, VIII 1, 5)¹³⁶ in two parts,¹³⁷ separated by penal codes (VIII 16b–IX 2).¹³⁸ The temple symbolism noted in Column V is explicit and further elaborated in VIII 5-12 and IX 3-6. Here, the community is described as “a holy house for Israel” (בית קודש לישראל, VIII 5), “the foundation of the holy of holies for Aaron” (סוד קודש קודשים לאהרון, VIII 5-6), “a most holy dwelling for Aaron” (מערון קודש קודשים לאהרון, VIII 8-9), and “a house of perfection and truth in Israel” (בית תמים ואמת בישראל),

1997: 68-79). Brooke 1996: 126-27 notes that the dates of the manuscripts themselves need to be taken into account when analyzing the social realities of the community. Accordingly, it seems that as the community developed, the notion that it was understood as a temple was retained, but its atoning function jettisoned. The sons of Zadok were no longer dominant since they are not mentioned in 4QS^b and 4QS^d. See the discussions in Alexander 1996: 447-48; Garnet 1997: 76; Hempel 2007: 212-14.

¹³⁵ This is the implication of the references to Aaron and Israel in line 6, see Wernberg-Møller 1957: 94; Knibb 1987: 107.

¹³⁶ Since the following details apply to the entire community, not just to the fifteen men referred to in line 1, the expression does not refer to some body in the organisation of the community, but to the community as a whole (Wernberg-Møller 1957: 122; Worrell 1970: 71; Knibb 1987: 91, 129). The expression appears in 1QS III 2; VI 3, 10, 12-13, 14, 16, 22-23; VII 2, 22, 24; VIII 1, 5 22; XI 8, and a similar expression in VIII 11. Alexander 1996: 441 refers to “the emergence of fifteen perfect men [see 1QS VIII 1] within godless Israel, as a sort of saving remnant.” These formed the nucleus of the community, in much the same way as the Twelve formed the nucleus of the church in the NT period. In this connection I note the names of the twelve apostles on the foundations of walls of the New Jerusalem in Rev 21:14, and 4QpIsa^d, which reads the precious stones of Isa 54:10-11 as the founding members of the community. See Sutcliffe 1959: 134-38; Baumgarten 1976: 59-78; Draper 1988: 41-61; Beale 1999: 1071; Mathewson 2003: 497-98.

¹³⁷ Nickelsburg 2005a: 141-42. Brooke 1996: 123 subdivides this part of the manuscript differently with VI 24–IX 11 described as “directives for punishing various offenses against the community,” and IX 12–X 8 as “explicit directives for the wise instructor.” Arguably VI 24–IX 11 contain more than the directives about offences against the community, and VIII 1–IX 11 are better described as either regulations for founding the community, or as “a unit describing the ideal community” (Dimant 1984: 498, 502).

¹³⁸ Metso 1997: 124-28; Nickelsburg 2005a: 142. 4QS^c (4Q259) 1 II 7–1 III 6 contain the same material as 1QS VIII 1-15a, followed immediately by the material in 1QS IX 12-26, omitting the penal codes in 1QS. See Qimron and Charlesworth 1994a: 85-89, and especially footnote 26 (p. 89). Metso 1997: 143-44 suggests that 1QS VIII 1-15a introduced “the sections dealing with the duties and responsibilities of the *maskil*. The material in 1QS IX 3-11 largely duplicates material in 1QS VIII 1-16a” (1997: 71-73). Some consider this section to be the earliest part of the document, perhaps predating the foundation of the community and providing its manifesto (see Sutcliffe 1959: 137-38; Leancy 1966: 112, 15, 211; Murphy-O'Connor 1969: 529; Pouilly 1976: 19-22; Knibb 1987: 129; Gagnon 1992: 70-2; Alexander 1996: 441). For a contrary view see Metso 1997: 118-19, 143-44; 1998: 223-24, who sees it as an introduction to the sections dealing with the *maskil*, and Collins 2009: 362, who finds here “the establishment of an elite group set aside for special training.” Stegemann 1998: 110-12 considers that 1QS VIII-IX comprises a number of secondary additions. The precise details are beyond my scope, although I note with Brooke 1994: 126 that, whether or not it was a primitive manifesto, it is now embedded within a document that contains legislation for the operation of the community, suggesting that “the ideal was in large measure actualized in the subsequent life of the community.”

VIII 9).¹³⁹ The distinction between Israel and Aaron indicates an inner core of priestly members of the community, although all functioned in similar ways as the succeeding lines indicate.

Cultic metaphors describe their functions. While they are “to make expiation for the land” (לְכַפֵּר בְּעַד הָאָרֶץ) VIII 6, 10) and “to offer a pleasant aroma” (לְקַרִּיב רִיחַ) VIII 9),¹⁴⁰ these functions are connected not with animal sacrifice, but with perfect lives.¹⁴¹ As they live like this, God is pleased and the land atoned for. Thus, the community is envisaged as a sanctuary, taking the place of the Jerusalem temple,¹⁴² and the members are given cultic functions for the land that had been defiled.¹⁴³ This land is, of course, the defiled land of Israel and, by implication, the “quintessence” of the land, that is, the temple.¹⁴⁴ The land is probably also a metonym for the inhabitants. This holy community, separated off from a defiled land and temple, was the nucleus of the new Israel, with the purpose of purifying the bulk of the nation.¹⁴⁵

Similar material appears in column IX, although here polemic against temple sacrifices is added.¹⁴⁶ The expiation that the community achieves for the guilt and unfaithfulness of Israel, obtaining God’s favour for the land is “without the flesh of burnt offerings and the

¹³⁹ Following Knibb 1987: 131, I have taken the ל in the expressions לְיִשְׂרָאֵל and לְאַהֲרֹן as a dative of advantage (for the sake of): the community is made up of priests (the holy of holies) and laity (the holy house) for the sake of Israel and Aaron. Wernberg-Møller 1957: 124 claims that the ל should be translated “consisting of.” On this reading the “holy house” is equivalent to Israel and the “holy of holies and most holy dwelling” equivalent to Aaron. The description of the atoning function of the community in lines 6-7, 10 tends to favour Knibb’s reading.

¹⁴⁰ For a similar expression see Gen 8:21, where Yahweh smelled the pleasing odour of Noah’s sacrifices.

¹⁴¹ Knibb 1987: 132. See Heb 13:15-16.

¹⁴² Brooke 1996: 125. Wernberg-Møller 1957: 124-25; Knibb 1987: 131; Qimron and Charlesworth 1994a: 87; Charlesworth and Strawn 1996: 426-32; Brooke 1996: 129 read the word (מִקְדָּשׁ) in 4Q5^e (4Q259) 1 III 1, and if correct the community would also be referred to as a sanctuary there. Metso 1997: 53 reads קֹדֶשׁ (“holiness”) and DSSSE 530-31 reads לְקֹדֶשׁ (“for holiness”). PAM image 43263 in Reynolds et al., 1998 clearly shows the letters קֹדֶשׁ preceded by the remains of the bottom of one preceding letter, which could either be ל or מ. As Charlesworth and Strawn 1996: 428-29 argue, the latter is preferable on orthographic and lexical grounds (the expression לְקֹדֶשׁ only appears elsewhere in 4Q216 VII 16; 2Q228 I 5, while מִקְדָּשׁ appears almost 150 times). At the same point, 1QS VIII 11 reads קֹדֶשׁ (“holiness,” with *plene* spelling). Cross 1994: 57 dates 4Q5^e between 50-25 B.C.E., and Brooke 1996: 129 surmises that the understanding of the community as a temple may have developed around this time.

¹⁴³ Leaney 1966: 216-19; Knibb 1987: 131.

¹⁴⁴ Davies 1974: 152.

¹⁴⁵ Compare Num 25:33. Wernberg-Møller 1957: 125 reads אֶרֶץ as “earth,” but this obscures the connection with the land of Israel. It is this holy land that had been polluted and that had led the community to withdraw to the desert to atone for it. For land as a metonym for its inhabitants see Zech 12:12, and see Hos 4:1-3 for the impact of injustice on the land. I am not suggesting conscious dependence on these texts on the part of the Qumran community.

¹⁴⁶ Leaney 1966: 224-25.

fat of sacrifice” (מבשר עולות ומחלבי זבח, IX 4);¹⁴⁷ rather, it is achieved with “the offerings of the lips” (תרומת שפתים, IX 4-5) and “right conduct as a pleasing freewill offering” (תמים דרך כנדבת מנחה רצון, IX 5). Words of praise and proper conduct are referred to with cultic metaphors, and are sufficient to remove defilement and secure God’s favour.¹⁴⁸

3.7.3 1QS IX 26–XI 22

The *Community Rule* (in 1QS) ends with a lengthy prayer ascribed to the *maskil*.¹⁴⁹ In 1QS XI 5-10 it becomes clear that some members of the community considered that God had chosen them to have an inheritance “in the lot of the holy ones” (בגורל קדושים, line 7-8) and to be united “with the sons of heaven” (עם בני שמים, line 8) to form the community council, although the speaker himself is not included since he belongs to evil humankind.¹⁵⁰ There is, however, no ascent to a heavenly temple. The communion happens within the community.¹⁵¹ Alongside this, in line 8, the community is designated as

¹⁴⁷ Wernberg-Møller 1957: 133 reads the preposition מן in the phrase מבשר עולות as “by means of,” referring to Milik with no bibliographical detail. Milik 1951: 151 translates “ex carne holocaustorum et ex pinguedine hostiarum oblationis.” He argues that while the sacrificial terminology is kept, “the attitude is altogether spiritual, and there can hardly be any doubt that the religious circles behind 1QS did not practice sacrificial cult.” His translation obscures this. Moreover, there seems little justification for translating עולות מבשר with “by means of the flesh of burnt offerings” and תרומת זבחי מחלבי with “from the fat pieces the sacrifices ...” Leaney 1966: 210 translates “more than by flesh of burnt offerings or by the fat of sacrifice,” although he makes no comment on this translation. Knibb 1987 notes “some uncertainties of translation,” but gives no further detail. For the various sense of מן see Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 212-14. The text of 4QS^b reads slightly differently: מבשר is lost in a lacuna, the מ is omitted from מחלבי, זבח is in the plural and נדבת is added in the description of the offering of the lips to read ותרומות ונדבת שפתים (“and gifts and freewill offerings”). The sense is, however, similar. Metso 1997: 87-88 suggests that “there is no ambiguity as to which of the versions represents the more original text,” but does not actually say which does.

¹⁴⁸ See Ps 51:15-17; Isa 57:18 [MT 57:19]; Hos 14:3; Pss. Sol. 15:3; Heb 13:15. The same cultic metaphors appear in the closing prayer ascribed to the *maskil*. In IX 26 Qimron and Charlesworth 1994b: 43 restore a reading where the *maskil* is instructed to bless his maker (עושי) with the offering of his lips (תרומת) יברכנו שפתים ..., 1QS IX 26). Qimron notes that “[i]t is unwise to restore too much in a lacuna such as at the bottom of col. 9.” Leaney 1966: 229 leaves a lacuna. Similar expressions appear in X 6 where the *maskil* resolves to bless God with the offering of the lips (תרומת שפתים הברכנו) and in X 14 where he resolves to bless God with the offering of the utterance of his lips (תרומת מוצא שפתים).

¹⁴⁹ The *maskil* is a technical term for a community functionary (Newsom 1985: 3; 1990b: 374, footnote 4, see 1QSb I 1; III 22; V 20). The term appears in the introductory rubrics of the songs in *ShirShabb*, which Newsom translates with “By the Instructor” (1985: 93, etc.). See 4Q400 1 I 1; 4Q400 3 II-5 8; 4Q401 1 2 1; 4Q402 1 I 30; 1 II 18; 4Q405 8-9 1; 20 II-22 6; 4Q406 1 4; 11Q17 II 1; VII 9). The role of the *maskil* was to admit candidates to the community and to regulate their lives, monitoring their holiness (1990b: 374-80). For these functions attributed to the *maskil* see 1QS III 13-15; IX 12–X 5. The term is common in 1QS/4QS and in some layers of CD.

¹⁵⁰ For similar ideas see 1QS^a II 8-9; XI 7-9; 1QM VII 6; 4Q400 2.

¹⁵¹ Nitzan 1994b:164-65. Alexander 2006:108 discusses this text under the rubric of realised eschatology, suggesting that the speaker is confident that his destiny to be part of the angelic community will ultimately be realised. There is little in the context to indicate a dichotomy between the present and the future. Those whom God chooses for such communion experience it in the present and expect it to endure throughout “all future ages” (כול קין, line 9).

“a holy building” (מבנית קודש), that is, a “spiritual earthly temple.”¹⁵² Thus, the encounter with angels takes place within the community, which then takes on the characteristics of a temple, the dwelling place of God on earth.

3.8 The *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa)

This manuscript was written by the same scribe and originally formed part of the same scroll as 1QS.¹⁵³ It is written in the hope that “all the congregation of Israel in the last days” (כול עדת ישראל באחרית הימים, I 1) would turn away from the wickedness of the nation and come together in the (Qumran) community under the authority of the Zadokite priests.¹⁵⁴ In this sense it is an inclusive document; however, when discussing the decision-making gatherings of the senior members of the community it becomes exclusive.¹⁵⁵ It debars those with defilement from participation in such gatherings, since angels were also present, requiring standards of temple purity to be maintained.¹⁵⁶

In II 3 all those afflicted with human uncleanness are forbidden to enter “the congregation of ‘these’” (קהל אלה).¹⁵⁷ In II 4-5 those with such defilement are debarred from any “standing in the midst of the congregation” (מעמד בתוך העדה), and in II 5b-9 there is a catalogue of the ways in which a person can be defiled, and thus “excluded from congregation of the men of renown” (להתיצב [ב]תוך עדת אנשי השם). The reason for this is given in lines 8-9: “for the holy angels are in their congregation” (כיא קודש [בעד]תם מלאכי).¹⁵⁸

The men of renown described in I 28–II 1 include the wise, the intelligent, those learned in perfect behaviour, leaders and officials and Levites, that is, senior members of

¹⁵² Gäbel 2006: 71. See also Gärtner 1965: 63–4.

¹⁵³ Charlesworth and Stuckenbruck 1994b: 108; Stegemann 1996: 481–87. The two documents are also related in subject matter. There are no other extant copies of the *Rule of the Congregation*. For the structure see Hempel 1996: 253–54.

¹⁵⁴ Boccaccini 1998: 154; Holtz 2009: 26. For a definition of “the last days” as the final period of history, immediately prior to the eschaton, and already begun in the life of the Qumran community, see Davidson 1992: 276–77; Steudel 1994b: 161; Stegemann 1996: 494. The final section of 1QSa (II 11–22) deals with a communal meal. It is debated whether it is wholly future or whether this too reflects the same sort of realised eschatology. For a reading of this reflecting realised eschatology see Davidson 1992: 277; Cross 1995: 75–6. For a wholly future meal see Priest 1963: 95–100; Schiffman 1989: 55–56.

¹⁵⁵ See Davidson 1992: 186, 278.

¹⁵⁶ Gärtner 1965: 61; Schiffman 1985: 383–84.

¹⁵⁷ The translation “these” is from *DSSSE* 103. The antecedent of אלה is presumably the men of renown (אנושי השם) of line 2, as in line 8. Charlesworth and Stuckenbruck 1994b: 114–15 read קהל אלה as “the assembly of God.” He notes that the formula derives from Deut 23:1–3 where certain people are excluded from the assembly of Yahweh (קהל יהוה ... לא יבא), and detects Aramaic influence in the text with אלה being the Aramaic form for God. See the discussion of this point in Schiffman 1989: 37.

¹⁵⁸ Charlesworth and Stuckenbruck 1994b: 116 restore תם [בעצ] (“in their council”), rather than תם [בעד] (“in the congregation”). For a critique of this reading see Hempel 1996: 269.

the community.¹⁵⁹ When these people gather, conditions of temple purity are to be maintained because of the presence of the holy angels.¹⁶⁰ Schiffman argues that the regulations of 1QSa are for a community living “on the verge of the end of days”¹⁶¹ and are intended as an attempt to “realize ... the very same level of perfection and purity which was to characterize the future age.”¹⁶² But this seems not to be the reason in this part of the text. Already, in the present the holy angels are in the congregation, thus conditions of temple purity are to be maintained.¹⁶³

3.9 The *Rule of Benedictions* (1QSb)

This manuscript was written by the same scribe and originally formed part of the same scroll as 1QS and 1QSa.¹⁶⁴ It seems to contain four blessings, although only three opening rubrics are preserved. A blessing upon the faithful community members begins in I 1,¹⁶⁵ a blessing upon the Zadokite priests begins at III 22,¹⁶⁶ and a blessing on the prince of the congregation begins at V 20.¹⁶⁷ The *maskil* prays that the Lord (אֲדֹנָי) would bless them

¹⁵⁹ The text is influenced by Deut 1:9-18; Exod 18:13-26. See Schiffman 1989: 32-35. In Deut 23:14 (MT 15) purity is required because Yahweh is travelling with the people.

¹⁶⁰ See also 1QM VII 6; XII 7-8; CD XV 15-17 (4Q265 8 I 1-7); 4QmidrEschat^a I 4, and the discussion in Gärtner 1965: 95; Wassen 2008: 115-29.

¹⁶¹ See 1QSa I 1 וְזֶה הַסֵּדֶר לְכֹל עֵדֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים (“and this is the rule for every assembly of Israel at the end of days”). For the translation “every assembly of Israel” see Stegemann 1996: 494.

¹⁶² Schiffman 1989: 8-9. However, Schiffman seems to read “the end of days” not as the last period of history, immediately prior to the eschaton (Steudel 1994b: 161; Stegemann 1996: 494), but as the time after the eschaton has dawned. As Stegemann also points out (pp. 494-95), in the messianic age such impurity would no longer exist and regulations such as this would be unnecessary.

¹⁶³ Schiffman 1989: 49-51 notes that “the angels are regarded as being in the assembly,” but then immediately defers this to the future, referring to 1QM and the belief that the angels “would be present in the military camp.” He seems to downplay the notion that the angels are with the congregation in the present, seemingly deferring it to the future messianic age. Bokser 1985: 283-84, in discussion of 1QM, suggests that the presence of the angels is a reworking of Deut 23:24 (MT 15) which excludes certain people from the camp because God is travelling (מִתְהַלֵּךְ) within the camp. He extrapolates from this that the Qumran community “saw themselves as a replacement for the Temple, where the divine presence would dwell until the eschaton when God will bring a New Temple” (p. 284).

¹⁶⁴ Milik 1955d: 119; Alexander 1996: 438; Stegemann 1996: 480.

¹⁶⁵ I use the line and column numbers in *DSSSE* 104-109.

¹⁶⁶ The blessings pronounced upon to the faithful members of the community and the Zadokite priests (בְּנֵי צְדוֹק, III 23) uniformly use singular pronoun suffixes (יְבָרְכֶכָּה אֲדֹנָי, III 25, see also I 3), see Nitzan 1994c:155-56, Stegemann 1996: 497-98. These blessings use the language of the priestly blessing of Num 6:24-27 (see Milik 1955d: 121 and *passim*; Schiffman 1989: 74-75, Abegg 2003: 91-92). In that text, while the opening words are addressed to the Israelites (בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, plural), the blessing uniformly uses a singular pronominal suffix (יְבָרְכֶךָ יְהוָה וַיִּשְׁמְרֶךָ, “may Yahweh bless you and keep you”). Ps 128:5; 134:3 display this same phenomenon.

¹⁶⁷ Others suggest different arrangements for 1QSb. Dimant 1984: 524 suggests three sections, and Schiffman 1989: 72-73 (following Licht 1965–Hebrew, and not accessed) suggests several blessings addressed to various groups within the community, based on the different groups delineated in 1QSa. Nitzan 1994c: 163 and Abegg 2003: 91 also suggest that columns I-III may have contained a series of blessings addressed to different groups, some unknown. The last column ends at line 29, and the most of the blessing on the prince of the congregation is no longer extant, see Milik 1955d: 120; Stegemann 1996: 496-498. Column V refers

“from his holy dwelling” (קודשו I 3 ממעון), that is, the heavenly temple from where God blesses his people.¹⁶⁸

Column IV 22–V 19 seems to be a blessing on the high priest, although the opening rubric is missing.¹⁶⁹ The *maskil* claims that he has been chosen to be raised “at the head of the holy ones” (לשאת ברוש קדושים, IV 23)¹⁷⁰ and prays that he would become “as an angel of the presence in the holy dwelling” (קודש כמלאך פנים במעון קודש, IV 25), “serving in the royal temple” (משרת בהיכל מלכות, IV 25) and “casting the lot with the angels of the presence and the community council” (מפיל עם מלאכי פנים ועצת יחד, IV 26).¹⁷¹ He prays that the high priest would be made “holy among his people” (קודש [ש], IV 27), and a “luminary” (למאור, IV 27).¹⁷² Line 28 refers to “a diadem for the holy of holies” (נזר לקודש קדושים),¹⁷³ and the blessing concludes with the statement that the high priest would “glorify the name of God and God’s holy things” (תכבד שמו וקודשיו, IV 28).¹⁷⁴

Three related issues are debated here. Scholars question whether the sense of the preposition כ (as, like) in IV 25 means that the high priest takes on an angelomorphic (or angelic) identity or whether he is simply “like” the angel of the presence in his service of God. The second issue is whether the text refers to the present or the future; that is, whether the high priest is an eschatological priestly messiah (in the future) or whether the priests at Qumran and the high priest in particular “actually received this blessing and served as angels of the presence in the abode of holiness” in the present.¹⁷⁵ The third issue

twice to a sceptre (שבט, lines 24, 27), echoing Num 24:17 which is also echoed in Heb 7:14–15, and Isa 11:4. For a fuller discussion of the allusions to Num 24 in Hebrews see Church 2008. For the echo of Num 24:17 in 1QSb V see Fletcher-Louis 2002: 10, 226 and for the echoes of Isa 11:4 see Evans 2003: 66.

¹⁶⁸ These words are added in a lacuna by the editors of *DSSSE* (p. 104). Charlesworth and Stuckenbruck 1994a: 122 make no attempt to fill the lacuna. The words קודש במעון (“in the holy dwelling”) appear in IV 25. The expression refers to God’s heavenly dwelling place in Deut 26:15; Ps 68:6; 2 Chron 30:27; Jer 25:30; Zech 2:17. It is from here that Deut 26:15 instructs the people to call on Yahweh to look down and bless his people.

¹⁶⁹ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 151–58 argues this from the focus on the apparel of the high priest. See also Schiffman 1989: 73; Ringgren 1995: 177–78; Abegg 2003: 91. Gäbel 2006: 71 assumes that the blessings in this column are a continuation of those addressed to the Zadokite priests in column III.

¹⁷⁰ This translation from Fletcher-Louis 2002: 152, see also DJD I:126. *DSSSE* 107 translates רוש as a plural.

¹⁷¹ In this text the angel of the presence is both singular (line 25) and plural (line 26).

¹⁷² The ל marks the indirect object of שים as in Mic 1:6.

¹⁷³ This translation is from Fletcher-Louis 2002: 155. Milik 1955d: 126 restored וישימכה (“and may he make you”) prior to the word נזר, giving a reading that Fletcher-Louis calls “non-literal,” referring to the priest himself as a diadem. Such a diadem was worn by the high priest (Exod 29:6; 39:30; Lev 8:9), with the words “holy to the Lord” (Exod 39:30) inscribed upon it.

¹⁷⁴ Stuckenbruck 1995: 152–154 suggests that the referent of קודשיו in this line is “his holy place.” This is similar to the use of the neuter plural τὰ ἁγία for the sanctuary in Heb 8:2.

¹⁷⁵ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 158.

relates to the identification of the holy dwelling. Is this the heavenly temple (above), the earthly temple (below), or both?

On the first issue, Gieschen argues for a “functional identity between these human priests and their heavenly counterparts,” but denies that human priests were angelomorphic.¹⁷⁶ On the other hand, Fletcher Louis suggests that the force of the preposition “demands a real angelic identity for the high priest.”¹⁷⁷ While I cannot enter this debate, I do note that the elevation of the priest to such an exalted status is important background to Hebrews, showing that in contemporary Judaism it was possible to envisage a human exalted to where he could be compared with the angels, making it also possible to envision Christ as a supra-angelic being.¹⁷⁸ Nevertheless, I will argue below that in Hebrews Jesus the high priest is an exalted human who has become superior to the angels (1:4-13; 2:5-9) but does not take on any angelic (or angelomorphic) status.¹⁷⁹

The remaining questions revolve around the way that the community perceived the relationships between the present and the future, and between earth and heaven. Gäbel suggests that the blessings will come to pass in the eschaton when the covenant of the priesthood is renewed and that participation in angelic functions on the part of the members of the community will take place within the cult of the earthly temple.¹⁸⁰ On the other hand, Stegemann argues that here there are “no elements of eschatology or any connotation of the future.”¹⁸¹ Hannah suggests that the text reflects a belief in “an angelic

¹⁷⁶ Gieschen 1998: 174. The idea of a heavenly counterpart appears in the *Ladder of Jacob* where the angels see Jacob’s counterpart enthroned in heaven. See Rowland 1984: 504; Fossum 1995: 140-41; Orlov 2007: 153-73). I discuss this and its later development in later Jewish literature briefly below (5.8).

¹⁷⁷ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 152. This issue also raises its head in *Jub.* 31:14 where Levi is glorified to serve in the sanctuary “as the angels of the presence and the holy ones” (trans. Wintermute 1985: 115). For the influence of *Jub.* 31:14 on 1QSb IV 24-35 see Hultgård 1977: 1: 38-9; Endres 1987: 160; VanderKam 1988: 352-65; Fletcher-Louis 2002: 155-58. Barker 1995: 23-24 suggests that 1QSb column IV reflects the notion that “those who led the earthly worship [at Qumran] were angels before the heavenly throne.” Brooke 2005b: 162-64 is cautiously optimistic about Fletcher-Louis’s arguments concerning angelomorphic priesthood, suggesting that “[i]t is manifestly clear, however, that the worshipping community is envisioned as participating in the worship of the angels to the point at which the distinction between the human and the divine, between community members and angels, and between heaven and earth, is blurred.”

¹⁷⁸ Morray-Jones 1992: 22 argues that the notion of the human priesthood representing “the mediating angel ... [is] surely the background of the Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews.”

¹⁷⁹ See 6.3 (below).

¹⁸⁰ Gäbel 2006: 70-71. Milik 1955d: 127 proposed that the temple referred to was that of the New Jerusalem and on pp. 121-22, 128-29, followed by Schiffman 1989: *passim*, he argued that 1QSb related entirely to the future, considering that the blessings were for the eschatological royal and priestly messiahs. Alexander 1996: 442 suggests that 1QSb is “part of a special order of service to be enacted at the inauguration of the *eschaton*.” Schiffman 1989: 75 suggests that these blessings “represent the eschatological benedictions of the present age, which the sect believed would be recited at the dawn of the *eschaton*.” Nitzan 1994c: 141 refers to the recitation of these blessings “in the eschatological future.”

¹⁸¹ Stegemann 1996: 500. He notes on p. 488 that there is no trace of a priestly messiah in 1QSb and argues that this document relates not to the future but to the present. Gärtner 1965: 96 also considers that relegating this text to the future is “an unnecessary limitation,” proposing that it reflects “the attitude of the

priesthood and cult parallel to earth,”¹⁸² while Fletcher-Louis maintains that “[t]here is no ‘on earth (below) as it is in heaven (above)’ language here.”¹⁸³

Given the fragmented nature of the scroll it is unlikely that the issues can be resolved. Hebrews also reflects ideas such as this concerning the high priest, the present and the future, and the relationship between the heavenly and earthly sanctuaries. Jesus is exalted to a position at the right hand of the throne of God (Heb 1:3) and crowned with glory and honour (Heb 2:7-10; cf. 1QSb III 25). He is a high priest (8:1-2) who serves the heavenly sanctuary (Heb 8:2; cf. *Jub.* 30:18; 31:14; 1QSb IV 28). I will argue below that the heavenly sanctuary is the eschatological goal of the people of God.¹⁸⁴ But since the recipients of Hebrews are also considered to have “come to the heavenly Jerusalem” (12:22-24), the heavenly sanctuary encompasses both heaven and earth. And while the situation of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary is understood as a present reality, there is a sense in which the future has irrupted into the present with his exaltation. In Hebrews as also perhaps in 1QSb, both present and future, and above and below are merged.

3.10 The *War Scroll* (1QM)

The first editor of this document aptly named it “The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light with the Sons of Darkness,”¹⁸⁵ since it “records the rules for the conduct of the eschatological war its author expected to be waged between Israel and the nations.”¹⁸⁶ Clearly, this was no ordinary war, and to see it as such would obscure the theological nature of the work.¹⁸⁷ Children of light and children of darkness are theological terms,¹⁸⁸ and the children of light ultimately prevail because God intervenes (XVIII 1).

present community to their cultic contacts with the heavenly world, it being a general and natural characteristic to combine and interweave present and future in this way.” Fletcher-Louis 2002: 159-60 suggests that belief in an “angelomorphic human high priesthood” was not confined to the future at Qumran, and that “even though the angelomorphic high priest is placed in the heavenly realm, this was already the sphere of life for the Qumran community members.”

¹⁸² Hannah 1999: 61. Davidson 1992: 280 detects the idea of the community as a holy temple, and proposes that “the blessing envisaged for the priests would be that they should serve God in the sectarian community on earth and on into perpetuity.”

¹⁸³ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 152 (*italics original*). In his discussion of Heb 8:5, Ellingworth 1993: 408 suggests that 1QSb IV 24-28 is evidence for the theory that the OT cultus “was only a copy of the heavenly reality.” I argue against this reading of Hebrews below (8.5).

¹⁸⁴ Chapter 7 (below).

¹⁸⁵ Sukenik 1955: 35. The *War Scroll* is also preserved in six fragments from Cave 4, all copied from around 50 B.C.E. until the beginning of the first century C.E. (4Q491, 4Q492, 4Q493, 4Q494, 4Q495, 4Q496). In addition, 4Q285 and 11Q14 are almost certainly part of the *War Scroll*. See *DSSSE* 112-13; Dimant 1984: 515.

¹⁸⁶ Nickelsburg 2005a: 143.

¹⁸⁷ Davidson 1992: 213-15; Wenhe 1998: 293; Harrington 2006a: 177-83. Ringgren 1995: 18-19 suggests that it is more aptly described as “a liturgy for the Holy War” (p. 19).

¹⁸⁸ Ringgren 1995: 19.

1QM was copied late in the first century B.C.E.,¹⁸⁹ but the date of composition is debated, with some suggesting the Seleucid period and others the Roman period.¹⁹⁰ The text can be divided into four distinct sections, one of which (X-XIV) contains liturgical material, providing a theological foundation for the eschatological war.¹⁹¹

The *War Scroll* refers to angelic hosts several times.¹⁹² Gammie argues that these references indicate a thoroughgoing spatial dualism, with angels actively participating in the battle between the members of the community and their human enemies, albeit operating not from earth but from heaven.¹⁹³ He further suggests that this sort of spatial dualism, or “homology,” that is, analogical relationship between what goes on on earth and what goes on in heaven, is found in a variety of texts from Middle Judaism, including Hebrews.¹⁹⁴

I will argue below that this is a misreading of Hebrews and I suggest here that Gammie has misread the *War Scroll*. Indeed, as Fletcher-Louis rightly points out, it mentions no war in heaven. Rather, it rehearses a human conflict in which angels have a role to play, a phenomenon also present in a variety of other texts.¹⁹⁵ Moreover, the outcome of the war

¹⁸⁹ Dimant 1984: 515. It is a composite document, with a complex literary history which I cannot go into. See Davies 1977: 25-124 and the discussion in Duhaime 2004: 45-53.

¹⁹⁰ See the discussion in Wenthe 1998: 291-92. This issue is complex and not particularly relevant for this study. Wenthe considers that the Kittim are Romans, as in 1QpHab and 4QpNah, and that the military configurations described in the *War Scroll* favour the Roman period (1998: 291-92, footnote 6). Davidson 1992: 213 refers to “the overwhelming majority opinion of scholars ... that the *War Scroll* is a Qumran sectarian composition from the second century BC [the Seleucid period].” These scholars include Dimant 1984: 487-88, Stegemann 1996: 502; Collins 1998: 168-69; Davies 2006: 224.

¹⁹¹ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 403. On the structure and contents see Yadin 1962: 7-17; Davies 1977: 20-23; Wenthe 1998: 292, 94. There are two references to the earthly sanctuary (מִקְדָּשׁ): in II 3, in a discussion of temple service; and in VII 11, in a discussion of priestly roles in the war and battle garments that may not be taken into the sanctuary; and a tantalising reference to “his (God’s?) house” (בֵּיתוֹ) in X 18, which is devoid of any immediate context. In VII 3-7 ritual purity is required because of the presence of the holy angels in the camp. I discuss this above in connection with 1QSa II 4-10. Another version of this material, omitting reference to the holy angels, is found in 4Q491 1-3.

¹⁹² 1QM I 10-11; VII 6-7; XI 17; XII 1, 7; XV 14; XVII 6-7.

¹⁹³ Gammie 1974: 371. Duhaime 1982: 34, claims that the *War Scroll* evidences a correspondence “between what happens in heaven and on earth, the two essential planes of the world.” Collins 1975: 603 refers to “the two-storey structure of the war and the intermingling of Israel with the heavenly host.” This aspect is absent from Collins’ discussion in 1998: 166-68, where he refers simply to “the presence of angelic forces” without suggesting that there was another battle taking place in heaven. Schiffman 1989: 50-51 also refers to the “great eschatological battle ... fought ... both in heaven and on earth ... a simultaneous and mutual [battle].”

¹⁹⁴ Gammie 1974: 360-61.

¹⁹⁵ Exod 23:20; 33:2; Josh 5:13-15; 1 Kings 22:19; 2 Kings 6:17; 19:35; 2 Chron 32:21; 2 Macc 10:29-31; 11:6; 15:23; 1 En 56:5. War in heaven is reflected in texts such as Dan 10:13, 20-21; Rev 12:7-9. Davidson 1992: 232 refers to spatial dualism between the heavenly and earthly worlds. While he finds no specific mention of a war in heaven between angels in 1QM, he argues that it is “presupposed” by a number of factors, including the exaltation of Michael (1QM XVII 8-9), the defeat of Belial and his spirits by God (1QM I 15; XIV 14; XV 13-14; XVII 5-6; XVIII 1-3) and the influence of Daniel. Davidson also notes a similar conceptual framework in Dan 10 and Rev 12:7-9. However, in 1QM God is an active participant in the battle, while in Daniel and Revelation the angels are at war between themselves. In *L.A.B.* 61:8-9 the dying Goliath

is on earth. There is nothing in the text to indicate a worldview where “there are two separate, albeit interdependent, but nevertheless quite distinct worlds, the heavenly and the earthly.”¹⁹⁶

Column XII comprises two sections, separated by a blank line (6). Lines 1-5 contain three references to God’s dwelling place and one reference to heaven, as well as several descriptions of the beings in God’s dwelling place. Lines 1-2 refer to “the multitude of [these] holy ones in heaven” (רוב קדושים [א]לה בשמים),¹⁹⁷ “the host of angels in God’s holy dwelling” (עבאות מלאכים בזבול קודשכה),¹⁹⁸ “the book (or the enumeration)¹⁹⁹ of the names of all their hosts in God’s holy dwelling” (ספר שמות), and “the number of the righteous in God’s glorious dwelling” (מ[ספר צד]קים בזבול כבודכה). Lines 1-2 also refer to “the chosen ones of the holy people” (בחירי עם קדוש), and line 4 to “the armies of God’s chosen ones” (עבאות ב[חיריכה]), God’s “holy ones” (קדושיכה) and God’s “angels” (מלאכיכה), all of whom are mustered together. Finally, in line 5, “the people of the chosen ones of heaven” (בחירי שמים עם) prevail.

Lines 7-17 are silent about heaven, but the community is not alone. The speaker addresses God, noting that “the congregation of God’s holy ones is amongst ‘us’” (עדת קדושיכה בתוכנו, line 7),²⁰⁰ that “the king of glory is with ‘us’ together with the holy

opens his eyes and sees not David but an angel. See also *Midr. Ps.* 18:32, and *Tg. Supplement* at 1 Sam 17:42-43 which refers to the involvement of angels in Goliath’s death at the hand of David. See Jacobson 1996: 1186-87; Fletcher-Louis 2002: 417-8 (footnote 42).

¹⁹⁶ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 397-98.

¹⁹⁷ Gäbel 2006: 73 transcribes **לה** [ל] (“to you”) rather than **לה** [א] (“these”) following Lohse 1986: 206. Sukenik 1955, Plate 27 shows a lacuna here, with space for one character, followed by the remains of a **ל** and what appears to be a **ה**. In Tov and Pfann 1993: Fiche 97; Reynolds et al., 1998; Sukenik 1955, Plate 27 the distinction between what remains of this word and the word **לכה** in the following line is quite clear. Sukenik did not attempt to fill the lacuna. Fletcher-Louis 2002: 429 (footnote 70), following Jongeling 1962: 18, 274 argues that **אלה** is the most likely reading since there is insufficient space for a **כ** between the **ל** and the **ה**. The word **אלה** refers back to the contents of the end of column 11, which are no longer extant (Yadin 1962: 314; Jongeling 1962: 274). Had the referent of **אלה** been preserved the understanding of XII 1-5 could have been considerably enhanced by clarifying the referent of “these holy ones.”

¹⁹⁸ The expression **קודשכה בזבול** appears in Isa 63:15 alongside **שמים** as here. In Hab 3:11 **זבול** refers to the exalted place of the moon at the dedication of the temple; in 1 Kings 8:13 and 2 Chron 6:2 it is the exalted house that Solomon builds for Yahweh, and in Ps 49:15 it refers to Sheol as the dwelling place of the foolhardy. There is a similar reference to a dwelling in the nether world in 4Q298 II 1, and in *ShirShabb* in 4Q403 I I 41 (4Q405 6 2) and in 4Q405 81 2. Newsom 1985: 212 renders **זבול רום רומים** in 4Q403 I I 41 as “supremely lofty abode.” It is probably not a proper name for heaven in this text or in *ShirShabb* as it is in 3 *En* 17:3 (for the fourth heaven along with the names of six other heavens) and *b. Hag.* 12b (see Newsom 1985: 221).

¹⁹⁹ *DSSSE* 133 reads **ספר** in line 2 as “book,” while Yadin 1962: 314 reads it as “enumeration.” See Ps 147:4; Isa 40:26; 1 *En* 43:1-2 for God naming and enumerating the stars. Fletcher-Louis 2002: 424 renders the word with “book,” followed by a question mark. The text is ambiguous.

²⁰⁰ Yadin 1962: 316 renders line 7 with “And Thou, O God, [art terrible] in the glory of Thy majesty, and the congregation of Thy holy ones are amongst us.” This appears to be an English grammatical error, with the plural verb incorrectly attracted to the plural (holy ones) rather than the singular (congregation). Yadin

ones” (מֶלֶךְ הַכְּבוֹד אֲתָנוּ עִם קְדוּשִׁים),²⁰¹ that “the army of his angels is enlisted with ‘us’” (צְבָא מַלְאָכִים בַּפְּקוּדֵינוּ), line 8), that “the war hero is in ‘our’ congregation” (הַמֶּלֶח [מֵהָ] בַּעֲדָתָנוּ גִּבּוֹר), line 9), and that the army of his spirits is with “our” steps (עִם צַעֲדֵינוּ צְבָא רוּחִיו), line 9).

Davies recognises that in lines 1-2, while רֹב קְדוּשִׁים (“the multitude of holy ones”) might refer to humans, the parallel expression צְבָאוֹת מַלְאָכִים (“the host of angels”) indicates that angels are in view in each case.²⁰² However, this need not be the case. Indeed, צְבָאוֹת clearly refers to humans in 1QM VI 6; X 10 and XVI 1, and while מַלְאָךְ (“angel”) refers to the Levitical priesthood.²⁰³ Thus, Fletcher-Louis argues that 1QM XII 1-2 refers to “two groups who share the same space.”²⁰⁴ This is more likely, given that the lines 7-17 envisage

apparently intends to say that God is “terrible,” and the congregation (sing) of his holy ones is amongst the community. Similarly, *DSSSE*, 133 translates, “You God, are [awesome] in the splendour of your majesty, and the congregation of your holy ones is with us.” See also Black 1961: 155. On the other hand, Fletcher-Louis 2002: 432 translates “You, O God, [...] in the Glory of your kingship and the congregation of the holy ones, are in our midst. For this reading to be valid, the preposition ב attached to מְלֻכּוֹתֵכֶם (“the glory of your kingdom”) also needs to govern the words וְעַד קְדוּשִׁיכֶם (“the congregation of your holy ones”). Gärtner 1965: 93 translates the line similarly, adding “in” in brackets before “the congregation of your holy ones.” I have not found another example of this syntax in the DSS, although the breadth and fragmentation of the material makes certainty impossible. In 1QH^a V 25-26 the preposition עִם appears to govern two substantives. It is preferable to read the text as exclaiming the greatness of God and claiming the presence of the holy ones with the community on earth (as in *DSSSE*).

²⁰¹ I read עִם as the preposition “with,” although reading it as “people” is also possible (see Collins 1993: 315). Fletcher-Louis 2002: 435 reads it as “people” and argues that the congregation of the holy ones (line 7) and the people of the holy ones (עִם קְדוּשִׁים, line 8) refer to the members of the community. It is difficult to see how a congregation comprising people can be “amongst us.” Gärtner 1965: 98 also reads “people” and sees some alternation with the holy ones “now ... the company of angels, and now the sanctified members of the community.” On this reading line 7 refers to angels and line 8 to the community. Brekelmans 1965: 323 argues for a reference to people rather than angels in this text, claiming that עִם appears not to be used of angels either in the OT or the DSS. He is probably correct. The translation in *DSSSE* (p. 133) is obscure. It reads “the Lord is holy and the King of glory is with us the nation of his holy ones are [our] heroes.” At first glance it appears that “the nation of his holy ones” is in apposition to “with us,” however, the addition of the verb to be (“are [our] heroes”) makes the nation of his holy ones the subject of that verb. A comma is required between “with us” and “the nation of his holy ones” to clarify the sense. For similar expressions see 1QM X 10 (בְּרִית עִם קְדוּשִׁים, “a people of holy ones of the covenant”) and 1QH^a XIX 11-12 (בְּגוֹרֵל עִם, “in the lot with your holy ones”).

²⁰² Davies 1977: 100-1; Brekelmans 1965: 321.

²⁰³ The words בְּרִית (“covenant”), שְׁלוֹם (“peace”) and חַיִּים (“life”) appear together only in Mal 2:5 and 1QM XII 3. See Fletcher-Louis 2002: 425. On pp. 13-15 Fletcher-Louis proposes that this text in Malachi is “[o]ne of the most important biblical texts which gave canonical authority to the belief in an angelomorphic priesthood.” This text also exerted an influence on *Jub.* 31, reflected in 1Q28b III 22-27. See VanderKam 1988: 362

²⁰⁴ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 425-26. Davidson 1992: 229-230 refers to God’s army consisting of holy ones and angels in heaven and “‘the elect ones of the holy nation’ *on earth*” fighting together (italics added). However, the only reference to the earth in this column is in line 5, where God’s armies are said to destroy “the rebels of earth” (קָמִי אֶרֶץ). While these rebels are apparently on earth (Yadin 1962: 315), all the other participants in the battle appear to be located in sacred space, i.e. “heaven on earth.”

angelic beings among the human community. Thus, lines 1-5 have angels and humans in heaven, while in 7-17 humans and angels are on earth.

At first it appears that the heavenly temple is in view in lines 1-5,²⁰⁵ especially with שמים (“heaven”) in line 1 juxtaposed with three other expressions for God’s dwelling place. However, it seems clear that the battle takes place on earth, and that Fletcher-Louis is right in his claim that these lines “do not describe angels in heaven above moving in synch with the human troops on the ground below. The angels—the spirits—are among the troops in the earthly conflict and both are therefore set apart from the heavenly setting of 12:1-5.”²⁰⁶ That this is so is confirmed in lines 13-14 where Zion, Jerusalem and the cities of Judah are called upon to rejoice at the victory that the war hero has won and to open their gates to the wealth of the nations.

Gärtner concurs, arguing that the oscillation between the third person (lines 1-5) and first person references to the community (lines 6-9) indicates that “the community considered itself to be a dwelling place for heavenly beings” and that they “believed themselves, through the cultus, to be living a life of fellowship with heaven.” He concludes that the heavenly beings are in the midst of the community, but also in the heavenly world, suggesting “a direct link between heaven and earth, between the heavenly temple and the earthly; and further, that the earthly congregation is to some extent a reflection of the heavenly world.”²⁰⁷

This text provides further evidence of human and angelic beings involved in the same functions, probably simultaneously on earth and in heaven, with no rigid dualism between earth and heaven.²⁰⁸ This notion is reflected in Heb 12:22-24 where the earthbound community has access to the heavenly Jerusalem. The text seems to refer to one and same (sacred) space, so that the angels and the humans are in the dwelling place of God, which is on earth and in heaven simultaneously.²⁰⁹

²⁰⁵ Yadin 1962: 241 suggests that lines 1-4 establish that “the elect of the holy people are in heaven together with the angels before God.”

²⁰⁶ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 435.

²⁰⁷ Gärtner 1965: 94. On pp. 88, 98 he finds similar ideas in 1QM XII 1-9 and Heb 12:18-24, and suggests that Heb 12:18-24 “determines the temple symbolism of Hebrews” (footnote 2, pp. 88-89), although he does not explain this remark. I will argue below (7.6) that the claim of Heb 12:22-24 that the recipients “have come to” the heavenly Jerusalem while still on earth, indicates that the heavenly temple cannot be some Platonic ideal in heaven above, of which the tabernacle on earth below is a copy.

²⁰⁸ Davies 1977: 103; Fletcher-Louis 2002: 435.

²⁰⁹ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 425 refers to “the possibility that these refer to the supernal world *and* Israel’s cult at one and the same time” (emphasis original).

3.11 The *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*

The *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (*ShirShabb*)²¹⁰ contain considerable evidence of the notion of human fellowship with angels and substantial detail describing the heavenly temple.²¹¹ These songs were evidently important for the Qumran community, since no less than ten copies were found, eight in Cave 4, one in Cave 11 and one at Masada.²¹² They were apparently produced over a period of one hundred and twenty years, from around 75 B.C.E.²¹³ While the evidence is debated, Newsom considers that they were probably composed prior to 100 B.C.E., outside the Qumran community.²¹⁴ There are thirteen songs, one for each of the thirteen Sabbaths of one quarter of the year,²¹⁵ ostensibly sung by angels in the heavenly temple.²¹⁶

²¹⁰ For the designation *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* see Strugnell 1960: 318. Strugnell published two scrolls, which he named *Serek Širôt Ólat Haššabbat* (*Rule for the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*).

²¹¹ Collins 2007b: 299.

²¹² Morray-Jones 1998: 410-11; Frennesson 1999: 94. Newsom 1985: 74; 1990c: 182 discusses the significance of the copy found at Masada.

²¹³ Newsom 1985: 86, 126, 147-48, 168, 186-87, 249-50, 258-59, 355, 359, 363; Alexander 2006: 13-14. The copies found in Cave 11 and at Masada are in late Herodian script, and dated around 50 C.E. (DJD XI: 239), while those found in Cave 4 are in a Hasmonean script, and all predate the turn of the era. 4Q406 1 2 and perhaps fragment 3 2 has the word אֱלֹהִים in Palaeo-Hebrew characters. Alexander notes (pp. 14-15) little evidence of reworking in the different manuscripts, indicating perhaps that it was a liturgical document, “the text of an important ritual performed by the community, [and] approached in a conservative spirit, the performance being deemed effective only if repeated exactly as transmitted” (p. 15).

²¹⁴ The precise provenance of *ShirShabb* is not decisive for this study. Newsom 1985: 1-4 adopted the “working hypothesis” that they were a product of the Qumran community. Later she changed her stance suggesting that their origin should be sought outside the Qumran community “in the priestly scribal circles that produced such works as *Jubilees* or Aramaic *Levi*” (2000b: 887). This revision of her view was due to the presence of a copy at Masada, the frequent use of אֱלֹהִים for God, a rare phenomenon at Qumran other than in quotations from the Bible, and the relationship between *ShirShabb* and other documents considered to be community compositions, although she does recognise the complexity of the evidence (1990c: 179-85). Most recently (2010: 1246), Newsom suggests that “on balance [the internal evidence] probably points towards a Qumran origin.” Those who see these songs as a community composition include Strugnell 1960: 318; Yadin 1965: 106; Davidson 1992: 235; Maier 1992: 559-60; Collins 1997a: 141-43; Falk 1998: 126-30; Fletcher-Louis 2002: 394. Nickelsburg 2005a: 153 finds community terminology lacking and is uncertain whether they are a Qumran composition. Alexander 2006: 23-24 believes that the language of the fifth song is “strongly reminiscent of other passages in the Scrolls,” providing evidence that it was either composed by the Qumran sect or is “at least a sectarian reworking of a non-sectarian text.” He finds similarities with 1QS III 15-16, noting the idea of war in heaven in this song and also the celestial liturgy it reflects, ideas that are present in other scrolls.

²¹⁵ Newsom 1985: 5, 19, 2000b: 888 considers that they were used in the first quarter only, suggesting that since no other extant scrolls containing any such similar liturgies have been found, it is unlikely that there were other liturgies for the remainder of the year. This does not necessarily follow. Strugnell 1960: 320, who did not have the benefit of the entire corpus, proposed that one such song would have been composed “for every Sabbath of the year according to the Essene calendar.” Maier 1992: 544-545 (and *passim*) finding nothing that points to the first quarter only, considers they were intended for each quarterly cycle throughout the year, as do Nitzan 1994c: 284; Collins 1997a: 136-37; Falk 1998: 136-37 and Alexander 2006: 51.

²¹⁶ Alexander 2006: 13. Davidson 1992: 236 assembles evidence indicating that angels are addressed in *ShirShabb*. He notes that, “it is clear that an extensive angelological vocabulary is utilized” (*ibid.*). On pp. 339-42 he lists the angelic designations used in *ShirShabb*.

3.11.1 The Structure and Purpose of *ShirShabb*

After a superscription, each of the thirteen songs begins with a call to praise (הללו), followed by an epithet for God, and then a substantive addressing those who are called to praise God. For example, 4Q403 1 I 30-31 begins the song for the seventh Sabbath with the words הללו אלוהי מרומים הרמים בכול אלי דעת (“praise the God of the heights you exalted ones among all the gods of knowledge”). It appears that a member of the community (on earth) calls upon the angels in heaven to praise God. The remainder of each song describes different aspects of their worship,²¹⁷ and Newsom suggests that the songs imply that the community considered itself to be participating in the liturgy of heaven.²¹⁸

Newsom discerns a pyramid structure, with the seventh song (the most liturgically detailed) at the apex, and other scholars have followed this suggestion.²¹⁹ She also notes progression from the outer courts of the heavenly sanctuary to the inner sanctum in the ninth to the thirteenth songs, suggesting that it reflects a tour of the heavenly temple, modelled on Ezek 40-48.²²⁰ Newsom concludes:

During the course of this thirteen week cycle, the community which recites the compositions is led through a lengthy preparation. The mysteries of the angelic priesthood are recounted, a hypnotic celebration of the sabbatical number seven produces an anticipatory climax at the center of the work, and the community is then gradually led through the spiritually animate heavenly

²¹⁷ Schwemer 1991: 60-62 considers that *ShirShabb* has its roots in such texts as Ps 103:19-22 and Dan 3:52-58 (LXX). On the other hand Fletcher-Louis 2002: 261 finds no precedent elsewhere for the (human) “*maskil* who conducts the Sabbath Songs ... [commanding] the imagined heavenly beings to worship.” He outlines the differences between what is found in the OT and what is found in *ShirShabb* on pp. 261-62, noting that when texts such as Ps 66:1-3; 96:1-2, 7-9; 103:19-22; 148; 150:6 and the LXX additions to Daniel call upon heavenly beings, and indeed the entire creation, to praise God, they do so with much less detail than is encountered in *ShirShabb*, and also in the context of human praise. He suggests a “*development*” in *ShirShabb* from the biblical material, but not a one-to-one correspondence.

²¹⁸ Newsom 1985: 59-63; 1987: 11. In 1987: 13 she suggests that “this fascination with the angelic priesthood can probably be judged to be an expression of a disenfranchised priestly community’s attempt to clarify its own identity,” an opinion shared by Nickelsburg 2005a: 153 and Puech 1987: 605. Strugnell 1960: 320 suggested that *ShirShabb* was composed either to accompany the sacrifice “schismatically performed” by the Qumran sect, or else as songs “by which these sacrifices were spiritually replaced.” However, the evidence for animal sacrifice at Qumran is mixed. Maier 1992: 552-53 proposes that the songs in *ShirShabb* were offered as substitutes for the real Sabbath offerings performed in the Jerusalem temple, and “in a certain sense also staging and participating in the performance of the corresponding ritual in the heavenly sanctuary.” Chazon 1999a: 260 proposes several options: “a substitute for the earthly sacrifice; liturgical accompaniment to the angelic offering; communion with the angels; and experiencing the Heavenly Temple.”

²¹⁹ Newsom 1985: 13-17; Maier 1992: 546; Falk 1998: 133; Frennesson 1999: 96; Davila 2000: 84. Baumgarten 1988: 206-7 suggests that Newsom pays too little attention to the progression towards a climax in the ninth to the thirteenth songs. Morray-Jones 1998: 417-19 finds that the seventh song is a “preliminary crescendo,” and that the real climax comes in the twelfth song with a vision of the *Merkabah*. Fletcher-Louis 2002: 382-88 argues that the climax comes in the thirteenth song, with the vision of God enthroned in the holy of holies. A climax here in the presence of God seems a more likely scenario than earlier in the liturgy.

²²⁰ Newsom 1985: 14, 52-57.

temple until the worshippers experience the holiness of the merkabah and of the Sabbath sacrifice as it is conducted by the high priests of the angels.²²¹

While these songs do resemble a heavenly ascent, there is some debate as to precisely what is being described. Newsom proposes a “virtual tour” of the heavenly sanctuary,²²² so as to “create and manipulate the virtual experience of being present in the heavenly temple and in the presence of the angelic priests who serve there.”²²³ Since the Qumran priests had withdrawn from the Jerusalem temple, this would give them the experience of serving in the true temple above.²²⁴ On the other hand, Strugnell suggests that the worship takes place on earth and that “the presence of the angels is in a sense invoked.”²²⁵ He further suggests that these songs are “a composition ... in which the Heavenly Temple is portrayed on the model of the earthly one and in some way its service is considered a pattern of what is being done below.”²²⁶ Fletcher-Louis refers to the heavenly ascent “form,” with a progression into the inner sanctum of the heavenly holy of holies, not of “an individual ... [but a] corporate ritualized ascent ... [with] some genetic relationship to the heavenly ascents of the apocalypses and early *Merkabah Mysticism*.”²²⁷ And Morray-Jones contends that since worship in the earthly temple is in effect also worship in heaven, the human worshippers (on earth) join with “the angelic hierarchy in its worship before the throne.”²²⁸

Clearly, such proposals are relevant for the present thesis, for if the earthbound worshippers in the Judean desert are considered to be participating in worship in the heavenly temple, their situation is analogous to that of the community addressed in Hebrews, who are encouraged to enter the heavenly sanctuary (Heb 10:19-25) and are said

²²¹ Ibid.: 19; Frennesson 1999: 100; Nitzan 2000: 139-45 express similar ideas with respect to both 4QBerakhot and *ShirShabb*.

²²² Newsom 1990a: 115. Davila 1999: 480 suggests that “there is no indication that any human being has ascended or is expected to ascend to heaven to view these marvels,” but goes on to agree with Newsom in positing “some such virtual experience or ascent by wishful thinking.” See also Strugnell 1960: 335-36; Wolfson 1994: 196-99, and Himmelfarb 1993: 49, “[t]he recitation of the Sabbath Songs with their description of the liturgy in the heavenly temple was intended to create a feeling of participation in the service on high.”

²²³ Newsom 1990a: 115.

²²⁴ Ibid.: 1985: 72; Davila 1999: 480; Collins 1997a: 140.

²²⁵ Strugnell 1960: 320.

²²⁶ Ibid.: 320. See also Davila 2000: 91 (footnote 12), who refers to the ancient concept that “the earthly sanctuary is a shadow of the archetypal heavenly sanctuary,” a notion that many scholars propose for Heb 8:5. I discuss this in 8.5 (below).

²²⁷ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 387.

²²⁸ Morray-Jones 1998: 420. In *Jub.* 2:17-22 the angels and Israel keep the Sabbath together, something Schwemer 1991: 53 considers “takes place in heaven and on earth,” although for Schwemer, this takes place on earth (for the community) and in heaven (for the angels) simultaneously. Nitzan 1994c: 292-93 concludes that “a congregation composed of the members of the sect and the angels ... joining together ... in one song of praise, which in the other scrolls is no more than an abstract idea, is here embodied in a concrete-liturgical act.”

angelomorphism for at least an inner core of Qumran members,” considering that it is only with “great difficulty” that a coherent reading of this (first) song as a reference to a “suprahuman angelic community” can be maintained.²³⁵ The implication of this is that “the gods of all the holiest of the holy ones” (אלוהי כול קדושי קדושם, 4Q400 1 I 2) and “the congregation of all the gods” (עדה לכול אלי, 4Q400 1 I 4) are humans addressed as gods (אלים, אלוהים).²³⁶ In this case, the community that performed this liturgy understood itself as a temple in which this inner core were envisaged to be in heaven worshipping with the angels, albeit still in the Judean desert. I cannot discuss Fletcher-Louis’s entire treatment, but limit myself to his discussion of the first song, where the priesthood is described in detail, and the second song, where the members of the community refer to themselves in the first person.

Fletcher-Louis marshalls several arguments. First, he argues that it is difficult to see how angels can be referred to as “a people of discernment” (עמ בינור [sic], 4Q400 1 I 6).²³⁷ Newsom appeals to the expression עמ קדושים (“people of holy ones”) in 1QM XII 8, which she considers refers to “the angelic hosts,”²³⁸ but actually seems to refer to the community members. Fletcher-Louis argues that this expression, reflecting as it does Isa 27:11 and the use of that text in CD V 16 and 1QH^a X 19 to refer (negatively) to people outside the Qumran community, most naturally refers (positively) to the members of that community.²³⁹ On the same basis, he concludes that the עמ בינור of 4Q400 1 I 6 are not

glorified human worshippers may be implied as well.” For this opinion see also Davidson 1992: 236 and his Appendix D (pp. 339-42). For a human attaining a place among the angels see Smith 1990: 181-88; 1992: 294-99; Himmelfarb 1993: 47-49; Wolfson 1994: 185-202; Davila 1999: 473-76.

²³⁵ Fletcher-Louis 1998: 371-73. For the distinction between “angelic” and “angelomorphic” see Gieschen 1998: 27-28. Gieschen defines “angel Christology” as “the explicit identification of Jesus Christ as an angel,” and “angelomorphic Christology” as “the identification of Christ with angelic form and functions.” See also Rowland 1985: 99-100.

²³⁶ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 292-93.

²³⁷ In the scroll the ם in עמ is a medial ם. See Newsom 1998: 176-77, and DJD XI, Plate XVI.

²³⁸ Newsom 1985: 99; 1998: 180; Fletcher-Louis 2002: 435. *DSSSE* 133 translates 1QM XII 8 “the nation of his holy ones” a reference to the community rather than the angels. Significant here is the understanding of the Aramaic expressions קדושי עליונין (“holy ones of the Most High”) in Dan 7:18, 22, 25 and קדושי עליונין עמ (“people of the holy ones of the Most High”) in v. 27. Collins 1993: 318-22 argues that in line with normal usage the holy ones are angels, and that the people of the holy ones is Israel under the protection of the angels. For contrary arguments see Brekelmans 1965: 305-329; Kuhn 1966: 90-93; Meadowcroft 1995: 204-205; 230-34. See also Ps 34:10 (MT v. 9), where God’s people are called “his holy ones” (קדשיו). For a convenient summary of the arguments for reading the holy ones of the Most High throughout Dan 7 as the human community (Israel) see Poythress 1976: 208-13.

²³⁹ Fletcher-Louis 1998: 373-74. See the further development of his arguments in 2002: 282-83, referring to 4Q417 II 1 17, where true humanity is made in the image of the holy ones (כתבנית קדושים); and to 4Q504 8 4-5 where Adam is created in the image of God’s glory and filled with discernment and knowledge. Newsom 1985: 99 recognises the connection with Isaiah, CD and 1QH^a, as does Davila 2000: 102. Davila acknowledges with Fletcher-Louis that “it is reasonable to take ... [this expression] as a reference to human beings” (ibid), but disagrees with his contention that the beings encountered in *ShirShabb* are members of the Qumran community “who have assigned to themselves a divine or angelic identity” (ibid).

the angelic community, but the Qumran community themselves, “a people of understanding, *elohim*.”²⁴⁰

Those addressed also teach. Line 17 reads **ומפיהם הורות כול קדושים עם משפטי** (“and from their mouths come the teachings of all the holy ones with judgements of ...”).²⁴¹ Fletcher-Louis finds “no other example of a *pedagogic* community of angels in the highly structured setting which is implied by the context” in the Qumran Scrolls.²⁴² Angels reveal; they don’t normally teach.²⁴³ Moreover, the allusions to Mal 2:6-7 in the immediate context indicate to Fletcher-Louis that those who teach are in the inner circle of (angelomorphic) priests in the Qumran community.²⁴⁴

Alexander connects this line of the song with the widespread belief that the law was mediated by angels. He refers to such angels as “guardians, transmitters and interpreters of Torah (knowledge),” inscribed on heavenly tablets and taught by these angels to the rest of the angels.²⁴⁵ He also suggests that the earthly priests were, “*terrestrial* guardians and

²⁴⁰ Newsom 1985: 93 renders the line “the people (who possess) his glorious insight (**עם בינות**) the godlike beings who draw near to knowledge,” and in 1998: 178 she translates, “people of discernment (**עם בינות**), honored by God” (**כבודי אלוהים**), and begins a new sentence after a *vacat* in the line with “For those who draw near to knowledge ...” For the rendering “honoured by God” see Qimron 1986b: 359; Newsom 1998: 176-77; Davila 2000: 98. Newsom 1985: 89; *DSSSE* 808 and Fletcher-Louis 2002: 280 read **כבודו אלוהים** (with a **ו** pronominal suffix on **כבודו**), and Fletcher-Louis translates “the people of His Glorious discernment, *elohim*!” As Davila 2000: 98 (footnote b) argues, this does not fit well with the syntax of the rest of the line. While *DSSSE* 808 also transcribes the expression with the **ו** suffix, the editors read it as a plural construct and translate with “the people of the intelligence of his divine glory.” The photograph (DJD XI Plate XIV) is inconclusive as to whether **כבוד** ends with **ו** or **י**.

²⁴¹ My translation closely follows *DSSSE* 809. Newsom 1985: 93-4 translates, “And from their mouths (come) the teachings *concerning all matters of holiness* together with [*His glorious*] commandments” (italics original), while in DJD XI: 176 she translates “And from their mouths (come) teachings concerning all matters of holiness together with precepts of ...”. Davila 2000: 98 translates the line “and from their mouths are teachings of all holy ones with judgements of ...”

²⁴² Fletcher-Louis 2002: 284.

²⁴³ Davidson 1992: 205, 242-43. The Teacher of Righteousness is given special insight into the mysteries in 1QpHab VII 4-5 and while his title suggests a teaching function, he only appears in 1QpHab, the *Psalms Pesher* (4Q171, 4Q174), the *Micah Pesher* (1Q14) and the *Isaiah Pesher* (4Q165) and CD. A teaching function could also be imagined for the *maskil*, who has a liturgical role in *ShirShabb*, but is also pictured as a teacher (1QH^a XX 4; 1QS III 13; IX 12-21; 4Q298; 4QInstruction). See also 1QS VI 3-8; CD XII 2-8; 1QM X-XII. In 3 *Enoch* 45 Metatron reveals secrets to Rabbi Ishmael.

²⁴⁴ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 283. The allusions to Mal 2:7 are noted by Newsom 1985: 105; Davidson 1992: 241; VanderKam 1999: 507; Fletcher-Louis 2002: 284-85, who also refers to *Jub.* 31:14. Davidson notes that it is not stated whom these angels teach and suggests that the angelic priests in heaven teach in heaven, just as the earthly priests teach on earth (p. 206, 242). Davidson 1992: 205 finds angels teaching in 1QH 18:23-24 (now 1QH^a 21:7-8), but also finds this to be “not at all prominent in the Qumran literature,” and unclear “how the angels participate in communicating knowledge to the sectarian community.” On pp. 205, 276 Davidson suggests that the way that the heavenly guide in 5Q*New Jerusalem* instructs the seer is another possible example of an angel teaching a human.

²⁴⁵ Alexander 2006: 16. For the law on heavenly tablets see *Jub.* 3:10, 31; 4:5, 32; 5:13. For angels as mediators of Torah see *Jub.* 1:29; 2:1; 6:22; 30:12, 21; 50:1-2, 6, 13; Josephus *Ant.* 15.136; *Pesiqta Rabbati* 21; *Midr. Ps.* 68; Heb 2:1-4. I discuss this belief below (6.3), noting that it may not be as widespread as Alexander suggests.

interpreters of the 'Torah' corresponding to these angelic guardians.²⁴⁶ However, while the word חוק ("statute") appears in line 5 and משפט ("judgement") in lines 5 and 17, תורה ("law, instruction") does not appear anywhere in *ShirShabb*, and the line seems to be referring to something other than the angelic mediation of Torah.

Thirdly, Fletcher-Louis draws attention to 4Q400 1 I 9, which though badly mutilated, seems to refer to strengthening of some sort.²⁴⁷ He finds the notion of angels being strengthened nowhere else in the literature.²⁴⁸ On the other hand, there are examples of mortals growing in strength, as evidenced by Enoch's transformation into Metatron in 3 *Enoch* 9, which, although late, seems to preserve an idea with much earlier roots. In 4Q427 7 II 9 the idea of transformation in stature "up to the clouds ... and together with the gods in the congregation"²⁴⁹ appears, and in 4QIncantation a "transformed spiritual warrior is probably exhorted to 'transform yourself in the statutes of God'."²⁵⁰ The idea of growing in strength does seem to be more suited to humans than to angels.²⁵¹

Fourthly, line 13 describes some who occupy "their territory and their inheritance" (ובנחלתם בגבולם);²⁵² an expression that Newsom considers "implies a spatial organization of the angelic host about the precincts of the heavenly temple," somewhat like the allocation of the temple district and the land in Ezek 45; 47-48.²⁵³ The text appears to

²⁴⁶ Ibid.: 16 (italics original). This reflects the idea of a heavenly counterpart to what happens on earth.

²⁴⁷ The following argument depends on the slender evidence of the remains of a fragmented line, which is difficult to interpret. The extant Hebrew text reads וחזק בחזק יגברו לשבעה, which Newsom 1985: 93, 101; 1998: 178 translates, "[a]nd every statute they confirm to the seven," on the assumption that יגברו is a *Piel*. This interpretation is more or less followed by Davila 2000: 98 ("law upon law they confirm to the seven"). DSSSE 809 read it as *Qal*, and translate the line "And by each regulation they become stronger for the seven," a possibility also suggested by Newsom 1985: 101 and 1998: 181. Fletcher-Louis 2002: 286 notes that if the sense of יגברו is "confirm," a *Hiphil* would be expected as in Dan 9:27 (also noted by Davila 2000: 98). HALOT 175 notes that the *Qal* has the sense of "be superior, prevail or increase," the *Piel* "make superior," and the *Hiphil* "be strong."

²⁴⁸ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 286.

²⁴⁹ For the text and this translation see DSSSE 898-99. Cf. Schuller 1999: 100, "and to the clouds he magnifies him in stature, and (he is) with the heavenly beings in the assembly of the community."

²⁵⁰ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 287. 4Q444 1-4 I + 5 (Col. I) 4 reads והתחזק בחוקי אל ("And strengthen yourself by the laws of God"), trans Chazon 1999b: 374.

²⁵¹ See the discussion of this phenomenon in Morray-Jones 1992: 1-31.

²⁵² There is no space between these words in the text. Qimron 1986b: 359 suggests that the ך at the start of ובנחלתם may have been inserted later, a suggestion adopted by Newsom 1998: 177.

²⁵³ Newsom 1985: 103. Qimron 1986b: 366-67 proposes that the text reflects Deut 32:8, in the LXX and 4QDeut¹² where God is said to have apportioned the inheritance and the boundaries of the nations "according to the number of the angels," as does Davila 2000: 99. The MT has the allocation of territories according to the number of the sons of Israel (למספר בני ישראל), and LXX reads κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ ("according to the number of the angels of God"). 4QDeut¹² XII 14 reads בני אלוהים] ("sons of the gods/angels"), see Duncan 1995 (DJD XIV): 90. The context here in *ShirShabb* is quite different from this, reflecting the occupation of territory rather than the principle by which God distributed territories to the nations, see Newsom 1998: 181. The references to angelic princes of Persia and Greece in Dan 10:13, 20 reflect Deut 32:8 where earthly territories are allocated to angels (Collins 1993: 374-76). This is also quite

reflect the ideas of these chapters of Ezekiel, where the inheritance relates to humans. There seems to be no contemporary Jewish text predicating a territory and an inheritance to angels rather than humans.²⁵⁴ If echoes of the Ezekiel texts can be heard here in *ShirShabb*, then those around the heavenly temple are analogous to the returning exiles of Ezekiel's vision. The Qumran community in exile in the Judean desert is no longer a community of exiles. These people are gathered around the heavenly temple. Ezekiel's temple vision now transcends space and time and has become a vision of the heavenly temple, but a heavenly temple that encompasses both heaven and earth. This is the dwelling of God with his people.

Fletcher-Louis's fifth and sixth points concern line 15, where God is said to engrave statutes for this priesthood, by which they are to sanctify themselves.²⁵⁵ Newsom suggests that this is to fit these angelic priests for "service in the holy temple."²⁵⁶ On the other hand, Fletcher-Louis finds no instance of statutes for angels or of angels sanctifying themselves.²⁵⁷ But he does find these ideas applied to humans in the Qumran literature, where several texts refer to things engraved for humanity, although none of these is a close parallel to the text under discussion.²⁵⁸ On the other hand, in *Jub.* 31:14 Levi and his descendants are selected from all flesh "to serve in his sanctuary as the angels of his presence."²⁵⁹ In this and other texts, Fletcher-Louis finds evidence of sanctification language applied to humans transformed into "a new heavenly identity."²⁶⁰

different from Newsom's suggestion of a heavenly territory around the heavenly temple (Newsom 1985: 103, 1998: 181).

²⁵⁴ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 288. In Ezek 44:28; 45:1; 46:18 the temple precincts and the land are apportioned among the people of God.

²⁵⁵ Ibid.: 288-90.

²⁵⁶ Newsom 1998: 182.

²⁵⁷ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 288 cites *Jub.* 2:17-18; 15:27 as evidence that the angels have kept God's statutes since the day of creation. *Jub.* 2:17-18 intimates that the angels had always kept the Sabbath with God and *Jub.* 15:27 intimates that angels do not need sanctification. However, the Enoch literature, "deeply concerned with the problems of angelic disobedience and consequent impurity" (Newsom 2003: 434), does seem to provide evidence of laws regulating the conduct of angels. The rebellion of the fallen angels in the Book of the Watchers is rebellion against some "standard" (*1 En* 6-8; 12:3-13:3), Astronomical Enoch contains regulations governing the conduct of the heavenly luminaries (*1 En* 82:9-20), and things go awry when the "sinners" do not observe the regulations (*1 En* 80:6-7), see Jackson 2004: 146-47. However, this is not the same as the ideas of sanctification to fit angels for the priesthood that Newsom proposes.

²⁵⁸ In 1QS X 6, 8, 11 a "decree" (חוק, as here) about praise by the narrator is engraved, and in X 8 it is engraved on his tongue. In 1QH^a IX 24 everything is engraved for God, "with a stylus of remembrance" (DSSSE 159). In 4Q180 I 3, everything concerning the ages is engraved on (heavenly) tablets for the benefit of humanity. In 4Q284 III 4 true purification "is engraved for God's people to purify them from their impurity." חרת is a *hapax legomenon* in the Hebrew Bible (Exod 32:16), where God engraves the Torah at Sinai.

²⁵⁹ Translation from Wintermute 1985: 115.

²⁶⁰ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 290. On p. 289 he reads the sanctification of Levi in *Jub.* 31:14 as being "a necessary fact to his becoming an angelomorphic minister." In 4Q511 35 (discussed below) God makes some

Finally, Fletcher-Louis discusses line 16 where the angels are said to provide atonement for those who repent.²⁶¹ Newsom suggests that this refers to priestly angels in heaven making atonement for repentant members of the community, citing CD II 3-6 as a parallel text,²⁶² as well as *T. Levi* 3:5.²⁶³ Davila adds *Jos. Asen.* 15:7-8.²⁶⁴ The text in *T. Levi* where the angels make propitiation (ἐξιλάσκομαι) for the sins of ignorance of the repentant righteous is probably the closest. But there is no evidence that it existed in that form at Qumran,²⁶⁵ and while there are superficial similarities between 4Q400 and the text in *Joseph and Aseneth*, the sense of that text is quite different.²⁶⁶ There “Repentance” entreats (παρακαλέω) God for the repentant; in 4Q400 the angels provide atonement for the repentant.

While Newsom finds several verbal similarities between 4Q400 and CD II 3-6, these two texts are also quite different. In CD God atones for those who repent (שבי פשע) and angels of destruction pursue those who do not; in 4Q400 angels are said to make atonement for those who repent (כול שבי פשע). While Newsom proposes inserting words in the missing part of the line referring to their punishing those who do not, there is no textual evidence for this.²⁶⁷ In addition, the expression כפר רצון is difficult to understand. The Piel of כפר normally has the sense of “atone” rather than “seek atonement,”²⁶⁸ and רצון has the sense of something that is pleasing, that is, the result rather than the object of the atonement.²⁶⁹ The fragmentary nature of the text, the difficulties surrounding its understanding and the slender evidence elsewhere for angels in heaven making atonement for humanity on earth,²⁷⁰ make it a difficult text from which to

(people) holy to “produce an angelic priesthood” (2002: 289). In 4QInstruction 81 a figure is taken from among the people and sanctified to serve as a priest.

²⁶¹ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 290-91.

²⁶² Newsom 1985: 105). The “repentant” (כול שבי פשע) is apparently a reference to members of the community, who seem to have used this expression as a title referring to themselves, see Ringgren 1995: 123; Schwemer 1991: 80.

²⁶³ Newsom 1998: 182.

²⁶⁴ Davila 2000: 103.

²⁶⁵ I discuss the complex issues surrounding *T. Levi* below. I note here that there is nothing equivalent to *T. Levi* 3:5 in the *Aramaic Levi Document*, although this is an argument from silence. It may have existed at Qumran, but not been preserved.

²⁶⁶ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 291.

²⁶⁷ Newsom 1998: 182). Davidson 1992: 241-42, rightly notes that Newsom has based this on “an argument from the assumed sense of the sentence rather than from textual evidence.”

²⁶⁸ Davila 2000: 99; *HALOT* 494, s.v. כפר, Piel. This usage appears over ninety times from Gen 32:21 through 2 Chron. Over half the occurrences are in Leviticus.

²⁶⁹ Newsom 1998: 182. Fletcher-Louis 2002: 291 refers to this as an oddity in the text, to which he has “nothing to add.”

²⁷⁰ In *1 En* 15:2 Enoch prays for the fallen watchers, but he remains a human. That text suggests that angels are to petition on behalf of humans rather than humans on behalf of angels, but language of atonement is absent.

propose this notion. On the other hand, the OT priesthood atoned for the people, and the idea of an (angelomorphic) priesthood within the community making atonement for the remainder of the community is a possibility that should not be dismissed too quickly.

In the second song, lines 6-8 of 4Q400 2 refer to “us,”²⁷¹ “our priesthood” (וכהנתנו), “our holiness” (ויק[ודשנו]) and the “offering of our tongue of dust” (תרומת לשון עפרנו).²⁷² The scholarly consensus is that this is a comparison of the human community with the angelic priesthood, denigrating the human community and exalting the angelic priesthood.²⁷³ Only here in *ShirShabb* does the speaker speak in the first person, and what he says appears to show the “inadequacy of all human cult, all human praise.”²⁷⁴ Humans are simply not good enough to join the angels in the heavenly worship. However, in Newsom’s view the ideal realm of the heavenly cult is made present to the human worshippers, and while there is no actual participation in the heavenly worship by the human community, “a common experience is generated through the power of the language of the songs to invoke and make present the worship of the heavenly temple.”²⁷⁵

Fletcher-Louis proposes a new reading of this text. He compares 4Q511 35 where the language of human exaltation exists alongside the self-deprecating language of 4Q511 30 4-6, noting that these two understandings co-exist “because what man is by nature is one thing and what he may become by the power of God is quite another.”²⁷⁶ This text in *ShirShabb* is not, therefore, so much a description of the angelic priesthood and a comparison with the human community, but rather, “an antiphonal response of the human

²⁷¹ The expression מה נתחשב [ב] in line 6 is usually translated “how shall we be regarded among them,” with נתחשב construed as a first person plural Hithpael imperfect (Newsom 1985: 111; 1998: 188; Davila 2000: 108; Fletcher-Louis 2002: 306). *DSSSE* 811 reads נתחשב as a third person masculine singular Niphal perfect and translates “how will it be regarded,” referring to the priesthood of the human community (which appears explicitly in the following clause).

²⁷² These translations are from Newsom 1998: 188.

²⁷³ Newsom 1985: 115-16; 1998: 190-91; Davidson 1992: 237, 245; Nitzan 1994c: 291-92, 343; Stuckenbruck 1995: 158-59, 248; Davila 2000: 109; Nitzan 2000: 144; Gäbel 2006: 63; Alexander 2006: 20-46.

²⁷⁴ Newsom 1990a: 117.

²⁷⁵ Ibid.: 117. In 1985: 17 Newsom refers to “ecstatic experiences,” and on p. 65 she considers that through the “descriptions of heavenly worship ... the earthly community evokes that sense of being present in the heavenly temple.” Nitzan 1994b: 182-83 considers that “human beings do not participate in the choirs of the angelic hosts, nor ascend to the heavenly sanctuaries to be close to the angelic choirs ... Nevertheless ... [the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*] may have been considered as a medium for creating an experience of mystic communion between the earthly and the heavenly worshippers, each one of which kept the Sabbath law in their respective dwellings, but with a single, united faith.” Alexander 2006: 20 suggests that the human praise takes place on earth, “effecting on earth the sort of liturgy performed by the angels in heaven, and in communion with them.”

²⁷⁶ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 307.

to the angelic praise,”²⁷⁷ concluding with a call to the community to join in the angelic praise and “to extol the God of knowledge” (נרוממה לאלהי דעת).

Fletcher-Louis argues that rather than describing (true) worship in heaven above corresponding to (inadequate) worship in the earth below, the two are the same, and the text envisages the human community, worshipping as part of the angelic priesthood in a genuine *Engelgemeinschaft*.²⁷⁸ The questions in lines 5-7 anticipate the exaltation of the human community. They ask (rhetorically) how their worship could compare with that of angels, and then encourage one another to worship along with the angelic worship (line 8), as in line 1.²⁷⁹ If, as in other texts, the community considers itself to be a temple (4Q511 35; 4QmidrEschat^a; 1QM XII 1-8) and if a temple is to be understood as “heaven on earth,” what Fletcher-Louis proposes is quite understandable, “the human worshippers ... [are] henceforth absorbed into the ontology of the heavenly cult.”²⁸⁰

Fletcher-Louis has challenged the prevailing understanding of *ShirShabb*, but his views have not found ready acceptance, with most scholars having difficulty in accepting the application of such terms as אלים and אלהים to humans.²⁸¹ On the other hand, while

²⁷⁷ Ibid.: 308.

²⁷⁸ Ibid.: 308. Compare Gäbel 2006: 68, “Die ShirShabb sprechen also nicht davon, dass die irdische Gemeinschaft am himmlischen Gottesdienst der Engel teilhat oder dass sie ihren irdischen Gottesdienst mit dem himmlischen vereint. Vielmehr besteht folgende doppelte Korrespondenz zwischen himmlischen und irdischen Priestern: Die irdische Priesterschaft blickt am Tage der Priesterinvestitur zur himmlischen Priesterschaft und deren Investitur durch Gott auf, und im Bewusstsein der Unvollkommenheit allen irdisch-menschlichen Kults vergegenwärtigt sie sich den vollkommenen Gehorsam und den fehlerlosen Kultdienst der Engel-Priester.” Stuckenbruck 1995: 159-60 notes that the cohortative נרוממה (“let us extol”) in line 8 indicates that “despite a sense of unworthiness, the worshippers are nevertheless able to participate in the heavenly cult.”

²⁷⁹ Wolfson 1994: 186 refers to “angelification,” whereby a human “crosses the boundary of space and time and becomes part of the heavenly realm.” Later (p. 199), he suggests that 4Q400 1 II 6-8 express “... the desire of the sectarians to join the angelic host above,” concurring with Newsom’s notion of a “virtual experience of being present in the heavenly temple.”

²⁸⁰ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 309. Newsom 2003: 434 acknowledges that Fletcher-Louis is “right” in arguing that the expression of human insufficiency here is a “prelude to the sense of God’s graciousness in granting humans a place in the heavenly world,” but questions why the first person forms completely disappear from the rest of *ShirShabb* if the subject is the exalted Qumran priesthood.

²⁸¹ Alexander 2006: 45-7 strongly critiques these suggestions. He considers it counter-intuitive to understand a text that seems to refer to angels (אלים, אלהים) in the heavenly sanctuary as referring to “humans on earth, and to an earthly sanctuary conceived symbolically as ‘heaven’” (p. 45). He refers to 4Q400 2 6-8, where the members of the community appear over against the angels, he questions the designation “angelomorphic humanity,” suggesting that it is not entirely clear what Fletcher-Louis means by this and considers that Fletcher-Louis “misconstrues the trope of anthropomorphism as applied to the angels” (p. 47) and that the realised eschatology at Qumran is “far more partial than Fletcher-Louis seems to suppose” (p. 47). As may be expected, Barker 2008: 247-48 is critical of Alexander’s review. Stuckenbruck 1995: 154, 156-57 identifies certain characteristic terms used in the Qumran texts in connection with angelic presence in the human community (the preposition עם, as well as expressions such as במעמד, יחד, גורל, התיצב), and finds none of these used in this sense in *ShirShabb*. Nevertheless, he agrees that “the whole document is a construction predicated on the community’s belief to partake in the angelic worship of the heavenly cultus.” Three published reviews of Fletcher-Louis 2002 critique his reading of *ShirShabb*. Collins 2003: 74 considers that Fletcher-Louis’s “assessment of the prevalence of ‘angelomorphic humanity’

Brooke finds Fletcher-Louis's treatment less cautious than he would like, he does note that "there is evidently more than enough in the well-known sectarian texts to underline that the true humanity of the righteous can be conceptualized as angelomorphic."²⁸² He notes that the understanding Fletcher-Louis has put forward is yet to be demonstrated as suitable, but also grants that he has made it "manifestly clear ... that the worshipping community is envisioned as participating in the worship of the angels to the point at which the distinction between the human and the divine, between community members and angels, and between heaven and earth, is blurred."²⁸³

As Brooke intimates, no scholar has yet systematically confirmed or refuted the claims that Fletcher-Louis has raised. It also seems clear that some scholars have been too hasty in dismissing them. Considered cumulatively, Fletcher-Louis's arguments are strong, and it seems clear that the Qumran community did understand itself as an exalted, human and perhaps angelomorphic, priesthood serving simultaneously in the Judean desert and in the heavenly sanctuary. There are implications here for the understanding of Heb 10:19-25, where the readers, situated somewhere in the ancient Mediterranean world, are urged to enter the heavenly temple, and of Heb 12:22, where this community is said to have proleptically joined with angelic worship in the heavenly Jerusalem. Nevertheless, there are differences, since angelomorphism is absent from Hebrews. In Hebrews, humans have access to the heavenly temple while still on earth and this access is made possible by the exaltation of the human Jesus. His exaltation as a human is as a pioneer through whom God is leading many heirs to glory.²⁸⁴

3.11.3 Other Relevant Material in *ShirShabb*

Several other expressions in *ShirShabb* are relevant to the present study.²⁸⁵

is maximalist" and also questions the use of אֱלֹהִים and אֱלִים to refer to humans (p. 77), although he does suggest that Fletcher-Louis has "raised new possibilities and opened up questions that invite a fresh look at the text [of the Sabbath songs]" (p. 79); Collins' student (Goff 2003a: 174) reaches similar conclusions. Newsom 2003: 433 is "intrigued though largely not persuaded" by Fletcher-Louis's reading of the Sabbath songs. She does concede that he has "raised an important question that deserves further attention" (p. 434), concluding that a closer look at angelomorphism is deserved (p. 435). See also the reserved comments of Sullivan 2004: 149-55.

²⁸² Brooke 2005b: 163. Brooke notes with reference to 1QSb IV.24-26 "[s]omebody writing at the beginning of the first century B.C.E. could readily conceive of the high priest as functioning like the Angel of the Presence" (2005b: 164).

²⁸³ Brooke 2005b: 164. Cf. also Schuller 2001: 137, "mortals on earth can join with the angels in heaven precisely through the agency of the words of praise that both groups offer to God. The dynamics of the interrelationship is not articulated explicitly and what was understood often is hinted at rather than explained." Fletcher-Louis does not deal with 4Q400 1 II 1-21, but there the human community is seen as directly addressing God in worship, further evidence for this blurring of the distinction. See Charlesworth 1980 Schwemer 1991: 80-81; Dimant 1996: 93-103; Newsom 1998: 185; Sullivan 2004: 149-55.

²⁸⁴ See 6.3.3 and 6.3.4 (below).

²⁸⁵ Possible references to Melchizedek appear in several fragments of *ShirShabb*, although the name needs to be reconstructed in every case. While Melchizedek is important in Hebrews, his priesthood, and that of

3.11.3.1 Camps and Tents

In 4Q400 2 II 2 the “gods of knowledge” (אֱלֹהֵי דַעַת) are said to be organised in “camps of God/gods” (מַחֲנֵי אֱלֹהִים), an expression Alexander suggests reflects the organisation of Israel in the wilderness, “in an orderly fashion around the central shrine, the abode of the divine presence.”²⁸⁶ Alexander, however, proposes that the camps of angels in heaven reflect the camps of humans on earth, with a sort of “on earth as in heaven dualism.”²⁸⁷ On the other hand, Fletcher-Louis detects an allusion to Gen 32:2-3, where Jacob meets the angels of God not in some encampment in heaven, but as he journeys in Canaan. He calls the place מַחֲנֵים (“Mahanaim, two camps”), since, as Fletcher-Louis points out, “his own camp and those of the angels converge.”²⁸⁸ If Fletcher-Louis is right, this text is evidence for the borders of “God’s camp” extending to encompass earth and heaven. The dualism Alexander proposes is unnecessary.

ShirShabb describes the heavenly sanctuary with the word מִשְׁכָּן in 4Q403 1 II 10.²⁸⁹ Newsom translates the complete Hebrew expression מִשְׁכָּן רוֹשׁ כְּבוֹד מַלְכוּתוֹ “the uppermost exalted tabernacle, the glory of His kingdom, the inner shrine,” while Davila translates מִשְׁכָּן רוֹשׁ “tabernacle of the exalted chief,” arguing that while there is no evidence elsewhere for multiple tabernacles in heaven,²⁹⁰ there is evidence of “an angelic or divinized human high priest serving in the heavenly tabernacle.”²⁹¹ The syntax of the sentence is ambiguous. However the words are read, the text refers to a tabernacle as either the entire heavenly temple or as the *debîr* of the heavenly temple. While

Jesus, is peripheral to this study. There is considerable secondary literature on Melchizedek, including Fitzmyer 1967; 1974; 2000; Horton 1976; Kobelski 1981; Orlov 2000; Rooke 2000a.

²⁸⁶ Alexander 2006: 18-19. For a similar orderly arrangement see 1QM III 13-V 17; CD VII 6; XIX 2; 4Q511 2 I 7-8; 4Q394 (MMT) 8 IV 10-12. This is similar to what Balaam sees in Num 24:1-6, a text alluded to in Heb 8:2. Newsom 1998: 189 translates “camps of godlike beings.” The same expression appears in the twelfth song (4Q405 20 II-22 13).

²⁸⁷ Alexander 2006: 19.

²⁸⁸ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 306. In Gen 32:3 (EVV 32:2) Jacob exclaims מַחֲנֵה אֱלֹהִים זֶה (“this is God’s camp”).

²⁸⁹ מִשְׁכָּן also appears in 4Q405 20 II 21-22, line 7. See Newsom 1998: 345, 350; Sterling 2001: 207 notes that apart from Hebrews and Rev 13:6; 15:5; 21:3, only here in the literature is the heavenly sanctuary referred to as a tabernacle.

²⁹⁰ Davila 2000: 128. Alexander 2006: 53-54 finds the idea of multiple temples and sanctuaries in heaven at the proposed date of composition of *ShirShabb* “unusual”. He suggests this expression might be symbolic, “a rhetorical device, which expresses the transcendent perfection of the celestial temple.” Barker 2008: 247 suggests it might mean “the fullness, the totality.” Newsom 1998: 282; 1998: 285 suggest that if Davila’s translation is valid the “exalted chief” refers either to God or to “a single superior angel.” The expression רוֹשֵׁי דְבִיר (chiefs of his *debîr*) appears in the following line. It would be strange for רוֹשׁ to have these two different senses in such close proximity, especially as Davila 2000: 128 notes, the word usually has a personal reference. Thus, Davila’s reading is more likely.

²⁹¹ Davila 2000: 129. See e.g. 3 En 15B:1 and Num. Rab. 12:12. NRSV translates Heb 8:2 with reference to Jesus as “a minister in the [heavenly] sanctuary.” I argue below that the genitive expression τῷ ἁγίῳ λειτουργός should be rendered “a minister of the sanctuary.” See 8.5.3 (below).

the details are debated, Heb 8:1-2 also refers to the heavenly (and eschatological) temple as τῆς σκηנῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς (“the true tent/tabernacle”).

3.11.3.2 The Heavenly Sanctuary

In *ShirShabb* the worship takes place in a heavenly sanctuary, regardless of whether it is understood to be in heaven, or as heaven on earth. In several places the text reflects ideas also present in Hebrews.

3.11.3.2.1 The Curtain

A tantalisingly fragmented reference to the heavenly sanctuary in 4Q402 2 3-4 includes the expression [...] בדביר מלך [...] [כ]מעשי רוק[מה]. Davila translates this with “workmanship of colorful stuff [...] in the inner chamber of the king.”²⁹² Newsom notes that the expression מעשי רקם is used for both the priestly garments and the hangings of the wilderness shrine.²⁹³ This workmanship refers to the curtain in the heavenly temple. Further detail concerning the curtain concealing the *debir* in the heavenly temple appears in the tenth song, where the inner shrine is described as “the *debir* of his presence” (דביר פנו, 4Q405 15 II–16 4) and the veil is described as “the veil of the *debir* of the king” (פרוכת דביר המלך, 4Q405 15 II–16 3)²⁹⁴ or the “veils of the wondrous *debirim*” (הפלא פרוכות דבירי, 4Q405 15 II–16 5).²⁹⁵ The figures embroidered on either side of the veil sing their praises to God.²⁹⁶

What remains of the ninth song refers to “the vestibules where the king enters” (אולמי, 4Q405 14-15 I 5) and “the vestibules of their entrances” (מבואיהם, 4Q405 14-15 I 5). Newsom suggests that these entrances are an allusion to such texts as Ezek 44:3; 46:8 where the prince is permitted to enter the sanctuary forecourts, and that the vestibules in line 5 are of the inner sanctuary where the King (God) enters, alluding to Ps 24:7, 9.²⁹⁷ If so, the heavenly temple in *ShirShabb* is a bicameral structure like the wilderness tabernacle. Alexander agrees, drawing the analogy from Ezekiel’s temple in Ezek 40:7-8.²⁹⁸

²⁹² Ibid.: 112. Davila equates the noun רוקמה with רקם, see Jastrow 1989: 1497; HALOT 1290, 1291, and Qimron 1986a: 39-40, para. 200.26, who notes that in Qumran orthography a *waw* sometimes appears where the Tiberian tradition has *qamets*, *pathach* or *seghol*.

²⁹³ Newsom 1998: 225-26. The expression refers to the fabric of the tabernacle hangings and screen in Exod 26:36; 27:16; 36:37; 38:18, and for the high priest’s tunic in 28:39 and 39:29. In Philo the curtain and the priestly garments have the same cosmic significance. See my discussion in 2.5 (above).

²⁹⁴ The Hebrew word פרוכת used here is the word for the veil concealing the Holy of Holies in OT. See e.g. Exod 26:33-37; 36: 35-38. In Exod 39:34; 40:21; Num 4:5 it is the פרכת המסך.

²⁹⁵ Newsom 1998: 336 notes the plural in this last description, but make no attempt to explain it. Alexander 2006: 36 suggests that it may refer to the seven *debirim*.

²⁹⁶ For Rabbinic literature describing the veil as having figures on both sides see *Baraytha b. Yom* 72b; *y. Sheqalim* 8.2; Rashi on Exod 26:1, 36. See Haran 1985: 161.

²⁹⁷ Newsom 1985: 281; 1998: 333.

²⁹⁸ Alexander 2006: 34-35.

However, it is difficult to determine whether or not *ShirShabb* envisages a bicameral structure. Fletcher-Louis points out that the engraving of animate figures in Ezekiel's temple vision is on the vestibule of "the inner sanctuary proper", and proposes that this song is not about a two chambered structure, but about the Holy of Holies, where the King (God), rather than the prince of Ezek 44:3; 46:8, enters.²⁹⁹

While Hebrews has little interest in the detail of the heavenly temple, two references to the veil or curtain (καταπέτασμα, 6:19; 10:20), and one reference to the curtain in the wilderness sanctuary (9:3), have led some to argue that Hebrews also envisages a bicameral heavenly temple, corresponding to the earthly tabernacle.³⁰⁰ I will argue below that the author does not envisage a bicameral structure, with the two parts separated by a veil. The veil is a figurative expression in Heb 6:19 and 10:20, referring to the means of access to the presence of God.³⁰¹

3.11.3.2.2 The תבנית

The word תבנית appears twice in Exod 25:9 (LXX παράδειγμα), in Exod 25:40 (LXX τύπος), quoted in Heb 8:5, and in 1 Chron 28: 11, 12, 18, 19, referring to the plan or model provided to Moses and Solomon for use in the construction of the wilderness tabernacle and the Jerusalem temple respectively.³⁰² The same word also appears in several places in *ShirShabb*, and in most, if not all, of these the sense is "structure," rather than "pattern."³⁰³ In 4Q405 20 II 21-22 8, however, Newsom translates תבנית כסא מרכבה with "the image of the chariot throne,"³⁰⁴ proposing that the expression is an allusion to 1 Chron 28:18 (תבנית המרכבה הכרבים זהב), "the plan of the chariot, the golden

²⁹⁹ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 340. Koester 1989: 39 suggests that the tabernacle in *ShirShabb* seems to be only the divine throne room and is not a two-part structure, as was the wilderness tabernacle. Alexander 2006: 35 suggests that while two chambers are envisaged, this description might be of the inner shrine only.

³⁰⁰ This also leads scholars to see two referents in Heb 8:2, a central shrine (τὰ Ἁγία) and an outer tent (ἡ ὁσσην). I will discuss this in detail below (8.5).

³⁰¹ See 7.4 and 8.3 (below).

³⁰² The word also has other senses in the OT. In Deut 4:17, 18, 19; Josh 22:8; Ps 106:20; Isa 44:13; Ezek 8:3, 10; 10:8 it has the sense of "form, image, likeness, representation," and in 2 Kings 16:10; Ps 144:12 it refers to a "model."

³⁰³ 4Q403 1 I 44; 4Q403 1 II 3//4Q404 6 5; 4Q403 1 II 16; 4Q405 20 II 21-22 8; 11Q17 VIII 3 and 11Q17 IX 6. In 4Q403 1 II 16 the Hebrew expression is ראשי תבנית אלהים. Newsom 1998: 282 translates this as "the chiefs of the divine structure." The word has the sense of "image" or "pattern" elsewhere at Qumran. See 1QM X 14 (תבנית אדם, "human image"); 4Q417 2 I 17//4Q418 43-45 I 13 (קדושים כתבנית), "according to the pattern of the holy ones". For the sense "structure" see 4Q286 1 II 6 (תבנית דעה, "structure of knowledge"); 4Q287 2 2 (תבנית דרמה), "majestic structures".

³⁰⁴ Ibid.: 347. Fletcher-Louis 2002: 345 suggests that this rendering could mislead someone into thinking it was a reference to an image "on" a throne, as in Ezek 1:26-28. Fletcher-Louis himself translates "the pattern/construction of the chariot throne," while in his discussion he uses the term "the structure of the throne" (p. 347). Compare Strugnell 1960: 337, "the structure of the chariot throne;" Schwemer 1991: 108, "Das Urbild des Thronwagens;" Davila 2000: 151, "the structure of a throne chariot," and DSSSE 833, "the image of the throne chariot."

cherubim”) and Exod 25:40.³⁰⁵ It is conceivable that *ShirShabb* could be read with תבנית understood to refer to that plan or model; however, it is difficult to understand what this contributes to the understanding of the text. It is more likely that the reference is to a “structure,” rather than a “plan,” as in Exod 24 and 1 Chron 28.³⁰⁶ Thus, the word appears to have quite a different sense than in these texts and in the LXX of Exod 25:40 quoted in Heb 8:5.³⁰⁷

3.11.3.2.3 The Throne

God’s throne appears four times in Hebrews as a metonym for God’s rule (4:16; 8:1; 12:2), or the rule of the exalted Son (1:8), also referred to as God in that text.³⁰⁸ God’s throne also appears several times in *ShirShabb*. The seventh song ends with a detailed description of the heavenly sanctuary, concluding with a reference to “a plurality of animate *merkabot* which praise God.”³⁰⁹ This text depends to some extent on Ezek 1 and 10, with imagery that resurfaces in the eleventh and twelfth songs where the merkabah throne reappears. These chapters of Ezekiel seem not to have had any influence on the author of Hebrews.³¹⁰

References to the throne in *ShirShabb* alternate between singular and plural.³¹¹ In 11Q17 v 8 (the ninth or tenth song)³¹² the expression כסאי עולמים (“eternal thrones”) appears.³¹³ Alexander notes in the present context that it is “pluralized, because there is a

³⁰⁵ Newsom 1998: 351. See also Rowland 1979: 143; Fletcher-Louis 2002: 345.

³⁰⁶ The word תבנית appears to also have this sense in 4QBer^b 2 2.

³⁰⁷ Davila 2002: 3-5 suggests that the account of the tabernacle building in Exodus is reflected in some of the details of the heavenly sanctuary in *ShirShabb*, and refers specifically to תבנית in Exod 25:9, 40. Koester 1989: 39 is right when he claims that תבנית is not used in *ShirShabb* in the sense of “the heavenly pattern of the earthly sanctuary.” Although HALOT 1686-87 gives the sense “construction, shape” at the beginning of the entry, the editors give no instances of this sense in the Hebrew Bible. See Jastrow 1989: 1645.

³⁰⁸ In middle Judaism an exalted figure is sometimes seen as enthroned alongside God and invested with authority as God’s chief agent. See Hurtado 1988: 53-59, 66. See Wis 9:4; 1 En 45:3; 3 En 10:1; Ezek. Trag. 68-89; Lad. Jac. 2:7; 4Q491^c 1 4-6. In Zech 6:13 there is a priest alongside the throne, a text echoed in Heb 8:1-2.

³⁰⁹ Newsom 1987: 14.

³¹⁰ NA²⁷ (pp. 797-98) only detects allusions to Ezekiel in Hebrews in Heb 6:6 (Ezek 18:24); 10:22 (Ezek 36:25); 10:25 (Ezek 7:4, LXX 7:7); 11:7 (Ezek 14:14, 20); 13:10 (Ezek 44:10-14); 13:20 (Ezek 16:60). I will argue below (8.5.4) that there may be an echo of Ezek 42:15 in Heb 8:5. This is in stark contrast to the influence of Ezekiel in Revelation, where the allusions are too numerous to list (see NA²⁷, pp. 795-96).

³¹¹ See 4Q405 20 II 21-22 2 (singular), 4Q405 20 II 21-22 8 (singular), 4Q405 23 I 3 (plural, translated as a singular in Newsom 1998: 356-57; DSSSE 834-35 and Fletcher-Louis 2002 351, but as a singular by Davila 2000: 154), 11Q17 X 7 (plural) and 11Q17 VII 2 (singular).

³¹² Newsom 1998: 335.

³¹³ Newsom 1985: 378 hesitatingly restores כ[ס]אי פלא כ[ס] (“wonderful throne”) at 11Q17 IV 6. DSSSE 1214-15 restores כ[ס]אי פלא כ[ס] (“wonderful appearance”), as do Davila 2000: 137 and García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1998: 275.

divine throne on which the divine presence manifests itself in each of the seven *debirs*.”³¹⁴ Thus, *ShirShabb* seems to refer to multiple thrones or seats. The eleventh song mentions a seat like his royal throne (מושב כסא מלכותו) along with references to the plural *merkabot* (4Q405 20 II 21-22 2-5). The priests stand and serve this seat, which may not be the divine throne, but a seat like it, suggesting the enthronement of some other figure.³¹⁵ Davila refers to “this seated being,”³¹⁶ suggesting that greater angels sit, while lesser angels stand. On the other hand, Fletcher-Louis wonders whether there might be “an empty throne.”³¹⁷ Then, following Davila he proposes that while humans are entitled to sit in heaven, non-humans are not.³¹⁸ The twelfth song mentions the מרכבה כסא תבנית (“the structure of the throne of the merkabah,” 4Q405 20 II 21-22 8), followed by the expression מושב כבוד (“his glorious seat”). Near the end of this song there is another reference to “his glorious royal throne(s)” (כסאיכה כבוד מלכותו).³¹⁹ In Heb 8:1; 12:2 there is a single throne of God in heaven, with Jesus exalted to God’s right hand on this throne.³²⁰ This expression seems to be a metonym for his rule alongside God in fulfilment of Ps 110:1, and the author of Hebrews did not necessarily imagine an actual “throne” in heaven as in *ShirShabb*.³²¹ Aside from this, Hebrews has little interest in the detail of the throne.

3.11.3.2.4 Sacrifice in heaven

I noted in connection with 4Q400 1 I 16 that the heavenly priesthood is said to make atonement for those who repent, although no details are given as to what this involves.³²² Some have argued that the references to sacrifices in the thirteenth song refer to sacrifices in heaven (11Q17 IX 3-5, 4Q405 23 II 12-13 and perhaps 4Q405 94 1-2).³²³ In 4Q405 23 II 12-13 the sacrificial language seems to be metaphorical. The word used is תרומה

³¹⁴ Alexander 2006: 36-37.

³¹⁵ Davila 2000: 146 suggests Melchizedek or the chief princes of the sixth song.

³¹⁶ Ibid.: 146.

³¹⁷ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 344. Bauckham 1999: 52 notes that God alone sits in heaven.

³¹⁸ See Ezek. Trag. 68-89; 1 En 45:3; 51:3; 55:4; 61:8; 62:5; 69:29, 108:12; Mark 14:62; Eph 2:6; Col 3:1-4; Rev 3:21; Heb 1:3; 8:1; 10:12-13; 12:2; Asc. Isa. 9:24-26 as evidence for humans permitted to sit in heaven, and Gen. Rab. 65:21 for angels who are not permitted to do so.

³¹⁹ The letters כה in כסאיכה are marked by the scribe for deletion, and the letter כ in the following word (כבוד) is written in above the line. This gives the appearance of a transcription error with the words כסא כבוד originally written as כסאיכה כבוד and subsequently corrected. See the discussion in Newsom 1985: 325, and PAM Image 43727 in Reynolds et al., 1998.

³²⁰ Bauckham 1999: 61-64; 2006: 168; 2009: 17.

³²¹ See 6.2 (below).

³²² See 3.11.2 (above).

³²³ See Newsom 1998: 393. 4Q405 94 1-2 consists of the single word הוזבחים. For sacrifices in heaven see Davila 2000: 157-61; Newsom 1985: 371-77; 1998: 361-66; Alexander 2006: 43-44.

(praise-offering),³²⁴ and the same line refers to “tongues of knowledge” (לשוני דעת) which “bless the God of knowledge” (ברכו לאלוהי דעת).

Aside from this, זבח (“sacrifice”) appears in 4Q405 94 2 and 11Q17 IX 4, and while it is devoid of any context in 4Q405, in 11Q17 it is part of a list which includes “offerings” (מנחות) and “libations” (נסכים). The text is fragmented and contains little detail apart from this list. The use of זבח, which in the OT usually refers to the slaughter of sacrificial animals, could imply animal sacrifice in heaven.³²⁵ However, as I have argued above, it is not entirely clear that *ShirShabb* envisages worship in heaven (above), separate from the worship of the community in the Judean desert (below).³²⁶ Secondly, while זבח usually refers to animal sacrifice in the OT, the sacrifices are most often connected with communal meals, creating communion between God and his people, and among the people of God,³²⁷ and at times the word seems to refer to “the celebration of the ritual (sacrificial festival or meal)” itself.³²⁸ These considerations and the fragmentation of the text render impossible any certainty as to whether a sacrificial cult in heaven is envisaged.

There are few explicit references elsewhere in the literature to a heavenly sacrificial cult.³²⁹ In most of these it is clear that the sacrificial language is used metaphorically and not for animal sacrifice.³³⁰ It seems more likely, as Fletcher-Louis argues, that the use of

³²⁴ DSSSE 836-37.

³²⁵ Deut 12:15, 21; 1 Kings 1:9, 19, 25; 2 Chron 18:2 and frequently elsewhere. Davila 2000: 158 finds this usage in 11Q17 “remarkable,” and Falk 1998: 135-36 makes similar points about נסך, זבח and מנחה in the DSS. He notes an “understandable reluctance [on the part of Newsom 1985: 18-19, 59; 1990a: 114] to imagine actual animal sacrifice in heaven,” but appeals to *T. Levi* 3:5 and Rev 6:9 (sic); 8:3-5, which he suggests indicates that heaven “presumably” contained an altar of burnt offering. See the discussion of these altars in Beale 1999: 454-60. *T. Levi* 3:5-6 specifically states that those sacrifices are bloodless. There is no reference to an altar of incense in *ShirShabb* (Fletcher-Louis 2002: 360).

³²⁶ See 3.11.2 (above).

³²⁷ HALOT 262-63; Bergman, Ringgren and Lang 1980: 8-29. See Gen 31:54; Exod 18:12; 29:28; 34:15; Lev 3:1, 3, 6, 9; 4:10, 26, 31, 35; 7:11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 29, 32, 34, 37; 9:18; 10:14; 17:5; 19:5, 6; 22:21, 29; 23:19, 37; Num 6:17, 18; 7:17, 23, 29, 35, 41, 47, 53, 59, 65, 71, 77, 83, 88; 10:10; 15:3, 8; Deut 12:27; 18:3; 32:38; Josh 22:23, 27; Judg 16:23; 1 Sam 2:13, 29; 9:13; 10:8; 11:15; 16:3, 5; 20:6, 29; Neh 12:43; 1 Chron 29:21; 2 Chron 7:5; 30:22; 33:16; Ps 106:28; 107:22; 116:17; Prov 17:1; Jer 7:21; 17:26; Ezek 39:17, 19; Hos 8:13. For a metaphorical use see Ps 50:19.

³²⁸ Ibid.: 12. See Exod 34:15; Lev 19:6; Num 25:2; Deut 32:38; 1 Sam 9:13; Prov 17:1; Ezek 39:17, 19; Zeph 1:7

³²⁹ Himmelfarb 1993: 33-36; Newsom 1998: 372.

³³⁰ *T. Levi* 3:5-6; *Jub.* 6:18 (Feast of Weeks); *3 Bar* 14 where Michael brings human prayers to God, and *b. Hag.* 12b where he offers sacrifices in heaven. Bietenhard 1951: 125 suggests that the heavenly priesthood of Michael in *b. Hag.* 12b is “an interim and stopgap measure” in force from the time of the destruction of Jerusalem until the restoration of Israel and the earthly sanctuary. Ego 1991: 370-71 suggests that the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E. modified the understanding of the traditions surrounding the heavenly temple. Prior to that, the heavenly temple served to legitimise the earthly one, but when the earthly cult ceased it became a replacement for it. Ultimately, this led to the tradition of Michael’s heavenly sacrifices, which Hannah 1999: 101, 150-51 suggests may have originated “in the closing decades of the first century at the latest.” Nonetheless, even in *b. Hag.* 12b what Michael offers is a קרבן (a vague general word for an

sacrificial terms such as זבחי קדושים (“acceptable offerings”),³³¹ מנחות רצון (“sacrifices of the holy ones”), ריח מנחותם (“aroma of their offerings”) and ר[י]ח נסכיהם (“aroma of their libations”) in 11Q17 refer not to sacrifices offered in heaven, but to the “(real and/or metaphorical) cultic activity of the human worshippers.”³³² The notion of a sacrificial cult going on in heaven, with angelic priests offering animal sacrifices, is difficult to comprehend, and seems to have grown out of an understanding of a heavenly temple corresponding to the earthly temple, with a heavenly cult in which angels who are priests “provide a platonic ideal for the activities of the priests in the temple below.”³³³

These ideas underlie a common reading of Heb 9:11-12, where it is argued that Christ offered his blood in the heavenly sanctuary. I will argue below that in Hebrews Christ offers not his blood, but himself, and that this “self-offering” took place not in the heavenly sanctuary, but at Golgotha, prior to his exaltation.³³⁴ Along the same lines the Christian altar (θυσιαστήριον) of Heb 13:10 is best understood as a metonym for the sacrifice of Christ.³³⁵ There is no suggestion in Hebrews that there is an altar in heaven on which sacrifices are offered.³³⁶

3.11.4 Conclusion

Barker claims that *ShirShabb* “must alter forever what we understand as the background to Revelation or Hebrews.”³³⁷ While Barker may have overstated the case for Hebrews, angels are prominent in Heb 1-2, and angelic worship surfaces in Heb 12:22. Moreover, while it is debated whether participation in angelic worship in *ShirShabb* took place in the heavenly temple, or among the community in the Judean desert, it is clear that in Heb 12:22-24, the community addressed is earthbound, but somehow has access to the heavenly

offering and not necessarily a blood sacrifice) rather than זבח (“animal sacrifice”). See *HALOT* 1136-37; Jastrow 1989: 1411.

³³¹ Only the final ת remains of the word מנחות. Newsom 1985: 372 suggests restoring this word or לעשות (“works”). The former restoration is followed by *DSSSE* 1218-19 and Fletcher-Louis 2002: 356. Davila 2000: 158 makes no attempt to restore the text.

³³² Fletcher-Louis 2002: 361. Fletcher-Louis proposes that actual sacrifices were offered at Qumran, as do Humbert 1994: 187-89; Cross 1995: 84-86. For an earlier view arguing that there was no sacrificial activity at Qumran see Baumgarten 1953: 146, 155. Schiffman 1999: 272, and VanderKam 2010a: 135-35, 144-45 are adamant that no sacrifices were offered at Qumran.

³³³ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 359. The word כיוריהמה appears in 4QBer^b 2 1. Nitzan 1998: 52 reads this as “engraved forms,” while Davila 2000: 69-70 reads it as “lavers,” with the implication that they function in connection with sacrifices that take place in the heavenly sanctuary. While Davila’s reading is technically possible, the scarcity of references to sacrifice in heaven elsewhere makes it unlikely.

³³⁴ I discuss this text in 8.6.2 (below), with bibliographical details of those who read the text in this way.

³³⁵ I discuss this text below (7.8).

³³⁶ The reference to the altar of incense in Heb 9:4 is in the wilderness sanctuary, and in 7:13 Levitical priests are described generically as serving at the altar, again in the wilderness sanctuary or the Jerusalem temple.

³³⁷ Barker 1991: 166.

Jerusalem where this worship takes place. Thus, both texts are concerned, albeit implicitly, with the relationship of the community to the heavenly temple.³³⁸

There are also several references to aspects of the heavenly/eschatological temple in both texts. Both refer to the dwelling place of God as a tent/tabernacle; both refer to a curtain and to a throne or thrones; and the words for “pattern” or “structure” (תבנית, τύπος) appear in both texts. In *ShirShabb*, while the precise details are debated, there seems to be evidence that the community in the Judean desert, or at least some members of it, had access to the heavenly dwelling place of God, a suggestion that also appears in Hebrews. Scholars have made similar claims for both texts with respect to the notion of blood sacrifice in heaven, which is doubtful, and scholars have read both texts with the understanding that there is a heavenly temple above that corresponds in some way to the earthly temple or tabernacle below, which is also doubtful. It would be going beyond the evidence to posit that Hebrews depends on *ShirShabb* for these ideas. However, that similar ideas surface in two quite different contexts makes it clear that such ideas were current at the time and in the place Hebrews was written. This is not, however, to obscure the very real differences between the two texts, especially in terms of detail. *ShirShabb* goes into considerable detail on the structure and content of the heavenly temple, something quite absent from Hebrews, where the concentration is on the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God, signalling the arrival of the eschaton. The emphasis, and the *raison d’être* of each of the two texts is quite different.

3.12 4QBerakhot (4Q286-290)

The five copies of this document show evidence of belief in extensive interaction between the angelic and human worlds, and contain blessings and curses, as well as descriptions of the heavenly temple.³³⁹ The formal late Herodian hand indicates a date around 50 C.E. for 4Q286, 4Q287, 4Q288 and 4Q290, and between 20-50 C.E. for 4Q289.³⁴⁰ Several opening rubrics indicate a liturgical function, as do the closing responses, אמן אמן.³⁴¹ There is some resemblance to 1QS I 16–II 25,³⁴² confirming the judgement of

³³⁸ Gieschen 1998: 294 refers to the “widespread opinion” that Heb 1-2 are polemic against the notion of an “Angel Christology.” He then examines the text of Hebrews finding several motifs that he suggests indicate that the author did embrace such a Christology. I am not convinced by his exegesis of Hebrews and will return to this below. I simply note now that if this was the case it would be expected to be more explicit than it is. The text of Hebrews makes a quite different use of the comparison of the exalted Son and the angels (see 6.3, below).

³³⁹ 4Q280, which contains the same set of curses as 4Q287 7 II, bears some relationship to 4QBerakhot, but the precise nature of this relationship is debated. See Nitzan 1995: 489-90; Davila 2000: 47.

³⁴⁰ Nitzan 1998: 10, 50, 62, 68, 73.

³⁴¹ An example of an opening rubric preceded by a closing liturgical response appears in 4Q286 7a II b, c, d, 1-2. עֲצָה הֵיחָד יוֹמְרוּ כּוֹלָמָהּ בִּיחָד אָמֵן אָמֵן (“and the council of the community shall say, all of them together, Amen, Amen”). This is followed by a *vacat*, and then the words וְאַחֲרַיִם יִזְעֲמֵן [ו] אֶת בְּלִיעֵל (“and afterwards they shall curse Belial”). See Ibid.: 27-29.

³⁴² Nitzan 1994a: 54.

Milik that 4QBerakhot is a further edition of the annual ceremony of the renewal of the community's covenant,³⁴³ although only God is blessed and Belial cursed. There are no extant blessings addressed to the community itself. Blessings are addressed to God in the second person singular in 4QBer^a 1-7 I, 4QBer^a 12,³⁴⁴ 4QBer^b 1-5 in 4QBer^d, and in several places there are details of the structure of the heavenly temple and the beings who serve therein, as well as God's work in creation.

The blessings addressed to God are of two types: those that praise God for his work in the world, and those that Davila refers to as “merkavah hymns” ... set in the heavenly realm and sung by heavenly beings and mystics.”³⁴⁵ By this, he seems to mean that the members of the community (mystics) join with the heavenly beings to sing these praises as in *ShirShabb*.³⁴⁶

3.12.1 4QBer^a (4Q286)

This text describes the heavenly sanctuary and refers to the angels who inhabit that sanctuary and to the blessings chanted there. Four places in the text suggest the identity of those who chant the blessings. 4QBer^a 2, a, b, c, is a fragment comprising seven partially preserved lines probably containing two hymns,³⁴⁷ with the second starting with a liturgical formula in line 4, **יברכו ביחד כולמה את שם קודשכה** (“all of them together will bless your holy name”).³⁴⁸ If this is a single hymn, “the spirits who support the sanctuary” (**גבורי אלים**, line 2) are “רוחי משאי מקד[ש]” (line 1), and “the mighty divine beings” (**גבורי אלים**, line 2) are

³⁴³ Milik 1972: 135-36; Nitzan 1995: *passim*; 1998: 1; Davila 2000: 41-45. Newsom 1985: 2 notes a close relationship with *ShirShabb*. At that time, she concluded that both documents were community compositions, while later (1990c: 181), after arguing that *ShirShabb* was not a community composition, suggested that 4QBer was produced under the influence of *ShirShabb*. Newsom (1990c: 181) also notes that the annual covenant renewal took place at Pentecost, which Alexander 2006: 63 dates in the same week as the eleventh Sabbath of the *ShirShabb* cycle, just prior to the climax of that cycle (assuming that *ShirShabb* only applies to the first quarter). The Community Rule (1QS I 18-22) requires the leaders of the community to recite God's faithfulness, his mighty works and his mercy to his people, and while there is no record there of what they are to say, Davila suggests that what remains of 4QBerakhot may be remnants of this.

³⁴⁴ Nitzan 1994a: 55 also lists blessings in fragment 16 of this manuscript, but this fragment only contains the single word **בפקודות** (“in visitations of”). See 1998: 36.

³⁴⁵ Davila 2000: 43-45. For a discussion of the term “mysticism” see Newsom 2000a: 491-94; Alexander 2006: 7-11. The term is used to refer to a religious experience in which a person or community becomes aware of the transcendent divine presence and some union/communion with this presence.

³⁴⁶ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 477-78 suggests that these liturgical fragments should be included among those texts that are likely to have expressed “in parts now lost” the same “divine anthropology” found in *ShirShabb* and in other texts.

³⁴⁷ I use the fragment, column and line numbers of 4QBerakhot from Nitzan 1998. The state of the manuscript precludes certainty, but there appears to be blank space at the end of line 3 (see DJD XI, plate 1), indicating that the beginning of a new hymn begins in line 4 (Davila 2000: 53). Nitzan 1998: 17-19 does not mention this space and expresses no opinion on whether this fragment comprises one or two hymns.

³⁴⁸ Nitzan 1998: 17-18.

probably those who sing the blessings of line 4.³⁴⁹ If the fragment comprises two hymns, then the referent of the word כולמה (“all of them”) in line 4 is unidentifiable, although בן[חד כולמה (“all of them together”) may imply that the heavenly beings and the members of the earthly community chant together.³⁵⁰

Line 5 includes the words קודש קודשים, either “the holy of holies,” or “holiest holiness.” Nitzan favours the former rendering, also suggesting as an alternative “the most holy heavenly sanctuary.”³⁵¹ If the expression refers to the holy of holies, however, and if the fragment refers to heavenly beings and members of the community chanting praises together, the referent could either be the heavenly holy of holies, or that of the earthly community understood as a temple.³⁵² The most that can be said is that the text may reflect temple symbolism, but the precise details are unclear.

4QBer^a 7a I 2, 3 and 6 may give some insight into the identity of those who chant the blessings, although the text is badly damaged. Line 2 refers to “their chosen ones” (בחריהמה), an expression best understood as a reference to the members of the community. Line 3 refers to וכול [י]דעהמה בתהלי (“all their experts in Psalms of” ...), which is also a probable reference to members of the community.³⁵³ On the other hand, line 6 refers to ס[וד אלי טוהר עם כול ידעי עולמים (“the council of the Elim of purification with all those who have eternal knowledge”).³⁵⁴ This is most likely a description

³⁴⁹ Davila 2000: 53 translates רוחי משאי מקד[ש] “the spirits of the oracles of the sanctuary,” an expression he finds “odd.” He suggests that it refers to angels serving in the heavenly temple.

³⁵⁰ In the DSS, as in Biblical Hebrew, יחד functions either as a substantive (“the community”) or as an adverb (“together”), see *HALOT* 405-6. When combined with the preposition ב, it is either an adverbial phrase of place (“in the community”), or of manner (“together”). Nitzan 1998: 17 renders בן[חד with “together,” translating line 4 as “[all [will bless together Your holy name]” (see also *DSSSE* 645). Davila 2000: 52 does not translate ביחד, reading the line as “[...]..all of them ... Your holy name.” Here, and in 4Q286 VII 1 and the reconstructed duplicate text 4Q287 V I, it is syntactically preferable to read ביחד as an adverb of manner (Nitzan 1998: 27-28, 57). In his concordance to 1QH^a, Stegemann, Schuller and Newsom 2009: 350-51 read ביחד as an adverb of place only in 1QH^a XVI 28, although he also gives it this value in XI 23 (p. 155). Elsewhere he treats it as an adverb of manner (VI 29; VII 17, 18; XI 24; XII 25; XIII 24, 32; XIV 16; XVI 6; XVIII 36; XIX 17, 28; XXI 35; XXVI 11, 14). In XI 24 and XIX 17 he translates the expression “in a common rejoicing” (p. 155, 248), while Fletcher-Louis 2002 104-5 translates it as “in community.” Other texts where the expression could be read as an adverb of place are 1QS I 12; II 22; II 24; III 6; V 5, 21, 22; VII 23; 4Q181 I II 1; 4Q257 III 8; 4Q258 II 2, 10; 4Q259 II 6; 4Q427: 7 I 18; 4Q417: 7 II 18; 4Q427: 8 I 9. For the sense of “together” see 1QM XIV 4; 1QS VI 7, 8; 4Q174 III 18 (citing Ps 2:1); 4Q415 11: 4, 5; 4Q417: 2 II 17; 4Q218 167 5, 6; 4Q418 199, 2. For an early discussion of the use of יחד in the Bible and the DSS see Talmon 1953: 153-40. The expression ביחד does not appear in BHS.

³⁵¹ Nitzan 1998: 17. *DSSSE* 645; Davila 2000: 52, 54 read “holly of holies.”

³⁵² It is difficult to decide whether this expression refers to the holy of holies or to holiest holiness. The expression is frequent in the scrolls and, as here, the referent is not always clear. Apart from 4Q392 1 9 where what appear to be heavenly beings are described as מ[שרתי דביר] (“servants of the *debir*”), the word דביר only refers the heavenly holy of holies in *ShirShabb*.

³⁵³ Davila 2000: 58 considers that they could either be “sectarian sages” or angels, and Nitzan 1998: 26 suggests that these “are in all probability the sages of the community.” For the translation “experts” see Qimron 1995: 309-10. The sense is “knowledgeable, discerning.”

³⁵⁴ Translation from Nitzan 1998: 26.

of angels.³⁵⁵ In this text both the humans described in lines 2 and 3, and the angels described in line 6, call upon the glorious name of God (וּלְבָרַךְ אֶת שֵׁם כְּבוֹדֵךָ). While the text is too fragmentary for definite conclusions to be drawn, this text may also be evidence of an understanding of the temple as encompassing both heaven and earth, with angels and humans blessing God's name together.³⁵⁶

3.12.2 4QBer^b (4Q287)

Fragment 2 of this scroll preserves several lines describing what appears to be the heavenly temple and those who worship there.³⁵⁷ This fragment ends with the bottom margin of a column and fragment 3 begins with the top margin, suggesting that the two fragments go together. Fragment 2, lines 1-7a pile up a number of substantives, first referring to the structure of the heavenly temple and then to those who serve there. Lines 7b-8 contain verbs indicating that those who serve will praise God in the heavenly temple (lines 9-13), and line 1 of fragment 3 ends the cycle with a closing liturgical formula. Lines 2-4 of fragment 3 describe earthly creatures who also bless God, after which the fragment breaks off.

God's "ministers" (מְשָׁרְתֵיכֶּה) appear in line 12 in apposition to מְלָאכִי ("angels"). In line 13 Nitzan restores קוֹדֶשְׁכֶּה [רוּחִי ("spirits of your [God's] holiness") at the start of the line, and the line closes with the expression מְלָאכִי צְדִיקָה (angels of your [God's] righteousness). These serve "in their wonderful dwelling places" (בְּמַעוֹנֵי) (פְּלִיאֵיהֶם). All these expressions describe heavenly (angelic) beings.

Line 10 seems to have other beings in view. The beginning and the end of this line have not been preserved. It contains just two words, בְּתַמִּים מַעֲשֵׂיהֶם (in integrity their works),³⁵⁸ with no indication of the referent of the third person plural pronoun suffix. Nitzan includes this line in her discussion of "the angelic ministers of the heavenly temple,"³⁵⁹ maintaining that, as in *ShirShabb*, תַּמִּים is used to describe angels as well as humans.³⁶⁰ The word תַּמִּים ("integrity") refers in the OT to unblemished sacrificial

³⁵⁵ Ibid.: 27; Davila 2000: 58.

³⁵⁶ Nitzan 1994b: 175-76; Frennesson 1999: 82-83.

³⁵⁷ There is partial overlap with 4QBer^a fragment 12, enabling the restoration of a few words. The last line preserves the words קְדוֹשֵׁי קְדוֹשֵׁי ("holiest of the holy ones"), which Nitzan restores in 4QBer^b 3, 1. The expression קוֹדֶשׁ קוֹדֶשִׁים appears in 4QBer^b 2 5, 7.

³⁵⁸ Nitzan 1998: 52 and *DSSSE* 649 read בְּתַמִּים in this line as though it were a construct ("in the perfection of their works" (Nitzan, p. 52).

³⁵⁹ 1994b: 173; 1998: 52.

³⁶⁰ Nitzan 1998: 53 refers to Ps 101:6; 1 Kings 9:4; Prov 10:9; 20:7; 1QS VIII 10, 18, 21; IX 6, 8, 9 CD VII 5 as texts where תַּמִּים refers to humans, and 4Q403 1 I 22; 4Q404 2 3; 4Q405 13 6 where she considers it refers to angels.

offerings, to God's character and to blameless humans.³⁶¹ It does not appear to refer to angels in any text, either in the OT or the DSS.³⁶² If, indeed, this line refers to humans, and the previous and subsequent lines refer to angels in "the temples of God's kingdom" (היכלי מן לכותכה), it seems clear again that the human community is worshipping together with the angels before God in the heavenly temple.

3.12.3 4QBer^d (4Q289)

Fragment 1 of 4QBer^d appears to reflect similar ideas. Again the text is badly damaged and certainty is impossible. Nitzan restores a reference to "the priest appointed at the head of the Many" (הפ[כהן] קיד ברואש הרבים) in line 4, and a reference to "the holy [angels] within all [their congregation]" (מלאכי [הקודש בתוך כול] [עדתם]) in line 5.³⁶⁴ In line 6 these are said "to give thanks in the presence of God" (וליהוד[ות לפניו]). The "priest appointed at the head of the Many" is clearly a significant member of the community.³⁶⁵ He gives thanks to God with the holy angels, and also animate and inanimate creation.³⁶⁶ Nitzan suggests that "the blessings ... are to be recited by the priests

³⁶¹ Gen 6:9 (Noah); 17:1; Deut 18:13; 32:4 (referring to God); Josh 24:14; Judg 9:16, 19; 2 Sam 22:24, 26, 31 (referring to God); Ezek 28:15 (the king of Tyre); Ps 15:2; 18:24, 26, 31 (God); 37:18; 84:12; 101:6; 119:1, 90; Job 12:4; 36:4; Prov 2: 21; 11:5, 20; 28:10, 18.

³⁶² Davila 2000: 121-22; Fletcher-Louis 2002: 258, 315; Bockmuehl 1990: 158-60. This word does seem to be restricted to humans and, in particular, the community members at Qumran. See CD I 21; II 15; VII 5; XX 2, 5, 7; 1QH^a IX 38; 1QM VII 5; XIV 7; 1QS I 8; II 2; III 3; III 9; IV 22; VIII 1, 9, 10, 18, 20, 21; IX 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 19; 1QSa I 28; 1QSB I 2; V 22; 4Q223-224 2 I 53; 2 II 13; 4Q255 2 5; 4Q256 XVIII 2; 4Q257 III 5, 13; 4Q258 VI 5, 11; VII 3, 6, 7, 8, 9; VIII 3, 4Q259 II 10, 18; III 1; III 18; 4Q266 2 I 4, 24; 2 II 16; III 3 6; 5 I 19; 4Q268 1 6; 4Q403 1 I 22; 4Q404 2 3; 4Q405 13 6; 4Q415 2 I + 1 II 3; 4Q418 43-45 I 9; 172 4; 4Q445 4 3; 4Q448 1 9; 4Q491 8-10 I 5; 4Q510 1 9; 4Q511 10 8; 63 III 3; 4Q525 5 11, 4Q528 1 4; 11-12 3; 11Q5 XVIII 1, 18; XXII 8; XXVII 3; 11QTemple LX 21. In Ezek 28:15 it is applied to the king of Tyre, where Fletcher-Louis 2002: 258-59 argues that its appearance for the "*Urmensch* ... suggests that it would fittingly describe humanity in its heavenly mode." The form תם is applied to Jacob (Gen 25:27), to Job by God (Job 1:1, 8; 2:3) and by Job himself (Job 9:20, 21, 22). It describes a blameless person in Job 8:20; Prov 29:10.

³⁶³ Nitzan 1998: 68 tentatively suggests that a verb of speaking may have appeared in the lacuna at the start of line 4.

³⁶⁴ Nitzan (Ibid.: 68-70) restores מלאכי ("angels") from 4Q289 3 2. Very little context has been preserved around this line, but if correct it may reflect a belief in angels present with the community. Davila 2000: 77 makes no mention of this restoration by Nitzan and does not include any reference to "angels" in his translation.

³⁶⁵ The expression appears in CD XIV 6-7; 4QD^a (4Q266) 11: 1, 8; 4QD^b (4Q267) 9 V 10-11, and 4QD^c (4Q270) 7 I 16. The Many seems to have been a term used for full members of the community, see 1QS VI 1, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 25; VII 3, 10, 13, 16, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25. 1QS VI 14 refers to the man appointed at the head of the many (האיש הפקיד ברואש הרבים), whom Leaney 1966: 196 identifies with the priest at the head of the many, and 1QS VI 12 to the inspector of the many (המבקר על הרבים). The priest at the head of the many is distinguished from the inspector in CD XIV 6-10.

³⁶⁶ Alexander 2006: 62.

and responded to by those who enter the covenant.”³⁶⁷ Both of these classes of people are probably members of the community, worshipping with the angels.

To conclude, 4QBerakhot is further evidence from Qumran of the worship by humans and angels together, not in a heavenly sanctuary separate from and above the earth, but on earth and in heaven simultaneously.

3.13 Songs of the Sage (4Q510-511)

The *Songs of the Sage* are two copies of a set of liturgical compositions which, like *ShirShabb*, have some connection to the *maskil*.³⁶⁸ They are written in Herodian Script and can be dated sometime late in the first century B.C.E.³⁶⁹ The reference to the government of the community in 4Q511 2 I 9-10 indicates that they were composed within the community,³⁷⁰ apparently as some sort of defence against evil spirits.³⁷¹

Several places in the text reflect the notion of communion with angels.³⁷² 4Q511 2 I 7-10 suggests a relationship between the earthly and heavenly communities, with the people “walking in the lot of God according to his glory, and serving him in the lot of the people of his throne” (להתהלך [ב]גורל [אלוהים] לפי כבודו [ו] לשרתו בגורל עם) (4Q511 2 I 9-10), and in 4Q511 8 6-11 someone speaks of being both among and with God’s holy ones, giving thanks to God.

Less fragmented is 4Q511 35 1-5, which suggests that God sets some apart for himself as an everlasting sanctuary. Lines 1-2a appear to be a heading for a song that ends with a *vacat* at the end of line 5. The song describes the foundation of a priesthood and its role in praising God. According to lines 2b-3 “God will select from those refined seven times and

³⁶⁷ Priest 1962: 56 notes how the priests take complete charge of the covenant renewal ceremony of 1QS I 18–III 12, a ceremony said to be reflected in 4QBerakhot (see Milik 1972: 136, followed by Nitzan 1994a: 45 and 1995: 490 and *passim*).

³⁶⁸ The expression לַמַּשְׁכִּיל (“to/for/by the *maskil*”) could refer to composition by the *maskil* (Baillet 1982: 215), or composed for the *maskil* to sing (Alexander 1997: 319). Alexander suggests that “the voice of the Maskil” is heard in the songs, see also Lyons and Reimer 1998: 27. The expression appears in 4Q511: 2 I 1, and is restored in 4Q511: 8:4. In 4Q510:1:4 the speaker announces ואני משכיל משמיע (“and I, a *maskil*, declare ...,” trans DSSSE 1029). In Isa 38:9; Hab 3:1 a ל indicates authorship in similar contexts.

³⁶⁹ Nitzan 1994c: 236. Nitzan suggests that 4Q510 and 4Q511 may be two copies of one work, remnants of two parallel works or two versions of the same work. They are from different hands and there is little overlap between the two scrolls. They have both suffered considerable damage and their precise relationship may never be known.

³⁷⁰ Newsom 1990c: 184 suggests that these songs were composed “under the strong influence both of the Hodayot and the Sabbath Songs.” A close connection between these songs and *ShirShabb* is the use of אלוהים as a divine epithet in 4Q511 2 I 6, 8, 10; 2 II 6; 18 II 8, 10; 19 4; 30 6; 35 2, 3; 73 2), as well as numerous times throughout *ShirShabb*. Others who conclude that these songs were composed within the community include Alexander 1997: 321; Chazon 1999a: 263-64; Eshel 2003: 69, 79.

³⁷¹ Nitzan 1992: 53-63; 1994c: 227-272; Alexander 1997: 319-24; 1999: 344-48; Lyons and Reimer 1998: 16-32; Chazon 1999a: 263; Frennesson 1999: 71-72; Eshel 2003: 69-88.

³⁷² Alexander 2006: 69.

from the holy ones” (במזוקקי שבעתים ובקדושים יקדו[ש] אלהים לו)³⁷³ and set them apart to be “an everlasting sanctuary” (למקדש עולמים) for God.³⁷⁴ There appear to be two groups here: those refined seven times and the holy ones.³⁷⁵ Those refined seven times are clearly humans who have become members of the community.³⁷⁶ The holy ones may be angels, although members of the community are referred to as “the holy ones of his people” (קדושי עמו) in 4Q511 2 I 6 and distinguished from the “angels of his glorious luminaries” (מלא[כי] מאורות כבובו).³⁷⁷ Thus, they could either be angels or other members of the community, distinguished from those refined seven times.³⁷⁸

The list of expressions describing what these purified holy ones become when God sanctifies them is more complex. We have noted line 3 where they will become “an everlasting sanctuary” (למקדש עולמים), that is, a “temple-like community.”³⁷⁹ The succeeding lines describe communion with angels and angelic identity.

Line 4 starts a new sentence describing these sanctified members of the community with what appears to be a “pleonastic list of appositional epithets,”³⁸⁰ והיו כוהנים עם צדקו צבאו ומשרתים מלאכי כבודו (“and they will be priests, his righteous people, his host and servants, his glorious angels”).³⁸¹ A new sentence begins in line 5, with the verb יהללוהו (“they shall praise him”). This text apparently identifies the sanctified members of the community as God’s glorious angels, although a variety of ways to avoid this identification have been proposed.

³⁷³ For sevenfold refinement see 1QH^a XIII 15-17. Nitzan 1994b: 165; Davila 1999: 479; Fletcher-Louis 2002: 163.

³⁷⁴ DSSSE 1032-33 divides the line into two sentences, with “those purified seven times” the object of God’s anger (אפי אלהים, line 2) and “the holy ones” the subject of God’s sanctifying activity. Their translation reads “Among the holy ones, God makes (some) holy for himself ...” This is unsatisfactory given the strange notion of God’s wrath being poured out on the purified ones. They also supply an additional object, “some” for God’s sanctifying activity and ignore the ו (“and”) prefixed to ובקדושים.

³⁷⁵ It seems clear that there are two groups here, given the repetition of the preposition ב (among, see Davila 1999: 479). See the similar construction in Deut 15:19 where the people are to set apart (תקדיש) the firstborn males from among their herd (בבקרך) and from among their flock (בצונך) for Yahweh.

³⁷⁶ Most scholars agree that those refined seven times are humans, see Baillet 1982: 237-38; Caquot 1988: 242; Davidson 1992: 283; Fletcher-Louis 1997c: 190.

³⁷⁷ Bauckham 2003: 81. See also the badly damaged fragment 8. Lines 8-9 read גי בקדושו [...] עם [...] קדשו[יו] (“me among his holy ones ... with his holy ones”). Bauckham also suggests that “holy ones” in 1QM VI 6; XVI 1 designates humans.

³⁷⁸ Davila 1999: 479 argues that they are angels. Newsom 1990c: 183 suggests that “it is not entirely clear” whether they are humans or angels.

³⁷⁹ Dimant 1986: 188. Frennesson 1999: 74 posits equivalence to the מקדש אדם of 4QmidrEschat^a III 6.

³⁸⁰ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 164.

³⁸¹ For this interpretation cf. Gieschen 1998: 174, “where the priests, at least some of them, are identified as angels.” See also Fletcher-Louis 2002: 293-96.

Baillet translates the expression **ומשרתים מלאכי כבודו** with “ministers of the angels of His glory,” as though the plural absolute noun **משרתים** was a construct. Thus, he reads the text as saying that the servants of God’s glorious angels praise God.³⁸² This is clearly unsatisfactory.³⁸³ Another option is to see two groups in line 4. Davidson adopts this reading, with the first group the complement of **וידו** (“and they will be”) and the second part the subject of **יהללוהו** (“and they will praise him”). The first group are **כוהנים עם צדקו** (“priests, the righteous people, his host”) and the second group are **ומשרתים מלאכי כבודו** (“servants his glorious angels”). On Davidson’s reading, this second group alone praise God.³⁸⁴ While this is a satisfactory reading of the Hebrew, the abrupt introduction of two groups, when the two groups in lines 2-3 were combined to form the temple-like community, is strange. Furthermore, neither of these options solves the problem of identifying the members of the community as angels, since the word **צבא** in the first half of line 4 already has this connotation.³⁸⁵ There seems to be a single group in view: community members described in angelomorphic or angelic terms.³⁸⁶

Some relegate the description to the eschaton, when some community members “would achieve apotheosis ... to serve as priests in the heavenly temple alongside the angels.”³⁸⁷ This, too, is unsatisfactory, as there is no suggestion of any temple in this text apart from the temple-community. Nitzan is surely correct in suggesting that these songs are intended to ward off evil spirits in the present, “until the day of their punishment.”³⁸⁸ While the verbs are all future, the eschatology is surely realised, with the community seen as “a bridgehead before God’s kingdom finally arrived.”³⁸⁹

No text in Hebrews explicitly refers to the community in terms of a sanctuary, and nor is there any angelomorphic language applied to the community. There is a clear distinction between humans and angels, and indeed, it is essential to the argument that Jesus is fully

³⁸² Baillet 1982: 237 (“ministres des anges de Sa gloire”). Caquot 1988: 425 also adopts this reading “ceux qui servent Ses anges glorieux.”

³⁸³ Frennesson 1999: 75 (footnote 22).

³⁸⁴ Davidson 1992: 284. See also Davila 1999: 479; Sullivan 2004: 165-67.

³⁸⁵ HALOT 995-96, s.v., **צָבָא**, A 4-5, B; Fletcher-Louis 2002: 165-66.

³⁸⁶ Frennesson 1999: 75 suggests that these are “likened to, and perhaps even identified with angels.” He prefers the former, treating the expression as a metaphor, since he does not find transformation into an angel elsewhere at Qumran. However, there seems no compelling reason to read this epithet differently from the other epithets in the line.

³⁸⁷ Davila 1999: 479. Davidson 1992: 283-85 also adopts this reading, claiming that “[n]owhere else in the corpus is there found an expectation that the sectaries will live in heaven, let alone become angels” (p. 284). Such rigid separation of earth and heaven cannot stand, given that the text has already described the community as a temple. See Fletcher-Louis 2002: 165.

³⁸⁸ Nitzan 1994c: 252. See also p. 237.

³⁸⁹ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 175. If this is a valid reading, it reflects similar ideas to 4QmidrEschat^a, where the temple of Adam is an interim step prior to the establishment of the eschatological temple.

human. Nevertheless, this human Jesus is exalted above the angels (1:1-4) and is worshipped by them (1:6). In Heb 12:22-24 the community is considered to be already in the eschatological temple, worshipping with myriads of angels and humans (the righteous made perfect). Since they are clearly still on earth the implication is that the heavenly temple encompasses heaven and earth.

3.14 *Hodayot* (1QH^a)

This set of thanksgiving hymns was probably composed at Qumran in the fourth quarter of the second century B.C.E. in the early period of the Qumran community.³⁹⁰ While the notion of union between humans and angels appears several times in this text, I limit my comments to column XI, where it is accompanied with explicit temple symbolism.³⁹¹

1QH^a XI 20-37 is an individual composition in which the speaker gives thanks to the Lord (אֲדֹנָי) for his redemption from the pit of Sheol (מִשְׁחַת וּמִשְׁאֹל אֲבִדֹן, line 20).³⁹² After this initial thanksgiving, the composition splits into two parts: the speaker delineates the outcome of his redemption in lines 20-24, and his prior state in lines 25-37. I am concerned with lines 20-24.

In line 21 the speaker expresses thanks that he has been raised to an everlasting height (לְרוֹם עוֹלָם)³⁹³ and can walk about on a limitless plain (בְּמִישׁוֹר לָאֵין)

³⁹⁰ Nickelsburg 2005a: 132. Dimant 1984: 523 dates all the extant manuscripts during the first century B.C.E. The most complete manuscript is 1QH^a. Other fragments are 1QH^b (1Q35); 4Q427, 4Q428, 4Q429, 4Q430, 4Q431, 4Q432, 4Q471b. There are two groups of *Hodayot*, those in which the speaker uses the first person singular and those in which the speaker uses the first person plural. The former have been ascribed to the Teacher of Righteousness, and the latter to the community as a whole, although these ascriptions are hypothetical. See the discussions in Sukenik 1955: 39; Dimant 1984: 523; Douglas 1999: 239-240; Brooke 2010: 41-53. Holm-Nielsen 1960: 316-48 rigorously denies this ascription, suggesting that they are “examples of the Qumran community’s liturgical prayers and songs of praise” (p. 348) and that questions of authorship are secondary. After a lengthy discussion, Douglas 1999: 266 concludes that columns 10-17 did originate with the Teacher of Righteousness. This discussion is beyond my scope.

³⁹¹ Other places in the *Hodayot* where there is union with angels include XIV 15-21, where the speaker is associated with the angels of the presence; XIX 13-17, where this “creature of clay” is raised up to have a part with the everlasting host of angels; and XXIII 30, which uses the term “sons of heaven,” although the manuscript is too fragmented to enable any firm conclusions to be drawn. I have not discussed the *Self Glorification Hymn* (4Q491^c), which seems to be part of the *Hodayot* collection. While it is evidence of the exaltation of some individual to a mighty throne in the congregation of the gods and thus useful background to the exaltation of Christ in Hebrews, it is lacking in explicit temple symbolism.

³⁹² The column and line numbering of 1QH^a is complex. Modifications to the column numbers assigned by Sukenik 1955 were suggested by Puech 1988: 40-53 and further modified by Stegemann. The text with Stegemann’s column numbers now appears in DJD XL (Stegemann, Schuller and Newsom 2009). The column numbers in *DSSSE* follow Stegemann’s reconstruction, although some line numbers differ from those in DJD XL. In what follows I use the references in DJD XL. For a cross reference to Sukenik’s numbering see Stegemann’s table in Stegemann 2003: 224-26.

³⁹³ עוֹלָם has a temporal rather than a spatial reference (*HALOT* 798-99), thus its appearance here in a construct chain governed by רוֹם is odd. The sense is probably “the height of eternity,” that is, heaven. Charlesworth and Stuckenbruck 1994a: 129 translate “to eternal heights.”

חקר).³⁹⁴ He recognises that he has been created from dust “for an everlasting community” (צבא קודשים, line 22) and can take his place with “the host of holy ones” (עדת בני שמים, line 23) and with “the congregation of the sons of heaven” (רוחות דער, line 23-24), three terms all describing angels.³⁹⁵ Clearly, the speaker considered that his redemption had resulted in a common lot with angels, but there is no indication in the text that he becomes an angel himself. Rather, he refers to himself in line 22 as “a depraved spirit” (רוח נעוה) who has been “purified” (איש), in line 23 as a “man” (איש) and in line 24-25 as “a creature of clay” (יצר החמר).

The eternal height and the limitless plain are descriptions of heaven,³⁹⁶ and the Hithpael of הלך (“to walk about”) confirms this, given its frequent use in sanctuary contexts in the OT.³⁹⁷ In heaven, he walks about doing what angels do, praising the divine name as one of them.³⁹⁸ However, while the hymn is set in the context of the eschatological battle,³⁹⁹ it is clear that the speaker is not anticipating this exaltation to heaven in the future after his death; he experiences all this in the present, while still earthbound, as a result of his becoming part of a community “associated with the holy angels.”⁴⁰⁰ The concepts are

³⁹⁴ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 104 reads this expression as “walk in uprightness without limit.” For מישור with the sense of “uprightness” see HALOT 578, s.v. מישור, 4; Mansoor 1961: 116. Laurin 1958: 344-45 translates the expression with “I walk in complete security,” suggesting “a place whose boundaries are impossible to be determined ... where there is complete freedom of movement.” See Ps 18:20; 40:3; 31:9; Isa 26:7; 1QH^a X 29. Holm-Nielsen 1960: 67 refers to “the endless plains of heaven.” The idea of a limitless plain provides an apt contrast to the confines of the pit of Sheol (Newsom 2004: 258). The expression לאין חקר appears elsewhere 1QH^a V 16 refers to חקר ... לאין, “limitless judgement”; XIV 6 to חקר, “limitless calamity”; XIV 19-20 and XCI 18 to חקר, “limitless seas”; and XXII 16 to חקר, “limitless peace.” In XIII 20 DSSSE restores חקר [לאין חקר] (“without end”).

³⁹⁵ Licht 1957: 84, 163; Kuhn 1966: 45-47; Lichtenberger 1980: 224-27; Davidson 1992: 192; Nitzan 1994c: 275; Chazon 2003: 44; Nickelsburg 2006: 189-90.

³⁹⁶ Delcor 1952: 375; Dupont-Sommer 1952: 72; Black 1961: 138-39. For a contrary view see Laurin 1958: 346, who considers it is a metaphor for safety and security, as in 1QSb V 23.

³⁹⁷ The Hithpael of הלך is not restricted to sanctuary and cultic contexts in the OT, but this is a significant use. In Gen 3:8 God walks about in Eden; in Gen 5:22, 24 Enoch walks with God, as does Noah in Gen 6:9, Abraham in Gen 17:1; 24:40; 48:15 and Hezekiah in Isa 38:3. In Lev 26:12 Yahweh walks among his people, and in Deut 23:15 he walks in the midst of the camp. In 2 Sam 7:6-7 and its parallel text 1 Chron 17:6 Yahweh claims to have walked about in a tent and a tabernacle. In Job 22:14 Yahweh walks on the dome of heaven, and in Ps 26:3; 56:14; 116:9 the psalmist walks with or before God. In Ezek 1:13 the torch “walks” about the temple and the king of Tyre walked in the Edenic sanctuary (Ezek 28:14). See Wenham 1986: 20. I argue below (8.2) that this imagery is reflected in Heb 4:14.

³⁹⁸ Maier 1964: 133; Mach 1992: 213-14; Chazon 2003: 43-45.

³⁹⁹ Davidson 1992: 190.

⁴⁰⁰ Holm-Nielsen 1960: 66; Davidson 1992: 192-93; Nitzan 2000: 164-65; Schuller 2000: 34. Collins 2000b: 24, writes “[t]he community at Qumran claimed to enjoy, in effect, heaven on earth (in the improbable setting of the Judean desert) by becoming companions to the angels already in this life.” Van der Ploeg 1952: 171-72: reads this text in the light of what he perceives to be a belief in the immortality of the soul on the part of the Dead Sea sect, a belief he detects in 1QS IV 8. He continues by acknowledging present communion with angels (pp. 173-74), leading to eternal communion with them in the afterlife. Laurin 1958: 346 reads the text as referring to deliverance “from some present difficulty.” Mansoor 1961: 84-87 argues that the exaltation to heaven is after death, and reflects a belief in immortality.

similar to Heb 12:22-24, with no sense either here or in Heb 12 that this exaltation and angelic communion is other-worldly or in the future.⁴⁰¹ It is “eschatology already inaugurated.”⁴⁰²

3.15 4QApocryphon of Moses^c? (4Q408)

This text, formerly known as 4QMorning and Evening Prayer,⁴⁰³ has now been identified as copy of 1Q29 (*Liturgy of the Three Tongues of Fire*) and 4Q376 (4QapocrMoses^b),⁴⁰⁴ both of which picture a priest emerging from the sanctuary to speak to the people. The Tetragrammaton appears in three places, and the orthography is Hasmonian. These factors, as well as similarities to 4Q503 and the presence of other Qumranic terminology, lead Steudel to suggest that it is a “very early” Essene liturgy.⁴⁰⁵

Fragment 3+3a line 5 reads, ...[ב]הפיע פארי כבודו מזבול קד[ש] (“when his glorious turbans shine forth from the holy dwelling”).⁴⁰⁶ Steudel renders the words פארי כבוד with “the adornments of His glory,”⁴⁰⁷ the upper case “H” indicating that she reads the suffix with reference to God.⁴⁰⁸ Steudel reads the text as a description of the emergence of the heavenly bodies in the morning and evening, following a suggestion of Baumgarten that 1QS X 3 is the key parallel to this verse.⁴⁰⁹ However, given the context of the

⁴⁰¹ Compare Laurin 1958: 347, “the author is promising equality with the angels in respect to knowledge and access to God, but strictly on the earthly sphere.”

⁴⁰² Davidson 1992: 193.

⁴⁰³ Alexander 2006: 66.

⁴⁰⁴ There may also be some connection with 4Q375. See Steudel 2000: 298 (DJD XXXVI). In what follows I use the fragment and line numbers in DJD XXXVI.

⁴⁰⁵ Steudel 1994a: 333-34. See Steudel’s discussion of the orthography on pp. 314-16. The Tetragrammaton appears in 1Q29 1 7 and 4Q408 2 1, 3, and 4Q408 3+3a 6 (with the words אתה אדני, “you, Lord” written above the line). See Steudel 2000: 304-305.

⁴⁰⁶ For the rendering “turbans” see HALOT 908. The word has this sense in Ezek 24:17, 23 for a male head covering and in Isa 3:20 for a female head covering. It is a priest’s head-dress in Exod 39:28; Ezek 44:18. See Fletcher-Louis 2002: 244-45.

⁴⁰⁷ Steudel 2000: 304. In 1994a: 323 Steudel explains the derivation of the notion of adornment from the Hebrew noun פאר. The Piel of the verb פאר has the sense of glorify, and Steudel suggests that the noun designates “magnificence,” “splendour” and “ornament” in later Hebrew. Jastrow 1989: 1131 gives the senses of “ornament,” “crown,” and “bonnet of distinction.” For the verb see HALOT 908, s.v. פָּאַר, pi., and Jastrow 1989: 1131, s.v. פָּאַר, pi. There seems no reason to resort to the verb and to apply a denominative sense from a much later period as Steudel does, when the noun provides an adequate sense in the context, particularly given the proposed early date for the scroll. See Fletcher-Louis 2004b: 245.

⁴⁰⁸ Steudel 2000: 306. In the preliminary edition (1994a: 321) Steudel translates the expression with “His [God’s] magnificent glory.” In a discussion of this line on p. 323 Steudel uses a lower case “h”.

⁴⁰⁹ Baumgarten 1997: 143; Chazon 1999a: 256-57; Alexander 2006: 66. Verbal and contextual parallels do exist between this text and 1QS X 2-3, which describes the movements of heavenly bodies.

emergence of the priest in 1Q29 and 4Q376, the **פארי כבדו** is more likely to refer to the priest's glorious head-dress, as he emerges from the sanctuary to address the people.⁴¹⁰

The sanctuary is described as **זבול קדש** ("holy sanctuary"). In 1QM XII 2 **זבול** clearly refers to the heavenly dwelling place of God. However, the same word appears in 1 Kings 8:13 and 2 Chron 6:2, referring to Solomon's temple, the **בית זבל** ("exalted house") that he built for Yahweh. It is from there that the priests emerged from the temple at its dedication (1 Kings 8:10-11; 2 Chron 5:11-14), when the glory of Yahweh filled the temple. This is a plausible background for the present text, which if it is a pre-Qumranic composition, could refer to the Jerusalem Temple. Since the word **זבול** can refer to both the heavenly dwelling place of God and the earthly temple, this text gives some insight into how the Qumran community could envisage themselves in the presence of the angels of the heavenly sanctuary during their worship in the Judean desert.⁴¹¹ If the community was seen as a temple then it was already "heaven on earth," and the angels in the heavenly temple can be understood as with the community in their worship.

3.16 Conclusion

The fragmentary nature of many of these manuscripts means that definitive conclusions are sometimes difficult. It is clear from 4QmidrEschat^a that the community understood itself in some way to be an interim temple until God himself builds the eschatological temple in the last days, an idea also present in the *Temple Scroll* and the *New Jerusalem* text. The idea that the community is a temple is also reflected in most of the other texts surveyed here, particularly in those texts where angels are understood to be present in the community, especially in their worship. The presence of the angels requires a degree of ritual purity that is normally associated with the temple as the place where God is encountered. Conversely, and especially in *ShirShabb* and related texts, the community, or at least an inner core, considered that it was participating in the worship of angels. Moreover, while many scholars consider this participation to take place in the heavenly temple, the presence of an "above and below" dichotomy in these texts is not as certain as has often been maintained. Rather, the heavenly temple encompasses earth and heaven, so that the community has access to this temple, while still on earth, in the Judean desert. Thus, it is not a physical structure. Moreover, in some texts their worship is considered to be "sacrificial," the offering of their lips. There is no sure evidence of an understanding of sacrificial activity in heaven, apart from words of praise and thanksgiving.

⁴¹⁰ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 246. For similar ideas see Josephus *Ant.* 3.186-87, where the priest's head-dress (**πίλος**) is likened to heaven, since it is inscribed with the name of God. Fletcher-Louis (p. 247) connects this line with the cosmological statements of lines 8-10 suggesting that "the high priest represents, or embodies, the sun and so his appearance from the sanctuary (heaven) is perfectly timed to coincide with the appearance of the sun at the break of day." For similar ideas to this see Sir 50:5-7.

⁴¹¹ Cf. Ibid. 247 "[a]lready in the biblical text the identification of Israel's sanctuary as God's **זבל** is a cosmological statement grounded in temple-as-microcosm theology."

There are clear correlations with Hebrews here. While the idea of the community as a temple is not at all clear in Hebrews, I will argue below that the true tent of Heb 8:2 is to be understood as the eschatological temple that God was expected to build in the last days and that it is now in place since the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God.⁴¹² Furthermore, the readers of Hebrews are encouraged to enter this eschatological temple in 10:19-25, and in 12:22-24 they are considered to be present in this temple, participating in the worship of angels. Thus, the claims about angelic worship and an eschatological temple reflected in the Dead Sea Scrolls are also reflected in Hebrews. This material is indispensable background to the understanding of these aspects of Hebrews.

⁴¹² See 8.5 (below).

4 Temple Contested: Temple Symbolism in Literature Reflecting Dissatisfaction with the Temple

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter I examine several texts that reflect dissatisfaction with the Jerusalem temple. In these texts there is speculation about a heavenly temple that replaces the earthly temple, a phenomenon some have traced to Ezekiel's vision of the departing glory of God due to the corruption of the priesthood (Ezek 10).¹ Dissatisfaction with the temple also surfaces in Hebrews, but for other reasons. I will argue below that in Hebrews the former temple and cult are said to anticipate the eschatological temple and Christ's offering of himself, and that now that he has been exalted to God's right hand, the former temple has reached its intended *telos*.² God is now encountered in the heavenly temple. The recipients of Hebrews have access to this temple in the present (10:19-25; 12:22-24), and it is their eschatological goal. Both Hebrews and the texts I examine in this chapter are endeavouring to come to grips with a temple and a cult no longer considered effective as a means of approach to God.

Temple language in these texts includes speculation about heavenly journeys, the heavenly temple and the eschatological temple.³ My concern is with the relationship between the heavenly temple and the earthly sanctuaries,⁴ and whether the former was understood as a heavenly archetype of the latter or whether there was some other relationship between them. I will also be alert to signs of dissatisfaction with the wilderness tabernacle, to suggestions of sacrifice in heaven and to discussions of an eschatological temple where God will ultimately dwell with his people.

¹ Himmelfarb 1993: 10-14 suggests that Ezekiel's belief that the temple was defiled and deserving of destruction (Ezek 9.3-8) is reflected in the vision of Ezek 10:18, where God abandons the temple until the establishment of the ideal eschatological temple in Ezek 40-48, to which he will return. Consequently, the second temple is not considered to be God's true dwelling place, but "a mere copy of the true temple located in heaven" [arguing that] "this desacralization of the earthly temple in favor of the heavenly ... opens the way for Enoch's ascent in the Book of the Watchers... [making this] first ascent in Jewish literature ... a journey to the true temple" (p. 13). This, she argues, becomes a paradigm for other heavenly journeys. See the discussions in Scholem 1946: 43-45; Stone 1978: 488; Rowland 1982: 84-94; Himmelfarb 1986: 149-51. For a similar phenomenon cf. the withdrawal of the *Shekinah* in 3 *En.* 5.

² See 7.8 and 8.5 (below).

³ Many of the texts examined in this chapter are apocalyptic texts, where revelation about transcendent realities is mediated by otherworldly beings. For a definition of apocalyptic see Collins 1991b: 19, where he updates his definition of 1979: 9, following (A. Yarbro) Collins 1986: 7. See also the discussion of apocalyptic in DiTommaso 2007: 238-50.

⁴ The plural "sanctuaries" here encompasses the wilderness tabernacle, Solomon's temple and the Second Temple

4.2 1 (*Ethiopic*) *Enoch*

The composite document known as 1 (*Ethiopic*) *Enoch* dates from between the fourth century B.C.E. and the turn of the Era.⁵ It comprises five major sections: The Book of the Watchers (1-36), the Book of Parables or Similitudes (37-71), the Book of the Luminaries (72-82), the Dream Visions (83-90) and the Epistle of Enoch (92-105). These are followed by two appendices: the Birth of Noah (106-107), and chapter 108 which recounts an earlier journey of Enoch. Aramaic fragments of parts of 1 *Enoch* were found at Qumran, indicating that part of the collection was composed in Aramaic and existed in the second century B.C.E.⁶ The complete collection is now only extant in an Ethiopic translation of an intermediate Greek version.⁷ Temple imagery surfaces in the Book of the Watchers, the Book of Parables, the Animal Apocalypse (85-90) and the Apocalypse of Weeks.⁸

4.2.1 The Book of the Watchers (1 *En.* 1-36)

The Book of the Watchers (BW) comprises an introduction containing an oracle of judgement (1-5); an ancient work dealing with the rebellion of the angels (watchers) recounted in Gen 6:1-4 (1 *En.* 6-11); an account of Enoch's heavenly journey and his commissioning by God to deliver an oracle of judgement to the fallen watchers (12-16); and a record of other cosmic journeys undertaken by Enoch (17-36).⁹

The story of the rebellion of the angels recounted in Gen 6:1-4 is central to BW.¹⁰ Both Suter and Nicholson have argued that this aspect of BW is to be understood against the background of dissatisfaction with and polemic against the Jerusalem priesthood because

⁵ Nickelsburg 2001: 1.

⁶ Kvanvig 1988: 95-96. The Qumran MSS are 4QEn^a, 4QEn^b, 4QEn^c, 4QEn^d, 4QEn^e. For summaries of their contents see Milik 1971: 336-37; 1976: 6; García Martínez 1992: 46-47; Flint 2005: 224-33; Knibb 2007a: 32-33. Stuckenbruck 2007b: 41-63 and Knibb 2010: 143-47 discuss their nature and significance. The Qumran Aramaic MSS are very fragmented, and Milik's *editio princeps* contains numerous restorations, which are at times difficult to distinguish from the actual manuscripts (Barr 1978: 518-19; Bhayro 2005: 53). Parts of the Book of the Watchers, the Astronomical Book, the Dream Visions and the Proto-Epistle of Enoch (for this designation see Boccaccini 1998:104-13) are represented at Qumran. The rest of Epistle of Enoch and the Book of the Parables are absent.

⁷ Black and VanderKam 1985: 1-7; Nickelsburg 2005a: 44; Knibb 2007a: 25-26, 29. Greek MSS preserve about twenty-eight percent of 1 *Enoch*, see Nickelsburg 2001: 12; Knibb 2007a: 33-36.

⁸ In the following discussion I refer to the Greek text of 1 *Enoch* in Black 1970 supplemented with the Aramaic witnesses from Qumran where available, and to the English translation of Nickelsburg and VanderKam where the only extant witnesses are in Ethiopic. Unless otherwise indicated, translations are my own. Flint 2005: 229-33 discusses fragments of what he maintains is a Greek text of parts of 1 *Enoch* found in Qumran Cave 7, although Nickelsburg 2005b: 237-39 is sceptical about its identification.

⁹ See Hartman 1979: 15; Kvanvig 1988: 85; García Martínez 1992: 62-3; Nickelsburg 2005a: 46-47; Dochhorn 2007: 477-95. For introductions to BW see VanderKam 1984a: 110-11; Black and VanderKam 1985: 1-17; Tigchelaar 1996: 152-64; Nickelsburg 2001: 25-6; 2005a: 46-53; Bergsma 2009: 39-41; Kvanvig 2009: 167.

¹⁰ Kvanvig 2009: 167-68.

of marriages with “foreign” women from outside priestly families,¹¹ jeopardising priestly and temple purity.¹² In *1 Enoch*, Enoch accesses the heavenly temple not from Jerusalem, but from a location near the ancient rival shrine of Dan at the base of Mount Hermon in the far north. This is as far away from Jerusalem as possible,¹³ and thus sidelines Jerusalem and the temple. While some of the details can be debated, it seems clear that both the setting of the revelation outside Jerusalem, and the presentation of Enoch as a priest in the heavenly temple, imply some critique of the temple and its priesthood.

4.2.1.1 The Introductory Theophany

In *1 En.* 1:2 Enoch reports a vision of “the Holy One and of heaven” (τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ), accompanied with a theophany (1:4-9) introducing an oracle of judgement against the wicked (2:1–5:9). This sets the tone for the entire book, concerned as it is with the origin and outcomes of sin in the world.¹⁴ He announces that God, “the (my) Great Holy One” (ὁ ἅγιός μου ὁ μέγας) will come “from his dwelling place” (ἐκ τῆς κατοικήσεως αὐτοῦ),¹⁵ “from the heaven of heavens” (ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῶν

¹¹ Suter 1979a: 119-24; 2002: 137-42; 2007b: 195-207. Nickelsburg 1977: 91-2, 96-7; Wright 2007a: 172-76. Nickelsburg 1981: 584-87; 2005a: 51 points to several parallels between the Enoch story and the story of the transgression of marriage rules in Ezra 9-10. Other texts reflecting these concerns include Neh 10:30; CD V 6-7; *Pss. Sol.* 8:11-13; *T. Levi* 2-7; *Jub.* 30:7-17; 4QMMT 1-2 IV 9-11; 1QS VII 5-9; IX 5-6.

¹² This theory has not met with universal acceptance. Himmelfarb 1993: 20-23 is sympathetic to the theory, although she critiques it in 1999b: 6-12 and then moderates her views in 2002: 131-35; 2007: 219-28. Tigchelaar 1996: 195-203; 2002: 143-44 argues that the foreign women were Samaritan women from Shechem and that those who left Jerusalem to marry such women may not have been priests. Thus, he finds no critique of the temple in this part of *1 Enoch*. Fletcher-Louis 1997c: 127-28 is cautious, while Collins 1982: 111; 1998: 49-51, 59 suggests that BW does not address any specific crisis, rather “it provides a lens through which any crisis can be viewed.” Boccaccini 1998: 184 notes that while the Enochians believed the temple to be impure, they were “awaiting its future restoration ... [and] never questioned its existence and centrality,” and in 2005: 6 Boccaccini describes Enochic Judaism as “a non-conformist, anti-Zadokite, priestly movement of dissent ... [at whose centre] was neither the temple nor the torah.” Sacchi 2005: 402 suggests that while the author of BW never refers to the temple, “he has no dispute with the priests of Jerusalem ... he simply ignores them.” Reed 2005: 63-66 argues that BW is not so much a critique of the temple, but of an impure priesthood. Horsley 2007: 161, 242 (footnote 27) disputes any connection with defiled priests, arguing instead that the watchers and the holy ones in heaven are represented as “officers of the imperial divine government of the universe, who are supposed to maintain the divinely created order,” rather than as priests, and that the havoc on earth reflects the suffering of the Judean population under the rule of the Ptolemaic regime. Hebrews, as well as much of the literature discussed in this chapter, mentions neither Jerusalem nor the temple, but it is unwarranted to infer from this a lack of interest in these central institutions of Judaism. Given the centrality of the temple in middle Judaism, the silence is too loud to be ignored.

¹³ Nickelsburg 1981: 582-87; Kvanvig 2009: 169. For Hermon as a rival shrine see Eshel and Eshel 2002: 118-20.

¹⁴ VanderKam 1973: 131. The theophany announces that God will come to judge the wicked, and his coming will result in cosmic disturbances. For similar ideas see Mic 1:3-4; Isa 26:21; Jer 25:30-31.

¹⁵ Κατοίκησις appears in 1 Kings 8:30 and 2 Chron 6:21 in apposition with οὐρανός for God’s dwelling place. The Hebrew text in 1 Kings 8:30 is אל מקום שבתך אל השמים (“to your dwelling place, to heaven”), and in 2 Chron 6:21 ממקום שבתך מן השמים (“from your dwelling place, from heaven”). Column 1 of 4QEn^a is badly damaged and little of the description of the theophany has been preserved. See Milik 1971: 335-37; 1976: 141-45; *DSSSE* 398-401. *DSSSE* 398 restores ... מן[דורה] (“from your dwelling”) in 4QEn^a I 5. In Dan 2:11 מדרור denotes the dwelling of the gods (אלהין), which is not with mortals.

οὐρανῶν)¹⁶ and will “tread” (πατέω) upon Mount Sinai.¹⁷ He also appears in strength from his “encampment” (παρεμβολή).¹⁸ In this text God’s heavenly dwelling resembles his encampment with the Israelites in the wilderness.

God is said to come in this way in several OT texts.¹⁹ But, apart from Exod 19:11, God usually comes not to, but from Sinai.²⁰ In Mic 1:2 God speaks “from his holy temple” (מְהִיכַל קִדְשׁוֹ), and in 1:3 “exits” (יֵצֵא) his “place” (מְקוֹם), “descends” (יֵרֵד), and “treads” (דָּרַךְ) on the “high places” (בְּמֹת) of the earth,²¹ words that seem to be reflected in 1 *En.* 1:3-4 and the judgement scene that follows.²² Since God speaks from the temple in Mic 1:2, but descends to the earth in 1:3, the text in Micah reflects the belief that the temple is “heaven on earth,” with God simultaneously in the temple and in heaven from where he descends.²³

¹⁶ That is the highest heaven. For similar expressions see 2 Chron 2:6 (MT and LXX 2:5); Ps 68:33 (MT v. 34, LXX 67:34); Ps 148:4; Neh 9:6. While this is the highest heaven, there is no plurality of heavens in 1 *Enoch*. The expression is probably hyperbolic (VanderKam 1973: 134; Collins 1995a: 62).

¹⁷ VanderKam 1973: 136 and Nickelsburg 2001: 145 suggest that πατέω probably translates דָּרַךְ (see Mic 1:3). The LXX of Mic 1:3 has ἐπιββαίνω (“set foot on,” see BDAG 367).

¹⁸ The expression ἐκ τῆς παρεμβολῆς αὐτοῦ in v. 4 parallels ἐκ τῆς κατοικήσεως αὐτοῦ in v. 3 and refers to God’s heavenly dwelling. Nickelsburg 2001: 145 argues that παρεμβολή should be rendered with “host” (Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2004: 20 translate with “army,” see BDAG 774, s.v. παρεμβολή, 3), that is, God’s heavenly entourage. Both Nickelsburg (p. 142), and VanderKam 1973: 138-39 note that the Ethiopic version refers to God’s army, and Milik 1976: 142 restores עִמָּו חֵילָהּ [בָּהּ] (“with his mighty army”) in 4QEn^a 1 I 6. Barr 1978: 521 notes the meagre evidence for this reconstruction and also that חֵיל is never rendered by παρεμβολή in the LXX. He proposes restoring מַשְׁרֵי, “the common Targumic word for ‘camp,’” suggesting that this word could have the sense of God “appearing *from* his *abode*” (italics original). Charles 1912: 6 translates the word with “camp.”

¹⁹ Nickelsburg 1995: 332-54 notes that the authors of 1 *Enoch* never quote the OT. Rather, “they wove into their texts words, phrases and motifs found in the Hebrew Bible” (p. 334). They did not so much see themselves as interpreting or rewriting scripture, but as presenting authoritative scripture, “revelations not found in the Tanakh” (p. 347). He continues, “They do not quote the Hebrew Scriptures ... [i]nstead they cut themselves loose from the received texts and create new ones ... [complementing] the old texts and investing their new texts with pre-eminent authority that makes them uniquely binding and superlatively relevant for their times.”

²⁰ Deut 33:2; Ps 68:7-8, 17-18 (MT 68:8-9, 18-19, LXX 67:8-9, 18-19); Hab 3:3. See VanderKam 1973: 132-33. Nah 1:3b-5 describes a theophany, where God is accompanied with a storm and cosmic upheaval, but in that text God neither comes from or to any specific locale.

²¹ See Amos 4:13 for similar ideas.

²² VanderKam 1973: 134. See Cross 1973: 100-110 for a discussion of the theophanic tradition. See also Deut 33; Judg 5; Hab 3.

²³ For similar ideas see Solomon’s prayer at the dedication of the temple (1 Kings 8; 2 Chron 6), where, while God is resident in the temple, Solomon prays that God will hear from his dwelling place in heaven. Otzen 1984: 199-215; Smith 1984: 17; McKane 1998: 29; Andersen and Freedman 2000: 162; Waltke 2007: 47 all believe that the מְהִיכַל קִדְשׁוֹ (“his holy temple/palace”) of Mic 1:2 is in heaven. However, that is not at all clear. While Yahweh exits his place (מְקוֹם) and descends (יֵרֵד) in v. 3, in v. 2 he is simply a witness against the peoples of the earth from his holy temple, and there are no verbs conveying movement. Hillers 1984: 19-20 sees a primary reference to heaven, but cautions against distinguishing “too sharply between a heavenly and an earthly temple,” comparing Amos 1:2; Isa 6:6. Ben Zvi 1998: 109-10 argues that the text is intentionally ambiguous and may be “(re-)read as indicating a heavenly temple, the Jerusalem temple, or

However, in *1 Enoch* God's heavenly dwelling place reflects not the Jerusalem temple but the wilderness encampment of the Israelites, and God treads not on Zion where he might be expected to, but on Sinai. Jerusalem and the temple are ignored in favour of the wilderness and Sinai. This displacement of Zion and Jerusalem with the wilderness tabernacle is an implicit critique of the former and reflects the importance of the latter.

4.2.1.2 The Myth of the Fallen Angels (*1 En.* 6-16)

This part of *1 Enoch* is foundational to BW and may be its oldest part.²⁴ It is a composite work,²⁵ supplementing the events recounted in Gen 6:1-4, where the watchers descended from heaven, had sexual relations with human women and taught them previously unknown secrets.²⁶ These events are portrayed as the cause of all evil (7:3-4),²⁷ since the offspring of these illicit unions were giants who wrought havoc throughout the world. On seeing this evil, the four heavenly archangels asked God to intervene (9:1-11), and God responds by giving each a commission (10).

4.2.1.3 The Sanctuary in Heaven *1 Enoch* 9:1

The Greek text of *1 En.* 9:1 records that “from heaven the four archangels saw much bloodshed on earth” (ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐθεάσαντο αἷμα πολὺ ἐκχυννόμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς). There is considerable damage to both 4QEn^a IV 7 and 4QEn^b III 7,²⁸ but Milik restores in both manuscripts the words “they looked down ... from the sanctuary of heaven upon the earth” (מן קדש[י] שמיה על ארעה אדיק).²⁹ Confirming this is the papyrus fragment XQpapEnoch,³⁰ which reads קדש[י] שמיה על ארעה (“... the sanctuary of

both,” noting that the “ambiguity conveys a close association between the divine (sic) and the earthly temple.” For similar ambiguity see Ps 11:4.

²⁴ Nickelsburg 2005a: 47; García Martínez 1992: 65; Olson 2004: 10. Milik 1976: 25-28 dates BW in the third century B.C.E., but argues that it incorporates a much older source comprising *1 En.* 6-16, which predates the same version of the story in Gen 6:1-4, while Nickelsburg 2005a: 48 suggests that it is an elaboration of Gen 6:1-4. Kvanvig 2004: 169-83 concludes that the relationship is complex, and that Gen 6:1-4 and *1 En.* 6-16 need to be read in dialogue with one another. For an early date for this section see Stone 1978: 484, 491; Himmelfarb 1986: 147-48; 1993: 10, 116 (footnote 3); Sacchi 1990: 61; Olson 2004: 7; Kvanvig 2004: 167-83.

²⁵ Nickelsburg 1977: 384-86; Newsom 1980: 313-14; García Martínez 1992: 65-69. Davidson 1992: 41-3. For a comprehensive treatment see Bhayro 2005: 11-20.

²⁶ For a convenient summary of *1 En.* 6-11; 12-16 see Kvanvig 2004: 163-65.

²⁷ Boccaccini 1998: 72.

²⁸ See Bhayro 2005: 78.

²⁹ This is Milik's reading of 4QEn^a 1 IV 6-7. All that remains in 4QEn^b 1 II 7 are parts of two angelic names. See Milik 1976: 157-59, 170-71; *DSSSE* 402-3; Olson 2004: 35. The Greek version attested in Syncellus reads παρέκυσαν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (“they leaned over to look from the sanctuary of heaven”), but these words are not present in the Ethiopic version (Black 1970: 23; Bhayro 2005: 78). Bhayro considers that Milik's reconstruction “would appear to confirm ... [the reading preserved in Syncellus] as original” (p. 162). Stuckenbruck 2000: 18 translates “peered down from among the hol[y]one[s] of heaven,” but the Aramaic text for this reading would probably be מביין (from among) rather than מן (from), see Eshel and Eshel 2005: 146.

³⁰ Eshel and Eshel 2005: 146.

heaven upon the earth”). *1 Enoch* reflects such texts as Deut 26:15 where Yahweh is asked “to look down from his holy house in heaven” (קִדְשׁ מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם הַשְּׁכִיפָה מִמַּעוֹן, LXX κάτιδε ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ ἁγίου σου ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) and bless his people.³¹ The text implies a holy dwelling place (sanctuary) above the earth where God dwells with his heavenly entourage, and from where he and they can view the earth.

4.2.1.4 Enoch’s Heavenly Journey *1 Enoch* 12-16

Although *1 En.* 12-16 follows 6-11 in BW, it is apparent that the two sections were originally independent.³² Enoch is the chief character of chapters 1-5, but he does not feature in chapters 6-11 and is introduced as though for the first time in 12:1-2. Chapters 6-11 are a third person description of events in heaven, while chapters 12-16 are mostly in the first person. Nevertheless, it does seem clear that the author of 12-16 had at least some parts of 6-11 at his disposal, and created 12-16 as a response,³³ reiterating and reinterpreting 6-11.³⁴

In these chapters, Enoch “the righteous scribe” (ὁ γραμματεὺς τῆς δικαιοσύνης)³⁵ is a central figure (12:4). He recounts his interaction with the fallen watchers and his ascent to heaven. He becomes “the great intermediary of salvation”³⁶ who enters the presence of God, intercedes for the fallen watchers, receives a commission from God and announces God’s judgement on the watchers. All this is to save the inhabitants of the earth from the disastrous outcomes of the illicit unions between the watchers and human women.

After an editorial pericope (12:1-2) introducing Enoch, said to have been taken by God prior to the events of chapters 6-11,³⁷ the material falls into four main parts. (1) Enoch is

³¹ See also Ps 14:2; 53:3; Isa 63:15; 1 Bar. 2:16; *1 En.* 15:3.

³² The Aramaic fragments from Qumran provide evidence that both sections (and indeed all of 1-36) were part of BW. Thus, they were joined at an early stage, and should be read in the context of one another (Dimant 1978: 323; Collins 1978: 315-19; Newsom 1980: 312-20; Nickelsburg 2001: 232; 1978a: 311). That they were originally independent can be inferred from the Hebrew fragments of the Book of Noah (1Q19 19^{bis}), which preserve fragments from 12-16 but not 6-11. See Milik 1955b 99; Dimant 1978: 333 (footnote 3).

³³ Newsom 1980: 315-16, 329.

³⁴ Nickelsburg 2001: 229. See also Suter 1979a: 119; Tigchelaar 1996: 154-57; Reed 2004: 53-54. Newsom 1980: 329 and Collins 1982: 96-97 suggest that chapters 12-16 are transitional, preparing the way for Enoch’s cosmic journeys in 17-36, which along with 12-16 are recounted in the first person.

³⁵ For a discussion of Enoch the scribe see Milik 1976: 262; Schams 1998: 92-94 (who suggests that the title reflects “his expertise in reading and writing and his reputation as a righteous man”); Nickelsburg 2001: 65-67; Orlov 2005a: 50-59; Horsley 2007: 152-54; Wright 2007a: 174-76. See also *Jub.* 4:17-19; *T. Ab.* B 11:2-4.

³⁶ Sacchi 1990: 59.

³⁷ The Greek verb translated “taken” is the aorist passive of λαμβάνω, equivalent to לקח in Gen 5:24. LXX uses μετατίθημι (“translated” from one place to another—i.e. from earth to heaven, see BDAG 642, s.v. μετατίθημι, 1). Hebrews 11:5 reflects the LXX. Nickelsburg 2001: 233 notes that Gen 5:24 refers to Enoch’s disappearance at the end of his life, while *1 En.* 12:1-2 refers to “the beginning of a period of his association with the angels (οἱ ἄγγελοι, 12:2).” The Hebrew morpheme האלהים in Gen 5:22, 24 is ambiguous and appears to have been read by these who composed BW as a reference to divine beings. See Skinner 1930: 131;

sent to the fallen watchers to declare a sentence of judgement passed against them, which he does (12:3-13:3); (2) the fallen watchers ask Enoch to write a petition and intercede for them, whereupon he goes to the waters of Dan, to the south-west of Hermon³⁸ and recites the words of the petition until he falls asleep (13:4-7); (3) while sleeping he has a visionary experience (13:8) in which he goes on a journey to the heavenly throne room (13:8-15:1);³⁹ and (4) while Enoch is in the presence of God in God's throne room, God gives him an oracle of judgement to deliver to the fallen watchers (15:2-16:4).

The Waters of Dan and the environs of Hermon are significant religious sites, ideal for a vision such as this.⁴⁰ In the vision, the winds make Enoch fly, lift him upwards and bring him to heaven (14:8).⁴¹ The implication is that, somewhat like Bethel where Jacob has a visionary experience and describes his location as “the house of God and the gate of heaven” (Gen 28:10-17), and like Sinai in Exod 24:9-18 where Moses has an encounter with God, this sacred location is the axis between earth and heaven.⁴²

Dimant 1983: 21; VanderKam 1984a: 130-31; 2001: 133-34; Fletcher-Louis 1997c: 146; Kvanvig 2004: 171-73.

³⁸ The location is further elaborated in 13:9 where it is specified as being ἐν Ἐβελσατά which may be a corruption of Abel-Main, perhaps the same location where Levi began his visionary heavenly journey, see Milik 1955c: 403-405; 1976: 196; De Jonge 1974: 138; Nickelsburg 1981: 582-90; 2001: 248, 250. Eshel and Eshel 2003: 458-68, dispute the geographical connection with the Levi vision, and Nickelsburg 2003: 469-71 seems to agree, a modification of his earlier stance (see also 2005a: 413, fn 19). Greenfield, Stone and Eshel 2004: 137 suggest that Eshel's proposal “remains in the realm of hypothesis,” but do agree that the Hermon location for Levi's vision is unlikely. Much earlier, Charles 1906: 35 suggested that Ἐβελσατά was a corruption of Ἀβειλήνη, a suggestion that Knibb 1978: 2: 94 considers plausible. See also Charles 1912: 31 and Horsley 2007: 241-42 (footnote 26).

³⁹ *1 En.* 14-16 is a report of the vision referred to in 13:8 (Tigchelaar 1996: 183-84). In 13:9-10 Enoch explains how he awoke and recited the things he saw in the vision. In 14:1-7 his commission is summarised; 14:8-23 detail the heavenly journey; and 14:24-16:4 recount God's oracle to Enoch concerning the watchers. For the structure of *1 En.* 12-16, and the structural parallels between 12:4-13:3 and 15:2-16:4, see Reed 2004: 59-62 and Reed's diagram on p. 62.

⁴⁰ Milik 1955c: 405; Nickelsburg 1981: 582-87; 2001: 238-47; Black and VanderKam 1985: 144; Eshel and Eshel 2002: 118-20; Carlsson 2004: 36-37; Olson 2004: 42. The region is an ancient religious location, with significant cultic connotations.

⁴¹ This part of 4QEn^c is badly damaged. Column VI 21 reads [... שמיא לנ] (‘... on high. And they brought me and placed me in [heaven]’). The Greek text reads ἐξεπέτασάν με καὶ ἐπῆράν με ἄνω καὶ εἰσήνεγκάν με εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν (‘caused me to fly and lifted me upward and brought me into heaven’). For the sense of “spreading wings in flight” for ἐκπετάννυμι see BDAG 307; LSJ 516.

⁴² Bautch 2003: 61. This is also the place to which the fallen watchers descend in *1 En.* 6:6. In *1 En.* 14:8-23 heaven has a preponderance of snow and ice. As Nickelsburg 2001: 261 notes, “... many of ... [the features of heaven] are compatible with the appearance of Mount Hermon and the conditions that surround it; a massive snowcap, ice, heavy clouds, fierce winds, and terrible cold at its peak.” This is not to suggest that Bethel, Hermon or Sinai constitute the heavenly temple, but these sacred mountains are where God is encountered and in some sense act as “temples.” Neither Jacob nor Moses experienced a heavenly ascent like Enoch did (Rowland 1979: 137-42; Himmelfarb 1993:9-14), rather they encounter God at these sacred places. For Sinai as a temple see Freedman 1977: 46-67; 1981: 20-29; Levenson 1985: 19-23; Houtman 2002: 3: 294, and for Jacob's staircase see Rowland 1984: 498-507; Hurowitz 2006: 436-48.

Heaven is twice described as a sanctuary in this part of BW. In 12:4 the watchers are accused of forsaking “the highest heaven, the sanctuary of the(ir) eternal station” (τὸν οὐρανὸν τὸν ὑψηλόν, τὸ ἁγίασμα τῆς στάσεως τοῦ αἰῶνος).⁴³ Later, when Enoch enters the throne room, God asks the fallen watchers through Enoch, “Why have you forsaken “the high heaven, the eternal sanctuary” (τὸν οὐρανὸν τὸν ὑψηλὸν τὸν ἅγιον τοῦ αἰῶνος, 15:3). The appositional expressions here indicate that the text envisages heaven as a sanctuary.⁴⁴

1 *Enoch* 14:8-23 is an account of Enoch’s journey from the time he fell asleep at Dan until he entered the heavenly throne room, and 14:24–16:4 recount his entry to that throne room. He presents his petition to God, who rejects it, responding with an oracle of judgement for Enoch to deliver to the watchers. The account resembles a prophetic call narrative, similar to Isa 6 and Ezek 1-2,⁴⁵ where an enthroned Deity appears and speaks to the prophet. But there is one significant difference, for while Isaiah encounters the deity in

⁴³ Black and VanderKam 1985: 143 notes the expression τὸ ἁγίασμα τῆς στάσεως is unparalleled and suggests that στάσις may reflect מקום comparing Isa 26:1; Mic 1:3; 1 Kings 8:30; 2 Chron 6:20. See also Charles 1912: 28; Olson 2004: 42-43. See LSJ 1634, s.v., στάσις B.2, for the sense of “a place where one stands.” Burkitt 1913: 68 translates “the sanctuary of the eternal covenant,” reconstructing a putative Aramaic text from the Greek text used by Charles, with reference to the Targums to Gen 9:16, which refer to the bow that Yahweh promises to place in the clouds, as a sign of the “eternal covenant” (קִים עֲלֵם, Tg. Ps.-J. and Tg. Onq. Gen 9:16; קִים עֲלֵם, Tg. Neof. Gen 9:16). Knibb 1978: 2: 92 suggests that this emendation is plausible. However, there seems little justification for rendering στάσις with covenant. In 4Q491^c 11 the speaker claims that “my station is with the gods” (עִם אֱלֹהִים מַעְמַדִּי), and 4Q405 23 II 7 refers to the “station” (מַעְמַד) of the holy ones, showing that the notion of a standing place in the heavenly temple is not unknown elsewhere.

⁴⁴ Nickelsburg 2001: 271. A possible third reference to the heavenly sanctuary is preserved in 4QEn^c VI 4 (1 *En.* 13: 8) where the words]לְהַרְעִי הַיְכָל appear, to which Milik 1976: 193 adds [הַיְכָל שְׁמִיָּא. He translates (p. 195) “I lifted up my eyelids to the gates of the palace [of heaven].” *DSSSE* 450-51 adopts this restoration in its translation, although the editors do not restore שְׁמִיָּא in the Aramaic text. Nickelsburg 1981: 584 and Black and VanderKam 1985: 144 also adopt Milik’s reading, although Nickelsburg 2001: 248-49 notes the damage to the text of 4QEn^c and omits the words in question. He suggests that the reading may lie behind the Greek of the Mt Athos addition to *T. Levi* 2:3, where, before he prays, Levi says τότε τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς μου καὶ τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἤρα πρὸς οὐρανόν (“then I raised my eyes and my face to heaven”). Olson 2004: 43 adds the reference to the gates of heaven in his translation, with no comment on the state of the text. In *ALD* Levi “enters directly into heaven from the summit of the mountain” (Milik 1976: 196). See 4QLevi^b 1 II 16-18, and my discussion of *T. Levi* below (4.4.1). *ALD* has affinities with 1 *En.* 13:7-10, although the immediate context is different (Draemel 2004: 104; Greenfield, Stone and Eshel 2004: 67, 139). The text 4QLevi^b is badly damaged, but the wording of what remains is quite different from Milik’s reconstruction. There Levi “sees heaven” (... וְחִזִּית שְׁמִיָּא), and “the gates of heaven” (תַּרְוֵי שְׁמִיָּא) are mentioned, although the immediate context is lost. The word הַיְכָל (“temple/palace”) does not appear. See Milik 1955c: 404-405.

⁴⁵ This was first proposed by Jansen 1939: 114-17. Habel 1965: 309-314 identifies a call narrative tradition where the prophet stands before Yahweh in the heavenly temple. He refers to 1 Kings 22:19-21; Isa 6:1-13; Ezek 1:1–3:15. See also Himmelfarb 1993: 10-11; Nickelsburg 1981: 575; 2001: 254-56; Olson 2004: 46; Horsley 2007: 241 (footnote 24). Stone 1978: 490 and Nickelsburg 2001: 254 see some influence from Ezek 40-44, but Ezek 1-2 seems to be the major influence, as Nickelsburg’s charts (2001: 254-56) indicate. There are also connections with Dan 7.

the Jerusalem temple⁴⁶ and Ezekiel sees the open heaven from beside the river Chebar, Enoch ascends to heaven.⁴⁷

While the Jerusalem temple and the heavenly temple seem to merge for Isaiah who, on entering the temple, encounters God in heaven,⁴⁸ and while Ezekiel sees God on his chariot throne “above the firmament” (מעל לרקיע),⁴⁹ Enoch leaves the earth and travels to the heavenly temple to receive his commission. Here, dissatisfaction with the Jerusalem temple resurfaces. Of course, as Ezek 8-10 records, Solomon’s temple had been abandoned by God and had been destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar’s army. And while the second temple would have been standing when *1 Enoch* was written, since it was understood to be defiled it was ignored. Enoch’s only option for a commissioning such as this is to ascend to the heavenly temple, which he does. Thus, the heavenly temple is not so much a reflection of the earthly temple, as a replacement of it.⁵⁰

After his ascent Enoch moves through what appears as a heavenly temple.⁵¹ As Nickelsburg notes:

⁴⁶ Isaiah 6 does not explicitly locate the vision in the Jerusalem temple. But the shaking of the thresholds (v. 4), the references to the house (v. 4) and to the seraphs and the altar (v. 6) imply that Isaiah was in the temple. See Habel 1965: 310; Oswalt 1986: 176; Wildberger 1991: 263; Goldingay 2001: 58; Childs 2001: 55; Tucker 2001: 102-103.

⁴⁷ Himmelfarb 1993: 9. See Wheeler-Robinson 1944: 151-57; Cross 1953: 274-75; Nickelsburg 1981: 576-82; Dean-Otting 1984: 55-57; Levenson 1988b: 53-54; Collins 1995c: 45-6.

⁴⁸ Habel 1965: 310 (footnote 29); Wildberger 1991: 263 (“to try to distinguish between an earthly and a heavenly sanctuary attempts to make a distinction which the ancient person would never have attempted”); Goldingay 2001: 58 (“[i]n the temple, the symbolism of worship with the incense swirling becomes a vision of the reality the symbolism pointed to”).

⁴⁹ Nickelsburg 2001: 259 notes the following differences from Ezekiel’s vision: (1) in Ezek 1 the chariot comes to Ezekiel, while in *1 En.* 14 Enoch ascends to heaven, (2) Ezekiel sees only the cherubim, the throne with the human-like figure seated upon it, the fire beneath the throne and the ice-like pavement, while Enoch describes the heavenly temple in considerable detail; and (3) Ezekiel is largely passive, while Enoch is the subject of a number of the verbs. Morray-Jones 1998: 401-2 considers the differences to have been overstated. He notes that Isaiah receives the burning coal from God and receives his instructions from God (who is enthroned in the heavenly temple), and Ezekiel also receives his instructions, “not on earth, but above the firmament,” and is later returned to earth. He comments, “[W]hether he [Ezekiel] has been transported to the earthly sanctuary or the celestial throne room is nowhere specified and it is perhaps doubtful whether this distinction would have been very meaningful to the author, for whom the ritual identification of the one with the other was not merely a dramatic metaphor.” The difference between these proposals depends upon the understanding of a temple that is adopted. Morray-Jones works with a paradigm where a temple is “heaven on earth,” so that to enter an earthly temple is to be transported to heaven, while Himmelfarb, Nickelsburg and Dean-Otting work with a paradigm where the heavenly temple corresponds to the earthly, but is removed from it. That Enoch took a heavenly journey indicates that in *1 Enoch* heaven is understood as a sanctuary or temple, above and separated from the earth (see *1 En.* 1:3; 9:1, 4; 12:4; 15:5).

⁵⁰ Carlsson 2004: 43.

⁵¹ A detailed exegetical treatment of Enoch’s heavenly journey would be a diversion; rather, I simply draw attention to those parts of the text that describe the heavenly sanctuary. For detailed discussions see Dean-Otting 1984: 42-58; Black and VanderKam 1985: 145-51; Carlsson 2004: 34-48; Nickelsburg 2001: 257-66. Tigchelaar 1996: 184 and Nickelsburg 2005a: 50 point out the account of Enoch’s heavenly journey and the detailed description of the heavenly sanctuary are somewhat redundant since the fallen watchers had

(1) The palace of the Deity is by definition a temple. (2) Both 12:4 and 15:3 speak of the eternal sanctuary. (3) Language about both the fallen watchers ... and the angels “who approach” God ... suggest that at least some of the angels are construed as priests. (4) *Testament of Levi* 2-5 reuses the material in this vision, making explicit reference to Levi’s vision of the heavenly temple.⁵²

In vv. 9-14a Enoch sees and then penetrates a wall of hailstones and tongues of fire,⁵³ from where he sees a “house” (οἶκος). The description of the wall and the house is clearly fantastic. It bears little relation to any aspect of the Jerusalem temple, apart from the use of οἶκος (vv. 10, 13), which often refers to God’s dwelling place in both the OT and the NT.⁵⁴ The wall either corresponds to the outer wall of the temple or perhaps the wall of the heavenly city.⁵⁵

Enoch enters the house and is overcome with fear, falling upon his face. Through an open door he sees a second house (v. 15), “greater” (μείζων) than the first, also built of tongues of fire, but indescribable. This is the heavenly holy of holies, where God dwells. The description of the heavenly holy of holies is loosely based on the layout of the Jerusalem temple in that it is a second compartment. But there the correspondence ends.⁵⁶ In the earthly temple the holy of holies is a second compartment within the sanctuary, while the description in *1 Enoch* seems to imply two separate dwellings.⁵⁷ The text does not

previously inhabited heaven (12:4; 15:3) and would have known the details. They do establish Enoch’s credentials for the reader.

⁵² Nickelsburg 2001: 256. For angels as priests see Davidson 1992: 238-43; Hannah 1999: 32; 44-45, 60-61.

⁵³ See Schäfer 1992: 79-80 for the predominance of fire in the description of heaven in later hekhalot texts, in particular *Ma’aseh Merkanab*. See also *3 En.* 22B: 3 for fire and hail.

⁵⁴ Gen 28:22; Exod 23:19; 34:26; Judg 18:31; 1 Sam 1:7; Josh 6:24; 1 Kings 6:2, 5; Isa 2:2; 66:1; Jer 7:1, 11; Ezek 40:47-48; Dan 1:2; Amos 7:13; Mic 3:12; Hag 1:8; 1 Chron 9:23; Matt 12:4 (and parallels in Mark 2:26; Luke 6:4); Matt 21:13 (and parallels in Mark 11:17; Luke 19:46); Luke 11:51; John 2:16; Acts 7:47, 49. Heb 3:6; 10:21 are more likely to refer to the household of God.

⁵⁵ Black and VanderKam 1985: 146; Carlsson 2004: 39.

⁵⁶ Himmelfarb 1993: 16 notes that the architectural detail does not correspond to any known earthly temple, suggesting that there need not be a strict correspondence since the heavenly sanctuary transcended that on earth. Newsom 1985: 49 refers to “elusive transcendence” in the descriptions of heaven in *ShirShabb*, and on p. 50 suggests that the structure “described in *1 Enoch* 14 is probably that of a temple “with nave and adytum.” Rowland 1979: 140-41 suggests that “there is hardly enough similarity in detail to justify any [sic] but the assumption that the basic outline of the Temple would have been taken by many apocalyptists as a reflection of the court of God.” Himmelfarb 1986: 151-52 finds a correspondence in that both the heavenly and earthly sanctuaries have priests, with the angels functioning as priests in the heavenly sanctuary. Gäbel 2006: 78-9 sees no correspondence here between the heavenly and earthly temples.

⁵⁷ Nickelsburg 2001: 264 recognises that one of these dwellings could be within the other, but also considers it paradoxical that this second house is greater than the one in which it stands. The normal rules of logic need not apply in the description of the two houses in *1 En.* 14, and a house containing a greater house is no more paradoxical than walls made of hailstones and fire, through which Enoch passes unharmed (Alexander 2006: 77-78). Furthermore, the comparative adjective μείζων need not imply a greater physical size, rather the superior greatness could refer to the importance, rank or dignity, of the house, described as διαφέρων ἐν δόξῃ καὶ ἐν τιμῇ καὶ ἐν μεγαλωσύνῃ (“excelling in glory and in splendour and in majesty,” v. 16). See BDAG 624, s.v. μέγας, 4; Gruenwald 1980: 32-35; Rowland 1982: 83, 221. Dean-Otting 1984: 49;

seem to reflect concentric areas of increasing holiness; rather, the two houses deal with the practical issue of where the angels who serve God live, since they are not permitted to enter God's dwelling place.⁵⁸

This second house in heaven was more significant than the first. Within it was a "lofty throne" (θρόνος ὑψηλός) upon which "the Great Glory" (ἡ δόξα ἡ μεγάλη) was seated⁵⁹ and flowing from beneath the throne there was a burning river of fire. The description of the lofty throne reflects Isa 6:1 and the rivers of burning fire from beneath the throne Ezek 47.⁶⁰ There are also wheels and cherubim (Ezek 1:15-21; 10:1-22) and a brief description of the appearance of God.

The angels in the first house correspond to the priests in the earthly temple,⁶¹ but none was permitted to "enter" (παρέρχομαι, v. 21) the second.⁶² However, the Lord himself calls Enoch and invites him to "approach" (προσέρχομαι, v. 24). An angel takes him to the entrance, from where he is again invited to "approach" (προσέρχομαι, 15:1).⁶³ He enters the presence of God to mediate for the fallen watchers, taking on the role of the high priest on the Day of Atonement,⁶⁴ although there is no suggestion that he carries sacrificial blood into the presence of God.⁶⁵ Enoch surpasses the angels in greatness, "because he is addressed individually and is brought near to God."⁶⁶ Nevertheless, his mediation is ineffective. He receives the oracle of judgement for the watchers—they will have no peace (16:4). The role of Jesus as heavenly high priest in Hebrews is similar to that of Enoch in this text. He, too, takes on the role of the high priest on the Day of

Halperin 1988: 81; Collins 1995c: 48; Carlsson 2004: 39 see a house within a house after the analogy of the Jerusalem temple. VanderKam 2001: 141 refers to "two temple-palaces."

⁵⁸ That God dwells in the greater house indicates that it represents the holy of holies, but the description is speculative rather than reliant on some awareness of the structure of some existing temple or of the wilderness tabernacle. See Gruenwald 1980: 29-37; Rowland 1982: 255; Collins 1998: 54.

⁵⁹ See *T. Levi* 3:4. For a discussion of the names for God in *1 Enoch* and the echoes here of Exod 24:10-17, Isa 6:1-4, Ezek 1:26-28; 43:1-4 see Dean-Otting 1984: 50-56.

⁶⁰ See also Joel 3:18; Zech 14:8; Dan 7:9-10; Rev 22:1-2.

⁶¹ Himmelfarb 1993: 20; Carlsson 2004: 42-43.

⁶² There is some tension in *1 En.* 14:21-23, where the angels are said to be barred from the second house (v. 21). In v. 22 they are forbidden to "approach" (ἐγγίζω) God, but are then described as those who do approach him (23). Halperin 1988: 81-82, notes the apparent contradiction, where although they are unable to enter this structure (v. 21), they are perpetually in attendance (vv. 22-23). For ἐγγίζω referring to cultic approach to God, see Exod 19:21, 22; 24:2; Lev 21:21, 23; Isa 29:13; Ezek 40:46; 42:13; 43:19; 44:13; 45:4; Heb 7:19.

⁶³ For προσέρχομαι referring to cultic approach to God, see Lev 9:5, 7, 8; 10:4; 21:17, 18, 21, 23, Num 17:5; 18:22; Deut 4:11; 5:23, 27; Jer 7:16; Ezek 44:16; Sir 1:28, 30; 2:1; Heb 4:16; 7:25; 10:1, 22; 12:18, 22.

⁶⁴ Halperin 1988: 82; Wright 2000: 251; Carlsson 2004: 42-44.

⁶⁵ Hebrews 9:11-14 is often read as though Christ took his blood into the heavenly holy of holies. See my discussion of this text in 8.6.2 (below).

⁶⁶ Wright 2000: 251; Gruenwald 1980: 36-37.

Atonement (Heb 9:11-14). However, unlike Enoch whose intercession for the fallen watchers is ultimately ineffective, Jesus obtains eternal redemption (Heb 9:12).

In this earliest description of the heavenly temple it is a structure in heaven with two compartments, one greater than the other. It is vertically separated from the earth and Enoch undertakes a heavenly journey to access it. Nevertheless, it does not seem to correspond to any earthly sanctuary, as the pattern upon which the earthly sanctuary could have been modelled.⁶⁷ God is enthroned in one compartment, while the angels live in another.

4.2.1.6 Enoch's Cosmic Journeys (*1 En.* 17-36)

The Book of the Watchers concludes with an account of two cosmic journeys undertaken by Enoch (*1 En.* 17-36). In 17:1–19:3 Enoch's heavenly guides lead him on a journey to a mountain whose summit reaches heaven (17:2)⁶⁸ and then to seven other mountains of precious stones, one of which also had a summit reaching heaven, like the throne of God (18:8). In 21:1–36:4 Enoch covers the same ground in reverse.⁶⁹ Whatever else can be said on the debated background of these journeys,⁷⁰ it seems clear that they continue the theme of the punishment of the watchers. Since Enoch sees where this will take place, their punishment is certain. On the other hand, there is also a place of blessing for the righteous. Those who suffer can take courage from the transcendent perspective these journeys reveal.⁷¹

The central peak of the seven mountains with precious stones, whose summit reached heaven and which “resembled God's throne” (ὥσπερ θρόνος θεοῦ), was topped with lapis lazuli, as in Exod 24:10.⁷² This mountain is clearly Sinai.⁷³ On his return (24:3), Enoch notes again that the seventh peak rises above the others “like the seat of a throne” (ὅμοιον καθέδρα θρόνου). On it, there is a unique tree that is clearly the tree of life (24:6–25:7). In 25:3 Enoch's angelic guide (now Michael, 24:6) explains that this mountain is “like the throne of God” (ὁμοία θρόνου θεοῦ) and is the “seat” (καθέδρα) to which God will descend when he visits the earth with goodness.

⁶⁷ Himmelfarb 2007: 221.

⁶⁸ See Bautch 2003: 41-49 for a discussion of the setting off point for this journey. While there is a seam in the narrative at 17:1, as the text now stands the journey begins in heaven, and the “they” of *1 En.* 17:1 are Enoch's heavenly guides. On pp. 59-66 Bautch identifies the mountain whose summit reaches heaven as Hermon. If Bautch is correct, this is another indication of the sacredness of Hermon over against Zion.

⁶⁹ Nickelsburg 2001: 25. The two journeys are separated by a list of angelic names and roles (20:1-8).

⁷⁰ See the various suggestions in Collins 1982: 104-107.

⁷¹ Ibid.: 107-9, 1998: 55-59.

⁷² Lapis lazuli and the other jewels mentioned are also reminiscent of Ezek 28:11-14, reflecting Eden traditions.

⁷³ Kvanvig 2009: 170-71.

From there, Enoch proceeds to the centre of the earth where he sees “a holy mountain” (ὅρος ἅγιον, 26:2), surrounded with rivers and filled with trees, and a cursed valley alongside it. This holy mountain is Zion,⁷⁴ and the city is the New Jerusalem alongside the Valley of Hinnom.⁷⁵ Then, in 25:5-6, the tree of life on the high mountain is “transplanted to the holy place beside the house of God” (μεταφυτευθήσεται ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ παρὰ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ). Thus the New Jerusalem supersedes Sinai as the dwelling place of God, and is the place where God reigns forever. The present Jerusalem is simply ignored.

Mountains are prominent in this part of *1 Enoch*. Sinai and Zion are identifiable, but not the other mountains, since Enoch’s angelic guide is revealing heavenly things.⁷⁶ Like Hermon in 13:7 and Sinai in 1:3-4, Zion is associated with God. Its location at the centre of the earth, the presence of the tree of life, and the lapis lazuli are reminiscent of the Eden traditions, in particular those connected with Ezek 28, and reflect temple imagery.⁷⁷ The imagery of Eden combined with Zion, as well as the allusions to the final judgement, inform the reader of the continuity between Eden and the New Jerusalem. In the eschaton the conditions of Eden will be restored.⁷⁸

In *1 En.* 1-16 the temple is simply ignored. Zion is not the place where God is encountered, that place is in the far north and in the heavenly temple. However, in *1 En.* 17-36 Zion is the place where God will return in the eschaton to judge the wicked and bless the righteous. The text anticipates the eschatological dwelling place of God in the New Jerusalem. Nevertheless, there is no earthly structure in BW that can be referred to as a temple. Temple symbolism is reflected in the holy mountains that serve as setting-off places for heavenly journeys and as the place where celestial travellers and angels return to earth, and in the ultimate reign of God over his people. Similarly, Hebrews never mentions the earthly Zion or Jerusalem; it is displaced in favour of the city to come (13:14).

4.2.2 The Animal Apocalypse (*1 En.* 85-90)

1 Enoch 83-90 contains two visions. The first (83-84) details the imminent flood and the second is an allegory of the history of the world from creation to the eschaton (85:3–90:41). Human beings are depicted as animals, fallen angels as fallen stars, and the seven archangels as human beings.⁷⁹ The date of this part of *1 Enoch* is disputed, but allusions to

⁷⁴ Collins 2004a: 303; Kvanvig 2009: 171.

⁷⁵ Donaldson 1985: 59-60. Several attempts have been made to map Enoch’s cosmic journeys and locate the different mountains. See the diagrams in Grelot 1958: 46; Milik 1976: 40; Stock-Hesketh 2000: 30; Bautch 2003: 185. All four maps place Jerusalem/Zion at the centre of the earth.

⁷⁶ Rowland 1982: 124-25; Collins 1982: 104, 108-109; Davidson 1992: 62-66.

⁷⁷ Grelot 1958: 38-44.

⁷⁸ Suter 2007b: 207.

⁷⁹ Nickelsburg 2005a: 83.

the Maccabean revolt indicate that it was written in Judea probably around 165-160 B.C.E.⁸⁰

Egypt and the Exodus and wilderness wanderings are covered in 89:28-38. This part concludes with the death of Moses, “a sheep that changed and became a man” (89:36), that is, attained angel-like status,⁸¹ and built a house for the sheep.⁸² Since all the sheep dwell in the house, the referent is probably the wilderness camp.⁸³ Here, both the tabernacle and the surrounding camp are the place where God and his people dwell together. In 89:40 the same house is in the midst of the people in their pleasant land, an allusion to the tabernacle and camp at Shiloh.⁸⁴

1 *Enoch* 89:39-50 covers the entrance into the land under Joshua, the period of the judges, and the activities of Saul, David and Solomon. It culminates with the building of a house (Jerusalem), which contained a high tower, upon which the Lord of the sheep stood with a table spread before him (89:50).⁸⁵ The tower is Solomon’s temple and the spread table represents the sacrificial offerings.⁸⁶ That the Lord himself stands on it reflects the

⁸⁰ Charles 1912: 206-208; Tiller 1993: 61-82; Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2004: 361; Olson 2004: 204-206. The events portrayed in 1 *En.* 90:9-16 are connected with Judas Maccabeus and are followed by a vision of the eschaton. The *terminus ad quem* is decided by 4QEn^f, which contains 1 *En.* 86:1-3. Milik 1976: 244 dates 4QEn^f around 150-125 B.C.E., while Beyer 1994-2004: 228 proposes a slightly later date, around the end of the second century B.C.E. Tiller 1993: 61 follows Beyer as well as a private communication from F. M. Cross who suggests that it cannot be earlier than 100 B.C.E. The *terminus post quem* is around the time of Judas Maccabeus since events at that time seem to be reflected in 90:9-16 (Tiller, pp. 62-63).

⁸¹ Nickelsburg 2001: 375; Porter 1983: 53; Tiller 1993: 259, 295-96 all note that the depiction of Moses as a sheep that becomes a man (see also 89:1, 9 where Noah is depicted as a bull that becomes a man) indicates that Moses attains angel-like status. See also *Sir.* 45:2; 4Q374 2 6; 4Q377 1 recto II 1-12. In 1 *En.* 67:2 angels build the (Noah’s) ark. Dillmann 1853: 257 and Charles 1912: 190 suggest that he became a man so as to perform the human task of building, but since sheep build a house in 89:72 this is unnecessary.

⁸² 4QEn^c 4 10 reads **וְהָיָה אִתּוֹ אִשָּׁה וְהָיָה אִתּוֹ אִשָּׁה** (“the sheep which was changed, and it was a man and built ...”). Milik 1976, Plate XIV shows traces of the initial letter of another word after **וְהָיָה**, which Milik (p. 206) judges to be **מִשְׁכָּן** (“tabernacle”), followed by Black and VanderKam 1985: 76-77, 267; *DSSSE* 418-19; Suter 2007b: 208. The damaged letter could be **ב**, making **בֵּית** (“house”), a reading adopted by Knibb 1978: 2: 206; Tiller 1993: 291; Nickelsburg 2001: 369; Olson 2004: 196-97.

⁸³ Nickelsburg 2001: 381-82.

⁸⁴ Tiller 1993: 301. See Josh 18:1, 9.

⁸⁵ Dillmann 1853: 262-63; Tiller 1993: 37-38, 312-14; VanderKam 1995a: 117; Nickelsburg 2001: 384; Black and VanderKam 1985: 269; Olson 2004 198. Jerusalem is referred to as a house as in Tob 1:4 (BA text tradition); *T. Levi* 10:5. For a full discussion of the temple and associated images in the Animal Vision of Enoch see Tiller 1993: 36-51, who relies to a considerable extent on Dimant 1982 (in Hebrew and not seen by me). Tiller concludes from the imagery of a house to signify both the wilderness camp and Jerusalem that, “the author of the *An. Apoc.* seems to accept the halakic equation found in both the Temple Scroll and 4QMMT, that Jerusalem is the camp” (p. 312).

⁸⁶ Black and VanderKam 1985: 269; Tiller 1993: 314.

glory of Yahweh inhabiting Solomon's temple (2 Chron 7:1-3),⁸⁷ portrayed in an entirely positive light.

1 *Enoch* 89:50-65 recounts the history of God's people up to the exile. But everything deteriorates from the time of the dedication of Solomon's temple,⁸⁸ until in 89:66-67 the tower and the house are destroyed and the exile ensues. In 89:72 three sheep return and rebuild the tower.⁸⁹ This rebuilt tower had a table that had polluted bread on it, and is only "called the high tower." Moreover, God is not said to stand on it. Here, the allegory betrays dissatisfaction with the second temple and its associated cult.⁹⁰ Moreover, the sheep are blind and cannot see (89:72), a reference to the ritual impurity of the priesthood.⁹¹ The second temple is portrayed in an entirely negative light.

This detail about houses and towers is essential background for two other references to a house and a tower. In 90:28-29 the rebuilt house is removed and the Lord of the sheep brings a new house and erects it in its place.⁹² Since both the wilderness camp and Jerusalem have already been referred to with the term "house," this "house" is the eschatological Jerusalem and envisages "a geographic restoration of Israel to Jerusalem."⁹³ All the animals on earth and the birds of the sky come to this house to worship (90:30), and the presence of the Lord is also there (90:34).⁹⁴ Gentiles are now in this house, which becomes large, spacious and very full.⁹⁵

⁸⁷ Nickelsburg 2001: 384; Olson 2004: 198-99. In 89:26 the wolves (Egyptians) see the Lord of the sheep and flee, a reference to the cloud and the fire of the wilderness journey (Nickelsburg 2001: 379).

⁸⁸ Nickelsburg 2001: 384.

⁸⁹ Black and VanderKam 1985: 273 identifies two of the three sheep as Zerubbabel and Joshua, but is uncertain as to the identification of the third (suggesting Ezra, Nehemiah, Haggai or Zechariah). See also Nickelsburg 2001: 394. More plausible is the suggestion that they are three tribes, Levi Judah and Benjamin, see *T. Jos.* 19:3. Olson 2004: 202 notes that Ethiopic MS EMMML 2080 (fifteenth–sixteenth century) reads "two sheep."

⁹⁰ Nickelsburg 2001: 394-95; Suter 2007b: 208; Himmelfarb 2007: 229.

⁹¹ Tiller 1993: 340; Nickelsburg 2001: 395. In 89:54 (prior to the exile) the eyes of the sheep were blinded; here they are blinded, they did not see, and neither did their shepherds see. The post-exilic situation is worse than prior to the exile.

⁹² For Yahweh building a "house," see Exod 15:17; 4QmidrEschat^a III 3; 11QT XXIX 7-10; *Jub.* 1:17, 26-29; Heb 8:2. In the allegory in 1 *Enoch* the house is the city, while in these texts it is the eschatological temple.

⁹³ Tiller 1993: 46.

⁹⁴ Olson 2004: 210 notes that MS M and some of Eth 2 MSS read at 90:29 that "The Lord of the sheep was in the midst of it" (the new house). Olson discusses the Eth 2 MSS on p. 22. They are dated in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and represent the editorial work of Ethiopian clerics who took upon themselves the task of correcting and clarifying the text, often with harmful results.

⁹⁵ The new Jerusalem and its temple seem to become progressively larger in the ancient traditions, which include this text, as well as Ezek 40-48; 11QT^a LX-LXV; the *New Jerusalem* scroll (4Q554 1 I 9-22) and Rev 21:16. For the background to the ideas expressed in this part of 1 *Enoch* see Isa 2:2-4

2-4; 14:2; 66:19-20; Mic 4:1-4; Ezek 37:24-28; Zech 8:23.

Significantly, this new house has no tower. While some scholars have assumed that the rebuilt house must include a rebuilt tower,⁹⁶ its absence seems deliberate, indicating that in the New Jerusalem there is no temple.⁹⁷ Since God dwells within the entire city, it becomes a city-temple.⁹⁸ The house itself is larger and higher than the tower it replaced, with its height indicating its proximity to God.⁹⁹ As Tiller explains:

The main point is that the New Jerusalem reaches toward heaven and, in fact, becomes heaven in the sense that it becomes the abode of God. The apocalyptic dualism between heaven and earth is resolved.¹⁰⁰

The absence of a tower in the New Jerusalem indicates a return to a situation analogous to the wilderness, where God and his people dwell together in a house with no tower, a city with no temple (*1 En.* 89:36).¹⁰¹ It also indicates that while Solomon's temple is portrayed in a positive light in 89:50, the second temple is inferior to the wilderness tabernacle, Solomon's temple and the new house to be constructed by God in the eschaton. There is no denigration of the tabernacle in this text; it is on a par with Solomon's temple and the eschatological temple.

In Heb 8:2 Jesus is said to be a minister of the sanctuary, the true tent that the Lord has pitched. I will argue below that this is the eschatological temple to be built by God, now inaugurated with the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God, and symbolising God's eschatological dwelling with his people.¹⁰² In Hebrews, as in the Animal Apocalypse, the second temple is sidelined in favour of the heavenly, eschatological temple.

4.2.3 The Apocalypse of Weeks (*1 En.* 93:1-10; 91:11-17)

The Apocalypse of Weeks (ApW) follows the Animal Apocalypse in *1 Enoch*, but predates it, since the Animal Apocalypse refers to the persecution under Antiochus IV and the Maccabean revolt (90:6-12), while ApW does not.¹⁰³ This text analyses the history of the world into ten weeks, each consisting of seven generations,¹⁰⁴ from information Enoch

⁹⁶ Dillmann 1853: 284; Black and VanderKam 1985: 278.

⁹⁷ Tiller 1993: 46-47; Assefa 2010: 553.

⁹⁸ Olson 2004: 210; Himmelfarb 2007: 229-30.

⁹⁹ Nickelsburg 2001: 404.

¹⁰⁰ Tiller 1993: 376. Olson 2004: 210 draws a parallel with Rev 21:22. See also Jer 3:16 where the Ark of the Covenant is missing from the new, ideal Jerusalem.

¹⁰¹ Tiller 1993: 48-49; Nickelsburg 2001: 404-405; Suter 2007b: 208-209.

¹⁰² See 8.5 (below).

¹⁰³ Olson 2004: 15-17; Nickelsburg 2001: 440-41.

¹⁰⁴ The seven "parts" of the weeks are only mentioned for the first and tenth weeks and are assumed for the others, see Koch 2005: 186-87. Olson 2004: 220 limits the seven generation schema to the first five weeks. For the significance of the number seven see VanderKam 1984b: 520-21. For similar divisions of history see Dan 9:20-27; *Sib. Or.* 1, 2 and 4; 11QMelch, 4Q *Ages of Creation*. See Nickelsburg 2001: 439-40.

learned in a vision of heaven and from the heavenly tablets (93:1-2).¹⁰⁵ Only significant events are recounted, often in code,¹⁰⁶ and generally at the conclusion of each week. Significant are the birth of Enoch (week one), Noah and the flood (week two), the election of Abraham (week three), law and tabernacle (week four), Solomon's temple (week five), the destruction of the temple and the exile (week six), and the righteous remnant (week seven). After this the details are vague, with the eschaton and the establishment of the eschatological temple anticipated.¹⁰⁷ Most scholars agree that the author belongs to the seventh week (91:9-11), which probably ends just prior to the Maccabean revolt, somewhere around 175-170 B.C.E.¹⁰⁸

Weeks one to seven appear in 93:1-10, the end of week seven in 91:11, and weeks eight to ten in 91:12-17.¹⁰⁹ The text is embedded in the Epistle of Enoch, a place that it occupies in 4QEn^g.¹¹⁰ It is included within six discourses addressed by Enoch to his descendants and

There is no Greek text for ApW, but parts of the Aramaic text are preserved in 4QEn^g (4Q212). Quotations and references are from Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2004 unless otherwise noted.

¹⁰⁵ This clarifies that it is an apocalyptic text, see VanderKam 1984a: 150-53; Nickelsburg 2001: 439.

¹⁰⁶ Koch 2005: 186. There is also an ethical and religious substructure to the text, with every week apart from the fourth and fifth containing some critique of the wickedness of the people living at the time, and God's judgement of their wickedness.

¹⁰⁷ The details in weeks one to seven are in the past. The eighth week, which refers to the building of the eschatological temple, belongs to the future, along with weeks nine and ten, followed by "many weeks without number (91:17). See Charles 1913b: 262-63; Dexinger 1977: 139; García Martínez 1992: 85-86; Stuckenbruck 2007a: 60.

¹⁰⁸ Hengel 1974: 1: 168, 176, 2: 117 (footnote 459); Milik 1976: 255-56; VanderKam 1984a: 142-49; 1984b: 521-23; García Martínez 1992: 90-92; Boccaccini 1998: 107; Nickelsburg 2001: 440-41; Olson 2004: 16; Knibb 2005: 217; Stuckenbruck 2007a: 61-62. Dexinger 1977: 139 detects references to the Antiochene persecution in the "sword" that appears in 91:11 and assigns a date just after the Maccabean revolt. As VanderKam 1984a: 148-49 and García Martínez 1992: 86 argue, the "sword" is more likely to be a reference to the eschatological battle, as in 4Q246 II 6 and *1 En.* 90:19. Further evidence for a date in the first half of the second century B.C.E. is an apparent allusion to ApW in *Jub.* 4:18, normally dated around the middle of the second century B.C.E., see Nickelsburg 2005a: 114.

¹⁰⁹ At some stage between the first half of the first century B.C.E (when 4QEn^g was written, Milik 1976: 246) and the much later Ethiopic translation the order of the chapters was either accidentally (VanderKam 1982: 518; Olson 1993: 77) or deliberately (Knibb 1978: 2: 218; 2007a: 22; Black and VanderKam 1985: 288-89; Nickelsburg 2001: 414-15) transposed. Milik 1976: 247-48 analysed the Qumran fragments into five columns and concluded that the original order of 4QEn^g was *1 En.* 91:1-10, 18-19; 92:1-93:10; 91:11-17; 93:11-14. For an alternate proposal (not affecting the order of the weeks in ApW) see Olson 1993: 69-94, who is followed by Boccaccini 1998: 104. Nickelsburg 2001: 414-15; Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2004: 139-4; Tigchelaar 2005: 220-23; Stuckenbruck 2007a: 51-52 dispute Olson's proposal and follow Milik's original order. Whichever reconstruction is followed, 4QEn^g IV shows that *1 En.* 91:11 originally followed *1 En.* 93:13, since these verses occupy consecutive lines in the same manuscript. Notwithstanding the original order in 4QEn^g IV, the placement of 91:11-17 in its present position in the Ethiopic text displays some logic. *1 Enoch* 91:8-10 describes the end of wickedness, a theme picked up and elaborated in 91:11-17. This indicates that Stone 1976: 424-25 and Nickelsburg 2001: 414-15 are probably right in their argument that the displacement of these verses is not accidental, contra Olson 1993: 71-72.

¹¹⁰ I need not enter the debate as to whether ApW was an earlier text embedded here (Charles 1913b: 170; Black 1978: 466-69; Black and VanderKam 1985: 289; Nickelsburg 1982: 340; 2001: 438-41; 2005b: 235-36; Berner 2006: 121-22; Stuckenbruck 2007a: 62-64; Kvanvig 2009: 173), or whether it was composed at the

to the righteous and the wicked of the last days.¹¹¹ A characteristic feature is the “woe” form addressed to sinners, which extends through all six discourses. Intermingled with the woes are exhortations addressed to the righteous, as well as non-specific references to the coming judgement for the righteous and for sinners. A timeframe is given in weeks eight to ten for the judgement. Weeks one to seven and eight to ten place this timeframe in the context of the history of the world from the birth of Enoch in the first week (93:3) to the consummation of all things in the tenth (91:16-17).

Scholars have noted a concentric structure to ApW, which begins and ends with enduring righteousness (93:3; 91:17).¹¹² Deceit and violence arise in the second week (93:4), and deeds of wickedness vanish in the ninth (91:14). The appearance of Abraham and the plant of righteous judgement (Israel) from whom the plant of righteousness will go forth forever and ever in the third week (93:5) have their counterpart in the building of the eschatological temple for all the generations of eternity in the eighth week (91:13). The giving of the law in the fourth week (93:6)¹¹³ contrasts with the perverse generation and the choice of the remnant from the plant of righteousness in the seventh (91:9).¹¹⁴ This leaves the two central weeks, five and six, in which Solomon’s temple is constructed (fifth week, 93:7) and destroyed (sixth week, 93:8), followed by the exile.

The temple appears in the centre, in the fifth and sixth weeks. This, along with the stark contrast between its grandiose description in the fifth week, as “the temple [house] of

same time as the rest of the Epistle and is an integral part of it (Milik 1976: 255-56; VanderKam 1984a: 145; García Martínez 1992: 79-84; Boccaccini 1998: 104-110; Knibb 2005: 213-19).

¹¹¹ Nickelsburg 2001: 416. Boccaccini 1998: 105-13 analyses the Epistle into three speeches, of which the second is ApW. If so, ApW is an integral part of the Epistle.

¹¹² Stone 1984: 405; VanderKam 1984b: 518-21; Boccaccini 1998: 107-109; Kvanvig 2009: 175-76. Henze 2005: 207-208 points out, however, that the concentric structure is not completely tidy. He refers to a “linear view of history with alternating patterns of righteousness and sin” (p. 209). This linear view is seen in particular in the third to the fifth week, with the election of Abraham, the gift of the law and the tabernacle, and the construction of the temple recounted at the end of each of these weeks, see Berner 2006: 141-42.

¹¹³ Nickelsburg 2001: 446, and Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2004: 141 render the Ethiopic word *sher’ata* (“law”), with “covenant” in this verse and with “law” in 93:4. The semantic range of the word includes both covenant and law (Leslau 1991: 531-32). Neither verse is extant in Aramaic. Following Bedenbender 2005: 202; Berner 2006: 136-37; Stuckenbruck 2007a: 98-99, I use “law” rather than “covenant,” although the precise distinction is peripheral to my study.

¹¹⁴ On the plant metaphor see Tiller 1997: 319-21; Nickelsburg 2001: 444-45; Stuckenbruck 2002: 255-57; 2005: 210-12; Koch 2005: 192-93; Bedenbender 2005: 202-203. The plant metaphor appears in *1 En.* 93:2, 10, both of which are extant in Aramaic and preceded by a partitive מן (“from”). In 4QEn^s 1 III 19-20 the discourse of Enoch is intended for those chosen “from the plant of truth” (מן נצבת יצבתה), a group who appear in 93:10, where the equivalent Aramaic expression is מן נצבת קשט על[מ]א (“from the plant of everlasting justice,” 4QEn^s 1 IV 12-13). In 93:5 (not attested in Aramaic) Abraham is the plant of righteous judgement, from whom the plant of righteousness goes forth forever. Thus, the descendants of Abraham comprise the plant, and the discourse concerns the righteous remnant that will arise from within the plant (93:2) in the seventh week (93:10). For the plant metaphor see also *Jub.* 1:16-17 (where God builds his sanctuary in the midst of the plant of righteousness); *1 En.* 10:3, 16; 84:6; 1QS VIII 5-6; XI 7-9; 1QH^a XIV 17-21; XVI 5-28; CD I 7-8.

the glorious kingdom,”¹¹⁵ built to last forever, and its destruction in the sixth week because the people stray from wisdom, gives it considerable prominence.¹¹⁶ There is no extant Aramaic text for *1 En.* 93:4b-9a, but the words **היכל** (“temple”), **מלכות** (“kingdom”), and **כבוד** (“glory”), as well as the notion of endurance, all appear in the description of the eschatological temple in 91:13, indicating that in this text Solomon’s temple was intended as the pinnacle of salvation history, but destroyed because of the wickedness of the people.¹¹⁷

The sixth week is perhaps the most significant, since in that week the race of the chosen (the descendants of Abraham forever and ever, third week) are dispersed, the law for all generations (fourth week) is nullified by a perverse generation and the temple built forever (fifth week) is burned with fire. In weeks seven to ten these issues are resolved with the chosen remnant, the rebuilt temple, and the righteous law revealed to the people of the whole earth.¹¹⁸

Aside from Solomon’s temple, the tabernacle receives a brief mention in the fourth week.¹¹⁹ But the second temple is completely overlooked. Again, dissatisfaction with this temple emerges, even though its desecration by Antiochus IV had probably not yet happened.¹²⁰ The second temple looks like an aberration, ignored in favour of the

¹¹⁵ Black and VanderKam 1985: 290 suggests that the “temple” (the Ethiopic equivalent has the sense “house,” see Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2004: 141, footnote h) may also refer to the royal house(hold) of David, following 2 Sam 7:16. That the “house” is burned with fire in 93:8 makes a reference to a structure more likely. Black’s suggestion no doubt arises out of the tension in the text where, while the “house” of the fourth week is “forever,” it is destroyed in the fifth. But the endurance of the temple was always conditional upon the obedience of the people (1 Kings 9:7; 2 Chron 7:20; Jer 7: 1-15). See Stuckenbruck 2007a: 110-11.

¹¹⁶ Nickelsburg 2001: 446, 49; Himmelfarb 2007: 233-34.

¹¹⁷ Berner 2006: 141. This would not become apparent to the reader of 4QEn^g until the description of the eschatological temple in the eighth week. But readers of *1 En.*, as the text now stands, could be expected to recognise the similarities in the descriptions.

¹¹⁸ Kvanvig 2009: 176-77.

¹¹⁹ The Ethiopic word is *‘atsad* (Nickelsburg 2001: 446). Leslau 1991: 74 gives the sense of “circumscribed area,” including a “tent.” Charles 1913b: 263 and Olson 2004: 220 render the word with “enclosure,” suggesting a reference to Palestine. Isaac 1983: 74 translates “a law shall be made with a fence” and opines that the fence could be around the Torah, as in *m. Abot* 1.1. A Coptic fragment of ApW, found in Egypt in 1937 and dated around the sixth to the seventh century C.E. contains the word *skēnē* (“tent”) at this point. See Donadoni 1960: 197-99; Milik 1976: 81-82. Those who read a reference to the tabernacle include Dillmann 1853: 295; Black and VanderKam 1985: 290 (referring to Exod 27:9, see also *Tg. Neof, Onq. Ps. -J.* Exod 27:9 all of which read **דַּרְתַּ מִּשְׁכָּנָא** (“the court of the tabernacle”); Nickelsburg 2001: 446; Berner 2006: 140; Stuckenbruck 2007a: 107-108; Himmelfarb 2007: 234. A reference to the tabernacle seems likely and, if so, it is a temporary structure, soon to be replaced by the more significant temple (Koch 2005: 193).

¹²⁰ I acknowledge that this is an argument from silence, and the text includes no specific polemic against temple, cult and priesthood (García Martínez 1992: 89; Himmelfarb 2007: 233-34; Stuckenbruck 2007a: 137-38). The silence is surely significant, given the mention of the tabernacle and the prominence of both Solomon’s temple and the eschatological temple (Nickelsburg 2001: 447-49).

eschatological temple,¹²¹ described in superlative terms in the eighth week. This is “the temple of the kingdom of the Great One” (היכל [מ]ל[כ]ות רבא, 4QEn^g IV 18),¹²² which will be built in the greatness of its glory for all generations of eternity” (91:13).¹²³ Its establishment signals the eschatological judgement of humanity (91:14) and of the fallen watchers (91:15), bringing wickedness on earth to an end, and introducing the eschaton, described as a new heaven and many weeks without number forever (91:16-17). This is the goal of history and of the people of God. Hebrews likewise anticipates an eschatological temple, the dwelling of God with his people. But unlike ApW, it is inaugurated with the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God. The people of God have access to it in the present (Heb 10:19-25; 12:22-24), but it is also their eschatological goal (4:11; 11:13-16; 13:14).

This text, apparently composed while the second temple was functioning, completely overlooks it. It venerates Solomon’s temple in the past and anticipates the establishment of the eschatological temple as the fulfilment of God’s purposes in the building of Solomon’s temple. This eschatological temple is the symbol of the reign of God over earth and heaven, where God will dwell with his people.

Hebrews is also silent about the second temple. Rather, the text works from the regulations surrounding the wilderness tabernacle and its cultic arrangements, which anticipate the eschatological temple, established by God with the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God. This is the eschatological goal of the people of God.

4.2.4 The Parables of Enoch (1 En. 37-71)

Two aspects of the Parables of Enoch (BP) have dominated scholarly discussion over recent decades, neither of which is central to this study.¹²⁴ One is the date of the work and

¹²¹ Boccaccini 1998: 108-9 suggests that the glorious temple of the eighth week is an interim temple as in the Temple Scroll and is not yet the “eschatological temple in the world to come” (p. 109). However, the expression “for all generations forever” (לכל דרי עלמין) in 4QEn^g IV 18 leaves the impression that the eschatological temple is being described. See Black and VanderKam 1985: 293; Nickelsburg 2001: 449; Koch 2005: 194; Himmelfarb 2007: 233-34.

¹²² For an equivalent expression see 1QSb IV 25-26 where the heavenly temple is היכל מלכות (“temple of the kingdom”).

¹²³ This text is silent about the identity of the builder of the eschatological temple, although the passive is probably to be read as a divine passive. In ApW God is never the subject of any verb in the active voice, although the verbs describing the building of the tabernacle and the temple are also passives, along with the election of Abraham and the giving of the law. See Koch 2005: 189-90; Stuckenbruck 2007a: 108.

¹²⁴ 1 Enoch 37-71 is also referred to as the Similitudes of Enoch. Both “parables” and “similitudes” are attempts to render the Ethiopic *mešālē* (37:5; 38:1; 43:4; 45:1; 57:3; 58:1; 68:1; 69:29), a word that could also be rendered “(revelatory) discourse” (Jastrow 1989: 862; Nickelsburg 2005a: 248). Following Nickelsburg 2007: 23, I use the term “parables.” I also note that 37:1 refers to BP as a “vision of wisdom” and that the term “The Book of the Parables” appears in 68:1. *Mešālē* also appears in 1 En. 1:2-3 where the Aramaic equivalent (4QEn^a I 2) is מתל and the Greek παραβολή. The cognate Hebrew word מושל describes the oracles of Balaam (Num 23:7, 18; 24: 3, 15, 20, 21, 23), see also Isa 14:4; Mic 2:4; Hab 2:6; Job 27:1; 29:1. In these instances, the sense is quite different from that of a wisdom saying (see e.g. Prov 1:1, 6). In the NT

the other is the background to the expression “Son of Man” in the NT.¹²⁵ In BP an exalted figure, known as Righteous One, Chosen One, Anointed One and “that Son of Man,”¹²⁶ is enthroned in heaven and ultimately identified with Enoch himself. In Hebrews the command addressed to the Davidic king in Ps 110:1 is said to be fulfilled in Jesus (1:3; 8:1; 10:12-13; 12:23), also enthroned in heaven. This aspect of BP would be relevant in a study of the exaltation of Christ in Hebrews, but is somewhat peripheral to my study of temple imagery.

No consensus has emerged on the date. Probable dependence on Dan 7:13 for the background of the term Son of Man gives a *terminus post quem* sometime after 164 B.C.E. The *terminus ante quem* is probably the fall of Jerusalem in 70 C.E., since some reference to those events would be expected if they had already happened. The majority of scholars argue for a date somewhere around the turn of the Common Era and perhaps during the reign of Herod the Great (37-4 B.C.E). More precision than this is unnecessary for my study.¹²⁷

παραβολή only appears outside the Synoptic Gospels in Heb 9:9; 11:19. For a connection between Balaam’s oracles and *1 En.* 1:1-2 see Nickelsburg 2005a: 47, and between Balaam’s oracles and Hebrews see Church 2008: 154-57.

¹²⁵ Recent studies on the Son of Man in BP include Chialà 2007: 153-78; Kvanvig 2007: 179-215; Collins 2007c: 216-27; Koch 2007: 228-37; Gieschen 2007: 238-49; Oegema 2007: 250-59. Charlesworth 1998: 93-98 goes so far as to suggest that “Jesus may have been influenced by many of the ideas found in this scintillating book” (p. 97). For a recent summary of the issues see Kvanvig 2007: 211-15; Walck 2007: 311-37. The expression son of man (υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου) appears in Heb 2:6 in a quotation from Ps 8:4, referring not to Jesus but to humanity in general. The Psalm continues by suggesting that these seemingly insignificant creatures are a little less than God, and crowned with glory and honour as God’s vice-regents over creation. In Hebrews the Psalm demonstrates the subjection of the world to come to humans. While there is a consensus that the Son of Man in *1 Enoch* depends upon Dan 7:13 rather than Ps 8, the exalted nature of humanity ruling the universe in Ps 8 is probably part of the background of Dan 7. See Walker 1972: 487-90; 1983: 595-98; Perrin 1976: 835; Collins 1991a: 223; Borsch 1992: 131-32.

¹²⁶ All these designations all refer to the same figure. See Collins 1991a: 224; VanderKam 1992: 185-86; Orlov 2005a: 77-85.

¹²⁷ See the discussion of the date of Daniel’s visions in Collins 1993: 58-65. For a comprehensive recent survey of the options on the dating of BP see Suter 2007a: 415-43. While Suter favours a date prior to the destruction of Jerusalem, he is reluctant to rule out a date after those events. For a contrary view see Knibb 1979: 358-59. The “city of my righteous one” in *1 En.* 56:8 seems to refer to Jerusalem and the expression there that this city “... will be a hindrance to their horses” would be unlikely after the fall of Jerusalem (Suter 1979b: 29-31; Nickelsburg 2005a: 255; Suter 2007a: 443; Piovanelli 2007: 375-79). Milik 1976: 89-92 argued that since BP is not attested at Qumran, it is a Christian Greek composition dependent upon the NT and with affinities to the *Sibylline Oracles*, and is to be dated around 270 C.E. His arguments have been universally rejected, although Lindars 1981: 297 argues on similar grounds that BP is later than the NT. For early reviews of Milik’s work see Nickelsburg 1978b: 411-19; Knibb 1979: 345-52; VanderKam 1982: 85-97, and Greenfield and Stone 1977: 55 who argue that the absence of BP from Qumran could be because (1) it was not yet known; (2) it was not considered “canonical”; (3) it was not considered worthy of study at Qumran; or (4) it was accidentally omitted. Boccaccini 1998: 144-49 argues that by the time BP was composed, Enochic Judaism and Qumran had parted and that there were theological reasons for the book’s absence. Historical allusions in BP, in particular in *1 En.* 56:5-8 which refers to the Parthians and the Medes, have also given rise to widely divergent dates. Hindley 1968: 556-65 detects a reference to Trajan’s Parthian campaign of 115-17 C.E., while Bampfylde 1984: 22-28 refers to the Parthian invasion of Syria in 50-51 B.C.E. Greenfield and Stone 1977: 58-9 present a thorough critique of Hindley’s work, whose suggested dating is too

While BP does not mention Torah, temple or cultus, and while there is nothing in the text to indicate Jewish provenance, it does seem to be a Jewish rather than a Christian work. Moreover, *1 En.* 71:14 identifies Enoch as the Son of Man. The use of this title for Jesus in the canonical Gospels would preclude its application to any figure other than Jesus in a Christian text, and indeed there is nothing in the text that bears any relationship to the life of Jesus.¹²⁸ Therefore I proceed on the understanding that BP is a Jewish text composed around the turn of the era.¹²⁹

The book comprises an introduction (37:1-5) and three parable discourses (38:1–69:29),¹³⁰ followed by an epilogue (70-71). The introduction imitates the introduction to *1 Enoch* as a whole (*1 En.* 1:1-2), although tailored to suit BP. Here, Enoch explains that he had received wisdom in the form of three parables from the Lord of the Spirits.¹³¹ Since each parable is a unit, I examine them separately, followed by a glance at the epilogue.

late for the acknowledged dependence of parts of the Synoptic Gospels on the Parables (see e.g. Nickelsburg 2005a: 255-56; Walck 2007: 299-337; Collins 2007a: 338-42). On the other hand, Suter 1979b: 12, 24 argues that *1 En.* 56:5-8 is related to apocalyptic myth rather than to any historical event. Charlesworth 1998: 94-97 also argues from historical reminiscences in the text, but his arguments are more wide-ranging. He detects references to the harassment of the inhabitants of Palestine in the reign of Herod the Great (37-4 B.C.E.) through harsh taxation and land seizures in such texts as *1 En.* 43:8; 53:7; 56:6 and elsewhere, and argues that this apocalyptic text is written to encourage God's people that God will ultimately deal with the strong, wealthy people who possess the land (see 62:1, 3, 6, 9; 63:1, 12) by acting to vindicate his people. Sacchi 2006: 386-95 reaches similar conclusions on slightly different grounds. These arguments would fit with the content of BP and this seems as good a date as any. A later date is favoured by Stuckenbruck 2007c: 69-72, on the basis that the changes from passive verb forms to active forms in those parts of BP that contain allusion to BW could indicate that the author of BP is more likely to have had a Greek version of BW in his possession than an Aramaic version. See, e.g. 14:9 ("I drew near"); 14:10, 13 ("I went in"); 14:14, 18 ("and I saw"), and cf. these with 71:3 ("and the angel took me by my right hand ... and raised me up ... and brought me out ... and showed me ... and showed me"). For the relationship between BP and BW see Himmelfarb 1993: 59; VanderKam 2007: 84-91, and responses to VanderKam in Tigchelaar 2007: 100-109 and Kvanvig 2007: 184-85.

¹²⁸ Knibb 1979: 350-52; Suter 1981: 218; Nickelsburg 2005a: 255; Davila 2005b: 132-37. As Davila notes with reference to the similarities between the Parables of Enoch and Matthew, it is understandable that Matthew might use a Jewish apocalypse, but it is hardly likely that a Jewish author would base his work on Matthew. For an argument that the Parables is a Jewish-Christian work from the first half of the first century see Mearns 1979: 360-69.

¹²⁹ If this date is correct it is too early to be a Christian work.

¹³⁰ The three discourses are 38:1–44:1; 45:1–57:3; 58:1–69:29. BP is only extant in Ethiopic, possibly translated from a Greek translation of an original Aramaic *Vorlage*, although conclusive evidence for this is lacking (Knibb 1978: 2: 38-42; 2007a: 27-29; Vermes 1986: 259; VanderKam 1987: 247-62; Nickelsburg 2001: 15). Unless otherwise noted, all quotations are from Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2004: 50-95.

¹³¹ This is the usual name for God in BP. It appears in Num 16:22; 2 Macc 3:24. A likely derivation is from the Hebrew expression Yahweh of Hosts (יהוה צבאות) in Isa 6:3, cited in *1 En.* 39:12, see Black 1984: 1: 53-59; Kvanvig 2007: 185-87; Koch 2007: 233; Gieschen 2007: 239. In some places in BP God is also referred to as the Head of Days, as in Dan 7:9.

4.2.3.1 The First Parable (38:1–44:1)

The first parable concerns the eschatological dwelling places of the righteous and the sinners when the Righteous One appears in the presence of the righteous ones (38:2),¹³² and when light appears to the righteous and chosen who dwell on earth. It would have been better if the sinners had never been born (38:2) as they will be driven from the earth (38:1). These sinners are the kings and the mighty ones who will be given into the hands of the congregation of the righteous and holy ones (37:5) and whose lives will end.

The eschatological dwelling place of the righteous is detailed in the remainder of the first parable, which is indebted to Enoch's heavenly journey (*1 En.* 14-16). Enoch describes his ascent to heaven (39:3) and the heavenly temple. While the description in BW is concerned with the geography of the heavenly temple, here the inhabitants of heaven and their worship are in the foreground.¹³³ God (the Lord of the Spirits) is present and there are innumerable angels (40:1). Enoch is accompanied by an *angelus interpres*, who is never formally introduced (40:8), and the four archangels are named in 40:9. The "Chosen One of righteousness and faith" is also there (39:6),¹³⁴ before whom the righteous and chosen ones will be forever (39:6).¹³⁵ Enoch sees his dwelling place "beneath the wings of the Lord of the Spirits," where he himself wishes to dwell (39:8), and he hears the righteous and chosen ones praising the names of the Lord of the Spirits (39:7).

In *1 En.* 39:4-5 "the dwellings of the holy ones and the resting places of the righteous" are "with his righteous angels and their resting places with the holy angels." Here, both the people of God and the angels are referred to as righteous and holy and, ultimately, they dwell together.¹³⁶ It is clear from the description of the inhabitants, the reference to resting

¹³² For details of the variant readings in the MSS at this point see Knibb 1978: 2: 125. VanderKam 1992: 170, and Kvanvig 2007: 187 (footnote 17) argue that the abstract noun "righteousness" is preferable to "the Righteous One" being the *lectio difficilior*, as it results in the strange line "when righteousness appears in the presence of the righteous." Note also the parallel in the third line "and [when] light appears to the righteous and chosen." There is also some uncertainty as to whether the Righteous One (if that is the correct reading) is a specific individual or "any righteous person" (Olson 2004: 74).

¹³³ Nickelsburg 2007: 27. In 41:3-8; 43:1–44:1 Enoch also sees a variety of astronomical and other secrets. In 42:1-3 Wisdom also dwells in heaven among the angels, not finding a dwelling place on earth. In *Sir.* 24:8 wisdom dwells among God's people in the temple. The difference between the two texts indicates differing attitudes to the temple, positive in *Sirach* and negative here.

¹³⁴ A textual variant here reads "the chosen ones." Black and VanderKam 1985: 197 argues from both external and internal evidence for the singular reading. This epithet appears fifteen times in BP. See VanderKam 1992: 172-74.

¹³⁵ That the exalted individual is the Chosen One and the Righteous One, and that God's people are the chosen and righteous ones, shows that he is their heavenly representative (Collins 1980: 111-33; Nickelsburg 2005a: 249).

¹³⁶ It is not always easy to tell whether the adjective holy refers to the people of God or to the angels in *1 Enoch*. The latter seems apparent in 39:1, 5; 47:2, 4; 57:2; 58:5; 60:4; 61:8, 10, 12; 65:12; 69:13; 71:1, 8, 9 and the former in 38:4; 39:4; 41:2; 43:4; 45:1; 48:1, 7, 9; 50:1; 51:2; 58:3; 62:8; 65:12. See Decock 1983: 71.

places, the prayers and intercessions of the holy ones (39:5), and the singing of the trisagion, an allusion to Isa 6:3, that it is the heavenly temple.

On his heavenly journey, Enoch sees the righteous dead dwelling with the holy ones and the Chosen One in the heavenly temple (1 *En.* 39-40). However, in the eschaton they appear on earth (38:1-6).¹³⁷ The mighty and exalted who possess the earth in the present will have disappeared, and there will be a reversal of fortunes, so that the righteous ones, who now have a heavenly dwelling place with the angels and the Lord of Spirits, will dwell on the renewed earth.

4.2.3.2 The Second Parable (45:1–57:3)

This parable begins with a superscription (45:1-2) and a prophetic oracle of judgement and salvation in which God speaks (45:3-6).¹³⁸ According to the superscription, the parable is directed to those who “deny the name of the dwelling of the holy ones and of the Lord of Spirits” (45:1).¹³⁹ These are the practical atheists who harass the people of God as though neither the heavenly temple nor God exist. These will not ascend to heaven, nor will they return to earth (as do the righteous and chosen ones of the first parable); rather, they will be kept for the day of affliction and tribulation. On the other hand, the heavens and the earth will be renewed and God’s chosen ones will dwell on it, with the Chosen One dwelling with them. The eschatological temple can be inferred from the transformation and renewal of the earth, the Chosen One dwelling on earth with the chosen ones, and the chosen ones dwelling in God’s presence (45:6).¹⁴⁰

Three visions of heaven appear in 1 *En.* 46; 47-48; 49, followed by a description of an eschatological scenario (51:1-5) and an account of Enoch’s cosmic journeys, where he sees the places of the eschatological punishment of the wicked (52:1–56:4). He sees a deep valley prepared as a place of punishment for the kings and the mighty of the earth (53:1-5), and in 53:6-7 either the angel or Enoch¹⁴¹ announces that after their punishment “the

¹³⁷ While Lee 2001: 61 heads up his treatment of the First Parable as “*heavenly/New Temple/Jerusalem*” (italics original), this parable mentions neither the earthly nor the heavenly Jerusalem, nor any earthly eschatological temple. See the discussion in Hofius 1970c: 63-64; Gäbel 2006: 80.

¹³⁸ Nickelsburg 2007: 30-31.

¹³⁹ Black and VanderKam 1985: 204-5 following Eth^{tana} suggests that some of the words in the verse may have been misplaced, and proposes that a more likely reading is those who “deny the Name of the Lord of the Spirits ... [and the] dwellings (congregations) of the holy ones.” This reading is adopted by Olson 2004: 87. In 1QM XII 7 “the congregation of God’s holy ones is among his people” (בתוכנו ועדת קדושיכה).

¹⁴⁰ Lee 2001: 63.

¹⁴¹ Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2004: 67 confine the angel’s reply to v. 6. Charles 1913b: 220 extends it to the end of v. 7 while Black and VanderKam 1985: 53 has no closing quotation mark. Olson 2004: 99 breaks off the reply at the end of v. 6 with an ellipsis, understanding v. 7 as the resumption of the angel’s earlier speech in 52:4-9.

Righteous and Chosen One will cause the house of the congregation to appear.”¹⁴² From then on, God’s people “will not be hindered in the name of the Lord of Spirits.” Cosmic phenomena follow, with the mountains becoming level¹⁴³ and the hills becoming like a fountain of water. Then “the righteous will rest from the oppression of the sinners.”

The “house of the congregation” is a reference to the eschatological temple.¹⁴⁴ The levelling of mountains accompanies the return from exile in Isa 40:3-5. The water is reminiscent of the water flowing out of Ezekiel’s ideal post-exilic temple (Ezek 47:1-12), and the rest of the people from their enemies echoes Exod 15:13-17; 1 Kings 8:56; 2 Chron 6:41. The text anticipates the return from exile. This had already happened, with the people in the land and second temple functioning when BP was composed. But the second temple is ignored and the defeat of the rich and mighty still anticipated along with the true return from exile. That will be signalled by the defeat of the enemies and the establishment of the eschatological temple where God’s people will rest.¹⁴⁵

4.2.3.3 The Third Parable (58:1–69:29)

The third parable is directed to the righteous and chosen ones, and their future blessedness (58:1-6).¹⁴⁶ The structure and contents are complex, and Nickelsburg proposes transposing several pericopes to improve the flow of the narrative.¹⁴⁷ Temple imagery emerges in a vision of the heaven (60:1-6), depicted as in BW (14:18-10) as a throne room. In BW Enoch describes the throne on which the Great Glory was seated; here, the Head of Days is seated on the throne, surrounded by the angels and the righteous (60:2).

4.2.3.4 The Epilogue to the Book of the Parables (70-71)

An epilogue of at least one, and perhaps three, parts follows the third parable.¹⁴⁸ These chapters comprise an introduction recounting the raising up of Enoch in the third person

¹⁴² Black and VanderKam 1985: 53 translates this line, “[a]nd after this the Righteous and Elect One shall appear, and his congregations from now on shall not be subject to interdict in the Name of the Lord of Spirits.” On p. 209 he notes his preference for the Eth^{ana} MS at this point, and that he has construed “his congregations” as a collective singular and as the subject of the verb “shall not be subject to interdict.” This removes any reference to “the house of the congregation.” Black asks, “[i]s the author thinking of the Temple”? I am not qualified to comment on the Ethiopic text.

¹⁴³ Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2004: 67 read “the mountains will be ... as <wax>,” with the brackets indicating that he has emended the text (footnote t). For mountains like wax, a metaphor for their levelling, see Ps 97:5. See Black and VanderKam 1985: 53, 218; Olson 2004: 100-101. Charles 1913b: 220 reads “the mountains shall not stand as the earth” and in a footnote suggests that this is figurative language referring to “the kingdoms of the earth” not enduring.

¹⁴⁴ Charles 1913b: 220 suggests the institution of the synagogue, but this is quite unlikely.

¹⁴⁵ Wright 1992: 299-307.

¹⁴⁶ Nickelsburg 2007: 34.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid.: 34-42.

¹⁴⁸ Critical issues surround the authenticity of these two chapters, which I cannot enter into. The somewhat surprising identification of Enoch with the Son of Man in 71:14 indicates to Knibb 1995: 177-80; 2007b: 63; Collins 1992: 453-59; 1998: 190-91; 2007c: 221-27; Kvanvig 2007: 197-210 that they are a

(70:1-2); followed by an account of Enoch's entry to paradise in the first person (70:3-4); Enoch's ascent to heaven (71:1-4); Enoch's entry to the heavenly temple (71:5-16); and a conclusion to the book (71:17).¹⁴⁹

Here, the heavenly temple is located in the "heaven of heavens," and is described, in what appears to be a deliberate allusion to *1 En.* 14:9-10, as a house of hailstones. But while *1 En.* 14:9-10 describes the geography of the heavenly temple with two houses, here there is only one and it is inhabited by innumerable angels, the seraphim, cherubim and ophanim who guard the throne of God's glory, the four archangels and the Head of Days. As in *1 En.* 14:24, Enoch is prostrate until "that angel" comes and greets him (71:14), announcing that he is the Son of Man, in terms reminiscent of *1 En.* 46:3. The identity of "that angel" is obscure,¹⁵⁰ but the beings that guard the throne are reminiscent of the cherubim in the holy of holies, guarding the Ark of the Covenant. There are indications in this text that the heavenly temple in the heaven of heavens corresponds in some way to the holy of holies in the earthly temple, and has replaced it as the proper dwelling place of God.¹⁵¹

4.2.3.5 Conclusion

Temple imagery emerges in BP in its anticipation of the eschatological dwelling place of the righteous in the heavenly temple with God and numerous angels. While this dwelling place is at present in heaven, ultimately it will be on earth, following a reversal of fortunes when the mighty and exalted disappear. The epilogue is a little different, envisaging the

secondary addition. On the other hand, VanderKam 1992: 177-85 argues strongly that they are a natural conclusion to the book, corresponding to the introduction in *1 En.* 37, and that the questions that have led some scholars to reject them can all be resolved. In the absence of any MS evidence pointing to their exclusion, I treat them as an integral part of the text.

¹⁴⁹ VanderKam 1992: 177-79. Gruenwald 1980: 38-46 discusses aspects of *1 En.* 71 found in later merkabah texts. He notes that there seem to be two separate heavens, the first in vv. 1-4, and the second in vv. 5-17, where heaven is a palace from which God and the archangels emerge to greet Enoch. Suter 1979b: 14-23 notes the importance of the identification of Enoch with the Son of Man in 71:14 for the later merkabah texts where Enoch and Metatron are identified, the significance of the expression the throne of his glory here and in later texts, and of the *Qedushah* reflected in *1 En.* 39:10-14. Similar features to those found here also appear in *ShirShabb.* Both BP and *ShirShabb.* seem to belong to an early stage of the merkabah traditions. See Eskola 2001: 95-96; Carlsson 2004: 60.

¹⁵⁰ Black and VanderKam 1985: 68, and Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2004: 95 read "that angel." Black and VanderKam 1985: 68 identifies the angel as Michael, although v. 13 names four angels (Michael, Gabriel, Raphael and Phanuel), as well as "thousands and ten thousands of angels without number" (Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2004: 94). Olson 2004: 134-35 reads "that one," noting that "that angel," appears in "Eth 2, MS Q and marginal corrections in EMM 2080 and 7584." On the other hand, Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2004: 95 (footnote d) note that "some mss read *and he*," without specifying which MSS they refer to. It seems that Olson considers a reading to be primary that Black and Nickelsburg consider secondary. I am not qualified to comment on which reading is more likely, and whether one of the named angels or the Head of Days approaches Enoch and addresses him.

¹⁵¹ Himmelfarb 1993: 13.

heavenly temple as the dwelling place of God in heaven. In the parables and in the epilogue the second temple is overlooked in favour of the heavenly, eschatological temple.

The eschatological temple is portrayed in Hebrews in a similar manner to BP. Hebrews refers to an eschatological rest for the people of God that lies in the future (Heb 3-4), but has also come into the present with the exaltation of Jesus since the community has already come to the heavenly Jerusalem and is worshipping with innumerable angels (12:22-24). As in BP, they also await the arrival of the kingdom that cannot be shaken, that is, the world to come where Jesus is already enthroned (1:6; 2:5), equivalent to the new heavens and earth of Rev 21.

4.3 *Jubilees*

Jubilees retells Gen 1–Exod 24,¹⁵² in words claimed to have been revealed to Moses on Mt Sinai during his forty days there with Yahweh.¹⁵³ It was written down to ensure correct understanding.¹⁵⁴ The date of composition is debated, but is probably somewhere around the middle of the second century B.C.E., prior to the establishment of the Qumran community, where several copies were found,¹⁵⁵ and later than *1 Enoch*, since material from *1 Enoch* appears in several places and is treated as authoritative.¹⁵⁶ *Jubilees* was written in Hebrew and translated into Greek and Syriac. The Greek translation was translated into Latin and Ethiopic. The only complete witness to the text is the Ethiopic version. Parts of

¹⁵² Wintermute 1985: 48; Scott 2005: 11; VanderKam 2008: 405. Nickelsburg 1984: 97 suggests that the narrative ends at Exod 14, while in 2005a: 69 he suggests that it ends at Exod 12, as does Charlesworth 1993: 39. The superscription alludes to Exod 24:4, and *Jub.* 49 deals with the institution of the Passover (following the Exodus). *Jubilees* 50 contains legal material concerning the Sabbath. On pp. 38-40 Charlesworth includes *Jubilees* in the category “[e]xegesis by expansion.” He continues, “the biblical stories were ... taken seriously ... but to speak to the curiosities and needs of a later time the stories needed to be retold and completed with details ... It seems obvious that the text was considered divine, but the spirit for interpretation allowed the Jewish exegete to alter, ignore, expand, and even rewrite the sacred Scripture” (p. 39).

¹⁵³ See the “Prologue” to *Jubilees*, *Jub.* 1:4-6. In *Jub.* 1:27-28 (4Q216 IV 6-7) Yahweh commands the Angel of the Presence to dictate (הכתִּיב) the content of the revelation, then from *Jub.* 2 onwards the Angel of the Presence speaks to Moses and commands him to write.

¹⁵⁴ VanderKam 2008: 409-11.

¹⁵⁵ VanderKam (1977: 207-85; 2008: 407-409) has an extensive discussion of the date of *Jubilees* and concludes that the date is between 161-152 B.C.E. He argues for this on the basis of allusions to the Enochic Book of Dreams in *Jub.* 4:17-26 and the palaeographic dating of 4QJub^a. See also Nickelsburg 2005a: 73-74; Bergsma 2009: 41-42. For the influence of *Jubilees* at Qumran see Hempel 2000: 196; Shemesh 2009: 259-60, and for the relationship of BW (and other parts of *1 Enoch*) to *Jubilees* see Boccaccini 1998: 86-98; Bergsma 2009: 45-51; Jackson 2009: 411-25. The Qumran witnesses to *Jubilees* are 4Q216–4Q224 (4QJub^a–4QJub^g, 4QPapJub^h).

¹⁵⁶ Nickelsburg 2001: 72. Material from *1 Enoch* and about Enoch appears in *Jub.* 4:15-26; 5:1-12; 7:20-39; 8:1-4; 10:1-17.

the Greek, Syriac and Latin versions remain, and some fragmentary witnesses to the Hebrew text have survived from Qumran.¹⁵⁷

To the author of *Jubilees*, Zion and the Jerusalem temple had been defiled (1:10; 23:21), and they await eschatological re-sanctification by Yahweh and his return to dwell with his people (1:17; 4:26).¹⁵⁸ *Jubilees* also implies a temple in heaven where angels approach God in priestly service (31:14). Indeed, several things in *Jubilees* take place “on earth as in heaven”: God keeps the Sabbath (in heaven) on the seventh day of creation (2:1), as do the angels (2:18); the feast of weeks is kept in heaven (6:17-19); and circumcision has its origins with the angels in heaven.

Enoch, the first to learn to write, is also an important figure. In a dream vision he sees all that will happen until the Day of Judgement (4:19) and writes it down. After spending an extended period with the angels in heaven who show him everything on earth and in heaven, including the dominion of the sun (the basis of the solar calendar, 4:21), he testifies against the watchers and is then led back to earth and taken to Eden where he offers incense as a priest (*Jub.* 4:23-26). In the context of the career of Enoch, *Jubilees* anticipates the new creation when “the eschatological priesthood that will enter priestly service in the rebuilt temple on Mt. Zion in the new creation.”¹⁵⁹ *Jubilees* contains several references to sanctuaries and holy places, mainly at the beginning and the end of the book. I begin with an overview of these and then deal with the notion of Eden as a sanctuary.¹⁶⁰

4.3.1 The Tabernacle, the Temple and the Eschatological Sanctuary

In the redactional narrative frame of *Jubilees* (*Jub.* 1:1-29),¹⁶¹ God tells Moses to write the history of his people in terms that reflect the Deuteronomic theme of unfaithfulness, followed by exile and ultimate restoration.¹⁶² *Jubilees* 1:10 predicts that they will forsake “my sacred place, which I sanctified for myself among them, and my tabernacle and my

¹⁵⁷ For a discussion of the manuscript tradition see VanderKam 2009: 3-21. In what follows, unless otherwise indicated, I will use Wintermute’s translation of the Ethiopic text. I will refer to the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin witnesses where they are available.

¹⁵⁸ van Ruiten 1999b: 224. As van Ruiten notes, while *Jubilees* is negative about the temple it speaks positively about the former sanctuary in Eden and the restored sanctuary on Mt Zion. For a connection between Eden and the restoration of Zion see Isa 51:3.

¹⁵⁹ Scott 2005: 5. Scott introduces the theme of “on earth as in heaven” in *Jubilees* on pp. 1-8. On p. 5 he refers to the plan for the tabernacle in Exod 25-30, which *Jubilees* omits in order to keep “the primary focus on this trajectory from Enoch to the eschatological temple.” Nevertheless, Scott claims that part of the impetus for the theme “probably” came from Exod 25:9, 40, although this is impossible to verify. 4Q475 also connects Zion with the renewal of the creation. See Elgvin 1999: 578-91, 2003: 467.

¹⁶⁰ A discussion of the priesthood of Levi in *Jub.* 31:14 is beyond my scope.

¹⁶¹ Segal 2007: 247.

¹⁶² Davenport 1971: 24-25; Knibb 1976: 266-60; van Ruiten 1999b: 215-27; Scott 2005: 77-79. See Deut 28:15-68; 31:16-29; Lev 26:14-39.

sanctuary,¹⁶³ which I sanctified for myself in the midst of the land so that I might set my name upon it and might dwell there.” After they repent and return to God, God will restore them from exile and build his sanctuary in their midst, dwell with them and not be alienated from them (1:17). While Charles reads this as a prediction of the second temple,¹⁶⁴ that God himself builds it, indicates that it is the eschatological dwelling place of God with his people.¹⁶⁵

Leviticus and Deuteronomy predict exile for unfaithfulness and subsequent restoration, but they refer in the first instance to the events of 587 B.C.E. and the return from exile. *Jubilees* applies these texts to the generation of the author and to the pollution of the holy of holies in the present (*Jub.* 23:21).¹⁶⁶ *Jubilees* 1:10-17 assures the reader that while the current state of affairs may have been brought about by their own rebellion, it is not permanent. If they repent, God will return to them on the day of the new creation, build a temple and dwell among them on Mt Zion in Jerusalem (1:26-29; 4:26; 49:18), where he will reign forever and ever. These predictions ultimately owe their origin to Exod 15:17-18.

While Noah (*Jub.* 6:1, 3) and the Patriarchs (13:9, 16; 15:2; 18:1-13; 22:3; 24:23) offer sacrifices on altars in a variety of places, the importance of Zion and Jerusalem is underscored in several places. It is one of the four sacred places on the earth in 4:26, along with Eden, the mountain of the East and Sinai, and is one of the three holy places in 8:19. Furthermore, its importance is implied in the story of Jacob’s dream at Bethel (*Jub.* 32:16-26). On awakening, Jacob decides to build walls around the place and “sanctify it and make it eternally holy for himself and his sons after him” (32:16). However, in a subsequent vision, an angel shows Jacob heavenly tablets and instructs him not to build, and not to make an eternal sanctuary at Bethel, because “this is not the place” (32:23). Jacob is not told where the place is, but Zion and Jerusalem are no doubt implied.¹⁶⁷

Zion is also implied in *Jub.* 49:16-21, a pericope that records the institution of the Passover in terms mostly taken from Exod 12. However, the regulations of Deut 16:1-8, where the people are commanded to sacrifice the Passover at the central sanctuary rather

¹⁶³ “Sanctuary” is a translation of מקדש in 4Q216 II 9. VanderKam and Milik 1991: 225; 1994: 9 render this word with “temple.” The same Hebrew word appears in 4Q216 IV 7, where VanderKam and Milik (p. 12) read “my sanctuary.” The only remaining mark in line 10 of this column is a dot identified by Milik and VanderKam as the tip of a ל, and they restore the words ציון וירושלם (“Zion and Jerusalem”). These lines correspond to *Jub.* 1:28.

¹⁶⁴ Charles 1913c: 11-12.

¹⁶⁵ Davenport 1971: 29-31; Knibb 1976: 61; 2007c: 410; Suter 2009: 403-404. For other texts implying that the eschatological temple is in view see *Jub.* 1: 27, 29; 25:21. The pollution of the second temple is “foretold” in 23:21.

¹⁶⁶ Davenport 1971: 27; van Ruiten 1999b: 217. Scott 2005: 87 and Gäbel 2006: 40-41 relate Israel’s downfall in *Jubilees* to failure to properly observe the solar calendar.

¹⁶⁷ Larson 2009: 380.

than in their homes, are brought into play. In *Jub.* 49:16-17 Moses is commanded to ensure that it is not eaten “outside the sanctuary of the Lord, but facing the tabernacle of the Lord” (*a sanctificatione domini sed secus tabernaculum domini*).¹⁶⁸ *Jubilees* 49:18 anticipates the setting up of the tabernacle in the midst of the promised land in one of the tribes, until “the sanctuary of God is built” (*aedificabitur sanctificatio dei*). This text probably refers to Solomon’s temple, but ultimately the eschatological temple of *Jub.* 1:17, 27, 29 is in view, especially in the use of the passive voice to refer to “the house being built in the name of the Lord” (*aedificabitur domus in nomine domini*) in v. 19. In this way, the closing sections of *Jubilees* anticipate the wilderness tabernacle, Solomon’s temple and the eschatological temple.¹⁶⁹ The second temple is overlooked.

The references to Zion and Jerusalem in *Jubilees* indicate that the anticipated eschatological temple was probably conceived as a physical structure. This perspective is quite different from Hebrews, where Jerusalem and Zion are negated in favour of the heavenly, eschatological Jerusalem. A rebuilt temple in Jerusalem, even one built by God, is foreign to Hebrews. The community has “no continuing city,” seeking instead the city to come (Heb 13:14).

4.3.2 Eden as a Sanctuary

In Gen 2-3 Eden appears to be a sanctuary,¹⁷⁰ although this is never made explicit. However, Eden is clearly a sanctuary in a variety of places in *Jubilees*.¹⁷¹ *Jubilees* 3:4-7 recounts the creation of Eve, and while in Gen 2:15-25 this happens in Eden, in *Jub.* 3:9 it happens outside Eden. Adam is not admitted to Eden until forty days had passed and Eve remains outside a further forty days (3:8-14), because “it is more holy than any land” (3:12). This delay is attributed to the laws of purification after the birth of a female child (Lev 12:1-5), where a new mother is not permitted to enter the sanctuary (ἱερόν, *Jub.* 3:10) for that time. Thus, the creation of Eve provides a paradigm for the later law concerning purification after childbirth.¹⁷² Furthermore, *Jub.* 3:6 adds to the Genesis account that when

¹⁶⁸ The sense “sanctuary” for *sanctificatio* seems odd. Lewis and Short 1966: 1625 give the sense “sanctification.” However, the word appears in the Vulgate of Ps 113:2; Ezek 37:28; Amos 7:13; 1 Macc 1:41; 4 *Ezra* 10:21 with the sense “sanctuary.” The definition “sanctuary” also appears in Stelten 1995: 238.

¹⁶⁹ Scott 2005: 131. Later (pp. 207-8), Scott argues that this text “provides a likely scenario” for the return from the exile and the rebuilt temple. This ultimately leads to the goal of history when “everything will become ‘on earth as in heaven’.” However, in *Jubilees* the heavenly temple is only implied by the presence of worshipping angels in heaven. There is no hint of the “on earth as in heaven” with respect to the heavenly and earthly temples, and no suggestion of a physical structure in heaven. See also VanderKam 2008: 425-26.

¹⁷⁰ Levenson 1985: 128-31, 142-45; Wenham 1986: 19-25; Barker 1991: 68-103; Parry 1994: 126-51; Stordalen 2000: 307-12; 457-59; Beale 2004b: 66-80. See also Ezek 28:11-19, and the discussion of this text in McKenzie 1956: 323.

¹⁷¹ Hayward 1996: 90.

¹⁷² A similar prohibition is found in 4Q265. See Levison 1988: 92-3; Milgrom 1993: 278; Baumgarten 1994: 5-8; Himmelfarb 1999b: 25-27; van Ruiten 1999a: 77; 1999b: 219-20; 2000: 86-87; Segal 2007: 47-9; VanderKam 2008: 412-13. On the other hand, Ravid 2002: 76-80 finds it difficult to understand that God

God brought Eve to Adam “he knew her,” a euphemism for sexual activity,¹⁷³ which, according to the author of *Jubilees*, could not take place in a sanctuary since it renders a person unclean (Lev 15:18).¹⁷⁴

The next indication that Eden is a sanctuary is found in *Jub.* 3:27. As Adam leaves the garden he offers a sweet smelling sacrifice and covers his shame. Since incense is burned at the entrance to the holy of holies (Exod 30:7-8, 34-38; Num 16: 39-40; 2 Chron 26:16-20), Eden is equivalent to the holy of holies, and since Adam covers his shame (nakedness), he plays the part of a priest (Exod 20:26; 28:42).¹⁷⁵ Adam the priest is the first of a priestly line that includes Enoch, who offered the evening incense offering in Eden (4:23-26).¹⁷⁶

Aside from these texts where it can be inferred that Eden is a sanctuary, this fact is explicitly stated in two other texts. In *Jub.* 4:26 Eden is one of four sacred places on the earth, including the mountain of the East, Sinai and Zion. In 8:19 there are three holy places, Eden, Sinai and Zion, with Eden described as “the holy of holies and the dwelling of the Lord.”¹⁷⁷ There is no explicit reference to Eden as a sanctuary in Hebrews; however, as I have argued elsewhere, it is implied in the allusion to Num 24:6 in Heb 8:2.¹⁷⁸

4.4 The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*

The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* are presented as death-bed speeches of the sons of Jacob.¹⁷⁹ In each case the patriarch gives an account of his life and exploits, including his wicked behaviour. He encourages his descendants to live well and predicts that they will

could create two impure persons and argues that *Jub.* 3:10-11 comprises general regulations relating to impurity after childbirth that have been combined with the Adam and Eve story. See the response to Ravid in VanderKam 2002: 213.

¹⁷³ HALOT 391, s.v. יָדָע, 6. See Anderson 1989: 128-29; van Ruiten 2000: 80-81; Loader 2007: 242-45, 286, 88; Doering 2009: 262-64, and *Jub.* 3:34. Both Anderson 1989: 125-28 and Loader 2007: 240, 286 suggest that Adam observes sexual activity between the animals in *Jub.* 3:1-3 and longs for the same. See also *Gen. Rab.* 17:4.

¹⁷⁴ Ravid 2002: 78 points out that there are two distinct categories here: uncleanness in connection with sexual activity and uncleanness in connection with childbirth. For the former see Anderson 1989: 129; van Ruiten 1999a: 76-77; 1999b: 218. See also 11QT XLV 11-12; CD XI 21-XII 2. In *Gen. Rab.* 18:6; 19:3 the opposite is true, and Adam and Eve have sexual relations in Eden.

¹⁷⁵ Levison 1988: 94; van Ruiten 1999a: 77-78; 1999b: 219; 2000: 88, 106; Scott 2005: 31, 56-7, 134-45.

¹⁷⁶ For Enoch as a priest see van Ruiten 1999b: 220; VanderKam 1984a: 186; Anderson 1989: 129; Larson 2009: 372. In *Jub.* 4:25 Enoch offers incense on Mount Qatâr. The identification of this mountain is problematic. Wintermute 1985: 63 identifies it as “an eastern mountain identified with incense;” van Ruiten 1999a: 78, 1999b: 220 suggests that it is at the gate of Eden, as do Charles 1913c: 19; VanderKam 1984a: 186-87; Scott 2005: 56-7.

¹⁷⁷ Suter 2009: 405 notes that since the three sanctuaries in 8:19 face each other, they correspond to “the *debir*, the *bekhal*, and the *’ulam* of one temple.”

¹⁷⁸ Church 2008: 156-57.

¹⁷⁹ For introductions to the *Testaments*, see Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 1-85; De Jonge 1987: 359-420; Kugler 2001: 11-39; Nickelsburg 2005a: 302-303.

not do so.¹⁸⁰ Joseph is presented as the paradigmatic virtuous person whose example the patriarchs' descendants are encouraged to follow. They are also encouraged to honour and obey Levi and Judah, because the priesthood and the kingship were given to them respectively and because Israel's salvation would come from them (e.g. *T. Jud.* 21:1-4; *T. Sim.* 7:1-3).¹⁸¹ The *Testaments* also predict the coming of an ideal saviour (e.g. *T. Levi* 18; *T. Jud.* 24), descended from Levi and/or Judah, and they predict that the descendants of the patriarchs will reject this saviour, resulting in their exile. Ultimately, they will be restored (e.g. *T. Jud.* 24; *T. Dan* 5:10; *T. Gad* 8:1).¹⁸² The issues of sexual impropriety detected in *1 Enoch* carry over into the *Testaments*. In some cases, these issues are connected with the temple, evidencing the same dissatisfaction with the temple found in *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*.¹⁸³

The compilation history of the *Testaments* is complex and has been the subject of considerable scholarly debate.¹⁸⁴ I am persuaded by De Jonge's arguments that while they reached their present form in the second half of the second century C.E., they were composed some time earlier. Their present form is the result of extensive Christian redactional activity on pre-existing Jewish documents, although the precise content of these documents can no longer be determined.¹⁸⁵ Whether the *Testaments* are of Jewish or Christian provenance is not critical for this study.¹⁸⁶ They are texts of middle Judaism, possibly composed by Christians sometime in the first two centuries of the common era, but based, at least in part, on pre-existing Jewish documents.¹⁸⁷

¹⁸⁰ Slingerland 1984: 531-32.

¹⁸¹ See De Jonge 1953: 86-89 for a discussion of the L-J (Levi-Judah) passages. A convenient list of these is found in Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 40-41.

¹⁸² See the list of the so-called "Sin-Exile-Return" passages, identified by De Jonge 1953: 83-86 and listed in 1991: 164-65.

¹⁸³ Suter 1979a 128-31; Nickelsburg 1981: 589, Himmelfarb 1993: 21-23; 1999a: 1-6. For a recent reassessment see Suter 2002: 137-42.

¹⁸⁴ For an early account see De Jonge 1953: 38-52, and for convenient summaries of the major positions see Dean-Otting 1984: 76-80; Collins 1998: 133-36; 2000a: 174-77.

¹⁸⁵ De Jonge 1991: 233-34. On p. 241 he suggests that "it is extremely difficult to find convincing proof for the existence of such a [pre-existing Jewish] document, nor are we in a position to determine its contents." See also 1960: 187-88. Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 2 note that various attempts have been made to distinguish between "sources, contributions by the author and later interpolations and additions" yielding widely differing results, so much so that it seems that the only viable option is to interpret the *Testaments* in the form in which they have been preserved, without attempting to delineate sources, whether Jewish or Christian (p. 8, see also Charlesworth 1985: 100-101).

¹⁸⁶ Davila 2005b: 23-63 discusses the complexity involved in assessing whether a particular pseudepigraphon is either Jewish or Christian, or somewhere on a continuum between the two. See also the discussion in De Jonge 1991: 150-51, 160-63. Sacchi 1990: 36 denies that they are a Christian work, but does not give any reasons.

¹⁸⁷ Slingerland 1977: 106-114 concludes that the *Testaments* should be seen as documents with both Jewish and Christian origins, which "reveal the contours of life in both Jewish and Christian communities." Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 67 decline to describe them as either "'typically' Jewish or 'typically' Christian." Neither do they believe it possible to decide whether there ever was a "Jewish *Testaments*" (1985:

4.4.1 The Testament of Levi

While Levi is a significant figure throughout the *Testaments* as the one from whom a redeemer will come, and the one to be honoured and obeyed as the anointed priest,¹⁸⁸ he is even more prominent in *T. Levi*. Indeed, the *Testaments* can be read as an apology for a priestly messiah descended from Levi and a royal messiah from Judah, with the *Testaments* other than *T. Levi* and *T. Jud.* preparing the reader for what they will encounter in these two works.¹⁸⁹

The *Testament of Levi* contains details of Levi's consecration as a priest and several references to a heavenly temple.¹⁹⁰ In *T. Levi* 2-3 an angel conducts Levi on a heavenly journey and reveals to him that he will stand near the Lord as his "minister" (λειτουργός, 2:10). In 3:1-8 this angel describes the heavens, and Levi sees "the great glory in the holy of

85). Elsewhere, De Jonge 1991: 155 states that it is "practically certain" that the present Testaments were composed in Greek, given that they often presuppose the wording of the LXX and use Hellenistic or Hellenistic-Jewish terms. See also the useful summaries in Charlesworth 1981b: 211-13; 1993: 32-34. On the proposal of a Jewish source for the *Testaments* see Puech 1992: 490, and the critique of this in Knibb 1995: 181-84. One pre-existing document that can be identified is the *Aramaic Levi Document (ALD)* and it must be taken into account when reading *T. Levi*. Witnesses to *ALD* were first discovered in a MS the Cairo Geniza, parts of which are held in the Cambridge University Library (Cambridge MS T. S. 16 fol. 94), and parts in the Bodleian Library (Bodleian MS Heb c 27, fol. 56). For the relationship of these parts see the diagram in Greenfield, Stone and Eshel 2004, facing p. 1. See also Milik 1955c: 399-406. A number of fragments were also discovered at Qumran (4QLevi^{a-f}). These are all in Hasmonean script, and are dated on palaeographical grounds between 150-151 B.C.E. (Greenfield, Stone and Eshel 2004: 4). Caquot 1998: 5-25 analyses and translates all the major Qumran fragments associated with Levi and, in addition to 4QLevi^{a-f}, he includes 4QapocrLevi^{a,b}, 4QTQahat, the *Testament of Amram* (4Q543-4Q548) and the *Work Mentioning Hur and Miriam ar* (4Q549). For an assessment of these other works see Greenfield, Stone and Eshel 2004: 25-29. Although De Jonge 1953: 38-52, 129-31 and Milik 1955e: 87; 1955c: 404-6 originally referred to 1Q21 as "Testament de Lévi," De Jonge 1991: 147-48; 1998: 220 has now clarified that this is not the case. It seems to be an Aramaic work that the compiler of *T. Levi* was aware of in some form and used. Another witness is in part of a Greek translation discovered at Mt Athos in Greece (Athos, Monastery of Koutloumos Cod. 39, hereinafter MS e). Both Greenfield, Stone and Eshel 2004: 5 and Drawnel 2004: 31 assign an eleventh century date to MS e. It contains three passages that are not part of *T. Levi*, two of which contain material also found in the Qumran and Geniza MSS. The Greek and Aramaic witnesses to *ALD* are conveniently assembled in Charles 1966: 245-56. Stone 1988: 159-61 dates *ALD* in the third century B.C.E., based on the palaeographical dating of the Qumran fragments, and its use as a source for *Jubilees*. Milik 1976: 24 proposes an even earlier date, perhaps in the fourth century B.C.E., as does Lange 2008: 79, while De Jonge 1998: 213-14 suggests the second century. The precise date is outside my scope. The referencing system for *ALD* is complex. Three major studies have been undertaken, all of which use a different system; Kugler 1996 and Drawnel 2004 use (and supplement) the versification developed by Charles 1908: 245-56, with minor differences. Greenfield, Stone and Eshel 2004 have developed a system of chapters and verses from 1:1-13:16, which I use in what follows. When referring to the Qumran witnesses I use the fragment, column and line numbers from DJD XXII. For those parts of *ALD* included in *T. Levi* see Greenfield, Stone and Eshel 2004: 480-50. For discussions of the relationship between *ALD* and *T. Levi* see Himmelfarb 1984: 59; Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 23-24, 130; De Jonge 1991: 150-54; 244-262; Kugler 1996: 2-7; 2001: 31; Knibb 1998: 203-213; De Jonge 1998: 220-24, 232; Drawnel 2004: 1-4.

¹⁸⁸ *T. Ren.* 6:5-12; *T. Sim.* 7:1-3; *T. Jud.* 21:1-6; *T. Iss.* 5:6-8; *T. Dan* 5:4, 7-13; *T. Naph.* 5:3-6; 8:1-2; *T. Gad* 8:1; *T. Jos.* 19:11-12.

¹⁸⁹ De Jonge 1953: 112; Slingerland 1984: 532-37 argue from the "we" passage in *T. Levi* 19:2-3 that the *Testaments* are "a product of Israel's Levitical circles."

¹⁹⁰ I only deal with those texts that contain explicit temple symbolism and make no comment on texts referring to the priesthood of Levi without such symbolism.

holies, above all holiness” (ἡ μεγάλη δόξα ἐν ἁγίῳ ἁγίων ὑπεράνω πάσης ἁγιότητος, 3:4);¹⁹¹ in 4:2 he is told that he will be “a son, a servant and a minister” (υἱὸν καὶ θεράποντα καὶ λειτουργόν) in the presence of the Most High; and in 5:1-2 Levi sees “the holy sanctuary, and the Most High on a glorious throne” (τὸν ναὸν τὸν ἅγιον· καὶ ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης τὸν ὕψιστον) through the opened gates of heaven, and God announces that he has been given the blessing of the priesthood. In 8:3 seven men clothe him in priestly garb and command him “to be a priest” (γίνου εἰς ἱερέα) along with his descendants; in 9:3 he recounts a vision in which Jacob learned that Levi would be a priest;¹⁹² and in 12:5 Levi himself says that he became a “priest” (ἱεράτευσα) at nineteen years of age. Temple symbolism appears finally in 18:6, where “the glorious sanctuary” (ὁ ναὸς τῆς δόξης) is the place from which holiness will come from the voice of a father upon the new priest who will arise.

T. Levi seems to be dependent to some degree upon BW.¹⁹³ In *T. Levi* 14-16, Levi explains that he had learned from the “writing of Enoch” (ἀπὸ γραφῆς Ἐνώχ, 14:1) that his descendants would “act impiously against the Lord” (ἀσεβήσετε ἐπὶ κύριον, 14:1). In 14:5-8 their evil deeds are catalogued, including defilement through sexual contact with improper women (14:6), and in 15:1-16:5 Levi predicts the exile and the desolation of the temple. The ultimate outcome is the return from exile and the “new priest” that the Lord will raise up (18:2).

4.4.1.1 Levi’s Heavenly Journey (*T. Levi* 2:5-3:10)

In *T. Levi* 2:5-3:10 Levi undertakes a journey to the second heaven, from where he sees the third heaven and where his angelic guide reveals details of another four heavens. He explains in 2:2-5 how he was praying about the corruption of humanity when he fell asleep.¹⁹⁴ In a dream, he sees a high mountaintop and “the heavens opened” (ἠνεώχθησαν οἱ οὐρανοί).¹⁹⁵ An angel invites him to enter.¹⁹⁶ He enters the lower

¹⁹¹ Unless otherwise noted, translations are my own. Quotations from the Greek text are from De Jonge 1978.

¹⁹² *T. Levi* 9 also includes Jacob’s detailed instructions to Levi on how to function as a priest.

¹⁹³ Milik 1955c: 404-405. For a list of similarities between the two documents see Nickelsburg 1981: 588-89.

¹⁹⁴ Schäfer 1992: 86-89 discusses prayer as a means of ascent to heaven in hekhalot texts, e.g. *3 En.* 1:2; 15B: 2, 4; 44:7; *Ma’aseh Merkabah*, Sections 544; 550; 592; 595. (for the Hebrew text see 1981: 202-207, 226-31). Himmelfarb 1995: 122-37 also discusses techniques associated with ascent in these later works. She notes that while they were not unknown in earlier texts, “the dominant understanding of ascent in ancient Jewish and Christian literature is of a process initiated not by the visionary but by God.”

¹⁹⁵ *ALD* 4: 4-4 (4QLevi^b 1 II 16) reads בחזית חזויה וחזית שמ[יא] (“in the vision of visions I saw heaven ...”). Milik 1955c: 399, 404 (followed by *DSSSE* 450-51) relates this line to the heavens being opened in *T. Levi* 2:5 and the prayer of Levi preserved in MS e, interpolated here, with the answer to the prayer found in *T. Levi* 4:2. Milik’s reconstruction was adopted by Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 142; Wright 2000: 144-45, but rejected by De Jonge 1974: 137-39; Greenfield and Stone 1990: 154-58; Stone and Greenfield 1993: 249-53; Stone 2003: 430-37; Kugler 1996: 82-87; Knibb 1998: 205-207; Drawnel 2004: 224-28; Greenfield, Stone and Eshel 2004: 138-39. Nothing in the context of *ALD* at this point demands that this line belongs here.

heavens and sees the higher heavens.¹⁹⁷ A brief description of what Levi sees follows in 2:7-8, and in 3:1-8 the angel describes the heavens with more detail. In the uppermost heaven, God dwells.

The first announcement of Levi's elevation to the priesthood appears in 2:9-11, although the word "priest" does not appear.¹⁹⁸ The angel advises Levi that he will see the higher, more brilliant and incomparable heavens, and when he ascends there he "will stand near the Lord" (σὺ ἐγγύς κυρίου στήση), and will become his "cultic official" (λειτουργός), a word that appears in Heb 8:2 with reference to Jesus.¹⁹⁹ The service of Levi is then detailed, involving the announcement of the Lord's mysteries among people,²⁰⁰

Kugler 1996: 83 notes that there is not enough preserved "to decide with complete confidence which of the many possibilities for its reconstruction and placement is correct." Kugler himself (p. 175) relates it to the beginning of *T. Levi* 8. For detailed arguments for this placement see Stone 2003: 430-37.

¹⁹⁶ See Mach 1992: 124-27 for a summary of the features of heavenly journeys and the roles played by angelic guides.

¹⁹⁷ The text-critical issues surrounding *T. Levi* 2-3 are complex. One group of MSS (α) refer to three heavens, while another group (non-α) refers to four additional heavens in 2:9, which they describe in 3:3-8. The α MSS compress these descriptions into the third heaven. In the α MSS of 2:5-10 Levi enters the first heaven and sees the remainder (Kee 1983: 788). In the non-α MSS Levi enters the second heaven and sees the third (De Jonge 1978: 26). In the α MSS the angel tells him he will see the third heaven and ascend to it and receive the priesthood, while in the non-α MSS he sees the third heaven and the angel advises him that he will see four more heavens. In the α MSS the heavens are described in the order 1-2-3-2, and in the non-α MSS the seven heavens are described in the order 1-2-3-7-6-5-4. For a discussion of the text-critical issues of this part of *T. Levi* and arguments for the secondary nature of the α manuscripts see De Jonge 1974: 133-36; 1975: 61-68; 1991: 148-51. The readings of the non-α manuscripts are incorporated in De Jonge 1978: 26-28 and adopted by Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 132, 136. Kee 1983: 788-89 considers that the inclusion of the seven heavens is a modification and expansion of an original reference to three heavens, as do Charles 1913f: 304-306; Collins 1995a: 63-65; 1995c: 46, 56 (footnote 12); Carlsson 2004: 100-102, and Alexander 2006: 80, while Wright 2000: 144, 148 considers the three-heaven schema to be a corruption of the earlier seven-heaven schema, perhaps by a Christian editor under the influence of 2 Cor 12:1-4. Kugler 1996: 181 comments that "all that can be said is that one scheme was original, and the other was imposed later" (footnote 36). Whichever option is adopted, God dwells in the uppermost heaven, either the seventh (Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 136-37) or the third (Kee 1983: 788-89). Dean-Otting 1984: 80, 87 proposes eight heavens, suggesting that there are seven, plus a "heaven above the heavens" where God dwells (3:4).

¹⁹⁸ The text is based in part upon Mal 2:4-7. Kugler 1993: 30-36 traces the influence of Mal 2:4-7 in this part of *T. Levi*, which he refers to as "Levi's Apocalypse." He suggests that this "apocalypse" may have originally existed independently (pp. 37-38). In Mal 2:4-7, true instruction comes from Levi and he is the messenger (ἄγγελος) of the Lord of hosts. See also Deut 33:8-10. For the significance of Mal 2:4-7 for the idea of an angelomorphic priesthood see Fletcher-Louis 2002: 13-17.

¹⁹⁹ See Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 135 for the cultic connotations of this word. See Exod 28:35, 43; Isa 61:6; Sir 7:30; *Let Aris* 95; Heb 8:2; *1 Clem* 41:2, and in connection with Levi, Num 8:22; 16:9; 18:6; Deut 10:8; 18:5, 7; 1 Chron 15:2; 2 Chron 29:11; Ezek 40:46; *T. Levi* 4:2; *Jub.* 30:18; 31:14; 11Q^{Temp} LX 10-11; 1QS^b IV 24-25. In Heb 8:2 Jesus is described as τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργός, and in Heb 8:6 his λειτουργία is described as being "more excellent" than that of the former priests. The cognate verb λειτουργέω appears in Heb 10:11 to describe the cultic service of priests in the OT and in *T. Levi* 3:6 to describe the service of the angels in the sixth heaven.

²⁰⁰ The word μυστήριον has apocalyptic connotations. Bornkamm 1967: 815-16 refers to the use of this word in connection with heavenly journeys in which things normally concealed from humans are revealed. See Brown 1968: 1-30; Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 135; Bockmuehl 1990: 31-32; Rowland 1982: 9-14; Carlsson 2004: 107; Dean-Otting 1984: 86-87, 89-90. Stone 1976: 414-19 notes that matters revealed in apocalyptic include details about the nature of the heavenly sanctuary and occur "at the high point of a

and proclamation concerning the coming redeemer of Israel. In its present context in *T. Levi* this statement implies that in the milieu in which *T. Levi* circulated one function of the OT priesthood and cultus was to point to Christ, something reflected in Heb 8-10.²⁰¹

It is unclear whether Levi is envisaged as a heavenly or an earthly priest. On the one hand, when he ascends to the upper heaven “he will stand near the Lord” (ἐγγὺς κυρίου στήση, 2:10). On the other hand, he is to declare God’s mysteries to the people. Hollander and De Jonge suggest that “Levi’s priestly service on earth is carried out in the presence of God.”²⁰² This is somewhat analogous to the role of the angel Raphael in Tobit. In Tob 12:11-15 Raphael is said to stand in the presence of God. He takes Tobias’ prayer into the presence of God, but also appears to Tobias and Sarah on earth. Levi, like Raphael, receives a revelation of divine mysteries in the heavenly sanctuary and brings them to bear on earthly things. The angel Gabriel has a similar function in Luke 1-2, revealing heavenly things to Zechariah and Mary.²⁰³ Since the temple is a microcosm of the universe and “heaven on earth,” to “stand near the Lord” refers to Levi’s priestly service in the earthly temple/tabernacle, also understood as service in the presence of God. Thus, in this text, there is no rigid distinction between the earthly and the heavenly temple.

In *T. Levi* 3 the angelic guide explains the contents of the various heavens to Levi. In 3:3c the upper heavens “down to the fourth” are said to be “holy” (ἅγιοι),²⁰⁴ although Wright considers that it is the angels inhabiting them who are described as ἅγιοι, being elevated above unrighteousness.²⁰⁵ It is difficult to decide between these two options, but

revelation” (p. 418). Gruenwald 1980: 29-72 discusses the mystical aspects of apocalyptic literature, and the relationship between this literature and merkabah mysticism.

²⁰¹ The proclamation of “the coming redeemer of Israel” (τοῦ μέλλοντος λυτροῦσθαι τὸν Ἰσραήλ, 2:10) is no doubt a reference to Jesus Christ and betrays Christian origins (Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 135, see also *T. Sim.* 7:1-2; *T. Levi* 18:1-14). An allusion to Luke 24:21 (ὁ μέλλων λυτροῦσθαι τὸν Ἰσραήλ) seems likely.

²⁰² Ibid.: 134. In *T. Jud.* 21:1-5 the priesthood is said to be superior to the kingship because, while God had given the things on earth to Judah, to Levi he had given the things in heaven (τὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς). Accordingly, just as heaven “is higher” (ὑπερέχει) than earth, so the priesthood is higher than the (earthly) kingship. The pericope concludes that Levi had been chosen to “draw near” (ἐγγίζω) to God. Similar notions are expressed in *Jub.* 30:18 (where Levi is said to have been chosen to serve in the presence of the Lord); and in 31:14 (where Jacob blesses Levi and prays that the Lord would draw him and his seed near to him to serve in his sanctuary as the angels of the presence and the holy ones). See also Exod 19:21-22; 24:2; Lev 10:3; 21:21; Ezek 40:46; 42:13; 1QSb IV 24-28.

²⁰³ It is somewhat similar in the case of Zechariah. The angel Gabriel appears to him in the “temple” (ναός, Luke 1:9) and is described as “an angel of the Lord” (ἄγγελος κυρίου, 1:11). When Zechariah questions Gabriel, he replies “I am Gabriel, the one who stands before God, and I have been sent to speak to you” (ἐγὼ εἰμι Γαβριήλ ὁ παρεστηκὼς ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀπεστάλην λαλῆσαι πρὸς σέ, 1:19). The temple does not feature in Gabriel’s appearance to Mary, and there is no such explanation (1:26-37).

²⁰⁴ Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 136, Carlsson 2004 108.

²⁰⁵ The Greek text reads οἱ δὲ εἰς τὸν τέταρτον ἐπάνω τούτων ἅγιοί εἰσιν. Wright 2000: 147 translates, “But those in the fourth (heaven) above these are the holy ones,” as does Dean-Otting 1984: 90-91. Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 136 translate “But the heavens down to the fourth above these are holy,” referring to Ps 20 (LXX 19):7; Wis 9:10 and *1 En.* 15:3, which describe heaven as ἅγιος (p. 138). Wright

the causal clause beginning v. 4 (ὅτι) seems to indicate that it is the heavens that are holy, because of those who dwell there. If this is correct, the heavens constitute the sacred space of a temple. This sacred space exhibits decreasing levels of holiness from the top to the bottom. Just as in the wilderness tabernacle and the Jerusalem temple, there are decreasing degrees of holiness the further away one travels from the holy of holies.²⁰⁶

In the seven temple schema in *T. Levi*, the following verses describe these decreasing levels of holiness. “In the uppermost heaven” (ἐν τῷ ἀνωτέρῳ πάντων) “the great glory” (ἡ μεγάλη δόξα)²⁰⁷ “rests” (καταλύει). While this word normally refers to a temporary stay,²⁰⁸ it echoes the expression κατάλυμα ἅγιος (“holy dwelling”) used to describe the ultimate goal of the Exodus in Exod 15:13. This is the heavenly temple, further specified as being ἐν ἁγίῳ ἁγίων ὑπεράνω πάσης ἁγιότητος (“in the holy of holies, above all holiness”),²⁰⁹ that is “the innermost part of the heavenly temple.”²¹⁰

Verse 5 describes the inhabitants of the sixth heaven²¹¹ as οἱ ἄγγελοι ... τοῦ προσώπου κυρίου (“angels of the presence of the Lord”).²¹² These angels are first described in v. 5 with two participles describing them as “ministers” (λειτουργοῦντες) who “make atonement to the Lord for the sins of ignorance of the righteous” (ἐξιλασκόμενοι πρὸς κύριον ἐπὶ πάσαις ταῖς ἀγνοίαις τῶν δικαίων).²¹³ The verb

argues that the inhabitants of heaven are holy, rather than the heavens themselves, and that the οἱ δέ in 3:3 sets up a contrast between these and the powers in the third heaven. Wright’s reading recognises that οἱ δέ usually indicates a change to a new subject (Moulton and Turner 1963: 37)—the angels in contrast to the powers in the third heaven (v 3a)—and that εἰς is sometimes equivalent to ἐν (1963: 254–55, BDAG 289, s.v. εἰς 1. a. δ and 1.b. β). For angels designated as οἱ ἅγιοι see Job 5:1; 15:15; Dan 7:21; Tob 11:14; *1 En.* 1:9; 14:22–23, 25; Mark 8:38; Luke 9:26; Rev 14:10; Jude 14.

²⁰⁶ For a similar schema see *Asc. Isa.* 7–10

²⁰⁷ For other uses of this epithet for God see *1 En.* 14:19; 25:3, 7; 47:3; 102:3.

²⁰⁸ For this sense of καταλύω see BDAG 522, s.v. καταλύω 4. This word appears in this sense several times in the LXX, but never with God as the subject. The word derives from κατάλυμα (BDAG 521), which has the sense of a lodging place or guest room, that is, a place where one finds rest and hospitality (Louw and Nida 1988: 1: 454). The notion of a temporary place to stay is clear in Luke 9:12; 19:7. In the LXX see Gen 19:2; 24:23, 25; Sir 14:25, 27; 36:27.

²⁰⁹ For the expression ὁ ἅγιος τῶν ἁγίων see Exod 26:33–4; 1 Kings 6:16. The expression τὰ τῶν ἁγίων ἅγια appears in *3 Bar.* Prologue 2, and in *2 Bar.* 34:1 it appears as a metonym for the (destroyed) earthly temple. In *Sib. Or.* 3.308 God comes to punish Babylon “from heaven, his holy realm” (ἀπ’ οὐρανόθεν ... ἐξ ἁγίων, translation Buitenwerf 2003: 216). The expression ὁ ἅγιος τῶν ἁγίων appears in Heb 9:3 and as a variant reading (MS P) in Heb 9:12.

²¹⁰ Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 138; Himmelfarb 1993: 31, 33.

²¹¹ It is not referred to specifically as the sixth heaven, but the one “after” the highest (μετά with accusative, see BDAG 637, s.v., μετά B), as the angel describes the heavens in descending order.

²¹² For this expression see 1QSb IV 25–26, where the high priest prays that he will become as an angel of the presence, with the angels of the presence; 1QH^a XIV 13, where these angels have direct access to God; and *Jub.* 30:14; 31:14, where Levi is exalted to serve in the sanctuary as the angels of the presence.

²¹³ The entire expression οἱ λειτουργοῦντες καὶ ἐξιλασκόμενοι πρὸς κύριον ἐπὶ πάσαις ταῖς ἀγνοίαις τῶν δικαίων is governed by a single definite article, indicating not two bodies of angels of the presence, but one with these functions (BDF 144–45, § 276). See Gen 26:10; Lev 5:18; 22:14; Ps 25:7 (MT

ἐξιλάσκομαι does not appear in the NT, but is frequent in the LXX with a technical sense of “make atonement for” or “propitiate.”²¹⁴ λειτουργέω is used in secular contexts for a variety of public services, but in the LXX this too is a technical term for the service of priests and Levites in the temple.²¹⁵ In 2:10 Levi is described as the Lord’s λειτουργός indicating some connection between what these angels do before God, what Levi will do when exalted to the priesthood and what the earthly priests do.²¹⁶

In the following verse the function of the angels of the presence is described with a verb in the present indicative. They “offer to the Lord a pleasing, spiritual fragrance, and a bloodless offering” (προσφέρουσι δὲ κυρίῳ ὁσμὴν εὐωδίας λογικὴν καὶ ἀναίμακτον προσφοράν).²¹⁷ The words λογικός and ἀναίμακτος make it clear that these are not animal offerings.²¹⁸ While the language of atonement is used, it appears not to be achieved by animal sacrifice.²¹⁹

Similar words appear in Hebrews with similar cultic connotations. In 2:17 Jesus is said to have become “like his brothers and sisters in every respect” (κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὁμοιωθῆναι) “in order to become a faithful and merciful high priest and to

25:6; LXX 24:6); Ezek 40:39; 42:13; 44:29; 46:20 for ἄγνοια referring to “sin of ignorance.” In the Ezekiel texts the term is used for “guilt-offering” (NRSV). It is not used in this precise sense in the NT, but see Acts 3:17; 17:30; Eph 4:18; 1 Pet 1:14. See also *Ps. Sol.* 3:8 for ἐξιλάσκομαι used with ἄγνοια, although in that context atonement is made outside the cult, ἐν νηστεία καὶ ταπεινώσει ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ (“by fasting and humbling his soul”).

²¹⁴ BDAG 350; Muraoka 2002: 197-98, s.v. ἐξιλάσκομαι, 1-6; Lust, Eynikel and Hauspie 2003: 215. See e.g. Exod 30:10, 15, 16; Lev 1:4 and several times in Lev 16 in connection with the Day of Atonement ceremony.

²¹⁵ BDAG 591, s.v. λειτουργέω 1, a. See Exod 28:35, 43; 29:30; 30:20; 35:19; 36:33; 38:27; 39:11, 12; Num 1:50; 3:6, 31; 4:3, 9, 12, 14, 23, 24, 26, 30, 35, 37, 39, 41, 43; 8:22, 26; 16:9; 18:2, 6, 7; 18:21, 23; Deut 10:8; 17:12; 18:5, 7; 1 Kgdms 2:11, 18; 3:1; 3 Kgdms 8:11; 4 Kgdms 25:14; 1 Chron 6:17; 15:2; 16:4, 37; 23:13, 28, 32; 26:12; 2 Chron 5:14; 8:4; 11:14; 13:10; 23:6; 29:11; 31:2; 35:3; Joel 1:9, 13; 2:17; Jer 52:18; Ezek 40:46; 42:14; 43:19; 44:11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 19, 27; 45:4, 5; 46:14; Jdt 4:14; 1 Macc 10:42; Sir 4:14; 24:10; 45:15.

²¹⁶ Brooke 1993: 84.

²¹⁷ This translation is from Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 136. For the sense of “spiritual” for λογικός see BDAG 598, who note that with this sense the term contrasts with “literal.” See also Rom 12:1. For ἀναίμακτος (“bloodless”) see LSJ 105.

²¹⁸ De Jonge 1953: 49 notes that this notion expresses Christian sentiments, and that ἀναίμακτον προσφοράν is a “Christian *terminus technicus*,” referring in the first place to prayer and later to the Eucharist. He lists several patristic sources that corroborate this judgement. See also Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 138. The idea of bloodless sacrifice appears in Athenagoras, *Leg.* 13; Eusebius *D. E.* 1, 6, 29, 50; Origen *Cels.* 8:21; *Const. App.* 2: 25.7; 6: 23.5; 8:5, 7; Cyril of Alexandria on Heb 5:5; and Ambrosius, *De sacramentis* 4.6, 27. In some cases, the reference is to prayer and in others to the Eucharist (see PGL 104, 659-60 for numerous other patristic sources, and Fletcher-Louis 2002: 272-73). It is difficult to understand this particular text as a reference to the Eucharist being celebrated in heaven. It is clear that animal sacrifice is not in view and it is more likely that the offerings are prayers.

²¹⁹ Gäbel 2006: 48 notes that this is the only reference to a heavenly sacrificial cult in early Jewish literature prior to 70 C.E., suggesting that it might be a Christian interpolation. See also *Sbir. Shabb* (11Q17 IX 4-5) and the function of the future priest in 4QapocrLevi^b 9 I 2 (although this is unlikely to take place in heaven).

make atonement for the sins of the people” (εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ). This atonement was made by the “offering” (προσφέρω) of himself, a word which appears twenty times in Hebrews, with cultic connotations in nineteen of these.²²⁰ Where it has cultic connotations, it refers to the multiple offerings of the former priests, which are compared with the single self-offering of Jesus. It is debated whether this offering takes place on earth (the cross), or in the heavenly sanctuary, or simultaneously both in heaven and on earth. I will argue below that the self-offering of Jesus takes place on the cross, and that he subsequently enters the heavenly sanctuary (διὰ ... τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος, “by means of his own blood,” that is, his death).²²¹

Verse 7 describes the fifth heaven, where there are angels who bear “answers” to the angels of the presence (in the sixth heaven).²²² The fourth heaven contains another class of angels,²²³ described as “thrones, and powers” (θρόνοι, ἐξουσίαι),²²⁴ among whom hymns of praise are offered to God.²²⁵

This part of *T. Levi* evidences a hierarchy of angels serving God in various capacities in the various heavens. The text has a developed concept of heaven that is made up of several layers, with increasing levels of holiness and priestly angels with functions that also reflect their relative proximity to God. It is not possible to infer from *T. Levi* that heaven somehow corresponds to the earthly temple, as the description of heaven surpasses a simple bicameral sanctuary.

Detail like this is absent from Hebrews. There is no hierarchy of angels, nor are there any enumerated heavens with increasing levels of holiness. Jesus is described in one text as

²²⁰ The word has cultic connotations in Heb 5:1, 3; 8:3, 4; 9:7, 9, 14, 25, 28; 10:1, 2, 8, 11, 12; 11:4, 17. In Heb 5:7 Jesus “offers” δεήσεις τε καὶ ἱκετηρίας (“entreaties and prayers”). Attridge 1989: 149 considers this to be a metaphorical use of προσφέρω, while Lane 1991a: 119-20 notes that in this contexts it has frequently been given cultic connotations, paralleling the offerings of the former priests described in 5:1, 3. In 12:7 the word has the sense of “treat” (ὥς υἱοῖς ὑμῖν προσφέρεται ὁ θεός, “for God is treating you as sons [and daughters]”).

²²¹ See 8.6.2 (below).

²²² See 3 Bar. 12:1-8 for angels bringing “the virtues of the righteous” (αἱ ἀρεταὶ τῶν δικαίων) to Michael, the highest archangel dwelling in the fifth heaven.

²²³ For classes of angels see 1 En. 61:10; 2 En. 20:1; Asc. Isa. 7:21, 27 (see Knibb 1985: 166, footnote m in Asc. Isa. 7:14) T. Sol. 20:15; T. Adam 4:4, 8; Eph 1:21; Col 1:16.

²²⁴ For this sense of θρόνος see BDAG 460, s.v., θρόνος, 2 (“a supreme power over a political entity”). For this usage see 1 Clem. 65:2; Mart. Pol. 21. While the term does not appear, the ideas are also present in Dan 10:13, 20.

²²⁵ For praises offered to God see Ps 50 (LXX 49):14, 23; 107 (LXX 106): 22; Hos 14:3; Philo, Plant, 126; Let Aris 234; Heb 13:15; Justin Dial. 117, and for this offering by angels see Isa 6:3; 1 En. 40:3-4; 61:10-13; 2 En. 17; 19:6; 21:1; 3 Bar. 10:7; Asc. Isa. 7:15-17, Ap. Zeph. in Clement of Alexandria, Strom. 5:11 (77.2); Cyril of Alexandria on Heb 5:5, b. Hag. 12b.

“traversing the heavens” (διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, 4:14),²²⁶ and in another as being “exalted above the heavens” (ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος, 7:25).²²⁷

4.4.1.2. *T. Levi* 5:1-3

These verses form the climax of Levi’s heavenly journey.²²⁸ Immediately prior to his return to earth to execute vengeance upon Shechem, Levi recounts that the angel opened the gates of heaven and he saw “the holy temple” (τὸν ναὸν τὸν ἅγιον) and “the Most High upon a glorious throne” (καὶ ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης τὸν ὑψιστον).²²⁹ God addresses Levi and gives him the blessing of the priesthood (σοὶ δέδωκα τὰς εὐλογίας τῆς ἱερατείας).²³⁰

There are several differences between this text and *T. Levi* 3:3-4, where God is said to dwell in the uppermost heaven. Here, there appears to be only one “heaven” (οὐρανός, singular),²³¹ and the description of God is different. In 3:4 God is described as ἡ μεγάλη δόξα (“the great glory”), “dwelling” (καταλύω) “in the holy of holies, above all holiness” (ἐν ἁγίῳ ἁγίων ὑπεράνω πάσης ἁγιότητος). Here, God is “the Most High” (ὁ

²²⁶ NRSV renders διέρχομαι here with “passed through.” I argue below (8.2) that the perfect participle acts as an adjective, and that the OT background for this verb is the hithpael of פָּתַח.

²²⁷ I discuss the use of the singular and the plural of οὐρανός below (8.2). There is no indication that the author conceived of different layers of heaven.

²²⁸ Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 144. Dean-Otting 1984: 83 notes the similar themes in 2:1-5 and 5:1-7, indicating the “original unity of these two parts.” For a vision of God as the climax of a heavenly journey see *1 En.* 14:18-23; *2 En.* 22.

²²⁹ There is some debate as to whether Levi enters heaven, as in *T. Levi* 2:6, or simply looks through the opened gates. In 2:6 the heavens are opened, he is invited to enter, but he goes no further than the second heaven (2:7) from where he views the remaining heavens. Here, the angel opens the gates of heaven and Levi sees God enthroned in heaven. De Jonge 1974: 138-39, writes “the angel obviously gives Levi access to the highest heaven where the Most High dwells, previously described as the highest heaven (III,4).” Kugel 1993: 27 refers to Levi’s entrance into heaven in the vision of *T. Levi* 2-3, 5 and notes that he does not enter heaven in the vision of *T. Levi* 8 (which seems unconnected with heaven). On the other hand Nickelsburg 1981: 588 states, “The angel opens the gates of heaven (*T. Levi* 5:1; cf. 4QEn^c 1 6:4 [4Q204]), and he sees—but does not enter—the temple in which God is enthroned (cf. *1 En.* 14:15-25).” For the gate of heaven see *T. Levi* 2:6; 4QLev^b 2 18; Gen 28:17; 3 Macc 6:18; *1 En.* 9:2, 10; *ApZerub*; Rev 4:1. In *3 Bar.* 2:2, 5; 3:1; 6:13; 11:2, 5; 15:1; *1 En.* 14:12, 15, 25 there are doors to different parts of heaven.

²³⁰ Kugel 1993: 27-28 suggests that the visions of heaven are primary in this part of *T. Levi*, and that Levi’s own role is somewhat secondary, since the priesthood is only mentioned in 5:2, in what he refers to as a “Christian remark”—Levi has the priesthood until God comes to dwell in the midst of Israel—which he reads with reference to Jesus Christ, as do Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 143-44 (see below). For a related, but different, tradition concerning Levi receiving the priesthood in a dream see *Jub.* 32:1 and *T. Levi* 8-9 (where Levi has a second dream, and Jacob also has a dream concerning Levi’s elevation to the priesthood). For the complexity surrounding these traditions see Kugel 1993: 8-10.

²³¹ This is the eighth heaven in Dean-Otting’s reconstruction (Dean-Otting 1984: 80, 87). De Jonge 1974: 138-39 suggests that the singular οὐρανός may correspond to the expression שְׁמַיָּא תַּרְעִי in 4QLev^b (4Q213a) 1 II 18 (*ALD* 4:6). Drawnel 2004: 104 translates “gates of heavens,” although the substantive שְׁמַיָּא is an emphatic plural corresponding to Hebrew שָׁמַיִם (Jastrow 1989: 1595b). Greenfield, Stone and Eshel 2004: 67 translate “gates of heaven,” and note that this is a point of contact between *ALD* and *T. Levi* (5:1). Stone 2003: 434-37 discusses the relationship between *ALD* and *T. Levi* in general, and at this point in particular. See also Himmelfarb 1993: 30-33.

ὑψιστος),²³² enthroned on “a throne of glory” (θρόνος δόξης). While it is clear from other texts that the heavenly sanctuary is a throne room where God is enthroned,²³³ the cultic symbolism has disappeared from the description and the notion of God’s sovereignty has come into the foreground. There is no correspondence here with the earthly sanctuary; rather, this vision presupposes OT call narratives, as is appropriate given Levi’s appointment to the priesthood in the immediate context.²³⁴

It seems that *T. Levi* 2-5 is a composite account of Levi’s heavenly journey, some of which has its origins in Aramaic Levi.²³⁵ In one strand of the tradition Levi is taken on a tour through the heavens. The upper heavens are described in cultic terms, and the angel tells him that he will receive the blessing of the priesthood (4:2-3). In the other strand, he sees, and perhaps enters, the heavenly throne room where the Most High is enthroned and he is given the priesthood (5:2). In both cases the priesthood is a temporary endowment, awaiting the coming of Christ. Hebrews 7:11-28 also argues that the Levitical priesthood is a temporary measure, although written as it is from the perspective of the exaltation of Christ (1:1-4), the end of the Levitical priesthood is not anticipated, but seen as already having taken place with the advent of Christ as a priest who is superior in every way.²³⁶

4.4.2 An Eschatological Temple in the *Testaments*

Several texts in the *Testaments* predict a new, pure and more glorious eschatological temple, with the implication that the second temple that it will replace has been defiled. These references are usually connected with the writings of Enoch.²³⁷

²³² The word ὑψιστος is relatively common in the LXX as an epithet for God. It appears four times in the Melchizedek story (Gen 14:18, 19, 20, 22), translating עֲלִיּוֹן, and elsewhere only in poetic texts in the OT (Num 14:16; Deut 32:8; 2 Sam 22:14; Ps 7:18 (MT 7:17); 9:2 (MT 9:3); 18:13 (MT 18:14); 21:7 (MT 21:8); 46:4 (MT 46:5); 47:2 (MT 47:3); 50:14; 57:2 (MT 57:3); 73:11; 77:10 (MT 77:11); 78:17, 35, 58; 82:6; 83:18 (MT 83:19); 87:5; 91:1, 9; 92:1 (MT 92:2); 97:9; 107:11; Isa 14:14; Lam 3:35). The Aramaic adjective 'על appears ten times in Daniel, four as an adjective qualifying אלהא (God, 3:26, 32; 5:18, 21) and six times absolutely as a divine name (4:14, 21, 22, 29, 31; 7:25). In the NT ὑψιστος refers to God in Mark 5:7; Luke 1:32, 35, 76; 6:35; 8:28; Acts 7:48; 16:17; Heb 7:1. In the DSS it appears in CD XX 8; 1QH^a XII 32; XIV 36; 1QS X 12; XI 15, all as a divine epithet, and is the most common name for God in Sirach. After κύριος, ὑψιστος is the most common divine name, and implies uniqueness, see Zobel 2001: 121-39.

²³³ For “throne of glory” see Jer 14:21; 17:12; Wis 9:10; *1 En.* 9:4. For the throne of God in the heavenly sanctuary see Rev 16:17; Heb 8:2. For the notion of God’s throne see 1 Kings 22:19; Isa 6:1; Ezek 1:26; Ps 47:9 (LXX 46:8, EVV 47:8); *1 En.* 14:18-23; *2 En.* 22:2; *T. Mos.* 4:2.

²³⁴ Gäbel 2006: 48. On call narratives see the discussion of *1 En.* 14:8-23 (4.2.1.4, above). Carlsson 2004: 111-13 details several similarities between *T. Levi* 3-4 and Isa 6 (although Isaiah is a prophet rather than a priest).

²³⁵ Kugler 1996: 181-82 considers that *T. Levi* 2:7-9, with its multiple heavens, was “clumsily inserted into the original *Testament of Levi* sometime after the document’s initial composition.” He also considers that when 2:7-4:1 is deleted “the narrative flow of Levi’s first vision is coherent” (p. 182).

²³⁶ Given the late dating of the *Testaments* in their present form (see 4.4, above), this part of *T. Levi* is probably a literary fiction containing *vaticinia ex eventu* concerning the coming of Jesus.

²³⁷ Enoch is frequently mentioned as an authority who predicts that the descendants of the Patriarchs will fall into sin. See *T. Sim.* 5:4; *T. Levi* 10:5; 14:1; 16:1; *T. Jud.* 18:1; *T. Dan* 5:6; *T. Naph.* 4:1; *T. Zebu.* 3:4. See

4.4.2.1 *T. Levi*

While *T. Levi* does not specifically refer to the eschatological temple, there are three references to the defiling of the second temple. The first is in *T. Levi* 10:5 and is connected with the wickedness of Levi's descendants and their exile. In 10:2 Levi predicts that they will transgress “against the saviour of the world” (εἰς τὸν σωτῆρα τοῦ κόσμου) “acting impiously” (ἀσεβέω).²³⁸ This will lead to exile “since the Lord will not bear Jerusalem” (ὥστε μὴ βασιτάξαι τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ) on account of their sin, and will tear apart “the covering of the temple” (σχίσαι τὸ ἔνδυμα τοῦ ναοῦ).²³⁹ The reason for God's judgement against Jerusalem and the temple is given in 10:5, “For the house which the Lord will choose, will be called Jerusalem (ὁ γὰρ οἶκος, ὃν ἂν ἐκλέξεται κύριος, Ἱερουσαλήμ κληθήσεται), as the book of Enoch the righteous contains.”²⁴⁰ The sense of this causal clause is not immediately clear, but probably indicates the uniqueness of Jerusalem as chosen by God as the temple-city where his name is set.²⁴¹ If God's name is defiled by their actions, God's name will be removed. The reference to the writings of Enoch may be to the Animal Apocalypse, although Jerusalem is not specifically named there.²⁴²

Another passage that mentions Enoch extends from *T. Levi* 14:1–15:4. Here Levi knows from the writing of Enoch that at the end his descendants will “act impiously against the Lord” (ἀσεβήσετε ἐπὶ κύριον). There is significant Christian material in this part of *T. Levi* and the details concern the treatment of Christ by the priestly hierarchy (vv. 1-4). But this is not all. In v. 5 Levi predicts that they will steal from the offerings, eat with prostitutes and teach out of covetousness. Then, in v. 6 he predicts that they will engage in all sorts of sexual impropriety, even to the extent of taking wives from the Gentiles.²⁴³ The

also 4QLevi^a 3-4 6 which reads קבל[ח] הלא (“did not Enoch accuse”). The semantic range of קבל also includes the sense of “receive” (HALOT 1965-66). The context in 4QLevi^a, with its references to the descendants of Levi forsaking the paths of justice, tends to favour the sense of “accuse,” although the lacunae in the MS make the sense uncertain.

²³⁸ Kee 1983: 792 reads “[against Christ, the savior of the world]” (square brackets original). While Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 160 identify the saviour of the world with Jesus Christ, there seems to be no textual justification for Kee to include it in the text. Ἀσεβέω expresses the idea of violating “the norms of a proper or professed relation to deity” (BDAG 141).

²³⁹ A similar expression appears in *T. Benj.* 9:4, ἔσται τὸ ἄπλωμα τοῦ ναοῦ σχιζόμενον (“and the covering of the temple will be torn”). The context there is the crucifixion of Christ and reflects Matt 27:51. Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 79-81 read *T. Levi* 10:3 as a further reference to the tearing of the veil of the temple and attribute the use of the term ἔνδυμα (“clothing”) to the interpretation, “so as not to cover your shame” (ὥστε μὴ κατακαλύπτειν ἀσχημοσύνην ὑμῶν). See also Kee 1983: 792, footnote b.

²⁴⁰ Translation from Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 159.

²⁴¹ Deut 12; 2 Kings 21:7; 23:27; 2 Chron 6:34, 38; 33:7; Tob 1:4.

²⁴² 1 En. 89:40, 50, 54, 56, 66, 72.

²⁴³ On this text and its antecedents in *ALD* see Himmelfarb 1999a: 11-12. Milik 1976: 23 suggests some relationship between what is now 4QLevi^a 3 and *T. Levi* 14:1-3, although there are considerable differences between the two texts. See also De Jonge 1991: 183-85; Kugler 1996: 187-88; Greenfield, Stone and Eshel 2004: 216; Drawnel 2004: 37; 245-46.

outcome of this activity is explained in 15:1, “Because of these things the temple which the Lord will choose will be desolate in uncleanness” (διὰ ταῦτα ὁ ναός, ὃν ἂν ἐκλέξῃται κύριος, ἔρημος ἔσται ἐν ἀκαθαρσίᾳ) and they will be exiled among the Gentiles. There is no promise of restoration. Rather, the text ends with an expression of God’s faithfulness to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, without whom there would be no descendants of Levi left on the earth. Here, the reference to the writings of Enoch is combined with predictions of priestly impropriety with women and the desolation of the temple.²⁴⁴ The theme of dissatisfaction with the priesthood leading to the desolation of the temple is clear.

The final reference to Enoch in *T. Levi* is in 16:1-5. Here, Levi learns from the book of Enoch that they will go astray for seventy weeks.²⁴⁵ There follows a long catalogue of their sins, beginning with “desecrating the priesthood and defiling the sacrifices” (τὴν ἱερωσύνην βεβηλώσετε καὶ τὰς θυσίας μιανεῖτε). Ultimately, their wickedness will lead them to kill “a man who renews the law in the power of the Most High” (ἄνδρα ἀνακαινοποιῶντα νόμον ἐν δυνάμει ὑψίστου), a further reference to Jesus Christ (v. 3),²⁴⁶ because of whom “the sanctuary” (τὰ ἅγια) “will be desolate and razed to the ground” (ἔσται ἔρημα ... ἕως ἐδάφους μεμιαμμένα).²⁴⁷ This text attributes the fall of Jerusalem to the rejection of Christ by the religious leaders who are the descendants of Levi. The chapter ends with a prediction that they will be scattered among the Gentiles, where they will be a curse until the return of the Messiah, who will receive them “through faith and water” (ἐν πίστει καὶ ὕδατι), a reference to Christian baptism.²⁴⁸

4.4.2.2 *T. Dan* 5:4-13

In *T. Dan* 5:6 Dan explains to his descendants that he had read in the book of Enoch, the righteous one, that their ruler was Satan and that all the spirits of “impurity” (πορνεία) and insolence would obey Levi “to serve” (παρεδρεύω)²⁴⁹ the sons of Levi to make them

²⁴⁴ There is no clear text in *1 Enoch* that the writer refers to (VanderKam 1995a: 145); nevertheless, the underlying theology of Enoch, especially in BW and the Animal Apocalypse, seem to have informed the writer of the *Testaments*.

²⁴⁵ There is no reference to seventy weeks in *1 Enoch*, although seventy generations appears in *1 En.* 10:12. The words **בשבעים השבוע** (“in the seventieth week”) appear in 4Q181 2 5 (for this line numbering see Milik 1976: 249, it is line 3 in Allegro 1968: 80). Milik, p. 251 claims that 4Q180 and 4Q181 are copies of the same document (4Q *Ages of Creation*), although Strugnell 1969-71: 252-55 finds the relationship between the two documents difficult to define, and there is no indication of this in Allegro 1968: 77-81. The combined document refers twice to **עזאזל** (“Azaz’el”), thus there is some connection to *1 Enoch*, although given the fragmentary nature of the manuscripts the relationship is unclear. See also Puech 1993: 526-31; Black and VanderKam 1985: 137. The same schema underlies the seventy shepherds of Enoch’s Animal Apocalypse, see Hengel 1974: 187; VanderKam 1984a: 164-67.

²⁴⁶ Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 172.

²⁴⁷ The translation “razed to the ground” is from Kee 1983: 794.

²⁴⁸ Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 173. Nowhere does Enoch predict a diaspora among the nations (VanderKam 1995a: 145).

²⁴⁹ This word has cultic connotations in some contexts, see BDAG 773. See 1 Cor 9:13. In Prov 1:21; 8:3 it is used of Wisdom taking a stand in “High Street.”

sin before the Lord. Again, there is no specific text in *1 Enoch* that has this as its focus, but the reference to πορνεία reflects the sexual impropriety that occupies much of *1 Enoch*.²⁵⁰

This wickedness results in exile (vv. 7-8), followed by a return to the Lord, who will bring them “into his sanctuary” (εἰς τὸ ἁγίασμα αὐτοῦ). Verse 12 expands on this, referring to “holy ones resting in Eden” (ἀναπαύσονται ἐν Ἑδὲμ ἅγιοι), and “righteous ones rejoicing in the new Jerusalem” (ἐπὶ τῆς νέας Ἱερουσαλὴμ εὐφρανθήσονται δίκαιοι). Rest in Eden and rejoicing in the New Jerusalem are evidence of the combination of eschatology and protology that reflects Eden as a sanctuary and the new Jerusalem as the return to the conditions of Eden.²⁵¹

Verse 13 proclaims safety for Jerusalem and security for Israel, with “the Lord in the midst of her” (Κύριος ἔσται ἐμμέσῳ αὐτῆς), “living together with people and the Holy One of Israel reigning over them” (τοῖς ἀνθρώποις συναναστροφόμενος, καὶ ἅγιος Ἰσραὴλ βασιλεύων ἐπ’ αὐτούς).²⁵²

There are allusions to Exod 15:17-18 in this part of *T. Dan*, with the Lord bringing his people to his “sanctuary” (ἁγίασμα, Exod 15:17) and reigning over them (Exod 15:18). The sanctuary of the Exodus text is read in *T. Dan* as the eschatological sanctuary to be built by God, as in *Jubilees* and in some texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls.²⁵³

4.4.2.3 *T. Benj.* 9:1-5

This is a sin-exile-return passage that foretells deeds that are not good among the descendants of Benjamin, as foretold in the words of Enoch the righteous. The text explains that they will act with the impurity of Sodom and revive sensuality with women. God will immediately remove his kingdom from them. “Nevertheless, the temple of God will be in their portion” (πλὴν ἐν μερίδι ὑμῶν γενήσεται ὁ ναὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ). This expression probably refers to the New Jerusalem and an earthly eschatological temple in the territory of Benjamin.²⁵⁴ Following this, both Kee, and Hollander and De Jonge read a text that expresses the idea that “the last [temple] will be more glorious than the first.”²⁵⁵

²⁵⁰ For descendants of Dan causing a Levite to sin see Judg 18:11-30.

²⁵¹ See *Jub.* 4:26; *2 En.* 8; *3 En.* 23:18; *4 Ezra* 7:36; 8:52; *2 Bar.* 4:3-5; *Rev* 3:12; 21: 2; 22:2. See also Hofius 1970c: 64.

²⁵² Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 289.

²⁵³ *Jub* 1:17, 27-29; 11QTemple XXIX 7-9; 4QmidrEschat^a.

²⁵⁴ Deut 33:12; Josh 18:11-28. *Tg. Onq.*, *Tg. Ps-J.*, and *Tg. Neof.* Gen 49:27 all refer to the temple being built in the territory of Benjamin.

²⁵⁵ Kee 1983: 827; Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 434-35, see De Jonge 1978: 175 for the textual variants in this verse.

This refers not to the second temple replacing the first, but to the eschatological temple that God will build at the end of time.²⁵⁶

This selection of “Enoch” texts in the *Testaments* mostly evidences a preoccupation with sexual impropriety, together with resultant defilement of the temple. There is considerable Christian material, referring to the way the descendants of each patriarch will mistreat Jesus Christ, leading in several cases to the end of the temple, and in two cases to the prediction of an eschatological temple where God will dwell with his people. Given the proposed dating of the *Testaments*, the question needs to be asked whether these texts are grappling with the loss of the temple. If this is the case, the texts place the blame for the loss of the temple on the mistreatment of Christ by the Jewish leaders, and should therefore be read as polemic against Judaism using the important figure of Enoch to express this polemic. Hebrews is silent about the defilement of the temple. There, dissatisfaction with the temple is related to the repetitive nature of its sacrifices when compared with the superior sacrifice of Christ.

In *T. Dan* and *T. Benj.* the texts anticipate a glorious temple in the eschaton. The *Testament of Dan* combines eschatology with protology, referring to rest in Eden and *T. Benj.* places this eschatological temple in the territory of Benjamin. While Hebrews also anticipates an eschatological temple, this temple is no physical structure. Rather, it refers to the eschatological dwelling of God with his people, now inaugurated with the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God.

4.5 The *Testament of Moses*

The *Testament of Moses* (*T. Mos.*), also known as the *Assumption of Moses*,²⁵⁷ is extant in a single, damaged, partly illegible, Latin palimpsest discovered in Milan in 1861, probably dated from the fifth or sixth century.²⁵⁸ It is clearly a translation of a Greek original, since

²⁵⁶ Hollander and De Jonge 1985: 435. See Hag 2:9; Tob 14:5; *Jub* 1:17, 27-29; *1 En.* 90:29; *T. Dan* 5:12.

²⁵⁷ The title of the work is a complex issue. There appear to have been at least two Moses apocrypha which were bound together: the *Testament of Moses* and the *Assumption of Moses* (Davila 2005b: 149-52). On the basis of a sixth century fragment that quotes *T. Mos.* 1:14 referring to it as the *Assumption of Moses* (ἀναλήψεως μωσεώς, for the text see Bauckham 1990: 260), Tromp 1993: 115-16 continues to refer to the extant work by that name (noting that the title “Testament of Moses” was sometimes associated with *Jubilees*), as do Rhoads 1973; Sweet 1984: 601-602; Muddiman 2007: 169 and many others, although Tromp 1993: 115 does concur that it “displays the characteristics of a testament.” Given the nature of the work, a number of scholars now refer to it as the *Testament of Moses*. See Kolenkow 1973: 71-72; Nickelsburg 1973b: 11-12; 2005a: 363 (footnote 33); Collins 1984b: 344-46; Bauckham 1990: 236; Grierson 2008: 266-74. Discussion of the source of the citation in Jude 9 and its relationship with the extant document is outside my scope. See Bauckham 1983a: 65-76; 1990: 235-80 and the critique of Bauckham’s arguments in Muddiman 2007: 174-80 and Grierson 2008: 266-74. I am concerned with this text because it was apparently a living document in the early decades of the first century C.E. and records certain attitudes to the temple and the priesthood.

²⁵⁸ Charles 1913a: 409; Zeitlin 1947: 1; Nickelsburg 1973b: 5; Priest 1983: 919; Collins 1984b: 344; Tromp 1993: 87-88; Hofmann 2000: 12.

several Greek words appear transliterated into Latin characters;²⁵⁹ although some scholars consider that the Greek was translated from a Semitic original, which was either Hebrew or Aramaic.²⁶⁰ Since the only city mentioned is Jerusalem and since there is no reference to the diaspora, the place of writing is probably Palestine.²⁶¹ The MS is incomplete and the extent of what is missing is unknown.²⁶²

Licht suggests that it was composed in Maccabean times and updated between 4 B.C.E (the death of Herod the Great) and 30 C.E. with the insertion of chapters 6-7.²⁶³ This theory was developed by Nickelsburg, who continues to maintain it,²⁶⁴ although Tromp has mounted a strong case for literary integrity and a date around the turn of the era (4 B.C.E.–30 C.E.).²⁶⁵ While no consensus has emerged on the question of literary integrity,

²⁵⁹ Grierson 2008: 274-75; Hofmann 2000: 12.

²⁶⁰ Charles 1913a: 410; Priest 1983: 920. Collins 1984b: 345; Nickelsburg 2005a: 77. Tromp 1993: 78-86 concludes that the evidence for a Semitic original is “extremely weak and unconvincing.” Grierson 2008: 275 dismisses the suggestion of a Semitic original as unnecessary, suggesting that the author used “biblicizing Greek when writing about a biblical character.” See also Hofmann 2000: 13-15.

²⁶¹ Tromp 1993: 117; Hofmann 2000: 12-13.

²⁶² Sweet 1984: 601; Grierson 2008: 266. Priest 1983: 919 opines that around one third to one half has been lost.

²⁶³ Licht 1961: 100-103. *T. Mos.* 6:2-6 tells of “an impudent king” (*rex petulans*) who will reign for thirty-four years, and v. 6 explains that his sons will reign for “shorter periods” (*breviora tempora*). This detail would have been written sometime within thirty-four years of Herod’s death in 4 B.C.E. For the historical details surrounding Herod and his successors see Josephus *Ant.* 17.188-99. Licht (pp. 100-102) also shows that the theory propounded by Charles 1913a: 420 that chapters 8-9 had been transposed from between chapters 5-6 to be untenable, giving the book “neither meaning nor message.” Charles places chapters 6-7 referring to Roman times, after chapter 9 which appears to refer to the persecution under Antiochus IV, thus repairing what he considered to be faulty chronology. Lattey 1942: 11-12 agrees in part with Charles, but argues that only chapter 8 has been displaced, since chapter 10 flows naturally after chapter 9. Collins 1976: 179-86 detects redactional activity in 10:8 with the reference to an eagle reflecting the action of certain young men pulling down the image of an eagle from over the gate of the temple (see Josephus *Ant.* 17.149-67).

²⁶⁴ Nickelsburg 1972 (now 2006: 7, 61-64); 1973a: 33-37; 2005a: 74-77, 247-47; Carlson 1982: 85; Priest 1983: 920-21, 930. Collins 1973a: 18-30, who originally argued for literary integrity and composition in 4 B.C.E., later adopted Licht’s theory (1973b: 38-43; 1984b: 347-48; 1998: 129).

²⁶⁵ Tromp 1993: 116-17. For a thorough review of the arguments and counter-arguments see Hofmann 2000: 21-26. Goldstein 1973: 44-47 also argues for literary integrity, but dates the entire work in the time of Antiochus IV.

Tromp's dating has been adopted by more recent scholars,²⁶⁶ although still strongly contested by Nickelsburg.²⁶⁷ This date precludes Christian provenance.²⁶⁸

The text takes the form of a testament, a death-bed retelling of Israel's history from the perspective of Deut 31-34.²⁶⁹ Moses the seer gives Joshua an *ex eventu* prophecy of the history of God's people up to post-exilic times, including the crisis of the Maccabean era. Finally (in the extant form of the work), that crisis is brought to bear on the present situation of the people of Israel under Roman domination.²⁷⁰ This heralds the beginning of the eschaton (10:1).²⁷¹ Chapter 10 relates the vindication of God's people in cosmic terms, and chapters 11-12 revert to the end of the life of Moses, with Joshua responding to the revelation in appropriate terms and Moses giving him a final charge to remain faithful to the Torah.

The text evidences a high regard for Solomon's temple and the wilderness tabernacle. The tabernacle appears three times: in 1:7, Joshua is appointed to be Moses' successor for the people and for "the tent of witness with all its holy objects" (*scene testimonii cum omnibus sanctis illius*);²⁷² in an apparent allusion to Deut 31:14-23 in 1:9, Joshua's commission takes place "in the tabernacle" (*in scenae*); and in 2:3-4 where, after being ruled by kings and

²⁶⁶ Hofmann 2000: 28-30; Grierson 2008: 275-77. Charles 1913a: 411 argues for a date between 7-30 C.E., and Lattey 1942: 13 for a date close to 30 C.E.. Zeitlin 1947: 9-12; 27-37 argues for a date around the Bar Kochba revolt (132-135 C.E.), but this has not found any acceptance. Indeed, the prediction of *T. Mos.* 3:9 that Israel will never fail from the land that God promised them could hardly have been written after 70 C.E. (assuming a date after 586 B.C.E.), and Collins 1973a: 15 argues that if the fall of the temple had happened when this "review of history" was written, it would almost certainly have been mentioned. Moreover, 1:17-18 and 8:5 suggest that the temple was still standing. Of course, the date depends on whether literary integrity is accepted. If so, a date in the first third of the first century C.E. is adopted for the entire work, while if not, this date is for the final form of the work, after the addition of material referring to Herod and his sons.

²⁶⁷ Nickelsburg 2005a: 74, 363 (footnote 34).

²⁶⁸ Davila 2005b: 149-54. Numerous suggestions have been made as to which sector of Judaism it emanates from (see e.g. Zeitlin 1947: 4, 12-21), but the complexity of Judaism at the time precludes precise identification (Priest 1983: 919-20; Grierson 2008: 278-79). Sweet 1984: 604 finds no trace of any Christian influence.

²⁶⁹ Harrington 1973: 59-66. Nickelsburg 2006: 43-44 discerns the pattern of sin-punishment-repentance and salvation that he finds in Deut 31-34 represented in *T. Mos.*, but as Harrington 1973: 64-65 notes there is nothing in *T. Mos.* to correspond to the repentance phase of this schema, and the restoration (or vindication) is the result of the intercession of significant people such as Moses, Daniel and the enigmatic Taxo (*T. Mos.* 9:1).

²⁷⁰ Nickelsburg 2005a: 247-48. Assuming the integrity of the work, the reference to Herod and his descendants 6:1-9, followed by the end times, precedes what looks like the Maccabean crisis. The author has read that crisis as a paradigm of God's judgement on his people for their sins, and "foretells" that it will happen again under the rule of Rome (see Schreiber 2001: 259-60).

²⁷¹ Schreiber 2001: 258. This appears to be the time of the author, since it marks the end of the retelling of history.

²⁷² Latin quotations are from Tromp 1993: 6-25. Unless otherwise noted English translations are mine. The Latin term *scene*, translated "tabernacle," is unattested in any other Latin text. It is a transliteration of the Greek σκηνή and evidence of a Greek *Vorlage*, see 1993: 79. The Vulgate routinely uses *tabernaculum*.

princes for eighteen years, ten tribes will break loose.²⁷³ The remaining tribes (*tribus sanctitatus*, “holy tribes,” 2:4) will transfer “the tabernacle of the testimony” (*scenae testimonium*),²⁷⁴ and “the God of heaven” (*Deus caelistis*) “will fasten the pole of his tabernacle” (*figet palum scenae*) and “the tower of his sanctuary” (*turrim sanctuarii sui*).²⁷⁵

“Fasten the pole of his tabernacle and the tower of his sanctuary” refers to the building of the temple, which, according to this text, was done not by Solomon but by God who builds *his* tabernacle and *his* sanctuary. This perspective gives divine approval for Solomon’s temple. Since the temple and tabernacle seem to be combined in 2:8-9, where the ten tribes erect idols in the tabernacle and act wickedly in the house of the Lord, the tabernacle also has divine approval.²⁷⁶ However, consequent on the apostasy of both the ten tribes and the two tribes, the exile ensues and, from this point on, the significance of the temple and cultus changes.²⁷⁷

In *T. Mos.* 4:7 either the temple or Jerusalem is called “a place” (*locus*).²⁷⁸ The context is the return from the exile, where “some parts of the tribes” (*aliquae partes tribuum*) “enter

²⁷³ The chronology is obscure. Charles 1913a: 416 and Priest 1983: 928 refer to fifteen judges and three kings (Saul, David and Solomon) and the nineteen kings of the northern kingdom, so that the word *annus* (“year”) is a cipher for a ruler. Tromp 1993: 154 notes this symbolism and its uniqueness in *T. Mos.* and suggests that, given the difficulty of enumerating the precise number of judges, the years are best understood as relative periods of time, in a similar way to the “hours” of *1 En.* 89:72; 90:5 (See Black and VanderKam 1985: 273, 75). The text seems to refer to the division of the kingdom after the death of Solomon. The ten tribes who break loose will sacrifice their children, “erect idols in the tabernacle” (*ponient idola scenae*) and act wickedly “in the house of the Lord” (*domo domini*). These verses describe the apostasy of the northern tribes, and have no immediate bearing on the Second Temple Period, although the pattern is repeated by the author’s contemporaries. The beginning of their apostasy is “surrounding themselves with walls” (*circumvallabunt muros*), something repeated by the parts of the tribes who rebuild Jerusalem after the exile (4:7-9).

²⁷⁴ This refers either to the moving of the ark of the covenant to Jerusalem (2 Sam 6), or the transfer of the ark and its contents into the temple (1 Kings 8:4-6). Tromp 1993: 156 connects it with the separation of the two tribes from the other ten. They are designated holy tribes because the temple is in their territory (Ps 78:67-71).

²⁷⁵ The history is dischronologised here with the transfer of the tabernacle to Jerusalem after the schism, rather than before it as in 2 Sam 7. The manuscript is badly damaged at this point, and several emendations and reconstructions are necessary (Tromp, pp. 8, 137). The above rendering follows Tromp’s emendations. Priest 1983: 928 notes the difficulty with the text and paraphrases, “the twelve tribes will move the tent of testimony to the place where the God of heaven will build a place for his sanctuary.” However, the text does not refer to “twelve” tribes, and this paraphrase also attempts to repair the dischronologisation. Charles 1913a: 416 attempts to do the same.

²⁷⁶ Koester 1989: 45-46.

²⁷⁷ Ibid.: 93-94.

²⁷⁸ Charles 1913a: 415 connects the statement of 1:17 that Joshua had to store the books Moses would give him in “the place that God made from the beginning of the world” (*in loco quem fecit ab initio orbis terrarum*), with the so-called *omphalos* myth, the understanding that Jerusalem (the temple) was the navel of the earth and the beginning of creation. This reading is also adopted by Hamerton-Kelly 1970: 3. The *omphalos* myth has its beginnings in Ezek 38:12 and was highly developed in the Rabbinic literature. In other traditions, Jerusalem and the temple are the centre of the earth, as in Ezek 5:5; *1 En.* 26:1; 90:26; *Jub.* 8:12. See Schäfer 1978: 122-33; Levenson 1985:115-26. While this reading is possible, it is unlikely, since the same phrase is used of Moses himself in 1:14 (he was prepared to be a mediator of the covenant “from the beginning of the world,” *ab initio*

their appointed place” (*venient in locum constitutum suum*), “surround it with walls, and restore it” (*circumvallabunt locum renovantes*).²⁷⁹ On the other hand, the “two tribes” (*duae tribus*) weep and mourn, being unable to bring offerings to the Lord of their ancestors. Since no reason is given for their inability to sacrifice, considerable debate has developed, centring on the different groups that are referred to. In 4:7 some parts of the tribes go up and enter their appointed place; in 4:8 two tribes are contrasted with these tribes. The tribes that do not go up maintain the allegiance ordained for them, and weep and mourn because they cannot sacrifice; and in v. 9 ten tribes no longer exist. The identity of the ten tribes is clear, but the distinction between the two tribes who remain faithful and the parts of the tribes who go up and rebuild the city/temple is unclear.

The solution to the question of the identity of the two groups is connected with the rebuilding of the city/temple, which appears to be a sinful act. The same word (*circumvallabunt*, “surround with walls”) also appears in 2:7, where it is the beginning of apostasy. Thus, rebuilding after the exile is to be seen as an act of unfaithfulness, while those who remain faithful, and weep and mourn because they cannot sacrifice, withdraw from the cultus of the rebuilt temple. This text, too, evidences dissatisfaction with the second temple and its cultus.²⁸⁰

This reading is supported by the immediately following reference to God’s punishment through the foreign kings (5:1-3), leading Israel to turn away from the truth. This statement

orbis terrarum), and 12:4 (where God is said to have seen all the nations of the earth from the beginning). The issue here is God’s comprehensive, pre-ordained plan (see Tiede 1973: 90). Moreover, *T. Mos.* is aware that the temple was not built until after the death of Solomon (2:4) and was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar (3:2), yet the books would remain in this place until the Lord visits them at the end of days (1:18). See Tromp 1993: 146-47. The text should be read as referring to a primordial decision of God that there would be a mediator of his covenant (Moses), and that God prepared a place for the revelation Moses is about to give to Joshua from the beginning, prior to the construction of the temple. See also Kolenkow 1973: 73. *Locus* (“place”) appears elsewhere in *T. Mos.* in a general sense (2:2; 6:3; 7:10; 11:5, 7). In 8:5 the central shrine of a temple (either a pagan temple or the Jerusalem temple, see Tromp 1993: 220-21) is referred to as “their secret place” (*abditum locum eorum*), and in 10:9 the heavenly temple is referred to as “the place of God’s habitation” (*loco habitationis*). I discuss this text further below.

²⁷⁹ There is some debate as to whether this place is Jerusalem or the temple. The reference to walls suggests the city (Tromp 1993: 181), while the reference to sacrifices in v. 8 suggests the temple (Goldstein 1973: 49; Collins 1973b: 43; Schwartz 1980: 217-23). See Matt 24:15; John 4:20; 11:48; Acts 6:13-14; 21:28 for evidence for the Greek word τόπος being used to refer to the temple in the first century. In 1 Chron 6:40 מקום is rendered τόπος in the LXX and *locus* in the Vulgate. Whether a strong distinction should be maintained between city and temple is also debateable. The temple dominated the city and was by far its most significant feature. See Davies 1974: 152; Sanders 1992: 51-69. See also Koester 1972a: 188-89 for τόπος in the sense of a holy place.

²⁸⁰ Here, I follow Tromp 1993: 180-82. Schwartz 1980: 217-23 and Doran 1987: 491-92 argue that these two tribes who remain faithful are those who remain in Babylon and are too far from Jerusalem to sacrifice. As Tromp 1993: 181-82, notes the author of *T. Mos.* is more likely to have described the returnees as the two tribes and those who stayed as part of them. Charles 1913a: 417; Lattey 1942: 13-16; Goldstein 1973: 49; Collins 1973b: 43 see this text as evidence of dissatisfaction with the temple and cultus, while Klinzing 1971: 159-60 proposes that the weeping shows their high estimate of the temple. Priest 1983: 929 is unsure whether a definitive interpretation is possible.

is supported by the quotation of an unidentifiable text,²⁸¹ which claims that “they will defile the house of their worship with pollution” (*contaminabunt iniquationibus domum servitutis suae*, 5:3),²⁸² and that certain people “who are not priests but slaves born of slaves” (*qui non sunt sacerdotes, sed servi de servus nati*) will “defile the altar” (*alterium inquinabunt*) with the offerings they bring to the Lord (5:4).²⁸³ The surrounding verses enlarge upon their moral misconduct in terms of adultery with foreign gods, bribery, crime and injustice against God, and impious, partial judges. Chapter 6 continues by referring to kings who proclaim themselves priests, who will fail in their moral duty with respect to “the holy of holies” (*sancto sanctiatis*). In all this, the temple and cult are “condemned in extremely radical terms.”²⁸⁴ There are simply no redeeming features and the text displays contempt for both temple and priesthood. In this text there is no anticipation of an eschatological temple. Dissatisfaction with the temple also emerges in Hebrews, but not because of the sinfulness of the people and the priesthood. Rather, it has reached its *telos*, and God is no longer encountered there.

4.6 The *Apocalypse of Zephaniah*

This enigmatic text (hereafter *Apoc. Zeph.*) exists in three parts: a short quotation in Clement of Alexandria,²⁸⁵ a small fragment in the Coptic Sahidic dialect and a longer fragment in the Akhmimic dialect. Clement refers to Zephaniah as the author of his quotation,²⁸⁶ and v. 7 of the Sahidic fragment contains the words, “And I, Zephaniah saw these things in my vision,”²⁸⁷ but the Akhmimic fragment bears no identification, and is sometimes referred to as the *Anonymous Apocalypse*.²⁸⁸ The original language was probably Greek, and the provenance is probably Egyptian.²⁸⁹ Assuming the quotation in Clement is

²⁸¹ Tromp 1993: 190-91. The author may have been quoting from memory or giving a paraphrase. Deut 31:29 and Jer 11:10 express similar ideas.

²⁸² *Domus servitutis* (“house of slavery”) refers to Egypt in Exod 13:3, 14; 20:2; Deut 5:6; 6:12 (Vulg. 6:13); 7:8; 8:14; 13:5, 10; Josh 24:17; Judg 6:8; Jer 34:13; 4 Esdr 1:7. In Mic 6:4 the same phrase is rendered by *domus servientium*. In the present context, the reference is surely to the temple (ibid.: 191).

²⁸³ Josephus (*Ant.* 13.292) mentions and denies the claim that the mother of Hyrcanus was a slave under Antiochus. Charles 1913a: 418 suggests that these statements suit Jason and Menelaus, priests who preceded the Maccabees.

²⁸⁴ Tromp 1993: 192. See Tromp’s discussion on pp. 185-99 of the structure, rhetorical features and historical background of this part of *T. Mos.* He notes that the terms are too general and too vague for precise identification, and argues that the reference is to recent contemporary history and a society that is “diseased in all its branches” (p. 187).

²⁸⁵ *Strom.* 5.11.77. The quotation only contains forty-two Greek words.

²⁸⁶ Coxe 1975: 923.

²⁸⁷ Wintermute 1983: 508. Unless otherwise noted, quotations from *Apoc. Zeph.* are from Wintermute. I use the name Zephaniah, although *Apoc. Zeph.* is no doubt pseudepigraphic.

²⁸⁸ Himmelfarb 1985: 14-15; Kuhn 1984a: 753-55; 1984b: 915-17. Whether these parts have been correctly classified as part of the same text is subject to debate (see Bauckham 1986: 101-2; Collins 1998: 242; Robinson 2000: 39). I treat them as such.

²⁸⁹ Wintermute 1983: 500-501.

from the same document, the date cannot be later than the end of the second century C.E., and the reference to Susanna in 6:10 gives an earliest date around 100 B.C.E.²⁹⁰ Bauckham suggests that it may be the earliest apocalypse that refers to the punishments of those in hell²⁹¹ and, if this is correct, it may be an older Jewish text that has had some later Christian embellishment.²⁹²

Because it is fragmented²⁹³ and seems to have been abbreviated, it is difficult to work with.²⁹⁴ There is no reference to temple or cultus in the extant text, so the attitude to the temple is unknown. It seems to be a first person account of Zephaniah's tour of heaven and hell, following a dead person through Hades to Paradise.²⁹⁵ *En route* he encounters various angels, he appears to be transformed into an angel himself and participates in angelic worship.

4.6.1 Zephaniah's Encounters with Angels

Chapter 8 follows two missing pages and is therefore devoid of any previous context. It recounts part of Zephaniah's heavenly journey. He travels in a boat and encounters thousands and thousands and myriads and myriads of angels giving praise and praying. He joins them, dons angelic clothing, prays with them and understands their language. In *Apoc. Zeph.* 9-10 a great angel blows a trumpet and announces that Zephaniah has prevailed and has escaped from the abyss and from Hades. Thus, Zephaniah joins the angelic liturgy, takes on an angelic identity and becomes as one of them.²⁹⁶

The quotation in Clement recounts Zephaniah's arrival in the fifth heaven, after being "taken" (ἀναλαμβάνω) and "carried up" (ἀναφέρω) by a spirit. He encounters angels called "lords" (κύριοι).²⁹⁷ They were crowned with diadems by the "holy spirit" (ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ)²⁹⁸ and their thrones were seven times brighter than the rising sun. They

²⁹⁰ Ibid.: 501; Robinson 2000: 39.

²⁹¹ Bauckham 1986: 102-103.

²⁹² Wintermute 1983: 501 refers to 2:1-4; 6:11-15 and 10:9 as evidence of this embellishment. Scholem 1960: 18-19 tentatively suggests that the quotation from Clement is from a Jewish source, but notes that the language sounds more like a hekhalot text than an older apocalypse. Mach 1992: 295-96 suggests that 6:11-15 is borrowed from Rev 19:10, against this see Bauckham 1981: 325; Stuckenbruck 1995: 78-79. See also Robinson 2000: 39; Davila 2005b: 234-35.

²⁹³ Wintermute 1983: 498.

²⁹⁴ Bauckham 1986: 102.

²⁹⁵ Bauckham 2001: 157.

²⁹⁶ Gieschen 1998: 169.

²⁹⁷ In 1 Cor 8:5 Paul, in a polemical context, refers to many gods and many lords. See also LXX Deut 10:17, where Yahweh is "God of gods and Lord of lords" (οὗτος θεὸς τῶν θεῶν καὶ κύριος τῶν κυρίων). These "lords" appear to be part of God's heavenly entourage.

²⁹⁸ Wintermute 1983: 508 capitalises this term (Holy Spirit), noting that Clement may have understood it in a Christian or trinitarian sense. It need not be understood in this way, see Wis 9:17; *Asc. Isa.* 3:16, 19, 26; *Ps. Sol.* 17:37.

dwelt “in the temples of salvation” (ἐν ναοῖς σωτηρίας), “singing hymns to the inexpressible Most High God” (καὶ ὑμνοῦντας θεὸν ἄρρητον ὑψιστον).

Since this quotation is devoid of any context, it is difficult to understand what is being conveyed with any degree of clarity. These angels resemble those encountered by Levi in the fourth heaven where there were “thrones and authorities and praises offered to God” (θρόνοι, ἐξουσίαι, ἐν ᾧ ὕμνοι ἀεὶ τῷ θεῷ προσφέρονται, *T. Levi* 3:8), more than those in the fifth heaven who carried answers to the angels of the presence in the sixth heaven. The plural “temples of salvation” recalls *ShirShabb* where there are seven *debirim*, although in this context, as in *ShirShabb*, the plural may be a plural of majesty.²⁹⁹ As in *ShirShabb* and *T. Levi* 8:5 these angels are singing hymns to God, here described with the adjective “most high” (ὑψιστος). The angels have thrones, although are not said to be seated upon them.³⁰⁰ The thrones, the temples of salvation and the crowns evoke ideas found in later hekhalot literature.³⁰¹

The worship of angels and Zephaniah’s part in it is similar to Heb 12:22-24 where the recipients are said to have come to myriads of angels in joyful worship and the church of the firstborn enrolled in, that is angels, and “a vast multitude of believers from all ages.”³⁰² However, in Hebrews there is no heavenly ascent (or sea voyage) and there is no transformation into an angelic identity, and in *Apoc. Zeph.* Zephaniah seems to be the only human present.

4.6.2 The Heavenly City

In the Sahidic fragment and in chapters 1-5 of the Akhmimic text, the Angel of the Lord is the *angelus interpres* for Zephaniah. Zephaniah sees a variety of things, including his own (unnamed) city from above (2:1-7),³⁰³ and the tour climaxes with a vision of the heavenly city (chapter 5). This is clearly a beautiful city, with bronze gates, which the angel

²⁹⁹ Newsom 1985: 49.

³⁰⁰ Alexander 2006: 36 suggests that “the later mystics” were probably reluctant to see anyone other than God enthroned in heaven. It seems that while humans are allowed to sit in heaven, and are enthroned, angels are not. See *Ezek. Trag.* 68-89; *1 En.* 55:4; 61:8; 62:5; 69:29, 108:12; Mark 14:62; Eph 2:6; Col 3:1-4; Rev 3:21; *Asc. Isa.* 9:24-26 as evidence for humans being permitted to sit in heaven, and *Gen. Rab.* 65:21 for angels who are not permitted to do so

³⁰¹ Scholem 1960: 19 connects the Greek phrase “temples of salvation” with the Hebrew **היכל** (“temple”) and later hekhalot literature. This may also be the sole example of an early text that has angels wearing crowns, see Fletcher-Louis 2002: 354-55. See *Zost. NHC VIII* 1 58: 13-24; *3 En.* 12:3; 18:3. Mach 1992: 121, 191-93 argues that crowned angels is a later, hellenistic development.

³⁰² Lane 1991b: 469.

³⁰³ The city is probably Jerusalem (Wintermute 1983: 509), and Zephaniah sees scenes reminiscent of those in Matt 24:40-41; Luke 17:35-35, but *Apoc. Zeph.* is probably not indebted to these texts. Wintermute (p. 509) suggests a familiar parable used by this author and by Matthew and Luke. Certainty as to the attitude to Jerusalem in the text is impossible, but the fact that it is unnamed may indicate that it is negated, as in other texts where Jerusalem is overlooked.

opens with a touch. Zephaniah enters and walks around the square of the city, but gives no more detail, as his mouth was shut (5:6), suggesting that the details were not to be revealed.³⁰⁴ Consequently, no more details of the city are given.

The earthly Jerusalem is never mentioned in Hebrews. The patriarchs lived in the promised land like aliens looking for the heavenly city, and the recipients, who have come to the heavenly Jerusalem (12:22), have no continuing city on earth, seeking the city to come (13:14). The details of the heavenly city in Heb 12:22-24 are likewise minimal, but angels worship there, as in *Apoc. Zeph.*, and the spirits of the righteous who have been made perfect are there (*Apoc. Zeph.* 10:9), as are the firstborn enrolled in heaven. The Book of the Living appears in *Apoc. Zeph.* 3:7; 9:3, where those whose names are enrolled have access to the heavenly city,³⁰⁵ an idea similar to the enrolment in heaven of the church of the firstborn in Heb 12:23.

4.7 Conclusion

In this chapter I have reviewed several texts that reflect dissatisfaction with the Jerusalem temple. However, several of these texts, as also Hebrews, are silent about Jerusalem and the temple, and the dissatisfaction is more implied than explicit. On the other hand, the wilderness tabernacle and Solomon's temple are ideal sanctuaries. In some places the second temple is replaced with an eschatological temple that God will build in the eschaton, a concept sometimes traced to Exod 15:17. Elsewhere, the second temple is replaced with a heavenly temple, the true dwelling place of God. In BW this temple is a sort of bicameral structure in heaven, although not corresponding precisely to the Jerusalem temple. In *T. Levi*, heaven has either three or seven levels of increasing holiness, a concept also reflected in *Apoc. Zeph.* Neither heaven nor the heavenly temple resemble any earthly sanctuary, other than in the most general terms. None of these texts suggest that the earthly temple is a copy of the heavenly temple. Rather, God dwells in the heavenly temple, and while he is envisaged as coming to earth in BW, he alights on a cosmic mountain, seen as the link between earth and heaven.

These texts have implications for the understanding of the temple symbolism of Hebrews. Hebrews is traditionally read as disparaging the tabernacle as a "mere earthly copy" of the heavenly temple and as being unconcerned with the second temple. I will argue that both of these readings are inadequate. In Hebrews, as in the texts discussed in this chapter the tabernacle is never disparaged, and where the second temple is disparaged, it is not because it is *made* by humans. Rather, it is because it has been *polluted* by humans.

³⁰⁴ Ibid.: 512. See 2 Cor 12:1-4.

³⁰⁵ The Book of the Living is to be distinguished from the Book of Life, apparently one of two truncated manuscripts in *Apoc. Zeph.* 7. Chapter 7:1-9 is about the recording of sins, while 7:10 and the missing section that follows are probably about the recording of good deeds. For the Book of the Living containing people's names see Ps 69:28. See Bauckham 2001: 157-58.

Moreover, like Hebrews, some of the texts that reflect dissatisfaction with the second temple do not mention it but, as in Hebrews, the silence is too significant to be ignored.

In the eschaton, God is expected to construct an eschatological temple where he will dwell with his people, and at times this is pictured as a return to the conditions of Eden or as a new Jerusalem. While Zion and Jerusalem are significant, it is usually unclear whether this eschatological temple is a structure or a metaphor for the dwelling of God with his people. It is probably the former, located in Zion. While I will argue that Hebrews also envisages the eschatological dwelling of God with his people, there the heavenly temple symbolises this dwelling. Earthly sanctuaries prefigure the eschatological temple and, since the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God has inaugurated the eschatological temple, earthly sanctuaries have reached their *telos* and God is no longer encountered in them.

5 Temple Destroyed: Temple Symbolism in Literature Responding to the Fall of the Temple

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter I examine several texts that respond to the fall of Jerusalem in 70 C.E. While I have argued that Hebrews predates that event, these texts are relevant since they reflect ideas current in late first century Judaism. Some of these texts are positive towards the temple, but negative towards priesthood and people, while others are more negative about the temple itself. They all anticipate a rebuilt temple; sometimes an eschatological temple to be built by God and sometimes a new physical temple in Jerusalem.¹

I consider here the same questions considered in previous chapters. I am concerned with the relationship of the (now destroyed) earthly temple to the heavenly temple and the eschatological temple to be built by God; with attitudes to the wilderness tabernacle reflected in the texts; with the understanding of the eschatological dwelling of God with his people and whether the communities addressed have access to this dwelling in the present; and whether any of these texts refer to sacrificial activity in heaven.

5.1 The *Fourth Book of Ezra*

The *Fourth Book of Ezra* (*4 Ezra*)² is a Jewish apocalypse appearing as chapters 4-13 of 2 Esdras in the Vulgate.³ The work is set in Babylon thirty years after the exile (3:1-3), a fictional literary device modelled on Ezek 1:1.⁴ The name Ezra is a pseudonym taken by an anonymous Jew, probably living in Palestine⁵ in the final years of the first century C.E., in

¹ I do not treat *Lam. Rab.*, a midrash on the book of Lamentations responding to the destruction of the temple. This fifth century C.E. text is too late for inclusion. See the comparison of *Lam. Rab.*, *4 Ezra* and 2 *Bar.* in Kirschner 1985: 27-46.

² For the different works associated with the name of Ezra see the table in Metzger 1983: 516; Willett 1989: 51-52. Unless otherwise noted, all English quotations are from the NRSV text of *4 Ezra*. Latin quotations are from Fischer et al., 1969.

³ For Jewish provenance see Davila 2005b: 136-41, who notes the centrality of Torah (3:19; 5:27; 7:19-20; [79]-[81]; [89]; [94]; [63] 133; 8:12, 29, 56; 9:11; 29-37; 13: 42, 54; 14: 21-22), of Zion (5:21-30); and of the people of Israel (6:55-59; 7:10-11; 8:15-16, 26, 45). Ezra mourns the destruction of Jerusalem (3:1), the temple and its sacred contents, and the priesthood (10:20-22), and anticipates the restoration of Zion (10:38-54) and Zion's role in the eschatological battle (13:35-36). Ezra anticipates the coming of the Messiah in 7:28-[44] but nothing in these verses can be related to eschatological scenarios found in the NT. Moreover, the virgin birth, the earthly life, and the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus are absent from *4 Ezra*. 2 Esdras 1-2 (*5 Ezra*); 15-16 (*6 Ezra*) is a Christian framework placed around *4 Ezra* in the second and third centuries (DeSilva 2002: 324, 346-51), which is beyond the scope of this study, although they do set the context in which *4 Ezra* is now to be read. Since these chapters did not exist in the immediate aftermath of the events of 70 C.E., I exclude them from consideration.

⁴ The reference to thirty years has been used as a guide to the date of the book, but it is more likely that it imitates Ezek 1:1, see Stone 1990: 55.

⁵ The evidence for the location of *4 Ezra* is slim. Davila 2005b: 138-39 refers to a consensus that the work emanated from Palestine, although he gives no details of those scholars who hold to that view.

whose name he writes following the fall of Jerusalem.⁶ Thus, the destruction of the second temple is described “in the code of 587.”⁷ The original language seems to have been Hebrew,⁸ but no Hebrew text has survived. There was probably an early Greek translation, but evidence for this in quotations and allusions in some early Christian works may simply represent dependence on common traditions.⁹ Versions in several different languages remain, the most important of which are Latin and Syriac.¹⁰

The author of *4 Ezra* mentions neither Solomon’s temple nor the second temple, although Solomon’s temple is co-terminus with the city (3:24; 10:46). That *4 Ezra* ignores the second temple indicates the same sort of dissatisfaction that appears elsewhere in the literature. The implication is that the “real” temple was Solomon’s rather than Herod’s. As the narrative proceeds, it becomes clear that the city built by God to be revealed at the end exceeds Solomon’s temple in significance.

The book contains seven episodes: three dialogues with the angel Uriel, three visions and an epilogue.¹¹ The first dialogue begins when Ezra is on his bed, distressed at the

Longenecker 1995: 15-16; 1997: 271-93 argues that the author was a scribe associated with Yavneh, and Stone 1989: 18 suggests someone “steeped in one aspect of Pharisaic tradition.”

⁶ This date arises from the identification of the three heads of the eagle in *4 Ezra* 11-12 as Vespasian, Titus and Domitian. Since two of these had died (11:33-35; 12:23-27) and the third was expected to die with the advent of the Messiah in the last days (12:28), a date late in the reign of Domitian is likely. See Grabbe and Charlesworth 1981: 51-52; Stone 1984: 412; 1989: 7-11; 1990: 10, 366-71; Vermes 1986: 297-300; Willett 1989: 53; Hallbäck 1992: 270-71; Longenecker 1995: 13-16; Collins 1998: 195-96; Lichtenberger 1999: 239; DeSilva 2002: 330-32; Harrington 2003a: 665; Nickelsburg 2005a: 275. For a review of the history of scholarship on the dating of *4 Ezra*, including the historical problems associated with this so-called “Flavian” dating, see DiTommaso 1999: 3-38. DiTommaso argues that the eagle vision is an interpolation from the early third century. He argues that while the book requires an eagle vision at this point, it does not require the actual eagle vision that is extant in the book, and he considers that only with great difficulty can the historical details of this eagle vision be identified with events of the late first century. The weakness of his argument is the lack of any evidence for an alternative eagle vision. DiTommaso does accept a date around the end of the first century for the composition of the remainder of the book, although he does not specify his grounds for this opinion. Clement of Alexandria cites *4 Ezra* 5:35 in *Stromateis*, which can be dated around the end of the second century, but this is of no consequence for DiTommaso’s argument, since Clement does not cite the eagle vision.

⁷ Kirschner 1985: 29-30.

⁸ Myers 1974: 115-17; Stone 1990: 10-11; DeSilva 2002: 329.

⁹ Stone 1990: 1-2.

¹⁰ Ibid.: 1-9. For the importance of the Syriac and Latin versions see p. 3. For an earlier assessment see Blake 1926: 308-14. The most convenient text is that in the Latin Vulgate (Fischer et al., 1969: 1931-74). The Syriac text is found in Bidawid 1973. I have not been able to access the critical edition of the Latin text in Klijn 1983b.

¹¹ Metzger 1983: 517-18; Stone 1990: 50. Humphrey 1995: 59 refers to all seven episodes as visions and, indeed, Stone notes that a vision can be auditory as well as visual. Nevertheless, I follow Sanders 1985b: 409-18; Vermes 1986: 294-98; Collins 1998: 200-210; Lichtenberger 1999: 240 in referring to three dialogues, three visions and an epilogue. This clarifies the auditory nature of the first three episodes and the combination of visual and auditory features in the next three. The epilogue is also auditory, although here the Lord speaks rather than Uriel. Esler 1994: 109-11 notes that the description of the angel’s appearance in the

desolation of Zion and the wealth of “Babylon” (3:1-3), a cipher for Rome.¹² He brings his complaint to God (3:4-36), Uriel responds, and then Ezra and Uriel embark on a vigorous debate (4:1–5:13), which continues until Ezra awakes (5:14-20). This pattern of distress, followed by complaint, debate and conclusion, is repeated twice more in Ezra’s room over the space of three weeks (5:21–6: 34; 6:35–9:26). At the end of the third dialogue, Uriel sends Ezra out into a field to eat the flowers and pray (9:24-25), and wait until he comes to speak with him.

Ezra is still distressed when he receives the first vision (9:26–10:59), a woman grieving at the recent loss of her son. While he consoles her, she is transformed into a glorious city, which Uriel identifies as the restored Zion. Ezra’s second vision (11:1–12:51) is of an eagle with three heads and numerous wings rising out of the sea. It is ultimately destroyed by a lion. Uriel identifies the eagle as the fourth kingdom of Daniel’s vision (Dan 7:7-8, 23-25) and the lion as the Messiah. In Ezra’s final vision (13:1-58) a man rises out of the sea and stands on a mountain that he had carved out for himself. Uriel identifies the mountain as Zion and the man as the Son of God who will destroy the enemies of God’s people. These three visions transform Ezra’s distress into joy, and he praises God who governs times and events. God appears to Ezra in an epilogue (14:1-48) and commissions him to comfort and instruct the people and to rewrite the Scriptures that were destroyed along with the temple.¹³

Earlier scholars argued that *4 Ezra* was a conglomeration of sources,¹⁴ but Breech demonstrates that it is a carefully structured narrative showing “Ezra’s movement from distress [at the loss of Jerusalem and the temple] to consolation by the Most High himself who reveals to the prophet, in dream visions, his end time plans.”¹⁵ These plans involve God’s actions to redeem his people. Central to this is the restoration of Zion “prepared and built, as you saw the mountain carved out without hands” (13:36) from where God will destroy their enemies.

dialogues is understated, thus limiting their visual aspect (see 4:1). For the rarity of extended dialogues in apocalypses see Stone 1981: 202.

¹² Babylon is a cipher for Rome as in several works of the period (e.g. Rev 18; *Sib. Or.* 5:130). See Harrington 2003b: 349.

¹³ Knibb 1982: 62-63; Hallbäck 1992: 273; Lichtenberger 1999: 248. DeSilva 2002: 336-37 suggests that the major purpose of *4 Ezra* is, “the reinforcement of Torah observance as a positive and necessary value.”

¹⁴ E.g. Box 1913: 549-52. See the discussions in Longenecker 1995: 22-24; Collins 1998: 196-98; DeSilva 2002: 335-36.

¹⁵ Breech 1973: 269. See also the comprehensive discussion in Stone 1990: 11-23, especially pp. 21-23. Esler 1994: 99-123 argues that the purpose of *4 Ezra* is to manage the cognitive dissonance between the experience of the destruction of the temple and the theology of election. He notes “it is clear that the author of *4 Ezra*, and presumably his readers, did consider that the sack of Jerusalem in 70 CE and the enslavement and exile of many Jews thereafter were grossly inconsistent with theological views on the election of Israel and the significance of the Temple” (p. 106). For a critique of the notion of cognitive dissonance see Wright 2003b: 697-701.

5.2.1 The First Dialogue (3:1–5:20)

Here, Ezra prays in his distress, rehearsing the history of the world from the creation to the time when David builds a city (*civitas*) for God's name, in which to offer oblations (3:24). These were offered for many years, until God gave the city over to the hand of his enemies because of the transgressions of the people. While Ezra never mentions the temple,¹⁶ it is subsumed under the identity of the city built to offer oblations to God. For Ezra, "the city is clearly the sanctuary."¹⁷ The key to understanding the narrative that follows is found in Uriel's response, "Your understanding has utterly failed regarding this world." As the narrative unfolds, it becomes clear that while Ezra is thinking of the earthly Zion that has been devastated, Uriel responds in terms of the heavenly Zion.

5.2.2 The Second Dialogue (5:21–6:34)

In 5:23-30 Ezra recounts the uniqueness of Israel. God chose one vine, one region, one lily, one river, one city, one dove, one sheep and one people. The vine is clearly Israel,¹⁸ as are the dove¹⁹ and the sheep;²⁰ the region is apparently the land, the river is the Jordan, but the city is named: "from all the cities that have been built (*aedificatis civitatibus*) you have consecrated (*sanctificasti*, ܣܢܬܝܦܥܬܝ) Zion for yourself" (5:25).²¹ Why then, Ezra asks, has the one been given over to the many?

Ezra's description of Zion as a "built city" is ironic, for elsewhere in *4 Ezra* the built city is the heavenly Jerusalem (10:27, 42, 44; 13:36; see also Ps 122:3).²² So while in 5:25 he sees the built city, Zion that has been destroyed, it soon becomes clear that there is more to the destroyed Zion than Ezra sees. In 6:1-6 Uriel explains, with a series of divine passives, that God had planned and made all things before the creation,²³ including the

¹⁶ The Syriac version adds "and a house" (ܡܕܢܚܐ). In 10:46 Solomon builds the city and offers sacrifices in it, although in the OT Solomon built the temple rather than the city. Fisher 1963: 34-41 argues for a wider semantic range than just "city" for the Hebrew word עִיר, positing a sense such as "temple quarter" or "hill of God/altar." In Ezek 40:2 Ezekiel sees a structure like a city that turns out to be the temple area in v. 5 (Koester 1989: 18-19). See also Isa 60:7, 13, 14; Zech 8:3. Fisher 1963: 40 suggests, "ideally, YHWH does not have a temple quarter within a city but the city is his temple quarter, temple and even the Hill of God."

¹⁷ Stone 1990: 74. See also Hamerton-Kelly 1970: 4; Myers 1974: 171; Lee 2001: 129-32. The Armenian version expands the text to explain that Solomon built the temple (Stone 1990: 74).

¹⁸ Ps 80:8; Isa 5:1-7; Hos 14:17.

¹⁹ Ps 74:19.

²⁰ E.g. Ps 80:1; Jer 23:1-4; Ezek 34.

²¹ The use of the language of sanctification is another indication of the cultic aspects of the city. Cf. the language of "choice" in similar contexts in Ps 78:68; 132:13. See Stone 1990: 130.

²² See the discussion in Stone (ibid.: 129-30).

²³ Before the beginning of the circle of the earth, before the portals of the world were in place, before winds blew, thunder sounded and lightening shone, before the foundations of paradise were laid. The passives are best understood as divine passives.

establishment of “the footstool which is Zion (*aestimaretur scabillum Sion*, 6:4).”²⁴ While David might have built Zion, Zion was planned by God before the creation. This, as well as other texts in *4 Ezra* that describe the heavenly Jerusalem as the “built city,” indicate that the earthly city/temple corresponds in some way with the heavenly city/temple.

Hebrews refers to a city built by God (Heb 11:10, 16; 13:14) as the eschatological goal of God’s people. In the narrative flow of *4 Ezra* Jerusalem/Zion is the built city *par excellence*, and when the earthly Zion disappears the heavenly remains. In Hebrews the two are distinguished. The readers are called to leave the earthly city and seek the heavenly (13:11-14). The earthly city belongs in the readers’ past and has no ongoing significance.

5.2.3 The Third Dialogue (6:35–9:25)

What is implicit about the two cities becomes explicit in the third dialogue when Ezra asks why Israel did not possess the world as an inheritance and how long the present situation would continue. Uriel responds in 7:26-44 with an eschatological scenario, “Indeed the time will come, when ... the city that now is not seen shall appear, and the land that now is hidden shall be disclosed.”²⁵ This city is the heavenly Jerusalem, whose eschatological appearance is portrayed in the fourth vision (see below).²⁶ And, while Ezra thinks of land in terms of the land of Israel,²⁷ the land Uriel refers to is Paradise,²⁸ the location of the heavenly, unseen city. This city and land are real in the eschatological present, even though hidden from view.²⁹

That paradise is in view is confirmed in 7:36, where Uriel uses two sets of parallel terms for the disclosure of eschatological end of the wicked and the righteous respectively: the pit of torment³⁰ opposite the place of rest and the furnace of Hell opposite the Paradise of delight.³¹ Stone remarks that rest is a standard feature of Jewish eschatology, referring to Ps 95:11; Isa 14:7. Significant also, are such texts as 2 Sam 7:1 and 1 Kings 5:4, where God

²⁴ Translation from Stone 1990: 157. For Yahweh’s footstool see 1 Chron 28:2; Ps 98:5; 110:1; 132:7; Isa 66:1; Lam 2:1.

²⁵ Here I follow Stone (*ibid.*: 202, see also footnotes f and g) and the NRSV. Both follow the Armenian version, which refers to a city. The textual witnesses for this line are “chaotic” (Stone, p. 202).

²⁶ For the ideal future Jerusalem see Isa 52:1; 54:11-12; 60:10-22; Ezek 40-48; Zech 2:10-12; Tob 13:16-18; 14:5; *T. Dan* 5:12; *2 En.* 55:2; *2 Bar* 4:2-4; 32:2-4; 11QNJ. See also Gal 4:26; Heb 11:10-16; 12:22; 13:14; Rev 21-22; *b. Hag* 12b.

²⁷ Box 1913: 582. See also 8:52 which juxtaposes city and land.

²⁸ Hofius 1970c: 182-83 (footnote 368); Knibb and Coggins 1979: 167; Willett 1989: 73; Lee 2001: 132-33. Stone 1989: 102-3, 197-98 argues that this identification is not certain, since in *4 Ezra* paradise is nowhere described in terms of “land.”

²⁹ Stone 1990: 213-14 notes that this sort of terminology is “a standard part of apocalyptic mystification.”

³⁰ *Ibid.*: 203 retains the word Gehenna from the Latin, Syriac, Ethiopic and Georgian versions.

³¹ Hofius 1970c: 61; Laansma 1997: 107-108. In *2 En.* 8-10 Enoch sees paradise and the place of torment from the third heaven.

gives David and Solomon rest from their enemies and they decide to build a house for God's name, and 2 Chron 6:41–7:3 where Solomon invites Yahweh to enter his resting place and the glory of the Lord fills the temple. The paradise of delight is where God rested at the creation (Gen 2:2; Heb 4:4), that is, the heavenly temple, which will be disclosed in the eschaton.³²

The eschatological disclosure of the heavenly city/temple becomes clear in the reference to paradise in 8:52, where Uriel lists the features of the world to come:³³ for “Ezra and those like him,”³⁴ paradise is opened, the tree of life planted, the age to come prepared, plenty provided, a city built, rest appointed, goodness established and wisdom perfected. This piling up of the features of the world to come describes the eschatological reward of the righteous.³⁵ Strict differentiation of the terms seems unwarranted; rather, they represent different aspects of the eschatological dwelling of God and his people.³⁶ That the “built city” is paired with the “appointed rest” indicates that “rest” should be understood in a local sense as “a place of rest.”³⁷ In Heb 4 the eschatological goal of the people of God is also described as God's rest where his people will also rest in the eschatological temple.

5.2.4 The First Vision (9:26–10:59)

Following these dialogues are three visionary experiences in which Ezra sees the eschatological events hinted at in the dialogues.³⁸ The first vision is pivotal, as Ezra begins

³² Stone 1990: 221 suggests that “[t]he term ‘paradise of delight’ is probably a literal translation of the rendering of ‘Garden of Eden’ in Greek as παράδεισος τῆς τρυφῆς.” See 1989: 197–204 for Stone's treatment of paradise. Care must be taken with the distinction between earth and heaven in the discussion of paradise in 4 *Ezra*, and it is probably overstating the case to claim that paradise refers to some transcendental and heavenly garden simply on the basis that it is said to have been pre-created (3:6), as does Box 1912: 195–97. See *b. Ned.* 39b; *b. Pesah.* 54a; *Pirqe R. El.* 3; *Midr. Ps.* 72:66 and 90:13 (where the temple is the heavenly temple); *Tg. Onq.* (Grossfeld 1988: 45, footnote 5) and *Tg. Ps.-J.* (Maher 1992: 22, footnote 23) on Gen 2:8; and *Tg. Ps.-J.* on Gen 3:24 for the suggestion that the Garden of Eden was built before the creation (along with the throne of glory, the name of the Messiah, Torah, Israel, Gehenna, repentance and the Temple). Stone 1989: 200–204 argues that paradise in 7:36 is simply the earthly garden of Eden. But it seems valid to treat paradise in the same way as the heavenly Zion, for that too was established at the creation (6:4) and will be revealed in the end (7:26). The relationship between the heavenly and earthly dimensions of paradise and Zion is complex, but in the eschaton, what is now concealed (in heaven) will be revealed (on earth). In the story of the four who entered פֶּרֶדֶס, found in *t. Hag.* 2.1; *y. Hag.* 77b; *b. Hag.* 14b–15b; *Cant. Rab.* 1.44, as well as in *Hakhalot Zutarti* and *Merkabah Rabbah*, paradise seems to be identified with the heavenly temple. For a convenient translation of the texts see Morray-Jones 1993: 196–98, 210–17. See also Morray-Jones's discussion (1993) on pp. 199–202, 207–208.

³³ Verses 53–54 list what will be absent from the world to come.

³⁴ Stone 1990: 286. The Latin “you” at the start of v. 52 is plural (*vobis*), as also the Syriac (ܠܚܡܝܢ) and all other versions apart from the Armenian.

³⁵ Stone 1989: 218; 1990: 288.

³⁶ On this cf. Stone 1990: 287, “[i]n 4 *Ezra*, we should observe, heavenly Jerusalem is usually related to the ‘messianic kingdom’ complex of ideas, and this is not readily to be reconciled with its connection with paradise in a number of contexts.”

³⁷ Hofius 1970c: 62.

³⁸ Longenecker 1991: 111.

to see what Uriel had previously told him would happen.³⁹ Distressed, and out in a field eating flowers (9:27), he sees a woman grieving at the recent death of her only son on his wedding day. Ezra attempts to console her, reminding her that the distress of the community was greater than her distress, for while she was grieving for one son, the community was grieving for the whole world. Moreover, the sanctuary and its furnishings had been destroyed; the priests, the Levites and the people had been killed or exiled; and the seal of the glory of Zion had been given over into the hands of their enemies (10:21-24).⁴⁰

At this point, the woman is transformed into a city. Uriel arrives on the scene and identifies the city as the restored Zion that was to be revealed at the end of time.⁴¹ What the reader had suspected from the analogy between the grief of the woman over her son and the grief of Ezra over Zion is now made explicit. The woman is the desolate Zion and also the renewed Zion.⁴² Uriel encourages Ezra to enter the city, noting that there will be limitations on what he can see and hear. He is entering God's realm that transcends human comprehension.⁴³

Uriel explains the vision to the perplexed Ezra in 10:38-59, picking up features from the earlier dialogues. Instead of the woman he sees a "city being established" (*civitas aedificabatur*, 10:27),⁴⁴ a place of huge foundations (*locus ... de fundamentis magnis*) identified as Zion in 10:44. The city "appears" (10:27, 42, 44) as predicted in 7:26. Its description as an "established city" and the reference to foundations identifies it with the heavenly Jerusalem.⁴⁵ Finally, in 10:55 the city becomes a building. Ezra is encouraged to enter it and see "the splendour and vastness of the building" (*ingredere et vide splendorem vel magnitudinem*

³⁹ Stone 1981: 202-3; 1990: 304; Longenecker 1995: 58-64; Humphrey 1995: 59; Lichtenberger 1999: 242; Lee 2001: 134-35; DeSilva 2002: 327.

⁴⁰ Cf. the lament for Zion in 4 *Ezra* 10:21-24 with 1 Macc 2:7-12 and 4Q179 I.

⁴¹ See 5:25; 7:26; 8:52.

⁴² Lichtenberger 1999: 243-45. DeSilva 2002: 328 (footnote 4) suggests that the woman represents the earthly Zion, which "even though now mourning and childless, is not bereft of glory. God has prepared an eternal Zion, so that the earthly city, now broken and desolate, is seen by Ezra to have a glorious future." The distinction between the earthly Zion and the heavenly Zion is complex in 4 *Ezra*, and it seems more likely that the heavenly Zion will ultimately come to earth (as in Rev 21-22) and stand in the place of the now desolate earthly Zion. See Longenecker 1995: 68; Nickelsburg 2005a: 273-74; Gäbel 2006: 101-2.

⁴³ Stone 2007: 402-7 argues that the limitations on Ezra's ability to see and hear what he encounters in the city/building in 4 *Ezra* 55-56 indicate that the city is a metaphor for the heavenly realm where God dwells.

⁴⁴ This description is emphasised with double repetition in 10:42, 44. See Lee 2001: 135. In the Latin text the city was being built (*aedificabatur*, imperfect indicative). The Syriac and Ethiopic versions refer to "an established city" (NRSV Marg).

⁴⁵ For the foundations of Jerusalem see Ps 87:1; Isa 54:11. In Rev 21:14, 19 the new Jerusalem has foundations that are identified as the apostles, reflecting the idea of the community as a temple (Beale 1999: 1069-71). See also 1QS VIII and my discussion of this text in 3.7.2 (above). In Heb 11:10 Abraham is said to have looked for a city with foundations; that is, the heavenly Jerusalem.

aedificii).⁴⁶ That it is a building recalls the identification of the city with the temple in 3:24.⁴⁷ The heavenly Jerusalem turns out to be the eschatological temple, as in Heb 12:22-24.

5.2.5 The Third Vision (13:1-58)

The final reference to the city in *4 Ezra* is in the third vision,⁴⁸ that of the man who will emerge from the sea (the Messiah) and carve out a great mountain (13:6-7) without hands (13:36).⁴⁹ In 13:35-36 the mountain is identified as “Zion”, which will “come and be revealed to all people” (*Sion autem veniet et ostendetur omnibus*). It is also described as “prepared and built” (*parata et aedificata*), which recalls the earlier references to the built city (5:24; 10:27).

This imagery forms a fitting climax to the book. It clarifies the centrality of Zion, now identified as the heavenly Jerusalem, prepared and built by the Lord, hidden from human view, but to be revealed at the end of time as the place from where God will judge and destroy his enemies.

5.2.6 Conclusion

Zion is central in *4 Ezra*. It is the desolate place Ezra mourns and it becomes the locus of Ezra’s eschatological hopes. It is difficult, however, to distinguish the earthly Zion from the heavenly and, indeed, they seem to refer to the same reality. Both were planned and made by God, although David did build the earthly Zion. The language of copy is less appropriate than the language of identification. In the eschaton, the earthly and the heavenly Zion seem to merge when sovereignty is restored to the people of God, thus satisfying Ezra’s hopes (6:59) at the place where his distress first became apparent. However, all this is predicated of Solomon’s temple. The second temple is passed over in silence, almost as an aberration.

There are similarities between *4 Ezra* and Hebrews,⁵⁰ although the tone of *4 Ezra* is quite different. While both look to the eschatological goal of the people of God, for Ezra the distress occasioned by the loss of Zion and the temple is consoled with the hope that God will ultimately reveal the eschatological Zion and re-establish the sovereignty of God’s people on the earth. Hebrews looks to the heavenly Jerusalem, but does so in order to

⁴⁶ The Ethiopic version has Ezra seeing the vastness of the walls and the Armenian version adds “of that city” (Stone 1990: 340).

⁴⁷ See also 10:46. See Hamerton-Kelly 1970: 4; Stone 1990: 337.

⁴⁸ The Eagle Vision (*4 Ezra* 11-12) is a key part of the text, but contains no temple imagery.

⁴⁹ For the expression “without hands” as a reference to the eschatological temple see Mark 14:58; Acts 7:48; Heb 8:2; 9:11. See also Dan 2:34-35.

⁵⁰ DeSilva 2002: 347.

negate the earthly one (11:10, 16; 12:18-24; 13:12-13).⁵¹ Jerusalem and the temple were probably still standing when Hebrews was written, but these are not to feature in the hopes of the people of God. They are to seek the heavenly Jerusalem, the eschatological dwelling of God with his people.

5.3 The *Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*

Syriac Baruch (2 *Baruch*) is an apocalypse⁵² written by a “Torah-observant Jew”⁵³ Like 4 *Ezra* it is fictionally set around the time of the exile of the southern kingdom and written in the name of Jeremiah’s illustrious scribe (Jer 36:32), who has now become an apocalyptic seer and Jeremiah’s “legitimate prophetic successor.”⁵⁴ This is a literary device, and it is clear that the work post-dates the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 C.E.⁵⁵ It was probably written prior to 135 C.E.⁵⁶ It is extant in a single Syriac manuscript from the sixth or seventh century,⁵⁷ as well as in some Syriac, Latin and Greek fragments, and an Arabic translation.⁵⁸ The Syriac version seems to be a translation from Greek, but whether or not

⁵¹ See Lichtenberger 1999: 247-48 for similar comparisons between 4 *Ezra* and Rev 21-22. He also notes that in Revelation, also written after 70 C.E., there is no lament for the loss of Jerusalem and the temple.

⁵² Hobbins 1998: 48; Davila 2005b: 126; Gurtner 2009: 18-20. Note e.g. the angel Ramail who reveals the interpretation of Baruch’s dream vision in 55:3–74:4.

⁵³ Davila 2005b: 128-30; Gurtner 2009: 13. Davila notes the centrality of the Torah, the Jewish nationalistic identity, the lack of distinctly Christian features in the eschatology of the book, and the absence of any reference to the life, death and resurrection of Jesus. Nir 2003: 3-15, 199-201 (and *passim*) argues that it is a Christian work preserved by Christians because the picture of the Messiah appears more Christian than Jewish. As Davila 2005b: 131 suggests, Nir’s work rather than establishing Christian authorship of 2 *Baruch* shows how it might be relevant for Christians. See also Henze 2006: 158 (footnote 4); Gurtner 2009: 14. It is apparent that in his emphasis on law and covenant, Baruch is presented as a second Moses, see Murphy 1985b: 117-34; Henze 2006: 168-70; Gurtner 2009: 14-15.

⁵⁴ Wright 1998: 271-76, 284 (quote from p. 275); Henze 2006: 157-77; Lied 2008: 1; Gurtner 2009: 2. Baruch is never referred to as a scribe in 2 *Bar.*, and in 2:1-2; 5:5; 10:2-4 Baruch speaks the word of the Lord to Jeremiah and not the other way around, showing that “Baruch is a prophet in his own right and successor to Jeremiah” (Henze, p. 166).

⁵⁵ Hobbins 1998: 48; Nir 2003: 1; Davila 2005b: 126-27. Gurtner 2008: 23; 2009: 16-18, 27-32, argues that the reference to the “twenty-fifth year of Jeconiah” in 2 *Bar.* 1:1 indicates that it is to be dated in 95 C.E. (twenty-five years after the fall of the temple). Roddy 1996: 3-14 argues from 2 *Bar.* 28:2 that it was written around 95 C.E. and that Baruch expected the end in 99 C.E. See the response to Roddy in Laato 1998: 39-46, who considers that Baruch expected the end around 139 C.E.

⁵⁶ 2 *Bar.* 32:2-4 refers to the destruction of the temple, but there is no reference to the Bar Kokhba revolt of 135. There may be an allusion to 2 *Bar.* 61:7 in *Barn.* 11:9, although this is doubted by some scholars (e.g. Saylor 1984: 110). The date of *Barnabas* is also debated, although the range is similar to that of 2 *Baruch* (Holmes 2007: 373).

⁵⁷ Lied 2008: 21; Gurtner 2009: 6-7.

⁵⁸ Gurtner 2009: 6-8. The Arabic translation is of a *Vorlage* related to, but not identical with, the Syriac MS. On the nature of this translation see Koningsveld 1975: 205-7; Leemhuis, Klijn and Gelder 1986: vi, 4-13; Leemhuis 1989: 19-26. Thirty-six Syriac MSS of 2 *Bar.* 78-87, (the *Epistle of Second Baruch*) are also extant (Gurtner, pp. 9-10).

there was a Semitic original is debated.⁵⁹ A relationship exists between *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, although its precise nature has eluded scholars.⁶⁰

The structure of *2 Baruch* is complex, and several schemes have been proposed, mostly involving seven sections, although scholars differ on their precise delineation.⁶¹ Earlier scholars detected a variety of documents behind the text, and referred to Baruch as an editor rather than an author.⁶² More recent scholars, while not denying the use of sources, argue that the work is a literary unity.⁶³ This question impinges on the issue of the temple, since different attitudes to the temple surface in different parts of *2 Baruch*.⁶⁴ That there seem to be contradictions in our minds in the understanding of the symbols of an ancient work need not lead to theories of editorial compilation. This text grapples with significant issues, and while one solution suggests itself in one place, another may suggest itself elsewhere.⁶⁵

5.3.1 Section 1 (*2 Bar. 1:1–5:7*)

The opening words announce that in the twenty-fifth year of Jeconiah of Judah the word of the Lord came upon Baruch. The Lord declared that the wickedness of the two southern tribes was worse than that of the ten northern tribes and that he was about to bring evil upon the city and its inhabitants. The city would be taken away for a time and the people would be scattered among the Gentiles. Baruch responds (3:1-9),⁶⁶ referring to the city as his mother,⁶⁷ and pointing out that if God were to do this, the name of Israel would

⁵⁹ Davila 2005a: 59-60; Gurtner 2009: 10-13.

⁶⁰ Davila 2005b: 127 suggests that *4 Ezra* has influenced *2 Baruch*, as does Collins 1998: 222-24 (although tentatively). See the discussions in Kirschner 1985: 32-33; Nickelsburg 2005a: 283-86; Gurtner 2009: 15-16.

⁶¹ See e.g. Charles 1913e: 474; Bogaert 1969: 1: 64-76; Klijn 1970: 67-68; 1983a: 615 (who summarises the contents into twelve sections); 1989: 4-7; Sayler 1984 (who retains seven sections, but omits any reference to the *Epistle*); Murphy 1985b: 11-29 (see the chart on p. 12); Willett 1989: 80-95 (who has eight sections, including the *Epistle*—see the chart on p. 82); Whitters 2003: 35-48 (chart on p. 42); Gurtner 2009: 21-24. Hobbins 1998: 53-54 has a fourfold structure, and Henze 2010: 426-27 argues for three parts (1-9; 10-77; 78-87), with the long central part containing several “set elements ... that are frequently repeated.” Deciding on a precise structure is not critical to the present study, and I follow Gurtner’s outline. Unless otherwise noted, I use Gurtner’s translation (Gurtner 2009). The Syriac text is available in Dederling 1973 and Gurtner 2009.

⁶² E.g. Charles 1913e: 474-76.

⁶³ Bogaert 1969: 1: 56-81; Sayler 1984: 4-6; Murphy 1985b: 2-3; Collins 1998: 214-16; Lied 2008: 24-26; Henze 2010: 428. Murphy 1985a: 2 describes Charles’ approach as “scissors-and-paste,” a process quite different from the author’s use of sources to compose a new and coherent work.

⁶⁴ Hobbins 1998: 49-51; Collins 1998: 215. I discuss these different attitudes as they arise.

⁶⁵ See Collins 1998 215, “an apocalypse does not aspire to formulate doctrine in a consistent way, but to suggest future hope by means of symbols.”

⁶⁶ This is the start of the extended dialogue between God and Baruch that characterises all of *2 Baruch* (Henze 2006: 163).

⁶⁷ See also 10:16. For the imagery of the city as a mother and the inhabitants as her children see Isa 49:20-22, 25; 50:1; 51:18, 20; 54:1; Jer 50:12; Ezek 16:20-21, 36; Hos 4:5; Bar 4:8–5:9; *4 Ezra* 5:50; 10:6-8; Gal 4:25-26.

be no longer remembered. Nobody would speak the Lord's praises, there would be none to receive Torah instruction, the world would return to its "natural state" and to silence, and humanity would be destroyed. As in other texts,⁶⁸ this text reflects the cosmic nature of the temple. While the temple is not specifically mentioned, the return of the cosmos to silence (3:4-6), implies that the destruction of the temple means the reversal of creation.⁶⁹ The city is more than just any city; rather, the symbolic destruction of the world and humanity imply that the city stands for the temple.⁷⁰

God's response in 2 *Bar.* 4 confirms that it is more than just a city. God initially refers to the city (ܐܪܡܝܐ 4:1-2) and then to the building (ܒܝܬܐ 4:3)⁷¹ that he showed to Adam in paradise,⁷² to Abraham, and then to Moses when he showed him the pattern of the tabernacle (ܡܕܒܪܐ ܡܕܒܪܐ 4:5) and all its vessels.⁷³ Finally, in 5:1 Baruch responds in terms of Zion, "this place" (ܐܝܬܐ ܕܐܝܬܐ)⁷⁴ and "your sanctuary" (ܡܕܒܪܐ).

While Baruch responds to the threat of destruction (2 *Bar.* 3) with arguments for the ongoing significance of the city and the temple, God responds that he is determined to hand over the city and punish the people "for a time," but that the world would not be

⁶⁸ E.g. Sir 24; Philo, *Mos.* 2.70-108, 136-40; *QE* 2.68-69; *Her.* 221-29; *Spec.* 1.172; *L.A.B.* 12:9.

⁶⁹ Hobbins 1998: 54-55 has a slightly different understanding of the relationship between temple and cosmos. He notes that the relationship in 2 *Bar.* 1 is expressed in Baruch's questions and not in God's statements, and suggests that Baruch enquires whether "the destruction to be wrought on Jerusalem is a foretaste of God's resolve to destroy the cosmos and the human race altogether." Be that as it may, that Baruch can ask such questions implies that he made a connection between the temple and the cosmos. Later (p. 55), Hobbins suggests that 2 *Bar.* 4:2-6 indicates that the earthly Jerusalem "is only a copy." Nowhere does the text delineate the relationship between the earthly and the heavenly Jerusalem, nor does it use the language of "copy."

⁷⁰ Murphy 1985b: 71 1987: 671-73; Lee 2001: 150-51; Lied 2008: 35-37; 47-49. On p. 671 Murphy notes that in 2 *Baruch* "the author does not clearly differentiate between Jerusalem and the Temple. The Temple defines Jerusalem ... The significance of the loss of Jerusalem is that the Temple no longer exists." See also Lee 2001: 145. For a similar phenomenon see 4 *Ezra* 3:24; 10:46. On the cosmic nature of the temple and its relationship with creation see Blenkinsopp 1976: 275-77; Kearney 1977: 25-40; Levenson 1984: 275-98; Otzen 1984: 199-215; Murphy 1985b: 84; Boorer 2001: 19-33; Lied 2008: 49-52. On the lack of differentiation between the temple and the city, Klijn 1989: 9 suggests that the concern is not really the temple but the "fall of Jerusalem, the City of God." It is better to see the city/temple as a single complex that is in view, so that one is subsumed under the other.

⁷¹ The term "building" in 4:3 seems to be a reference to the temple, although Bogaert 1969: 1: 422 refers to "l'édifice de Sion."

⁷² That God showed the building to Adam perhaps reflects the temple connotations of Eden in such texts as *Jub.* 3. See also 2 *En.* 31:2; *L.A.B.* 26:6. For revelation to Abraham see Gen 15:5; 4 *Ezra* 3:13-14; *Gen. Rab.* 44:21.

⁷³ 2 *Bar.* 5:5; 59:4 reads Exod 25:8-9, 40 as though God showed Moses the heavenly temple as the pattern of the tabernacle. I will argue that Hebrews reads this text as indicating that God commanded Moses to construct a tabernacle to prefigure his eschatological dwelling with his people. Hebrews makes no comment on the pre-existence of the heavenly temple.

⁷⁴ For place (Aramaic ܐܝܬܐ) as the location of the temple see Ezra 5:15; 6:3, 5, 7.

forgotten as Baruch had suggested in 3:7.⁷⁵ Then God turns to the heavenly temple. God points out that the city Baruch sees is not the city engraved on the palms of God's hands,⁷⁶ and the building Baruch sees is not the one that was "prepared beforehand from the time when I decided to create paradise." The dichotomy between the earthly city and temple and the heavenly is striking in the light of the close connection between the two elsewhere in *2 Baruch*.⁷⁷ The ideas reflect Ezek 8-10, where the glory of Yahweh abandoned the temple. Without the presence of Yahweh, the temple is simply an empty shell. The real Jerusalem and the temple are preserved with God (4:6).⁷⁸

5.3.2 Section 2 (2 Bar. 6:1–9:1)

This section recounts the destruction of both city and temple,⁷⁹ not by enemies but by four angels, and only after another angel from heaven enters "the holy of holies" (**קדש הקדשים**),⁸⁰ takes the contents of the temple and commands the earth to swallow them up for a time. These are hidden in the earth "until the end times," so that they may be restored at the proper time and "so that strangers may not get possession of them" (6:8),⁸¹ for the time will come when it is restored "forever" (**לחלם**).⁸² This text envisages the restoration of the temple "forever," together with the reuse of the sacred contents. It makes use of traditions known from elsewhere of the temple utensils being hidden for re-use in the rebuilt

⁷⁵ Murphy 1985b: 72-92 refers to the form of this interchange as "intercessory bargaining." See Num 14:10b-25; 16:19b-24; Exod 32:9-14; Gen 19:1-28, where in each case God relents and does not carry out the intended punishment. In 2 Bar. 1-5 God does not relent. "Since Baruch bases his intercession on certain views of the Temple, God's failure to agree with him amounts to a rejection of those views. Thus, God himself points out the inadequacy of the Temple ideology behind some responses to the destruction of Jerusalem" (1987: 673).

⁷⁶ For this image see Isa 49:16. In its context in Isaiah the text refers to the earthly Jerusalem, which God promises not to forget. Baruch's reshaping of the text has the effect of negating the earthly Jerusalem in favour of the heavenly one. Charles 1913e: 482 could not understand the derision of Jerusalem and the temple in this section, and considered 4:2-7 a later interpolation. Similarly, Nir 2003: 19-32, not finding any suggestion of the inferiority of the earthly temple to the heavenly in early Jewish sources argues that 2 *Baruch* is a Christian composition, reflected in what she sees as denigration of the earthly tabernacle in Heb 8:1-5. I argue below (8.5) that there is no denigration of the tabernacle in Hebrews. It is set aside, not because it is inferior, but because the reality to which it pointed is now in place.

⁷⁷ The close relationship appears where (in Baruch's mind at least) the loss of the temple means the reversal of creation (see 3:4-9; 10:8-17; 61:1-8).

⁷⁸ Willett 1989: 85. See also Hamerton-Kelly 1970: 4 (who refers to "hostility" against the Jerusalem temple); and Stone 1981: 199-200, who notes, "[f]or all its glory, the earthly Temple ... does not bear the full weight of the cosmic role. This is reserved for the heavenly Temple."

⁷⁹ Again, city and temple merge. In 6:4 angels stand at the four corners of the city and in 7:1 they tear down the walls to their foundations, while in 8:1 Baruch hears a voice from within the temple after the wall had fallen, calling the enemies to come. The Chaldeans obey and seize the house and everything around it.

⁸⁰ This expression only occurs here and in 34:1, where Baruch himself decides to go and enquire of God at the place of the former holy of holies.

⁸¹ See 80:2 where only one reason is given, "that they may not be polluted by enemies."

⁸² Gurtner 2009: 37 translates **לחלם** with "forever," while Murphy 1985b: 95 suggests that the sense is "for a long time" (see also p. 21).

(second) temple after the exile.⁸³ Murphy reads the text as referring to the building of the second temple,⁸⁴ but the consistent use of **לחל** with the sense of “forever” throughout 2 *Baruch*,⁸⁵ and especially in 32:4 which refers to an eschatological temple being built “forever,” makes this conclusion difficult to uphold.⁸⁶ It seems, rather, that here also the text anticipates a new (earthly) temple in the eschaton that will endure forever, and in which the sacred contents of the first temple will again be used.⁸⁷ There is no space for such utensils in Hebrews, since the sacrifice of Christ abolished the former cult and its rituals (Heb 10:1-18). There the eschatological temple is a metaphor for God’s dwelling with his people; in 2 *Baruch* the eschatological temple replaces the destroyed temple and will include a restored sacrificial cult.

The earthly temple has minimal significance in 2 *Bar.* 4, probably because of the departure of the glory of God from it because of the wickedness of the people. This is also apparent in chapters 7-8. In 7:1 the destroying angel breaks down the walls so that the enemies of God’s people cannot claim credit for burning down “the place” (**רִיבֵר**) of the mighty God. Following this, a voice is heard from within “the temple” (**מִחֲלֵל**),⁸⁸ inviting the invading armies to enter, since “he who preserved the ‘house’ (**בֵּית**)”⁸⁹ has abandoned

⁸³ For a discussion of these traditions see Collins 1972: 97-116; Nickelsburg 1973c: 63-65, 67; Nir 2003: 43-77. See Bar 1:8-10; 2 Macc 2:4-8; 4 *Bar.* (*Paraleipomena of Jeremiah*) 3:9-19; *Lin. Pro.* (Life of Jeremiah) 2:12.

⁸⁴ Murphy 1985b: 95; 1987: 679.

⁸⁵ The expression appears in 5:2 (the name and the glory of the Lord lasting “forever”); 32:4 (the eschatological rebuilding of Zion “forever”); 40:3 (the “enduring” reign of the messiah—in an interim messianic age); 43:1 (“enduring” consolations for Baruch); 44:1 (the “endurance” of the new world); 59:2 (the lamp of the “eternal” law); 66:6 (an “eternal” reward for Josiah); 73:1 (“eternal” peace in the messianic age); 78:6 (“eternal” hope); and 78:7 (God will not forget or forsake his people “forever”). In 14:18 it refers to “the world.”

⁸⁶ Bogaert 1969: 1: 422. Three temples appear in 32:2-4. They seem to be: (1) the destroyed temple of Solomon; (2) the second temple that will uprooted “after a time” (**בְּיָמֵינוּ**); and (3) a temple that will be “renewed in glory and perfected forever” (**לְחַיֵּי חַיִּים וְשָׁלוֹם לְעוֹלָם**). The use of **לחל** (“forever”) both here and in 6:9 should be read as referring to the same (eschatological) temple.

⁸⁷ Ibid.: 1: 422; Hobbins 1998: 56-57. Collins 1998: 214-15 refers to an eschatological restoration of the temple, but one that was not imminent, making the heavenly Jerusalem and temple more important than the restored temple. Nir 2003: 43-77 argues that the hiding of the sacred vessels is evidence of Christian provenance for 2 *Baruch*, suggesting that they will be used again in the rebuilt temple at the return of Christ. But the NT nowhere anticipates a rebuilt earthly temple after the return of Christ. That the messianic age seems to be on earth is seen in such texts as 2 *Bar.* 40:2, where God’s people are found “in the place that I have chosen,” and 71:1, where the holy land will have mercy on its inhabitants during the eschatological battle. See Harrington 2003a: 667-72.

⁸⁸ This word only appears here, in 10:5 where Baruch sits in front of the destroyed temple, and in 80:3, where the destruction of the temple is described.

⁸⁹ This word appears here and in 8:4; 10:18; 80:3 to refer to the temple, and twice in 22:8 to refer to an ordinary dwelling.

it” (8:1-2).⁹⁰ The earthly temple is an empty shell when devoid of the presence of God. In this part of 2 *Baruch*, there is no hope of a new temple.

5.3.3 Section 3 (2 *Bar.* 10:1–12:5)

This section is a lament over the loss of the temple, again reflecting Baruch’s understanding of its cosmic nature as in 3:4-9. The earth need no longer produce crops, vines or grapes, since these will no longer be required for temple offerings. Normal seasonal rhythms will cease, people will no longer marry and have children for “this mother is desolate,” and no longer will beauty be the topic of conversation. Had the temple still stood, all of life would have had significance, but with its fall, everything else falls.

The priests are to hurl the keys to heaven so that God would guard the house himself, for they have been false stewards. The implication is that the sin of 2 *Bar.* 1:2-3 is now attributed to the priesthood and the heavenly temple has taken the place of the earthly.

5.3.4 Section 5.1 (2 *Bar.* 31–43)

Here, Baruch assembles the elders of the people in the Kidron valley to instruct them. Temple imagery appears in 31:1–32:6 and 44:5-7, surrounding a vision of a forest and a vine (36–42), interpreted with reference to the ultimate destruction of Daniel’s fourth kingdom, whose end will come at the hands of the Messiah on Mount Zion (39–40).⁹¹ The vision comes to Baruch at the desolate site of the former temple, showing the ongoing significance of that site.⁹² He “enters” the holy of holies to enquire of God. As he sits there in the holy place and weeps, God reveals the eschatological scenario just described. The temple is the place of revelation, and the place where the priests of old offered holy sacrifices and fragrant incense (34-35).⁹³

In 31:4 Baruch admonishes the elders of the people not to forget Zion and to remember the anguish of Jerusalem. Murphy may be right when he suggests that Baruch is here picking up a slogan repeated by the people. Baruch agrees in principle, but provides an

⁹⁰ Nir 2003: 80-81 relates the abandonment of the temple by God to the tearing of the temple veil in Matt 27:50; Mark 15:38 with the implication (as in *T. Benj.* 9:3-4) that God was leaving the temple and going to the nations. Such ideas are absent from 2 *Baruch*.

⁹¹ Cf. the Eagle Vision and the Vision of the Man from the Sea in 4 *Ezra* 11-13.

⁹² Fuller Dow 2010: 123-24. Cf. 2 *Bar.* 10:4.

⁹³ Nir omits 2 *Bar.* 34 from her study and only makes passing references to 2 *Bar.* 35 (pp. 21, 47). If 2 *Baruch* was a Christian composition, as Nir maintains, it would be difficult to imagine Baruch going to site of the former temple to seek God, and weeping over the desolation, for the NT shows the limited significance of the temple site after the death of Christ. See e.g. Heb 13:10-16. The primitive Christian community maintained some connection with the temple (Luke 24:53; Acts 2:46; 3:1-10; 4:1; 5:20-42; 21:27-30). See the discussion of the place of the temple in Luke-Acts in Walker 1996: 60-68. In Acts 21:30 Paul is dragged from the temple and the doors are shut behind him. There is no positive reference to the temple in Luke-Acts after this.

appropriate explanation (2 *Bar* 32).⁹⁴ Just as Jerusalem has been destroyed, everything will be destroyed (31:5) so that the new era can be inaugurated (32). The allusion to Hag 2:6 in 32:1 also puts the destruction of Jerusalem in its cosmic context, as a precursor to the shaking of the whole creation so that the creation can be renewed (32:6). The author of Hebrews uses Hag 2:6 similarly in Heb 12:25-29 to explain the removal of the present age and the inauguration of the unshakeable kingdom.⁹⁵

The destruction of Solomon's temple and its rebuilding (32:2), followed by the destruction of the second temple (32:3),⁹⁶ and the building of the eschatological temple, "renewed in glory and perfected forever" (ܠܚܕܝܢ ܕܥܠܝܐ ܕܡܕܢܚܐ ܕܥܠܝܐ ܕܡܕܢܚܐ)⁹⁷ are detailed in 2 *Bar*. 32:2-5. The text reflects the history of the temple site, with the successive construction and destruction of the two temples known to the author, but anticipates not the imminent rebuilding of the recently destroyed second temple, but the eschatological temple.⁹⁸

5.3.5 Section 6.2 (2 *Bar* 53:1–77:26)

This section contains Baruch's dream vision of a cloud coming out of the sea containing black and bright waters (53), the interpretation of the vision by the angel Ramail (55:3–74:4), and the conclusion to the apocalypse. The vision is a history of the world from the creation to the consummation (56:2), alternating with events that were good (bright waters) and bad (black waters).⁹⁹ The detailed review of history comes to an end with the post-exilic rebuilding of the temple (the twelfth waters). The Maccabean wars are ignored, as are the details of the fall of the second temple.¹⁰⁰

The fourth bright waters refer to the time of the Exodus and the Sinai revelation when the heavens were shaken (59:3). This was when God revealed numerous things to Moses,

⁹⁴ Murphy 1985b: 104.

⁹⁵ Laansma 2008b: 12-15. In Hebrews the allusion to Haggai follows immediately after a contrast between the terrors associated with Sinai and the glory of the heavenly Jerusalem (12:18-24). The allusion to Hag 2:6 would have brought with it an echo of Hag 2:9, "The latter splendor of this house shall be greater than the former, says the LORD of hosts ..." (NRSV). For this principle see Hays 1993: 20-21, who discusses the significance of unstated points of resonance between texts. I discuss the allusion to Hag 2:6 in Heb 12:25-29 in 7.7 (below).

⁹⁶ This is anticipated in the fictional setting of the narrative, but had taken place in reality.

⁹⁷ See Bogaert 1969: 2: 67-68. Charles 1913e: 499 considers that these verses are an interpolation interrupting the flow of the chapter, but the allusion to Hag 2:6 in 32:1 indicates that Baruch is thinking of the cosmic implications of the destruction of the temple and the construction of the eschatological temple.

⁹⁸ Collins 1998: 215.

⁹⁹ See Lied 2008: 92-95 for the implications of the white and black waters creating and de-creating covenantal space respectively.

¹⁰⁰ On this phenomenon see Grabbe and Charlesworth 1981: 65, who suggest that this vision and its interpretation may be a much earlier text put to use by the author. He notes an exception to the general rule that historical reviews were meant to show reader that they were living in the end-time.

the foremost of which was the “blueprint’ (רָשָׁמָה) of Zion and its measurements” in the “pattern” (רָשָׁמָה) of which “the present sanctuary” (רָשָׁמָה רָשָׁמָה) was made. The issue here is the referent of the terms “Zion” and “present sanctuary.” Gurtner’s choice of “blueprint” for the word רָשָׁמָה when it refers to Zion in 59:4¹⁰¹ is confusing. “Shape,” “image” or “form” would have been better.¹⁰² In 4:5 the “pattern” of the tabernacle that God showed to Moses was probably the “city engraved on the palm of God’s hands,” that is, the heavenly city and temple (4:3). The same idea seems to be present in this text. God showed Moses the “shape” or “image” or “form” of the heavenly city (here Zion), which Moses was to use as the pattern of the “present sanctuary.” In the context of 59:4, the “present sanctuary” is either the wilderness tabernacle or the first or second temple. While none of these can really be described as “present,” the second temple is surely “present” in the narrative of 2 *Baruch*. Charles communicates the sense well, when he translates “the sanctuary of the present time,”¹⁰³ that is the earthly sanctuary in its various manifestations, designed according to the pattern shown to Moses on Sinai (Exod 25:8-9, 40).

Moses sees more than just the shape of the heavenly temple. He also sees the greatness of paradise, the completion of the ages and the beginning of the day of judgement, the number of offerings not yet offered, and the worlds that have not yet come. He also sees innumerable angels and flaming hosts, and the orders of the heads of angels. The text is based on Deut 34:1-4, but Moses sees not just Canaan, but the entire cosmos, including the heavenly city and temple. Just as in 4:1-7, the “real” Jerusalem is in heaven, so here the real land promised to the ancestors is in heaven, and the text negates the earthly realities, transferring them to heaven.¹⁰⁴ Expectations are shifted from earth to heaven,¹⁰⁵ and “the

¹⁰¹ This word appears twice in this verse, and Gurtner translates “the blueprint (רָשָׁמָה) of Zion ... in the pattern (רָשָׁמָה) of which the present sanctuary was made.” The word also appears in 4:5, where God showed Moses the pattern of the tabernacle (רָשָׁמָה רָשָׁמָה). See Gurtner 2009: 33, 102.

¹⁰² The text may be read as a subjective genitive (the image that is Zion). For “shape,” “form” or “image” for רָשָׁמָה see Brockelmann 1895: 74; Gurtner 2009: 160. There is an error in Gurtner’s concordance, with the instances of רָשָׁמָה in 4:5; 59:4 listed under רָשָׁמָה on p. 175.

¹⁰³ Charles 1913e: 513 (see footnote 4). For this reading the word רָשָׁמָה (“in the likeness”) needs to be emended to רָשָׁמָה (“and the likeness”), an emendation adopted by Bogaert 1969: 2: 111-12; Dederling 1973: 34; and Gurtner 2009: 102. Klijn 1983a: 642 declines to emend the text and reads, “he showed him ... the likeness of Zion with its measurements which was to be made after the likeness of the present sanctuary.” While the Arabic translation must be used with great care as a witness to the text, it also supports this emendation (Leemhuis, Klijn and Gelder 1986: 90-91). If the un-emended text were original (which seems unlikely) it gives an interesting perspective, suggesting that Zion would be made in the likeness of the wilderness sanctuary, with the implication that the eschatological sanctuary in which God will ultimately dwell with his people will resemble that sanctuary. I will argue for a sense close to this for Heb 8:5. Gäbel 2006: 103, working from Klijn 1983a: 642 suggests that God revealed to Moses that Solomon’s temple was to be built after the pattern of the wilderness tabernacle. This reading seems out of the question, and is irrelevant to Exod 25:8-9, 40, which is surely in view here.

¹⁰⁴ Lied 2008: 278.

¹⁰⁵ Murphy 1985b: 86-87.

promises God made to Moses regarding the land will therefore ... be fulfilled (sic) in the other world.”¹⁰⁶

The sixth bright waters are the time of David and Solomon, including “the building of Zion” (בנין ציון) and the dedication of “the sanctuary” (המקדש)¹⁰⁷ with the offering of many offerings (61:2). There was peace and tranquillity, and Zion enjoyed sovereignty over lands and regions. These conditions reflect such texts as 2 Sam 7:1, 11; 2 Kings 5:4, where God gives his people rest from their enemies and the temple is built.¹⁰⁸ Given the nature of the temple as a microcosm of the universe seen in the devastating effects of its destruction (3:1-9), the temple in this text can be seen as the completion of the creation.¹⁰⁹

The ninth black waters were the time of Manasseh, who acted so wickedly that “it [the wickedness of Manasseh] removed the glory of the Most High from the Sanctuary” (64:6). The primary reference is Ezek 10:18-19, which is to be dated at the time of the exile, but Baruch brings it forward to the time of Manasseh (2 Chron 33:1-10), ignoring Manasseh’s repentance and restoration (2 Chron 33:10-17), and leaving the temple an empty shell.¹¹⁰ The eleventh black waters represent the exile, with the destruction of Zion and the temple, “the disaster that has now befallen Zion,” although the king of Babylon who did this will ultimately fall (67:7). This is followed by the twelfth bright waters, the rebuilding of the temple.

In the literary setting of 2 *Baruch* the rebuilding of the temple is in the future: “Zion will again be built” (בנין ציון), its offerings restored, the priests return to their ministry, and the gentiles come to honour it, “but not as fully as before” (אשר לא כשלפניו, 68:5). This reflects dissatisfaction with the second temple and the reality that the second temple was not as glorious as was the first.¹¹¹

The remainder of this part of 2 *Baruch* details an eschatological battle (70), followed by the messianic age (71-74), when the Messiah has sat down in eternal peace on the throne of

¹⁰⁶ Lied 2008: 297.

¹⁰⁷ 2 *Baruch* consistently uses the expression המקדש for the sanctuary (10:18; 34:1; 59:4; 61:2; 64:2, 6). It could be translated “holy house” or “holy place.” (Lied, *ibid.*, p. 65).

¹⁰⁸ See also Deut 12:10; 25:19; Josh 21:44; 23:1; 2 Sam 7:1, 11; 2 Chron 6:41-2.

¹⁰⁹ Lied 2008: 68-70.

¹¹⁰ The departure of the Lord from the temple is reported in 2 *Bar.* 8:2 when the angel permits the enemies to destroy it. However, there is no reference to the glory returning to the temple after Manasseh. While 2 *Bar.* 66 recounts Josiah’s reform, the implication is that it was a superficial reform, since the glory of Yahweh was no longer present in the temple. *Ibid.*: 76, 90 (footnote 50) suggests the continuing presence of the Lord in the temple from the time of David to the destruction, apart from during the time of Manasseh. On this see *Tg. Jon.* Isa 66:1 (Chilton 1987: 126, footnote 66:1); *b. San* 103b.

¹¹¹ Ezra 3:12; 1 *En.* 89:73-74.

his kingdom.¹¹² Joy will be revealed and rest will appear (73:1). While the text reflects the restoration of the pristine conditions of Eden, including the end of pain in childbirth (73:7),¹¹³ the appearance of rest echoes again the conditions associated with the building of the temple under David and Solomon. The cosmic deconstruction associated with the destruction of the temple is now undone with the advent of the messianic age with the Messiah enthroned. However, the text is silent about Zion and the temple. While these have disappeared from view, the restoration of creation in terms of the return to the conditions of Eden suggests that the entire creation has become an eschatological temple. No longer are the joy and rest restricted to Zion, but gladness will spread throughout all the earth (73:2). That which is incorruptible has replaced that which is corruptible as history comes to its intended *telos*. But, given the place of the righteous dead, in Paradise in the heights of heaven in 2 *Bar.* 51, and the “paradisiacal” description of the restored conditions of Eden in these chapters that appear to be on earth, it seems that in 2 *Baruch*, as in some NT texts, heaven as God’s space and earth as human space are merged into one in the eschaton.¹¹⁴

5.3.6 Conclusion

In most of 2 *Baruch* there is a consistent picture: the temple has cosmic features, so that its destruction means the reversal of creation and its reconstruction the renewal of creation. This contrasts with the picture in the opening section where Baruch expresses his dismay at the destruction of city and the temple. There, God assures him that the city and temple he sees are not the real ones that pre-existed the visible ones and were revealed to Adam, Abraham and Moses. Thus, Baruch uses the notion of a heavenly temple to make a negative point about the earthly temple.¹¹⁵ Two oblique references to the rebuilding of the

¹¹² Nir 2003: 195 thinks that this is in the heavenly temple, citing Matt 19:28; Heb 1:8; 8:1; Rev 4: 2, 9. But the text is silent as to the location of the throne. 2 *Baruch* seems to envisage an earthly Messiah. If this was a Christian text as Nir maintains, it would surely recognise that the Messiah Jesus had already taken his seat on the throne in the heavenly temple/palace as Heb 1:3; 8:1 maintains.

¹¹³ Lied 2008: 219-20. Sayler 1984:71 refers to “the generating of children as part of the curses brought about by Adam’s sin” and for this reason finds the restoration in this text partial for that reason. But surely it is pain (עצבון) in childbirth that is the curse rather than child-bearing itself, as Sayler (tentatively) suggests as part of the solution to her quandary.

¹¹⁴ Rev 21:1-4, 9–22:7. Nickelsburg 2005a: 283 notes that it is unclear how the future reversal takes place and how the pictures of heaven in 2 *Bar.* 51 and the earthly, eschatological paradise in 2 *Bar.* 73-74 can be reconciled. To be sure, 2 *Baruch* never explicitly mentions a merger of heaven and earth. Murphy 1985b: 88-89 negates any earthly eschatological hope in 2 *Baruch*, suggesting that Baruch “anticipates the passing away of everything earthly.” This seems to be an inadequate reading of what appears as an (implicit) earthly eschatology, and he does not treat 2 *Bar.* 73-74 in his chapter on Zion. Hobbins 1998: 56 refers to “the *restitution* of the point of intersection of the temporal and eternal spheres.”

¹¹⁵ Murphy 1985b: 88. Murphy suggests that only here and in Heb [8:5] does an author use the heavenly idea to make a negative point about the Jewish cult or the earthly temple; however, this is not correct, as I show above in connection with *T. Levi* and *1 Enoch* where dissatisfaction with the earthly cult and priesthood led to the transfer of holiness to the heavenly temple. See Suter 1979a: 115-35; Nickelsburg 1981: 575-600; Himmelfarb 1993: 12-13. Similar ideas permeate the Qumran texts, where dissatisfaction with the Jerusalem

(second) temple appear in 6:9; 32:3, but this notion fades from view, as attention shifts to the heavenly city/temple/palace as the place of the righteous dead (51). At the end of the vision of black and bright waters there is a picture of the restoration of Eden, which appears to be on earth. In this eschatological temple the utensils from Solomon's temple will be used, indicating the restoration of the sacrificial cult.

Some of these features also appear in Hebrews. Hebrews shifts attention away from Jerusalem and the temple (never explicitly mentioned) to the eschatological temple inaugurated by God with the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God. This is the place of God's rest, which God's people are to strive to enter, and the heavenly Jerusalem to which they have now come (12:22-24). On the other hand, in Hebrews the creation will be shaken so that what is incompatible with God's rest can be removed and what cannot be shaken can remain (12:25-29). Until they reach their eschatological goal, God's people are to turn away from the earthly city, seeking the city to come, God's eschatological dwelling with his people. Unlike 2 *Baruch*, there is no place for a restored sacrificial cult.

5.4 The *Apocalypse of Abraham*

The *Apocalypse of Abraham* (*Apoc. Ab.*) is extant only in an Old Church Slavonic translation that exists in six manuscripts dating from the fourteenth to the seventeenth centuries.¹¹⁶ Chapters 1-8 tell the story of Abraham's life in Ur working for his father, an idol maker. Abraham realises the futility of idol worship and, as he reflects on this God calls him to leave his father's house. No sooner than he does, fire descends from heaven and destroys the house.¹¹⁷ Chapters 9-32 are an apocalypse set in the context of Abraham's sacrifice as related in Gen 15.¹¹⁸ In *Apoc. Ab.* the sacrifice takes place at Horeb, where the angel Yahoel appears and escorts Abraham on a heavenly journey in which he sees the throne of God. From there God reveals to him the course of world history from Eden to the destruction of the temple (27:1-12), followed by its restoration at the end of the age. In the final chapters God promises to restore the sovereignty of his people, and the work ends with Abraham accepting the words of God in his heart (32:6).¹¹⁹

Since the work recounts the destruction of the temple, it post-dates the events of 70 C.E., although the precise date is elusive. The earliest external evidence for the work

temple and cultus is keenly felt and manifests itself in talk of a heavenly temple. I will argue below that Heb 8:5 does not negate the wilderness tabernacle as is so often maintained.

¹¹⁶ Rubinkiewicz and Lunt 1983: 681-82, 686-88; Kulik 2004: 3, 97 (who lists ten MSS). Rubinkiewicz notes that other "fragments, summaries and reworkings" are derived from these. For the details of each MS see Turdeanu 1972: 153-80.

¹¹⁷ See Orlov 2008a: 36-39. Cf. also *Jub.* 11:16-12:14; *Gen. Rab.* 38:13.

¹¹⁸ For the association of apocalyptic speculation with Gen 15 see Gruenwald 1980: 52; Begg 1988: 36-46.

¹¹⁹ Kulik 2004: 1-2 summarises the contents.

consists of an inconclusive allusion in the Pseudo-Clementine *Recognitiones*, which are to be dated somewhere in the first three centuries.¹²⁰ For *Apoc. Ab.*, a date late in the first century seems reasonable.¹²¹ The original language was probably Hebrew, although an intermediate Greek translation seems clear.¹²² Composition in Hebrew probably indicates Palestinian provenance,¹²³ and the lack of any Christian signature features makes it likely that it is a Jewish work.¹²⁴

Some scholars have suggested that the two parts of *Apoc. Ab.* are separate documents joined by an editor and need to be read as such.¹²⁵ But, as Stone points out, the story of Abraham's life in Ur "forms a fitting preamble" to the visionary material that follows, which refers back to the story in several places.¹²⁶ For example, in 8:6 fire burns Terah, his house and everything in it because of his idolatry, and in 27:1-8 the heathen come and burn the temple and plunder the holy things in it, again because of the idolatry of the people. And indeed, in 9:1-10, God commands Abraham, recently rescued from an idolatrous past, to offer a proper sacrifice in the place God will show him.¹²⁷

After Terah's house is destroyed, God commands Abraham to offer the sacrificial animals listed in Gen 15:9-10 as a "pure sacrifice ... in the place which I shall show you on a high mountain" (9:5, 8).¹²⁸ Abraham falls on his face, and while prone on the ground hears "the voice <of the holy one>, saying, 'Go, Yahoel, the namesake of the mediation of my ineffable name ...'" (10:3). Yahoel becomes Abraham's *angelus interpres*, accompanying him until he arrives in the heavenly throne room. Then, after averting tension between the living creatures in the throne room, he disappears from view.

¹²⁰ Mueller 1982: 344-45; Rubinkiewicz and Lunt 1983: 683; Kulik 2004: 3.

¹²¹ Rubinkiewicz and Lunt 1983: 683; Vermes 1986: 290.

¹²² Stone 1984: 416; Vermes 1986: 289; Kulik 2004: 37-66, 91. Rubinkiewicz and Lunt 1983: 683 tentatively suggest that the Slavonic version may have been translated directly from Hebrew.

¹²³ Rubinkiewicz and Lunt 1983: 683.

¹²⁴ Vermes 1986: 289. *Apoc. Ab.* 29:4-13 has traditionally been seen as a Christian interpolation, referring to a man from Abraham's tribe being mocked and beaten, and worshipped by the heathen and by some from Israel. The Christian provenance of this material is, however, disputed, see Licht 1971: 126, and Stone 1984: 415-16. Hall 1988: 107-10 argues that it is a Jewish interpolation, and Kulik 2004: 51-53 reads the pericope in terms of an "anti-messiah" such as Beliar/Belial or Melki-reša'. A decision on this is not critical for this study. Pennington 1984: 366 appears to think the entire Apocalypse is a Christian work.

¹²⁵ Ginzberg 1906: 1: 91-92; Mueller 1982: 342; Vermes 1986: 288.

¹²⁶ Stone 1984: 415; Himmelfarb 1993: 62. See 9:6; 10:12; 19:3; 26:3-5..

¹²⁷ Both Lee 2001: 169-72, and Orlov 2009a: 830-31 make a strong case for the unity of *Apoc. Ab.* on this basis.

¹²⁸ Unless otherwise noted, all quotations from *Apoc. Ab.* are from Kulik 2004: 9-36.

When God commands Abraham to offer these sacrifices, he also promises that he will reveal eschatological secrets to Abraham (9:6, 9-10).¹²⁹ Consequently, in 12:3 Abraham and Yahoel come to “the glorious God’s mountains–Horeb,” where Yahoel instructs Abraham to do as God had commanded him. As in Gen 15:10, he bisects all the animals apart from the birds on whose wings he and Yahoel will ascend to heaven. There, God will reveal to Abraham what is in heaven, on the earth and in the sea, in the abyss and in the lower depths, in the garden of Eden, and in its rivers, and in the fullness of the inhabited world. Horeb is the setting off point for Abraham’s heavenly journey (15:1-7).¹³⁰ This is where Moses ascended and saw the God of Israel (Exod 24:9-18). Abraham will do the same.

Significantly, the place is not Zion, which is odd given the allusions to the *Aqedah* in the story.¹³¹ Abraham responds to the call of God with “Here I am,” and God commands him to sacrifice “in the place I shall show you on a high mountain.” The only word Abraham utters to God in Gen 22 is **הִנְנִי** (22:1, 11, see also *Apoc. Ab.* 14:1), and in Gen 22 Abraham is to offer Isaac on one of the mountains God will show him (Gen 22:2). In *Apoc. Ab.* 12:4 Abraham tells Yahoel that he has no sacrifice or altar, and Yahoel responds with an invitation to look behind him (cf. Gen 22:13). These allusions, and the traditional association of Moriah with Zion, would seem to make Zion a natural choice for the start of the journey.¹³² That it is Horeb indicates dissatisfaction with Zion.¹³³ The temple, not yet built in the narrative setting of the story, but in fact destroyed because of idolatry, may

¹²⁹ The things revealed are described as “things built and firmed, made and renewed.” Ibid.: 46-47 explains this in terms of the construction of Solomon’s temple and the second temple. He also notes that since there is no reference to the destruction of the second temple, *Apoc. Ab.* could predate that event. If so, the text describes the destruction of Solomon’s temple rather than of the second temple, and could function as a warning against idolatry. If that is the case it presents the (second) temple in a positive light. See 1:2-3; 25:4; 27:1-5; 29:18.

¹³⁰ Dean-Otting 1984: 255 notes that the heavenly journey in *Apoc. Ab.* is a bridge between the earlier journeys of Enoch and Levi and the later hekhalot texts. Several features of these later texts appear, including the angelic name Yahoel, the voice calling to Abraham and the angelic liturgy that Abraham and Yahoel sing together, which is the impetus for Abraham’s entry into the heavenly throne room. Carlsson 2004: 144 notes that the similarity with the hekhalot texts is because God is no longer able to be localised in an earthly temple. Since its destruction he can only be encountered in a heavenly temple by way of a heavenly journey.

¹³¹ Begg 1988: 44-45.

¹³² 2 Chron 3:1; Jos. *Ant.* 1.224-26; 7.333; *Tg. Neof.* Gen 22:2; *Jub.* 18:13. See Alexander 1988: 115; Kalimi 1990: 345-62; Waltke and Fredricks 2001: 305-306; Fuller Dow 2010: 42-43, 46, 115.

¹³³ Halperin 1988: 109-110 notes the echoes of the story of Moses at Sinai/Horeb, suggesting that the author is deliberately modelling Abraham’s experience on Moses at Sinai, although he does not suggest why he might be doing this. He also notes associations with Deuteronomic theology, as does Orlov 2008b: 61-62. This makes the choice of Horeb all the more remarkable, giving the centralisation of worship at Zion in Deuteronomy. While the sacrifice at the “place I shall show you” (*Apoc. Ab.* 9:6) echoes Gen 22:2, it is also reminiscent of the regulations concerning the centralisation of worship in Deut 12:13-14.

have been considered too defiled to function as the place where proper sacrifice could be restored.¹³⁴

In *Apoc. Ab.* 12:10 Yahoel explains what Abraham will see. Then, in 15:1-5, as the smoke ascends Abraham and Yahoel mount the birds and ascend to heaven.¹³⁵ Abraham sees Gehenna (15:5-7) and begins to experience the appropriate fearful emotions.¹³⁶ Yahoel reassures him and explains that he will soon see the Eternal One (16:3), although will not look at him. At this point, the fire approaches them and together they recite an angelic liturgy (17:8-21).¹³⁷ In chapter 18 they arrive in the seventh heaven.¹³⁸ That they ascend with the sacrificial birds with the smoke (15:1-4) and join in the heavenly liturgy indicates that heaven is a temple. While the earthly temple had been destroyed by idolatry, the heavenly temple still existed and could be reached by proper sacrifices.¹³⁹ That the ascent begins at the “temple” of Horeb and ends at the temple of heaven indicates that the temple is understood as the link between heaven and earth. Abraham enters the temple at Horeb, offers sacrifices and finds himself in heaven.¹⁴⁰

The description of heaven is drawn largely from the early chapters of Ezekiel, with a fiery throne and fiery living creatures with many eyes and four heads that each have four

¹³⁴ Since the destruction of Terah’s house due to his idolatry prefigures the destruction of the temple for the idolatry of the people, the command for Abraham to offer sacrifice prefigures the resumption of proper sacrifice, and the offering “in the place which I will show you on a high mountain” (9:8) indicates a restored temple (Lee 2001: 172-73). The Jerusalem temple will later be described in superlative terms and as intended by God as the place where God is encountered, indicating that it is not the temple *per se* that is the cause of the dissatisfaction, but idolatry connected with the temple (Harlow 2010: 298). In the same context God’s anger at the people’s idolatry also features. Unlike Ezra and Baruch, Abraham does not mourn the loss of the temple at any length, although he exclaims that his heart is afflicted when he sees it being overthrown (27:6). Unlike 2 Bar 25:1-5, Zion is never called the holy place. In fact, the names Zion and Jerusalem never appear in this text.

¹³⁵ The significant role of Azazel plays in *Apoc. Ab.* is outside the scope of the present study. I do note, however, 13:14 where the heavenly garment formerly belonging to Azazel is now set aside for Abraham, indicating an angelic identity for the latter. This is nowhere developed in the text, aside from Abraham’s kneeling with Yahoel and reciting the liturgy. He is not appointed as a priest and clothed in priestly clothing as others are, though angels are the “priests” of heaven and clothed as such. On the role of Azazel see Orlov 2009a: 836-39.

¹³⁶ Himmelfarb 1993: 39-40; 63-64; Collins 1998: 229. See also 1 *En.* 14.

¹³⁷ On the liturgy see Weitzman 1994: 21-33. For connections between this hymn and later hekhalot songs see Scholem 1946: 57-61; Dean-Otting 1984: 252-53; Himmelfarb 1993: 61, 64. This hymn is early evidence for what flourished in these later texts.

¹³⁸ Collins 1998: 228-29; Lee 2001: 175. There is no account of Abraham’s passage through the heavens. He is clearly in the heavenly throne room, standing on the seventh firmament (19:4), and later he looks down and sees other heavens. Strangely *Apoc. Ab.* 19:6 refers to an eighth heaven, which does not quite fit the schema. See the discussion in Poirier 2004: 391-408.

¹³⁹ Himmelfarb 1993: 66; Lee 2001: 175-76.

¹⁴⁰ This is preferable to seeing the earthly temple as a copy of the heavenly temple, with “above and below” typology as Lee 2001: 176 proposes. Under that scheme, there is no necessary link between the two. The text envisages one temple “in the place I shall show you on a high mountain” (9:8), which is also the gateway to the heavenly throne room.

faces and six wings.¹⁴¹ In keeping with Ezekiel's vision, the throne is a chariot throne with fiery wheels full of eyes and an indescribable light. Unlike Ezek 1:26-28, however, there is no human-like creature with "the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord" (Ezek 1:28). Rather, the experience moves from "the visual plane to the aural plane;"¹⁴² Abraham hears the sound of the angelic *qedushah*, like the voice of a single man. Then he hears the voice of God calling out of the midst of the fire (19:1), to which he replies, "Here I am." God is enthroned, and speaks, but is not visible to Abraham.¹⁴³

God invites Abraham to look down from his vantage point in heaven. In the sixth and seventh heavens he sees hosts of incorporeal angels, and in the fifth, the stars (19:1-9). Abraham's star counting episode (Gen 15:5-6) follows in *Apoc. Ab.* 20, and in 21 God invites Abraham to look beneath his feet and "contemplate the creation which was previously covered over ... and the age that has been prepared to follow it." He sees heaven and the things in it and earth and the things in it, and Eden, and men and women on the right and on the left (21:1-7). He enquires of God and learns that those on the left are the people of the present age prepared for judgement and those on the right will be God's people in the future, Abraham's descendants (22:4-6). In these chapters, the temporal axis is viewed spatially. The present age is described in vv. 3-4, and the age to come is depicted by Eden in vv. 6-7.¹⁴⁴ There, he sees "those who act righteously ... their food and their rest" (21:6). Protology is combined with eschatology and, at the end, the conditions of Eden are restored.¹⁴⁵

In *Apoc. Ab.* 25-27 Abraham sees the destruction of the temple, because "the idol of jealousy," like the ones his father used to make, was set up within it, alongside what

¹⁴¹ The living creatures in Ezek 1 have four wings, while the seraphim in Isa 6 have six. For a similar combination of elements from Isa 6 and Ezek 1 see Rev 4:6-8. The living creatures in *Hekhalot Zutarti* have four heads with four faces, a total of sixty-four faces. See Schäfer 1992: 62-63; 1981: 148-49 (Section 354). See also *Tg. Ezeke.* 1:6, where the same scheme occurs, including sixty-four wings for each head, giving a total of 256 wings (Levey 1987: 21, footnote 5).

¹⁴² Orlov 2008b: 67, see also Halperin 1988: 108.

¹⁴³ Rowland 1982: 86-87 refers to "a deliberate attempt to exclude all reference to the human figure" of Ezek 1, as part of a trend away from describing God and his throne. See also Orlov 2009a: 831-32. For similar avoidance of anthropomorphism in the Targums see Halperin 1988: 120-23; in the twelfth song of *ShirShabb* see Fletcher-Louis 2002: 346-50; and for the beginnings of this in the OT see Weinfeld 1972: 193-209; Orlov 2008b: 58-60. Rowland 1982: 102-103 and Fossum 1985: 320 suggest that the throne is empty, and that Yahoel had been seated there and had left the throne to accompany Abraham. However, Yahoel and God are distinguished in 10:3, where Abraham hears "the voice" speaking, apparently the same voice of 18:14, see also 8:1-2; 16:3-4, and with Abraham, Yahoel worships God (17:2). See also Gieschen 1998: 143. For fuller discussions of the avoidance of anthropomorphic representations of the deity in this text see Orlov 2008a: 33-53; 2008b: 53-70. This is quite different from Hebrews, which claims at the outset that Jesus is the ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ ("the reflection of the glory and the representation of his [God's] reality," 1:3).

¹⁴⁴ Cf. this description of Eden with 4 *Ezra* 7:123; Rev 2:7; 22:2.

¹⁴⁵ Rowland 1982: 144; Lee 2001: 176-77.

resembled the art and beauty of God's glory that lay beneath God's throne. Abraham enquires of God, who explains that the temple was God's idea, a place for prayers to be offered and sacrifices made by Abraham's descendants, and the idol was the cause of God's anger against the people of Abraham's tribe for their idolatry. The description of the temple in terms of the glory beneath the throne again depicts the temple as the link between earth and heaven.

In *Apoc. Ab.* 27 the temple is burned and plundered. Abraham asks for an explanation in 28, which God gives in 29.¹⁴⁶ In 29:14-21 God explains that the time will come when the heathen will be judged. Then numerous righteous men, descendants of Abraham, will hasten in the glory of my name "to the place prepared beforehand for them, which you saw deserted in the picture. And they will live, being sustained by the sacrifices and offerings of justice and truth in the age of justice" (29:17-18). This is in the temple in Jerusalem, where right sacrifices will again be offered and all the people will be like priests,¹⁴⁷ gaining sustenance from feeding on the sacrifices.¹⁴⁸ The references to justice and truth are reminiscent of the description of Eden in 21:6, so that in the age to come when the temple is restored the conditions of Eden will also be restored and God will rejoice with his people (29:29). Whether it is God or humans who build this temple is unclear. What is clear is the reinstitution of the sacrificial cultus in the new age of righteousness and peace, with the temple in its former location.¹⁴⁹

Two features of this text can assist in the understanding of Hebrews. The first is the connection between the earthly temple at Horeb and the heavenly temple. The text does not portray an above and below typology, where the temple in heaven is the counterpart of the temple on earth. Rather Abraham offers sacrifices at the holy place of the "temple" on earth and finds himself in the heavenly throne room. In Hebrews Jesus ascends to the heavenly temple to be sure, but this temple also encompasses earth and heaven since the readers have access to it in the present (12:22-24).

The second feature is the anticipation of the renewed temple. In Hebrews the renewed temple is the eschatological temple, to which the readers have access in the present. The only sacrifices associated with this temple are those of praise and good deeds (13:14-15).

¹⁴⁶ Lee 2001: 177 (footnote 36) suggests that the destruction described is of the first temple and is unsure whether it is typological of the destruction of the second temple, or whether the second temple is simply not acknowledged, since the original text of chapter 29 had been lost through Christian interpolation. However, valid doubts have been expressed about this theory. Given the placement of the true temple at Horeb in the flow of the narrative, *Apoc. Ab.* seems to downplay Zion as a location, and it seems likely that the Zion of his own time is simply ignored because it has been defiled. No temple imagery appears in 29:4-13.

¹⁴⁷ Collins 1998: 230-31; Lee 2001: 177-78.

¹⁴⁸ Kulik 2004: 53.

¹⁴⁹ Lee 2001: 178.

Apoc. Ab. anticipates an earthly temple “in the place ... which you saw deserted” (29:17), in which cultic rituals will be reinstituted and animal sacrifices again offered. There is none of this in Hebrews, since the sacrifice of Christ has rendered the former sacrifices obsolete.

5.5 Pseudo-Philo (*L.A.B.*)

The *Biblical Antiquities* of Pseudo-Philo (*L.A.B.*)¹⁵⁰ is a selective retelling of the biblical narrative from Adam to the death of Saul. Some incidents are omitted, others are revised or paraphrased, sometimes with interpolated prayers and other expansions, and some new stories introduced.¹⁵¹ It is only extant in Latin, apparently a translation from a Greek *Vorlage*, translated in turn from Hebrew.¹⁵² The work was probably composed in Palestine,¹⁵³ sometime from 50–150 C.E., which makes it roughly contemporary with Hebrews. Like Hebrews, it is anonymous. It was preserved with MSS of Philo, and ascribed to Philo in the Middle Ages, a tradition that cannot be sustained.¹⁵⁴ Jacobson argues cogently that it was written after the crisis of 70 C.E.¹⁵⁵ and, if so, like other literature of the time it represents an attempt to come to grips with this crisis.

¹⁵⁰ *L.A.B.* is an abbreviation of the Latin title *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*.

¹⁵¹ Nickelsburg 2005a: 265–66. Harrington 1985: 297 describes it as an “imaginative retelling.” Murphy 1993: 4–13 discusses genre of rewritten bible with respect to *L.A.B.* suggesting that the aim of such activity was to make the stories of the Bible useful for the present, noting also that *L.A.B.* was “one of the last examples of the rewritten Bible” (p. 13). See also 1988: 284–87. Bauckham 1983b: 33–34 suggests that the work was intended as a commentary on the biblical text, intended to be read alongside it. The work was introduced to the scholarly world by Cohn 1898: 277–332. For discussions of the concept of rewritten bible in general see the works listed in footnote 145 in Section 2.5 (above).

¹⁵² Harrington 1970: 503–14; 1985: 298–99; Nickelsburg 2005a: 269; Murphy 2010: 440. A Hebrew original was first proposed by Cohn 1898: 311–13. There are eighteen complete and three fragmentary Latin manuscripts dated between the eleventh and the fifteenth centuries (Harrington 1985: 298). Unless otherwise noted, the references to the Latin text and the English translation are taken from Jacobson 1996. See the brief critique of Jacobson’s translation in DesCamp 2007: 14. The fourteenth century manuscript of the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel* contains a Hebrew text corresponding to parts of *L.A.B.*, but is probably a retroversion from the Latin text and of little use as a textual witness for *L.A.B.* (see Harrington 1974: 2–5).

¹⁵³ Jacobson 1996: 210–11. Harrington 1971:16; 1985: 300; Harrington and Horgan 1986: 240–41 propose a Palestinian biblical text as the source of the information in *L.A.B.* although Jacobson 1996: 254–56 argues that this goes beyond the evidence, preferring the view that the author mostly depended upon his memory in quoting from the Bible.

¹⁵⁴ Harrington 1985: 299–300; DesCamp 2007: 5–6; Murphy 2010: 440. DesCamp 1997: 79–80 argues that Pseudo-Philo was a woman, on the basis of the prominence given to women and the discussion of matters of interest to women.

¹⁵⁵ Jacobson 1996: 199–210. Certainty about the date is not possible, although a post 70 C.E. date does seem evident. The general consensus is that it comes from the first century C.E. (Harrington 1985: 299; Murphy 1993: 3, 6; 2010: 440; Jacobson 1996: 199–210; Fisk 2001: 34–45; Nickelsburg 2005a: 269; DesCamp 2007: 3–4). The debate is often centred on the reading of 19:7, which could be taken to refer to the destruction of the second temple. Harrington 1985: 299 argues suggests a date prior to 70 C.E. from the claim of 22:8 that burnt offerings continue “even to this day.” However, this could simply reflect the situation of the persona of Pseudo-Philo in pre-Solomonic times. On the other hand, in 22:1–6 Joshua berates the people for building an altar rather than teaching Torah, a notion that could be connected with the replacement of temple service with Torah study after 70 C.E. (Nickelsburg 2005a: 269). Vogel 1999: 255–58 argues for a post 70 C.E. date on the basis of the deference shown to Phinehas in 28:3, in the face of the dwindling authority of the priesthood after the destruction of the temple.

5.5.1 Moses on Sinai

Pseudo-Philo relates the golden calf incident in chapter 12. In 12:1 Moses descends from the mountain coming down “to the place where the light of the sun and moon are.”¹⁵⁶ He is unrecognisable with his face outshining the sun and moon. Since he had been on the mountain enveloped in thick darkness, the place of the sun and moon sounds like a description of the ordinary world. Apparently while Moses had been on the mountain, he had been “bathed with invisible light” an expression that could indicate that he had been in heaven.¹⁵⁷ If so, Sinai has the characteristics of a temple where Moses on the mountain is also in heaven where he encounters God, is transformed and becomes unrecognisable.¹⁵⁸

In *L.A.B.* 12:8-9 Moses ascends the mountain again, and prays for rebellious Israel, the vine planted by God.¹⁵⁹ While vine imagery refers to Israel several times in the Bible,¹⁶⁰ here the vine has roots in the deep (*abyssum*)¹⁶¹ and shoots that reach God’s “lofty seat” (*ad sedem tuam altissimam*).¹⁶² Moses argues that if God destroys the vine, the link between the abyss, earth and heaven will cease to exist. Since Israel (the vine) extends from the abyss to God’s lofty seat, Israel is pictured as inhabiting the sanctuary where God dwells.

¹⁵⁶ The sense of this verse is difficult in that there seem to be two descents, the first from the mountain (*et descendit Moyses*) from where he had been in chapter 12; and the second to the place where the sun and the moon are (*descendit in locum ubi lumen solis et lune est*), a reading that Harrington 1985: 319 seems to adopt. It is better to follow Jacobson 1996: 110 who puts the second descent in parentheses, explaining the first. For a similar reading of God’s descent to see the Tower of Babel in Gen 11:5-7 see Cassuto 1961-64: 2: 246-47. God does not descend in Pseudo-Philo’s retelling of the Tower of Babel narrative.

¹⁵⁷ Fletcher-Louis 2002: 8. Murphy 1993: 68-9 suggests that he had “access to the light of the world above.”

¹⁵⁸ Meeks 1968: 354-71; VanderKam 1973: 133-34; Freedman 1981: 21; Lundquist 1983 207-208; Houtman 2002: 3: 294; Beale 2005a: 100-102. Fletcher-Louis 2002: 139 points to other texts where angels are unrecognised and claims an angelomorphic transformation for Moses. He refers to Judg 6:11-12 (where there is no lack of recognition of the angel); 13:15-19 (where Manoah does not recognise the angel of Yahweh, v. 16); Tob 5:4-12:22; Heb 13:2. See also Gen 18-19. Pseudo-Philo shares with other texts a belief in the apotheosis of Moses, a notion that has its origins in Exod 7:1. See also Philo *Mos.* 1.155-58; *Midr. Tan. Exod.*, Parashah II Parts I-IV. In *L.A.B.* 61:8-9 the appearance of David is changed so that Goliath does not recognise him, seeing an angel instead. Not only does Goliath see an angel, but Pseudo-Philo emphasises that nobody recognises David, not even Saul. On this, see Fletcher-Louis 2002: 416-17. In *L.A.B.* 64:6 the dead Samuel called up by the witch of Endor also appears as an angel.

¹⁵⁹ For the imagery of Israel as a vine planted by Yahweh, see *L.A.B.* 18:10-11; 23:12; 28:4; 30:4; 39:7. In Exod 15:17 Israel is planted on the mountain of Yahweh’s possession. The reference in *L.A.B.* 18:10-11 is further evidence of a Hebrew original. The context is the Balaam story and, in particular, the oracle in Num 24:3-9. The Hebrew text of Balaam’s oracle describes Israel as trees planted by Yahweh (24:6), while the LXX reads this verse as tents pitched by Yahweh. In *L.A.B.* there is no vision of tents, rather the imagery is one of planting by Yahweh, reflecting a Hebrew *Vorlage*. See my discussion of the difference between the Hebrew and Greek texts of Num 24:6 in Church 2008: 148.

¹⁶⁰ Isa 5:1-7; Ps 80:14-18; Ezek 17:1-21; John 15:1-8. See also *Exod. Rab.* 43:9. For a similar description, although this time of Egypt as a cedar, see Ezek 31:1-9.

¹⁶¹ Harrington 1985: 320 translates this with “abyss.” In Ps 80:9 (MT 80:10) the vine takes “deep root” (*שרשיה ותשרש*), an expression Jacobson 1996: 497 claims is quoted here.

¹⁶² In Ps 80:10 (MT 12) the vine is so great the mountains are covered with its shade. For similar imagery of Israel as a plant linking Sheol, earth and heaven see 1QH^a XIV 17-21.

5.5.2 The Tabernacle

Hebrews 8:5 appeals to Exod 25:40 to demonstrate that Moses was instructed to make everything according to the “pattern” (תבנית, LXX, τύπος) he was shown on the mountain. Like the author of Hebrews, Pseudo-Philo shows little interest in the details of the structure of the tabernacle. But in 11:15 he probably alludes to Exod 25:8 where God declares that he will come and dwell with them, and Exod 25:9 where God declares that he will show Moses the pattern of the tabernacle.¹⁶³ Pseudo-Philo simply alludes to the Exodus text and makes no further use of this information, although it probably indicates the divine origin of Israel’s cult.¹⁶⁴ In 13:1 he reports that Moses did as he was instructed, making “everything God commanded him”¹⁶⁵ and “everything that was shown to him.”¹⁶⁶

There is no indication in *L.A.B.* that the tabernacle anticipates the world to come as in Hebrews. Hayward claims that in making things according to their heavenly pattern Moses “is expected exactly to replicate on earth items which properly belong in heaven itself.”¹⁶⁷ However, the text only refers to the “likeness” (*similitudo*) and “pattern” (*exemplar*) of the tabernacle and its furnishings (11:15), not to any physical heavenly temple with which the earthly is to correspond.¹⁶⁸ The language of copy is absent, and there is no disparagement of the tabernacle simply because it is earthly and made by humans.

5.5.3 The Temple

Pseudo-Philo has several references to the temple (12:4, 9; 19:7; 26:12, 25-27) sometimes predicting that it will be destroyed because of the rebellion of the people. In 25-27 he anticipates an eschatological temple. In all of these texts Solomon’s temple is in view. The Second Temple is ignored.

In *L.A.B.* 12:4 Pseudo-Philo anticipates Solomon’s temple and its destruction. God announces to Moses at the Golden Calf incident that the rebellion of the people at that time would not result in God’s rejection of his people, for he would “turn again and be reconciled with them so that a ‘house’ (*domus*) may be built for me among them.” At the same time God announces its destruction: this house was “a house that in turn will be

¹⁶³ Harrington 1971: 7; 1985: 319. Jacobson 1996: 481 suggests that *L.A.B.* conflates Exod 25:8, 40. While in Exod 25:8 God “dwells among them” (שכנתי בתוכם), Pseudo-Philo has “the tent of my glory among them.” God is one step removed. His glory dwells among them in Exod 40:34-35. See also Lev 26:11; Ps 26:8. The active voice in Exod 25:8-9, rather than the passive in 25:40, is reflected here in *L.A.B.*

¹⁶⁴ Murphy 1993: 66. See also *L.A.B.* 13.

¹⁶⁵ See Exod 40:16. The description that follows is largely taken from Exod 40.

¹⁶⁶ See Exod 25:40; 26:30; 27:8; Num 8:4.

¹⁶⁷ Hayward 1996: 159.

¹⁶⁸ Hayward (ibid.: 159) notes that this “is not far removed from those Rabbinic texts which speak of the earthly temple corresponding to the heavenly dwelling place of God.” See *Mek. de R. Ishmael Shirata* 10; *Exod. Rab.* 33:3; *Tg. Ps. - J.* Gen 28:17; *Tg. Ps. - J.* Exod 15:17. But there is no hint of such correspondence in *L.A.B.*

destroyed because they will sin against me.”¹⁶⁹ Similar ideas appear in God’s speech to Moses in 19:7, where Jerusalem (or the temple) is described as “the place where they will serve me for 740 years” (*locus, in quo mihi servient annos DCCXL*) before it is turned over to enemies and destroyed.¹⁷⁰ The fall of the temple is thus compared to the breaking of the tablets of the law.¹⁷¹ Even from the beginning, the temple was doomed to destruction.¹⁷² There is no suggestion that it will be rebuilt.

God’s “house” (*domus*) is the subject of 12:9, the referent of which is debated. Harrington and Jacobson are probably correct in suggesting that God’s house is the universe¹⁷³ and, if so, the house is described in terms that reflect the account of the construction of the temple.¹⁷⁴ This is evidence of an understanding of the temple as a microcosm of the universe.¹⁷⁵

Pseudo-Philo also refers to the temple when he recounts the covenant renewal of Josh 8 in *L.A.B.* 21. He describes the altar at Mount Ebal, the sacrifices and the priestly blessings. In 21:10 Joshua blesses the people and anticipates the building of the temple, “a dwelling place for God” (*habitaculum Dei*). This is expanded in 22:9 with an editorial comment, “for until the house of the Lord was built in Jerusalem (*domus Domini in Ierusalem*)”¹⁷⁶ and sacrifice offered on the new altar, the people were not prohibited from

¹⁶⁹ There is an allusion to Isa 40:15 at the end of 12:4 in the words “a drop in a bucket” indicating that the text should be read as indicating that the judgement against Israel would extend to all humanity (Murphy 1993: 71; Fisk 2001: 170-71). There is also a note of hope in 12:10 where God records that the prayer of Moses has been heard, indicating that even this judgement is provisional (Fisk, p. 171). The wider context of Isa 40:15 indicates also that the destruction of the temple did not signal the end of the covenant relationship (Fisk, p. 174).

¹⁷⁰ Gäbel 2006: 85 reads this “place” as Jerusalem, as does Jacobson 1996: 624; Harrington 1985: 327 suggests the temple. See also *Sifre Deut.* 357.

¹⁷¹ Murphy 1993: 92; Fisk 2001: 271-76. In Exod 32:19 Moses smashes the tablets, while in *L.A.B.* 19:7 God smashes them, indicating that God was involved in this event and the destruction of the temple. Both were God’s judgement on the rebellion of the people (Fisk, pp. 272-73).

¹⁷² Gäbel 2006: 85; Perrot et al., 1976: 115 Fisk 2001: 34. Jacobson 1996: 489 suggests that the use of the words *et ipsa iterum* (“in turn”, perhaps “a second time”) suggests the Second Temple, although he finds this difficult to construe in the context, noting as well that “we are at a third stage from the original” and care needs to be taken not to construe too much from the language. *L.A.B.* 15:6 refers to a “sanctuary” (*sanctimonia*), which Yahweh taught them to build. Nevertheless, they abandoned him and God proposed to spread their bodies in the wilderness. In the context, the reference is to the wilderness tabernacle, also doomed from the start because of their rebellion, see Vogel 1999: 258-59.

¹⁷³ Harrington 1985: 320; Jacobson 1996: 499-500.

¹⁷⁴ Cf. 1 Kings 5:31; 7:10-11; 1 Chron 29:2; 2 Chron 3:6.

¹⁷⁵ Jacobson 1996: 500. See *Bereshit Rabbati* P. 32, where it is claimed that Jerusalem was not submerged by the flood; *Num. Rab.* 12:13; Philo *Mos.* 2.88-127. Hayward 1996: 160 thinks this text reflects the suggestion that the earthly and heavenly sanctuaries correspond, with the heavenly sanctuary the counterpart of the earthly. But in this text there is no suggestion of a heavenly sanctuary above, with a corresponding sanctuary on earth below; rather, the sanctuary that Israel inhabits links heaven and earth.

¹⁷⁶ See 1 Kings 7:40; 9:1. This is the only reference to Jerusalem in *L.A.B.*

offering sacrifice there” (at Shiloh, v. 8). As early as Joshua, Pseudo-Philo predicts the Jerusalem temple, with a direct line of continuity from the tabernacle to Gilgal, to Shiloh and to Solomon’s temple.¹⁷⁷ Here, there is no prediction of the destruction of either Solomon’s temple or the second temple. While the text predicts that Solomon’s temple will be destroyed, it is not disparaged. It is destroyed because of the rebellion of the people, not for any inherent failure of the temple.

5.5.4 The Heavenly Temple

In Deut 34 Yahweh shows Moses the extent of the land from Mount Nebo. Pseudo-Philo recounts these events in 19:10-13 and, again, the biblical narrative is expanded. As well as showing Moses the land, God shows him four “places” (*loci*) that are apparently in heaven: the place where the clouds draw up water to water the whole earth; the place from where the river takes its water; the place in the firmament from which the holy land drinks; and the place from where God rained down manna in the wilderness. The clouds drawing up water to water the whole earth is an allusion to Gen 2:6¹⁷⁸ and the four places, along with the emphasis on water and rain echo the four rivers of Eden,¹⁷⁹ indicating that God is showing Moses the heavenly temple. Just as the rivers from the primeval Eden sanctuary watered the earth, so waters from the heavenly sanctuary water “the holy land” (*terra sancta*).¹⁸⁰

God also gives Moses the measurements of the sanctuary, again presumably the Jerusalem temple,¹⁸¹ “the number of the sacrifices” (*numerus oblationem*),¹⁸² and “the signs by

¹⁷⁷ There are two temporal markers in 22:8, 9. In 22:8 sacrifices are offered in Gilgal “unto this day” (*usque in hodiernum diem*), and in 23:9 sacrifices were offered in Shiloh until that day (*usque in illam diem*), i.e. the day on which sacrifices were offered in Solomon’s temple. Harrington 1985: 232 proposes that the temporal marker in 22:8 (until this day) indicates a date of composition prior to 70 C.E. However, it is better to see these either as simple temporal markers inserted by Pseudo-Philo, in line with his pre-Solomonic persona, or comments by a narrator.

¹⁷⁸ Jacobson 1996: 634.

¹⁷⁹ Perrot et al., 1976: 2: 132. Murphy 1993: 93. The allusion to Gen 2:10-13 is disputed by Jacobson 1996: 634. While there is nothing explicit in the text, the definite allusion to Gen 2:6, the four “places” (compare the “place” where the people will serve Yahweh in 19:7) and the emphasis on water and rain indicates that temple imagery is in the frame in this text.

¹⁸⁰ The “holy land” may also refer to Jerusalem as the pinnacle of the land. See Jacobson 1996: 635; Lee 2001: 188.

¹⁸¹ Jacobson 1996: 636. In 19:7 God told Moses that he would show him the land and the “place where they would serve him for 740 years,” and in 19:10-13 God does that. Lee 2001: 187 suggests that the sanctuary in 19:10 is the heavenly sanctuary, because this and the sacrifices and the signs of heaven are “heavenly scenes.” However, the references to sacrifices would militate against this, since sacrifice in heaven is unlikely. Also, the land that God showed Moses is not part of a “heavenly scene,” nor is the land of Egypt (if this reading is correct, see Jacobson 1996: 635). God shows Moses the land, then the four places in heaven and then the sanctuary, thus the text begins and ends on earth, enclosing the four heavenly scenes.

¹⁸² Given that the Latin text is two stages removed from the Hebrew original, it is impossible to tell what sorts of sacrifice are envisaged here. *Oblatio* is a general word for an offering, including an animal sacrifice. The Vulgate renders θυσία καὶ προσφορά (“sacrifices and offerings”) in Heb 10:5 as *hostiam et oblationem*, and uses *hostia* to describe the “sacrifice” (θυσία) of praise and good deeds in Heb 13:15-16. *Hostia* is the

which men shall interpret the heaven.”¹⁸³ However, these are only of limited duration, as God will soon shorten the time and bring the present order to an end.¹⁸⁴ Moses, however, is not affected by this as he is dwelling “in the immortal dwelling place that is not subject to time” (19:12). At the end of time, he will be joined by all who sleep, so that they too may dwell “in the place of the sanctuary (*locus sanctificationis*) that I showed you” (19:13).¹⁸⁵ The immortal dwelling place and the place of the sanctuary are two different places. The former is where the dead remain until the resurrection and the latter is a new temple to be built on earth at the end of time.¹⁸⁶ While Pseudo-Philo anticipates Solomon’s temple and its destruction, he also holds to a belief in its heavenly origin and to the notion of a temple as “heaven on earth.” He also anticipates a new temple to be built at the end of time.

5.5.5 Kenaz and the Twelve Stones

The history of the temple, its destruction and eschatological restoration are told in the story of Kenaz, who is only a name in the Bible,¹⁸⁷ although Pseudo-Philo has built a long story around him (*L.A.B.* 25-27). He is second in importance only to Moses.¹⁸⁸ Kenaz appears first in 25:2 where he is appointed by lot to be Israel’s first judge succeeding Joshua. He demands that the members of each tribe confess their sins, and the tribe of Asher confesses to secreting away seven precious stones from Havilah that had been used

normal word for a sacrificial victim, see *OLD* 807. In time it came to be used for the consecrated Eucharistic bread. Cf. the hymn of Aquinas, *O Salutaris Hostia* (“Oh Saving Victim”) sung during the adoration of the Blessed Sacrament in Catholic liturgy (Foley 2000: 229).

¹⁸³ Murphy 1993: 93 finds here a reference to the importance of the Israelite cult, while Perrot et al., 1976: 132 reads the verse as a reference to the signs of the Zodiac, a suggestion that Jacobson 1996: 637 is attracted to, although he admits that he cannot understand its “relevance” or “appropriateness.” That it is forbidden knowledge tends to support this view.

¹⁸⁴ Hayward 1996: 165-66. *L.A.B.* 19:13 refers to “this present heaven (*celum*)” in the context of Moses’ immortal dwelling place not subject to time. Harrington 1985: 328 proposes emending the text to read “this present age” (*seculum*), and Jacobson 1996: 644 sets out palaeographical arguments to support this emendation.

¹⁸⁵ For *sanctificatio* as “sanctuary” see footnote 171 in chapter 4 (above).

¹⁸⁶ Murphy 1993: 94 refers to “paradise” as a possible referent for the place of the sanctuary. Jacobson 1996: 189 is unclear, referring first to “Jerusalem and the Temple” (see Isa 52:1; 60:13; Ps 24:3; Eccles 8:10), and then to “Paradise” and the “Celestial Jerusalem.” Hofius 1970c: 65 proposes that both of these places are the same, and that they “kann nichts anderes sein, als das 19,10 erwähnte himmlische ‘sanctuarium’.” Lee 2001: 189 suggests a future earthly Jerusalem, as does Halpern-Amaru 1994: 92 and Gäbel 2006: 85-86. On p. 84 Gäbel refers to 28:6-9, which he reads as a vision of heaven, where the souls of the dead will remain for 7,000 years until they are transformed. On the other hand, Murphy 1993: 132-33 reads that text as a vision of all of human history. This seems to be a more coherent reading since the vision begins with the creation and ends with the transformation of humanity.

¹⁸⁷ The name Kenaz appears in several texts. He is a descendant of Esau in Gen 36:11, 15, 42; 1 Chron 1:36, 53. The Kenaz who is the subject in *L.A.B.* appears in Josh 15:17; Judg 1:13 where he is identified as the brother of Caleb and the father of Othniel who took Kiriath-Sepher. In Judg 3:9, 11 Othniel the son of Kenaz is the first judge of Israel, who gave the Israelites rest for forty years. Kenaz fades out of the picture, apart from the genealogical record in 1 Chron 4:13. Caleb also had a grandson called Kenaz (1 Chron 4:15). Pseudo-Philo has “created” the figure of Kenaz as Caleb’s son (Nickelsburg 1980: 54).

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*: 54; Lee 2001: 190.

in the idolatrous Amorite sanctuary (25:10-12). God commands Kenaz to set these seven stones on a mountain-top from where his angel will take them and cast them into the depths of the sea (26:4).¹⁸⁹ Following this, an angel brings twelve other stones from Havilah to replace the seven taken by the first angel (26:4).¹⁹⁰ These twelve stones, corresponding to the twelve stones on the breastplate of the high priest, are to be set on the ephod and engraved with the names of the tribes (Exod 28:15-21). All this happens as predicted (*L.A.B.* 26:8-11).

In 26:12 God commands Kenaz to place the twelve stones in the Ark of the Covenant, where they are to remain until “Jahel” builds a “house” (*domus*) for God’s name.¹⁹¹ In the following verse God predicts that when the sins of his people reach full measure their enemies will come and destroy “their house” (*domus ipsorum*).¹⁹² God will rescue the stones and return them to the place from where they were taken at the beginning (Havilah?), where they will remain until God remembers the “world” (*seculum*) and visits the people of the “earth” (*terra*). At that time he will take the stones, along with other vastly superior ones whose existence will light up the world, so much so that the light of the sun and moon will no longer be needed.¹⁹³ The implication is that God will build an eschatological temple where these stones will function.¹⁹⁴ Again, there is no mention of the second temple. At the conclusion of the story, the twelve stones are present in the ark of the covenant of the Lord, “until this day,” waiting until the establishment of the eschatological temple.¹⁹⁵

¹⁸⁹ The identity of the mountain is obscure, see Harrington 1985: 337, who suggests either Shechem or Shiloh. Gäbel 2006: 89 connects the seven idolatrous stones with the seven planets of the Zodiac and also with the signs of the heavens in 19:10.

¹⁹⁰ Hayward 1992a: 12 connects Havilah and Paradise and notes that Pseudo-Philo is a very early witness connecting the precious stones of the High Priest’s ephod with Eden. In *Tg. Ps.-J.* Exod 35:27 these stones come from Pishon (פִּישׁוֹן), the river that flows around the land of Havilah (Gen 2:11).

¹⁹¹ Perrot et al., 1976: 2: 158 proposes that the text has been corrupted from the Hebrew for the name Ithiel, one of ten names attributed to Solomon (see Ginzberg 1913-1967: 4: 125; 6: 183, who explains the corruption from אֵת יֵאֵל to אֵת יֵאֵל). See also Harrington 1985: 338; Murphy 1993: 124; Jacobson 1996: 773. For the words “will build a house in my name” (*edificet domum in nomine meo*) see 2 Sam 7:13 (referring to Solomon).

¹⁹² That God should call the temple “their house” is odd, and in Jacobson’s opinion “impossible,” although 2 Chron 36:17 refers to מִקְדָּשָׁם (“their sanctuary”). Jacobson 1996: 774 proposes that it could be equivalent to “the house[hold] of Israel.” Perrot et al., 1976: 2: 158 and Harrington 1985: 338 propose that a Hebrew *Vorlage* בֵּיתִי (“my house”) could have been confused for בֵּיתוֹ (“his house”), although *domus ipsorum* would translate בֵּיתָם (“their house”).

¹⁹³ *L.A.B.* 26:13 cites Isa 64:4, indicating the “otherworldly origin of the eschatological stones” (Murphy 1993: 124).

¹⁹⁴ Hayward 1992a: 13 argues that the connection between the stones, paradise and the temple show that what Adam lost in Eden (26:6) is restored in the temple service. Lee 2001: 191 argues that the stones “represent” paradise, giving access to paradise in the temple. Even so, the present temple service is temporary, until the conditions of paradise are restored in the eschaton (Hayward 1992a: 13).

¹⁹⁵ Perrot et al., 1976: 2: 158-59 suggests that this indicates a date of writing prior to 70 C.E., suggesting at the same time that Pseudo-Philo situates himself at the time of Kenaz, so would not necessarily know that there was no ark of the covenant in the second temple, see also Murphy 1993: 125. Jacobson 1996: 775 finds

The story of the twelve stones demonstrates continuity between the primeval sanctuary with its reference to Havilah, the source of the gold and precious stones of the Eden sanctuary (Gen 2:11-12),¹⁹⁶ the Ark of the Covenant and the temple, and the eschatological sanctuary that God will build. The destruction of the first temple is clear in 26:13, however, there is no second temple; rather, the text anticipates the eschatological temple.¹⁹⁷ Again, the second temple is of little consequence, for God would yet visit his people and build an eschatological temple. “God’s resolution of Israel’s problems must await the eschaton,”¹⁹⁸ a resolution that involves returning to the beginning, with the eschatological sanctuary containing precious stones from the protological sanctuary.

5.5.6 Conclusion

Pseudo-Philo’s *L.A.B.* contains diverse material. Like Hebrews, the text never refers to the second temple and only once, in what may be a slip-up, does it refer to Jerusalem. Pseudo-Philo explains the divine origin of the Israelite cult from Exod 25:8-9. He sees a line of continuity from the tabernacle to the shrines at Gilgal and Shiloh and to the temple, and also recognises that the temple will ultimately be destroyed. God shows Moses the heavenly temple from Mount Nebo and explains that after his death he will be in an immortal dwelling place (paradise?), until he is joined by all who sleep in “the place of the sanctuary,” that is, the heavenly temple. Finally, the heavenly temple becomes an eschatological temple, built by God, and corresponding to the protological temple of Eden. Unlike the eschatological temple in Hebrews, this temple will exist on earth as a building. In Hebrews the temple to be built by God in the last days has been inaugurated with the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God and is now accessible to God’s people. But this is a metaphorical temple, not a physical building.

5.6 *Sibylline Oracles* Book 4

Sib. Or. 4 is a composite text built around a central section that recounts the history of the world in ten generations (see vv. 47-48), encompassing four kingdoms from the Assyrians to the Macedonians (vv. 49-101).¹⁹⁹ Since some of the detail in vv. 88-101 (the Macedonian kingdom) can be related to the conquests of Alexander, this section can

here evidence of a date after 70 C.E., since the author of *L.A.B.* and his readers would have known that “the priestly stones were in fact intact and in place during the second temple.” See Josephus, *Ant.* 3.218; *Let. Aris.* 97. *T. Sotah* 13.2 notes that the Urim and Thummim ceased when the first temple was destroyed. *B. Yoma* 21b lists five things missing from the Second Temple: the ark, the ark cover and cherubim, the fire from heaven and the divine presence. The Urim and Thummim were present, but not as helpful as previously.

¹⁹⁶ Perrot et al., 1976: 2: 155.

¹⁹⁷ God removes the stones in 587 B.C.E., and will replace them not in the second temple, but in the eschatological temple (see Murphy 1993: 124).

¹⁹⁸ Nickelsburg 1980: 55.

¹⁹⁹ Collins 1983b: 381; Davila 2005b: 188. Lanchester 1913: 372-73 argued that the entire book was a single composition around 80 C.E. I have given an introduction to the *Sib. Or.* in chapter 2 (above).

probably to be dated around that time.²⁰⁰ The section on the rise of Rome (vv. 102-51) that follows is not incorporated into the ten-generation schema and was probably added later.²⁰¹ The reference to an earthquake in Laodicea (v. 107, 60 C.E.), the destruction of the temple (vv. 115-18, 125-26), and the eruption of Vesuvius (79 C.E.) gives a date for this section around 80 C.E.²⁰² The remainder of the book (vv. 1-48, 152-92) contains religious teachings from a redactor.²⁰³ The provenance is difficult to pin down. The climax of the ten generation schema is the fall of Macedonia, and Collins proposes “any place that was subject to Macedonia” as the place of origin.²⁰⁴ Agnosticism on this issue may be the wisest course.²⁰⁵ It is difficult to judge whether it is a Jewish or Christian composition, and while Collins finds “no trace of Christian redaction,”²⁰⁶ vv. 162-70 do enjoin baptism, prayer and praise to escape the judgement of God and this, along with the polemic against temples and temple worship, must leave that possibility open.²⁰⁷

While the section on the destruction of Jerusalem is brief, it concentrates on the sack of “the great temple of God” (νηὸν δὲ θεοῦ μέγαν, v. 116), also referred to as “the temple of Jerusalem” (νηὸν ... Σολύμων, v. 126).²⁰⁸ The leader of Rome (Titus) comes to destroy “the great land of the Jews with its wide street” (Ἰουδαίων ὀλέσει μεγάλην χθόνα εὐρυάγειαν, v. 127). That only Jerusalem and the temple are singled out, and that the

²⁰⁰ Collins 1974a: 370-71; 1983b: 381.

²⁰¹ Collins 1974a: 373; 1987a: 427; Lucas 1989: 186. Nikiprowetzky 1970: 54-55 suggests that the Macedonian and Roman Empires are combined as the fourth empire, since elsewhere in such schemata Rome is always the fourth empire. However, vv. 102-103 indicate the fall of the Macedonian empire and the rise of Rome.

²⁰² Lanchester 1913: 373; Nikiprowetzky 1972: 29-30; Collins 1983b: 382; Goodman 1986: 643.

²⁰³ Collins 1983b: 381.

²⁰⁴ Ibid.: 381. On p. 382 Collins proposes Syria or the Jordan Valley, see also 1974a: 367; 1987b: 86. Noack 1963: 97 proposes Egyptian provenance on the basis of numerous references to Egypt. But the text only refers to Egypt once (v. 72). Nikiprowetzky 1972: 58 proposes Egypt on the basis of his assumption that all the Jewish Sibylline oracles belong together.

²⁰⁵ Goodman 1986: 643.

²⁰⁶ Collins 1983b: 381. See also Goodman 1986: 641; Lucas 1989: 186. Collins 1974a: 376-80 refers to a Jewish author and redactor. See also Nikiprowetzky 1972: 33-34 who argues for Jewish provenance and lists several earlier critics who adopted this view (without any bibliographical details). Collins 1974a: 69 lists earlier scholars who posited an Essene origin for *Sib. Or.* 4. See the critique of this in Noack 1963; Nikiprowetzky 1972: 29-56; and Collins 1974a: 378.

²⁰⁷ Davila 2005b: 188-90 finds nothing pointing to Jewish authorship, and leaves open the possibility of “a radically Hellenizing, baptizing Jew” or “a god-fearer or Jewish or gentile Christian.” On the other hand, there is no reference to Christ, which could be expected in the context of the discussion of resurrection in vv. 187-92, see Goodman 1986: 642.

²⁰⁸ Σόλυμα is “Jerusalem,” as in Josephus *Ant.* 1.180; 7.67; *J. W.* 6.438.

temple is described as “the great temple of God,” indicates the significance of Jerusalem and the temple.²⁰⁹

However, if Jerusalem and the temple are significant here, the opening verses give a quite different perspective. The sibyllist begins with polemic against idolatry. She claims to be a messenger of “the great God whom no human hands fashioned ... of stone,” and the God who “does not have a stone dragged into a temple as a dwelling place” (οὐδὲ γὰρ οἶκον ἔχει ναῶν λίθον ἐλκυσθέντα, v. 8).²¹⁰ Rather, he has a house²¹¹ “that cannot be seen from the earth, or measured with mortal eyes, since it was not formed by mortal hands” (ἀλλ’ ὃν ἰδεῖν οὐκ ἔστιν ἀπὸ χθονὸς οὐδὲ μετρήσαι ὁμμασιν ἐν θνητοῖς, οὐ πλασθέντα χερὶ θνητῇ, vv. 10-11). This text starts as polemic against idolatry, and concludes as polemic against temples made by humans, claiming that God dwells in a heavenly temple, not made by any mortal hand.²¹² The polemic continues in vv. 24-30 where the humans who put their trust in the great God are described as happy, “since they reject all temples” (οἱ νηοὺς μὲν ἅπαντας ἀπαρνῆσονται, v. 27), as well as altars and stone statues of handmade images stained with the blood of animal sacrifices. The polemic is ultimately against idolatry, and polemic against the Jerusalem temple is caught up in that.²¹³ No human temple, not even that in Jerusalem, is suitable for the worship of God.

²⁰⁹ Collins 1974a: 367-68 suggests that the statements about the destruction are “simple historical statements” and the sibyllist does not attach special significance to them. But the way the temple is described as “the great temple of God,” and the fact that Jerusalem and the temple are singled out for special mention, are significant indicators of a positive attitude to the temple. Simon 1983: 230-31 refers to a “certain warmth towards the temple.” The reference to the eruption of Vesuvius (vv. 130-34) is also significant. Nikiprowetzky 1970: 234; 1972: 35 suggests that this is God’s punishment for the destruction of the temple, while Collins 1974a: 368 attributes this to Rome’s treatment of the Jews (vv. 135-36). But surely the Jews and their temple must be held together, as in vv 125-26, and God’s judgement attributed to the entire complex of events from 66-70 C.E. As Collins himself (1974c: 44) points out with respect to *Sib. Or.* 3, “[t]he destruction of the temple was equivalent to the destruction of the people.” See also Goodman 1986: 642; Chester 1991b: 65-68.

²¹⁰ This is my translation of the text in Geffcken 1902a: 91. For the sense of ἔχω as “have something *as* something,” see BDAG 420, s.v. ἔχω 2a, and Matt 3:9. Collins 1983b: 384 adopts the variant reading of the Ψ manuscript group οὐδὲ γὰρ οἶκον ἔχει ναὸν λίθον ἰδρυθέντα, and translates “he does not have a house, a stone set up as a temple.” This differs from 1974a: 365 where Collins translates “God ‘does not have a house, stone drawn to the temple’.”

²¹¹ Here I read the accusative noun οἶκον in v. 8 as the antecedent of the accusative relative pronoun ὃν in v. 10. See Chester 1991b: 66.

²¹² Chester (ibid.: 63-64) argues that the text represents polemic against idolatry while Collins’ translation represents polemic against temples. However, the sense is almost the same as Chester (p. 66) ultimately concedes: “[h]ence it appears most likely that the present passage disallows the possibility of God having any material habitation or temple.” See also Gäbel 2006: 99. Dunn 2006: 89-90 clarifies that the term “made with hands” refers to the manufacture of idols. See LXX Lev 26:1, 30; Isa 2:18; 10:11; 16:12; 19:1; 31:7; 46:6; Dan 5:4, 23; 6:28; Jdt 8:18; Wis 14:8.

²¹³ Collins 1974a: 369; 1987a: 428-29; Simon 1983: 228-29. This is quite different from Qumran, where there was a negative attitude to the temple cult as carried on in Jerusalem, and in *1 Enoch*, *T. Levi* and elsewhere where there was polemic against the priesthood. Here, temple and sacrifice *per se* are rejected, something highly unusual in Judaism, see Collins 1974a: 378. Noack 1963: 98; Nikiprowetzky 1970: 236-37; 1972: 56-57 argues that only pagan temples are condemned.

The polemic in this text is similar to that in Acts 7:48; 17:24, where first Stephen and then Paul claim that God does not inhabit structures or temples “made with human hands” (ἐν χειροποιήτοις). The same ideas are implicit in Heb 8:1-2, where the “true tent,” of which Jesus is minister, is pitched by the Lord and no human, and in Heb 9:11, 24 where the sanctuary Christ entered was not made by human hands.

On the other hand, in *Sib. Or.* 4:163-70 the readers are encouraged to participate in ritual washing and “extend their hands to heaven to ask forgiveness for their previous deeds and to make propitiation for bitter impiety with words of praise” vv. 166-68).²¹⁴ This is similar to Heb 13:10-16 where the text encourages readers to offer sacrifices of praise and good deeds to God, rather than participate in “meals” (βρῶμα), which do not benefit those who observe them.

The negative attitude to the temple and the cult, and the positive attitude to baptism, prayer and repentance, represent the response of one ancient author (and perhaps a later redactor) to the crisis of 70 C.E. The tension in the layers of this text is clear. On the one hand, the message to the assumed readers is that the eruption of Vesuvius was God’s judgement on Rome for their treatment of the people and the temple. On the other hand, there is the underlying theological message that the entire enterprise of temple and cult is a misguided attempt at the worship of God, and ultimately temple and cult must be rejected. Hebrews also argues for the rejection of temple and cult, not because they must be judged along with all pagan temples and their respective cults, but because, while the Jewish tabernacle and temple and their associated cult were part of God’s design for his people, they are now set aside, having reached their *telos* with the superior sacrifice of Christ. In their place is the eschatological temple, which is a metaphor for the dwelling of God with his people.

5.7 *Sibylline Oracles Book 5*

A consensus has developed that the final form of *Sib. Or.* 5 can be dated sometime between the destruction of Jerusalem and the Bar-Kochba revolt (70-132 C.E.).²¹⁵ The former event is referred to in vv. 115-129, and there is generous praise for Hadrian in vv. 47-50.²¹⁶ Verses 1-51 introduce the book with a review of history up to Hadrian, and vv.

²¹⁴ This is quite different from *Sib. Or.* 3:545-72, where salvation comes from offering sacrifices to God. It is for this reason that Collins 1974a: 366 posits a quite different provenance for *Sib. Or.* 4 than for *Sib. Or.* 3. See also p. 370 for Collins’ comments on the belief in resurrection expressed in *Sib. Or.* 4:179-82, a belief quite different from the eschatology of *Sib. Or.* 3 and 5. On *Sib. Or.* 4:179-82 see Nickelsburg 2006: 174-75.

²¹⁵ Collins 1974c: 73-75; 1984a: 371; 2000a: 143-44; Simon 1983: 223-24; Goodman 1986: 643-45; Chester 1991b: 38; Barclay 1996: 227-28; Gäbel 2006: 99.

²¹⁶ Hadrian reigned from 117-138, but brutally suppressed the Bar-Kochba revolt in 135 (Evans 2000: 1112-14). As Simon 1983: 223-24 and Goodman 1986: 645 note, a positive estimation of Hadrian after that date would be unlikely. Verse 51 seems to refer to Marcus Aurelius (reigned 161-180), and since this is juxtaposed with the positive treatment of Hadrian, most scholars consider it to be a later addition (Lanchester 1913: 373; Collins 1983b: 390; 1984a: 371; Davila 2005b: 186).

435-50 provide a conclusion, which includes details of an Egyptian temple-building project and its destruction by the Ethiopians, and of a battle in the heavens. The remainder of the book consists of four oracles (111-178, 179-285, 286-434, 435-530), held together by common themes: (1) oracles against various nations; (2) the eschatological return of Nero: (3) the coming of a saviour figure; and (4) a prediction of destruction.²¹⁷ This common theme probably indicates a unified composition. An Egyptian provenance is generally accepted,²¹⁸ with most scholars opting for Jewish authorship, although vv. 256-59 may be a Christian interpolation.²¹⁹

5.7.1 The Return of Nero

Book 5 builds on the legend of Nero's return, which also appears in *Sib. Or.* 3:63-74 where Nero is identified with Beliar, and in *Sib. Or.* 4:138 where he is "the fugitive from Rome" who will come and destroy Cyprus and Antioch.²²⁰ This myth is considerably developed in *Sib. Or.* 5, where Nero is depicted both as God's instrument to punish Rome for its part in the destruction of the temple, and also as the eschatological enemy of God's people who will come to destroy the rebuilt city and temple. In both roles he is connected with the temple.²²¹

The second oracle describes the sack of Jerusalem in the past tense.²²² Nero appears in v. 130 as a great king of great Rome and a god-like man who will flee from "Babylon" (Rome),²²³ since he would be hated by all mortals and noble men. The reasons for this hatred are given in vv. 150-154: he took "the temple built by God and burned the citizens and people who entered it" (ναὸν θεότευκτον ἔλεν καὶ ἔφλεξε πολίτας λαοὺς εἰσανιόντας, vv. 150-51). This destruction of the temple was accompanied by cosmic

²¹⁷ Collins 1974c: 74-75; 1983b: 390; 1984a: 371; 1987a: 436; 1998: 234; 2000a: 143-44; Goodman 1986: 644.

²¹⁸ Collins 1974c: 75; 1984a: 372; Goodman 1986: 645; Lee 2001: 197-98.

²¹⁹ Collins 1983b: 390-91. Davila 2005b: 186-89 proposes three scenarios: (1) a Jewish work with vv. 256-59 a Christian interpolation; (2) a Jewish-Christian work as a whole, with no interpolation; and (3) a work by a Gentile God-fearer, again with a Christian interpolation. He notes that there are no references to "circumcision, Jewish dietary rules, the sabbath, or the Jewish festivals ..." (p. 189). A decision on these options, none of which can be definitively established or dismissed, is outside my scope. Nikiprowetzky 1972: 58-65, and O'Neill 1991: 87-102 argue for what amounts to Davila's second option.

²²⁰ Bauckham 1993: 414-16, 419-21; Collins 1974c: 86-87.

²²¹ For discussions of the legend of Nero's return see Collins 1974c: 80-87; Bauckham 1993: 407-423. For Nero's dual role in *Sib. Or.* 5 see Barclay 1996: 226-27; Lee 2001: 199. The legend is often referred to as Nero *redivivus*, although, as Collins 1974c: 188 and Bauckham 1993: 421-23 note, this term is inappropriate as initially Nero was not expected to rise from the dead. Rather, the mysterious events surrounding his death gave rise to the suggestion that he had fled to Parthia (Collins 1974c: 80-81), from where he would return to conquer Rome and rule the world.

²²² While Nero did not actually destroy Jerusalem, the war began in his reign.

²²³ Collins 1983b: 396. As elsewhere in *Sib. Or.*, Babylon is a cipher for Rome.

phenomena (“the whole creation was shaken” <ὅλ>η κτίσις ἐξετινάχθη, v. 152),²²⁴ kings were destroyed, while those who continued to rule “destroyed a great city and righteous people” (ἐξόλεσαν μεγάλην τε πόλιν λαόν τε δίκαιον, v. 154). The descriptions of Jerusalem, the city and the people, as well as the attendant cosmic phenomena, demonstrate cosmic implications of the destruction of the temple. These events shook the foundations of the world and society.²²⁵

The other three oracles all predict the return of Nero. In vv. 214-26 he returns to destroy Corinth, because of Rome’s attack on Jerusalem. Here, he comes “on account of the great city and the righteous people preserved through everything” (εἵνεκα τῆς μεγάλης πόλεως λαοῦ τε δικαίου σωζομένου διὰ παντός, vv. 226-27). This is the same great city of v. 154 and the same righteous people (the Jews).²²⁶ God will send Nero to strike at the heart of the Roman Empire (vv. 220-24) as retribution for the campaign against Jerusalem.

The fourth oracle (vv. 361-410) contains the most detailed description of the return of Nero. He is introduced as a matricide who will sweep in like an eschatological enemy and destroy every land and all people (vv. 363-85).²²⁷ Verses 386-96 are addressed to the people of Rome, also addressed as matricides, and berated for sexual perversion and revelry. Rome will be silenced when Nero comes. Then, in a digression, the sibyllist turns and describes the destruction of the temple. It was “a desirable house” (πεποθημένος οἶκος, v. 397), the “second house” (δεύτερος ... οἶκος, v. 398) and “a house ever-flourishing, a watchful temple of God” (οἶκος ἀεὶ θάλλοντα, θεοῦ τηρήμων ναός, v. 400). It had been birthed “by holy people who hoped it would always be imperishable” (ἐξ ἁγίων γεγαῶτα καὶ ἄφθιτον αἰὲν ἔοντα, v. 401). Verses 403-407 describe this people as faithful to the one true God, always avoiding idolatry, and offering sacrifices to God alone, and vv. 408-10 revert to the destruction of the temple by “a certain insignificant and impure king,” probably Titus, since Nero is elsewhere described in grandiose terms.²²⁸

The significance of the temple and the holiness and faithfulness of the people are in stark contrast to the figures of Nero and his armies. But, because of Nero and his armies, great disaster will come upon Rome, and the oracle ends by announcing the destruction of Titus “by immortal hands when he left the land” (αὐτὸς δ’ ὤλετο χερσὶν υπ’

²²⁴ The brackets around <ὅλ>η indicate a textual variant. The Φ and Ψ manuscripts read the definite article (ἡ), while Alexandre proposed ὅλη (Geffcken 1902a: 111).

²²⁵ For similar ideas see 2 Bar 3-4.

²²⁶ Collins 1983b: 398.

²²⁷ Bauckham 1993: 408 discusses Nero the matricide.

²²⁸ Barclay 1996: 226.

ἀθανάτοις ἀποβὰς γῆς, v. 411)²²⁹ as a sign to “those who would think that they might sack such a great city” (ὥστε δοκεῖν ἐτέρους μεγάλην πόλιν ἐξαλαπάξαι, v. 413). But while his death was not miraculous in any way,²³⁰ his death sentence was carried out by God, for daring to destroy Jerusalem.

The legend of the return of Nero was a tool in the hand of the sibyllist to declare that God would judge Rome for Rome’s part in destroying the temple. That was a catastrophe of the highest order with repercussions throughout the world and the universe. God would not leave the perpetrators unpunished.

Earlier, however, Nero has a different role. In vv. 93-100 he is “the Persian one” who will come against Egypt initially, and then all Asia. The climax, when he has “formidable height and unseemly daring,” v. 106),²³¹ is when he will come, seeking “to utterly destroy the city of the blessed ones” (ἥξει καὶ μακάρων ἐθέλων πόλιν ἐξαλαπάξαι, v. 106), that is, Jerusalem. Jerusalem has been rebuilt, and now the eschatological enemy of God’s people returns to destroy it, an event that will precipitate the coming of an eschatological redeemer.

5.7.2 The Eschatological Redeemer

Alongside Nero, another figure appears in various guises, again in all four oracles. In the first oracle he is described as “a certain king sent from God against Nero,” v. 108).²³² This king will execute the judgement of the imperishable God and destroy all the kings and noble men. Those who dare to destroy God’s people and city will face God’s judgement.²³³

The same theme appears in the second oracle, where cosmic destruction is announced in vv. 151-61. In this case, after the fourth year,²³⁴ “a great star will shine” (λάμψη μέγας ἀστήρ, v. 155). The star is probably an allusion to the star of Balaam’s oracle (Num 24:17) or some other saviour figure, since these were frequently designated as stars in the ancient world.²³⁵ This “star from heaven” (οὐρανόθεν ἀστήρ μέγας, v. 159) would “burn the

²²⁹ For this text see the critical apparatus in Geffcken 1902a: 124. Geffcken proposes this emendation in place of the texts preserved in both the Φ and Ψ MS groups, which make little sense (αὐτὸς δ’ ὤλετο χέρσον ἀπ’ ἀθανάτην ἐπιβὰς γῆν, “by an immortal having come upon a barren land”).

²³⁰ Collins 1983b: 403.

²³¹ This translation is from Collins (ibid.: 395). For ἀηδής (“unpleasant, odious”), Geffcken 1902a: 109 proposes ἀναιδής (“shameless, bold”) as in vv. 314, 459.

²³² In *Sib. Or.* 3 deliverance was from a political “seventh king” of Egypt. Here, it is from God himself, see Collins 2000a: 148-49. Chester 1991b: 48-56 discusses whether it is appropriate to refer to this figure in messianic terms.

²³³ Collins 1974c: 87-88 connects this oracle with 3:286 and the reference there to Cyrus.

²³⁴ A reference to the “three and a half times” of Dan 7:25; 12:7 (Collins 1983b: 397).

²³⁵ Bar Kochba (son of a star) is one of these. See the discussion in 1974c: 89-92; 1983b: 392. See also Rev 8:10; 9:1-11; 22:16.

deep sea and Babylon (Rome),²³⁶ and the land of Italy,” vv. 159-60. The reason for the conflagration was because Rome was the cause of many holy faithful Hebrews and true people perishing (vv. 160-61). There is no suggestion that the Hebrew people were to blame for the disaster. They were faithful to God, but Rome had attacked them and they had perished. On the other hand, the reference to the star from heaven shows the cosmological nature of the eschatological redeemer. Deliverance comes not from politics, but from the intervention of God in human affairs.²³⁷

The saviour figure is announced in the third oracle as a prominent man “from the sky” (ἀπ’ αἰθέρος, v. 256), “the noblest of the Hebrews,” v. 258. He will cause the sun to stand still, an allusion to Josh 10:12,²³⁸ and speak with fair speech and holy lips.²³⁹ While the redeemer figure of the first two oracles came to destroy the enemies of God’s people, in this oracle and the next he comes to restore Jerusalem.²⁴⁰ In vv. 247-52, a time of peace is announced when the divine and heavenly race of the blessed Jews will “live around the city of God in the middle of the earth” (περὶ ναιετάουσι θεοῦ πόλιν ἐν μεσογαίοις, v. 250).²⁴¹ These people will be exalted to the dark clouds and the walls of Jerusalem will extend even to Joppa. This text reflects the so-called *omphalos* myth, where Jerusalem is the navel of the earth, and other texts where the restored city of Jerusalem is of gigantic proportions.²⁴² It looks to the future restoration of Jerusalem, “a beautiful city, inspired with hymns” (καλὴ πόλις, ἔνθεος ὕμνων, v.263). The messianic figure builds the new Jerusalem.²⁴³ Verse 268 suggests that a restored temple is anticipated, where God will be honoured “with all sorts of sacrifices” (παντοίαις θυσίαισι). This oracle implies a rebuilt city and temple, with the restoration of the cult, and God’s people inhabiting the land in peace and prosperity.

²³⁶ Collins 1974c: 89.

²³⁷ Ibid.: 91.

²³⁸ Davila 2005b: 188. See especially his discussion in footnote 14.

²³⁹ The allusion to Joshua (Greek Ἰησοῦς) may have led to v. 257 (ὃς παλάμας ἥπλωσεν ἐπὶ ξύλου πολυκάρπου, “who stretched out his hands upon fruitful wood”), which appears to be a Christian interpolation referring to the crucifixion of Jesus. Whatever is done with this text, vv. 256-59 are a piece of messianism, referring to a prominent man from the sky. Collins 1974c: 88 notes that the structure of the passage requires a saving figure here, and this Christian interpolation probably replaces a Jewish one.

²⁴⁰ Collins 2000a: 149-50.

²⁴¹ Translation from Collins 1983b: 399.

²⁴² Chester 1991b: 59-60; Lee 2001: 200. For Jerusalem as the centre of the earth see Ezek 38:12; *Jub.* 8:19; *1 En.* 26:1, and for the gigantic proportions of Jerusalem see the discussion of the 11QNJ in Chapter 3 (above). Such texts include 4Q554 1 I 9-22; *1 En.* 90:29, 36; 11QTemple LX-LXV; Rev 21:16. These texts depend initially on the vision of Ezek 40-48. The combination of these two motifs demonstrates the subversive nature of the text: “Jerusalem, not Rome is the centre and hub of the whole earth” (Chester 1991b: 62).

²⁴³ Lee 2001: 200.

The fourth oracle (vv. 414-34) becomes more explicit. Here, the saviour figure is “a blessed man from the clouds of heaven” (οὐρανίων νώτων ἀνὴρ μακαρίτης, v.414).²⁴⁴ While the clouds of heaven are reminiscent of Dan 7:25, the sceptre in his hand, given by God, is another allusion to Balaam’s oracle (Num 24:17). This one destroys evil doers and restores all things for the people of God. He rebuilds Jerusalem and the temple. Jerusalem is “the city which God desired” (πόλις, ἣν ἐπόθησε θεός, v. 420)²⁴⁵ made more brilliant than stars, sun and moon. Not only this, “he also made a holy place” (ἅγιόν τ’ ἐποίησεν, v. 422)²⁴⁶ that was “very beautiful” (καλὸν περικαλλέα, v. 423).²⁴⁷ He built “a great and immense tower over many stadia” (πολλοῖς ἐν σταδίοισι μέγαν καὶ ἀπείρονα πύργον, v. 425), “touching the clouds and visible to all” (αὐτῶν ἀπτόμενον νεφέων καὶ πᾶσιν ὁρατόν, v. 425). As in the third oracle, these verses draw on the traditions of the gigantic proportions of the restored Jerusalem.²⁴⁸

Then, drawing on such texts as Isa 2:2-4; Mic 4:1-4; Zech 8:20-23, the sibyllist announces that all the faithful see the restored Jerusalem, and people from the East and the West sing out the glory of God. These events spell the end of terrible things in the earth: adultery, murder, war and pederasty. The oracle closes by announcing that this takes place when “the high-thundering God, creator of the greatest temple accomplishes these things.” This is the final age when God will restore Jerusalem and build the eschatological temple and his people will live in peace.²⁴⁹ It is, however, an entirely earthly temple, albeit of

²⁴⁴ This one is said to have come (aorist tense—“used by anticipation,” Collins 1983b: 403). The word μακαρίτης, here translated “blessed,” is used for the “blessed dead,” see LSJ 1074. If the word is understood with this sense then the correspondence with Nero *redivivus* may be significant. Just as Nero returns from the dead to bring God’s judgement on Rome, so also the saviour figure returns from the dead to bring salvation.

²⁴⁵ See Ps 78:68-72.

²⁴⁶ The text is corrupt. The Φ group of MSS read ἅγιόν τ’ ἐποίησεν, and the Ψ MSS ἅγιόν ποτ’ ἐποίησεν. Geffcken 1902a: 124 notes that Rzach proposed ἅγιόν τ’ οἶκον ἐποίησεν, and Castalio ἅγιόν τε ναὸν ἐποίησεν. Whichever reading is adopted, the text refers to the building of a temple or sanctuary.

²⁴⁷ This verse begins with the word ἔνσαρκος (related to flesh, LSJ 573). Collins 1983b: 403 emends the text to read ἐν σηκῷ (“in its shrine”).

²⁴⁸ For the tower referring to the temple see 1 En. 89.

²⁴⁹ In vv. 423-25 the eschatological redeemer builds the eschatological temple, while in vv. 433-34 God is the creator of the temple. Lee 2001: 202-203 discusses the tradition that God builds the eschatological temple, while Gaston 1970: 148 suggests that vv. 432-33 identify the eschatological redeemer with God. Chester 1991b: 50 argues that it is not a case of identification, but of God acting through the redeemer figure. For temple building by a messianic figure see 2 Sam 7:13; Isa 45:1, 13; Zech 6:12-13. Lee argues that while this “follows the biblical tradition” it is here for political reasons; the messianic figure is a counter-foil for the eschatological enemy Nero. God builds the eschatological temple in Tob. 14:5-6; 1 En. 90:28-29; Jub. 1:15-17; Pss. Sol. 17:21-34; 11QTemple XXIX 10; 2 Bar. 32:4; 68:5. In Tg. Zech 6:12; Tg. Isa 53:5 the messiah builds the sanctuary. See also Mark 14:58; Matt 26:61; John 2:19.

gigantic proportions, with the cult restored and all nations gathering in it to worship God.²⁵⁰

5.7.3 Conclusion

Like *Sib. Or.* 4, this book specifically refers to the destruction of the second temple. This contrasts with other works discussed in this chapter that ignore the second temple and treat its destruction as though it was Solomon's temple. Nero is condemned for destroying the temple of God, and the text announces an eschatological redeemer who will destroy Nero and all the enemies of God's people. He will also rebuild the temple in a new Jerusalem of gigantic proportions, where the cult will be restored and all the nations come to Jerusalem to worship.

Hebrews predates the destruction of the temple, nevertheless, there the tabernacle (temple) and cult point to the eschatological things God had recently accomplished in the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God, in the age to come (1:6; 2:5). In contrast to *Sib. Or.* 5, Hebrews does not look to anticipate an eschatological temple in Jerusalem. Temple imagery is transferred to the heavenly world. The eschatological temple is "the true tent which God has pitched" (8:2), inaugurated with the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God. This is the heavenly Jerusalem, the city with foundations, the heavenly country that Abraham sought (Heb 11:10, 16), and the city to come that God's people are called to (Heb 11:14). Thus, what this sibyllist sees as a renewed earthly city and temple appears in Hebrews as the heavenly, eschatological temple, with the arrival of the eschaton signalled by the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God.

5.8 The *Ladder of Jacob*

The *Ladder of Jacob* (*Lad. Jac.*) is known only from what has survived in the *Tolkovaya Palaya*, a collection of Slavonic "expansions and elaborations of the biblical text."²⁵¹ It retells the story of Jacob's dream at Bethel. Behind the Slavonic version there is probably a Greek version and perhaps a Hebrew or Aramaic original.²⁵² The date and provenance are

²⁵⁰ Collins 1998: 236, 238 notes that in *Sib. Or.* 5, nothing is beyond this world. Simon 1983: 228 comments that the Fifth Sibyl, like the Third, "cannot conceive of Judaism without Palestine, without Jerusalem, without temple." See also Gäbel 2006: 100.

²⁵¹ Kugel 1997: 584. There are seventeen manuscripts dating from the fifteenth to the seventeenth centuries, comprising various sources dating back to the ninth century, see Lunt 1985: 402-3.

²⁵² Lunt 1985: 403 argues for a Greek original on the basis of the use of the Slavonic word "*lice*," apparently normally used with the sense of "face," for "image" in *Lad. Jac.* 1:5-7; 5:2. He suggests that this word probably renders πρόσωπον ("face"), in the sense of "bust" or "portrait" (see LSJ 1533, s.v. πρόσωπον III, 1), a sense that he argues has no Semitic parallel. He also argues from the presence of Hebrew words in 2:18-19 for "an originally Jewish text written down in Greek but intended for readers with at least some knowledge of Hebrew." On the other hand, Kugel 1995: 209; 2006: 24, 227, followed by Orlov 2004b: 60, proposes that the linguistic connections between *Lad. Jac.* and rabbinic exegetical traditions concerning the image of Jacob in heaven "do not preclude an original Greek composition ... but make that possibility somewhat less likely." I refer below to several places in the text that seem to presuppose a Semitic original.

unknown, although Kugel argues that material in *Lad. Jac.* 5, referring to the destruction of the temple, was added after the events of 68-70 C.E., and consequently the original text must predate those events.²⁵³ Given the state of the text and the uncertainties surrounding its provenance, care must be taken in drawing any fixed conclusions.²⁵⁴

Jacob's vision in *Lad. Jac.* 1 involves twenty-four human faces, one on each side of the twelve steps of the ladder,²⁵⁵ and the image of a terrifying face at the top of the ladder, an early indication of the later traditions about the figure of Jacob engraved on the divine throne in heaven.²⁵⁶ In *Lad. Jac.* 2 Jacob prays for an interpretation of his dream, and in chapter 3 he hears Sariel being instructed to interpret the dream.²⁵⁷ In chapter 4 Sariel changes Jacob's name to Israel ("similar to my name"—Sariel), and in chapter 5 Sariel interprets the dream as a brief review of the history of Jacob's descendants. Thus, for *Lad. Jac.* 5, the dream is "some sort of symbolic message about the future."²⁵⁸

The twelve steps and twenty-four human faces reappear in 5:1. The twelve steps are twelve ages, and the twenty-four human faces are twenty-four rulers of ungodly nations,²⁵⁹ who will rise up to test Jacob's descendants.²⁶⁰ In 5:6 these rulers will rise up because of the iniquity of Jacob's grandsons,²⁶¹ and "this place" (Jerusalem)²⁶² will be made desolate by

²⁵³ Kugel 1995: 221-24; 2006: 27-33 argues that the interpretation of the dream in 5:7-15 bears little relationship to the details of the dream in chapter 1, and is a post-70 C.E. interpolation into a much earlier text, perhaps predating the Maccabean period. He also acknowledges that the absence of any reference to *Lad. Jac.* elsewhere in the literature of middle Judaism makes this early date problematical and eventually settles on a date in the first half of the first century C.E. This interpolation theory is not germane to the present study, nor is the precise date of the work. *Lad. Jac.* 5:7-15 seems to post-date the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E. so I include it in this chapter as another response to that event. Bauckham 2001: 160-61 proposes a date after 70 C.E., around the same time as *Apoc. Ab.* Orlov 2004b: 60 proposes a date in the first century C.E. The seventh chapter is a much later Christian addition to what was originally a Jewish text (Lunt 1985: 404-5; Kugel 1995: 227; Orlov 2004b: 60).

²⁵⁴ Lunt 1985: 401.

²⁵⁵ Strangely Orlov 2004b: 61 notes only twenty-two human faces.

²⁵⁶ For these traditions see the Targums on Gen 28:12, esp. *Tg. Ps.-J.*; *Tg. Neof.*; and the *Frg. Tg.* For these three Targums in parallel columns in English see Rowland 1984: 501-2, and Fossum 1995: 138. For a similar tradition see *Pirqe R. El.* 45B; *Gen. Rab.* 68:12; 78:3; *Num. Rab.* 4:1; and *b. Hullin* 91b.

²⁵⁷ For the role and identity of Sariel see Milik 1976: 172-74; Orlov 2004b: 71-3.

²⁵⁸ Kugel 1995: 211; 2006: 19-24. Philo, *Somn.* 1, 150, 153-56 also reads Jacob's dream as some sort of preview of the future.

²⁵⁹ Kugel 1995: 210; 2006: 25, 227-28 reads lawless nations, i.e. Gentiles.

²⁶⁰ Lunt 1985: 409 uses the word "interrogate" in 5:5, where Kugel 1995: 210; 2006: 25, 228 argues for "test."

²⁶¹ "Because of" is from Kugel 1995: 211; 2006: 25, 228. Lunt 1985: 409 reads "against" (which is apparently a more accurate rendering of the Slavonic preposition *Ha*). Kugel 2006: 228 (note 24) suggests that the source of the confusion is the Hebrew preposition **כַּ**, that can have the sense both of "against" and "because of." This is evidence for a Semitic original as the Greek preposition **διὰ** ("because of," "through," "by means of") nowhere has the sense of "against."

²⁶² Kugel 1995: 216. In the original context of Gen 28, a more likely referent is Bethel, but in the context of *Lad. Jac.* 5 Jerusalem is meant.

“four ascents.” The precise referent of the “four ascents” is unclear,²⁶³ but it leads the text into a discussion of the building of the temple and its subsequent destruction and desolation until the fourth descent of the age.²⁶⁴ The following verses read “upon the property of your forefathers a palace will be built, a temple in the name of your God and your fathers’ [God], but in anger against your children it will be made deserted, until the fourth descent of this age.”

The text continues, referring to oppression by the descendants of Esau (a cipher for Rome),²⁶⁵ whom God will raise up to punish his people. While their ability to do so is limited by God, ultimately they will do more evil than any other opposing power, forcing God’s people to serve idols and sacrifice to the dead, which some will do.²⁶⁶ The pericope ends with a quotation from Gen 15:13, referring to their slavery in Egypt,²⁶⁷ followed by a note of hope, “the Lord will judge the people for whom they slave” (*Lad. Jac.* 5:17).

This seems to be a reference to Rome, and while it is quite obscure, the destruction and desolation of the temple seems clear. If it is a valid reading, and if it does refer to Rome’s *descent*, then the text attributes the fall of the temple to the sin and idolatry of Jacob’s descendants. It is their punishment by God through the agency of Rome. This will lead some to even greater idolatry. The text also limits the duration of the temple’s desertion until the fall of the Roman Empire. It ends with the assurance that God will eventually judge Rome.

²⁶³ These “ascents” do not appear in the account of the dream in 1:1-6, leading Kugel (*ibid.*: 17-18) to suggest that the interpretation is the conflation of two different traditions. Supporting, this he demonstrates that the text flows smoothly with the elimination of vv. 7-15. There is no MS evidence for this proposal, but the state of the witnesses to the text would probably preclude this. He also suggests (*Ibid.*: 212-15) that the four ascents equate to the four world empires of Dan 3:36-40; 7:3-27, with the angels being the princes of those empires (Dan 10:13, 20). See the midrash on Jacob’s dream attributed to R. Samuel b. Nahman (third–fourth century C.E.), where Media’s angel ascends and descends fifty-two times, Greece’s one hundred and eighty times, and Rome’s continues to ascend. While these connections seem valid, certainty is not possible. For ascending and descending referring to the destiny of nations see *Exod. Rab.* 32.7; *Lev. Rab.* 29.2.

²⁶⁴ *Ibid.*: 215; 2006: 25. Note that Kugel refers to the fourth “descent,” while Lunt 1985: 215 refers to four “ascents” of this age. Kugel 1995: 215; 2006: 228 cites MS evidence for descent, but notes that it is difficult to assess the relationship of the different witness with no critical edition of the text available.

²⁶⁵ Kugel 1995: 215; 2006: 27.

²⁶⁶ The text is quite obscure, with Lunt 1985: 409 reading “*kṣalkonagargailnyu*.” Kugel 2006: 229 notes that others have seen a reference to some named deity. He posits an original Aramaic text reading פלחן גלליא (*pulchan gillulaya*, “foreign worship”). If correct, this is further evidence for a Semitic original and, in this case, Aramaic.

²⁶⁷ *Lad. Jac.* 5:16. This quotation bears little relationship to vv 7-15 and the references to Rome, but could conceivably follow on smoothly from v. 6. Kugel 2006: 28 suggests that under Roman domination they were not “exiles in a strange land.” On the other hand, the end of exile was supposed to result in Jewish sovereignty (Acts 1:6), and the Roman domination meant that the exile was in that sense not yet over. If Kugel’s proposals are valid, the editor of the text, understanding that, may have seen no need to modify the placement of this quotation. The text continues, referring to the Exodus and to Edom and Moab (*Lad. Jac.* 6:1-15), which naturally follows on from the reference to Egypt.

The text appears to be a response to the fall of the temple, recognising that it was fore-ordained by God as a punishment for idolatry. All this was revealed to Jacob in a dream. The punishment was also limited, for Rome would also finally fall like the empires of Babylon, Media and Greece.²⁶⁸ The dissatisfaction with the temple in this text is not so much with the temple *per se*,²⁶⁹ rather it is a recognition of the wickedness of the people, with God punishing them by striking at the heart of their national and religious life, the temple. The text probably holds the temple in high esteem and mourns its loss.

The *Ladder of Jacob* contains a tradition of the destruction of the temple for the idolatry of the people, and its eventual reconstruction when God judges Rome for its actions against his people and his temple. In Hebrews the temple, while still standing, is now of limited significance since its *telos* has come with the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God, and Hebrews anticipates the eschatological temple, the dwelling of God with his people.

5.9 Josephus

Josephus ben Matthias was born in 37/38 C.E. and lived until around the turn of the century. He was born and raised in a priestly family in Judea. At the age of twenty-six (64 C.E.) he went to Rome and successfully secured the release of several priests who had been sent there to be tried by Nero (*Life* 13-16). He returned to Palestine, where in 66/67 he had command of a Jewish garrison in Galilee. At the siege of Jotapata, he surrendered to Vespasian and was held under house arrest in Caesarea. After the destruction of Jerusalem he accompanied Titus to Rome, where he was given Roman citizenship and a pension under the patronage of Vespasian (*Life* 422-25). From there, he produced his substantial corpus of literature.²⁷⁰

Josephus authored four works: the *Jewish War* (*J.W.*) written in Aramaic (no longer extant) soon after the fall of Jerusalem, and translated into Greek between 75-79;²⁷¹ the *Antiquities of the Jews* (*Ant.*), completed in 93/94 during the reign of Domitian (*Ant.* 20.267);

²⁶⁸ 1995: 216. See also the positive picture painted in *Lad. Jac.* 6.

²⁶⁹ Jacob's prayer in *Lad. Jac.* 2 acknowledges that God is enthroned on a "the fiery throne of glory" surrounded by angelic beings who serve him. The imagery is of God in a heavenly temple, with allusions to Isa 6. There is no suggestion that God is in the earthly temple, but in the literary setting of Gen 28 the temple had not been built.

²⁷⁰ See Nickelsburg 2005a: 289-90 for this biographical detail. For detail of the social context of Josephus see Barclay 1996: 246-51. For a fuller summary of his life and works see Schwartz 1990: 1-22; Mason 2003: 34-53.

²⁷¹ Barclay 1996: 448 notes that there is some debate as to this date and *J.W.* may not have been completed until around 96 C.E. See the discussion in Feldman 1984: 839-90. Nickelsburg 2005a: 290 cites *J.W.* 1.1-3 as claiming that the Greek translation was a "complete revision." But whether μεταβάλλω (*J.W.* 1.3) will bear that force is debateable. The word has a wide semantic range (LSJ 1109), but, as in *Ant.* 1.10, the context here seems to indicate that the sense is "translate." To be sure, it is not hard to imagine that Josephus would have taken care to revise what he had written earlier when he made this translation.

an autobiography, (*Life*), usually dated around 100 C.E. and appended to *Ant.* (*Life* 430); and an apologetic tract, *Against Apion* (*Ag. Ap.*), written in the nineties of the first century.²⁷² All of these works post-date the fall of Jerusalem and can be treated as a response to that event, although the most relevant information comes from *J.W.* written to explain the events leading up to and following the sack of Jerusalem.

I will first examine several relevant texts in *Ant.*, which now stands as a prelude to *J.W.* (*Ant.* 20.259). All that Josephus wrote about the temple he wrote in the knowledge that it was no longer standing in Jerusalem.²⁷³ While he had certain things to say about the temple and its destruction, he made no comment on the theological implications of these events. His interests were more with historiography and apologetics than theology.²⁷⁴ However, some places reveal his attitude to the temple.

5.9.1 The *Antiquities of the Jews*

This work is a history of the Jewish people from Adam until the inception of the Jewish War, although there is some overlap with the later books of *J.W.* where Josephus treats the history of the same period.²⁷⁵ The first half of the work retells the biblical story, using the Bible as the main source.²⁷⁶ *Antiquities* is a long and detailed history, and I restrict my comments to the treatment of the tabernacle, Solomon's temple, the rebuilt post-exilic temple and Herod's temple-building project. Since Josephus was not an eyewitness to any of these events, his main source is the biblical text (including 1 Maccabees). Evidence of his attitude to the temple will come from the modifications he makes to the text and his interpretive comments.²⁷⁷

5.9.1.1 The Tabernacle

Josephus deals with the design and construction of the wilderness tabernacle, the priestly garments, and various cultic and other regulations in *Ant.* 3.100-290. He begins with God's wish that a "tent" (σκηνή) should be set up for God to descend to when he came among them, and which they would carry about with them so that they no longer needed to go to Sinai to encounter God (3.100). Rather, God would "frequent"

²⁷² Attridge 1984: 192-93, 210-11; Barclay 1996: 448; Nickelsburg 2005a: 290-92.

²⁷³ Josephus refers to the garments of the high priest in *Ant.* 3.151-87; and discusses the sacrificial ritual in *Ant.* 2.224-57; *Ag. Ap.* 2.77, 193-98 using the present tense as though the temple cultus was still in operation.

²⁷⁴ Spilsbury 2001: 242-43.

²⁷⁵ *J.W.* begins with Antiochus IV, and the actual sack of Jerusalem is not recounted until Book 6. I deal with the descriptions of Herod's temple in *Ant.* 15 and *J.W.* 5 together for convenience.

²⁷⁶ Attridge 1984: 211. At the outset, Josephus refers to "the Hebrew writings" (τὰ ἑβραϊκὰ γραμμάτια, *Ant.* 1.5), but also to a Greek translation (*Ant.* 1.10). This translation differs from the LXX. See Attridge's discussion of the biblical witnesses used by Josephus in 1976: 30-33; 1984: 211, and for a summary of Josephus' other sources in *Ant.* see 1976: 33-38; 1984: 211-16; Schwartz 1990: 45-57; 223-24.

²⁷⁷ Barclay 1996: 358.

(ἐπιφοιτάω) the tent and “be present” (παρατυγχάνω) with them in their prayers. The portable shrine is constructed because God desired it, and in some sense replaces Sinai as the place where God is encountered.²⁷⁸ While the tabernacle is also a place of sacrifice (*Ant.* 2.224-57), as in Exod 25:8, it is primarily the place where God is encountered among his people.

Josephus describes the three parts of the tabernacle in 3.122-25. In 3.125 he calls it a “temple” (ναός), a word that the LXX never uses of the tabernacle. The entire structure is called “a holy place” (ἅγιον), and the “inaccessible” (ἄβατος) “inner chamber” (ἄδυτον) “the holy place of the Holy One” (ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ ἁγίου).²⁷⁹ The parts of the tabernacle have cosmic symbolism similar to that found in Philo.²⁸⁰ The innermost part, accessible only to the priests, was “devoted to God like heaven” (ὥς οὐρανὸς ἀνεῖτο τῷ θεῷ), while the outer parts were “like land and sea, accessible to humans” (ὥσπερ γῆ καὶ θάλασσα βάσιμος ἀνθρώποις), although only priests were permitted to enter. Thus, the entire tabernacle was a “representation (μίμησις) of universal nature” (ἡ τῶν ὅλων φύσις, 3.123). These comparisons indicate that the central shrine was analogous to heaven, and the dwelling place of God and the outer courts analogous to the earth and the sea where humans dwell. Notably, language of imitation refers to the structure of the universe and not to an imitation of the heavenly temple.

Cosmic symbolism reappears in 3.179-87. Josephus suggests that if the critics of Judaism were to observe the construction of the tabernacle, the priests’ garments and the sacred equipment they would recognise that their lawgiver was a divine man, since in every way these were made “in imitation and representation of the universe” (εἰς ἀπομίμησιν καὶ διατύπωσιν τῶν ὅλων).²⁸¹ Again, Josephus describes the tripartite sanctuary as “signifying (ἀποσημαίνω) the land and the sea” (ἡ γῆ καὶ ἡ θάλασσα), accessible to all, while the third part belongs to God, “because heaven is inaccessible to humans” (διὰ τὸ καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεπίβατον εἶναι ἀνθρώποις). The twelve loaves signify the twelve months of the year, the candlestick in seventy parts the planets, and the seven lamps the course of the planets. The veils (φάρσος) woven of four materials signify the four

²⁷⁸ In *Ant.* 3.212, 223 Moses no longer goes to Sinai. Rather, he goes to the tabernacle to receive answers to his prayers and instructions as to praxis and laws.

²⁷⁹ Thackeray (Josephus 1926-1965: 4: 375) translates with “Holy of Holies”, and Feldman 2000: 264 “the holy of the holy.” Neither translator makes any comment on why Josephus may have used the singular when both the Hebrew text and the LXX use the plural in Exod 26:33 (the text that Josephus reflects).

²⁸⁰ While Josephus had access to a considerable library, Attridge 1984: 211 suggests that “[d]ependence on Philo ... is quite unlikely.” Hayward 1996: 145 and Schwartz 1990: 40-43 also deny dependence on Philo, noting that both writers reflect traditions that existed elsewhere. In particular, he notes Zech 4:10 (esp. the LXX); Heb 8:5; Wis 18:24. Josephus mentions Philo in *Ant.* 18.257-60, noting that he is an eminent man, “not unacquainted with philosophy” (φιλοσοφίας οὐκ ἄπειρος).

²⁸¹ This translation from Feldman 2000: 280.

elements: the fine linen signifies the earth; the purple, the sea; the blue, the air; and the red, fire.²⁸²

These descriptions are much briefer than those in Philo and appear for apologetic rather than philosophical purposes.²⁸³ There is no suggestion that the tabernacle is a copy of a heavenly temple or sanctuary; rather, it is an “imitation” (ἀπομίμησις) and “configuration” (διατύπωσις) of the universe (3.180). The tabernacle symbolises the universe and is a microcosm of it,²⁸⁴ with the holy of holies equivalent to “heaven” where God dwells, and the outer courts, “earth and sea,” accessible to humans.

The tabernacle took seven months to complete (3.201),²⁸⁵ and God was pleased with the work (3.202). He came and “visited” (ἐπιξενόομαι) with the people,²⁸⁶ “taking up residence (κατασκηνῶ) in this temple” (τῷ ναῷ τούτῳ), as was evidenced by the darkness surrounding the tabernacle, while the sky (οὐρανός) was clear, from which flowed “a pleasant dew (ἡδύς ... δρόσος), revealing the presence of God” (θεοῦ δηλοῦσα παρουσίαν). God was present with his people in the tabernacle, and was encountered there. It had cosmic significance. Josephus nowhere denigrates it as inferior because it is earthly.

5.9.1.2 Solomon’s Temple

In *Ant.* 4.199-201 Moses announces that in one city in the land of Canaan in a most beautiful place, there is to be one temple. There is to be no other temple in any other city, “for God is one and the Hebrew race is one” (θεὸς γὰρ εἷς καὶ τὸ Ἑβραίων γένος ἓν). While in Deut 12 Moses makes no mention of a temple, Josephus here reflects the Deuteronomic prescriptions for the centralisation of worship.²⁸⁷ In 4.313 Moses predicts that if the people disobey God’s law then, among other disasters that would befall the

²⁸² The same scheme appears in Philo *Mos.* 2.84-88, 117-30. Josephus also describes the “tunic” (χιτῶν) of the high priest. The linen signifies the earth, the blue signifies the sky and the pomegranates signify lightning and thunder. The ephod signifies the four elements, the breastplate the earth, the girdle the ocean, the sardonyxes the sun and moon, the twelve stones the twelve months and the blue “turban” (πίλος), heaven, since it has God’s name inscribed upon the golden crown representing the sunlight. Thoma 1989: 196-97, 203-204 discusses the symbolism of the priest’s garment.

²⁸³ For comparisons with Philo see Daniélou 1957: 83-90; Koester 1989: 60; Hayward 1996: 147-51. Allegory like that found throughout Philo is absent from Josephus apart from these paragraphs that Barclay 1996: 358 (footnote 48) suggests reflect an older Jewish tradition. In *Ant.* 1.24-25 Josephus refers to the possibility of allegorical meanings and promises to write more about these if God gives him the time. In *J.W.* 4.324-25 he refers to the high priests in “sacred clothing” (ἱερά ἐσθής) presiding over “cosmic worship” (κοσμικὴ θρησκεία). See Thackeray’s brief discussion of this expression in Josephus 1926-1965: 3: 96-97 (footnote a); Hayward 1996: 144.

²⁸⁴ Feldman 2006: 109.

²⁸⁵ For details of the calculation see Feldman 2000: 285 (footnote 531). *Exod. Rab.* 52.2 has six months.

²⁸⁶ Ibid.: 205 translates, “He was a guest.”

²⁸⁷ Ibid.: 400 (footnote 591).

people, their temple (ναός) would be burnt, a prediction that does not appear in the OT.²⁸⁸ As *Ant.* 7.91 indicates, Josephus read these pronouncements as a prediction that a temple would be built (and subsequently destroyed). He believed that a temple was part of God's design for his people from the beginning and invests "David's project with Mosaic authority."²⁸⁹

Josephus describes Solomon's temple in *Ant.* 8, relying on the biblical text.²⁹⁰ While he emphasises the splendour of the building and its magnitude, its deep foundations and gold overlay, there is no cosmic symbolism. There are two chambers, rather than three (8.71),²⁹¹ and in the "inner house" (ἐνδοθεν οἶκος) twenty cubits each way was the "shrine" (ἄδυτος). The brazen sea is called a sea, not because it represents the sea, but because it was so large (8.79). Solomon spared no cost when he built the temple (8.95). He completed the work in seven years (8.99), which was a relatively short time given its size. Clearly, it was a significant building.

Josephus recounts the dedication of the temple in 8.106-21, relying to a large extent on the biblical narrative. The presence of God is signified by a "dense cloud" (πίλημα νεφέλης) that appeared and "spread itself into the temple" (εἰς τὸν ναὸν εἰσερρήν). It gave the people the "impression and opinion"²⁹² (φαντασία καὶ δόξα) that God had descended to the "temple" (ἱερόν) and "taken up residence" (κατασκηνῶ) in it (8.106). When Solomon prays (8.107), he acknowledges that God has "an eternal house" (οἶκος αἰώνιος), which consists of heaven (οὐρανός), the atmosphere (ἀήρ), the earth (γῆ) and the sea (θάλασσα), none of which can contain or limit God (8.107). He (Solomon) built a temple (ναός) for God, so that when they sacrifice and perform their cultic actions and send their prayers into the atmosphere (ἀήρ) they can be persuaded that God is present (πάρειμι) and not remote (μακράν) from them, since this is where God dwells (οἰκέω).

As in 2 Kings 8 and 1 Chron 6, Josephus recognises that God dwells in heaven, but also in the temple. In his prayer (8.114), Josephus has Solomon asking God to send some portion of his spirit to the temple, so that God would "appear" (δοκέω) to be with them

²⁸⁸ Ibid.: 470 (footnote 1092).

²⁸⁹ Begg 2005: 231 (footnote 359).

²⁹⁰ Schiffman 2001: 71, 76. Schiffman notes that Josephus would have searched the OT for data about the tabernacle in Exodus and for the temple in Kings and Ezekiel, and supported his descriptions from the temple that he was familiar with, although the influence from this latter source seems minimal (p. 82).

²⁹¹ Ibid.: 71.

²⁹² This translation from Begg and Spilsbury 2005: 30. In 8.102 Josephus refers to the "human opinion" (κατ' ἀνθρωπίνην δόξαν) that God was taking up residence in the temple. Begg (2005: 29, footnote 240) suggests that Josephus is dealing with the issue raised by Solomon in his prayer that "God cannot actually be contained in any human-made house." This notion is reflected in the NT in Acts 7:48.

on earth,²⁹³ even though the heavens themselves are just a “small dwelling place” (μικρόν οἰκητήριον) for God, and “this poor temple” (οὗτος ὁ τυχὼν ναός) of even less significance. Now the grandeur of the building in the previous section is de-emphasised, elevating the importance of God’s dwelling place in heaven (1 Kings 8:27; 2 Chron 6:18).

Finally, and ironically given that Josephus knows about and had already written about the destruction of the second temple, Solomon prays that God would guard the temple “as his own” (ὥς ἴδιον) from being “ransacked” (ἀπόρθητος) by enemies, keep it “as the property of his household” (ὥς οἰκείου κτήματος) and care for it “forever” (εἰς ἅπαν). This prayer is absent from 1 Kings 8 and 2 Chron 6, and needs to be seen as background to what Josephus will have to say about the destruction of both Solomon’s temple and the second temple.

In his discussion of the temple, Josephus struggles with the idea of God dwelling in a building constructed by humans, yet acknowledges that it was possible for God to do this (8.108). In some sense, he recognises two dwelling places of God: one on earth and the other encompassing the entire universe (8.107). The worshippers send their prayers “into the air” (εἰς τὸν ἀέρα), but are constantly convinced that God is “present and not far distant” (ὅτι πάρει καὶ μακρὰν οὐκ ἀφέστηκας). Josephus reflects the ambiguity of Solomon’s prayer, where God dwells in the temple, but hears from heaven. However, in Josephus there is no notion of a heavenly temple, that is, a structure in heaven. He seems to understand the entire universe as God’s temple. God is accessible everywhere, but in the temple in a special way. The temple is not a copy of any heavenly temple.

5.9.1.3 The Destruction of Solomon’s Temple

The destruction of Solomon’s temple is dealt with quickly and unemotionally, and taken largely from the biblical text (2 Kings 25; 2 Chron 36), which is also brief. In *Ant.* 10.136 the enemies’ commanders entered “the sacred precinct” (εἰς τὸ ἱερόν),²⁹⁴ and Zedekiah fled out of the city. In 10.144 the king of Babylon sent his official Nebuzaradan to Jerusalem “to sack (συλλάω) the temple” (ναός),²⁹⁵ to burn it, the palace and the city, and to exile the people to Babylon. This he did (10.145), carrying off the cultic vessels and burning the temple (ναός) to the ground. The following paragraphs give chronological detail about the day on which the temple was destroyed, the length of time it had been standing, and the elapsed time since the Exodus. A final note in 10.154 records that the cultic vessels from the Jerusalem temple were dedicated to the gods of the king of Babylon.

²⁹³ This notion reflects 8.102 with its reference to the “human opinion” that God dwelt in the temple. See Begg and Spilsbury 2005: 32 (footnote 382).

²⁹⁴ This translation from *ibid.*: 250. See Jer 39:3-4.

²⁹⁵ It is difficult to know whether the distinction between ἱερόν (“temple complex”) and ναός (“shrine”), as indicated in e.g. BDAG 470, 665-66 can always be maintained in Josephus. He uses each word more than four hundred times. The holy of holies is called τὸ ἅγιον ἱερόν (“the holy temple”) in *J.W.* 5.207.

Thus, the Davidic dynasty ends (10.143). City, temple and palace are destroyed, the people exiled and the cultic vessels put to the service of foreign gods.

5.9.1.4 The Post-Exilic Temple

Book 11 recounts the post-exilic rebuilding of the temple. Again, it is a matter-of-fact account. As in Ezra 3:12 and Hag 2:3, there is considerable disappointment at the inferiority of the rebuilt temple, although the people were “very satisfied” (ἀγαπάω) with their lot (11.82),²⁹⁶ and contented that they were permitted to build the temple. There is no detail as to the architecture of the building or its grandeur, nor is there any indication that this was the dwelling place of God. As in the biblical text, God’s presence, which is symbolised by the cloud, is conspicuous by its absence. Moreover, twice Josephus notes that this temple was more like a “fortress” (φρούριον) than a temple (11.89, 97). This is clearly a different class of building from Solomon’s temple.

5.9.1.5 Herod’s Temple Building Project

As *Ant.* 15.380-425 indicates, Herod’s temple was a magnificent structure, apparently making up for the deficiencies of the post-exilic temple. At the outset, Herod decides that he would build “the temple of God” (τὸν νεῶν τοῦ θεοῦ) with a larger footprint and sixty cubits higher so as to match the height of Solomon’s temple.²⁹⁷ The description of the building concludes with a note that the entire structure (ἱερόν) was built in eight years (15.418-20) and that the shrine (ναός) within this, which Herod did not enter because he was not a priest, was built by the priests in one year and six months. Its completion, on the anniversary of Herod’s inauguration, was marked with great rejoicing, and the combined festival was very notable. Josephus also notes that rain was restricted to the hours of darkness, and if anyone was amazed at this they should have regard to the manifestations of God, showing that this was not an incredible circumstance. Clearly, Josephus understood this strange factor as indicating that God was involved in this building project, ensuring that the work was not hindered by inclement weather. Josephus reveals here his positive attitude to Herod’s temple, as a building project ordained by God.

In *J.W.* 5.184-236 Josephus gives a further description of Herod’s temple. He comments on the different parts of the temple, and the allegorical readings of the various parts of the wilderness tabernacle resurface. In 5.207 “the shrine itself (αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ ναός) situated in the centre” (κατὰ μέσον κείμενος), that is, “the holy temple” (τὸ ἅγιον ἱερόν) was separated from the outer courts by an “entrance” (πύλη) that had no doors. Thus, the broad expanse of “heaven” (οὐρανός) was displayed, unexcluded. This part of the temple symbolises heaven. However, within this is a “veil” (καταπέτασμα), with

²⁹⁶ For this sense of ἀγαπάω see BDAG 5-6, s.v. ἀγαπάω 2,

²⁹⁷ Schiffman 2001: 76-77. For νεώς as “temple” see 2 Macc 4:14; 6:2; 9:16; 10: 3, 6. νεώς is an attic form of ναός, see BDF 25, §44 (1).

multi-coloured embroidery, symbolising an “image of the universe” (εἰκὼν τῶν ὅλων), details of which are elaborated in 5.213-14, with the same schema as for the tabernacle. The lamp stand with seven lamps symbolises the seven planets, the twelve loaves the circle of the Zodiac and the year, and the “altar” (θυμιατήριον) and its thirteen spices communicate that both the “uninhabited” (ἀοίκητος) and “inhabited” (οἰκουμένη) world are of God and for God.

Josephus deals with the high priest’s garments in *J.W.* 5.231-235, with brief notes on the symbolism of the bells (thunder) and the pomegranates (lightning). He notes that the colours of the garments are the same as the colours of the veil, promising to give more detail at another time (5.237). On the other side of the veil was an “inaccessible” (ἄβατος) compartment, “undefiled” (ἄχραντος) and “invisible” (ἀθέατος) to all people, called “the holy place of the Holy One” (ἁγίου δὲ ἁγίου ἐκαλεῖτο).

The impact of these descriptions and their absence from the description of Solomon’s temple and the rebuilt post-exilic temple demonstrate that Josephus believed that this enlarged and beautified temple took the people and cult back to the pristine times of the wilderness tabernacle. Along with the remarkable circumstances of its construction, these details show that this temple was ordained by God, as his dwelling place with his people.²⁹⁸ The positive attitude to the temple is probably for apologetic purposes, as Josephus commends the Jewish religion to his Roman patron.²⁹⁹

5.9.2 The *Jewish War*

This is the earliest of Josephus’ works, written from Rome in the aftermath of the sack of Jerusalem. It was originally composed in Aramaic for the people of Parthia and Babylon (*J.W.* 1.3).³⁰⁰ It was later translated into Greek for a Roman audience, to correct the distortion in other accounts due to either hatred for the Jews or flattery of the Romans (1.2). Thus, Josephus claims to be writing an unbiased account of the war from the perspective of an eyewitness who can speak for both sides.³⁰¹ He begins with a history of the Jews from Antiochus (c. 175 B.C.E.) to the death of Herod the Great (4 B.C.E.). Book 2 moves quickly to an account of the events leading up to the war and books 3-6 detail the course of the war itself. Book 7 recounts the aftermath of the war, including the triumphant arrival of Vespasian in Rome, with the spoils from the temple.

²⁹⁸ That Josephus understood that God was encountered in Jerusalem and in the temple can be deduced from *J.W.* 5.380 where, long before any temple was built, Abraham is said to have lifted up his hands to the temple site to seek help from God. The temple site is described as the place which “you (the Jews) have now polluted” (εἰς ὃν νῦν ἐμίανετε χώρον ὑμεῖς). On this see Spilsbury 2001: 253.

²⁹⁹ It probably also reflects the fact that Herod was installed by the Romans, and Josephus is reporting on his prowess as a temple builder.

³⁰⁰ Nickelsburg 2005a: 290.

³⁰¹ Marguerat 2007: 327.

While Josephus claims impartiality, this work will eventually become an official history of the events for the emperor (*Life* 363). He cannot be too critical of Rome. Moreover, he has a positive view of the temple and does not hide his emotions at its destruction (*J.W.* 1.9-12; 6.111). Ultimately, he absolves Rome from blame for the destruction, representing Rome as an unwilling participant in events that can be attributed to certain elements within Jewish society and are ultimately ordained by God.³⁰²

The culpable elements within Jewish society are also apparent in *Ant.* 20.164-66. Certain “insurrectionists” (λησται) entered Jerusalem and killed the high priest Jonathan, whose murder was never avenged. They then mingled with other worshippers with hidden weapons, even committing murder in the temple. This, says Josephus, seems to be the reason why God rejected “our city” (ἡμῶν ἡ πόλις), and no longer judges the “temple” (ἱερόν) to be pure enough to be his “dwelling place” (οἰκητήριον).³⁰³ Consequently, God brought the Romans to purify the city and enslave the people, so as to make them wiser by their misfortune. The destruction of the temple is attributed not to any failure of the temple or the priesthood,³⁰⁴ but to the actions of the insurrectionists.³⁰⁵

Contrasting with the culpability of the Jewish insurrectionists, the Romans, and especially Titus, appear in a favourable light. When the city is burning and the temple gates alight, Titus expresses his reluctance to burn the temple (*J. W.* 6.241), despatching chosen men to quench the fire (6.243). A recalcitrant soldier throws a firebrand through a window under some “supernatural impulse” (δαιμόνιος ὁρμή, 6.252). While Titus and his men try

³⁰² Barclay 1996: 352-53. Leoni 2007: 39-51 concludes that in his account of the destruction of the temple Josephus is “substantially trustworthy,” but while Barclay 1996: 351 argues that *J.W.* is too complex to be dismissed as “imperial propaganda,” he also suggests (p. 353) that the way he absolves Titus from blame is “economical with the truth’ and possibly a complete fabrication.” Since this debate is tangential to my study I take what Josephus writes at face value as indicating his attitude to the temple and its destruction. Levine 1994: 233-46 argues for the “basic integrity of Josephus as a historian of first-century Jerusalem,” as do Schürer et al., 1973-1987: 1: 506-507 (footnote 115). For a list of those who find Josephus’ account implausible see Spilsbury 2002: 307 (footnote 2). More recent works include Barnes 2005: 142-43; Rives 2005: 145-51; McLaren 2010: 839-40.

³⁰³ This repeats an earlier pattern reported in *Ant.* 11.299-300 where the high priest Johanan kills his brother in Solomon’s temple. God was not indifferent to this, and Josephus attributes the defilement of the temple by the Persians to it. This attitude to the temple would have been at variance with the attitudes of many Jews, whose issue with the temple would have been that it was built by Herod, who could not have been seen as the proper successor of Solomon. See Wright 1992: 225-26.

³⁰⁴ In *J.W.* 6.94-97, 100-102 John of Gischala is said to have suspended the perpetual sacrifice, and bears some responsibility, although he was a rogue, and not representative of an ideal priest. See Marguerat 2007: 327.

³⁰⁵ Rajak 1983: 80-95; Attridge 1984: 195; Barclay 1996: 352; Marguerat 2007: 327-28. The word ληστής (“insurrectionist,” “brigand,” “robber”) appears seventy-six times in Josephus, but only once in the first half of *Ant.* (9.183). It appears thirty-eight times in *J.W.*, four times in *Ant.* 14, eleven times in *Ant.* 11 and fourteen times in *Ant.* 20, all of which cover the same historical period as *J.W.* It also appears eight times in *Life*. Such statistics need to be read with care, but could indicate that Jewish insurrection is a major theme in Josephus’ account of the period of Roman domination of Palestine. For other examples see *J.W.* 2.414; 2.316-42, where the high priest implores the people not to take up arms.

to quench the fire they are ultimately unable to do so (6.260-66), thus, it was burned “against Caesar’s wishes” (ἄκοντος Καίσαρος).³⁰⁶

The reference to a “supernatural impulse” raises the question of a theological reason for the destruction of the temple.³⁰⁷ God seems to have decreed that Israel’s enemy (Rome) should be the instrument of his punishment.³⁰⁸ This is made clear by a series of events that Josephus attributes to God. In *J.W.* 2.539 God hinders Cestius from ending the war; in 4.104 Josephus attributes the escape of John of Gischala from Titus to the action of God, who saved him for the sake of the destruction of Jerusalem (4.104);³⁰⁹ and in 4.288-99 the Zealots sleep and the Idumeans enter the city, an event not attributed to their laziness, but to the overruling decree of “Destiny” (μείρομαι, 4.297),³¹⁰ and moreover, there was also a storm so that nobody heard anything (298-99). God’s involvement in the destruction of the city and the temple is even clearer in 4.323, where Josephus says that God had “condemned (κατακρίνω) the city for its pollutions” (ὥς μεμιασμένης τῆς πόλεως) and resolved to “purge” (ἐκκαθαίρω) “the sanctuary” (τὰ ἅγια) by fire. Finally, and most significantly, Josephus claims that God had gone over to the Romans.³¹¹ This is expressed in speeches by Agrippa (2.390), by Titus (3.484; 6.38-39); and by Josephus himself, first when he surrenders at Jotapata (3.354) and later (5.367-419; 6.110-11).³¹²

For Josephus, then, city and temple are destroyed because God was on the side of the blameless Romans and against the rebellious Jews. There is little of the dismay encountered in *2 Baruch* (although Josephus does not hide his emotions); little of the distress encountered in *4 Ezra*, and the cause is not idolatry as in *Apoc. Ab.* Nor are the Romans castigated for their part in the destruction as in *Sib. Or.*, and nowhere does Josephus anticipate an eschatological temple to be built by God.³¹³ Rather, God is judging his people

³⁰⁶ Attridge 1984: 203 suggests that “the Jewish revolutionaries were wicked and the Roman conquerors ... not only brave, but blameless in their conquest of the city.”

³⁰⁷ On this see *ibid.*: 203-206.

³⁰⁸ Marguerat 2007: 328-29. See Is 45:1-8; Jer 20:1-6.

³⁰⁹ John encouraged the people of Gischala to rebel against Titus. When Titus marched upon Gischala, John convinced him not to attack the city since it was the Sabbath, although he was more concerned to save his own skin. Titus, who seems to have been taken in, withdrew. John took advantage of this and fled to Jerusalem, ultimately becoming leader of the Zealot rebellion against Rome. See *J.W.* 4.84-223. See also Schwartz 1990: 85.

³¹⁰ Attridge 1984: 204 capitalises Destiny, and reads this expression as “the inexorable will of the God worshipped in the Temple at Jerusalem.”

³¹¹ Spilsbury 2002: 312-14; Marguerat 2007: 327-31.

³¹² Attridge 1984: 194-95 notes the significance of the speeches in *J. W.* as “important for illustrating the tendencies of Josephus’ work.” He places such speeches in his own mouth and the mouths of significant actors in the drama.

³¹³ Nickelsburg 2005a: 291.

for their rebellion, and the God of the Jews is now the God of the Romans. To all intents and purposes, this central symbol of Jewishness has gone.

5.9.3 *Against Apion*

Against Apion is an apologetic work, written to refute criticism of the *Antiquities* on the basis that the five thousand years of Jewish history appears nowhere else and cannot be true (*Ag. Ap.* 1.1-2).³¹⁴ The title is somewhat of a misnomer, since Apion is only one of those addressed, and there are numerous other opponents, both named and unnamed.³¹⁵

Josephus describes the temple in *Ag. Ap.* 2.102-111.³¹⁶ It is surrounded by four courts, each one with a higher degree of sanctity.³¹⁷ The outer court was open to anyone, even foreigners, women were permitted in the second court, Jewish men in the third, and the priests, when clothed in their priestly regalia, in the fourth. In addition there was “the most sacred place” (*adytum*), which was accessible only to the high priest clad in specific regalia. The schema reflects the increasing levels of holiness within the temple.³¹⁸ Moreover, the priests only enter at certain times, and no vessels are permitted to be carried through the temple. If Apion had taken the time to make himself aware of such things he would not have uttered such incredible words as he did. Indeed Apion, betrays no knowledge of “the purity of our temple” (*templi nostri pietatem*).

In 2.193 Josephus refers to “one temple of the one God” (εἷς ναὸς ἐνὸς θεοῦ), and then proposes that it should be “common to all” (κοινός ἀπάντων), since “God is common to all” (κοινοῦ θεοῦ ἀπάντων). The priests are to be occupied with their sacrificial work, and the offerings are not so as to overindulge themselves, for excess is against the will of God (194-95), and when they make sacrifices they are to pray first for the common welfare of all people and then for their own.

Since Josephus is discussing Judaism, he probably refers here to a single temple for the nation,³¹⁹ but since he had earlier spoken of the outer court for foreigners, this paragraph may also reflect a universalistic outlook.³²⁰ Moreover, while the temple has by this time been in ruins for twenty-five years, he describes the regulations about access and the cult in the present tense, indicating that while God had gone over to the Romans, this was not the

³¹⁴ He also appears to have been stung by criticism of *J.W.*, see *Ag. Ap.* 1.47-56.

³¹⁵ Nickelsburg 2005a: 294.

³¹⁶ For the background to this section see Bauckham 1996: 128.

³¹⁷ Barclay 2007: 222-23.

³¹⁸ For similar restrictions see *J.W.* 5.227.

³¹⁹ See *Ant.* 4.199-201.

³²⁰ Hayward 1996: 152; Barclay 2007: 279-80 (footnote 771). In *Ag. Ap.* 2.76-77 sacrifices are offered for the emperors and the people of Rome.

end of the Jewish religion.³²¹ Either it was difficult for him to imagine the religion without its ritual or else, like his contemporaries, he anticipated the rebuilding of the temple sometime in the future.³²² However, Josephus never discusses a rebuilt temple, and there is no hint of an eschatological temple.

5.10 Conclusion

All the texts discussed in this chapter post-date the destruction of the second temple, but apart from *Sib. Or.* 5 and Josephus, they all conceal their references to its destruction under the guise of the destruction of Solomon's temple. Also, apart from these two texts the second temple is by and large overlooked, only appearing in *2 Bar.* 32:3; 68:5, as something far off in the future, that will be built "for a time" and "not as fully as before." Where these texts anticipate a restored rebuilt temple, it is the eschatological temple. While the narrative settings of *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* demand references to Solomon's temple, the setting of *Sib. Or.* 5, with its references to Nero, demands a reference to the second temple. The reviews of history in *Apoc. Ab.*, *L.A.B.*, and *Lad. Jac.*, could have included the second temple, but they all ignore it. It seems that, to these writers, the real temple, in which the glory of Yahweh dwelt, was Solomon's and its destruction was a great disaster. The destruction of the second temple, while deeply significant to be sure, paled in comparison with the destruction of Solomon's temple. Moreover, those events could be pinned on sin and idolatry as the OT prophets had said, while this may not have been the case for the second temple, which was destroyed by the occupying forces of Rome. On the other hand, the Egyptian provenance of *Sib. Or.* 5 is significant. As noted above in Chapter 2, texts emanating from Egypt express a positive attitude to the second temple, and this positive attitude is reflected in a text that takes its destruction more seriously than texts with a Palestinian provenance.³²³

Josephus is different. He has a positive opinion of the temple, as indeed the tabernacle and Solomon's temple and, as in Philo, they have cosmic significance. Both Solomon's temple and the second temple were destroyed not because they were inadequate, but because of the recalcitrance of the people. Ultimately, God had gone over to the side of the Romans.

³²¹ Bauckham 1996: 347 suggests that the present tense indicates that "Josephus, even when he wrote *CA*, could not envisage Judaism without the ministry of the priests in the temple at its heart."

³²² Barclay 2007: 279 (footnote 769). In *Ant.* 4.314 Moses predicts the frequent destruction and rebuilding of the temple. The Mishnah, likewise, seems to have anticipated the rebuilding of the temple and the restoration of the cult (*m. Qodashim*; *m. Middot*), as did Barnabas (*Barn.* 16: 3-4). Hebrews 10:1-18 refers to the temple cultus in the present tense; however, there he is discussing the abolition of the sacrificial cultus, and I take it as evidence that Hebrews was written prior to 70 C.E. See 1.5.5 (above).

³²³ Neusner 1975: 35 suggests that "for large numbers of ordinary Jews outside of Palestine, as well as substantial numbers within, the Temple was a remote and, if holy, unimportant place." While this may have been true for some, it was apparently not true for the authors of the texts discussed in this chapter.

To the extent that the tabernacle appears, references are always positive and it is nowhere denigrated because it is built by humans. It was built as directed by God and, like Solomon's temple, has cosmic significance. It is nowhere presented as an inferior copy of the heavenly temple.

The anticipation of a rebuilt temple in some of these texts is also significant for this study. While it is sometimes seen as an eschatological temple to be built by God, elsewhere it seems to be more like Solomon's temple. Texts where this is the case look back to the pristine days of Solomon's temple and project them forward to the eschaton. Hebrews presents a quite different scenario. The eschatological dwelling of God is the eschatological temple, now come with the exaltation of Christ. While the temple was still standing when Hebrews was written, its fall when it came would simply underscore the reality already understood: "here we have no lasting city, but we are looking for the city that is to come" (Heb 13:14).³²⁴

³²⁴ Ibid. 35 also suggests that "for the Christian Jews, who were indifferent to the Temple cult ... the year 70 cannot be said to have marked an important change."

6 The Eschatological Orientation of Hebrews

6.1 Introduction

Having examined temple symbolism in a selection of texts from the literature of middle Judaism, I now turn to Hebrews. In this chapter I examine Heb 1-2, which set the context in which the remainder of the book is to be read. I will argue from Heb 1 that the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God signals the arrival of the eschaton. He has been exalted in the world to come, now come into the present. This heavenly world is not, however, to be understood in terms of a three-tier universe, as though the author of Hebrews imagined an actual throne “up” in heaven. Rather, just as Ps 110:1 envisaged the Davidic monarch as God’s vice-regent ruling alongside God with the power and authority of God, Heb 1 envisages Jesus ruling alongside God, with the same power and authority.

I will argue from Heb 2 that the exaltation of Jesus anticipates the exaltation of the people of God, the “siblings” of Jesus. Here the author establishes from Ps 8 that God will ultimately make the world to come subject to humanity. God’s original intention will be realised, and redeemed humanity will be restored to its proper role as God’s vice-regents over the world to come. The remainder of Hebrews is to be read from this dual perspective of the exaltation of Jesus and his siblings.

In the following chapters I examine temple symbolism in Heb 3:1–4:15; 10:19–13:25 (chapter 7) and in Heb 4:14–10:18 (chapter 8). I will argue in chapter 7 that the world to come is to be understood as an eschatological temple where God dwells with his people. The ultimate goal of the people of God, as established in Heb 2, is participation in God’s rest in this eschatological temple (Heb 3-4). In Heb 10-13, this goal is described as a city-temple, the heavenly Jerusalem. The recipients of Hebrews have access to this city-temple in the present (12:22-24) and are called to follow Jesus away from the earthly Jerusalem to the city to come.

Hebrews 8:1-5 is normally read as though the heavenly temple is vertically separated from the earth and the archetype of the wilderness tabernacle, which is its inferior copy. In chapter 8, I will argue that the heavenly temple in these verses is also to be read as the eschatological temple symbolising God’s dwelling with his people in the eschaton.

I maintain that the temple symbolism in Hebrews is consistent. The heavenly, eschatological temple is the eschatological goal of the people of God where Jesus is now exalted and to which they have proleptic access in the present. They are to persevere to ensure that they reach this goal in the future.

6.2 Psalm 110:1 in Heb 1:1-14

In an allusion to Ps 110:1, Hebrews 1:1-4 claims that “in these last days” (ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων) God has spoken through a Son who has been exalted to God’s right hand, having obtained a name superior to angelic names, the measure of his superiority over the angels. In 1:5-16 a catena of OT quotations establishes his superiority. After a brief exhortation in 2:1-4, Heb 2:5-10 shows that the exaltation of the Son of God to this position of supreme authority anticipates the ultimate rule of humanity over the world to come. Thus, the creation mandate of Gen 1:26-28, celebrated in Ps 8, is fulfilled.

This first major section of Hebrews can be structured as follows:¹

- 1:1-4 Exordium: God has spoken in these last days through a Son who has sat down at God’s right hand.²
- 1:5-14 A catena of quotations establishing and clarifying the claim that the Son of God is superior to the angels.
- 2:1-4 An exhortation to attend closely to what God has said through the exalted Son.
- 2:5-9 The quotation and exposition of Ps 8:4-6 (LXX), showing that God has made the world to come subject to humans rather than angels.
- 2:10-18 An explanation that the solidarity of Christ with humanity qualified him to become a high priest so as to free the descendants of Abraham from their fear of death.

I restrict my comments to the quotation of Ps 110 in Heb 1:13, the allusion to the same Psalm in 1:3, the reference to the entrance of the Son into the inhabited world in 1:6, and the quotation and interpretation of Ps 8:4-6 in Heb 2:5-9; 10-18.

¹ This structural outline follows Attridge 1989: 35-97 (see Attridge’s Table of Contents on p. vii); Bruce 1990: 44-89 (Table of Contents pp. vii-viii); Lane 1991a: 1-67 (Table of Contents, p. viii); Guthrie 1994: 144; DeSilva 2000b: 83-130.

² A number of scholars have detected a pre-existing liturgical fragment in these verses, perhaps an early Christian hymn. See Bornkamm 1959: 197-98; Deichgräber 1967:137-140; Sanders 1971:19-20, 92-94 and many others (see the discussion in Ellingworth 1993: 96-97). This proposal has not received unqualified support, partly due to the multiplicity of suggested reconstructions. More recent discussions usually express caution, often noting that even if there is a hymn fragment here, the author has modified it, and the original wording is no longer recoverable (Frankowski 1983: 184-91; Meier 1985b: 524-28; Attridge 1989: 41-42; Lane 1991a: 7-8; DeSilva 2000b: 86-87; Koester 2001: 178-79; O’Brien 2010: 47). It is not beyond the author of Hebrews to make use of traditional materials and modify them to suit his purposes, but identifying the sources and his redaction in this pericope is fraught with difficulty. For example, Theissen 1969: 50 and Grässer 1990-97: 1: 65 think that the words about the Son achieving purification for sins were added by the author of Hebrews, while Braun 1984: 31-32 claims that the word καθαρισμός (“purification”) is one of the factors indicating the presence of a hymn in the first place.

6.2.1 Psalm 110:1

Psalm 110:1 is a key text in the argument of Hebrews, with a quotation in Heb 1:13 and allusions in 1:3; 8:1; 10:12-13; 12:2. While there has been considerable debate over the original *Sitz im Leben* of Psalm 110,³ recent interpreters assign it to time of the Israelite monarchy and perhaps early in that period,⁴ considering it to be a royal Psalm, addressed to a king reigning in Zion (v. 2). The monarch to whom it was addressed “reigned with the power and authority of Yahweh himself.”⁵ This verse is quoted and alluded to in the NT more often than any other OT text,⁶ and the number of studies that have been devoted to its treatment in the NT is a measure of its importance.⁷ In Hebrews, as in other parts of the NT, the Psalm is applied to Jesus, considered to have been exalted to the place of highest honour, ruling with the power and authority of God.

The quotation of Ps 110:1 in Heb 1:13 agrees with the text of the LXX, but allusions elsewhere in Hebrews (1:3; 8:1; 10:12-13; 12:2) differ, and indeed each one differs from the others.⁸ Nevertheless, no study has yet systematically examined the differences between the quotation and the allusions, and the impact of these differences on the understanding of Hebrews. An analysis of the changes in the allusion in Heb 1:3 will highlight the points that the text emphasises. I begin with the quotation in Heb 1:13 and then return to Heb 1:3, since this quotation is the standard from which the modification introduced in 1:3 can be identified.

6.2.2 Psalm 110:1 in Heb 1:13

This quotation comprises the words said in the Psalm to have been spoken by Yahweh and appears precisely as in the LXX, although without the opening words Εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου (“the Lord said to my lord”).⁹ These words are implied in the rhetorical question which functions as a citation formula: πρὸς τίνα δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων εἶρηκεν

³ See Goldingay 2008: 292

⁴ Allen 1983: 111-13; Kraus 1989: 347; Eaton 2003: 6-7, 384; Hilber 2005: 76-88; Waltke, Houston and Moore 2010: 498-500. For a recent overview of the critical discussion concerning the Psalm see Rooke 2000b: 90-103.

⁵ Hay 1973: 19-20.

⁶ Matt 22:44; 26:64; Mark 12:36; 14:62; Luke 20:42-43; 22:69; Acts 2:34-35; 5:31; Rom 8:34; 1 Cor 15:25; Eph 1:20; Col 3:1; Heb 1:3, 13; 8:1; 10:12; 12:2; 1 Pet 3:22. Cf. also Acts 7:55 where the Son of Man stands at the right hand of God. It also appears in the longer ending of Mark (Mark 16:19).

⁷ Significant contributions to the understanding of Ps 110 in the NT include Coppens 1956; Kistemaker 1961; Hay 1973; Dupont 1974; Gourgues 1978; Loader 1978; 1981; Hengel 1995: 119-225; Anderson 2001.

⁸ Frankowski 1983: 189-90 notes that no two allusions to Ps 110:1 in the NT are the same.

⁹ It would be anachronistic to suggest that the author of Hebrews had a copy of the LXX in front of him when he wrote. Clearly, he cited some form of the Greek OT, and usually his OT quotations are close to the extant LXX text. He seems not to have used the OT in Hebrew. Since the LXX in the first century was more like a collection of translations of a now unattainable Hebrew text, each exhibiting various translation techniques, word usage in different books cannot be used as a guide to word usage in other books (McLay 2003: 100-36).

ΠΟΤΕ; (“to which of the angels has he ever said?”).¹⁰ This rhetorical question forms an inclusio around the catena of quotations in Heb 1:5-13, balancing a similar question about Ps 2:7 in Heb 1:5.¹¹

The question in v. 13 differs from the LXX in that the aorist εἶπεν in the opening words of the Psalm has been replaced by the perfect εἶρηκεν. While both Attridge and Ellingworth consider that this change in tense emphasises the continuing effect of the session at the right hand,¹² more recent studies of the aspect of the perfect tense tend away from the traditional “past action with continuing effect” force of the perfect, pointing out that it expresses imperfective aspect with heightened intensity.¹³ The perfect draws the reader’s attention to the ΠΟΤΕ (“ever”) in the emphatic position at the end of the formula, with the sense of the question being, “to which of the angels has he *ever* said”? This question (and the question in 1:5) underscore the superiority of the Son to the angels by pointing out that these scriptures addressed by God to the Son were never addressed to angels.¹⁴

In each of the earlier quotations in the catena there is an explicit christological title either in the introductory formula or in the quotation; here, there is neither. Those titles are υἱός (“Son,” 1:5, 8), πρωτότοκος (“firstborn,” 1:6), θεός (“God,” 1:8, 9), κύριος (“Lord,” 1:10), and ὁ αὐτός (“the Same,” 1:12).¹⁵ While the addressee in the rhetorical question of 1:13 is unspecified, it is clear that the reader is to supply the answer: it is not

¹⁰ Loader 1981: 16 does not consider these words to be a citation formula, but while they differ from other such formulas in Hebrews, they do have the same function, implying that God spoke the words in question. See Longenecker 1975: 164-69.

¹¹ Thompson 1976: 353 notes that “[T]he important place given to Ps 110:1 indicates that the catena is to be understood as an interpretation of the exaltation, a reflection on the hymn in 1:1-3.” See also Combrink 1971: 28-29; Meier 1985a: 168-89; 1985b: 504-33; Lane 1991a: 31-32, Ellingworth 1993: 129; Bauckham 2004: 177-78.

¹² Attridge 1989: 61; Ellingworth 1993: 131. If this reading of the aspect of perfect tense has any validity, it would be more correct to say that the perfect tense emphasises the continuing validity of the oracle in the Psalm.

¹³ Campbell 2007: 184-211, followed by O’Brien 2010: 77. See also Campbell’s simplified discussion in Campbell 2008a: 50-51. Campbell argues that the present and imperfect tense forms in Greek express imperfective aspect, with the imperfect tense form expressing remoteness and the present tense form expressing proximity. He then argues that the perfect tense form also expresses imperfective aspect, but with heightened proximity when compared with the present tense form. See Campbell’s discussion of his categories of proximity and intensity in 2007: 199. Since the similar rhetorical question introducing Ps 2:7 in Heb 1:5 uses the aorist εἶπεν (which appears in Ps 2:7 and in Ps 110:1), the perfect tense in 1:13 may be no more than a stylistic variation, as with the other differences between the rhetorical questions in vv. 5, 13. See Vanhoye 1969: 208. The Hebrew expression נֹאֵם יְהוָה (“oracle of Yahweh”) is never translated with the perfect tense of λέγω (“to say”) in the LXX, making it unlikely that the author found this form of the verb in his Vorlage of Ps 110:1.

¹⁴ I use an upper case S for Son although the word is anarthrous where it first appears in Heb 1:3. It is clear that the subject is the exalted Son of God, reigning alongside God with God’s power and dignity. The Son is identified as Jesus for the first time in Heb 2:9.

¹⁵ Bauckham 2009: 34-36. For this title see also Heb 13:8.

the angels, but the exalted Son and Lord addressed throughout the rest of the catena who has been invited to take his seat.¹⁶

Apart from the tense of the verb in the introductory rhetorical question and the implication that the Psalm is addressed to the exalted Son rather than to the angels, the text agrees with that of the LXX. Clearly then, the author knew the OT Greek text in a form identical to that in which we know it, and the quotation presents a standard that can be used to compare the allusion to Ps 110:1 in Heb 1:3.¹⁷

6.2.3 Psalm 110:1 in Heb 1:3

Hebrews 1:1-4 contrasts God's speech in the past through the prophets with his definitive speech "in these last days" through a Son whom he appointed heir of all things. This Son, having made purification for sins, sat down at the right hand of the Majesty in the heights, inheriting a name superior to angelic names, with the superiority of this name being the measure of his superiority to the angels.

Hebrews 1:1-4 is a single periodic sentence containing several adverbial clauses but only two verbs in the indicative mood, one with God as subject (ἐλάλησεν, "he spoke") and one with the Son as subject (ἐκάθισεν, "he sat down"). The temporal contrast between these two "speech-events" of God sets the context in which Hebrews is to be read. God spoke "formerly" (πάλαι) through the prophets, and has now spoken "in these last days" (ἐπ' ἐσχάτου¹⁸ τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων) through a Son who has sat down at his right hand.

While the expression ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν, or similar, appears several times in the LXX and the NT,¹⁹ only here is the demonstrative adjective τούτων appended. The words are equivalent to the Hebrew words **אחרית הימים** that appear in 4QmidrEschat^a, a text that makes use of Ps 2; 89; 2 Sam 7:14; Exod 15:17-18 to anticipate the building of an eschatological temple "in the last days."²⁰ But while in the Qumran text this is the final

¹⁶ Meier 1985b: 519.

¹⁷ Rahlfs 1931: 276-77 notes no variant readings in the LXX in connection with the words quoted in Heb 1:13.

¹⁸ MSS Ψ, 629, 1505 and several other late witnesses read ἐσχάτων. The singular form has superior attestation.

¹⁹ The words appear with the genitive singular of ἔσχατος in Num 24:14; Jer 23:20; 25:19 (MT 49:39); Dan 10:14, and with the genitive plural of ἔσχατος in Gen 49:1; Deut 8:16; Josh 24:27; Hos 3:5; Mic 4:1; Jer 37:24; Dan 2:28, 29; 2 Pet 3:3. Ἐπ' ἐσχάτω τῶν ἡμερῶν appears in Deut 4:30, and ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις in Isa 2:2; Dan 11:20; Acts 2:17 (replacing μετὰ ταῦτα, "after these things," in Joel 2:28 LXX [MT: 3:1]). In some of these texts (Gen 49:1; Num 24:14; Isa 2:1; Dan 2: 28-29; 10:14; Hos 3:5; Mic 4:1) there is an eschatological orientation, as God's people look to the age to come. In the NT the last day (singular) is anticipated in John 6:39, 40, 44, 54; 11:24; 12:48. The words ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ("in last days", anarthrous) appears in 2 Tim 3:1 and combinations of ἔσχατος and χρόνος appear in 1 Pet 1:20; Jude 18.

²⁰ See 4QmidrEschat^a III 2, 12, 15, 19, V 3; 1QS^a I 1. For the use of this expression at Qumran see Steudel 1994b: 161-63. While Exod 15:17 is not cited in Hebrews, Ps 2:7 appears in 1:5; 5:5; 2 Sam 7:14 in 1:6, and Ps 89:28 is echoed in Heb 1:6 (see my discussion of this text in 6.3.5 below).

period of history before the still future eschaton,²¹ in Hebrews, the demonstrative adjective indicates that for this author, the eschatological age had arrived with the exaltation of the Son to the right hand of God.²² The presence of these texts in both Hebrews and Qumran is evidence of a conversation about eschatological expectation in middle Judaism, a conversation to which the author of Hebrews had a contribution to make.²³

Placing the two texts side by side identifies the changes that the author made when he incorporated Ps 110:1 into his discourse.²⁴

Psalm 110 (LXX 109):1

Εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου Κάθου
ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς
ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν
σου.

The Lord said to my lord; sit at my right
hand until I make your enemies a footstool
for your feet.

Hebrews 1:3

ὃς ... καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν
ποιησάμενος ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς
μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς.

Who ... having made purification for sins sat
down at the right hand of the majesty in the
heights.²⁵

²¹ Steudel 1994b: 162-63.

²² Attridge 1989: 39; Lane 1991a: 10-11.

²³ I am not proposing that Hebrews is dependent on 4QmidrEschat^a. Brooke 2005a: 77 suggests that both authors “were acquainted with a tradition” that combined Ps 2:7 and 2 Sam 7:14, although they do different things with them. In place of Exod 15:17, Num 24:6 (LXX) appears in Heb 8:2 to refer to the eschatological temple. I discuss this text in Church 2008: 145-57.

²⁴ Loader 1981: 18-21 connects the allusions to Ps 110:1 in Hebrews with Acts 5:31 (ἀρχηγός καὶ σωτήρ, “a ruler and saviour”) and Eph 1:20 (ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, “in the heavenly places”), and argues that the author knew of this tradition and that this was the foundation of his thinking, rather than the LXX. That he knew the traditions is not at issue, but that he built his thinking on them rather than on the LXX is based on rather tenuous evidence, since Hebrews never uses the noun σωτήρ (“saviour”) and never uses the adjective ἐπουράνιος (“heavenly”) to describe the situation of Jesus. The closest he comes to this is in 8:5 and 9:23 where ἐπουράνιος is a substantival adjective describing the heavenly “things.”

²⁵ One minor change that can be dealt with quickly is the replacement of ἐκ δεξιῶν (“at the right hand”) in Ps 110:1 with ἐν δεξιᾷ in Heb 1:3 (and in all the allusions to Ps 110:1 in NT). Hengel 1995: 142-43 refers to “an old kerygmatic formula ... independent of the LXX.” Several suggestions have been offered for this “persistent interpretive tradition” (Stuckenbruck 1995: 131-32). Kistemaker 1961: 28 and Ellingworth 1993: 103 suggest it reflects the singular form in the MT (although there is no textual evidence of any other reading than לַיְמִינִי in Ps 110:1). Hay 1973: 34-35 suggests either a different version of the Greek OT (although Rahlfs 1931: 277 gives no evidence of any LXX MS with this reading at Ps 110:1), the author’s own translation from Hebrew, or dependence on liturgical materials, a suggestion similar to that offered by Hengel 1995: 143 and Wallace 2003: 46-47. Loader 1978: 212 proposes a tradition stemming from the Aramaic-speaking communities, and Albl 1999: 220 suggests “an authoritative source other than the LXX.” Hengel 1995: 141 (footnote 52) analyses the relative frequencies of ἐκ δεξιῶν and ἐν δεξιᾷ outside the NT, showing that the former is overwhelmingly more frequent. The Hebrew word translated ἐκ δεξιῶν μου in Ps 110:1 is לַיְמִינִי, which is made up of the preposition לַ and the singular substantive יְמִין with a first person singular pronominal suffix. Both the preposition ἐκ and the plural substantive are odd as a rendering of this into Greek. The preposition ἐκ seems to be an instance of the “blending of constructions,” with ἐκ used for ἐν (BDAG 298, s.v. ἐκ, 6, a; 1 Macc. 11:41; 13:21; Jud. 15:5; Luke 11:13; Matt. 24:17; Col. 4:17). The

In the Psalm ὁ κύριος μου (“my Lord”) is commanded to sit down; in Hebrews it is υἱός (“a Son,” anarthrous)²⁶ who has sat down, and v. 5 will clarify that the υἱός of Psalm 2:7 is in view.²⁷ This is confirmed by the first qualifying statement in the text, ὃν ἔθηκεν κληρονόμον πάντων (“whom he appointed heir of all things”), which echoes Ps 2:8.²⁸ In Hebrews, Ps 2 regularly appears alongside Ps 110, making it clear that it is the exalted Son of Ps 2 who is seated at the right hand of God in terms of Ps 110.²⁹

Like Ps 110, Ps 2 is a royal psalm used as part of the enthronement ceremony of the ancient Israelite kings.³⁰ Using ancient oriental royal court hyperbole, the Psalm envisages the king as ruling the nations with the power and authority of God, and as “Son of God.”³¹ The echo of Ps 2 in Heb 1:2 and the quotation in Heb 1:5 complement the allusion to Ps 110 by identifying the Son as the ideal king in whom the promises to the ancient Davidic monarch have now found their eschatological fulfilment.

expression ἐκ δεξιῶν (μου) appears several times in the Greek Psalter, rendering מימיני (“from my right hand”) in Ps 15:8 (MT 16:8) and 90:7 (MT 91:7); לימיני (“at my right hand”) in Ps 44:10 (MT 45:10) and Ps 109:1 (MT 110:1); על-ימינו (“on his right hand”) in Ps 108:6 (MT 109:6); לימין אביון (“at the right hand of the needy”) in Ps 108:31 (MT 109:31); and על ימינך (“at your right hand”) in Ps 109:5 (MT 110:5). The translator of this part of the Psalter seems to be fond of this expression, using it three times in the space of a few verses to render a variety of Hebrew expressions. In Gen 48:13 ἐκ δεξιῶν and ἐν δεξιᾷ appear together, although they translate two different Hebrew expressions. Ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ ἐξ ἀριστερῶν δὲ Ἰσραὴλ renders בימינו משמאל ישראל (“on his right, to the left of Israel”), and ἐν τῇ ἀριστερᾷ ἐκ δεξιῶν δὲ Ἰσραὴλ renders בשמאלו מימין ישראל (“on his left, to the right of Israel”). They are not quite interchangeable there as Ellingworth 1993: 102-103 suggests, but they do seem to be stylistically different expressions used to communicate similar ideas.

²⁶ The absence of the article focuses on the son in question, and emphasises his character as “a son” (Wallace 1996: 244-45). Thus, there is a qualitative difference between the former revelation ἐν τοῖς προφήταις (“in the prophets”) and the more recent revelation ἐν υἱῷ. Compare Westcott 1892: 7 and Spicq 1952: 2: 5 who comments, “L’absence de l’article ... souligne la nature et la qualité du témoin ... un fils est le personnage le plus qualifié pour parler de son père”; Attridge 1989: 43; Lane 1991a: 11; O’Brien 2010: 50. Delitzsch 1868: 1: 41-42 considers that υἱός functions as a proper name here, making the article unnecessary (see BDF §254, and Ellingworth 1993: 93). The article is sometimes omitted in prepositional phrases (BDF §255).

²⁷ Wallace 2003: 44-47.

²⁸ Loader 1981: 22-23; Meier 1985a: 177; Attridge 1989: 40; Bruce 1990: 46; Lane 1991a: 12; Ellingworth 1993: 94-5; DeSilva 2000b: 86-7; Koester 2001: 178. Langkammer 1966: 273-80 argues for an allusion to God’s promise to Abraham that he would be father of many nations (Gen 17:5), but this seems to be alien to context of Heb 1.

²⁹ In addition to these two allusions, Ps 2:7 is quoted in Heb 1:5 and again in Heb 5:5, where it is combined with Ps 110:4 to identify the Son of Ps 2 with the high priest of Ps 110. A final allusion appears in Heb 7:28 as part of the concluding summary to Heb 4:14–7:28. For a connection between Ps 2 and 110 see Eaton 2003: 284; Goldingay 2008: 291.

³⁰ Craigie 1983: 64; Kraus 1988: 125; Eaton 2003: 65; Goldingay 2006: 95-96; Waltke, Houston and Moore 2010: 162-63.

³¹ Loader 1981: 7; Craigie 1983: 68-9; Kraus 1988: 126, 133. McKenzie 1957: 34-36 discusses the *Sitz im Leben* of Ps 110 and notes, “the Israelite king is not viewed as a simple historical figure, but as a religious figure who incorporates in himself the kingdom of Israel and its hope for the future in which the kingship of Yahweh will become universally effective” (pp. 35-36).

The next noteworthy modification is a change in the tense of the verb κάθιζω (“to sit”). God’s command to the king to sit on his right (the present middle imperative κάθου, “sit”!) is modified in Hebrews to the aorist indicative active ἐκάθισεν (“he sat”). The change of tense expresses the conviction that Ps 2 and Ps 110 have found their fulfilment in the Son. The Son addressed in Ps 2:7 has taken his seat next to God “at the invitation of God,”³² having been given the place of highest honour in the universe.³³ This is a central claim in Hebrews, noted in every allusion to Ps 110:1.³⁴ The text interprets the exaltation of Christ in terms of these royal Psalms and envisages him ruling the world.

The description of God is significantly enhanced when compared with the Psalm, which simply refers to God with the personal pronoun μου. Hebrews claims that the Son has sat down at the right hand of τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς (“the majesty in the heights”). The change from the second person imperative to the third person indicative necessitated the replacement of the personal pronoun μου with an expression referring to God, however, in all four allusions in Hebrews the expression is different. Loader detects Jewish sensitivity with respect to the name of God,³⁵ but this does not account for the term ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ in 10:12 or, indeed, the appearance of ὁ θεός in the first line of Hebrews. It seems more likely that the author chose his expressions for God with care and that the different expressions carry different nuances. It is also possible that, given the author’s familiarity with the LXX, the words are deliberate OT allusions.

This appears to be the case with the substantives ὑψηλός and μεγαλωσύνη.³⁶ Ὑψηλός is an adjective, used relatively frequently as a substantive. In the Deuteronomic History it often refers to idolatrous high places.³⁷ It refers to the dwelling place of God in several places,³⁸ and in Ps 89 (LXX 88):28 it is used adjectivally when Yahweh promises that he will appoint (τίθημι) the Davidic king, the “firstborn” (πρωτότοκος) “higher” (ὑψηλός) than the kings of the earth. In Heb 1:2 τίθημι refers to the appointment of the

³² Hay 1973: 86; Lane 1991a: 32; Ellingworth 1993: 10.

³³ Hay 1973: 90-91.

³⁴ Heb 1:3, 13; 8:1; 10:12-13; 12:2.

³⁵ Loader 1981: 16. See also Windisch 1913: 13; Hay 1973: 86-87.

³⁶ Both words are characteristic of hekhalot literature (Hofius 1991:84). For the height (of heaven) see 3 *En.* 4:7; 14:1; 17:3; 18:25; 22:3; 26:4, 10; 35:1; 42:1; 48C: 4, 5; and for majesty see 3 *En.* 5:11; 12:2; 15B: 1, 3, 5; 17:8; 18:18; 22: 7, 12, 15; 22B: 6; 26: 4, 8; 28:3; 39: 2; 45:1; 48A: 2; 48B: 1; 48C: 4, 5, 7. Thompson 1976: 353-54 remarks that it is of “great importance to the author of Heb” that Christ is ἐν ὑψηλοῖς or ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, “for a fundamental aspect of his argument is the spatial distinction between this creation ... and the heavenly world of the exaltation.” Thompson overstates the case for this spatial distinction, as is clear from those texts where the community addressed in Hebrews has access to the heavenly world while on earth (10:19-25; 12:22-24).

³⁷ See e.g. Deut 12:2; 3 Kgdms 3:4; 11:5; 12:31, 32; 13:2, 32, 33; 14:23; 15:14; 22:44 and in many other texts.

³⁸ Ps 93 (LXX 92):4; 113 (LXX 112):5; Isa. 33:5; 57:15. In Sir 24:4 Wisdom is said to dwell ἐν ὑψηλοῖς.

Son as heir of all things, and the Son is referred to as the πρωτότοκος in Heb 1:6. The appearance of these three words in Ps 89:28 and in Heb 1:2, 3 and 6 is evidence of an intertextual echo of Ps 89:28.³⁹ While Ps 89, which sets out the future intentions of Yahweh with regard to the Davidic monarchy, is not explicitly quoted in Hebrews, it is clearly part of the thought world of the author. The Son of God is exalted in the heights,⁴⁰ higher than all the kings of the earth.

Μεγαλωσύνη seems to be a reverential periphrasis for God. It is found rarely in the New Testament, although twice in Hebrews,⁴¹ and is relatively common in the LXX.⁴² It emphasises the greatness of God, thus the two terms ὑψηλός and μεγαλωσύνη serve to underscore the superlative exaltation of the Son alongside God.⁴³

The verb ἐκαθίσεν (“he sat down”) is modified by two adverbial clauses in Heb 1:3. The first clause (καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος,⁴⁴ “having made purification for sin”) gives a cultic connotation to the Son’s exaltation, something not suggested in Ps 110:1.⁴⁵ The substantive καθαρισμός (“purification”) is most often used in the NT for ritual purification, but here and in 2 Pet 1:9 it has the sense of cleansing from sins. Both senses (ritual and moral cleansing) also appear in the LXX, at times in cultic

³⁹ I discuss the author’s use of Ps 89 further in 6.3.5 below.

⁴⁰ The word ὑψηλός is only used as a substantive here in the NT. Elsewhere, it is used adjectivally in Matt 4:8; 17:1 Mark 9:2; Luke 16:15; Acts 13:17; Rom 11:20; 12:16; Heb 7:26; Rev 21:10, 12.

⁴¹ Heb 1:3; 8:1· Jude 15.

⁴² Attridge 1989: 46; Ellingworth 1993: 103; Spicq 1952: 2: 11. See Deut 32:3; 1 Chron 29:11; Ezra 44:6; Tob 12:6; 13: 4, 8, 9; 14:2; Ps 78:11; 144:3, 6; 150:2; Ode 2:3; Prov 18:10; Wis 18:24; Sir 2:18; 18:5; 39:15; Dan 2:20; 4:22, 36.

⁴³ Gordon 2008: 57. Weiss 1991: 151 considers that μεγαλωσύνη comes by way of the δύναμις (“strength”) in Ps 110: 2, 3, reflected in Mark 14:62 and Matt 26:64, and ultimately derived from Dan 2:20. Michel 1966: 102 (footnote 2) and Braun 1984: 30-31 trace the derivation from גְּבוּרָה (“strength”), which is twice rendered by μεγαλωσύνη in the LXX (1 Chron 29:11; Ps 150:2), but this seems rather obscure. Μεγαλωσύνη does not appear in Philo or Josephus, but refers to the majesty of God in 1 En. 5:4; 12:3; T. Levi 18:8; Let. Aris. 192, and to the greatness of the second house in 1 En. 14:16.

⁴⁴ P⁴⁶, the original hand of D and several later MSS add δι’ ἑαυτοῦ at the beginning of this clause, and P⁴⁶, the second reviser of D and other MSS add δι’ αὐτοῦ. These additions probably have the effect of emphasising the force of the middle voice of the participle ποιησάμενος (Metzger 1994: 589). The external evidence for the reading adopted in NA²⁷ is strong, including ⳨, A, B, the first reviser of D, the original hand of H and numerous later witnesses. Holmes 2010 (the editor of the SBLGNT) adopts the reading with δι’ αὐτοῦ included. The second reviser of ⳨, the first reviser of D and several witnesses including the Majority Text add ἡμῶν after ἁμαρτιῶν. The pronoun is omitted in P⁴⁶, the original hand of ⳨, A, B, the original hand of D, P, Ψ, and numerous later witnesses, and should not be considered original.

⁴⁵ It is, of course, implied in Ps 110:4, which is exploited later in Hebrews. Lane 1991a: 14-15, noting a sharp contrast with the preceding clauses that refer to the involvement of the Son in creation and providence, translates, “yet made purification for sins and then sat down” (p. 5). He also notes the reflections of wisdom traditions in the immediate context. He observes that there is no tradition of Wisdom procuring cleansing from sins and traces the reference to the accomplishment of purification to “reflection on the incarnation and the cross” (p. 15). Weiss 1991: 149-50 maintains that this indicates how closely Hebrews combines the death and exaltation of Jesus, and that this is a key to understanding the Christology of Hebrews.

contexts.⁴⁶ Of the seven statements in Heb 1:1-4, only this is original to Hebrews, “being unparalleled elsewhere,”⁴⁷ with the implication that it warrants special attention. It functions as an announcement of the subject of the long central section of Hebrews (5:1–10:18)⁴⁸ and implies that the heavenly throne room where the Son sits is to be understood as a sanctuary.⁴⁹ The original readers of Hebrews would have recognised a reference to the death of Jesus (who is not named until Heb 2:9), and they would probably have inferred that his death was to be interpreted in cultic terms, even though the text does not make this claim until 2:17 or argue for it until 5:1-10.

The precise relationship of this clause to the aorist indicative verb ἐκάθισεν (“he sat down”) is difficult to specify. Wallace notes that an aorist participle subordinated to an aorist indicative often refers to action contemporaneous with the verb.⁵⁰ Comparison with Heb 10:11-12, which expresses similar ideas, clarifies this. There, the actions of every priest who “stands” (ἕστηκεν, perfect indicative), “serving” (λειτουργῶν, present participle), and “offering” (προσφέρων, present participle) the same sacrifices is contrasted with the actions of Christ who “offered” (προσενέγκας, aorist participle) a single sacrifice for sin forever, and then “sat down” (ἐκάθισεν, aorist active) at the right hand of God, where he “waits” (ἐκδεχόμενος, present participle) for God to subdue his enemies. In this text

⁴⁶ Exod 29:36; 30:10; Lev 14:32; 15:13; Num 14:18; 1 Chron 23:28; Neh 12:45. For the NT see Mark 1:44; Luke 2:22; 5:14; John 2:6; 3:25. The cognate verb καθαρίζω appears much more frequently in similar contexts in both the LXX and the NT. In particular, I note Lev 16:30, which deals with the Day of Atonement ceremony that is significant in Hebrews (9:14, 22, 23; 10:2).

⁴⁷ Bauckham 2004: 174.

⁴⁸ This is almost universally accepted. See Delitzsch 1868:1: 54-55; Westcott 1892: 14; Moffatt 1924: 8; Spicq 1952: 2: 10; Lohse 1963: 167-68; Hay 1973: 88; Braun 1984: 29; Lindars 1989: 391; Attridge 1989: 45-46; Bruce 1990: 49; Lane 1991a: 14-15, 18; Weiss 1991: 64-65, 148-49; Stuckenbruck 1995: 30; Guthrie 1998: 49; DeSilva 2000b: 89-91; Bauckham 2004: 169-70; Johnson 2006: 71; Mitchell 2007: 43; O’Brien 2010: 58-59. Albl 1999: 231 and Bauckham 2004: 169-70 point out that all the other allusions to Ps 110:1 in Hebrews interpret that verse in the light of Ps 110:4, which sees Jesus as a High Priest like Melchizedek exalted to the right hand of God. While this is true of the allusion in 8:1 and 10:12-13, the allusion in 12:2 has a different function. Smith 1969: 67 notes the appearance of καθαρότης in 9:13 and καθαρίζω in 9:14, 9:22; 10:2, as well as καθαρός in 10:22. He concludes “the ‘purification’ of 1:3 leads into the heart of the epistle.”

⁴⁹ See Rissi 1987 37, “[s]ince the whole theology of the Hebrews is cultic-priestly oriented, God’s world is presented primarily as a heavenly sanctuary”; Schenck 2001: 479, “Christ’s heavenly high priesthood is at root a metaphor built on the efficacy of his atoning death coupled with his ascension to the highest heaven—heaven’s holy of holies. Christ’s entrance as priest into the Holy of Holies of the true tabernacle is a metaphorically charged presentation of his exaltation to the right hand of God.” Weiss 1991:149 argues that the close relationship between the purification and the exaltation in this verse means that the exaltation can be interpreted as “des Eintritts des Hohenpriesters in das himmlische Heiligtum.”

⁵⁰ Wallace 1996: 614. See Eph 1:4-5, 8-9, 13-14, 19-20 and the frequent use of ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν (“answering he said”). BDF 174-75, § 339 indicates that the relationship of a participle to a main verb must be determined by the context, and that a aorist participle of itself does not indicate antecedent time. Porter 1994: 188 proposes the general rule that *[i]f a participle occurs before the finite verb on which it depends ... the participle tends to refer to antecedent (preceding) action. If a participle occurs after the finite ... verb on which it depends, it tends to refer to concurrent (simultaneous) or subsequent (following) action*” (italics original).

Christ offers a sacrifice and then sits down; in Heb 1:3 the Son achieves purification for sin and sits down.⁵¹

The second adverbial clause follows the statement that the Son sat down: τοσούτῳ κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων ὅσῳ διαφορώτερον παρ' αὐτοὺς κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα ("becoming as much superior to the angels as the name he has inherited is superior to theirs"). It is often suggested that that this second clause expresses the result or consequence of his exaltation,⁵² but a participle expressing the result of an action is normally in the present tense.⁵³ To suggest that he becomes superior to the angels as a consequence of his sitting in heaven is somewhat incongruous. Rather, he sits down *because* he is superior to the angels (who only stand).⁵⁴ It seems more likely that this clause expresses something of the significance of his heavenly session.⁵⁵ Since the Son sits in heaven, it is clear that he has become superior to the angels.

His superiority to the angels can be measured by the superiority of the name he inherits to their names. The identification of this name has been debated, with most scholars concluding that it is "Son,"⁵⁶ although this is difficult, since it is the Son who inherits this superior name. Guthrie suggests that the "name" is a reference to the "designation or rank formerly reserved for God,"⁵⁷ but it is preferable to understand the name as the Tetragrammaton, יהוה, or in its Greek form κύριος.⁵⁸ Like the king of Ps 110, now the

⁵¹ There may also be an element of causality, cf. Wallace (ibid.: 624). I will argue in 8.6.2 (below) that Heb 9:11-14 is to be read in the same way. He offered himself to God and thus procured "eternal redemption" (9:11).

⁵² Meier 1985a: 185; Hagner 1990: 26; Guthrie 1998:49; Bauckham 2009: 23; O'Brien 2010: 60-61.

⁵³ Wallace 1996: 638. Wallace also notes that this usage can blend "imperceptibly into cause."

⁵⁴ For angels standing in heaven see 11QMelch II 10-11; *Gen Rab.* 65:21; *3 En.* 16. In *2 En.* 24:1-4 Enoch sits on God's left in his role as a scribe. Humans sit in heaven in *Exagōgē* 68-89; *1 En.* 45:3; 51:3; 55:4; 61:8; 62:5; 69:29; 108:12; Mark 14:62; Eph 2:6; Col 3:1-4; Rev 3:21; *Asc. Isa.* 9:24-26.

⁵⁵ Wallace 1996: 629-30.

⁵⁶ Montefiore 1964: 39; Deichgräber 1967:138; Buchanan 1972: 9; Hay 1973: 109-10; P. E. Hughes 1977: 51; G. Hughes 1979a: 7; Käsemann 1984: 97-99; Meier 1985a: 187-88; Attridge 1989: 47-48; Bruce 1990: 50-51; Lane 1991a: 17; Ellingworth 1993: 106-107; Schenck 1997: 93-98; 2001: 472; 2007: 87; DeSilva 2000b: 91-92; Koester 2001: 181-82; Lee 2005: 273-76; Mackie 2007: 217-18; 2008: 448; Mitchell 2007: 45; O'Brien 2010: 60-61.

⁵⁷ Guthrie 1998: 50; 2003: 273-74. See also Westcott 1892: 17; Moffatt 1924: 8; Koester 2001: 182. Similarly Delitzsch 1868: 1: 60-61 argues that the name is "*the name which no one knoweth but himself*" (Rev. xix. 12)," italics original, as does Spicq 1952: 2: 12-13. Hurst 1987: 157 suggests that the "names" are Son, God and Lord, from the use of these titles in Heb 1:4-14. He omits "Firstborn" (v. 6) and "the Same" (v. 12).

⁵⁸ Rowland 1982: 113; Gieschen 1998: 297; 2003: 142-43; Barker 1999: 99; Hannah 1999: 142-44; Bauckham 2004: 175; 2009: 19-22; Johnson 2006: 73-74. In *Apoc. Ab.* 10:3 the Holy one addresses the angel Yahoel as "the namesake of the mediation of my ineffable name" (trans. Kulik 2004: 167); and *3 En.* 12:1-5 (where Metatron, Prince of the Presence is given the name "the Lesser YHWH"); 48c:7; 48:1. See also Exod 23:21, and for the conferral of names see *1 En.* 48:2-5; 69:13-29. It is "the name above all names" of Phil 2:6 as Hengel 1976: 87-88 points out, thus, there is no contradiction in 1:8, where Jesus is addressed as God, and in 1:10 as Lord.

Son becomes God's chief agent, ruling with the power and authority of God. The opening words of Ps 110 (Εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου, "the Lord said to my lord," i.e., the king in the Psalm) are one factor that may have led to this designation.⁵⁹

With these modifications, the author emphasises that the eschaton has arrived with the exaltation of the Son to God's right hand. He rules with the power and authority of God as God's chief agent. This exaltation followed his making purification for sins, and resulted in him being honoured with the name "Lord," indicating his superiority to the angels. Similar statements were made to the Davidic monarch in the OT, where they need to be seen against the background of ancient oriental royal court hyperbole, but the text of Hebrews implies that these statements have now become a reality with the exaltation of the Son of God.

6.2.4 The Catena of Quotations (Heb 1:5-14)

The author establishes the superiority of the Son to the angels in Heb 1:5-14 with a catena of seven OT texts, which he reads with reference to the exalted Son. The source of the quotation in v. 6 is debated, but the others are clear. Hebrews 1:5 juxtaposes Psalm 2:7 and 2 Sam 7:14, applying the title "Son" to Jesus. Psalm 2:7 is from the royal Psalm already alluded to in Heb 1:2, claiming that the Son has been "appointed heir of all things" (ὃν ἔθηκεν κληρονόμον πάντων), and 2 Sam 7:14 is part of Nathan's oracle to David concerning his son who will build a house for Yahweh. Hebrews 1:7 cites Ps 104:4 (LXX 103:4) referring to the subordinate function of angels as "winds" (πνεύματα) and "a flame of fire" (πυρὸς φλόγα),⁶⁰ setting up a contrast in vv. 8-9 with Ps 44:7-8 (LXX, MT 45:7-8), which the author reads as God addressing the Son as "God" (θεός)⁶¹ and celebrating his

⁵⁹ Hay 1973: 104-8. This is also the point of Jesus' question to the Pharisees in Mark 12:35-37; Matt 22:43-45; Luke 20:41-44; John 17:11. Acts 2:32-36; Rom 1:4; 10:9; 1 Cor 12:3; Phil 2:6-11; Rev 19:11-16 reflect traditions similar to what is encountered here in Hebrews where Jesus is accorded the highest honour after his death and resurrection. Important background to this notion appears in 4Q491c; Ezek. Trag. 69-82; Wis 9:4; 1 En. 45:3; 51:3; 55:4; 69:27; 3 En. 10:1; *Lad. Jac.* 1:5; 2:7; and the Targums to Gen 28:12.

⁶⁰ Heb 1:7 begins with καὶ πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἀγγέλους λέγει, and Heb 1:8 with πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱόν. These citation formulas could be translated "and to the angels he says" and "and to the Son." However, since the citation in 1:7 is about the angels rather than to the angels, it is preferable to render πρὸς in v. 7 with "concerning," and even though the whole of Ps 44:7-8 (LXX) is addressed to the Israelite king, addressing him as God, I prefer to retain the parallelism and read the citation formula in v. 8 as "and concerning the Son." For this sense of πρὸς see BDAG 875, s.v. πρὸς, 3, e. α.

⁶¹ The Hebrew text of Ps 45:7 reads כִּסֵּאךָ אֱלֹהִים, words that could be rendered either "God is your throne," or "your throne O God." Early attestation for the latter reading is found in the Targum, which reads יְהוָה לְעַלְמֵי עַלְמִין כִּרְסֵי יִקְרָךְ ("your divine throne, Yahweh, endures forever and ever"), and in Aquila who translates אֱלֹהִים in this line as a vocative ὅτι (see Attridge 1989: 58, who claims that "[t]he author of Hebrews stands in this exegetical tradition and takes the psalm as an address to the Son as God"). See also Kraus 1988: 455-56. The LXX reads ὁ θρόνος σου, ὁ θεός and is cited verbatim in Hebrews. Again, ὁ θεός could be a vocative or a nominative, but with most commentators I read it as a vocative, with the Son addressed as God. For a full discussion of both the Hebrew text, the LXX and the reading of these in Hebrews see Harris 1984: 65-89; 1985: 129-62. Those who take ὁ θεός as a vocative include Thompson 1982: 134-35; Attridge 1989: 58-60; Bruce 1990: 59-61; Lane 1991a: 29-30; Ellingworth 1993: 121-23; Koester 2001: 194; Bateman 2001: 3-21; DeSilva 2000b: 98-99; Bauckham 2004: 175-85; 2009: 24-26; Johnson 2006:

righteous rule. In Ps 102 (LXX 101): 26-28 the Psalmist addresses God as “Lord” (κύριος), the one who laid the foundations of the earth, which will perish, although God is “the Same” (ὁ αὐτός) and his years have no end. Hebrews 1:10-12 quotes this Psalm as addressed to the Son, and the catena ends with Ps 110:1, rounding the chapter off by forming an inclusio with the allusion to the Psalm in v. 3. A discussion of the entire catena is outside my scope, however, one verse in particular (v. 6) warrants discussion as it locates the exalted Son in the οἰκουμένη (“inhabited world”).

Heb 1:6a is a citation formula that reads ὅταν δὲ πάλιν εἰσαγάγῃ τὸν πρωτότοκον εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην, λέγει,⁶² and Heb 1:6b is an OT quotation, καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ (“and let all God’s angels worship him”).

I pass over the source of the quotation quickly,⁶³ noting that whatever source the author used, he recognised it as an authoritative text calling on all God’s angels to worship the Son, indicating a qualitative difference between the angels and the Son. It therefore supports the claim that the Son shares the divine identity and is to be worshipped as God. This quotation is stark in the context, because while the other quotations ascribe divine titles to the Son, this one actually claims that worship is due to the Son. It also underlines

80; Thompson 2008: 54-55; O’Brien 2010: 72-75. Jewett 1981: 32 reads “God is your throne,” since he believes it “unlikely that the author would here intend the Son to be addressed as God,” but then acknowledges that his expression is “difficult to conceptualize.” He has no issue with the Son being addressed as Lord in v. 10.

⁶² I offer no translation of the citation formula at this point, since every word is the subject of intense debate.

⁶³ This question is complex, but the solution has no impact on the present study. The quotation can be traced back to Deut 32:43, however, the LXX of that verse reads καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες υἱοὶ θεοῦ (“and let all the sons of God worship him”). Deut 32:43, as reflected in Ode 2:43, reads καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι θεοῦ, which agrees with Heb 1:6b, apart from the addition of the definite article before ἄγγελοι. 4QDeut^a II 5 ii 7 reads **וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּ לְכָל אֱלֹהִים** (“and bow down to him all you Gods,” trans. Abegg, Flint and Ulrich 1999: 192-93). This line is missing from the MT, but see now the Critical Apparatus in BHS where it has been supplied from 4QDeut^a, and Wevers 1977: 359; 1995: 533-35. Psalm 97:7 (LXX 96:7) reads προσκυνήσατε αὐτῷ, πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ (“worship him all his angels”). The source of the quotation seems to be Deut 32:43 in a form equivalent to Ode 2:43 or 4QDeut^a. There also seems to be an intertextual echo of Ps 97 (LXX 96), especially since v. 4 contains the word οἰκουμένη, appearing in the citation formula. For Ode 2:43 as the source of the quotations see Spicq 1952: 2: 18; Katz 1958: 217-19; Lindars 1961: 244, and footnote 3 on p. 211; Kistemaker 1961: 20-23; De Jonge and Woude 1965-66: 314-15; Thomas 1965: 304; Howard 1968: 215; Héring 1970: 9; Buchanan 1972: 15-17; Helyer 1976:7; Longenecker 1975: 169; Ellingworth 1977: 38-40; 1993: 118-19; Wilson 1987: 40; Hurst 1987: 157-59; Attridge 1989: 57; Bruce 1990: 56-57; Grässer 1990-97: 80; Lane 1991a: 28; Albl 1999: 202; Cockerill 1999: 51-60; DeSilva 2000b: 98; Steyn 2000: 263-72; Koester 2001: 193; McLay 2003: 107-14; Gheorghita 2003: 42; Bauckham 2004: 179 (footnote 27); Johnson 2006: 78; Thompson 2008: 46; Allen 2008: 44-53; O’Brien 2010: 70-71. Oberholtzer 1988a: 86-87; Guthrie 1998: 67; Wright 2003a: 7 think that Ps 97:7 is a more likely source, and Manson 1951: 92; Thompson 1982: 132 (footnote 17); Charles 1990: 176 (footnote 31); Weiss 1991: 161 think that Heb 1:6b is a conflation of Ps 97:7 and Deut 32:43.

the uniqueness of the Son, for here God commands the angels to worship someone other than God.⁶⁴

More significant for this study is the way the citation formula is to be read, as it throws significant light on the situation of the exalted Son. At issue are (1) the identification of the time reference of the expression ὅταν δὲ πάλιν εἰσαγάγῃ; (2) the syntactical function of the adverb πάλιν; (3) the referent of the substantives οἰκουμένη and πρωτότοκος; and (4) the significance of πρωτότοκος in the present context.

The πρωτότοκος (“firstborn”) of 1:6 is clearly the Son of Heb 1:2 and the antecedent of the pronoun αὐτῷ (“him”) in 1:6b, whom the angels are to worship. However, the rationale behind the use of πρωτότοκος is not so clear. Montefiore refers to Luke 2:7, where Mary is said to have given birth to τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον (“to her firstborn son”), and to Luke 2:13-14 where the angels are present giving glory to God.⁶⁵ In Luke 2:7 πρωτότοκος has the sense of (temporal) priority of birth.⁶⁶ But this is the only place in the NT where it has this sense. Elsewhere in the NT it refers not to priority of birth, but to priority of rank.⁶⁷ This word is an honorific title and, in most cases where it is used of Jesus in the NT, it expresses his special relationship with God. In Luke 2 it expresses his relationship to Mary.

That it refers to rank rather than honour is clear in Exod 4:22, where Israel is God’s πρωτότοκος, and in Ps 89:28.⁶⁸ Here, God announces concerning David’s descendant, καὶ γὰρ πρωτότοκον θήσομαι αὐτόν, ὑψηλὸν παρὰ τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν τῆς γῆς (“and I will make him the firstborn, the highest of the kings of the earth”). Since the angels give glory to God rather than Mary’s firstborn in Luke 2:7, Ps 89 is a more likely source of the

⁶⁴ Bauckham 1999: 66-67. Close to this is *Jos. As.* 15:11-12, where Aseneth prostrates herself before Michael and worships God. She asks his name so that she can worship him and he refuses to disclose his name. Gieschen 1998: 126-31 refers to this as “vereration” (sic., p. 131) of Michael. In the *Exagōgē* of Ezekiel the stars prostrate themselves before the enthroned Moses. In *1 En.* 48:5 all who dwell on earth will (in the eschaton) fall down and worship before the named Son of Man, but they glorify and bless and sing hymns to the Lord of Spirits. In *Apoc. Zeph.* 6 Zephaniah is forbidden to worship Jeremiel. In *2 En.* 22:7 the angels do obeisance. Orlov 2003: 286 reads this as the worship of Enoch, but there is no direct object for the verb “do obeisance” in either the A or the J recension in Andersen 1983: 138-39, and Forbes 1913: 443 has the angels bowing down to the Lord. See Stone 1993: 148; Macaskill 2007: 223. On the question of early Christian devotion to God over against ancient Jewish monotheism, see Hurtado 1988, *passim*.

⁶⁵ Montefiore 1964: 45-46. Other similarities have been detected between Luke 2 and Heb 1:6, see Helyer 1976 9-10. Πρωτότοκος appears in Luke 2:7; οἰκουμένη in Luke 2:1; the heavenly host praises God in Luke 2:13; and there is an allusion to Ps 2:7 in Luke 1:32 and to 2 Sam 7:14 in Luke 1:32-33, 69-71.

⁶⁶ Nolland 1989: 105. On the other hand, Bovon 2002: 85-86 suggests Luke 2:7 implies the theological implications of the notion of the firstborn. It places “Jesus in a privileged relationship to God, and not in a relationship with later sisters and brothers.” See also Langkammer 1993: 190; and *TLNT* 211.

⁶⁷ Michaelis 1968: 876; Bartels 1986: 668-69; BDAG 894, s.v. πρωτότοκος, 2. See Rom 8:29; Col 1:15, 18; Heb 11:28; 12:23; Rev 1:5. For this sense in the LXX see Gen 4:4; 27:19; 43:33; 48:18; 49:3; Exod 4:22-23; 13:2; 22:28; 34:20; Lev 27:26; Num 3:12-13; 8:16-18; Deut 21:16-17; 2 Chron 21:3; Ps 89:28 (LXX 88:28).

⁶⁸ I have noted an echo of this Psalm in Heb 1:3 in 6.2.3 (above).

imagery.⁶⁹ As Attridge notes, “The term ultimately derives from the same royal ideology evidenced in Ps 2 and 2 Sam 7, being found once in the Psalms [in 89:28].”⁷⁰

There are two ways to read the adverb πάλιν (“again”) in this context. It can be read either as introducing the third quotation in the catena, or as modifying verb εἰσαγάγει, in which case it would refer to a second or subsequent entry of the firstborn into the οἰκουμένη,⁷¹ a reading adopted, mainly (but not exclusively) by earlier interpreters of Hebrews.⁷² However, the immediate context is a set of three OT quotations, with πάλιν

⁶⁹ Attridge 1989: 56. This allusion is referenced in the margin of NA²⁷. Stuckenbruck 1995: 120 lists other verbal links between Ps 89 and Heb 1, including the rhetorical questions in vv. 5 and 13, which he traces to Ps 89:6 (p. 135, footnote 228). Recognition of the connection with Ps 89 has a long history. See Bruce 1899: 52-53; Syngé 1959: 3. Peake 1914: 83 mentions the Psalm, but says little about it, except that it may have been regarded as messianic in Second Temple Judaism, as also does Narborough 1930: 84. Westcott 1892: 23 also mentions the Psalm, but does not elaborate on the allusion, referring rather to the use of the word in Paul, as does Farrar 1893: 36. Moffatt 1924 10-11 refers to the Pauline occurrences of the word, and Delitzsch 1868: 1: 67-68 discusses Paul’s other uses of the term in his earlier epistles (Delitzsch argues for Pauline authorship of Hebrews). See also Spicq 1952: 2: 17; Schierse 1955: 95; Davidson 1959: 48; Sarna 1963: 36-39; Michel 1966: 113-14; Helyer 1976: 1-11, 17; Loader 1981: 9-10; Caird 1984: 75; Braun 1984: 37; Wilson 1987: 59; Bruce 1990: 56; Lane 1991a: 26-27; Ellingworth 1993: 118; DeSilva 2000b: 96; Koester 2001: 192-93; Bauckham 2004: 178; Hossfeld and Zenger 2005: 414-15; O’Brien 2010: 79-80. Andriessen 1976: 295-97 downplays the suggestion, preferring to see a parallel with Deut 6:10 and the use of πρωτότοκος for Israel. Scholer 1991: 146 and Allen 2008: 57 allow this possibility, but prefer to see πρωτότοκος as pointing to the same word used in 12:23 for the people of God. These two options are not mutually exclusive. Michaelis 1968: 871 observes that πρωτότοκος with the passive sense of “firstborn” is rare outside the Bible and does not occur before the LXX.

⁷⁰ Attridge 1989: 56. Grässer 1990-97: 1: 78-79 considers the derivation from Ps 89:28 to be “not proven.” He prefers to find the background in Hellenistic Judaism, and connects the title with other epithets for Jesus in Hebrews such as ἀρχηγός (“pioneer”), πρόδρομος (“forerunner”), and ποιμήν ὁ μέγας (“the great shepherd”), and makes a connection with the Gnostic myth of the redeemed redeemer. He draws several parallels from Philo, most of which concern the exalted place of Moses. Philo uses πρωτότοκος several times, but apart from *Sacr.* 126 where it is a metaphor for reasoning powers, it is always used in a natural sense to refer to an eldest offspring, whether human or animal. He also uses πρωτόγονος (“firstborn”) several times in an exalted sense, see *Post.* 63, (referring to Ex. 4:22); *Agr.* 151; *Conf.* 62-63 (referring to the “Branch” of Zech 6:12); *Conf.* 146 (God’s firstborn the λόγος); *Fug.* 208; *Somm.* 1.215. Grässer suggests that only Jesus, and not the prophets, Moses or the angels, are worthy of the title λόγος (a word that appears several times in Hebrews, but not with reference to Jesus, although Swetnam 1981b: 214-224, considers that it may be applied to Jesus in 4:12-13, and Williamson 1983: 4-8 argues for the presence of a Logos-Christology in Hebrews. These proposals seem to be unlikely since the author nowhere develops a Logos-Christology, and such a subtle change of the sense of the word at the end of a pericope encouraging the readers to listen to God’s voice (3:7-4:11) would be quite unexpected. See Koester 2001: 273, 75; Smillie 2005: 20). Grässer also connects the title πρωτότοκος in Hebrews with Col 1:18, Rom 8:29 and Acts 26:23. πρωτότοκος does not appear in the last of these, and in the first two it is not used absolutely, as here and in Ps 89. Grässer’s arguments are weak, and appear to stem from a desire to find incipient Gnosticism in Hebrews. See also Stuckenbruck 1995: 120, who considers that none of the passages usually cited from Greek Jewish literature (outside the LXX) “furnishes an intelligible background” for what we have in Heb 1.

⁷¹ On the possible senses of πάλιν in this context see BDAG 752, s.v. πάλιν 2, 3 and 4. πάλιν has both functions in Hebrews, introducing successive OT quotations in 1:5; 2:13; 10:30; and referring to the repetition of an action in 4:7; 5:12; 6:1, 6.

⁷² This results in reading ὅταν δὲ πάλιν εἰσαγάγει as “when he again brings ...” This is adopted by Delitzsch 1868: 1: 66-67; Westcott 1892: 22-24; Windisch 1913: 15; Schierse 1955: 94-95; Kistemaker 1961: 19; Montefiore 1964: 45; Michel 1966: 113; Andriessen 1976: 296-300; Swetnam 1981a:143; Loader 1981 23-24. DeSilva 2000b: 96-97 makes no comment, but his translation implies this option.

introducing the second and the third (vv. 5, 6). In Heb 1:5 it introduces the second quotation, and it should probably be read in the same way in v. 6, introducing the third quotation.⁷³ In this case, the three quotations belong together and establish the Son's superiority to the angels from the OT.⁷⁴ Moreover, the causal particle γάρ at the start of Heb 1:5 relates the quotations back to the exaltation of the Son and its consequences in terms of superiority to angels. The first two quotations underline the Son's superiority to the angels by what God says about him, and the third underlines his superiority to the angels by virtue of God's command that they worship him.⁷⁵ An examination of the expression ὅταν δὲ ... εἰσαγάγῃ will show this to be the case.

When ὅταν is followed by an aorist subjunctive, the clause normally expresses "a future contingency from the perspective of the time of the main verb,"⁷⁶ in this case λέγει,⁷⁷ and since λέγει refers to an utterance in Deut 32:43, it could refer to any event in the career of the Son.⁷⁸ There are three options: the incarnation, the ascension or the

⁷³ This result in the reading, "and again, when he brings ..." For a similar construction see Wisdom 14:1. Meier 1985b: 509-10 gives detailed arguments as to why the particular word order in Heb 1:6 is necessary, why this word order does not require the adoption of the other. This reading is adopted by Moffatt 1924: 10-11; Spicq 1952: 2: 17; Helyer 1976: 7-8; Thompson 1982: 132; Wilson 1987: 39; Attridge 1989: 55; Bruce 1990: 56; Lane 1991a: 26; Koester 1994: 192; Schenck 2001: 478-79; Caneday 2008: 32-33; O'Brien 2010: 68. Vanhoye 1969: 154 considers that δὲ πάλιν introduces a strong contrast between v. 5 and v. 6 (BDAG 752, s.v. πάλιν, 5), but this is not necessary, see Bruce 1990: 56.

⁷⁴ Several scholars have attempted to find either a synthetic parallelism between the exordium and the catena, or a concentric structure to the catena, but none of the arguments are entirely satisfactory. See Lane 1991a: 22; Meier 1985a: 168-89; 1985b: 523; Rhee 2001: 64-70; Bauckham 2004: 173-74; Helyer 2006: 1-22. Thompson 1982: 130-31 has the most satisfactory approach, noting that vv. 5-6 contain two citations concerning the Son followed by one concerning the angels, and vv. 7-12 contain one citation concerning the angels and two concerning the Son. The seventh citation returns to Ps 110:1 (v. 13). This structure is supported by the use of πάλιν in vv 5, 6 tying these three citations together. Verses 7, 8-9 are tied together with a μὲν ... δέ structure, and vv. 10-12 are tied to this sequence with καί attaching 8-9 to 10-12; and the rhetorical question in v. 13 provides an inclusio with a similar question in v. 5, τίνι γὰρ εἶπεν ποτε τῶν ἀγγέλων ("for to which of the angels did he ever say ...").

⁷⁵ Schenck 2003: 48-50.

⁷⁶ Wallace 1996: 479.

⁷⁷ Moulton and Turner 1963: 112.

⁷⁸ Bruce 1990: 58. The same construction (ὅταν followed by an aorist subjunctive) appears three times in 1 Cor 15:24-28 (ὅταν also appears followed by a present subjunctive in v. 24, although the Majority Text, the entire Latin tradition and the fourteenth century MS 1881 have an aorist subjunctive). In 1 Cor 15:24 the reference is clearly to "a future reality whose time is not known" (Fee 1987: 752), and the construction appears again in v. 28 with the same sense. In v. 27 it seems to have an analogous function to its use in Heb 1:6, introducing an allusion to the Jewish Scriptures, with the most coherent option being to read the expression ὅταν δὲ εἶπῃ (and when he says) as referring to the "speaking" of the scripture just quoted, an event that took place in the past. See Conzelmann 1975: 274-75; Fee 1987: 757-59; Thistleton 2000: 1235-36. Moulton and Turner 1963: 113 lists Heb 1:6 and 1 Cor 15:27 as instances of the normal usage (definite action taking place in the future concluded before the action of the main verb), but that makes little sense in 1 Cor 15:27. Luke 12:54 is a similar construction to Heb 1:6 (with the main verb being the present tense of λέγω). There the expression is clearly indefinite and could be translated with "whenever."

Parousia.⁷⁹ The solution to this issue depends upon the referent of οἰκουμένη,⁸⁰ a word that appears here and in 2:5 in the expression ἡ οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα, περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν (“the world to come to which we refer”). I will argue that both have the same referent.

Οἰκουμένη is the present passive participle of οἰκέω, used as a substantive. BDAG gives four senses in which it is used: (1) the inhabited world “...exclusive of the heavens above and nether regions”; (2) the inhabitants of the world; (3) the Roman Empire; and (4) an extraordinary use in *1 Clem.* 60:1 where it “seems to mean *the whole world* (so far as living beings inhabit it, therefore the realm of transcendent beings as well”).⁸¹ BDAG lists Heb 2:5 under this last sense, and Heb 1:6 under the first sense, that is, the inhabited world. If this is the case, Heb 1:6 refers to the entrance of the Son into this world of time and space, either at the incarnation or the Parousia, when he returns to earth a second time (Heb 9:28).⁸²

Attridge, noting that οἰκουμένη normally refers to the “inhabited human world,” and that “introduce into the world” is “a common Hebrew idiom” for giving birth,⁸³ argues that Heb 1:6 is a reference to the incarnation.⁸⁴ But this is unlikely for several reasons. First, Heb 2:9 refers to the incarnation as the time when Jesus became lower than the angels; Heb 1:6 describes a time when he became superior to the angels.⁸⁵ Secondly, Heb 10:5

⁷⁹ Owen 1854: 151-52 lists three other possibilities: the resurrection, the effectual preaching of the gospel, and the 1000 year reign of Christ on earth. Bateman 1997: 222 thinks it refers to the baptism of Jesus since the voice from heaven at that time quotes Ps 2:7 (Mark 1:11; Matt 3:17; Luke 2:22). Eisele 2003: 50 also suggests the introduction of the Logos at the creation as a possibility, but does not discuss this in his analysis of the text (pp. 57-60).

⁸⁰ Caneday 2008: 29.

⁸¹ BDAG 699-700.

⁸² Michel 1967: 159 and Flender 1975: 519 suggest that in Heb 1:6 the word refers to (this) inhabited world and that in 2:5 it refers to the world to come. PGL 944, reads a reference to this world in Heb 1:6 and to another world in Heb 2:5. LSJ 1205 does not refer to Heb 1:6, but suggests that Heb 2:5 refers to “the kingdom of Christ.” Cremer 1895: 447 notes that the expression ἡ οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα is peculiar to the NT, that it is synonymous with αἰὼν μέλλων, and that it was “chosen in Heb. ii. 5 with reference to i. 6, 10, 11.” Strack and Billerbeck 1924: 3: 681 equate the expression in Heb 2:5 with the Hebrew expression עולם הבא (“the age to come”). As well as referring to the world to come, Hebrews also refers to the “age to come” (6:5) and the “city to come” (13:14), all of which refer to the same reality.

⁸³ Attridge 1989: 56. This suggestion comes from Spicq 1952: 2: 17. The Hebrew phrase for “bring into the world” cited by Spicq and Attridge is הביא לעולם, although Jenni (*TLOT* 862) and *HALOT* 799 note that the meaning “world” for עולם does not appear until the first century C.E. Moffatt 1924: 10 cites similar expressions in Epictetus and Pseudo-Musonius, but these expressions simply use εἰσάγω to refer to giving birth and there is no reference to “the world.”

⁸⁴ Other scholars who refer the expression to the incarnation include Spicq 1952: 2: 17; Lindars 1961: 211; Michel 1966: 113; Michaelis 1968: 880; Caird 1984: 75-76; Adams 2009: 135. Patristic authors adopting this reading include Chrysostom (Hebrews, *Homily III*, see PG 63: 27-28), Theodoret Cyr. (*Interpretation of Hebrews I*, see PG 82: 685).

⁸⁵ Schenck 2003: 50; Caneday 2008: 31.

refers to the incarnation as Christ's entry into κόσμος ("world") rather than οἰκουμένη. Thirdly, a reference to the incarnation in Heb 1:6 would introduce an "anticlimax and reversal of the sequence begun in 1:5."⁸⁶

The second option is the Parousia,⁸⁷ which also preserves the normal sense of οἰκουμένη as the inhabited world. The Synoptic Gospels report that the Parousia will be accompanied by "the holy angels" (Mark 8:38; Luke 9:26), and the Parousia does appear elsewhere in Hebrews (9:28). Nevertheless, the major problem with this option is that the three quotations in vv 5-6 are a set to be taken together, showing that the superiority over the angels at his exaltation was foretold in the OT.⁸⁸ The argument coheres better if the third quotation is taken in the same way as the first two and is seen as a reference to the entry of the Son into the "heavenly world."⁸⁹ The other instance of οἰκουμένη in Hebrews indicates that this is indeed the case. Heb 2:5 refers to τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν περὶ ἧς λαλούμεν ("the world to come to which we refer"), and the most natural way to understand this expression is to see it as a reference back to the οἰκουμένη of Heb 1:6.⁹⁰

The difficulty with this interpretation is that it unusual for οἰκουμένη to refer to the heavenly world, and some explanation for this must be found.⁹¹ The word appears over

⁸⁶ Caneday 2008: 33.

⁸⁷ The Parousia is proposed by Westcott 1892: 22-23; Héring 1970: 9; Loader 1981: 23-25; Käsemann 1984: 112; Weiss 1991: 162-63. See also Thayer 1898: 422, who explains Heb 2:5 as referring to "that consummate state of all things which will exist after Christ's return from heaven." This reading appears in the Vulgate (*et cum iterum introducit primogenitum in orbem terrae*) and is adopted by Gregory of Nyssa (*Contra Eunomium* 2:8; 4:3). Helyer 1976: 11-12 sees no need to differentiate between the ascension and the Parousia. He comments: "The introduction of the Son into the 'age to come' begins at his ascension and is culminated at the Parousia and visible reign" (p. 12). Schierse 1955: 96 offers a similar reading.

⁸⁸ A reference to the Parousia also involves reading the adverb πάλιν as modifying the verb εἰσάγω, which I have argued is unlikely. See Caneday 2008: 32.

⁸⁹ Ibid.: 33; Cf. Vanhoye 1964: 253, "[C]ette exaltation ne se situe par lors du retour du Christ, mais, selon le contexte de l'épître et la doctrine unanime du N.T., elle a eu lieu déjà, dans son triomphe pascal." In *Asc. Isa.* 11:32, Isaiah sees Jesus returning to the seventh heaven and sitting down at the right hand of the great glory, to the accompaniment of angelic worship.

⁹⁰ Vanhoye 1964: 248-53; Balz 1991: 504; Schenck 2001: 478; 2003: 49-50; Caneday 2008: 31. Heb 2:5 introduces a quotation from Ps 8, a text frequently linked with Ps 110 in early Christian exegesis (see Hay 1973: 35, 42; Loader 1981: 30; Dunn 1989: 108-11; Stuckenbruck 1995: 129-20; Albl 1999: 226-27; Bauckham 2004: 169). The connection between the two Psalms supports the suggestion of Stuckenbruck 1995: 135-36 that the citation of Ps 8 is the final OT citation in the set that began in 1:3 with Ps 110:1, establishing the superiority of Christ to the angels; and Caird 1959: 49, who suggests that the entire argument of Heb 1 needs to be read in the light of the quotation and explanation of Ps 8 in Hebrews 2, a suggestion he repeats in 1984: 77. Nevertheless, in 1984: 75-76 Caird reads the bringing of the firstborn into the world in Heb 1:6 as a reference to the incarnation, and wonders why the author should refer to angelic worship of the Son in his earthly life, when he was "a little lower than the angels."

⁹¹ The suggestion that the οἰκουμένη is the heavenly world was first made by Schierse 1955: 96, although he did not show how the word could be understood in that sense. It is adopted by Johnston 1963: 353-54; Vanhoye 1964: 253; Meier 1985b: 507; Wilson 1987:39; Bruce 1990: 58; Weiss 1991: 162-64; Lane 1991a: 1: 27; Ellingworth 1993: 117-18; Guthrie 1998: 69; DeSilva 2000b: 96-97; Schenck 2001: 478-79; 2003: 49-50; Koester 2001: 193; Eisele 2003: 57-60; Helyer 2006: 3-7; Johnson 2006: 69; Mitchell 2007: 48; Caneday 2008: 28-39; O'Brien 2010: 69. While Adams 2009: 135 argues that Christ's entry to the οἰκουμένη is the

fifty times in the LXX, usually with the sense of the world created by God and inhabited by people.⁹² At times, it is the world that God will judge.⁹³ However, there are some cases where the word has an eschatological orientation, referring to the world to come. It appears several times in the so-called enthronement Psalms (93, 95-99). Psalm 93 (LXX 92):1 claims that ὁ κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν ... ἐστερέωσεν τὴν οἰκουμένην, ἥτις οὐ σαλευθήσεται (“The Lord has begun to reign ... he has established the world, it shall never be moved”),⁹⁴ and this is repeated in Ps 96 (LXX 95):10, (ὁ κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν, καὶ γὰρ κατώρθωσεν τὴν οἰκουμένην, ἥτις οὐ σαλευθήσεται, “the Lord has begun to reign, for he has set right the world, which shall not be moved”). In Psalm 96: 10-13 the entire created order (including the heavens) joins in the praise of Yahweh the coming king.⁹⁵ Kraus comments, “[t]he worship of Israel is governed by the signature of an eschatological, end-time enthronement of Yahweh; his sacral limits ... have been extended into universality.”⁹⁶ These Psalms celebrate the reign of God who is coming to judge the οἰκουμένη (“world”) and set things right.

It is this eschatological orientation that informs the sense of οἰκουμένη in Heb 2:5, and this sense is carried back to Heb 1:6 with the words τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν, περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν (“the world to come to which we refer”).⁹⁷ In these last days (ἐπὶ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων, Heb 1:2) the exalted Son of God has taken his seat alongside God in the world to come.

Further echoes of these Psalms appear at the end of Heb 12. Hebrews 12:26 quotes Hag 2:6, ἔτι ἅπαξ ἐγὼ σείσω οὐ μόνον τὴν γῆν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν οὐρανόν (“yet once more I will shake not only the earth but also the heaven”).⁹⁸ The author then explains that

incarnation, he also proposes (p. 137) that ἡ οἰκουμένη ἢ μέλλουσα refers to “a new worldly environment to be populated by the people of God, i.e., a new created order.”

⁹² For example (all the following reflect LXX versification) Ps 23:1; 48:2; 49:12; 71:8; 88:12; 89:2; Prov 8:31; Isa 14:14; 37:18; Jer 10:12; 28:15; Lam 4:12.

⁹³ E.g. 2 Kgdms 22:16; Ps 9:9; 17:16; 95:13; Isa 10:23; 13:5, 9, 11; 24:1 (LXX versification).

⁹⁴ Eisele 2003: 59 reads ἐβασίλευσεν as an ingressive aorist. The Hebrew *Vorlage* is מָלַךְ, which has an ingressive-durative sense here, “YHWH has entered upon royal rule and has governed since as king” (Hossfeld and Zenger 2005: 448). See also Goldingay 2008: 66-67. This understanding was first proposed by Mowinckel 1966: 1-10 (first published 1939) and has been subjected to vigorous debate ever since. See the brief discussion in Kraus 1989: 233-35; Tate 1990: 472. Whether or not the verbs are taken in this way is not critical to this study, although when read in this way they do accord neatly with the theme of the exaltation of the Son. The exaltation of the Son of God in Heb 1 carries the implication that he has begun to rule with the power and authority of God, whose rule these Psalms celebrate.

⁹⁵ Kraus 1989: 254.

⁹⁶ Ibid.: 255. On the eschatological orientation of these Psalms see Weiser 1962: 618; Tate 1990: 481; Hossfeld and Zenger 2005: 450, 467.

⁹⁷ Caneday 2008: 34-35.

⁹⁸ The text in Hebrews is slightly modified from the text of Hag 2:6 and reads ἔτι ἅπαξ ἐγὼ σείσω τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τὴν ξηρὰν (“yet once more I will shake the heaven and the earth and the sea and the dry land”). I discuss this text more fully in 7.7 (below).

what can be shaken (the things that have been made) will be removed so that what cannot be shaken can remain, and he encourages the readers to give thanks and to offer acceptable worship to God, because they are receiving an “unshakeable kingdom” (βασιλείαν ἀσάλευτον, 12:28). This unshakeable kingdom is the οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα of Heb 2:5, to which the Son of God has been exalted in the present.⁹⁹ Just as in Ps 93:1; 95:10 the οἰκουμένη over which the Lord reigns “cannot be shaken” (οὐ σαλευθήσεται), so also in Heb 12:28, the kingdom that the readers are receiving is an “unshakeable kingdom” (βασιλείαν ἀσάλευτον). This is the same “heavenly” reality as the rest of God that the people are to strive to enter in Heb 4. It is the true tent pitched by the Lord of which Jesus is a minister in Heb 8:1-2; the city with foundations of Heb 11:10; the better country of Heb 11:16; “Mount Zion ... the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem” of Heb 12:22; and the city to come of Heb 13:14.

There is also a further, more subtle, echo of Exod 16:35, where οἰκουμένη also appears. This text reads οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἔφαγον τὸ μαν ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα ἕως ἦλθον εἰς γῆν οἰκουμένην (“and the Israelites ate the manna for forty years until they came into an inhabited land”). Here, the γῆν οἰκουμένην is the promised land, an inhabited place over against the desert.¹⁰⁰ Psalm 95 (LXX 94) celebrates the reign of God and appears in Heb 3 as the basis of an exhortation to the readers to strive to enter God’s rest (the world to come),¹⁰¹ based on the failure of the wilderness generation to enter the promised land. The close proximity of this argument about entering the promised land to the use of οἰκουμένη to refer to the world to come, brings this text into the frame as well. Finally, I note that, the citation formula for Heb 1:6 reflects Deut 6:10; 11:29, two other texts about entry to the promised land.¹⁰²

⁹⁹ Vanhoye 1964: 250-51, 1969: 154-57 makes the connection by way of the words οἰκουμένη and ἀσάλευτον in Psalm 96 (LXX 95), while Lane 1991b: 485-86 refers to Ps 93 (LXX 92):4 and 113:5 (LXX 112). See also Meier 1985b: 507-11; Koester 2001: 192; Eisele 2003: 57-60; Mackie 2007: 42-43. Attridge 1989: 55-6 finds the connection with Ps 93 “weak.” Loader 1981: 24 (footnote 13) dismisses this argument on the basis that οἰκουμένη never has this meaning in the LXX, and that Hebrews needs the additional ἡ μέλλουσα in 2:5 to clarify the reference to the “world to come.” This seems to be a quite unimaginative reading of Pss 93 and 96 and Heb 1:6.

¹⁰⁰ Andriessen 1976: 299 notes that “the entry of the Israelites to the land of Canaan was not the passage from one country to another, but from the wilderness to a new “terre habitée et cultivée.” Vanhoye 1964: 250 is unconvinced, noting that in this text (the only occurrence of οἰκουμένη in the Pentateuch) the word is an adjective rather than a substantive. There are variant readings in this verse with several witnesses reading εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην (“into the οἰκουμένη”) rather than εἰς γῆν οἰκουμένην. See the critical apparatus in Wevers 1991: 217. Whichever reading is adopted, the word οἰκουμένη appears, referring to Canaan (Wevers 1990: 261).

¹⁰¹ While the word οἰκουμένη does not appear in Ps 95 (LXX 94), it does appear in Ps 92; 95; 96; 97 (LXX numbering). The use of Ps 95 in Heb 3:1-7 would have attracted the author to these Psalms and their use of the word, especially since all five deal with the same themes.

¹⁰² Both Deut 6:10 and 11:29 read, Καὶ ἔσται ὅταν εἰσαγάγῃ σε κύριος ὁ θεός σου εἰς τὴν γῆν (“and it shall be when the Lord your God brings you into the land”), words that are very close to Heb 1:6a (ὅταν δὲ πάλιν εἰσαγάγῃ τὸν πρωτότοκον εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην).

As the author of Hebrews reflects on the exaltation of the Son to the right hand of God, he seems also to have in mind the entry of the people of God into the promised land. He applies this typologically to the Son's entry to the world to come and the eschatological goal of God's people in that same world. As Schenck comments "... a metaphorical reference to heaven as the truly civilised world is exactly the kind of thing we would expect from the author of Hebrews."¹⁰³ That "truly civilised world" is the ultimate goal of the people of God.

I am now in a position to offer a gloss of Heb 1:6: "And again, when he brings the firstborn into the 'world (to come),' he says, 'And let all God's angels worship him'." This took place at his exaltation when he entered his kingly rule at the right hand of God.

6.3 The Dominion of Humanity over the World to Come (Heb 2:5-18)

Hebrews 1:14 concludes the catena of quotations with a rhetorical question concerning the role of the angels, "Are they not all (οὐχὶ πάντες εἰσὶν) ministering spirits (λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα),¹⁰⁴ sent to serve for the sake of those who are about to inherit salvation (τοὺς μέλλοντας κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν)"? Beginning as it does with οὐχί, the question demands a positive answer.¹⁰⁵ While the Son is superior to the angels and seated at the right hand of God, angels have the quite different role; they are simply sent to serve the recipients of salvation.¹⁰⁶ The reference to "salvation" (σωτηρία) announces the

¹⁰³ Schenck 2001: 428. See also Andriessen 1976: 295-301, Balz 1991: 504; Stuckenbruck 1995: 120; Cockerill 1999: 63; Caneday 2008: 35; O'Brien 2010: 69.

¹⁰⁴ This claim grows out of the quotation of Ps 104:4 in Heb 1:7 (Lane 1991a: 32).

¹⁰⁵ BDAG 743, s.v., οὐχί, 3.

¹⁰⁶ While the comparison of the Son with angels is put to use in two different ways in Heb 2, this does not answer the related question of why the author thought it necessary to raise the issue of angels in the first place. Stuckenbruck 1995: 124-26 lists five reasons that have been given, along with bibliographical references for those who hold each position. The interpretations listed by Stuckenbruck include: (1) the readers were attracted to the veneration of angels; (2) the community understood Christ as an intermediary, angelic figure (as e.g. in 2 En. 22); (3) the community was interested in worship with angels (as e.g. in *ShirShabb*); (4) the author was attempting to discourage his readers from showing an interest in contemporary Jewish angelological traditions; and (5) the comparison acts as a "rhetorical and literary foil through which the author argues the superiority of the new covenant. Of these, (3) should be discounted, since in 12:22 the text envisages worship with angels. Of the remainder, the absence of any explicit polemic would tend to make options (1), (2) and (4) unlikely (Käsemann 1984: 100; Mach 1992: 287, footnote 22; Gäbel 2007: 358), and (5) is precisely what happens in Heb 2:1-4 (Spicq 1952: 2: 53), although not in Heb 2:5-18 (Gäbel 2007: 359). Stuckenbruck himself (p. 139) suggests "at the very least a polemic against a *Zeitgeist* in which the fluid ideas about angels and preeminent heavenly figures, however metaphorically conceived, were perceived a threat to belief in a surpassing exaltation of Christ." For similar views see Rowland 1982: 112-13; Hannah 1999: 137-39. More recently, Gieschen 1998: 294-303 has argued that the author embraced a form of angelomorphic Christology and used these categories as he sought "to distinguish more carefully between Christ and his angelic hosts. Gleason 2003: 90-107 argues that the author was trying to discourage his readers from relying on angelic support for Jewish nationalistic hopes. Gäbel 2007: 358-76 dismisses the notion that angels were considered to be heavenly priests by the community addressed in Hebrews on the basis that neither angels nor angelic priests feature anywhere in Heb 5:1-10:18. He also argues (2006: 137-44; 2007: 257-66) that the text reflects rivalry between angels and humans, such as is found in texts like Wis 2:23; *L.A.E.* 10-16, 47; *Apoc. Sedr.* 4-5 (A, B); *Apoc. Mos.* 17-19, 39; 3 *Bar.* 4:8; 2 *En.* 30:11-12; 31:1-6; 3 *En.* 4:6. In later Rabbinic literature, this rivalry is connected with Ps 8:5 and Gen 1:26-28 (*Ber. Rab.* 8.5-6; *b. Sanh.* 38b; *b. Shab* 88b; *m.*

subject of Heb 2:5-18, and the appearance of the same word in 2:3, 10 indicates that it is a hook-word tying these two sections to 1:5-14. Hebrews 2 is concerned with those who will inherit salvation. The next reference to angels (2:5) denies that the world to come has been made subject to them and the final reference to angels (2: 16) denies that they are the objects of salvation.¹⁰⁷ Hebrews 2 can be divided into four parts.

- 2:1-4 A warning that since the Son is superior to angels, the readers must pay closer attention to what God has said through the Son than to what he has said through the angels,¹⁰⁸ lest they slip away. They must not neglect the great salvation (σωτηρία) that was declared through the Lord, confirmed to them by eyewitnesses, and attested by God with signs and wonders and gifts of the Holy Spirit, that is, the signs of the age to come.¹⁰⁹
- 2:5-9 A quotation from Ps 8:4-6 (LXX, MT 8:5-7),¹¹⁰ introduced in v. 6 with a vague citation formula (διεμαρτύρατο δέ πού τις, “someone has testified somewhere”), and interpreted in v. 9. This section is connected to the

Teb 7). On this rivalry see Fossum 1985: 266-301; Kinzer 1995: 40-95; Anderson 1997: 105-34. Gäbel 2007: 373 concludes that Hebrews “talks about angels to make it clear what it means to be truly human.” I return to this question below.

¹⁰⁷ Heb 2:5 (Οὐ γὰρ ἀγγέλοις ὑπέταξεν τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν, “for he has not made the world to come subject to angels”) and 16 (οὐ γὰρ δήπου ἀγγέλων ἐπιλαμβάνεται, “for, of course, it is not angels that he is concerned with”) form an inclusio around the treatment of Ps 8 in Heb 2, both containing a negative reference to angels. See Lane 1991a: 44; Gäbel 2007: 364.

¹⁰⁸ This is normally understood as a reference to the giving of the law through angels, although the evidence for this tradition is mixed. See *Jub.* 1:27-29; 4QapocPentB 2 II 4-12; Gal 3:19; Acts 7:38, 53; *Jos. Ant.* 15.136; *Midr. Ps.* 68; *Tg. Onq.* and *Ps. J.* Deut 33:2; LXX Deut 33:2; *Midr. Rab.* Song of Songs 1:12. See Schultz 1971: 282-307; Attridge 1989: 64-65; Najman 2000: 313-33. Silberman 1981: 91-101 argues that the angels in this verse are the prophets of Heb 1:1 on the basis of 11QPs^a 151 where LXX ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτοῦ (“his angel,” Ps 151:4) appears as נְבִיאֵי (“his prophet,” line 8), and the tradition in *Lev. Rab.* 1:1 that prophets were called angels. It would be a diversion to enter into this debate.

¹⁰⁹ Blomberg 2008: 92.

¹¹⁰ The quotation omits Ps 8:7a (LXX καὶ κατέστησας αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου (“you have placed him over the works of your hands”). This line appears in **8**, A, C, the original hand of D, P, **Ψ**, and several other witnesses. It is omitted from P⁴⁶, B, the corrector of D, K, L. While the external evidence is strong, it seems clear that the line has been added to the text to assimilate it to the LXX. See Attridge 1989: 69; Bruce 1990: 70; Lane 1991a: 42; Ellingworth 1993: 148; Metzger 1994: 593-94. Several reasons have been offered as to why this line should be omitted from the quotation. Zuntz 1953: 32-33, 172 suggests that it would conflict with the clause “we do not see all things made subject to him,” but that would also affect Ps 8:7b, which is included. Ellingworth 1993: 149 notes a frequent suggestion that it would conflict with the Son’s part in creation (Heb 1: 2b, 10), but the Son’s part surely presupposes God’s part. More likely is Ellingworth’s alternative suggestion that the line was omitted along with the succeeding lines that list those parts of creation that have been made subject, as not germane to the argument—it is concerned not so much with the creation, but with the world to come. One other variant reading appears in the quotation from the Psalm. The opening word (τί, “what”) in Heb 2:6, reads τίς (“who”) in P⁴⁶, the original hand of C, P, and several other witnesses. The weight of the external evidence is against this, and the suggestion of Zuntz 1953: 48-49 that it was a deliberate alteration, to refer to Christ rather than to humanity in general, is unlikely as it would probably also require the following word ἄνθρωπος to be definite (a question Zuntz answers by transcribing ἄνθρωπος (with a rough breathing, and the ὁ merged with ἄνθρωπος). On this, see Tasker 1955: 185; Attridge 1989: 71; Lane 1991a: 42; Ellingworth 1993: 148.

previous section with the causal particle γάρ (“for”), which is not always given due weight.¹¹¹ It indicates that the paragraph explains the claim of “so great salvation” (τηλικαύτη σωτηρία) in 2:3¹¹² and demonstrates that salvation involves dominion over “the world to come about which ‘we’ are speaking” (ἡ οἰκουμένη ἢ μέλλουσα, περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν).¹¹³

2:10-13 A claim of solidarity between Jesus and his siblings, supported with three OT quotations. This paragraph, beginning with γάρ (“for”), explains the claim that “by the grace of God” (χάριτι θεοῦ) Jesus “should taste death for everyone” (ὕπὲρ παντὸς γεύσεται θανάτου).¹¹⁴ God is now described as the one “for whom and through whom all things exist” (δι’ ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα), who is “bringing many heirs to glory” (πολλοὺς υἱοὺς εἰς δόξαν ἀγαγόντα). The “many heirs” of v. 10 are equivalent to the “everyone” of v. 9.¹¹⁵

2:14-18 A conclusion to the chapter developing the claim of solidarity in vv. 10-13. This section contains the first specific reference to Jesus being a high priest. The paragraph begins with Ἐπεὶ οὖν (“since then”), which looks back to the solidarity of Jesus and the children of v. 13 and forward to the inference that will be drawn—Jesus “had to become like us in every respect” (ὅθεν ὤφειλεν κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὁμοιωθῆναι) “so as to become a

¹¹¹ Attridge 1989: 69-70 translates with “now” (see also Moffatt 1924: 21; Lane 1991a: 41; Koester 2001: 213; Mitchell 2007: 64) and explains that often in Hebrews γάρ functions similarly to δέ. Nevertheless, he also suggests that “[m]ost frequently it does introduce explanations of various sorts.” I suggest that this is one of those cases. Neither Bruce 1990: 69 nor O’Brien 2010: 91 translate the particle, and Ellingworth 1993: 145 relates it back to Heb 1, as does Guthrie 1994: 97; Guthrie and Quinn 2006: 238-39.

¹¹² Delitzsch 1868: 1: 101-102; Westcott 1892: 41; DeSilva 2000b: 108; Johnson 2006: 89; Thompson 2008: 69; Blomberg 2008: 92.

¹¹³ The antecedent of the relative clause περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν (“about which we are speaking”) in 2:5 is ἡ οἰκουμένη ἢ μέλλουσα (“the world to come”) in the same verse (Blomberg 2008: 92-93). The reference to speaking (λαλέω) relates back to all of chapter 1. That it is the world “to come” that is being discussed is evident from the expression “in these last days” of Heb 1:2, which sets the eschatological tone of the book, and that Jesus is in the “world” to come is clear from Heb 1:6a “and when he brings the firstborn into the world” (ὅταν δὲ ... εἰσαγάγῃ τὸν πρωτότοκον εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην).

¹¹⁴ πᾶς is a significant word in this chapter, appearing as a neuter plural (“all things”) in vv. 8, 10; as a masculine singular (“everyone”) in v. 9; and as a masculine plural in v. 11, expressing the solidarity of ὁ ἁγιάζων καὶ οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι (“the sanctifier and the sanctified”). There is strong MS support for the words χάριτι θεοῦ (“by the grace of God”), including P⁴⁶, Ⲙ, A, B, C, D. However, some later Greek MSS as well as a MS of the Vulgate, and Origen, Ambrose, Jerome and Fulgentius read χωρὶς θεοῦ (“apart from God”), with the sense either that Jesus tastes death for everyone except God (as in 1 Cor 15:27), or that in his death he was abandoned by God. This reading seems to be secondary, although it is more difficult. Bruce 1990: 70-71, and Metzger 1994: 594 suggest that it may have been a marginal note that made its way into the text. See Swetnam 1981a: 164; Ellingworth 1993: 155-57; Koester 2001: 217-18.

¹¹⁵ Lane 1991a: 52-53. I discuss my translation “many heirs” in 1.2 (above).

merciful and faithful high priest” (ἵνα ἐλεήμων γένηται καὶ πιστὸς ἀρχιερεὺς).

Thus, Heb 2:1-4 warns the readers not to neglect the salvation they are about to inherit, and vv. 5-18 explain the means of this salvation (through the suffering and exaltation of Jesus) and its outcome (human dominion over the world to come).

Hebrews 2:5 claims that God did not subject the world to come to angels.¹¹⁶ But rather than using his own words to specify those to whom it has been made subject, the author quotes Ps 8:5-7, a text that makes it explicit.¹¹⁷ The world to come has been made subject to humans.¹¹⁸

6.3.1 Psalm 8:5-7 in Hebrew and Greek

Psalm 8 is a communal song of praise to Yahweh the creator on account of his majestic name (vv. 1-2, 9), and also contains an individual reflection.¹¹⁹ In vv. 3-4 the psalmist wonders why Yahweh should lavish such care on humans who are so small when compared with the rest of creation, and vv. 5-6 explain that though seemingly insignificant, they have great dignity being only “slightly inferior to God” (מַעַט מֵאֱלֹהִים), an expression that the LXX renders with βραχύ τι παρ’ ἀγγέλους (“a little lower than angels”), the words quoted in Hebrews.¹²⁰ The Psalm claims that the human race is crowned with glory and honour and given dominion over the works of God’s hands, works

¹¹⁶ Lying behind this claim is Deut 32:8-9, where angels are guardians of the nations (Westcott 1892: 41; Wilson 1987: 47; Bruce 1990: 71; Ellingworth 1993: 146-47; Allen 2008: 106-107). See also Dan 10:13, 20; *Jub.* 15:32; *1 En.* 56:5-6; Sir 17:17. Deut 32:809 has a complex textual history, especially in the LXX. At issue is whether the reading ἀριθμός ἀγγέλων θεοῦ (“the number of the angels of God”) in the Rahlfs edition, or the reading ἀριθμός υἱῶν θεοῦ (“the number of the sons of God”) in the Göttingen edition is judged to be original. Wevers 1978: 85; 1995: 513 argues that ἀριθμός υἱῶν θεοῦ is a theologically motivated change. Philo alludes to Deut 32:8 in *Post.* 89; *Plant.* 59 and in both cases reads ἀριθμός υἱῶν θεοῦ. 4QDeut XII 14 reads בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים (“sons of God”). The reference to both the “sons of Adam” (υἱοὶ Ἀδὰμ) and the sons (angels) of God in Deuteronomy prepares the way for the shift from anthropology to Christology in Heb 2:5-9, see Allen 2008: 107-108. The association with Deut 32:8 here and Deut 32:43 in Heb 1:6 strengthens the identification of the referent of οἰκουμένη in both 1:6 and 2:5 as the same (eschatological) world.

¹¹⁷ Note the appearance of ὑποτάσσω (“to make subject”) in Heb 2:5, in Ps 8:7 cited in Heb 2:8a, and in the comment on the Psalm in Heb 2:8b.

¹¹⁸ I will establish this debated reading in the exegetical discussion below. The Psalm refers to the protoplast made in the image of God and commanded to have dominion over the world just created (Gen 1:26); that is, the world that was “to come” for him (Blomberg 2008: 92-93).

¹¹⁹ Verses 3-8 are in the first person, while vv. 1, 9 are a communal song of praise, beginning with יְהוָה אֱדֹנֵינוּ (“Yahweh, our Lord”).

¹²⁰ Caird 1959: 49 expresses the valuable insight that the quotation of the Psalm in Heb 2:5-8 “controls the argument of the preceding chapter, for from the first mention of angels at 1:5 [sic—angels appear in 1:4] throughout the formidable catena of texts in ch. 1 the author’s one aim is to illustrate the theme of the psalm that man has been destined by God to a glory excelling that of angels and that this destiny has been achieved by Christ.” Both Hurst 1987: 151-64 (Caird’s student) and Schenck 2001: 469-85 demonstrate the validity of this claim. If so, perhaps the simple answer to the question as to why Hebrews deals with angels is that the author had in his mind from the outset a text that could be used to explain both the dominion of humanity over the world, and the career of Jesus made lower than the angels and subsequently exalted above them.

that are enumerated in vv. 7-8.¹²¹ Verse 9 repeats the opening words forming an inclusio and providing the context in which the reflection on the seeming insignificance, yet great dignity of humanity is to be understood.¹²²

The LXX of Ps 8 renders the Hebrew words for humanity (אָנוּשׁ and בֶּן אָדָם) with ἄνθρωπος and υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, and while these are normal words for humanity, in the context of the Psalm they refer to “the first man ruling in paradise and created as one just less than God himself.”¹²³ This opens the way to an eschatological reading of the Psalm in the NT, and especially here in Hebrews. This (representative) man, ruling in the garden, will rule in the world to come.

6.3.2 Psalm 8:5-7 in the NT and in Hebrews

Psalm 8 is quoted several times in the NT¹²⁴ and several allusions have been detected.¹²⁵ Apart from Matt 21:16, which cites Ps 8:1, all other quotations and allusions apply Ps 8:6 to Jesus, and all read it with an eschatological orientation.¹²⁶ Moreover, as here, in some cases Ps 8 is combined with Ps 110.¹²⁷ The authors of Ephesians and 1 Peter share a tradition with the author of Hebrews that combines these two Psalms and applies them to Jesus.¹²⁸ However, the application to Jesus in Heb 2:5-9 is more subtle than in Ephesians and 1 Peter, for in Hebrews Jesus does not enter the picture until v. 9.¹²⁹ The Psalm quotation is to be read anthropologically, claiming that “the world to come” (ἡ οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα) has been made subject to humanity. As v. 9 points out, while this is not presently evident, it

¹²¹ These are small and large domesticated animals, wild animals, birds and fish. See Leschert 1994: 91.

¹²² Maré 2010: 105-112.

¹²³ Borsch 1967: 114; Leschert 1994: 91.

¹²⁴ Matt 21:16; 1 Cor 15:25-27; Heb 2:6-8.

¹²⁵ Eph 1:20-22; Phil 3:21; 1 Pet 3:22 seem to be clear allusions. Rom 3:23; 8:20; Phil 2:6-11 are also possible allusions, although not so clear (see Peterson 1982: 52; Hurst 1990: 111-12; Kinzer 1995: 1-2).

¹²⁶ Kistemaker 1961: 107-108; Leschert 1994: 94-98. 1 Cor 15:27 anticipates Christ's enemies being put under his feet in the eschaton; Eph 1:20-22 claims that when God raised Christ from the dead he put all things under his feet; Phil 3:21 claims that the power that enables Christ to put all things under his feet will enable him to transform our humble bodies; and 1 Pet 3:22 claims that Christ has been raised to the right hand of God, with angels, powers and authorities made subject to him.

¹²⁷ Eph 1:20-22; 1 Pet 3:22. See Fuhrmann 2010: 85-89.

¹²⁸ Peterson 1982: 52-53.

¹²⁹ There are arguments for reading this part of Hebrews either christologically or anthropologically. For a recent defence of an anthropological reading see Blomberg 2008: 88-99. Leschert 1994: 111 proposes intentional ambiguity on the part of the author of Hebrews and finally opts for a christological reading. For an anthropological reading see Delitzsch 1868: 1: 101-109; Westcott 1892: 42-45; Moffatt 1924: 22-24; Lindars 1991: 38-41; Montefiore 1964: 56-57; Borsch 1967: 237; Swetnam 1981a: 138-39; Kistemaker 1984: 66; Smothers 1985: 339; Hurst 1987: 155; 1990: 110-11; Wilson 1987: 48-50; Lategan 1990: 158-61; Lane 1991a: 47-48; Mitchell 1992: 695; Kinzer 1995: 261-63; France 1996: 261-63; Pfizner 1997: 60-63; Motyer 1999: 21; Gordon 2008: 66-67 (who suggests that the difference is “ultimately insubstantial”); DeSilva 2000b: 110; Koester 2001: 215, 220-21; Osborne 2003: 259; Young 2003: 54; Blomberg 2004: 211-12; 2008: 88-99; Gäbel 2006: 144-47; 2007: 264; O'Brien 2010: 95-96.

is clear that Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, is now crowned with glory and honour, and that through him God is leading many heirs to glory, that is, restoring to humanity the dominion given to them at the creation. The validity of this reading is clear from the three paragraphs that follow.

6.3.3 Hebrews 2:8b-9

As the three occurrences of ὑποτάσσω / ἀνυπότακτος in Hebrews 2:8b-9 and the causal particle γάρ, indicate, these verses explain the last line of the Psalm. The subjection of all things to humanity (αὐτῷ)¹³⁰ is comprehensive. Nothing is omitted, although this is not yet evident. Those who read the Psalm christologically read this verse as a discussion of the submission of all things to the Son, but this is unlikely for two reasons. First, Heb 1:13 anticipates the placing of all things under the feet of the Son at some time in the future (as also Heb 10:12-13). This would contradict the suggestion of the present comprehensive subjection of all things to the Son in Ps 2:8. Secondly, the grammatical construction in v. 9, beginning as it does with τὸν δέ, and ending with Ἰησοῦς in the final, emphatic position (τὸ δέ ... βλέπομεν Ἰησοῦν,¹³¹ “but ... we see *Jesus*”) implies a subtle contrast where Ἰησοῦς is set over against the αὐτόν of v. 8.¹³² The sense of Heb 2:8-9 is that while the subjection of all things to humanity is comprehensive, but presently unclear (νῦν δὲ οὐπω ὁρῶμεν),¹³³ the exaltation of Jesus is evident (τὸν δέ ... βλέπομεν Ἰησοῦν).¹³⁴

¹³⁰ The word αὐτῷ (“to him”) appears twice in this verse, each time as the indirect object of the notion of submission, and possibly a third time. The editors of NA²⁷ have placed the first occurrence in square brackets (ἐν τῷ γὰρ ὑποτάξαι [αὐτῷ] ...), “for in the subjecting of all things [to him] ...”. This instance of αὐτῷ is omitted in P⁴⁶ (which omits the entire phrase αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, see NA²⁷, p. 745), B, d, v, some MSS of the Vulgate and one Bohairic witness. It is included in **8**, A, C, D, **Ψ**, a few minuscules, the Majority Text, the Vulgate and the Peshitta. That P⁴⁶ and B include the word while **8** and A omit it, makes the text-critical decision difficult. Inclusion within square brackets seems to be a reasonable choice (Metzger 1994: 594). Attridge 1989: 69 places the words “subjecting all things” in quotes, as a quotation of the words in v. 8a, and omits the αὐτῷ, following Zuntz 1953: 32-33 (although it is not a precise quote since the two words are inverted and a neuter plural definite article is added). Bruce 1990: 70 also favours omitting the word.

¹³¹ This is the first time the name “Jesus” appears in Hebrews and here, as usually elsewhere, it is in the emphatic final position (2:9; 3:1; 7:22; 10:10, 19; 12:2, 24; 13:20). In 4:8 Joshua is the referent, and in 13: 8, 12, 21 the word is not emphatic.

¹³² Swetnam 1981a: 163-64. The expression ὁ δέ in the nominative marks the continuation of a narrative to be sure (BDF, 131, § 251; Porter 1994: 112-13; Wallace 1996: 211-12), but it also indicates a change of subject (see Acts 8:40-9:1; John 5:11, 13; Heb 10:37-38 (citing Hab 2:4); 13:19-20. While the noun in Heb 2:9 is in the accusative, the implied contrast remains, as also in Acts 11:29, where the noun is in the genitive case. Wallace (1996: 674) notes that δέ involves the change to a new topic of discussion. In the present context, the topic of v. 8 is the subjection of all things to humanity, while the topic of v. 9 is the humiliation and exaltation of Jesus.

¹³³ Note the two verbs for seeing, ὁράω and βλέπω, in vv. 8-9. Brawley 1993: 85 argues that the two verbs are interchangeable in Hebrews. ὁράω appears in 2:8; 8:5 (in a quotation); 9:28 (passive, with the sense “appear”); 11:27; 12:14; 13:23. βλέπω appears in 2:9; 3:12, 19; 10:25; 11:1, 3, 7; 12:25. Only ὁράω occurs in a literal sense for what is seen with the eyes (13:23); both appear in a figurative sense for the perception of present or future realities; and both have the sense of a warning in the sense “make sure” (ὁράω, 8:5; βλέπω, 3:12; 12:25).

The reference to Jesus is qualified by two expressions taken from the Psalm (βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἡλαττωμένον, “made a little lower than the angels,” and δόξη καὶ τιμῇ ἑστεφανωμένον, “crowned with glory and honour”). While the verbs quoted from the Psalm are aorist indicatives (ἡλάττωσας, “he made lower”; ἑστεφάνωσας, “he crowned”), in the interpretation of the Psalm in Heb 2:9 they are perfect passive participles (ἡλαττωμένον, “made lower”; ἑστεφανωμένον, “crowned”). While in the Psalm these expressions describe the dignity of humanity as made in God’s image, they are sometimes read in Hebrews as describing a sequence: Jesus was made lower than the angels (either in the incarnation or in his death), and has now been exalted above the angels.¹³⁵ But the change from aorist indicative verbs to perfect passive participles indicates an alternative reading.

Traditional analysis of the perfect participle emphasises the resultant state of a prior verbal action.¹³⁶ However, this analysis causes problems with this sentence, for the whole point of Heb 1-2 is that Jesus is no longer inferior to the angels. Campbell argues that a “perfect participle nearly always expresses action that is contemporaneous with its leading verb.”¹³⁷ In this sentence, the leading verb is βλέπομεν (“we see”), the object is Jesus, and the perfect participles describe the characteristics of Jesus as we see them. We see one who is a true human (a member of the class of those “made a little lower than the angels,” βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἡλαττωμένον).¹³⁸ who is “crowned with glory and honour”

¹³⁴ Those who read the Psalm quotation christologically from the outset argue that the world to come is to be made subject to Christ in this text as in 1 Cor 15:27; Eph 1:22; Phil 3:21; 1 Pet 3:22. These include Spicq 1952: 2: 31-32; Cullmann 1963: 187-88; Héring 1970: 15-16; Colpe 1972: 464; Buchanan 1972: 27-28; Giles 1975: 328-32; Hughes 1977: 84-85; Loader 1981: 32-35; Moloney 1981: 657-59; Peterson 1982: 51-55; Craigie 1983: 110; Käsemann 1984: 124-28; Attridge 1989: 69-77; Bruce 1990: 72-73; Brawley 1993: 84; Ellingworth 1993: 150-52; Long 1997: 34-36; Guthrie 1998: 96-98; Guthrie and Quinn 2006: 235-46; Hagner 2002: 54-57; Gleason 2003: 92-93; Mackie 2007: 43-44; Thompson 2008: 60-61, 69; De Wet 2010: 113-25. This reading depends in part upon the identification of the term “son of man” with the “Son of Man” of the Synoptic Gospels and John (Childs 1969: 25). France 1996: 262 suggests, “[I]t is hard to imagine that any Christian, particularly a Greek-speaking Christian, after the middle of the first century could have heard the phrase υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου without thinking of Jesus.” For a similar argument see Leschert 1994: 103-104, and his footnote 98 (p. 103), where he lists previous scholars who have made a similar claim. But this is not necessarily the case. As Lane 1991a: 47 notes, (1) the expression υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου is anarthrous in Hebrews, while apart from John 5:27, which depends on Dan 7:13 (LXX), in the Gospels it uniformly has both articles (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου), and (2) in Hebrews no use is made of the expression υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου in the comment on the Psalm. Attridge 1989: 74 suggests that the author may not have been aware of the Son of Man traditions, but this seems unlikely given the claims of Heb 2:3 that the gospel traditions were transmitted to the author and his assumed readers by those who heard them from “the Lord” (ὁ κύριος).

¹³⁵ Moffatt 1924: 22-23; Peterson 1982: 214-25; Lane 1991a: 47-48; Thompson 2008: 62; Mitchell 2007: 66-67.

¹³⁶ Wallace 1996: 576.

¹³⁷ Campbell 2008a: 111; 2008b: 26. Campbell illustrates this from Luke 9:27; 11:17; John 1:51; 11:56; Rom 5:3; Phil 1:25. There are twenty-nine perfect passive participles in Hebrews and this understanding is evident in all of them. See Heb 2:8; 4:2, 13, 15; 5:14; 7:3, 26, 28; 9:4, 6, 13, 15; 10:2, 10, 22; 11:12; 12:11, 12, 18, 23, 27; 13:3, 23. The “present state of a past action” is also evident in 4:15.

¹³⁸ The Greek expression βραχύ τι, like the corresponding Hebrew word מְעַט, can have either a spatial or temporal sense (“a little” or “a little while”). If the perfect participle is understood with a durative force

(δόξη καὶ τιμῇ ἑστεφανωμένον). What was true of the protoplast is true, but presently unclear of humanity, but is both true and evident in the case of Jesus.

6.3.4 Hebrews 2:10-13

The next paragraph (Heb 2:10-13) also begins with the causal particle γάρ, and explains the purpose clause of Heb 2:9. The explanation of this clause is provided in the claim that God is “bringing many heirs to glory” (πολλοὺς υἱοὺς εἰς δόξαν ἀγαγόντα),¹³⁹ along with the claim that it was proper that in doing this God should “make perfect” (τελειώω) “the author of their salvation” (ἀρχηγός τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν) through suffering.¹⁴⁰ Verse 11 refers to Jesus as “the one who sanctifies” (ὁ ἁγιάζων), and the many heirs as “the sanctified ones” (οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι), who together share in family solidarity, a claim supported by three OT citations, from Ps 22:22 (LXX 21:23) and Isa 8:17, 18.¹⁴¹ Hebrews 2:10-11 are important for this study, as they contain language that reflects idea associated with cult and sanctuary.¹⁴²

(the present result of a past action—i.e. Jesus is one who became and remains a little lower than the angels—i.e., a human being), a spatial sense is unlikely, since a key plank in the argument is that Jesus is exalted above the angels. Consequently, the durative force of the perfect participle cannot be forced in this verse, especially with the promotion of the expression βραχύ τι to an emphatic position at the start of the phrase. Leschert 1994: 112 is perhaps right to suggest that the author may be “employing a subtle use of tense to imply that, while Jesus did not always remain lower than the angels, he still retains his human nature which he took on to become one of us.” Ellingworth 1993: 153-54 suggests that the perfect participles “present Christ’s humiliation and exaltation, not as a mere temporal succession, but as two complementary aspects of a single work.” See Westcott 1892: 45-46; Attridge 1989: 75-76; Lane 1991a: 48; O’Brien 2010: 98-99.

¹³⁹ The word ἀγαγόντα is an accusative singular masculine aorist active participle of ἄγω (“to lead”). The nearest accusative noun is τὸν ἀρχηγόν (“the pioneer,” i.e., Christ), and Grogan 1969: 60; Buchanan 1972: 32; Käsemann 1984: 132-44; DeSilva 2000b: 112-13 (footnote 56) suggest that this word is the subject of the participle, so that God makes Christ perfect, who in turn leads the many heirs to glory. Most commentators construe the participle with the infinitive τελειῶσαι, and see it as part of a long noun clause acting as the subject of that participle, so that the sense of the sentence is that “it was proper that God, in leading many heirs to glory, should make perfect the pioneer of their salvation.” See Westcott 1892: 49; Hughes 1977: 101-102; Attridge 1989: 82; Bruce 1990: 77; Lane 1991a: 52, 55-56; Ellingworth 1993: 159; Gäbel 2006: 151-52; Johnson 2006: 95; Mitchell 2007: 73; Thompson 2008: 73; O’Brien 2010: 104 (footnote 113).

¹⁴⁰ O’Brien 2010: 103 connects the propriety (ἔπρεπεν, 3rd person masculine singular imperfect active indicative of πρέπω, used impersonally, “it was proper”) with the expression “by the grace of God” in 2:9. For the syntactical structure of the sentence see Mitchell 1992: 668-69, who explains that the antecedent of the dative singular relative pronoun αὐτῷ (“for him”) is God, described as δι’ ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα (“the one through whom and for whom are all things”), “to whom propriety is attributed,” and that the subject of ἔπρεπεν is the noun clause τὸν ἀρχηγόν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν διὰ παθημάτων τελειῶσαι (“to make the pioneer of their salvation perfect through suffering”).

¹⁴¹ The source of the first Isaiah citation is debated. The second citation is clearly from Isa 8:18, but 2 Sam 22:3 and its parallel in Ps 18 (LXX 17):3; Isa 12:2; and Isa 8:17, have been suggested for the first. Ps 18:3 seems unlikely, as it uses the verb ἐλπίζω (“I hope”) rather than the passive of πείθω (“be persuaded”). The word order in Heb 2:13a differs from Isa 12:2; 2 Sam 22:3; and Isa 8:17. Isa 8:17 is the most likely source, since Heb 2:13b is from Isa 8:18, with the word probably changed for emphasis.

¹⁴² Hughes 1977: 97-98; Peterson 1982: 49; Mitchell 1992: 694-95.

The claim that God is leading many heirs to glory reflects the language of the Exodus, where God leads his people through the wilderness to the promised land.¹⁴³ Especially pertinent in this context is Exod 15:17, where God “leads” (εἰσάγω) his people into the promised land, with the ultimate goal “the mountain of God’s inheritance, God’s prepared dwelling place, and the sanctuary God’s hands have established” (εἰς ὄρος κληρονομίας σου, εἰς ἑτοιμον κατοικητήριόν σου, ὃ κατειργάσω, κύριε, ἁγίασμα, κύριε, ὃ ἡτοίμασαν αἱ χεῖρές σου).¹⁴⁴ This part of Hebrews echoes these Exodus traditions, but in Hebrews God does not simply lead them to the promised land.¹⁴⁵ God leads them to “glory” (δόξα).¹⁴⁶ This is the “glory and honour” (δόξα καὶ τιμή) of Ps 8:6, which in Heb 2:7 describes the not-yet-apparent dominion of humanity over all things, and in 2:9 the present visible exaltation of Jesus. The glory to which God is leading humanity in Heb 2:10 is the restoration of humanity’s dominion. This is the great salvation (Heb 2:3). It is a “heavenly and eschatological condition,”¹⁴⁷ where they share the glory that belongs to Christ, who is now in the presence of God.¹⁴⁸

This is also demonstrated in the remainder of the verse: in leading these to glory it is proper that God “should make the pioneer of their salvation perfect through sufferings” (τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν διὰ παθημάτων τελειῶσαι). While the precise sense of ἀρχηγός is debated,¹⁴⁹ it is likely that the background is to be found in the LXX

¹⁴³ Schreiner 1961: 2-18; Lane 1991a: 56; Thompson 2008: 73; O’Brien 2010: 104; See Exod 3:8 (where God leads his people out (ἐξάγω) of Egypt and into (εἰσάγω) the promised land); 6:6-8; 7:4-5; 13:5, 11; 15:17 (where God leads them into (εἰσάγω) the promised land, with the ultimate goal God’s dwelling place, the sanctuary God’s hand established); 23:20, 23; 33:3; Lev 18:3; 20:22; 26:13; Num 3:8, 16; 15:18; Deut 6:10, 23; 7:1; 8: 2, 7, 15; 9:4, 28; 11:29; 26:9; 29:4; 30:5; 31:20, 21, 23; 32: 12; Josh 24:8; Ps 78:52. See also Philo *Post.* 31.

¹⁴⁴ Similar ideas are expressed in Ps 78:52-54, where God leads his people to his holy hill, cf. LXX Ps 77:54, καὶ εἰσήγαγεν αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄριον ἁγιάσματος αὐτοῦ, ὄρος τοῦτο, ὃ ἐκτήσατο ἡ δεξιὰ αὐτοῦ (“and he led them to the boundary of his sanctuary, this mountain which his right hand acquired”).

¹⁴⁵ Thompson 2008: 73.

¹⁴⁶ Heb 2:10-11 anticipate Heb 3-4 where the eschatological goal of the people of God is God’s rest (in the heavenly, eschatological temple). I discuss Heb 3-4 below (7.3).

¹⁴⁷ Attridge 1989: 83.

¹⁴⁸ Bruce 1990: 80; Lane 1991a: 55; Johnson 2006: 95; O’Brien 2010: 118. For “glory” referring to the presence of God see Dean-Otting 1984: 50-58; Koester 2001: 228. See Exod 24:16-18; Isa 6:1-3; 60:19; Ezek 1:28; 10:1-22; Tob 13:14-17; Bar 5:7-9; 1 *En.* 45:3; 71:7; 2 *En.* 22:8-10; 4 *Ezra* 7:91, 98; *T. Levi* 5:1; *T. Dan* 5:12; For eschatological glory attributed to humanity see *T. Ab.* 11:3-10; 1QS IV 23; CD III 23; 1QH^a IV 26. In 1 *En.* 14:20; *T. Levi* 3:4 God is referred to as “the Great Glory.” For the NT see Rom 5:2; 8:17; 1 Cor 15:43; Phil 3:21; Col 1:27; 3:4 1 Pet 1:11, 21; 4: 13-14; 5:4, 10.

¹⁴⁹ Ἀρχηγός has a wide semantic range, and its precise sense needs to be determined by the literary and cultural context. For the semantic range see Delling 1964: 487-88; Johnston 1981: 381-85 (who surveys the English translations offered in a variety of sources, and opts for “prince,” equivalent to the Hebrew word נָשִׂיא); Müller 1990: 163-64. Käsemann 1984: 128-33 argued for the derivation of the term from its use in incipient Gnosticism, for which there is no evidence at the time Hebrews was written (Hurst 1990: 72). Others have made connections with the Hellenistic cult of the hero (Delling 1964: 487-88; Knox 1948: 234-35, 245-47; Manson 1951: 102-103; Lane 1991a: 56-57; Guthrie 1998: 107-108 who translates the word with “champion”). A more appropriate background is the word in the LXX, although there it has several senses

and, in particular, in Num 13-14. In Num 13:2-3 those who are to spy out the land are to be selected from each tribe, “everyone a leader among them” (πάντα ἀρχηγὸν ἐξ αὐτῶν, Num 13:3) and all those sent are described as “men who are leaders among the Israelites” (ἄνδρες ἀρχηγοὶ υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ οὗτοι, Num 13:4).¹⁵⁰ In Num 14:4 the rebels deliberate among themselves and decide to select a “leader” (ἀρχηγός) to take them back to Egypt. There are numerous allusions to Num 14 in Heb 3-4, and it seems clear that the rebellion of Num 14 is in the background of these chapters,¹⁵¹ thus the choice of the word ἀρχηγός to describe Jesus here is an echo of these texts.¹⁵² Jesus the “pioneer” has achieved the goal, being crowned with glory and honour, and through him God is leading many heirs to the same goal.¹⁵³

Also significant for the present study is the notion of “perfection” in this verse, a much discussed term that seems to be used in a variety of senses in Hebrews.¹⁵⁴ The verb τελειόω appears here with God as subject and Jesus as direct object. Jesus is also the direct object in 5:9 and 7:28, where the verb is in the passive, with God as the implied subject.¹⁵⁵ “The law” (ὁ νόμος) is the subject in 7:19 and 10:1, and the former sacrifices offered according to the law are the subject in 9:9. In these three instances the verb is negated, so that the law and the offerings are unable to perfect anything (7:19), the consciences of the worshippers (9:9) or those who approach God (10:1). Three remaining instances have the people of God as direct object. In 10:14, Jesus has perfected the sanctified ones by a single sacrifice; in 11:40 faithful people of the former covenant are not made perfect apart from

(Müller 1990: 163). The word appears four times in the NT (Acts 3:15; 5:31; Heb 2:10; 12:2), always as a christological title, and always related to the death and subsequent exaltation of Jesus.

¹⁵⁰ The versification in Wevers 1982: 174-75 (Göttingen LXX) differs from that in Rahlfs 1935: 236. The verse numbers given here follow Wevers. Rahlfs’ verse numbers are 13:2-3. Num 12:16 in BHS and Rahlfs is Num 13:1 in the Göttingen LXX and the Vulgate. See the critical apparatus in BHS.

¹⁵¹ The Psalm mentions the rebellion at Massah and Meribah, suggesting that either Exod 17:1-7 and/or Num 20:1-3 could be seen in the background. Coming as they do at the start and at the end of the wilderness wanderings, they probably sum up everything in between. Numbers 14:1-35 has even more points of contact with the Psalm, and Hofius 1970c: 117-53 has argued at some length that this is the true background of the Psalm, followed by Laansma 1997: 262-64. I discuss this more fully in 7.3 (below).

¹⁵² I have used “pioneer” to translate ἀρχηγός (following NRSV), to convey the notion of a leader, who is first in a series, “providing the impetus for further developments” (BDAG 138, s.v., ἀρχηγός, 2). Koester 2001: 228-29.

¹⁵³ Bruce 1990: 80; Ellingworth 1993: 160-61; Johnson 2006: 96; Thompson 2008: 73; Mitchell 2007: 73; O’Brien 2010: 106-107.

¹⁵⁴ A comprehensive survey of the large body of literature on this topic is not possible. See Wikgren 1960: 159-67; Dey 1975: 31-118; Silva 1976: 60-71; Loader 1981: 41-47; Peterson 1982: 49-187; Käsemann 1984: 133-44; Attridge 1989: 83-87; Lindars 1991: 42-47; Scholer 1991: 185-200; Ellingworth 1993: 161-63; Vanhoye 1996: 321-38; Gäbel 2006: 163-70. Peterson 1982: 1-20 surveys earlier scholarship. See also Delling 1972: 67-87; Schippers 1986: 59-65; Hübner 1993: 342-46. Paul seems to use verb τελειόω and the adjective τέλειος in the sense of “[a]ttitudinal and ethical maturity” (Bockmuehl 1990: 158-60). See Rom 12:1-2; 1 Cor 2:6; 14:20; Eph 4:13; Phil 3:12, 15; Col 4:12.

¹⁵⁵ Ellingworth 1993: 293, 397.

“us”; and in 12:23, followers of Jesus in the present join the spirits of the righteous made perfect in the heavenly Jerusalem. The noun τελείωσις appears in 7:11, which conveys the idea that the Levitical priesthood (by its sacrifices) is unable to make the people perfect. The adjective τέλειος appears in 5:14 to describe “mature” people, as does the noun τελειότης in 6:1. The comparative adjective τελειότερος appears in 9:11 to describe salvation connected with “the greater and more perfect tent” (ἡ μείζων καὶ τελειότερα σκίνη). Finally, in 12:2, Jesus is “the pioneer and perfecter of faith” (ὁ τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγός καὶ τελειωτής).

Not all of these instances are significant for this study, but to summarise those that are: God makes Jesus perfect (2:10, 5:9; 7:28); the law, the priesthood and the offerings of the former covenant cannot make anything or any person perfect (7:11, 19; 9:9; 10:1); and Jesus makes his followers perfect by the offering of himself (10:14; 11:40; 12:23).

The present context is connected with the perfecting of Jesus and is closely connected with him being crowned with glory and honour as the “pioneer” (ἀρχηγός) of salvation; in 5:9 it results in him becoming the “source of eternal salvation” (αἴτιος σωτηρίας αἰωνίου); and in 7:28, as a Son, he is appointed high priest who has been made perfect forever.

The sense in which the verb and noun is used in Hebrews has been the subject of considerable debate. BDAG gives the following definitions: (1) “to complete an activity,” e.g. in Luke 2:43, where it describes the end of the Passover festival; (2) “to overcome an imperfect state of things by one that is free fr[om] objection,” under which Heb 2:10; 5:9; 7:28 are listed; and (3) to “consecrate, initiate,” where Heb 2:10; 5:9; 7:28 are also listed.¹⁵⁶ This third definition is said to be “a term of mystery religions,”¹⁵⁷ however, the editors of BDAG do note that it is also present in the LXX. In Exod 29:9 the Hebrew expression for the consecration of Aaron and his sons is מלאת יד (“you shall fill the hand”), translated with τελειώσεις τὰς χεῖράς (“you shall make the hands perfect”). This expression appears with the sense “consecrate” eight times in the Pentateuch and, indeed, τελειόω has no other sense in the Pentateuch.¹⁵⁸ The noun τελειώσις appears seventeen times in

¹⁵⁶ BDAG 996, s.v., τελειόω 1, 2, 3. Five sub-categories are listed for the second option: (a) Jesus being brought to completion (Heb 2:10; 5:9; 7:28); (b) to bring something to its full measure; (c) to fulfil prophecies; (d) the perfection of an upright person (e.g. Heb 12:23); and (e) to make someone perfect, and while the sense of “perfect” in this context is not defined, the texts in Hebrews where perfection is applied to humans are listed (7:19; 9:9; 10:14).

¹⁵⁷ For the connection with the mystery religions BDAG gives four bibliographical entries, dated between 1921 and 1939. One of these entries is the original 1939 German edition of Käsemann 1984, who argues for this sense (pp. 133-44). For a discussion of mystery religions and their similarities to early Christianity see Meyer 1997: 723-24.

¹⁵⁸ For τελειόω τὰς χεῖράς see Exod 29:9, 29, 33, 35; Lev 4:5; 8:33; 16:32; Num 3:3. In Lev 8:33 the noun τελείωσις also appears, with no direct object, and in Lev 21:10 the perfect passive participle of τελειόω is used with this sense absolutely, without the direct object τὰς χεῖράς (“the hands”).

the LXX, and twelve of these are in Gen 29 and Lev 7-8 where the word refers to aspects of the ceremony of the ordination of priests.¹⁵⁹ In 2 Chron 29:35 and 2 Macc 2:9 it is connected with the dedication of the temple, and three other occurrences are in non-cultic contexts.¹⁶⁰ Accordingly, the expression *τελειόω τὰς χεῖρας* and the noun *τελειώσις* have been seen by some scholars as technical terms (in the Pentateuch at least) for the consecration of a priest.¹⁶¹

Peterson has argued strongly that any suggestion of a technical term for consecration is an overstatement. He proposes that the idea behind the expression was a “literal ‘filling of the hands’ with sacrifices” ... [as] the high point of the consecration ceremony ... to ‘perfect’ or ‘qualify’ the hands for priestly service.”¹⁶² On the one hand, the validity of Peterson’s argument is illustrated by the other senses in which *τελειόω* is used in the LXX,¹⁶³ as well as the other expressions that are used to translate the Hebrew expression *מלא [את] יד*.¹⁶⁴ But, on the other hand, the evidence from Exodus and Leviticus suggests that he may have overstated his case.¹⁶⁵ Both the formula *τελειόω τὰς χεῖρας* and the noun *τελειώσις* are

¹⁵⁹ Exod 29:22, 26, 27, 31, 34; Lev 7:37; 8:22, 26, 28, 29, 31, 33. Apart from Lev 8:26 these all translate the Hebrew word *מלאים* which refers to ordination and is derived from *מלא* (“to fill”), see *HALOT* 585. In Lev 8:26, 31 the Hebrew expression *סל המצות* (“basket of unleavened bread”) is rendered with *ὁ κανὼν τῆς τελειώσεως* (“the rule of ordination”). Perkins 2007 (*NETS*) consistently translates *τελειώσις* with “validation,” as does Büchner 2007.

¹⁶⁰ Jer 2:2; Jdt 10:9; Sir 34:8.

¹⁶¹ Peterson 1982: 10 suggests that Dibelius made this suggestion in 1921. See also Delling 1972: 80-83; Hübner 1993: 345.

¹⁶² Peterson 1982: 26-30. Delling 1972: 81 suggests that the notion behind the expression is that “someone’s hands are made free from stain ... [so] that the person is ‘able to practise cultus’.”

¹⁶³ *Τελειόω* appears in non-cultic settings in 2 Kgdms 22:26 (ethical perfection or blamelessness); 2 Chron 8:16 (the completion of Solomon’s work building the temple); Ezek 27:11 (perfection of beauty); Jdt 10:8 (fulfilment of plans); 4 Macc 7:15, and Wis 4:13 (geriatric maturity); Sir 7:32 (complete blessing); 31:10 (passing a test); and 50:19 (the completion of an order of worship).

¹⁶⁴ The expression *πληρώω τὰς χεῖρας* also appears with this sense in Exod 32:29 (although this text concerns “consecration” for holy war, see Peterson 1982: 27); Num 7:88; Jud 17:5, 12; 3 Kgdms 13:33; 1 Chron 29:5; 2 Chron 13:9; 29: 31; Sir 45:15; *T. Levi* 8:10. In *T. Levi* 8:10 there is also an indirect object. The text reads *καὶ ἐπλήρωσεν τὰς χεῖρας μου θυμιάματος, ὥστε ἱερατεύειν με κυρίῳ* (“and they filled my hands with incense so that I could serve the Lord as a priest”). In 4QLevi^c 6 (Bodleian a 20) there is no reference to incense. Levi’s hands are simply “filled,” and he “becomes a priest of God forever” (*ומלי ידי* (והוית כהין לאל עלמא). In Exod 28:41, one version of Judges 12:5, and Ezek 43:26, the verb for “to fill” is *ἐμπίπλημι*.

¹⁶⁵ On p. 203 (footnote 55) Peterson concludes that “*τελειώσις* is a short-hand way of referring to the ceremony described by the full phrase *τελειοῦν τὰς χεῖρας*.” He is probably correct, but this consistent usage needs to be brought into the discussion of Hebrews, which Peterson does not do. Scholer 1991: 190 (footnote 2) refers to the absolute use of the noun in these contexts, and then discusses the “diverse way and disparate contexts in which *τελειοῦν* is used in the LXX,” but does not discuss the consistent use of the noun.

consistently used in the Pentateuch to refer to the ordination of priests.¹⁶⁶ This does need to be taken into account when discussing the use of these words in Hebrews.

Ellingworth summarises the senses in which the word can be used: (1) telic, in the sense of bringing something to its intended goal;¹⁶⁷ (2) cultic, in the sense of qualifying a person to participate in worship; (3) ethical, removing imperfection; (4) organic, that is making mature, as in 1 Cor 14:20; (5) temporal, completing a period, as in Luke 2:43; and (6) human, referring to someone's death, as in Luke 13:32.¹⁶⁸

In assessing the use of the word in Hebrews with reference to Jesus, it seems that the context excludes options (3), (4) and (5). Option (6) referring to the death of Jesus is technically a possibility,¹⁶⁹ although it is unlikely as when used in this sense the word suggests the completion of one's allotted life-span which does not seem to be the emphasis in Hebrews. This leaves (1) the telic sense;¹⁷⁰ or (2) the cultic sense. Neither of these is completely satisfying. The telic sense seems insufficient to completely account for the use of the terms with reference to Jesus, and those who opt for the cultic sense usually take other considerations together with it. A combination of these two is preferable.¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁶ Delling 1972: 80-81; Lane 1991a: 57-58. This is denied by Loader 1981: 40-47; Peterson 1982: 25-30; and Scholer 1991: 188-94. That the word *τελειόω* (used absolutely) has this sense in Lev 21:10 is dismissed by Peterson as "an obscure and singular example ..." [and that it is] "too far-fetched to suppose that ... [this text] alone influenced the writer of Hebrews or that his readers would have made the necessary connection." This seems to be special pleading.

¹⁶⁷ This seems equivalent to what Peterson 1982: 66-73 calls a "vocational" sense. Peterson proposes that the perfection of Christ is connected with his ascension and enthronement, following his suffering and death, and also involved "his whole incarnate experience ... but particularly his suffering which equipped him to help those who are similarly tested" (p. 67). All this qualified him to become a high priest. In the final analysis, this seems to be able to be reduced to "the experiences that qualified Christ to become a high priest," which is not far from the idea of consecration, without actually using the word (see Scholer 1991: 193-94). Gäbel 2006: 165 finds Peterson's vocational reading "too general."

¹⁶⁸ Ellingworth 1993: 162 gives Luke 13:22 as the reference here. He clearly means 13:32, which Attridge 1989: 86 reads as the completion of Jesus' messianic ministry. For the ambiguity of the sense of *τελειόω* here, see Nolland 1993: 740-41. This sense is clear in *T. Ab.* A 15: 1 where "the measure of Abraham's life is completed" (*τὸ μέτρον τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ τελειοῦται*).

¹⁶⁹ Attridge 1989: 85-86.

¹⁷⁰ Delitzsch 1868: 1: 119-20. Westcott 1892: 65-67 seems to favour some sort of development until Christ reached human perfection. He sees a process beginning with Christ becoming human, developing through his experience of what it means to be human, until he reached the stage of demonstrating perfection in all that he did. For a telic sense see Moffatt 1924: 31; Manson 1951: 101, 110; Wikgren 1960: 159-67; Montefiore 1964: 61; Buchanan 1972: 31-32; Hughes 1977: 100; Peterson 1982: 66-73; Wilson 1987: 56-57; Attridge 1989: 86-87; Long 1997: 41-42; Guthrie 1998: 108; Koester 2001: 122-25; O'Brien 2010: 107-108. DeSilva 2000b: 112 is also close to this when he translates 2:10 with "for it was fitting for him [God] to bring the pioneer of the salvation of those many sons and daughters ... to the end of his journey though sufferings."

¹⁷¹ Best 1960: 285-86 argues for a double sense, the cultic sense of installation and the telic sense of "attainment of the true end." Delling 1972: 81-84 avoids the term "consecration," but still argues for a cultic reading. Silva 1976: 60-71 argues for the cultic sense, but adds to that the eschatological exaltation of the Son. Schippers 1986: 63-64 has a very brief treatment and notes that the word group appears "nearly always" in Hebrews "with cultic overtones" from the OT usage for priestly ordination. Lane 1991a: 57-58 suggests that

With reference to the cultic use of the word, I note that the expression τελειόω τὰς χεῖρας never appears in Hebrews, and nowhere is there any suggestion of a consecration ritual. Moreover, the humanity of Jesus qualifies him to be a high priest (2:17), not his death and exaltation.¹⁷² By the ritual described with this term the former priests were qualified to stand in the presence of God in the sanctuary, and it is probably this aspect of τελειώσις that is to be emphasised in the way this word is used in Hebrews. As 7:18-19 indicates, the former commandment is set aside because of its weakness, since the law could not make anything perfect (οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος), and a better hope has been introduced through which we can approach God (κρείττονος ἐλπίδος δι' ἧς ἐγγίζομεν τῷ θεῷ) with “unimpeded access.”¹⁷³ The perfection of Jesus is his exaltation to the right hand of God,¹⁷⁴ for his followers it is access, through his self-offering, to glory.

6.4 Conclusion

The first two chapters of Hebrews set the eschatological tone of the book. Hebrews 1 claims that Jesus has been exalted to the right hand of God in the world to come “in these last days,” with the implication that the eschaton has arrived. Hebrews 2 claims that the world to come has been made subject to humanity, and that the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God in this world to come is as a pioneer through whom God is leading the many heirs of salvation to glory. This chapter concerns the salvation of humanity, seen in terms of the restoration of the glory and honour given by God to humanity at the creation, and celebrated in Ps 8.

These ideas set the scene for what will follow in Heb 3-4 where the text makes explicit that this destination is the rest of God in the heavenly temple. I examine this text in the following chapter, along with several texts from the closing chapters of Hebrews that

the cultic idea provides the background, but the “specific designation” is “the eschatological exaltation of Jesus as the fulfilment of the promises of God.” Ellingworth 1993: 162-63 combines the telic and the cultic senses, and adds to these an ethical sense, which he describes not in negative terms as the removal of imperfection, but positively in terms of Christ “being appointed high priest, not on the basis of a purely ritual act, but because of the death he suffered, understood in sacrificial terms.” Vanhoye 1996: 321-38 argues from the cultic sense of τελειόω that the “main point” (κεφάλαιον) of Heb 7:28–8:2 is that there is a priest who has been made perfect forever serving in the heavenly holy of holies and that his self-offering constituted his priestly consecration. However, to this he adds the notion of relational τελείωσις in that he is also made perfect in his relationship with humanity, and existential τελείωσις in the sense that he is made whole and complete. Johnson 2006: 96-97 has a similar analysis.

¹⁷² The τελειώσις of Jesus is always connected with his exaltation, but his death is interpreted as the offering of himself (1:3; 7:27; 9:14, 26, 28; 10:10; 12:2; 13:12), a priestly act. Consequently he needs to be understood as performing priestly functions prior to his exaltation. On this, see Scholer 1991: 85-89. Scholer also reads his offering of loud cries and tears in 5:7 as a priestly act (p. 86), but the word seems not to have a sacrificial sense there (Bruce 1990: 126-27, footnote 43).

¹⁷³ Bruce 1990: 80.

¹⁷⁴ Attridge 1989: 86-87 sees a vocational process so that Christ is “made complete or fit for his office ... consummated in his exaltation.” See also Lindars 1991: 45; Thompson 2008: 73. That this is so is seen when Heb 2:9 is read alongside Heb 2:10—the perfection of Jesus through suffering is set alongside his coronation with glory and honour because of the suffering of death.

negate Jerusalem and the promised land in favour of the heavenly Jerusalem, the city to come, two alternative metaphors that the author uses to refer to the eschatological dwelling of God with his people.

7. The Eschatological Goal of the People of God: Temple Symbolism in Hebrews 3:1–4:11; 11:1–13:16

7.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter I discussed the eschatological orientation of Hebrews, and demonstrated that the text presents Jesus the exalted Son of God as enthroned in the world to come, which God has made subject to humanity, something not yet evident. His exaltation anticipates the glorification of humanity, so that humanity will ultimately reach that goal. In this chapter I carry this discussion forward by examining texts that refer to the eschatological goal of the people of God and texts that claim that the recipients have proleptic access to this goal in the present.

7.2 The House(hold) of God (Heb 3:1-6)

Jesus first appears as a high priest in Heb 2:17-18, a text that claims that he had to become like his siblings in order to be a faithful and merciful high priest. Hebrews 3:1-6 takes up the theme of Jesus the faithful high priest. The pericope is introduced by a call to the holy “brothers (and sisters),” (ἀδελφοὶ ἅγιοι) “who share in a heavenly calling” (κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι),¹ to “consider carefully” Jesus, the apostle and high priest they confess.² The two descriptions of the readers (ἀδελφοὶ ἅγιοι and κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι) continue the themes of the previous chapter where they are referred to as the “siblings” (ἀδελφοί) of Jesus and “the sanctified ones” (οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι), whom Jesus is leading to glory.³ The pericope ends by identifying the readers as the house over which Christ is Son, as long as they hold fast to the boldness and pride of their hope.⁴ The prominence of these opening and closing words indicates the contribution of the pericope to the discussion.⁵ It functions to encourage the readers to endure so that they will remain the house of God,⁶ with the opening and closing parts

¹ Μέτοχος appears five times in Heb (1:9; 3:1, 14; 6:4; 12:8). Apart from 1:9 where it appears in a quotation of Ps 45:7 to refer to the companions of Christ, it refers to things that the people of God participate in. In the NT, outside Hebrews, it only appears in Luke 5:7 referring to “business partners.” The word appears in the LXX in 1 Kgdms 20:30 (where Saul accuses Jonathan of being a “partner” of David); 1 Macc 3:21 (participants in religious rites); Ps 45:7 (LXX 44:8); Ps 119:63; Eccles 4:10 (companions); Hos 1:17 (Ephraim a companion of idols).

² While the reference to the high priest takes the reader back to Heb 2:17-18, the implications of the word “apostle” are more obscure. See Andriessen 1976: 313; Jones 1979: 98; Lane 1991a: 76.

³ O’Brien 2010: 126-27. The conjunction ὅθεν (“hence,” “therefore”) with which the pericope begins indicates that 3:1-6 carries forward the discussion of the preceding chapter.

⁴ After ἐλπίδος Ⲙ, A, C, D, Ψ, the Majority Text and several minuscules and versions add μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν (“firmly until the end”). These words also appear in v. 14, modifying the word ὑπόστασις (“assurance,” feminine singular). Since βέβαιος would need to be βέβαιον (neuter singular) to qualify καύχημα (“pride”) in this verse, the words were probably added from v. 14 (Metzger 1994: 595).

⁵ Long Westfall 2000: 190-92.

⁶ Lane 1991a: 79-80.

existing in a “relationship of expository apposition.”⁷ One explains the other, and those who share in the heavenly calling constitute the house of God as long as they endure.

Between the appeal to the readers and their identification as the house of God, Jesus and Moses are compared.⁸ Jesus is the Son who is faithful *over* God’s house and Moses is the servant who was faithful *in* God’s house. This structure of the pericope is complex.⁹ While the main underlying text is Num 12:7 (ὁ θεράπων μου Μωυσῆς ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ μου πιστός ἐστίν, “my servant Moses is faithful in all my house”), reflected in Heb 3:2, 5, the references to the faithfulness of Jesus and to God’s house echo 1 Chron 17:14 and 1 Sam 2:35.¹⁰

In 1 Chron 17 Nathan forbids David from building “a house (the temple) for God to inhabit” (οἶκον τοῦ κατοικῆσαι με ἐν αὐτῷ), and promises that “the Lord will build a house (dynasty) for David” (καὶ οἶκον οἰκοδομήσει σοι κύριος, 1 Chron 17:10). Nathan also announces that David’s descendant “would build a house (the temple) for God” (αὐτὸς οἰκοδομήσει μοι οἶκον, 17:12),¹¹ and that “God would establish him

⁷ Long Westfall 2000: 192. Οἶκος (“house”) appears six times in the pericope (vv. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) showing that this is the topic of discussion (Long Westfall, p. 189), and the emphatic concluding declaration (“whose house we are”) shifts the focus from Jesus (Heb 1-2) to the readers (p. 192).

⁸ The treatment of Moses in Hebrews is in marked contrast to his treatment elsewhere in middle Judaism. Here he faithfully serves God in God’s house as a servant. Jesus has a different role, as Son over God’s house, where he too was faithful. These different roles imply that Jesus is worthy of more “glory” (δόξα) than Moses. 1 En. 89:36 depicts Moses with an angel-like status; in Ezek. Trag. Moses sits on the throne of God in heaven as God’s vice-regent; Sir 45:2 compares him with the angels in glory; in Philo *Somm.* 2.188-89; *Mos.* 2.70 Moses is in some sense divine; in 4Q *Visions of Amram* (4Q543 3 1; 4Q545 1 I 17) Moses is a Messenger/Angel of God; and in 4Q374 9 3 and 4Q377 Moses is God’s “anointed” (משיח). Many of these texts can be traced back to the influence of Exod 7:1 where Moses is “God/a god” to Pharaoh. This text does not feature in Hebrews. Moses was clearly an important figure in middle Judaism, and it seems unlikely that the author and his readers would not have been aware of some of the ideas reflected in these texts. There is neither polemic against these views, nor the adoption of them. Spicq 1952: 2: 63 surely misses the point when he suggests that the faith of Christ is superior to that of Moses in this pericope. Dey 1975: 155-83 embarks on a long discussion of Moses in Philo and reads this pericope against the background of Moses as “the supreme exemplar of perfection,” which the author needed to combat. These ideas seem far removed from the context in Hebrews.

⁹ D’Angelo 1979: 69. DeSilva 2000b: 137 describes these verses as “convoluted logic ... difficult to untangle.” An allusion to 1 Chron 17:14 (see below) assists in understanding the structure of the pericope, see D’Angelo 1979: 76. For a useful analysis see Long Westfall 2000: 175-201.

¹⁰ Aalen 1961-62: 236; D’Angelo 1979: 65-93; Lane 1991a: 76; Leithart 2000: 59-60; Koester 2001: 243-44; Son 2005: 128-33; Docherty 2009: 184. Isaacs 1992: 136-37 and Ellingworth 1993: 201-202 suggest that the primary reference is to Num 12:7, read in the light of Chron 17:14 and 1 Sam 2:35. But it is more likely that v. 2a is an allusion to 1 Chron 17:14, and v. 2b is an allusion to Num 12:7. Philo *Leg.* 3.103 cites Num 12:7 in the context of a discussion of Moses’ building the tabernacle (*Leg.* 3.102-103). Thompson 2008: 81-82 finds this building activity to be significant for the understanding of Hebrews at this point. However, Moses is simply a counterfoil in Hebrews for a discussion of the faithfulness and glory of Jesus. He builds nothing in Heb 3:1-6.

¹¹ While in 1 Chron 17:12 David’s descendant builds the house, this text is not quoted in Hebrews. In 1 Chron 17:14 God makes David’s descendant faithful, and in 1 Sam 2:35 God does the building. It is debated whether Jesus is depicted as building in Heb 3:3. Attridge 1989: 110; Lane 1991a:72; Isaacs 1992: 136 see vv. 3-4 as general statements about the role of builder, while Williamson 1970: 461; D’Angelo 1979: 70-71;

(David's descendant) in his (God's) house" (the temple), (וְהַעֲמַדְתִּיהוּ בְּבֵיתִי, 17:14), a text that the LXX renders πιστώσω αὐτὸν ἐν οἴκῳ μου ("and I will confirm him in my house"). This text is echoed in Heb 3:2 which describes Jesus as the one who was "faithful to the one who made him" (πιστὸν ὄντα τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν).¹² Moses enters the argument here with the allusion to Num 12:7: faithful, "as was Moses in [all] his (God's) house" (πιστὸν ὄντα τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτὸν ὡς καὶ Μωϋσῆς ἐν [ὅλῳ] τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ).¹³ The Numbers text is left in abeyance until picked up again in v. 5.¹⁴

In 1 Sam 2:34-35 a man of God announces to Eli the priest that his sons would die, bringing his lineage to an end, and that in its place God would "raise up for himself a faithful priest" (καὶ ἀναστήσω ἐμαυτῷ ἱερέα πιστόν), whom "he would build into a sure house" (οἰκοδομήσω αὐτῷ οἶκον πιστόν).

Both of these texts are echoed in Heb 3:1-6.¹⁵ They reflect the theme of the Davidic sonship of Jesus claimed Heb 1:4-6,¹⁶ and they exploit the same ambiguity attached to the

Ellingworth 1993: 195-96 suggest that Jesus is the builder. It is preferable to see Heb 3:3 as a general comment, and 3:4 as the development of this to explain that God builds all things (πάντα). The third corrector of C, the second corrector of D, Ψ, 0278 and the Majority Text include the definite article with πάντα (τὰ πάντα). The article is absent in P13, P46, Ⲙ, A, B, the original hands of C and D, I, K and several minuscules, and the weight of these witnesses indicate that it should be omitted.

¹² This allusion is identified in the margin NA²⁷. πιστόω has the sense of "confirm," and is a passive deponent in its only occurrence in the NT (2 Tim 3:14) where it expresses firm belief. The word appears in the LXX in 2 Sam 7:16; 25; 1 Kings 1:36; 8:26; 1 Chron 17:14, 23; 2 Chron 1:9; 2 Macc 12:25; 3 Macc 4:19; Ps 77:8, 37; 92:5; Sir 27:17; 29:3 in a variety of senses usually related to the confirmation or fulfilment of promises. The semantic range also includes notions of faithfulness (LSJ 1408 where the first definition offered is "make trustworthy"). It is probably in this sense that the author of Hebrews read 1 Chron 17:14 when he referred to Jesus as faithful "to him who 'made' him" (τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν). While ποιέω can have the sense of "appoint" (1 Sam 12:6; Mark 3:14), D'Angelo 1979: 74-75 and Lane 1991a: 76 detect a *double entendre* in this verse with the sense both of "appoint" and "make (faithful)."

¹³ The square brackets around ὅλῳ ("whole") indicate some doubt about this word. It is omitted from P13, P⁴⁶ *vid*, B, one MS of the Vulgate, the Coptic witnesses and Ambrose. It is included in Ⲙ, A, C, D, Ψ, several minuscules, and the Old Latin and Syriac Versions. Metzger 1994: 594 suggests that the word may have been inserted to conform the text to Num 12:7, to which there is another allusion in Heb 3:5 where ὅλῳ does appear. Braun 1984: 80; Attridge 1989: 104; Bruce 1990: 90-92; Johnson 2006: 105-108 think it was added to conform the text to Heb 3:5; while Spicq 1952: 1: 419, and Mitchell 2007: 81-82 think that it is original by comparing it with v. 5. Neither speculates as to how it might have dropped out. Since the allusion is to 1 Chron 17:14 (where ὅλῳ does not feature), rather than to Num 12:7, it should probably be excluded (D'Angelo 1979: 73; Lane 1991a: 71; Koester 2001: 243-44).

¹⁴ D'Angelo 1979: 73-74.

¹⁵ These two texts (1 Chron 7:14; 1 Sam 23:5) are also read with reference to one another in the Targums. *Targum* 1 Chron 17:14 reads וְאֶקְיַמְנִיהּ מִהִימָן בְּעַמִּי בְּבֵית מִקְדָּשִׁי ("and I will establish him as one who is faithful among my people and in my holy house"), and *Tg.* 1 Sam 23:5 reads וְאֶקְיַם קִדְמִי כִּהְיִן מִהִימָן ("and I will raise up before me a faithful priest"). They also seem to be combined in a similar way in CD III 19-20 where God builds "a faithful house" (בֵּית נֶאֱמָן) for them, and those who remain "steadfast" (חֲזִק, cf. κατέχω in Heb 3:6) will acquire eternal life and "all the glory of Adam is for them" (וְכָל כְּבוֹד אָדָם לָהֶם). I do not propose that Hebrews depends on CD or the Targums, rather all three texts evidence the combination of these two OT texts to refer to the community as a "house of God." On this see Aalen 1961-62: 235; D'Angelo 1979: 87-89. Isaacs 1992: 137 thinks that any allusion to 1 Sam 2:35 here is unlikely since Jesus' role as Son here is more dominant than his role as priest. But it is difficult to separate these roles in Hebrews.

word οἶκος (“house”) that Nathan exploits with בית in 2 Sam 7 and 1 Chron 17:14. While the primary sense of οἶκος is “household” in both Heb 3:1-6 and Num 12:7, the allusion to 1 Chron 17:14 brings temple symbolism with it, especially as read in the Targums.¹⁷ While this is not developed at this point in the argument of Hebrews, it anticipates the later discussion of the heavenly temple in Heb 8.

The identification of the people of God as “sharers in a heavenly calling” (κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι, 3:1), and as “the house(hold) of God over whom Christ is the Son” (Χριστὸς δὲ ὡς υἱὸς ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ· οὗ οἶκος ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς, 3:6)¹⁸ are significant. The heavenly calling is the eschatological goal of the people of God described in 2:5-11, the glory that Christ is leading them to,¹⁹ the “true realm of God’s presence.”²⁰ And while the house of God is probably primarily God’s “household,”²¹ given the relationship between the opening and closing sentences there is probably a *double entendre* intended, with temple imagery not far beneath the surface.²² The people of God are called to share in the

¹⁶ Lane 1991a: 76.

¹⁷ See *Tg. Ps.-J.* Num 12:7, **דמשה עבדי בכל בית ישראל עמי מהימן הוא** (“as for Moses my servant, he is faithful in all the house of Israel my people”), and *Tg. Onq.* Num 12:7, **עבדי משה בכל עמי מהימן הוא** (“Moses my servant is faithful among all my people”). There is a variant reading in *Tg. Onq.* here, with some texts reading **ביתי** (“my house”) in place of **עמי** (“my people”), see Sperber 2004: 998. For a brief discussion of the date of the Targums, see Church 2008: 149 (footnote 21) and the bibliography listed there.

¹⁸ The antecedent of αὐτοῦ in this sentence is probably God rather than Christ (Koester 2001: 247; O’Brien 2010: 134-35). The reading οὗ οἶκος (“whose house”) is supported by P¹³, **Ⲅ**, A, B, C, the corrector of D, I, K, P, **Ψ**, and several minuscules and versions. A variant reading ὅς οἶκος (“which house”) is supported by P⁴⁶, the original hand of D, and several versions and minuscules. The evidence for the reading οὗ οἶκος is much stronger, and it should be retained. Metzger 1994: 359 suggests that the alternative reading may have arisen to clarify that Christians are God’s house rather than Christ’s house.

¹⁹ O’Brien 2010: 138. For this reading see also Attridge 1989: 106-107; Lane 1991a: 74; Guthrie 1998: 126. The adjective ἐπουράνιος appears six times in Hebrews. See 3:1 (“heavenly calling”); 6:4 (“heavenly gift”); 8:5 and 9:23 (“heavenly things”); 11:16 (“heavenly country”); 12:22 (“heavenly Jerusalem”). In the present context it is likely to be a call to “heaven,” that is, to the eschatological goal of the people of God where they exercise dominion over the world to come. Ellingworth 1993: 198, followed by Johnson 2006: 106 suggests that the heavenly calling is “directly from, and indirectly to, heaven,” but this probably places the emphasis in the wrong place. Koester 2001: 242 reverses the order, suggesting that the destination is primary and the origin of the call secondary. Spicq 1952: 2: 64 spreads the weight evenly, “the objective call coming from God and inviting to the heavenly life.”

²⁰ Attridge 1989: 106.

²¹ Ibid.: 111; Ellingworth 1993: 196. Isaacs 1992: 80 denies that οἶκος has any temple connotations in this pericope. Son 2005: 132-33 argues on the basis of parallel expressions in Heb 3:6: 8:8; 10:19-21 (παρρησία, ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον, ἀδελφοί) “proves that the ‘house’ in Hebrews 3:6 refers to a priestly community over which Jesus is the high priest, and which enters the Most Holy Place by the blood of Jesus (10:19-21). While this is possible, to speak in terms of “proof” in connection with an ancient text is problematic. Moreover, that the community is a “priestly community” is questionable. For the identification of the house as a “priestly house” see Leithart 2000: 60 and the critique of Leithart in Motyer 2004: 182. Motyer appears to have changed his mind from an unpublished version of this work cited by Son 2005: 133 (Motyer’s student).

²² Ellingworth 1993: 197.

heavenly temple/house, built by God.²³ While this theme remains undeveloped here, the pericope serves as a preliminary announcement that those who remain faithful will ultimately have a place in the eschatological temple,²⁴ the subject of the following pericope (Heb 3:7–4:11).

7.3 God's Rest (3:7–4:11)

As the inferential conjunction διό (“therefore”) at the beginning of Heb 3:7 indicates, this section develops the claim of 3:6 that only those who persevere constitute the “house” of God.²⁵ On the basis of Ps 95 (LXX 94):7b-11, which he quotes in Heb 3:7b-11,²⁶ the author exhorts the readers to remain faithful lest they fall away from God (3:12).²⁷ Here, the Exodus and wilderness imagery implicit until now becomes explicit as the faithless and disobedient wilderness generation is held up as an example (ὑπόδειγμα, 4:11) to avoid.²⁸ The Psalm tells of those who rebelled against God and were forbidden to enter God’s rest, and is expounded to encourage the people of God to strive to enter that rest. The structure

²³ Moffatt 1924: 42; Spicq 1952: 67-68; Buchanan 1972: 57-58; Attridge 1989: 104, 110; Mitchell 2007: 82 treat Heb 3:4 as a parenthetical comment. It is better to read it as making the significant claim that God is the one who “builds” or “prepares” (κατασκευάζω) all things. O’Brien 2010: 132-33 suggests that all things include “the rest, the glory, and the city that God has prepared for his people (2:10; 4:4, 10; 11:16).” See also Koester 2001: 245. To this, I also add the “true tent” of Heb 8:2 and the “heavenly” house of 3:6, both references to the eschatological temple of the last days to be built by God. For the integral part of v. 4 in the argument see Lane 1991a: 72-73; Ellingworth 1993: 204-205; O’Brien 2010: 132-33.

²⁴ Gärtner 1965: 67-68; Peterson 1982: 154. The text exploits the multiple senses of οἶκος here, where the sense moves from house to dynasty and then to temple.

²⁵ Attridge 1989: 114; Guthrie 1998: 129; O’Brien 2010: 135. In 3:1-6 Moses was faithful; in 3:7-19 the people he led in the wilderness are shown to be unfaithful. Moreover, Heb 3:1-6 demonstrates that the one “house” of God includes the wilderness generation (vv. 2-5), as well as the recipients of Hebrews (v. 6). This allows the author to apply to his readers a Psalm he would have read as addressed to the community worshipping in Solomon’s temple, which draws an example from the wilderness generation. See Enns 1993: 269-72. I discuss the *Sitz im Leben* of Psalm 95 in 7.3.1 (below).

²⁶ Since I am only concerned with the reference to God’s rest in v. 11 of the Psalm quotation, I will not take the time to analyse the difference between the text quoted in Hebrews and the extant LXX text. These changes are peripheral to my study. For the details see Lane 1991a: 86; Enns 1993: 273-78; Wray 1998: 64-66; O’Brien 2010: 143-44. Kistemaker 1961: 36 suggests that the changes arose out of the use of the Psalm in worship rather than being introduced by the author. The actual text known to the author is irrecoverable, and it is unknown whether or not the differences between the text appearing in Heb 3:7-11 and the extant LXX text were the result of editorial activity.

²⁷ Note the imperatives in 3:12, 13, and the hortatory subjunctives in 3:14; 4:1, 11.

²⁸ In Heb 1:6a God “leads” (εἰσάγω) the firstborn into the coming world, and 2:10 God “leads” (ἄγω) many heirs to glory. In 2:15-16 Jesus becomes human to free the descendants of Abraham from “slavery” (δουλεία, cf. Exod 6:2-6; 13:3, 14; 20:2; Lev 26:45 [LXX]; Deut 5:6; 6:12; 7:8; 8:14; 13:6, 11; Judg 6:8; 1 Kings 9:9 [LXX]; Jer 41:13; Mic 6:4). Also, the reference to the faithfulness of Moses in 3:1-6 recalls the Exodus and wilderness wanderings. The wilderness generation and the recipients of Hebrews were in analogous situations, both travelling to a goal (Deut 12:9; Heb 2:10) and both in danger of rebellion (Enns 1993: 272). Osborne 1975: 147-48; Goppelt 1982: 171-72; Gleason 2000: 286-88 discuss the use of typology in the application of the experiences of the wilderness generation to the present generation in this part of Hebrews.

is quite complex, but attention to the verb forms, the conjunctions connecting the sentences and paragraphs, and the repeated citations of the Psalm can clarify this.²⁹

The quotation of the Psalm (3:7b-11) is followed by two plural imperatives. One βλέπετε (“see to it”) directs the readers to avoid hard-heartedness, which could result in some falling away from the living God, and the other παρακαλεῖτε (“encourage”) enjoins mutual daily encouragement for the same reason. These imperatives are supported in v. 14 by a clause corresponding to 3:6, explaining that only those who retain (κατέχω) their confidence to the end are partners of Christ. The repetition of the first person plural subjunctive of κατέχω (κατάσχωμεν) at the end of vv. 6 and 14 forms an inclusio around these verses, and the appearance of καρδιά (“heart”) in v. 12 and σκληρύνω (“to harden”) in v. 13 indicates that hard-heartedness is the presenting issue (3:8, 15; 4:3).

The quotation of Ps 95:7b-8a in Heb 3:15 is followed by three rhetorical questions, all beginning with the interrogative particle τίς (“who”). The first is joined to the Psalm citation with the causal particle γάρ, and the other two are connected to the first with the conjunction δέ. These three questions ask to whom particular phrases from the Psalm apply, and the answers identify those who left Egypt under Moses as the ones who rebelled for forty years and who were forbidden to enter God’s rest. Verse 19 concludes the chapter with the mutual recognition (βλέπομεν, “we see”) that the wilderness generation was forbidden to enter God’s rest because of “unbelief” (ἀπιστία). The repetition of βλέπω and ἀπιστία in vv. 12 and 19 form an inclusio around these verses.³⁰

Hebrews 4:1-11 applies the same argument to the readers of Hebrews, recognising that the promise of entering God’s rest “remains in place” (καταλείπω, 4:1). This chapter opens and closes with hortatory subjunctives: φοβηθῶμεν (“let us take care,” v. 1) and σπουδάσωμεν (“let us make every effort,” v.11), forming an inclusio around the section. Both of these subjunctives relate to God’s rest: the readers are to take care that none of

²⁹ There are different opinions as to where this section ends. Hebrews 4:12 begins with the causal particle γάρ, showing that vv 12-13 explain in some way what has preceded. These verses support the urgency of the appeal from the text of the Psalm with the claim that “what God is saying is living and effective” (Ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐνεργής ...). The exhortation is ultimately to hear what God is saying in the Psalm and apply it to their lives; something the wilderness generation did not do (4:2). Since this is the case, it is best to see the pericope extending to the end of 4:13 (Hofius 1970c: 54; Käsemann 1984: 17; Braun 1984: 85; Bruce 1990: 90; Grässer 1990-97: 2: 173; Strobel 1991: 40; Enns 1993: 278; Guthrie 1998: 144; Wray 1998: 56-57; DeSilva 2000b: 131; Koester 2001: 276-77; Johnson 2006: 122-23; Thompson 2008: 78-79; O’Brien 2010: 139, 156). Vanhoye 1989: 26 and Lane 1991a: 96-97 extend it to 4:14, since 4:14 begins with the inferential conjunction οὖν (“so then, therefore”) indicating that it expresses the implications of what precedes. Nevertheless, it is odd to separate vv. 14 and 15, since v. 15 begins with γάρ, and consequently Ellingworth 1993: 212-13 ends the section at v. 16. Kistemaker 1961: 108; Weiss 1991: 254; Laansma 1997: 283; Thompson 2008: 92 end it at 4:11. I work with 3:7–4:11, conscious, nevertheless, that vv. 12-13 are closely related.

³⁰ Lane 1991a: 83; O’Brien 2010: 140. Guthrie 1994: 67 refers to a shift to the first person plural in 4:3, and includes Heb 4:1-2 with Heb 3:12-19, starting a new section with 4:3. But surely the shift to the first person plural is in 3:19.

them are judged to have “missed” (ὑστερέω) it, and they are to make every effort to “enter” (εἰσερχομαι) it. Between these, the author gives two arguments to support the claim that the promise of entering God’s rest was still open (vv. 3-5; 6-11).³¹

The first argument is based on the reference to God’s rest in Ps 95:11, quoted in Heb 4:3, and read in conjunction with Gen 2:2 where the verb καταπαύω (“to rest”) appears for first time in the LXX, and with God as the subject. That God entered his rest at the creation and that he later forbade certain people from entering his rest demonstrates that God’s rest is still available to be entered.

The second argument is based on Ps 95:7b-8a, which opens with the word “today” (σήμερον), quoted in Heb 4:7. Since “David” could refer to God’s rest long after the people entered the promised land under Joshua, Joshua could not have given them the rest referred to in the Psalm. Moreover, since “David” speaks in terms of “today,” the “today” of the Psalm still applies to the readers of Hebrews. Consequently, there remains “a Sabbath celebration” (σαββατισμός) for the people of God, which they must make every effort to enter.

I need to identify the referent of God’s “rest” (κατάπαυσις) in the exposition of Ps 95 in Heb 3-4, where the noun appears six times (3:18; 4:1, 3, 5, 10, 11), the verb καταπαύω (“to rest”) three times (vv. 4, 8, 12), as well as the pronoun αὐτός with God’s rest as the antecedent in v. 6.

The interpretation of this part of Hebrews is dominated by two streams, represented by Ernst Käsemann and Ottfried Hofius respectively. The pericope itself is the basis of the title of Käsemann’s 1939 work, *Das wandernde Gottesvolk*, in which he argued that Hebrews was to be read against the background of pre-Christian Gnosticism, mediated through Philo of Alexandria.³² Käsemann argued that the notion of “rest” in this part of Hebrews, while dependent on the OT, did not solely come from the OT. Rather, the OT quotations here served “to anchor in Scripture a speculation already in existence.”³³ For Käsemann the

³¹ Attridge 1980: 281; Lane 1991a: 95-96; Leschert 1994: 124-27. The words εἰσερχομαι εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν form an inclusio in vv. 1, 5; and again in vv. 6, 11. Lane also notes the citation from the Psalm in the centre of each paragraph to keep it in the readers’ minds. Laansma 1997: 285-87 treats vv. 3-10 as a single block, which he analyses into four sections (1-2, 3a, 3b-5, 6-8, 9-10) surrounded by opening and closing exhortations. For a similar structural analysis see O’Brien 2010: 157-58. Certainly, these verses are closely argued, with γάρ (“for”) appearing five times, οὖν (“then”) three times and ἄρα (“then”) once. The only verses not beginning with one of these conjunctions are v. 5 which connects the quotes from Gen 2:2 and Ps 95:11 with καί, and v. 7, which is the apodosis of the “since, then” clause that begins in v. 6. Nevertheless, it is helpful to recognise the two arguments in vv. 3-5 and 6-10, one based on the reference to God’s rest in Gen 2:2 and the other based on God’s speech about his rest through “David.”

³² Käsemann 1939: 5-58. I refer generally to the English translation of Käsemann’s second German edition (1957), 1984: 17-96.

³³ Käsemann 1984: 74. To be sure, Käsemann saw this rest as a heavenly location (p. 68), but reached this conclusion via Gnostic speculation rather than from the OT itself.

notion of “rest,” as expressed in two Greek words that he considered to be synonymous (κατάπαυσις, σαββατισμός), “found its historical origin in the notion of the aeons, according to which the highest aeon, the realm of the divine Spirit, the Sabbath, and the ἀνάπαυσις are identical.”³⁴

Against Käsemann, Hofius argues that the background of the idea of rest is to be found in the OT and in Jewish apocalyptic. Ultimately, God’s rest, which the people of God enter (Heb 4:3, 9), is in the world to come, specifically in the holy of holies of the heavenly sanctuary.³⁵ While more recent scholars have modified Hofius’ position, the idea that God’s rest is connected in some way with the world to come, and that this world to come is somehow connected with a heavenly and eschatological temple, has proved to be influential.³⁶

While the author of Hebrews never defines what he means by “rest,”³⁷ that he bases his exhortations to his readers on the OT, and in particular Ps 95:11, indicates that this text was an important influence on his thinking. Accordingly, I start with this text and then seek to explain the understanding of God’s rest in Heb 3-4 against its background.³⁸

³⁴ Ibid.: 73. Those who depend on Käsemann to one degree or another include Thompson 1982: 81-102; 2008: 78-100; Theissen 1969; Lombard 1971: 60-71; Braun 1984: 90-93; Grässer 1990-97: 210-11; Wray 1998: 51-94; Johnson 2006: 111-37. See the critiques in Williamson 1970: 539-57; Lincoln 1982: 208; Hurst 1990: 68-71. Thompson 1982: 88-91 critiques Käsemann’s analysis, noting that the notion of rest in Gnostic texts sometimes depends on “biblical and common usage” (p. 89), and ultimately “was not a Gnostic category; it was a useful term for those who read the Bible with Platonic assumptions” (p. 91).

³⁵ Hofius 1970c: 53, 60, 102, 110. Vanhoye 1971: 67-69 argues that this theory is too simplistic. He notes (p. 68) that Hofius extends his theory to all of Hebrews, but really only treats Heb 3-4. Moreover, I will argue below that it is unlikely that the author of Hebrews envisaged the heavenly temple as a bicameral sanctuary with an outer and an inner court in such a way that the holy of holies can be identified like this. Laansma 1997: 314-16 likewise critiques Hofius’ position, although in a more recent publication (2008b: 12) he notes, “I still hesitate over some of Hofius’ argumentation and I am not sure I wish to make the referent as precise as he seems to, but I am more inclined now than I was then to view the heavenly temple and its Most Holy Place as included in the κατάπαυσις in Hebrews 3-4.”

³⁶ While there is a broad spectrum of opinions, the arguments of Hofius are adopted to one degree or another by Lane 1991a: 80-105; Ellingworth 1993: 212-71; DeSilva 2000b: 140-78; Koester 2001: 254-81; O’Brien 2010: 138-79. See also the thorough study of Laansma 1997: 10-123; 251-358. Attridge 1989: 126-28 argues for a mediating position between Hofius and Käsemann.

³⁷ Leschert 1994: 127-29 lists a variety of proposals that have been offered.

³⁸ Attridge 1980: 279-80 notes that attention to supposed parallels in other literature can “obscure the dynamics of Hebrews’ argument.” It is important, therefore, to concentrate on that argument and its background in the LXX (see Laansma 1997: 253-358). Indeed, there seems to be little, if any, evidence for the existence of Gnosticism or even “proto-gnosticism” at the stage when Hebrews is thought to be written. See Hengel 1976: 33-45 for a further negative assessment of any Gnostic influence on the NT, and on Hebrews in particular, p. 86 (footnote 147); Wilson 1987: 25-27; 75-76; Laansma 1997: 255-57. Theissen 1969:123-29, one of the main defenders of Käsemann’s theory, refers to early Gnosticism, defined as “a return to the source before creation.” This definition of Gnosticism is so broad to be almost all-encompassing. I also note that κατάπαυσις appears once in Philo in the context of the murder of Cain (*Q.G.* 1.76), and καταπαύω just nine times. In *Leg.* 1. 5, 6, 16, 18 Philo argues not that God rested on the seventh day, but that God “caused to rest,” since God οὐ παύεται δὲ ποιῶν αὐτός (“he does not cease from creating”). In *Leg.* 3.169 Philo uses καταπαύω of the dew lying round about; he cites Gen 2:2 in *Post.* 64; and in *Post.* 183 Phinehas

7.3.1 God's Rest in Psalm 95

Psalm 95:1-7a is a dual call to worship motivated by the character and deeds of Yahweh, and vv. 7b-11 is a prophetic announcement addressed to the gathering worshippers. The dual call to worship (95:1-2, 6) is followed by two reasons why Yahweh should be worshipped (95:3-5, 7a).³⁹ The exhortations “to come before his presence” (נִקְדְּמָה פָּנָיו, v. 2) and to kneel “before Yahweh” (לִפְנֵי יְהוָה, v. 6) make it likely this Psalm is part of a temple liturgy, for that is where Yahweh was encountered.⁴⁰ That the second part of the Psalm is quite different has led some scholars to posit the joining of two different compositions. But a comparison with Ps 50, and especially with Ps 81, shows that this hypothesis is unnecessary and that the Psalm should be seen as a unity.⁴¹ The situation envisaged is somewhat like that in Jer 7:26 where the prophet stands at the gate of the temple and accosts the gathering worshippers.⁴²

The prophetic announcement (quoted in Heb 3) is an urgent call to the worshippers to listen to the voice of Yahweh “today,”⁴³ and not to harden their hearts like the wilderness generation at Massah and Meribah.⁴⁴ Yahweh loathed that generation for forty years and swore, “they will not enter my rest” (מְנוּחָתִי).

7.3.2 God's Rest in LXX Psalm 95:11

The LXX of Ps 95:11,⁴⁵ quoted in Heb 3:11, 18; 4:3, 5, renders the Hebrew expression מְנוּחָתִי with κατάπαυσις μου (“my rest”). Like מְנוּחָה, κατάπαυσις can refer either to

“puts an end” (καταπαύω) to the apostasy connected with the worship of Baal of Peor (Num 25). All this is far removed from Heb 3-4. Hofius 1970c: 29-33 finds κατάπαυσις only twice in Gnostic writings, both of which he argues are dependent on Hebrews 3-4. On this see Laansma 1997: 261 (footnote 38).

³⁹ Goldingay 2008: 88-89; Human 2010: 152-54. See the chart in Westermann 1981: 131 for other Psalms displaying this pattern, and the discussion in Hossfeld 1994: 30.

⁴⁰ Hofius 1970c: 33; Davies 1973: 187; Tate 1990: 498-99; Hossfeld 1994: 30-32; Hossfeld and Zenger 2005: 461.

⁴¹ Hofius 1970c: 33; Braulik 1986: 33-39; Kraus 1989: 459-60; Tate 1990: 498-99; Enns 1993: 255-69; Hossfeld 1994: 30-32; Hossfeld and Zenger 2005: 459-60; Prinsloo 1995: 393-94; Goldingay 2008: 89; O'Brien 2010: 141. See the review of earlier scholarship in Davies 1973: 184-87. Recently, Frevel 2010: 175 has claimed that there are several reasons to see the second part of the Psalm as “a redactional addition,” but declines to identify or discuss them.

⁴² Weiser 1962: 625; Hofius 1970c: 33; Davies 1973: 192. While this may be a literary fiction, it is almost certain that the author of Hebrews would have read the Psalm as a liturgy for Solomon's temple.

⁴³ For similar urgency expressed by הַיּוֹם (“today”) see Deut 4:8, 26, 39, 40; 5:1, 3, 24; 6:6; 7:11; 8:1, 11, 19; 9:1, 3; 10:13; 11: 2, 8, 13, 26, 27, 28, 32; 13:19; 15:5, 15; 19:9; 27:1, 4, 9; 28:1, 13, 14, 15; 30:2, 8, 11, 15, 16, 18, 19.

⁴⁴ Massah and Meribah are stylised references probably referring to the entire wilderness journey as the reference to the forty-year period in Ps 95:10 indicates. Massah and Meribah occur together in Exod 17:17 (early in the wilderness period) and Deut 33:8 (near the end). Num 20:13 refers to Meribah, also near the end of the wilderness period. See Davies 1973: 193-94; Braulik 1986: 37; Enns 1993: 265-67; Prinsloo 1995: 403. In the LXX these words are translated as παραπικρασμός (“rebellion”) and πειρασμός (“testing”), which removes the specific places, and characterises the entire wilderness period as rebellion (O'Brien 2010: 142).

⁴⁵ The LXX Psalm is 94. I continue to refer to Ps 95 for convenience.

a state or a place of rest.⁴⁶ **κατάπαυσις** appears just thirteen times in the LXX, some of which are not relevant for this study.⁴⁷ It is a state of rest in 3 Kgdms 8:56, and elsewhere it is a resting place. Apart from Ps 95:11, it appears in Deut 12:9 in apposition to **κληρονομία** (“inheritance”) to refer to rest in the promised land; in 2 Chron 6:41 Solomon invites Yahweh to go to his **κατάπαυσις** (“resting place”) in the Temple; in Jdt 9:8 the tabernacle is described as τὸ σκηνῶμα τῆς καταπαύσεως τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς δόξης σου (“the tabernacle where your glorious name rests”);⁴⁸ in Ps 132 (LXX 131):14 the temple is Yahweh’s resting place; and in Isa 66:1 Yahweh asks ποῖον οἶκον οἰκοδομήσετε μοι; ἢ ποῖος τόπος τῆς καταπαύσεώς μου; (“what sort of house will you build for me, or what is my resting place?”). Thus, in the LXX the people’s resting place is their inheritance in the land, and Yahweh’s resting place is the temple.⁴⁹

The sense in which the notion of rest is to be understood in Ps 95:11 is debated, with some arguing that a place of rest is in view,⁵⁰ and others that the verse refers either to rest from enemies or some other sense of “resting.”⁵¹ The reference to the wilderness period and Yahweh’s denial of permission for the rebellious people to enter the promised land make it almost certain that entry to the promised land is the referent,⁵² whether or not the nuance of rest from enemies is also present.

⁴⁶ For **מנוחה** see HALOT 600; Oswalt 2002: 56-59. For a state of rest see Ruth 1:9; 2 Sam 7:14; 1 Kings 8:56; 1 Chron 22:9; Isa 28:12; Jer 45:3. For a resting place see Gen 49:15; Num 10:33; 1 Chron 28:2; Ps 132:8, 14; Isa 11:10; 32:18; 66:1; Mic 2:10; Zech 9:1. The merging of the senses is seen in such texts as Deut 12:10; 25:19; 2 Chron 14:7 (MT 14:6); Isa 14:3 where hiphil of the verb **נח** is used in connection with the gift of the land, so that not only does God give the land to his people, he also gives them rest from their enemies in that land. For rest in connection with the temple see 2 Sam 7:1, 11; 1 Kings 8:56; 1 Chron 22:9. For **κατάπαυσις** see BDAG 523-24. Lombard 1971: 60-71 and Wray 1998: 52-94 overlook the local sense of both **מנוחה** and **κατάπαυσις** and give a one-sided reading of “rest” as a state of repose.

⁴⁷ In Exod 35:2 the people are to do work on six days and “do” rest on the seventh day; in Num 10:35 the Ark of the Covenant comes to rest; in Jud 20:43 (A) Benjamin “stops”; in 1 Chron 6:16 the Ark of the Covenant rests in the temple; 2 Macc 15:1 refers to the Sabbath as the “day of rest”; and in Sir 5:6 Yahweh’s wrath rests on sinners.

⁴⁸ This text is part of a prayer that Yahweh would break the power of the Assyrians, who intended to defile Yahweh’s “sanctuary” (τὰ ἁγία), and pollute the tabernacle where his glorious name rests. Thus, this text reflects the traditions of Yahweh resting in the temple (Laansma 1997: 83-84).

⁴⁹ Hofius 1970c: 49-50. Laansma 1997: 89.

⁵⁰ Hofius 1970c: 35-37. Laansma 1997: 44 refers to a “mundane and tangible good.”

⁵¹ Weiser 1962: 627 reads **מנוחה** in Ps 95:11 as “peace.” von Rad 1966: 95 reads it as “in the ‘pleasant land’, at rest from all enemies,” and later (p. 99) to “a gift which Israel will find only by a wholly personal entering into its God.” Kraus 1989: 248 combines in the entry to the promised land and “a salvific blessing that is not material but personal, and that has its root and center in God himself.”

⁵² Weiser 1962: 627; Anderson 1972: 2: 680; Kraus 1989: 461; Tate 1990: 498; Prinsloo 1995: 405; Laansma 1997: 41-42; Goldingay 2008: 97. See Num 14:23, 30; 32: 10-13; Deut 1:34-35; 4:21; Josh 5:6.

Some who read Yahweh's rest in Ps 95:11 as a place of rest suggest that it refers to the temple.⁵³ In this context, Hofius argues that the notion of rest has three referents in the OT:⁵⁴ in some texts it refers to the land as the resting place of Israel;⁵⁵ in some texts it refers to the resting place of Yahweh;⁵⁶ and in some texts it refers to the resting place of both Israel and Yahweh; the category that Hofius includes Ps 95:11 in.⁵⁷ While questions have been raised about this analysis,⁵⁸ there are several reasons why the notion of the temple as God's resting place in Ps 95:11 should not be dismissed too quickly.

First, in both the MT and the LXX the rest is qualified with a first person pronoun referring to Yahweh. Elsewhere, where this is the case the expression always refers to the temple as Yahweh's resting place.⁵⁹ Secondly, while the primary referent in the Psalm is the promised land, the land itself does not exhaust the significance of the promise of rest. Rather, the land is to be recognised as a holy place, with increasing levels of holiness culminating in the temple⁶⁰ and, indeed, Exod 15:17 can be read as indicating that the temple as the dwelling place of Yahweh was the ultimate goal of the Exodus.⁶¹ Thirdly, in the *Sitz im Leben* of the Psalm, the address to the worshippers at the gate of the temple is a call to hear the voice of Yahweh, lest they too are barred from entering the resting place of Yahweh, that is, the temple.⁶² Finally, this reading has ancient attestation, with the Targum

⁵³ Hofius 1970c: 35-48; Lincoln 1982: 208; Braulik 1986 33-44; Laansma 1997: 41-45 (cautiously); Hossfeld and Zenger 2005: 461.

⁵⁴ Hofius 1970c: 37-39.

⁵⁵ Deut 3:20; 12:9-10; 25:19.

⁵⁶ 2 Chron 6:41; Ps 132:8, 14.

⁵⁷ 1 Chron 23:25.

⁵⁸ Laansma 1997: 42 is right to note that in no case in the MT does מנוחה refer "simultaneously to the land *qua* Israel's resting place and the temple building *qua* YHWH's resting place." This also applies to κατάπαυσις.

⁵⁹ Ps 132:1, 14; Isa 66:1. In 2 Chron 6:41 Solomon invites Yahweh to go to "your resting place" (ἡ κατάπαυσις σου) in the newly constructed temple. For the reference to the temple in Ps 132: 8, 14, see Hofius 1970c: 37-38; Kraus 1989: 480-82; Laansma 1997: 39-40, 42. Hossfeld 1994: 39 argues that the pronominal suffix in Ps 95 is a subjective genitive, with the sense "the resting place that Yahweh would provide for Israel." While this is possible in the context of the Psalm and its background in Deut 12:9 and 1 Kings 8:56, since a genitive pronominal suffix attached to this noun elsewhere refers to the rest of Yahweh himself it tends to suggest an objective genitive (the resting of Yahweh or his resting place). On p. 461 Hossfeld also suggests that Yahweh's rest has "rich connotations ranging from the land as heritage, to the Temple, to peace with God."

⁶⁰ Davies 1974: 94, 150-53.

⁶¹ See my discussion of this text in 1.3 (above).

⁶² Hofius 1970c: 41-41; Bruce 1990: 97-98; Hossfeld 1994: 30-32; Leschert 1994: 163-68. Laansma 1997: 41-45 is sceptical of this reading, noting that the actual use of the Psalm cannot be tied to either Solomon's temple or to the second temple. Gerstenberger 1988: 28 argues, "we have to read the Psalter as a whole in the light of Jewish community organisation in Persian and Hellenistic times ... [they] were read and prayed in local assemblies and, at least primarily, not in the temple community of Jerusalem ... In short at this latest stage the Psalter is not exactly a hymnbook of the second temple but more precisely a hymnbook of many synagogal communities that lived with their hearts turned toward the Holy City but ritually independent of her."

reading מנוחתִי (“my rest”) as לְנִייהַ בֵּית מִקְדָּשִׁי (“the rest of my sanctuary”).⁶³ In conclusion, while in the context of Ps 95:11 God’s rest is primarily the entrance to the promised land under Joshua, the temple lies beneath the surface as the ultimate goal of the Exodus and conquest.⁶⁴

The verb καταπαύω appears sixty-seven times in the LXX, although not all are relevant for this study.⁶⁵ Two groups of texts are significant. Genesis 2:2, quoted in Heb 4:4, refers to God resting on the seventh day, as do Gen 2:3 and the motive clauses for the Sabbath command in Exod 20:11; 31:17. The people are commanded to rest (καταπαύω) on the Sabbath in Exod 34:21.⁶⁶ In the context of Sabbath keeping, Yahweh rests (καταπαύω), and in one text (Exod 34:21), the people are to rest.

Another significant use of καταπαύω refers to the rest that Yahweh gives his people from their enemies. In this sense, the word is relatively frequent.⁶⁷ In Exod 33:14 Yahweh promises Moses that his presence will go with him and he will give him rest, while the remaining instances refer to the rest of the people in Deuteronomy, Joshua, 1-2 Chronicles

Nevertheless, since the author of Hebrews following the LXX attributes this Psalm to “David” (Heb 4:7), he could also conceivably understand it as being related to Solomon’s temple. That it intimates temple worship may be a literary fiction to twenty-first century readers, but not necessarily so in the eyes of a first century reader, even if he had experienced its use in a synagogue. Weiss 1996: 677 also finds the liturgical association of the Psalm conjectural, and makes the questionable claim that the notion that “in antiquity authors quoting earlier sources were concerned with their contexts” is problematic. See the discussion of the “Davidization” of the fourth book of Psalms in Frevel 2010: 184-85. Strangely, Human 2010: 161 thinks that the attribution of the Psalm to David is “a definite interpretation of the author of Hebrews.”

⁶³ *Ps. Rab.* 95:11 notes that God’s rest is “the Land of Israel ... and also Zion,” referring to Deut 12:9 and Ps 132:13-14. Ps 95:11 is cited three times in the *Midrash Rabbah*. In *Lev. Rab.* 32:2 the text is read to say that while they would not enter (my rest), they would enter another rest. This is explained with reference to a king who decreed that his son would not enter his palace, and destroyed the palace and built another. In *Num. Rab.* 14:9 this text is invoked to explain why Moses was unable to enter the Tent of Meeting as long as the cloud was there. In *Qob. Rab.* the same example as in *Lev. Rab.* 32:2 is adduced, although Braude notes (p. 282, footnote 1) that “[d]riven from the first Temple they will be allowed to enter the second Temple.” *T. San.* 13:10 uses Ps 95:11 to claim that the wilderness generation has no share in the world to come, as also *b. San* 110b. Hofius 1970c: 41-47 discusses these texts.

⁶⁴ See my discussion of Sir 24 (2.2.1, above) where Wisdom rests in the temple.

⁶⁵ In some contexts καταπαύω simply refers to the cessation of some activity (e.g. Gen 49:33; Exod 5:5). It appears in a similar sense, but transitively, in Num 25:11 where Phinehas causes Yahweh’s anger to cease. In Josh 3:3 the feet of those carrying the ark rest in the waters of the Jordan. In Ruth 2:7, Ruth works in the corn fields all day, without resting. See Laansma 1997: 79, 90 for tables listing the various Greek words for rest with their Hebrew equivalents.

⁶⁶ The rest that the people of God are to observe on the Sabbath is normally described as doing no work, and there is no word for “rest” in that context, although in Exod 31:15 ἀνάπαυσις, the near synonym of κατάπαυσις is used to describe the Sabbath as “a holy rest for the Lord” (ἀνάπαυσις ἁγία τῷ κυρίῳ). The word ἀνάπαυσις appears sixteen times in the LXX. In the Pentateuch it always appears in the context of the Sabbath (Exod 16:23; 23:12; 31:15; 35:2; Lev 16:31; 23:3, 24, 39) or a sabbatical year (Lev 25:4). Elsewhere, it appears in various contexts (Eccles 6:5; Mic 2:10; Isa 11:10; 23:12, 13; Sir 30:17).

⁶⁷ Exod 33:14; Deut 3:20; 5:33 (here MT reads חַיִּי “[to live]”, while the LXX reads καταπαύσῃ σε [“that he may give you rest”], perhaps from a different *Vorlage*); 12:10; 25:19; Josh 1:13, 15; 11:23; 21:44; 22:4; 23:1; 1 Chron 23:25; 2 Chron 14:5-6; 15:15; 20:30; 32:22; Sir 47:13.

and Sir 47:13. Rest in connection with the temple appears in Deut 12:10 where Yahweh commands them to bring their offerings to a central shrine in the place he will choose when “he will give them rest from their enemies” (καταπαύσει ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑμῶν); in 1 Chron 23:25 where David makes arrangements for the service of the Levites in the house of the Lord, for κατεπαυσεν κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ καὶ κατεσκήνωσεν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἕως αἰῶνος (“the Lord, the God of Israel has given his people rest, and he has settled in Jerusalem forever”);⁶⁸ and in Sir 47:13 “God gives Solomon rest from all around him so that he can build a house for the name of God and prepare a sanctuary that would last forever” (ὁ θεὸς κατέπαυσεν κυκλόθεν, ἵνα στήσῃ οἶκον ἐπ’ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐτοιμάσῃ ἁγίασμα εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα).⁶⁹

In summary, of the thirteen instances of κατάπαυσις in the LXX, two refer to the Sabbath as a day of rest (Exod 35:2; 2 Macc 15:1), two refer to the state of rest that God gives his people in the context of the temple (Deut 12:9; 3 Kdgs 8:56), and four refer to Yahweh’s place of rest in the temple (2 Chron 6:41; Ps 94:11; Isa 66:1; Jdt 9:8).⁷⁰ Of the sixty-seven occurrences of καταπαύω in the LXX, four refer to Yahweh resting after the creation (Gen 2:2-3; 20:11; 31:17) and one refers to the people imitating the creator by doing the same (Exod 34:21). In eighteen texts, Yahweh promises and gives rest to his people from their enemies in the promised land, and three of these appear in contexts related to the Jerusalem temple (Deut 12:10; 1 Chron 23:25; Sir 47:13).

Hofius probably outstrips the evidence when he argues that κατάπαυσις, when used in a local sense, is a technical term for the temple as God’s resting place,⁷¹ although this sense is there in some occurrences. In a few cases, both God and the people rest where the temple is in the context. More accurate, then, is Laansma’s observation that κατάπαυσις, a “relatively uncommon term ... is used with relative frequency within the ‘rest tradition’ generally, and very frequently in connection with the temple.”⁷² Given this, it makes it

⁶⁸ For the sense “settled” for the aorist of κατασκηνώω see BDAG 527, s.v. κατασκηνώω 2.

⁶⁹ The Hebrew text in Beentjes 1997: 84 (MS B) reads שלנה מלך בימי שלווה ואל הניח לו מסביב אשר הכין בית לשמו ויצב לעד מקדש (“Solomon reigned in days of peace, and God caused his borders to rest so that he should establish a house for his name and set up a sanctuary forever”). Noteworthy, also, are texts in 2 Chronicles where Yahweh gave the land rest from enemies for ten years in the time of Asa (2 Chron 14-15), and in the times of Jehoshaphat (20:30) and Hezekiah (32:22) where Yahweh gave them victory in battle, followed by a period of rest. Thus, near the end of the pre-exilic period, the rest promised in Deuteronomy and actualised in Joshua reappears in the context of faithfulness to Yahweh.

⁷⁰ This accounts for eight of the thirteen instances. One other instance appears in Jud 20:43 in the context of a battle. Two instances refer to the Ark of the Covenant resting (in the wilderness in Num 10:35 and in the temple in 1 Chron 6:16 (EVV 6:31). The remaining instance is in Sir 5:6 where the anger of the Lord rests on sinners.

⁷¹ Hofius 1970c: 49-50.

⁷² Laansma 1997: 100.

possible that a reader of the LXX would associate at least the noun κατάπαυσις with the temple,⁷³ and probably also the verb καταπαύω.

7.3.3 κατάπαυσις in the NT

In the NT, outside of Hebrews κατάπαυσις only appears in Acts 7:49 where Stephen cites Isa 66:1 as part of his polemic against the temple to demonstrate from the OT that Yahweh does not dwell there.⁷⁴ Elsewhere, it only appears in Heb 3-4 in quotations from Ps 95:11 or in the exposition of that text. I will now survey those verses in Hebrews where the noun appears, in order to delineate the sense(s) in which it is to be read.⁷⁵

7.3.4 Hebrews 3:18-19

Hebrews 3:16-18 asks and answers three questions to show that the people of the wilderness generation were those who rebelled, those with whom God was angry for forty years and those who were forbidden to enter God's rest. Hebrews 3:19 draws the conclusion that they were forbidden to enter (God's rest) because of unbelief.⁷⁶ The primary referent of God's rest here is the promised land, as in Deut 12:9, but, given the possessive pronoun in the expression τὴν κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ ("God's rest"), the temple is somewhere beneath the surface as a secondary referent—the ultimate goal of the Exodus and wilderness wanderings (Exod 15:17).

7.3.5 Hebrews 4:1-2

While Heb 3:12-19 applies the Psalm as a warning, these verses apply it as a "promise" (ἐπαγγελία, 4:1),⁷⁷ not for the wilderness generation who have faded from view but for the recipients of Hebrews. Verse 1 claims that a promise (anarthrous) of entering God's rest remains open,⁷⁸ that the good news has been preached to the recipients just as it was preached to the wilderness generation, although in the case of the wilderness generation

⁷³ Ibid.: 101.

⁷⁴ In its context, Isa 66:1 does not reject temple worship *per se*, rather it shows that the entire creation is Yahweh's temple (Ibid.: 59).

⁷⁵ I do not deal with its appearance in the initial quotation from Ps 95 in Heb 3:11, as this is the primary text expounded in Heb 3-4.

⁷⁶ On the three questions see O'Brien 2010: 152-54. While the conclusion in v. 19 attributes the failure to enter God's rest to ἀπιστία ("unbelief"), the answer to the third question (to whom did he swear they would not enter his rest) is in terms of those who "disobeyed" (ἀπειθέω). Ἀπειθεία ("disobedience") appears twice in Heb 4 (vv. 7-11), and ἀπιστία twice in Heb 3 (vv. 12-19) to characterise the wilderness generation.

⁷⁷ Koester 2001: 275. This is the first occurrence of ἐπαγγελία in Hebrews. It also appears in 6:12, 17; 7:6; 9:15; 10:36; 11:9, 13, 17, 33, 39. Similar to 4:1 are 9:15, where believers can receive "the promised eternal inheritance" through Jesus; 10:36, where believers are to endure so as to receive the promises; and 11:9, 13, 17, 33, 39 where, while Abraham and others received some promises (11:13, 33), they ultimately did not receive what was promised.

⁷⁸ The original hand of D reads τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ("the promise"). The attestation for this reading is weak and it should be rejected. There is no prior reference to a promise of rest.

“those who heard the message were not united in faith with those who listened to it” (ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς ἐκείνους μὴ συγκεκρασμένους τῇ πίστει τοῖς ἀκούσασιν).⁷⁹ “While the promise of entering God’s rest remains open” (καταλειπομένης ἐπαγγελίας εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ)⁸⁰ the recipients need to take care that none of them are “judged” (δοκέω)⁸¹ to have fallen short of it.

The promise referred to in these verses is the promise that the recipients of Hebrews may also enter God’s rest. While the primary referent of God’s rest in Heb 3 was the promised land, with secondary connotations relating to the temple in Jerusalem, and while the recipients may be pictured as the wilderness generation journeying to the promised land, God is leading these people not to the promised land, but to glory (2:10). The promised land has faded into the background, and God’s rest has a different connotation,⁸² which will be clarified in the following verses.⁸³

⁷⁹ Those who listened to the word were probably Joshua and Caleb (Num 13-14) and those who simply heard the rest of the Israelites. This reading involves taking the references to hearing in two different senses. Ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς (“the word heard”—BDAG 36, s.v. ἀκοή, 4b suggests a “message” or “report”) is simply heard, and those who heard “did not have the same faith” (μὴ συγκεκρασμένους τῇ πίστει) as “those who listened” (τοῖς ἀκούσασιν). This dual sense of “hearing” probably gave rise to the variant reading συγκεκρασμένος (nominative singular), qualifying ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς rather than the accusative plural (qualifying ἐκείνους). In this variant reading, it is the word heard that is not united in faith with those who heard it. Both readings make adequate sense. The accusative plural reading is supported by P¹³ (*vid*), P⁴⁶, A, B, C, the original hand of D, Ψ, and several minuscules and versions. The nominative singular is supported by **Σ** and several later MSS and versions. Συγκεκρασμένους is the more difficult reading, given the need to read the notion of “hearing” in different senses and should be adopted. One eleventh century MS (104) omits the words τῇ πίστει and reads συγκεκρασμένοι τῶν ἀκούσαντων so as to read “[the word] not united with the hearers”. This late reading should be discounted. For a discussion of this textual problem see Attridge 1989: 125-26; Lane 1991a: 93 (note h); Weiss 1991: 278 (footnote 88); Ellingworth 1993: 242; Metzger 1994: 595; Laansma 1997: 286-87 (footnote 162); Koester 2001: 270; O’Brien 2010: 162. Bruce 1990: 103 (footnote 4) adopts the nominative singular reading, suggesting that the other readings arose from attempts to correct a very early corruption. This reading is followed by several earlier scholars and by Thompson 2008: 94.

⁸⁰ This genitive absolute construction most probably expresses a temporal relationship with the main verb, in this case the subjunctive φοβηθῶμεν (“let us take care”). See Wallace 1996: 655; Laansma 1997: 285 (footnote 156); O’Brien 2010: 159 (footnote 13).

⁸¹ For this sense of δοκέω see Moffatt 1924: 50; Attridge 1989: 124 (who translates with “deemed,” p. 122); Grässer 1990-97: 1: 201-202; Weiss 1991: 275; Laansma 1997: 285. Hofius 1970c: 217 (note 849) relates this expression to the final judgment, as does O’Brien 2010: 160, although, as Ellingworth 1993: 239 notes, this word is used “rarely, if ever directly of God’s judgment.” The sense “seem” is also possible, see Delitzsch 1868: 1: 186; Westcott 1892: 93; Ellingworth 1993: 239-40. See also BDAG 255, s.v. δοκέω, 2a. On this reading the recipients need to take care to avoid even the mere suggestion of failure.

⁸² Kaiser 1973: 148-50 classifies Ps 95 as a “Millennium Psalm” and thinks that the promise of rest for the recipients of Hebrews is in the promised land in the Millennium. This imports ideas into Hebrews that are quite foreign and, indeed, in Hebrews the promised land and the earthly Jerusalem are always negated in favour of the heavenly land and city (11:8-16; 12:22-24; 13:13-14). This view is also adopted by Oberholtzer 1988b: 188-96 and critiqued by Bruce 1990: 106-107 and DeSilva 2000a: 25-43. See my own critique in Church 2011b: 54-56.

⁸³ Suggestions for the referent of κατάπαυσις that can be discounted are those of Buchanan 1972: 71-74, who reads it as referring to Jewish national sovereignty, something quite absent from the NT as a Christian hope; and of Gleason 2000: 295-97, who reads the reference to rest in Ps 95 to “the right to

7.3.6 Hebrews 4:3-5

These verses explain the statement that the promise of rest remains open for the readers of Hebrews (4:1). Verse 3 claims that “‘we’ who have come to faith” (οἱ πιστεύσαντες)⁸⁴ “enter into rest” (εἰσερχόμεθα γὰρ εἰς [τὴν] κατάπαυσιν),⁸⁵ a claim explained with reference to Ps 95:11, quoted here in full, and followed by the claim that God’s works had been finished since the foundation of the world,⁸⁶ for it says somewhere concerning the seventh day that “God rested on the seventh day from all his works” (κατέπαυσεν ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ Gen 2:2).⁸⁷ This is followed by a second quotation of Ps 95:11b in v. 5. Verse 5 is complex, but the sense is clarified when it is recognised that the quotation of Ps 95:11 in v. 3 is not so much to reiterate the prohibition of rest for the wilderness generation, but to show that God’s rest still exists.⁸⁸ Genesis 2:2 shows that it has existed from the foundation of the

worship in the temple.” This is unduly restrictive, but suits Gleason’s argument that the recipients of Hebrews will lose not their salvation if they are unfaithful, but the blessings of God’s presence and the enjoyment of the blessings of the new covenant. The warnings in Hebrews are far more serious than this (O’Brien 2010: 154-55, footnote 173). Johnson 2006: 122 recognises that the rest in Heb 3:7-19 is the land of Canaan, but thinks that in Heb 4:1-11 it refers to “God’s own way of existing,” referring to the Platonic worldview, with the noumenal world as the greater reality beyond the material world (p. 126).

⁸⁴ This translation is from Johnson 2006: 126. O’Brien 2010: 163 translates “we who have believed,” suggesting that the context indicates that the participle should be rendered by the past tense. A substantive aorist participle is timeless, although it retains its antecedent aspect with respect to the main verb in the sentence. The readers of Hebrews are described in 4:3, 10; 6:18 with substantive aorist participles followed by verbs expressing some subsequent action, and in 2:11, 18, 5:9 6:12; 7:25; 9:28; 10:14 with substantive present participles, with no such verb. Campbell 2008b: 37-47 discusses verbal aspect with substantive participles.

⁸⁵ There are several variant readings in this clause. MSS A and C and a few others read the subjunctive εἰσερχόμεθα (“let us enter”), and these MSS plus **Σ** and several minuscules read οὖν (“so then”) rather than γάρ. This makes the sentence an exhortation rather than a statement. The weight of the witnesses reading γάρ (P¹³, P⁴⁶, B, D, Ψ, 33, the Majority Text and some versions) and the inappropriateness of the exhortation that accompanies the reading of οὖν indicate that the text should be read as a statement explaining in some way what precedes, see Metzger 1994: 595-96. The definite article (enclosed in square brackets in NA²⁷) is omitted by P¹³ (*vid*), P⁴⁶, B and the original hand of D; and is included in **Σ**, A, C, the first reviser of D, Ψ, several minuscules and the majority text. These witnesses are evenly spread and a decision is difficult. I omit the article, since definiteness here would relate this rest to that previously mentioned (in the promised land), but as the following verses show the rest that believers enter is qualitatively different (Attridge 1989a: 122). This is also a more difficult reading since the expression εἰς (τὴν) κατάπαυσιν is always definite elsewhere (Ellingworth 1993: 244).

⁸⁶ The claim that God’s works had been finished since the foundation of the world is introduced with the rare conjunction καίτοι, only appearing a total of six times in the LXX and the NT. In each case the NRSV translates with a different word. See 4 Macc 2:6 (“in fact”); 5:28 (“even”); 7:13 (“indeed”); 8:16 (“on the other hand”); Acts 14:17 (“yet”); and Heb 4:3 (“though”). Here, it is followed by the participle γενηθέντων and, as LSJ 860 notes, it acts much like καίπερ, which can be rendered with “although.” See also BDF 219, §425 (1); 234, §450 (3). In this context it has concessive force: God forbade that generation from entering his rest, although his works had been finished since the foundation of the world, as Gen 2:2 demonstrates.

⁸⁷ The LXX omits ὁ θεός (the subject of κατέπαυσεν), since God is specified as the subject of the verb συντελέω (“he finished”) earlier in Gen 2:2. See the critical apparatus in Wevers 1974: 83-83 for the numerous witnesses to the text, which include ὁ θεός as the subject of both verbs, including Philo *Leg.* 1. 16; *Post.* 64.

⁸⁸ Lane 1991a: 99; Ellingworth 1993: 244-45; Laansma 1997: 288-89; O’Brien 2010: 166.

world when God completed the work of creation, and the repetition of Ps 95:11b in Heb 4:5 shows that the possibility of exclusion from it remains.⁸⁹

Two issues require clarification in this sentence: the force of the present tense of the verb εἰσερχομαι (“to enter”), and the implications of the quotation from Gen 2:2. Εἰσερχόμεθα could be: (1) a gnomic present (we believers are those who enter rest); (2) a true present, with the believers envisaged as entering the rest in the present, probably combined with the idea of progression towards that rest (we are entering);⁹⁰ (3) a combination of present and future, that is, a proleptic sense (we enter already, but will not enter fully until the eschaton);⁹¹ or (4) a futuristic present (we who believe will enter).⁹²

A gnomic present would be more likely if the verb was in the third person rather than the first,⁹³ and should probably be discounted. It is difficult to decide between the remaining options, which can be classified as either wholly future (4), or present, with some sense of progression towards consummation (2, 3). While Laansma marshals several arguments for a future sense, he also concludes that a present-future proleptic sense is not out of the question.⁹⁴ While these arguments have some validity, a future orientation does seem to be primary, given the repeated exhortations to persevere (3:1, 6, 14; 4:11).⁹⁵ God’s rest is the ultimate goal of these people.⁹⁶

The other issue is the implication of the appeal to Gen 2:2.⁹⁷ At one level there is the interpretive principle of *gezerah shava*.⁹⁸ Since Ps 95:11 uses the word κατάπαυσις and

⁸⁹ For the chiasmic structure of vv. 3-5 see Laansma 1997: 288; O’Brien 2010: 167.

⁹⁰ Westcott 1892: 95; Spicq 1952: 2: 81-82; Kistemaker 1961: 109; Montefiore 1964: 83; Lincoln 1982: 210-12; Attridge 1989: 126; Lane 1991a: 99.

⁹¹ Barrett 1954: 372; Thompson 1982: 98-99; Hagner 1983: 49; Oberholtzer 1988b: 192; Mackie 2007: 48-54; Schenck 2007: 61-62.

⁹² Hofius 1970c: 180 (note 352); Braun 1984: 108; Ellingworth 1993: 246; Laansma 1997: 305-10; Koester 2001: 270; O’Brien 2010: 164-66. Moffatt 1924: 51 proposes that the present expresses the certainty that believers will enter God’s rest. A so-called futuristic present often appears with verbs of motion (Matt 11:3; 17:11; John 8:14; 14:3; 1 Cor 16:50; see BDF 168, §323; Wallace 1996: 535-37). Scholer 1991: 202-203 argues strongly that there is no present force at all in this verb (which he represents as a subjunctive εἰσερχώμεθα, p. 203, footnote 2). This may be a misprint in Scholer’s text. He has no further discussion of Heb 4:3 and may be adopting the variant reading without comment.

⁹³ Ellingworth 1993: 246.

⁹⁴ Laansma 1997: 305-10.

⁹⁵ If the author used the future tense (we will enter) instead of the present, it would undercut his appeal to hold fast (3:6) and to strive to enter the rest (4:11).

⁹⁶ It is not wholly future, as 12:22-24 indicates.

⁹⁷ Enns 1993: 255-69 highlights the creation themes in Ps 95:4-6, which may have led the author of Hebrews to a consideration of Gen 2:2.

⁹⁸ This is one of the seven rules of Hillel listed in *t. Sanh.* 7.11. See the discussion in Strack and Stemberger 1992: 17-34, and p. 21 for *gezerah shava*. For the application of these principles to Heb 4 see Leschert 1994: 186-97. In Gen 2:2 and Ps 95:11 *gezerah shava* only works with the LXX, since the Hebrew

Gen 2:2 the verb καταπαύω, the two texts can be used to interpret one another.⁹⁹ But there is more than this, for as discussed above, καταπαύω appears numerous times in the OT with various connotations. This is the first occurrence of καταπαύω in the LXX and, since God is the subject, the text is significant in that it explains how the rest in the Psalm can be “God’s rest.” This text is a paradigm for explaining the rest of God.¹⁰⁰

Several scholars have noted similarities between the creation story of Gen 1:1–2:3 and the account of the construction of the wilderness sanctuary (Exod 25-40), with the implication that the universe is to be viewed as a temple, and that the temple is to be viewed as a microcosm of the universe.¹⁰¹ The creation story extends over seven days and ends with God blessing the seventh day and resting (Gen 2:1-3). Similarly, God gives Moses the details of construction of the tabernacle in seven speeches.¹⁰² In the seventh speech (31:1-17), the people are commanded to rest (καταπαύω, 31:17) on the seventh day, as Yahweh did. Similarly, just as God blessed the seventh day at the end of his work of creation, Moses blesses the people when he completes the construction of the tabernacle (39:43). Later, Solomon constructs the temple in seven years (1 Kings 8:37-38), he dedicates it in a feast lasting seven days (2 Chron 8:7; 1 Kings 8:65), and with a prayer that contains seven petitions (1 Kings 8:22-23; 2 Chron 6:12-39). In addition to these similarities, the idea of the temple as microcosm extends to the pattern of the temple and tabernacle, with its three parts, the holy of holies representing heaven, the dwelling place of God, and the inner and outer courts representing the earth and the sea respectively. Philo, in particular is explicit about this, as is Josephus.¹⁰³

verb in Gen 2:2 is שבת, rather than נוח. שבת is translated with καταπαύω in Gen 2:2, making a connection with the noun κατάπανσις in Ps 95:11.

⁹⁹ In addition to καταπαύω Gen 2:2 shares two other significant words with Ps 95, ἔργα (v. 9) and ἡμέρα (v. 8). As well as appearing in the quotation from the Psalm in Heb 3:7-11, ἔργα appears in Heb 4:3, 4, 10, and ἡμέρα in 3:13; 4:4, 7, 8.

¹⁰⁰ Enns 1993: 278-79. Kistemaker 1961: 36 notes a Jewish Saturday evening ritual that combined Gen 2:2 and Ps 95:11, but gives no further detail.

¹⁰¹ Clements 1965: 64-75; Blenkinsopp 1976: 76-83; Kearney 1977: 375-87; Fishbane 1979: 3-16; Weinfeld 1981: 501-12; Lundquist 1983: 207-208; Levenson 1984: 283-98; 1985: 111-84; 1988a: 67-99; Hurowitz 1985: 21-30; Niditch 1986: 208-224; Koester 1989: 59-63; Janowski 1990: 37-69; Barker 1991: 104-32; 1995: 8-12; 2004: 16-32; Hayward 1996: 8-10; Fletcher-Louis 1997a: 156-62; 2002: xii, 61-87; Walton 2001: 147-57; 2006: 113-14, 123-29; Beale 2004a: 193-94; 2004b: 29-80. The idea that a god builds a temple with cosmic features is widespread in the ANE as Hurowitz 1992: 332-34 demonstrates. See also Kapelrud 1963: 56-62; Fisher 1963: 34-41; 1965: 313-24. See e.g. Gudea, Cylinder B: I 1-7; Esarhaddon’s description of Esarra, the temple of Assur, cited in Hurowitz 1992: 245. *Enuma Elish* I 71-78; IV 141-46; VI 45-81 (see the discussion Hurowitz, pp. 93-96). This imagery also extends to the garden of Eden as the archetypal temple in which God is encountered. See Barker 1991: 69-103; Wenham 1986: 19-25; Parry 1994: 126-51; Beale 2004b: 66-80; Walton 2006: 124-25. For these ideas in Rabbinic texts see Patai 1967: 54-104.

¹⁰² Exod 25:1; 30:11; 30:17; 30:22; 30:34; 31:1; 31:12.

¹⁰³ See Philo *Max.* 2.73-82, 102-103; *Q.E.* 2.68-69, 83; *Her.* 221-229; *Ebr.* 134; Josephus *Ant.* 3.123, 181. See also Sir 24; 50; Wis 9:8 and my discussion of these texts in chapters 4 and 5 (above).

Since, on this understanding, the cosmos is to be understood as a temple, then God's rest after the creation takes place in his universe/temple.¹⁰⁴ This understanding illuminates several texts referring to God's rest.¹⁰⁵ In Isa 66:1 Yahweh claims that heaven is his throne and the earth his footstool, and asks what house and resting place could be built for him? In Ps 132:8; 2 Chron 6:41 Yahweh is invited to go to his resting place in the temple, and in Ps 132:14 Yahweh exclaims that he has chosen Zion as his resting place forever. Other texts that demonstrate that Yahweh's resting place in the temple is equivalent to his throne in heaven, where the notion of rest does not appear, include Exod 15:17; Ps 11:4; 78:69.¹⁰⁶

Given these associations the appropriateness of the appeal to Gen 2:2 becomes clear.¹⁰⁷ God's rest for the wilderness generation was the promised land, with secondary temple connotations; God's rest for the believers (οἱ πιστεύσαντες) is God's resting place in the temple/universe, the world to come of Heb 2:5, which Jesus has already entered (1:3, 6). The idea of the promised land has faded from view, and the destination of the many heirs God is leading to glory (Heb 2:10) is explicated. This is where the dominion over the world to come is exercised (2:5), where God has rested since the creation, and where he will rest forever with his people.¹⁰⁸

7.3.7 Hebrews 4:6-11

These verses explain the significance of the word "today" (σήμερον) in Ps 95:7, quoted in Heb 4:7, and explained in vv. 8-10. They begin by repeating the ideas of Heb 4:1-2, which claim that "it remains possible to enter 'it'" (ἀπολείπεται τινὰς εἰσελθεῖν εἰς αὐτήν, v. 6)¹⁰⁹ and that "those who formerly had the good news preached to them failed to enter through disobedience" (οἱ πρότερον εὐαγγελισθέντες οὐκ εἰσῆλθον δι

¹⁰⁴ Andreasen 1972: 174-202; Levenson 1984: 288; 1988a: 100-121; Hurowitz 1992: 330-31; Laansma 1997: 70-83; Walton 2001: 147-57; 2006: 157-60, 196-99; Beale 2004b: 60-66. The idea that gods rest in a temple is widespread in the ANE, although outside the OT the gods rest after conflict, at times after the creation of humans to do all the work. The rest is seen as the god taking refuge from the clamouring of the lesser gods. It is sometimes pictured not so much as sleeping, but as indicating ongoing control. See *Enuma Elish* I 35-40, 71-75, 108-10; V 122-28; VII 9-14; *Atrahasis Epic* I i 1-49; and the *Theology of Memphis*, where after creating everything, the god Ptah is satisfied, or rests (for the text and comments see Reid 1987: 29-31). There are clear differences between these accounts and the OT, where in Gen 2:1-3 the text simply states that God rested after his work of creation, see the brief remarks in Heidel 1951: 127-28.

¹⁰⁵ Andreasen 1972: 182-83.

¹⁰⁶ See also Num 10:33-36; 1 Chron 6:31; 28:2; Ps 99:1; Isa 6:1-3 (where Isaiah in the Jerusalem temple is also in heaven); 57:15; Jdt 9:8.

¹⁰⁷ von Rad 1966: 102; Lincoln 1982: 209-210; Laansma 1997: 61-75. On the other hand, as Laansma points out (pp. 74-75), the OT never explicitly links Yahweh's rest following the creation with his resting place in the temple. That is, the Hebrew text of Gen 2:2 uses שָׁכַח for Yahweh resting, and nowhere is it explicitly said that he enters his resting place (מִנוּחָה). Nevertheless, Isa 66:1 does imply a cosmic temple as God's resting place.

¹⁰⁸ Enns 1993: 278-79; 1997: 359; Laansma 1997: 334.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. 4:1, καταλειπομένης ἐπαγγελίας εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ ("while the promise of entering his rest remains").

ἀπειθειαν, v. 6).¹¹⁰ That the first of these claims remains true is indicated by Ps 95:7, since there God sets another day, “today” (σήμερον)¹¹¹ when he says through David¹¹² (long after the conquest under Joshua), σήμερον ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε, μὴ σκληρύνετε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν (“today if you will hear his voice do not harden your hearts”).

Here, the rest promise is seen from the perspective not of those who failed to enter the promised land, but of those who actually entered it, effectively denying that their entry was entry to God’s rest.¹¹³ For, if “Joshua” (Ἰησοῦς)¹¹⁴ had given them God’s rest, God would not speak about another day.¹¹⁵ The implication is that there is more to God’s rest than possession of the promised land.¹¹⁶

With the quotation of Gen 2:2, rest as entry to the promised land is redefined as entry to the place where God rests, the heavenly temple.¹¹⁷ This is confirmed by the conclusion

¹¹⁰ Cf. 4:2, ἐσμεν εὐηγγελισμένοι καθάπερ κακεῖνοι· ἀλλ’ οὐκ ὠφέλησεν ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς ἐκείνους μὴ συγκεκρασμένους τῇ πίστει τοῖς ἀκούσασιν (“we have had the good news preached to us just as they have, but the word heard did not benefit them since they were not united by faith with those who listened”). Ἀπειθεια (“disobedience”) only appears in Hebrews in 4:6, 11, and in both places textual variants read ἀπιστία (“unbelief,” cf. Heb 3:12, 19). In 4:6 ἀπιστία is supported by P⁴⁶ and the original hand of **8**, and in 4:11 by P⁴⁶, 104 and some versions. This is the smoother reading, since it is consistent with 3:12, 19, and this, along with its weak attestation, indicates that it is probably secondary (Attridge 1989: 122). ἀπειθεία provides an inclusio around vv 6-11.

¹¹¹ As 3:13 (ἄχρις οὗ τὸ σήμερον καλεῖται, “as long as it is called today”) shows, “today” will not last forever, and “may be the last ‘today’ of the present age” (O’Brien 2010: 169). Hofius 1970c: 106-7 equates this day with the day of salvation, which began with the coming of Jesus, as does Thompson 2008: 95. In the context of Hebrews, “today” probably began with the exaltation of Jesus “in these last days” (1:1-3).

¹¹² This may either refer to the LXX heading of Ps 95 (LXX 94) that attributes the Psalm to David (Attridge 1989: 130) or it may be a conventional title for the Psalter (BDF 118, §219; Lane 1991a: 94; Leschert 1994: 126).

¹¹³ Walker 2000: 89. For Joshua giving the people rest see Josh 1:13, 15; 11:23; 21:44; 22:4; 23:1, but this was not God’s ultimate rest, which is outside the promised land as later parts of Hebrews show. In Heb 11:8-16 Abraham wandered in the promised land with his descendants, as aliens looking for a city with foundations and a heavenly country; in 12:22-24 those who have been made perfect have attained the true rest in the heavenly Jerusalem; and in 13:13-14 the recipients of Hebrews have no continuing city (Jerusalem), but seek the city to come. See Attridge 1989: 123; Arowele 1990: 440-42; Leschert 1994: 134-35.

¹¹⁴ Ellingworth 1993: 252-53 discusses the suggestion that there is a typological relationship between Joshua and Jesus in this verse. Leschert 1994: 126 thinks that there is “a subtle typological contrast between Joshua’s failure to lead the Israelites into the true rest, and Jesus’ accomplishment of it for his people.” But this is not developed in Hebrews (O’Brien 2010: 169), and Jesus (as distinct from Joshua) does not feature at all in 3:7-4:11. When the name Ἰησοῦς refers to Jesus (rather than Joshua) it nearly always appears in an emphatic position in Hebrews, a position it does not occupy here. See 2:9; 3:1; 4:14; 6:20; 10:10, 19; 12:2, 24; 13:12, 20. It seems not to be emphatic in 13:8, 21, but there Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς is used to identify him.

¹¹⁵ This conditional sentence (εἰ plus the indicative in the protasis, and ἂν plus the indicative in the apodosis) is a “past contrary to fact” condition. This construction makes it clear that Joshua did not give rest to those who entered the promised land. See Wallace 1996: 694-96; O’Brien 2010: 169.

¹¹⁶ Fuller Dow 2010: 173.

¹¹⁷ Laansma 1997: 278-83. Pate 2000: 205 suggests that God’s rest is in “the true heavenly temple or some similar metaphor.” O’Brien 2010: 163-64 equates God’s rest in this part of Hebrews with the world to come (2:5), the heavenly city (11:10, 16; 12:22; 13:14) and the unshakable kingdom (12:28). For rest in the

in vv. 9-10, which begins with ἄρα (“so then”): a “Sabbath celebration” (σαββατισμός) awaits the people of God.¹¹⁸ The word σαββατισμός conveys a nuance not conveyed by κατάπαυσις.¹¹⁹ It is derived from σαββατίζω (“to keep Sabbath”), which occasionally appears in the LXX with the idea of enjoying the Sabbath.¹²⁰ While the evidence is slight, the Sabbath seems to have been marked by the cessation of activity as well as by joyful worship,¹²¹ and is associated with the temple.¹²² For Hebrews, the σαββατισμός takes place in the heavenly Jerusalem (the place of God’s κατάπαυσις), where the people join “with myriads of angels in joyful worship” (μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων, πανηγύρει, 12:22).¹²³

Verse 10 (beginning with γάρ) develops the implications of the claim that a Sabbath celebration awaits the people of God. The significance of Gen 2:2 to the argument appears here, where both Ps 95:11 and Gen 2:2 are merged into a single statement:¹²⁴ “those who

new creation see 4 *Ezra* 7:26-44; 8:52; 2 *Bar.* 73; 1 *En.* 39:4-5; 45:3-6; 53:6; and 4QmidrEschat^a III 7-9. See also *Josephus As.* 8:11; 22:9 and the discussions in Laansma 1997: 106-111 and Son 2005: 139-40.

¹¹⁸ Σαββατισμός only appears here in the NT and is sometimes translated “Sabbath rest” (NRSV, NIV; Thompson 2008: 95). Koester 2001: 272 translates it with “Sabbath.” Hofius 1970c: 102-110 examines the use of σαββατισμός in Justin, Epiphanius, *Mart. Paul*, *Mart. Pet.*, *Apos. Con.*, and concludes that it refers to a Sabbath celebration or observance. See Lincoln 1982: 212-13; Attridge 1989: 130-31; Ellingworth 1993: 255; Laansma 1997: 276-77, 83. Wray 1998: 81-83 denies this, as does Attridge 1980: 283, who considers that what Hofius identifies in these later texts is not decisive “for the interpretation of the term in Hebrews” (p. 283). Wray argues from the causal relationship of v. 10 with v. 9 that σαββατισμός refers to God’s rest, “**which remains available for the people of God**” (emphasis original), which she explains from Philo *Cher.* 87-90, as “an energy completely free from labor ... with the most perfect ease.” Attridge (1980) comes to a similar conclusion (p. 283). While this could be inferred from Heb 4:10, it is not the most natural reading of vv. 9-10. Wray nowhere considers that the semantic range of κατάπαυσις might include the idea of a “resting place.” The relationship between vv. 9-10 is better expressed by Weiss 1996: 282 who suggests that “God lives in a perennially joyful Sabbath celebration,” which is available for the people of God. Σαββατισμός is not found in any ancient Greek literature earlier than Hebrews, leading to the suggestion that the author may have coined the word (Moffatt 1924: 53; Spicq 1952: 2: 83-84; Isaacs 1992: 84; Laansma 1997: 276). Hofius 1970c: 106 thinks that this is unlikely, as does Hughes 1977: 160-61 (footnote 670), given its likely derivation from σαββατίζειν. Moreover, it appears as a variant reading in Plutarch *Superstition* 166 (Plutarch 1927-1976: 2: 460, footnote 1), which is unlikely to be dependent upon Hebrews (Attridge 1989: 131), although the MS tradition could have been influenced by other works influenced in turn by Hebrews.

¹¹⁹ Käsemann 1984: 68-75 equates κατάπαυσις, σαββατισμός and ἑβδομος (seventh) and finds the background of the rest in Heb 3-4 in Gnostic speculation about the seventh aeon. But in Heb 4, the seventh (ἑβδομος) day is simply introduced to set the context of God’s rest in Gen 2:2, and κατάπαυσις and σαββατισμός are not synonymous. See the critiques of Käsemann’s reading in Hofius 1970c: 102-106 and Laansma 1997: 320-21. Leschert 1994: 135-36 thinks that κατάπαυσις and σαββατισμός are sometimes synonymous in Heb 4, but since the latter term only appears once, it is difficult to see how he has reached this conclusion.

¹²⁰ Lev 26:34-35; Esdras A 1:55. Σαββατίζω also appears in Exod 16:30; Lev 23:32; 2 Chron 26:31; 2 Macc 6:6.

¹²¹ Andreasen 1972: 141-50. See Ps 92:1 (MT); 2 Macc 8:27; Jub. 50:9; *L.A.B.* 11:8; 1 *En.* 41:7; 63:5.

¹²² Laansma 1997: 283. For Sabbath celebration related to the temple see Lev 23:3, where the Sabbath is described as שָׁבֻעַ קֹדֶשׁ (“a holy assembly”); Num 28:9-10 and Ezek 46:4-5 where sacrifices are offered on the Sabbath. See also 2 Kings 11:4-12; 16:17; Isa 1:10-14; Lam 2:6; Ezek 22:8, 26; 23:38; 45:17. On this see Laansma 1997: 68-69; Walton 2001: 153.

¹²³ Son 2005: 138-40; Schenck 2007: 62-63.

¹²⁴ Laansma 1997: 261.

enter their rest,¹²⁵ rest” (ὁ ... εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς κατέπαυσεν) from their works,¹²⁶ as did God from his own works. The reference to God’s rest takes the reader back to v. 4 and illustrates the merger of the place of rest and the state of rest: just as God rested in his resting place, “from all his works” (ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ), the believers who enter also rest from their works. Significantly, God and believers rest together in the “great sabbath celebration around God’s throne.”¹²⁷

Verse 11 renews the appeal for the recipients to “make every effort” (σπουδάζω)¹²⁸ “to enter that resting place” (εἰσελθεῖν εἰς ἐκείνην τὴν κατάπαυσιν), that is, the resting place of Gen 2:2; Ps 95:11. The pericope ends with a purpose clause, so that nobody falls following the example of the disobedience of the wilderness generation, who for this very reason failed to enter God’s rest (Heb 4:6).

7.3.8 Conclusion

This pericope (3:7–4:11) clarifies that the goal of those whom God is leading to glory (2:10) is the resting place that God entered at the creation, in the temple/universe that God had created (Gen 1:1–2:3). It also clarifies that the promised land (and by implication the Jerusalem temple) was not God’s ultimate resting place. That still awaits “the believers” (οἱ πιστεύσαντες, 4:3, that is, “God’s people,” ὁ λαὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, v. 9). Later this rest will be identified as the true tent pitched by the Lord (8:2), the heavenly Jerusalem (12:22) and the city to come (13:13–14). The referent of all these expressions is the same: it is the world to come of Heb 2:5, already occupied by Jesus (1:6) and ultimately to be made subject to those who persevere and, therefore, enter it.¹²⁹

¹²⁵ I have rendered this expression in the plural to avoid any masculine exclusivity. The antecedent of the genitive pronoun αὐτοῦ is ambiguous, but is best understood as God’s rest (NRSV; Bruce 1990: 109; Lane 1991a: 93; Ellingworth 1993: 257; Enns 1997: 360; Koester 2001: 279; O’Brien 2010: 171), since nowhere do these chapters refer to an individual entering his own rest (contra Attridge 1989: 131).

¹²⁶ The aorist (κατέπαυσεν) may be a gnomic aorist, expressing a general (timeless) concept (Ellingworth 1993: 256) or perhaps a proleptic aorist, expressing certainty (Wallace 1996: 564). Whichever way it is read, this verse makes a close connection between God’s rest in v.4 (κατέπαυσεν ὁ θεὸς ... ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ, “God rested from all his works”) and the believer’s rest here (αὐτὸς κατέπαυσεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ (“he’ rests from all ‘his’ works”).

¹²⁷ O’Brien 2010: 172. See the similar ideas in Rev 13:14. Isaacs 1992: 82–88 refers to the relocation to heaven of earthly hopes of land.

¹²⁸ BDAG 939. The word here is a hortatory subjunctive as the author includes himself in the appeal.

¹²⁹ Cf. DeSilva 2000b: 397 (footnote 47). “The author skilfully changes and develops the images for the final destiny of the believers and the content of the promise as the context of his discussion changes. Thus in chapters 3 and 4 in the context of the example of the wilderness generation, the promise is conceived of as ‘rest’; in the context of the presentation of Jesus’ work and the hearers’ advantage in cultic imagery the goal becomes the heavenly ‘holy of holies.’ Now [11:10], as the author more directly addresses the believers’ experience of loss and abuse in their current city, the image is again transformed into a secure city and homeland where they shall enjoy perpetual honor in God’s presence.” Loader 1981: 52; Lincoln 1982: 209; Thompson 2008: 96 express similar ideas.

7.4 Access to the Heavenly Temple in the Present (10:19-25)

Hebrews 4:14-16 and 10:19-25 form an *inclusio* around the long central section of Hebrews.¹³⁰ The conjunction οὖν (“so then”) in 10:19 indicates that the exhortations flow from what precedes, and the causal particle γάρ (“for”) in 10:26 shows that what follows explains these paragraphs in some way. The exhortations in this pericope are tied to the existence of a great (high) priest for the community, and are supported by a variety of motive clauses.

The first exhortation (19-22) and its motive clauses contain considerable temple symbolism.¹³¹ The exhortation is to approach (προσέρχομαι)¹³² God (in his dwelling place),¹³³ in the present, with the implication that God’s dwelling place is not somewhere “up in heaven” separated from the earthbound community (who would then need to undertake a heavenly journey to access it); rather, since the community on earth has this access in the present, God’s space, while distinct from human space, intersects with human space.¹³⁴

Hebrews 10:19 begins with the masculine plural present participle of ἔχω (“to have”), expressing a causal relationship with the other verbs in the sentence. While impersonal in itself it should be rendered “since we have” in line with the first person plural verbs in the sentence. This sentence makes two claims upon which the exhortations that follow are

¹³⁰ Each of these pericopes contains the present subjunctive of προσέρχομαι (“let us approach”), part of an exhortation based on the participial clause ἔχοντες οὖν ... (“so then, since we have ...”). In 4:14-16 the author and readers are said to have “a great high priest” (ἀρχιερέως μέγας); in 10:19-25 “a great priest” (ἱερέως μέγας); in both texts the priest/high priest is identified as Jesus; in 4:14-16 they are exhorted to approach with “confidence” (παρρησία), in 10:19-25 they are said to have “confidence” (παρρησία); and in 4:14-16 they are encouraged to “hold on” (κρατέω) to the “confession” (ὁμολογία), as also in 10:19-25, although there the verb is κατέχω (“hold fast”). Nauck 1960: 203-204 concludes from this *inclusio* that the theme of the second part of Hebrews (4:14–10:25) is “come near to God and hold fast to the confession, because Jesus Christ has opened up this way.” I deal with 4:14-16 in 8.2 (below).

¹³¹ It would be a diversion to discuss whether the claim of Hebrews that the people of God are able to “draw near” (ἐγγίξω) to God (7:19) or “approach” (προσέρχομαι) God (4:16) indicates that they are to be viewed as priests. Scholer 1991: 9-207 argues for this (see his conclusions on pp. 204-205). However, it seems more likely that humans approach God not because they are priests (even if priestly language is used of them), but rather because they have a high priest in God’s presence (4:14-16; 10:19-25).

¹³² The original hand of P⁴⁶ appears to read the indicative προσερχομεθα followed by γάρ, rather than the subjunctive. The indicative also appears in D, K, L, P and several minuscules. The subjunctive appears in P¹³, the corrector of P⁴⁶, Ⲙ, A, C, Ψ, some minuscules and the Majority Text. Its superior attestation, the parallel with 4:16 and the other subjunctives in 10:19-25 indicate that this is almost certainly the original reading.

¹³³ While the location of the approach is unstated, the use of προσέρχομαι in Hebrews for the approach to God (7:25; 10:1; 11:6), or to the dwelling place of God (4:16; 12:18, 22), indicates that this is in view (O’Brien 2010: 366, footnote 127), as does the concentration of temple imagery in the pericope.

¹³⁴ Kline 1996 (n.p.) notes that “[r]eference to the invisible realm as ‘above’ is simply a spatial figure based on a natural analogy between what is physically higher and what is more exalted in dignity and honor.” See also Wright 2007b: 120-22.

based. The first claim is that “we” have “confidence” (παρρησία)¹³⁵ “with respect to the entrance to the sanctuary” (εἰς τὴν εἵσοδον τῶν ἁγίων), and the second claim is that “we” have a great priest over the house of God.

In line with the customary usage in Hebrews, the definite, neuter plural of ἅγιος (v. 19) should be read as a reference to the heavenly temple, pictured as a holy of holies where God dwells,¹³⁶ but no consensus has been reached on the precise sense of the expression τὴν εἵσοδον τῶν ἁγίων. The Greek word εἵσοδος, like the English word “entrance,” has two senses, a verbal sense (“the act of entering”) and a local sense (“a place of entry”).¹³⁷ While it is not always clear which sense is being used in either the LXX or the NT, the usage in some texts indicates that when followed by a genitive personal pronoun it refers to the act of entering,¹³⁸ and when followed by a genitive of place it refers to a place of entry.¹³⁹ In Heb 10:19 εἵσοδος is followed by a genitive of place (τῶν ἁγίων), suggesting the expression here refers to the entrance to the sanctuary. This is confirmed by the following claim that the “entrance” (εἵσοδος) has been “consecrated” (ἐγκαινίζω)¹⁴⁰ as “a new and living way” (ὁδὸν πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν) “through the curtain” (διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος).¹⁴¹

¹³⁵ For the sense of this word in the NT see van Unnik 1980: 2: 269-89; 290-306. Dahl 1951: 403 refers to “both the God-given permission and the personal confidence and frankness arising from it.” The confidence of the people of God is ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ (“by the blood of Jesus”), that is his death (Scholer 1991: 126). It has procured for us a pure conscience (9:14), forgiveness (9:22), sanctification (13:12) and a new covenant relationship with God (13:20). None of these are achievable by the animal blood with which the former high priest entered annually (9:7), for animal blood cannot remove sin (10:4).

¹³⁶ Heb 8:2; 9:8, 12, 25; 13:11. This statement does not imply a bicameral heavenly temple with an outer court and a holy of holies, rather the entire heavenly temple is pictured as equivalent to the holy of holies in the wilderness tabernacle. I discuss this reading in 8.5 (below).

¹³⁷ BDAG 294-95 also lists a third sense “acceptance” or “welcome” (1 Thess 1:9). The word appears only here in Hebrews and four times elsewhere in the NT. Apart from 1 Thess 1:9, the NRSV reads the other four occurrences, including Heb 10:19, in the verbal sense, as an act of entering (Acts 13:24; 1 Thess 2:1; 2 Pet 1:11).

¹³⁸ Judg 1:14; 1 Kgdms 16:14; 29:6; 2 Kgdms 3:25; 3 Kgdms 2:13; 3:7; 4 Kgdms 19:27; Ps 120:8; Isa 37:28; Jer 8:7; Mal 3:2; Pss Sol 4:14; Acts 13:24; Thess 2:1; Philo, *Dens.* 132; *Ebr.* 9. Other syntactical constructions occur, e.g. in 2 Pet 1:11, although it seems clear that that text refers to the entry of the readers into (εἰς) the eternal kingdom (verbal sense).

¹³⁹ Judg 1:24, 25; 4 Kgdms 11:16; 23:11; 2 Chron 26:8; Ezek 27:3; 44:5; Josephus *Ant.* 19.332.

¹⁴⁰ BDAG 272 suggests that ἐγκαινίζω has the sense of “open” in Heb 10:20. The word appears only twice in the NT, here and in Heb 9:18 referring to the inauguration of the first covenant with blood. It appears fifteen times in the LXX, in a variety of contexts, but in cultic contexts it always has the sense of “consecrate” or “(re)dedicate” (3 Kgdms 8:63; 2 Chron 7:5; 15:8; 1 Macc 4:36, 54, 57; 5:1) and this sense should be read here. The antecedent of ἐγκαινίζω is not ὁδός (“way”), but εἵσοδος (“entrance”). The entrance has been consecrated for us as a “new and living way.” In this sentence, then, ἐγκαινίζω takes a double accusative, and ὁδός is “in independent juxtaposition with εἵσοδος as a predicative acc[usative]” (Michaelis 1967: 76). For a similar construction with τίθημι see Heb 1:2. This is a further reason for reading εἵσοδος as a reference to the entrance.

¹⁴¹ Those who read the text in this way include Westcott 1892: 318; Peterson 1982: 270 (note 170); Attridge 1989: 284; Koester 2001: 442; O’Brien 2010: 365. Consequently, the preposition εἰς is used

While the text refers to the “curtain” (καταπέτασμα) separating the holy of holies from the outer court of the wilderness tabernacle, I will argue below that the heavenly temple is not a bicameral sanctuary.¹⁴² Rather, this curtain symbolises the access to God now available through Christ. This is clear from its apparent identification with the flesh of Christ in the clause τοῦτ’ ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ (“this is his flesh”).¹⁴³ This expression has long been the subject of debate,¹⁴⁴ bristling as it is with both syntactical and hermeneutical difficulties.¹⁴⁵

In terms of syntax, the antecedent of the demonstrative clause τοῦτ’ ἔστιν (“this is”) could be either: (1) the new and living way; (2) the curtain; or (3) the entire clause beginning with ἐγκαινίζω. If the antecedent is the new and living way (1), the phrase is a dependent genitive, with the sense that the new and living way through the curtain is “the way of his flesh,” perhaps the way that Christ entered into the holy of holies or some similar construction.¹⁴⁶ If the antecedent is the curtain (2), the phrase is to be understood as appositional, identifying the flesh of Christ with the curtain, and with the preposition “through” governing both καταπέτασμα and the σὰρξ (“flesh”) to give the sense of “a new and living way through the curtain, that is through his flesh.”¹⁴⁷ If the antecedent is the entire clause (3), the τοῦτ’ ἔστιν clause is again appositional, although here another διὰ needs to be supplied, so that the phrase is read as “he has inaugurated a new and living way through the curtain, that is, [through, sc. by means of] his flesh.” Here the preposition διὰ is to be construed locally with καταπέτασμα (“a way through the curtain”), and the supplied preposition construed instrumentally with σὰρξ (“by means of his flesh”).¹⁴⁸

referentially (“with reference to” the entrance to the sanctuary). For this sense of εἰς see BDAG 291 and Attridge 1989: 284 (footnote 15). Εἰς has this sense in Heb 6:10; 7:14; 9:9; 12:3. If εἰσοδος is read as the act of entry, as numerous scholars maintain (Calvin 1996: 206; Delitzsch 1868: 2: 170; Moffatt 1924: 142; Spicq 1952: 2: 315; Montefiore 1964: 172; Buchanan 1972: 167-68; Hughes 1977: 406; Jewett 1981: 173-74; Wilson 1987: 187; Bruce 1990: 250; Johnson 2006; Thompson 2008: 202, the preposition εἰς expresses purpose or result. Héring 1970: 90 wants the best of both worlds—“we can enter the approach”).

¹⁴² Section 8.5.

¹⁴³ Buchanan 1972: 168 deletes the expression τοῦτ’ ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ as a gloss that has made its way into the text, a suggestion that Héring 1970: 91 mentions, but seems not to prefer, and Hofius 1970b: 133 discounts. Käsemann 1984: 224-27 reads this pericope with reference to Gnostic speculation. Details of such speculation are given in Wilson 1987: 188-89, who argues that these parallels show how the image could be developed along such lines, but do not explain its source.

¹⁴⁴ Young 1973: 100 notes the debate has continued since 1875.

¹⁴⁵ The various issues are set out in Young (ibid.: 100-102)

¹⁴⁶ Westcott 1892: 320-21; Spicq 1952: 2: 316; Cody 1960: 161; Montefiore 1964: 173-74; Andriessen and Lenglet 1970: 214-15; Héring 1970: 91; DeSilva 2000b: 335.

¹⁴⁷ Young 1973: 103-104; Peterson 1982: 153-54; Wilson 1987: 188-89; Attridge 1989: 286; Bruce 1990: 252-53; Guthrie 1998: 342-43; Mitchell 2007: 211; Thompson 2008: 203; O’Brien 2010: 364-65. I leave aside for the moment whether the preposition διὰ has a local or an instrumental sense or both.

¹⁴⁸ Moffatt 1924: 143; Hofius 1970b: 156-58; Jeremias 1971: 131; Lane 1991b: 275-76; Koester 2001: 443-44 argue for this reading, while Rissi 1987: 42 thinks it unlikely not only for Hebrews, but for the entire

Since the expression τοῦτ' ἔστιν appears six times in Hebrews, and in the other five it is appositional,¹⁴⁹ there is good reason for reading the expression in 10:20 in the same way.¹⁵⁰ This makes it unlikely (although not impossible) that the genitive τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ is to be read as “(the way of) his flesh”¹⁵¹ (reading 1) and the answer is to be sought in one of the other two readings.

The referent of the flesh of Jesus (σάρξ) is also debated. It could be understood either as his incarnation (as in 2:17),¹⁵² or his death (corresponding to the reference to his blood in v. 19, a metaphor for his death), and the curtain (καταπέτασμα) could be understood either as a barrier to the presence of God or a means of access to the presence of God.¹⁵³

While the precise sense may be elusive, the temple imagery is clear. Based on other instances of τοῦτ' ἔστιν in Hebrews, I favour an appositional reading, making it likely that the curtain is to be identified with the flesh of Jesus and is governed by the preposition in the expression διὰ τοῦ καταπέτασματος, with the sense “through the curtain, that is (through) his flesh.” This applies whether the expression τοῦτ' ἔστιν relates back to the curtain or to the entire clause. It is also likely that whichever of these two options is adopted (and both have their merits), the preposition in the text is to be understood locally

NT. For similar constructions see Rom 9:7-8; 10:7. Johnsson 1973: 353-55 is confusing. He argues for this reading, but then offers the translation “a new and living way which he opened for us through the curtain—that is, the way of his flesh ...” Similarly, DeSilva 2000b: 353 (wrongly) attributes to Lane the suggestion that τοῦτ' ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ clarifies not the “veil,” but the “way,” and then proposes that it “stands parallel to ‘by means of the blood of Jesus’.”

¹⁴⁹ In Heb 2:14 the one who has the power of death is identified as the devil; in Heb 7:5 the people are identified as the siblings of the descendants of Levi; in 9:11 the tent not made with hands is identified as being not of this creation; in 11:16 the better country that people seek is identified as a heavenly country; and in 13:15 the sacrifice of praise is identified as the fruit of lips. While the τοῦτ' ἔστιν does not always relate to the immediately preceding word (as Andriessen and Lenglet 1970: 214-15 point out), the following word is always in the same case and in apposition to the antecedent.

¹⁵⁰ Young 1973: 103; Attridge 1989: 286.

¹⁵¹ Moreover, one would expect to read τοῦτ' ἔστιν τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ if the genitive was dependent upon ὁδός, since this word is a long way from τῆς σαρκός. It is also unlikely that the expression is to be read as “through the veil, that is, the veil of his flesh,” a suggestion made and dismissed on these grounds by Westcott 1892: 319-20; Young 1973: 103; Lane 1991b: 275; Lindars 1991: 103; Koester 2001: 443, but adopted by Johnson 2006: 257 (with no discussion). Ellingworth 1993: 520 wrongly attributes it to Young 1973.

¹⁵² Hughes 1977: 409.

¹⁵³ Young 1973: 100, footnote 4. As Delitzsch 1868: 2: 172-73 suggests, there may be an allusion to the torn veil of the Synoptic tradition, with the notion of the (torn) veil a “daring poetical touch” (Moffatt 1924: 143) with the flesh of Christ torn before his blood could be shed, enabling access to the presence of God. Hughes 1977: 409 thinks that if the flesh of Christ refers to “the incarnation, seen in the light of the fulfilment of its purpose in the offering of the perfect and final sacrifice on the cross,” there is no need to postulate two different senses for the preposition διὰ. On this reading both the torn flesh of Christ and the torn veil indicate that the way to the presence of God is now open. Attridge 1989: 286-87 and Lindars 1991: 102-103 find such an allusion unwarranted. All this is unnecessary. The veil, as in 6:19; 9:2 is simply the point of entry to the presence of God, and the imagery is from the Day of Atonement rather than from the tearing of the veil when Jesus died.

(a new and living way through the curtain), with the sense of the supplied preposition gliding to an instrumental sense.¹⁵⁴ The expression “[through] his flesh” is parallel to “by means of his blood” in v. 19, and the flesh and the blood both refer to the death of Christ.¹⁵⁵ The curtain in the wilderness tabernacle was the barrier concealing the way into the earthly holy of holies (Heb 9:6-10), and the death of Christ has inaugurated a new and living way into the heavenly temple.

Verse 22 contains two clauses beginning with perfect participles, describing the hearts of the recipients as “sprinkled from an evil conscience” (ῥεραντισμένοι τὰς καρδίας ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς), and their bodies as “washed with pure water” (καὶ λελουσμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι καθαρῷ). The word ῥαντίζω appears four times in the NT, all in Hebrews,¹⁵⁶ and three times in the OT, none of which are in strictly cultic contexts.¹⁵⁷ Psalm 51:7 (LXX 50:9), however, contains similar imagery to Heb 10:22 when the psalmist claims that if God were to “sprinkle him with hyssop” (ῥαντιεῖς με ὑσσώπῳ) and “wash him” (πλυνεῖς με), then he would be clean, whiter than snow. Cultic metaphors are adopted to refer to inner cleansing by God.¹⁵⁸ The word λούω appears five times in the NT, only one of which is in Hebrews, and elsewhere there are no cultic connotations.¹⁵⁹ However, there are distinct cultic connotations in the LXX.¹⁶⁰

The imagery behind ῥαντίζω is to be understood in terms of its use in Heb 9:13, 19-21 and, in particular, 9:13 where the text compares the sprinkling of the ashes of a heifer that purifies the flesh with the blood of Christ that cleanses the conscience.¹⁶¹ Aside from this,

¹⁵⁴ I argue below (8.6.2) in connection with 9:11-12, where the preposition διὰ appears three times governed by the same verb, that construing it with two different senses is difficult, but not impossible. There, I argue for an instrumental sense in all three instances. Here, I am arguing that an explicit διὰ (διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος) is to be read locally, and an implicit διὰ ([διὰ] τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ) governing the same verb is to be read instrumentally. I wonder whether the supplied preposition was omitted because it would need to be read with a different sense from that already in the text, although there is no way to verify this.

¹⁵⁵ Gardiner 1888: 142-46; Young 1973: 104; Ellingworth 1993: 520-21; Koester 2001: 443-44; Mitchell 2007: 211; Thompson 2008: 203; O'Brien 2010: 364-65.

¹⁵⁶ Heb 9:13, 19, 21; 10:22. It also appears in textual variants in Mark 7:4; Rev 19:13—in both places as a substitute for βαπτίζω.

¹⁵⁷ In Lev 6:20; 4 Kgdms 9:33 it refers to blood spattering.

¹⁵⁸ A similar verb ῥαίνω (“to sprinkle”) appears thirteen times in the OT, mostly in cultic contexts. See Exod 29:21; Lev 4:17; 5:9; 8:11; 14:16, 27; 16:14, 15, 19; Num 19:4; Isa 45:8; Ezek 36:5. In Isa 45:8 the word refers to the skies raining righteousness, and Ezek 36:25 is similar to the use of ῥαντίζω in Ps 50:9, where God explains that he will sprinkle clean water on the people and they will be clean. Similar ideas appear in Isa 1:16 where the verb is ῥαίνω.

¹⁵⁹ John 13:10; Acts 9:37; 16:33; 2 Pet 2:22.

¹⁶⁰ For λούω in connection with the priesthood see Exod 29:4; 40:12; Lev 8:6; 16:4, 24, 26, 28; Num 19:7, 8, 19; and in connection with the cleansing of defiled people, see Lev 11:40; 14:8, 9; 15:5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 16, 18, 21, 22, 27; 17:15, 16; 22:6; Deut 23:12.

¹⁶¹ Heb 9:19, 21 are allusions to the inauguration of the Sinai covenant in Exod 24:3-8; and the consecration of the priests in Lev 8:15-19, although in neither of these texts do the words ῥαίνω or ῥαντίζω appear.

the cultic connotations of both λούω and ῥαίνω where they appear in the LXX in connection with the consecration of the priesthood, as well as the frequent use of λούω for ritual cleansing from defilement, are significant background. The author is using familiar cultic terminology to refer to inward (heart) and outward (body), and therefore comprehensive, cleansing to support the exhortation to approach the presence of God.¹⁶² The text is similar to Ps 50:9; Isa 1:16; Ezek 36:25-26, where cultic terminology is applied figuratively to refer to purification from defilement.¹⁶³

While it is not difficult to understand the sense of “have confidence to enter the sanctuary,” it is not so clear what it means to have confidence “with respect to the entrance to the sanctuary.” However, when read with reference to Heb 9:7-10, where the high priest enters only annually, and “not without blood” (οὐ χωρὶς αἵματος), clarity begins to emerge. Under the new order all has changed: approach to the presence of God is not limited to the high priest, and the restrictions around the approach of the OT priesthood have been lifted, so that all who are cleansed can confidently approach God. Under the old order the “entrance” (εἵσοδος) to the holy of holies was restricted to the high priest; now all may pass through it.

The concentration of cultic imagery in this pericope finds its counterpart in earlier chapters of Hebrews. The “curtain” (καταπέτασμα) appears in 6:19 as the place hope enters, and where Jesus the forerunner has gone, and in 9:2 to separate the holy place from the holy of holies in the wilderness tabernacle; the “new” (πρόσφατος) and “living” (ζάω) way that has been “consecrated” (ἐγκαινίζω) contrasts with the former way, also consecrated (9:18), but now “grown old” (γηράσκω) and near to “destruction” (ἄφανισμός, 8:13).¹⁶⁴ The sprinkling of 9:13 could only cleanse externals, while the sprinkling and washing of 10:22 effect internal and external purification.

This pericope deals with the “free access” (παρησία) that the believers have to the presence of God through the death of Jesus. What is significant for this study, however, is that this access is described using temple symbolism. Nowhere is the heavenly temple conceived as a structure above the earth. Nor is the access anticipated in the future. Rather,

¹⁶² There may also be an allusion to baptism in reference to washing with pure water. This suggestion is adopted by Delitzsch 1868: 2: 177-79; Westcott 1892: 323 (who also sees a veiled reference to the Eucharist in the sprinkling); Moffatt 1924: 144-45; Dahl 1951: 407; Spicq 1952: 2: 317; Montefiore 1964: 174-75; Hughes 1977: 412; Peterson 1982: 155; Wilson 1987: 191; Attridge 1989: 289; Bruce 1990: 255; Lane 1991b: 287; Weiss 1991: 528-30; Ellingworth 1993: 523-34; Leithart 2000: 49-65; DeSilva 2000b: 339-40 (who makes a parallel between Christian baptism and priestly ordination, and argues that the community addressed is a priestly community); Koester 2001: 445-49; Thompson 2008: 204. But apart from the oblique reference to the “confession” (10:23), there is no explicit indication that baptism is in view, leading Calvin 1996: 208; Rissi 1987: 100; Scholer 1991: 130-31 Guthrie 1998: 344; O’Brien 2010: 367-68 to deny any reference to baptism.

¹⁶³ Calvin 1996: 208; Rissi 1987: 99-100; Bruce 1990: 255-56; Attridge 1989: 289; Scholer 1991: 131; Lane 1991b: 287; Thompson 2008: 204; O’Brien 2010: 368.

¹⁶⁴ Dahl 1951: 404; Walker 1994: 63.

temple symbolism is pressed into service to describe the access to God now available to God's new covenant people. Jesus is enthroned in the heights in the world to come in the present (1:1-3, 6), and his followers, who must strive to enter God's rest in the heavenly temple future (4:11), now have access to it in the present, while still on earth. Both present and future and above and below are merged into a single present reality, and temple symbolism is the mechanism used to express this.

7.5 A City with Foundations (Heb 11:8-16)

The long central section of Hebrews ends with three hortatory subjunctives. The author encourages the readers to approach God (10:22), to hold on to their confession (10:23) and to find ways to stimulate love and good deeds in the community (10:24). These subjunctives are followed by a warning that God's judgment awaits those who persist in deliberate sin (vv. 26-31), which is in turn followed by an appeal to the readers to recall how they had endured in the past and not to abandon their confidence, which leads to great reward (μισθαποδοσία v. 35). The paragraph ends with a quotation from Hab 2:3-4 (LXX), conflated with three words from Isa 26:20 to establish that the coming one will come in a little while and not delay, and that the righteous one will live by "faith" (πίστις), because God has no pleasure in those who shrink back. Verse 36 leads into the Habakkuk quotation, explaining that they need "endurance" (ὑπομονή), so that, having done the will of God they will "receive" (κομίζω) the "promise" (ἐπαγγελία). The chapter ends with the declaration that "we" (the author and readers) are not those who shrink back and are lost, but rather those who have "faith" (πίστις) and preserve their lives.

Several words in these verses reappear in significant places in Heb 11:1–12:7, indicating that Heb 11 cannot be detached from Heb 10 and 12,¹⁶⁵ and confirming the judgment of Schenck that Heb 11 functions as an indirect exhortation to the readers to remain faithful.¹⁶⁶ The substantive ὑπομονή ("endurance"), appears only twice in Hebrews (10:36; 12:1) and the verb ὑπομένω ("to endure") four times (10:32; 12:2, 3, 7). While μισθαποδοσία ("reward") appears in 2:2 in terms of a penalty for transgression, it also appears in 10:35 claiming that the readers' confidence will lead to a reward, and in 11:26 where Moses remained faithful, anticipating the reward. The substantive ἐπαγγελία

¹⁶⁵ Calvin 1996: 227; Moffatt 1924: 158; Thompson 1982: 69; 2008: 228-29; Buchanan 1972: 184; Wilson 1987: 201; Cosby 1988: 260; Attridge 1989: 305-306; Hamm 1990: 279-80; Lane 1991b: 312-24; DeSilva 2000b: 377; Johnson 2006: 275; O'Brien 2010: 394-95. Note the conjunction δέ in 11:1 tying Heb 11 with what precedes and τοιγαροῦν ("therefore") tying Heb 12 to Heb 11. It can be misleading to read Heb 11 apart from these preceding and following texts. Käsemann 1984: 184-85 thinks that because he cannot imagine how a Christian would end a historical record with the Maccabees, Heb 11 can be traced "neither to the author of Hebrews nor to any Christian sphere of tradition," and that 12:1-2 is not the clear goal of the list in Heb 11, thus he tries to read it apart from its context.

¹⁶⁶ Schenck 2007: 28. This is interesting since Heb 11 contains neither hortatory subjunctive nor second person plural imperative, although the former appears in 12:1 (τρέχωμεν, "let us run") and the latter in 12:3 (ἀναλογίσασθε, "consider"), both growing out of the claim that they are surrounded by the cloud of witnesses enumerated in Heb 11.

(“promise”) appears fourteen times in Hebrews,¹⁶⁷ seven of which occur between Heb 10:35–11:39, and two of which (10:36; 11:39) are juxtaposed with the verb κομίζω (‘to receive, possess’). Finally, the substantive πίστις (“faith”) is common in Hebrews, appearing thirty-two times, with all but five of these between Heb 10:38–12:2. These words indicate the thrust of Heb 10:32–12:7: with faith and endurance the readers will receive the promised reward.

This gives the faith that is the subject of Heb 11 an eschatological orientation,¹⁶⁸ as indeed the opening paradigmatic definition that informs the rest of the chapter maintains.¹⁶⁹ Hebrews 11:1 explains that faith is the “reality” (ὑπόστασις) of what is hoped for and the “verification” (ἔλεγχος) of what is unseen,¹⁷⁰ unseen, that is, because it is still future (11:7, 13).¹⁷¹ In 12:2, Jesus the supreme exemplar of faith, like those in the catalogue of faithful people in Heb 11,¹⁷² endured and has now received his eschatological reward, having taken his seat at the right hand of the throne of God. The “unseen things” (πράγματα ... οὐ βλεπόμενα) of Heb 11:1 are to be correlated with the unseen subjection of the world to come to humanity in Heb 2:8, and the “things” (πράγματα) that the law has a foreshadowing of in Heb 10:1; that is, the blessings of the new age, now come with the exaltation of Christ (9:11). And, while the faithful figures of the OT saw and greeted the promised blessings from afar (11:13), the subjection of the world to come to

¹⁶⁷ Heb 4:1; 6:12, 15, 17; 7:6, 8:6; 9:15; 10:36; 11:9, 13, 17, 33, 39. The concentration of promise language in this chapter is reminiscent of 4:1–2, where the readers are to take care not to fail to reach God’s rest, as did the wilderness generation, while the promise of entering it remains. Interestingly, the end of the list of faithful people with Rahab, at the time of the conquest, carries the implication that none of these faithful people entered the promised rest of Ps 95, that is, the land of Canaan. Hebrews 11 compares and contrasts the faithful people who endured and will ultimately enter God’s rest with those unfaithful people of Heb 3 who did not and will not. Nevertheless, while the content of Heb 3–4 and 11 can be compared in this way, there is little specific vocabulary to indicate that. The implications simmer below the surface (see Ellingworth 1993: 563).

¹⁶⁸ Rhee 2001: 39–63.

¹⁶⁹ Not everybody is comfortable referring to Heb 11:1 as a “definition” (see e.g. Baugh 2006: 119, following Calvin 1996: 227). I take the terminology from Attridge 1989: 307.

¹⁷⁰ It is beyond my scope to enter into discussion of the complex translation problems surrounding Heb 11:1. The glosses “reality” and “verification” are from Attridge 1989: 309–10 (see the entire discussion on pp. 307–11). For a discussion of ὑπόστασις in Hebrews (also arguing for the sense of “reality”) see Koester 1972b: 585–88 and, for more recent discussion of both words, with similar conclusions, see Lane 1991b: 325–26; 28–29; Baugh 2006: 113–18; Bockmuehl 2009: 371; O’Brien 2010: 398–400.

¹⁷¹ Williamson 1970: 340; Lane 1991b: 329; Eisenbaum 1997: 384–86; Koester 2001: 473; Baugh 2006: 121; Moberly 2009: 354. It is true, nevertheless, that this eschatological orientation does not exhaust the ideas in the chapter, as vv. 3, 27 indicate (Attridge 1989: 311; Gordon 2008: 149–50). On the other hand Thompson 1982: 73–79; 2008: 231 draws a line between the things hoped for (eschatology) and the unseen things belonging to “the Platonic distinction between the visible and the invisible world,” as does Johnson 2006: 277. But as Ellingworth 1993: 562–63 and Rhee 2001: 31–34 demonstrate there is little, if any, indication of this distinction in the chapter.

¹⁷² For similar lists of heroes from the past see Wis 10; Sir 44–50; 4 Macc 16:16–23 and the discussion in Ellingworth 1993: 560–61. See Cosby 1988: 257–73 for a discussion of the use of anaphora in this chapter.

humanity is not yet apparent.¹⁷³ The exaltation of Christ, visible to all now through faith (Heb 2:9), is the “reality” (ὑπόστασις) of what is hoped for and the “verification” (ἐλεγχος) of this unseen subjection of all things.¹⁷⁴

This catalogue of faithful people who endured without receiving the promises is uneven. Some are treated in single sentences (Abel, v. 4; Enoch, v. 5; Noah, v. 7; Rahab, v. 31; Joseph, v. 22)¹⁷⁵ and others given an extended treatment. Abraham and the Patriarchs feature in vv. 8-22¹⁷⁶ and Moses in vv. 23-28. While the Exodus and conquest are mentioned in vv. 29-30, no names are given apart from Rahab, the rhetorical centre of the chapter,¹⁷⁷ followed by a brief eight-verse summary naming a few people in passing and a two verse conclusion.¹⁷⁸

The extended treatment given to Abraham indicates his significance.¹⁷⁹ Three incidents from his life are mentioned: his following God to the land of promise, while unaware of his destination, and his sojourn there as an alien with Isaac and Jacob; his ability along with Sarah to procreate when old; and the *Aqedah*. The eschatological orientation of Abraham’s faith is clear in the first incident, defined in terms of three locales: the place to which he travelled, the land where he sojourned and the country he anticipated.¹⁸⁰ At the outset he

¹⁷³ Cf. Brawley 1993: 95: “In spite of the appearance of present circumstances, faith is a conviction about the consummation of divine victory now withheld from human eyes.” Brawley reads Heb 2:8 as referring to the subjection of the world to come to Jesus rather than to humanity. Nevertheless, his argument for a correlation between Heb 2:8-9 and 11:1 still stands.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid.: 97.

¹⁷⁵ I exclude Isaac and Jacob, who also receive one sentence each (vv. 21-22), as they are subsumed under Abraham in vv. 9, 13-16, see Hamm 1990: 277.

¹⁷⁶ There is a generalising interlude in vv. 13-16, although Abraham and the Patriarchs remain in the background. Isaac and Jacob are mentioned in passing in v. 9 and given one sentence each in vv. 20-22. The largest space is given to Abraham, indicating that he is the most important figure in the chapter.

¹⁷⁷ Mosser 2009a: 384-86, 394-95 discusses the place of Rahab, the Gentile woman prostitute at the end of a list of the illustrious figures of Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph and Moses. The mention of Rahab is even more surprising in connection with the conquest of Canaan, since Joshua is absent from the list, although he does appear in 4:8 in a claim that he did not give the people the rest God had promised for them. As Johnson 2006: 290-91 suggests, this amounts to a critique of Joshua along with the wilderness generation for “seeing the land of Canaan as ‘God’s rest’ in the first place.” Moreover, Rahab did not perish with the disobedient (ἀπειθέω, see 3:18). Significantly, while the author has time to refer to Rahab, he has insufficient time to mention Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthah, David, Samuel and the prophets.

¹⁷⁸ For a discussion of the rhetorical composition and the function of Heb 11 in the book see Cosby 1988: 258-73, who concludes that the “rhetorical techniques reinforce the actual evidence presented to validate the author’s claim that those who please God are the ones who ignore earthly blessing and live their lives in the glorious hope of the promised heavenly rest.” For similar assessments see D’Angelo 1979: 24-26; Lane 1991b: 319; Schenck 2007: 28; O’Brien 2010: 395-96.

¹⁷⁹ Moffatt 1924: 168; Wilson 1987: 205.

¹⁸⁰ Apart from leaving in obedience to God, Abraham and the Patriarchs do not move, Abraham goes to “receive” (λαμβάνω) an inheritance; he “awaits” (ἐκδέχομαι) the city with foundations; he and the others “see” (εἶδον) and “greet” (ἀσπάζομαι) the (contents of) the promises; they “seek” (ἐπιζητέω) a homeland; and they “aspire to” (ὀρέγω) a better country. Thus, they are not pilgrims migrating towards heaven (after

travelled “to a place he was about to receive as an inheritance” (εἰς τόπον ὃν ἤμελλον λαμβάνειν εἰς κληρονομίαν).¹⁸¹ He arrived in “a land of promise” (γῆ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας), living there as an “alien” (παροικέω) with Isaac and Jacob (Gen 23:4), heirs with him of the same “promise” (ἐπαγγελία), as though living in a “foreign land” (ἄλλότριος).¹⁸² However, they were well aware this was not their ultimate goal, for while they “camped” there (ἐν σκηναῖς κατοικήσας),¹⁸³ they were waiting for “the city with foundations” (ἡ τοὺς θεμελίους ἔχουσιν πόλις),¹⁸⁴ whose “maker” (τεχνίτης) and “builder” (δημιουργός) is God.¹⁸⁵ The description of the city as being constructed and built by God is initially reminiscent of Heb 3:4, where the one who builds all things is God (although the Greek word there is κατασκευάζω, “prepare”), but more pertinent is Heb 8:2, where the true tent is “pitched” (πήγνυμι) by the Lord. Hebrews 11:10 is another text reflecting God intention to dwell with his people in the eschaton, this time not so much in

death) as Käsemann 1984: 32-37, 48-55 and Johnsson 1978: 245 suggest. Rather they anticipate the appearance of the city (Lane 1991b: 358-59). In Hebrews the city does not descend to earth as in Rev 21:2, 10 and 4 *Ezra* 13:36. Rather, as Heb 12:22-24 indicates, the city transcends the distinction between heaven and earth. I discuss this text in 7.6 (below).

¹⁸¹ The second correctors of **Σ** and **D**, and several minuscules add the definite article to τόπος in this verse. It is absent from P⁴⁶, the original hands of **Σ** and **D**, and from A, P, **Ψ** and several other minuscules. Adding the article may suggest that copyists were thinking of Canaan, but as the sequel shows, Canaan is not “the place.” See Lane 1991b: 349; Ellingworth 1993: 581-82; Koester 2001: 484; Schenck 2007: 63-64.

¹⁸² While there has been a tendency on the part of scholars to read Hebrews as though the author has a negative view of material things, and a positive view of the unseen world, this is a misreading of the text. Nevertheless, in 11:9-10 he does treat the “land of promise” (γῆ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας) with a degree of disdain, matching the suggestion of 4:8 that Joshua did not lead the people into God’s rest. The contrast is not between inferior earthly things and superior heavenly things, but between the eschatological dwelling place of God and the earthly territory that pointed to that reality. There can no longer be any attachment to that land, contra Buchanan 1972: 191-94 who thinks the goal is the earthly land, which is only metaphorically heavenly (see Attridge 1989: 329, footnote 12).

¹⁸³ In the entire NT only here in Hebrews does σκῆνη refer to a temporary human dwelling. It appears in Matt 17:4; Mark 9:5; Luke 9:33 (the transfiguration); Luke 16:9 (eternal homes); Acts 7:43-44 (the tabernacle); Acts 15:16 (the fallen tent of David); Heb 8:2, 5; 9:2, 3, 6, 8, 11, 21; 13:10 (the earthly or heavenly tabernacle); Rev 13:6; 15:5 (the tabernacle in heaven); 21:3 (the eternal dwelling place of God with his people).

¹⁸⁴ This is the first occurrence of πόλις (“city”) in Hebrews. The word appears three more times (11:16 in an emphatic position at the end of a paragraph; 12:22; 13:14). In 11:16; 12:22 the heavenly city is in view, and in 13:14, the earthly city (Jerusalem) is negated in a similar way that the land is negated in 11:9. Bruce 1990: 299 refers to Canaan and Jerusalem as “temporary object lessons.” Only here does one of the places referred to in vv. 8-10 have the definite article. This city is “the” place over against other places.

¹⁸⁵ Philo juxtaposes τεχνίτης and δημιουργός in several places, sometimes referring to builders generally (*Leg.* 3.98; *Cher.* 126; *Contempl.* 4-5; *Prov.* 2.15-16) and sometimes referring to God as a builder (*Leg.* 3.99; *Cher.* 127-28; *Gig.* 23; *Deus* 21, 25, 30, 31; *Congr.* 105; *Mut.* 29-32; *Aet.* 41-44). Spicq 1952: 1: 43-44 concludes that the author of Hebrews is indebted to Philo here, but as Williamson 1970: 46-51 points out, Philo uses the words for the creation of the world and the author of Hebrews for the construction of the new Jerusalem. Josephus juxtaposes the two words referring to builders in *Ant.* 12.35, and in *Ant.* 12.23 he uses δημιουργήμα of humans as God’s “workmanship”; and Wis 13:1 uses τεχνίτης of God. *T. Job* 39:12, the later *Hel. Syn. Pr.* (*Apos. Con.* 8.5.2; 8.12.22; 8.40.2) and the much later *Gk. Apoc. Ezra* use δημιουργός of God. DeSilva 2000b: 397 refers to the superior quality of the tent of 8:2 and this city because both were constructed by God. While this may be true, this is not the issue in either text. Rather “built by God” is a pointer to the eschatological dwelling place that God will construct.

a temple, but in a restored temple-city (the heavenly Jerusalem). This is confirmed by the reference to the foundations, since it is these that Yahweh would lay in the restored Zion.¹⁸⁶

Verses 13-16 are an important digression and emphasise the eschatological perspective of the chapter.¹⁸⁷ Verse 13 explains that Abraham, Sarah and the other Patriarchs died in faith, not having received the “promises” (ἐπαγγελία, pl.), although they saw them from a distance and greeted them,¹⁸⁸ while acknowledging that they were “strangers and aliens on the earth” (ξένοι καὶ παρεπίδημοι εἰσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς). Verses 14-15 explain that those who recognise that they are strangers and aliens make it clear that they are seeking a “homeland” (πατρίς), but this homeland is quite different from normal uses of the word;¹⁸⁹ it is not the place they “left” (ἐκβαίνω),¹⁹⁰ but the place they were “seeking” (ἐπιζητέω),¹⁹¹ to which they were more attached than their place of origin.

¹⁸⁶ Betz 1987: 106; O’Brien 2010: 414. For God laying the foundations of the eschatological Zion/Jerusalem see Ps 87 (LXX 86):5; Isa 28:16; 44:28; 54:11; for the stability of the heavenly city see Ps 46:4-5; and for God laying the foundations of the earthly Zion/Jerusalem see Ps 48:8 (LXX 47:9); 87 (LXX 86):1; Isa 14:32; 58:12. In 4 *Ezra* 10:27 the eschatological Jerusalem is a “place of huge foundations” (*locus ... de fundamentis magnis*), and in Rev 21:14, 19 the new Jerusalem has foundations, named with the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb. Of course, tents have no foundations, in contrast to this anticipated city. See De Young 1960: 138; Muntingh 1971: 108-129; Lane 1991b: 351-52; Ellingworth 1993: 584.

¹⁸⁷ Swetnam 1981a: 91-92; Lane 1991b: 355; O’Brien 2010: 417-18. Arowele 1990: 440-41, who subscribes to Käsemann’s belief that Heb 11 is from another source, attributes these verses to the author.

¹⁸⁸ That Abraham and the Patriarchs saw and “greeted” (ἀσπάζομαι) the promises indicates that they did not just see a mirage or an illusion (Moffatt 1924: 173; Braun 1984: 363). Apart from Matt 10:12, where Jesus advises his disciples to greet any “house” (οἰκία) they enter, clearly referring to those in the house, elsewhere in the NT ἀσπάζομαι only occurs with a personal direct object (including Heb 13:24) suggesting to Bockmuehl 2009: 369-70 that this was like greeting a friend, and to Ellingworth 1993: 594 that the city Abraham and the Patriarchs awaited was primarily a community. The antecedent of the plural direct object here (αὐτάς) is the (content of) the promises. Spicq 1952: 1: 84 cites as a supposed parallel Philo *Spec.* 4.17, who uses προσκυνέω (“prostrate oneself”) to refer to the plight of exiled slaves, unable to fall to the surface of their homeland on arrival there. Heb 11:13 is quite different.

¹⁸⁹ Πατρίς appears elsewhere in the NT only in the Synoptics (Matt 13:54, 57; Mark 6: 1, 4; Luke 4:23-24) and John 4:44, referring to a prophet’s hometown, where no honour is received. The sense here is different, as Abraham and the others were seeking a heavenly homeland, their destination rather than their place of origin (O’Brien 2010: 420). Πατρίς appears twenty-four times in the LXX (Lev 25:10; Esth 2:10, 20; 8:6; Jer 22:10; 26:16; Ezek 23:15; Tob 5:11; 2 Macc 4:1; 5:8, 9, 15; 8:21, 33; 13:3, 10, 14, 18; 4 Macc 1:11; 4:1, 5, 20; 17:21; 18:4), always referring to a place of origin and, at times, expressing a longing for that. The word is also frequent in Philo (eighty-nine times) and in Josephus (one hundred and forty-two times). Significant occurrences referring to attachment to one’s homeland in Philo include *Legat.* 277, 285; *Plant.* 146; *Ebr.* 17; *Flacc.* 46; and in Josephus *Ant.* 1.317; 12.304; 20.11; *J.W.* 1.434. See Ellingworth 1993: 595; Koester 2001: 490; DeSilva 2000b: 394-95 for discussions of homeland in Greco-Roman and Jewish literature. Braun 1970: 319-27 finds dependence on Philo here, who envisages heaven as a homeland that people come from and return to (*Her.* 274, see also 82), but these ideas are absent from Hebrews, see Ellingworth 1993: 595-96.

¹⁹⁰ Ἐκβαίνω is a *hapax legomenon* here in the NT and is rare in the LXX, appearing in Josh 4:16, 17, 18 (the priests coming up out of the Jordan with the ark); Isa 24:18; Jdt 5:8 (abandoning the ways of one’s ancestors); 1 Macc 4:27; 15:4; Sir 30:8; 38:18. Ellingworth 1993: 597 suggests an allusion to Josh 4, although an allusion to Jdt 5 is more likely, referring to the ancestors who have lived in Mesopotamia and left at the beginning of a potted history of Israel from Abraham to the return from the exile. The second revisers of **Σ** and **D**, as well as **Ψ** and the Majority Text read ἐξῆλθον, perhaps assimilating to v. 8. The attestation for

The homeland they sought that was “better” (κρείππων), “because” (τοῦτ’ ἔστιν)¹⁹² it is “heavenly” (ἐπουράνιος), since God has “prepared” (ἐτοιμάζω) a “city” (πόλις) for them. The use of ἐτοιμάζω echoes the text that above all refers to the eschatological dwelling place of God with his people, Exod 15:17—the “sanctuary” (ἁγίασμα) God’s hands have prepared.¹⁹³

Abraham is significant in Heb 11 by virtue of the length of the treatment given to him, but also because he is “the paradigmatic father of the pilgrim people of God *en route* to the better country and the city built by God.”¹⁹⁴ He contrasts with the wilderness generation of Heb 3:7–4:11, who failed to enter God’s rest through disobedience.¹⁹⁵ While the city that Abraham seeks is unnamed in Heb 11, its descriptions identify it as the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem of 12:22 and the city to come of 13:14.¹⁹⁶

Hebrews 11 ends with a similar statement. Not only did Abraham and the Patriarchs die in faith, waiting for their inheritance, but all those mentioned in the chapter, while commended for their faith, did not “receive” (κομίζω) “the promise” (ἡ ἐπαγγελία).¹⁹⁷ The promise, the inheritance, the heavenly homeland and the city with foundations are all unspecified in Heb 11, although the language used implies the eschatological dwelling of God with his people, to be confirmed in 12:18-29.

ἐκβαίνω is strong (P⁴⁶ *vid*, the original hands of **Σ** and D, A, P and several minuscules), and it should be retained.

¹⁹¹ Note the series of verbs expressing longing (ἐκδέχομαι, “to expect, wait,” v. 10; 10:13; ἐπιζητέω, “to desire strongly,” v. 14; 13:14; ὀρέγω, “to aspire to, strive for,” v. 16). See the discussion in O’Brien 2010: 420.

¹⁹² For this explanatory sense of τοῦτ’ ἔστιν see Matt 27:49; Mark 7:2; Acts 1:19; 19:4; Rom 7:18; 9:8; 10:6, 7; Phlm 12; Heb 2:14. See BDAG 741, s.v. οὗτος 1, b, ε; O’Brien, *ibid.*: 421.

¹⁹³ It is difficult to decide whether the text envisages the heavenly Jerusalem as already existing as, e.g. in 2 Bar 4, where it is said to have been prepared beforehand and shown to Abraham (among other people), or whether the “preparation” (ἐτοιμάζω) of the city took place with the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God. The text does make this clear, although Ellingworth 1993: 585 suggests that, like God’s resting place, it may have been understood to have existed since the creation (4:3), and that since Abraham and the Patriarchs were “waiting” (ἐκδέχομαι) for it, it was already in existence. In 2 Bar 4 the city is a cipher for the temple. This may also be the case here, although the text is unclear (but will be clarified in 12:22-24).

¹⁹⁴ Bockmuehl 2009: 364.

¹⁹⁵ In Heb 3:18 they fail because they “disobey” (ἀπειθέω); in 11:8, when called Abraham “obeys” (ὑπακούω). Cf. also Mosser 2009a: 393, “[e]very time the author repeats the word πίστει a contrast is drawn with the ἀπιστία of the wilderness generation.”

¹⁹⁶ Bruce 1990: 193-94; Baugh 2006: 130; Bockmuehl 2009: 369, 371, 373; Mosser 2009a: 390-91; Johnson 2006: 293-94; Thompson 2008: 235-38 O’Brien 2010: 412-14.

¹⁹⁷ Note the repetition of κομίζω and ἐπαγγελία in 10:36 and 11:39, providing an inclusio around Heb 11.

7.6 You have come to Mount Zion (12:18-24)

Hebrews 12:1-3 concludes the list of faithful people with the example of Jesus, “the pioneer and perfecter of faith” (ὁ τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγός καί τελειωτής Ἰησοῦς). A string of imperatives in vv. 3-17 demonstrate that this pericope is an appeal to the readers to persevere and endure discipline,¹⁹⁸ ending with the negative example of Esau, who fell short of the grace of God (v. 15) sacrificing his inheritance rights to satisfy his immediate hunger. A further imperative appears in v. 25, where the readers are to “see to it” (βλέπω) that they do not refuse the one who speaks.¹⁹⁹ Between the example of Esau (12:13-17) and the call to listen to the one who speaks is a finely balanced pericope that claims that the readers have not come to Sinai but to Zion. This pericope, which Lindars refers to as the “grand finale” of Hebrews,²⁰⁰ contains significant temple imagery.

This pericope does not stand alone, however, being joined to what precedes with the causal particle γάρ, showing that vv. 18-24 provide the theological foundation for the warnings of vv. 14-17.²⁰¹ Moreover, the repetition of the present participle of λαλέω (“to speak”) in vv. 24, 25 shows that vv. 18-24 lead into the appeal to listen to the speech of God.

¹⁹⁸ In v. 3 the readers are directed to “consider” (ἀναλογίζομαι) Jesus who endured hostility against himself; in v. 12 they are to “lift up” (a participle of παρίημι with imperatival force) their drooping hands, and “strengthen” (ἀνορθόω) their weak knees; in v. 13 they are to “make” (ποιέω) straight paths for their feet; in v. 14 they are to “seek” (διώκω) peace with all people, and holiness; and in v. 15, another imperatival participle directs them to “take care” (ἐπισκοπέω) that none falls short of the grace of God, that no root of bitterness springs up and that none becomes like Esau. For participles with imperatival force see Wallace 1996: 650-53, and for this example see O’Brien 2010: 473 (footnote 146). There are twenty-one second person plural imperatives in Hebrews: three in Heb 3 (vv. 1, 12, 13), one in 7:4, one in 10:32 and sixteen in chapters 12-13 (Heb 12:3, 12, 13, 14, 25; 13:2, 3, 7, 9, 16, 17, 18, 24). There are also nineteen hortatory subjunctives, but only four fall in Heb 12-13 (see 2:1; 3:6, 14; 4:1, 11, 14, 16; 6:1, 18; 10:22, 23, 24; 12:1, 28; 13:13, 15) Exhortation is mostly replaced by directive in the closing chapters of Hebrews.

¹⁹⁹ The present imperative of βλέπω also appears in 3:12 as part of the appeal to the readers to hear the Holy Spirit speaking in Ps 95:7-12.

²⁰⁰ Lindars 1989: 402. Lindars actually refers to 12:18-29 as the “grand finale.” I will examine vv. 25-29 in 7.7 (below). Others who assign climactic significance to 12:18-24 in the rhetorical structure of Hebrews include Jones 1985: 396; Lane 1991b: 448; Isaacs 1992: 87; Ellingworth 1993: 669; Guthrie 1994: 143; Koester 2001: 548; Son 2005: 78; Thompson 2008: 266 (who seems to have changed his mind from 1982: 44, where following Käsemann 1939: 27-29 [ET 1984: 48-51] he proposed that vv. 18-24 had been taken over from some other source and adapted); O’Brien 2010: 477. Others who see the incorporation of a traditional source here include Rissi 1987: 101-102 and Scholer 1991: 137-38. On the other hand, Jones 1985: 396-74 finds that the theme of the two covenants that has pervaded Hebrews is synthesised in this pericope, and Son 2005: 24, 77-104 (and *passim*) argues that this pericope “reveals the author’s conceptual framework on the basis of which he has developed his argument throughout this epistle” (p. 24) and sums up everything that precedes.” Son has probably overstated the results of his study, but there is no doubt that this pericope occupies a significant place in concluding the argument, making it unlikely that it has been incorporated from some earlier source.

²⁰¹ Moffatt 1924: 213-14; Schierse 1955: 170-72; Thompson 1982: 43; 2008: 267; Casey 1982: 325, 332-33; Lane 1991b: 459; Ellingworth 1993: 670. The word γάρ appears twice in v. 17 explaining the situation of Esau. Γάρ in v. 18 is related not to Esau, but to the appeal to seek for peace and holiness in v. 14, so as to “see” (ὁράω) the Lord (Attridge 1989: 372).

Hebrews 12:18-24 comprises two contrasting sentences, the first beginning with the expression οὐ ... προσελήλυθατε (“you have not come”), and the second beginning with ἀλλὰ προσελήλυθατε (“but you have come”).²⁰² While no mountain is named as the place to which the readers have not come,²⁰³ it is clear from the string of descriptors joined by the conjunction καί,²⁰⁴ that Sinai is in view. These words describe “the physical phenomena accompanying the giving of the law,”²⁰⁵ followed by the reaction of the people who could not endure the order that no animal touch the mountain, and of Moses who trembled with fear. The overriding emotion that surfaces in this description is terror at the presence of God. As in 3:7–4:11, the readers are compared with the Sinai generation. But, while in the earlier text the comparison was motivation to persevere so as to attain to God’s rest in the heavenly temple, here it is motivation to seek peace and sanctification (12:14), since they already have proleptic access to that heavenly temple.

The perfect indicative of προσέρχομαι (“to approach”) needs to be read similarly in vv. 18 and 22.²⁰⁶ These are the final occurrences of the verb in Hebrews, and only here is it in the indicative mood. Previously, it has referred to the approach of the community to God, either his throne (4:16) or God himself (7:25; 10:22; 11:6); as well as to the approach of the Israelites to God under the old covenant (10:1).²⁰⁷ Here, the text claims that the

²⁰² BDF 232, §448 (1); Scholer 1991: 140; Lane 1991b: 440 (note v).

²⁰³ The first sentence claims that the readers have not come to what can be touched using the present passive participle of ψηλαφάω (“to touch, handle”). Several witnesses to the text (D, Ψ, several minuscules, the Majority Text and some versions add ὄρει—the dative singular of ὄρος, “to a mountain”). This reading seems to be secondary, probably assimilated to v. 22 where “Mount Zion” (Σιὼν ὄρος) is the place to which they have come. See Lane 1991b: 441 (note x); Metzger 1994: 605. The word ὄρει is absent from P⁴⁶, 8, A, C, several minuscules and versions.

²⁰⁴ In addition to the seven occurrences of καί, the contracted form κὰν (καὶ ἑάν) appears in v. 20.

²⁰⁵ Johnson 2006: 326. See the discussion in Son 2005: 31-35. The marginal notes in NA²⁷ identify allusions to Exod 19:16-19; 20:18; Deut 4:11-12; 5:22; and the words ἔκφοβός εἰμι (“I am terrified,” 12:21) are from Deut 9:19 where Moses describes his terror at Sinai/Horeb.

²⁰⁶ Ellingworth 1993: 671.

²⁰⁷ I discuss below (8.2) the cultic sense of προσέρχομαι in Hebrews, where only God, his throne or the heavenly temple are “approached.” Εἰσέρχομαι (“to enter”) also has a cultic sense in Hebrews, but normally appears in different contexts. It describes entry into God’s rest, which I have argued is in the heavenly temple (3:11, 18, 19; 4:1, 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, although the impetus for the use of the verb in Heb 3-4 is its appearance in Ps 95 (LXX 94):11, quoted in Heb 3:11). It is used for entry into the heavenly holy of holies (6:19, 20; 9:12, 24), or the earthly (9:25), and for the entry of Christ into the world (10:5). On the basis of this word and the clear temple imagery in the pericope, Scholer (ibid.: 149) extrapolates that the readers of Hebrews, as well as those they encounter in the heavenly temple, have attained “a high priestly status with regard to their access to God.” This is not a necessary deduction and, indeed, the word is never used in Hebrews to refer to the approach of the high priest to the holy of holies. Rather, as Thompson 1982: 45 notes, it is always used of the approach of the community in worship or prayer. Since under the new covenant the former cultic arrangements are no longer necessary, there is no role for the former priesthood. While the faithful now experience the same privileges granted to the former high priests in terms of access to God, they are not thereby given the status of high priests, of which there is now only one (Jesus). Under the new covenant, they have privileges that far outstrip those of the community of the old covenant. The presence of God is open to them, and they worship in the heavenly Temple along with the angels, the whole community of the faithful and the righteous dead (Ellingworth 1993: 678). The priestly nature of the

readers have not come to Sinai, but to Zion. The verb echoes Deut 4:11 where the people “approached” (προσέρχομαι) and “stood” (ἵστημι) at the foot of Horeb. The perfect tense intensifies the action of coming,²⁰⁸ and perhaps indicates that the readers are to recognise that either in their conversion,²⁰⁹ or in their worship,²¹⁰ that they have come to and are now (proleptically) present at Mount Zion.²¹¹

Setting the stage for the contrast in the two sentences (18-21, 22-24) is the clause οὐ ... προσεληλύθατε ψηλαφωμένῳ (“you have not come to something that can be touched”), which finds its counterpart in the clause ἀλλὰ προσεληλύθατε Σιὼν ὅρει

Christian community in 1 Pet 2:5 is quite different. This has its origins in priestly language applied to the people at the foot of Sinai in Exod 19:6, where there are to be “a holy people called to worship and praise God in the world” (Michaels 1988: 113).

²⁰⁸ Burton 1976: 38; Campbell 2007: 201-10; O’Brien 2010: 479. The syntax of the perfect indicative is complex, and the traditional definition of “the *continuance of completed action*” (BDF 175, §340, italics original) is not always appropriate (for a critique of this traditional definition see Evans 2004: 205-206; Campbell 2007: 162; 2011: 139-55). Of the forty-five perfect indicatives in Hebrews, three are in OT quotations (1:5; 5:5; 10:7) and six introduce OT quotations (1:13; 4:3, 4, 7; 10:9; 12:26; 13:5). The remainder occur in the author’s own discourse. Those where the traditional definition is unsuitable include 2:18 (Jesus suffered when tested); 7:6 (Melchizedek collected tithes and blessed Abraham); 7:9 (Abraham paid tithes), 11 (the people received the law); 7:13 (Jesus belongs to another tribe from which nobody serves at the altar); 8:5 (Moses warned); 9:18 (the covenant inaugurated); 9:26 (Jesus has appeared); 10:11 (every priest stands); 11:5 (it was attested that Enoch was taken away), 17 (Abraham offered Isaac at the *Aqedah*) and 28 (Moses kept the Passover); while those where the traditional definition is suitable include 1:4; 2:14; 3:3, 14; 5:11, 12; 6:9; 7:14, 16; 8:13; 10:14, 30; 12:2, 5, 8, 17. At times, where the traditional definition is unsuitable, a simple past tense is an appropriate translation (e.g. 2:18), and at other times a present tense translation is appropriate (e.g. 10:11, although this is inherent in the verb ἵστημι, to stand, rather than the perfect tense itself). In Heb 12:18, 22 the notion that the people have come and are considered to be present at Zion rather than Sinai is probably indicated, replicating the sense of the two aorists in Deut 4:11—the source of the allusion (προσῆλθετε καὶ ἑστήτε, “you came and stood”). Any verbal action in any tense has consequences or creates a new state (Campbell 2007: 164-65) and since, as Deut 4:11 indicates, the state of having been at Horeb (and, indeed, the ongoing results of that in the behaviour of the people, Deut 4:9) can be expressed by a simple aorist (you came to Horeb—and you should therefore live differently), the perfect is to be seen as giving prominence to the new state created by the verbal action (you came to Zion—and therefore you must not refuse the one who speaks, 12:25). While in Deut 4:11 the people were no longer at Horeb, in Heb 12:22-24 there is no indication that they have left Mount Zion.

²⁰⁹ Barrett 1954: 376; Peterson 1982: 160; Bruce 1990: 255; Thompson 2008: 267; O’Brien 2010: 482. Cf. the etymology of the English word “proselyte” with the form in this verse (προσεληλύθατε).

²¹⁰ Jones 1985: 396-97; Scholer 1991: 144; Ellingworth 1993: 678. Scholer (p. 144) refers to “worship and prayer ... as the means by which Christians may already dwell in the heavenly ... while still on earth.” The text is a reminder to the readers of the access to God that they have in the present (4:14-16; 6:19-20; 7:19; 10:19-23), arising out of their conversion and realised in their worship (Arowele 1990: 444).

²¹¹ Johnsson 1973: 332 (footnote 207); Peterson 1982: 160; Casey 1982: 332; Scholer 1991: 143; Attridge 1989: 372; Lane 1991b: 440-41 (note w). Contra Montefiore 1964: 229 who suggests that “they have drawn close but not yet arrived”; Hofius 1970c: 142 who suggests that they have arrived at the gates; Wilson 1987: 230 who suggests that they have come near, but not actually arrived; and Rissi 1987: 100-101 who suggests that while they have access to Mount Zion, they remain on earth with their temptations and suffering. Ellingworth 1993: 671 proposes that προσέρχομαι is ambiguous here, indicating that “their worship ... [is] dominated by the reality of heaven ... yet negative and positive exhortation ... are still needed.” Thus, the word expresses the already and not yet of Christian eschatology. For similar ideas see Eph 1:3-14. See Lincoln 1990: 19-44.

(“but you have come to Mount Zion”).²¹² This contrast has been read in different ways. Thompson detects a Platonic philosophical background and suggests that the word ψηλαφάω (“to touch”) is used pejoratively to distinguish the inferior phenomenal world from the superior noumenal world.²¹³ However, as elsewhere in Hebrews, the two sentences contrast not what is vertical and spatial, but what is linear and eschatological, between two covenants. The former was mediated by Moses (implied, but not stated in the first sentence) and the new covenant is mediated by Jesus (8:6; 9:15; 12:24).²¹⁴ This has led other scholars to suggest that Mount Zion cannot be touched primarily because it is future.²¹⁵

Significantly, however, the text nowhere suggests that Mount Zion cannot be touched.²¹⁶ That is not the essence of the contrast. The source of the imagery is the palpable darkness of the ninth plague (Exod 10:21),²¹⁷ where both the adjective ψηλαφητός (“palpable”) appears alongside the noun γνόφος (“darkness”), two words that appear in Heb 12:18. This is a more likely allusion, especially given the semantic range of ψηλαφάω, which includes the sense of “feel around, grope.”²¹⁸ The old covenant is

²¹² For the translation “you have not/have come” see Lane 1991b: 440-41. I discuss the cultic implications of προσέρχομαι in Hebrews in 8.2 (below). These implications are also reflected in Heb 12:18-24 (Johnsson 1973: 332, footnote 207); Attridge 1989: 372; Scholer 1991: 141; Lane 1991b: 440-41; Son 2005: 91-93; Beale 2004b: 301-303; O’Brien 2010: 483). Since God was encountered at Sinai, Sinai is to be recognised as a temple-mountain (Beale 2004b: 105-107), and Zion refers not so much to the city where people live, but to the temple-city where God dwells and is encountered. For a contemporary indication of Sinai as a “temple,” see Josephus *Ant.* 3.99 where the rationale for building the tabernacle in which God would dwell with his people was so that they would no longer have to go to Sinai to encounter God. Sinai and Zion are paired as holy places in *Jub.* 4:26; 8:19.

²¹³ Thompson 1982: 45-47; 2008: 267; Scholer 1991: 140; Ellingworth 1993: 672; Johnson 2006: 329-30. Philo never uses ψηλαφάω in this sense. The verb appears in *Her.* 250 with the sense of groping around in the darkness; and in *Mut.* 126 with the sense of “being in touch with divine things.” In *Mut.* 126 the cognate noun ψηλάφημα (“touch”) also appears as one of the meanings of the name Moses, and in *Leg.* 3. 231 it is the meaning of the name “Chemosh” (Χαμώς). Another associated noun ψηλαφητός (“palpable”) refers to deep darkness in *Somn.* 1.114, an allusion to the same word in Exod 10:21. Thompson 1982: 45 refers to Philo, *Cher.* 57, 73, *Post.* 20, *Legat.* 6, where Philo discusses the distinction between what is and what is not sense-perceptible. In *Cher.* 57 Philo uses the substantive ἀφή (“sense of touch”); in *Cher.* 73 he uses the verb ἅπτω (“to touch”); in *Post.* 20 the verb ψαύω (“to touch”); and in *Legat.* 6 he uses the adjective ἄψαυτος (“untouchable”). Thompson also refers to Plato *Phaedo* 99E (where the verb is ἅπτω, “to touch”); *Tim.* 28B, 31B (adjective ἅπτός, “tangible”). The only occurrence of ψηλαφάω in Plato is in *Phaedro* 99B, where it has the sense “groping in the dark” (ψηλαφῶντες οἱ πολλοὶ ὥσπερ ἐν σκότει).

²¹⁴ Lohse 1971:337; Peterson 1982: 160-66; Scholer 1991: 138 (footnote 1); Lane 1991b: 461.

²¹⁵ Hurst 1984: 70; Lane 1991b: 461.

²¹⁶ Thompson 1982: 45 acknowledges this.

²¹⁷ Attridge 1989: 372; Bruce 1990: 352.

²¹⁸ BDAG 1097-98. It appears with this sense in Gen 27:12, 21, 22 where the blind Isaac “touches” Jacob and identifies him as Esau. It also has this sense in Deut 28:29; Judg 16:26; Job 5:14; 12:26; Isa 59:10; Luke 24:39; Acts 17:27.

characterised by darkness and gloom that is so thick that it can be felt.²¹⁹ The new covenant is quite different.²²⁰

Apart from the reference to a “festal gathering” (πανήγυρις) in v. 22, the positive emotions in Heb 12:22-24 are not explicated. Again, the conjunction καί appears seven times, with the eight descriptors falling into four pairs.²²¹ “Mount Zion” (Σιών ὄρει) is the destination, with the first descriptor identifying Zion as the “city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem” (πόλει θεοῦ ζῶντος, Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐπουρανίῳ).²²² In the OT, Zion is frequently designated as God’s dwelling place.²²³ Given that this is the only reference to Zion in Hebrews, the readers may have inferred that the author was referring to the earthly Mount Zion and the Temple Mount over against Sinai. However, the two additional epithets clarify that the earthly Zion is not in view.²²⁴ The “city” (πόλις) recalls the city with foundations (11:10), that God had prepared for Abraham and the patriarchs (11:16),²²⁵

²¹⁹ The word translated “touch” in Heb 12:20 is θιγγάνω, in an allusion to Exod 19:12 (where it is a *bapax legomenon* in the LXX), also appearing in Heb 11:28 for the destroying angel touching the firstborn of Israel at the Passover; and in the list of regulations in Col 2:21—do not “touch” (ἅπτω), “taste” (νεύομαι) or “handle” (θιγγάνω).

²²⁰ Guthrie 1998: 420 suggests that the imagery in vv. 22-24 “communicates exultation, warmth, openness, acceptance, and relationship, set off in bold relief against the dismal portrait of the Sinai assembly.” Son 2005: 93 proposes that the imagery in these two sentences is neither primarily vertical nor primarily horizontal, rather it explains “the superior situation of the Christian community under the new covenant ...” Unfortunately, following this comment Son, reverts to the notion that the earthly sanctuary is inferior because it is only a copy of the true heavenly sanctuary. I will argue in 8.5 (below) that there is no trace of this in Hebrews and that the heavenly city and sanctuary are superior not because they are immaterial, but because they are the true reality that the former sanctuary anticipated.

²²¹ Westcott 1892: 412; Attridge 1989: 374; Son 2005: 87-89. Delitzsch 1868: 2: 244-45 finds a sevenfold division, combining the myriads of angels and the firstborn; Hughes 1977: 545 finds seven items in each list, but to get this he has to add Sinai as a heading in the first list and treat Zion as a heading in the second; Rissi 1987: 101-102 proposes that the author inherited a list of seven descriptors to which he added an eighth (the spirits of the just made perfect), which he considers is out of order and should precede the reference to God the judge of all. Attridge 1989: 372 finds twelve items, analysed into the same four pairs as I have, but counts “appositional elements added a four points” separately.

²²² All of these expressions are anarthrous in Greek. I have supplied a definite article in English where appropriate. Johnson 2006: 327 translates “a city of the living God, a heavenly Jerusalem,” as though there were more than one of each. He also translates the καί in the expression καὶ πόλει θεοῦ ζῶντος, Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐπουρανίῳ with “and,” reading “Mount Zion, and a city ...” But surely this καί is explicative, identifying Zion with the city and Jerusalem (Spicq 1952: 2: 405; Lane 1991b: 441 [note gg]; Ellingworth 1993: 677; O’Brien 2010: 483). This καί is omitted by the original hand of D, but since its omission has such little support it should be retained.

²²³ 1 Kings 14:21; Ps 2:6; 9:11; 48:2; 50:2; 65:1; 74:2; 76:2; 78:68; 84:7; 87:2; 99:2; 102:16, 21; 110:2; 128:5; 132:13; 134:3; 135:21; Amos 1:2; Mic 4:7; Joel 4:16, 17, 21; Zech 2:10; 8:3; 9:9; Isa 8:18; 12:6; 18:7; 24:23; 60:14; 64:10; Sir 36:18.

²²⁴ Koester 2001: 550; Son 2005: 89; O’Brien 2010: 483.

²²⁵ Johnson 2006: 331; Fuller Dow 2010: 173-74. Scholer 1991: 142 wants to distinguish between the other references to a “city” in Hebrews (11:10, 13-16; 13:14) and this reference, acknowledging that only he and Rissi 1987: 44 read the text in this way. On the other hand, he identifies the heavenly Jerusalem with the heavenly sanctuary (p. 141). For the significance of the “city” in Hebrews see Walker 1996: 214-21.

that is, the heavenly Jerusalem.²²⁶ Thus, the author has taken the well-known imagery of Zion/Jerusalem as the place of access to God and, by means of the adjective “heavenly” (ἐπουράνιος), applied it as a metaphor for access to God under the new covenant.²²⁷

The sense in which this city can be described as “heavenly” is important. Since the readers have access to it, it is clearly not “up in heaven.” Rather, as elsewhere in Hebrews, what is heavenly refers to what is to come, now come into the present.²²⁸ This is the eschatological dwelling of God with his people.²²⁹ Just as God dwelt with his people in the earthly Jerusalem/Zion under the old covenant, he now dwells with his people in the heavenly Jerusalem/Zion.²³⁰ Temple imagery is pressed into service to symbolise the close relationship between God and his people under the new covenant. This is appropriate, since Zion/Jerusalem is a cipher for the temple where God was encountered. The figurative language used elsewhere for this dwelling: “the world to come” (2:5); “God’s rest” (4:1-11); “the true tent” (8:2); “within the curtain” (6:19-20; 10:19-25); “the city built by God” (11:10); “the heavenly homeland” (11:16); “the unshakable kingdom” (12:28); and “the city to come” (13:14), is now extended to include the heavenly Jerusalem.

The next pair of descriptors refers to the inhabitants of the heavenly Jerusalem, the “myriads of angels in a festal gathering” (μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει),²³¹ and the “assembly of the firstborn, inscribed in heaven” (ἐκκλησία πρωτοτόκων

²²⁶ Attridge 1989: 374. Buchanan 1972: 222 thinks it is a reference to the restored earthly city of Jerusalem, called “heavenly” because of its divine origin. He refers to Ezek 40-48; Zech 14:9-11. But this is to misread the eschatological outlook of Hebrews. See Gordon 2008: 43-44

²²⁷ DeSilva 2000b: 466.

²²⁸ Heb 3:1; 6:4; 8:5; 9:23; 11:16.

²²⁹ Lane 1991b: 465; Koester 2001: 544; Son 2005: 91; O’Brien 2010: 483.

²³⁰ The notion of a (new) heavenly Jerusalem is absent from the OT, but appears in Rabbinic and apocalyptic literature as the eschatological dwelling place of God with his people. See *T. Dan* 5:12-13; *2 Bar.* 4:2-7; *4 Ezra* 7:26; 8:52; 10:27, 54; 13:36; *1 En.* 90:26-39; *2 En.* 55:2; *Tob* 13:10-16; *Sib. Or.* 3.787; 5. 250-51; *Gal* 4:26; *Rev* 3:12; 21:1-4; *b. Hag* 12b; *B. Bat.* 75b. See Barrett 1954: 374-76. Philo (*Somm.* 2. 250) refers to Jerusalem not made of wood or stone, but found in a peaceful human soul. Thus, in Philo Jerusalem is allegorised as a “vision of peace” (Williamson 1970: 144; Fuglseth 2005: 215). In Hebrews, there is no such allegory; rather the heavenly Jerusalem is a metaphor for the dwelling of God with his people.

²³¹ The original hand of D reads μυρίων ἁγίων ἀγγέλων (ten thousand holy angels). This reading is only attested in this MS and, for this reason, as well as the genitive case of μυρίων among a succession of datives, indicates that it is secondary. It is debated whether the dative singular of πανήγυρις refers to what precedes (the angels) or to what follows (the assembly of the firstborn). The presence of καί after πανηγύρει suggests that is to be construed with what precedes, as a circumstantial dative qualifying the angels. If it is construed with what follows the καί functions as in v. 22, expressing the idea that the readers have come to a festal gathering, even (καί) the church of the firstborn. Apart from v. 22 καί functions elsewhere in this list to join different aspects of Mount Zion, making this latter option unlikely, although adopted by De Young 1960: 139 (footnote 69); Dumbrell 1976: 155-56, and reflected in the punctuation of NA²⁷. For arguments for construing it with what precedes see Williamson 1970: 68; Hughes 1977: 552-54 (who gives six possible options); Attridge 1989: 375; Bruce 1990: 353; Lane 1991b: 441-42 (note jj); Scholer 1991: 145 (footnote 5); Ellingworth 1993: 679; O’Brien 2010: 484 (footnote 209).

ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς).²³² The presence of angels in a festal gathering is to be read in the context of the numerous references to angels in the other literature surveyed in earlier chapters of this study. Especially at Qumran, the community seems to have envisaged that they were involved with angelic worship, either on earth in the life of the community, or in the heavenly temple.²³³ As well as the notion that the Qumran community were involved with angelic worship, angels also feature in other texts as cultic officials in the heavenly temple.²³⁴ All these texts include the notion of a heavenly journey, something that is absent from Hebrews. Here, the community is pictured as already having come to the heavenly Jerusalem, to be participating in angelic worship, while still earthbound. The heavenly Jerusalem encompasses earth and heaven and is where the new covenant community encounters God and his heavenly entourage in worship.

Some scholars read the “assembly of the firstborn inscribed in heaven” as a further reference to angels,²³⁵ but the notion of enrolment in heaven seems to indicate humans are in view. They are the firstborn ones, who belong to Jesus the firstborn one, already in the world to come (1:6). This is the “assembly” (ἐκκλησία) of Heb 2:12 that he came to sanctify, the siblings of Jesus, enrolled in heaven, now assembling in the heavenly temple,²³⁶ and participating in the “Sabbath celebration” (σαββατισμός) of Heb 4:9.²³⁷

The temple imagery fades with the next pair of descriptors. “God the judge of all” (κριτὴ θεῶ πάντων) is present, as are the “spirits of the righteous made perfect”

²³² The Majority Text and one minuscule witness invert the word order here. The evidence for the word order in the main text of NA²⁷ is much stronger.

²³³ In my treatment of *ShirShabb* (3.11, above) I discussed the understanding that *ShirShabb* envisaged angelic worship in the heavenly temple, and also the reading of Fletcher-Louis, who discounts any “above and below” distinction between the earthly community and the heavenly temple at Qumran, arguing that the community envisaged themselves as angelomorphic priests worshipping God alongside the angels while earthbound in the Judean desert. See also my treatment above of 4QInstruction (3.5); 4QDaily Prayers (3.6); *The Community Rule* (3.7); *The Rule of the Congregation* (3.8); *The War Scroll* (3.10); 4QBerakhot (3.12); *Hodayot* (3.14). For these connections with Qumran see Strugnell 1960: 320; Gärtner 1965: 89-99; Bruce 1990: 357-58; Lane 1991b: 468. Some of the early literature on Qumran (especially Gärtner 1965: 94-99 on the relationship between 1QM and Heb 12) overstates the case for connections between Qumran and this text in Hebrews, as the differences are significant. The reference in Hebrews to Mount Zion is absent from Qumran, and the Qumran understanding of the community as a temple is at best, muted if present at all, in Hebrews. Furthermore, the elaborate descriptions of the heavenly temple and liturgy at Qumran are absent from Hebrews. See the judicious comments in Klinzing 1971: 201-202, who suggests the adoption of a common tradition with significant differences in the way it has been put to use.

²³⁴ *Jub.* 31:14; *T. Levi* 3:5; *1 En.* 5-16; *Apoc. Zeph.* Already in the OT numerous angels inhabit heaven and are involved in the worship of God (Ps 89:6; 103:21; 148:2), a tradition also reflected in Rev 5:11-12.

²³⁵ Spicq 1952: 2: 407-408; Montefiore 1964: 231; Käsemann 1984: 50 (footnote 89).

²³⁶ Peterson 1982: 162; Bruce 1990: 358; Attridge 1989: 375; Lane 1991b: 468-69; Ellingworth 1993: 679; Johnson 2006: 332.

²³⁷ Lane 1991b: 467; Koester 2001: 545.

(πνεύμασι²³⁸ δικαίων τετελειωμένων). In 10:26-31 those who persist in sin have only the fearful prospect of judgment. But the reference to God as judge, juxtaposed in this verse with the reference to the spirits of the righteous made perfect, that is, the righteous dead,²³⁹ indicates that there is also the prospect of positive judgment for those made perfect—the dead Christians already worshipping in heaven.²⁴⁰ These include those listed in Heb 11 (see Heb 11:40) and all who endure to the end. For these people there is the prospect of eschatological acceptance.²⁴¹ Thus, the worship of the community on earth, wherever it is located, is also in the heavenly temple in the presence of myriads of angels, the assembly of the firstborn and the righteous dead.

The final pair of descriptors refer to the “mediator of the new covenant, Jesus” (διαθήκης νέας μεσίτη Ἰησοῦ), and “the blood of sprinkling, speaking in a better manner²⁴² than [the blood of] Abel” (αἷματι ῥαντισμοῦ κρείττον λαλοῦντι παρὰ τὸν Ἄβελ).²⁴³ The blood of sprinkling echoes Heb 9:11-22 and the inauguration of both the Sinai covenant and the new covenant, the latter enabling the promised eternal inheritance (9:22) envisaged in the present text.

This neatly balanced pericope contrasts the terrifying events surrounding the inauguration of the Sinai covenant with “the ultimate, eschatological encounter with God

²³⁸ The original hand of D, B, and some Vulgate MSS read πνεύματι (singular, “by [S]pirit”). Attridge 1989: 371, probably rightly, suggests a “Trinitarian connection.” In place of δικαίων τετελειωμένων the original hand of D and Hilary read δικαίων τεθεμελιωμένων (“of the righteous who have been established”), and the original hand of **8** reads πνεύμασι τελείων δεδικαιωμένοις (“justified spirits of perfect ones”). The evidence for these readings is slim, and the reading adopted in NA²⁷ well suits the context of Hebrews.

²³⁹ Arowele 1990: 444-45. See *1 En.* 22:3-4; 41:8; 103:3-4.

²⁴⁰ Scholer 1991: 146.

²⁴¹ O’Brien 2010: 487.

²⁴² Κρείττον (“better”) is probably best construed as an adverb (Attridge 1989: 377) rather than a singular adjective where it would refer to “something better.” P⁴⁶ and 1505 read κρείττονα (plural, “better things”), but this attestation is minimal.

²⁴³ The question as to whether the blood of Abel speaks in this verse (as in Gen 4:10) or whether Abel speaks (as in Heb 11:4) is not critical to this study. Ellingworth and Nida 1983: 313 and O’Brien 2010: 489 claim that most translations add a reference to the blood of Abel speaking (alongside the sprinkled blood of Jesus), and this reading is explicit in P⁴⁶ followed by L and a few MSS where the definite article appears as neuter (τό, governing the neuter αἷμα blood), rather than τόν (masculine, governing Ἄβελ). The definite article appears with a personal name in Hebrews only here and in 7:1 (where it is required by the grammatical structure, οὗτος ... ὁ Μελχισέδεκ, “now this Melchizedek”); 6:13 (where it clarifies that Abraham is in the dative case); and in 11:20 (where it clarifies that Isaac and Jacob are in the accusative case). Lane 1991b: 442 (note qq) suggests these statistics make the reading with the masculine definite article unlikely. However, the reading with the neuter definite article could also reflect scribal activity, perhaps an attempt to make unambiguous what is ambiguous in the text. While NA²⁷ gives no text-critical detail, Lane (p. 442) notes that the reading with the accusative definite article “enjoys massive support.” Smillie 2004: 275-83 argues from Heb 12:25 that God is speaking in v. 24, but this requires a disturbance in the tight rhetorical structure of 12:18-24 at its climactic point. See the discussion (and the critique of Smillie’s position) in O’Brien 2010: 489-91.

in the heavenly Jerusalem.”²⁴⁴ Considerable temple imagery surfaces in the description, indicating that under the new covenant the encounter with God is the reality to which the Jerusalem temple pointed. Given the emphasis in Hebrews on the need to persevere, it seems clear that this imagery does not nullify the eschatological goal that lies ahead of the readers. Rather, it clarifies that in their worship they can now, proleptically,²⁴⁵ experience what is promised to them at the end of their journey to God’s rest. There, they will find a reality that had been experienced all along.²⁴⁶ That they can access the heavenly temple now indicates, once more, that the distinction between the heavenly world and the earthly world is not spatial, vertically separated from the earth. Rather, this text clarifies that the faithful have proleptic access to the presence of God,²⁴⁷ that will be consummated in the future when they attain to God’s rest (4:11), as long as they endure and remain faithful.

7.7 A Kingdom that cannot be Shaken (12:25-29)

There are several verbal and rhetorical links between this passage and the first warning in 2:1-4, forming an *inclusio* around Heb 2-12.²⁴⁸ The readers are now warned not to “disregard” (παραιτέομαι)²⁴⁹ the one who speaks. It takes the form of a *qal wahomer* argument: since those who disregarded the one who warned them on earth did not escape, it is even more important for them not to turn away from the one who warns from heaven. The parallels between this text and 2:1-4, as well as the reference to Sinai in 12:18-21, indicate that the one speaking in 12:25 is God.²⁵⁰ At Sinai he warned “on earth” (ἐπὶ γῆς, 12:25),²⁵¹ now he warns “from heaven” (ἀπ’ οὐρανῶν).²⁵² “Then” (τότε) his voice

²⁴⁴ O’Brien 2010: 491.

²⁴⁵ Johnson 2006: 328. If it were not proleptic, there would be no need to encourage them to endure. See the discussion in Lane 1991b: 465, who writes, “[t]hrough faith that grasps the future as though it were present ... Christians come to that future reality.”

²⁴⁶ Jewett 1981: 223; Scholer 1991: 144.

²⁴⁷ Scholer 1991: 145.

²⁴⁸ On the similarities between Heb 2:1-4; 12:25-29 see Auffret 1979: 178-79; Lane 1991b: 477; DeSilva 2000b: 470; Smillie 2004: 286-87. Both warnings take the form of a *qal wahomer* argument concerning God’s speech (using the word λαλέω), both contain the word ἐκφεύγω (“to escape”), referring to those who either neglect to act on God’s speech, or deliberately reject it, and both contain allusions to the Sinai events.

²⁴⁹ For the translation “disregard” see Lane 1991b: 475. Παραιτέομαι occurs three times in Hebrews. In 12:19 it is followed by a (negated) infinitive and has the sense of “to beg.” It appears twice in 12:25, followed by participles referring to God’s speech to the readers and his warning to them from heaven. Here, it “connotes a deliberate and culpable refusal to listen to the one speaking” (Lane, *ibid.*: 475). On this verb see BDAG 764, and Lane 1991b: 462-63.

²⁵⁰ Ellingworth 1993: 683-84; Smillie 2004: 283-87.

²⁵¹ The word order reflected in NA²⁷ (ἐπὶ γῆς παραιτησάμενοι τὸν χρηματίζοντα) is supported by the corrector of P⁴⁶, the original hand of \aleph , A, C, D, I, numerous minuscules and the Coptic versions. This word order, with “on earth” placed at the start for emphasis and “the one who warned” in the secondary emphatic position at the end, could cause confusion as to whether the “on earth” related to the one warning or to the ones who disregarded the warning. For this reason, other MS traditions change the word order. The original hand of P⁴⁶, the second corrector of \aleph , Ψ , 0285 and the Majority Text read τὸν ἐπὶ γῆς χρηματίζοντα παραιτησάμενοι (which BDF 250, 51, § 474, 5c and Ellingworth 1993: 685 note is the “normal” word order), and MSS 104, 629, a few others and (the supposed *Vorlage* of) the Vulgate read τὸν

“shook” (σαλεύω) the earth,²⁵³ “now” (νῦν) he promises that he will “once more shake not only the earth, but also heaven” (ἔτι ἅπαξ ἐγὼ σείσω οὐ μόνον τὴν γῆν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν οὐρανόν),²⁵⁴ words taken from Hag 2:6 and modified to make a significant point.

Haggai 1:15b–2:9 compares the temple being restored in the sixth century B.C.E. with its former glory (Solomon’s temple) and suggests that it is as though it was as nothing in their eyes (Hag 2:3); that is, nothing about it suggested that God would be honoured by it.²⁵⁵ Nevertheless, God announced that “in a little while he would shake the heavens and the earth, the sea and the dry land” (Ἐτι ἅπαξ ἐγὼ σείσω τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τὴν ξηράν). He would cause all the nations to “tremble” (συσσειώσω), the “treasure” (ἡ δόξα, LXX ἐκλεκτός)²⁵⁶ of all the nations would come and God would fill the house with “glory,” (כבוד, LXX δόξα), and “the later glory” (ἡ δόξα ... ἡ ἐσχάτη) of “this house” (ὁ οἶκος οὗτος) would be greater than the “former” (πρῶτος) glory (2:6-9).

This context in Haggai is determinative for the understanding of Heb 12:26-28.²⁵⁷ While the imagery of shaking in Haggai’s prophetic predecessors heralded cosmic disturbance related to God’s judgement against Israel and/or the nations, in Haggai it

παραιτησάμενοι ἐπὶ γῆς χρηματίζοντα. As Lane 1991b: 442-43 notes these modifications make it more explicit “that ἐπὶ γῆς modifies the one who warns, not those who failed to escape.”

²⁵² Several minuscules have “heaven” in the singular here.

²⁵³ While the reference is apparently to the earthquake accompanying the eruption at Sinai (Exod 19:18), the LXX of Exod 19:18 differs from the MT, with the people trembling rather than the earth. The allusion is probably to Judg 5:4-5 where the mountains “shook” (σαλεύω) and the earth “trembled” (σείω). The combination of these two verbs leads into an allusion to Hag 2:6 where σείω also appears, and the comments on that text in Heb 12:27-28 using σαλεύω. See Lane 1991b: 478. See also Ps 68:8 (LXX 67:9); 77:18 (LXX 76:19); 114 (LXX 113): 7.

²⁵⁴ That God shakes earth and heaven, sea and dry land also appears in Hag 2:21, where the verb σείω is in the present tense. MSS D, Ψ, and the Majority Text read the present tense of σείω here in Hebrews, perhaps assimilating to Hag 2:21. There is overwhelming support for the future (P⁴⁶, ⳨, A, C, numerous minuscules, as well as some versions). As Ellingworth 1993: 686-87 notes, the future suits the context in Hebrews.

²⁵⁵ There is no sense in Haggai that this is a “second temple.” The text is explicit: the people are asked about “this house in its former glory” (הבית הזה בכבודו הראשון). Meadowcroft 2006: 151-53 also notes that “glory” (כבוד) concerns not the grandeur of the buildings (which were still incomplete), but the extent to which the temple under construction honoured Yahweh, as in 1:8. The Targum of Hag 1:8 renders the Hebrew verb כבד (“to honour”) with שכינה, referring to the glory associated with the presence of the deity.

²⁵⁶ For this sense of ἐκλεκτός see BDAG 306, s.v. ἐκλεκτός, 3. The MT points the Hebrew word as הַמְדָּה (singular), but the verb is plural, leading to the proposal in BHS to change the pointing to הַמְדָּה (plural, see GKC 463, §145, e; Wolff 1988: 70). LXX renders it with the plural τὰ ἐκλεκτά. The reference to silver and gold in v. 8 indicates that the nations would contribute to the building project (Smith 1984: 413). However, the Targum reads the text with a much bigger project in view, with the nations streaming to the temple with their treasures (וַיָּבִיאוּ כָּל עַמְמֵיָא, “and they will bring the treasures of all the peoples”). See the translation in Cathcart and Gordon 1989: 179, and footnote 4 on that page), and Meadowcroft 2006: 169. The involvement of nations with the eschatological temple is reflected in Isa 2:1-4; 60:1-22; Mic 4:1-4; Zech 14:16; Rev 21:26; *Sib. Or.* 3.657-808.

²⁵⁷ Laansma 2008b: 13.

announces the gathering of the nations into Israel.²⁵⁸ The traditions of holy war are put to use in a new way as Yahweh shakes heaven and earth, sea and dry land to bring in the new order.²⁵⁹

In incorporating Hag 2:6 into his discourse, the author omits the reference to the sea and the dry land, inverts the references to heaven and earth, and transforms the list in Haggai to a contrast with the addition of οὐ μόνον ... ἀλλὰ καὶ (“not only ... but also”). The expression οὐ μόνον τὴν γῆν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν οὐρανόν (“not only earth but also heaven”) refers the reader back to the shaking of the earth at Sinai (Heb 12:26) and announces an eschatological shaking of both earth and heaven. Hebrews 12:27 interprets the Haggai quotation. However, heaven and earth fade into the background and only the words ἔτι ἅπαξ (“once more”) receive any comment.²⁶⁰ The ἔτι ἅπαξ indicates the “removal” (μετάθεσις)²⁶¹ of “the things that can be shaken” (τὰ σαλευόμενα), that is, “things that have been made” (πεποιήμενα) so that “the things that cannot be shaken” (τὰ μὴ σαλευόμενα) can “remain” (μένω). The pericope concludes with an appeal to the readers to give thanks because they are receiving “a kingdom that cannot be shaken” (βασιλεία ἀσάλευτος), for “our God is a consuming fire” (ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ καταναλίσκων).²⁶²

Thompson recognises the background in Hag 2:6, but suggests that this text betrays “the author’s dualistic worldview.” He argues that the “eternally abiding realm” (βασιλεία ἀσάλευτος) is set over against “the realm that can be shaken” (τὰ σαλευόμενα), that is “the created things” (τὰ πεποιήμενα). These, he claims are “merely made” and

²⁵⁸ Smith 1984: 157-58; Wolff 1988: 81 Meadowcroft 2006: 164-65. See Isa 13:13; 24:18; Jer 4:24; 8:16; 10:10; 49:21; 50:46; Ezek 26:10, 15; 31:16; 38:20; Joel 2:10; 4:16; Nah 1:5. See also Ps 18:8.

²⁵⁹ Wolff 1988: 81. Hag 2:6-9 was also read in this way by authors roughly contemporary with Hebrews (2 Bar. 59:3-12; 4 Ezra 6:11-16, 25-28: 10:25-28).

²⁶⁰ Ἄπαξ appears fourteen times in the NT, of which eight are in Hebrews (6:4, 9:7, 26, 27, 28, 10:2, 12:26, 27; see also in 2 Cor 11:25; Phil 4:16; 1 Thess 2:18; 1 Pet 3:18; Jude 3, 5). The near synonym ἐφάπαξ appears five times in the NT, of which three are in Hebrews (Rom 6:10; 1 Cor 15:6; Heb 7:27; 9:12; 10:10). The implication of the expression ἔτι ἅπαξ in 12:25-26 is that this shaking will not be repeated (Gordon 2008: 182-83).

²⁶¹ In the NT μετάθεσις only appears in Heb 7:12; 11:5; 12:27. In 7:12 a “change” (μετατίθημι) in the priesthood necessitates a “change” (μετάθεσις) in the law; 11:5 refers to the “removal” (μετάθεσις) of Enoch (see Gen 5:24; Sir 44:16 where μετατίθημι also appears); and the sense of Hag 2:1-9; 22 indicates that this is probably the sense here. See Hurst 1984: 71; Lane 1991b: 443, 481; Mackie 2007: 66-67; BDAG 639, 642. In the LXX μετατίθημι appears to have the sense “to remove” in Gen 5:24; Deut 27:17; 3 Macc 1:16; Wis 4:10; Sir 44:16; Hos 5:10, and “to change” or “transform” in 3 Kgdms 21:25; 2 Macc 4:46; 7:24; 4 Macc 2:18; Ps 45:3; Sir 6:9; Isa 29:14, 17. Nevertheless, at times the sense seems to glide between the two and it is difficult to gauge where the usage fits on a spectrum from one to another. The word appears in Philo with the sense of “change” (*Gig.* 66; *Mut.* 60, 130; *Abr.* 18, 81; *Ios.* 136; *Praem.* 17; *Aet.* 113).

²⁶² The picture of God as a consuming fire appears in Exod 24:17 in connection with the Sinai theophany; in Deut 4:24 in a warning against idolatry; and in Deut 9:3 in a reference to the destruction of the inhabitants of Canaan. πῦρ καταναλίσκω describes God in Deut 4:24; 9:3, and the probable source of the imagery is Deut 4:24, given the appeal for acceptable worship.

“transitory” over against what is “not material.”²⁶³ Thompson detaches this text from the world of Jewish apocalyptic that, despite his claims, knows nothing of what he describes as “two worlds already possessing full reality, one of which is material, and therefore shakable; the other is not material, and is unshakable,”²⁶⁴ and argues for the removal of the space-time, sense-perceptible universe so that the noumenal world can remain. What is created and phenomenal is inferior to what is uncreated and noumenal. The former will be removed, and the latter will remain.²⁶⁵

There is no need, however, to read Haggai through the eyes of Philo.²⁶⁶ Careful attention to the context in Haggai, and to the way the author has treated the LXX text of Haggai, shows that metaphysical concerns are nowhere in view. Haggai anticipated the eschatological temple, the new order of things when God would fill this house with splendour. In Hebrews this new order is “the world to come” (2:5) and the city to come (13:14).²⁶⁷

The identification of the things that have been made (τὰ πεποιημένα) is a significant crux. I have already critiqued Thompson’s view that this refers to the created universe as “merely made,” with the pejorative implications of that expression. Others also identify the things that have been made as the created universe,²⁶⁸ although not always with Thompson’s pejorative connotations. But Laansma denies categorically that the removal of

²⁶³ Lane 1991b: 443 suggests that Thompson “slants the interpretation of the text” with the addition of the adverb “merely.” There is no warrant for this addition and no suggestion in Hebrews that created things are inferior as this adverb suggests.

²⁶⁴ See Thompson 1982: 48-52; 2008: 268-69 for the entire argument. Similar views are found in Cody 1960: 140-44; Käsemann 1984: 51-52; Attridge 1989: 381; Ellingworth 1993: 688; Johnson 2006: 335-36; Schenck 2007: 125-32. Not only do these ideas result from the imposition of Platonic thought categories onto Hebrews, they also contradict the positive assessment of created things elsewhere in Hebrews. Adams 2009: 129 suggests, “[t]he inherent goodness of the existing created order ... which would have been axiomatic for this author, is not in these verses [9:11; 12:27] called into question.” For a positive assessment of the created order in Hebrews see also Laansma 2008a: 125-43.

²⁶⁵ It is customary to refer to the citation of Ps 102:25-27 (LXX 101:26-28) in Heb 1:10-12 in this context where the heavens and the earth will “perish” (ἀπόλλυμι), “wear out” (παλαιόω), and “be changed” (ἀλλάσσω). See Hughes 1977: 558; Bruce 1990: 364-65; DeSilva 2000b: 471; Mitchell 2007: 290. However, Heb 1:10-12 has more to do with the exaltation of Christ over the angels and the subordination of the creation to him than any cosmological theory. The text that calls God “Lord” (κύριος) and “The Same” (ὁ αὐτός) is applied to the exalted Son of God to explain the extent of his exaltation. He created the universe and will outlast the created universe (see Adams 2009: 130, 35).

²⁶⁶ Hurst 1984: 69-73; Mackie 2007: 67-71. Lincoln 2006: 98 suggests that a Platonic reading of Heb 12:25-29 “does not do enough justice to the axiom that words take on a particular force from their most immediate context, so that the vocabulary here should primarily be interpreted within the major assumptions that are clearly operative in Hebrews.”

²⁶⁷ Hebrews 12:25-29 does not refer explicitly to a new heaven and earth, but these texts along with the background of the Haggai text, which refers to the shaking of the present order so that the new order can be introduced, imply that a new heaven and earth are expected, see Lincoln 2006: 96-97; Adams 2009: 137-38.

²⁶⁸ E.g. DeSilva 2000b: 472-73; Allen 2010: 596; Mitchell 2007: 290.

the creation is in view at all in this text, referring instead to the cleansing of creation. What is displeasing to God is removed.²⁶⁹

That this is correct is seen from an analysis of the syntax of vv. 26-27. What God will “shake” (σειώ) is earth and heaven, what will be “removed” (μετάθεσις, μετατίθημι) are “the things that can be shaken” (τὰ σαλευόμενα), that is, “the things that are made” (τὰ πεποιεμένα). The switch from σειώ to σαλεύω in the light of v. 26, where God’s voice shook the earth at Sinai, is significant for two reasons. First, it distinguishes between the things that can be shaken; that is, the things connected with Sinai,²⁷⁰ which will be removed, and the cosmic disturbance connected with the quotation from Haggai. Given the temple connotations of Sinai and given that in 12:18-22 Sinai signifies the old order, the things that will be removed are the things connected with the former order, so that the things connected with the new order, the heavenly things can remain.²⁷¹ “The things made” (τὰ πεποιεμένα) include the earthly tabernacle made by Moses (8:5) and the Jerusalem temple; the “things not made” are the heavenly temple, “not made by human hands” (οὐ χειροποίητος, 9:11, 24).²⁷²

The second reason for the change in the verb from σειώ to σαλεύω is connected with its connotations in other significant LXX texts. In my earlier discussion of the subjection of the world to come to humanity (Heb 2:5),²⁷³ I referred to Vanhoye’s suggestion that the background of this idea is to be found in Pss 93 and 96, which refer to the eschatological world where God comes to reign, referred to as ἡ οἰκουμένη (“the inhabited world”).²⁷⁴ These Psalms describe this eschatological world as unshakable (σαλεύω, negated as in

²⁶⁹ Laansma 2008b: 14.

²⁷⁰ That Sinai is in view seems clear from the word τότε (“then”), probably referring back to vv. 18-22 (Ellingworth 1993: 686), although neither σαλεύω nor σειώ appear in the Pentateuch.

²⁷¹ See Caird 1970: 23, “[t]he author believes that he and his friends, transient creatures that they are have been given a share in the unshakable. The difference between the shakable and the unshakable, then, lies not in their natural status, but in their relationship to God ... whatever gains his [God’s] approval ... is thereby made part of the unshakable kingdom.” Koester 2001 notes that the readers, who also belong to the created order, will not be destroyed (p. 548), while vv. 25-27 imply that those who refuse the God who speaks will be removed/destroyed (p. 552). Others who read the text in this way include Hughes 1977: 558-59; Lane 1991b: 482 Ellingworth 1993: 687; O’Brien 2010: 496.

²⁷² Ποιέω (“to make”) appears nineteen times in Hebrews. God or Jesus is the subject nine times (1:2, 3, 7; 3:2, 7:27; 8:9; 10:7, 9; 13:21). In 6:3 it is a first person plural indicative with the author and readers as subject; 8:5 Moses is the subject in 8:5 (making the tabernacle) and in 11:28 (keeping the Passover); the readers in 10:36; 12:13; 13:19, 21; an adversarial person in 13:6; and the community leaders in 13:17. See Nairne 1913: 383; Caird 1961: 205. Hurst 1984: 70-71; Walker 1994: 64; 1996: 232 Allen 2010: 596-97 identify the Jerusalem temple as what will be removed in this verse. See also Heb 8:13; 10:25, 37 which can be read in the light of the anticipated conflagration in Jerusalem (Walker 1994: 64-65).

²⁷³ See 6.3 (above).

²⁷⁴ Vanhoye 1964: 250-53.

Heb 12:27-28).²⁷⁵ Thus, Vanhoye draws a connection between the eschatological subjection of the world to come in Heb 2:5 and the unshakable kingdom of these verses.

While ἀσάλευτος only appears three times in the LXX with an entirely different sense,²⁷⁶ σαλεύω is more frequent, appearing seventy-eight times.²⁷⁷ Not all are relevant to the present context, but in four texts σαλεύω is negated and refers to the establishment of the unshakable world where God reigns, and in Ps 93 (LXX 92):1; 96 (LXX 95):10 the unshakable world is referred to as the οἰκουμένη, confirming Vanhoye's suggestion.²⁷⁸ The coming world to be made subject to humanity of Heb 2:5 is the unshakable kingdom of Heb 12:27 that the readers are receiving, and the rebuilt temple context of Hag 2:6, as well as the imagery of the heavenly, eschatological temple in Heb 12:22-24, indicate that the coming world is to be seen as a temple. Once again, the heavenly temple is the eschatological dwelling of God with his people.²⁷⁹

On this reading, then, what is removed is not the (inferior, phenomenal, merely), created universe; it is the former means of access to God,²⁸⁰ so that, as in Hag 2:6, the glory of the later temple can be greater than that of the former temple. However, in Hebrews, the later temple is not a rebuilt temple in Jerusalem as in Haggai.²⁸¹ It is the eschatological dwelling of God with his people in the world to come, now inaugurated with the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God.

²⁷⁵ Ps 93 (LXX 92):1; 96 (LXX 95):10.

²⁷⁶ In Exod 13:16; Deut 6:8; 11:18 it refers to phylacteries.

²⁷⁷ There are too many to list. I note Ps 18:7 (LXX 17:8); 46 (LXX 45):6; 77:18 (LXX 76:19); 97 (LXX 96):4; 99 (LXX 98):1 where σαλεύω refers to the shaking of the earth. In Ps 82 (LXX 81):5 the foundations of the earth are shaken, and in Ps 96 (LXX 95):9 the whole earth is called upon to shake before the Lord. The same word appears in Matt 24:29; Mark 13:25; Luke 21:26 in an eschatological context referring to the shaking of the powers of heaven.

²⁷⁸ The other two texts are 1 Chron 16:30, an alternative version of Ps 96, where the world is ἡ γῆ, and Ps 46 (LXX 45):3 where God is in the midst of the city of God, which therefore shall not be shaken. The connection with Haggai is also suggested by the LXX Psalm heading, "Ὅτε ὁ οἶκος ᾠκοδομεῖτο μετὰ τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν" ("when the house was built after the captivity"). The call to worship of Heb 12:28 probably has its origin in the calls to worship of Ps 95.

²⁷⁹ Lane 1991b: 474-91; Beale 2004b: 301-306; Laansma 2008b: 12-16.

²⁸⁰ Laansma 2008b: 13-14. Laansma argues that this text anticipates "God's judgement, of cleansing (1:3), of removal of that which opposes God, and then of entrance into the place of salvation which goes under the name of heavenly tabernacle, city, κατάπαυσις, and so forth" (pp. 14-15). These ideas are similar to those found in Rev 21:1-2 where the new Jerusalem (already existing) comes down out of heaven from God.

²⁸¹ Ibid.: 13. Beale 2004b: 115-16; 305-306 suggests that Haggai's prophecy may also transcend the limitations of a localised temple in Jerusalem. It is more likely, however, that Haggai was interested in the present building programme and the author of Hebrews is reading Haggai from his own eschatological perspective.

7.8 No Continuing City (13:10-16)

Hebrews 13 comprises a series of ethical instructions. Wedderburn questions its authenticity on the basis of a different style of argument from Heb 1-12, the significant number of words not found in the earlier chapters, what appears to be a different situation addressed and what he detects as a different understanding of the sacrificial cult.²⁸² However, he stands almost alone among recent scholars in this opinion. Most conclude that this chapter is an integral part of Hebrews and forms a fitting conclusion to the book.²⁸³

While the chapter mainly comprises these ethical injunctions, a central section, vv. 7-19, is bounded by an *inclusio* referring to the leaders of the community.²⁸⁴ The readers are to remember their former leaders and imitate their faith (v. 9), to be “persuaded” (passive imperative of πείθω) by their leaders and to pray for the authors (plural), so that he (singular) would be restored to them soon.²⁸⁵ Within this section is the claim that Jesus Christ is the same, yesterday, today and into the future (v. 8), and a charge not to be carried away by varieties of strange teaching, “since” (γάρ) it is good for them to be strengthened by grace rather than foods, which have proved to be of little benefit to “those who walk” (οἱ περιπατοῦντες) in them.²⁸⁶ The central part of the section, vv. 10-16, contains considerable cultic and temple imagery.

Hebrews 13:10-16 has a chiasmic structure, with vv. 10-12 containing exposition and vv. 13-16 containing exhortations based on that.²⁸⁷ Verses 10-12, the first three members of the

²⁸² Wedderburn 2004: 390-405. Earlier scholars who have questioned the authenticity of Heb 13 include Jones 1935: 562-67; Héring 1970: 119; Buchanan 1972: 238-39, 267; Grässer 1990-97: 3: 409 (who doubts the authenticity of vv. 22-25). Isaacs 1992: 212 thinks it was an epistolary appendix added by the author.

²⁸³ For earlier studies arguing for the authenticity of Heb 13 see Williams 1911: 129-36; Tasker 1935: 136-38; Filson 1967: 22-29; Vanhoye 1977: 121-39. Recent scholars accepting its authenticity and integrity include Attridge 1989: 384-85; Bruce 1990: 367-68; Lane 1991b: 495-98; Ellingworth 1993: 692-93; Guthrie 1994: 134; Koester 2001: 554; Thompson 2008: 273-74; Mosser 2009a: 397; Rothschild 2009: 46-62; O’Brien 2010: 502-503; Allen 2010: 603.

²⁸⁴ Attridge 1989: 390-91; Lane 1991b: 502-503; Ellingworth 1993: 701-702; O’Brien 2010: 514-15.

²⁸⁵ The switch from the plural (προσεύχεσθε περὶ ἡμῶν, “pray for us”) in v. 18 to the singular (περισσότερως δὲ παρακαλῶ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, “and I encourage you to do this all the more”) may indicate joint authorship, as though the author was writing on behalf of himself and some other person, while he alone was hoping to visit them soon.

²⁸⁶ Mosser 2009a: 402-403 detects a reference to “halakhic controversies” in the reference to “walking” in foods, following Attridge 1989: 394. I will not deal at length with this debated verse, although it is part of the larger section vv. 7-17 and, while it does have some cultic implications, temple imagery *per se* is absent. For a recent discussion see Young 2002a: 253-55, who suggests that the readers may have been joining their Jewish neighbours in communal synagogue meals (for this view see also Lehne 1990: 115-16). For useful summaries of other approaches to this text see Loader 1981: 178-79; Attridge 1989: 394-96; O’Brien 2010: 519-20.

²⁸⁷ Attridge 1989: 396. For the chiasmic structure see the diagram in Lane 1991b: 503. Several treatments of Heb 13 treat vv. 9-14 separately (Koester 1962; Thompson 1982: 141-51; Walker 1994) and, indeed, v. 9 refers to “food” (βρῶμα) and v. 10 to “eating” (ἐσθίω) showing that there is some connection between vv. 9-10. However, my interest is in the temple imagery of the chiasm in vv. 10-16. The connection between v. 9

chiasm, begin (v. 10) with the assertion that “we have an altar” (ἔχομεν θυσιαστήριον) from which “those who serve (in) the tent” (οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες) are not permitted to eat. This is explained in v. 11 (beginning with γάρ) with reference to the burning of the bodies of sacrificial victims “outside the camp” (ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς), with this explanation providing the rationale (v. 12, beginning with Διὸ καί, “therefore”) for the suffering of Jesus “outside the gate” (ἔξω τῆς πύλης).

The second three members of the chiasm comprise exhortations based on these assertions. “Since” (τοίνυν) Jesus suffered outside the gate, the readers are encouraged “to go” (ἔξερχώμεθα, hortatory subjunctive) to him “outside the camp” (ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς, v. 13). The reason for this appeal is given in v. 14 (beginning with γάρ), they have no continuing city, but are “intently seeking” (ἐπιζητέω) “the city to come” (ἡ πόλις ἡ μέλλουσα). Finally, vv 15-16 encourage the readers to “offer” (ἀναφέρωμεν, hortatory subjunctive) “a sacrifice of praise” (θυσία αἰνέσεως), and direct them “not to forget” (μὴ ἐπιλανθάνεσθε, imperative) to do good deeds and share their possessions, for God is pleased with such “sacrifices” (θυσία).²⁸⁸ This reference to sacrifices that are pleasing (εὐαρεστέω) to God takes the reader back to 12:28 with its exhortation to acceptable worship (λατρεύωμεν εὐαρέστως), and indicates that these verses concern the worship of the community, announced in advance there.²⁸⁹

This pericope is so cryptic that some scholars have identified it as the most difficult in Hebrews, if not in the entire NT, with several parts the subject of furious debate.²⁹⁰ I start with the identity of the Christian altar, for which there have been five main suggestions: the eucharistic table, the cross, an altar in the heavenly sanctuary, Christ himself²⁹¹ or a metonym for the sacrifice of Christ.²⁹²

and vv. 10-16 is not clarified until v. 13, where the readers are encouraged to exit the “camp,” which I argue below refers to Jewish cultic rituals. Koester 2001: 568 starts a new section at 13:10, and on pp. 560-61 argues that the “foods” are a general reference to “teachings that erode faith,” following Wilson 1987: 242; Grässer 1990-97: 3: 375-76; Weiss 1991: 720-22, but this obscures the connection between v. 9 and vv. 10-16.

²⁸⁸ Note the inclusio in vv. 10, 16 with the “altar” (θυσιαστήριον) and the “sacrifices” (θυσία), although the particular sacrifices in view are not those that would be offered on the altar.

²⁸⁹ Swetnam 1974: 340. Note also the use of λατρεύω (“to serve”) for those who serve the tent in 13:10, showing that in this pericope Christian worship/service is contrasted with the service of officials of the former sanctuary.

²⁹⁰ Schierse 1955: 184; Koester 1962: 299; Thompson 1982: 141.

²⁹¹ For these four alternatives see Schierse 1955: 190-91, with references to earlier, and some pre-critical readers of Hebrews who have held these views. Those who see the altar as the eucharistic table include Strobel 1991: 179; DeSilva 1995: 275; 2000b: 499-500. Moffatt 1924: 233-34 and Braun 1984: 463-65 read vv. 9-10 as a critique of the community’s eucharistic practice, and Johnson 2006: 348, while not mentioning the Eucharist, sees the altar as a metonym for the Christian’s “share in worship consisting in praise and thanksgiving to God.”

²⁹² Bruce 1990: 378-79.

Of these, the eucharistic table, while it continues to have its adherents, should be discounted. It only arises when it is not recognised that v. 9 lies outside the chiasm of vv. 10-16, and v. 10 is read in the light of the reference to the “meals” (βρῶμα) of v. 9. On this reading, v. 10 simply denies that those in view in this verse have any right to share in the Eucharist. Although Schierse sees a merger of senses in the text (“behind the communion table stands the cross and it opens the heavenly sanctuary”),²⁹³ he ultimately reads the text in this way, and then, unsure what to do with vv. 11-12, passes over them hastily to discuss the exhortations of vv. 13-16.²⁹⁴ Moreover, there is no evidence that the eucharistic table was referred to as an altar prior to the second century²⁹⁵ and, indeed, if “meals” (βρῶμα) are unable to mediate grace (v. 9), then any reference to the eucharistic table is incongruous.²⁹⁶ Indeed, while the Levitical priests are excluded from eating, the text nowhere suggests that the Christians eat from this altar.

An altar in the heavenly sanctuary should also be discounted as there is no evidence in Hebrews,²⁹⁷ or indeed elsewhere, for blood sacrifices in the heavenly sanctuary.²⁹⁸ Moreover, as I will argue in the following chapter, the heavenly sanctuary in Hebrews symbolises the eschatological dwelling of God with his people. It is not a place of sacrifice. Identifying the altar with Christ himself is a possibility; however, he has already been identified as high priest and sacrifice (9:11-14) and it is difficult to imagine him as the altar as well.

It is difficult to decide whether to read the altar as referring to the sacrifice of Christ or to the cross,²⁹⁹ but vv. 11-12 seem to indicate that a reference to the sacrifice of Christ makes the best sense, with perhaps a blending of these two referents.³⁰⁰ “Those who serve

²⁹³ Schierse 1955: 191, (“[h]inter dem Abendmahlstisch erhebt sich das Kreuz und öffnet sich das himmlische Heiligtum”).

²⁹⁴ Ibid.: 186-93.

²⁹⁵ Isaacs 1992: 215; Koester 2001: 569. The earliest reference to the eucharistic table as an altar is in Ignatius of Antioch, *Phld.* 4, in the first half of the second century (Holmes 2007: 170-71, 238-39).

²⁹⁶ Loader 1981: 179-81.

²⁹⁷ Lehne 1990: 115 argues for this on the grounds that “ἔρχομεν consistently refers to the proleptic possession of heavenly realities by the addressees.” See Heb 4:15; 6:19; 8:1; 13:14. For an altar in the heavenly sanctuary see Filson 1967: 48-50; Williamson 1975: 308-9; Thompson 1982: 146; 2008: 282 and the critique in Isaacs 1992: 214.

²⁹⁸ That blood sacrifices are in view is evident from the reference to blood in v. 11.

²⁹⁹ Westcott 1892: 437-38; Manson 1951: 149-56, both of whom allow for a secondary reference to the Eucharist. Similarly Ellingworth 1993: 711-12 proposes a “polysemous” interpretation.

³⁰⁰ Koester 2001: 568-69 combines the cross and the sacrifice of Christ, suggesting that it “encompasses multiple dimensions of Christ’s death.” Those who adopt this view include Spicq 1952: 2: 425; Montefiore 1964: 244-45; Hughes 1977: 574-78; Loader 1981: 180-81; Attridge 1989: 396; Lindars 1989: 389; Bruce 1990: 378-79; Lane 1991b: 538; Isaacs 1992: 216; Johnson 2001: 117; O’Brien 2010: 51. Filson 1967: 49 excludes the cross on the understanding that the once and for all self-offering of Jesus was “made by blood in the heavenly sanctuary.” I argue against this reading in 8.6.2 (below).

(in) the tent” (οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες)³⁰¹ are the Levitical priests, and since these alone are excluded from eating at the Christian altar, rather than unbelievers, it seems clear that there is some cultic reason for their exclusion.³⁰² Verse 11 gives this reason in terms of the burning of the bodies of certain sacrificial victims outside the camp. The text echoes Lev 16:27 where the bodies of the sacrificial animals are burned outside the camp. The Christian altar (sacrifice) is a Day of Atonement type of sacrifice as in Heb 9:11-12.³⁰³

Verse 12 clarifies that this is the case, since, “for this reason” (διὸ καί)³⁰⁴ Jesus suffered ἔξω τῆς πύλης (“outside the gate”—of Jerusalem).³⁰⁵ Three exhortations follow from this claim. First the readers are encouraged to “go out” (ἐξέρχομαι) to Jesus “outside the camp” (ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς),³⁰⁶ “bearing his reproach” (ὀνειδισμός).³⁰⁷ The precise

³⁰¹ Peterson 1982: 134; Lehne 1990: 115-16; Ellingworth 1993: 710; Young 2002a: 246-47; O’Brien 2010: 522. See footnote 85 in 1.4.1 (above) for a discussion of whether λατρεύω τῇ σκηνῇ should be translated “serve the tent,” or “serve in the tent.” That these priests are described as “serving (in) the tent” is anachronistic, since the “tent” (the wilderness sanctuary) was no longer standing. In the context, the term refers to the leaders of the Jewish community, described in this way to make the point that follows about the burning of sacrificial bodies outside the camp. To suggest as Koester 2001: 570 does that it refers to “the opponents of the community” obscures this important clue to the understanding of what follows. Braun 1984: 465, who sees this verse as a critique of the readers’ eucharistic practices sees these priests as Christians in analogy with the priests of Lev 16. Similarly Moffatt 1924: 235 thinks of Christians serving in the heavenly sanctuary.

³⁰² O’Brien 2010: 522 seems to miss this point, suggesting that the exclusion applies to any “adherents of the old cult” and to “those who conduct their lives under the Levitical system.”

³⁰³ Loader 1981: 180; Trudinger 1982: 236; Attridge 1989: 397-98; Lane 1991b: 538; Young 2002a: 246-47. Ellingworth 1993: 710 thinks that this is not the most natural meaning of the Greek, although he does not say what he thinks is most natural. One would normally expect that on this reading the relative pronoun in the expression ἔξ οὗ would be ὅστις rather than ὅς, indicating that the altar belongs to that class of altar (BDAG 729-30). As BDF 152-53, §293 indicates, the two forms of the relative pronoun “are no longer clearly distinguished in the NT ... [and] ὅστις is virtually limited to the nom.” Here the preposition requires a genitive. ὅστις occurs one hundred and forty-four times in the NT and, apart from Matt 5:25; Luke 12:50; 13:8; 22:16; John 9:18 (all neuter genitive singular in the expression ἔως ὅτου), it is always in the nominative case. See Wilson 1939: 380.

³⁰⁴ Διὸ καί indicates that the inference that follows is “self-evident” (BDAG 250). Lehne 1990: 116 who locates the altar in the heavenly sanctuary reads the reference to eating as a metaphor for “the proleptic enjoyment of salvation.” Williamson 1975: 309 expresses a similar view.

³⁰⁵ Koester 1962: 468; Thompson 1982: 147; Fuller Dow 2010: 176; Mosser 2009a: 398. It is clear that the physical city of Jerusalem is in view in this verse, given the Gospel traditions locating his death at Golgotha (although the detail that Golgotha was outside the gates of the city is not mentioned in Matt 27:33; Mark 15:22; Luke 23:33). John 19:20 notes that the location was near the city. It is outside the first century walls of Jerusalem, but inside the current walls of the old city. The point in Hebrews is not only historical, however, but to make a connection with the Day of Atonement. It carries with it the implication that Jesus was excluded from the sacred precincts of the city and died as an outcast (Lane 1991b: 541-42; O’Brien 2010: 523). P⁴⁶, P, 104 and a Bohairic MS read ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς (or the Coptic equivalent) here, probably an assimilation to this same expression in the immediate context.

³⁰⁶ The carcasses of sacrificial animals are burnt outside the camp (Exod 29:14; Lev 4:12, 21; 6:4; 8:17; 9:11; 16:27); Moses pitched the tent of meeting (Heb מועד, LXX μαρτύριον—witness) outside the camp (Exod 33:7-8); Mishael and Elzaphan took the bodies of Nadab and Elihu outside the camp for burial (Lev 10:4, 5); those who slaughter animals either outside or inside the camp without presenting them to Yahweh are cut off from the people (Lev 17:3); blasphemers are stoned outside the camp (Lev 24:14, 23); persons with leprosy live outside the camp (Lev 13:46; 14:3; Num 5:3, 4; 12:14, 15); the man who violated the Sabbath was stoned outside the camp (Num 15:36); the red heifer is slaughtered outside the camp (Num 19:3); and its

referent of this expression is debated. Thompson suggests that the readers are exhorted to follow Jesus into the transcendent (heavenly) world,³⁰⁸ an unlikely suggestion given that there would be no reproach involved there.³⁰⁹ H. Koester thinks they are to leave the security of the Christian community and enter the secular world, with consequent exposure to uncleanness and harsh experiences,³¹⁰ yet elsewhere in Hebrews the death of Jesus sets people apart from the unclean world to pursue holiness and avoid defilement (12:10, 14).³¹¹ DeSilva hears a call to leave the security associated with the society in which they lived.³¹² It is more likely that there is an oblique reference to Judaism³¹³ which v. 14 specifies more closely.³¹⁴

ashes are deposited in a clean place outside the camp to be available for purification (19:9); Moses, Eleazar and the priests met the warriors who returned from battle outside the camp (Num 31:13); anyone who killed a person or touched a corpse had to remain outside the camp for seven days (Num 31:19); men who have nocturnal emissions must go outside the camp (Deut 23:11); latrines were to be located outside the camp (Deut 23:13); Rahab was saved from death in the battle of Jericho when she was taken outside the camp (Num 6:23); and Achior is killed outside the camp (Jdt 6:11). Apart from the location of the tent of meeting outside the camp away from normal patterns of activity so as to indicate that it was a unique place, and apart from the location of the rescue of Rahab, “outside the camp” is a place of defilement, where carcasses were burnt, criminals executed and human excrement buried. Bruce 1990: 381; Lane 1991b: 543-44; O’Brien 2010: 524 make some connection between the location of the Tent of Meeting outside the camp after the golden calf incident, seeing a parallel between the rejection of God then and the rejection of Jesus here, although Attridge 1989: 399 is probably correct in seeing this detail as of marginal significance. On the relevance to Hebrews of the rescue of Rahab outside the camp see Mosser 2009a: 395-403.

³⁰⁷ Elsewhere in Hebrews, the readers are encouraged to approach (προσέρχομαι, 4:16; 10:22); here, the movement is in the opposite direction, although the goal is the same—the presence of Jesus. As well as identification with his exaltation, this text encourages identification with his reproach. See Attridge 1989: 398; O’Brien 2010: 523. In bearing the reproach of Jesus the readers follow Moses who did the same (11:26), and reproach had also been the experience of the readers in their former persecution (10:33). Thus, the call to exit the camp and bear the reproach of Jesus is a call to suffer in the place where Jesus was executed.

³⁰⁸ Thompson 1982: 147-49; 2008: 283. For the camp in Philo see *Leg.* 3.46; *Det.* 160; *Ebr.* 95-100; *Gig.* 54; *Rer.* 68.

³⁰⁹ For this and other reasons Young 2002a: 256 dismisses Thompson’s claim as “erroneous.” See also the critique in Koester 2001: 570-71.

³¹⁰ Koester 1962: 301-303; Hughes 1977: 580-81.

³¹¹ Koester 2001: 571; Young 2002a: 255.

³¹² DeSilva 1995: 200; 2000b: 517. Attridge 1989: 399 envisages “the realm of security and traditional holiness, however that is grounded or understood”; Koester 2001: 571 refers to the need to “move outside the mainstream of urban life,” and hints that the “continuing city” that the readers do not have is Rome. This avoids what seem to be clear references to Jerusalem and Judaism in the context, and is too general. Elsewhere in Hebrews, there is no suggestion that an urban setting is an inappropriate place for the followers of Jesus to live.

³¹³ Hughes 1977: 580-81; Loader 1981: 181; Bruce 1990: 381; Salevao 2002: 147. I sense that some scholars who deny any polemic against Judaism in Hebrews do so out of a desire to conform to the current “post-Holocaust rapprochement between Jews and Christians” (Young 2002a: 260), but Hebrews comes from a different era and, moreover, there is evidence elsewhere in the pages of the NT that the relationships between the Jewish leadership and the Christian community were strained, to say the least (e.g. John 9; Acts 7). While it would be going too far to suggest that Hebrews was supersessionist or anti-Semitic, the reality is that this text claims that the sacrifice of Jesus rendered the Jewish sacrificial ritual obsolete, as it completed and filled out all that that ritual pointed to. The remarks of Hays 1989: 109 referring to Paul, who “simultaneously affirms and transmutes” the promises to Abraham in Gal 3:7, would apply to this author in

Hebrews 13:14 contrasts “a continuing city” (μένουσα πόλις),³¹⁵ “which they do not have here” (οὐ ... ἔχομεν ὧδε), with a city “to come” (μέλλουσα), which they “eagerly expect” (ἐπιζητέω).³¹⁶ This text contrasts³¹⁷ the heavenly Jerusalem to come (symbolising the eschatological dwelling of God with his people), and the earthly Jerusalem, either the physical city, or a cipher for Jewish ritual and the sacred associations of Judaism, centred in Jerusalem and temple.³¹⁸

Care is necessary here not to err in the direction of supersessionism. The text does not encourage abandoning Judaism for Christianity; rather, it encourages the readers to abandon the cultic rituals practised by their Jewish contemporaries that they might follow Jesus. They are to abandon the rituals that pointed to Christ and follow Christ himself.³¹⁹

terms of the temple cult. See the discussion on polemic in Hebrews in Young 2002a: 258-61 (partly in response to the claims of Thompson 1982: 142 that Hebrews is not polemical), and my own critique of the charge of supersessionism in Church 2011a: 147-57. On anti-Jewish polemic in Hebrews see Salevao 2002: 113-17, and Frevel 2010: 189-93, who concludes that in denying Israel a place in the land “Hebrews [3-4] does not provide a conscious and affective *anti-Judaism*, but an implicit substitution, and therefore a sort of *anti-Judaism*, one which has to be corrected by a focus on the remaining promises of the Torah.” Gordon 2008: 36-53 argues for what he refers to as “constitutional supersessionism” (p. 40) in Hebrews, but his proposal that “in Christ a new entity emerges from the ancestral religion of Israel that incorporates both Jews and non-Jews, that does not look to the old covenants conceived purely in ethnic terms, and that envisages the fulfilment of the ancient promises not only in the birth of the church but also in the ultimate blessing of the Jewish people through the Gospel” (p. 48) is not strictly supersessionist. It rather describes the affirmation and transmutation of the promises to Abraham through Christ. See also Gordon’s earlier discussion in 2000: 27-29, reproduced in 2008: 27-29.

³¹⁴ In 4QMMT the “camp” is identified with Jerusalem (4Q394 3-7 II 16-19; 8 IV 10-11; 4Q396 III 1-2; 4Q397 3 3; 6-13 3-5), see Schiffman 1996: 79-80; McCarter 2000: 307-308; Mosser 2009a: 400-403.

³¹⁵ Cf. with this claim of Heb 12:27, which refers to the removal of what can be shaken so that what cannot be shaken can “remain” (μένω). Just as some scholars read 12:27 as a reference to the coming destruction of Jerusalem, so also can this text be read in the same way. See Walker 1994: 46-49, 64-65; Mosser 2009a: 390-91.

³¹⁶ This is the same word used of Abraham and the patriarchs who eagerly sought a homeland (11:14).

³¹⁷ See Attridge 1989: 399; Lane 1991b: 547; Ellingworth 1993: 718; O’Brien 2010: 525 for the chiasmic structure of v. 14 highlighting the contrast between the two cities. Nonetheless, Attridge 1989: 399 still detects “a quasi-Platonic dichotomy” here. The contrast, as in 11:8-16, is surely eschatological, as indicated by the expression “city to come.”

³¹⁸ Bruce 1990: 381-82 argues that this text implies that what was formerly sacred—Jerusalem and the temple—is now unhallowed because Jesus was excluded, and what was formerly unhallowed is now sacred because Jesus is there. See the discussion in Lane 1991b: 544-46; Walker 1996: 216-17; Isaacs 1992: 217; Motyer 2004: 489; O’Brien 2010: 525. Along with the temple, the earthly Jerusalem is ignored in Hebrews. Unlike other texts that identify Salem as Jerusalem (Ps 76:2; Josephus *Ant.* 1.180; 1QapGen XXII 13; *Tg. Neof.* Gen 14:18), Hebrews simply calls Melchizedek “king of Salem” (βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ) and ignores this identification. Burge 2010: 98 suggests that this is part of a strategy to direct attention to the heavenly city. Along the same lines, Walker 1996: 202 suggests that the author was not ignoring Jerusalem so much as ensuring a proper “approach” to Jerusalem, by which he means that it was a city they had to “discard” (p. 220), “... for now they had to forego their attachment to the earthly city” (p. 222). Fuller Dow 2010: 172 expresses a similar opinion.

³¹⁹ Ellingworth 1993: 716 goes not quite far enough when he argues that it cannot be “an appeal to abandon Judaism for Christianity ... [since] the author’s thought ... moves consistently within the category of God’s twofold action on behalf of one people.” While this is correct, what the text calls for is to abandon a

On this reading vv. 10-16 clarify the significance of the “meals” (βρῶμα) of 13:9. These meals are not to be contrasted with the Eucharist, either positively or negatively; they were meals associated with Jewish rituals centred on the temple cultus in Jerusalem, and incompatible with attachment to Jesus who was excluded from that city and died as an outcast. They had therefore to be abandoned.³²⁰

Nevertheless, there are still sacrifices to be offered by those who exit the camp to follow Jesus. Through Jesus,³²¹ they are to continually “offer” (ἀναφέρω) “a sacrifice of praise” (θυσία αἰνέσεως) to God, defined as the fruit of lips that confess the name of Jesus, and to do good and share their possessions, actions described as “sacrifices” (θυσία) that please God. The use of the language of sacrifice is ironic in the context of an exhortation to exit Jerusalem and the temple. Its poignancy would not have been lost on the recipients of Hebrews.³²²

The expression θυσία αἰνέσεως only appears here in the NT, but is more frequent in the LXX. The defining text is Lev 7:11-15, where it refers to “a thanksgiving offering” (זבח תודה),³²³ one class of an “offering of well-being” (זבח השלמים).³²⁴ And while the regulations in Leviticus refer to various leavened and unleavened cakes, Hebrews redefines the offering as the “fruit of lips that confess the name of Jesus” (καρπὸν χειλέων ὁμολογούντων τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ). The expression “fruit of lips” appears in Hos 14:2

set of rituals that belonged to God’s former actions on behalf of his people, and to follow Jesus and his sacrifice that belongs to God’s present action on behalf of his people.

³²⁰ Loader 1981: 180-81; Lindars 1989: 388-89; Walker 1996: 205-207. Since Jesus died in this way it would be unthinkable for this author that his readers should have any attachment to Jerusalem or to what Jerusalem represented.

³²¹ There are some variant readings at the start of v. 15. NA²⁷ reads Δι’ αὐτοῦ [οὖν] (“through him, therefore”). The οὖν is in square brackets to acknowledge that it is omitted from P⁴⁶, the original hands of **Σ**, and D, as well as P, **Ψ**. The second corrector of **Σ** added it as did the first corrector of D, and it is present in A, C, numerous minuscules, the Majority Text and Latin and Syriac versions. The evidence is evenly weighted and οὖν could have been accidentally omitted in transcription, or added by a scribe who thought it necessary. See Ellingworth 1993: 720; Metzger 1994: 605. MS K (ninth century) and a few other MSS read διὰ τοῦτο οὖν, (“because of this, then”), which, while it makes sense, is too late to be seriously entertained.

³²² O’Brien 2010: 527 suggests that the genitive αἰνέσεως (“of praise”) is epexegetical, suggesting that the expression means “a sacrifice consisting of praise.” While this might be correct, it is the appositive that follows, τοῦτ’ ἔστιν καρπὸν χειλέων ὁμολογούντων τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ (“that is the fruit of lips that confess his name”) that gives this sense. The original readers would have heard an echo of Lev 7:11-15 where this was a ritual prescribed by the Torah, see Mosser 2009a: 388-89, and footnotes 19-20.

³²³ The reference in the Göttingen LXX is Lev 7:2-4, while the Rahlfs LXX reflects the MT and English versification (7:12-15).

³²⁴ The translation “offering of well-being” is from the NRSV. The LXX translates the term in Lev 7:11-15 with θυσία σωτηρίου (“sacrifice of salvation”), that is, an offering for salvation. See the discussion in HALOT 1537-38 and the excursus on the offering of well-being in Hartley 1992: 37-40. Hartley notes that the offering is shared by the presenter’s family, the priest and God, and that it demonstrates harmony between the family and God. Milgrom 2004: 28-29 notes the defining characteristic of all three sub-classes of the offering of well-being is joy and that it is the “spontaneous byproduct of one’s happiness, whatsoever its cause.”

(LXX 14:3) where the people are given a liturgy for a prayer for forgiveness, including a promise to “repay” (ἀνταποδίδωμι) the fruit of their lips, that is, put their words into action by fulfilling their vows of repentance.³²⁵ In Hebrews, as in Hosea, sacrificial language is put to use in terms of speech. A similar phenomenon is encountered at Qumran, where the community (which had withdrawn from the temple) transferred the language of sacrifice to speech in honour of God.³²⁶ As at Qumran, so also in Hebrews, sacrificial language is used figuratively to refer to the words the community uses in its liturgy.³²⁷ Finally, the language of sacrifice also appears in v. 16 where good deeds and acts of generosity are described as “sacrifices” (θυσία) that are pleasing to God.

While the language of sacrifice appears here, it is figurative language. The transformation of sacrifice language in this way also confirms my earlier arguments that Hebrews does not envisage a bicameral heavenly temple, with a holy of holies as in the wilderness shrine and the temple. The once-and-for-all sacrifice of Christ, who offered himself (the Christian “altar”), has put an end to the earthly temple and its sacrificial ritual, and makes the idea of any of the appurtenances of sacrifice in the heavenly temple superfluous. While the life of a Christian is characterised by sacrifices offered to God, they are sacrifices that express gratitude for his saving deeds in the past (12:28) and anticipate the consummation of their salvation when God and his people will dwell together in the eschaton.³²⁸

³²⁵ Stuart 1987: 213. Stuart notes that an Israelite who appeared before Yahweh was not supposed to appear empty-handed (Exod 23:15; 34: 20), but to bring a sacrificial offering. In Hosea no offering was called for, since Yahweh wanted obedience rather than sacrifice (Hos 6:6; 8:13). For similar ideas see Ps 51 (LXX 50):15; 63 (LXX 62):3, 5; 71: (LXX 70): 23; 119 (LXX 118): 171.

³²⁶ See 4Q400 2 7; 1QS IX 4-5. See also *Pss. Sol.* 15:3. For the notion that good deeds and praise were preferable to sacrifice see Ps 51:15-17; Hos 6:6; Sir 34:18-35:11; *T. Levi* 3:5-6

³²⁷ This phenomenon is not unique to Qumran and the NT. In Ps 107 (LXX 106):22 those who have been healed from sickness are to “offer” (θύω) a “sacrifice of praise” (θυσία αἰνέσεως) and “tell of God’s deeds with joy” (ἑξαγγεῖλάτωσαν τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει). The word for the offering of this “sacrifice” (ἀναφέρω), appears elsewhere in Hebrews to refer to the self-offering of Christ (7:27), and also for his bearing the sins of the people (9:28). Ἀναφέρω appears to be a technical term in Leviticus at least for the actions of the priest in bringing the offering and placing it on the altar (Harris 1978: 1196-97); see e.g. Lev 3:6-16 where in vv. 6, 9 the actions of the offeror are described with προσφέρω, while the actions of the priest are described in vv. 5, 11, 14, 16 with ἀναφέρω. See also Lev 4:10, 19, 26, 31 and many other texts in Leviticus. Ἀναφέρω is also used for Noah’s offering in Gen 8:20; Abraham’s offering at the *Aqedah* in Gen 22:2, 13; Saul’s offering in 1 Kgdms 13:9-10; David’s offering when he brought the Ark of the Covenant to Jerusalem in 2 Kgdms 6:17; 1 Chron 16:2; and Solomon’s offering at the dedication of the temple in 2 Chron 8:12. There is a departure from this usage in 2 Chron 29:21-32 where ἀναφέρω describes the actions of the priests in vv. 27, 29, as well as the actions of the officials in bringing the animals to the priests (v. 21), and in vv. 31-32 of the community in bringing their “sacrifices” (θυσία) and “thanksgiving offerings” (αἰνέσις).

³²⁸ Cf. Attridge 1989: 401, “[t]he new covenant community has a cult that is quite outside the realm of the cultic.”

7.9 Conclusion

In this chapter I have examined texts in Hebrews in which the people of God have access to the heavenly temple. In some texts, this access is in the present (10:19-25; 12:22-24) and in other texts it is in the future, as their eschatological goal (3-4; 11:8-16; 12:18-29; 13:10-16). That this access is available in the present demonstrates that the heavenly temple is not a structure “up” in heaven, rather it is a metaphor for God’s dwelling with his people. The eschatological aspects of this dwelling of God grow out of the eschatological orientation of Hebrews. The world to come (2:5) is the ultimate goal. Along with this is a critique of the old order symbolised by Jerusalem and the temple. The former things are passing away in favour of the things to come; that is, the temple not made with hands, which God will prepare in the eschaton when he dwells with his people.

This chapter builds on the previous chapter and demonstrates how the eschatological orientation of Hebrews functions with respect to the people of God. In the following chapter I will show that the central part of Hebrews (4:16–10:18) is consistent with this orientation, and that the heavenly temple is again no structure “up in heaven,” but the eschatological dwelling of God with his people, now inaugurated with the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God.

8 Jesus High Priest of the Heavenly Temple: Temple Imagery in Hebrews 4:14–10:18

8.1 Introduction

The central section of Hebrews (4:14–10:18) deals with the priesthood of Christ and his unique self-offering by which forgiveness is achieved, enabling access for God’s people to God’s presence in the eschatological temple. In this chapter I examine the claims that this part of Hebrews makes about this temple. I need to take care, however, not to be diverted into a discussion of the high priestly Christology of Hebrews, which is an important topic in its own right.¹ As this thesis is an exploration of temple symbolism in Hebrews, that high priestly Christology is only significant to the extent that it impinges on this discussion. The perspective for which I argue in this chapter is that the heavenly temple is not to be understood as the heavenly archetype of the wilderness tabernacle as is often claimed. Rather, as in the remainder of Hebrews, it symbolises the dwelling of God with his people in the last days, now inaugurated with the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God.

8.2 A Great High Priest Traversing the Heavens (4:14-16)

In this pericope the argument makes a transition from the discussion of God’s rest to a discussion of the priesthood of Christ and the heavenly sanctuary that encompasses Heb 5–10. In 4:14 Jesus is identified for the third time as a high priest.² In 2:17 his identification with humans is said to be necessary for him “to become a high priest and make expiation for the sins of the people” (ἵνα ἐλεήμων γένηται καὶ πιστὸς ἀρχιερεὺς τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εἰς τὸ ἰλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ),³ and in 3:1 the readers are encouraged to “consider Jesus, the apostle and high priest of their confession” (κατανοήσατε τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν). That Jesus is to be understood as a high priest is established in 5:1–10; 7, and the claim of 2:17–18 that he makes expiation for the sins of the people is developed in 8:1–10:18.

¹ This is the emphasis of Cody 1960; Gäbel 2006.

² The conjunction οὖν (“therefore”) at the start of 4:14 relates back to both the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God and the claims of 2:17; 3:1 that he is a high priest. Thus, as well as introducing 5:1–10:19, 4:14–16 also draws inferences from what has preceded. See Ellingworth 1993: 266; Thompson 2008: 104; O’Brien 2010: 180.

³ The verb ἰλάσκομαι along with the cognate nouns ἰλασμός and ἰλαστήριον refer either to the placating of a deity (propitiation) or to the removal of the impediments that alienate a deity (expiation). Since in Heb 2:17 ἁμαρτία (“sin”) is the direct object of the verb the translation “expiate” is appropriate. Since the removal of sin placates the deity, both ideas are included in the semantic range of the verb, demonstrating the appropriateness of the NRSV translation “make atonement.” See BDAG 473–74; Koester 2001: 121–22; O’Brien 2010: 121–22.

Hebrews 4:14 claims that the author and his readers have “a great high priest traversing the heavens” (ἔχοντες οὖν ἄρχιερέα μέγαν διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς).⁴ In seeking to understand this sentence it is necessary to discuss the sense of the words οὐρανός (“heaven”), and διέρχομαι (“to traverse”).

As elsewhere in the NT, οὐρανός has two different senses in Hebrews:⁵ it refers either to the upper part of the created universe (i.e. the sky) or the transcendent (uncreated) dwelling place of God.⁶ The former sense is clear in three places, all OT quotations or allusions: Heb 1:10-12 quotes Ps 102:25-27 (LXX 101:26-28) referring to the created heavens and earth that will pass away; Heb 11:12 alludes to the promise that Abraham would have descendants as the stars of heaven; and Heb 12:26 quotes Hag 2:6 where God announces that he will shake both earth and heaven. Normally in this sense the word is in the singular,⁷ although it is plural in Heb 1:10.

When οὐρανός refers to the transcendent dwelling place of God it is normally in the plural.⁸ In Heb 8:1 Jesus is seated at the right hand of the throne of the majesty “in heaven” (ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς); in Heb 9:23 “the outlines of the things in heaven” (τὰ ... ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς) require cleansing; in 12:23 the firstborn are “enrolled in heaven” (ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς); and in 12:25 God warns “from heaven” (ἀπ’ οὐρανῶν). This usage also occurs in the singular in Heb 9:24, where Jesus is said to have entered “heaven itself” (εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν).⁹ Aside from these texts, οὐρανός appears in 4:14 and 7:26. In both texts it could refer either to the created heavens or to the dwelling place of God.¹⁰

⁴ While the participle ἔχοντες is impersonal, the first person verbs in this section (κρατῶμεν, ἔχομεν, προσερχόμεθα, λάβωμεν, εὐρώμεν) indicate that the author includes himself and his readers in the claim that they have a great high priest. See O’Brien 2010: 185. I argue in what follows that the perfect participle διεληλυθότα has the sense of “traversing” rather than “has passed through” as it is usually rendered.

⁵ Cody 1960: 77-86 finds three perspectives on heaven in Hebrews. He finds what he calls a cosmological perspective (the created heavens) in such texts as 1:10-11; 12:26-27, an axiological perspective in such texts as 8:1, where Christ is exalted in heaven, and an eschatological perspective in 12:28. Cody takes his axiological perspective from Philo and Middle Platonism, where heaven is understood to be the realm that has ultimate value, and earth, which has derived value, is secondary, “defective and shadowy” (p. 82). I will demonstrate below that this is inadequate. Koester 2001: 99 suggests that the author does not clearly distinguish between the created heavens and the transcendent heavens where God dwells, but this too seems not to be the case. See DeSilva 2000b: 37-32; Adams 2009: 130-32.

⁶ BDAG 737-39, s.v. οὐρανός, 1, 2. BDAG also lists a third sense where οὐρανός is a periphrasis for God, e.g. Luke 15:18, 21. This sense does not feature in Hebrews.

⁷ BDF: 77-78, § 141 (1).

⁸ BDF: 77-78, § 141 (1); BDAG 738. I will revisit several of the texts listed in this paragraph.

⁹ This switch from plural to singular in Heb 9:23, 24 is for no apparent reason (see BDAG 738, s.v. οὐρανός, 2, b).

¹⁰ I deal below (8.4) with Heb 7:26 where Jesus is said to be exalted above the heavens. A further text that has a bearing on the reading of these two texts is 9:11-12, which some have read as claiming that Jesus passed through the created heavens into the transcendent heavens. I argue against this reading below (8.6.2).

The word I have translated “traverse” (διέρχομαι) appears forty-three times in the NT, but only here is it a perfect participle. It appears thirty-one times in Luke-Acts, and in Acts it often refers to the places Paul visited on his journeys.¹¹ It can refer to movement into and out of a location,¹² to movement towards a destination, where it is usually followed by a preposition,¹³ or of an object penetrating something.¹⁴ The lack of a preposition seems to exclude the notion of movement towards a destination in Heb 4:14, leaving either the notion of Christ penetrating the heavens or traversing the heavens. The sense depends on the force of the perfect participle.

In my earlier discussion of the perfect participles in Heb 2:8-9, I referred to Campbell’s discussion of the perfect,¹⁵ and his claim that the traditional analysis of the perfect participle as describing the resultant state of a past action is inadequate.¹⁶ He argues that it expresses “contemporaneous temporal reference,” with the main verb in a similar manner to the present participle, but with heightened proximity.¹⁷ Thus, this word does not describe one who has “penetrated the heavens” and is now in the highest heaven,¹⁸ but one who “traverses the heavens.” It remains to explain how this is to be understood.

¹¹ Outside of Luke-Acts, it appears twice in Matthew (of an unclean spirit wandering through waterless regions, 12:43; and of a camel going through the eye of a needle, 19:24); twice in Mark (going across to the other side, 4:35; and the camel and needle analogy, 10:25), once in Romans (5:12, sin spreading to all people); three times in the Corinthian correspondence (Jewish ancestors passing through the sea, 1 Cor 10:1; Paul passing through Macedonia, 1 Cor 16:5; 2 Cor 1:16), and here in Heb 4:14. The word also appears in a variant reading in John 8:59.

¹² Matt 12:43; Luke 11:24; 17:11; 19:1; Acts 14:24; 15:3, 41; 16:6; 18:23; 19:21; 1 Cor 16:5. In Acts 13:5-6 Paul and Barnabas traverse the island of Cyprus from Salamis to Paphos, indicating that the verb does not always include the notion of entering and exiting a location.

¹³ Busse 1990: 322-23. See Mark 4:35; Luke 2:15; 8:22; John 4:15; Acts 9:38; 11:19, 22; 13:14; 18:27; Rom 5:12.

¹⁴ Luke 2:35; Matt 19:24; Mark 10:25; Luke 18:25. For these three senses see BDAG 244, where the sense of “going over something in one’s mind” is also listed, although not appearing in the NT.

¹⁵ See 6.3.3 (above).

¹⁶ Campbell 2008b: 24-26.

¹⁷ Ibid.: 26-29. Campbell demonstrates this from the perfect participle εἰδὼς in the expression εἰδὼς αὐτῶν τὰ διανοήματα (“knowing their thoughts”) in Luke 11:17; from the perfect participle ἐστηκότες in the expression ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐστηκότες (“standing in the temple”) in John 11:56; and from the perfect participle πεπειθῶ in the expression καὶ τοῦτο πεπειθῶ (“being persuaded of this”) in Phil 1:25. See also the combination of present and perfect participles in Luke 2:12; 8:35; 13:34. It is best understood as analogous to an adjective.

¹⁸ Those who read the text in this way usually understand Jesus to have journeyed through successive layers of heaven in a similar manner to other figures in the literature of middle Judaism who undertook heavenly journeys. The prime example is Enoch, but there are others including Abraham, Levi, and Zephaniah. Apart from *1 Enoch* where there is a single heaven containing two houses, other texts often envisage multiple heavens, with increasing levels of holiness leading to the uppermost heaven where God dwells. There is nothing like this in Hebrews. Those who adopt this reading include Montefiore 1964: 90; Héring 1970: 35; Attridge 1989: 139; Koester 2001: 282; Johnson 2006: 139; Mitchell 2007: 105; O’Brien 2010: 181. Alternatively, DeSilva 2000b: 181 reads the heavens in this verse as the created heavens that Jesus passed through when he ascended to the right hand of God, in much the same way as Luke reports the

The word *διέρχομαι* appears more than one hundred and fifty times in the LXX. It appears seventeen times in Joshua to describe the ways that the tribal borders of the land pass through various territories, and also in the Psalms with a variety of senses. In Deut 2:7 and Judg 11:18 it refers to the passage of the Israelites through the wilderness, two texts that could be relevant here in Hebrews given the discussion of Ps 95 in Heb 3-4. Interestingly, it is never used to refer to the movement of the high priest through the tabernacle on the Day of Atonement, although in several texts it does appear in cultic contexts. In Ps 42:4 (LXX 41:5) “David” anticipates proceeding “to a place of a marvellous tent as far as the house of God” (*διελεύσομαι ἐν τόπῳ σκηνῆς θαυμαστῆς ἕως τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ θεοῦ*);¹⁹ in 2 Kgdms 7:7 and 1 Chron 17:6 it translates the Hithpael of *הלך*, describing Yahweh’s “moving about” among Israel, in a context that suggests his movement in the tabernacle;²⁰ in Joel 4:17 Yahweh claims that he dwells in Zion and strangers shall never “pass through” (*διέρχομαι*) it; and in Ezek 44:2 the east gate of the temple is closed and, since Yahweh has “entered” (*εἰσέρχομαι*) there nobody else is permitted to “pass through” (*διέρχομαι*) it.

ascension in Luke 24:51; Acts 1:9. For a similar reading see Zwiep 1997: 27, 129 (who refers to “a description of the Easter events along the lines of a heavenly journey”, p. 129). See also Acts 1:2, 11; the longer ending of Mark (16:19); John 20:17; Rom 8:34; Eph 1:20; 2:6. This does not mean that heaven in the sense of the dwelling place of God is located on the other side of heaven in the sense of the upper part of the created universe. Rather, the notion of passing through (or perhaps penetrating) the heavens is a figurative way of expressing the idea that Jesus has left the space-time universe and moved into the transcendent dwelling place of God. See Wright 2003b: 653-55; 2007b: 66, 120-22. A third option is suggested by Jewett 1981: 81-82, who proposes a background in “gnostic theology in which redemption is thought of as ascent through the hostile cosmic spheres to the spiritual homeland ... [something that would be] readily accepted in the Lycus Valley.” Jewett (pp. 5-13) argues that Hebrews is the lost Laodicean letter (Col 4:16), written by Epaphras to combat “a unique Jewish-Gnostic heresy prevalent in the Lycus Valley” (p. 6) involving the veneration of angels. Given that Hebrews contains no polemic against angel-veneration this intriguing thesis seems ultimately unlikely. See my discussion in 6.3 (above) and especially footnotes 106 and 120 to Chapter 6.

¹⁹ This translation is from Pietersma 2009: 568. As Kraus 1988: 435 notes the MT of Ps 42:4 is unintelligible as it stands, and he proposes emending the expression *בְּסֶךְ אֲדִירִים* (NRSV “with the throng, and led them ...”) to *בְּסֶךְ אֲדִיר* and translates “the tent of the glorious Lord,” that is, the temple, a reading corroborated by the parallel expression *בית אלהים* in the next line.

²⁰ The Hithpael of *הלך* appears several times in cultic contexts in the OT. Aside from these two verses, it appears in 2 Sam 7:7; 1 Chron 17:6 where Yahweh “walks” among the people of Israel (in a portable sanctuary); in Job 22:14 where Yahweh “walks” on the dome of heaven; and in Ps 26:3; 56:14; 116:9 where the psalmist “walks” with or before God. In Gen 3:8 Yahweh “walks” in Eden; in Ezek 1:13 the torch “walks” about the temple, and the king of Tyre “walks” in the Eden sanctuary (Ezek 28:14). See the discussion of this sense of the verb in Wenham 1986: 20. See also my discussion of 1QH^a XI 21 in 3.14 (above), where the Hebrew verb also appears to describe the speaker in the hymn walking about heaven. The word is also used to refer to the manner of life of significant people from Israel’s past, including Enoch (Gen 5:22, 24), Noah (Gen 6:9), Abraham (Gen 17:1; 24:40), Hezekiah (2 Kings 20:3; Isa 38:3), Job (Job 1:7; 2:2). In Gen 5:22, 24 Enoch “walks” with God (*התהלך*). The LXX renders this with *εὐαρεστέω* (“to please”). Kvanvig 2004: 171-73 suggests that “Enoch walked with God” (*יתהלך חנוך את האלהים*) may have been read by the composers of *1 Enoch* in terms of Enoch’s sojourns with angels. If he is correct, the hithpael of *הלך* in this text refers to movement around the heavenly temple.

While any of these texts could have a bearing on Heb 4:14, the most significant background to this text is 1 Sam (1 Kgdms) 2:30-35, already echoed in Heb 3:1-6.²¹ Here, a man of God announces to Eli that the priesthood would be taken from him. In v. 30 he explains that Yahweh had chosen his ancestors to “walk before him forever” (תהלכו לפני עד עולם, LXX διελεύσεται ενώπιόν μου ἕως αἰῶνος); and in v. 35 he explains that Yahweh would raise up a “faithful priest” (כהן נאמן, LXX ἱερέα πιστόν) for whom he would build “a sure house” (οἶκος πιστός), and who would walk before Yahweh’s anointed forever (והתהלך לפני משיחי כל הימים, LXX καὶ διελεύσεται ενώπιον χριστοῦ μου πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας).²²

In Heb 4:14, Jesus is designated a “great high priest” (ἀρχιερεύς μέγας) and, while scholars debate the force of the epithet “great,”²³ the text appears to echo both Zech 6:11, where Joshua “the high priest” (ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας) is singled out as the one who would build the eschatological temple,²⁴ and 1 Sam 2:35. Hebrews 4:14 identifies Jesus as the “faithful priest” (ἱερεὺς πιστός) of that text, the one whom Yahweh will raise up and for whom Yahweh will build a sure house, and who will “walk about” (תהלך, διέρχομαι) before Yahweh’s anointed forever. Jesus is the one who walks about (traverses) the heavenly temple, the sure house that Yahweh has built with his exaltation to God’s right hand “in these last days” (Heb 1:2). This text anticipates “the true tent” (ἡ σκίνη ἡ ἀληθινή) of Heb 8:2, pitched by the Lord. This is where God and his people will dwell together in the eschaton, where Jesus is now exalted and here he now “walks about.”

²¹ See my discussion of this text in 7.2 (above).

²² In the LXX διέρχομαι translates the hithpael of הלך in Josh 18:4; 1 Sam (LXX 1 Kgdms) 2:30, 35; 12:2; 30:31; 2 Sam (LXX 2 Kgdms) 7:7; 1 Chron 17:6; 21:4; Ps 105 (LXX 104):13.

²³ The expression ἀρχιερεύς μέγας is applied to Simon in 1 Macc 13:42; 14:27, and ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας applied to Joshua in Zech 6:11. Philo *Somm.* 1.214, 219; 2.183 refers to the Logos as ἀρχιερεύς μέγας. Moffatt 1924: 58; Héring 1970: 35; Wilson 1987: 91 posit dependence on Philo, while Spicq 1952: 1: 42; Montefiore 1964: 90; Héring 1970: 35; Ellingworth 1993: 266 suggest that the adjective is redundant. See the discussion in Williamson 1970: 130-32. Attridge 1989: 139 and O’Brien 2010: 180-81 suggest the adjective μέγας in Heb 4:14 differentiates Jesus from the Aaronic high priests and indicates that his priesthood is superior to theirs. Schenk 1980: 246-47, noting that the adjective μέγας is absent in 4:15, proposes that the greatness is connected with his presence in heaven. In Heb 10:21 Jesus is a “great priest” (ἱερεὺς μέγας) and in 13:20 he is “the great shepherd of the sheep” (ὁ ποιμήν τῶν προβάτων ὁ μέγας). The word ἀρχιερεύς is rare in the O.T. In Lev 4:3 it translates הכהן המשיח (“the anointed priest”), in Josh 22:13 (MT) Phinehas is a “priest” (כהן, LXX “high priest,” ἀρχιερεύς), and in Josh 24:33 the LXX reads Ελεάζαρ υἱὸς Ααρων ὁ ἀρχιερεύς (“Eleazar the son of Aaron the high priest”) where the MT simply has ואלעזר בן אהרן (“and Eleazar the son of Aaron”). Aside from these verses where there is a Hebrew Vorlage, the word appears in four times in Esdras A (5:40; 9:39, 40, 49); nineteen times in 1 Maccabees (which probably has a Hebrew Vorlage, see DeSilva 2002: 247) 10:20, 32, 38, 69; 12:3, 6, 7; 13:36, 42; 14:17, 23, 27, 30, 41; 15:17, 21, 24; 16:12, 24); twelve times in 2 Maccabees (3:1, 4, 9, 10, 16, 21, 32, 33, 4:13; 14:3, 13; 15:2); twice in 3 Maccabees (1:11; 2:1); and twice in 4 Maccabees (4:13, 16). The usual Hebrew expression is הכהן הגדול, appearing numerous times, translated with ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας.

²⁴ In my discussion of Heb 8:1-2 in 8.5.3 (below), I identify a second allusion to Zech 6:11-13.

Two hortatory subjunctives follow the assertion that Jesus the great high priest traverses the heavens. The readers are encouraged to hold fast to their confession and “approach the throne of grace with confidence so as to receive mercy and find grace for their time of need” (προσερχόμεθα οὖν μετὰ παρρησίας τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος, ἵνα λάβωμεν ἔλεος καὶ χάριν εὕρωμεν εἰς εὐκαιρον βοήθειαν, 4:16). It is necessary to identify the referent of the throne of grace and the sense in which the word προσέρχομαι is used.

The throne of grace is doubtless God’s throne (8:1; 12:22) from where God dispenses grace,²⁵ and where Jesus is seated at God’s right hand (8:1; 12:2).²⁶ The expression ὁ θρόνος τῆς χάριτος is not found elsewhere in Judaism,²⁷ although occasionally in Rabbinic Judaism God is said to have two thrones, one of judgement and one of mercy.²⁸ In both the OT and the NT God is understood to be enthroned in heaven,²⁹ and also enthroned in the holy of holies, between the cherubim,³⁰ on the so-called “mercy seat” (כַּפֶּרֶת).³¹ This has led some scholars to suggest that the “throne of grace” is the heavenly equivalent of the mercy seat in the wilderness tabernacle.³² This should not be pressed, however, since the LXX consistently renders the “cover” (כַּפֶּרֶת) of the Ark of the Covenant with ἱλαστήριον, rather than θρόνος.³³ In Heb 2:17 Jesus becomes a high priest “so as to make expiation for the sins of the people” (εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ), and Day of Atonement imagery is exploited in Heb 9:1–10:18 along

²⁵ Delitzsch 1868: 1: 223; Héring 1970: 36; Scholer 1991: 104; O’Brien 2010: 185.

²⁶ For a heavenly throne see 1 En. 14:18; 45:3; Wis 9:4; 3 En. 10:1; Exagōgē 68–69; Lad. Jac. 2:7; 4Q491c; 4Q405 20 II 21–22 2–5, 8; 11Q17 V 8. The throne of Jesus in 1:8 is probably a metonym for his kingly rule.

²⁷ Jewett 1981: 80.

²⁸ Lev. Rab. 29:3–9. See also b. San. 38b; Blendinger 1976: 614 suggests that this text in Hebrews is in “implicit contrast” to this notion, although he gives no evidence to support this suggestion.

²⁹ 1 Kings 22:19; Job 26:9; Ps 11:4; 103:19; Isa 6:1; 66:1; Ezek 1:26; 10:1; 4 Macc 17:18; Matt 5:34; 23:22; Acts 7:49; Rev 1:4; 3:21; 4:2–10; 5:1–13; 6:16; 7:9–17; 12:5; 14:3; 19:4–5; 20:11; 21:3, 5.

³⁰ 1 Sam 4:4; 2 Sam 6:2; 2 Kings 19:15; 1 Chron 13:6; Ps 80:1; 99:1; Isa 37:16. See also Ezek 9:3; 10:1–20; 11:22.

³¹ Exod 25:18, 19, 20, 22; 37:7, 8, 9; Num 7:89.

³² Westcott 1892: 109; Buchanan 1972: 82; Michel 1975: 209–10; Hagner 1983: 60; Attridge 1989: 142; Bruce 1990: 116–17; Grässer 1990–97: 1: 258; Koester 2001: 284; Eskola 2001: 252–53; Mackie 2007: 166; O’Brien 2010: 185–86. Against this see Ellingworth 1993: 270..

³³ In the Hebrew bible כַּפֶּרֶת is always the cover of the Ark of the Covenant (Exod 25:17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22; 26:34; 30:6; 31:7; 35:12; 37:6, 7, 8, 9, 35; 40:20; 16:2, 13, 14, 15; Num 7:89; 1 Chron 28:11), but its derivation from כָּפַר (piel, “to atone,” see HALOT 493–94) indicates that it was understood as the place of atonement (Lev 16:2, 13, 14, 15). In the LXX it is almost always rendered with ἱλαστήριον, see Exod 25:17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22; 31:17; 35:12; 37:6 (LXX 38:5–6); 37:7 (LXX 38:7); 37:8 (LXX 38:8); Lev 16:2, 13, 14, 15; Num 7:89. In 1 Chron 28:11 the Greek equivalent is ἐξιλασμός. Ἱλαστήριον refers to the place of expiation or propitiation, rather than to a throne or a seat *per se*. Delitzsch 1868: 222 notes the derivation of the term “mercy-seat” from Luther’s *Gnadenstuhl*, as do BDAG 474; HALOT 495.

the same lines, but here people are to approach, not for the removal of sin, but to receive mercy and grace as needed.

More appropriate to the context is Isa 16:5, which announces “the establishment of a throne in steadfast love” (יְהוֹכֵן בְּחֶסֶד כִּסֵּא), an expression rendered in the LXX with καὶ διορθωθήσεται μετ’ ἐλέους θρόνος.³⁴ This throne is established in “the (restored) tent of David” (ἐν σκηνῇ Δαυιδ) and one will sit on it “with sincerity” (μετὰ ἀληθείας). And while a throne is normally in a palace, that this throne is in a tent makes the identification of Jesus the Son of God as the Great High Priest more appropriate in the context. This is the throne of grace on which Jesus is enthroned in response to the command of Ps 110:1 in the last days (Heb 1:1-2).³⁵

The readers are encouraged to “approach” (προσέρχομαι) this throne of grace. προσέρχομαι appears eighty-six times in the NT, fifty-one of which appear in Matthew and twenty in Luke-Acts. Outside of Hebrews, this is the usual word for the approach of one person to another or to some object or location. In Stephen’s speech in Acts 7:49 it refers to Moses approaching the burning bush, and in 1 Pet 2:4 people are called to approach the risen Christ. The word appears seven times in Hebrews and in four of these it refers to people approaching God.³⁶ In Heb 12:18, 22 the readers are said to have approached not Sinai, but Zion, and in the present verse they approach the throne of grace.

Hebrews is unique in the NT in using the word in cultic contexts, reflecting a minor usage of the word in the LXX,³⁷ where either priests or people approach God in the wilderness tabernacle or in one case in Ezekiel’s ideal temple.³⁸ The word is not used for the entry of priests into the tabernacle proper,³⁹ or of the entry of the high priest into the

³⁴ Moffatt 1924: 60; Braun 1984: 128.

³⁵ For messianic and cultic associations related to the throne in the tent of Isa 16:5 see Wildberger 1997: 143-44.

³⁶ Heb 7:25; 10:1, 22; 11:6.

³⁷ Of the eighty-six NT occurrences it only has cultic connotations in Hebrews. It appears one hundred and twelve times in the LXX, and only with cultic connotations in Exod 12:48; 16:9; Lev 9:5, 7, 8; Ezek 44:16; 1 Macc 2:23. In Heb 11:6 the word seems to be used in a general non-cultic sense. See Peterson 1982: 78-79, 230-31 (note 34); Mackie 2008: 204. A cultic sense for 11:6 is asserted by Delitzsch 1868: 2: 230; Käsemann 1984: 54; Scholer 1991: 133-37.

³⁸ For the approach of the people see Exod 16:9; 34:32; Lev 9:5; 18:22, and for the approach of the priests see Lev 9:7, 8; 21:17, 18, 21, 23; 22:3; Num 17:5; Ezek 44:16. In Num 18:3 the Levites serve in the temple, but must not approach the utensils of the sanctuary or the altar. The word usually translates either קָרַב or נָשָׂא but numerous other Greek words render these two words as well. Since Hebrews always cites the LXX, I will not discuss the use of these two Hebrew words. See the discussion of προσέρχομαι in the LXX in Peterson 1982: 230 (note 33), and in Scholer 1991: 90-95, 150-53, who notes that it is limited to the approach to the environs of the wilderness tabernacle rather than the holy of holies. However, his conclusion seems unwarranted: Jesus “the ‘great high priest’ has entered into the heavenly holy of holies (4:14), and ... now the readers are encouraged to ... enter into the same holy of holies” (p. 107).

³⁹ See Exod 28:43 where entry to the tent of meeting is expressed with εἰσπορεύομαι and approach to the altar of burnt offering (in the outer court of the tabernacle) with προπορεύομαι.

Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement.⁴⁰ Thus, in the LXX the priests or the people approach the altar to worship, but when they enter the tabernacle or the holy of holies another verb is used.

Several scholars, noting cultic imagery in this pericope, have concluded that in this verse the readers are encouraged to enter the holy of holies in the heavenly temple.⁴¹ However, while later in Hebrews Jesus is said to do this, and while in 10:19 the people are encouraged to do the same, that is not the focus of this verse. Indeed, if this verse were to refer to the entry of the people into the holy of holies, surely another verb such as εἰσέρχομαι would be used.⁴²

I have argued that the pericope refers to the presence of Jesus in the heavenly temple. In this verse the readers are encouraged to approach the same heavenly temple, seeking mercy and grace, which they receive in response to their prayers.⁴³ The language of approach does not envisage any physical motion towards the heavenly temple or any heavenly journey on the part of the people,⁴⁴ rather, it indicates that the heavenly, eschatological temple encompasses both heaven and earth.⁴⁵ God's space, where Jesus is enthroned, intersects with human space at the point where God's people approach God in prayer.⁴⁶ There is no "above and below" correspondence in this text. The heavenly temple

⁴⁰ In Lev 16:2, 17, 23 the verb is εἰσπορεύομαι.

⁴¹ Lane 1991a: 115; Scholer 1991: 91-95.

⁴² Εἰσέρχομαι appears seventeen times in Hebrews and προσέρχομαι seven times. Scholer 1991: 182 concludes that "προσέρχεσθαι and εἰσέρχεσθαι are synonymous cultic terms which are used interchangeably in Heb. as the object necessitates." Εἰσέρχομαι is used for the entry into God's rest in Heb 3-4, which I have argued is in the heavenly temple; for entry into the heavenly sanctuary in Heb 6:19-20; 9:12, 24, 25; and for Christ's entry into the κόσμος in Heb 10:5. Προσέρχομαι is used for the approach of people to God (7:25; 10:1, 22; 11:6); approach to the throne of grace (4:16); and the approach to Sinai and the heavenly Jerusalem respectively in 12:18, 22. Only in 4:16; 12:18, 22 might προσέρχομαι have a similar force to εἰσέρχομαι. This does not seem to be the case in 12:18, as it is difficult to understand how the people could "enter" Sinai, and the use of the same word in 12:22 is for stylistic reasons in the finely balanced pericopes 12:18-20 and 12:22-24. This leaves only 4:16, which I argue is about the approach to God in prayer, rather than entry to the heavenly sanctuary.

⁴³ Rissi 1987: 97. Προσέρχωμεθα is a present subjunctive, suggesting ongoing or repeated approaches to the throne of grace (Lane 1991a: 115; O'Brien 2010: 185).

⁴⁴ Contra Attridge 1989: 141 who suggests that the addressees are "urged to follow the path 'through the heavens' that Christ blazed and take advantage of the access to God that he provides." He also suggests that approaching God in this verse is "a more encompassing image for entering into a covenantal relationship with God."

⁴⁵ A similar understanding of God's space and human space is apparent in the Dead Sea Scrolls, where the community has access to the heavenly temple while in the Judean desert. See my treatment above of 4QInstruction (3.5); 4QDaily Prayers (3.6); *The Community Rule* (3.7); *The Rule of the Congregation* (3.8); *The War Scroll* (3.10); *ShirShabb* (3.11); 4QBerakhot (3.12); *Hodayot* (3.14).

⁴⁶ In Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the temple (1 Kings 8; 2 Chron 6) he asks that when people pray in the temple God will hear in heaven. The distinction in Hebrews is not so much that his people have access to the presence of God in heaven, but that it is available without an earthly priesthood and temple. In Hebrews God's space and human space intersect wherever people pray, not just in the temple. See Mitchell 2007: 107.

is the eschatological temple where Christ is now enthroned and where God dwells. In the meantime, while they journey to their ultimate goal, the faithful have access to God's presence in order to have their needs met.⁴⁷

8.3 A Stable and Reliable Hope (6:18-20)

Hebrews 6:18-20 claims that Jesus has entered the heavenly sanctuary, although it does so rather obliquely with the expression εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσμετος ("within the curtain").⁴⁸ The verses also introduce Heb 7:1–10:25, with each point in 6:18-20 developed in those chapters.⁴⁹

The central section of Hebrews can be divided into two parts. Hebrews 5:1–7:26 deal with the appointment of the Son of God as a superior high priest, and 8:1–10:18 deals with the self-offering of this high priest.⁵⁰ Hebrews 5:1-10 establishes his appointment as a high priest from Ps 110:4 where the Israelite king is addressed as "a priest forever just like Melchizedek" (ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισέδεκ),⁵¹ a text quoted in Heb 5:6 alongside Ps 2:7, earlier applied to the exalted Son of God (Heb 1:5). Hebrews 5:7-10 is one long sentence relating the process by which Jesus became such a priest, and concluding with an allusion to Ps 110:4 that claims that Jesus was "designated by God a priest just like Melchizedek" (προσαγορευθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀρχιερεὺς κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισέδεκ).

⁴⁷ For a discussion of inaugurated eschatology in connection with the heavenly temple see Mackie 2007: 157.

⁴⁸ This expression occurs four times in the LXX to refer to the holy of holies in the wilderness tabernacle (Exod 26:33; Lev 2:16, 12, 15, see also Heb 9:3). Here, it is a periphrasis for the holy of holies in the heavenly temple (see Hofius 1972: 88; Schenck 2007: 175), although I will argue in 8.5 (below) that the heavenly temple should not be understood as a bicameral sanctuary. This language is figurative, referring to the presence of God. Rice 1987: 65-71 attempts to argue that the word καταπέτασμα ("curtain") in Heb 6:19 could refer to any of three curtains in the heavenly temple (which he thinks corresponds in detail to the wilderness tabernacle—a notion that I will also argue is unwarranted). He suggests from the LXX usage that it could be the screen of the courtyard as in, e.g. Exod 38:18 (LXX 37:16); the veil over the entrance to the tabernacle proper (Exod 26:37); or the veil separating the holy of holies from the outer compartment (e.g. Exod 26:31). His arguments are cogently countered by Gane 2000: 5-8; Gurtner 2004: 105-11; 2005b: 345-53 (who both operate from the same assumptions as Rice about the design of the heavenly temple).

⁴⁹ Rice 1981: 244-45. Rice suggests that Heb 7:1-17 deals with Jesus a priest like Melchizedek (corresponding to 6:20b), that 7:18–10:18 deals with the entry of Jesus into the inner shrine (corresponding to 6:20a), and that 10:19-39 deals with the entry of the readers into the inner shrine (corresponding to 6:19).

⁵⁰ Guthrie 1994: 106-108, 144 (figure 35). On p. 108 Guthrie demonstrates the transitional nature of Heb 8:1-2 as the discourse moves from one topic to the next. On p. 82 he demonstrates how Heb 5:1-3 and 7:27-28 form an inclusio around this section.

⁵¹ For the translation of κατὰ τὴν τάξιν with "just like" see Longenecker 1978: 174; BDAG 989, s.v. τάξις, 4. NRSV translates Ps 110:4 (עַל דְּבַרְתִּי מַלְכִּי צִדְקָה) with "according to the order of Melchizedek," a translation it retains wherever the expression appears in Hebrews (5:6, 10; 6:20, 7:11, 17). But one point of the Melchizedek argument of Hebrews is that unlike Aaron, Melchizedek was not the first of an "order" of priests. In an allusion to Ps 110:4 in Heb 7:15, the author replaces the words κατὰ τὴν τάξιν with κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα ("according to the likeness") of Melchizedek.

According to Heb 5:11 the readers were too dull to understand what the author had to say about Melchizedek's priesthood.⁵² Consequently, he digresses in 5:11–6:20 to warn them about the possibility of falling away (5:11–6:12). This digression concludes with a call for them to imitate those “who through faith and patience inherit the promises” (6:12). Verses 13-15 give the example of Abraham as one who patiently endured and obtained what God promised him following the *Aqedah* (Gen 22:16-17, cited in Heb 6:13-14), and the example of Abraham leads into a discussion of a promise of God, guaranteed by an oath (vv. 15-16). These two unchangeable things (the promise and the oath)⁵³ are intended to encourage the readers to “hold on” (κρατέω) to the hope that lies ahead (vv. 17-18).⁵⁴ Verse 19 explains why this hope is so sure, and in v. 20 the digression concludes with a return to the claim that Jesus has become a priest just like Melchizedek, a claim that will be substantiated in Heb 7:1-28.

In v. 19 “the hope laid before the readers” (τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος) is likened to an “anchor for life” (ἄγκυραν ... τῆς ψυχῆς).⁵⁵ This hope is “stable and reliable, reaching into the curtain” (ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ βεβαίαν καὶ εἰσερχομένην εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος)⁵⁶ where “Jesus a forerunner has entered on ‘our’ behalf” (ὅπου πρόδρομος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εἰσῆλθεν Ἰησοῦς).⁵⁷

⁵² Ibid.: 174 suggests that relative pronoun in the expression περὶ οὗ (“concerning which”) is masculine and that the antecedent is Melchizedek. While grammatically possible, this is unlikely since the text says much more about priesthood like Melchizedek than about Melchizedek himself.

⁵³ Bruce 1990: 154. The precise promise and oath are not specified, perhaps because the author had more than one text in mind. Gen 22:16-17 cited in Heb 6:13-14 is in the immediate context, and the allusion to Ps 110:4 in 6:20 would bring with it the first part that verse (“Yahweh has sworn and will not change his mind,” LXX ὥμοσεν κύριος καὶ οὐ μεταμελήσεται), cited and interpreted in Heb 7:20-21, 28. Young 2001: 170-71 and Johnson 2006: 171 suggest that Heb 6:19-20 links these two texts together. Attridge 1989: 181-82 suggests the promise and oath contained in Pss 2:7 and 110:4.

⁵⁴ The NRSV translates the aorist active infinitive of κρατέω with “seize.” Most commentators argue that the sense is “hold on to,” which accords with the general tenor of Hebrews, encouraging perseverance and endurance. See BDAG 565, s.v. κρατέω, 6, a; Westcott 1892: 162; Braun 1984: 190; Attridge 1989: 183; Weiss 1991: 364-65 (footnote 29); Koester 2001: 329. Lane 1991a: 147 translates “hold fast,” while in his comment on the verse he writes “take hold of” (p. 153). Moffatt 1924: 88; Spicq 1952: 2: 163; Zerwick 1963: 82 (para. 250) proposes “seize,” reading the aorist as an ingressive aorist. The imagery in this verse may include the idea of “refugees” (καταφυγόντες) taking refuge in a sanctuary, holding the horns of the altar as in Exod 21:12-24; 1 Kings 1:50; 2:28 (Attridge 1989: 183; Gordon 1991: 437-41) and, if so, either sense of the verb could apply.

⁵⁵ For the translation “anchor for life” see Lane 1991a: 147.

⁵⁶ For the translation of the present participle εἰσερχομένην with “reaching into” see BDAG 294, s.v. εἰσερχομαι, 3, and Hofius 1972: 87, who suggests that εἰσερχομαι has a “static” sense here and a dynamic sense in v. 20. This feminine singular participle could refer either to the “hope” (ἐλπίς) or to the “anchor” (ἄγκυρα). Delitzsch 1868: 1: 319; Simpson 1946: 187; Käsemann 1984: 227; Attridge 1989: 183-84; Mayer 1990: 440; Scholer 1991: 181; Johnson 2006: 172-73 envisage the anchor (sometimes identified as Jesus himself) entering the sanctuary, but it is better to read the words ἦν ὡς ἄγκυραν ἔχομεν τῆς ψυχῆς (“which we have as an anchor for life”), and ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ βεβαίαν καὶ εἰσερχομένην εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος (“both stable and reliable, and reaching within the curtain”) as two statements qualifying ἡ ἐλπίς, with the hope reaching within the curtain rather than the anchor. See the discussion in Westcott 1892: 163; Ellingworth 1993: 345; Lane 1991a: 153-54; O’Brien 2010: 241 (footnote 187). Hofius

In the NT ἔλπις (“hope”) has three senses:⁵⁸ an expectant attitude,⁵⁹ the basis or foundation of hope,⁶⁰ or that for which a person hopes.⁶¹ The noun appears five times in Hebrews⁶² and the verb ἐλπίζω (“to hope”) once (11:1), where it is a substantival present participle, referring to “things hoped for” (corresponding to the third sense in which the noun is used). In Hebrews the noun is always in the genitive case and only in 7:19 is it anarthrous. The adjectival present participle προκειμένης (“lying ahead”)⁶³ in Heb 6:18 indicates that here ἔλπις refers to the object of hope,⁶⁴ which extends within the curtain. ἔλπις probably carries this sense in the other instances where it is definite in Hebrews, usually referring to the eschatological goal of the people of God,⁶⁵ that is, God’s rest in the eschatological temple of Heb 4:1-11.⁶⁶

This hope extends “into the heavenly temple” (εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος) where Jesus has already entered as a forerunner. Whatever else is to be said about this claim it seems that along with other parts of these verses it is to be taken figuratively. The readers are depicted as “refugees” (οἱ καταφυγόντες). Hope is “like an anchor” (ὡς ἄγκυραν), and Jesus is a “forerunner” (πρόδρομος), an athletic image.⁶⁷ If

1972: 87 (footnote 226) suggests that the conjunction καί in the expression καὶ εἰσερχομένην εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος is exegetical, giving the participle a causal nuance: the hope is stable and reliable *because* it reaches within the curtain. This is a valuable insight.

⁵⁷ Delitzsch 1868: 1: 321; Spicq 1952: 2: 165; Lane 1991a: 148 (note n); Scholer 1991: 177; Ellingworth 1993: 348-49; O’Brien 2010: 242 suggest that as in 9:24 the words ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν are dependent on the verb εἰσῆλθεν (“he entered”) rather than the noun πρόδρομος (“forerunner”).

⁵⁸ For the following analysis see BDAG 319-20.

⁵⁹ E.g. Acts 16:19; 27:20; 1 Cor 9:10; 2 Cor 1:7. Christian expectation (hope) is confidence in God, as in e.g. Rom 5:4-5; 12:12; 15:13.

⁶⁰ E.g. Col 1:27; 1 Thess 2:19; 1 Tim 1:1.

⁶¹ E.g. Rom 8:24; Col 1:5; Tit 2:13.

⁶² Heb 3:6; 6:11, 18; 7:19; 10:23.

⁶³ Πρόκειμαι appears five times in the NT, three of which are in Hebrews, always a present participle, acting as an adjective. In Heb 12:1 the readers are encouraged to run the race set before them, and in Heb 12:2 Jesus endures the cross because of the joy set before him. Here, the readers are to seize the hope that lies ahead (unlike 12:1, 2 there is no qualifying pronoun in 6:18). For the translation “lies ahead” see Johnson 2006: 172 and O’Brien 2010: 240.

⁶⁴ Moffatt 1924: 88; Bultmann and Rengstorff 1964: 530 (footnote 100); Attridge 1989: 183; Lane 1991a: 153 (who argues that in Hebrews hope “never” describes a subjective attitude). However, Rissi 1987: 97 argues for the subjective sense in this verse, and Westcott 1892: 162 and Koester 2001: 329 suggest that neither the objective nor the subjective sense can be excluded.

⁶⁵ Ellingworth 1993: 212, 332, 344, 382, 525. In 3:6 ἔλπις qualifies confidence and pride (ἡ παρησία καὶ τὸ καύχημα) in what is hoped for; in 6:11 the hope is the promise of 6:12, which they will inherit if they hold on to their hope; and in 10:23 it is again the hope of entering God’s rest in the eschaton. In 7:19 where it is anarthrous it refers to “a better hope” by which we can approach God, that is, the better covenant of 7:22.

⁶⁶ O’Brien 2010: 243.

⁶⁷ Πρόδρομος also appears in military and naval contexts. For the details see Bauernfeind 1972: 235; Ellingworth 1993: 348; Koester 2001: 330; O’Brien 2010: 242 (footnote 194). Like ἀρχηγός (“pioneer”),

the object of hope extends within the curtain, it raises the question as to whether the expression εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος (“within the curtain”) should also be taken figuratively, rather than imagining a literal curtain in the heavenly temple enclosing an inner compartment where God is enthroned.⁶⁸ Judgement needs to be reserved on this question until the discussion of Heb 8:1-5 and 9:11-12, where I will argue that it is doubtful that the author of Hebrews conceived of the heavenly temple in this way.⁶⁹ As I have continually argued, heavenly temple imagery in Hebrews refers to the eschatological dwelling of God with his people. That such a temple should have a veil separating God from the people is an odd idea.⁷⁰ Rather, the expression is likely to be a figurative reference to the presence of God,⁷¹ where Jesus is now exalted.⁷²

8.4 Jesus Exalted Higher than the Heavens (7:26-28)

It would be a diversion to work through Heb 7:1-25 which clarifies the implications of Jesus being a priest like Melchizedek. However, the concluding summary with verbal links back to earlier parts of Hebrews warrants attention.⁷³ This summary sets out the characteristics of the high priest like Melchizedek (7:26).⁷⁴ In contrast to the former priests

πρόδρομος refers to the first in a series that will follow afterwards, the “precursor” of the believers. See Simpson 1946: 187; Bruce 1990: 155; Scholer 1991: 177; O’Brien 2010: 242.

⁶⁸ The veil of the *debir* appears twice in the tenth song of *ShirShabb* (4Q405 15 II-16 3, 5), in a context that seems to indicate that in the “temple” in these texts, however conceived, there is an inner shrine (or multiple inner shrines). See the discussion of *ShirShabb* in 3.11 (above).

⁶⁹ Those who see a reference to a literal heavenly holy of holies in this text include Hofius 1972: 50-55, 84-94; Rice 1987: 65-71 (although he argues that this text refers to more than the *debir*); Attridge 1989: 184-85 (tentatively); Bruce 1990: 155; Gane 2000: 5-8; DeSilva 2000b: 251 (footnote 98); Young 2001: 165-73; 2002b: 61-68; Davidson 2001: 175; 2002: 70 (on p.78 Davidson suggests that Heb 9:8 and 10:20 refer to “the official starting up of the heavenly sanctuary services,” a suggestion that seems to be an all too wooden reading of the text); Gurtner 2005b: 344-53.

⁷⁰ Schenck 2007: 175-77.

⁷¹ Moffatt 1924: 89; Loader 1981: 182-84; Koester 1989: 163-64; 2001: 330; Johnson 2006: 172-73. In Philo *Heir* 221-29; *Q.E.* 2.68-69; *Spec.* 1.66; and *Jos. A.J.* 3.123, 181 the curtain separates the material world from the heavenly world. On this imagery in Philo and Josephus see Koester 1989: 59-63. Käsemann 1984: 299-300 sees the curtain as referring to the boundary between the earthly and heavenly worlds, but with its background in gnostic traditions.

⁷² O’Brien 2010: 242 suggests that the notion of hope penetrating behind the curtain means that “believers *in hope* may now enter where Jesus has already gone in reality.” But this is not what the text says. The object of hope (their eschatological goal) extends into the heavenly temple where Jesus is. He has entered as a forerunner, and they will enter if they hold on to their hope of entry. Similarly, Scholer 1991: 181 refers to the believers’ freedom to enter the holy of holies, and Johnson 2006: 173 suggests that the readers are to “follow after and ‘take hold of the hope ... that is, enter themselves in to God’s presence.’” This seems to stretch the imagery too far. For the future orientation of these verses see Ellingworth 1993: 344—the hope is God’s rest of Heb 4:1-11, the city of 11:10; 13:14, and the country of 11:14, all in the world to come. They are to hold fast the hope of entering this.

⁷³ Vanhoye 1989: 27-29; Guthrie 1994: 82. See the brief discussion of the transitional nature of this paragraph in Ellingworth 1993: 392.

⁷⁴ The alternate descriptions of Jesus as a “priest” (ἱερεύς) and as a “high priest” (ἀρχιερεύς) have caused some consternation to readers of Hebrews. The author is concerned to establish that Jesus is a high priest so that he can argue that his self-offering corresponds typologically with the actions of the high priest

he has no need to offer multiple sacrifices, since his “once and for all” (ἐφάπαξ) self-offering finally dealt with sin (v. 27). It concludes with the claim that while the law appoints priests who are subject to weakness, the oath (of Ps 110:4) appoints a son (Ps 2:7) who has been made perfect forever (v. 28). Verse 26 sets out the characteristics of the high priest, v. 27 anticipates the treatment of his self-offering (to be covered in 8:1–9:18), and v. 28 functions as a conclusion to the treatment of his appointment as a high priest that began in 5:11.

The description of the high priest who is appropriate (ἔπρεπεν) for “us,”⁷⁵ comprises three adjectives (“holy, blameless, undefiled,” ὅσιος ἄκακος ἀμίαντος),⁷⁶ an adjectival phrase with a perfect passive participle (“separated from sinners,” κεχωρισμένος ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν) and a second adjectival phrase using an aorist participle and a further adjective (“having become higher than the heavens” καὶ ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος). This last phrase expresses a spatial relationship between Jesus and the heavens. The understanding of this sentence partly depends on the sense of the word καί (“and”) joining the last two expressions.

If “separated from sinners” is taken with what precedes, it is a further declaration of the blamelessness of the high priest.⁷⁷ The perfect passive participle acts as an adjective,⁷⁸ and the καί joining this expression to what follows simply adds the third of the three qualities of the high priest—he is qualitatively different from sinners, and he has been exalted above the heavens. On the other hand, if “separated from sinners” is construed

on the Day of Atonement, but the text he uses to establish that he is a priest (Ps 110:4) refers not to a high priest but to a priest. Jesus is only called a “priest” (ἱερεύς) in texts where Ps 110:4 is in the frame (5:6; 7:11, 15, 17, 21), or when comparing him in general terms with the former priests (8:4); elsewhere he is a “high priest” (ἀρχιερεύς, 2:17; 3:1; 4:14, 15; 5:5, 10, 6:20; 7:26, 27, 28; 8:1, 3; 9:11), or in one instance (10:21) a “great priest” (ἱερεύς μέγας). That the term high priest is what the author wants to convey is evident in that the three concluding summaries containing allusions to Ps 110:4 use the word ἀρχιερεύς (5:10; 6:20; 7:28), and in that Jesus is never referred to with the term ἱερεύς after Heb 7. See the brief discussion in O’Brien 2010: 278 (footnote 194).

⁷⁵ Ἐπρεπεν also appears in Heb 2:10 for the appropriateness of God making perfect the pioneer of our salvation through suffering. Elsewhere in the NT it appears in Matt 3:15; 1 Cor 11:13; Eph 5:3; 1 Tim 2:10; Tit 2:1.

⁷⁶ See the discussion of the senses of these three words in Ellingworth 1993: 393–94 and O’Brien 2010: 279–80, who points out that they are near synonyms. Together they give some emphasis.

⁷⁷ For this reading see Westcott 1892: 195; Buchanan 1972: 128; Héring 1970: 63; Hughes 1977: 273–74. In *T. Levi* 4:2 Levi is “separated” (διαίρέω) from “unrighteousness” (ἀδικία) so that he can serve God “as son, a servant and a minister in his presence.” In *m. Yoma* 1.1 the high priest remains away from his house for a week of priestly duties before the Day of Atonement, but this is preparation for his role rather than separation from sinners.

⁷⁸ Other perfect passive participles in Hebrews that function as adjectives are found in 2:8, 9; 4:2, 13, 7:3; 9:4, 13, 15; 10:2, 22; 11:12; 12:12, 18, 23, 27; 13:13. See Campbell 2008b: 24–29.

with what follows, it expresses the extent of his separation from sinners. His separation is “even” (καί) higher than the heavens.⁷⁹

Lane argues strongly for the latter sense,⁸⁰ noting that especially when used with the preposition ἀπό (“from”), χωρίζω (“to separate”) has a local rather than a qualitative sense.⁸¹ Confirming this is the aorist participle γενόμενος (having become) at the end of the verse, which expresses some relationship to the previous clause.⁸² Thus, it seems likely that the separation of Jesus from sinners took place when he was exalted to the highest height, higher even than the heavens.⁸³

It is clear that ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος expresses extreme exaltation,⁸⁴ but it is unclear whether “heaven” is the created heavens, so that Jesus has been exalted beyond these, or whether “heaven” is God’s space, with Jesus exalted to the uppermost heaven with God, a reading perhaps reflecting the idea of successive levels of heaven found in other texts,⁸⁵ even though such speculation is absent from Hebrews.⁸⁶ Whichever reading is adopted, the expression refers to the exaltation of Jesus to the highest place possible.⁸⁷

⁷⁹ For similar uses of the perfect passive participles in Hebrews see 4:15; 7:28; 9:6; 12:11; 13:13. BDAG, 1995, s.v. χωρίζω, 2. c. notes that the verb here can include both senses; that is, spatial separation from sinners and also qualitative difference. Peterson 1982: 116; Bruce 1990: 176 (footnote 88); Koester 2001: 367; DeSilva 2000b: 274-75; Mitchell 2007: 155-56 are reluctant to exclude either sense.

⁸⁰ Lane 1991a: 192. Lane’s translation (“having been separated from sinners, he became even higher than the heavens” p. 174) places the emphasis slightly differently. A better rendering that takes seriously the aorist participle at the end of the verse is “... separated from sinners, having become even higher than the heavens.”

⁸¹ For χωρίζω with ἀπό in the NT see Acts 1:4; 18:2; Rom 8:35, 39; 1 Cor 7:10, and for other constructions see Matt 19:6; Mark 10:9; Acts 18:1 (with ἐκ); 1 Cor 7:11, 15; Phlm 15. Nowhere else in the NT does it refer to a qualitative difference. It does have this sense in 3 Macc 2:25 (without ἀπό), but elsewhere it refers to physical separation, either from a location or from people (with ἀπό Judg 4:11; Prov 18:1; Esdr A 7:13; 9:9; Esdr B 9:1; Wis 1:3; 1 Macc 1:11; 2 Macc 5:21; without ἀπό Lev 13:46; Judg 6:18; 1 Chron 12:9; Esdr A 8:54, 66; Esdr B 6:21; Ezek 46:19; 2 Macc 10:19; 12:12; 3 Macc 5:50. In Esdr A 5:39 it refers to people being excluded from serving as priests.

⁸² The passive may be a divine passive (Ellingworth 1993: 394).

⁸³ Delitzsch 1868: 2: 4-5; Moffatt 1924: 101; Montefiore 1964: 130; Hay 1973: 102; Braun 1984: 223; Wilson 1987: 130-31; Attridge 1989: 213; Johnson 2006: 195; O’Brien 2010: 280. See also Heb 9:28 where Jesus appears once to deal with sin, and will appear a second time “apart from sin” (χωρίς ἁμαρτίας) to save those who eagerly await him. In 4:15 he was tested in every respect as we are, “without sin” (χωρίς ἁμαρτίας). “Sinners” (ἁμαρτωλοί) only feature in Hebrews here and in 12:3 where Jesus endured hostility from sinners, a claim that immediately follows a reference to his exaltation to the right hand of God. In both cases, the word is definite and possibly refers to the hostile “sinners” who put him to death (Attridge 1989: 213). That he is separated from the sinners (and not from the righteous) implies that he remains accessible to his people (4:16).

⁸⁴ Ὑψηλότερος (“higher”) is the comparative of ὑψηλός, the word used in Hebrews in 1:3 to describe the situation of the exalted Son ἐν ὑψηλοῖς (“in the heights,” i.e. in heaven).

⁸⁵ In *T. Levi* 3: 4 God dwells “in the uppermost heaven of all” (ἐν τῷ ἀνωτέρῳ πάντων).

⁸⁶ Ellingworth 1993: 394. Contra Isaacs 1992: 205-206 who sees such speculation behind Heb 7:26.

⁸⁷ Hofius 1972: 68-69; Lane 1991a: 192; Scholer 1991: 161; Bauckham 1999: 52-53; O’Brien 2010: 280-81. While the reference to the uppermost heaven in *T. Levi* 3:4 (see footnote 86, above) is in the context of a heavenly journey, in *1 En.* 1:4 God is comes “from the heaven of heavens” (ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῶν

However, since the readers also have access to heaven (4:14-16; 10:19-25; 12:22-24) it is unlikely that heaven is understood to be spatially separated from the earth. The language is figurative and refers to the supreme exaltation of this high priest.⁸⁸

8.5 Jesus, Minister of the Sanctuary, the True Tent (8:1-13)

A second allusion to Ps 110:1 appears in Heb 8:1-2, verses that make a transition from 7:1-28 on the appointment of the high priest to 8:3–10:18, dealing with the ministry of the high priest.⁸⁹ Hebrews 8:1 highlights the central significance of the claim that the author and his readers have a high priest as described in Heb 7, who has sat down at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in heaven. The allusion to Ps 110 is similar in form to that in Heb 1:3, with the exception that whereas there it was the exalted Son who had sat down, here a high priest has sat down.

There is a sense that the plausibility of my thesis depends on the coherence of my reading of this pericope. I deal first with Heb 8:1-2 and then turn to Heb 8:5 which compares “the heavenly things” (τὰ ἐπουρανία) with the wilderness tabernacle. The precise sense of some of the vocabulary of verse 5 has been debated, with the interpretation of that verse largely depending on whether the imagery is seen in terms of a temporal and horizontal sequence between the former earthly sanctuary and the heavenly sanctuary, or whether the imagery is spatial and vertical, with the sanctuary on earth corresponding to the sanctuary in heaven. To clarify this, I will extend my analysis into Heb 9 where similar vocabulary appears.

I note at the outset that Heb 8:1–10:18 is more concerned with the ministry of the heavenly high priest than with the heavenly sanctuary *per se*. To the extent that this is the case, the heavenly sanctuary is a secondary issue, but an understanding of it can clarify for us the relationship of the former sanctuaries (tabernacle and temple) to the heavenly sanctuary. The nature of this relationship is a *crux interpretum* in this part of Hebrews. Bruce argues convincingly that the main contrast in Hebrews is horizontal, between past and present, between the new order that has come with Christ and the old order.⁹⁰ But he also recognises the presence of a vertical above and below contrast in Hebrews, citing this

οὐρανῶν). There are no successive levels of heaven in *1 Enoch*, and the expression “the heaven of heavens” is a figurative way of expressing the remoteness of God’s dwelling place from the earth. Heb 7:26 expresses a similar notion with respect to the exaltation of Christ. In *Asc. Isa.* 9:18 Christ ascends to the seventh heaven.

⁸⁸ Similar metaphors operate in Ps 113:4-6 where God’s glory is “above the heavens” (ἐπὶ τοὺς οὐρανοὺς), God “dwells in the heights” (ὁ ἐν ὑψηλοῖς κατοικῶν) and looks down “on the heavens and the earth” (ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐν τῇ γῇ).

⁸⁹ Guthrie 1994: 106-108 calls Heb 8:1-2 a “direct intermediary transition” in that it gathers up thoughts of the previous section (5:1–7:28) dealing with the appointment of Jesus as a high priest like Melchizedek, and prepares the way for the following section dealing with the ministry of the high priest in the heavenly sanctuary (8:3–10:18). Hay 1973: 87, 151 expresses a similar view.

⁹⁰ Bruce 1978: 81-2.

passage as an example.⁹¹ Some of the texts examined in previous chapters do evidence such “above and below” imagery, especially in the various heavenly journeys undertaken. I have not found this in Hebrews.

In my treatment of Heb 1:1-3, I argued that the exaltation of the Son to the right hand of God was not so much exaltation to some realm “above” the earth, but referred rather to his exaltation to the place of the highest authority in the universe, alongside God, and in the world to come. Hebrews 4:14 has often been read as referring to the high priest passing through the heavens, but I have argued that it is an echo of 1 Sam 2:35 where the faithful priest walks about in the heavenly temple. And I have just argued that Heb 7:26 refers to the exaltation of the high priest to the place of supreme authority in similar terms to Heb 1:1-3. Hebrews 8:1 also takes the reader back to 1:1-3, where the exaltation of the Son is ἐν ὑψηλοῖς (“in the heights”), an expression replaced with the words ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (“in heaven”) in Heb 8:1. As I have already noted, in Hebrews οὐρανός (“heaven”) refers to either the created heavens (the sky)⁹² or the dwelling place of God.⁹³ And while the “sky” is clearly above the earth, there is no indication in Hebrews that the dwelling place of God is similarly “above” the earth. And, indeed, this is unlikely, since it is accessible to the readers in the present (4:14-16; 10:19-25; 12:22-24).

On the other hand, horizontal and temporal imagery is clearly present in Hebrews. At the outset the text contrasts God’s “former” (πάλαι) speech through the prophets and his speech ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν (“in these last days”) in a Son. Temporal imagery surfaces in the frequent use of the verb μέλλω (“to be about to ...”). This verb appears in 1:14 to describe the people who are “about” to inherit salvation; in 2:5 to refer to “the world to come”; in 6:5 to refer to the “age to come”; in 10:1 to refer to “the good things to come”; and in 13:14 to refer to the “city to come.” Moreover, since the city to come of 13:14 is identified with the heavenly Jerusalem of 12:22,⁹⁴ what is “to come” and what is heavenly are somehow related.

Those who see both vertical and spatial and horizontal and temporal imagery in Hebrews usually argue that neither must dominate to the extent that the other is excluded.⁹⁵

⁹¹ Ibid.: 82. In 1990: 184 Bruce notes that in 8:5 “there is some affinity with Platonic idealism ... [but for the author of Hebrews] the relation between the two sanctuaries is basically a temporal one.”

⁹² Heb 1:10; 12:25-26.

⁹³ Heb 4:14; 7:26; 8:1; 9: 24-24; 11:12; 12:23.

⁹⁴ Lincoln 2006: 95.

⁹⁵ Compare Attridge 1989: 224, “The earthly-heavenly dichotomy of the temple imagery intersects with, interprets, and is at the same time transformed by another dichotomy, that is of new and old. The interrelated functions of both dichotomies must be recognised, and it is a mistake simply to subordinate the ‘spatial’ to the ‘temporal’ or vice versa.” See also Lincoln 2006: 95; Davidson 1981: 345-358; Brady 1965: 329-32; Son 2005: 197. Sterling 2001: 192 considers that the relationship between the vertical/spatial and the linear/temporal aspects of the theology of Hebrews is “[t]he major issue for those who attempt to make

But if the language of “heaven” refers to God’s space where Christ is enthroned, and also to the eschatological goal of the people of God that they have access to in the present, then it is not to be understood as some location, physical or otherwise, “above” the earth. I will argue therefore, that the horizontal perspective predominates.

8.5.1 The Context and Structure of Hebrews 8

Hebrews 7:26-28 concludes the treatment of Jesus as a priest like Melchizedek (Heb 4:14-7:28),⁹⁶ and Heb 9:1–10:18 deals with the ministry of this priest. Hebrews 8 lies between these two sections and is made up of three parts: Heb 8:1-2 forms a transition from the treatment of Jesus as a priest like Melchizedek to the heavenly ministry of Jesus; Heb 8:3-6 compares the heavenly temple of which Jesus is a minister with the earthly sanctuaries; and Heb 8:7-13 cites and briefly interprets Jer 31 (LXX 38):31-34. This text is cited again in 10:17-18, forming an *inclusio* around the treatment of the ministry of Jesus and indicating the context in which it is to be understood.⁹⁷ Jeremiah anticipated a time when God would introduce a new means of relating to his people, and the author of Hebrews announces that this time has now come. Moreover, Jeremiah announced that one aspect of this new covenant is the forgiveness of sins, and the author of Hebrews explains that the new means of procuring this forgiveness (10:17) is through the self-offering of Jesus. The new covenant context in which the author places his treatment of the heavenly sanctuary indicates that his interest lies in the arrival of the eschatological events announced by Jeremiah and that the cosmology in these chapters serves the eschatology.

8.5.2 Structure of Hebrews 8:1-13

- 8:1-2 These verses establish the main point (κεφάλαιον)⁹⁸ of what is being said: Jesus, the high priest has sat down at the right hand of God in fulfilment of the invitation of Ps 110:1, as a minister of the sanctuary, the true tent pitched by the Lord, not a human.
- 8:3 Verse 3 looks back to 5:1, which established the principle that high priests are appointed to offer sacrifices for sins, and to 7:27, which claims that this high priest had no need to offer ongoing sacrifices either for his own sins or for the sins of others, because he did this, once and for all, when he

sense of the background of Hebrews.” Isaacs 1992: 205-19 argues that heaven is not only “above,” but is also the eschatological goal of the people of God. Davidson 1981: 352-355 discusses the “vertical structures” in Hebrews and their intersection with the “horizontal structures,” and concludes that the horizontal ultimately takes precedence over the vertical (p. 357).

⁹⁶ Hughes 1979a:13; Vanhoye 1996: 323-30.

⁹⁷ Sterling 2001:193-94.

⁹⁸ BDAG 541. Löhr 2005: 202-203 discusses this word as a *terminus technicus* in classical rhetoric. It appears six times in the LXX (Lev 5:24; Num 4:2; 5:7; 31:26, 49; Dan 7:1). In Acts 22:8 it refers a sum of money (as in Lev 5:24; Jos. *Ant.* 12.30, 155). It has the sense of “main point” in Jos. *Ant.* 16.290; 17.93, 182, 303, 314; *J. W.* 1.502. Philo uses the adjective κεφάλαιος forty-nine times with a variety of senses.

offered himself. These verses anticipate the discussion of Heb 9-10, dealing with the self-offering of the high priest Jesus.⁹⁹

- 8:4-5 Verses 4-5 compare Jesus with the earthly priests. Verse 4 looks back to 7:13-14, which establishes that Jesus could not be a priest on earth since he had emerged from the tribe of Judah and not the tribe of Levi. It is also the first part of a contrast (εἰ μὲν οὖν, “since then”) that will be picked up in v. 6 (νυνὶ δέ, “but now”). Verse 5 describes the ministry of the earthly priests in the earthly sanctuary, contrasting that sanctuary with “the heavenly things” (τὰ ἐπουράνια). Exodus 25:40 is quoted to support this claim.
- 8:6 Verse 6 completes the contrast started in v 4, claiming that the ministry of Jesus is superior to that of the earthly high priests, since he is mediator of a better covenant based on better promises.
- 8:7-13 Verses 7-8a introduce a quotation from Jer 31 (LXX 38):31-34 in vv. 8-12. These verses describe the respective covenants using the words “first” and “second,” which will play an important role in 9:1-10. Verse 13 concludes the quotation with the claim that the announcement of a new covenant indicates that the former covenant had become obsolete and was about to disappear.

Hebrews 9:1-10 discuss the sanctuary of the first covenant and its service, and 9:11–10:18 the heavenly, new covenant service of the high priest Jesus.

8.5.3 Hebrews 8:1-2

It is useful to compare the allusion to Ps 110:1 in Heb 8:1 with that in Heb 1:3. This will highlight the different use that is made of the Psalm.

Hebrews 1:2-3

... ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων
ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν υἱῷ, ... καθαρισμόν
τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος ἐκάθισεν
ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς,
τοσούτῳ κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν

Hebrews 8:1-2

Κεφάλαιον δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις,
τοιοῦτον ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα, ὃς ἐκάθισεν
ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης
ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς,¹⁰⁰ τῶν ἁγίων
λειτουργὸς καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς

⁹⁹ DeSilva 2000b: 281 refers to verse 3 as “a postponed topic.”

¹⁰⁰ MS 33, some manuscripts of the Vulgate, and Eusebius read ὑψηλοῖς here in place of τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, assimilating this text to Heb 1:3.

ἀγγέλων ὅσῳ διαφορώτερον παρ’
αὐτοῦς κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα

... in these last days God has spoken in a
Son ... who, having made purification for
sins sat down at the right hand of the
Majesty in the heights, becoming as much
greater than the angels as the name he has
inherited is more excellent than theirs.

ἀληθινῆς, ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος,¹⁰¹ οὐκ
ἄνθρωπος.

The main point of the things being said is
that we have such a high priest who has sat
down at the right hand of the throne of the
majesty in heaven, a minister of the
sanctuary, the true tent pitched by the Lord,
not a human.

As in Heb 1:3, the present middle imperative κάθου (“sit down”) of the Psalm has
been changed to the aorist active indicative ἐκάθισεν (“he sat down”); and ἐκ δεξιῶν
(“on the right”) changed to ἐν δεξιᾷ (“on the right”). This allusion differs from that in 1:3
in the change in the subject of the verb ἐκάθισεν from υἱός (“son”) to ἀρχιερέυς (“high
priest”); the addition of ὁ θρόνος (“the throne”); and the replacement of the words ἐν
ύψηλοῖς (“in the heights”) with ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (“in heaven”).

The subject of the verb ἐκάθισεν (ἀρχιερέυς) recalls the treatment of Ps 110:4, which
is the main subject of the section from 4:14–7:28, and constitutes an allusion to that Psalm,
although the Psalm itself uses the word ἱερεύς. It also takes the reader back to the closing
summary in 7:26-28, which begins with a description of this high priest as τοιοῦτος ...
ἀρχιερέυς (“such a high priest”), words picked up in 8:1 with τοιοῦτον ἔχομεν
ἀρχιερέα (“we have such a high priest”).

The situation of the exalted Son was described in 1:3 as ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης
ἐν ύψηλοῖς. Here, the words ἐν ύψηλοῖς (“in the heights”) have been replaced by ἐν τοῖς
οὐρανοῖς (“in heaven”) and the word θρόνος (“throne”) has been added. The high priest
is at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in heaven. That God is enthroned in
heaven is well attested in the OT (Ps 11:4; 47:8; Isa 6.1; Ezek 1:26), in the NT (Rev 7:15-
17) and in other literature of middle Judaism (1 En. 14:18; 3 En. 7), but only in Zech 6:13
(LXX) and Heb 8:1 is there an enthroned high priest.¹⁰² Zech 6:9-14 is an oracle from

¹⁰¹ The second reviser of **Σ**, A, and the second reviser of D, followed by a number of other witnesses
and versions, and the Majority Text add καί here, softening the asyndeton. The καί is absent from P⁴⁶, the
original hand of **Σ**, B and the original hand of D, and several other witnesses. The combination of P⁴⁶, **Σ**, and
B is considered to be very strong attestation in Hebrews, being three of the four “category 1” manuscripts in
Ellingworth’s list, which he notes “should always be considered in establishing the original text” (Ellingworth
1993: 81-82). The other category 1 manuscript here is A, which includes the longer reading. Thomas 1965:
305 notes that in 12 places in Hebrews where variant readings exist, the combination of P⁴⁶, **Σ**, and B is
considered original. Thomas does not list these occurrences, but an examination of the critical apparatus in
NA²⁷ gives the following instances where this combination is considered original: Heb 1:2, 8; 3:3, 6, 9, 10; 4:2,
5; 5:3, 4; 6:3, 10, 14, 16; 7:6, 10, 11; 7:16, 17; 7:22; 8:2, 4, 11, 12. In some cases there is more than one variant
in the verse.

¹⁰² Lane 1991a: 205 refers to a “secondary allusion” to Zech 6:13, as does Koester 2001: 375. Synge 1959:
25 attributes this allusion to Justin. Synge considers that the words of 8:1, “who sat down at the right hand of

Yahweh, commanding the prophet to make a golden crown and place it “upon the head of Joshua the high priest” (ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰησοῦ ... τοῦ ἱερέως τοῦ μεγάλου–6:13). This symbolic action is then explained with reference to one called “Sprout” who would sprout and build the house of Yahweh.¹⁰³ Zech 6:13 [LXX], continues with reference to this “Sprout” as follows: καὶ αὐτὸς ... κατάρξει ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσται ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ (“and he will sit on his throne, and will be a priest at his right hand”).

Evidence for the identification of an echo of Zech 6:9-15 includes the context of temple building in Zech 6 and the true tent pitched by the Lord in Heb 8:2; the words ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ in Zech 6:13 and Heb 8:1;¹⁰⁴ the use of μέγας as a qualifier for the “high” priest in Zech 6:11 (see Heb 4:14 and 10:21 for the use of this qualifier for Jesus), and the related word μεγαλωσύνη here; and the mention of the throne in Zech 6:13 and Heb 8:1. The text combines Zech 6:13 with Ps 110:1, indicating that the eschatological temple anticipated in Zechariah is in mind.¹⁰⁵

The high priest is enthroned “in heaven” (ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς), a statement that picks up Heb 4:14 where the “great priest” (ἀρχιερεὶς μέγας) is said to traverse the heavens, and 7:26 where he is exalted above the heavens. He occupies an exalted place in the dwelling of God. While Lane argues that these claims demonstrate that the high priest is exalted to the highest possible place,¹⁰⁶ two other considerations are also relevant. The allusion to Ps 110:1 brings with it the earlier allusion in 1:3, where his exaltation is said to have taken place “in these last days” (Heb 1:1), and the claim of Heb 1:6 that he is exalted in “the world to come” (Heb 1:6; 2:5). Thus, his exaltation is more than just exaltation to the

the Majesty in heaven” [sic, he omits the reference to the throne], are an echo not so much of Ps 110, as of Zech 6:13. See Justin *Dialogue*, 115: οὕτω καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἐν βαβυλῶνι Ἰησοῦ ἱερέως γενομένου ἐν τῷ λαῷ ὑμῶν ἀποκάλυψιν, ἔρχομαι νῦν ἀποδείξαι ἀποκίρυσιν εἶναι τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡμετέρου ἱερέως, καὶ θεοῦ, καὶ Χριστοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων (PG 6: 741-44, “so I proceed now to show that the revelation made among your people in Babylon in the days of Joshua the priest, was an announcement of the things to be accomplished by our Priest, who is God, and Christ the Son of God the Father of all,” ET Cox 1996: 498-99).

¹⁰³ The NRSV (and many other EVV) translate the Hebrew word צמח with “Branch”. For the translation “Sprout” see *HALOT* 1033-34. See also Driver 1906: 197-98; Rose 2000: 91-93.

¹⁰⁴ The MT of Zech 6:13 reads וְהָיָה כֹהֵן עַל כִּסְאוֹ. As Baldwin 1972: 136 notes, the MT has the high priest enthroned, a comment “so unusual as to make the translator hesitate,” and substitute “on his right hand” for “on his throne.”

¹⁰⁵ See *ibid.*: 135-137; Smith 1984: 217-219, Petersen 1985: 275-78; Rooke 2000b: 146-49. Baldwin 1972: 137-38 discounts the suggestion that the temple referred in Zechariah is that built by Zerubbabel since it was already being built. She continues, “[l]ike many other prophetic passages ... [Zech 6] was concerned with the focal point of all history, the coming of the Davidic king, who would transform the concepts of Temple and leadership.” Smith 1984: 219 suggests that the reference to those who are “afar off” building the temple of Yahweh in Zech 6:15 is to another [eschatological] temple. Whether or not this suggestion is valid, the oracle here influences speculation about the temple and has apparently had an influence on the text of Hebrews at this point. I discuss the implications of the allusion to Zech 6:13 in Church 2008: 156-57.

¹⁰⁶ Lane 1991a:192. See also Attridge 1989: 139.

highest place; it is exaltation to the highest place in the world to come as a signal that the eschatological moment has arrived. Secondly, that he is designated a high priest implies that heaven is to be understood as a temple,¹⁰⁷ an idea reflected in Heb 8:2, which describes him as “a minister of the sanctuary, the true tent which the Lord has pitched, not a human” (τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργὸς καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς, ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος).¹⁰⁸ Considerable debate surrounds these words.

The word λειτουργός appears in secular Greek literature for those who perform various kinds of community service,¹⁰⁹ as also in the LXX where it also has a cultic sense in several texts.¹¹⁰ It appears twice in Hebrews and three times in the remainder of the NT with a variety of senses.¹¹¹ Significant here is the nature of the relationship between λειτουργός and its dependent genitive τῶν ἁγίων. It is commonly read as a reference to the sanctuary “in which” this minister serves,¹¹² although the genitive is more correctly “of the sanctuary.”¹¹³ It does not specify so much the location where the high priest serves, but the fact that his service is carried out in connection with the heavenly sanctuary.¹¹⁴

¹⁰⁷ DeSilva 2000b: 28. See *1 En.* 14:8-23; 90:28-29; *T. Levi* 5:1. Johnson 2006: 198 refers to the picture of heaven as the true sanctuary as “the great imaginative leap of the composition ... If what defines a sanctuary is the presence of God, where God essentially and eternally exists must be the real ‘holy place’.”

¹⁰⁸ The neuter plural of the adjective ἅγιος routinely refers to the sanctuary in Hebrews. See 9:8, 12, 24, 24, 25; 10:19; 13:11. For this usage in the LXX see Exod 29:30; 36:1, 8; 39:1; Lev 5:15; 10:4; 19:30; 20:3, 12; 26:2, 31; 27:25; Num 3:32; 4:12, 15; 8:19; 18:3; 19:20; 31:6; 3 Kgdms 8:6; 2 Chron 5:9, 11; 29:21; Ps 133:2; Isa 43:28; Jer 28:51; Ezek 5:11; 21:7; 23:38; 24:21; 25:3; 37:26, 28; 44:8, 9; 11; 13, 16; 47:12; 48:10, 21; Dan 8:13; Mal 2:11; Jdt 4:12; 8:21, 24; 9:8; 16:20; 1 Macc 3:51, 58, 59; 4:36, 41, 43, 48; 7:42; 14:15, 29, 31; 15:7; 2 Macc 15:17; Sir 45:24; *Pss. Sol.* 1:8; 2:3; 8:11.

¹⁰⁹ BDAG 591-92; Johnson 2006: 198.

¹¹⁰ It is used alongside ἱερεύς (“priest”) in Isa 61:6; Sir 7:30; in lists of cultic officials in Esdr B (Ezra) 7:24; 20:39 (Neh 10:39), and refers to Simon’s service at the altar in Sir 50:14. O’Brien 2010: 288 also refers to Jer 33:21, but this verse is absent from the LXX.

¹¹¹ See Heb 1:7 (for the service of angels, quoting Ps 103:21, LXX); 8:2. Outside of Hebrews it appears in Rom 13:6; 15:16; Phil 2:25. In Rom 15:16 Paul refers to his call to be a “minister” (λειτουργός) of Christ Jesus to the Gentiles and to what he does as “priestly service of God’s good news” (ἱεουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ).

¹¹² Moffatt 1924: 103; Hughes 1977: 280; Wilson 1987: 132; Ellingworth 1993: 400 (“the place of Christ’s ministry”); Guthrie 1998: 277-79; Mitchell 2007: 159; Thompson 2008: 182-83; Allen 2010: 441. O’Brien 2010: 287 translates “a minister in the sanctuary,” while on p. 288 he uses the expression “a *minister* of the sanctuary.”

¹¹³ Westcott 1892: 214; Montefiore 1964: 132-33; Buchanan 1972: 133; Héring 1970: 65 (who also uses the term “in the supernatural tabernacle,” p. 66); Attridge 1989: 216 (who later refers to Jesus as “a liturgist in the true, divinely pitched tabernacle”); Bruce 1990: 180; Lane 1991a: 205; DeSilva 2000b: 279; Koester 2001: 374; Johnson 2006: 196.

¹¹⁴ In the NT λειτουργός is always qualified by a genitive substantive, but apart from Heb 8:2 the genitive is a genitive of the person served. It appears fourteen times in the LXX (2 Sam 13:18; 1 Kings 10:5; 2 Kings 4:43; 6:15; 2 Chron 9:24; Ezra 7:24; Neh 10:40; Ps 102:21; 103:4; Isa 61:6; Sir 7:30; 10:2; 50:14; 3 Macc 5:5), and in ten of these it is qualified by a genitive of the person served. In two of the other four (Neh 10:40 and 3 Macc 5:5), the word is used absolutely. In one (Sir 50:14) it is followed by the prepositional phrase ἐπὶ βωμῶν (“at altars”). The other instance is Ezra 7:24, which describes certain cultic officials as λειτουργοὶ οἴκου θεοῦ (“ministers of the house of God”), without suggesting that they were presently engaged in

When Heb 8:2 is read with reference to Jesus serving “in the heavenly sanctuary” it conveys the idea that the heavenly sanctuary is a structure in heaven. But if the heavenly sanctuary is the eschatological dwelling of God with his people, the “temple” that God was expected to build in the last days, now in place with the exaltation of Christ to God’s right hand “in these last days” (Heb 1:2),¹¹⁵ then it need not be understood as a structure in heaven in which Jesus serves as a minister. As Heb 8:6 indicates, his “ministry” (λειτουργία) is superior to that of the former priests since he is mediator of a better covenant, that is, a better means of access to God (Heb 7:18-22). His ministry makes this access possible, opening the way for the eschatological dwelling of God with his people.

This is confirmed by the other description of the heavenly temple, “the true tent pitched by the Lord and no human” (ἡ σκῆνη ἡ ἀληθινή, ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος). Two questions arise. The first surrounds the sense of the word ἀληθινός. This word has the sense of “genuine, authentic or real,”¹¹⁶ but a number of scholars consider that it also has the sense of “eternal.”¹¹⁷ With Hurst I note that this tent is said to have been pitched by the Lord, something that could hardly be said about a tent that was eternal.¹¹⁸ Furthermore, the word αἰώνιος appears six times in Hebrews to describe salvation (5:9), judgement (6:2), redemption (9:12), spirit (9:14), inheritance (9:15) and

service “in” the temple. The Aramaic *Vorlage* reads **בֵּית אֱלֹהִים דְּנַה פְּלִיחֵי**, which the NRSV renders “servants of this house of God.” Wooden 2007: 411, translates the LXX with “ministers of God’s house.” Philo uses λειτουργός eleven times (*Leg.* 3.135; *Post.* 184; *Somm.* 2.186, 231; *Mos.* 2.94, 149, 276; *Spec.* 1.152, 249; 4.191; *Virt.* 74) and in six of these it is followed by a genitive of the person served. Of the remainder, *Leg.* 3.135 refers to a person who administers holy things (λειτουργὸς τῶν ἁγίων); in *Mos.* 2.94; *Spec.* 1.152; *Virt.* 74 it is used absolutely; and *Mos.* 2.276 refers to τῶν περὶ τὸν νεὼν λειτουργῶν (“the ministers of the temple”).

¹¹⁵ Schenck 2007: 186-89.

¹¹⁶ BDAG 43; Johnson 2006: 199. The word appears fifty times in the LXX and twenty-eight times in the NT, three of which are in Hebrews. It appears once in Luke 16:11 (true riches); once in Paul (1 Thess 1:9, the true God); nine times in John (1:9; 4:23, 37; 6:32; 7:28; 8:16; 15:1; 17:3; 19:35); four times in 1 John (2:8; and three times in 5:29); and 10 times in Revelation (3:7, 14; 6:10; 15:3; 16:7; 19:2, 9, 11; 21:5; 22:6). In Heb 8:2; 9:24 it describes the true sanctuary, and in 10:22 a true heart.

¹¹⁷ Delitzsch 1868: 2:19 (“not temporal and typical, merely, but antitypical, archetypal and eternal”); Barrett 1954: 384 (“the true tabernacle exists eternally in heaven”); Bultmann 1964: 250: (“[i]n Hellenism it also takes on the sense of “real as eternal” or “real as mediated by revelation”); Sowers 1965: 107; Hughes 1977: 282 (“the imperishable holy of holies”); Peterson 1982:131 (“fundamentally [it] means that it is eternal in character”); Lane 1991a: 205; Koester 2001: 374; O’Brien 2010: 289. Aside from Heb 8:2; 9:24 where these scholars suggest that ἀληθινός has the sense “eternal,” nowhere else in the NT is this sense appropriate. The reading arises from a Platonic understanding of Hebrews as Sowers 1965: 107 suggests. Philo uses the word eighteen times (*Leg.* 1.32, 35; 3.52; *Det.* 10; *Gig.* 33; *Her.* 162; *Congr.* 101, 159; *Fug.* 17, 82, 131; *Somm.* 2.193; *Mos.* 1.289; *Spec.* 1.332; *Virt.* 78; *Praem.* 41, 104; *Legat.* 366), nowhere with the sense of “eternal,” although in *Leg.* 1.32, 35; 3.52 it qualifies ζωή. Colson renders this expression with “real life” in all three texts (Philo 1929-1962: 167, 169, 227), although Yonge 1993: 56 renders it with “eternal life” in 3.52.

¹¹⁸ Hurst 1990: 37-38 also refers to Farrar (without any bibliographical detail), as saying that, for the author the tent is an “uncreated eternal archetype” (p. 29). Farrar 1893: 105 uses the words “[d]ivine and eternal archetype(s),” and “Heavenly Ideal” to refer to the “genuine tabernacle” of this verse. In his introduction Farrar refers to the heavenly world as being “supersensuous, immaterial, immoveable, eternal” (1893: xlv).

covenant (13:20). If the author intended to say that the tent was eternal, the normal word was ready at hand. Rather than describing the tent as “eternal,” Heb 8:2 describes it as “genuine,” “authentic” or “true.”

The implication of this is that the tent pitched by Moses is in some sense inauthentic, but this need not be understood in a pejorative sense.¹¹⁹ The language anticipates Heb 8:5, which describes the wilderness tabernacle as a preliminary outline of the heavenly things.¹²⁰ Thus, the tabernacle where God camped with his people in the wilderness was the figurative tabernacle (2 Sam 7:6; 1 Chron 17:5),¹²¹ prefiguring the real or authentic dwelling of God in the eschaton.

The second question relates to the sense of the word καί in the expression τῶν ἁγίων ... καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς (“the sanctuary ... and the true tent”). Is this καί to be taken as an explicative καί or as a copulative καί? If the former, the expression refers to the totality of the heavenly sanctuary (the sanctuary, that is, the true tent); if the latter, the text envisages a bicameral sanctuary, made up of an inner shrine surrounded by an outer tent, similar to the earthly sanctuary.¹²² On this reading “the sanctuary” (τὰ ἅγια) is the inner shrine and “the tent” (ἡ σκηνή) the outer court surrounding this shrine. A related question is whether, if the καί is an explicative, the text envisages the heavenly temple as corresponding to the inner shrine of the earthly temple or to the entire temple complex.

A number of scholars, noting that the expression τῶν ἁγίων ... καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς is followed by a singular relative pronoun, argue that the καί in this expression is καί explicative, and that the expression refers to a “unicameral heavenly sanctuary.”¹²³ Others consider that the sanctuary is bicameral, comprising “the holy of

¹¹⁹ Similar language appears in John 15:1, where Jesus describes himself as “the true vine” (ἡ ἄμπελος ἡ ἀληθινή), over against Israel, at times represented as a vine or vineyard in the OT, and always in contexts where the nation is under God’s judgement (Hos 10:1-2; Isa 5:1-7; Jer 2:21; Ezek 15:1-5, 17:1-21; 19:10-15; Ps 80:8-18) for failing to produce good fruit. Jesus the true vine does produce good fruit. See Beasley-Murray 1999: 272.

¹²⁰ I establish this reading of ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά in 8.5.4 (below).

¹²¹ See the discussion in Beale 2004b: 295. Beale makes the point that “the literal sanctuary is the heavenly one and the figurative sanctuary is the earthly.” And, while his words “literal” and “figurative” might imply a structure in heaven, he also explains that what is “literal” need not be physical. The wilderness tabernacle was physical and figurative, while the heavenly tabernacle is non-physical, but no less real and genuine.

¹²² Such an arrangement never appears elsewhere in the literature of middle Judaism. 1 En. 14:10-20 is similar in that it describes two “houses” in heaven, with the throne of God in the second part. In *ShirShabb* there is a curtain and a *debir*, but this text is somewhat figurative as there are in fact seven *debirim*. Other texts, e.g. *T. Levi*, *2 En.*, *Asc. Isa.*, portray increasing levels of holiness with successive levels of heaven. But no text has an outer tent and an inner holy of holies as some scholars argue for Heb 8:1-2.

¹²³ Gordon 2008: 109. See also Moffatt 1924: 104-5; Montefiore 1964: 133; Hughes 1977: 280-282; Braun 1984: 228; Wilson 1987: 133; Bruce 1990:180; Lane 1991a: 200, 205; Ellingworth 1993: 402; Koester 2001: 374, 376; O’Brien 2010: 288. Peterson 1982: 130-131; Isaacs 1997: 275 and Johnson 2006:199 refer to

holies” (τὰ ἅγια) and “the outer tent” (ἡ σκηνὴ ἡ ἀληθινή).¹²⁴ Discussion of this issue often revolves around the Day of Atonement ritual in Lev 16 and the significance of the bicameral earthly sanctuary to that ritual. Hofius refers to Lev 16:20 where, as part of that ritual, the high priest is directed to make atonement for “the sanctuary” (τὸ ἅγιον) and “the tent of meeting” (ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου),¹²⁵ a verse Hofius finds reflected in Heb 9:21-24.¹²⁶ Scholer refers to Lev 16:16, 33 where a distinction is also maintained between the inner sanctuary and the tent.¹²⁷ And Rissi argues that in Hebrews τὰ ἅγια (plural and definite) always refers to the inner tent, and when the word is used indefinitely it refers to the sanctuary in general.¹²⁸ These scholars conclude, therefore, that in an allusion to Lev 16, Heb 8:2 refers to a bicameral heavenly sanctuary. This, it is claimed, prepares the way for the comparison between the self-offering of Christ and the former Day of Atonement ritual, which is the subject of Heb 9-10.

However this is not a necessary deduction. While Rissi might be right in identifying τὰ ἅγια (plural and definite) as a reference to the inner tent in the wilderness tabernacle, it is not so clear that this applies to the heavenly temple and, furthermore, in Hebrews ἡ σκηνὴ does not always refer to the outer tent.¹²⁹ While Heb 9-10 refers to the former Day of Atonement ritual and the significance of the bicameral sanctuary for that ritual, the author does not exploit that aspect of the ritual in discussing the self-offering of Christ. He is more interested in the relationship between the earthly and heavenly sanctuaries than the relationship between supposed inner and outer compartments of the heavenly sanctuary. I

the expression as a hendiadys, although strictly speaking a hendiadys is two nouns expressing a single idea in place of a noun and a qualifier (Burton 1996-2003), which is not precisely what we have here. Attridge 1989: 218 notes it is more accurate to describe the expression as two synonyms connected by an explicative καί.

¹²⁴ Delitzsch 1868: 2:18-19; Westcott 1892: 211-214; Koester 1962: 309; Vanhoye 1965: 4; Hofius 1972: 59; Sabourin 1973: 199, 203; Rissi 1987: 38; Attridge 1989: 217; Scholer 1991: 155, 160-61; Thompson 2008: 173. Attridge 1989: 218 notes that what the author intends by this distinction requires further clarification, and Lane 1991a: 201 comments, “There is ... no common agreement among these writers as to the theological significance of the distinction.” She 2011: 129 argues for a bicameral sanctuary in Heb 8:2, citing an unpublished paper as his authority for the claim that “epexegetical *kai* cannot be present when it joins a plural and a singular” (Shea 1989). I have not seen Shea’s paper. This rule is not specified in the discussions of epexegetical or explicative καί in Robertson 1914: 1181; Moulton and Turner 1963: 335; BDF 228-29, § 442 (9); BDAG 495, s.v. καί, c. No commentator who argues for a bicameral sanctuary refers to this rule.

¹²⁵ The LXX expression ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτυρίου is, of course, “tent of witness.” The Hebrew *Vorlage* is מוֹעֵד, either “a meeting place” or “an agreed time for meeting” (HALOT 557-58). It appears that the LXX translators mistook this word for מַעֲיֵד, the hiphil participle of עוּד (“to witness, be a witness,” HALOT 795). See Wevers 1990: 442. The Hebrew noun עֵדוּת (“witness, testimony”) in the expression אֲרוֹן הָעֵדוּת appears in the LXX as ἡ κιβωτός τοῦ μαρτυρίου (“ark of testimony”). Both expressions appear in Exod 30:26, where the LXX renders both מוֹעֵד and עֵדוּת with μαρτύριον.

¹²⁶ Hofius 1972: 59-60.

¹²⁷ Scholer 1991:160-161.

¹²⁸ Rissi 1987: 38-9. See Heb 8:2; 9:8, 12, 25; 10:19; 13:11.

¹²⁹ In Heb 8:5 the “tent” (σκηνή) refers to the entire tabernacle complex; in Heb 9:2, 3, 6 both the inner and outer parts of the wilderness tabernacle are referred to as tents.

will argue below that ἡ μείζων καὶ τελειότερα σκηνή (“the greater and more perfect tent”) in Heb 9:11 is a metaphor for the new order, and that this expression most naturally refers back to “the true tent” (ἡ σκηνὴ ἡ ἀληθινή) of 8:2.¹³⁰ I conclude that the καί in Heb 8:2 is best understood as explicative καί, and that the expression is to be understood as referring to the heavenly sanctuary, envisaged as a heavenly “holy of holies,” symbolising access to the presence of God, and the ultimate dwelling of God with his people.¹³¹ The expression identifies the sanctuary that the high priest serves as τὰ ἅγια (“the sanctuary”), which it then defines more closely as ἡ σκηνὴ ἡ ἀληθινή (“the true tent”).

Rather than describing the heavenly sanctuary as the holy of holies surrounded by the true tent, the text refers to the “genuine” or “real” (ἀληθινή) tent ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος (“which the Lord has pitched, and not a human”). This is an allusion to Num 24:6 (LXX), part of Balaam’s third oracle addressed to the Israelite tribes encamped in the desert with Yahweh (Num 24:5-9). While several scholars mention this allusion and, indeed, the presence of a number of other words in the context of both passages seems to indicate that Balaam’s oracle was in the author’s mind, many consider that it adds little to the understanding of Hebrews.¹³² However, there is more to this allusion than at first appears. As I have argued elsewhere, it indicates that the true tent pitched by the Lord is the eschatological dwelling place of God and his people, which was to be built by Yahweh in the last days, but is now inaugurated with the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of the throne of God.¹³³

¹³⁰ See 8.6.2 (below).

¹³¹ The ideas are similar to Rev 21:15-27 where the holy city is a cube, the size of the then known world (with each plane around 2,400 km). The cube is reminiscent of the holy of holies in the wilderness tabernacle, now enlarged to encompass the entire earth, and symbolises God’s dwelling with his people (Rev 21:3).

¹³² Moffatt 1924:105 suggests a reminiscence of Num 24:6 and Exod 33:7. Nairne 1957: 81 notes that the verbal parallels are with Num 24:6, but that “the underlying thought is with Ex. xxiv.18–xxv.40”; and Hughes 1977: 282 refers only to Exod 33:7. See also Wilson 1987: 133; Lane 1991a: 205 for passing references to Num 24:6. Gordon 2008: 109 calls the allusion a “purely verbal parallel”; and Mitchell 2007: 161 thinks the image from Num 24:6 is “somewhat accidental.” Ellingworth 1993: 402-3 notes Isa 42:15 (sic, the reference is to Isa 42:5); Isa 40:22; Exod 33:7; 1 Chron 16:1 as other possible parallels. Of these, Exod 33:7 is the most appropriate, with Heb 8:2 contrasting the action of Moses pitching the tent of meeting with the Lord pitching the “true” tent.

¹³³ In Church 2008: 145-57 I argue for a clear allusion to Balaam’s oracle in the LXX. Recognising this allusion adds considerably to the understanding of this text. As I also argued (pp. 147-49), there are echoes of the Eden sanctuary in Balaam’s oracle that carry over to Hebrews, so that in Heb 8:1-2 protology and eschatology are combined. The “true tent” looks back to Eden and forward to the consummation of all things when God will dwell with his people. See my discussion of this phenomenon in connection with Sir 24 (2.2.1, above). That the author of Hebrews had this eschatological sanctuary in mind is clear from the echoes of 1 Sam 2:35 and 1 Chron 17:14 in Heb 3:1-6; the echo of 1 Sam 2:35 in Heb 4:14; the allusion to Zech 6:13 in Heb 8:1; and the echo of Exod 15:17 in Heb 12:16, all texts that were understood to refer to the building of the eschatological temple. That Yahweh will build this temple is clear from Exod 15:17 and this notion appears in 11QTemple XXIX 7-9; 4QmidrEschat^a; *Jub* 1:17, 32. For this reading of Heb 8:2 see Beale 2004b: 294-99; O’Brien 2010: 289.

One further clarification is necessary before proceeding. In Exod 25:8 God directs Moses to construct a “sanctuary” (Heb **מִקְדָּשׁ**, LXX **ἀγίασμα**),¹³⁴ in which God will “dwell” (**יָשָׁב**) with his people or, as the LXX puts it, where God will “appear among them” (**καὶ ὀφθήσομαι ἐν ὑμῖν**).¹³⁵ The sanctuary, at the outset, was not so much a place of sacrifice, but a place where God dwelt with his people and was encountered by them. The connections with the Balaam oracle, where God and his people are seen camping together in the wilderness, clarify that it is this aspect of the comparison that is to the fore. The heavenly sanctuary/temple, the “true tent,” is where God is encountered and where God will dwell with his people in the eschaton, now inaugurated with the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God.

8.5.4 Hebrews 8:5

Hebrews 8:4 claims that if Jesus was “on earth” (**ἐπὶ γῆς**) he would not be a priest, since there are already those who offer gifts according to the law. Hebrews 8:5 continues this line of thought by setting up a comparison between the “tabernacle” (**σκίνη**) constructed by Moses (in) which they serve and “the heavenly things” (**τὰ ἐπουράνια**).¹³⁶ Here Moses’ tent is described as a **ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά** of the heavenly things,¹³⁷ a claim the author substantiates by citing Exod 25:40. The quotation differs from the LXX with the addition of **πάντα** (“everything”), and the use of the aorist participle **δειχθέντα** (“shown”) in place of the perfect passive participle **δεδειγμένον** (“shown”). While it is impossible to know whether or not the author introduced these changes, since his precise *Vorlage* cannot be identified,¹³⁸ most scholars assume that he did.¹³⁹

¹³⁴ Hebrews 8:2 uses the neuter plural of **ἅγιος** to refer to the sanctuary, rather than the LXX word **ἀγίασμα**, which appears in Exod 15:17 for the sanctuary that is the ultimate goal of the Exodus; and in Exod 25:8 for the sanctuary Moses was to construct so that Yahweh could dwell among them. **Ἀγίασμα** does not appear in the NT, although **ἀγιασμός** appears ten times with the sense of holiness or consecration (Rom 6:19, 22; 1 Cor 1:30; 1 Thess 4: 3, 4, 7; 2 Thess 2:13; 1 Tim 2:15; Heb 12:14; 1 Pet 1:2).

¹³⁵ Wevers 1990: 395-96 (see also 1991: 282) notes that later versions of the LXX replace the passive voice of **ὁράω** (“to see”) with the active voice of **σκηνώω**.

¹³⁶ See footnote 85 in 1.4.1 (above) for a discussion of whether **λατρεύω ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκίῳ** should be translated “serve a preliminary outline,” or “serve in preliminary outline.”

¹³⁷ I leave this expression untranslated at this point as the precise sense is debated.

¹³⁸ See the critical apparatus in Wevers 1991: 293 for the different MS evidence that includes these readings, although no single MS reads the same as Heb 8:5, the evidence is late and, as Kistemaker 1961: 40 notes, could have been influenced by Irenaeus, Philo or Hebrews. This latter remark applies in particular to the addition of **πάντα** since Philo includes **πάντα** in a citation of Exod 25:40 (*Leg.* 3.102; *Q.E.* 2:52); and Irenaeus *Against Heresies* 4.14.3 cites the text with the word *omnia* (“all”) corresponding to the **πάντα** in Hebrews. Kistemaker 1961: 136; Williamson 1970:558; McCullough 1971: 120; Michel 1975: 290; Weiss 1991: 438 refer to an otherwise unknown exegetical tradition common to both Philo and the author of Hebrews. In both Philo and Heb 8:5 the word **πάντα** qualifies **ποιήσεις** (“make”), although Philo inverts the sentence. The word “all” appears in the English translation of *Q.E.* 2.52 by Marcus in Philo 1929-1962: Supp 2: 99, but is absent from *Q.E.* 2.82, 90 (pp. 131-32, 139-40).

¹³⁹ Delitzsch 1868: 2: 32-33; Moffatt 1924: 106; D’Angelo 1979: 205; Attridge 1989: 220; Lane 1991a: 207; Ellingworth 1993: 407; DeSilva 2000b: 282; Koester 2001: 378; Johnson 2006: 200. The reason for the

Establishing the sense of the key terms ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά in Heb 8:5 is critical. Moffatt notes, correctly, that it is a hendiadys, which he translates with “shadowy outline.”¹⁴⁰ This translation is adequate, although the precise contribution of σκιά to the expression warrants further discussion. This word is relatively common, appearing fifty-eight times in the LXX and 7 times in the NT.¹⁴¹ Three senses are listed in BDAG: shade (from light and/or heat); the shadow cast by an object; and a “mere representation of someth[ing] real.”¹⁴² Heb 8:5 is referred to under the third option and, if these are the only three options, this appears to best suit the context, although whether the word “mere” is appropriate to this context may be questioned. I discuss the precise sense of σκιά below, but simply note here that it is common to read this word as “a mere representation,” with pejorative connotations that suggest that the wilderness sanctuary is in some sense inferior.¹⁴³

addition of πάντα (if that is what it is) may be explained by the author’s use of Exod 25:40, which strictly refers only to the lamp stand rather than Exod 25:9, which is very similar and which includes πᾶς twice, thus the text assimilates Exod 25:40 to 25:9. The choice of Exod 25:40 rather than 25:9 may be due to the appearance of παράδειγμα (“pattern”) in v. 9 where v. 40 uses τύπος (“pattern”). The author has already used ὑπόδειγμα in his sentence, and using παράδειγμα could have caused confusion, since in Exod 25:9 παράδειγμα refers to the pattern Moses saw and in Heb 8:5 ὑπόδειγμα refers to the tabernacle Moses constructed. Schenck 2007: 118 notes that παράδειγμα is a “more Platonic term” and that if the author “meant his readers to take the verse Platonically, he failed miserably.” Scholars assign varying weights to the substitution of δειχθέντα for δεδειγμένον, with Thomas 1965: 309 considering that the author found in his *Vorlage* a text that could indicate that in the present the heavenly sanctuary permanently remains a τύπος for the earthly one, and that this would never do: while it may have been the case in the past, it was now no longer the case, for the earthly reality has given way to the heavenly and has been made obsolete. For this view see also Attridge 1989: 220; Ellingworth 1993: 407. However, the change seems rather too subtle to bear this weight (Delitzsch 1868:2: 33; McCullough 1971: 12).

¹⁴⁰ Moffatt 1924: 105 and many other scholars since Moffatt, most recently Johnson 2006: 202; O’Brien 2010: 290; Allen 2010: 443. Cf. Attridge 1986: 5, “shadowy imitation.” Later (p. 6), he refers to “copy and shadow.”

¹⁴¹ Matt 4:16, 32; Luke 1:79; Acts 5:15; Col 2:17; Heb 8:5; 10:1.

¹⁴² BDAG 929.

¹⁴³ Those who see the earthly sanctuary as a “copy and shadow” of the heavenly archetype, usually consider that Heb 8:5 expresses a value judgement as to the inferiority of the priestly service carried out in the earthly sanctuary, on the basis that the earthly sanctuary is a “mere” copy. See Westcott 1892: 216; Moffatt 1924: 105-106; Spicq 1952: 2: 236; Montefiore 1964: 136; Jewett 1981: 133-34; Wilson 1987: 134; Attridge 1989: 219-20; Lane 1991a: 206; Ellingworth 1993: 406-8; DeSilva 2000b: 282-83; Johnson 2006: 200-202 (a claim that Johnson claims “supports ... the entire worldview of the composition,” p. 200); Thompson 2008: 167-70. Schröger 1968: 161-62 argues that the author subverts the meaning of the Exodus text here, making negative what was a positive value judgement in Exodus. Bruce 1990: 183-85 and O’Brien 2010: 290-91 express no such value judgement, noting that the contrast is eschatological rather than spatial, although both use the expression “only a copy,” while Mitchell 2007: 161-62 is unsure if any value judgement is expressed. Koester 1989: 156-57 2001: 377 suggests that the sense of σκιά is ambiguous, “[I]n a positive sense God provided Moses with the pattern of the sanctuary so that the earthly tent was the counterpart to the heavenly one, but in a negative sense the earthly tent was transient and limited in its benefits.” Later he comments, “Some take the comment [ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά] to be pejorative, an affirmation that the earthly sanctuary is ‘only’ a copy of the true one ... but for most people in antiquity, the idea that the earthly sanctuary represented the heavenly one would have been reason to revere it” (p. 383). Löhr 1993: 224 argues that the terms ὑπόδειγμα and σκιά do not imply any judgemental relationship between earthly and heavenly sanctuary.

Another option for σκιᾶ is that it could have the sense of “foreshadowing,” as in Heb 10:1 and Col 2:17,¹⁴⁴ as the 1979 edition of Bauer’s *Lexicon* suggests.¹⁴⁵ In these texts the context suggests the sense “foreshadowing,” since in both cases the word μελλοντων appears in close proximity. The question arises whether anything in the context of Heb 8:5 indicates that the author is thinking in terms of foreshadowing, with temporal, rather than spatial, connotations. There are indications that this is the case.

First, this description of the tabernacle is found in the context of a pericope concerning the high priest who has sat down at the right hand of the throne of the majesty in the heavens, something that the author understands to have happened “in these last days” (1:1-4). Secondly, there is a temporal marker at the beginning of verse 6 describing the ministry of Jesus with the words νυνὶ δέ (“and now”) as opposed to the earthly ministry of the former priests (v. 5).¹⁴⁶ Thirdly, there are eschatological implications in the allusion to Balaam’s oracle in Heb 8:2,¹⁴⁷ and fourthly, ὑπόδειγμα itself carries a temporal nuance.

A good place to begin the discussion of ὑπόδειγμα is by comparing the entries in the second and third editions of Bauer’s *Lexicon*.¹⁴⁸ Both editions give two senses for ὑπόδειγμα, but whereas the first sense of “example, model or pattern of behaviour to be followed” stands in both editions, the second sense is different. In the second edition the sense of “copy, imitation” is listed with Heb 8:5 and 9:23 given as examples. In the third edition “copy” and “imitation” have been replaced by “an indication of someth[ing] that appears at a subsequent time, *outline, sketch, symbol*.”¹⁴⁹ Again, Heb 8:5 and 9:23 are given as examples.¹⁵⁰ Between 1979 and 2000 the editors’ understanding of ὑπόδειγμα appears to

¹⁴⁴ Bruce 1990: 184-85.

¹⁴⁵ BAGD 755, s.v. σκιᾶ, 2 has a separate sense of “*shadow, foreshadowing*” under which Heb 8:5 and 10:1 are listed, without specifying whether the sense in these verses is shadow or foreshadowing. In the 2000 edition (BDAG 929-30) the sense of “foreshadowing” is included in the third option with Col 2:17 as an example. See also Louw and Nida 1988: 593, § 58.65. I discuss Heb 10:1 in 8.6.5 (below).

¹⁴⁶ The νυνὶ δέ picks up the εἰ μὲν οὖν (“if then”) of Heb 8:4. This verse is an “unreal” or “contrary to fact” condition, which uses an augmented tense, without necessarily implying a past time reference, see BDF: 188, § 371, Zerwick 1963: 107-9, § 313-318; Wallace 1996: 694-96. If this is the case the expression νυνὶ δέ may indicate a logical rather than a temporal contrast (BDAG 682, s.v. νυνί, 2, b). For a temporal reading see Ellingworth 1993: 408-9; Koester 2001: 378; Johnson 2006: 202; and for a purely logical reading see Westcott 1892: 218; Bruce 1990: 181; Lane 1991a: 201. Hughes 1977: 295-96 and O’Brien 2010: 292 allow for both a logical and temporal nuance.

¹⁴⁷ I have argued this in Church 2008: 154-57.

¹⁴⁸ BAGD 844; BDAG 1037.

¹⁴⁹ BDAG 1037.

¹⁵⁰ A sampling of the entries for ὑπόδειγμα in other lexicons makes for interesting reading. Robinson 1876: 812 gives two senses: an example for imitation or as a warning, and a copy or likeness taken from an original, with Heb 8:5 and 9:23 as the only NT examples of the latter sense. Robinson cites Aquila Deut 4:17 as an example from the LXX where ὑπόδειγμα translates תבנית (I discuss this rendering below). Thayer 1898: 642-43 has the same two senses, again citing only Heb 8:5 and 9:23 for the sense of “copy.” PGL 1447 has five senses: a model or pattern, a precept, a fixed period (hesitatingly), a copy, for which Lampe lists Heb 8:5 and 9:35 (sic), and an illustration or figure. For “copy” Lampe cites Origen on John 10:24; Chrysostom

have turned full circle: from a copy or imitation of something, to an outline of something that will later appear.

The debate over the precise sense of this word is not new. Writing in 1868, Delitzsch noted that the word could refer to a visible image or pattern, “whether as a foretype which is followed (iv. 11), or an after-copy (as here [Heb 8:5] and [Heb] ix. 23) from an original. In the latter sense it is sometimes used to denote a mere sketch or outline.”¹⁵¹ He continues, “The assumption made by interpreters, that ὑπόδειγμα has properly the meaning of sketch or outline is incorrect,”¹⁵² but nowhere explains this claim. Nevertheless, almost one hundred years after Delitzsch, Lee argues that in Heb 8:5 the word means neither example nor copy, but “a partial suggestion.” His words merit quoting in full:

The temple fabric and ritual of that day . . . were not an *example* (A.V.) nor even a *copy* (R.V.) but a *glimpse* as distinct from a vision, a partial suggestion as distinct from a complete expression, a shadow as distinct from the reality of heaven ... The earthly worship of the Mosaic dispensation was not a copy in the sense of an exact reproduction of the original; it was but a rough reminiscence intended to suggest the idea and to train the mind to appreciate eventually the reality of the heavenly truths themselves.¹⁵³

Homily XVI.2 on Hebrews; Oecumenius on Heb 9:23 and John of Damascus on Heb 8:5. The reference in Origen comes from *Contra Celsus* 2.1 in the context of a discussion of the OT sacrificial cult, and is an allusion to Heb 8:5, which Coxe 1997: 831 translates “pattern and shadow.” The reference in Chrysostom is to *Homily XVI.6*, where the word appears three times in allusions to Heb 9:23. It also appears three times in *Homily XIV.3* in allusions to Heb 8:5. In *Homily XIV.3* the heavenly things of Heb 8:5 are interpreted with a forward-looking reference to the church over against the temple: “The Church is heavenly, and there is nothing else than Heaven” (translation in Schaff 1994: 933, see PG 63: 112, οὐρανία γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκκλησία, καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ οὐρανός). In *Homily XVI.6*, the heavenly things are said to be “our things,” with Phil 3:20 (“Our conversation is in heaven”) cited in support (Schaff 1994: 954). The extracts from the Greek text of Oecumenius included in *PGL* also support the translation “pattern” rather than copy (ὑπόδειγμα γὰρ τὰ τῆς παλαιᾶς, ὡς τύποι ὄντα τῆς νέας, “for the outlines of the old are as types of the new”), as does the extract from John of Damascus (ἐλάτρευον ἐν ὑπόδειγμα, ὡς τὸ πρόβατον προσφέροντες εἰς τύπον Χριστοῦ, “they served in outlines as they offer the sheep as a type of Christ”). None of these references support the suggestion in *PGL* that ὑπόδειγμα has the sense of “copy.” Torrance 1955: 20-21 interprets Hebrews 8:5 and 9:23 along the same lines as Chrysostom, but see the criticisms of Torrance in Barr 1961: 152-55. Schaff translates Chrysostom with “example” (p. 933) or “pattern” (p. 933). *EDNT* 4: 402 reflects this general trend, with the meaning “copy” only given for Heb 8:5; 9:23. Moulton and Milligan 1930: 657 gives two senses, example and specimen. Spicq (*TLNT* 403-5) discusses the use of this word in classical sources and gives the sense of “specimen, sample” (p. 403). Then he makes the curious claim that, “In Heb 4:11; 8:5; 9:23, whether with regard to disobedience or with regard to the earthly sanctuary as a copy of the heavenly sanctuary, a *hypodeigma* is always a reproduction.” How the word can possibly have this sense in Heb 4:11 escapes me. Martin 1976: 2: 291 proposes that the sense “copy” is restricted to Heb 8:5; 9:23. Opposing all this is *LSJ* 1878, which lists four senses for ὑπόδειγμα: a sign, token or indication; an illustration or picture showing how something is to be done; a pattern, under which Ezek 42:15; Heb 8:5; 9:23 are listed; and an example, instance or specimen. *LSJ* nowhere suggests that the word has the sense of “copy.” Finally Schlier 1964: 33 wants both senses for Heb 8:6 (sic). In footnote 2 he writes “for Christianity ... the Jewish σκῆνη provided only an obscure copy,” while in the text he states, “... they are also, in the sense of Hebrews, models which point to these heavenly things.”

¹⁵¹ Delitzsch 1868: 2: 32.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*: 2: 489 (note L).

¹⁵³ Lee 1961: 168.

Numerous scholars have been misled by the closeness in the vocabulary of Hebrews to that used in Philo, and have interpreted the expression ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά as “copy and shadow.” Only Buchanan,¹⁵⁴ Lee,¹⁵⁵ Hurst¹⁵⁶ and Schenck¹⁵⁷ suggest that the sense of “example” or “pattern” could be appropriate in Heb 8:5.¹⁵⁸

In an article published in 1983 and in his later monograph,¹⁵⁹ Hurst claims that “[t]here is no instance in known Greek literature where ὑπόδειγμα can be demonstrated to mean ‘copy’.”¹⁶⁰ Furthermore, he argues that it actually has the opposite sense, that is, “a basis for

¹⁵⁴ Buchanan 1972: 134 translates ὑπόδειγμα with “pattern” and comments, “It was not a contrast between an earthly copy and its heavenly reality, but one between a historical time in the past compared with one which was to succeed it.”

¹⁵⁵ Lee 1961: 168.

¹⁵⁶ Hurst 1990: 13. Most recently Mackie 2007: 159-64 reads ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά as expressing a temporal rather than a spatial relationship. While Riegenbach 1987: 220 can speak of the earthly sanctuary as a defective image of the heavenly one, later (p. 225) he explains that ὑπόδειγμα does not mean image or copy, rather it is “an imperfect picture of the true sanctuary ... in contrast to the archetype.”

¹⁵⁷ Schenck 2007: 117-22. See my discussion of Schenck’s odd rendering of ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιά in footnote 85, section 1.4.1 (above).

¹⁵⁸ Westcott 1892: 216 notes that ὑπόδειγμα refers to “the image made by imitation [as in Heb. 8:5] ... but also the model offered for imitation.” Moffatt 1924: 105 refers to “a mere outline or copy.” Stewart 1965-66: 287-88 notes that while ὑπόδειγμα normally has the sense of example, its juxtaposition with σκιά shows that it does not have that sense here. Michel 1975: 290 translates ὑπόδειγμα with “Nachbildung” and σκιά with “Schatten.” Hughes 1977: 292-93 uses the word “copy” in his translation and his comments on this verse, and discusses “a definite correspondence with the heavenly reality.” Later he notes, “The reality comes not only after but also before the copy and shadow ... Every earthly entity is preceded by the mind and purpose of God” (1977: 293). Hahn 1986: 555-56 claims that alongside σκιά in Hebrews ὑπόδειγμα “plays an important part in the distinction drawn between real and unreal existence ... in comparison with the high-priestly work of Jesus Christ who is “in the heavens,” all earthly worship, as conducted in the tabernacle, takes on secondary importance.” Müller 1986: 905 seems to want it both ways when he notes that “[a] certain closeness to the Platonically influenced speculation concerning original and copy must not mislead us: even this passage has its place in the eschatological-temporal theology of history of Heb. The relationship of the original heavenly pattern ... to the earthly copy ... is inserted into the scheme of the past and future blessings of salvation. Through Christ the heavenly patterns enter history and show the copies and shadows to be perishable.” Riegenbach 1987: 220 refers to the heavenly sanctuary as the prototype, of which the earthly one is simply a defective image. Attridge 1989: 219 recognises that the word more commonly has the sense of example, but notes that as in this instance it can mean copy. Bénétreau 1989-90: 54 notes that ὑπόδειγμα “porte habituellement le sens de “modèle,” “exemple”... Mais ici, curieusement ...il désigne nécessairement ce qui renvoie au modèle, la copie, l’imitation.” Bruce 1990: 183 uses the word “copy”; Lane 1991a: 201 refers to an “... [imperfect] reflection of the heavenly realities”; Ellingworth 1993: 406 refers to “the earthly copy of the heavenly realities, or possibly a sketch of them”; DeSilva 2000b: 282 finds that the earthly temple [sic] has an “imitative, secondary quality,” and that there is an original heavenly temple that it is a copy of. Sterling 2001: 195 notes that ὑπόδειγμα is “a *terminus technicus* in Middle Platonism, but generally for the noetic ‘idea’ rather than the earthly counterpart.” Mitchell 2007: 161 uses the word “example,” but interprets it in terms of “copy” in the sense that it was an example “patterned on the heavenly prototype.” Thompson 2008: 167-70 has a full discussion giving numerous examples of the use of similar language in Philo. He also cites Hurst’s contention that ὑπόδειγμα means “example” without any contrary argument, but still refers to “the inferior earthly ‘copy’ and the ‘shadow’.” O’Brien 2010: 291 calls the wilderness tabernacle “a replica of God’s heavenly dwelling place,” nevertheless, in the following paragraph he downplays any influence from Philo, insisting that the distinction is “eschatological rather than philosophical” (quoting Lane 1991a: 208).

¹⁵⁹ Hurst 1983: 156-68; 1990: 13-17.

¹⁶⁰ Hurst 1983: 157; Hurst 1990: 13. A TLG search of ὑπόδειγμα returns over 3,500 occurrences. Four of these are in Philo (*Post.* 122; *Conf.* 64; *Somm.* 2.3; *Her.* 256), and none in Plato. Sterling 2001: 195 claims that

something which comes later.”¹⁶¹ And, when combined with σκιᾶ, as in Heb 8:5, it becomes clear that both words have a horizontal nuance. An examination of the use of ὑπόδειγμα in the Bible shows this to be correct.

Ὑπόδειγμα appears five times in the LXX. In four of these it has the sense of a moral example,¹⁶² while in the fifth (Ezek 42:15), it has the sense of “pattern” or “outline.”¹⁶³ The statistics in the NT are similar. Ὑπόδειγμα has the sense of a moral example to be followed or avoided four times,¹⁶⁴ leaving two other instances (Heb 8:5; 9:23).¹⁶⁵ Thus, it only appears three times in the Greek Bible without the sense of a moral example, and all three are in the context of an eschatological sanctuary (Ezek 42:15; Heb 8:5, 9:23).¹⁶⁶ Hurst concludes:

in Middle Platonism ὑπόδειγμα occasionally has the sense of “example [in the sense of] a copy of the idea that lay behind it,” citing Philo *Conf.* 64 (Balaam an example of depravity); *Her.* 256 (instances of people being in a trance, which Johnson 2006: 202 considers has the sense of “example to be followed”); *Somm.* 2.3 (Jacob’s vision of a ladder as an example of a kind of dream). In none of these cases is the “example” a “copy” of the idea in the same sense as is argued for the earthly shrine as a copy of the heavenly in Hebrews (Schenck 2007: 118). These cases would be better described as “instances of a topic being discussed,” rather than “copies of an idea.” Nevertheless, Sterling considers that the author of Hebrews understood the term in this way, and that in Heb 8:5 ὑπόδειγμα refers to “an example derived from the heavenly τύπος.” That ὑπόδειγμα can have the sense of example is true, but when it does in the biblical literature it is an example to be copied (or avoided in Heb 4:11). Sterling finds Hurst’s reading of Hebrews to be forced on three counts: (1) “the language in this text is spatial” (but I argue that it is more temporal than spatial); (2) “[Hurst] is forced to argue that σκιᾶ in 8:5 has a temporal dimension based on 10:1,” which Sterling finds incongruous since the reader would not know that until he reached 10:1 (but the author of Hebrews often uses words to announce something he will develop later, e.g. the reference to purification from sins in 1:3 which has cultic connotations that are not fully developed until 10:18); and (3) “the consistent appearance of Platonic language throughout the argument in 8-10” (but while the language is reminiscent of Platonism, the similarities are only superficial, see Williamson 1970: 568-70; Mackie 2007: 158-64; O’Brien 2010: 291).

¹⁶¹ Hurst 1990: 13.

¹⁶² Sir 44:16; 2 Macc 6:28, 31; 4 Macc 17:23. In Deut 4:17 and Ezek 8:10 in Aquila, ὑπόδειγμα translates תבנית and appears to have the sense of “image” or “representation” (Field 1870: 1: 279; 2: 788; Reider and Turner 1966: 246). In Deut 4:17 LXX reads ὁμοίωμα, and Ezek 8:10 LXX reads ὁμοίωσις. However, Aquila must be treated with caution, since, as Field 2005: 46 points out, Aquila always attempts to express Hebrew words by the same Greek words, “without any consideration of the meaning in context.” For the characteristics of Aquila’s version see Katz and Ziegler 1958: 272-73; Field 2005: 37-56, and Marcos 2000: 116-17, who notes that Aquila “translates Hebrew words with an eye on etymology, even though his procedure produces semantic shifts in Greek that are difficult to fit into the context.” There is no extant text of Aquila for any of the other instances of תבנית in the Hebrew Bible and it is impossible to see how he renders this word elsewhere.

¹⁶³ Hurst 1990:14. Spicq 1952: 2: 236 thinks that ὑπόδειγμα designates “la copie ou l’imitation d’un original” in Ezek 42:15, but this is incorrect. Attridge 1989: 219 seems also to make this suggestion.

¹⁶⁴ John 13:15; Heb 4:11; Jas 5:10; 2 Pet 2:6.

¹⁶⁵ Ὑπόδειγμα appears six times in Josephus, always as an example (*J.W.* 1.374, 507; 2.208, 397; 6.103, 106). It also appears with the same sense in *Let. Aris.* 143; 4 Macc 17:23; *Eup. Frag.* 2, 34:5, where it refers to Solomon constructing the lamp stand for the temple, using as a “model” (ὑπόδειγμα) the lamp stand placed in the tabernacle by Moses.

¹⁶⁶ As Hurst 1990: 14-15 notes, in Ezek 52:15 “copy” is not an option, although the referent of ὑπόδειγμα in that text is unclear. Braun 1984: 232 thinks that this is an instance when the word means *Abbild* as opposed to *Vorbild*. The MT of Ezek 42:15 is shorter than the LXX, and the lack of a word in the

Rather than any “copy” therefore, it would appear that Moses’ ὑπόδειγμα is a lightly traced outline, pattern or blueprint, a preliminary sketch to be followed ... But does this mean that God later “copies” something from Moses’ “pattern”? This is unlikely to be the point. The idea is probably closer to the procedure of an artist or sculptor, who, before the work of art is begun, produces a light sketch or mould which is later to be filled.¹⁶⁷

A century ago, Gray noted a relationship between Ezekiel’s vision and the origin of the tabernacle in Exod 25.¹⁶⁸ Hurst draws attention to this and describes what would nowadays be referred to as intertextual echoes between the LXX of Exod 25:40, Ezek 40:2-4 and Heb 8:5.¹⁶⁹ The words ὁράω (“see”), πᾶς (“everything”), δείκνυμι (“show”) and ὄρος (“mountain”) appear in all three texts. As Hurst comments:

Ezekiel is given his vision of the city-temple on a *mountain* (ὄρος) and is warned to lay up in his heart *all things* (πᾶς) *shown* (δείκνυμι) to him (Ezek. 40:2-4). In this case “mountain,” “all things,” and “show” would be link words or magnets and would have the effect of drawing the attention of a writer such as the author of Hebrews from Ex. 25:40 to Ezek. 40-8 ... He may be quoting Exodus, but what is really in his mind is Ezekiel’s city-Temple.¹⁷⁰

If these echoes are correctly heard, then the author of Hebrews was thinking not only of the wilderness sanctuary, but also of Ezekiel’s eschatological city-temple. And it is not too much to suggest that he envisages the heavenly temple of which Jesus is a minister as being anticipated not only in the wilderness tabernacle that Moses saw, but also in the tents pitched by the Lord that Balaam saw and the city-temple that Ezekiel saw.¹⁷¹

Having established the sense of ὑπόδειγμα, I return to σκιά. Earlier, I asked whether σκιά has a spatial or temporal nuance in Heb 8:5. Hurst refers to the “curious opinion” that σκιά is used in two different senses in 8:5 (vertical) and 10:1 (horizontal), and argues for a temporal/horizontal sense in both texts.¹⁷² Of course, σκιά could be used in both

Hebrew *Vorlage* corresponding to ὑπόδειγμα makes the referent difficult to establish. In the MT the angel measures the interior of the “house” (הבית) and then takes Ezekiel outside and “measures around it” (ומדרו סביב סביב). In the LXX he takes Ezekiel outside and measures “the plan of the house all around in its arrangement” (καὶ διεμέτρησε τὸ ὑπόδειγμα τοῦ οἴκου κυκλόθεν ἐν διατάξει, trans. Hubler 2007: 980). The “plan” (ὑπόδειγμα) of the house appears not to be a “model” or an architectural plan, but it is unclear what it is. One option could be “how the exterior of the house had been designed.” Given this, Braun’s suggestion is difficult to uphold.

¹⁶⁷ Hurst 1990: 16.

¹⁶⁸ Gray 1908: 531-34.

¹⁶⁹ Hurst 1990: 14-16.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid.: 15. Hurst omits to mention the appearance of ὁράω in each text.

¹⁷¹ All three were on mountains when they “saw” these sanctuaries. Heb 8:5 specifically notes this with respect to Moses.

¹⁷² Hurst 1990: 16-17. This opinion is held by Fritsch 1966: 102; Braun 1984:232-33; Attridge 1989: 219, 269; Lane 1991a: 207; 1991b: 259; Ellingworth 1993: 406, 490-91; DeSilva 2000b: 282-8, 317; Koester 2001: 377; Sterling 2001: 195-99. On the other hand, Buchanan 1972: 134, 206; Wilson 1987: 134-35, 170-73; Bruce 1990: 185; O’Brien 2010: 290 see a temporal relationship in both texts. Barrett 1954: 381 suggests that the sense of foreshadowing “is not absent” from Heb 8:5. Hughes 1977: 3-90 is ambivalent, but appears to suggest that the vertical correspondence is primary in both 8:5 and 10:1, as also do Delitzsch 1868 2: 32, 142;

senses, but given the sense of ὑπόδειγμα that I have argued for, the spatial sense seems to be less appropriate. If ὑπόδειγμα is to be understood as a sketch or outline to be followed rather than a copy of something already existing, and if an inter-textual echo of Ezekiel’s vision of the eschatological city-temple is correctly heard, then given the other temporal markers in the immediate context, there are strong reasons to read σκιά in this verse in the same way as in Heb 10:1. Hebrews 8:5 refers to the heavenly things, of which the wilderness sanctuary was a “preliminary outline” (ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά).¹⁷³ As Hurst concludes, “[t]here is a cumulative case to be made that for *Auctor* the heavenly sanctuary is the new sanctuary, built (8:2) along with the city, by God at the end of the age (now come, Heb 1:2) and inaugurated (9:23f) by the supreme eschatological sacrifice.”¹⁷⁴

Consideration of the referent of τὰ ἐπουρανία (“the heavenly things”) confirms this reading. This expression is usually read as referring to “the heavenly sanctuary,” equivalent to τὰ ἅγια Heb 8:2.¹⁷⁵ This would be reasonable when ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά is read as “copy and shadow,” but this reading is suspect, and τὰ ἅγια in Heb 8:2 is a considerable distance from Heb 8:5. Westcott is closer to the mark when he suggests that it refers to

Westcott 1892: 304; Moffatt 1924: 105, 135; Montefiore 1964: 164; Héring 1970: 85; Kistemaker 1984: 218-19, 272; Johnson 2006: 248-49.

¹⁷³ Hurst 1990: 17 argues that the author “deliberately coupled ὑπόδειγμα with σκιά in order to guarantee that the latter would have a forward nuance identical to its usage in 10:1.” Throughout this thesis I have consistently used the expression “preliminary outline” to describe the relationship of the wilderness tabernacle to the heavenly sanctuary, although I am conscious that the precision in design of the former does not accord with the vague specifications of the latter. The relationship seems not to relate to architectural detail; rather, God’s dwelling with his people in the wilderness (and later in Solomon’s temple) prefigured in some way his eschatological dwelling with his people.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid.: 42. Son 2005: 176-80 critiques Hurst’s interpretation of ὑπόδειγμα, arguing that Hurst has adopted a dominant meaning of the word (“example” or “pattern”), and not paid enough attention to the discourse situation and the context in Heb 8, which shows that another less frequent meaning (“copy”) is intended. Son rightly notes that the meanings of words can change over time and that words can have different meanings in different situations. However, he fails to recognise that the word only carries the sense of “copy” in Aquila’s literal translation of Deut 4:17 and Ezek 8:10, where the sense is suspect (Attridge 1989: 219, footnote 41 and Schenck 2007: 118, footnote 9 also appeal to Aquila for this sense of ὑπόδειγμα, without any recognition that Aquila’s rendering is suspect). Son considers that Hurst has sacrificed the vertical imagery in these verses, but that is not necessarily the case, rather Son has permitted the (assumed) spatial categories of the chapter to dominate, and has all but eliminated the horizontal and temporal categories. The words “in heaven” (8:1) and “on earth” (8:4) refer to the location of Jesus in “God’s space” and not the location of a sanctuary structure somewhere “above” the earth. The only other words in this paragraph that could have spatial connotations are ὑπόδειγμα and σκιά, which I have argued is unlikely. Readers of Hebrews who see spatial connotations in this expression follow this with circular argumentation to argue that the context is spatial rather than temporal.

¹⁷⁵ Attridge 1989: 216 translates ἐπουρανία with “heavenly things,” but also refers to the heavenly temple (ibid) and heavenly tabernacle (p. 217); Bruce 1990: 181 translates “the heavenly reality,” and later refers to the heavenly sanctuary (p. 184); Lane 1991a: 199 translates “heavenly sanctuary,” and later refers to “a heavenly original” (p. 201); Ellingworth 1993: 406 refers to heavenly and earthly “tabernacles” and “realities”; Koester 2001: 374 translates “a heavenly [sanctuary],” and later states that could refer to “heavenly realities” but prefers “heavenly sanctuary” as “the counterpart to the earthly tent” (p. 378).

“the ideas of the Divine Presence and the realities of heaven ... ‘the heavenly order,’ the scene of the spiritual life with the realities that belong to it.”¹⁷⁶

This is confirmed from the use of ἑπουράνιος elsewhere in Hebrews. It appears six times, four as an attributive adjective¹⁷⁷ and twice as a substantive.¹⁷⁸ Where it functions as an adjective, it has an eschatological nuance: the things described as heavenly all have a future orientation.¹⁷⁹ This same nuance seems to be present in this text along with the other temporal ideas I have identified. Indeed, in both 8:5 and 9:23 the word is juxtaposed with ὑπόδειγμα, referring to the former sanctuary. The “heavenly things” are contrasted with the former earthly things that pointed to them. These are the eschatological realities that have come with the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God, the better covenant and the better promises.¹⁸⁰

In Heb 8:5 the author supports his contention that the earthly sanctuary is a preliminary outline of the heavenly things by quoting a text from the Torah (Exod 25:40), presented as a warning given by God to Moses.¹⁸¹ He was to make everything according to the τύπος shown to him when he was on the mountain. The word τύπος is ambiguous in this context and the scholarly discussion has yielded few insights.¹⁸² Moses was shown a “plan” or “model” (תבנית) of the earthly sanctuary and told to be sure to construct the sanctuary according to that. Scholars have debated as to whether: (1) he was shown (a) the

¹⁷⁶ Westcott 1892: 216-17. Cf. also Luther 1939: 44, who refers to “*spiritualium et celestium rerum*.”

¹⁷⁷ Heb 3:1 (“heavenly calling”); 6:4 (“heavenly gift”); 11:16 (“heavenly homeland”); 12:22 (“heavenly Jerusalem”).

¹⁷⁸ Heb 8:5; 9:23.

¹⁷⁹ Brady 1965: 332-37 examines the expressions “heavenly” and “to come” in Hebrews and concludes that both of these terms “point to one reality: the life of the Christian in the city of the living God (p. 337).” She writes, “There is a world to come and a heavenly country, a city to come and a heavenly Jerusalem, good things to come and heavenly things; those who have tasted the heavenly gift have also tasted the powers of the world to come” (p. 332).

¹⁸⁰ The ideas expressed in this verse are similar to Heb 9:9-10 where the tabernacle on earth is a symbol pointing to the time when things will be put right. I will argue that the “greater and more perfect tent” in Heb 9:11 is a symbol of that time now come with the exaltation of Jesus (see 8.6.2, below).

¹⁸¹ Χρηματίζω always appears in the passive voice in the NT and has two senses. It is a divine warning or instruction in Matt 2:12, 22; Luke 2:26; Acts 10:22; Heb 8:5; 11:7; 12:25, while in Acts 11:26; Rom 7:3 it refers to the attaching of a name or description to people, a sense that Brown 1986: 324 suggests may be from a different verb. It is a divine warning five times in the LXX of Jeremiah, referring to the word of Yahweh delivered by a prophet (33:2; 36:23; 37:2; 43:2, 4). Embedded in the quotation from Exod 25 are the words γάρ φησιν (“for he said”). Γάρ binds the quotation to the introductory formula, and φησίν introduces the quotation as the words of God. Φησίν appears five times in Num 24:3, 4, 15 introducing Balaam’s oracles, suggesting that Num 24 may have still been on the author’s mind. Φησίν also appears in the LXX of Jer 31 (LXX 38):31-34, quoted in Heb 8:7-12, where it is changed to λέγει.

¹⁸² BDAG 1020, s.v. τύπος 6 a, suggests the sense of a “design” or “pattern” for this word in Heb 8:5 (along with Acts 7:44, also an allusion to Exod 25.40). For thorough discussions of the possible senses of τύπος see Davidson 1981: 119-132, and Goppelt 1972: 246-59.

heavenly sanctuary; (b) a model of the heavenly sanctuary; or (c) a model of the wilderness sanctuary; and (2) which of these the author of Hebrews understood Moses to have seen.¹⁸³

After considering the evidence, Davidson concludes that it is not possible to decide what was shown to Moses.¹⁸⁴ While it could have been either a model of the heavenly sanctuary or the heavenly sanctuary itself, whatever it was, it is clear that Moses was instructed to use it as a pattern in constructing the earthly sanctuary.¹⁸⁵ In applying these insights to Hebrews, Davidson finds a similar state of affairs, concluding again that it is not possible to decide whether the author considered Moses to have seen a model of the heavenly sanctuary, the heavenly sanctuary itself, or both.¹⁸⁶

Whatever the solution to this issue, it is nevertheless clear that the τύπος seen by Moses is related to “the heavenly things” (τὰ ἐπουρανία) by way of “the tent” (ἡ σκῆνη, Heb 8:5) that Moses erected. If ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά has the sense of (inferior) “copy and shadow” then the author considered Moses to have seen an archetypal heavenly

¹⁸³ Representative is Bruce 1990: 184, who suggests Moses saw “something like a scale model of the sanctuary which was to be erected,” but also allows the possibility that Moses may have seen “the heavenly dwelling place of God.” He then argues that the author of Hebrews understood from the text that the wilderness tabernacle was to be a “replica” of this heavenly dwelling place. Cf. also Montefiore 1964: 136, “In this biblical text nothing is said about a heavenly antitype to which the tent of meeting was an earthly counterpart.” Hamerton-Kelly 1970: 5-6 suggests that Moses saw an actual heavenly model; Attridge 1989: 220 considers that it is unclear whether Exodus indicates that Moses saw a model of the heavenly sanctuary or the heavenly sanctuary itself; and Ellingworth 1993: 408 considers it unnecessarily complicated to posit the existence of a “model.” Hurst 1990: 23 is in no doubt that the “original meaning of Exodus” is that Moses saw a pattern rather than an actual heavenly sanctuary, cf. the much earlier contention of Gray 1908: 533, “One thing is clear and must be expressly noted: neither Ezekiel nor Moses is represented in the Old Testament as having seen a temple in heaven; nor are the buildings which they are bidden to have constructed represented as earthly copies of buildings that played any part in the life and society of heaven.” Hughes 1977: 296 doesn’t think Moses “saw” anything.

¹⁸⁴ Davidson 1981: 372-388. Davidson considers the semantic range of the word תבנית, the immediate context, the common belief in the ancient Near East that “an earthly temple is built as a copy of a heavenly original” (pp. 378-79), and concludes that Exod 25:9, 40 may have in view “a miniature model of the heavenly sanctuary” (p. 378), and/or “the heavenly sanctuary itself” (p. 386). He also finds parallels for this idea elsewhere in the OT, including Gen 28:10-22; Ps 11:4; 18:6; 60:6; 63:2; 68:35; 96:6; 102:19; 108:7; 150:1; Isa 6:1-3; Jonah 2:7; Mic 1:2; Hab 2:20 (p. 382, fn 6), and further developed in the literature of what he refers to as “late Judaism” (pp. 383-84).

¹⁸⁵ The Hebrew word תבנית is rendered by παράδειγμα in Exod 25:9 and by τύπος in Exod 25:40. παράδειγμα does not occur in the NT, but it appears eight times in the LXX with the sense of pattern, example, plan or spectacle. Three times in Jeremiah (8:2; 9:21; 16:4) it euphemistically translates the Hebrew word דמן (“excrement,” see Holladay 1986: 315). It is an alternative to ὑπόδειγμα, used more frequently in classical Greek than ὑπόδειγμα which classical writers seem to have avoided. See Schlier 1964: 32-33 and Martin 1976: 290. Davidson 1981: 342-43 notes that both תבנית and τύπος “can denote the *Vorbild* and the *Nachbild* simultaneously,” and concludes that for Exod 25:40 and Heb 8:5 “[t]he תבנית / τύπος is thus a *Nachbild* of an original *Vorbild* (or perhaps the *Urbild* itself) that serves as a *Vorbild* for the construction of an earthly *Nachbild*” (p. 343). Johnson 2006: 201-2 notes that by using the words παράδειγμα and τύπος, the LXX opened up the possibility that inferences not suggested by the Hebrew word תבנית could be drawn, that is, that “the earthly, material edifice was but a pale imitation of an ideal prototype.” I would argue that the author of Hebrews did not draw such inferences, although numerous modern readers of Hebrews have done so.

¹⁸⁶ Davidson 1981: 359-60.

sanctuary, and constructed the earthly shrine as a pale imitation of it.¹⁸⁷ However, if ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά has the sense of “preliminary outline,” the wilderness sanctuary is invested with great dignity. As the place where God would dwell with his people (Exod 25:8) in the wilderness, it anticipated God’s ultimate dwelling with them in the eschaton.

Hebrews 8:6 claims that the ministry of Jesus is superior to that of the earthly priests. But its superiority is not because his is a heavenly ministry as opposed to an earthly one, rather it is because he is mediator of a superior covenant based on superior promises. These promises relate to the forgiveness of sins bringing to an end the requirement for any further offering for sins (10:18). This statement leads into a quotation of Jer 31 (LXX 38):31-34 used to establish the former covenant (which Heb 9 will make clear is to be understood in terms of the cultic regulations of that covenant) is “worn out” and is about to disappear.¹⁸⁸ Hebrews 9-10 demonstrates how the earthly sanctuary and the ministry related to it have this preliminary role, pointing to the heavenly things to come.

8.5.5 Summary and Preliminary Conclusions

The purpose of this pericope in the discourse of Hebrews is to lead into the argument put in Heb 8:7-13, by way of a quotation from Jeremiah, that the former covenant and its cultic regulations are worn out and are about to disappear. The author achieves his purpose with reference to several parts of the OT, all of which he interprets with an eschatological nuance.

He starts with Ps 110:1 from which he had previously established that Jesus had been enthroned at the right hand of God in the world to come “in these last days.” He combines this text with Ps 110:4 to show that the exalted Son is also an exalted high priest, a minister of the heavenly sanctuary. Hebrews 8:1-2 echoes Zech 6:13 and alludes to Balaam’s third oracle (Num 24:6), both of which imply that the heavenly sanctuary is to be understood in eschatological terms. In this way, he establishes that the heavenly sanctuary of which Jesus is a minister is the sanctuary to be built by God in the last days, the eschatological dwelling of God with his people.

¹⁸⁷ Westcott 1892: 217; Moffatt 1924: 106; Barth 1962: 269 (footnote 28); Ellingworth 1993: 408; DeSilva 2000b: 282-83; Johnson 2006: 201-202. Goppelt 1982: 177 notes that according to Hebrews, Moses used τύπος for “the more important prototype,” while “Philo usually uses τύπος, in the technical sense, to designate the more insignificant copy.” As I show above, Philo had a positive view of the tabernacle and temple, referred to their cosmic symbolism to enhance their prestige.

¹⁸⁸ The translation “worn out” for παλαιούμενον is from Motyer 2004: 179 (see Heb 1:11 where heavens and earth will wear out, παλαιώω). Motyer also suggests that the author refers to the former covenant, rather than the earthly sanctuary as worn out and about to disappear, as a rhetorical strategy to avoid a “massive ideological assault on the Jerusalem Temple and cultus ... [going] beyond anything else in the New Testament, severing the link between the heavenly and earthly temples, denying the effectiveness and even the divine origin of the earthly cult ...” (p. 180). Walker 1996: 209 suggests that the words ἐγγὺς ἀφάνισμοῦ in 8:13 could be translated “close to destruction,” proposing this as a clue to a date before 70 C.E. for Hebrews (p. 227, see also Ellingworth 1993: 32).

Having established that Jesus is an exalted high priest he then turns to the earthly sanctuary, which he argues from Exod 25:40 is a preliminary outline of the heavenly things, now inaugurated with the exaltation of Jesus to his right hand. He makes no value judgement as to the relative merits of either sanctuary at this point, but uses his claims that the earthly sanctuary is a pointer to the heavenly things to lead into the quotation of Jer 31:31-34, which demonstrates that God had long ago announced that he would replace the Mosaic covenant with a second, better covenant based on better promises about the forgiveness of sins. In 9:1–10:18 he will explain how these better promises are brought to fruition through Jesus’ offering of himself.

As I noted earlier, Heb 8:1-6 introduces the author’s treatment of the high priestly ministry of Jesus that is developed at length in Heb 9-10. I now turn to Heb 9 and apply the insights gained from this analysis of Heb 8 to demonstrate that my reading of Heb 8 provides a coherent basis for understanding this chapter.

8.6 Perspectives from Hebrews 9:1-28; 10:1

Hebrews 9 contains four paragraphs:¹⁸⁹ the cult of the old covenant (1-10); the heavenly cult of the new covenant (11-14);¹⁹⁰ the inaugural sacrifice of the new covenant (15-22); and the heavenly sacrifice of the new covenant (23-28).

8.6.1 The Cult of the Old Covenant (9:1-10)

This paragraph contains brief descriptions of the earthly sanctuary (1-5), the daily sacrificial ritual (6), and the Day of Atonement Ceremony of Lev 16 (7-10). Here I am concerned with the words used to describe the former sanctuary and the sense of the words “first” and “second.”

Hebrews 8:2 refers to the heavenly sanctuary as τὰ ἅγια (plural, definite) and ἡ σκηνή (singular, definite) connected by an explicative καί. I have argued that the referent of these terms is the eschatological dwelling of God with his people and not a bicameral structure in heaven. In Heb 9:1-10, however, the bicameral structure of the earthly sanctuary is exploited. In 9:1 τὸ ἅγιον (singular, definite)¹⁹¹ refers to the entire “earthly (κοσμικός) sanctuary,”¹⁹² with two parts (9:2-3): “a tent” (σκηνή—singular, indefinite), which is called

¹⁸⁹ Attridge 1989: 230-266. See also the subdivisions in NA²⁷.

¹⁹⁰ Vanhoye 1963: 237-38 considers that 9:1-10; 11-14 are the two central subdivisions of the central section of the central part of Hebrews. Spicq 1952: 2: 247 notes the tight parallelism between these two sections. See also the table in Young 1981: 199 showing the close parallels in 9:7, 11-12, 25.

¹⁹¹ This is the only occurrence of this form in Hebrews, although it appears in the OT to designate the outer tent (Exod 26:33), the tabernacle as a whole (Ex 36:3; Num 3:38), or Ezekiel’s visionary temple as a whole (Ezek 45:4, 18). It also appears in *T. Levi* 8:17 to refer to the sanctuary as a whole.

¹⁹² The adjective κοσμικός (“earthly”) is in the predicative position, and it is best translated with a relative clause, “a sanctuary which was earthly” (Zerwick 1963: 60, § 187). This grammatical construction, and the placement of the word at the end of the sentence, probably gives it some emphasis and sets up a contrast with the heavenly sanctuary to be discussed in vv 11-14. Attridge 1989: 232 considers the adjective to be

Ἅγια (“the Holy Place”),¹⁹³ and behind the second curtain¹⁹⁴ another “tent” (σκηνή, singular indefinite), called Ἅγια Ἁγίων (“the Most Holy Place”).¹⁹⁵

A discussion of the activities of the former priests in this earthly sanctuary follows. In v. 6 they are said to continually enter εἰς τὴν πρώτην σκηνήν (“the first [outer] tent”), and in v. 7 the high priest is said to enter εἰς τὴν δευτέραν [σκηνήν] (“into the second,” [inner tent]) annually for the Day of Atonement ceremony.¹⁹⁶ These are the tents of vv. 2-3

pejorative (“worldly”), similar to its only other occurrence in the NT (Tit 2:12), as do Sterling 2001: 196; Thompson 1982: 105; O’Brien 2010: 293. These writers are operating from the assumption that the earthly sanctuary is an inferior copy of the heavenly. The word is neutral, and a pejorative reading is not necessary in this context. The distinction is “qualitative ... not antithetical” (Adams 2009: 129). Philo uses the word to refer to the cosmic motion of the planets (*Aet.* 53), and Thackeray translates the expression ἡ κοσμικὴ θρησκεία in *J.W.* 4.324 with “ceremonies of world-wide significance” (Josephus 1926-1965: 3: 97). It non-pejorative in *T. Jos.* 17:8; *T. Abr.* A 7:8; *Sib. Or.* Prologue 24; 8.444; and pejorative in *T. Job* 49:1; 50:2.

¹⁹³ NA²⁷ capitalises this nominative, neuter plural, indefinite noun to indicate that it is a proper noun referring to the outer tent. Accordingly, I translate “the Holy Place.” Witnesses for this reading are the second reviser of D, minuscules 0278, 33, 1739, 1881 and the Majority Text. It is also supported (without accentuation) in **Ⲛ**, the first reviser of D, I and P. It can also be construed as a feminine singular adjective (ἁγία), agreeing with σκηνή or πρόθεσις, see Swetnam 1970: 205-221). This reading is found in two minuscules 365, 629, some other witnesses, and some Vulgate MSS. Codex Vaticanus (B) has τὰ ἅγια (definite neuter plural), making the neuter plural reading explicit. A well attested reading that Attridge 1989: 230 considers to be original on the grounds that it is the *lectio difficilior* is ἅγια ἁγίων (P⁴⁶, A, the original hand of D and some mss of the Vulgate—holy of holies). The difficulty with this reading is that while it refers to the inner tent, the list of contents (v. 2) indicates a reference to the outer tent. The external attestation for the nominative feminine singular adjective is too weak to give it serious consideration, although it is adopted by Montefiore 1964: 144 and Synge 1959: 26. The reading adopted by NA²⁷ is probably the best option, as the only other serious contender in terms of external evidence (ἅγια ἁγίων) is too difficult in the context. See the discussion in Attridge 1989: 230, 233-34, 236-38; Lane 1991b 2:25; Ellingworth 1993: 423; DeSilva 2000b 298; Koester 2001: 394; O’Brien 2010: 307 (footnote 16).

¹⁹⁴ The terminology is “peculiar” (Koester 1989: 158) since the OT depicted the tabernacle as a single tent, with the holy of holies separated from the holy place by a curtain. The “second curtain” in Heb 9:3 distinguishes this curtain from the curtain at the front of the structure. Rice 1987: 67-68; Gane 2000: 5 and Gurtner 2005b: 344-47 identify three curtains: the courtyard curtain, a curtain screening off the holy place, and the inner curtain screening off the holy of holies. However, most consider that there were only two curtains: one screening the holy of holies and an outer curtain screening off the holy place. See Schneider 1965: 629; Attridge 1989: 184-85; BDAG 524.

¹⁹⁵ Again, this is the reading adopted by NA²⁷. Following the capitalisation in NA²⁷, I translate “the Most Holy Place.” The expression reflects a Hebrew superlative (Gehman 1954: 346; Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 154, para. 9.5.3j). For the Hebrew equivalent (קדש הקדשים) referring to the holy of holies see Exod 26:33-34, where the LXX reads ὁ ἅγιος τῶν ἁγίων. The reading ἅγια ἁγίων is reflected in the original hands of **Ⲛ** and D as well as A and I (*vid.*), plus some later manuscripts and the Majority text. The expression only appears here in the NT and there are a variety of other readings. The second revisers of both **Ⲛ** and D, and B, K, L and several later witnesses add definite articles to both words (τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων a possible assimilation to Lev 16:33), while P and a few other witnesses add the definite article to the word in the genitive (perhaps reflecting a *nomen regens* in a Hebrew *Vorlage*). P⁴⁶ reads ἀνά, probably an error for ἅγια (corresponding to its reading ἅγια ἁγίων in v. 2). According to v. 4, this tent contained the golden altar of incense, which was, in fact, outside the holy of holies (Exod 30:6; 40:26). A discussion of this problem is beyond my scope. See Attridge 1989: 236-38; Lane 1991b: 270; Ellingworth 1993: 425-27; Koester 2001: 402-4; Sterling 2001: 197. This tradition as to the placement of these objects is also reflected in the Samaritan Pentateuch (where Exod 30:1-10 appears between Exod 26:35 and 36), 2 Bar. 6:7; 2 Macc 10:3.

¹⁹⁶ The language of “first” and “second” with respect to the compartments in the temple appears in Josephus *J.W.* 5.193-95, although for Josephus the “second” court is the Holy Place rather than the Most Holy Place (to use the terminology of Heb 9:1-7).

and are definite because of this previous reference to them. To this point, both parts of the sanctuary are described with the word σκηνή, qualified with the numbers πρῶτος (“first”) and δεύτερος (“second”), the entire tabernacle has been described as τὸ ἅγιον κοσμικόν (“the earthly sanctuary”), the outer tent has been called Ἅγια (“Holy Place”), and the inner tent Ἅγια Ἀγίων (“Holy of Holies”). From here on, however, things are described differently. Before I consider the differences, however, I need to examine the use of the expressions πρῶτος and δεύτερος.

These words appear in Heb 8:7 to refer to the first (former) and second (new) covenants, and πρῶτος appears again in 8:13; 9:1 describing the former covenant over against the new covenant of Jer 31:31-34, although the word διαθήκη (“covenant”) has to be supplied in both places.¹⁹⁷ Here, the enumerators have a temporal reference. But in 9:1-7 a semantic shift occurs and they have a spatial reference, describing the outer (first) and inner (second) tents of the earthly sanctuary.

In Heb 9:8-10, the first tent (the antecedent of ὅστις, “which,” v. 9)¹⁹⁸ is said to be a παραβολή (“image or symbol”)¹⁹⁹ “for the present time” (εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεσθηκότα, v. 9) by which the Holy Spirit indicates that μήπω πεφανερωθῆναι τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδὸν ἔτι τῆς πρῶτης σκηνῆς ἐχούσης στάσις (“the way into the sanctuary is not yet revealed, while the first tent still has status”).²⁰⁰ A reader encountering v. 8 for the first time would infer that the existence of the first (outer) tent was a figurative explanation that the way into the holy of holies (in the wilderness tabernacle) had not yet been

¹⁹⁷ Attridge 1989: 230; Stanley 1995: 385-86. Several late witnesses mistakenly supply the word σκηνή, a reading adopted by Buchanan 1972: 139.

¹⁹⁸ In line with the way the relative pronoun ὅστις consistently refers to a preceding substantive in Hebrews (2:3; 8:5, 6; 9:2, 8, 10:8, 11, 35; 12:5; 13:7), I treat the antecedent here as ἡ πρῶτη σκηνή (“the first tent”). See Moffatt 1924: 118; Hofius 1970a: 276; Young 1981: 200-201; Attridge 1989: 241; Lane 1991b: 223-24; Ellingworth 1993: 439; Stanley 1995: 393; Koester 2001: 397-98; O’Brien 2010: 313-14 (footnote 51). The other option is to read the antecedent of the pronoun as the entire state of affairs described in vv. 7-8, adopted by Michel 1966: 22, Hughes 1977: 323; Bruce 1990: 209; Johnson 2006: 25; Thompson 2008: 184.

¹⁹⁹ Παραβολή appears in a variety of senses in the LXX for various types of figurative speech, see Attridge 1989: 241; Ellingworth 1993: 440; BDAG 759. In the NT outside the Synoptic Gospels (where it is a technical term for a type of narrative) it only appears here and in Heb 11:19 for Abraham’s “figurative” recovery of Isaac from the dead at the *Aqedah*. The word appears seven times in Num 23-24 referring to Balaam’s oracles (Num 23:7, 18; 24:3, 15, 20, 21, 23), and thirty-seven times elsewhere in the LXX.

²⁰⁰ I discuss the debated referent of ἡ πρῶτη σκηνή (“the first tent”) in v. 8 in what follows. I note here that Moffatt 1924: 118; Spicq 1952: 2: 253-54; Cody 1960: 147-48; McKelvey 1969: 148; Hughes 1977: 322-23; Héring 1970: 74-75; Bruce 1990: 208-209; Hurst 1990: 26; Ellingworth 1993: 438 read it as referring to the entire wilderness tabernacle. Delitzsch 1868: 2: 66-67; Westcott 1892: 252; Young 1981: 200-1; Hagner 1983: 113-14; Koester 1989: 158-59; 2001: 396-97; Attridge 1989: 240; Lane 1991b: 223; Schenck 2007: 96-99, 149-55; O’Brien 2010: 313 read it as the outer tent of the wilderness tabernacle as in vv. 2, 6, 8, arguing that to see it in any other way involves too subtle a change in meaning from the definition in v. 2 and the same expression in v. 6, with both vv. 6 and 9 part of the same periodic sentence (vv. 6-10). However, it is not a matter of either/or, but of both/and.

disclosed, for in line with the author's normal usage τὰ ἅγια (definite, neuter plural) refers to the holy of holies and ἡ πρώτη σκηνή refers to the outer tent.²⁰¹

But when the reader reaches vv. 9-10 it becomes apparent that τὰ ἅγια (definite neuter plural) has become the heavenly temple,²⁰² the sense it had in 8:2 (the only previous occurrence of this form), leading to a suggestion that ἡ πρώτη σκηνή might also refer to the entire wilderness tabernacle, with the author exploiting the ambiguity set up in his use of πρῶτος and δεύτερος with both temporal and spatial nuances, and his use of ἅγιος and σκίνη for the earthly and heavenly sanctuaries, both as a whole and also for their various parts.²⁰³ Thus, there is a *double entendre* here with reference to both tent and sanctuary. When read from the perspective of the construction of the wilderness tabernacle, the way into the holy of holies is not visible (φανερῶ) while the outer tent surrounds it. When read from the perspective of the distinction between the former (earthly) and the eschatological (heavenly) sanctuaries, while the earthly sanctuary has normative status (ἔτι τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς ἐχούσης στάσις),²⁰⁴ the way into the presence of God (τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδόν) is not disclosed (φανερῶ).²⁰⁵

The temporal expressions in vv. 8-9 make it clear that this is the case. The existence of the first (outer/former) tent is said to be a symbol “for the present time” (εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεσθηκότα), according to which various “ineffective cultic rituals” (δικαιώματα σαρκός) are imposed “until the time of correction” (μέχρι καιροῦ διορθώσεως). The understanding of these temporal expressions is complex, but clarified once it is recognised that they are two ways of referring to the same epoch: the present time (v. 9) is the time of correction (v. 10).²⁰⁶ The prepositions εἰς and μέχρι also support this interpretation. Εἰς

²⁰¹ See Young 1981: 199.

²⁰² Koester 1989: 158-59; 2001: 396-97; Lane 1991b: 216 (note r, who translates “real” sanctuary, in an allusion to 8:2).

²⁰³ At the first reading of Hebrews 9:1-2, the reference to ἡ πρώτη σκηνή in 9:2 may also appear to be a reference to the entire former sanctuary, for prior to this πρῶτος has appeared three times in the close context with the temporal sense of “former,” and it is only when vv 2-4 unfold that it becomes apparent that it is a spatial reference to the outer tent. As Koester 1989: 158 explains, at a first reading the assumption would be that this first tent, like the first covenant, was becoming obsolete.

²⁰⁴ Hughes 1977: 322-23; Attridge 1989: 240 (footnote 127); Schenck 2007: 150, 53. Schenck suggests that this may be an oblique reference to the readers' tendency to give the former age and covenant more status than was warranted. This also includes the temple (if still standing). In Hebrews, any status the former tent had came to an end with the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God. I also note that the suggestion that it has “normative status” is in stark contrast to common the reading of Heb 8:5 that it was a “mere, inferior copy” of the heavenly sanctuary.

²⁰⁵ I am arguing that the sense of πρῶτος in v. 8 is not either spatial or temporal, but both spatial and temporal, depending on how the entire sentence is read. For a *double entendre* in these verses see Stanley 1995: 395-96; Johnson 2006: 224. The *double entendre* seems also to extend to the use of the verb φανερῶ. For the new order as a means of access to the presence of God see Heb 7:19.

²⁰⁶ Moffatt 1924: 26-19; Hughes 1977: 323-26; Loader 1981:165; Attridge 1989: 240-42; Bruce 1990: 209-11; Ellingworth 1993: 440-41; DeSilva 2000b: 299-303; Johnson 2006: 224-25; Mackie 2007: 87 read the text in this way. Westcott 1892: 252-55; Schierse 1955: 31-32; Buchanan 1972: 145-46; Hofius 1972: 64; Young

has the common sense of “until” in temporal expressions with the indication of a specific time up to which something continues,²⁰⁷ as does μέχρι.²⁰⁸ The word διόρθωσις is a *hapax legomenon* in the Greek Bible, but appears in Philo in a list of virtues,²⁰⁹ and in Josephus with the sense of “putting things right.”²¹⁰ This is the sense here in Heb 9:10 and, as Bruce suggests, it is a reference to the “new order.”²¹¹ The present time is the time of the new order, the inauguration of the eschaton that began with the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God.

Consequently, these two verses enlarge on the expression ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά in Heb 8:5. There, the earthly sanctuary is said to be a preliminary outline of the heavenly things; here, the same earthly sanctuary is a parable pointing to the present time, when the heavenly things (the new order) have arrived.²¹² Hebrews 9:6-10 then presents a temporal/horizontal perspective on the relationship between the earthly and the heavenly sanctuaries. While the earthly one had “normative status,” access to the heavenly sanctuary was not disclosed. Now that the new order has come, that status no longer applies and access to the presence of God (the heavenly sanctuary) has been disclosed.

8.6.2 The Heavenly Cult of the New Covenant (9:11-14)

Hebrews 9:7 briefly describes the annual Day of Atonement ritual (Lev 16), and vv. 11-14 compare the imagery of this ritual with the death of Christ. Verse 7 refers to the “annual” (ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ) entrance of the high priest, “not without blood” (οὐ χωρὶς αἵματος) “which he offers” (ὃ προσφέρει) “for himself” (ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ) and for “the unintentional sins” (ἄγνῶματα) of the people. Verses 11-12 describe the “once and for all” (ἐφάπαξ)²¹³ entrance of Christ “into the sanctuary” (εἰς τὰ ἅγια),²¹⁴ and vv. 13-14

1981: 201; Lane 1991b: 224-25; Koester 2001: 398 see a contrast in line with standard rabbinic and apocalyptic Judaism—הַזֶּה עוֹלָם הַבָּא over against עוֹלָם הַבָּא, this age and the age to come. See 4 Ezra 6:9; 7:12-13, 50, 113; 8:1; 2 Bar 14:13; 15:8; 44:11-15; 1 En. 48:7; 71:17; Gen. Rab. 44; m. Aboth 44. In the NT see Mark 10:30; Luke 18:30; Rom 12:2; 1 Cor 1:20; 2:6, 8; 3:18; 2 Cor 4:4. See Sasse 1964: 204-207. KJV translates the expression in v. 9 as “the time then present,” but the expression normally refers to the “actual” present, see e.g. Philo *Sacr.* 47; Jos. *Ant.* 16.162, and in the NT, 2 Thess 2:2; Gal 1:14; 1 Cor 3:22. O’Brien 2010: 314-15 sees overlapping periods here, when the new covenant “had been inaugurated, but the old had not yet disappeared.”

²⁰⁷ BDAG 289, s.v. εἰς, 2, a, α. See the other options for εἰς in Ellingworth 1993: 440.

²⁰⁸ BDAG 642, s.v. μέχρι, 1.

²⁰⁹ *Sacr.* 27.

²¹⁰ *J.W.* 1.389; 2.449; *Ant.* 2.51.

²¹¹ Bruce 1990: 211. See also Preisker 1967: 540; BDAG 251. Ellingworth 1993: 444 refers to this verse as “a convenient summary of Jer 31:31-34 = Heb 8:8-12.”

²¹² Ellingworth 1993: 444 notes that the author does not explicitly say that the former regulations no longer “remain in force after the new age is inaugurated.” While this is strictly true, as he also notes, “the strong implication is that they do not.” This implication is strongest perhaps in 8:13. See also 7:18-19 and my discussion of 9:11-14 in 8.6.2 (below).

²¹³ For this sense of ἐφάπαξ see BDAG 417. The word occurs five times in the NT and in four of these it describes the “once for all” death of Christ (Rom 6:10; Heb 7:27; 9:12; 10:10). In 1 Cor 15:6 it refers to the

(beginning with γάρ) explain this by contrasting the sprinkling of animal blood with the self-offering of Christ. However, Christ neither offers nor sprinkles his blood (as did the high priest, 9:7, cf. 9:13).²¹⁵ Rather, he offers himself (ἐαυτόν) to God to cleanse the consciences of the people from dead works,²¹⁶ so that they can serve the living God. This offering of himself accomplished much more (πρόσος μᾶλλον) than what “Aaron and his successors performed in type by the twofold act of slaying the victim and presenting its blood in the holy of holies.”²¹⁷

Hebrews 9:11-12 is a single sentence containing a main clause with a single verb: Χριστός ... εἰσῆλθεν ἐφάπαξ εἰς τὰ ἅγια (“Christ ... entered once and for all into the sanctuary”), and several subordinate clauses. The opening words (Χριστὸς δὲ παραγενόμενος ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν γενομένων ἀγαθῶν, “but Christ having appeared as a high priest of the good things which have come”)²¹⁸ refer to the exaltation of Christ the

appearance of the risen Christ to five hundred people “at one time.” It does not occur in the LXX, Josephus or Philo.

²¹⁴ This word (plural, definite) picks up the former uses of the same word (8:2; 9:8) and refers to the heavenly temple as a holy of holies. To this point in my study I have avoided referring to the heavenly sanctuary as a “place,” reading rather it as a symbol for the dwelling of God with his people (in the eschaton). However, in Heb 9:11-14 the language of place is appropriate, since Christ is said to have “entered” the heavenly holy of holies. Nevertheless, I will argue that the text applies the symbolism of the Day of Atonement ritual to the death of Christ, interpreting his death as the antitype of both the slaughter of the sacrificial animals on the Day of Atonement and the aspersion of the animal blood in the holy of holies. The text does not envisage him entering the inner compartment of a heavenly temple to sprinkle his blood as the former high priest did in the earthly holy of holies.

²¹⁵ When Jesus is the subject of προσφέρω in Hebrews, he offers prayers (5:7), himself (9:14, 25) and a single sacrifice for sins (10:12, see also 9:28 where, with the passive voice, Christ himself is offered). Nowhere in Hebrews does he offer his “blood.” Young 1981: 207-208 notes that in the entire Greek Bible, only in Heb 9:7 is προσφέρω used to refer to the high priestly aspersion of blood in the holy of holies. He also draws attention to the appearance of the same verb in 9:14, with a different direct object (ἐαυτόν). As he notes, in Heb 9 the self-offering of Christ (at Golgotha) is considered to correspond to the “offering” of the blood by the former high priest in the earthly holy of holies. If we apply this reasoning to 9:11-12 it becomes clear that the entrance of Christ into the heavenly holy of holies is to be equated with his self-offering, that is his death, as two sides of the same event (see Stegemann and Stegemann 2005: 14). Προσφέρω occurs sixty-nine times in Leviticus, but the only occurrence in Lev 16 is in v. 9 where Aaron offers a goat as a sin offering, thus the “offering” takes place outside the holy of holies and the aspersion inside (see also Lev 16:14-15). It is this prior offering which procures entry to the holy of holies (Riggenbach 1987:259). In Lev 1:5 the blood of the burnt offering is offered by dashing it on the altar of burnt offering at the entrance of the tabernacle. See also Lev 7:14, 33 for a similar ritual connected with the offering of well-being. In Lev 9:9, 12, 18, at Aaron’s inauguration blood is presented (προσφέρω) to him, which he places on the altar. Blood is also offered in Exod 23:18; 34:25; Ezek 44:7, 15, but never in connection with the Day of Atonement ritual apart from Heb 9:7.

²¹⁶ These are deeds that defile the conscience and lead to death. See O’Brien 2010: 325.

²¹⁷ Bruce 1990: 214.

²¹⁸ There is a variant reading here, with Ⲭ, A, the second reviser of D, I (*vid*), several minuscules, the Majority Text, part of the old Latin tradition, a marginal reading in one MS of the Syriac tradition, the Coptic tradition and Eusebius all reading μελλόντων (“about to come”). The text adopted by the editors of NA²⁷ is witnessed by P⁴⁶ (with minor differences), B, the original hand of D, 1739 and a few other manuscripts, the Peshitta (with minor differences) and the Syriac witness Harklensis. The reading μελλόντων seems to have arisen through assimilation to Heb 10:1 and, moreover, the attestation of γενομένων is “superior ... on the score of age and diversity of text type” (Metzger 1994: 598). See the discussion in Westcott 1892: 256; Zuntz

high priest.²¹⁹ The adversative δέ at the beginning of v. 11 sets up a contrast with the previous sentence (vv. 6-10), which describes the former/outer tent as a symbol pointing to the time of the correction, now come with that exaltation.²²⁰ The final clause (αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὐράμενος, “obtaining eternal redemption”) explains what Christ’s offering of himself achieved. Embedded in this sentence are three other clauses, all beginning with διὰ plus a genitive, further qualifying the entrance of Christ into the heavenly sanctuary. They read:

- (1) διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειότερας σκηνῆς οὐ χειροποιήτου, τοῦτ’ ἔστιν οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως (“through the greater and more perfect tent, that is not of this creation”)
- (2) οὐδὲ δι’ αἵματος τράγων καὶ μόσχων (“not through the blood of bulls and goats”)
- (3) διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος (“but through his own blood”)

The sense(s) of the preposition διὰ in this clause is a *crux interpretum*. The second and third clauses are relatively straightforward and I deal with them first. They describe the action of Christ with negative and positive statements, implicitly contrasting with the action of the high priest on the Day of Atonement. That high priest entered “not without [animal] blood” (οὐ χωρὶς αἵματος); Christ entered not “διὰ” animal blood, but rather, “διὰ” “his own blood” (τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος).

Some read these clauses as though they describe Christ entering the heavenly sanctuary “with” his blood, which that he then offered to God, corresponding to the aspersion of blood on the cover of the Ark of the Covenant by the former high priest.²²¹ But the

1953: 119; Braun 1984: 265; Wilson 1987: 149; Attridge 1989: 244; Bruce 1990: 211; Lane 1991b: 229; DeSilva 2000b: 303; Koester 2001: 407-8; Joslin 2008: 228, all of whom prefer γενομένων. Those who read μελλόντων include Delitzsch 1868: 2: 75-76; Moffatt 1924: 120; Montefiore 1964: 151; Michel 1966: 310. See the discussion in Ellingworth 1993: 449-50 and the list of those adopting either reading there. Ellingworth does not specify his preferred reading.

²¹⁹ The substantive ἄρχιερεύς echoes Heb 8:1-2 and together with the participle παραγενόμενος refers to his exaltation as high priest to the right hand of God. Compare 1:4; 6:20; 7:26 where γενόμενος refers to Jesus “becoming a high priest” at his exaltation. See Moffatt 1924: 120; Attridge 1989: 245; Bruce 1990: 212; Lane 1991b: 236; Ellingworth 1993: 449; Koester 2001: 407; Mackie 2007: 91. Westcott 1892: 255 sees a reference to the incarnation, as do Delitzsch 1868: 2: 75 and Spicq 1952: 2: 256. Hebrews is written from the perspective of the exaltation of Christ rather than his birth.

²²⁰ Attridge 1989: 245.

²²¹ The NRSV “not with the blood of goats and calves, but with his own blood” may have an instrumental sense in terms of “attendant circumstances.” However, since v. 7 has just explained how the high priest entered annually into the holy of holies οὐ χωρὶς αἵματος (“not without blood”) which he offers, the NRSV translation implies that just as the high priest took animal blood into the earthly holy of holies, so Christ took his blood into the heavenly holy of holies to offer it to God. Loader 1981: 167-68 argues strongly for this reading, concluding that it “ist bei weitem die natürlichste, wenn man an die Handlung des Hohenpriesters denkt.” In a similar context, Heb 9:25 refers to the High Priest entering ἐν

preposition διὰ does not seem to have the sense of accompaniment anywhere.²²² A more satisfactory reading is to take the διὰ instrumentally: Christ entered, not by means of animal blood, but by means of his own blood. On this reading, “blood” is a metaphor for “death.”²²³ It was by means of his own death that he entered the sanctuary, not by means of the death of another.²²⁴

While this instrumental reading is preferable for the second and third clauses, many scholars construe the διὰ in the first clause spatially,²²⁵ sometimes supplying a second verb.²²⁶ On this interpretation, Christ is said to have gone through the “greater and more perfect tent” (the outer compartment of a bicameral heavenly sanctuary) and entered the heavenly holy of holies (the inner compartment of this heavenly sanctuary). This reading apparently describes the action of Christ in a way that corresponds to the action of the former high priest as described in 9:7. A number of objections can be raised.

The first objection concerns the syntactical structure of 9:11. The question must be asked whether the same preposition (διὰ) can have different senses (spatial and

αἵματι ἄλλοτρίῳ (“with the blood of another”), but the corresponding statement describing the work of Christ there refers to his “having been offered” (ὁ Χριστὸς ... προσεγενεθῆς). It seems that the author avoids any words that suggest “accompaniment” when speaking of the “blood” of Christ. Others who adopt a similar reading to the NRSV include Attridge 1989: 248-51; DeSilva 2000b: 305; Sterling 2001: 198; Gräbe 2008: 124. She 2011: 142 claims on the basis of Heb 12:24 that “the blood of Jesus is ontologically present in the heavenly sanctuary.”

²²² BADG: 224-26 lists no case where διὰ has the sense of “with” (accompaniment). See the discussion in O’Brien 2010: 321-22.

²²³ BDAG 26-27, s.v. αἷμα, 2, b. See Behm 1964: 174-75; Hughes 1977: 328; Young 1981: 207-9; Peterson 1982: 138; Bruce 1990: 213, 216-17; Lane 1991b: 238; Ellingworth 1993: 447, 452, 456; Joslin 2008: 230-31. Αἷμα appears twenty-one times in Hebrews. It refers to animal blood offered to God in 9:7, 12, 13, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25; 10:4; 11:28; 13:11. In 2:14 the expression αἷμα καὶ σὰρξ (“blood and flesh”) refers to what constitutes humanity. The shedding of blood is a metaphor for death in 12:4. In the remaining instances it is a metaphor for the death of Jesus (9:14; 10:19; 12:24; 13:12, 20). While the former high priest is said to “offer” (προσφέρω) animal blood in the holy of holies, Christ offers not his blood, but himself (9:14, 23-28), implying that τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ in Heb 9:12, 14 is to be understood as a figurative reference to his sacrificial death.

²²⁴ Andriessen 1971: 81-82; Willi-Plein 2005: 33-34.

²²⁵ Moffatt 1924: 120; Spicq 1952: 2: 256; Cody 1960: 149-51 (although on pp. 164-65 Cody combines a local and an instrumental reading); Koester 1962: 309; Sowers 1965: 110-11; Héring 1970: 76; Michaelis 1971: 377; Hofius 1972: 67-68; Johnsson 1973: 293-96; Williamson 1975: 304-306; Michel 1975: 310-11; Loader 1981: 166-68; Peterson 1982: 143-44; Käsemann 1984: 228 (footnote 159); Thompson 1982: 106; 2008: 186; Braun 1984: 265; Rissi 1987: 39; Attridge 1989: 244-47; Weiss 1991: 465-67; Lane 1991b: 237-38; Scholer 1991: 163; Isaacs 1992: 210; Ellingworth 1993: 250-51; Grässer 1990-97: 2: 146-47; DeSilva 2000b: 304; Son 2005: 194-95; Mackie 2007: 90-93; Joslin 2008: 231; O’Brien 2010: 320. Only in Heb 10:20 does διὰ plus the genitive have a local sense, although even there the reading is uncertain. I argue for it below.

²²⁶ The NIV (both 1984 and 2011) adds the verb “went through” in 9:11 (διέρχομαι?—“he went through the greater and more perfect tabernacle”). The NRSV does not supply a second verb, but also seems to read the διὰ in clause 1 in a spatial sense (“through the greater and more perfect tent ... he entered”). For this interpretation see Attridge 1989: 244-48, although he concludes his treatment with a somewhat different interpretation suggesting Christ as “having arrived ‘through the tabernacle,’” construing the clause with the participle παραγενόμενος.

instrumental) in the same sentence, modifying the same verb. This is possible, but difficult.²²⁷ Elsewhere in Hebrews, the same preposition occurs with different nuances in the same sentence,²²⁸ but in these cases the prepositions are construed with different verbs. Here, three adverbial clauses beginning with the same preposition modify the same verb and the reader is asked to read one of these in a different sense.²²⁹

The second objection is that this reading assumes a bicameral sanctuary in heaven, with an outer court and an inner compartment, something that I find nowhere else in Hebrews.²³⁰ The heavenly temple is not to be understood in Hebrews as a heavenly archetype of the earthly sanctuary, corresponding in its architectural detail. Rather, it symbolises the eschatological dwelling of God with his people, the “temple” that God was expected to build in the last days. It is the world to come, where Christ is enthroned at the right hand of God (1:3, 6; 8:1-2), whose ministry is as mediator of the new covenant (8:6).

The third objection is that the former high priest is nowhere (either in Leviticus or in Hebrews) ever said to “go through” the outer tent to reach the inner tent, suggesting that if Christ is considered to do this, it is additional (tautological) detail.²³¹

While none of these alone is decisive, cumulatively they make a case for reading the *διά* in the first clauses instrumentally,²³² explaining that Christ entered “by means of the greater and more perfect tent,” although this reading remains obscure until the referent of the “greater and more perfect tent” is clarified. Some scholars, recognising a correspondence between the first and the third *διά* clauses, argue that since the third refers

²²⁷ Hofius 1972:81-82 considers that it is possible, and Young 1981: 203 that it is “extremely difficult, though not impossible.” Schenck 2007: 161 finds it “not unusual.”

²²⁸ Heb 1:7-8 (*πρός*); 5:1 (*ὑπέρ*); 7:25 (*εἰς*). See Attridge 1989: 245

²²⁹ One solution is to construe the first *διά* clause not with *εἰσήλθεν*, but with some other word. Nairne 1957: 89 construes it with *τῶν γενομένων ἀγαθῶν* (“the good things that have come”), and according to Attridge 1989: 246, Seeberg 1912: 100 construes it with *Χριστός* (I have been unable to access Seeberg). It is difficult to see how the prepositional clause can be attached to either of these substantives and, moreover, the conjunction *οὐδέ* (“and not”) would require the other two clauses to also be construed in the same way, which is even more difficult. See Young 1981: 202; Riggensbach 1987: 258.

²³⁰ I have already dealt with 8:2, 5 (8.5.3; 8.5.4, above) where such readings are often assumed. I acknowledge that my argument is somewhat circular at this point, but I am seeking to make a cumulative case for a consistent understanding of the heavenly temple in Hebrews.

²³¹ Young 1981: 203. Of course, the design of the tabernacle required this of the high priest, but it is assumed and never expressed.

²³² For the instrumental sense of *διά* see BDAG 224, s.v. *διά*, 3. It has this sense in Heb 2:14; 6:11, 18; 7:19; 9:26; 10:10; 11:4, 7, 33, 39; 12:15, 28; 13:2, 12. To this list Attridge 1989: 245 adds 2:3, 7:11, 25; 9:14 (all personal agency, BDAG 225): 12:1 (probably attendant circumstances, see BDAG 224, s.v. *διά*, 3.c.): 13: 15, 21 (both personal agency). Cf. Young 1981 204-5, “[b]y means of the new order, not by means of animal sacrifices (as in the old order), but by means of his own blood (as in the new order) he entered the holy of holies (i.e. heaven itself, the presence of God, 9. 24) ... The ‘greater and more perfect tent’ symbolizes the eschatologically new cultic means of access; the ἅγια is the ultimate goal of that access—the presence of God in heaven.”

to Christ's blood, the first refers to his body with the metaphor "tent."²³³ There are several variations on this reading, including his human body,²³⁴ his whole human life,²³⁵ his resurrection body,²³⁶ his sacramental body;²³⁷ or the church as the body of Christ.²³⁸ The metaphor "tent" is applied to "body" in Paul,²³⁹ but nowhere in Hebrews, where σκίνη consistently refers to either the earthly or the heavenly sanctuary. Such readings are alien to the context and should be abandoned.²⁴⁰

A more satisfactory reading arises when the context in vv. 7-10 is considered. There, the former tent (or the outer compartment tent of the former tent) is understood as a "symbol" (παραβολή) pointing to the new order. The "greater and more perfect tent" (9:11) contrasts with this former tent and symbolises the new order itself.²⁴¹ In support of this, I note the correspondence between the expression ἡ μείζων καὶ τελειότερα σκηνὴ οὐ χειροποιήτου, τοῦτ' ἔστιν οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως ("the greater and more perfect tent not made with hands; that is not of this creation") here and ἡ σκηνὴ ἀληθινή, ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος ("the true tent, which the Lord has pitched and not a human") in Heb 8:2. The two expressions coincide and describe the heavenly sanctuary as a whole,²⁴² referring to the eschatological dwelling of God with his people, brought about by the self-offering of Christ. On this reading, Christ enters the sanctuary "by means" of the new order. Sabourin comes close to this when he suggests that the greater and more perfect tent, not made with hands is "that great liturgy of the sacrifice of Christ, totally

²³³ Chrysostom *Homily XXXIV* on Hebrews (PG 63.119, ET Schaff 1969: 944), as does Oecumenius in his commentary on Hebrews (PG 119.376), and Calvin 1996: 178. See also the discussion in Westcott 1892: 256-58. Son 2005: 194-95 adopts the spatial reading of διὰ in Heb 9:11-12 because he thinks that an instrumental reading requires the tent to refer to the body of Christ, which he rightly recognises as alien to the context.

²³⁴ Theodoret (*Interpretation of Hebrews IX*, PG 82.741). He proposes that "not of this creation" means that "the Lord Christ" (Δεσπότης Χριστός) "was not made according to the law of marriage" (οὐ γὰρ κατὰ γαμικὸν γεγένηται νόμον), but "the all-holy Spirit" (πανάγιον Πνεῦμα) was responsible for the tent.

²³⁵ Cody 1960 161-65 ("the entire span of Christ's saving passage through the earthly plane"); Schierse 1955: 57.

²³⁶ Vanhoye 1965: 10-13, 21-2.

²³⁷ Swetnam 1966: 97, 104.

²³⁸ Westcott 1892: 257-58. In this case, one metaphor (tent equals body) is mixed with another (body equals church).

²³⁹ Paul uses this metaphor in 2 Cor 5:1-4 although the word is σκῆνος rather than σκίνη. The same metaphor appears in Wis 9:15. Σκίνη has the sense of "tabernacle" throughout Hebrews, apart from in 11:9 where it refers to the temporary dwellings of the patriarchs in the land of promise. See 8:2, 5; 9:2, 3, 6, 8, 11, 21; 13:10.

²⁴⁰ Hughes 1977: 283-90; Ellingworth 1993: 447; Schenck 2007: 156. Those who read the text in this way also misunderstand the references to the blood of Christ in 9:11, 14, seeing them as referring to literal blood, rather than as a figurative expression referring to the sacrificial death of Christ.

²⁴¹ Hofius 1972: 66-7; Young 1981: 204-205.

²⁴² These parallel statements (8:2; 9:11) make it unlikely that the "tent" of 9:11 is an outer heavenly tent (ibid.: 203-4).

divine in its origin, in its effects, and in the Spirit which animates it.”²⁴³ Hebrews 9:11-14 describes the new order over against the old. The former tent symbolised the old order: the greater and more perfect tent symbolises the new order that has come with Christ.²⁴⁴

In conclusion then, as with 4:14; 7:26 and 8:2, there is no evidence in this text for a bicameral temple in heaven with the holy of holies concealed by a curtain within the holy place, which Christ passed through to enter the heavenly holy of holies to offer his blood to God. This text does not exploit the actions of the high priest on the Day of Atonement by drawing a distinction between two parts of the heavenly temple. Rather, the contrast is between the former earthly tent and the eschatological heavenly tent. This is the eschatological dwelling of God with his people in the world to come, now available to the people of God through the self-offering of Christ.

8.6.3 The Inaugural Sacrifice of the New Covenant (9:15-22)

This paragraph is central to the author’s argument, but is concerned with the high priestly service of Christ rather than temple symbolism *per se*. It is logically connected to v. 14 with καὶ διὰ τοῦτο (“and because of this”), and the following paragraph is logically connected to this one by means of οὖν (“therefore”) in v. 23.²⁴⁵ A series of syntactical markers indicate the flow of the argument.²⁴⁶

Hebrews 9:15 signals a shift from the discussion of the Day of Atonement ceremony as a model for understanding the death of Christ, to a discussion of his death as the means of inaugurating the new covenant, something announced in passing in 7:22 and 8:6-13. This

²⁴³ Sabourin 1971: 88 (“cette grande liturgie du sacrifice du Christ, toute divine dans son origine, dans ses effets, et dans l'Esprit qui l'anime”).

²⁴⁴ The contrast is implied in the words Χριστός δέ in 9:11 (corresponding to the μέν of 9:1). Buchanan 1972: 139-40 considers that the μέν in 9:1 has its counterpart in 9:3, and that the distance between 9:1 and 9:11 is too great. But this only works if the noun σκηνή is supplied in 9:1, which is unlikely. See Michel 1966: 309; Young 1981: 202. Cf. Williamson 1970: 146, “The perfect illustration of how a Christian eschatologist speaks is given in 9:11.”

²⁴⁵ There is debate as to where the paragraph beginning at Heb 9:15 ends. Lane 1991b: 235 considers that 9:11-28 are a single section, broken into three paragraphs: 11-14, 15-22, 23-28. Koester 2001: 424 has a similar analysis, although he argues for a break at the end of v. 23. Bruce 1990: 219 makes a section break at the end of v. 22, as do Attridge 1989: 253 and Ellingworth 1993: 474-75. Ellingworth notes that if 23-28 are a new section then the οὖν in 23 probably applies to the wider context, while if 18-23 are taken together the οὖν should be seen as relating to what immediately precedes it and concludes “[O]n balance there is perhaps slightly more to be said for grouping v. 23 with what precedes, but the second half of the verse certainly opens a door for the next stage in the argument” (p. 475).

²⁴⁶ Verses 16 and 17 begin with γάρ; v. 18 with ὅθεν, a favourite word of the author’s, appearing six times out of a total of fifteen in the NT (four in Matthew; four in Luke-Acts and once in 1 John) indicating that what follows is deduced from what precedes; and v. 19 with γάρ. The remaining verses are connected to one another with καί.

leads to a discussion of the theology of covenant making (16-17), explaining why it was necessary for Jesus to die for the new covenant to be inaugurated.²⁴⁷

Verses 18-20 discuss the aspersion of blood on the people at the inauguration of the first covenant on Sinai (Exod 24:8), and lead into a discussion of the ceremony marking the inauguration of the tabernacle (vv 21-22), when the “tent” (σκηνή) and “all the implements relating to the cult” (πάντα τὰ σκεύη τῆς λειτουργίας) were sprinkled with blood. This signals a shift to a wider, more general application of the principle of ritual cleansing by the aspersion of blood.²⁴⁸ In v. 22 this wider application is applied to the notion of ἄφεσις (“forgiveness”) by means of αἵματεκχυσία (“shedding of blood”),²⁴⁹ and an oblique reference to the death of Christ discussed in vv. 15-17 as the sacrifice inaugurating the new covenant, to be discussed more fully in 9:28; 10:1-18.

8.6.4 The Heavenly Sacrifice of the New Covenant (9:23-28)

This pericope is said to contain language reflecting Philo and Middle Platonism and a vertical and spatial contrast between the heavenly and earthly sanctuaries.²⁵⁰ Here, the discussion of the cleansing of the former earthly sanctuary with the sprinkling of the blood

²⁴⁷ Many scholars argue for a semantic shift in the word διαθήκη here from “covenant” to “(last) will (and testament),” arguing that the sentence is a description of how such a will is treated under Greco-Roman law. However, the tight flow of the argument from v. 15 to v. 22 makes an unannounced semantic shift like this unlikely and, as both Hughes 1979b: 35-59 and Hahn 2005: 81-85 have shown, the supposed connections with the Greco-Roman law of testamentary dispositions are tenuous (Hughes 1979b: 59-66; Hahn 2004: 416-36; 2005: 81-85). The pericope discusses the death of Christ, who took upon himself the curse of death on behalf of those who were subject to this curse for breaking the first covenant, thus freeing them from that curse (Hahn 2004: 435-36). Recent commentaries on Hebrews that read διαθήκη as “will” include Attridge 1989: 255; Bruce 1990 221-24; Ellingworth 1993: 462-63; DeSilva 2000b: 308; Koester 2001: 417; Johnson 2006: 240-41; Mitchell 2007: 188-89. Recent commentaries reading διαθήκη as “covenant” include Lane 1991b: 231 and O’Brien 2010: 329-31.

²⁴⁸ See the discussion in Ellingworth 1993: 470.

²⁴⁹ This word is a *hapax legomenon* here in both the LXX and the NT, but appearing elsewhere in later Christian writings, including Tatian, *Oratio Adversus Graecos* 23; Epiphanius *Panarion*, 39.9.2; Chrysostom, *Homily XVI on Hebrews*, who cites Heb 9:22. See Behm 1964: 176-77 for several other occurrences. A TLG search returned forty-nine occurrences, including Heb 9:22. Williamson 1970: 114 suggests that the word may have been coined by the author. The expression ἐγχεῖν αἷμα (“to pour out blood”) appears fifty-three times in the LXX, most often of the killing of humans or murder (e.g. Gen 9:6; 37:22; Lev 17:4; Num 35:33; Deut 19:10; 21:7; 1 Kgdms 25:31; 3 Kgdms 2:31; 4 Kgdms 21:16; 24:4; 2 Chron 36:5; 1 Macc 1:37; 7:17; 1:8; Ps 13:3; 78:3, 10; 105:38; Prov 1:16; 6:17; Sir 34:22; Pss. Sol. 8:20; Joel 4:19; Zeph 1:17; Isa 59:7; Jer 7:6; 22:3, 17; Lam 4:13; Ezek 18:10; 22:3, 4, 6, 9, 12, 27; 24:7), of bloodshed in battle (1 Chron 22:8; 28:3); or of the pouring out of the blood of an animal killed by a hunter (Lev 17:13; Deut 12:16, 24, 15:23). In cultic contexts it refers to the pouring out of sacrificial blood at the base of the altar (Exod 24:6; 29:12; Lev 4:7, 18, 25, 30, 34; 8:15; 9:9). The expression ἐκχύσις αἵματος appears in 3 Kgdms 18:28 referring to a flow of blood when individuals cut themselves. Given the quotation of Exod 24:8 in v. 20, the author may have coined the word αἵματεκχυσία from the appearance of ἐγχεῖν αἷμα in Exod 24:6. Consequently Thornton 1964: 63-65 argues that it refers to the sprinkling of the blood of Christ. However, I have argued above (8.6.2) that Christ did not offer his blood. He offered himself and his offering took place not in the heavenly sanctuary but on the cross. Consequently, the more general use of the word for the killing of an (innocent) human comes into play, since it was Christ’s death that achieved “forgiveness” (ἄφεσις, 9:22; 10:18).

²⁵⁰ Sterling 2001: 198; Schenck 2003: 30; Johnson 2006: 243; Thompson 2008: 192-93.

of animals (vv. 21-22) is contrasted with a description of the efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ for the removal of sin.

Verse 23 claims that since τὰ ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (“the outlines of the things in heaven”) had to be cleansed with “these” (τούτοις, “these rites,” as in 9:21-22), it was also necessary for αὐτὰ τὰ ἐπουράνια (“the heavenly things themselves”) to be cleansed, but with better sacrifices, and verse 24 asserts that Christ did not enter a χειροποίητα ἅγια, ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν, (“a sanctuary made by hands, an antitype of the true one”), rather he entered αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν (“heaven itself”) to appear before the presence of God.²⁵¹

Verses 25-28 assert that Christ’s offering was not to be repeated like that of the former high priest who entered τὰ ἅγια (“the holy of holies”) annually “with the blood of another” (ἐν αἵματι ἄλλοτρίῳ), for such repetition would involve multiple repetitions of his sacrificial death. This cannot be, for he has appeared ἅπαξ ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων (“once at the climax of history”) to remove sin by the sacrifice of himself, and will appear a second time to save those who wait for him.²⁵²

The language of 9:23-24 warrants a full discussion, but prior to this I refer in passing to vv. 25-28 and the appearance there of τὰ ἅγια (“the sanctuary”) in v. 25. This expression has previously referred to the heavenly holy of holies that Christ entered (9:12), of which he is a minister (8:2; 9:8). Here it refers to the holy of holies in the earthly sanctuary.²⁵³ This also seems to be the case in Heb 13:11, an allusion to Lev 16:27,²⁵⁴ where the bodies of the animals sacrificed on the Day of Atonement are burnt outside the camp and their blood is “carried in” (εἰσφέρω) “to the holy of holies” (εἰς τὰ ἅγια).²⁵⁵ A reference to the former Day of Atonement ceremony indicates that the discussion has reverted to this from

²⁵¹ Attridge 1989: 261, 263 and Sterling 2001: 198 consider that the use of the pronoun αὐτός with the sense of “itself” in these two verses reflects terminology used by Plato. While Plato may have used the word in this sense, e.g. *Prot.* 360E (αὐτὸ ἡ ἀρετή, “virtue itself”; *Parm.* 130B (αὐτὴ ὁμοιότης, “likeness itself”); 143A (αὐτὸ τὸ ἓν, “the one itself”); 150B (αὐτῆς σμικρότητος, “absolute smallness”); *Crat.* 411D (αὐτὸ ἡ νοήσις, “intelligence itself”); *Rep.* 438C (ἐπιστήμη αὐτή, “knowledge itself”); 582A (αὐτὴν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, “the truth itself”); 612C (αὐτὴ δικαιοσύνη, “justice itself”); *Soph.* 256B (αὐτὴ κίνησις, “motion itself”), surely it is also well established in the NT and elsewhere, making the reference to Plato a case of special pleading. See BDAG 152-53. See e.g. Mark 12:36; Luke 20:42; 24:15; John 3:28; 4:44; Acts 24:15; Rom 15:14; 2 Cor 10:1; Heb 11:11. It appears in Josephus *J.W.* 5.207 to refer to the holy of holies in Herod’s temple, Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ ναὸς κατὰ μέσον κείμενος, τὸ ἅγιον ἱερόν ... (“The shrine itself, found in the centre of the holy temple ...”).

²⁵² For the translation “climax of history” see Lane 1991b: 249. This is the “decisive final moment of history” (Attridge 1989: 264), equivalent to ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων (“in these last days”) in 1:2.

²⁵³ This is clarified by the second reviser of **8**, and a reading preserved in a few witnesses in the Sahidic tradition, which adds the genitive plural τῶν ἁγίων, perhaps assimilating this text to Heb 9:3.

²⁵⁴ See the marginal note in NA²⁷.

²⁵⁵ The text is not consistent, referring to the holy of holies, whether in the earthly or heavenly sanctuary as τὰ ἅγια (8:2; 9:8; 9:12; 9:25; 10:19; 13:11), ἅγια ἁγίων (9:3) or ἡ δευτέρα (σκιηνή, 9:7).

covenant inauguration rituals.²⁵⁶ Thus, v. 23 continues the discussion of covenant inauguration,²⁵⁷ and v. 24 marks a transition back to the discussion of the Day of Atonement.

Hebrews 9:23 compares and contrasts the purification rituals for τὰ ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (“the outlines of the things in heaven”) and for αὐτὰ τὰ ἐπουράνια (“the heavenly things themselves”).²⁵⁸ The expressions differ,²⁵⁹ but the differences are stylistic, and “the things in heaven” and “the heavenly things” have the same referent.²⁶⁰ Interpreters of Hebrews are unsure what these “heavenly things” are and why they would need to be cleansed. While “the outlines” (τὰ ὑποδείγματα) are the implements mentioned in v. 21,²⁶¹ it is not at all certain that the text envisages a set of σκεύη τῆς λειτουργίας (“implements of service”) in the heavenly sanctuary.²⁶² Rather, τὰ ἐπουράνια should be given the same general, non-specific sense as in 8:5, referring to the

²⁵⁶ O’Brien 2010: 338.

²⁵⁷ Hurst 1990: 38-39.

²⁵⁸ Hughes 1977 379; Attridge 1989: 260; Bruce 1990 227; Guthrie 1998 308; Johnson 2006: 242-43; Thompson 2008: 192; O’Brien 2010: 336 all translate τὰ ... ὑποδείγματα with “copies.” As in 8:5, Koester 2001: 417 translates ὑπόδειγμα with “representation” without clarifying the sense in which he is using the word. DeSilva 2000b: 311 translates the expression τὰ ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς with “the shadows of the realities in heaven,” which sounds like a translation of σκιά (“shadow”), which does not feature in these verses.

²⁵⁹ The first is a definite plural substantive (τὰ ὑποδείγματα), followed by a neuter plural definite article used absolutely (τῶν), followed by a prepositional phrase (ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς)—“the outlines of the things in heaven”; while the second is an emphasising pronoun (αὐτὰ), followed by a neuter plural definite noun (τὰ ἐπουράνια)—“the heavenly things themselves.”

²⁶⁰ Koester 2001: 417 translates both τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς and τὰ ἐπουράνια with “the heavenly things.” Zerwick and Grosvenor 1979: 674 note that the terms are equivalent (and refer to the heavenly sanctuary).

²⁶¹ Attridge 1989: 261; Ellingworth 1993: 475-76; O’Brien 2010: 336. Johnson 2006: 243 proposes that τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς refers to the heavenly sanctuary, so that the entire expression means “the copies of the heavenly sanctuary.” Not only does this mean assigning the sense “sanctuary” to the neuter plural genitive definite article τῶν standing alone, for which “things” is more appropriate, but it also suggests more than one earthly “copy” of the heavenly sanctuary. I have persevered with “outline,” following my use of the term “preliminary outline” for ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά in 8:5, which the word here recalls. Lane 1991b: 223 translates ὑπόδειγμα with “suggestion,” referring to Lee 1961: 167-69. While Ellingworth 1993 uses “copy” for this word in 8:5 (p. 406), he refers to Hurst 1983, claiming that “ὑπόδειγμα [in 9:23] retains its etymological force as pointing to something beyond itself” (p. 476). He offers no translation, but critiques “imitation” (BAGD 844). It is interesting that while both Lane and Ellingworth consider “copy” as an adequate translation for ὑπόδειγμα in 8:5, in 9:23 they both switch to a sense more in keeping with the arguments put forward by Hurst (although, on p. 247 Lane also refers to “the heavenly prototypes of the earthly tabernacle” needing to be cleansed).

²⁶² Contra McRay 1980: 6 who suggests that “the tabernacle and the church with their corresponding elements (table of showbread and Lord’s supper, laver and baptism, minora [sic] and Word of God, etc.) are antitypes of the reality in the heavens.”

“heavenly things.”²⁶³ As in 8:5, so also in 9:23 the details of the earthly sanctuary are seen as pointers to the heavenly realities that have now come in Christ.

That heavenly things need to be “purified” (καθαρίζω) has long caused consternation to interpreters of Hebrews.²⁶⁴ But it is only difficult if the heavenly things are equated with a heavenly sanctuary, of which the earthly sanctuary is a “copy.” If the heavenly things are the good things that have come with the exaltation of Christ, that is, the new order of things, the difficulty evaporates. As in 8:5-6, the “heavenly things” are the better promises and the better covenant through which forgiveness and purification comes. Verse 23, then, is commentary on vv. 8-10, 11-14, which refer on the one hand to the inability of the former cultic arrangements to provide the forgiveness available under the new covenant, and on the other hand the purification from sins that comes from the self-offering of Christ, first hinted at in 1:3 with the noun καθαρισμός (“purification”).²⁶⁵

Hebrews 9:24 begins with γάρ, indicating that it explains in some way the statements in 9:23 about the cleansing of the heavenly things with better sacrifices. Here, the outlines of the heavenly things are described with two synonymous expressions: a “hand-made sanctuary” (χειροποίητα ... ἅγια)²⁶⁶ and “antitype of the true one” (ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν).²⁶⁷ This he did not enter. What he did enter, “heaven itself” (αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν) is contrasted with the earthly sanctuary. The words χειροποίητος, ἀληθινή and οὐρανός form an inclusio with 8:1-2,²⁶⁸ where the high priest is said to have sat down

²⁶³ She 2011: 171-74 argues that the “heavenly things” are a spatiotemporal, literal and physical sanctuary in heaven. This he claims is “the correct interpretation” of this text (p. 9).

²⁶⁴ The most up-to-date discussion is in O’Brien 2010: 336-38, who classifies the readings into three groups. Some refer to the inauguration of the heavenly sanctuary, with καθαρίζω read as a purported synonym of ἐγκαινίζω (“to inaugurate,” v. 18, see Spicq 1952: 2: 267; Buchanan 1972: 153; Hurst 1990: 38-39; Dunnill 1992: 232; Ellingworth 1993: 477). Others refer to the purification of heaven itself, as though sin had caused celestial defilement (Delitzsch 1868: 2: 125; Moffatt 1924: 132; Johnsson 1973: 256-61; Lane 1991b: 247; Cockerill 2001: 192, footnote 50; Koester 2001: 421). Others refer to the cleansing of God’s people (Attridge 1989: 261-62; Loader 1981:169-70; Bruce 1990: 228-29). There are variations on this with Bruce referring to the heavenly things as the people of God, and Attridge the human conscience. Attridge 1989: 261-62; Ellingworth 1993: 477 have extensive discussions.

²⁶⁵ This reading is close to those readings that refer to the cleansing of humanity by providing forgiveness.

²⁶⁶ While ἅγια without the definite article could be explained with reference to the only other appearance of the word in this form in 9:2 where it is evidently a proper name, here the indefiniteness indicates that the text refers to it simply as “a holy place.” For the syntax of anarthrous substantives see Wallace 1996: 243-45. Rissi 1987: 38-39 considers that anarthrous ἅγια here refers to the entire heavenly sanctuary in general, as opposed to the heavenly holy of holies, but attention to the syntax of the sentence shows that it is actually a reference to the earthly sanctuary as a member of the class of holy places, into which Christ did not enter.

²⁶⁷ Ἀντίτυπα is a neuter plural adjective, agreeing with ἅγια, a collective noun referring to “a sanctuary.” It needs to be rendered into English in the singular.

²⁶⁸ Attridge 1989: 262-62; Lane 1991b: 248; Koester 2001: 421 consider that χειροποίητος is used pejoratively here, but that need not be so. Rather, it simply distinguishes the two sanctuaries, as does the

at the right hand of the majesty “in heaven” (ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς), a “minister of the sanctuary, the true tent which the Lord has pitched and not a human” (τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς, ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος). Thus, this verse and those that follow round off the section extending from 8:1–9:28.

The expression ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν contains the only instance of ἀντίτυπος in Hebrews, although its counterpart τύπος appears in the quotation of Exod 25:40 in Heb 8:5 to refer to the “pattern” (Heb, תבנית, Greek τύπος) Moses saw on the mountain, whether a model of the eschatological dwelling place of God, or that dwelling place itself. But what of ἀντίτυπος?²⁶⁹ The sense of this word can be clarified with reference to its other NT appearance in 1 Pet 3:21. While the interpretation of 1 Pet 3:21 continues to be debated,²⁷⁰ it does seem clear that the text there explains a correspondence between salvific events in the past and Christian baptism in the present, and that the ἀντίτυπος (“baptism”) comes after the τύπος (“the flood”),²⁷¹ and ἀντίτυπος has a temporal sense: Christian baptism clarifies the deeper meaning of the waters of the flood.²⁷²

It is sometimes claimed that in Heb 9:24 ἀντίτυπος here has a quite different sense from that in 1 Pet 3:21,²⁷³ and refers to the earthly sanctuary as “a (mere) copy of the true (sanctuary).”²⁷⁴ Thus, it is given spatial and vertical connotations, whereby the relationship between the wilderness sanctuary and the heavenly sanctuary is expressed as a relationship

similar expression in 8:2. The word is pejorative in Acts 7:48, referring to the temple as distinct from the wilderness tabernacle (see Acts 7:44); and 17:48 where it refers to idolatrous temples.

²⁶⁹ Woolcombe 1957: 64 proposes that τύπος and ἀντίτυπος are synonymous in Hebrews, both referring to the secondary nature of Moses’ tent. He comments, “The author’s purpose in quoting Ex. 25:40 was to show that Moses’ tent was at best a τύπος.” This is incorrect: Moses did not build a τύπος, but a ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά based on a τύπος.

²⁷⁰ See the discussion in Goppelt 1978: 266-67; Michaels 1988: 214; Achtemeier 1996: 266-67; Davids 1990: 143; Elliott 2000: 668-72.

²⁷¹ See the discussion of ἀντίτυπος in Selwyn 1961: 298-99, who refers to Melito of Sardis (*Homily on the Passion* 36-37) in connection with Heb 9:24 comparing the “Law and the institutions of the old dispensation to a sculptor’s cast or pattern ... [which] when the task is completed is discarded as of no value.” This is Selwyn’s summary of the entire discussion in Melito. For the text in Melito see Hall 1979: 19-21 (lines 224-76).

²⁷² Fritsch 1966: 100-101.

²⁷³ See Davidson 1981: 361-63. Davidson reads the τύπος seen by Moses either as the heavenly sanctuary itself, a model of it, or both, and argues that the τύπος was a model and the ἀντίτυπος corresponds to it. On this understanding, the heavenly sanctuary is the τύπος and the wilderness shrine the corresponding ἀντίτυπος, and the imagery is spatial and vertical.

²⁷⁴ BDAG 90 (italics original). BDAG does cite Hurst 1983: 165-68, who argues that the word is used in the same sense as in 1 Pet 3:21 (with which BDAG seems to disagree). Sowers 1965: 90 (footnote 3) also wonders how certain it is that the word is used differently in 1 Peter and Hebrews. The discussion of the use of ἀντίτυπος in classical Greek in Hurst 1990: 17-19 is valuable, showing that “copy” is an option for this word. Nevertheless, he also shows “copy” does not give the most coherent reading of Heb 9:23-24. Elliott 2000: 670 notes that τύπος and ἀντίτυπος “when used independently ... can [both] denote either something original or its copy, with its actual meaning determined by its context.” See LSJ 165, 1835.

between a superior archetype and its inferior copy.²⁷⁵ It is preferable, however, to recognise from the causal relationship of vv. 23, 24 that “the antitype of the true things” (ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν, v.24) explains in some way the outlines of the things in heaven (τὰ ... ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, v. 23). Consequently, the antitype of the true things and the outlines of the things in heaven are different, but complementary ways to describe the wilderness shrine, leading to the conclusion that ἀντίτυπος and ὑπόδειγμα are “virtual synonyms.”²⁷⁶ And, if so, since ὑπόδειγμα does not have the sense of “copy” neither does ἀντίτυπος.²⁷⁷

Given the primary interest in salvation history rather than cosmology in this verse, the comparison of the former covenant and the new covenant in the preceding paragraph, the other temporal contrasts that I have argued for throughout Heb 8-9 and the word’s virtual synonymy with ὑπόδειγμα, it is more likely ἀντίτυπος also has temporal connotations. Rather than referring to the hand-made sanctuary as a “copy” of the true one, it is rather a “*prefiguration*” of the heavenly one.²⁷⁸ Thus, ἀντίτυπος here is only obliquely related to τύπος in Heb 8:5. It is used in the same way as in 1 Pet 3:21 and also as τύπος is used in Paul to indicate a “perceived correspondence between events of the sacred past and the present and some assured continuity between God’s action in the past, present and future.”²⁷⁹

8.6.5 The Foreshadowing of the Good Things to Come (10:1)

Hebrews 10:1-18 completes the arguments about the high priesthood of Jesus and his priestly work. It summarises what has preceded in 8:1–9:23, introduces some OT texts and draws out some of the implications.²⁸⁰ It comprises four paragraphs, each concluding with

²⁷⁵ This reading of Heb 9:24 is assumed by Michaels 1988:214; Achtemeier 1996: 267; Elliott 2000: 670; Hanson 2002: 167 in their treatment of 1 Pet 3:21, all of whom suggest that this text and Heb 9:24 have little in common. Those who read Heb 9:24 along these lines, usually with reference to Philo, include Attridge 1989: 262-63; Ellingworth 1993: 479; DeSilva 2000b: 313; Sterling 2001: 198; Koester 2001: 421; Johnson 2006: 243; Thompson 2008: 192; O’Brien 2010: 338. I note that Philo uses ἀντίτυπος three times (*Plant.* 133; *Conf.* 102; *Her.* 181) and never with the sense of an inferior copy of a superior archetype. Rather, in Philo and in a variant reading in LXX Esth B 4 (see the Critical Apparatus in Hanhart 1983: 154) it has the sense of “inimical” or “resistant” (Hurst 1983: 165). Wilcox 1988: 651 discounts any Philonic influence in these verses, and in connection with Heb 9:26b refers to “the appearance of the heavenly original itself at the end in history at the ‘End time’,” although I note that that verse denotes the appearance of Jesus rather than of the heavenly sanctuary.

²⁷⁶ Davidson 1981:361.

²⁷⁷ Hurst 1990: 17-19.

²⁷⁸ Ibid.: 18 (*italics original*). See also Nomoto 1968: 17-19. Bruce 1990: 230 calls the earthly sanctuary and its associated priestly service “faint foreshadowings” of the heavenly priestly service of Christ. Lane 1991b: 248 considers that the comparison here “reflects upon the typological relation between the old and new covenants.”

²⁷⁹ Elliott 2000: 670. For τύπος in Paul see Rom 5:14; 6:17; 1 Cor 10:6; Phil 3:17; 1 Thess 1:7; 2 Thess 3:9 (1 Tim 4:12; Tit 2:7).

²⁸⁰ Attridge 1989: 268.

a categorical declaration. Verses 1-4 conclude that the blood of bulls and goats offered repeatedly cannot remove sin (v.5); vv. 5-10 establish from Ps 40:6-8 (LXX 39:7-9) that Christ's offering of himself has abolished and replaced the former sacrifices; vv. 11-14 cite Ps 110:1 for the third time in Hebrews, including (for the first time) the line about the one seated waiting for the subjugation of his enemies, and conclude with the claim that Christ, by his single sacrifice has perfected forever the sanctified ones (v. 14); and vv 15-18 pick up Jer 31:33-34, previously cited in Heb 8, and conclude that the claim of Jeremiah that God will no longer remember the sins and lawless deeds of his people means that forgiveness has been achieved. There is, therefore, no further need for an offering for sin (v.18).

The accumulation of words related to "offering" (προσφέρω, vv. 1, 2, 8, 11, 12; προσφορά, vv. 5, 8, 10, 14, 18); "sacrifice" (θυσία, vv. 1, 5, 8, 11, 12), "perfection" (τελειόω, vv. 1, 14); and "sin" (ἁμαρτία, vv. 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 11, 18) indicate the topic under discussion. These verses are about the inability of the sacrifices of the former covenant to achieve forgiveness, and the forgiveness now available for the people of God by Christ's unique offering of himself.²⁸¹ I am concerned with vv. 1-4 and, in particular, the language of shadow and reality in v. 1.

Hebrews 10:1-4 is a single sentence that begins with a causal participial clause: the reason why "the law" (ὁ νόμος) cannot make perfect those who approach God is because it "possesses" (ἔχω)²⁸² a "shadow" (σκιά) of "the good things to come" (τὰ μελλόντα ἀγαθά), and not "the image itself" (αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα) of "the realities" (τὰ πράγματα). Indeed, they would have ceased being offered if they could make these people perfect, and since they have not, it is clear that these sacrifices (the blood of bulls and goats) cannot remove sins.²⁸³

²⁸¹ See the discussion of the form, structure and purpose of this section in Lane 1991b 257-59; Ellingworth 1993: 488-90; Joslin 2008: 238; O'Brien 2010: 343-44.

²⁸² Joslin 2008: 244-45 explains the significance of the use of the verb ἔχω in this context. The author is not arguing that the law *per se* has been superseded, rather he is arguing for the end of the former cultus. It is this cultus, especially the tabernacle, priesthood and associated rituals, that constitute the shadow that the law possesses (Grässer 1990-97: 49). The text is similar to Col 2:16-17 where food and drink, festivals, new moons and Sabbaths foreshadow what is to come. Those who read Heb 10:1 as though the law itself "was" a shadow have to extrapolate that ὁ νόμος ("the law") is a shorthand expression for the cultic provisions of the former covenant (e.g. Bruce 1990 234-35; Lane 1991b: 259; Ellingworth 1993: 490; O'Brien 2010: 344-45). The NIV reads "the law is only a shadow," and Guthrie 1998: 326 (based on the NIV) suggests "the earthly system mimics enough of the original to point God's people to greater, heavenly realities." This misunderstands the text by applying it to the wilderness tabernacle as a "copy" of the heavenly, when the text is actually about the earthly cultus foreshadowing the blessings of the new covenant. I also note that there is no word for "only" in the text.

²⁸³ I have deliberately phrased the sentence in this way, supplying the positive answer that the question in v. 2 (οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύσαντο προσφερόμεναι, "would they not have ceased being offered?") demands. Attridge 1989: 8; Koester 2001: 52-53; Eisenbaum 2005: 225 suggests that this question has no bearing on the date of Hebrews, noting that Josephus (*Ant.* 3.102-87; 224-57; *Ag. Ap.* 2.77, 193-98) also refers to the former sacrificial cultus in the present tense after the events of 70 C.E. See also 1 *Clem.* 40-41 and *m. Qidd.* 1.8. But Josephus and the Rabbis were not discussing the end of the former cultus as was the author of Hebrews, and

The words “shadow” (σκιά), “image” (εἰκών) and “reality” (πρᾶγμα) have led some readers of Hebrews to understand this text in terms of middle Platonism.²⁸⁴ To be sure the claims of influence from Plato and Philo are often muted,²⁸⁵ with the suggestion that the similarities are superficial and, indeed, Mackie has demonstrated this to be the case.²⁸⁶ It would be a diversion to examine the use of these three words in Philo, since this study is concerned with the exegesis of Hebrews rather than of Philo.²⁸⁷ I simply examine their use in Hebrews to indicate that as opposed to Philo who uses them with spatial connotations, Heb 10:1 reflects not “above and below” typology, but in accord with 8:1–9:28, the typology is thoroughly temporal. The contrast is between the inability of the former cultus to achieve forgiveness, something now possible with the abolition of that cultus with Christ’s offering of himself (Heb 10:9).

“The coming good things” (τὰ μελλόντα ἀγαθὰ) are said to be “the realities” (τὰ πρᾶγματα),²⁸⁸ of which the law possesses “a shadow” (σκιά) and not “the form itself”

had the temple been destroyed when he wrote, he could have driven the point home by pointing to those events. On this see Walker 1994: 58-59 (footnote 37). Apparently, both Josephus and the Rabbis expected a rebuilt temple and a renewed sacrificial cultus.

²⁸⁴ Moffatt 1924: 135; Thompson 1982: 160; 2008: 194; Attridge 1989: 271; Weiss 1991: 502-503; Grässer 1990-97: 2: 206-207; DeSilva 2000b: 317; Sterling 2001: 198-99; Koester 2001: 98-99; Schenck 2002: 131-32; Johnson 2006: 249; Mitchell 2007: 199. Philo uses σκιά fifty-two times; εἰκών one hundred and eighteen times; and πρᾶγμα four hundred and nineteen times.

²⁸⁵ E.g. Thompson 2008: 194, one of the most ardent supporters over the last forty years of the influence of middle Platonism on Hebrews, suggests that the author here “is not consistently Platonic ... [but] is also making the familiar eschatological contrast between the two ages.” Similarly, Sterling 2001: 199 finds it “striking ... that Platonic language has been given a temporal thrust.” Attridge 1989: 271 suggests that in Hebrews the use of Platonic language is “playfully rhetorical ... [and] applied to a horizontal or temporal dichotomy that is quite foreign to the philosophical tradition, yet the significance of the Platonic conceptual framework has not been lost.” It sounds like these authors want to retain a Platonic framework, but cannot quite make it work properly.

²⁸⁶ Mackie 2007: 105-120. Other works denying any more than a superficial contact with Platonism include Manson 1951: 184; Williamson 1963: 421; 1970: 566-67; Peterson 1982: 144-45; Wilson 1987: 170; Lane 1991b: 259-60; Schenck 2007: 119-20; O’Brien 2010: 345. Hurst 1990: 19-20 perhaps overstates the case when he suggests that the juxtaposition of εἰκών with σκιά “tells against any direct knowledge of Plato’s works.”

²⁸⁷ See the brief surveys in Mackie 2007: 108-11; Joslin 2008: 245-47. Mackie 2007: 110-11 concludes that for Philo σκιά “continues to represent physical objects in the sense-perceptible world” (*Leg.* 3.96-103; *Post.* 112-119; *Deus.* 177; *Plant.* 27; *Somm.* 1.206; *Abr.* 119-120; *Flacc.* 165; *Legat.* 320); εἰκών “is a reflection or copy in a lower realm of something belonging to a higher realm” (Tobin 1983: 64-65), see *Opif.* 146; *Plant.* 50; *Sobr.* 132-34; *Migr.* 40; *Her.* 187; *Fug.* 12; *Mos.* 2.51, 267; *Spec.* 2.237; 4.146). At times these two terms are juxtaposed and appear as near synonyms (*Leg.* 3. 96); and πρᾶγμα is used in a general sense for “matter, thing,” although at times it is a synonym of εἰκών to refer to “the truly real things” (*Det.* 87; *Somm.* 2. 115-16; *Prob.* 62; *Flacc.* 41).

²⁸⁸ The word πρᾶγμα appears three times in Hebrews. In 6:18 it is “two unchangeable things,” the promise and the oath, and in 11:1 it is the assurance of things that are hoped for. Here, it is in apposition to the good “things” to come, and refers to the realities of forgiveness and salvation that have eventuated with the self-offering of Christ.

(αὐτὴ ἡ εἰκών).²⁸⁹ The text contrasts the shadow of the good things to come with the realities (the good things to come) themselves.²⁹⁰ In the context of the entire paragraph, these good realities are the self-offering of Christ inaugurating the better covenant based on the better promises (vv. 5-6), the removal of sins that the former sacrifices could not achieve (v. 4); the ability to “perfect” (τελειόω) those who approach,²⁹¹ which the former cultus was unable to achieve (vv. 2, 14), “our” sanctification (v. 10); and the forgiveness of sins (v. 18). These are “the boons and blessings of the new age.”²⁹²

Opposing these good things is their shadow, not their form itself. The word for “shadow” (σκιᾶ) in an emphatic position at the start of the verse represents the key point at issue.²⁹³ In my discussion of Heb 8:5 I noted that the juxtaposition in Heb 10:5 of σκιᾶ and τὰ μέλλοντα (“the coming things”) indicates that the sense of this word here is “foreshadowing,”²⁹⁴ the sense it also has in Heb 8:5 where it is coupled with ὑπόδειγμα. This is consistent with the temporal and horizontal relationship between the former wilderness sanctuary and the eschatological sanctuary.²⁹⁵

Given this sense of “foreshadowing,” the text simply claims that while the law possesses the foreshadowing of these things, it does “not” (οὐκ, 10:1) possess “the image itself” (αὐτὴ ἡ εἰκών) of the things. Here, εἰκών is contrasted with σκιᾶ. The σκιᾶ is a foreshadowing; the εἰκών is the “actual manifestation” or “embodiment” of the good things,²⁹⁶ or their “true form.”²⁹⁷ The language might sound Platonic, but the contrast is a straightforward “then and now” contrast rather than an “above and below” contrast.

²⁸⁹ Mitchell 2007: 198-99 translates this expression “the same form,” but that would be ἡ αὐτὴ εἰκών. He also mistakenly reads this verse as “the earthly sanctuary does not adequately reflect the heavenly.”

²⁹⁰ In P⁴⁶ καί replaces οὐκ αὐτήν, giving the sense that the law possesses a shadow of good things *and* the image of the realities. On this reading “shadow” and “image” are synonyms. The reading cannot be original since the entire sentence (vv. 1-4) implies a contrast between the law and the good things, see Metzger 1994: 599-600; Lane 1991b: 254, note b; Mackie 2007: 114.

²⁹¹ Cf. Heb 7:19; 9:9.

²⁹² Peterson 1982: 145; Wilson 1987: 171; Bruce 1990: 235; Lane 1991b: 260; Koester 2001: 430.

²⁹³ Lane 1991b: 254, note a.

²⁹⁴ Barrett 1954: 386; Williamson 1970: 566; Lane 1991b: 253; O’Brien 2010: 345. See 8.5.4 (above), and cf. Col 2:17.

²⁹⁵ As Wilson 1987: 171; Attridge 1989: 269; Mackie 2007: 106 note, while in 9:11 the good things have already come (τῶν γενομένων ἀγαθῶν), here they are still to come. The distinction is a matter of perspective: from the perspective of the former cultus, the good things are still to come (10:1); from the perspective of the exaltation of Christ, the good things have come (9:11).

²⁹⁶ O’Brien 2010: 345. Cf. also Kleinknecht 1964: 389, “εἰκών does not imply a weakening or a feeble copy of something. It implies the illumination of its inner core and essence.”

²⁹⁷ Flender 1976: 288. Spicq 1952: 1: 75 compares the relationship of σκιᾶ to εἰκών to an artist’s preliminary sketch and his completed masterpiece.

Hebrews 10:1 claims that the good things that have come with the self-offering and exaltation of Christ were foreshadowed in the former cultus, and that the former cultus was not the true form of these good things. This text nowhere disparages the former cultus.²⁹⁸ It was a valid foreshadowing of the good things that were to come with Christ, but its fundamental design was such that it could not achieve what it foreshadowed, and now that the reality that it foreshadowed has arrived, it is abolished (10:9).

This sentence accords with all that precedes it. The former cultus anticipated and pointed to the heavenly good things that were to come. These have now come with the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God at the climax of the age (9:26), inaugurating the last days (1:2) with its blessings.

8.7 Conclusion

I have argued in this chapter that there is minimal, if any, spatial imagery in Hebrews. Rather, the author has claimed that the turn of the ages took place with the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God. This decisive event indicated the end of the former covenant with its sanctuary and ritual, so much so that this ritual and this sanctuary no longer had the normative status it had in the past. It was a symbol of the new order that came with the exaltation of Christ. This symbolic function gave it its validity, prefiguring that new order. It was intended to point to the eschaton, which it did, and now that the eschaton has come it has reached its *telos* and is no longer normative.²⁹⁹

Hebrews is more about salvation history than cosmology. The influence of middle Platonic cosmology reflected in Philo has had an undue influence on modern day readers of Hebrews, leading to the continuing imposition of the ideas of Philo onto the text. It is this that continues to lead interpreters to interpret such words as ὑπόδειγμα and ἀντίτυπος in ways that make the author's secondary concern with cosmology primary, and relegate his primary concern, the decisive change brought about with the death and subsequent exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God, to something secondary.

²⁹⁸ Manson 1951: 144 warns against undervaluing “the real, though negative function assigned to the cultus in bringing home to the soul the ‘remembrance’ of sin” (Heb 10:3). See also Wilson 1987: 170-71; Joslin 2008: 261, 267.

²⁹⁹ I deny that these claims are to be read as supersessionist, rather, there is one people of God. It is not that Christianity has replaced Judaism; rather, the people of God has now been extended to include all people, both Jew and Gentile alike. The time of correction has come and the symbols pointing to that time have outlived their usefulness.

Chapter 9 Conclusion

This study is an examination of the temple symbolism in Hebrews in the light of temple symbolism in the literature of middle Judaism outside of Hebrews. I have argued that in Hebrews the heavenly temple is not an eternal heavenly archetype of which the wilderness tabernacle is an inferior copy. Rather, the wilderness tabernacle (as also Solomon's temple) prefigured the heavenly temple, which is to be understood as the eschatological dwelling of God with his people.¹ Christ the exalted Son of God is now crowned with glory and honour in the world to come. Ultimately, that world will be made subject to humanity. Humanity will enter God's rest, the true tent that the Lord has pitched, the heavenly Jerusalem, the city with foundations, the city of the living God and the city to come.

Several themes emerged from my study of the literature of middle Judaism that have a bearing on the understanding of the temple symbolism in Hebrews. First, some readers of Hebrews, noting that the Jerusalem temple never appears in the book, have argued that the author has no interest in this temple. However, arguments from the silence of Hebrews on the topic of the second temple cannot be used to argue that the author had no interest in the temple and the cult. In literature evidencing a sense of dissatisfaction with the second temple, the temple is also often ignored, being passed over in silence. In spite of this, few scholars deduce that there was no interest in the temple and the cult in that literature.

Secondly, many readers of Hebrews suggest that the author views the wilderness tabernacle as a mere, inferior copy of an archetypal heavenly temple. Four things can be said about this. First, my discussion of Heb 8:5 in particular has shown this to be untenable on lexical grounds. The words used simply do not have the sense in which they are often read. Secondly, in no text from middle Judaism that I have examined is there any disparagement of the wilderness tabernacle. Where the wilderness tabernacle appears it is always seen in a positive light. It was based on the design God showed to Moses on Sinai, which gave it considerable prestige. Thirdly, this reading has most often been based on perceived allusions to Philo and middle Platonism in Hebrews. But this approach does justice neither to Philo nor to Hebrews. Rather than the imagery of a heavenly archetype and an earthly copy, Philo sees the temple or tabernacle as a microcosm of the universe. When Philo does speak in terms of "copy," he describes the tabernacle as a copy of a noumenal "idea" existing in the mind of God. That Jesus or the people of God could have access to this "idea" would be unthinkable to Philo. Finally, while a heavenly temple does

¹ The text is silent about the second temple. I have read this silence as evidence of dissatisfaction with the second temple, as also in other texts from middle Judaism that ignore the second temple. Whether the author of Hebrews thought that the second temple prefigured the eschatological dwelling of God with his people cannot be established from the text.

appear in some of the literature, in no text does it correspond precisely to the bicameral wilderness tabernacle of the Pentateuch, with an outer court and an inner shrine separated by a curtain. The idea of an archetypal heavenly temple designed like this, with an inferior earthly copy corresponding to it, is absent from the literature.

Thirdly, many readers of Hebrews argue, especially from Heb 9:11-12, that Christ entered the heavenly sanctuary with his own blood, which he offered to God, in a manner corresponding to the aspersion of blood in the holy of holies by the high priest on the Day of Atonement. Not only have I argued that this reading cannot be justified exegetically, it also presupposes a notion of some sort of blood sacrifice in heaven. The notion of blood sacrifice in heaven is absent from the literature of middle Judaism, apart from *ShirShabb* where the word זבח appears along with other cultic terms. But even there it is not at all clear that the text envisages blood sacrifice in heaven. On this evidence it seems unlikely that the author of Hebrews would have entertained this notion.

On the other hand, several texts anticipate an eschatological temple that God will prepare, and in which God will dwell with his people in the last days. In most of the texts it is envisaged as an earthly structure, sometimes of gigantic proportions. In several texts, the community itself is seen as an interim temple awaiting this eschatological temple.

It is this model that I find reflected in Hebrews, with significant modifications. Hebrews is written from the perspective of the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God, in the world to come, in “these” last days (Heb 1:2) at the climax of the age. For Hebrews, the eschaton has arrived, and the eschatological temple where God will dwell with his people is in place. Christ is enthroned in this temple, and the people of God have proleptic access to it in the present, from their location somewhere in the first century Mediterranean Diaspora. They also anticipate their ultimate goal, sharing in God’s rest in this temple, in the heavenly Jerusalem. That this is the case shows that the dualism in Hebrews is not an “above and below” spatial dualism as has often been assumed, but thoroughly eschatological, with the former sanctuaries and their associated cultus prefiguring the eschatological temple, now come with the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God. This eschatological temple is not a structure, either in heaven or on earth. Rather, it is a metaphor for the eschatological dwelling of God with his people.

This has implications for the reading of Hebrews. The traditional view of Hebrews, the so-called relapse theory, supposes that the readers were tempted to relapse from Christianity to Judaism. As I noted at the outset, to speak of two religions, Judaism and Christianity, at the time Hebrews is thought to be written is anachronistic.² However, some form of a modified relapse theory seems to be a reasonable position to take, especially in

² See 1.5.7 (above).

the light of Heb 13, where the author calls his readers away from involvement in ritual meals. He does not call them to abandon these for another religion, rather they are to exit the “camp” (Jerusalem and the temple) and go to Jesus, whose sacrifice the former cultus anticipated. Now that the eschaton has arrived with the exaltation of Jesus, the former cultus has reached its *telos* and no longer has normative status. But this is not another religion. It is the arrival of the eschaton that the religion of Israel anticipated, the eschatological temple of which the Scriptures spoke. The author reads these Scriptures from the perspective of the exaltation of Christ, through whom God has spoken definitively to his people. God, who formerly spoke to “the ancestors” through the prophets, has now spoken to “us” through the exalted Son. That there is continuity between “the ancestors” and “us,” both being addressed by the same God, indicates that the author was no supersessionist.

Finally, the study has implications for the contemporary political situation in the land of the Bible. Hebrews 11:9 is the only text in either the OT or the NT to refer to “the land of promise,” and it does so in order to negate it. In Hebrews the readers are to leave the “camp” of Jerusalem. The city and its temple are negated in favour of the eschatological dwelling of God with his people. This is a call that some Zionist Christians need to hear, especially those who read the formation of the state of Israel in 1948 as somehow ushering in the last days and heralding the return of Christ. To these, the author of Hebrews would respond that the last days began with the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God. He would direct their attention not to the land of Israel, the city of Jerusalem or the hope of a rebuilt temple, but to Jesus at the right hand of God in the world to come (Heb 12:1-3). This is their eschatological goal.³

³ See my critique of Christian Zionism in Church 2009: 375-98.

Bibliography

- Aalen, Sverre (1961-62). "‘Reign’ and ‘House’ in the Kingdom of God in the Gospels." *NTS* 8: 215-40.
- Abegg, Martin G. (1999). "Does Anyone Really Know what Time it is: A Reexamination of 4Q503 in Light of 4Q317." In *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*. STDJ 30. Edited by D. W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich. Leiden: Brill: 396-406.
- . (2003). "The Covenant of the Qumran Sectarrians." In *The Concept of Covenant in the Second Temple Period*. JSJSup 71. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C. R. de Roo. Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature: 81-97.
- Abegg, Martin G., Peter Flint and Eugene Ulrich (1999). *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time into English*. New York, N.Y.: HarperOne.
- Achtemeier, Paul J. (1996). *1 Peter: A Commentary on First Peter*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg.
- Adams, Edward (2009). "The Cosmology of Hebrews." In *The Epistle to Hebrews and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel Driver, Trevor Hart and Nathan MacDonald. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 122-39.
- Aitken, Ellen Bradshaw (2005). "Portraying the Temple in Stone and Text: The Arch of Titus and the Epistle to the Hebrews." In *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods – New Insights*. Biblical Interpretation Series 75. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 131-48.
- Albl, Martin C. (1999). *‘And Scripture Cannot be Broken’: The Form and Function of the Early Christian Testimonia Collections*. NovTSup 46. Leiden: Brill.
- Albright, William Foxwell (1969). *Archeology and the Religion of Israel: The Ayer Lectures of the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, 1941*. 5th ed. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.
- Alexander, Philip S. (1988). "Retelling the Old Testament." In *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars S.S.F.* Edited by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 99-121.
- . (1996). "The Redaction-History of *Serekh Ha-Yahad*: A Proposal." *RevQ* 17: 437-56.
- . (1997). "'Wrestling against Wickedness in High Places': Magic in the Worldview of the Qumran Community." In *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After*. JSPSup 26. Edited by Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press: 318-37.
- . (1998). "From Son of Adam to Second God." In *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*. Edited by Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergren. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International: 87-122.
- . (1999). "The Demonology of the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill. 1: 331-53.
- . (2006). *The Mystical Texts: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and Related Manuscripts*. Library of Second Temple Studies 61. London/New York, N.Y.: Continuum.
- Allegro, J. M. (1956). "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature." *JBL* 75: 174-87.
- . (1958). "Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrašim." *JBL* 77: 350-54.
- . (1968). *Qumran Cave 4.1 (4Q158–4Q186)*. DJD V. Oxford: Clarendon.

- Allen, David L. (2010). *Hebrews*. NAC 35. Nashville Tenn.: Broadman and Holman.
- Allen, David M. (2008). *Deuteronomy and Exhortation in Hebrews: A Study in Narrative Re-presentation*. WUNT 2, 238. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).
- Allen, Leslie C. (1976). *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah*. NICOT. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- _____. (1983). *Psalms 101-150*. WBC 21. Waco, Tex.: Word.
- Andersen, Francis I. (1983). "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch: A New Translation and Introduction." *OTP* 1: 91-213.
- Andersen, Francis I. and David Noel Freedman (2000). *Micah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 24E. New York, N.Y.: Doubleday.
- Anderson, A. A. (1972). *The Book of Psalms*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- Anderson, David R. (2001). *The King-Priest of Psalm 110 in Hebrews*. Studies in Biblical Literature 21. New York, N.Y.: Peter Lang.
- Anderson, Gary A. (1989). "Celibacy or Consummation in the Garden? Reflections on Early Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Garden of Eden." *HTR* 82: 121-48.
- _____. (1997). "The Exaltation of Adam and the Fall of Satan." *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 6: 105-34.
- Andreasen, Niels-Erik A. (1972). *The Old Testament Sabbath: A Tradition-Historical Investigation*. SBLDS 7. Missoula, Mont.: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Andriessen, Paul C. B. (1971). "Das grössere und vollkommene Zelt (Hebr 9:11)." *BZ* 15: 76-92.
- _____. (1976). "La Teneur Judéo-Chrétienne de He I 6 et II 14B–III 2." *NovT* 18: 293-313.
- Andriessen, Paul C. B. and A. Lenglet (1970). "Quelques passages difficiles de l'Épître aux Hébreux." *Bib* 51: 207-20.
- Arowele, P. J. (1990). "The Pilgrim People of God (An African's Reflections on the Motif of Sojourn in the Epistle to the Hebrews)." *AJT* 4: 438-55.
- Assefa, Daniel (2010). "Dreams, Book of (1 Enoch 83-90)." *DEJ*: 552-53.
- Attridge, Harold W. (1976). *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus*. HDR 7. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press.
- _____. (1980). "'Let us Strive to Enter that Rest': the Logic of Hebrews 4:1-11." *HTR* 73: 279-88.
- _____. (1984). "Josephus and His Works." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. CRINT II 2. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Assen/Philadelphia, Pa.: Van Gorcum/Fortress: 185-232.
- _____. (1986). "The Use of Antithesis in Hebrews 8-10." In *Christians among Jews and Gentiles: Essays in Honor of Krister Stendahl on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg and G. W. MacRae. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress.
- _____. (1989). *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress.
- _____. (1990). "Paraenesis in a Homily (λόγος παρακλήσεως): The Possible Location of, and Socialization in, the 'Epistle to the Hebrews'." *Semeia* 50: 211-26.
- Auffret, Pierre (1979). "Note sur la structure littéraire d'Hb II. 1-4." *NTS* 25: 166-79.

- Baillet, M. (1982). *Qumrân grotte 4:III*. DJD VII. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Baldwin, Joyce G. (1972). *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi: An Introduction and Commentary*. Leicester: IVP.
- Balz, Horst (1991). “οἰκουμένη.” *EDNT* 2: 503-04.
- Bampfylde, Gillian (1984). “The Similitudes of Enoch: Historical Allusions.” *JSJ* 15: 9-31.
- Barclay, John M. G. (1996). *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- _____. (2007). *Against Apion*. Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Barker, Margaret (1987). *The Older Testament: The Survival of Themes from the Ancient Royal Cult in Sectarian Judaism and Early Christianity*. London: SPCK.
- _____. (1989). “The Temple Measurements and the Solar Calendar.” In *Temple Scroll Studies*. Edited by George J. Brooke. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- _____. (1991). *The Gate of Heaven: The History and Symbolism of the Temple in Jerusalem*. London: SPCK.
- _____. (1995). *On Earth as it is in Heaven: Temple Symbolism in the New Testament*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- _____. (1999). “The High Priest and the Worship of Jesus.” In *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus*. *JSJSup* 63. Edited by Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila and Gladys S. Lewis. Leiden: Brill: 93-111.
- _____. (2003). *The Great High Priest: The Temple Roots of Christian Liturgy*. London: T&T Clark.
- _____. (2004). *Temple Theology: An Introduction*. London: SPCK.
- _____. (2008). “Review of Philip S. Alexander, *The Mystical Texts: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and Related Manuscripts*.” *JTS* 59: 246-48.
- Barnes, T. D. (2005). “The Sack of the Temple in Josephus and Tacitus.” In *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*. Edited by Jonathan Edmondson, Steve Mason and J. B. Rives. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 129-44.
- Barr, James (1961). *The Semantics of Biblical Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____. (1978). “Review of J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*.” *JTS* 29: 517-30.
- Barrett, C. K. (1954). “The Eschatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews.” In *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*. Edited by W. D. Davies and D. Daube. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 363-93.
- Bartels, K. H. (1986). “First, Firstborn.” *NIDNTT* 1: 664-69.
- Barth, M. (1962). “The Old Testament in Hebrews: An Essay in Biblical Hermeneutics.” In *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation*. Edited by W. Klassen and G. F. Snyder. New York, N.Y.: Harper: 53-78.
- Bartlett, John R. (1985). *Jews in the Hellenistic World: Josephus, Aristaeus, the Sibylline Oracles, Eupolemus*. Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to 200 AD. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bateman, Herbert W. IV (1997). *Early Jewish Hermeneutics and Hebrews 1:5-13: The Impact of Early Jewish Exegesis on the Interpretation of a Significant New Testament Passage*. American University Studies vii, 193. New York, N.Y.: Peter Lang.

- _____. (2001). "Psalm 45:6-7 and its Christological Contributions to Hebrews." *TJ* 22: 3-21.
- Bauckham, Richard (1981). "The Worship of Jesus in Apocalyptic Christianity." *NTS* 27: 332-41.
- _____. (1983a). *Jude, 2 Peter*. Waco, Tex.: Word.
- _____. (1983b). "The Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum of Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as Midrash." In *Studies in Midrash and Historiography*. Edited by R. T. France and David Wenham. Sheffield: JSOT Press: 33-76.
- _____. (1986). "The Apocalypses in the New Pseudepigrapha." *JSNT* 26: 97-117.
- _____. (1990). *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- _____. (1993). *The Climax of Prophecy: Studies on the Book of Revelation*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- _____. (1996). "Josephus' Account of the Temple in Contra Apionem 2:102-109." In *Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Portion Missing in Greek*. Edited by Louis H. Feldman and John R. Levison. Leiden: Brill: 327-47.
- _____. (1999). "The Throne of God and the Worship of Jesus." In *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus*. JSJSup 63. Edited by Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila and Gladys S. Lewis. Leiden: Brill: 43-69.
- _____. (2001). "Apocalypses." In *Justification and Variegated Nomism: Vol. 1, The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*. WUNT 2.140. Edited by D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien and M. A. Seifrid. Tübingen/Grand Rapids, Mich.: Mohr (Siebeck)/Baker Academic: 135-87.
- _____. (2003). "The Early Jerusalem Church, Qumran, and the Essenes." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St Andrews in 2001*. Edited by James R. Davila. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 63-89.
- _____. (2004). "Monotheism and Christology in Hebrews 1." In *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*. Early Christianity in Context. Edited by Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy S. North. London/New York, N.Y.: T&T Clark: 167-85.
- _____. (2009). "The Divinity of Jesus Christ in the Epistle to the Hebrews." In *The Epistle to Hebrews and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel Driver, Trevor Hart and Nathan MacDonald. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 15-36.
- Bauernfeind, O. (1972). "τρέχω, δρόμος, πρόδρομος." *TDNT* 8: 226-35.
- Baugh, S. M. (2006). "The Cloud of Witnesses in Hebrews 11." *WTJ* 68: 113-32.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. (1953). "Sacrifice and Worship among the Jewish Sectarials of the Dead Sea (Qumrân) Scrolls." *HTR* 46: 141-59.
- _____. (1976). "The Duodecimal Courts of Qumran, Revelation, and the Sanhedrin." *JBL* 95: 59-78.
- _____. (1977). "The Exclusion of Netinim and Proselytes in 4QFlorilegium." In *Studies in Qumran Law*. SJLA. Leiden: Brill: 75-87.
- _____. (1982). "Exclusions from the Temple: Proselytes and Agrippa I." *JJS* 33: 215-25.
- _____. (1987). "4Q503 (Daily Prayers) and the Lunar Calendar." *RevQ* 12: 399-407.
- _____. (1988). "The Qumran Sabbath Shirot and Rabbinic Merkabah Traditions." *RevQ* 13: 199-213.

- _____. (1994). "Purification after Childbirth and the Sacred Garden in 4Q265 and Jubilees." In *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris, 1992*. STDJ 15. Edited by George J. Brooke and Florentino García Martínez. Leiden: Brill: 3-10.
- _____. (1996). *Qumran Cave 4: XIII. The Damascus Document (4Q266-273)*. DJD XVIII. Oxford: Clarendon.
- _____. (1997). "Some Notes on 4Q408." *RevQ* 18: 143-33.
- Baurain, Thomas (2006). "A Short Primer on Hermeneutics." *Journal of Dispensational Theology* 10 (31): 41-49.
- Bautch, Kelley Coblentz (2003). *A Study of the Geography of 1 Enoch 17-19: "No-one Has Seen What I Have Seen."* JSJSup 81. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Beal, Timothy (1992). "Glossary." In *Reading Between Texts. Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation*. Edited by Danna Nolan Fewell. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press: 21-24.
- Beale, G. K. (1999). *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- _____. (2004a). "The Final Vision of the Apocalypse and its Implications for a Biblical Theology of the Temple." In *Heaven on Earth: The Temple in Biblical Theology*. Edited by T. Desmond Alexander and Simon Gathercole. Carlisle: Paternoster: 191-209.
- _____. (2004b). *The Temple and the Church's Mission*. New Studies in Biblical Theology 17. Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP.
- _____. (2005a). "The Descent of the Eschatological Temple in the Form of the Spirit at Pentecost: Part 1: The Clearest Evidence." *TynBul* 56: 73-102.
- _____. (2005b). "Eden, the Temple, and the Church's Mission in the New Creation." *JETS* 48: 5-31.
- Beasley-Murray, George (1999). *John*. WBC 36. 2nd ed. Dallas, Tex.: Word.
- Bedenbender, Andreas (2005). "Reflection on Ideology and Date in the Apocalypse of Weeks." In *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini, J. Harold Ellens and James Alan Waddell. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans: 200-03.
- Beentjes, Pancratius C. (1997). *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of all Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of all Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts*. VTSup 48. Leiden: Brill.
- Begg, Christopher T. (1988). "Rereading of the 'Animal Rite' of Genesis 15 in Early Jewish Narratives." *CBQ* 50: 36-46.
- _____. (2005). *Judean Antiquities Books 5-7*. Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Begg, Christopher T. and Paul Spilsbury (2005). *Judean Antiquities Books 8-10*. Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Behm, Johannes (1964). "αἷμα, αἱματεκχυσία." *TDNT* 1: 172-77.
- Ben Ezra, Daniel Stökl (2003). *The Impact of Yom Kippur on Early Christianity: The Day of Atonement from Second Temple Judaism to the Fifth Century*. WUNT 163. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).
- Ben Zvi, Ehud (1998). "Micah 1.2-16: Observations and Possible Implications." *JSOT* 77: 103-20.
- Bénétreau, S. (1989-90). *L'Épître aux Hébreux*. Vaux-sur-Seine: Edifac.
- Bergman, J., H. Ringgren and B. Lang (1980). "זבח." *TDOT* 4: 8-29.

- Bergsma, John S. (2009). "The Relationship Between Jubilees and the Early Enochic Books (Astronomical Book and the Book of the Watchers)." In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 36-51.
- Berner, Christoph (2006). *Jahre, Jahrwochen und Jubiläen: heptadische Geschichtskonzeptionen in Antiken Judentum*. BZAW 363. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Bernstein, M. (2005). "'Rewritten Bible': A Generic Category Which has Outlived its Usefulness." *Textus* 22: 169-96.
- Best, Ernest (1960). "Spiritual Sacrifice: General Priesthood in the New Testament." *Int* 16: 273-199.
- Betz, Otto (1967). "The Eschatological Interpretation of the Sinai Tradition in Qumran and in the New Testament." *RevQ* 6: 89-107.
- _____. (1987). "Firmness and Faith in Heb 11:11 and 28:16." In *Scripture - Meaning and Method: Essays Presented to Anthony Tyrrell Hanson for his Seventieth Birthday*. Edited by Barry P. Thompson. Hull: Hull University Press: 92-113.
- Beyer, Klaus (1994-2004). *Die Aramäischen texte vom Toten Meer*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Bhayro, Siam (2005). *The Shemihazah and Asael Narrative of 1 Enoch 6-11: Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary with References to Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical Antecedents*. AOAT 322. Münster: Ugarit.
- Bidawid, R. J. (1973). "4 Esdras." In *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version: Part IV, Fascicle 3*. Edited by The Peshitta Institute. Leiden: Brill: i - iv, 1-50.
- Bietenhard, H. (1951). *Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum*. WUNT 2. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).
- Bissoli, Giovanni (1994). *Il tempio nella letteratura giudaica e Neotestamentaria: Studio sulla corrispondenza fra tempio celeste e tempio terrestre*. Studium Biblicum Franciscanum: Analecta 57. Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press.
- Black, David Alan (1999a). "On the Pauline Authorship of Hebrews (Part 1): Overlooked Affinities between Hebrews and Paul." *Faith and Mission* 16 (2): 32-51.
- _____. (1999b). "On the Pauline Authorship of Hebrews (Part 2): The External Evidence Reconsidered." *Faith and Mission* 16 (3): 78-86.
- Black, Matthew (1961). *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*. New York, N.Y.: Scribners.
- _____. (1970). *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- _____. (1978). "The Apocalypse of Weeks in the Light of 4Q En^g." *VT* 28: 464-69.
- _____. (1984). "Two Unusual *Nomina Dei* in the Second Vision of Enoch." In *The New Testament Age: Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke*. Edited by William C. Weinrich. Macon, Ga.: Mercer: 53-59.
- Black, Matthew and James C. VanderKam (1985). *The Book of Enoch, or I Enoch with Commentary and Textual Notes; with an Appendix on the Astronomical Chapters (72-82) by Otto Neugebauer*. SVTP 7. Leiden: Brill.
- Blake, Robert P. (1926). "The Georgian Version of Fourth Esdras from the Jerusalem Manuscript." *HTR* 19: 299-375.
- Blendinger, C. (1976). "Θρόνος." *NIDNTT* 2: 611-15.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph (1976). "The Structure of P." *CBQ* 38: 275-92.

- Blomberg, Craig L. (2004). "Better Things in This Case: The Superiority of Today's New International Version in Hebrews." *BT* 55: 311-18.
- _____. (2008). "But We See Jesus: The Relationship between the Son of Man in Hebrews 2:6 & Verse 9 and the Implications for English Translations." In *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrews in its Ancient Contexts*. LNTS 387. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Trevor Hart, Nathan MacDonald and Daniel Driver. London: T&T Clark: 88-99.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele (1991). *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought, 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E.* Minneapolis: Fortress.
- _____. (1998). *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways Between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans.
- _____. (2005). "Introduction: From the Enoch Literature to Enochic Judaism." In *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini, J. Harold Ellens and James Alan Waddell. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans: 1-14.
- Bockmuehl, Markus N. A. (1990). *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity*. WUNT 2, 36. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).
- _____. (1995). "Review of Annette Steudel *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b}): materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ('Florilegium') und 4Q177 ('Catena A') repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden*." *VT* 45: 429-30.
- _____. (2009). "Abraham's Faith in Hebrews 11." In *The Epistle to Hebrews and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel Driver, Trevor Hart and Nathan MacDonald. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 364-73.
- Bogaert, Pierre (1969). *Apocalypse de Baruch: Introduction, Traduction du Syriaque et Commentaire*. Paris: Éditions du cerf.
- Bokser, Baruch M. (1985). "Approaching Sacred Space." *HTR* 78: 279-99.
- Boorer, S. (2001). "The Earth/Land in the Priestly Material: The Preservation of the 'Good' Earth and the Promised Land throughout the Generations." *ABR* 49: 19-33.
- Borgen, Peder (1984). "Philo of Alexandria." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. CRINT II 2. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Assen/Philadelphia, Pa.: Van Gorcum/Fortress: 233-82.
- Bornkamm, Günther (1959). *Studien zu Antike und Urchristentum*. BEvT. Munich: Chr. Kaiser.
- _____. (1967). "μυστήριον." *TDNT* 4: 802-28.
- Borsch, Frederick H. (1967). *The Son of Man in Myth and History*. London: SCM.
- _____. (1992). "Further Reflections on the Son of Man: The Origins and Development of the Title." In *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity; the First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth, J. Brownson, M. T. Davis, S. J. Kraftchick and A. F. Segal. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress: 130-44.
- Böttrich, Christfried (1991). "Recent Studies in the Slavonic Book of Enoch." *JSP* 5: 35-52.
- _____. (2001). "The Melchizedek Story of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: a Reaction to A. Orlov." *JSJ* 32: 445-70.
- Bovon, François (2002). *Luke 1*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress.
- Bow, Beverly A. (2000). "Melchizedek's Birth Narrative in 2 Enoch 68-73: Christian Correlations." In *For A Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by Randal

- A. Argall, Beverly A. Bow and Rodney A. Werline. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International: 33-41.
- Box, G. H. (1912). *The Ezra-Apocalypse, Being Chapters 3-14 of the Book Commonly Known as 4 Ezra (or II Esdras)*. London: Pitman.
- _____. (1913). "IV Ezra." *APOT* 2: 542-624.
- Box, G. H. and W. O. E. Oesterley (1913). "The Book of Sirach." *APOT* 1: 268-517.
- Brady, Cora (1965). "The World to Come in the Epistle to the Hebrews." *Worship* 39: 329-39.
- Braulik, Georg (1986). "Gottes Ruhe—Das Land oder der Tempel? Zu Psalm 95, 11." In *Freude an der Weisung des Herrn: Beiträge zur Theologie der Psalmen; Festgabe zum 70. Geburtstag von Heinrich Gros*. Edited by Ernst Haag and Frank-Lothar Hossfeld. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk: 33-44.
- Braun, H. (1970). "Das himmlische Vaterland bei Philo und im Hebräerbrief." In *Verborum Veritas: Festschrift für Gustav Stählin zum 70*. Edited by O. Böcher and K. Haacker. Wuppertal: Brockhaus: 319-27.
- _____. (1984). *An die Hebräer*. HNT 14. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).
- Brawley, Robert L. (1993). "Discursive Structure and the Unseen in Hebrews 2:8 and 11:1: A Neglected Aspect of the Context." *CBQ* 55: 81-98.
- Breech, Earl (1973). "These Fragments I have Shored against My Ruins: The Form and Function of 4 Ezra." *JBL* 92: 267-74.
- Brekelmans, H. W. (1965). "The Saints of the Most High and their Kingdom." *OTS* 14: 305-29.
- Brenner, Martin Leon (1991). *The Song of the Sea: Ex. 15:1-21*. BZAW 195. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Brockelmann, Carolo (1895). *Lexicon Syriacum*. Edinburgh/Berlin: T&T Clark/Reuther & Reichard.
- Brooke, George J. (1985). *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in Context*. JSOTSup 29. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- _____. (1993). "4QTestament of Levi^d (?) and the Messianic Servant High Priest." In *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge*. JSNTSup 84. Edited by Martinus C. De Boer. Sheffield: JSOT Press: 83-100.
- _____. (1994). "Isaiah 40:3 and the Wilderness Community." In *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris, 1992*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Florentino García Martínez. Leiden: Brill: 117-32.
- _____. (1995). "Review of Annette Steudel *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b}): materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ('Florilegium') und 4Q177 ('Catena A') repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden*." *JSJ* 26: 380-84.
- _____. (1996). "From 'Assembly of Supreme Holiness for Aaron' to 'Sanctuary of Adam': The Laicization of Temple Ideology in the Qumran Scrolls and its Wider Implications." *Journal for Semitics* 8: 119-45.
- _____. (1999). "Miqdash Adam, Eden and the Qumran Community." In *Gemeinde ohne Temple/Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. WUNT 118. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange and Peter Pilhofer. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck): 285-301.
- _____. (2005a). *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament: Essays in Mutual Illumination*. London: SPCK.
- _____. (2005b). "Men and Women as Angels in Joseph and Aseneth." *JSP* 14: 159-77.

- _____. (2007). "The Ten Temples in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*. Edited by John Day. London: T&T Clark: 417-34.
- _____. (2010). "The 'Apocalyptic' Community, the Matrix of the Teacher and Rewriting Scripture." In *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*. JSJSup 141. Edited by Mladen Popović. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 37-53.
- Broshi, M (1995). "Visionary Architecture and Town Planning in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989-1990*. STDJ 16. Edited by D. Dimant and L. H. Schiffman. Leiden: Brill: 9-22.
- Brown, Colin (1986). "χρηματίζω." *NIDNTT* 3: 324-25.
- Brown, Raymond E. (1968). *The Semitic Background of the Term 'Mystery' in the New Testament*. FBBS 21. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress.
- Bruce, A. B. (1899). *The Epistle to the Hebrews: The First Apology for Christianity*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Bruce, F. F. (1959). *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*. London: Tyndale.
- _____. (1978). *The Time is Fulfilled*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- _____. (1985). "The Structure and Argument of Hebrews." *SwJT* 28: 6-12.
- _____. (1990). *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Buchanan, G. W. (1972). *To the Hebrews*. AB 36. New York, N.Y.: Doubleday.
- Büchner, Dirk L (2007). "Leuitikon." In *NETS*. Electronic ed. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin Wright. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 82-106.
- Buitenwerf, Rieuwerd (2003). *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles and its Social Setting: With an Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. SVTP 17. Leiden: Brill.
- Bultmann, Rudolph (1964). "ἀληθεια, ἀληθής, ἀληθινός, ἀληθεύω." *TDNT* 1: 232-51.
- Bultmann, Rudolph and K. H. Rengstorf (1964). "ἐλπίς κ.τ.λ." *TDNT* 2: 517-35.
- Burge, Gary M. (2010). *Jesus and the Land: The New Testament Challenge to "Holy Land" Theology*. London/Grand Rapids, Mich.: SPCK/Baker Academic.
- Burkes, Shannon (2002). "Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Wisdom of Solomon." *HTR* 95: 21-44.
- Burkitt, F. Crawford (1913). *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. The Schweich Lectures, 1913. London: Oxford University Press.
- Burrows, Eric (1935). "Some Cosmological Patterns in Babylonian Religion." In *The Labyrinth: Further Studies in the Relation Between Myth and Ritual in the Ancient World*. Edited by S. H. Hooke. London: SPCK: 43-70.
- Burtress, J. H. (1958). "Plato, Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews." *LQ* 10: 54-64.
- Burton, Ernest de Witt (1976). *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of New Testament Greek*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Kregel.
- Burton, Gideon O. (1996-2003) "Hendiadys." *Silva Rhetoricae*. Online: <http://humanities.byu.edu/rhetoric/silva.htm>. Retrieved 31 March 2005.

- Busse, U. (1990). “διέρχονται.” *EDNT* 1: 322-23.
- Caird, G. B. (1959). “The Exegetical Method of the Epistle to the Hebrews.” *CJT* 5: 44-51.
- _____. (1961). “Under-estimated Theological Books: Alexander Nairne’s ‘The Epistle of Priesthood.’” *ExpTim* 72: 204-06.
- _____. (1970). “The Christological Basis of Christian Hope.” In *The Christian Hope*. Theological Collections 13. London: SPCK: 9-24.
- _____. (1984). “Son by Appointment.” In *The New Testament Age: Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke*. Edited by W. C. Wienrich. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press. 1: 73-81.
- Callaway, P. (1985). “Exegetische Erwägungen zur Tempelrolle XXIX, 7-10.” *RevQ* 12: 95-104.
- _____. (1986-87). “Source Criticism of the Temple Scroll: The Purity Laws.” *RevQ* 12: 213-22.
- _____. (1989). “Extending Divine Revelation: Micro-Compositional Studies in the Temple Scroll.” In *Temple Scroll Studies*. Edited by George J. Brooke. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press: 149-62.
- Calvin, John (1996). *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews*. Ages Software. CD ed. Albany, N.Y.
- Campbell, Constantine R. (2007). *Verbal Aspect in the Indicative Mood, and Narrative: Soundings in the Greek New Testament*. Studies in Biblical Greek 13. New York: Peter Lang.
- _____. (2008a). *Basics of Verbal Aspect in Biblical Greek*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan.
- _____. (2008b). *Verbal Aspect in Non-Indicative Verbs: Further Soundings in the Greek New Testament*. Studies in Biblical Greek 15. New York: Peter Lang.
- _____. (2011). “Breaking Perfect Rules: The Traditional Understanding of the Greek Perfect.” In *Discourse Studies & Biblical Interpretation: A Festschrift in Honor of Stephen H. Levinson*. Edited by Stephen E. Runge. Bellingham, Wash.: Logos Bible Software: 139-55.
- Campbell, Jonathan G. (2004). *The Exegetical texts*. Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 4. London: T&T Clark.
- _____. (2005). “‘Rewritten Bible’ and ‘Parabiblical Texts’: A Terminological and Ideological Critique.” In *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 8-10 September 2003*. Edited by Jonathan G. Campbell, William John Lyons and Lloyd K. Pietersen. London: T&T Clark: 43-68.
- Caneday, A. B. (2008). “The Eschatological World Already Subjected to the Son: The οἰκουμένη of Hebrews 1:6 and the Son’s Enthronement.” In *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrews in its Ancient Contexts*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel Driver, Trevor Hart and Nathan MacDonald. London: T&T Clark: 28-39.
- Caquot, A. (1988). “Le service des anges.” *RevQ* 13: 421-49.
- _____. (1998). “Les Testaments Qoumrâniens des Pères du Sacerdoce.” *RHPR* 78: 3-26.
- Carlson, David C. (1982). “Vengeance and Angelic Mediation in Testament of Moses 9 and 10.” *JBL* 101: 85-98.
- Carlsson, Leif (2004). *Round Trips to Heaven: Otherworldly Travellers in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Lund Studies in the History of Religions 19. Lund: Department of History and Anthropology of Religions, Lund University.
- Casey, J. M. (1982). “Christian Assembly in Hebrews: A Fantasy Island.” *TD* 30: 323-35.

- Cassuto, Umberto (1961-64). *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press.
- Cathcart, Kevin J. and Robert P. Gordon (1989). *The Targum of the Minor Prophets*. ArBib. Wilmington, Del.: Michael Gazier.
- Charles, J. Daryl (1990). "The Angels, Sonship and Birthright in the Letter to the Hebrews." *JETS* 33: 171-78.
- Charles, R. H. (1906). *Anecdota Oxoniensia, the Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- _____. (1908). *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- _____. (1912). *The Book of Enoch*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- _____. (1913a). "The Assumption of Moses." *APOT* 2: 407-24.
- _____. (1913b). "Book of Enoch." *APOT* 2: 163-277.
- _____. (1913c). "The Book of Jubilees." *APOT* 2: 1-82.
- _____. (1913d). "The Book of the Secrets of Enoch: Introduction." *APOT* 2: 425-30.
- _____. (1913e). "II Baruch, or the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch." *APOT* 2: 470-526.
- _____. (1913f). "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *APOT* 2: 296-367.
- _____. (1966). *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Oxford/Darmstadt: Oxford University Press/Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Charlesworth, James H. (1980). "The Portrayal of the Righteous as an Angel." In *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*. SBLSCS 12. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press: 135-51.
- _____. (1981a). "Christian and Jewish Self-Definition in the Light of the Christian Additions to the Apocryphal Writings." In *Christian and Jewish Self-Definition. Volume 2: Aspects of Judaism in the Greco-Roman Period*. Edited by E. P. Sanders, A. I. Baumgarten and Alan Mendelson. London: SCM: 27-55.
- _____. (1981b). *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research, with a Supplement*. SBLSCS 7S. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press.
- _____. (1985). *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament: Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins*. SNTSMS 54. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. (1993). "In the Crucible: The Pseudepigrapha as Biblical Interpretation." In *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*. JSPSup 14. Edited by James H. Charlesworth and Craig A. Evans. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press: 20-43.
- _____. (1998). "The Date of the Parables of Enoch (1 En 37-71)." *Hen* 20: 93-98.
- Charlesworth, James H. and B. A. Strawn (1996). "Reflections on the Text of Serek Ha-Yahad found in Cave IV." *RevQ* 17: 403-35.
- Charlesworth, James H. and Loren T. Stuckenbruck (1994a). "Blessings (1QSb)." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth, F. M. Cross, J. Milgrom, E. Qimron, L. H. Schiffman, L. T. Stuckenbruck and R. E. Whittaker. Tübingen/Louisville, Ky.: Mohr (Siebeck): 119-31.
- _____. (1994b). "Rule of the Congregation." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Edited by James H.

- Charlesworth, F. M. Cross, J. Milgrom, E. Qimron, L. H. Schiffman, L. T. Stuckenbruck and R. E. Whittaker. Tübingen/Louisville, Ky.: Mohr (Siebeck): 108-17.
- Chazon, Esther G. (1992-93). "On the Special Character of Sabbath Prayer." *Journal of Jewish Music and Liturgy* 15: 1-21.
- _____. (1994). "Prayers from Qumran and their Historical Implications." *DSD* 1: 265-84.
- _____. (1999a). "Hymns and Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill. 1: 244-70.
- _____. (1999b). "Prayers." In *Qumran Cave 4. XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2*. DJD XXIX. Edited by Emanuel Tov. Oxford: Clarendon. 29: 343-78; 91-419.
- _____. (2000). "The Function of the Qumran Prayer Texts: An Analysis of the Daily Prayers (4Q503)." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery 1947-1997. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov and James C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in Cooperation with the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum: 217-25.
- _____. (2003). "Human and Angelic Prayer in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 19-23 January, 2000*. STDJ 48. Edited by Esther G. Chazon, with the Collaboration of Ruth Clements and Avital Pinnick. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 35-47.
- Chester, Andrew N. (1991a). "Hebrews: The Final Sacrifice." In *Sacrifice and Redemption: Durham Essays in Theology*. Edited by S. W. Sykes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 57-72.
- _____. (1991b). "The Sibyl and the Temple." In *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple Presented to Ernst Bammel*. JSNTSup 48. Edited by William Horbury. Sheffield: JSOT Press: 37-69.
- Chialà, Sabino (2007). "The Son of Man: The Evolution of an Expression." In *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of the Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 153-78.
- Childs, Brevard S. (1969). "Psalm 8 in the Context of the Christian Canon." *Int* 23: 20-31.
- _____. (2001). *Isaiah*. OTL. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox.
- Chilton, Bruce D. (1987). *The Isaiah Targum: Introduction, Translation, Apparatus and Notes*. ArBib. Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier.
- Church, Philip A. F. (2008). "'The True Tent which the Lord has Pitched': Balaam's Oracles in Second Temple Judaism and in Hebrews." In *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrews in its Ancient Contexts*. LNTS 387. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel Driver, Trevor Hart and Nathan MacDonald. London: T&T Clark: 145-57.
- _____. (2009). "Dispensational Christian Zionism: a Strange but Acceptable Aberration or a Deviant Heresy?" *WTJ* 71: 375-98.
- _____. (2011a). "'God Has by No Means Rejected His People' (Rom 11:1): A Response to the Accusation of 'Replacement Theology'." In *The Gospel and the Land of Promise: Christian Approaches to the Land of the Bible*. Edited by Philip Church, Peter Walker, Tim Bulkeley and Tim Meadowcroft. Eugene, Ore.: Wipf and Stock: 147-57.
- _____. (2011b). "'Here We Have No Lasting City' (Heb 13:14): The Promised Land in the Letter to the Hebrews." In *The Gospel and the Land of Promise: Christian Approaches to the Land of the Bible*. Edited by Philip Church, Peter Walker, Tim Bulkeley and Tim Meadowcroft. Eugene, Ore.: Wipf and Stock: 45-57.

- Chyutin, Michael (1997). *The New Jerusalem Scroll from Qumran: A Comprehensive Reconstruction*. JSPSup 25. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Clements, R. E. (1965). *God and Temple*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress.
- Clifford, R. J. (1972). *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament*. HSM. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Cockerill, Gareth Lee (1999). "Hebrews 1:6: Source and Significance." *BBR* 9: 51-64.
- _____. (2001). "Structure and Interpretation in Hebrews 8:1–10:18: A Symphony in Three Movements." *BBR* 11: 179-201.
- Cody, Aelred (1960). *Heavenly Sanctuary and Liturgy in the Epistle to the Hebrews: The Achievement of Salvation in the Epistle's Perspectives*. St Meinrad, Ind.: Grail Publications.
- Cohn, Leopold (1898). "An Apocryphal Work Ascribed to Philo of Alexandria." *JQR* 10: 277-332.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro (1976). "Composition and Redaction of the Testament of Moses 10." *HTR* 69: 179-86.
- _____. (1986). "Introduction: Early Christian Apocalypticism." *Semeia* 36: 1-11.
- _____. (1991a). "The Apocalyptic Son of Man Sayings." In *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester*. Edited by Birger A. Pearson, A. Thomas Kraabel, George W. E. Nickelsburg and Norman R. Petersen. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress.
- _____. (1995a). "The Seven Heavens in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses." In *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys*. Edited by John J. Collins and Michael Fishbane. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press: 59-93.
- _____. (2007a). "The Secret Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and the Gospel of Mark: A Response to Leslie W. Walck." In *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of the Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 338-42.
- Collins, John J. (1973a). "The Date and Provenance of the Testament of Moses." In *Studies on the Testament of Moses*. SBLSCS 4. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg. Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature: 15-32.
- _____. (1973b). "Some Remaining Tradition-Historical Problems in the Testament of Moses." In *Studies on the Testament of Moses*. SBLSCS 4. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg. Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature: 38-43.
- _____. (1974a). "The Place of the Fourth Sibyl in the Development of the Jewish Sibyllina." *JJS* 25: 365-80.
- _____. (1974b). "The Provenance of the Third Sibylline Oracle." *Bulletin of the Institute of Jewish Studies* 2: 1-18.
- _____. (1974c). *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism*. SBLDS 13. Missoula, Mont.: Society of Biblical Literature.
- _____. (1975). "The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll: A Point of Transition in Jewish Apocalyptic." *VT* 25: 596-612.
- _____. (1977). "Cosmos and Salvation: Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic in the Hellenistic Age." *HR* 17 (2): 121-42.
- _____. (1978). "Methodological Issues in the Study of 1 Enoch: Reflections on the Articles of P. D. Hanson and G. W. Nickelsburg." In *SBL 1978 Seminar Papers*. Edited by Paul J. Achtemeier. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press. 1: 315-22.

- _____. (1979). "Introduction: The Morphology of a Genre." *Semeia* 14: 1-20.
- _____. (1980). "The Heavenly Representative The 'Son of Man' in the Similitudes of Enoch." In *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*. SBLSCS 12. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg and John J. Collins. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press: 111-33.
- _____. (1982). "The Apocalyptic Technique: Setting and Function in the Book of Watchers." *CBQ* 44: 91-111.
- _____. (1983a). "The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic Judaism." In *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*. Edited by David Hellholm. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck): 531-47.
- _____. (1983b). "Sibylline Oracles: A New Translation and Introduction." *OTP* 1: 317-472.
- _____. (1984a). "The Sibylline Oracles." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. CRINT II 2. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Assen/Philadelphia, Pa.: Van Gorcum/Fortress: 357-81.
- _____. (1984b). "Testaments." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. CRINT II 2. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Assen/Philadelphia, Pa.: Van Gorcum/Fortress: 325-55.
- _____. (1987a). "The Development of the Sibylline Tradition." In *Hellenistisches Judentum in römischer Zeit, ausgenommen Philon und Josephus*. ANRW 2, 20.1. Edited by Wolfgang Haase and Hildegard Temporini. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter: 421-59.
- _____. (1987b). "The Kingdom of God in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha." In *The Kingdom of God in 20th-Century Interpretation*. Edited by Wendell Willis. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson.
- _____. (1991b). "Genre, Ideology and Social Movements in Jewish Apocalypticism." In *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium*. Edited by John J. Collins and James H. Charlesworth. Sheffield: JSOT Press: 11-32.
- _____. (1992). "The Son of Man in First-Century Judaism." *NTS* 38: 448-66.
- _____. (1993). *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress.
- _____. (1994). "The Sibyl and the Potter: Political Propaganda in Ptolemaic Egypt." In *Religious Propaganda and Missionary Competition in the New Testament World: Essays Honoring Dieter Georgi*. NovTSup 74. Edited by Lukas Bormann, Kelly Del Tredici and Angela Standhartinger. Leiden: Brill.
- _____. (1995b). "Review of Annette Steudel *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{ab}): materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ('Florilegium') und 4Q177 ('Catena A') repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden*." *JBL* 114: 314-16.
- _____. (1995c). "A Throne in the Heavens: Apotheosis in Pre-Christian Judaism." In *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys*. Edited by John J. Collins and Michael Fishbane. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press: 43-58.
- _____. (1997a). *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Routledge.
- _____. (1997b). *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*. OTL. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press.
- _____. (1998). *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- _____. (2000a). *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.

- _____. (2000b). "Powers in Heaven: God, Gods, and Angels in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by John J. Collins and Robert A. Kugler. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans: 9-28.
- _____. (2003). "Review of Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*." *JSJ* 24: 73-79.
- _____. (2004a). "Before the Fall: The Earliest Interpretations of Adam and Eve." In *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*. JSJSup 83. Edited by Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman. Leiden/Boston, Mass.: Brill 293-308.
- _____. (2004b). "The Third Sibyl Revisited." In *Things Revealed: Studies in Early Jewish and Christian Literature in Honor of Michael E. Stone*. JSJSup 89. Edited by Esther G. Chazon, David Satran and Ruth A. Clements. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 3-19.
- _____. (2007b). "The Angelic Life." In *Metamorphoses: Resurrection, Body and Transformative Practices in Early Christianity*. Ekstasis 1. Edited by Turid Carlsen Seim and Jorunn Økland. Berlin/New York, N.Y.: Walter de Gruyter: 291-310.
- _____. (2007c). "Enoch and the Son of Man: A Response to Sabino Chialà and Helge Kvanvig." In *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of the Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 216-27.
- _____. (2007d). "'Enochic Judaism' and the Sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 283-99.
- _____. (2007e). "The Nature and Aims of the Sect Known from the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. Edited by Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech and Eibert Tigchelaar. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 31-52.
- _____. (2009). "Beyond the Qumran Community: Social Organization in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *DSD* 16: 351-69.
- Collins, Marilyn F. (1972). "The Hidden Vessels in Samaritan Traditions." *JSJ* 3: 97-116.
- Colpe, Carsten (1972). "ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου." *TDNT* 8: 400-77.
- Combrink, H. J. B. (1971). "Some Thoughts on the Old Testament Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews." *Neot* 5: 21-36.
- Comfort, Philip W. and David P. Barrett (2001). *The Text of the Earliest Greek Manuscripts; New and Complete Transcriptions with Photographs*. Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale House.
- Conzelmann, Hans (1975). *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress.
- Coppens, E. (1956). "La Portée Messianique du Psaume CX." *ETL* 32: 5-23.
- Cornely, R. (1910). *Commentarius in librum Sapientiae*. Paris: P. Lethielleux.
- Cosby, M. R. (1988). "The Rhetorical Composition of Hebrews 11." *JBL* 107: 257-73.
- Coxe, A. Cleveland (1975). *Fathers of the Second Century: Hermas, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, and Clement Of Alexandria (Entire), Chronologically Arranged with Notes, Prefaces, and Elucidations*. The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Volume 2. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- _____. (1996). *The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus, Chronologically Arranged with Notes, Prefaces, and Elucidations*. The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Volume 1. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.

- _____. (1997). *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325*. The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Volume 4. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- Craigie, Peter C. (1983). *Psalms 1-50*. WBC 19. Waco, Tex.: Word.
- Crawford, Sidnie White (1985). "Three Fragments from Qumran Cave 4 and Their Relationship to the Temple Scroll." *JQR* 85: 259-73.
- _____. (2000). *The Temple Scroll and Related Texts*. Companion to the Scrolls 2. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- _____. (2008). *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, Mich.
- Cremer, Hermann (1895). *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek*. 4th English ed., with Supplement. Edinburgh/New York, N.Y.: T&T Clark/Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Cross, Frank Moore (1947). "The Tabernacle." *BA* 10 (5): 45-68.
- _____. (1953). "The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah." *JNES* 12: 274-77.
- _____. (1973). *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- _____. (1994). "Paleographical Dates of the Manuscripts." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth, F. M. Cross, J. Milgrom, E. Qimron, L. H. Schiffman, L. T. Stuckenbruck and R. E. Whittaker. Tübingen/Louisville, Ky.: Mohr (Siebeck): 57.
- _____. (1995). *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker.
- Culler, Jonathan (2001). *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction. With a New Preface by the Author*. London: Routledge.
- Cullmann, Oscar (1962). *Christ and Time*. Rev. ed. London: SCM.
- _____. (1963). *The Christology of the New Testament*. Rev. ed. Philadelphia, Penn.: Westminster.
- D'Angelo, M. R. (1979). *Moses in the Letter to the Hebrews*. SBLDS 42. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press.
- Dahl, N. A. (1951). "A New and Living Way: The Approach to God According to Heb 10:19-25." *Int* 5: 401-12.
- Daniélou, Jean (1957). "La symbolique du temple de Jerusalem chez Philon et Josephé." In *La symbolisme cosmique des monuments religieux*. Serie Orientale Rome XIV. Edited by Estremo Oriente. Rome: Instituto Italiano per il Medio: 83-90.
- Davenport, Gene L. (1971). *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*. StPB. Leiden: Brill.
- Davids, Peter H. (1990). *The First Epistle of Peter*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- Davidson, A. B. (1959). *The Epistle to the Hebrews: With Introduction and Notes*. Handbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Davidson, Maxwell J. (1992). *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1-36, 72-108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran*. JSPSup 11. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

- Davidson, Richard M. (1981). *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical TUPOS Structures*. Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series II. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press.
- _____. (2001). "Christ's Entry 'Within the Veil' in Hebrews 6:19-20: The Old Testament Background." *AUSS* 39: 175-90.
- _____. (2002). "Inauguration or Day of Atonement? A Response to Norman Young's 'Old Testament Background to Hebrews 6:19-20 Revisited'." *AUSS* 40: 69-88.
- Davies, G. H. (1973). "Psalm 95." *ZAW* 85: 183-95.
- Davies, John A. (1998). "The Temple Scroll from Qumran and the Ultimate Temple." *RTR* 57: 1-21.
- Davies, Philip R. (1977). *1QM, The War Scroll from Qumran: its Structure and History*. BibOr 32. Rome: Biblical Institute Press.
- _____. (1995). "Review of Annette Steudel *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b}): materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ("Florilegium") und 4Q177 ("Catena A") repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden*." *JTS* 46: 236-39.
- _____. (2006). "The Biblical and Qumranic Concept of War." In *The Bible and The Scrolls. Volume 1: Scripture and the Scrolls*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press. 1: 209-32.
- Davies, Philip R., George J. Brooke and Phillip R. Callaway (2002). *The Complete World of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Davies, W. D. (1974). *The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine*. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Davila, James R. (1999). "Heavenly Ascents in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill. 2: 461-85.
- _____. (2000). *Liturgical Works*. Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls 6. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- _____. (2002). "The Macrocosmic Temple, Scriptural Exegesis, and the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice." *DSD* 9: 1-19.
- _____. (2005a). "(How) Can We Tell if a Greek Apocryphon or Pseudepigraphon has been Translated from Hebrew or Aramaic?" *JSP* 15: 3-61.
- _____. (2005b). *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha*. JSJSup 105. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- De Jonge, Marinus (1953). *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of their Text, Composition and Origin*. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- _____. (1960). "Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *NovT* 4: 182-235.
- _____. (1974). "Notes on the Testament of Levi II-VII." In *Travels in the World of the Old Testament: Studies Presented to Professor M. A. Beek on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*. Edited by M. S. H. G. Heerma van Voss, Ph. H. Houwink ten Cate and N. A. van Uchelen. Assen: Van Gorcum: 132-45.
- _____. (1975). *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Leiden: Brill.
- _____. (1987). "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Central Problems and Essential Viewpoints." In *Hellenistisches Judentum in römischer Zeit, ausgenommen Philon und Josephus*. ANRW 2, 20.1. Edited by Wolfgang Haase and Hildegard Temporini. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter: 359-420.

- _____. (1991). *Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Collected Essays of Marinus De Jonge*. NovTSup 73. Leiden/New York, N.Y./København/Köln: Brill.
- De Jonge, Marinus, and Johannes Tromp (1998). "Jacob's Son Levi in the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha." In *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*. Edited by Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergren. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International: 203-36.
- De Jonge, Marinus, in cooperation with H. W. Hollander, H. J. De Jonge and T. H. Korteweg (1978). *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*. Leiden: Brill.
- De Jonge, Marinus and A. S. Van der Woude (1965-66). "11QMelchizedek and the New Testament." *NTS* 12: 301-26.
- De Souza, E. B. (2005). "The Heavenly Sanctuary/Temple Motif in the Hebrew Bible: Function and Relationship to the Earthly Counterparts." PhD Thesis. Andrews University.
- De Vaux, Roland (1997). *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*. Grand Rapids, Mich./Livonia, Mich.: Eerdmans/Dove Booksellers.
- De Wet, Chris L. (2010). "The Messianic Interpretation of Psalm 8:4-6 in Hebrews 2:6-9. Part II." In *Psalms and Hebrews: Studies in Reception*. Edited by Dirk J. Human and Gert J. Steyn. New York, N.Y./London: T&T Clark: 113-25.
- De Young, James Calvin (1960). *Jerusalem in the New Testament: The Significance of the City in the History of Redemption and in Eschatology*. Kampen: Kok.
- Dean-Otting, Mary (1984). *Heavenly Journeys: A Study of the Motif in Hellenistic Jewish Literature*. Frankfurt-am-Main: Peter Lang.
- Decock, P. B. (1983). "Holy Ones, Sons of God, and The Transcendent Future of the Righteous in 1 Enoch and the New Testament." *Neot* 17: 70-82.
- Dederling, S. (1973). "Apocalypse of Baruch." In *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version: Part IV, Fascicle 3*. Edited by The Peshitta Institute. Leiden: Brill: i - iv, 1-50.
- Deichgräber, Reinhard (1967). *Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit*. SUNT 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Delcor, M. (1952). "L'eschatologie des documents de Khirbet Qumran." *RevScRel* 26: 363-86.
- Delitzsch, F. (1868). *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Delling, G. (1964). "ἄρχω, κ.τ.λ." *TDNT* 1: 478-89.
- _____. (1972). "τέλος, κ.τ.λ." *TDNT* 8: 49-87.
- DesCamp, Mary Therese (1997). "Why Are These Women Here? An Examination of the Sociological Setting of Pseudo-Philo Through Comparative Reading." *JSP* 16: 53-80.
- _____. (2007). *Metaphor and Ideology: Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum and Literary Methods through a Cognitive Lens*. Biblical Interpretation Series. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- DeSilva, David A. (1995). *Despising Shame: Honor Discourse and Community Maintenance in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. SBLDS 152. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press.
- _____. (2000a). "Entering God's Rest: Eschatology and the Socio-Rhetorical Strategy of Hebrews." *TJ* 21: 25-43.

- _____. (2000b). *Perseverance in Gratitude: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on the Epistle 'to the Hebrews'*. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans.
- _____. (2002). *Introducing the Apocrypha; Message, Content and Significance*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic.
- Dexinger, Ferdinand (1977). *Henochs Zehnwochenapokalypse und offene Probleme der Apokalyptikforschung*. StPB. Leiden: Brill.
- Dey, Lala Kalyan Kumar (1975). *The Intermediary World and Patterns of Perfection in Philo and Hebrews*. SBLDS 25. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press.
- Dillmann, August (1853). *Das Buch Henoch*. Uebersetzt und erklärt. Leipzig: Vogel.
- Dimant, Devorah (1978). "1 Enoch 6-11: A Methodological Perspective." In *SBL 1978 Seminar Papers*. Edited by Paul J. Achtemeier. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press. 1: 323-39.
- _____. (1982). "Jerusalem and the Temple in the Animal Apocalypse (1 Enoch 85-90) in the Light of the Ideology of the Dead Sea Sect." *Sbnoton* 5-6: 177-93 (*non videtur*).
- _____. (1983). "The Biography of Enoch and the Books of Enoch." *VT* 33: 14-29.
- _____. (1984). "Qumran Sectarian Literature." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. CRINT II 2. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Assen/Philadelphia, Pa.: Van Gorcum/Fortress: 483-550.
- _____. (1986). "4Q Florilegium and the Idea of the Community as Temple." In *Hellenica et Judaica: Hommage à V. Nikiprowetzky*. Edited by A. Caquot, M. Hadas-Lebel and J. Riaud. Leuven: Peeters: 165-89.
- _____. (1996). "Men as Angels: The Self-Image of the Qumran Community." In *Religion and Politics in the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Adele Berlin. Bethesda, Md.: University Press of Maryland: 93-103.
- _____. (2007). "The Qumran Aramaic Texts and the Qumran Community." In *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. Edited by Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech and Eibert Tigchelaar. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 297-05.
- DiTommaso, Lorenzo (1999). "Dating the Eagle Vision of 4 Ezra: a New Look at an Old Theory." *JSP* 20: 3-38.
- _____. (2007). "Apocalypses and Apocalypticism in Antiquity (Part 1)." *CBR* 5: 235-86.
- Docherty, Susan E. (2009). *The Use of the Old Testament in Hebrews*. WUNT 260. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).
- Dochhorn, Jan (2007). "The Motif of the Angels' Fall in Early Judaism." In *Angels: The Concept of Celestial Beings—Origins, Development and Reception*. Edited by Friedrich Vinzenz Reiterer, Tobias Nicklas and Karin Schöpfli. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter: 477-95.
- Doering, Lutz (2009). "Purity and Impurity in Jubilees." In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 261-75.
- Donadoni, S. (1960). "Un frammento della versione copta del 'libro di Enoch'." *AcOr* 25: 197-202.
- Donaldson, Terence L. (1985). *Jesus on the Mountain: A Study in Matthean Theology*. JSNTSup 8. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Doran, Robert (1987). "T. Mos. 4:8 and the Second Temple." *JBL* 106: 491-92.
- Douglas, Michael C. (1999). "The Teacher Hymn Hypothesis Revisited: New Data for an Old Crux." *DSD* 6: 239-66.

- Draper, J. A. (1988). "The Twelve Apostles as Foundation Stones of the Heavenly Jerusalem and the Foundation of the Qumran Community." *Neot* 22: 41-61.
- Drawnel, Henryk (2004). *An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran: A New Interpretation of the Levi Document*. JSJSup 86. Leiden: Brill.
- Driver, S. R. (1906). *The Minor Prophets: Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*. The Century Bible. Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons.
- Duhaime, Jean (1982). "Dualistic Reworking in the Scrolls from Qumran." *CBQ* 49: 32-56.
- _____. (2004). *The War Texts: 1QM and Related Manuscripts*. Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 6. London: T&T Clark.
- Dumbrell, William J. (1976). "The Spirits of Just Men Made Perfect." *ETQ* 48: 154-59.
- Duncan, Julie Ann (1995). "4QDeut." In *Qumran Cave 4, IX*. DJD XIV. Oxford: Clarendon: 75-91.
- Dunn, J. D. G. (1989). *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Enquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. 2nd ed. London: SCM.
- _____. (2006). *The Partings of the Ways between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity*. 2nd ed. London: SCM.
- Dunnill, J. (1992). *Covenant and Sacrifice in the letter to the Hebrews*. SNTSMS 75. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dupont-Sommer, A. (1952). *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey*. Oxford: Blackwells.
- _____. (1967). "Observations on 'Un nouveau manuscrit de la Mer Morte: "Le rouleau du Temple"' by Y. Yadin." *CRAI* 111: 617-19.
- Dupont, J. (1974). "Assis à la droite de Dieu: L'Interpretation du Ps. 110 dans le Nouveau Testament." In *Resurrexit: Actes du Symposium International sur la Résurrection de Jésus*. Edited by Édouard Dhanis, S.J. Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana: 340-422.
- Durham, John I. (1987). *Exodus*. WBC 3. Waco, Tex.: Word.
- Eaton, John (2003). *The Psalms: A Historical and Spiritual Commentary with an Introduction and New Translation*. London/New York, N.Y.: T&T Clark.
- Eco, Umberto (1979). *The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts*. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press.
- Ego, B. (1991). "Der Diener im palast des Himmlischen Königs. Zur Interpretation einer priesterlichen Tradition in rabbinischen Judentum." In *Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Kult im Judentum, Urchristentum und in der hellenistischen Welt*. Edited by Martin Hengel and Anna Maria Schwemer. Tübingen: Mohr: 361-84.
- _____. (1999). "Der Strom der Tora: zur Rezeption eines tempeltheologischen Motivs in frühjüdischer Zeit." In *Gemeinde ohne Temple/ Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. WUNT 118. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange and Peter Pilhofer. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck): 205-14.
- Eichrodt, Walther (1961-67). *Theology of the Old Testament*. London: SCM.
- Eisele, Wilfreid (2003). *Ein Unterschütterliches Reich: Die mittelplatonische Umformung des Parusiegedankens im Hebräerbrief*. BZNW 116. Berlin/New York, N.Y.: de Gruyter.

- Eisenbaum, Pamela Michelle (1997). "Heroes and History in Hebrews 11." In *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. JSNTSup 148. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press: 380-96.
- . (2005). "Locating Hebrews within the Literary Landscape of Christian Origins." In *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods – New Insights*. Biblical Interpretation Series 75. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 213-37.
- Elgvin, T. (1995a). "The Reconstruction of Sapiential Work A." *RevQ* 16: 559-80.
- . (1995b). "Wisdom, Revelation and Eschatology in an Early Essene Writing." In *SBLSP 34*. Edited by Eugene H. Lovering. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press: 440-63.
- . (1996). "Early Essene Eschatology: Judgment and Salvation according to *Sapiential Work A*." In *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Stephen D. Ricks. Leiden: Brill: 126-65.
- . (1998). "The Mystery to Come: Early Essene Theology of Revelation." In *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments*. JSOTSup 290. Edited by Frederick H. Cryer and T. L. Thompson. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press: 112-50.
- . (1999). "Renewed Earth and Renewed People: 4Q475." In *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 31. Edited by D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich. Leiden: Brill: 577-91.
- . (2003). "4QRenewed Earth." In *Qumran Cave 4: XXVI*. DJD XXXVI. Edited by Stephen J. Pfann. Oxford: Clarendon: 464-73.
- . (2004). "Priestly Sages? The Milieus of Origin of 4QMysteries and 4QInstruction." In *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20-22 May, 2001* STDJ 51. Edited by John J. Collins, Gregory E. Sterling and Ruth A. Clements. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 67-87.
- Eliade, Mircea (1959). *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*. New York, N.Y./London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Ellingworth, Paul (1977). "The Old Testament in Hebrews: Exegesis, Method and Hermeneutics." PhD Thesis. University of Aberdeen.
- . (1993). *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- Ellingworth, Paul and Eugene A. Nida (1983). *A Handbook on the Letter to the Hebrews*. New York, N.Y.: United Bible Societies.
- Elliott, John H. (2000). *1 Peter: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 37B. New York, N.Y.: Doubleday.
- . (2003). "The Jesus Movement was not Egalitarian but Family-oriented." *BibInt* 11 (2): 173-210.
- Endres, John C. (1987). *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees*. CBQMS 18. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America.
- Enns, Peter E. (1993). "Creation and Recreation: Psalm 95 and its Interpretation in Hebrews 3:1–4:13." *WTJ* 55: 255-80.
- . (1997). "The Interpretation of Psalm 95 in Hebrews 3.1–4.13." In *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. JSNTSup 148. Edited by Craig A. Evans and J. A. Sanders. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press: 352-63.

- Eshel, Esther (2003). "Apotropaic Prayers in the Second Temple Period." In *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of an International Symposium of the Orion Center, 19-23 January, 2000*. STDJ 48. Edited by Esther G. Chazon, Ruth A. Clements and Avital Pinnick. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 69-88.
- Eshel, Esther and Hanan Eshel (2002). "Toponymic Midrash in 1 Enoch and in Other Second Temple Jewish Literature." *Hen* 24: 115-30.
- Eshel, Hanan and Esther Eshel (2003). "Separating Levi from Enoch: Response to 'Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee'." In *George W. E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning*. Edited by Jacob Neusner and Alan J. Avery-Peck. Leiden: Brill. 2: 458-68.
- _____. (2005). "New Fragments From Qumran: 4QGENF, 4QISAB 4Q226, 8QGEN and XQPAPENOCH." *DSD* 12: 134-57.
- Eskola, Timo (2001). *The Messiah and the Throne: Jewish Merkavah Mysticism and Early Christian Discourse*. WUNT 2, 142. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).
- Esler, Philip Francis (1994). "The Social Function of 4 Ezra." *JSNT* 53: 99-123.
- Evans, Craig A. (1992). *Noncanonical Writings and New Testament Interpretation*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson.
- _____. (1995). "A Note on the 'First-Born Son' of 4Q369." *DSD* 2: 185-201.
- _____. (2000). "Simon ben Kosiba." *DNTB*: 1112-16.
- _____. (2003). "Covenant in the Qumran Literature." In *The Concept of Covenant in the Second Temple Period*. JSJSup 71. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C. R. de Roo. Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature: 55-80.
- Evans, Trevor V. (2004). "Future Directions for Aspect Studies in Ancient Greek." In *Biblical Greek Language and Lexicography: Essays in Honor of Frederick W. Danker*. Edited by Bernard A. Taylor, John A. L. Lee, Peter R. Burton and Richard E. Whitaker. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans: 199-206.
- Falk, Daniel K. (1998). *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 27. Leiden: Brill.
- _____. (2000). "Qumran Prayer Texts and the Temple." In *Sapiential, Liturgical & Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet*. STDJ 35. Edited by Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez and E. M. Schuller. Leiden: Brill: 106-26.
- Farrar, F. W. (1893). *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews*. CGTSC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fearghail, F. Ó (1978). "Sir 50, 5-21: Yom Kippur or the Daily Whole Offering." *Bib* 59: 310-16.
- Fee, Gordon D. (1987). *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- Felder, Stephen (2002). "What is The Fifth Sibylline Oracle?" *JSJ* 33: 363-85.
- Feldman, Jackie (2006). "'A City that Makes all Israel Friends': Normative Communitas and the Struggle for Religious Legitimacy in Pilgrimages to the Second Temple." In *A Holy People: Jewish and Christian Perspectives on Religious Communal Identity*. Edited by Marcel Poorthuis and Joshua Schwartz. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 109-26.
- Feldman, Louis H. (1984). "Flavius Josephus Revisited: An Introduction to the Man, his Writings, and his Significance." In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*. ANRW 2, 21.2. Edited by Wolfgang Haase. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter: 763-862.

- _____. (2000). *Judean Antiquities 1-4*. Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary. Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill.
- Field, Frederick (1870). *Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt, Sive Veterum Interpretum Graecorum In Totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- _____. (2005). *Frederick Field's Prolegomena to Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt, Sive Veterum Interpretum Graecorum In Totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta*. CahRB. Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie Éditeurs.
- Filson, F. V. (1967). *'Yesterday': A Study of Hebrews in the Light of Chapter 13*. London: SCM.
- Fischer, Bonifatio, Iohanne Gribomont, H. F. D. Sparks, W. Thiele and Robertus Weber (1969). *Biblia Sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem*. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt.
- Fishbane, M. (1979). *Text and Texture: Close Readings of Selected Biblical Texts*. New York, N.Y.: Schocken Books.
- _____. (1985). *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Fisher, Loren R. (1963). "The Temple Quarter." *JSS* 8: 34-41.
- _____. (1965). "Creation at Ugarit and in the Old Testament." *VT* 15: 313-24.
- Fisk, Bruce Norman (2001). *Do You Not Remember? Scripture, Story and Exegesis in the Rewritten Bible of Pseudo-Philo*. JSPSup 37. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph (1997). *Essays on The Semitic Background of the New Testament*. The Biblical Resource Series. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge/Livonia, Mich: Eerdmans/Dove.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. (1961). "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament." *NTS* 7: 297-333.
- _____. (1967). "Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11." *JBL* 86: 25-41.
- _____. (1974). "'Now this Melchizedek ...' (Heb 7:1)." In *Essays on the Semitic background of the New Testament*. Edited by Joseph Fitzmyer. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press: 221-43.
- _____. (2000). "Melchizedek in the MT, LXX, and the NT." *Bib* 81: 63-69.
- Flender, O. (1975). "οἰκουμένη." *NIDNTT* 1: 518-19.
- _____. (1976). "εἰκὼν." *NIDNTT* Volume 2: 286-88.
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T. (1997a). "The Destruction of the Temple and the Relativization of the Old Covenant: Mark 13:31 and Matthew 5:18." In *'The Reader Must Understand': Eschatology and the Bible*. Edited by K. E. Brower and M. W. Elliot. Leicester: Apollos: 145-69.
- _____. (1997b). "The High Priest as a Divine Mediator in the Hebrew Bible: Dan 7:13 as a Test Case." In *SBLSP* 36. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press. 36: 161-93.
- _____. (1997c). *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology, and Soteriology*. WUNT 2, 94. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).
- _____. (1998). "Heavenly Ascent or Incarnational Presence? A Revisionist Reading of the *Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice*." In *SBLSP* 37. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press. 1: 367-99.
- _____. (2000). "Wisdom Christology and the Partings of the Ways Between Judaism and Christianity." In *Christian-Jewish Relations through the Centuries*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Brook W. R. Pearson. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press: 52-68.
- _____. (2002). *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 42. Leiden: Brill.

- _____. (2004a). "The Cosmology of P and Theological Anthropology in the Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sira." In *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture*. Edited by Craig A. Evans. London: T&T Clark. 1: 69-113.
- _____. (2004b). "God's Image, His Cosmic Temple and the High Priest: Towards an Historical and Theological Account of the Incarnation." In *Heaven on Earth: The Temple in Biblical Theology*. Edited by T. Desmond Alexander and Simon Gathercole. Carlisle: Paternoster: 81-99.
- Flint, Peter W. (2005). "The Greek Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 7." In *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini, J. Harold Ellens and James Alan Waddell. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans: 224-33.
- Flusser, David (1959). "Two Notes on the Midrash on 2 Sam vii." *IEJ* 9: 96-109.
- Foley, Edward (2000). *Worship Music: A Concise Dictionary*. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press.
- Forbes, Nevill (1913). "The Book of the Secrets of Enoch." *APOT* 2: 431-69.
- Fossum, Jarl E. (1985). *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism*. WUNT 36. Tübingen: Mohr.
- _____. (1995). *Image of the Invisible God: Essays on the Influence of Jewish Mysticism on Early Christology*. NTOA 30. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- France, R. T. (1996). "The Writer of Hebrews as a Biblical Expositor." *TynBul* 47: 245-76.
- Frankowski, Janusz (1983). "Early Christian Hymns Recorded in the New Testament: A Reconsideration of the Question in the Light of Heb 1,3." *BZ* 27: 183-94.
- Freedman, David Noel (1975). "Early Israelite History in the Light of Early Israelite Poetry." In *Unity and Diversity: Essays in the History, Literature and Religion of the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Hans Goedicke and J. J. M. Roberts. Baltimore, Md./London: John Hopkins University Press: 3-35.
- _____. (1977). "A Letter to the Readers." *BA* 40 (2): 46-48.
- _____. (1981). "Temple Without Hands." In *Temples and High Places in Biblical Times: Proceedings of the Colloquium in Honor of the Centennial of Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Jerusalem, 14-16 March 1977*. Edited by Avraham Biran. Jerusalem: Nelson Glueck School of Biblical Archaeology of Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion: 21-30.
- Frennesson, B (1999). *In a Common Rejoicing: Liturgical Communion with Angels in Qumran*. Studia semitica upsaliensia 14. University Park: Uppsala University.
- Fretheim, Terence (1991). *Exodus*. IBC. Louisville, Ky.: John Knox.
- Frevel, Christian (2010). "σήμερον—Understanding Psalm 95 within, and without, Hebrews." In *Psalms and Hebrews: Studies in Reception*. Edited by Dirk J. Human and Gert J. Steyn. New York, N.Y./London: T&T Clark: 165-93.
- Frey, J. (2000). "The New Jerusalem Text in Its Historical and Traditio-Historical Context." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery 1947-1997. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov and James C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in Cooperation with the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum: 800-16.
- Fritsch, Ch. T. (1966). "TO 'ANTITYPON." In *Studia Biblica et Semetica: Theodoro Christiano Vriezen qui munere Professoris theologiae per XXV annos functus est ab amicis, collegis, discipulis dedicata*. Edited by W. C. van Unnik and A. S. van der Woude. Wageningen: Veenman: 100-07.

- Früchtel, Ursula (1968). *Die kosmologischen Vorstellungen bei Philo von Alexandrien: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Genesisexegese*. ALGHJ 2. Leiden: Brill.
- Fuglseth, Kåre Sigvald (2005). *Johannine Sectarianism in Perspective: A Sociological, Historical and Comparative Analysis of Temple and Social Relationships in the Gospel of John, Philo and Qumran*. NovTSup 119. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Fuhrmann, Sebastian (2010). "The Son, the Angels and the Odd: Psalm 8 in Hebrews 1-2." In *Psalms and Hebrews: Studies in Reception*. Edited by Dirk J. Human and Gert J. Steyn. New York, N.Y./London: T&T Clark: 83-98.
- Fuller Dow, Lois K. (2010). *Images of Zion: Biblical Antecedents for the New Jerusalem*. New Testament Monographs 26. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix.
- Fyall, Robert (2004). "A Curious Silence: The Temple in 1 and 2 Kings." In *Heaven on Earth: The Temple in Biblical Theology*. Edited by T. Desmond Alexander and Simon Gathercole. Carlisle: Paternoster: 49-58.
- Gäbel, George (2006). *Die Kulttheologie des Hebräerbriefes: Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Studie*. WUNT 2, 212. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).
- _____. (2007). "Rivals in Heaven: Angels in the Epistle to the Hebrews." In *Angels: The Concept of Celestial Beings—Origins, Development and Reception*. Edited by Friedrich Vinzenz Reiterer, Tobias Nicklas and Karin Schöpflin. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter: 357-76.
- Gagnon, Robert A. (1992). "How did the Rule of the Community Obtain its Final Shape? A Review of Scholarly Research." *JSP* 5: 61-79.
- Gammie, John G. (1974). "Spatial and Ethical Dualism in Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic Literature." *JBL* 93: 356-85.
- Gane, Roy E. (2000). "Reopening *Katapetasma* ('Veil') in Hebrews 6:19." *AUSS* 38: 5-8.
- García Martínez, Florentino (1992). *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran*. STDJ 9. Leiden: Brill.
- _____. (1999a). "Man and Woman: Halakhah Based upon Eden in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by Gerard P. Luttikhuis. Leiden: Brill: 95-115.
- _____. (1999b). "The Temple Scroll and the New Jerusalem." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill. 2: 431-60.
- García Martínez, Florentino and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar (1998). *Qumran Cave 11.2: 11Q2-18, 11Q20-31*. DJD XXIII. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Gardiner, Frederic (1888). "Various Topics." *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis* 8: 142-51.
- Garnet, Paul (1997). "Cave 4 MS Parallels to 1QS 5.1-7: Towards a Serek Text History." *JSP*: 67-78.
- Gärtner, Bertil (1965). *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament: A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gaston, Lloyd (1970). *No Stone On Another: Studies on the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels*. NovTSup 23. Leiden: Brill.
- Geffcken, J. (1902a). *Die Oracula Sibyllina*. Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- _____. (1902b). *Komposition und Entstehungszeit der Oracle Sibyllina*. Leipzig: Heinrichs (*non vidi*).

- Gehman, Henry S. (1954). "Αγιος in the Septuagint, and Its Relation to the Hebrew Original." *VT* 4: 337-48.
- Gelardini, Gabriella (2005). "Hebrews, an Ancient Synagogue Homily for *Tisha be-Av*: Its Function, Its Basis, Its Theological Interpretation." In *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods – New Insights*. Biblical Interpretation Series 75. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 107-27.
- _____. (2007a) "Review of Georg Gäbel, *Die Kulttheologie des Hebräerbriefes: Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Studie*." *RBL*. Online: <http://www.bookreviews.org>. Retrieved 7 October 2008.
- _____. (2007b). "*Verhärtet eure Herzen nicht*": *Der Hebräer, eine Synagogenhomilie zu Tisha be-Av*. BibInt 83. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Gelston, A. (1972). "A Note on II Sam 7:10." *ZAW* 84: 92-94.
- Georgi, Dieter (1980). *Weisheit Salomos*. JSHRZ. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn.
- _____. (2005). "Hebrews and the Heritage of Paul." In *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods – New Insights*. Biblical Interpretation Series 75. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 239-44.
- Gerstenberger, Erhard (1988). *Psalms: Part 1; with an Introduction to Cultic Poetry*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- Gese, Hartmut (1981a). *Essays in Biblical Theology*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg.
- _____. (1981b). "Wisdom, Son of Man, and the Origins of Christology: the Consistent Development of Biblical Theology." *HBT* 3: 23-57.
- Gheorghita, Radu (2003). *The Role of the Septuagint in Hebrews: An Investigation of its Influence with Special Consideration to the Use of Hab 2:3-4 in Heb 10:37-38*. WUNT 2, 160. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).
- Gieschen, Charles A. (1997). "The Different Functions of a Similar Melchizedek Tradition in 2 *Enoch* and the Epistle to the Hebrews." In *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. JSNTSup 148. Edited by Craig A. Evans and J. A. Sanders. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press: 364-79.
- _____. (1998). *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence*. AGJU 17. Leiden: Brill.
- _____. (2003). "The Divine Name in Ante-Nicene Christology." *VC* 57: 115-58
- _____. (2007). "The Name of the Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch." In *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of the Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 238-49.
- Gilbert, M (1984). "Wisdom Literature." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. CRINT II 2. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Assen/Philadelphia, Pa.: Van Gorcum/Fortress: 283-324.
- Giles, Pauline (1975). "The Son of Man in the Epistle to the Hebrews." *ExpTim* 86: 328-32.
- Ginzberg, Louis (1906). "Abraham, Apocalypse of." In *The Jewish Encyclopedia: A Descriptive Record of the History, Religion, Literature, and Customs of the Jewish People from the Earliest Times to the Present Day*. Edited by Isidore Singer. New York, N.Y.: Funk & Wagnalls. 1: 91-92.
- _____. (1913-1967). *The Legends of the Jews*. Philadelphia, Pa.: The Jewish Publication Society of America.
- Gleason, Randall C. (2000). "The Old Testament Background of Rest in Hebrews 3:7-4:11." *BSac* 157: 281-303.

- _____. (2003). “Angels and the Eschatology of Heb 1-2.” *NTS* 49: 90-107.
- Goff, Matthew (2003a). “Review of Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*.” *JBL* 122: 172-75.
- _____. (2003b). *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*. STDJ 50. Leiden: Brill.
- _____. (2007). *Discerning Wisdom: the Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls* VTSup 116. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Goldingay, John (2001). *Isaiah*. NIBCOT. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson.
- _____. (2006). *Psalms Volume 1: Psalms 1-41*. Baker Commentary on the Old Testament, Wisdom and Psalms. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic.
- _____. (2008). *Psalms Volume 3: Psalms 90-150*. Baker Commentary on the Old Testament, Wisdom and Psalms. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic.
- Goldstein, Jonathan A. (1973). “The Testament of Moses: Its Content, its Origin and its Attestation in Josephus.” In *Studies on the Testament of Moses*. SBLSCS 4. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg. Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature: 44-52.
- Goodenough, Edwin R. (1935). *By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.
- Goodman, Martin (1986). “Jewish Literature Composed in Greek.” In *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*, Volume III 1. Edited by Emil Schürer, Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar and Martin Goodman. Edinburgh: T&T Clark: 470-704.
- Goppelt, Leonhard A. (1972). “τύπος, ἀντίτυπος, τυπικώς, ὑποτύπωσης.” *TDNT* 8: 246-59.
- _____. (1978). *A Commentary on 1 Peter*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- _____. (1982). *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- Gordon, Robert P. (1991). “‘Better Promises’: Two Passages in Hebrews Against the Background of the Old Testament Cultus.” In *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple Presented to Ernst Bammel*. JSNTSup 48. Edited by William Horbury. Sheffield: JSOT Press: 434-49.
- _____. (2008). *Hebrews*. Readings: A New Biblical Commentary. 2nd ed. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Görg, M (1990). “יָשָׁב.” *TDOT* 6: 420-38.
- Goshen-Gottstein, Alon (2002). “Ben Sira’s Praise of the Fathers.” In *Ben Sira’s God: Proceedings of the International Ben Sira Conference Durham–Ushaw College, 2001*. Edited by Renate Egger-Wenzel. Berlin/New York, N.Y.: Walter de Gruyter: 235-67.
- Gourgues, M. (1978). *À la droite de Dieu: Résurrection de Jésus et actualisation du Psaume 110:1 dans le Nouveau Testament*. EBib. Paris: Gabalda.
- Grabbe, Lester L. (1997). *Wisdom of Solomon*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Grabbe, Lester L. and James H. Charlesworth (1981). “Chronography in 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch.” In *SBLSP* 20. Edited by Kent Harold Richards. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press: 49-63.

- Gräbe, Peter (2008). "The New Covenant and Christian Identity in Hebrews." In *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrews in its Ancient Contexts*. LNTS 387. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel Driver, Trevor Hart and Nathan MacDonald. London: T&T Clark: 118-27.
- Grässer, Erich (1990-97). *An die Hebräer*. EKKNT XVII. Zürich: Benzinger/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.
- Gray, George Buchanan (1908). "The Heavenly Temple and the Heavenly Altar." *Expositor* VIII: 385-402, 530-46.
- _____. (1925). *Sacrifice in the Old Testament: its Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Greenfield, Jonas C. (1969). "Review: The Small Caves of Qumran." *JAOs* 89: 128-41.
- Greenfield, Jonas C. and Michael E. Stone (1977). "The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes." *HTR* 70: 51-65.
- _____. (1990). "Two Notes on the Aramaic Levi Document." In *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins*. College Theology Society Resources in Religion 5. Edited by H. W. Attridge, John J. Collins and Thomas J. Tobin S.J. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America: 153-61.
- Greenfield, Jonas, C., Michael Stone and Esther Eshel (2004). *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary*. SVTP 19. Leiden: Brill.
- Grelot, P (1958). "La géographie mythique d'Hénoch et ses sources orientales." *RB* 65: 33-69.
- Grierson, Fiona (2008). "The Testament of Moses." *JSP* 17: 265-80.
- Grogan, Geoffrey W. (1969). "Christ and His People: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Hebrews 2:5-18." *VE* 6: 54-71.
- Grossfeld, Bernard (1988). *The Targum Onqelos to Genesis*. ArBib 6. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Grotius, Hugo (1679). "Annotationes in Epistolam ad Hebraeos." In *Operum Theologicorum*. Amsterdam: Joannis Blaeu. Tomi 2, Volumen 1: 1010-69.
- Gruen, Erich S. (1998). *Heritage and Hellenism: the Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.
- _____. (2010). "Judaism in the Diaspora." *DEJ*: 77-96.
- Gruenwald, Ithamar (1980). *Apocalypticism and Merkavah Mysticism*. AGJU 14. Leiden: Brill.
- Gurtner, Daniel M. (2004). "Καταπέτασμα: Lexicographical and Etymological Considerations on the Biblical 'Veil'." *AUSS* 42: 105-11.
- _____. (2005a). "The 'House of the Veil' in Sirach 50." *JSP* 14: 187-200.
- _____. (2005b). "LXX Syntax and the Identity of the NT Veil." *NovT* 47: 344-53.
- _____. (2008). "The 'Twenty-Fifth Year of Jeconiah' and the Date of 2 Baruch." *JSP* 18: 23-32.
- _____. (2009). *Second Baruch: A Critical Edition of the Syriac Text: With Greek and Latin Fragments, English Translation, Introduction, and Concordances*. Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies. New York, N.Y./London: T&T Clark.
- Guthrie, Donald (1983). *The Letter to the Hebrews: An Introduction and Commentary*. TNTC. Leicester/Grand Rapids, Mich.: IVP/Eerdmans.

- Guthrie, George H. (1994). *The Structure of Hebrews: A Text-Linguistic Analysis*. NovTSup 73. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- _____. (1998). *Hebrews*. NIVAC. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan.
- _____. (2003). "Hebrews' Use of the Old Testament: Recent Trends in Research." *CurrBR* 1: 271-94.
- Guthrie, George H. and Russell D. Quinn (2006). "A Discourse Analysis of the Use of Psalm 8:4-6 in Hebrews 2:5-9." *JETS* 49: 235-46.
- Habel, Norman C. (1964). *Yahweh Versus Baal: A Conflict of Religious Cultures*. New York, N.Y.: Bookman Associates.
- _____. (1965). "The Form and Significance of the Call Narratives." *ZAW* 77: 297-323.
- Hagner, Donald A. (1983). *Hebrews*. A Good News Commentary. San Francisco, Calif.: Harper & Row.
- _____. (1990). *Hebrews*. NIBCNT. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson.
- _____. (2002). *Encountering the Book of Hebrews*. Encountering Biblical Studies. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker.
- Hahn, H.-C. (1986). "Shadow." *NIDNTT* 3: 553-56.
- Hahn, Scott W. (2004). "A Broken Covenant and a Curse of Death: A Study of Hebrews 9:15-22." *CBQ* 66: 416-36.
- _____. (2005). "Covenant, Cult and the Curse-of-Death: διαθήκη in Heb 9:15-22." In *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods – New Insights*. Biblical Interpretation Series 75. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 65-88.
- Hall, Robert G (1988). "The "Christian Interpolation" in the Apocalypse of Abraham." *JBL* 107: 107-10.
- Hall, Stuart George (1979). *Melito of Sardis: On Pascha and Fragments*. OECT. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Hallböck, Geert (1992). "The Fall of Zion and the Revelation of the Law: An Interpretation of 4 Ezra." *SJOT* 6: 263-92.
- Halperin, David (1988). *The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision*. TSAJ 16. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).
- Halpern-Amaru, B. (1994). *Rewriting the Bible: Land and Covenant in Postbiblical Jewish Literature*. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International.
- Hamerton-Kelly, R. G. (1970). "The Temple and the Origins of Jewish Apocalyptic." *VT* 20: 1-15.
- Hamm, Dennis (1990). "Faith in the Epistle to the Hebrews: The Jesus Factor." *CBQ* 52: 270-91.
- Hanhart, Robert (1983). *Esther*. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum VII 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Hannah, Darrell D. (1999). *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity*. WUNT 2, 109. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).
- Hanson, R. P.C. (2002). *Allegory and Event: A Study of the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture*. Louisville, Ky./London: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Haran, M. (1985). *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel: An Enquiry into Biblical Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.
- Harlow, Daniel C. (2010). "Abraham, Apocalypse of." *DEJ*: 295-98.

- Harrington, Daniel J. (1970). "The Original Language of Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*." *HTR* 63: 503-14.
- _____. (1971). "The Biblical Text of Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*." *CBQ* 33: 1-17.
- _____. (1973). "Interpreting Israel's History: *The Testament of Moses* as a Rewriting of Deut 31-34." In *Studies on the Testament of Moses*. SBLSCS 4. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg. Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature: 59-68.
- _____. (1974). *The Hebrew Fragments of Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum Preserved in the Chronicles of Jerahmeel*. Missoula, Mont.: Society of Biblical Literature.
- _____. (1985). "Pseudo-Philo: A New Translation and Introduction." *OTP* 2: 297-377.
- _____. (1999). *Invitation to the Apocrypha*. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans.
- _____. (2003a). "The 'Holy Land' in Pseudo-Philo, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch." In *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Lawrence H. Schiffman and Weston W. Fields. Leiden: Brill: 661-72.
- _____. (2003b). "Wisdom and Apocalyptic in 4QInstruction and 4 Ezra." In *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez. Leuven: Peeters: 343-55.
- _____. (2005). *Jesus Ben Sira of Jerusalem: A Biblical Guide to Living Wisely*. Interfaces. Collegeville, Minn: Liturgical Press.
- _____. (2006a). "'Holy War' Texts among the Qumran Scrolls." In *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich*. Edited by Peter W. Flint, Emanuel Tov and James C. VanderKam. Leiden/Boston, Mass.: Brill: 175-83.
- _____. (2006b). "Recent Study of 4QInstruction." In *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez, Annette Steudel and Eibert Tigchelaar. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 105-23.
- Harrington, Daniel J. and Maurya P. Horgan (1986). "Palestinian Adaptations of Biblical Narratives and Perspectives. I. The Bible Rewritten." In *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters*. Edited by Robert A. Kraft and George W. E. Nickelsburg. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press: 239-58.
- Harris, Murray J. (1978). "Appendix: Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament." *NIDNTT* 3: 1171-215.
- _____. (1984). "The Translation and Significance of Elohîm in Psalm 45:7-8." *Tynbul* 35: 65-89.
- _____. (1985). "The Translation and Significance of 'O ΘΕΟΣ in Hebrews 1:8-9." *Tynbul* 36: 129-62.
- Hartley, John E. (1992). *Leviticus*. WBC 4. Dallas, Tex.: Word.
- Hartman, Lars (1979). *Asking for a Meaning: A Study of 1 Enoch 1-5*. ConBNT 12. Lund: CWK Gleerup.
- Hatina, Thomas R. (1999). "Intertextuality and Historical Criticism in New Testament Studies: Is there a Relationship?" *BibInt* 7 (1): 28-43.
- Hay, David M. (1973). *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity*. SBLMS 18. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon.
- Hays, Richard B. (1989). *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

- _____. (1993). "Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul: Abstract." In *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*. JSNTSup 83. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press: 42-46.
- _____. (2001). *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1–4:11*. The Biblical Resource Series. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans.
- _____. (2008). "Can Narrative Criticism Recover the Theological Unity of Scripture." *JTI* 2: 193-211.
- Hayward, C. T. R. (1989). "The Dating of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Some Comments." *JJS* 40: 7-30.
- _____. (1991). "Sacrifice and World Order: Some Observations on ben Sira's Attitude to the Temple Service." In *Sacrifice and Redemption: Durham Essays in Theology*. Edited by S. W. Sykes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 22-34.
- _____. (1992a). "The Figure of Adam in Pseudo-Philo's Biblical Antiquities." *JSJ* 23: 1-20.
- _____. (1992b). "The New Jerusalem in the Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sira." *SJOT* 6: 123-38.
- _____. (1995). *Jerome's Hebrew Questions on Genesis: Translated with Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford: Clarendon.
- _____. (1996). *The Jewish Temple: A Non-biblical Sourcebook*. London: Routledge.
- _____. (2007). "Understandings of the Temple Service in the Septuagint Pentateuch." In *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*. Edited by John Day. London: T&T Clark: 385-400.
- Heidel, Alexander (1951). *The Babylonian Genesis: The Story of Creation*. 2nd ed. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.
- Heinemann, Isaak (1973). *Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung: kulturvergleichende Untersuchungen zu Philons Darstellung der jüdischen Gesetz*. Hildesheim/New York, N.Y.: Georg Olms.
- Helyer, Larry R. (1976). "The *Prototokos* Title in Hebrews." *SBTh* 6: 3-28.
- _____. (2002). *Exploring Jewish Literature of the Second Temple Period: A Guide for New Testament Students*. Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP.
- _____. (2006). "The *Prototokos* Title in Hebrews 1:6." *Paper presented at the St Andrews Conference on Hebrews and Christian Theology 19 July 2006*. St Andrews: 1-22.
- Hempel, Charlotte (1996). "The Earthly Essene Nucleus of 1QSa." *DSD* 3: 253-69.
- _____. (2000). "The Place of the Book of *Jubilees* at Qumran and Beyond." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context*. Edited by T. H. Lim, L. W. Hurtado, A. G. Auld and A. Jack. Edinburgh: T&T Clark: 187-95.
- _____. (2007). "The Sons of Aaron in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. Edited by Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech and Eibert Tigchelaar. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 207-24.
- _____. (2010). "Pluralism and Authoritativeness: The Case of the S Tradition." In *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*. JSJSup 141. Edited by Mladen Popović. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 193-208.
- Hengel, Martin (1974). *Judaism and Hellenism*. London: SCM.
- _____. (1976). *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religions*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress.

- _____. (1995). *Studies in Early Christology*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Henze, Matthias (2005). "The Apocalypse of Weeks and the Architecture of the End Time." In *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini, J. Harold Ellens and James Alan Waddell. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans: 207-09.
- _____. (2006). "From Jeremiah to Baruch: Pseudepigraphy in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch." In *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb*. Edited by Charlotte Hempel and Judith M. Lieu. Leiden: Brill: 157-77.
- _____. (2010). "Baruch, Second Book of." *DEJ*: 426-28.
- Héring, J. (1954). "Eschatologie biblique et Idéalisme platonicien." In *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*. Edited by W. D. Davies and D. Daube. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 444-63.
- _____. (1970). *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. London: Epworth.
- Hilber, John W. (2005). *Cultic Prophecy in the Psalms*. BZAW 352. Berlin/New York, N.Y.: Walter de Gruyter.
- Hillers, Delbert R. (1984). *Micah: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Micah*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress.
- Himmelfarb, Martha (1984). "R. Moses the Preacher and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *AJS Review* 9 (1): 55-78.
- _____. (1985). *Tours of Hell: An Apocalyptic Form in Jewish and Christian Literature*. Philadelphia, Pa: Fortress.
- _____. (1986). "From Prophecy to Apocalypse: The Book of the Watchers and Tours of Heaven." In *Jewish Spirituality: From The Bible Through The Middle Ages*. World Spirituality: An Encyclopedic History of The Religious Quest 13. Edited by Arthur Green. New York, N.Y.: Crossroads. 1: 145-65.
- _____. (1993). *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. New York, N.Y./Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____. (1995). "The Practice of Ascent in the Ancient Mediterranean World." In *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys*. Edited by John J. Collins. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press: 123-37.
- _____. (1999a). "Levi, Phinehas, and the Problem of Intermarriage at the Time of the Maccabean Revolt." *JSQ* 6: 1-24.
- _____. (1999b). "Sexual Relations and Purity in the Temple Scroll and the Book of Jubilees." *DSD* 6: 11-36.
- _____. (2000). "The Wisdom of the Scribe, the Wisdom of the Priest, and the Wisdom of the King according to Ben Sira." In *For a Later Generation: the Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*. Edited by Randal A. Argall, Beverly A. Bow and Rodney A. Werline. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International.
- _____. (2002). "The Book of the Watchers and the Priests of Jerusalem." *Hen* 24: 131-35.
- _____. (2007). "Temple and Priests in the Book of the Watchers, the Animal Apocalypse and the Apocalypse of Weeks." In *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 210-35.
- Hindley, J. C. (1968). "Towards a Date for the Similitudes of Enoch. An Historical Approach." *NTS* 14: 551-65.
- Hobbins, John F. (1998). "The Summing up of History in 2 Baruch." *JQR* 89: 45-79.

- Hofius, Otfried (1970a). "Das 'erste' und das 'zweite' Zelt: Ein Beitrag zur Auslegung von Hbr 9:1-10." *ZNW* 61: 271-77.
- _____. (1970b). "Inkarnation und Opfertod Jesu nach Hebr. 10,19f." In *Der Ruf Jesu und die Antwort der Gemeinde. Exegetische Untersuchungen Joachim Jeremias zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet von seinen Schülern*. Edited by Eduard Lohse, Christoph Burchard and Berndt Schaller. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: 132-41.
- _____. (1970c). *Katapausis: Die Vorstellung vom endzeitl. Ruheort im Hebräerbrief*. WUNT 11. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).
- _____. (1972). *Der Vorhang vor dem Thron Gottes: Eine exegetische-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Hebräer 6,19f und 10,19f*. WUNT 14. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).
- _____. (1991). *Der Christushymnus Philipper 2,6-11: Untersuchungen zu Gestalt und Aussage eines urchristlichen Psalms*. 2nd ed. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).
- Hofmann, Norbert Johannes (2000). *Die Assumptio Mosis: Studien zur Rezeption massgültiger Überlieferung*. JSJSup 67. Leiden: Brill.
- Holladay, William L. (1986). *Jeremiah 1*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress.
- Hollander, H. W. and M. De Jonge (1985). *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*. SVTP 8. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Holm-Nielsen, Svend (1960). *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran*. ATDan 2. Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget I.
- Holmes, Michael W. (2007). *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translation*. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic.
- _____. (2010). *The Greek New Testament: SBL Edition*. Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature/Logos Bible Software.
- Holmes, Stephen R. (2009). "Death in the Afternoon: Hebrews, Sacrifice and Soteriology." In *The Epistle to Hebrews and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel Driver, Trevor Hart and Nathan MacDonald. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 229-52.
- Holtz, Gudrun (2009). "Inclusivism at Qumran." *DSD* 16: 22-54.
- Hooker, Morna D. (2009). "Christ the 'End' of the Cult." In *The Epistle to Hebrews and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel Driver, Trevor Hart and Nathan MacDonald. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 189-212.
- Hoppin, Ruth (2004). "The Epistle to the Hebrews is Priscilla's Letter." In *A Feminist Companion to the Catholic Epistles and Hebrews*. Feminist Companions to the New Testament and Early Christian Writings 8. Edited by Amy-Jill Levine and Maria Mayo Robbins. London: T&T Clark: 147-70.
- Horgan, Maurya P. (1979). *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*. CBQMS 8. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America.
- Horsley, Richard A. (2007). *Scribes, Visionaries and the Politics of Second Temple Judea*. Louisville, Ky./London: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Horton, F. L. (1976). *The Melchizedek Tradition: Through the First Five Centuries of the Christian Era and in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. SNTSMS 30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hossfeld, Frank-Lothar (1994). "Psalm 95: Gattungsgeschichte, Kompositionskritische und bibeltheologische Anfragen." In *Neue Wege der Psalmforschung*. Herders Biblische Studien 1. Edited by K. Seybold and E. Zenger. Freiburg: Herder: 29-44.

- Hossfeld, Frank-Lothar and Erich Zenger (2005). *Psalms 2: A Commentary on Psalms 51-100*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress.
- Houtman, Cornelis (2002). *Exodus*. Historical Commentary on the Old Testament. Leuven: Peeters.
- Howard, G. (1968). "Hebrews and the Old Testament Quotations." *NovT* 10: 208-16.
- Howell, Maribeth (1989). "Exodus 15,1b-18: A Poetic Analysis." *ETL* 65: 5-42.
- Hubler, J. Noel (2007). "Iezekiel." In *NETS*. Electronic ed. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin Wright. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 946-85.
- Hübner, H. (1993). "τέλειος, κ.τ.λ." *EDNT* 3: 342-48.
- Hughes, Graham (1979a). *Hebrews and Hermeneutics: The Epistle to the Hebrews as a New Testament Example of Biblical Interpretation*. SNTSMS 36. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hughes, J. J. (1979b). "Hebrews ix.15ff and Galatians iii.15ff: A Case Study in Covenant Practice and Procedure." *NovT* 21: 27-96.
- Hughes, Philip Edgcumbe (1977). *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- Hullinger, Jerry M. (1993). "A Proposed Solution to the Problem of Animal Sacrifices in Ezekiel 40-48." ThD Thesis. Dallas Theological Seminary.
- Hultgård, Anders (1977). *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches*. Acta Universitatis Upsalienses Historia Religionum 6-7. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Human, Dirk, J. (2010). "A Prophetic Voice for Africa from Psalm 95." In *Psalms and Hebrews: Studies in Reception*. Edited by Dirk J. Human and Gert J. Steyn. New York, N.Y./London: T&T Clark: 147-64.
- Humbert, J. -B. (1994). "L'espace sacré à Qumran." *RB* 101-102: 161-214.
- Humphrey, Edith McEwan (1995). *The Ladies and the Cities: Transformation and Apocalyptic Identity in Joseph and Aseneth, 4 Ezra, the Apocalypse and The Shepherd of Hermas*. JSPSup 17. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Hurowitz, Victor (Avigdor) (1985). "The Priestly Account of Building the Tabernacle." *JAOs* 105: 21-30.
- _____. (1992). *I have Built you an Exalted House*. JSOTSup 115. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- _____. (2006). "Babylon in Bethel—New Light on Jacob's Dream." In *Orientalism, Assyriology and the Bible*. Hebrew Bible Monographs 10. Edited by Steven W. Holloway. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press: 436-48.
- Hurst, Lincoln D. (1983). "How Platonic are Heb. viii.5 and ix.23f?" *JTS* 34: 156-68.
- _____. (1984). "Eschatology and 'Platonism' in the Epistle to the Hebrews." In *SBLSP* 23. Edited by Kent Harold Richards. Chico, Calif.: Society of Biblical Literature: 41-74.
- _____. (1987). "The Christology of Hebrews 1 and 2." In *The Glory of Christ in the New Testament*. Edited by Lincoln D. Hurst and N. T. Wright. Oxford: Clarendon: 151-64.
- _____. (1990). *The Epistle to the Hebrews: Its Background of Thought*. SNTSMS 65. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hurtado, Larry W. (1988). *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*. London: SCM.

- Idel, Moshe (1990). "Enoch is Metatron." *Immanuel* 24/25: 220-40.
- Instone-Brewer, David (2004). *Prayer and Agriculture*. TRENT 1. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- _____. (2011). *Feasts and Sabbath: Passover and Atonement*. TRENT 2A. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge Eerdmans.
- Isaac, E. (1983). "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch: A New Translation and Introduction." *OTP* 1: 6-89.
- Isaacs, Marie E. (1992). *Sacred Space: An Approach to the Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. JSNTSup 73. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- _____. (1997). "Hebrews 13:9-16 Revisited." *NTS* 43: 268-84.
- Jackson, David R. (2004). *Enochic Judaism: Three Defining Paradigm Exemplars*. LSTS 49. London: T&T Clark.
- _____. (2009). "Jubilees and Enochic Judaism." In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans: 411-25.
- Jacobson, Howard (1996). *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum: With Latin Text and English Translation*. AGJU 31. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Janowski, Bernd (1990). "Tempel und Schöpfung. Schöpfungstheologische Aspekte der priesterschriftlichen Heiligtumskonzeption." In *Schöpfung und Neuschöpfung*. Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie 5. Edited by Ingo Baldermann. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener: 37-69.
- Jansen, H. Ludin (1939). *Die Henochgestalt, eine vergleichende religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Skrifter Utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo. Historisk-Filosofisk Klasse, 1. Oslo: I kommisjon hos Jacob Dybwad.
- Jastrow, Marcus (1989). *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and their Midrashic Literature*. New York, N.Y.: The Judaica Press Inc.
- Jefferies, Daryl F. (2008). "Scripture, Wisdom, and Authority in 4QInstruction: Understanding the use of Numbers 30:8-9 in 4Q416." *HS* 49: 87-98.
- Jeremias, Alfred (1911). *The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient Near East: Manual of Biblical Archaeology*. London/New York, N.Y.: Williams and Norgate/G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- Jeremias, J. (1971). "Hebräer 10:20: τοῦτ' ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ." *ZNW* 62: 131.
- Jewett, R. (1981). *Letter to Pilgrims. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. New York, N.Y.: Pilgrim.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy (2006). *Hebrews: A Commentary*. NTL. Louisville, Ky./London: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Johnson, Richard W. (2001). *Going Outside the Camp: The Sociological Function of the Levitical Critique in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. JSNTSup 209. London: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Johnsson, W. G. (1973). "Defilement and Purgation in the Book of Hebrews." PhD Thesis. Vanderbilt University.
- _____. (1978). "The Pilgrimage Motif in the Epistle to the Hebrews." *JBL* 97: 239-51.
- Johnston, George (1963). "Οἰκουμένη and κόσμος in the New Testament." *NTS* 10: 352-60.
- _____. (1981). "Christ as Archegos." *NTS* 27: 381-85.
- Jones, Edmund D. (1935). "The Authorship of Hebrews xiii." *ExpTim* 46: 562-67.

- Jones, Peter Rhea (1979). "The Figure of Moses as a Heuristic Device for Understanding the Pastoral Intent of the Epistle to the Hebrews." *RevExp* 76: 95-107.
- _____. (1985). "A Superior Life: Hebrews 12:3–13:25." *RevExp* 82: 391-405.
- Jongeling, Bastiaan (1962). *Le rouleau de la guerre des manuscrits de Qumrân: commentaire et traduction*. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Josephus (1926-1965). *Works*. London: Heinemann.
- Joslin, Barry C. (2007). "Can Hebrews be Structured? An Assessment of Eight Approaches." *CBR* 6: 99-129.
- _____. (2008). *Hebrews, Christ and the Law: The Theology of the Mosaic Law in Hebrews 7:1–10:18*. PBM. Milton Keynes: Paternoster.
- Kaiser, Walter C. Jr. (1973). "The Promise Theme and the Theology of Rest." *BSac* 130: 135-50.
- Kalengyo, Edison M. (2009). "The Sacrifice of Christ and the Ganda Sacrifice: A Contextual Interpretation in Relation to the Eucharist." In *The Epistle to Hebrews and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel Driver, Trevor Hart and Nathan MacDonald. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 302-18.
- Kalimi, Isaac (1990). "The Land of Moriah, Mount Moriah, and the Site of Solomon's Temple in Biblical Historiography." *HTR* 83: 345-62.
- Kampen, John (1994). "The Eschatological Temple(s) of 11QT." In *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honour of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*. Edited by John C. Reeves and John Kampen. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press: 86-97.
- _____. (1999). "The Significance of the Temple in the Manuscripts of the Damascus Document." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings*. Edited by R. A. Kugler and E. M. Schuller. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press.
- Kapelrud, A. S. (1963). "Temple Building, a Task for Gods and Kings." *Orientalia* 32: 56-62.
- Käsemann, Ernst (1939). *Das wandernde Gottesvolk: eine Untersuchung zum Hebräerbrief*. FRLANT 55. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- _____. (1984). *The Wandering People of God: An Investigation of the Letter to the Hebrews*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg.
- Katz, Peter (1958). "The Quotations from Deuteronomy in Hebrews." *ZNW* 49: 213-23.
- Katz, Peter and Joseph Ziegler (1958). "Ein Aquila-Index in Vorbeiterung." *VT* 8: 264-85.
- Kearney, Peter J. (1977). "Creation and Liturgy: The P Redaction of Ex 25-40." *ZAW* 89: 375-87.
- Kee, H. C. (1983). "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A New Translation and Introduction." *OTP* 1: 775-828.
- Kim, Lloyd (2006). *Polemic in the Book of Hebrews: Anti-Semitism, Anti-Judaism, Supersessionism?* Princeton Theological Monograph Series. Eugene, Ore.: Pickwick.
- Kinzer, Mark Stephen (1995). "'All Things Under His Feet': Psalm 8 in the New Testament and in Other Jewish Literature of Late Antiquity." PhD Thesis. University of Michigan.
- Kirschner, Robert (1985). "Apocalyptic and Rabbinic Responses to the Destruction of 70." *HTR* 78: 27-46.
- Kistemaker, S. J. (1961). *The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Amsterdam: van Soest.

- _____. (1984). *Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker.
- Kleinknecht, Hermann (1964). "The Greek Use of εἰκῶν." *TDNT* 2: 388-90.
- Klijn, A. Frederik J. (1970). "The Sources and the Redaction of the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch." *JSJ* 1: 65-76.
- _____. (1983a). "2 (Syriac Apocalypse) of Baruch." *OTP* 1: 615-52.
- _____. (1983b). *Der lateinische Text der Apokalypse des Esra*. TU 131. Berlin: Akademie (non vidi).
- _____. (1989). "Recent Developments in the Study of the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch." *JSP* 4: 3-17.
- Kline, Meredith G. (1996) "Space and Time in Genesis Cosmogony." *Perspectives in Science and the Christian Faith* 48. Online: <http://www.asa3.org/ASA/PSCF3-96Kline.html>. Retrieved 6 June 2011.
- Klinzing, Georg (1971). *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im NT*. SUNT 7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Knibb, Michael A. (1976). "The Exile in the Literature of the Intertestamental Period." *HeyJ* 17: 253-72.
- _____. (1978). *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- _____. (1979). "The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review." *NTS* 25: 345-59.
- _____. (1982). "Apocalyptic and Wisdom in 4 Ezra." *JSJ* 13: 56-74.
- _____. (1985). "Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah." *OTP* 2: 143-76.
- _____. (1987). *The Qumran Community*. Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to 200 AD 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. (1995). "Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Scrolls." *DSD* 2: 165-84.
- _____. (1998). "Perspectives on the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: The Levi Traditions." In *Perspectives in the Study of the Old Testament and Early Judaism: a Symposium in Honour of Adam S. van der Woude on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*. VTSup 73. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Ed Noort. Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill: 197-213.
- _____. (2005). "The Apocalypse of Weeks and the Epistle of Enoch." In *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini, J. Harold Ellens and James Alan Waddell. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans: 213-19.
- _____. (2007a). "The Book of Enoch or Books of Enoch? The Textual Evidence for 1 Enoch." In *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 21-40.
- _____. (2007b). "The Structure and Composition of the Parables of Enoch." In *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of the Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 48-64.
- _____. (2007c). "Temple and Cult in Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical Writings from Before the Common Era." In *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*. Edited by John Day. London: T&T Clark: 401-16.
- _____. (2010). "Reflections on the Status of the Early Enochic Writings." In *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*. JSJSup 141. Edited by Mladen Popović. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 143-54.
- Knibb, Michael A. and R. J. Coggins (1979). *The First and Second Books of Esdras*. CBC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Knipe, D. M. (1988). "The Temple in Image and Reality." In *Temple in Society*. Edited by Michael V. Fox. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns: 105-38.
- Knox, Wilfred L. (1948). "The 'Divine Hero' Christology in the New Testament." *HTR* 41: 229-49.
- Kobelski, Paul J. (1981). *Melchizedek and Melchireša'*. CBQMS 10. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America.
- Koch, Klaus (2005). "History as a Battlefield of Two Antagonistic Powers in the Apocalypse of Weeks and in the Rule of the Community." In *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini, J. Harold Ellens and James Alan Waddell. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans: 185-99.
- _____. (2007). "Questions regarding the so-called Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch: A Response to Sabino Chialà and Helge Kvanvig." In *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of the Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 228-37.
- Koester, Craig R. (1989). *The Dwelling of God: The Tabernacle in the Old Testament, Intertestamental Jewish Literature and the New Testament*. CBQMS 22. Washington D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America.
- _____. (1994). "The Epistle to the Hebrews in Current Study." *CurBR* 2: 123-45.
- _____. (2001). *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 36. New York, N.Y.: Doubleday.
- Koester, Helmut (1962). "'Outside the Camp': Hebrews 13:9-14." *HTR* 55: 299-315.
- _____. (1972a). "τόπος." *TDNT* 8: 187-208.
- _____. (1972b). "ὑπόστασις." *TDNT* 8: 572-89.
- Kolenkow, Anitra Bingham (1973). "The Assumption of Moses as a Testament." In *Studies on the Testament of Moses*. SBLSCS 4. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg. Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature: 71-77.
- Koningsveld, P. S.J. (1975). "An Arabic Manuscript of the Apocalypse of Baruch." *JSJ* 6: 205-07.
- Koosed, Jennifer L. and Robert P. Seesengood (2005). "Constructions and Collusions: The Making and Unmaking of Identity in Qoheleth and Hebrews." In *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods – New Insights*. Biblical Interpretation Series 75. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 265-80.
- Kraus, Hans-Joachim (1988). *Psalms 1-59: A Commentary*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg.
- _____. (1989). *Psalms 60-150: A Commentary*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg.
- Krauter, Stephan (2007). "Die Beteiligung von Nichtjuden am Jerusalemer Tempelkult." In *Jewish Identity in the Greco-Roman World* Edited by Jörg Frey, Daniel R. Schwartz and Stephanie Gripentrog. Leiden: Brill: 55-74.
- Kristeva, Julia (1986). *The Kristeva Reader*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Kugel, James (1993). "Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood in Second Temple Writings." *HTR* 86: 1-64.
- _____. (1995). "The Ladder of Jacob." *HTR* 88: 209-27.
- _____. (1997). *The Bible as It Was*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- _____. (1998). "4Q369 'Prayer of Enosh' and Ancient Biblical Interpretation." *DSD* 5: 119-48

- _____. (2006). *The Ladder of Jacob: Ancient Interpretations of the Biblical Story of Jacob and his Children*. Princeton, N.J./Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Kugler, Robert A. (1996). *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*. SBLJL 9. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press.
- _____. (2000). "Rewriting Rubrics: Sacrifice and the Religion of Qumran." In *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by John J. Collins and Robert A. Kugler. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans: 90-112.
- _____. (2001). *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Kuhn, Heinz-Wolfgang (1966). *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil: Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindeliedern von Qumran mit einem Anhang über Eschatologie und Gegenwart in der Verkündigung Jesu*. SUNT 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- _____. (1994). "Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte für das Verständnis des Galaterbriefs und dem Münchener Projekt: Qumran und das Neue Testament." In *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the first Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Florentino García Martínez. Leiden: Brill: 169-221.
- Kuhn, K. H. (1984a). "The Apocalypse of Elijah." In *The Apocrypha of the Old Testament*. Edited by H. F. D. Sparks. Oxford: Clarendon: 753-73.
- _____. (1984b). "The Apocalypse of Zephaniah and an Anonymous Apocalypse." In *The Apocrypha of the Old Testament*. Edited by H. F. D. Sparks. Oxford: Clarendon: 915-25.
- Kulik, Alexander (2004). *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha: Toward the Original of the Apocalypse of Abraham*. SBLTCS. Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Kvanvig, Helge S. (1988). *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*. WMANT 61. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.
- _____. (2004). "The Watcher Story and Genesis: An Intertextual Reading." *SJOT* 18: 163-83.
- _____. (2007). "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch." In *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of the Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 179-215.
- _____. (2009). "Enochic Judaism—A Judaism without the Torah and the Temple?" In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 163-77.
- Laansma, Jon C. (1997). "I Will Give you Rest": *The Rest Motif in the New Testament with Special Reference to Mt 11 and Heb 3-4*. WUNT 2, 98. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).
- _____. (2008a). "The Cosmology of Hebrews." In *Cosmology and New Testament Theology*. LNTS 355. Edited by Jonathan T. Pennington and Sean M. McDonough. London: T&T Clark: 125-43.
- _____. (2008b). "Hidden Stories in Hebrews: Cosmology and Theology." In *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrews in its Ancient Contexts*. LNTS 387. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel Driver, Trevor Hart and Nathan MacDonald. London: T&T Clark: 9-18.
- Laato, Antti (1998). "The Apocalypse of the Syriac Baruch and the Date of the End." *JSP* 18: 39-46.
- Lanchester, H. C. O. (1913). "The Sibylline Oracles." *APOT* 2: 268-517.
- Lane, William L. (1985). "Hebrews: A Sermon in Search of a Setting." *SJOT* 28: 13-18.

- _____. (1991a). *Hebrews 1-8*. WBC 47A. Dallas, Tex.: Word.
- _____. (1991b). *Hebrews 9-13*. WBC 47B. Dallas, Tex.: Word.
- Lane, William R. (1959). "A New Commentary Structure in 4Q Florilegium." *JBL* 78: 343-46.
- Lange, Armin (1995). *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran*. STDJ 18. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- _____. (2000). "The Determination of Fate by the Oracle of the Lot in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Mesopotamian Literature." In *Sapiential, Liturgical & Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet*. STDJ 35. Edited by Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez and E. M. Schuller. Leiden: Brill: 39-48.
- _____. (2008). "Your Daughters do not Give to their Sons and their Daughters do not Take for your Sons (Ezra 9,12). Teil 2, Intermarriage in Ezra 9-10 and in the Pre-Maccabean Dead Sea Scrolls." *BN* 139: 79-98.
- Langkammer, H. (1966). "Den er zum Erben von allem *eingesetzt* hat' [Hebr 1,2]." *BZ* 10: 273-80.
- _____. (1993). "πρωτότοκος." *EDNT* 3: 189-91.
- Laporte, Jean (1983). *Eucharistia in Philo*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 3. New York, N.Y./Toronto, Ill.: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- Larcher, C. (1983). *Le Livre de la Sagesse, ou, La Sagesse de Salomon*. Paris: Gabalda.
- Larson, Erik (2009). "Worship in Jubilees and Enoch." In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 369-83.
- Lategan, Bernard C. (1990). "Some Implication of Hebrews 2:5-18 for a Contextual Anthropology." In *Text and Logos: The Humanistic Interpretation of the New Testament*. Edited by Theodore W. Jennings. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press: 149-63.
- Lattey, C. (1942). "The Messianic Expectation in the 'Assumption of Moses'." *CBQ* 4: 11.
- Laurin, Robert B. (1958). "The Question of Immortality in the Qumran 'Hodayot'." *JSS* 3: 344-55.
- Leaney, A. R. C. (1966). *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning: Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. NTL. London: SCM.
- Lee, Aquila H. (2005). *From Messiah to Preexistent Son: Jesus' Self-consciousness and Early Christian Exegesis of Messianic Psalms*. WUNT 192. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).
- Lee, E. K. (1961). "Words Denoting 'Pattern' in the New Testament." *NTS* 8: 166-73.
- Lee, Pilchan (2001). *The New Jerusalem in the Book of Revelation: a Study of Revelation 21-22 in the Light of its Background in Jewish Tradition*. WUNT 2, 129. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).
- Leemhuis, Fred (1989). "The Arabic Version of the Apocalypse of Baruch: a Christian Text?" *JSP* 4: 19-26.
- Leemhuis, Fred, A. F. J. Klijn and G. J. H. van Gelder (1986). *The Arabic Text of the Apocalypse of Baruch. Edited and Translated with a Parallel Translation of the Syriac Text*. Leiden: Brill.
- Lehne, Susanne (1990). *The New Covenant in Hebrews*. JSNTSup 44. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

- Leithart, P. J. (2000). "Womb of the World: Baptism and the Priesthood of the New Covenant in Hebrews 10:19-22." *JNTS* 78: 49-65.
- Leonhardt-Balzer, Jutta (2007). "Jewish Worship and Universal Identity in Philo of Alexandria." In *Jewish Identity in the Greco-Roman World*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Daniel R. Schwartz and Stephanie Gripentrog. Leiden: Brill: 29-53.
- Leoni, Tommaso (2007). "'Against Caesar's wishes': Flavius Josephus as a Source for the Burning of the Temple." *JJS* 58: 39-51.
- Leschert, Dale F. (1994). *Hermeneutical Foundations of Hebrews: A Study in the Validity of the Epistle's Interpretation of Some Core Citations from the Psalms*. NABPR Dissertation Series 10. Lewiston/Queenston/Lampeter: Edwin Mellen.
- Leslau, Wolf (1991). *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez (Classical Ethiopic): Ge'ez-English / English-Ge'ez with an Index of Semitic Roots*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Levenson, Jon D. (1984). "The Temple and the World." *JR* 64: 275-98.
- _____. (1985). *Sinai and Zion*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Winston.
- _____. (1988a). *Creation and The Persistence of Evil: The Jewish Drama of Divine Omnipotence*. San Francisco, Calif.: Harper & Row.
- _____. (1988b). "The Jerusalem Temple in Devotional and Visionary Experience." In *Jewish Spirituality: From The Bible Through The Middle Ages*. World Spirituality: An Encyclopedic History of The Religious Quest 13. Edited by Arthur Green. New York, N.Y.: Crossroads. 1: 32-61.
- Levey, Samson H. (1987). *The Targum of Ezekiel*. ArBib. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Levine, Lee I. (1994). "Josephus' Description of the Jerusalem Temple: *War*, *Antiquities*, and Other Sources." In *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith*. StPB 41. Edited by Fausto Parente and Joseph Sievers. Leiden: Brill: 233-46.
- _____. (2010a). "Jerusalem." *DEJ*: 789-97.
- _____. (2010b). "Temple, Jerusalem." *DEJ*: 1281-91.
- Levison, John R. (1988). *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: from Sirach to 2 Baruch*. JSPSup 1. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Lewis, Charlton T. and Charles Short (1966). *A Latin Dictionary: Founded on Andrews' Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Licht, J. (1957). *The Thanksgiving Scroll*. Jerusalem: Bialik.
- _____. (1961). "Taxo, or the Apocalyptic Doctrine of Vengeance." *JJS* 12: 95-103.
- _____. (1965). מגילת הסרכים ממגילות מדבר יהודה [*The Rule Scroll. A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judea*] (*Hebrew*). Jerusalem: Bialik (*non vid.*).
- _____. (1971). "Abraham, Apocalypse of." *EncJud* 2: 126-27.
- _____. (1979). "An Ideal Town Plan from Qumran. The Description of the New Jerusalem." *IEJ* 29: 45-59.
- Lichtenberger, Hermann (1980). *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde*. SUNT 15. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

- _____. (1999). "Zion and the Destruction of the Temple in 4 Ezra 9-10." In *Gemeinde ohne Temple/ Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. WUNT 118. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange and Peter Pilhofer. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck): 239-49.
- Lied, Liv Ingeborg (2008). *The Other Lands of Israel: Imaginations of the Land in 2 Baruch*. JSJSup 129. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Lim, Timothy H. (1998). "Review of Annette Steudel *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{ab}): materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ('Florilegium') und 4Q177 ('Catena A') repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden*." JNES 57: 71-72.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. (1982). "Sabbath, Rest and Eschatology in the New Testament." In *From Sabbath to Lord's Day: A Biblical Historical and Theological Investigation*. Edited by D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan: 197-220.
- _____. (1990). *Ephesians*. WBC 42. Dallas: Word.
- _____. (2006). *Hebrews: a Guide*. London: T&T Clark.
- Lindars, Barnabas (1961). *New Testament Apologetic*. London: SCM.
- _____. (1981). "Enoch and Christology." *ExpTim* 92: 295-99.
- _____. (1989). "The Rhetorical Structure of Hebrews." *NTS* 35: 382-406.
- _____. (1991). *The Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lioy, Dan (2010). *Axis of Glory: A Biblical and Theological Analysis of the Temple Motif in Scripture*. Studies in Biblical Literature 138. New York, N.Y.: Peter Lang.
- Lloyd-Jones, Hugh (1996). *Sophocles Fragments*. LCL 483. Cambridge, Mass./London: Harvard University Press.
- Loader, William R. G. (1978). "Christ at the Right Hand: Ps cx.1 in the New Testament." *NTS* 24: 199-217.
- _____. (1981). *Sohn und Hohenpriester: Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Christologie des Hebräerbriefs*. WMANT 53. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.
- _____. (2007). *Enoch, Levi and Jubilees on Sexuality: Attitudes to Sexuality in the Early Enochic Literature, the Aramaic Levi Document, and the Book of Jubilees*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- Lockett, Darian (2005). "The Spectrum of Wisdom and Eschatology in the Epistle of James and 4QInstruction." *TynBul* 56: 131-48.
- Lohfink, Norbert (1969). *The Christian Meaning of the Old Testament*. London: Burns & Oates.
- Löhr, Hermut (1993). "'Umriß' und 'Schatten.' Bemerkungen Zitierung von Ex 25,40 in Hebr. 8." *ZNW* 84: 218-32.
- _____. (2005). "Reflections of Rhetorical Terminology in Hebrews." In *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods – New Insights*. Biblical Interpretation Series 75. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 199-210.
- Lohse, E. (1963). *Märtyrer und Gottesknecht*. FRLANT 46. 2nd durchgesehene und erweiterte Auflage. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- _____. (1971). "ΣΙΩΝ, Κ.Τ.Λ." *TDNT* 7: 292-338.

- _____. (1986). *Die Texte aus Qumran: Hebräische und Deutsch*. 4th ed. München: Kösel.
- Lombard, H. A. (1971). "Katapausis in the Epistle to the Hebrews." *Neot* 5: 60-71.
- Long, Thomas (1997). *Hebrews*. IBC. Louisville, Ky.: John Knox.
- Long Westfall, Cynthia (2000). "Moses and Hebrews 3:1-6: Approach or Avoidance?" In *Christian-Jewish Relations through the Centuries*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Brook W. R. Pearson. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press: 175-201.
- _____. (2005). *A Discourse Analysis of the Letter to the Hebrews: The Relationship between Form and Meaning*. LNTS 297. London: T&T Clark.
- Longenecker, Bruce W. (1991). *Eschatology and the Covenant: A Comparison of 4 Ezra and Romans 1-11*. JSNTSup. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- _____. (1995). *2 Esdras*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- _____. (1997). "Locating 4 Ezra: A Consideration of Its Social Setting and Functions." *JSJ* 28: 271-93.
- Longenecker, Richard N. (1975). *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- _____. (1978). "The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews." In *Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology*. Edited by R. A. Guelich. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans: 161-85.
- Louw, Johannes P. and Eugene A. Nida (1988). *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament based on Semantic Domains*. New York, N.Y.: United Bible Societies.
- Lucas, Ernest (1989). "The Origin of Daniel's Four Empires Scheme Re-examined." *TynBul* 40: 185-202.
- Lundquist, John M. (1983). "What is a Temple: a Preliminary Typology." In *The Quest for the Kingdom of God: Studies in Honor of George E. Mendenhall*. Edited by H. B. Huffmon, F. A. Spina and A. R. W. Green. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns: 205-19.
- Lunt, H. G. (1985). "The Ladder of Jacob: A New Translation and Introduction." *OTP* 2: 401-11.
- Lust, Johan, Erik Eynikel and Katrin Hauspie (2003). *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Luther, Martin (1939). "Die Vorlesung über den Hebräerbrief." In *D. Martin Luther's Werke, 57 Band, Nachschriften der Vorlesungen über Römerbrief und Hebräerbrief*. Kritische Gesamtausgabe. Weimar: Herman Böhlau.
- Lyons, W. J. and A. M. Reimer (1998). "The Demonic Virus and Qumran Studies: Some Preventative Measures." *DSD* 5: 16-32.
- Macaskill, Grant (2007). *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. JSJSup 115. Leiden: Brill.
- Mach, Michael (1992). *Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabbinischer Zeit*. TSAJ 34. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).
- _____. (2000). "From Apocalypticism to Early Jewish Mysticism." In *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism*. Edited by John J. Collins. New York, N.Y./London: Continuum. 1: 229-64.
- Mack, Burton L. (1985). *Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic: Ben Sira's Hymn in Praise of the Fathers*. Chicago, Ill. : University of Chicago Press.

- Mackie, Scott D. (2007). *Eschatology and Exhortation in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. WUNT 2, 223. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).
- _____. (2008). "Confession of the Son of God in the Exordium of Hebrews." *JSNT* 30: 437-53.
- Mackay, Peter W. (1990). *The Centrality of Metaphors to Biblical Thought*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 19. Lewiston/Queenston/Lampeter: Edwin Mellen.
- MacRae, George W. (1978). "Heavenly Temple and Eschatology in the Epistle to the Hebrews." *Semeia* 12: 179-99.
- Maher, Michael (1992). *The Targum Pseudo-Jonathan to Genesis*. ArBib 1B. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Maier, Johann (1964). *Vom Kultus zur Gnosis: Studien zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte der "jüdischen Gnosis": Bundeslade, Gottesthron und Märkabab*. Salzburg: Otto Müller.
- _____. (1985). *The Temple Scroll: An Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. JSOTSup 34. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- _____. (1992). "Shîrê 'Ôlat hash-Shabbat. Some Observations on their Calendric Implications and on their Style." In *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Madrid. 18-21 March, 1991*. STDJ 11, 2. Edited by Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner. Leiden: Brill. 2: 543-60.
- Manson, William (1951). *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Historical and Theological Reconsideration*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Mansoor, Menahem (1961). *The Thanksgiving Hymns: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction*. STDJ 3. Leiden: Brill.
- Marböck, J. (1971). *Weisheit im Wandel: Untersuchungen zur Weisheitstheologie bei Ben Sira*. BBB. Bonn: Peter Hanstein.
- _____. (1981). "Henoch–Adam–der Thronwagen." *BZ* 25: 103-11.
- _____. (1999). "Der Hohepriester Simon in Sir 50: ein Beitrag zur Bedeutung von Priestertum und Kult im Sirachbuch." In *Treasures of Wisdom: Studies in ben Sira and the Book of Wisdom, Festschrift M. Gilbert*. Edited by N. Calduch-Benages and J. Vermeylen. Leuven: Leuven University Press: 215-29.
- Marcos, Natalio Fernández (2000). *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*. Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill.
- Maré, Leonard P. (2010). "The Messianic Interpretation of Psalm 8:4-6 in Hebrews 2:6-9. Part I." In *Psalms and Hebrews: Studies in Reception*. Edited by Dirk J. Human and Gert J. Steyn. New York, N.Y./London: T&T Clark: 99-112.
- Marguerat, Daniel (2007). "Jewish and Christian Understandings of the Fall of Jerusalem: Conflicting Interpretations of a Historical Event." In *Ancient and Modern Scriptural Historiography*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Thomas Römer. Leuven: Leuven University Press: 311-31.
- Martin, Matthew J. (2000). "The School of Virtue and the Tent of Zion: An Investigation into the Relationship Between the Institutions of the Graeco-Roman Diaspora Synagogue and the Jerusalem Temple in Late Second Temple Judaism: Philo of Alexandria—A Case Study." PhD Thesis. University of Melbourne.
- Martin, R. P. (1976). "ὑπόδειγμα." *NIDNTT* 2: 290-91.
- Mason, Steve N. (2003). *Josephus and the New Testament*. 2nd ed. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson.

- Mathews, Kenneth A. (1996). *Genesis 1-11:26*. NAC 1A. Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman and Holman.
- Mathewson, David (2003). "A Note on the Foundation Stones in Revelation 21.14, 19-20." *JSNT* 25: 487-98.
- Mayer, B (1990). "ἐλπίς, κ.τ.λ." *EDNT* 1: 437-41.
- McCarter, P. Kyle Jr. (2000). "Geography in the Documents." *EDSS* 1: 306-08.
- McCullough, J.C. (1971). "Hebrews and the Old Testament." PhD Thesis. Queens University, Belfast.
- McKane, William (1998). *The Book of Micah: Introduction and Commentary*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- McKelvey, R. J. (1969). *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament*. Oxford Theological Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McKenzie, J. L. (1956). "Mythological Allusions in Ezek 28:12-18." *JBL* 75: 322-27.
- _____. (1957). "Royal Messianism." *CBQ* 19 (1): 25-52.
- McLaren, James S. (2010). "Josephus, Jewish War." *DEJ*: 838-41.
- McLay, R. Timothy (2003). *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- McRay, John (1980). "Atonement and Apocalyptic in the Book of Hebrews." *ResQ* 23: 1-9.
- Meadowcroft, Tim (1995). *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel: A Literary Comparison*. JSOTSup 198. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- _____. (2006). *Haggai*. Readings: A New Biblical Commentary. Sheffield: Phoenix.
- Mearns, Christopher L. (1979). "Dating the Similitudes of Enoch." *NTS* 25: 360-69.
- Meeks, Wayne A. (1968). "Moses as God and King." In *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough*. Edited by Jacob Neusner. Leiden: Brill: 354-71.
- Meier, J. P. (1985a). "Structure and Theology in Heb 1,1-14." *Bib* 66: 168-89.
- _____. (1985b). "Symmetry and Theology in the Old Testament Citations of Heb 1,5-14." *Bib* 66: 504-33.
- Mendels, D. (1998). "The Polemical Character of 'On Kingship' in the Temple Scroll: An Attempt at Dating 11QTemple." In *Identity, Religion and Historiography: Studies in Hellenistic History*. JSPSup 24. Edited by D. Mendels. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press: 365-78.
- Ménégos, E. (1894). *La Théologie de l'Épître aux Hébreux*. Paris: Fischbacher.
- Metso, Sarianna (1997). *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*. STDJ 26. Leiden/New York, N.Y./Köln: Brill.
- _____. (1998). "The Use of Old Testament Quotations in the Qumran Community Rule." In *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments*. JSOTSup 290. Edited by Frederick H. Cryer and T. L. Thompson. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press: 217-31.
- Metzger, Bruce M. (1983). "The Fourth Book of Ezra with the Four Additional Chapters: A New Translation and Introduction." *OTP* 1: 516-59.
- _____. (1994). *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (Fourth Revised Edition)*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Meyer, M (1997). "Mysteries." *DNTB*: 720-25.

- Michaelis, Wilhelm (1967). “ὁδός, κ.τ.λ.” *TDNT* 5: 42-114.
- _____. (1968). “πρωτότοκος, πρωτοτόκια.” *TDNT* 6: 871-81.
- _____. (1971). “σκήνη.” *TDNT* 7: 368-81.
- Michaels, J. Ramsey (1988). *1 Peter*. WBC 49. Dallas, Tex.: Word.
- Michel, O. (1966). *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. 12 Auflage. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- _____. (1967). “οἰκουμένη.” *TDNT* 5: 157-59.
- _____. (1975). *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. 13 Auflage. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Milgrom, Jacob (1978). “The Temple Scroll.” *BA* 41 (3): 105-20.
- _____. (1993). “The Concept of Impurity in Jubilees and the Temple Scroll.” *RevQ* 16: 277-84.
- _____. (2004). *Leviticus: A Book of Ritual and Ethics*. CCS. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress.
- Milik, J. T. (1951). “Manuale Disciplinae.” *VD* 29: 129-58.
- _____. (1955a). “Description de la Jérusalem Nouvelle (?).” In *Qumran Cave 1*. DJD I. Edited by D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik. Oxford: Clarendon: 134-35.
- _____. (1955b). “Deux apocryphes en araméen.” In *Qumran Cave 1*. DJD I. Edited by D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik. Oxford: Clarendon: 97-99.
- _____. (1955c). “Le testament de Lévi en araméen: Fragment de la grotte 4 de Qumrân (Pl. IV.).” *RB* 62: 398-406.
- _____. (1955d). “Recueil des Bénédictiones.” In *Qumran Cave 1*. DJD I. Edited by D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik. Oxford: Clarendon: 118-30.
- _____. (1955e). “Testament de Lévi.” In *Qumran Cave 1*. DJD I. Edited by D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik. Oxford: Clarendon: 87-91.
- _____. (1955f). “Une apocryphe.” In *Qumran Cave 1*. DJD I. Edited by D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik. Oxford: Clarendon: 101-02.
- _____. (1962). “Textes de la Grotte 5Q.” In *Les ‘Petites Grottes’ de Qumrân*. DJD III. Oxford: Clarendon: 167-97.
- _____. (1971). “Problèmes de la Littérature Hénochique à la Lumière des Fragments Araméens de Qumrân.” *HTR* 64: 333-78.
- _____. (1972). “Milkî-sedeq et Milkî-reša’ dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens.” *JJS* 23: 95-144.
- _____. (1976). *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Miller, James C. (2005). “Paul and Hebrews: A Comparison of Narrative Worlds.” In *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods – New Insights*. Biblical Interpretation Series 75. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 245-64.
- Miscall, Peter D. (1992). “Isaiah: New Heavens, New Earth, New Book.” In *Reading Between Texts*. Edited by Danna Nolan Fewell. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press: 41-56.
- Mitchell, Alan C. (1992). “The Use of πρέπειν and Rhetorical Propriety in Hebrews 2:10.” *CBQ* 54: 681-701.

- _____. (2007). *Hebrews*. SP 13. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press.
- Moberly, R. Walter L. (2009). "Exemplars of Faith in Hebrews 11: Abel." In *The Epistle to Hebrews and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel Driver, Trevor Hart and Nathan MacDonald. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 353-63.
- Moffatt, James A. (1924). *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Moloney, F. J. (1981). "The Re-interpretation of Psalm VIII and the Son of Man Debate." *NTS* 27: 656-72.
- Momigliano, A. (1980). "La Forma Storica dei Vaticini sul Settimo Re nel Terzo Libro degli Oracoli sibillini." In *Sesto Contributo Alla Storia degli Studi Classici e del Mondo Antico*. Roma: Storia e Letteratura. 2: 551-59.
- Montefiore, H. A. (1964). *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. London: A&C Black.
- Murray-Jones, C. R. A. (1992). "Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition." *JJS* 43: 1-31.
- _____. (1993). "Paradise Revisited (2 Cor 12:1-12): The Jewish Mystical Background of Paul's Apostolate. Part 1: The Jewish Sources." *HTR* 86: 177-217.
- _____. (1998). "The Temple Within: The Embodied Divine Image and its Worship in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish and Christian Sources." In *SBLSP 38*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press. 1: 400-31.
- Mosser, Carl (2009a). "Rahab Outside the Camp." In *The Epistle to the Hebrews and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel R. Driver, Trevor A. Hart and Nathan MacDonald. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 383-404.
- _____. (2009b) "Review of Gabriella Gelardini, 'Verhärtert eure Herzen nicht': Der Hebräer, eine Synagogenhomilie zu Tischa be-Aw." *RBL*. Online: [HTTP://www.bookreviews.org](http://www.bookreviews.org). Retrieved 30 August 2011.
- _____. (2011) "Torah Instruction, Discussion, and Prophecy in First-Century Synagogues." Online: http://eastern.academia.edu/CarlMosser/Papers/115948/_Torah_Instruction_Discussion_and_Prophecy_in_First-Century_Synagogues, 1-20. Retrieved 11 March 2011.
- Motyer, Steve (1999). "The Psalm Quotations of Hebrews 1: A Hermeneutic-Free Zone." *TynBul* 50: 3-22.
- _____. (2004). "The Temple in Hebrews: Is it There?" In *Heaven on Earth: The Temple in Biblical Theology*. Edited by T. Desmond Alexander and Simon Gathercole. Carlisle: Paternoster: 177-89.
- Moulton, James Hope and G. Milligan (1930). *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament: Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Moulton, James Hope and Nigel Turner (1963). *A Grammar of New Testament Greek: Volume 3: Syntax by Nigel Turner*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Mowinckel, Sigmund (1966). *Psalmstudien, Buch II*. Amsterdam: P. Schippers.
- Muddiman, John (2007). "The Assumption of Moses and the Epistle of Jude." In *The Assumption of Moses and the Epistle of Jude*. BZAW 372. Edited by Axel Graupner and Michael Wolter. Berlin/New York, N.Y.: Walter de Gruyter: 169-80.
- Mueller, James R. (1982). "The Apocalypse of Abraham and the Destruction of the Second Jewish Temple." In *SBLSP 21*. Edited by Kent Harold Richards. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press: 341-49.

- Mulder, Otto (2002). "Two Approaches: Simon the High Priest and YHWH God of Israel/God of All in Sirach 50." In *Ben Sira's God: Proceedings of the International Ben Sira Conference Durham–Ushaw College, 2001*. Edited by Renate Egger-Wenzel. Berlin/New York, N.Y.: Walter de Gruyter: 221-34.
- _____. (2003). *Simon the High Priest in Sirach 50: An Exegetical Study of the Significance of Simon the High Priest as Climax to the Praise of the Fathers in Ben Sira's Concept of the History of Israel*. JSJSup 78. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Müller, H. (1986). "Type, Pattern." *NIDNTT* 3: 903-07.
- Müller, P. -G. (1990). "ἀρχηγός, οὐ, ὁ." *EDNT* 1: 163-64.
- Muntingh, L. M. (1971). "'The City Which has Foundations,' Heb. 11:8-10 in the Light of the Mari Texts." In *De fructu oris sui: Essays in Honour of Adrianus von Selms*. Edited by E. Y. Eybers, F. C. Fensham, C. B. Labuschagne, W. C. Van Wyk and A. H. Van Zyl. Leiden: Brill: 108-20.
- Muraoka, T. (2002). *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: (Chiefly of the Pentateuch and Twelve Prophets)*. Louvain: Peeters.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome (1969). "La genèse littéraire de la Règle de la Communauté." *RB* 76: 528-49.
- Murphy, Frederick James (1985a). "2 Baruch and the Romans." *JBL* 104: 663-69.
- _____. (1985b). *The Structure and Meaning of Second Baruch*. SBLDS 78. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press.
- _____. (1987). "The Temple in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch." *JBL* 106: 671-83.
- _____. (1988). "Retelling the Bible: Idolatry in Pseudo-Philo." *JBL* 107: 275-87.
- _____. (1993). *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____. (2010). "Biblical Antiquities (Pseudo-Philo)." *DEJ*: 440-41.
- Myers, J. M. (1974). *I & II Esdras*. AB 42. New York, N.Y.: Doubleday.
- Nairne, A. (1913). *The Epistle of Priesthood*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- _____. (1957). *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. CGTSC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Najman, Hindy (2000). "Angels at Sinai: Exegesis, Theology and Interpretive Authority." *DSD* 7: 313-33.
- _____. (2003). *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*. JSJSup 77. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Narborough, F. D. V. (1930). *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. The Clarendon Bible. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Nauck, W (1960). "Zum Aufbau des Hebräerbriefes." In *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias*. BZNW 26. Edited by Walther Eltester. Berlin: A. Töpelmann: 199-206.
- Nebe, G. Wilhelm (1998). "4Q174, 1-2, I, 6f im Lichte von Sektenschrift und Jub 2,22." *RevQ* 18: 581-87.
- Neusner, Jacob (1975). *Early Rabbinic Judaism: Historical Studies in Religion, Literature and Art*. SJLA. Leiden: Brill.
- Newsom, Carol A. (1980). "The Development of 1 Enoch 6-19: Cosmology and Judgment." *CBQ* 42: 310-29.
- _____. (1985). *The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition*. HSS 27. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press.
- _____. (1987). "Merkabah Exegesis in the Qumran Sabbath Shirot." *JJS* 38: 11-30.

- _____. (1990a). “‘He has Established for Himself Priests’: Human and Angelic Priesthood in the Qumran Sabbath Shirot.” In *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*. JSPSup 8. Edited by L. H. Schiffman. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press: 101-20.
- _____. (1990b). “The Sage in the Literature of Qumran: The Functions of the Maškil.” In *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns: 373-82.
- _____. (1990c). “‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature from Qumran.” In *The Hebrew Bible and its Interpreters*. Edited by William Henry Propp, Baruch Helpern and David Noel Freedman. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns: 167-87.
- _____. (1998). “Shirot ‘Olat Hashabbat.” In *Qumran Cave 4: VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1*. DJD XI. Edited by Emanuel Tov. Oxford: Clarendon: 173-401.
- _____. (2000a). “Mysticism.” *EDSS* 1: 591-94.
- _____. (2000b). “Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice.” *EDSS* 2: 887-89.
- _____. (2003). “Review of Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*.” *DSD* 10: 431-35.
- _____. (2004). *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*. STDJ 52. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- _____. (2010). “Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice.” *DEJ*: 1246-48.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. (1972). *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- _____. (1973a). “An Antiochan Date for the Testament of Moses.” In *Studies on the Testament of Moses*. SBLSCS 4. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg. Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature: 33-37.
- _____. (1973b). “Introduction.” In *Studies on the Testament of Moses*. SBLSCS 4. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg. Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature: 5-14.
- _____. (1973c). “Narrative Traditions in the Paralipomena of Jeremiah and 2 Baruch.” *CBQ* 35: 60-68.
- _____. (1977). “Apocalyptic and Myth in 1 Enoch 6-11.” *JBL* 96: 383-405.
- _____. (1978a). “Reflections upon Reflections: A Response to John Collins’ ‘Methodological Issues in the Study of 1 Enoch’.” In *SBL 1978 Seminar Papers*. Edited by Paul J. Achtmeyer. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press. 1: 311-14.
- _____. (1978b). “Review of J. T. Milik, *The Book of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*.” *CBQ* 40: 411-19.
- _____. (1980). “Good and Bad Leaders in Pseudo-Philo’s *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*.” In *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*. SBLSCS 12. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg and John J. Collins. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press: 49-65.
- _____. (1981). “Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee.” *JBL* 100: 575-600.
- _____. (1982). “The Epistle of Enoch and the Qumran Literature.” *JJS* 33: 333-48.
- _____. (1984). “The Bible Rewritten and Expanded.” In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. CRINT II 2. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Assen/Philadelphia, Pa.: Van Gorcum/Fortress: 89-156.

- _____. (1995). "Scripture in *1 Enoch* and *1 Enoch* as Scripture." In *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in their Textual and Situational Contexts: Essays in Honor of Lars Hartman*. Edited by Torm Fornberg, David Hellholm and Christer D. Hellholm. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press; 333-54.
- _____. (2001). *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1-36; 81-108*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress.
- _____. (2003). "Response to Hanan Eshel and Esther Eshel." In *George W.E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning*. Edited by Jacob Neusner and Alan J. Avery-Peck. Leiden: Brill. 2: 469-71.
- _____. (2005a). *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress.
- _____. (2005b). "Response: Context, Text and Social Setting of the Apocalypse of Weeks." In *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini, J. Harold Ellens and James Alan Waddell. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans: 234-41.
- _____. (2006). *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity*. HTS 56. Expanded ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- _____. (2007). "Discerning the Structure(s) of the Enochic Book of Parables." In *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of the Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 23-47.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. and James C. VanderKam (2004). *1 Enoch: A New Translation Based on the Hermeneia Commentary*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress.
- Niditch, Susan (1986). "Ezekiel 40-48 in a Visionary Context." *CBQ* 48 (2): 208-24.
- Nikiprowetzky, Valentin (1970). *La troisième Sibylle. Oracula sibyllina. Book 3*. Paris: La Haye/Mouton.
- _____. (1972). "Réflexions sur quelques problèmes du quatrième et du cinquième livre des Oracles Sibyllins." *HUCA* 43: 29-76.
- Ninow, Friedbert (2001). *Indicators of Typology Within the Old Testament: The Exodus Motif*. Friedensauer Schriftenreihe-Reihe A Theologie 4. Frankfurt-am-Main: Peter Lang.
- Nir, Rivka (2003). *The Destruction of Jerusalem and the Idea of Redemption in the "Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch"*. SBLJL 20. Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Nitzan, Bilhah (1992). "Hymns from Qumran - 4Q410-4Q511." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. STDJ 10. Edited by Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport. Leiden: Brill: 53-63.
- _____. (1994a). "4QBerakhot (4Q286-290): A Preliminary Report." In *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris, 1992*. STDJ 15. Edited by George J. Brooke and Florentino García Martínez. Leiden: Brill: 53-71.
- _____. (1994b). "Harmonic and Mystical Characteristics in Poetic and Liturgical Writings From Qumran." *JQR* 85: 163-83.
- _____. (1994c). *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*. STDJ 12. Leiden: Brill.
- _____. (1995). "4QBerakhot a-c (4Q286-290): A Covenantal Ceremony in the Light of Related Texts." *RevQ* 16: 487-506.
- _____. (1998). "4QBerakhot." In *Qumran Cave 4: Poetical and Liturgical Texts Part 1*. DJD XI. Edited by Emanuel Tov. Oxford: Clarendon: 1-74.

- _____. (2000). "The Idea of Holiness in Qumran Poetry and Liturgy." In *Sapiential, Liturgical & Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet*. STDJ 35. Edited by Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez and E. M. Schuller. Leiden: Brill: 127-45.
- _____. (2003). "Prayers for Peace in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of an International Symposium of the Orion Center, 19-23 January, 2000*. STDJ 48. Edited by Esther G. Chazon, Ruth A. Clements and Avital Pinnick. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 113-32.
- Noack, Bent (1963). "Are the Essenes Referred to in the Sibylline Oracles." *Studia Theologica* 17: 90-102.
- Nolland, John (1978). "A Misleading Statement of the Essene Attitude to the Temple." *RevQ* 9: 555-62.
- _____. (1979). "Sib Or III: 265-94: An Early Maccabean Messianic Oracle." *JTS* 30: 158-66.
- _____. (1989). *Luke 1:1–9:20*. WBC 35A. Dallas, Tex.: Word.
- _____. (1993). *Luke 9:21–18:34*. WBC 35B. Dallas, Tex.: Word.
- Nomoto, Shinya (1968). "Herkunft und Struktur der Hohenpriestervorstellung im Hebräerbrief." *NovT* 10: 10-25.
- O'Neill, J. C. (1991). "The Man from Heaven: SibOr 5:256-259." *JSP* 9: 87-102.
- O'Brien, Peter T. (2010). *The Letter to the Hebrews*. The Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans.
- Oberholtzer, Thomas K. (1988a). "The Eschatological Salvation of Hebrews 1:5–2:5." *BSac* 145: 83-97.
- _____. (1988b). "The Kingdom Rest of Hebrews 3:1–4:13." *BSac* 145: 185-96.
- Oegema, Gerbern S. (2007). "'The Coming of the Righteous One' in Acts and 1 Enoch." In *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of the Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 250-59.
- Olson, Daniel C. (1993). "Recovering the Original Sequence of 1 Enoch 91-93." *JSP* 6: 69-91.
- _____. (2004). *Enoch: A New Translation: The Ethiopic Book of Enoch, or 1 Enoch. Translated with Annotations and Cross-References in consultation with Archbishop Melkesedek Workeneh*. North Richland Hills, Tex.: Bibal.
- Olyan, Saul M. (1987). "Ben Sira's Relationship to the Priesthood." *HTR* 80: 261-86.
- Orlov, Andrei A. (2000). "The Melchizedek Legend of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch." *JSJ* 31: 23-38.
- _____. (2003). "On the Polemical Nature of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: A Reply to C. Böttrich." *JSJ* 34: 274-303.
- _____. (2004a). "Celestial Choirmaster: The Liturgical Role of Enoch-Metatron in 2 Enoch and the Merkabah Tradition." *JSP* 14 (1): 3-29.
- _____. (2004b). "The Face as the Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the Slavonic Ladder of Jacob." In *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture. Volume 2, Later Versions and Traditions*. Edited by Craig A. Evans. London/New York, N.Y.: T&T Clark. 2: 59-76.
- _____. (2004c). "Noah's Younger Brother Revisited: Anti-Noachic Polemics and the Date of 2 (Slavonic) Enoch." *Hen* 26: 172-87.
- _____. (2005a). *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*. TSAJ 107. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).

- _____. (2005b). “‘Without Measure and Without Analogy’: Shirur Qomah Traditions in 2 (Slavonic) Enoch.” *JJS* 56: 224-44.
- _____. (2007). “Moses’ Heavenly Counterpart in the Book of Jubilees and the Exagoge of Ezekiel the Tragedian.” *Bib* 88: 153-73.
- _____. (2008a). “‘The Gods of my Father Terah’: Abraham the Iconoclast and the Polemics with the Divine Body Traditions in the Apocalypse of Abraham.” *JSP* 18: 33-53.
- _____. (2008b). “Praxis of the Voice: the Divine Name Tradition in the Apocalypse of Abraham.” *JBL* 127: 53-70.
- _____. (2009a). “The Pteromorphic Angelology of the Apocalypse of Abraham.” *CBQ* 71: 830-42.
- _____. (2009b). *Selected Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*. SVTP. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Osborne, Grant O. (1975). “Soteriology in the Epistle to the Hebrews.” In *Grace Unlimited*. Edited by Clark H. Pinnock. Minneapolis, Minn.: Bethany Fellowship.
- _____. (2003). “The Christ of Hebrews and other Religions.” *JETS* 46: 249-67.
- Osty, Emile (1957). *Le Livre de la Sagesse*. La Sainte Bible. 2nd ed., revue. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf.
- Oswalt, John N. (1986). *The Book of Isaiah Chapters 1-39*. NICOT. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- _____. (2002). “𐤒𐤓 etc.” *NIDOTTE* 3: 56-59.
- Otzen, Benedikt (1984). “Heavenly Visions in Early Judaism: Origin and Function.” In *In the Shelter of Elyon: Essays on Ancient Palestinian Life and Literature in Honor of G. W. Ahlström*. JSOTSup 31. Edited by W. Boyd Barrick and John R. Spencer. Sheffield: JSOT Press: 199-215.
- Owen, John (1854). *The Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews, with Preliminary Exercitations*. The Works of John Owen 19. Edinburgh: Johnstone and Hunter.
- Parry, D. W. (1994). “Garden of Eden: Prototype Sanctuary.” In *Temples of the Ancient World: Ritual and Symbolism*. Edited by D. W. Parry. Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book Co: 126-51.
- Patai, Raphael (1967). *Man and Temple in Ancient Jewish Myth and Ritual*. 2nd ed. New York, N.Y.: KTAV.
- Pate, C. Marvin (2000). *Communities of the Last Days: The Dead Sea Scrolls, the New Testament & the Story of Israel*. Leicester: Apollos.
- Patton, Corinne (2000). “Review of Michael Chyutin, *The New Jerusalem Scroll from Qumran: A Comprehensive Reconstruction*.” *JBL* 119: 560-61.
- Peake, A. S. (1914). *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. The Century Bible. Edinburgh: T. C. and E. C. Jack.
- Pearson, Birger A. (1998). “Melchizedek in Early Judaism, Christianity, Gnosticism.” In *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*. Edited by Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergren. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International: 176-202.
- Pennington, A (1984). “The Apocalypse of Abraham.” In *The Apocrypha of the Old Testament*. Edited by H. F. D. Sparks. Oxford: Clarendon: 363-91.
- Perdue, Leo G. (1977). *Wisdom and Cult: A Critical Analysis of the Views of Cult in the Wisdom Literatures of Israel and the Ancient Near East*. SBLDS 30. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press.
- _____. (1994). *Wisdom and Creation: The Theology of the Wisdom Literature*. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon.

- Perkins, Larry J. (2007). "Exodus." In *NETS*. Electronic ed. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin Wright. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 43-81.
- Perrin, N. (1976). "Son of Man." *IDBSup*: 833-36.
- Perrot, Charles, Pierre Bogaert, Jacques Cazeaux and Daniel J. Harrington (1976). *Pseudo-Philon: Les Antiquités Bibliques*. SC 229, 230. Paris: Éditions du cerf.
- Petersen, Anders Klostergaard (2007). "Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon—Genre, Textual Strategy, or Canonical Anachronism?" In *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. Edited by Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech and Eibert Tigchelaar. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 285-306.
- Petersen, David L. (1985). *Haggai and Zechariah 1-8: A Commentary*. London: SCM.
- Peterson, David (1982). *Hebrews and Perfection: An Examination of the Concept of Perfection in "The Epistle to the Hebrews."* SNTSMS 47. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pfitzner, V. C. (1997). *Hebrews*. ANTC. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon.
- Philo (1929-1962). *Philo in Ten Volumes (and Two Supplementary Volumes)*. LCL. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Pietersma, Albert (2009). "Psalms." In *NETS*. Electronic ed. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 542-620.
- Piovanelli, Pierluigi (2007). "'A Testimony for the Kings and the Mighty who Possess the Earth': The Thirst for Justice and Peace in the Parables of Enoch." In *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of the Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 363-79.
- Plutarch (1927-1976). *Plutarch's Moralia*. LCL London: Heinemann.
- Poirier, John (2004). "The Ouranology of the Apocalypse of Abraham." *JSJ* 35: 391-408.
- Porter, Paul A. (1983). *Metaphors and Monsters: A Literary Critical Study of Daniel 7 and 8*. CB Old Testament Series 20. Lund: CWK Gleerup.
- Porter, Stanley E. (1994). *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Pouilly, J. (1976). *La règle de la communauté de Qumran: son évolution littéraire*. CahRB. Paris: Gabalda.
- Poythress, Vern S. (1976). "The Holy Ones of the Most High in Daniel VII." *VT* 26: 208-13.
- Preisker, H. (1967). "διόρθωσις." *TDNT* 5: 540.
- Priest, John F. (1962). "Mebaqqer, Paqid, and the Messiah." *JBL* 81: 55-61.
- _____. (1963). "The Messiah and the Meal in 1QSa." *JBL* 82: 95-100.
- _____. (1983). "Testament of Moses: A New Translation and Introduction." *OTP* 1: 919-34.
- Prinsloo, W. S. (1995). "Psalm 95: If Only You Will Listen to His Voice!" In *The Bible in Human Society: Essays in Honour of John Rogerson*. JSOTSup 200. Edited by M. Daniel Carroll R., David J. A. Clines and Philip R. Davies. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press: 393-410.
- Propp, William H. C. (1998). *Exodus 1-18*. AB 2. New York, N.Y.: Doubleday.
- Puech, É. (1987). "Review of *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition*." *RB* 94: 604-13.

- _____. (1988). "Quelques aspects de la restauration du Rouleau des Hymnes (1QH)." *JJS* 39: 38-55.
- _____. (1992). "Fragments d'un apocryphe de Lévi et le personnage eschatologique: 4QTestLévi c-d(?) et 4QAJa." In *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Madrid. 18-21 March, 1991*. STDJ 11, 2. Edited by Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner. Leiden: Brill. 2: 449-501.
- _____. (1993). *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d'une croyance dans le Judaïsme ancien*. EB 21, 22. Paris: J. Gabalda.
- _____. (1995). "À propos de la Jérusalem Nouvelle d'après les manuscrits de la Mer Morte." *Semitica* 43-44: 87-102.
- _____. (2008). "Les identités en présence dans les scènes du jugement dernier de 4QInstruction (4Q416 1 et 4Q418 69 II)." In *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović. Leiden: Brill: 147-73.
- _____. (2009). *Qumrân Grotte 4.27: Textes Araméens, Deuxième Partie*. DJD XXXVII. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Qimron, Elisha (1986a). *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. HSS. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press.
- _____. (1986b). "A Review Article of *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifices: A Critical Edition*, by Carol Newsom." *HTR* 79: 349-71.
- _____. (1995). "The Biblical Lexicon in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls." *DSD* 2: 295-329.
- _____. (1996). *The Temple Scroll: A Critical Edition with Extensive Reconstructions*. JDS. Jerusalem: Ben Gurion University of the Negev Press/Israel Exploration Society.
- Qimron, Elisha and James H. Charlesworth (1994a). "Cave IV Fragments." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth, F. M. Cross, J. Milgrom, E. Qimron, L. H. Schiffman, L. T. Stuckenbruck and R. E. Whittaker. Tübingen/Louisville, Ky.: Mohr (Siebeck): 53-104.
- _____. (1994b). "Rule of the Community." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth, F. M. Cross, J. Milgrom, E. Qimron, L. H. Schiffman, L. T. Stuckenbruck and R. E. Whittaker. Tübingen/Louisville, Ky.: Mohr (Siebeck): 1-51.
- Rahlfs, A. (1931). *Psalmi cum Odis*. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum X. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- _____. (1935). *Septuaginta*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung.
- Rajak, Tessa (1983). *Josephus: The Historian and his Society*. London: Duckworth.
- Ravid, Liora (2002). "Purity and Impurity in the Book of Jubilees." *JSP* 13: 61-86.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko (2004). "Heavenly Ascent, Angelic Descent and the Transmission of Knowledge in 1 Enoch 6-16." In *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities in Late Antique Religions*. Edited by R. S. Boustani and A. Y. Reed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 47-66.
- _____. (2005). *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity*. New York, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. (2010). "Jewish Christianity." *DEJ*: 810-12.
- Reese, James M. (1965). "Plan and structure in the Book of Wisdom." *CBQ* 27: 391-99.

- _____. (1970). *Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and its Consequences*. AnBib 41. Rome: Biblical Institute Press.
- Reid, Patrick V. (1987). *Readings in Western Religious Thought: The Ancient World*. Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press.
- Reider, Joseph and Nigel Turner (1966). *An Index to Aquila: Greek-Hebrew, Hebrew-Greek, Latin Hebrew, with the Syriac and Armenian Evidence*. VTSup 12. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Reynolds, Noel B., Donald W. Parry, E. Jan Wilson and Steven W. Booras (1998). "Dead Sea Scrolls on CD." Leiden/Salt Lake City, Utah: Brill/The Center for the Preservation of Ancient Religious Texts at Brigham Young University.
- Rhee, Victor (Sung-Yul) (2001). *Faith in Hebrews: Analysis within the Context of Christology, Eschatology and Ethics*. Studies in Biblical Literature. New York, N.Y.: Peter Lang.
- Rhoads, David M. (1973). "The Assumption of Moses and Jewish History 4 B. C.–A. D. 48." In *Studies on the Testament of Moses*. SBLSCS 4. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg. Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature: 53-58.
- Rice, George E. (1981). "The Chiastic Structure of the Central Section of the Epistle to the Hebrews." *AUSS* 19: 243-46.
- _____. (1987). "Hebrews 6:18: Analysis of Some Assumptions concerning *Katapetasma*." *AUSS* 25: 65-71.
- Rickenbacher, Otto (1973). *Weisheitsperikopen bei Ben Sira*. OBO 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Riggenbach, Eduard (1987). *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus.
- Ringgren, Helmer (1995). *The Faith of Qumran: Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Christian Origins Library. Expanded ed. Edited with a New Introduction by James H. Charlesworth. New York, N.Y.: Crossroads.
- Rissi, Mathias (1987). *Die Theologie des Hebräerbriefs: ihre Verankerung in der Situation des Verfassers und seiner Leser*. WUNT 41. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).
- Rives, James (2005). "Flavian Religious Policy and the Destruction of the Jerusalem Temple." In *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*. Edited by Jonathan Edmondson, Steve Mason and J. B. Rives. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 145-66.
- Robertson, A. T. (1914). *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Robinson, Edward (1876). *A Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament*. New and improved ed., rev. by Alexander Negris and John Duncan. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Robinson, S. E. (2000). "Apocalypse of Zephaniah." *DNTB*: 39-40.
- Roddy, Nicolae (1996). "'Two Parts, Weeks of Seven Weeks': The End of the Age as Terminus ad Quem for 2 Baruch." *JSP* 14: 3-14.
- Rogers, Jessis (2004). "'It Overflows like the Euphrates with Understanding': Another Look at the Relationship between Law and Wisdom in Sirach." In *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture*. Edited by Craig A. Evans. London/New York: T&T Clark. 1: 114-21.
- Rooke, D. W (2000a). "Jesus as a Royal Priest: Reflections on the Interpretation of the Melchizedek Tradition in Heb. 7." *Bib* 81: 81-94.
- _____. (2000b). *Zadok's Heirs: The Role and Development of the High Priesthood in Ancient Israel*. Oxford Theological Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Rose, Wolter H. (2000). *Zemah and Zerubbabel: Messianic Expectations in the Early Postexilic Period*. JSOTSup 304. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Roth, Cecil (1960). "The Subject Matter of Qumran Exegesis." *VT* 10: 51-68.
- Rothschild, Clare K. (2009). *Hebrews as Pseudepigraphon: The History and Significance of the Pauline Attribution of Hebrews*. WUNT 235. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).
- Rowland, Christopher (1979). "The Visions of God in Apocalyptic Literature." *JSJ* 10: 137-54.
- _____. (1982). *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. London: SPCK.
- _____. (1984). "John 1.51, Jewish Apocalyptic and Targumic Tradition." *NTS* 30: 498-507.
- _____. (1985). "A Man Clothed in Linen: Daniel 10:6ff and Jewish Angelology." *JSNT* 24: 99-110.
- _____. (1991). "The Second Temple: Focus of Ideological Struggle." In *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple Presented to Ernst Bammel*. Edited by William Horbury. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- _____. (2007). "The Temple in the New Testament." In *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*. Edited by John Day. London: T&T Clark: 469-83.
- Rubinkiewicz, R. and H. G. Lunt (1983). "The Apocalypse of Abraham: A New Translation and Introduction." *OTP* 1: 681-705.
- Runia, David T. (1993). *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey*. CRINT III 3. Assen/Minneapolis, Minn.: Van Gorcum/Fortress.
- Russell, Brian D. (2007). *The Song of the Sea: The Date of Composition and Influence of Exodus 15:1-21*. Studies in Biblical Literature 101. New York, N.Y.: Peter Lang.
- Sabourin, Leopold (1971). "Liturge du sanctuaire et de la tente véritable." *NTS* 18: 87-90.
- _____. (1973). *Priesthood: A Comparative Study*. Leiden: Brill.
- Sacchi, Paolo (1990). *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History*. JSPSup 20. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- _____. (2005). "History of the Earliest Enochic Texts." In *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini, J. Harold Ellens and James Alan Waddell. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans: 401-07.
- _____. (2006). "Qumran and the Dating of the Parables of Enoch." In *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press. 2: 377-95.
- Salevao, Iutesone (2002). *Legitimation in the Letter to the Hebrews: The Construction and Maintenance of a Symbolic Universe*. JSNTSup 219. London: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Sanders, E. P. (1985a). *Jesus and Judaism*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress.
- _____. (1985b). *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*. London: SCM.
- _____. (1992). *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63BCE–66CE*. London: SCM.
- Sanders, Jack T. (1971). *The New Testament Christological Hymns: Their Historical Religious Background*. SNTSMS 15. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. (1983). *Ben Sira and Demotic Wisdom*. SBLMS 28. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press.

- Sandmel, S. (1984). "Philo Judaeus: An Introduction to the Man, his Writings, and his Significance." In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*. ANRW 2, 21.1. Edited by Wolfgang Haase. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter: 3-46.
- Sarason, Richard S. (2003). "Communal Prayer at Qumran and among the Rabbis." In *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of an International Symposium of the Orion Center, 19-23 January, 2000*. STDJ 48. Edited by Esther G. Chazon, Ruth A. Clements and Avital Pinnick. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 151-72.
- Sarna, N. M. (1963). "Psalm 89: A Study in Inner Biblical Exegesis." In *Biblical and Other Studies*. Studies and Texts, 1. Edited by Alexander Altmann. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press: 29-46.
- Sasse, Hermann (1964). "αἰών, αἰώνιος." *TDNT* 1: 197-209.
- Savran, George W. (1994). "Beastly Speech: Intertextuality, Balaam's Ass and the Garden of Eden." *JSOT* 64: 33-55.
- Sayler, Gwendolyn B. (1984). *Have the Promises Failed? A Literary Analysis of 2 Baruch*. SBLDS 72. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press.
- Schäfer, Peter (1978). *Studien zur Geschichte und Theologie des rabbinischen Judentums*. AGJU 15. Leiden: Brill.
- _____. (1981). *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* TSAJ 2. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).
- _____. (1992). *The Hidden and Manifest God: Some Major Themes in Early Jewish Mysticism*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.
- Schaff, Philip (1969). *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Christian Fathers of the Christian Church*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- _____. (1994). *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: Chrysostom: Homilies on the Gospel of John and the Epistle to the Hebrews*. A Select Library of the Christian Church 14. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson.
- Schaff, Philip and Henry Wace (1952). *Nicene and Post-Nicene Christian Fathers: Eusebius: Church History, Life of Constantine the Great, and Oration in Praise of Constantine*. A Select Library of the Christian Church: Second Series 1. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson.
- Schams, Christine (1998). *Jewish Scribes in the Second-Temple Period*. JSOTSup 291. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Schenck, Kenneth L. (1997). "Keeping his Appointment: Creation and Enthronement in Hebrews." *JSNT* 66: 91-117.
- _____. (2001). "A Celebration of the Enthroned Son: The Catena of Hebrews 1." *JBL* 120: 469-85.
- _____. (2002). "Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews: Ronald Williamson's Study after Thirty Years." In *The Studia Philonica Annual*. Edited by David T. Runia and Gregory E. Sterling. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press: 112-40.
- _____. (2003). *Understanding the Book of Hebrews: The Story Behind the Sermon*. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press.
- _____. (2005). *A Brief Guide to Philo*. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press.
- _____. (2007). *Cosmology and Eschatology in Hebrews: The Settings of the Sacrifice*. SNTSMS 143. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- _____. (2009). "God Has Spoken: Hebrews Theology of the Scriptures." In *The Epistle to the Hebrews and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Daniel R. Driver, Trevor A. Hart and Nathan MacDonald. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 321-36.
- Schenk, Wolfgang (1980). "Hebräerbrief 4.14-16. Textlinguistik als Kommentierungsprinzip." *NTS* 26: 242-52.
- Schierse, Franz-Josef (1955). *Verheissung und Heilsvollendung: Zur theologischen Grundfrage des Hebräerbriefs*. Munich: Zink.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. (1985). "Purity and Perfection: Exclusion from the Council of the Community in the Serekh Ha'Edah." In *Biblical Archaeology Today: Proceedings of the First International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, Jerusalem, April 1984*. Edited by Avraham Biran. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society: 373-89.
- _____. (1987). "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early History of Jewish Liturgy." In *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Lee I. Levine. Philadelphia, Pa.: ASOR: 33-48.
- _____. (1989). *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Study of the Rule of the Congregation*. SBLMS 38. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press.
- _____. (1992). "The Furnishings of the Temple According to the Temple Scroll." In *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18-21 March, 1991*. STDJ 11,2. Edited by Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner. Leiden: Brill. 2: 621-34.
- _____. (1994). "The Theology of the Temple Scroll." *JQR* 85: 109-23.
- _____. (1996). "Jerusalem in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *The Centrality of Jerusalem: Historical Perspectives*. Edited by M. Poorthuis and Ch. Safrai. Kampen: Kok Pharos: 72-88.
- _____. (1999). "Community without Temple: The Qumran Community's Withdrawal from the Jerusalem Temple." In *Gemeinde ohne Temple/Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. WUNT 118. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange and Peter Pilhofer. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck): 267-84.
- _____. (2001). "Descriptions of the Jerusalem Temple in Josephus and the Temple Scroll." In *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmonians to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 27-31 January, 1999*. Edited by David Goodblatt, Avital Pinnick and Daniel R. Schwartz. Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill: 69-82.
- _____. (2009). "Temple, Sacrifice and Priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*. STDJ 85. Edited by Florentino García Martínez. Leiden: Brill: 165-76.
- Schippers, R (1986). "τέλος." *NIDNTT* 2: 59-65.
- Schlier, H (1964). "δείκνυμι, κ.τ.λ." *TDNT* 2: 25-33.
- Schmidt, Francis (2001). *How the Temple Thinks: Identity and Social Cohesion in Ancient Israel*. The Biblical Seminar 78. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Schneider, Carl (1965). "καταπέτασμα." *TDNT* 3: 628-30.
- Scholem, Gershom G. (1946). *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*. 3rd rev. ed. New York, N.Y.: Schocken Books.
- _____. (1960). *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition*. New York, N.Y.: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America.

- Scholer, John M. (1991). *Proleptic Priests: Priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. JSNTSup 49. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Schoors, Antoon (2002). "The Language of the Qumran Sapiential Works." In *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*. BETL 159. Edited by C. Hempel, A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger. Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters.
- Schreiber, Stefan (2001). "Hoffnung Und Handlungsperspektive in Der Assumptio Mosis." *JSJ* 32: 252-71.
- Schreiner, Johannes (1961). "Führung—Thema der Heilsgeschichte im Alten Testament." *BZ* 5: 2-18.
- _____. (2002). *Jesus Sirach 1-24*. Die Neue Echter Bibel. Würzburg: Echter.
- Schröger, F. (1968). *Der Verfasser des Hebräerbriefs als Schriftausleger*. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet.
- Schüle, Andreas (2005). "Made in the 'Image of God': The Concepts of Divine Images in Gen 1-3." *ZAW* 117: 1-20.
- Schuller, E. M. (1999). "Hodayot." In *Qumran Cave 4. XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts*. DJD XXIX. Edited by Emanuel Tov. Oxford: Clarendon: 69-254.
- _____. (2000). "Petitionary Prayer and the Religion of Qumran." In *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by John J. Collins and Robert A. Kugler. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans: 29-45.
- _____. (2001). "Worship, Temple, and Prayer in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Judaism in Late Antiquity, Part 5: The Judaism of Qumran: A Systemic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Handbook of Oriental Studies 56.5. Edited by A. J. Avery-Peck, J. Neusner and B. D. Chilton. Leiden: Brill. 125-143.
- Schultz, Joseph P. (1971). "Angelic Opposition to the Ascension of Moses and the Revelation of the Law." *JQR* 61: 282-307.
- Schürer, Emil, Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar and Martin Goodman (1973-1987). *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.—A.D. 135)*. Rev. ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. (1979). "The Three Temples of 4 Q Florilegium." *RevQ* 10: 83-91.
- _____. (1980). "The tribes of *As. Mos.* 4:7-9." *JBL* 99: 217-23.
- Schwartz, Eduard (1903). *Eusebius Werke: Die Kirchengeschichte*. GCS. Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- Schwartz, Seth (1990). *Josephus and Judean Politics*. Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition. Leiden/New York, N.Y.: Brill.
- Schwemer, Anna Maria (1991). "Gott als König und seine Königsherrschaft in den Sabbatliedern aus Qumran." In *Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Kult im Judentum, Urchristentum und in der hellenistischen Welt*. Edited by Martin Hengel and Anna Maria Schwemer. Tübingen: Mohr: 45-118.
- _____. (1995). *Studien zu den frühjüdischen Propheten Legenden Vitae Prophetarum*. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).
- Scott, James M. (2005). *On Earth as in Heaven: The Restoration of Sacred Time and Sacred Space in the Book of Jubilees*. JSJSup 91. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Seeberg, Alfred (1912). *Die Brief an die Hebräer*. Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer (*non vidi*).
- Segal, Alan F. (1986). *Rebecca's Children: Judaism and Christianity in the Roman World*. Cambridge, Mass./London: Harvard University Press.
- Segal, Michael (2007). *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology*. Leiden: Brill.

- Selwyn, Edward Gordon (1961). *The First Epistle of St. Peter: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Essays*. London: MacMillan.
- She, King L. (2011). *The Use of Exodus in Hebrews*. Studies in Biblical Literature 142. New York, N.Y.: Peter Lang.
- Shea, William H. (1989). "The Significance and Function of Ton Hagion in Hebrews 8-10." Unpublished Paper collected by the Centre for Adventist Research (*non vidi*).
- Shemesh, Aharon (2009). "4Q265 and the Authoritative Status of Jubilees at Qumran." In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 247-60.
- Sheppard, Gerald T. (1980). *Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct: A Study in the Sapientializing of the Old Testament*. BZAW 151. Berlin/New York, N.Y.: Walter de Gruyter.
- Silberman, Lou H. (1981). "Prophets/Angels: LXX and Qumran Psalm 151 and the Epistle to the Hebrews." In *Standing before God: Studies on Prayer in Scriptures and in Tradition with Essays in Honor of John M. Oesterreicher*. Edited by Ashel Finkel and Lawrence Frizzell. New York, N.Y.: KTAV: 91-101.
- Silva, Moises (1976). "Perfection and Eschatology in Hebrews." *WTJ* 39: 60-71.
- Simon, Marcel (1983). "Sur quelques aspects des Oracles Sibyllins juifs." In *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*. Edited by David Hellholm. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck): 219-33.
- Simpson, E. K. (1946). "The Vocabulary of the Epistle to the Hebrews." *EvQ* 18: 187-90.
- Skehan, Patrick W. (1963). "New Translation of Qumran Texts." *CBQ* 25: 119-23.
- _____. (1971). "The Acrostic Poem in Sirach 51:13-30." *HTR* 64: 387-400.
- _____. (1979). "Structures in Poems on Wisdom: Proverbs 8 and Sirach 24." *CBQ* 41: 365-79.
- Skehan, Patrick W. and Alexander A. Di Lella (1987). *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*. AB 39. New York, N.Y.: Doubleday.
- Skelton, David A. (2009). "Ben Sira's Imaginative Theodicy: Reflections on the Aaronide Priesthood under Gentile Rule." *ResQ* 51: 1-12.
- Skinner, John (1930). *Genesis*. ICC. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Slingerland, H. Dixon (1977). *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical History of Research*. SBLMS 21. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press.
- _____. (1984). "The Levitical Hallmark within the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *JBL* 103: 531-37.
- Smend, R. (1906). *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach: Hebräisch und Deutsch*. Berlin: Reimer.
- Smillie, Gene R. (2004). "'The One who is Speaking' in Heb 12:25." *TynBul* 55: 275-94.
- _____. (2005). "The Other λόγος at the End of Heb 4:13." *NovT* 47: 19-25.
- Smith, Jerome (1969). *A Priest Forever: A Study of Typology and Eschatology in Hebrews*. London/Sydney: Sheed and Ward.
- Smith, Morton (1990). "Ascent to the Heavens and Deification in 4QM^a." In *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*. JSPSS 8. Edited by L. H Schiffman. Sheffield: JSOT Press: 181-88.

- _____. (1992). "Two Ascended to Heaven—Jesus and the Author of 4Q491." In *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. ABRL. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. New York, N.Y.: Doubleday: 290-301.
- Smith, Ralph L. (1984). *Micah-Malachi*. WBC 32. Waco, Tex.: Word.
- Smothers, Thomas G. (1985). "A Superior Model: Hebrews 1:1–4:13." *RevExp* 82: 333-43.
- Snath, John G. (1974). *Ecclesiasticus*. CBC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sommer, Benjamin D. (1998). *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40-66*. Contraversions: Jews and other Differences. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Son, Kiwoong (2005). *Zion Symbolism in Hebrews: Hebrews 12:18-24 as a Hermeneutical Key to the Epistle*. Paternoster Biblical Monographs. Milton Keynes: Paternoster.
- Sowers, Sidney G. (1965). *The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews: A Comparison of the Interpretation of the Old Testament in Philo Judaeus and the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Basel Studies of Theology 1. Richmond, Va.: John Knox.
- Spatafora, Andrea (1997). *From the 'Temple of God' to God as Temple: A Biblical and Theological Study of the Temple in the Book of Revelation* Tesi Gregoriana Serie Teologia. Rome: Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana.
- Sperber, Alexander (2004). *The Bible in Aramaic Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts, Volumes 1-3: The Pentateuch according to the Targum Onkelos; the Former Prophets according to Targum Jonathan, the Latter Prophets according to Targum Jonathan*. 3rd Impression. Leiden: Brill.
- Spicq, Ceslas (1952). *L'Épître aux Hébreux*. 3rd ed. Paris: Gabalda.
- Spilsbury, Paul (2001). "Josephus." In *Justification and Variegated Nomism: Vol. 1, The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*. WUNT 2. Reihe 2/140. Edited by D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien and M. A Seifrid. Tübingen/Grand Rapids, Mich.: Mohr (Siebeck)/Baker Academic: 241-60.
- _____. (2002). "Josephus on the Burning of the Temple, the Flavian Triumph, and the Providence of God." In *SBLSP 41*. Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature: 306-27.
- Stanley, Christopher D. (1992). *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*. SNTSMS 69. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stanley, Steve (1994). "The Structure of Hebrews from Three Perspectives." *TynBul* 45: 245-71.
- _____. (1995). "Hebrews 6:9-10: The 'Parable' of the Tabernacle." *NovT* 37: 385-99.
- Stegemann, Ekkehard W. and W. Stegemann (2005). "Does the Cultic Language in Hebrews Represent Sacrificial Metaphors? Reflections on Some Basic Problems." In *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods – New Insights*. Biblical Interpretation Series 75. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 13-23.
- Stegemann, Hartmut (1987). "Is the Temple Scroll a Sixth Book of the Torah—Lost for 2,500 Years?" *BAR* 13 (6): 28-35.
- _____. (1988). "The Origins of the Temple Scroll." In *Congress Volume Jerusalem, 1986*. Edited by J. A. Emerton. Leiden: E. J. Brill: 235-56.
- _____. (1992). "The Institutions of Israel in the Temple Scroll." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. Edited by Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport. Leiden: Brill: 156-85.
- _____. (1996). "Some Remarks to 1QSa, to 1QSB, and to Qumran Messianism." *RevQ* 17: 479-505.

- _____. (1998). *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- _____. (2003). "The Number of Psalms in 1QHODAYOTa and some of their Sections." In *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of an International Symposium of the Orion center, 19-23 January, 2000*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon, Ruth A. Clements and Avital Pinnick. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 191-234.
- Stegemann, Hartmut, Eileen Schuller and Carol Newsom (2009). *1QHODAYOTa, with Incorporation of 1QHODAYOTb and 4QHODAYOTa-f*. DJD XL. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Stelten, Leo F. (1995). *Dictionary of Ecclesiastical Latin: With an Appendix of Latin Expressions Defined and Clarified*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson.
- Sterling, Gregory E. (2001). "Ontology Versus Eschatology: Tensions Between Author and Community in Hebrews." In *The Studia Philonica Annual: Studies in Hellenistic Judaism. Volume 13*. Edited by David T. Runia and Gregory E. Sterling. Providence, R.I.: BJS: 190-211.
- Steudel, Annette (1994a). "4Q408: A Liturgy on Morning and Evening Prayer, Preliminary Edition." *RevQ* 16: 313-34.
- _____. (1994b). *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat.^{a, b}): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ("Florilegium") und 4Q177 ("Catena A") repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden*. STDJ 13. Leiden: Brill.
- _____. (2000). "4QApocryphon of Moses?" In *Qumran Cave 4. XVI: Miscellanea Part 1*. DJD XXXVI. Edited by Emanuel Tov. Oxford: Clarendon: 298-315.
- Stewart, Alexander (2010). "Cosmology, Eschatology and Soteriology in Hebrews: A Synthetic Analysis." *BBR* 20: 545-60.
- Stewart, R. A. (1965-66). "Creation and Matter in the Epistle to the Hebrews." *NTS* 12: 284-93.
- Steyn, Gert J. (2000). "A Quest for the Vorlage of the 'Song of Moses' (Deut 32) Quotations in Hebrews." *Neot* 34: 263-72.
- Stock-Hesketh, Jonathan (2000). "Circles and Mirrors: Understanding 1 Enoch 21-32." *JSP* 11: 27-58.
- Stone, Michael E. (1976). "Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature." In *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright*. Edited by F. M. Cross, W. E. Lemke and P. D. Miller. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday: 414-52.
- _____. (1978). "The Book of Enoch and Judaism in the Third Century B.C.E." *CBQ* 40: 479-92.
- _____. (1981). "Reactions to the Destructions of the Second Temple." *JSJ* 12: 195-204.
- _____. (1984). "Apocalyptic Literature." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. CRINT II 2. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Assen/Philadelphia, Pa.: Van Gorcum/Fortress: 383-441.
- _____. (1988). "Enoch, Aramaic Levi and Sectarian Origins." *JSJ* 19: 159-70.
- _____. (1989). *Features of the Eschatology of IV Eṣra*. HSS. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press.
- _____. (1990). *Fourth Eṣra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Eṣra*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress.
- _____. (1993). "The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on the Books of Adam And Eve." *JTS* 44: 143-56.

- _____. (2003). "Aramaic Levi Document and Greek Testament of Levi." In *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Lawrence H. Schiffman and Weston W. Fields. Leiden: Brill: 429-37.
- _____. (2007). "The City in 4 Ezra." *JBL* 126: 402-07.
- Stone, Michael E. and Jonas C. Greenfield (1993). "The Prayer of Levi." *JBL* 112: 247-66.
- Stordalen, T. (2000). *Echoes of Eden: Genesis 2-3 and Symbolism of the Eden Garden in Biblical Hebrew Literature*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Strack, H. L. and G. Stemberger (1992). *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press.
- Strack, Hermann L. and Paul Billerbeck (1924). *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. Die Briefe Des Neuen Testaments und die Offenbarung Johannis erläutert aus talmud und Midrasch, Dritter Band. Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Strobel, August (1991). *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. Das Neue Testament Deutsch. Göttingen/Zürich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Strugnell, John (1960). "The Angelic Liturgy at Qumran—4Q *Serek Širôt 'Ólat Haššabbat*." In *Congress Volume Oxford 1959*. VTSup 7. Edited by G. W. Anderson. Leiden: Brill: 318-45.
- _____. (1969-71). "Notes en marge du Volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan'." *RevQ* 7: 163-276.
- Strugnell, John and D. J. Harrington (1999). "Instruction." In *Qumran Cave 4, XXIV: Sapiential Texts Part 2*. DJD XXXIV. Edited by Emmanuel Tov. Oxford: Clarendon: 1-503.
- Stuart, Douglas K. (1987). *Hosea-Jonah*. WBC 31. Dallas, Tex.: Word.
- _____. (2006). *Exodus*. NAC 2. Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman and Holman.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. (1995). *Angel Veneration and Christology: A Study in Early Judaism and in the Christology of the Apocalypse of John*. WUNT 2, 70. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).
- _____. (1999). "Review of Michael Chyutin, *The New Jerusalem Scroll from Qumran: A Comprehensive Reconstruction*." *JTS* 50: 658-64.
- _____. (2000). "4QEnochGiants^a ar." In *Qumran Cave 4: XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*. DJD XXXVI. Edited by Emmanuel Tov. Oxford: Clarendon: 8-41.
- _____. (2002). "4QInstruction and the Possible Influence of Early Enochic Traditions: an Evaluation." In *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* Edited by Charlotte Hempel, Armin Lange and H. Lichtenberger. Leuven: Peeters: 245-61.
- _____. (2004). "'Angels' and 'God': Exploring the Limits of Early Jewish Monotheism." In *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*. JSNTSup 263. Edited by Loren T. Stuckenbruck and W. E. S. North. New York, N.Y./London: Continuum: 45-70.
- _____. (2005). "The Plant Metaphor in its Inner Enochic and Early Jewish Context." In *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini, J. Harold Ellens and James Alan Waddell. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans: 210-12.
- _____. (2007a). *1 Enoch 91-108*. CEJL. Berlin/New York, N.Y.: Walter de Gruyter.

- _____. (2007b). "Early Enoch Traditions Related to 1 Enoch from the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Overview and Assessment." In *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 41-63.
- _____. (2007c). "The Parables of Enoch according to George Nickelsburg and Michael Knibb: A Summary and Discussion of Some Remaining Questions." In *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of the Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 65-71.
- Sukenik, E. (1955). *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press.
- Sullivan, Kevin P. (2004). *Wrestling with Angels: A Study of the Relationship Between Angels and Humans in Ancient Jewish Literature and the New Testament*. AGJU 55. Leiden: Brill.
- Sutcliffe, Edmund F. (1959). "The First Fifteen Members of the Qumran Community: A Note on 1QS 8: I ff." *JSS* 4: 134-38.
- Suter, David W. (1979a). "Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest: The Problem of Family Purity in 1 Enoch 6-16." *HUCA* 50: 115-35.
- _____. (1979b). *Tradition and Composition in the Parables of Enoch*. SBLDS 47. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press.
- _____. (1981). "Weighed in the Balance: The Similitudes of Enoch in Recent Discussion." *RJR* 7: 217-21.
- _____. (2002). "Revisiting Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest." *Hen* 24: 137-42.
- _____. (2007a). "Enoch in Sheol: Updating the Dating of the Book of Parables." In *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of the Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 415-43.
- _____. (2007b). "Temples and the Temple in the Early Enoch Tradition: Memory, Vision and Expectation." In *The Early Enoch Literature*. JSJSup 121. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. Leiden: Brill: 195-218.
- _____. (2009). "Jubilees, the Temple, and the Aaronite Priesthood." In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 397-410.
- Svendson, Stefan Nordgaard (2009). *Allegory Transformed: The Appropriation of Philonic Hermeneutics in the Letter to the Hebrews*. WUNT 2, 269. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).
- Swanson, Dwight D. (1995). *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodology of 11QT*. STDJ 14. Leiden: Brill.
- Sweet, J. P. M (1984). "The Assumption of Moses." In *The Apocrypha of the Old Testament*. Edited by H. F. D. Sparks. Oxford: Clarendon: 601-16.
- Swetnam, James (1966). "'The Greater and More Perfect Tent': A Contribution to the Discussion of Hebrews 9:11." *Bib* 47: 91-106.
- _____. (1969). "On the Literary Genre of the 'Epistle' to the Hebrews." *NovT* 11: 261-69.
- _____. (1970). "Hebrews 9:2 and the Uses of Consistency." *CBQ* 32: 205-21.
- _____. (1972). "Form and Content in Hebrews 1-6." *Bib* 53: 368-85.
- _____. (1974). "Form and Content in Hebrews 7-13." *Bib* 55: 333-48.
- _____. (1981a). *Jesus and Isaac: A Study of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the Light of the Aqedah*. AnBib 94. Rome: Biblical Institute Press.

- _____. (1981b). "Jesus as Logos in Hebrews 4, 12-13." *Bib* 62: 214-24.
- Synge, F. C. (1959). *Hebrews and the Scriptures*. London: SPCK.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu (1953). "The Sectarial **סֵפֶר**: A Biblical Noun." *VT* 3: 133-40.
- Tasker, R. V. G. (1935). "The Integrity of the Epistle to the Hebrews." *ExpTim* 47: 136-38.
- _____. (1955). "The Text of the 'Corpus Paulinum'." *NTS* 1: 180-91.
- Tate, Marvin E. (1990). *Psalms 51-100*. WBC 20. Dallas, Tex.: Word.
- Thayer, J. H. (1898). *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, being Grimm's Wilke's Clavis Novi Testamenti, Translated, Revised and Enlarged*. 4th ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Theissen, G. (1969). *Untersuchungen zum Hebräerbrief*. SNT 2. Gütersloh: Gütersloher.
- Thiering, B. E. (1981). "Mebaqqer and Episkopos in the Light of the Temple Scroll." *JBL* 100: 59-74.
- _____. (1989). "The Date of the Composition of the Temple Scroll." In *Temple Scroll Studies*. Edited by George J. Brooke. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press: 99-120.
- Thistleton, Anthony C. (2000). *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- Thoma, Clemens (1989). "The High Priesthood in the Judgment of Josephus." In *Josephus, the Bible, and History*. Edited by Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata. Detroit, Mich.: Wayne State University Press: 196-215.
- Thomas, K. J. (1965). "The Old Testament Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews." *NTS* 11: 303-25.
- Thompson, James W. (1975). "'That Which Cannot Be Shaken': Some Metaphysical Assumptions in Heb 12:27." *JBL* 94: 580-87.
- _____. (1976). "The Structure and Purpose of the Catena in Heb 1:5-13." *CBQ* 38: 352-63.
- _____. (1982). *The Beginnings of Christian Philosophy: The Epistle to the Hebrews*. CBQMS 13. Washington D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association.
- _____. (2007). "EPHAPAX: The One and the Many in Hebrews." *NTS* 53: 566-81.
- _____. (2008). *Hebrews*. Paideia Commentaries on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic.
- Thompson, John A. (1955). "Joel's Locusts in the Light of Near Eastern Parallels." *JNES* 14: 53-55.
- Thornton, T. C. G. (1964). "The Meaning of αἱματεκχυσία in Heb IX.22." *JTS* 15: 63-65.
- Thyen, Hartwig (1955). *Der Stil der Jüdische-Hellenistischen Homilie*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Tiede, David L. (1973). "The Figure of Moses in *The Testament of Moses*." In *Studies on the Testament of Moses*. SBLSCS 4. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg. Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature: 86-92.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C. (1996). *Prophets of Old and the Day of the End: Zechariah, the Book of the Watchers and Apocalyptic*. OtSt 35. Leiden: Brill.
- _____. (2000). "The Addressees of 4QInstruction." In *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998, Published in*

- Memory of Maurice Baillet*. STDJ 34. Edited by Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez and Eileen M. Schuller. Leiden: Brill: 62-75.
- _____. (2001a). *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction*. STDJ 44. Leiden: Brill.
- _____. (2001b). "Towards a Reconstruction of the Beginning of 4QInstruction (4Q416 Fragment 1 and Parallels)." In *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* BETL 159. Edited by Charlotte Hempel, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger. Leuven: Peeters: 99-126.
- _____. (2002). "Some Remarks on The Book of Watchers, The Priests, Enoch and Genesis, and 4Q208." *Hen* 24: 143-45.
- _____. (2005). "Evaluating the Discussions concerning the Original Order of Chapters 91-93 and Codicological Data pertaining to 4Q212 and Chester Beatty XII Enoch." In *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini, J. Harold Ellens and James Alan Waddell. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans: 220-23.
- _____. (2007). "Remarks on the Transmission and Traditions in the Parables of Enoch: A Response to James VanderKam." In *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of the Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 100-09.
- _____. (2010a). "Aramaic texts from Qumran and the Authoritativeness of Hebrew Scriptures: Preliminary Observations." In *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*. JSJSup 141. Edited by Mladen Popović. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 155-71.
- _____. (2010b). "The Dead Sea Scrolls." *DEJ*: 163-80.
- Tiller, Patrick A. (1993). *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch*. SBLEJL 4. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press.
- _____. (1997). "The 'Eternal Planting' in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *DSD* 4: 312-35
- Tobin, Thomas H. (1983). *The Creation of Man: Philo and the History of Interpretation*. CBQMS 14. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America.
- Torrance, T. F. (1955). *Royal Priesthood*. SJT Occasional Papers 3. Edinburgh/London: Oliver & Boyd.
- Tov, Emmanuel and Stephen J. Pfann (1993). *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche*. Leiden: Brill.
- Traub, Helmut (1967). "οὐρανός, οὐράνιος, ἐπουράνιος, οὐρανόθεν." *TDNT* 5: 497-543.
- Tromp, Johannes (1993). *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary*. SVTP. Leiden/New York, N.Y.: Brill.
- Trotter, Andrew H. Jr. (1997). *Interpreting the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Guides to New Testament Exegesis. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker.
- Trudinger, L. Paul (1982). "The Gospel Meaning of the Secular: Reflections on Hebrews 13:10-13." *EvQ* 54: 235-37.
- Tucker, Gene M. (2001). "The Book of Isaiah 1-39: Introduction, Commentary and Reflections." In *The New Interpreter's Bible*. Edited by Leander Keck. Nashville, Tenn: Abingdon.
- Turdeanu, Émile (1968). "Une Curiosité de l'Hénoch Slave: les phénix du sixième ciel." *Revue des Etudes Slaves* 47: 54-54.
- _____. (1972). "L'Apocalypse D'Abraham En Slave." *JSJ* 3: 153-80.

- Ullman-Margalit, Edna (2006). *Out of the Cave: A Philosophical Enquiry into the Dead Sea Scrolls Research*. Cambridge, Mass./London: Harvard University Press.
- Vaganay, L. (1940). "Le plan de l'épître aux Hébreux." In *Mémorial Lagrange*. Paris. Gabalda: 269-77.
- Vaillant, A. (1952). *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch*. Paris: Institut d'Études Slaves.
- van der Kooij, Arie (2010). "Authoritative Scriptures and Scribal Culture." In *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*. JSJSup 141. Edited by Mladen Popović. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 55-71.
- Van der Ploeg, J. (1952). "L'immortalité de l'homme d'après les textes de la Mer Morte." *VT* 2: 171-75
- van Ruiten, J. T. A. G. M. (1999a). "Eden and the Temple: The Rewriting of Genesis 2:4–3:24 in *The Book of Jubilees*." In *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by Gerard P. Luttikhuisen. Leiden: Brill: 63-94.
- _____. (1999b). "Visions of the Temple in the *Book of Jubilees*." In *Gemeinde ohne Temple/ Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. WUNT 118. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange and Peter Pilhofer. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck): 215-27.
- _____. (2000). *Primaeval History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1-11 in the Book of Jubilees*. JSJSup 66. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- _____. (2007). "The Four Rivers of Eden in the Apocalypse of Paul (Visio Pauli). The Intertextual Relationship of Genesis 2.10-14 and the Apocalypse of Paul 23." In *The Visio Pauli and the Gnostic Apocalypse of Paul*. Edited by Jan N. Bremmer and István Czachesz. Leuven: Peeters: 50-76.
- van Unnik, W. C. (1980). *Sparsa Collecta: the Collected Essays of W. C. van Unnik*. NovTSup 30. Leiden: Brill.
- VanderKam, James C. (1973). "The Theophany of Enoch I 3b-7, 9." *VT* 23: 129-50.
- _____. (1977). *Textual and Historical Studies on the Book of Jubilees*. HSM 14. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press.
- _____. (1982). "Some Major Issues in the Contemporary Study of 1 Enoch: Reflections on J. T. Milik's *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*." *Maarav* 3: 85-97.
- _____. (1984a). *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*. CBQMS 16. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America.
- _____. (1984b). "Studies in the Apocalypse of Weeks (1 Enoch 93:1-10, 91:11-17)." *CBQ* 46: 511-23.
- _____. (1987). "The Textual Base for the Ethiopic Translation of 1 Enoch." In *Working with No Data: Semitic and Egyptian Studies Presented to Thomas O. Lambdin*. Edited by David M. Golomb, with the assistance of Susan T. Hollis. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns: 247-62.
- _____. (1988). "Jubilees and the Priestly Messiah of Qumran." *RevQ* 13: 353-65.
- _____. (1992). "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37-71." In *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity; the First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth, J. Brownson, M. T. Davis, S. J. Kraftchick and A. F. Segal. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress: 169-91.
- _____. (1994). "The Theology of the Temple Scroll: A Response to Lawrence H. Schiffman." *JQR* 87: 129-35.
- _____. (1995a). *Enoch a Man for All Generations*. Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press.

- _____. (1995b). "Review of Annette Steudel *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^b): materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ("Florilegium") und 4Q177 ("Catena A") repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden."* CBQ 57: 576-77.
- _____. (1999). "Isaac's Blessing of Levi and his Descendants in Jubilees 31." In *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 31. Edited by D. W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich. Leiden: Brill: 497-519.
- _____. (2001). "The Interpretation of Genesis in 1 Enoch." In *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape and Interpretation*. Edited by Peter W. Flint. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans: 129-48.
- _____. (2002). "Viewed from Another Angle: Purity and Impurity in the Book of Jubilees." JSP 13: 209-15.
- _____. (2004). *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile*. Minneapolis, Minn: Fortress.
- _____. (2007). "The Book of Parables Within the Enoch Tradition." In *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of the Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 81-99.
- _____. (2008). "Recent Scholarship on the Book of Jubilees." CBR 6: 405-31.
- _____. (2009). "The Manuscript Tradition of Jubilees." In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans: 3-21.
- _____. (2010a). *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans.
- _____. (2010b). "Judaism in the Land of Israel." DEJ: 57-76.
- VanderKam, James C. and J. T. Milik (1991). "The First Jubilees Manuscript from Qumran Cave 4: A Preliminary Publication." JBL 110: 243-70.
- _____. (1994). "Jubilees." In *Qumran Cave 4: VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*. DJD XIII. Edited by James C. VanderKam. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Vanhoye, Albert (1963). *La Structure littéraire de l'épître aux Hébreux*. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer.
- _____. (1964). "L' οἰκουμένη dans l'épître aux Hébreux." Bib 45: 248-53.
- _____. (1965). "'Par la tente plus grande et plus parfait . . . ' (He 9,11)." Bib 46: 1-28.
- _____. (1969). *Situation du Christ: Hébreux 1-2*. LD 58. Paris: Cerf.
- _____. (1971). "Trois ouvrages récents sur l'épître aux Hébreux." Bib 51: 62-71.
- _____. (1976). *La Structure littéraire de l'épître aux Hébreux*. 2nd ed. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer.
- _____. (1977). "La Question Littéraire de Hébreux xiii. 1-6." NTS 23: 121-39.
- _____. (1989). *Structure and Message of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press.
- _____. (1996). "La 'teleiôsis' du Christ: Point capital de la Christologie sacerdotale d'Hébreux." NTS 42: 321-38.
- Vattioni, Francesco (1968). *Ecclesiastico: Testo ebraico con apparato critico e versioni greca, Latina e Siriaca*. Napoli: Istituto Orientale di Napoli.
- Vermes, Geza (1961). *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*. StPB 4. Leiden: Brill.

- _____. (1986). "Jewish Literature Composed in Hebrew or Aramaic." In *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*, Volume III 1. Edited by Emil Schürer, Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar and Martin Goodman. Edinburgh: T&T Clark: 177-469.
- Vermes, Geza and Martin Goodman (1987). "Jewish Literature of which the Original Language is Uncertain." In *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*, Volume III 2. Edited by Emil Schürer, Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar and Martin Goodman. Edinburgh: T&T Clark: 705-808.
- Vermeulen, Jacques (2007). *Jérusalem centre du monde: Développements et contestations d'une tradition biblique*. Lectio Divina. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf.
- Vogel, Manuel (1999). "Tempel und Tempelkult in Pseudo-Philos Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum." In *Gemeinde ohne Temple/ Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. WUNT 118. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange and Peter Pilhofer. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck): 251-63.
- von Rad, G. (1966). *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*. London: Oliver & Boyd.
- Vorster, Willem S. (1989). "Intertextuality and Redaktionsgeschichte." In *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersel*. Edited by Sipke Draisma. Kampen: Kok: 15-26.
- Wacholder, B. Z. (1983). *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness*. HUCM 8. Cincinnati, Ohio: Hebrew Union College Press.
- Walck, Leslie W. (2007). "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and the Gospels." In *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of the Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 299-337.
- Walker, Peter. W. L. (1994). "Jerusalem in Hebrews 13:9-14 and the Dating of the Epistle." *TynBul* 45: 39-71.
- _____. (1996). *Jesus and the Holy City: New Testament Perspectives on Jerusalem*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- _____. (2000). "The Land in the Apostles' Writings." In *The Land of Promise*. Edited by Peter W. L. Walker and Philip Johnston. Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP: 81-99.
- _____. (2004a). "Introduction." In *Heaven on Earth: The Temple in Biblical Theology*. Edited by T. Desmond Alexander and Simon Gathercole. Carlisle: Paternoster: 1-10.
- _____. (2004b). "A Place for Hebrews? Contexts for a First-Century Sermon." In *The New Testament in Its First Century Setting: Essays on Context and Background in Honour of B. W. Winter on His 65th Birthday*. Edited by P. J. Williams, Andrew D. Clarke, Peter M. Head and David Instone-Brewer. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans: 231-49.
- Walker, William O. (1972). "The Origin of the Son of Man Concept as Applied to Jesus." *JBL* 91: 482-90.
- _____. (1983). "The Son of Man: Some Recent Developments." *CBQ* 54: 584-607.
- Wallace, Daniel B. (1996). *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan.
- Wallace, David (2003). "The Use of Psalms in the Shaping of a Text: Psalm 2:7 and Psalm 110:1 in Hebrews 1." *ResQ* 56: 41-50.
- Waltke, Bruce K. (2007). *A Commentary on Micah*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- Waltke, Bruce K. and Cathi J. Fredricks (2001). *Genesis: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan.
- Waltke, Bruce K., James M. Houston and Erika Moore (2010). *The Psalms as Christian Worship: A Historical Commentary*. Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans.

- Waltke, Bruce K. and M. O'Connor (1990). *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.
- Walton, J. H. (1995). "The Mesopotamian Background of the Tower of Babel Account and Its Implications." *BBR* 5: 155-75.
- _____. (2001). *Genesis*. NIVAC. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan.
- _____. (2006). *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic.
- Wassen, Cecilia (2007). "Angels in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Angels: The Concept of Celestial Beings—Origins, Development and Reception*. Edited by Friedrich Vinzenz Reiterer, Tobias Nicklas and Karin Schöpflin. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter: 499-523.
- _____. (2008). "What Do Angels Have Against the Blind and the Deaf? Rules of Exclusion in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Common Judaism: Explorations in Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by Wayne O. McCready and Adele Reinhartz. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress: 115-29.
- Watts, John D. W. (1957). "The Song of the Sea: Ex. XV." *VT* 7: 371-80.
- Wedderburn, A. J. M. (2004). "The 'Letter' to the Hebrews and its Thirteenth Chapter." *NTS* 50: 390-405.
- Weinfeld, Moshe (1972). *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- _____. (1981). "Sabbath, Temple and the Enthronement of the Lord: The Problem of the Sitz im Leben of Genesis 1:1-2:3." In *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Henri Cazelles*. AOAT 212. Edited by A. Caquot and M. Delcor. Kevelaer/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon & Bercker/Neukirchener: 501-12.
- _____. (1983). "The Heavenly Praise in Unison." In *Meqor Hajjim: Festschrift Für Georg Molin Zu Seinem 75. Geburtstag*. Edited by I. Seybold. Graz: Akademische Druck.
- Weiser, Artur (1962). *The Psalms: A Commentary*. London: SCM.
- Weiss, Hans-Friedrich (1991). *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. KEK. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Weiss, Herold (1996). "Sabbatismos in the Epistle to the Hebrews." *CBQ* 58: 674-89.
- Weitzman, Steven (1994). "The Song of Abraham." *HUCA* 65: 21-33.
- Wenham, Gordon J. (1986). "Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story." In *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies*. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies: 19-25.
- Wenthe, Dean O. (1998). "The Use of the Hebrew Scriptures in 1QM." *DSD* 5: 290-319.
- Wentling, Judith L. (1989). "Unraveling the Relationship Between 11QT, the Eschatological Temple, and the Qumran Community." *RevQ* 14: 61-73.
- Wernberg-Møller, P. (1957). *The Manual of Discipline: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction*. STDJ 1. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Westcott, B. F. (1892). *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- Westermann, Claus (1981). *Praise and Lament in the Psalms*. Atlanta, Ga.: John Knox.
- Wevers, John William (1974). *Genesis*. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum I. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

- _____. (1977). *Deuteronomium*. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum III, 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- _____. (1978). *Text History of the Greek Deuteronomy*. MSU 13. Göttingen Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- _____. (1982). *Numeri*. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum III, 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- _____. (1990). *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*. SBLSCS 40. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press.
- _____. (1991). *Exodus*. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum II, 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- _____. (1995). *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*. SBLSCS 39. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press.
- Wheeler-Robinson, H. (1944). "The Council of Yahweh." *JTS* 45: 151-57.
- Whitters, Mark F. (2003). *The Epistle of Second Baruch: A Study in Form and Message*. JSPSup 42. London: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Wikgren, Allen (1960). "Patterns of Perfection in the Epistle to the Hebrews." *NTS* 6: 159-67.
- Wilcox, M. (1988). "According to the Pattern (TBNYT) . . . : Exodus 25,40 in the New Testament and Early Jewish Thought." *RevQ* 13: 647-56.
- Wildberger, Hans (1991). *Isaiah 1-12*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press.
- _____. (1997). *Isaiah 13-27*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press.
- Willett, Tom W. (1989). *Eschatology in the Theodicies of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra*. JSPSup 4. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Wiley, Patricia Tull (1997). *Remember the Former Things: The Recollection of Previous Texts in Second Isaiah*. SBLDS 161. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press.
- Willi-Plein, Ina (2005). "Some Remarks on Hebrews from the Viewpoint of Old Testament Exegesis." In *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods – New Insights*. Biblical Interpretation Series 75. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 25-35.
- Williams, Clarence R. (1911). "A Word-Study of Hebrews 13." *JBL* 30: 129-36.
- Williamson, Ronald (1963). "Platonism and Hebrews." *SJT* 16: 415-24.
- _____. (1970). *Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Leiden: Brill.
- _____. (1975). "The Eucharist and the Epistle to the Hebrews." *NTS* 21: 300-12.
- _____. (1983). "The Incarnation of the Logos in Hebrews." *ExpTim* 95: 4-8.
- Wills, Lawrence M. (1984). "The Form of the Sermon in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity." *HTR* 77: 277-99.
- Wilson, Andrew M. and Lawrence M. Wills (1982). "Literary sources of the Temple Scroll." *HTR* 73: 275-88.
- Wilson, James P. (1939). "The Interpretation of Hebrews xiii. 10." *ExpTim* 50: 380-81.
- Wilson, R. McL. (1987). *Hebrews*. Basingstoke: Marshall, Morgan and Scott.
- Windisch, Hans (1913). *Der Hebräerbrief*. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).

- Winston, David (1979). *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 43. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.
- Wintermute, O. S. (1983). "Apocalypse of Zephaniah: A New Translation and Introduction." *OTP* 1: 497-515.
- _____. (1985). "Jubilees: A New Translation and Introduction." *OTP* 2: 35-142.
- Wise, Michael O. (1989). "The Covenant of Temple Scroll XXIX, 3-10." *RevQ* 14: 49-60.
- _____. (1990a). *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11*. SAOC 59. Chicago, Ill.: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- _____. (1990b). "The Eschatological Vision of the Temple Scroll." *JNES* 49: 155-72.
- _____. (1991). "4QFlorilegium and the Temple of Adam." *RevQ* 15: 103-32.
- _____. (1994). "That Which Has Been is That Which Shall Be; 4QFlorilegium and the **מִקְדָּשׁ אֶדָם**." In *Thunder in Gemini and Other Essays on the History, Language and Literature of Second Temple Palestine*. JSPSup 15. Edited by Michael O. Wise. Sheffield: JSOT Press: 152-85.
- _____. (2000). "New Jerusalem Texts." *DNTB*: 742-45.
- Wold, Benjamin G (2005). *Women, Men and Angels: The Qumran Wisdom Document Musar LeMevin and its Allusions to Genesis Creation Traditions*. WUNT 2, 201. Tübingen Mohr (Siebeck).
- _____. (2008). "Family ethics in 4QInstruction and the New Testament." *NovT* 50: 286-300.
- Wolff, Hans Walter (1977). *A Commentary on the Books of Joel and Amos*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress.
- _____. (1988). *Haggai: A Commentary*. CCS. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg
- Wolfson, Elliot R. (1994). "Mysticism and the Poetic-Liturgical Compositions from Qumran: A Response to Bilhah Nitzan." *JQR* 85: 185-202.
- Wolfson, Harry Austin (1968). "Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam." Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Wooden, R. Glenn (2007). "2 Esdras." In *NETS*. Electronic Ed. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin Wright. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 405-23.
- Woollcombe, K.J. (1957). "The Biblical Origins and Patristic Development of Typology." In *Essays on Typology*. London: SCM: 39-75.
- Worrell, John (1970). "עצד: 'Counsel' or 'Council' at Qumran?" *VT* 20: 65-74.
- Wray, J. H. (1998). *Rest as a Theological Metaphor in the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Gospel of Truth*. SBLDS 166. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press.
- Wright, Addison G. (1967). "The Structure of the Book of Wisdom." *Bib* 48: 165-84.
- Wright, Benjamin G. III (1989). *No Small Difference: Sirach's Relationship to its Hebrew Parent*. SBLscs 26. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press.
- _____. (1997). "'Fear the Lord and Honor the Priest': Ben Sira as Defender of the Jerusalem Priesthood." In *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research: Proceedings of the First International Ben Sira Conference, 28-31 July, Soesterberg, Netherlands*. BZAW 255. Edited by Pancratius C. Beentjes. Berlin/New York, N.Y.: Walter de Gruyter: 189-222.

- _____. (2007a). "1 Enoch and Ben Sira: Wisdom and Apocalypticism in Relationship." In *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 159-76.
- _____. (2010). "Ben Sira, Book of." *DEJ*: 436-38.
- Wright, G. Ernest (1944). "The Significance of the Temple in the Ancient Near East: Part III The Temple in Palestine-Syria." *BA* 7 (4): 65-77.
- Wright, J. Edward (1998). "Baruch: His Evolution from Scribe to Apocalyptic Seer." In *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*. Edited by Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergren. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International: 264-89.
- _____. (2000). *The Early History of Heaven*. New York, N.Y./Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wright, N. T. (1991). *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- _____. (1992). *The New Testament and the People of God*. London: SPCK.
- _____. (1996). *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress.
- _____. (2003a). *Hebrews for Everyone*. London: SPCK.
- _____. (2003b). *The Resurrection of the Son of God*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press.
- _____. (2007b). *Surprised by Hope*. London: SPCK.
- Yadin, Yigael (1959). "A Midrash on 2 Sam vii and Ps i-ii (4QFlorilegium)." *IEJ* 9: 95-98.
- _____. (1962). *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness*. London: Oxford University Press.
- _____. (1965). "The Excavation of Masada—1963/64 Preliminary Report." *IEJ* 15 (1-2): 1-120.
- _____. (1967). "The Temple Scroll." *BA* 30: 135-39.
- _____. (1977-1983). *The Temple Scroll*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society,.
- Yonge, C. D. (1993). *The Works of Philo: Complete and Unabridged*. New updated ed. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson.
- Young, Norman H. (1973). "ΤΟΥΤ' ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΗΣ ΣΑΡΚΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ (Heb. x.20): Apposition, Dependent or Explicative." *NTS* 20: 100-04.
- _____. (1981). "The Gospel According to Heb 9." *NTS* 27: 198-210.
- _____. (2001). "Where Jesus has Gone as a Forerunner on our behalf (Hebrews 6:20)." *AUSS* 39: 165-73.
- _____. (2002a). "'Bearing His Reproach' (Heb 13.9-14)." *NTS* 48: 243-61.
- _____. (2002b). "The Day of Dedication or the Day of Atonement? The Old Testament Background to Hebrews 6:19-20 Revisited." *AUSS* 40: 61-68.
- _____. (2003). "Suffering: A Key to the Epistle to the Hebrews." *ABR* 51: 47-59.
- Zahn, Molly . (2007). "New Voices, Ancient Words: The Temple Scroll's Reuse of the Bible." In *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*. Edited by John Day. London: T&T Clark: 435-58.
- Zeitlin, Solomon (1947). "The Assumption of Moses and the Revolt of Bar Kokba: Studies in the Apocalyptic Literature." *JQR* 38: 1-45.

- Zerwick, Maximilian (1963). *Biblical Greek Illustrated by Examples*. Reeditio photomechanica (1979). Rome: Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici.
- Zerwick, Maximilian and Mary Grosvenor (1979). *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press.
- Ziegler, Joseph (1980). *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach*. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum XII, 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Zimmer, Robert G. (1975). "The Temple of God." *JETS* 18: 41-46.
- Zobel, H.-J. (2001). "עֶלְיֹן 'elyôn." *TDOT* 11: 121-39.
- Zsengellér, József (2008). "Does Wisdom Come from the Temple? Ben Sira's Attitude to the Temple of Jerusalem." In *Studies in the Book of Ben Sira: Papers of the Third International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Shime'on Centre, Pápa, Hungary, 18-20 May, 2006*. JSJSup 127. Edited by Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér. Leiden/Boston: Brill: 135-49.
- Zuntz, G. (1953). *The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum*. The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1946. London: Oxford University Press.
- Zwief, A.W. (1997). *The Ascension of the Messiah in Lukan Christology*. Leiden: Brill.