Atonement, the Heavenly Sanctuary, and Purgation of Sin: An Exegetical Study of Hebrews 9

Clifford B. Kvidahl

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of

Master of Theology

at the South African Theological Seminary

2019

Supervisor: Prof. Dan Lioy

Declaration

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that the work contained in this thesis is my own original work and has not previously in its entirety or in part been submitted to any institution for a degree.

Date: October 2019

Signed: Clifford B. Kvidahl

Acknowledgements

This thesis is the culmination of a more than decade long obsession with the utterly fascinating writing that is the letter to the Hebrews. What began as an interest in the so-called warning passages quickly turned into an unquenchable curiosity for all that this homily had to offer. I soon found myself entranced by the poetic style, theological depth, and pastoral urgency that the *auctor ad Hebraeos* so brilliantly displays in his homily. For me to have the opportunity to spend the last few years engaged in research and writing on this ancient Christian homily is truly a blessing and a great joy.

Several people have both directly and indirectly contributed much to this thesis. First, I must thank my supervisor, Prof. Dan Lioy, for his guidance and mentoring throughout this work. He was patient with me during the early stages of this work when I was frustrated with myself for not "getting it." He both guided me and encouraged me through those early days of research and writing. Any mistakes that remain land squarely on my shoulders.

Four other people deserve mention: Drew Davis, Todd Scacewater, Jason Vaughn, and Shawn Wilhite. Each of these men offered encouragement in some form throughout the writing of this thesis. I am honored to call each of these brothers my friend.

I would like to specifically mention four people who have helped shape my understanding of Hebrews. First, to Dr. William Varner. My academic journey in Hebrews began during an advanced Greek exegesis course at The Master's University. Perhaps more than anyone else, Dr. Varner has taught me the meaning of faithfulness and endurance that permeates throughout Hebrews. Second, to Dr. Cynthia Westfall. Her work on the Greek text of Hebrews has greatly shaped my love for this sermon. I am still holding out hope that she will one day write a full-length commentary on Hebrews. It is a real blessing to be able to call her my friend. Third, to Dr. David Moffitt, whose landmark monograph on the resurrection and atonement in Hebrews stands alongside other groundbreaking works that have forever changed the landscape of New Testament studies. As you read through this study you will no

doubt see his influence upon my own thinking of Hebrews' theology of atonement and high priestly Christology. Lastly, to Dr. George Guthrie, whose monograph on the structure of Hebrews has influenced my own understanding of this Early Christian homily more than anyone else. As I return to his work from time to time, I am reminded anew of the literary genius of the *auctor ad Hebraeos*.

Finally, this thesis is dedicated to the three most important woman in my life: my wife Heather, and my daughters, Paisley Anne and Gracelyn Varner-Rose. You three girls are the reason I get up in the morning. I love you more than I can ever say. Thank you for all the joy you bring me and all the love you give.

> Ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης, ὁ ἀναγαγὼν ἐκ νεκρῶν τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων τὸν μέγαν ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης αἰωνίου, τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν, καταρτίσαι ὑμᾶς ἐν παντὶ ἀγαθῷ εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ, ποιῶν ἐν ἡμῖν τὸ εὐάρεστον ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν (Hebrews 13.20-21)

Abstract

The letter to the Hebrews is unique among its New Testament counterparts in that it is the only canonical writing to map the sacrifice of Christ upon a detailed discussion of Israel's cultic theology. In his homily, the author pays particular attention to both the Day of Atonement and the inauguration of the old covenant and its related cultic appurtenances. These two cultic events serve as the background for the author's theology of atonement with regard to the sacrifice of Christ. Alongside the atonement, this cultic background also informs the author's high priestly Christology with respect to the timing of Christ's installation as high priest. Hebrews is unique in its description of Christ with respect to his installation as high priest, building his high priestly Christology around the enigmatic Priest-King, Melchizedek.

This study is a detailed exegetical study of Hebrews' theology of the atonement, its distinctive high priest Christology, and its emphasis on purgation of the defilement caused by sin. This thesis challenges the more traditional understanding of the atonement that is common among both the scholar and the inquisitive reader of the Bible, one that is shaped more by a Pauline interpretation of the atonement than it is by the *auctor ad Hebraeos*. Rather than focusing on the death of Christ as the locus of atonement, for Hebrews, the Yom Kippur ritual supplies the theological script for the homily's distinct theology of atonement. Just as the immolation of the sacrificial victim in Leviticus 16 is essential for accessing the blood necessary for obtaining atonement within the Holy of Holies, so also is the death of Christ necessary for the self-offering and presentation for atonement within the heavenly sanctuary.

Also related to Hebrews' cultic theology of atonement is the installation of Christ as high priest. In his midrash on the life of Melchizedek, the author of Hebrews indicates that because Christ was from the tribe of Judah, he had no authority to rightly officiate in the Temple. However, because Christ's sacrifice inaugurated a new covenant, this necessitated a priestly regime change, one that was founded on the basis of an indestructible life. It was this indestructible life that Jesus took on at his resurrection, whereby he entered into the heavenly sanctuary and made his once-for-all-time offering for atonement, thus decisively purging the defilement of sin.

The author of Hebrews has provided the Church of Christ with perhaps the most detailed and beautifully structured example of an Early Christian homily. The author proves to be a creative and well-trained orator, steeped in the Greco-Roman philosophical and educational milieu of his time. Not only was he classically trained, he was also a top-notch theologian, well-versed in both the Old Testament scriptures and Jewish worldview. What is seen in this ancient homily is the working together of the author's Greco-Roman and Jewish heritage to produce one of the most important expositions on the atonement of Christ and his role as the great and faithful high priest.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Abbreviations

Unless otherwise indicated below, the abbreviations in this thesis follow the second edition of *The SBL Handbook of Style* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014). Citations from Aristotle, Cicero, Eusebius, Jerome, Josephus, Philo, Plutarch, Quintilian, and *Rhetorica ad Herennium* are from the Loeb Classical Library (LCL) Edition. Citations from the Dead Sea Scrolls are taken from Martínez and Tigchelaar's *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 1997-98). Citations from the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha are taken from Charlesworth's *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009). Citations from the Apostolic Fathers are taken from the third edition of Holmes's *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007).

Aet.	*De aeternitate mundi*
Ag. Ap.	*Against Apion*
ALD	*Aramaic Levi Document*
ANF	Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A Cleveland Coxe, *Fathers of the Second Century: Hermas, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, and Clement of Alexandria*. Buffalo: Christian Literature Company, 1885.
Ant.	*Jewish Antiquities*
b. Yoma	Yoma
b. Zebaḥ	Zebaḥim
BDAG	W Bauer, FW Danker, WF Arndt, and FW Gingrich*, Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
BDF	Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
CEB	Common English Bible
Cher.	*De Cherubim*
Claud.	*Divus Claudius*

COED	*Concise Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
CSB	Christian Standard Bible
De or.	*De oratore*
De Pudicitia	*Modesty*
Det.	*Quod Deterius Potiori Insidari Soleat*
Did.	Didache
Ebr.	*De Ebrietate*
Ep.	Letters of St. Augustine (NPNF 1.1.252). *The Confessions and Letters of St. Augustin with a Sketch of His Life and Work*. Edited by Philip Schaff Buffalo: Christian Literature Company, 1886.
ESV	English Standard Version
Fug.	*De fuga et inventione*
GE	Franco Montanari. *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*. Edited by Madeleine Goh and Chad Schroeder. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
HE	*Historia Ecclesiastica*
Her.	*Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres Sit*
History	*The Seven Books of History against the Pagans*
Hom. *Heb*.	*Homiliae in epistulam ad Hebraeos*
In Joh.	*Commentary on the Gospel according to S. John*. London: Walter Smith, 1885.
Inst.	*Institutio oratoria*
Inv.	*De inventione rhetorica*
Jov.	*Adversus Jovinianum*
Jub.	Jubilees
J.W.	*Jewish War*
Leg.	*Legum Allegoriae*

LEB	Lexham English Bible
LN	JP Louw and EA Nida. Editors. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains*. 2nd ed. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.
LSJ	Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones. *A Greek-English Lexicon.* 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
LW	*The Works of Martin Luther*
LXX	Septuagint
MHT	JH Moulton, WF Howard, and N Turner JH. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek. Vol. I: Prolegomena*. 1908, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek Vol. II. Accidence and Word-Formation*, 1929. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek Vol. III. Syntax*, 1963. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek Vol. IV. Style*, 1976. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
M-M	JH Moulton and G Milligan. *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930.
Mos.	*De Vita Mosis*
Mut.	*De Mutatione Nominum*
NASB	New American Standard Bible
NET	The NET Bible
NIV	New International Version
NLT	New Living Translation
NRSV	New Revised Standard Bible
Odes Sol.	Odes of Solomon
Opif.	*De Opificio Mundi*
OTP	Old Testament Pseudepigrapha
Pan.	*Panarion (Adversus haereses)*
PG	Patrologia Graeca [*Patrologiae Cursus Completus*: Series Graeca]. Edited by JP Migne. 162 vols. Paris, 1857-1886.

Plant.	*De plantatione*
Poet.	*Poetica*
Post.	*De Posteritate Caini*
P.Oxy.	*Oxyrhynchus papyri*
QE	*Quaestiones et Solutiones in Exodum*
Rhet.	*Rhetorica*
Rhet. Her.	Rhetorica ad Herennium
RSV	Revised Standard Version
t. Šebu.	Šebuʿot
Smyth	Smyth, Herbert W. *A Greek Grammar for Colleges*. New York: American Book Company, 1920.
Somn.	*De somniis*
Spec.	*De Specialibus Legibus*
T. Ab.	Testament of Abraham
T. Dan	Testament of Dan
T. Jos.	Testament of Joseph
T. Jud.	Testament of Judah
T. Levi	Testament of Levi
T. Sol.	Testament of Solomon
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* Edited by G Kittel and G Friedrich. Translated by GW Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976.
TNIV	Today's New International Version
Tranq. *an*.	*De tranquillitate animi*
T. Reu.	Testament of Reuben
1 En.	1 Enoch (Ethiopic Apocalypse)

1 Esd	1 Esdras
4 Bar.	4 Baruch
4QLevi^{b}	*4QAramaic Levi*^{b}
4Q400	*4Q*Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice^{a}
4Q403	*4Q*Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice^{d}
4Q405	*4Q*Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice^{f}
11Q17	*11Q*Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

1.1 Background

Once considered the riddle of the New Testament (Scott 1922:1), the letter to the Hebrews has experienced a renaissance as of late, with the publication of seminal commentaries, monographs, and articles all appearing within the last few decades. Within these publications a conversation is taking place regarding the nature of the atonement and how it relates to the priestly work of Christ. Specifically, this conversation centers in on questions regarding the timing, place, and efficacy of the atonement in Hebrews (see Eberhart 2005; Vis 2012; Jamieson 2017, 2019; Kibbe 2014; Moffitt 2011; Ribbens 2016). Each of these aspects of the atonement play an important part in how one interprets the cultic language of Hebrews, particularly as it relates to Hebrews 7-10.

Regarding the timing of the atonement, does the author of Hebrews consider the atonement of Christ as having been accomplished on the cross or at a later stage in the sacrificial drama? Further related to the timing of the atonement is the question of location. Where does the author of Hebrews apply the sacrifice of Christ? Lastly, what is the best way to understand the meaning of purgation in Hebrews 9? Each of these questions will be explored as it applies to the author of Hebrews' understanding of Christ's sacrifice, priestly work, and their relationship with purgation of sin in Hebrews 9.

The more traditional way of understanding atonement in Hebrews centers on the self-offering of Christ on the cross. According to this view, it is on the cross that Christ offered himself as a sacrifice for sin, thus making atonement and securing purgation of sin (see Young 1981; Bruce 1990; Cockerill 2012; Ellingworth 1993;

Lindars 1991; Richardson 2012; Schreiner 2015). More recently, however, the traditional view regarding the *time* and *place* of the atonement in Hebrews has been challenged by several interpreters of Hebrews (see Calaway 2013; Kibbe 2014; Moffitt 2011; Ribbens 2016; Jamieson 2019). Rather than viewing atonement as occurring on the cross, these interpreters suggest that atonement in Hebrews happens upon Christ's entrance into the heavenly tabernacle, where he presents himself alive as an offering to God (see Heb 9.11-14; 24; 26).

The traditional view of the atonement in Hebrews is influenced more by a Pauline understanding of the sacrifice of Christ than it is by the cultic theology of Hebrews. In Hebrews 9, the author portrays a more nuanced understanding of the death of Christ, his enthronement in heaven, and atonement for sin. For example, the death of Christ is understood in the context of the Day of Atonement (9.1-10; 11-14; 23-28) and covenant inauguration (9.15-22), for both of which death is but a part of the cultic ritual. In the Pauline literature, the focus of the atonement is primarily on the cross of Christ as the locus of salvation and forgiveness of sin (see Rom 3.25; 4.25; 5.6-11; 6.10; 1 Cor 15.3; Gal 1.4; Col 1.20). The author of Hebrews goes beyond the cross, into the heavenly tabernacle, where Christ offers his own life for atonement and purification from sin. This difference between the authors introduces the following important question: how does the difference in emphases effect one's understanding of atonement in Hebrews 9?

Several recent publications help lay the foundation for an examination of Hebrews 9 and its relationship with purgation of sin. Christian Eberhart has written two important works that help shape the discussion of how atonement language is utilized in the New Testament, and more specifically, in the letter to the Hebrews (2005; 2011). Eberhart's work challenges the more traditional view that the death of the sacrifice is the climax of the offering, arguing instead that death alone does not constitute atonement for sin but functions as one part of the sacrificial ritual. As it applies to Hebrews, Eberhart posits that the death of Christ is not the event that accomplishes salvation; rather, it allows for the availability of his blood, by which he can enter the heavenly tabernacle and offer himself as atonement for sin (2005:59). This suggests that when Hebrews 9 speaks of the death of Christ, rather than seeing it as the culmination of the sacrifice, it is instead the first step in the process, with the

manipulation of blood on the altar the effecting agent of atonement (see Leviticus 16). Therefore, in contrast to the traditional view mentioned above, Eberhart suggests that atonement is achieved when Christ entered the heavenly tabernacle to offer himself alive to God to make atonement for sin.

Perhaps one of the most significant studies on the atonement in Hebrews of late is David Moffitt's seminal 2011 monograph. To date, Moffitt provides the most thorough examination of the resurrection in Hebrews and its relationship to the high priestly duties of Christ in the heavenly tabernacle. While the traditional view regards the death of Christ on the cross as the apex of the atonement, Moffitt questions this interpretation, arguing that Jesus's self-offering on the cross is not the place where of atonement is achieved. Instead, it is Jesus's entrance into the heavenly tabernacle, where he presents himself alive to God, that provides the means of atonement (2011:292). For a shift to take place from the cross to the heavenly tabernacle as the place of atonement, Moffitt must show how the resurrection is forefront in the theology of Hebrews. For Moffitt, Hebrews 9 is important for his overall thesis, as the author of Hebrews goes into much detail about the death of Christ and his presentation in the heavenly tabernacle. Moffitt concludes that it is the resurrection of Christ that inaugurates the process of atonement that started on the cross. Moffitt's contribution will be an important dialogue partner for this thesis and will utilize his findings in an exegesis of Hebrews 9 to show that the atonement and subsequent purgation of sin occurred at Christ's self-offering in the heavenly tabernacle.

A further important monograph on the topic of the atonement in Hebrews is the study from Benjamin Ribbens (2016). Ribbens applies the research done by Moffitt (2011), Eberhart (2005), and others to the function of the heavenly cult in Hebrews. Ribbens' work offers a detailed study of the old covenant sacrifices and their relationship to the sacrifice of Christ and the question of its efficacy (2016:18). Ribbens traces the cultic theology in Second Temple Judaism and related primary texts and its transference of sacrificial language from ritual to non-ritual, concluding that in the letter to the Hebrews there is a similar transference in relationship to Christ and the heavenly sanctuary (2016:129). Ribbens highlights an important distinction that is made between Paul's emphasis on the death of Christ as the means of atonement

and the author of Hebrews' focus on the heavenly tabernacle. For the author of Hebrews, the priestly work of Christ is front and center in his atonement theology. He is both the sacrificial offering and the high priest who enters the heavenly tabernacle to make atonement.

Finally, the most recent book-length study to appear in print is the 2019 monograph from R. B. Jamieson. Like Ribbens above, Jamieson draws on the work of Moffitt and others, but also breaks new ground as well. Like Moffitt and Ribbens, Jamieson argues that the cross is not the *when* or *where* of Christ's offering, rather, it is *what* he offers (2019:1). However, unlike Moffitt, who tends to lighten the impact of Christ entering into heaven *with* his blood by referring to the blood rule of Leviticus 17.11, Jamieson, on the other hand, maintains the continuity between the high priest's entry into the Holy of Holies with that of Christ's entry into heaven (2019:163). Jamieson's major contribution to the subject of this thesis is found in his emphasis on the *what* that Christ offers to God in heaven. Whereas Moffitt's view of blood in Hebrews depends heavily upon Lev 17.11 and its equation of blood with life, Jamieson argues that when Hebrews uses the language of blood, it is not the life of Christ that is being stressed, but rather it is the life of Christ given in his death that is offered to God for atonement (2019:165-79). Jamieson's study offers a welcome balance between the traditional view of atonement in Hebrews and its emphasis on cross and that of Moffitt and others, who rightly view Christ's offering as taking place in heaven.

This brief survey of recent literature touches on the problem that this thesis will attempt to address concerning the relationship between Hebrews 9 and purgation of sin. While the works of Eberhart, Moffitt, Ribbens, and Jamieson have moved the discussion from the cross to the heavenly tabernacle as the place of atonement, Hebrews 9, nevertheless, poses several challenges regarding how the reader is to understand the nature of the atonement and its application to purgation. For example, the sacrifice of Christ is described in terms of cleansing (Heb 9.14). Closely related to the language of cleansing is the idea of ritual purification (9.23). Here, the author of Hebrews alludes to Yom Kippur and the high priest's entrance into the Holy of Holies, where he applies the blood of the sacrifice to the mercy seat and appurtenances for the cleansing of sin and defilement. But how does cleansing and

ritual purification of the heavenly tabernacle connect with the author of Hebrews' understanding of the nature of purgation of sin in Hebrews 9?

The purpose of this thesis is to supply an answer to this question by means of an exegetical and theological examination of Hebrews 9, highlighting the connection between the priestly work of Christ and its application to purgation of sin. As noted above, a conversation is ongoing regarding Hebrews and the nature of atonement and purgation of sin. This thesis will engage this conversation by means of an exegetical analysis of Hebrews 9 in order to provide a cohesive understanding of the nature of purgation and its relationship to the sacrificial work of Christ.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The main problem that will be addressed in this thesis is as follows: What does an exegetical and theological examination of Hebrews 9 reveal regarding the relationship between Christ's sacrificial death on the cross, his entrance into the heavenly sanctuary, and purgation of sin?

This thesis will likewise address the following subsidiary questions with the goal of providing a cohesive and systematic understanding of Hebrews 9 and its application to the sacrificial work of Christ and purgation of sin:

1.3 Secondary Research Questions

1. What is the current state of scholarship regarding Hebrews 9 and the priestly work of Jesus, his entrance into the heavenly sanctuary, and its connection to purgation of sin?
2. What is the historical, social, cultural, and literary background of Hebrews?
3. What is the significance of the Day of Atonement typology and how does it relate to the priestly work of Christ and the heavenly sanctuary?
4. How does an exegetical and theological examination of Hebrews 9 connect the sacrificial work of Christ on the cross to the heavenly tabernacle and subsequent purgation of sin?
5. How can insights gleaned from an exegetical and theological examination of Hebrews 9 shape a wider understanding of the biblical theology of the high

priestly ministry of Christ and the nature of atonement when compared with the Gospels and the writings of Paul?

1.4 Central Theoretical Argument

An exegetical and theological examination of Hebrews 9 indicates that the Son's sacrifice on the cross inaugurates the process of atonement, which is accomplished by his enthronement into the heavenly tabernacle and his self-offering for purgation of sin.

1.5 Purpose

The purpose of this thesis is threefold. First, this study will synthesize the use of sacrificial and cultic imagery in Hebrews 9 to show how the author of Hebrews appropriates these leitmotifs into his overall theological program. Second, this thesis will apply this synthesis to the author of Hebrews' understanding of purgation of sin, specifically as it relates to Hebrews 9. And third, this study will apply the findings of an exegetical and theological examination of Hebrews 9 in attempt to provide a biblical theology of Christ's high priestly ministry and atoning sacrifice.

1.6 Proposed Methodology

The primary methodology that will be employed in this thesis is an exegetical and theological analysis of Hebrews 9. Before an exegetical analysis of Scripture can occur, certain questions must be asked and answered from the text, particularly questions regarding *content* and *context* (Fee 2002:5). With regard to content, questions regarding the historical and literary worldview are key to a proper understanding of Scripture. As this relates to Hebrews, and Hebrews 9 more specifically, historical questions regarding author, audience, setting, theological worldview, and provenance are important interpretative questions that must be addressed if one is to engage in any type of exegetical analysis. It is central for an exegete to be able to situate Hebrews within the broader Jewish and Greco-Roman world in which the author of Hebrews lived. Closely related to the question of content is that of context. After closely examining the historical background of Hebrews, attention turns next to the text of Hebrews itself. Here, questions regarding style, vocabulary, semantics, and structure are addressed.

This thesis will analyze the text of Hebrews 9 with the purpose of ascertaining the exegetical and theological message regarding the atonement and purgation of sin by means of the following six steps (see Blomberg and Markley 2010; Croy 2011; Fee 2002; Trotter 1997):

1. Establishing the Text: Before an analysis of the text can occur, an exegete must establish the text by examining important variant readings to determine their significance to overall meaning and theology of Hebrews 9. Any such variant readings that are significant to the text will be addressed in the footnotes.
2. Grammatical and Syntactical Analysis: Once the text of Hebrews 9 is established an exegete can begin his analysis of Hebrews 9, noting any significant syntactical categories and grammatical relationships that shed light on the meaning of Hebrews 9.
3. Lexical and Sematic Analysis: Upon completion of step two, an exegete can then begin to survey key words of theological importance. Because meaning is determined by context, an exegete cannot begin this step until a thorough grammatical and syntactical analysis of Hebrews 9 is performed.
4. Production of an English Translation: Aided by steps one through three, an exegete will produce a critical translation of Hebrews 9 that will help serve as a basis for the thesis.
5. Application of Exegesis: This final step will serve as a bridge from the original meaning to the modern context.

Each of these six steps are important, as they help lay a proper foundation for an exegetical theological analysis of Hebrews 9.

To further help aid in the exegesis of Hebrews 9, other supporting methodologies may be used to help inform an exegesis of the text. Some of the methodologies used in this study include discourse analysis (see Neeley 1987; Westfall 2005), rhetorical criticism (see Lindars 1989; Koester 2001; Witherington 2009; Martin and Whitlark 2018), and literary analysis (see Guthrie 1998a; Vanhoye 1963; 1989). Also, considering the dependency of Hebrews 9 upon a proper understanding of the cultic theology outlined in Leviticus and other related passages in the Old Testament and Second Temple Judaism, this thesis will also by extension be informed by a study of

important sacerdotal motifs. Therefore, this study will engage these cultic themes as they develop throughout Second Temple Judaism and into Early Christianity, culminating in the importation of these motifs into the Christological theology of Hebrews 9.

1.7 Proposed Outline

This thesis consists of six chapters. Chapter one serves as an introduction to the problem at hand, providing a preliminary background of recent scholarship, the value of this study, the methodology that will be employed, and an overview of the chapters that will follow.

Chapter two consists of a substantive literature review, beginning with a survey of how commentators understand the nature of the atonement in the letter to the Hebrews. This survey will focus on three ways in which the death of Christ and atonement in Hebrews is understood by commentators: The traditional view; the metaphorical view; and the two-step process. The chapter concludes with a survey of key primary texts that discuss the heavenly sanctuary and its location.

Chapter three situates Hebrews within its historical, sociological, and literary setting. Perhaps more than any other writing in the New Testament, the letter to the Hebrews leaves the reader with more questions than answers. After surveying the various options for the authorship of Hebrews, attention shifts to the worldview of the author and the various influences that helped shape his letter. Following the discussion of the worldview, questions regarding date, provenance, and audience are explored. The chapter concludes with an exploration of the literary context and structure of Hebrews and its importance for understanding the argument of Hebrews.

Chapters four and five form the heart of this thesis and provides an exegetical analysis of Hebrews 9 and the themes of atonement, the heavenly tabernacle, and purgation of sin. Beginning with a brief introduction to the chapter, the thesis next moves on to establishing the text of Hebrews 9 by analyzing any significant variant readings and their importance to the overall meaning and structure of the chapter. Following the establishment of the text is a syntactical and grammatical study Hebrews 9, moving verse by verse, noting important nominal and verbal relationships and their significance to the meaning of Hebrews 9. With the focus of

this thesis centering on the sacrifice of Christ and its relationship to the atonement, the heavenly tabernacle, and purgation of sin, this chapter also includes a lexical and sematic analysis of key terms related to each of these areas of focus. For example, terms related to the tent/tabernacle [σκηνὴ; ἅγιον; Ἅγια; Ἅγια Ἁγίων], blood [αἷμα]/shedding of blood [αἱματεκχυσία], purgation [ἄφεσις] of sin, and purification [καθαρίζω] will be examined in the context of Hebrews 9 as well the broader canonical context in which these terms appear.

At the theological level, important themes related to sacred space will also be explored in chapter four, specifically as it relates to the sacrifice of Christ, atonement, and the purgation of sin. A detailed exegetical analysis of Hebrews 9, as described above, will highlight how a proper understanding of purgation in Hebrews and its relationship to purification and ritual cleansing of both the people of God and the sacred space is the central point of not only Hebrews 9, but also the entirety of the book itself. Finally, the chapter concludes with a summary of the material covered.

Chapter six briefly recaps the exegetical findings from chapters four and five, highlighting the role it plays in advancing the discussion of atonement in Hebrews 9 and its relationship to purgation of sin. After this brief recap of atonement in Hebrews 9, the thesis concludes with a biblical theological analysis of the high priesthood of Christ and the nature of the atonement in the New Testament and how the author of Hebrews' presentation of the sacrifice of Christ helps build upon the panorama of atonement theology laid out by Paul and other writers of the New Testament. The aim of such a panorama is to tease out the practical implications of recognizing the connection between the priestly work of Christ and the purgation of sin.

1.8 Conclusion

This chapter has introduced the topic and central research question this thesis will endeavor to answer. What is clear from the brief survey of recent literature above is that there is a need to reassess the theology of the atonement and its relationship to both the heavenly sanctuary and purgation of sin. The primary way in which this will be accomplished in this thesis is by means of an exegetical and theological examination of Hebrews 9. In the following chapters this thesis will strive to situate

Hebrews 9 within the broader context of its own message and theology. In light of this, a clear path has been outlined for how this study will address these concerns.

Before an exegetical examination of Hebrews can occur, it is important to get the lay of the land in regard to the history of interpretation of the atonement and the heavenly sanctuary in Hebrews 9. The following chapter consists of a review of the literature regarding the various ways in which commentators have interpreted the nature of the atonement in Hebrews and its relationship with the heavenly sanctuary. After this will follow a survey of select Second Temple writings which discuss the nature of the heavenly tabernacle and the cultic activity that occurs within it. For this section, the writings of Josephus, Philo, Wisdom of Solomon, 1 Enoch, Testament of Levi, and Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice will help situate the understanding of the nature of the heavenly tabernacle in Second Temple Judaism.

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

The main objective in this chapter is to assess and evaluate some of the more integral works on the atonement, as well as the heavenly sanctuary, and their relationship to the cultic theology of Hebrews 9. A brief overview introducing the theme of this thesis is undertaken already above in chapter one; this chapter will expand on that overview and include in more detail the issues at hand as it relates to main research question this thesis will attempt to answer.

The ensuing literature review will be organized in two parts. Part one will survey the various ways interpreters have viewed the crucifixion and its relationship with the heavenly sanctuary in Hebrews. Three interpretations on the death of Christ and atonement will be explored: 1) the Traditional View, 2) the Metaphorical View, and 3) the Two-Step Pattern. Part two will examine how primary source material from the Second Temple period utilized the heavenly tabernacle motif in their own writings and how they may have influenced the author of Hebrews' own view on the matter. This examination will be divided into two sections: 1) the Sanctuary as Cosmos and 2) the Sanctuary in Heaven.

Each section consists of a review of scholarship, followed by an assessment of their work and its contribution to this thesis. Although this chapter is organized around two distinct parts, there will nevertheless be some overlap. It is quite difficult to discuss the nature of the atonement without also highlighting its application to the heavenly sanctuary, just as it is not possible to survey literature on the heavenly tabernacle in Hebrews without noting its symbiotic relationship to the priestly sacrifice of Christ. It will be argued in this thesis that these two subjects are not just theologically related,

but that they also represent a temporal sequence inaugurated at Calvary, culminating at the enthronement of the Son in the heavenly sanctuary.

The letter to the Hebrews is perhaps the most significant document from the apostolic period in regard to its discussion on the nature and theological significance of the atonement. Although references to the crucifixion of the historical Jesus are minimal in Hebrews when compared to other New Testament writings, the theological significance of the Son's self-offering for the atonement of sin incorporates almost three chapters of theological discussion surrounding the priestly work of Christ, with a whole chapter dedicated to a detailed discussion of atonement, sacred space, and purgation of sin.

2.2 The Atonement in Hebrews

2.2.1 The Traditional View

A brief survey of the relevant literature on Hebrews reveals that a number of scholars view the cross as the location of Jesus's self-offering and atonement for sin. These scholars contend that when the author of Hebrews refers to the sacrifice of Christ or his self-offering, he does so with the cross as his point of reference. The cross is the locus for Christ's self-offering for sin, the place where he offers up his life as an atonement for sin (Moffatt 1924:123-24; Spicq 1953:257-58; Loader 1981:185-92, 199, 201; Weiss 1991:467; Wallis 1995:146; Gräbe 2008:125; Joslin 2008:30-32; O'Collins and Jones 2010:45-56; Cockerill 2012:394-95; Kuma 2012:273-74; Compton 2015:150 n. 231; Vanhoye 2015:143; 2018:71; Bockmuehl 2019:147). Likewise, most interpreters who share this view are under the assumption that the prevailing view of atonement in Hebrews suggests that it is accomplished at the death of Christ (Hay 1989:145, 149, 151; see Koester 2001:382 n. 264; Moret 2016:299-300; Church 2017:283, 286, 416-21).

One of the challenges for any interpreter of Hebrews is how to decipher the location and timing of the atonement and its relationship to the Day of Atonement. For the author of Hebrews, Yom Kippur supplies the theological script for his cultic exposition in Hebrews 9 (Nelson 2003:252), while also serving as the background for both the author's high priest Christology (see Heb 2.17-18; 4.14-16; 5.1-10; Heb 7) as well as the inauguration of the new covenant (see Heb 8.6-13; 9.15-22). The Day

of Atonement ritual consisted of two main elements: the immolation of the bull and goat, together with the collection of sacrificial blood, and the entry of the high priest into the Holy of Holies and the manipulation of blood upon the mercy seat (Heb 9.7-10; see Lev 16). For atonement to be accomplished both elements have to occur, with the manipulation of blood upon the altar functioning as the *sine qua non* of atonement and purgation from sin.

The normal succession for the high priest on the Day of Atonement is transformed in Hebrews by the self-offering of Christ on the cross. Instead of entering an earthly sanctuary to sprinkle blood on the mercy seat, Christ offered himself once and for all on the altar of the cross (Isaacs 1992:209). In light of this transformation of Yom Kippur, Christ's entrance into the heavenly sanctuary is not to be understood as an antitype of the high priest's entry into the Holy of Holies. Rather, Christ "trat ins Allerheiligste, nachdem er auf Erden die Erlösung schon gewonnen hatte" (Loader 1981:186). Ellingworth acknowledges that the act of applying blood on the altar, and not the slaughter of the victim itself, is the *sine qua non* of the sacrifice, and it is in the crucifixion of Christ that these two closely related sacrificial rituals have been transformed into a single, monumental atoning event (1993:474; see Bruce 1990:32).

Cockerill also notes the close association between the slaughter of the victim and the sprinkling of its blood on the mercy seat but concludes that because of Christ's superior sacrifice the pattern of Yom Kippur is broken. Further, the author of Hebrews carefully avoids any impression of Christ bringing his own blood into the heavenly sanctuary to offer it on the altar. Instead, Christ enters the heavenly sanctuary by means of his own blood, that is his death, and sits down at the right hand of God, thus demonstrating the once-for-all effectiveness of his sacrifice (2012:393-95; see Lindars 1991:94; Church 2017:416-21). Consequently, the self-offering of Jesus on the cross is a high priestly act and the necessary condition for his entrance into the heavenly sanctuary (Westcott 1903:199; 217; 263, 275-76; Stott 1962:64) and the epicenter of his atoning work (Hughes 1973:209; Small 2014:252-53).

Richardson, likewise, emphatically concludes that the cross clearly portrays to God's people that it is the sacrifice of Christ on earth and not in the heavenly sanctuary that

provides sanctification and redemption (2012:44; see Schreiner 2015:244; 285). Richardson argues that the analogy the author of Hebrews makes between the Levitical high priests (Heb 9.7-10) and the work of Jesus related only to the entry of Jesus into the Holy Place *and not to the atonement* (2012:39).

Young, in no uncertain terms, concludes that the crucifixion of Christ alters both the sequence and frequency of the Day of Atonement ritual, with the result that the cross now functions as the focal point and location of atonement (1981:209). Instead of Christ accomplishing atonement in the heavenly sanctuary, like that of the Levitical high priest on the Day of Atonement, Christ's self-offering on the cross is the means of atonement, forgiveness, and sanctification (Lane 1991:238; 248-49; Stegemann and Stegemann 2005:23). McKnight concurs, concluding that in the death of Christ is the fulfillment of Israel's cult. The cross is the place of Christ's self-sacrifice, and it is there, on Good Friday, that the author of Hebrews sees the fulfillment of all that the Day of Atonement represented (2005:363-66; see Treat 2014:217-20).

In an oft cited observation, F. F. Bruce unequivocally concludes that the cross is where atonement is achieved. Commenting on those who would conceive of the death of Christ as following closely the Day of Atonement ritual he writes:

> There have been expositors who, pressing the analogy of the Day of Atonement beyond the limits observed by our author, have argued that the expiatory work of Christ is not completed on the cross—not completed, indeed, until he ascended from earth and "made atonement 'for us' in the heavenly holy of holies by the presentation of his efficacious blood." But while it is necessary under the old covenant for the sacrificial blood first to be shed in the court and then to be brought into the holy of holies, no such division of our Lord's sacrifice into two phases is envisaged under the new covenant. When on the cross he offered up his life to God as a sacrifice for his people's sin, he accomplished in reality 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 (1990:213-14).

Bruce cautions against any tendency to press the analogy of Yom Kippur any further than what the author of Hebrews intended. Instead of the two-step process of slaughter and manipulation of blood, these two steps have been transformed into one by the self-offering of Christ on the cross. It is at the crucifixion of the Messiah

that atonement and forgiveness of sin takes place (Allen 2010a:488). Simply stated, the self-offering of Christ on the cross is the foundation for the forgiveness of sin, the place of intercession on behalf of all Christians, and the promise for the final deliverance from death (Kleinig 2017:461).

2.2.2 Assessment

Scholars who hold to the traditional view of sacrificial language in Hebrews tend to interpret the language of sacrifice and the blood of Christ as references to the crucifixion of Christ (Philip 2011:56). Christ suffers and is crucified outside the city gates in order that he might sanctify his people (Heb 13.12). Christ's once-for-all offering of his body procures sanctification for his own (Heb 10.10, 12, 14). Also, by means of his incarnation Christ is able to destroy the works of the devil and free his people from the fear of death (Heb 2.14), as well as make propitiation for sin (Heb 2.17). The implication here is that in order for Christ to secure atonement, he had to take on flesh and blood and experience a life of suffering—a suffering which culminated in his violent execution by means of a Roman cross.

Related to this is the repeated emphasis in Hebrews on the one-time nature of Christ's death. After his offering for sin Christ takes his seat at the right hand of God, emphasizing a completion of his priestly work (Heb 1.3; see Heb 10.12). Whereas the Levitical high priest needed to offer daily sacrifices for sin—for himself and for the people—Jesus accomplished this through his once-for-all offering of himself (Heb 7.27). Likewise, in contrast to the high priest's yearly entrance into the Holy of Holies, Christ enters once and for all into the true tent by means of his own blood, thus bringing a decisive end to sin through his self-offering on the cross (Heb 9.11-14; 25-28).

However, due to the finality of the cross as the location of the atonement, the relationship in Hebrews between the cross and Christ's entrance into the heavenly tabernacle does not follow the typical pattern of the high priest on the Day of Atonement. Leviticus 16 outlines the two-step process that the high priest must follow to cleanse both the people and the tabernacle from impurity. First, the high priest would slaughter a bull and a goat, one for his sin and the other for the people. Second, the high priest enters the Holy of Holies and sprinkles the blood of the

sacrifice upon the mercy seat. Both rites, the act of slaughter and the manipulation of blood, form the heart of Israel's definitive day of worship and are necessary for the purgation of sin.

However, the author of Hebrews turns this liturgy on its head. Instead of Jesus dying on the cross and entering the heavenly sanctuary to offer his own blood upon the altar, the cross is both the place of slaughter and the mercy seat upon which his blood is sprinkled (Stökl 2003:189). Rather than playing an essential role in the Day of Atonement liturgy, Christ's entrance into the heavenly sanctuary, unlike that of the Levitical high priest, is not to sprinkle blood on the mercy seat, but instead is a reference to Christ's entrance into heaven itself through his sacrifice on the cross (Guthrie 1998b:310). Christ secures atonement on the cross, and by means of his own blood he enters the heavenly sanctuary and takes his seat at the right hand of the Father, where he now intercedes on behalf of his people. Christ has fulfilled his divine mission of redeeming humanity and by so doing he has returned to heaven as high priest and enthroned Son, where he now waits for his return and the final deliverance from sin (Lane 1991:389; Ellingworth 1993:452).

Loader succinctly sums up the traditional view, concluding that the "death of Jesus is seen primarily as the salvific act. It cannot be reduced to being merely preparatory. Nor can it be reduced to part of what is seen as an exemplary life which qualifies a heavenly offering to have effect. Nor is it so that all cultic imagery is restricted to references to the heavenly realm and references to Jesus's death and its significance are all non-cultic. *Cleary the author places the weight of significance on Jesus's death as the salvific event* (2018:263).

2.2.3 The Metaphorical View

Similar to the commentators in 2.2.1, this second group of commentators would also propose the cross as the locale for Christ's atoning sacrifice for sin. Nevertheless, what distinguishes these interpreters of Hebrews from those in 2.2.1 is a continuity between the self-offering of the Messiah on the cross and his entrance into the heavenly sanctuary. Instead of concluding that the entrance of Christ into the heavenly sanctuary is synonymous with his enthronement in heaven, the commentators in this section argue that the language describing the entrance of

Christ into the heavenly sanctuary is best understood as a metaphor for the death of Christ on the cross (Schenck 2007a:168; see Kistemaker 1984:252-53). In this way, the continuity between the cross and the heavenly sanctuary that the author of Hebrews maintains—a continuity based the Day of Atonement liturgy—is kept slightly more intact than what is apparent in the first group of scholars above. Rather than collapsing the entirety of the Day of Atonement symbolism into the crucifixion event, the metaphorical view allows for the Yom Kippur ritual to play out in the death of Christ, albeit in a more spiritual sense. Eberhart posits that the Old Testament cult—of which the Yom Kippur ritual is the apex—is effective in establishing the foundation for the metaphorical view of Christ's sacrificial death (2005:60).

Whereas the location of atonement is still to be found at Calvary, the act of Christ's self-offering on the cross now contains a metaphorical component as well (see Carlston 1978:148, who understands the sacrifice of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary as a metaphor for Christ's death). For example, Peterson posits that the Day of Atonement symbolism in Hebrews emphasizes the heavenly nature of Christ's self-sacrifice on the cross. Peterson goes on to conclude that the Day of Atonement ritual highlights both the self-offering of Christ on the cross, along with his entrance into the heavenly sanctuary. What Peterson means by this is that both the ascent into the heavenly sanctuary *as well as* the crucifixion are meant to be read in light of the Day of Atonement imagery that the author of Hebrews is utilizing for his argument. Not only is Christ's entrance into the heavenly sanctuary a heavenly act, the cross as well is to be considered a heavenly act also (1982:192; see Smith 1969:98-99).

Schenck likewise views Christ's death, exaltation, and session to God's right hand as a single event. In his view, the death of Christ is the climactic moment in the drama of Hebrews. Schenck argues that unlike other New Testament writings, the ability to break down the various parts of Christ's salvific work into clear and distinct categories is not an easy task for the interpreter of Hebrews. Whereas other New Testament documents often distinguish between the cross, resurrection, and ascension, "Hebrews integrates these separate events together by using them to *construct a metaphor* in which Christ's death is a sacrifice offered in a heavenly tabernacle on a decisive 'Day of atonement.'" In this way, the cross, ascension, and

session to God's right-hand function as a single event in the sacrificial plot (2003:14-15, emphasis added).

Attridge likewise concludes that the death of Christ on the cross is not an isolated event; the crucifixion of Christ is an event that is intricately interwoven with the entrance of Christ into God's presence. For Attridge, Christ's entry into the heavenly sanctuary unites two aspects of his priestly ministry: his sacrificial death and heavenly ministry of intercession (1989:263; see Thompson 2008:186; Marshall 2009:271, as well as n. 54). Attridge affirms the physical and earthly reality of Christ's self-sacrifice while at the same time also recognizing that his self-offering is also a heavenly one as well (1989:27; see Laansma 2008:132). As Thompson notes, "[t]he death of Jesus is thus an event which spans earth and heaven." In other words, Christ's "death and exaltation *form one event* for the author of Hebrews" (1982:107-8, emphasis added).

2.2.4 Assessment

While the commentators in this group would concur with those in 2.2.1 regarding the cross as the location of Christ's self-offering and atonement for sin, they nevertheless part ways over their understanding of the how the atoning act of Christ and the heavenly sanctuary are connected to each other in the whole redemptive process. For these scholars, earth and heaven are intimately related to Christ's self-offering on the cross. Whereas the first group of interpreters viewed entrance into the heavenly tabernacle as a reference to Christ's enthronement in heaven after his ascension, this present group of interpreters view the entrance as a metaphor for Christ's death on the cross.

The significance of the self-offering of Christ on the cross is not its earthly location, or even necessarily the means of his execution; the earthly cross plays a part in the larger, heavenly role of atonement for sin. Therefore, when the author of Hebrews speaks about the death of Christ or utilizes vivid language like blood to describe his sacrifice, he is attempting to evoke more than just a mental picture of Golgotha and an old, rugged cross. The author of Hebrews is highlighting how the ascension of the Messiah into the heavenly sanctuary functions as a metaphor for the death of Christ (Schenck 2007a:183). Attridge points out that the metaphorical significance of

Christ's blood is similar to that of the blood used in the Day of Atonement liturgy; namely, it isuniting what takes place outside with what happens inside. In the same way, the sacrifice of Christ is intimately interwoven with his entrance into the heavenly sanctuary, albeit as a metaphor for his self-offering on the cross (1989:248).

2.2.5 The Two-Step Pattern

Commentators in section 2.2.1 apply the meaning of the sacrificial language in Hebrews to the cross as the location of Jesus's self-offering. In 2.2.3, scholars employ a metaphorical meaning to the sacrificial language in Hebrews, where Christ's entrance into the heavenly sanctuary is understood as a metaphor for his self-offering on the cross. In this section scholars follow rather closely the script of Yom Kippur and its relation to the crucifixion and subsequent entry of Christ into the heavenly sanctuary. In contrast with the first view, where entry into the heavenly sanctuary plays no part in the act of atonement, and the second view, where entry into the heavenly sanctuary is a metaphor for Christ's death on the cross, scholars who propose this third view regard the cross as the initiation of the sacrificial drama, with Christ's entry into heavenly sanctuary and self-offering serving as the culminating moment of the atonement (Kibbe 2016:163).

In his article on the element of time and its relationship to the atonement, Monroe compares the activity of the high priest on Yom Kippur with that of Christ and his entry into the heavenly sanctuary. Just as the high priest offered the sacrifice on the altar outside the tent, and then proceeded into the Holy of Holies to sprinkle the blood of the sacrifice upon the mercy seat, thus securing atonement, so too Christ, after offering his body on the cross, entered into the heavenly sanctuary, securing atonement by means of his efficacious blood (1933:404; see Regev 2019:268).

In a similar vein as Monroe, Cody notes that the author of Hebrews perceives the priestly sacrifice of Christ as the event that enables the Son's entrance into the heavenly sanctuary, similar to the Levitical high priest's entrance into the Adytum with the blood of the sacrificial victim (1960:174-75). Contrary to the traditional view in 2.2.1 and the metaphorical view 2.2.3, Cody argues that the death of Christ on the

cross is a necessary precondition for the Son's entry into the heavenly sanctuary, where the final consummation of our redemption takes place.

Ribbens concurs with Cody, noting that the location of Jesus's offering does not downplay the role of the cross as a sacrificial act. But similar to the Day of Atonement's two-step process of slaughter and blood manipulation, Christ's death also follows a similar two-step pattern of immolation and presentation of blood in the Holy of Holies (2016:107-8; see deSilva 2000:305; Eskola 2001:264, 267, 357; 2015:227; Mitchell 2007:185; Mason 2008:35; Moffitt 2011:215-96; 2017:59-64; Barnard 2012:92; 116; 134; Jamieson 2019:47-70). With regard to the distinction between the cross and the heavenly sanctuary, Mackie correctly notes the importance of this distinction, concluding, "As the place where Jesus' sacrifice is completed, the Heavenly Sanctuary must be as 'real' for both the author and audience as the cross where Jesus' self-offering began" (2007:159).

On the cross, Jesus is the sacrificial slaughter in the same manner as the sacrificial victims prescribed in the Old Testament. Similarly, just as the high priest took the blood of the sacrifice into the Adytum to be sprinkled on the ἱλαστήριον (mercy seat) for atonement, so too did Christ enter as high priest into the heavenly Holy of Holies to offer his sacrifice for an eternal redemption (Eskola 2001:267). Brooks gets right to heart of the matter when he concludes, "The blood is Christ's ticket of admission into the holy of holies as it is for the priests of the law" (1970:210; see 208-10).

In his 2012 dissertation, Vis highlights that the death and offering of Christ in Hebrews follows a similar temporal pattern that is described in the חַטָּאת offering in Leviticus. The temporal pattern of:

> the presentation of sacrificial animal → immolation → manipulation of blood in the sanctuary → and burning of the carcass

coincides with the sacrificial offering of Jesus in Hebrews:

> Jesus's obedience leads to the cross → where he is crucified → and upon his resurrection enters the heavenly sanctuary to offer his blood → which the Church now celebrates through the holy sacraments of the Lord's Supper (2012:258).

The importance of this temporal procession is key to understanding Hebrews' view of the atonement and the heavenly sanctuary. Instead of conflating everything into the cross-event, Hebrews follows the pattern set out in the cultic rituals of Leviticus, specifically the blood rite and its manipulation upon the mercy seat (Vis 2012:258). This adherence by the author of Hebrews to the pattern laid out in Leviticus brings Vis to conclude, "It is not enough for Jesus to die on the cross. *He needed to be raised and to ascend to heaven to offer his blood in the heavenly sanctuary* (2012:257, emphasis added).

Part of the rationale for understanding the death of Christ and the atonement in this manner is best understood in how one interprets passages in Hebrews that identify Christ as high priest or refer to his priestly ministry. According to the author of Hebrews, one of the responsibilities of the high priest is to offer sacrifices and gifts (Heb 8.3); Jesus would have been prohibited from making such an offering since there is already a functioning priesthood in Jerusalem, and because he is a member of a different tribe (Heb 7.13-14; see 8.4). The author of Hebrews resolves this problem by placing the Son's offering not in the copy and shadow of the heavenly reality, but instead in the true tent that the Lord set up (8.2, 5).

Brooks concurs, noting that the type of priesthood Christ now possesses is based on an indestructible life—a life without end—and because of this new type of life, it is unthinkable that his offering would be prior to his resurrection (1970:208). Only because he is now a priest forever can he have something to offer God. It is on the basis of his resurrection and ensuing exaltation that Jesus is able to receive the eternal priesthood (1970:206).

Commentators also highlight the connection between perfection and resurrection in Hebrews and its prerequisite for Christ's installation as high priest (Kurianal 2000:232-33; Moffitt 2011:198-200; Easter 2014:94-99). While the death of Christ is not the atoning agent for sin in and of itself, it is nevertheless the means by which God prepared the Son to be a faithful high priest for the people of God. Through his suffering and death Christ learned obedience, which ultimately led to his victory over death (Heb 5.7-10).

2.2.6 Assessment

The strength of this view is in its ability to maintain a logical connection between Yom Kippur and the sacrifice of Christ and his offering in the heavenly sanctuary. Instead of collapsing the entirety of Yom Kippur into the cross (2.2.1), or applying a heavenly significance to Christ's self-offering and entrance into the heavenly sanctuary in metaphorical terms (2.2.3), the proponents of the Two-Step View map the procession of the high priest in Lev 16 onto the death of Christ at Calvary and his entrance into the heavenly sanctuary, where he presents his offering of atonement. Christ enters the heavenly sanctuary not with the blood of goats and calves [οὐδὲ δι' αἵματος τράγων καὶ μόσχων], but with his own blood [διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος] (Heb 9.11-12; see 9.24-26). By taking the preposition διὰ as instrumental, this allows for a reading that coheres rather closely with the Yom Kippur ritual of the priest entering the Holy of Holies with the blood of the sacrificial victim.

Another strength of this view is the role resurrection explicitly plays in the author of Hebrews' Christology. For the author of Hebrews, the resurrection is an essential requirement for Christ's entering into the heavenly sanctuary, *as well as* for the atonement that is accomplished by the sprinkling of blood upon the mercy seat. In essence, it is at his resurrection that Jesus enters the heavenly Holy of Holies as the eternal high priest (Eskola 2001:357-58). As noted above, it is common for commentators to minimize the role that the resurrection plays in the author's overall argument (see Moffitt 2011:1-43 for a discussion). This is not to say that they deny the resurrection outright. Instead, it is more of a question of whether the author of Hebrews presupposes the resurrection in his argument, perhaps conflating it with language of exaltation and ascension (see Attridge 1989:8-9; Bruce 1990:32-33; Lane 1991:16; Guthrie 1998b:72; Koester 2001:43; Mitchell 2007:44; Witherington 2007:62). But as Moffitt and others have pointed out, the author of Hebrews not only alludes to the resurrection, he also builds much of his high priestly Christology on the foundation of this historical event (Heb 13.20; see 5.7; 7.15-16, 24).

2.3 The Heavenly Sanctuary

The heavenly tabernacle plays an integral role in the high priestly Christology of the letter to the Hebrews. The topic is formally introduced in Heb 8.1-5 and elaborated

on in greater detail in Hebrews 9, serving as a pivotal point in the author's discussion of the self-offering of the Son and atonement for sin. What follows is a survey of select writings from the Second Temple period that discusses the nature and role the heavenly tabernacle plays in the cultic theology of Second Temple Judaism and its relationship with the cultic theology of Hebrews. The first section consists of a discussion on how Josephus, Philo, and the Wisdom of Solomon understood the heavenly tabernacle, concluding that they typically viewed the earthly sanctuary as a representation of the cosmos. In the second section, the writings of 1 Enoch, Testament of Levi, and Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice each highlight a different understanding of the heavenly tabernacle that existed in some strands of thought in Second Temple Judaism. Whereas the nature of the heavenly tabernacle in 2.3.1 is influenced more by a Platonic cosmology, the writings in 2.3.3 are apocalyptic in nature, with the heavenly tabernacle representing a real structure existing in the heavenly realm.

2.3.1 Sanctuary as Cosmos

The interpretation of the earthly tabernacle as a representation of the created cosmos is influenced by the Hellenistic Judaism of the Second Temple period, as seen in the writings of Philo, Josephus, the Wisdom of Solomon. This in turn has influenced how some commentators have understood the role of the heavenly sanctuary in the letter to the Hebrews, as well as the overall cosmology and theology of the letter, so much so that the author of Hebrews interprets certain Old Testament passages and themes in light of this Platonic worldview (see Heb 8.1-5). It is this Platonic presupposition that leads Cody to suggest that the author of Hebrews shares the same Greek philosophical worldview that influenced Philo, a worldview that is distinct from Palestinian Jewish literature of the time (1960:36).

2.3.1.1 Josephus

Certain Second Temple writers perceived the earthly tabernacle as a representation of heaven or the created cosmos, with sections of the earthly tabernacle and its associated vessels used for worship corresponding to the different parts of the created universe (Koester 1989:174-75; Klawans 2006:114-23). This is certainly the case with regard to the first-century Jewish historian Josephus. Josephus posits that the Holy of Holies corresponds to heaven, the place of God's dwelling (*Ant*. 3.123). A

little further in *Antiquities*, Josephus goes into detail in his symbolic interpretation of the tabernacle and the high priests' vestments, signifying how each component represents various elements of the cosmos (*Ant*. 3.145, 180-87; *J.W*. 5.212-18).

2.3.1.2. Philo

Philo shared a similar cosmological worldview regarding the cosmic understanding of the earthly tabernacle. Philo depicts the tabernacle as symbolizing two realms of existence: the outer court representing the sense-perceptible world and the inner court representing the intelligible world (*Leg*. 3.102; *Ebr*. 134; *Her*. 221-29; *Mos*. 2.74, 81, 102-105; *QE* 2.68-69, 83). Like Josephus above, Philo also describes parts of the earthly tabernacle as symbols of the created cosmos (*Cher*. 23-26; *Mos*. 2.88; 98, 102-3; *QE* 2.75; 91).

2.3.1.3 Wisdom of Solomon

One also finds a similar view of the temple in the apocryphal Wisdom of Solomon. In Wis 9.8, the temple and altar which is to be built is a copy of the heavenly tent. The author's reference to the temple as a copy [μίμημα] is similar to Philo's usage of the word, specifically referring to earthly copies corresponding to their heavenly archetypes (see *Opif*. 25; 139; *Leg*. 45; *Det*. 83). In Wis 18.24, the author's reference to the high priest's long robe functions as a symbol for the created cosmos (18.24; see *Spec*. 1.84-97). Although Wis 18.24 is not a description of the heavenly tabernacle, it nevertheless highlights a shared cosmological understanding of the heavenly tabernacle and its relationship to the earthly tent.

2.3.2 Assessment

Scholars who are persuaded by a Philonic background for the heavenly sanctuary motif in Hebrews note a shared vocabulary between the two authors that would suggest a plausible Platonic worldview is likely shared by the author of Hebrews (Johnson 2006:17). The author of Hebrews uses technical terminology such as ἀληθινός, ἀντίτυπος, εἰκών, πρᾶγμα, σκιά, τύπος, and ὑπόδειγμα when referring to the heavenly sanctuary. These similar philosophical terms have been discussed in detail by several commentators on Hebrews (Cody 1960:26-36; Williamson 1970; Thompson 1982:113-15; Attridge 1989:223; Koester 1989:179; Hurts 1990:7-41; Sterling 2001:190-211; Mackie 2007:108-11).

The quotation of Exod 25.40 in Heb 8.5 has served as a lynchpin for this view. Hebrews 8.5 contains a cluster of Philonic terminology in its description of the heavenly tabernacle. The Levitical priests served in a copy and shadow [ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ] of the true tabernacle which God instructed Moses to make according to the pattern that he saw while on the mountain [τύπον τὸν δειχθέντα σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει]. Also, Heb 9.24 refers to Christ's entrance into heaven itself and not into any human-made holy place, which are merely copies of the true things [ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν]. The vocabulary here shares a close affinity with Philo's own cosmological understanding of the tabernacle as seen above.

A similar comparison can be found in Hebrews and the Wisdom of Solomon, where both writings use Exod 25.40 as a point of reference for their discussion of the heavenly tabernacle. Hebrews 8 refers to the holy places [τῶν ἁγίων] and the true tent [τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς], both of which were shown to Moses on the mountain [ἐν τῷ ὄρει]. Wisdom of Solomon likewise refers to a mountain [ὄρει] and a holy tent [σκηνῆς ἁγίας] that God prepared (see Church 2017:58-59). While these lexical similarities alone inconclusive, lacking any real indication of dependency on the Wisdom of Solomon by the author of Hebrews, it does support the possibility that both Wisdom of Solomon and Hebrews share a common tradition regarding the use of Exod 25.40 and the nature of the heavenly tabernacle. Therefore, instead of the presence of a literal heavenly tabernacle in the theology of Hebrews, the heavenly sanctuary is understood in more abstract terms as symbolizing heaven or the place of God's dwelling (Attridge 1989:247).

Sowers concludes that the author of Hebrews came from the same school of Alexandrian Judaism that Philo is a part of, with Philo's writings offering perhaps the best collection of *religionsgeschichtlich* material for comparison with Hebrews (1965:84). Spicq is even more convinced of Philo's influence on the background of Hebrews, asserting that the author is "un philonien converti au christianisme," *a Philonic convert to Christianity* (1952:1.91). For more than a century it was assumed that the author of Hebrews was either directly or indirectly influenced by the Platonism of Philo (Moffatt 1924:xxxi). This all started to change with the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls and a resurgence of interest in Jewish apocalyptic mysticism.

2.3.3. Sanctuary in Heaven

In contrast to 2.3.2, where the earthly tabernacle is symbolized by the created cosmos, some Second Temple writings describe the sanctuary as being present in heaven. Whereas the writings of Josephus, Philo, and Wisdom of Solomon exhibit more of a dualistic or symbolic meaning with regard to the earthly tabernacle, Second Temple writings that refer to a literal heavenly sanctuary occupied by an angelic priesthood are perhaps best classified as *apocalyptic* with respect to its genre (Moffitt 2011:81 n.83). Apocalyptic narratives are characterized by their otherworldly features such as dreams, visions, angelic mediators, and epic journeys to the supernatural realm (Collins 1979:9; see MacRae 1978:182-83; Rowland 2010:345-48; Murphy 2012:1-26). The following samples from 1 Enoch, the Testament of Levi, and Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice are characterized by their discussion of a heavenly tabernacle and angelic priestly ministry, and thus would seem to fit within Collins classification of apocalyptic genre.

2.3.3.1. 1 Enoch

The pseudepigraphal account of 1 Enoch 14 tells the story of Enoch's journey into the heavenly realm. Enoch is transported into God's presence and granted access into God's heavenly temple, represented by two houses, where he is witness to the innerworkings of God's holy sanctuary. Enoch is described as entering a house made of white marble and crystal floors, most likely a reference to the heavenly temple (1 En. 14.10; see 1 En. 71.5-9; 1 Kgs 6.2; Ezek 1.2). Inside this majestic house reside angels who minister before the throne of God, unable to approach (1 En. 14.21-22). A second group of angels are also present, referred to as "the most holy ones" [οἱ ἅγιοι τῶν ἀγγέλων], who continually remain in the presence of God, drawing near [οἱ ἐγγίζοντες] in the service of the Lord (1 En. 14.23; see Dan 7.10).

Enoch's vision represents a clear depiction of a functioning tabernacle in heaven. Analogous to the earthly temple, God's heavenly temple, as described in Enoch's vision, is divided into two sections, with access into the second section prohibited for all but those who are granted permission to approach the presence of God. Although there is no explicit reference to any cultic activity akin to what occurs in the earthly sanctuary, the presence of angelic beings ministering before the throne of God does imply a close connection with the Levitical priesthood and their cultic activity in the

earthly sanctuary. Nevertheless, it will be shown below that some Second Temple texts do describe in vivid detail angelic beings offering sacrifices and propitiatory offerings before the throne of God in the heavenly sanctuary.

2.3.3.2 Testament of Levi

Another Second Temple text that falls within the category of apocalyptic is the Testament of Levi, a pseudepigraphal account of the patriarch Levi's journey into the heavenly realm. Levi is summoned to heaven by the angel of the Lord, where he is given a tour of the three levels of heaven (water, light, and God's place of dwelling, OTP 1.779) and later confirmed as God's anointed priest (T. Levi 2.5-12; 4.2; 5.1-2; 8.3; 18.6; see *ALD* 4.4-6; 4QLevi^{b} ii.15-18; T. Reu. 6.8; Jub. 31.14; 32.1). Just as with the earthly sanctuary, the heavenly counterpart likewise has differing degrees of holiness, with the highest level of holiness representing the place where the glory of God dwells [ἡ μεγάλη δόξα ἐν ἁγίῳ ἁγίων ὑπεράνω πάσης ἁγιότητος] (T. Levi 3.4; see Church 2017:187).

Like 1 Enoch 14 above, the heavenly sanctuary in Levi's vision is characterized by angelic beings engaged in cultic activity. One such example of this cultic activity is found in T. Levi 3.5-6, where archangels are engaged in propitiatory offerings to the Lord [ἐξιλασκόμενοι πρὸς κύριον] for the sins of ignorance committed by the righteous ones. Their offerings [προσφέρουσι δὲ κυρίῳ] are described as bloodless and rational [λογικὴν καὶ ἀναίμακτον προσφοράν], and a pleasing aroma to the Lord [ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας]. A further related priestly activity is that of angelic intercession on behalf of Israel (T. Levi 5.6; see T. Dan 6.2). The cultic activity that occurs in Levi's vision is similar to that which takes place on earth in Israel's temple, where the Levitical priests offer sacrifices for propitiation and intercedes for the people. The purpose and function of the Testament of Levi is to solidify Levi's priesthood on earth by describing the angelic priesthood and cult in the same manner as Levi's priesthood and cult (Ribbens 2016:78).

2.3.3.3 Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice

Also relevant to this survey is the document titled The Song of the Sabbath Sacrifice, one of the myriads of writings commonly classified as the Dead Sea Scrolls. While the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice lacks some of the traditional apocalyptic

elements—most notably the lack of a heavenly ascent—it nevertheless does refer to a heavenly sanctuary populated by angelic priests who minister before the presence of God. Mostly fragmentary in nature, the Sabbath Songs may have been composed to function as liturgical hymns to be sung on thirteen Sabbaths according to the Qumran calendar (Newsom 2000:1138).

The Sabbath Songs refer to angels as eternal holy ones who God has established as priests [כוהני] to serve in his glorious sanctuary [משרתי פנים בדביר כבודו] (4Q400 1 i.3-4). Not only this, they are servants of God, established as priests in the inner sanctuary of the Holy of Holies [קורב קדושי קדושים] (4Q400 1 i.19; see 1 i.8-10). Alongside the sanctuary and the Adytum, the author also refers to the temple [מקדש] (4Q403 1 i.42) and tabernacle [משכן] (4Q403 1 ii.10). Finally, these angels also have holy precepts by which they are sanctified and make atonement for those who transgress the will of God [ויכפרו רצונו] (4Q400 1 i.15-16).

Cultic language for sacrifice is also used to describe the angels who minister in the heavenly sanctuary. For example, 4Q405 23 i.5-6 refers to the offering [כלילו] of angels. Also, in 11Q17 9 angels are described as presenting acceptable offerings, which include sacrifices [לזבחי] and libations [נסכיהם] that are suitable to God as a sweet aroma (11Q17 9 ix.3-5). The Sabbath Songs is one of the more explicit Second Temple writings regarding the function of an angelic priesthood and the sacrifices that take place within the heavenly sanctuary. In light of such an explicit cultic service, the angelic priestly ministry in the Sabbath Songs is unparalleled in all of Second Temple literature (Klawans 2006:135).

2.3.4 Assessment

This brief survey of 1 Enoch, the Testament of Levi, and the Sabbath Songs highlights the shared themes of a heavenly temple, an enthroned God, and an angelic priesthood. Each of these Second Temple texts depict a literal sanctuary in heaven, where God is enthroned in all his glory, and where an angelic priesthood ministers before him with sacrifices and offerings. In this way, the heavenly sanctuary, angelic priesthood, and related cultic activity serves as the foundation for

its earthly Levitical counterpart, and later, the theological framework around which the central argument of Hebrews is formed.

The letter to the Hebrews shares much in common with the apocalyptic writings of 1 Enoch, the Testament of Levi, and the Sabbath Songs. Much like Enoch and Levi, Jesus enters heaven, where God commands all his angels to worship him [καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ] (Heb 1.6; see Heb 2.5).[1] In Heb 6.19-20 the author describes the Son's ascent as passing through the heavens, where he enters the inner place behind the curtain and takes his seat at the right hand of God (see Heb 4.14; 8.1). Like the apocalyptic writings of 1 Enoch and the Testament of Levi, the author of Hebrews describes the Son of God ascending into the heavenly sanctuary and into the very presence of God (Barnard 2012:116-17). But unlike Enoch and Levi's ascent into the heavenly tabernacle, which is described in terms of a dream or vision, Christ ascends bodily into the heavenly sanctuary, where he is enthroned as high priest.

While the examples from the Second Temple writings above display an active and ongoing cultic activity in the heavenly sanctuary, in the letter to the Hebrews this unending cultic activity ceases with the redemptive and priestly work of Christ. By means of his crucifixion, Jesus enters bodily into the heavenly sanctuary and offers himself as a once-for-all-time sacrifice for sin (see Heb 7.27; 9.12, 28). Therefore, because of his high priestly work Jesus is eternally able to sanctify once and for all time those who cling to him for salvation (Heb 10.10).

2.4 Conclusion

In his formative essay on the eschatology of Hebrews, Barrett makes the following important observation: "The heavenly tabernacle and all its ministrations are from one point of view eternal archetypes, from another, they are eschatological events. This is a fact of cardinal importance in the interpretation of Hebrews" (2017:163). Unfortunately, Barrett may be guilty of wanting to have his cake and eat it too. While

[1] Instead of interpreting εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην as a reference to the incarnation of Christ, it is best to understand εἰσαγάγῃ τὸν πρωτότοκον εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην as a reference to Christ's entrance into heavenly realm (see Vanhoye 1964:248-53; Attridge 1989:55-56; Gräßer 1990:1.78; Lane 1991:26-27; Ellingworth 1993:117-18; deSilva 2000:96-97; Koester 2001:192; Johnson 2006:79; Caneday 2008:28-39; Moffitt 2011:53-69; Cockerill 2012:104-8; Mason 2017:280-81).

the survey of Second Temple texts above illuminated much in way of the heavenly tabernacle, they nevertheless came to very different conclusions regarding their interpretation of the heavenly sanctuary and its ministrations. For writers like Josephus, Philo, and the author of Wisdom of Solomon, the nature of the earthly tabernacle and its various instruments are symbolically interpreted as the created cosmos or symbolizing the two realms of existence. But for Second Temple writings like 1 Enoch, the Testament of Levi, and the Sabbath Songs, whose genre is apocalyptic in nature, the heavenly sanctuary is referred to as a literal place in heaven, where God resides in full glory, surrounded by an angelic priesthood who offer sacrifice and praise before his throne.

This thesis assumes that the writer of Hebrews' cosmology is influenced more directly by the apocalyptic tradition found in Second Temple Judaism than by any dependence upon a Platonic or Philonic dualism. Hurst is correct in his conclusions regarding the background of Hebrews. After highlighting several helpful insights gleaned from Philonic and other backgrounds, Hurst concludes that these insights could likewise be explained by influences within the apocalyptic tradition. Whereas previously the dualism of Philo is assumed to be the best explanation for the interpretation of the heavenly sanctuary passages in Hebrews, it may now be that the apocalyptic tradition provides the best alternative for our understanding of the heavenly sanctuary and Jesus's heavenly enthronement as our merciful and faithful high priest (Hurst 1990:131, 133; see Barrett 2017:164).

Before ending this literature review, a few observations can be deduced regarding the various views on atonement and the heavenly sanctuary. First, while the *when* and *where* of Christ's self-offering are debated, the cross nevertheless plays an important role in the author of Hebrews' argument about the nature and timing of the atonement. This is nowhere clearer than in Heb 6.4-6, where the author of Hebrews warns his readers about the utter peril of re-crucifying [ἀνασταυροῦντας] the Son of God by failing to continue in their profession of faith (Heb 6.4-6). Likewise, after praising the heroes of Israel for their faith in the face of suffering, Heb 12.1-3 offers the greatest praise for the Son, as one who endured the shame of the cross [ὑπέμεινεν σταυρὸν] and took his seat at the right hand of God in glory. The cross is also alluded to in Hebrews 13, where the author of Hebrews exhorts his readers to

go outside the gate, to the place of Jesus's suffering [ἔξω τῆς πύλης ἔπαθεν] for the sanctification of his people by means of a Roman cross (13.12-13). It becomes evident as the homily progresses that for the author of Hebrews the cross is the epicenter of Jesus's earthly humiliation and suffering.

Second, even with the disagreement regarding the nature and role the heavenly sanctuary plays in the author of Hebrews' theological program, it is clear that Christ's self-offering is a once-for-all-time event that procures atonement for and purgation of sin. From the very outset of the argument of Hebrews the reader is comforted by the fact that Christ's sacrifice and self-offering for sin is the long-awaited fulfillment of all that the Levitical cult is just a shadowy copy of. While the timing and place of the atonement remain an issue of much scholarly debate, what is ubiquitous in Hebrews is Christ's death once and for all time has put away sin and has brought a total purgation for all who hold fast to their confession of faith.

As the following chapters will attempt to illustrate, this thesis argues that the cross is not the locale of Christ's atonement or self-offering for sin. Instead, this thesis contends that at his resurrection and ascension Christ enters the heavenly sanctuary and presents his offering to God, thereby making purification for sin and taking his rightful place as the enthroned Son of God. However, in order to take up a close exegesis of Hebrews 9 and the question of *when* and *where* the atonement takes place, it is imperative to first grasp the historical and linguistic milieu of the letter to the Hebrews as a whole. While a great deal of information regarding the letter's historical setting remain unknown, there nevertheless remains enough information regarding the author's intent and the original reader's *Sitz im Leben* for the production of a historical portrait. It is the commissioning of this historical portrait that is the focus of the ensuing chapter.

CHAPTER 3

The Historical Setting of Hebrews

3.1 Introduction

The central aim of this thesis is to provide an exegetical and theological analysis of Hebrews 9 that argues for a two-step process of atonement that mirrors the high priest's procession during Yom Kippur as described in Leviticus 16. Just as the high priest takes the blood of the sacrificial victim into the Holy of Holies and applies it to the mercy seat to make atonement, the author of Hebrews likewise portrays the death of Christ and subsequent ascension into the heavenly sanctuary in a similar manner.

In order to engage in an exegetical and theological analysis of Hebrews 9, it is vital that a historical and theological foundation first be established. Such a foundation consists of answering a number of questions regarding the historical context of Hebrews, as well as addressing the literary riddles that arise from the text. Beginning with historical matters, questions regarding authorship, audience, destination, date of the composition, and worldview are taken up and addressed. This is followed by a linguistic examination of issues related to genre and structure of the letter to the Hebrews. Here, questions concerning Greco-Roman letter writing, Jewish-Hellenistic homilies, ancient rhetoric, and the literary structure of Hebrews are examined.

What emerges from a preliminary analysis of Hebrews is just how difficult situating the letter within its first century context proves itself to be. Unlike the Pauline writings, for example, Hebrews provides no clear indication of its author, audience, or destination. Without a clear understanding of these foundational elements it proves difficult to come to any consensus for the *who*, *where*, and *why* of Hebrews.

Be that as it may, the letter to the Hebrews does offer enough sufficient clues to attempt a reconstruction of the historical, rhetorical, and sociological context. The author of Hebrews does pull back the curtain just enough to catch a glimpse of the historical setting from which his letter was composed. Nevertheless, this brief glimpse into the author's world proves to be incomplete, and any attempt at a full reconstruction of the historical setting proves to be no simple or conclusive task.

3.2 Authorship

What can be deduced from the evidence at hand is that the author of Hebrews is a very skillful and eloquent writer. His exceptional grasp of the Greek language, along with his command of ancient rhetoric, is unparalleled among his canonical contemporaries. Not only this, the author of Hebrews is also an expert wordsmith. At many points in his writing one finds the presence of alliteration, assonance, chiasm, and other literary devices, all of which are utilized for painting rich and evocative images that are interwoven with his deep theological understanding of Israel's Scriptures (Attridge 1989:1; see Moffatt 1924:lvi-lxiv; Turner 1976:106-8; Black 1994:43-51).

The author of Hebrews also shows a deep knowledge and appreciation for the Old Testament cult. More than any other New Testament writer, the author of Hebrews expounds on the priesthood, tabernacle, and how the Christ-event is the fulfilment of the shadowy copy portrayed in the Levitical cult. This knowledge of cultic worship highlights the religious nature of the letter to the Hebrews. Just as the old covenant had a cult and regulations that were part of its worship, so too does Christianity under the new covenant. This cultic understanding of Hebrews helps shed light on the author's cultic presuppositions that permeate throughout his writing (Johnsson 1973:443-44).

Along with his religious convictions, which are rooted in the cultic worship of the Old Testament, the author of Hebrews is likewise influenced by the Hellenistic world in which he lived. At several points in his writing the author of Hebrews appears to tip his hat to the philosophical world in which Philo is a main participant. The philosophy of Philo and Middle Platonism has often been assumed by commentators to be a key

link in the explanation of the similarities in thought between the writings of Philo and the author of Hebrews.

The following subsections offer a summary of three proposals for the authorship of Hebrews. Each argument for a potential author will be analyzed on the strengths of their own merits. The three proposals for authorship that will be explored are Paul, an associate of Paul, and an unidentified author.

3.2.1 Paul

Most commentators today dismiss any possibility for a Pauline authorship of Hebrews (Moffatt 1924:xl; Spicq 1952:1.154; Montefiore 1964:1; Attridge 1989:2; Bruce 1990:19-20; Ellingworth 1993:12; Lane 1991:xlix; deSilva 2000:23-24; Koester 2001:44; Buchanan 2006:477; Allen 2010:43). While there have been a few commentators the past century or so who have argued for the Paulinity of Hebrews (see Stuart 1827:112-50; Leonard 1939; Black 2013; Pitts and Walker 2012:143-84, suggest the content is that of a Pauline speech, with Luke serving as stenographer), the consensus among scholars today tilt in favor of a non-Pauline authorship for the letter to the Hebrews.

While modern scholars have moved beyond a Pauline authorship of Hebrews, the testimony of the early church paints a much more favorable picture. Due to the debates surrounding the canonicity of the New Testament documents and the anonymity of Hebrews, the question of authorship became an important topic of discussion in the early church. The Church in the East were the first to mention Paul as the author of Hebrews. One of the earliest proponents of a Pauline authorship of Hebrews is Clement of Alexandria. Eusebius records Clement's belief that Paul is the author of Hebrews and that he originally composed the letter in Hebrew, with Luke later translating it into Greek. Clement goes on to explain that the reason for Paul's lack of his customary introductory inscription is due to a prejudice and suspicion that the original audience may have had against him (*HE* 6.14.2-3). Likewise, Pantaenus suggested that the reason for Paul's failure to identify himself as the author of Hebrews is because of his desire for modesty. Because Jesus, who is the apostle of God (see Heb 3.1), is sent to the Hebrews, Paul felt it necessary for the author of Hebrews to remain anonymous (*HE* 6.14.4).

Origen likewise proposed a Pauline authorship of Hebrews, albeit with a sense of reservation. Origen observed that the Greek of Hebrews is much more sophisticated and refined when compared with the known Pauline corpus, while at the same time acknowledging that the content itself is Pauline in nature. He suggests that the content of the letter is from the mind of Paul, but the style and composition came from the pen of a close associate of Paul. In the end, the most that Origen can conclude is that only God knew who the real author of Hebrews ultimately is (*HE* 6.25.11-14). Finally, over a century later in the West, Jerome likewise suggests a Pauline authorship for Hebrews (*Jov*. 1.17).

A further affirmation of Pauline authorship of Hebrews can be found in some of the earliest manuscripts that contain the writings of Paul. In a number of these manuscripts the letter to the Hebrews is placed immediately after Romans, with the most significant of these being $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$. Dating from c. 200 CE, $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ is one of the earliest collections of Pauline writings from antiquity. Hebrews also follows Romans in a few later manuscripts as well (see 103, 455, 1961, 1964, 1977, and 1994). Hebrews also appears within the Pauline corpus, sandwiched between the Pauline letters to churches and individuals, in the great uncial codices ℵ, A, B, C. Although the manuscript evidence alone is inconclusive with regard to a Pauline authorship of Hebrews, it does highlight the letter of Hebrews esteem among early communities of believers who collected Paul's writings for their own worship gatherings (Ellingworth 1993:7; see Koester 2001:21).

When compared to the Pauline corpus, Hebrews demonstrates a style far more refined that what can typically be found in the writings of Paul. Ellingworth provides an exhaustive list of differences that exist between Paul and the author of Hebrews, showing how the vocabularies and senses of key theological terms are significantly different between the two authors (1993:7-12; see Spicq 1952:1.152-68). Attridge concludes similarly as Ellingworth, noting that even in a letter as carefully composed as Romans, the style and prose of Hebrews proves to be unmatched (1989:2; see Spicq 1952:1.351-78; Trotter 1997:163-80).

Another factor weighing against Pauline authorship of Hebrews is what Cockerill refers to as an "exhaustive rhetorical style" (2012:11). Witherington observes that when compared with the undisputed Pauline letters the style of Hebrews is much

more elegant and refined (2007:39). This elevated style is no doubt a result of the author's educational training, with the author of Hebrews making use of several rhetorical devices that were part and parcel of the rhetorical handbooks of antiquity (Aune 1987:212). An example of some of these rhetorical devices include alliteration (Heb 1.1); anaphora (Heb 11); antithesis (Heb 7.18-21; 10.11-12); chiasm (Heb 7.23-24); and diatribe (3.16-18) (Trotter 1997:67-75; see deSilva 2000:37-39; Koester 2001:92-96; Lincoln 2006:19-21).

Commentators also note the author's own testimony regarding his exposure to the gospel. The author indicates that his exposure to the kerygma is the result of secondhand proclamation about the Messiah (Heb 2.3). According to Paul's own testimony, he received the gospel as divine revelation from the Lord himself (Gal 1.11-12; see 1 Cor 15.8).

Therefore, in light of both internal and external evidence, the most that can be concluded is that the author of Hebrews may have knowledge of the writings of Paul. Witherington suggests that the parallels between Paul and Hebrews are sufficient to establish familiarity with Pauline ideas, thus linking the author to the wider Pauline circle (2007:35). Perhaps the difference in style can be accounted for if one considers the possibility that one of Paul's associates penned the letter to the Hebrews, a la Pitts and Walker's thesis for a Pauline stenographer. This in turn may help explain both the familiarity in thought as well as the elevated style and prose that the letter to the Hebrews displays.

3.2.2 Pauline Associate

3.2.2.1 Luke

Among the potential candidates for the authorship of Hebrews, the writings of Luke provide the best literary corpus to conduct an examination of vocabulary and style (Spicq 1952:1.98 n.3; Jones 1955:117-18; Allen 2010b). In light of this, Westcott notes the striking similarity in vocabulary that exists between Hebrews and Luke (1903:xlviii; see lxxvi–lxxvii). This similarity has convinced some that Luke is responsible for the writing of Hebrews (Allen 2010b:78-174; see Pitts and Walker 2012:143-84, who argue that Luke is responsible for the elevated prose and style).

The similarity in style and vocabulary is noticed also by the early church fathers. To get around their hesitation of ascribing Pauline authorship of Hebrews, a proposal for an amanuensis is suggested in the form of Luke. As mentioned above, Clement believed that Paul is the original author of Hebrews, having written it Hebrew, with Luke later responsible for the Greek translation of Hebrews that has since been passed down to the church as part of the New Testament canon (*HE* 6.14.2).

Although Hebrews and writings of Luke share similar vocabulary, Strickland rightly highlights that shared lexemes alone are not enough to prove with any real certainty a Lukan authorship of Hebrews (2017:13-28). Furthermore, while Clement's hypothesis helps to account for the similarity in style between the Lucan writings and Hebrews, it is not without its difficulties. For example, a translation of Hebrew to Greek does not allow for a one-to-one correspondence. One such example of this problem is the *Vorlage*, or more specifically the *Textvorlage,* that lies behind the midrash of Ps 40 (39).7-9 in Heb 10.5-7 (Steyn 2011:1-4; 282-97). The reading of Heb 10.5-7 is dependent upon a Greek manuscript tradition that differs from the reading found in the MT, Ralph, and Göttingen, all of which contain the reading אָזְנַיִם/ὠτίον (ears). In Heb 10.5-7, instead of the reading "ears" the author of Hebrews substitutes σῶμα (body) in its place, a reading which is found in PBod XXIV, א, A, B.

The author of Hebrews relied on Greek textual tradition known to him at the time in his argument regarding the necessity of a body that is prepared for the Messiah's incarnation, a significant theological nuance that is absent in the Hebrew Old Testament. The author of Hebrews exclusive use of a Greek manuscript tradition for his midrash on Ps 40(39).6-7 in Heb 10.5-7 would seem to negate any translation of a Hebrew original into Greek. While similarities between Hebrews and the Lucan writings are of note, they are nevertheless inconclusive and can at best only highlight a similar fluency and grasp of the Greek language.

3.2.2.2 Barnabas

The earliest recorded testimony suggesting Barnabas as the author of Hebrews comes from the writing of Tertullian. In his work entitled *On Modesty*, Tertullian records a tradition during his lifetime of "an Epistle to the Hebrews under the name

Barnabas" (*De Pudicitia* 20). A relevant point of similarity between Hebrews and Barnabas is Barnabas's Levitical heritage (see Acts 4.36). The author of Hebrews demonstrates an intimate knowledge of the Levitical cult and liturgy, and this understanding to some extent would be common knowledge for Barnabas.

Despite these points of contact with the letter to the Hebrews, the evidence for Barnabas's authorship of Hebrews proves unconvincing. Although Barnabas is from the tribe of Levi, there is no record that he participated in the Levitical priesthood. Furthermore, such a knowledge of the cult is readily accessible in Israel's Scriptures. Further, Hebrews omits any reference to the Levities—minus the proper noun Levi (Heb 7.5, 9) and the adjectival "Levitical" in reference to the cultic activities in the temple (7.11). Lastly, while some posit a connection between the translation of Barnabas's name as "son of encouragement" [υἱὸς παρακλήσεως] with the designation of Hebrews as "word of exhortation" [τοῦ λόγου τῆς παρακλήσεως], this proves to be a rather lose connection and not a firm foundation upon which to build a hypothesis (Johnson 2006:41).

3.2.2.3 Apollos

The first to propose Apollos as the author of Hebrews was Martin Luther (*LW* 8:178), and since Luther, Apollos has remained one of the more conjectured proposals among commentators (see Manson 1949-50:1-17; Spicq 1952:1.209-19; Montefiore 1964:9-11; Ellingworth 1993:21; Guthrie 2001:41-56; Johnson 2006:42-44; Héring 2010:126; Cockerill 2012:9-11). The lack of literary evidence from the pen of Apollos renders any decision regarding his involvement in the composition inconclusive at best. Nevertheless, there are a few textual clues that help shed light on his potential rhetorical training and origin of birth, and how it fits into the composition of Hebrews.

The elevated style and vocabulary of Hebrews befits a person with a basic training in the art of rhetoric. According to Luke's description in Acts Apollos is an Alexandrian Jew, eloquent in speech and competent in the Hebrew Scriptures (Acts 18.24). Luke's characterization of Apollos as a "eloquent man" [ἀνὴρ λόγιος] may refer to Apollos's skill and education (BDAG: s.v. λόγιος 2; see *Mut*. 220; *Post*. 53; M-M 378). Further, Apollos's Alexandrian upbringing may help explain the possible points of similarity with the works of Philo.

3.2.3 Unknown Author

In his oft quoted remark, Origen famously concludes that only God knew who the true author of Hebrews is (*HE* 6.25.14). There is wisdom in heeding the words of the great church father; the evidence of Hebrews itself inconclusive, thus rendering it impossible to conclude with any degree of certainty who the author is (Koester 2001:45; Kleinig 2017:4-5). Though it proves difficult to identify who the author of Hebrews is, it is, however, possible to derive from the text a profile of the author that helps inform the reader of the possible situation that necessitated the writing of this letter (deSilva 2000:25).

The first clue regarding the identity of the author of Hebrews is his intimate knowledge of the recipients. For example, the author is aware of their recent trial, from which they had suffered public reproach and seizure of property (Heb 10.32-34; see 12.4). Further, even though he is harsh at times in his exhortations, he is nevertheless convinced that better things would come their way, desiring each of them to remain steadfast and full of assurance of hope until the end (Heb 6.9, 11).

A second insight into the identity of the author is the relationship he has with the gospel proclamation. The author of Hebrews describes himself as that of a second-generation believer. Unlike the apostles and other eyewitnesses who received the gospel firsthand from the Lord, the author insists that his reception of the gospel came from these very eyewitnesses of the life and ministry of Christ (Heb 2.3). The author of Hebrews is also a close associate of the inner circle, as indicated by his close relationship with Timothy (Heb 13.23).

As mentioned already, the author of Hebrews is a skilled rhetorician with an exquisite grasp of the Greek language, no doubt the beneficiary of an excellent education. The author is also well acquainted with Judaism, especially the Levitical cult and the appurtenances associated with the liturgy of the temple. He also possessed an exemplary grasp of the Greek Old Testament, moving from the Pentateuch to the Psalms and Prophets seamlessly and with relative ease. This extensive knowledge of both the cult and Israel's Scriptures most likely indicates the author's Jewishness, possibly that of a Hellenistic Jew from the diaspora.

Even though it proves impossible to identify who wrote the letter to the Hebrews, its authoritative influence in the early church is without question. Not only this, but as Trotter so eloquently put it, “the church has benefited for almost two thousand years from this magisterial work without knowing with any more certainty than we do today who authored it” (Trotter 1997:45). The most that one can conclude from the evidence is that the early church had another charismatic interpreter of the Christ-event, one in the same vein as the apostle Paul, a man capable of interpreting the significance of the Easter event and its influence on the whole of human existence (Johnson 2006:44).

3.3 Philosophical Worldview

The author of Hebrews’ masterful grasp of the Greek language, expert use of rhetoric, and exquisite style and prose highlight the author’s Greco-Roman formal education and training (Nairne 1913:31). The author is well acquainted with the writings of the Wisdom of Solomon, Maccabees, and according to some, the writings of Philo. It is these writings of Philo that serve as the motivation for the hypothesis of a Philonic influence upon the thought and theology of the author of Hebrews (Ménégoz 1894:197-219; Spicq 1949:542-72; 1952:1.39-91; Cody 1960:35-36; Sowers 1965:64-74; Thompson 1982:7-16; Svendsen 2009:55-68; Héring 2010:xii). For example, Moffatt proposes that the author may have dabbled in the works of Philo, which in turn provided him a general understanding of the philosophical worldview of the influential Alexandrian Jewish philosopher (1924:lxi-lxii). The author’s familiarity with the Greek Old Testament, as well as an awareness of Greek philosophical vocabulary, has led commentators to conclude that the goal of Hebrews is to present the Christian faith in terms that were borrowed from the philosophy of Plato and mediated through the writings of Philo (Vincent 2009:101-2; see Johnson 2006:21).

While the author of Hebrews and Philo share several similarities, these similarities are best explained by the broader Greco-Roman culture at large, with the author of Hebrews appropriating and expanding its imagery as a way to support a burgeoning Christian confession of faith (Koester 2001:78; see Isaacs 1992:47). To suggest that the author of Hebrews is familiar with—and perhaps even read for himself the works of Philo—is a *non sequitur*. While some commentators assert that Hebrews is

“biblical Platonism” (Johnson 2006:173), it is, nevertheless, impossible to substantiate with complete certainty any claim of Philonic influence given the totality of evidence available to the modern reader of Hebrews. Williamson posits that the author’s use of “the language of philosophy” is for the service of “expressing Christian truth,” and not the sign of a wholesale adoption of a Platonic worldview and its philosophical ideas (1970:567-68; see Barrett 2017:170). Williamson goes on to conclude, “It is possible to discover a thorough-going Platonism in Hebrews *only* when one has missed the profoundly historical, theological and eschatological character of the Author's thought” (1963:423, emphasis added).

Whereas Philo utilizes allegory in his interpretation of the Old Testament, the author of Hebrews applies analogy in the form of the symbols in his interpretation of the Old Testament, specifically as it relates to Levitical cult (Nairne 1913:37). Furthermore, the theological message of Hebrews is framed by the author’s Jewish worldview. The author of Hebrews builds his argument on the Old Testament Scriptures of Israel, specifically the LXX, which is transformed and fulfilled by the Christ-event. The institutions and liturgy of Israel—that of law and cult—have found their fulfillment in the sacrifice of Christ. The author of Hebrews uses the Old Testament Scriptures as the foundation for his writing, weaving exposition and exhortation together to show the greatness of over Israel’s former institutions, with Christ now reigning as both Son and high priest in heaven (Kleinig 2017:27).

In closing, the author of Hebrews is influenced by the worldview of both his religious training in Judaism as well as his Hellenistic education, relying on both in the proclamation of the Christian kerygma. He is a disciple of Christ, steeped in the Scriptures of Israel, but also fluent in the philosophy and language of Middle Platonism—specifically the school from which Philo was trained in— and the greater Greco-Roman culture and traditions (Ellingworth 1993:47).

3.4 Date of Composition

Dating the letter to the Hebrews proves to be as allusive as identifying the author (deSilva 2000:20; Kleinig 2017:8). The text of Hebrews provides a few clues that at best locates a date of composition somewhere between 60 CE and 90 CE (Koester 2001:50). One such clue for an early date of composition is found in Hebrews 10. In

10.32-34, the author describes a time of suffering, which may be a reference to the expulsion of the Jews from Rome under Claudius in 49 CE (Acts 18.2; see Orosius, *History* 7.6.15-16; Suetonius, *Claud.* 25.4; Cassius Dio 60.6.6-7). While it is possible that Hebrews is written shortly after Claudius's edict, a date closer to the fall of Jerusalem is a more probable date for the composition of Hebrews. If one is to interpret Heb 2.3 as referring to a second-generation Christian, then a date no earlier than 60 CE is possible for the earliest date for the composition of Hebrews.

On the opposite side of spectrum falls the writing of *1 Clement*. This document, purported to be the work of Clement of Rome, is the earliest non-canonical writing to refer to the letter of Hebrews, with a date no earlier than ca. 96 CE. With a date for *1 Clement* towards the end of the first century, this sets the ceiling for a date of composition no later than 96 CE (Lane 1991:lxii; Cockerill 2012:34). One of the arguments against dating Hebrews post 70 CE are the numerous references to cultic activity in the present tense (see Heb 5.1-4; 7.27-28; 8.3-5; 9.6-7, 13, 25; 10.1-3, 8; 13.10-11). If Hebrews is composed after the destruction of the Jerusalem temple in 70 CE, one would expect the author to use an aorist when referring to cultic activity (Hughes 1977:30). However, it is not uncommon for writers to refer to cultic activity in the present tense, specifically after the events of 70 CE and the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem (Jos. *Ant*. 3.151-178, 3.224-257; *Ag*. *Ap*. 2.193-198; *1 Clem*. 41.2). Further, as Porter points out, it is not possible to establish any firm date for the composition of Hebrews. Instead, Porter rightly suggests that the present tense is used to contrast the Levitical cult, which is no longer a valid institution, with the priestly work of Christ (1994:313).

3.5 Destination

Several options have been suggested for the destination of the letter to the Hebrews. These range from Palestine (Stuart 1827:37; Delitzsch 1874:1.20-21; with reservations, Hughes 1977:19; Isaacs 1992:22-45, specifically 45; see Spicq 1952:1.239 n.1 for references to earlier commentators), Zion (most likely a veiled reference to Jerusalem; Buchanan 2006:476), Jerusalem (Westcott 1903:xl; Ramsay 1908:304; Mosser 2004:159-209), Antioch (Spicq 1952:1.250-52; Allen 2010a:70-74), Corinth (Montefiore 1964:12-16), Lycus Valley (Manson 1949:11-13) and Rome, which most modern commentators tend to favor (Attridge 1989:10; Lane 1991:lxii-

lxvi; Lindars 1991:17-19; Weiss 1991:76; Ellingworth 1993:29; Brown 1997:699-701; Guthrie 1998b:20-21; deSilva 2000:20-21; Koester 2001:49-50; Johnson 2006:40; Hagner 2011:5; Schreiner 2015:6-10; Kleinig 2017:5; Schenck 2019:31-58).

The closest the letter of Hebrews comes textually to identifying a destination is in the closing greeting, where the author identifies his audience as "those from Italy" [οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας] (Heb 13.24). The preposition ἀπό can be taken one of two ways. The first way to understand ἀπό is in a locative sense, thus translating the prepositional phase as "those *in* Italy" (see P.Oxy.81, where ἀπ' Ὀξυρύγχων is understood in the locative sense and refers to the "inhabitants of Oxyrhynchus"; see Moffat 1924:246-247). The second way to understand ἀπό is in reference to the origin or source of the letter, hence the translation "those *from* Italy" (BDAG: s.v. ἀπό 3.b; see Acts 6.9; 10.23; 21.27). While both interpretations of ἀπό are possible, the more likely sense of origin or source better fits the context of Heb 13.24.

3.6 Audience

The original addressees of the letter to the Hebrews are just as much a mystery as the question of the authorship. This uncertainty stems from a lack of the more formal and traditional greetings that would normally be included in personal letters from antiquity (see the Pauline letters for a common examples). Nevertheless, what can be deduced from the text of Hebrews itself does help to provide some insight into the socio-historical context of the original recipients of Hebrews.

3.6.1 Historical Setting

An initial reading of Hebrews highlights a group of Christians who appears to be wavering in their commitment to Christ. They are exhorted by the author to hold on to what they have heard and not drift away from their confession of faith, thereby neglecting their great salvation (Heb 2.1-4). Further, because they share in the heavenly calling they are to continue to hold fast to their confidence and hope (Heb 3.1-5; 4.16; 10.22-23). They are also warned of the dangers of a hardened and deceitful heart, which lead to a falling away from God and a danger of failing to enter the rest promised by God (Heb 3.6-4.11). Their struggles have also caused a retardation in their own spiritual growth, and this in return puts them in grave danger

of apostasy. Nevertheless, the author is encouraged by their commitment and service towards their fellow believers and exhorted them to press on and not grow sluggish (Heb 5.11-6.8). The trials and struggles of this community also caused some to begin to neglect gathering together for worship, which is a concern for the author (Heb 10.24).

After the strong warning of Heb 10.26-31, the author gently reminds his readers to remember their past obedience amidst great suffering (Dyer 2017:99-100, 120). In Heb 10.32-36, the author commands his readers to recall [ἀναμιμνήσκεσθε] former days of great struggling [πολλὴν ἄθλησιν…παθημάτων], which included public reproach and affliction [ὀνειδισμοῖς τε καὶ θλίψεσιν θεατριζόμενοι], coming alongside those who were afflicted, imprisonment or involvement in compassion ministry [συνεπαθήσατε] to those incarcerated, and the seizure [ἁρπαγὴν] of personal property. At some point in their history the audience experienced a significant time of suffering, and this past trial is now being utilized by the author to encourage his readers to once again persevere in obedience (deSilva 2000:13).

The profile of the audience that emerges from Hebrews is that of a community that is experiencing real suffering, both in its past and at the time of the author's writing. This suffering resulted in what deSilva describes as a "significant loss of status and dignity as a result of their confession [of faith]." The past sufferings and subsequent obedience described in Heb 10.32-36 are to be reminders for the community to once again remain faithful to their confession of faith and strive for the same obedience as before (deSilva 2000:13).

3.6.2 Ethnicity of the Audience

3.6.2.1 Jewish-Christian

The question regarding the ethnicity of the original recipients of Hebrews is also a topic for debate. In the late nineteenth century, the consensus view among commentators was that of a Jewish-Christian audience (see Lünemann 1882:40). Some commentators suggest that the recipients were an exclusively Jewish community contemplating a return to their former religious lives (see Peterson 1982:186). For example, Lindars posits that Hebrews is written to a Jewish congregation struggling with their sense of guilt of sin and the need for atonement.

Their former lives in Judaism provided them with a continuous liturgical act—specifically the daily sacrifices and offerings outlined in Leviticus—that helped ease their conscience of guilt. Lindars argues that the central argument of Hebrews is complete efficacy of Christ's death and atoning sacrifice (1991:1-25).

Also supporting this assumption of an exclusively Jewish audience is the superscription ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ, first referred to by Pantaenus (*HE* 6.14.4), and followed later by Tertullian (*De Pudicitia* 20). Although the originality of the superscription is suspect in the eyes of most modern commentators (Long, however, is convinced that whoever added the superscription is as much in the dark as one is today; Long 1997:1), its presence in the earliest manuscripts of Hebrews does indicate a particular tradition that identified the content and character of Hebrews as Jewish in nature as early as the third century (Kümmel 1975:398-99; Ellingworth 1993:21; Koester 2001:46-47; Healy 2016:20-21; see Moffatt 1924:xv, who avers that the superscription is "intended to mean Jewish Christians").

The strongest evidence for an entirely Jewish audience is the myriad of references and allusions to the Old Testament the author employs throughout his writing. The author of Hebrews relies heavily upon Jewish customs, traditions, and characters from Israel's past to inform his exposition and exhortation. The author highlights the superiority of Christ over the angels, Moses, Aaron, Melchizedek; the episode at Kadesh and resultant wilderness generation; the finality of Christ's sacrifice over that of the Levitical cult; the fading away of the Old Covenant and the perfection of the New Covenant; the so-called "hall of faith" in Heb 11; and the description of the eschatological heavenly Jerusalem (Koester 2001:46-47). Each of these examples ring loudly in the collective memories and shared history of an entirely Jewish audience.

3.2.2.2 Gentile Audience

The supposition that Hebrews is written to an all Gentile audience is first postulated by E. M. Röth (as cited in Kümmel 1975:99; see Koester 2001:47 n.101). The author showcases a high competency in both the Greek language as well as in classical rhetoric; is familiar with the technical philosophical language of Platonism; quoted exclusively from the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible; and is familiar with Greco-Roman cultural practices. Likewise, language such as repentance (Heb 6.1)

and enlightenment (Heb 6.4; 10.32) were common terminology used in connection with conversion from paganism, with the warning of falling away from the living God more aptly applied to a Gentile God-fearer instead of a Jewish believer (Koester 2001:47). Aune affirms a Gentile audience, suggesting that the recipients are Gentile converts to Christianity in danger of lapsing back into the paganism from which they were converted from (1987:212).

3.2.2.2 Mixed Audience

While it is possible for the recipients to be an exclusively Jewish or Gentile group of believers, it is more likely that the author of Hebrews is addressing a mixed audience consisting of Gentile and Jewish Christians (see Brown 1983:74-79). Not only did the author exhibit a high competency in Greek and rhetoric, which is prolific among Gentiles, it is also a somewhat common among Jews residing in the Diaspora, specifically communities in places like Alexandria. Further, an Alexandrian provenance could also explain the familiarity with Greco-Roman philosophy, the exclusive use of the LXX, and familiarity with Greco-Roman culture and practice. Repentance, likewise, is not only commanded by God in calls to conversion among outsiders, it is also a constituent element of both the old and new covenants (Deut 4.30; 30.1-3, 10; 1 Sam 7.3; 1 Kgs 8.47-48; 2 Chr 6.36-39; Isa 55.7; Hos 6.1; Matt 3.2; Matt 4.17 // Mark 1.14-15; Acts 3.19-21; 20.21; Rom 2.4-5).

As with the questions of authorship and date, the text of Hebrews does not provide the reader enough information to identify the original audience. The most one can conclude from the evidence is that the audience consisted of second-generation believers who had made a past confession of faith in Christ but have since grown weary in light of their present trials and suffering. This in turn prompted the author of Hebrews to compose his letter to encourage them to remain faithful to their confession amid their struggles, holding firm their confession of hope without wavering (Heb 3.6; 10.23).

3.7 Genre

One of the primary tasks for interpreters of ancient texts like the letter to the Hebrews is deciphering its meaning. To do so, one must be able to differentiate the various parts of writing and discern their relationship not just to each other, but also

to the work as a cohesive whole (Martin and Whitlark 2018:1). One such task in the quest for meaning is the classification of genre, particularly as it relates to Hebrews. Before interpretation can occur, one must be able to identify the various genres at play within a text.

The following subsections will discuss three topics surrounding the genre of Hebrews. The first section examines the final chapter of Hebrews and its relationship to Greco-Roman letter writing. This is followed by an examination of Hebrews within the context of a Jewish-Christian homily. Finally, a discussion of Greco-Roman rhetoric and its application to Hebrews will be explored. Each one of these methodologies inform and shape the interpretation of genre in the letter to the Hebrews.

3.7.1 Hebrews 13 and the Greco-Roman Letter

At first glance, if the superscription attached to the letter of Hebrews is authentic to the document, it would appear then that Hebrews has already identified itself as that of a Greco-Roman letter. A typical Greco-Roman letter consists of three central elements: an opening, a body, and a closing (Stowers 1986:17-26; Weima 2000:642-44; Richards 2004:127-133). Consequently, most of Hebrews does not conform to this standard methodology of ancient letter writing. It is not until the final chapter of Hebrews that elements of Greco-Roman letter writing finally appear within the document.

The author incorporates several elements of Greco-Roman epistolography in his final salutation in Hebrews 13. One such example is the author's concentrated use of imperatives. This is intended to reaffirm and reestablish his relationship with the audience (Weima 2000:643). Another example of ancient epistolography in the final chapter is the inclusion of a final benediction in Heb 13.20-25. According to Aune, these final benedictions consist of three basic elements: a blessing of grace, the divine source of grace, and the benefactors of divine grace (1987:186; see 2003:268-72).

The author of Hebrews expands on this standard benediction in a few ways. First, the author begins with a peace benediction, which signifies the conclusion of the letter. This includes an introductory element (this is contained in the optative

καταρτίσαι in Heb 13.21); the divine source [Ὁ…θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης]; the prayer/wish [καταρτίσαι ὑμᾶς ἐν παντὶ ἀγαθῷ εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ]; and the recipient [ὑμᾶς, ἐν ἡμῖν] (Weima 2016:167-75). Second, the author includes a traditional doxology to end of his prayer in Heb 13.21 [θεὸς…ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν]. Third is the inclusion of an appeal formula in Heb 13.22 [Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, ἀνέχεσθε τοῦ λόγου τῆς παρακλήσεως]. While such a formula is more common in the body of Greco-Roman letters (see Aune 1987:188-91; Weima 2000:643), the inclusion of the appeal formula here in Hebrews 13 fits the overall genre of the chapter. Fourth is the repeated use of ἀσπάζομαι in Heb 13.24. And finally, Hebrews ends with a benediction consisting of two of the three typical elements traditionally present: a blessing of grace [ἡ χάρις] and benefactors of said blessing [πάντων ὑμῶν] (Heb 13.25).

The final chapter of Hebrews fits well within the genre of a Greco-Roman letter. It shares many of the same elements that make up the conclusion of an ancient letter in the first century. But how do the previous twelve chapters fit within the genre of an ancient letter? Are they to be classified as a Greco-Roman letter, or do they form a genre that is altogether different than what is found in Hebrews 13?

3.7.2 Hebrews and the First-Century Homily

With the publication of *Der Stil der jüdisch-hellenistischen Homilie* (Thyen 1955), Hartwig Thyen set an important trajectory for future studies on the genre of the letter to the Hebrews. Thyen argued that Hebrews is influenced by characteristics commonly found among Jewish-Hellenistic homilies of the Second Temple period. Thyen notes five features of Hebrews that led to his classification of the letter as a homily, for which Lane gives a helpful précis (1991:lxx-lxxi):

(1) A communal tone, characterized by such things as the *literary plural*, the use of the vocative ἀδελφοί, and inferential particles and phrases used to effect transition from exposition to exhortation
(2) The exclusive use of the LXX for Old Testament quotations, particularly from the Pentateuch and Psalms, as well as the use of rhetorical questions in introduction of Old Testament quotations

(3) A command of rhetorical devices from the Cynic-Stoic diatribe and later Hellenistic synagogue sermons
(4) The point of contact with other Hellenistic writers like Philo and the Wisdom of Solomon
(5) The inclusion of a parenetic instruction at several key places in Hebrews

The first twelve chapters of Hebrews fits within Thyen's criteria for what classifies as a Jewish-Hellenistic homily (*pace* Mosser 2013:529-32; Ellingworth 1993:62). Therefore, it is best to understand the genre of Hebrews as a homily, with a closing that resembles that of a Greco-Roman letter.

Lawrence Wills simplifies Thyen's five criteria for a Jewish-Hellenistic homily into what he classifies as a "word of exhortation." Wills analyzes several writings that are often referred to as homiletical in nature, noting a common pattern that persists throughout each of them. He identifies three parts that form the structure of an early Jewish-Christian homily: an indicative section (or exposition) that builds on an Old Testament quotation, a translational word or phrase that concludes the exposition, and an exhortation (1984:279).

The repetition of exposition, conclusion/transition, and exhortation is cyclical in Hebrews, helping to shape the structure of the homily, while at the same time moving the argument forward, with each unit building on the next. Willis identifies the following cyclical pattern of exposition, conclusion, and exhortation in Hebrews:

Exposition	Conclusion	Exhortation
1.5-14	1.14	2.1-4
2.5-13	2.14-18	3.1-6
3.7-18	3.19	4.1
4.2-8	4.9-10	4.11
4.12-13	4.14a	4.14b-16
8.1-10.18	10.19-21	10.22-25
10.26-33	10.34	10.35
11.4-40	12.1a	12.1b-3
12.4-10	12.11	12.12-16
12.18-21	12.22-24	12.25a
12.25b-27	12.28a	12.28b
13.10-11	13.12	13.13

Table 3-1: Homiletical Forms in Hebrews

The studies of Thyen and Wills have greatly impacted further investigations into the genre of Hebrews. For example, Otto Michel is convinced that Hebrews is *die erste vollständige urchristliche Predigt*, "the first complete early Christian sermon"

(1957:4). Gräßer likewise concurs, concluding that “the Jewish-Hellenistic synagogue sermon is influential on Hebrews” (1964:153). It is now almost universally acknowledged among scholars that Hebrews is one of the earliest examples of a Jewish-Christian homily (see Attridge 1989:13-14; Lane 1991:lxx-lxxv; Walker 2004:233; Vanhoye 2011:439; Griffiths 2014:16-24; Kleinig 2017:1-2). The classification of Hebrews as a homily—with an appended Greco-Roman salutation in Hebrews 13—would appear to be the best reading of the evidence, both in terms of genre and the overall structure of the letter (Swetnam 1969:261).

3.7.3 Hebrews and Greco-Roman Rhetoric

The Greco-Roman rhetorical handbooks from antiquity define rhetoric as the art of speaking well (Quintilian, *Inst*. 2.15.34; see *Inst*. 2.14.5; 2.17.37). The primary responsibility of an orator is to discern all possible means of persuasion for any given setting (Aristotle, *Rhet*. 1.2.1), and then deliver his speech in a style fitted to persuade (Cicero, *De or*. 1.138; see Cicero, *Inv*. 1.5.6). For a speech to be effective the following elements must be incorporated into an orator’s work: invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery (Rhet. Her. 1.2.3)

The handbooks identify three types of speeches common in antiquity: judicial (or, forensic), deliberative, and epideictic (Aristotle, *Rhet*. 1.3.3; Cicero, *Inv*. 1.5.7; 2.3.12-13; Rhet. Her. 1.1.2; 2.1.1; Quintilian, *Inst*. 3.3.1; 3.4.12-16). Each type of speech is designed to be delivered to a specific audience and is thus composed and delivered accordingly. The first type of speech, judicial, is most commonly used within the context of a courtroom. As is the nature of the courtroom, forensic rhetoric is concerned with past infractions, with a focus on a defense and counterplea. The second type of speech is that of deliberative rhetoric. Here, the orator is engaged in some type of public debate. This type of speech is often found in the political arena, where politicians are involved in expressing various opinions, all with the hope of persuading an audience towards a desired outcome. The third type of speech, epideictic, is devoted to the praise or censure of an individual. If the desire of the orator is to honor or shame his subject, epideictic rhetoric would be the venue by which to best achieve his intended outcome. Rhetoric is an artform, and the rhetorician crafts his speech much like a composer crafts a symphony, weaving in

and out of various rhetorical features to create a harmonious and emotive masterpiece.

The sermonic nature and elevated style of Hebrews naturally lends itself to a rhetorical analysis. The author of Hebrews possesses the skill of a highly trained orator capable of persuasively appealing to his audience (Kleinig 2017:9). This has led commentators to classify Hebrews as an example of deliberative rhetoric, designed in such a way as to persuade his audience to remain faithful to their confession of faith (Lindars 1989; deSilva 2000:47-56; Übelacker 2005:316-34). Other commentators note the presence of encomia in several places within the homily, thus concluding that Hebrews is an example of epideictic rhetoric (Aune 1987:212; Attridge 1989:14; 1990:214; Olbricht 1993:378; Witherington 2007:46-48; 2009:198). However, in a recent commentary on Hebrews, Kleinig introduces a new category of rhetoric which he classifies as *liturgical rhetoric* (2017:11-12).

However, most commentators have rightly suggested that Hebrews does not fit into any one specific type of speech, but instead shares elements of both deliberative and epideictic rhetoric (Johnson 2006:13; Thompson 2008:12). However, even though Hebrews does incorporate elements of Greco-Roman rhetoric into its homily, because of its genre as a Jewish-Christian homily it resists a wholesale taxonomy into any one type of classical speech (Guthrie 1998a:32; see Lane 1990:lxxix-lxxx).

The goal of Hebrews is that of persuasion, and the author crafts his homily in such a way as to solicit from his audience the desired behavior his sermon is designed to accomplish. Therefore, the genre of Hebrews is best understood as that of a Jewish-Christian homily, incorporating elements of epideictic and deliberative rhetoric into its overall message. Koester rightly suggests that Hebrews can serve as epideictic for those committed to Christ and the values of the community, or it can function as deliberative rhetoric for those who may be tempted to drift from their confession of faith, thus persuading one to remain faithful to the Messiah (2001:82).

3.8 Structure

A perusal of commentaries quickly illuminates the challenge of structuring the letter to the Hebrews. This challenge continues to remain one of the unsolved puzzles with respect to scholarship on the letter to the Hebrews (Aune 1987:213). Part of this

difficulty stems from the way the author moves from exposition to exhortation throughout his homily. On the surface this leaves the reader of Hebrews searching for a cohesive structure, especially when the author foreshadows themes that receive a fuller explanation later in his homily (Attridge 1989:16-17). This has led commentators to propose various outlines, many of which are quite different from one another. The following subsections are some of the more adopted outlines for structuring the letter of Hebrews.

3.8.1 Bipartite Division

One of the earlier proposals for structuring Hebrews is dividing the homily into two parts. John Brown, for example (1862:8-9), divides Hebrews into two sections: doctrinal (1.1-10.1) and practical (10.19-13.25). Donald Guthrie outlines Hebrews along the same lines as Brown, with 1.1-10.18 highlighting the Christian faith, and 10.19-13.25 containing exhortations (1983:63-64). Andrew Lincoln (2006:24-25) likewise divides Hebrews into two main sections: the written sermon (1.1-12.29) and the epistolary conclusion (13.1-25).

3.8.2 Patchwork or Thematic Approach

Another approach to the structuring of Hebrews is along the lines of what Black calls the “patchwork approach” (1986:175-77). Instead of tracing an argument around discourse features in the text, the patchwork approach begins by identifying specific themes present in Hebrews and building a structure around them (Kurianal 2000:18). An example of this approach is found in Bruce (1990:vii-x), where he outlines Hebrews in the following manner:

I.	The Finality of Christianity	1.1-2.19
II.	The True Home of the People of God	4.1-4.13
III.	The High Priesthood of Christ	4.14-6.20
IV.	The Order of Melchizedek	7.1-28
V.	Covenant, Sanctuary, and Sacrifice	8.1-10.18
VI.	Call to Worship, Faith, and Perseverance	10.19-12.29
VII.	Concluding Exhortation and Prayer	13.1-21
VIII.	Postscript	13.22-25

Table 3-2: Patchwork Outline

A further example of the patchwork approach is found in the work of Hughes (1977:2-4). Hughes surmises that the comprehensive theme of Hebrews is that of

the complete supremacy of Christ, and on the basis of this theme outlines Hebrews in the following way:

I.	Christ Superior to the Prophets	1.1-3
II.	Christ Superior to the Angels	1.4-2.18
III.	Christ Superior to Moses	3.1-4.13
IV.	Christ Superior to Aaron	4.14-10.18
V.	Christ Superior as the New and Living Way	10.19-12.29
VI.	Concluding Exhortations, Requests, and Greetings	13.1-25

Table 3-3: Thematic Outline

3.8.3 Tripartite Division

One of the first commentators to outline Hebrews in three parts is Otto Michel (1957). Michel's structure of Hebrews consists of the following three sections: 1.1-4.13; 4.14-10.18; and 10.19-13.25. Hans-Friedrich Weiss follows Michel by outlining Hebrews along similar lines (1991). Erich Gräßer, likewise, structures Hebrews into three sections, but parts ways with both Michel and Weiss regarding where the three divisions occur in Hebrews (1990:1.29). Wolfgang Nauck also divides Hebrews into three parts: 1.1-4.13; 4.14-10.31; 10.32-13.25. Nauck is also perhaps the first to emphasize the parallels between 4.14-16 and 10.19-23. These parallels function as a chiasm, bracketing off 5.1-10.18 as the middle section of the tripartite structure of Hebrews. The following table illustrates these parallels (1960:200-3; see Guthrie 1998a:79-82):

4.14	Ἔχοντες οὖν ἀρχιερέα μέγαν	10.19, 21	Ἔχοντες οὖν…ἱερέα μέγαν
4.14	διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς	10.19ff	εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον…ἣν ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν ὁδὸν πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος
4.14	Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ	10.19	ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ
4.14	κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας	10.23	κατέχωμεν τὴν ὁμολογίαν
4.16	Προσερχώμεθα…μετὰ παρρησίας τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος	10.22 (19)	προσερχώμεθα μετὰ ἀληθινῆς καρδίας ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πίστεως (παρρησίαν εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων)

Table 3-4: Parallels between 4.14-16 and 10.19-23

One of the main contributions of Nauck's analysis is his observation regarding the exhortations in Hebrews. Unlike the examples above that emphasize the expositions in Hebrews, Nauck contends that the exhortations are to be "recognized as the goal and highlight of the letter to the Hebrews, and the outline must be understood by them" (1960:203; see Kümmel 1975:390).

3.8.4 Literary Analysis

One of the earliest to utilize literary analysis in the structuring of Hebrews is Léon Vaganay. In his seminal essay, *Le Plan de L'Épître aux Hébreux* (1940:269-77), Vaganay highlights the author of Hebrews' use of "mot-crochets," or *hook-words*, in the structuring of the homily. Vaganay's analysis of Hebrews and the author's use of hook-words would be influential on later studies, perhaps none more so than the work of Albert Vanhoye.

Vanhoye's *La Structure Littéraire de l'Épître Aux Hébreux*, first published in 1963, remains to this day a *tour de force* in Hebrews scholarship. In his monograph, Vanhoye identifies six literary features present in the homily that help give shape to the structure of Hebrews: (1) announcement of the subjects to be discussed; (2) inclusions that indicate the boundaries of the developments; (3) variation of literary genre; (4) words which characterize a development; (5) transition by immediate repetition of an expression or word (i.e. hook words); and (6) symmetric arrangements (1989:19-20).

According to Vanhoye's analysis, Hebrews includes five announcements that function to identify cohesive units of text within the discourse: 1.4; 2.17-18; 5.9-10; 10.36-39; and 12.13. These announcements help shape the overall structure of Hebrews and produce the following outline:

a.		1.1-4	Exordium
I.	(1.4: Announcement)	1.5-2.18	Jesus, High Priest Worthy of Faith
II.	(2.17-18: Announcement)	3.1-4.14	Jesus, High Priest Worthy of Faith
		4.15-5.10	Jesus Compassionate High-Priest
III.	(5.9-10: Announcement)	5.11-6.20	Preliminary Exhortation
		7.1-28	Jesus, High Priest According to Melchizedek
		8.1-9.28	Come to Fulfillment
		10.1-18	Cause of Eternal Salvation
		10.19-39	Final Exhortation
IV.	(10.26-29: Announcement)	11.1-40	The Faith of the Men of Old
		12.1-13	The Endurance Required
V.	(12.13: Announcement)	12.14-13.18	Straight Courses
z.		13.20-21	Peroration
		13.22-25	Epistolary Ending

3-5: Literary Structure of Hebrews

Vanhoye continues to have widespread influence on the literary structure of Hebrews. Possibly the main reason for his influence is his use of literary analysis on the letter to the Hebrews. Previous attempts at structuring Hebrews centers more along the lines of a specific theme, particularly the language of superiority. These attempts at structuring Hebrews often leave unnatural interruptions in the flow of the argument of Hebrews. Vanhoye's study analyzes literary features and patterns in the text of Hebrews as a guide for his outline. Such an analysis allows for more natural divisions that are determined by the language and discourse of Hebrews as a unified whole rather than isolating certain repeated words or phrases in an attempt to structure the homily.

3.8.5 Discourse Analysis

A final approach to the structure of Hebrews is that of discourse analysis, or, text-linguistics. Simply defined, discourse analysis is the study of a text above the level of the sentence (Reed 1997:27; see Westfall 2005:23). Porter describes discourse analysis as the "emphasis…upon language as it is used." It is the attempt at integrating semantics, syntax, and pragmatics into a coherent and unified model of interpretation (1995:18). Similar to Vanhoye's approach above, discourse analysis is a text-based approach to the structuring of Hebrews, taking into account not only literary features but also matters of syntax, semantics, verbal voice and aspect, the grouping of lexemes or grammatical features that indicate units of text, prominence, and other discourse features like conjunctions and particles (Westfall 2005:20).

One of the first full-scale discourse analysis of the letter to the Hebrews was attempted by Linda Neeley (1987). Influenced by the linguistic models of functional grammar, Neeley's analysis of Hebrews centers around four universal elements of language: (1) the combining of shorter grammatical units into larger discourse units; (2) the usage of larger discourse units to indicate a function within a text, for example, an introduction or a climax in the argument; (3) the identification of foreground and background information; and (4) semantic organization (1987:2-5). Neeley highlighted the importance of what she called *embedded discourses* within the text of Hebrews. At the macro level, she organized Hebrews around three embedded discourses: 1.1-4.13; 4.14-10.19; and 10.19-13.21. Within each of these three embedded discourses are several smaller units of discourse that cohere with the message of the higher-level embedded discourse, thus giving shape and cohesiveness to the whole of the text (1987:6-18). The following table helps visualize Neeley's embedded discourses in Hebrews and how they give shape to the overall structure of Hebrews (1987:141):

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
ED1: 1.1-4.13	ED1a: 1.1-2.18	ED1a_1: 1.14
		ED1a_2: 2.1-18
	ED1b: 3.1-4.13	ED1b_1: 3.1-18
		ED1b_2: 4.1-13
ED2: 4.14-10.18	ED2a: 4.14-6.20	ED2a_1: 4.14-5.10
		ED2a_2: 5.11-6.20
	ED2b: 7.1-28	
	ED2c: 8.1-10.18	ED2c_1: 9.1-14
		ED2c_2: 9.15-28
		ED2c_3: 10.1-18
ED3: 10.19-13.21	ED3a: 10.19-39	
	ED3b: 11.1-40	ED3b_1: 11.1-16
		ED3b_2: 11.17-40
	ED3c: 12.1-29	ED3c_1: 12.1-13
		ED3c_2: 12.14-29
	ED3d: 13.1-21	
Finis: 13.22-25		

Table 3-6: Embedded Discourse in Hebrews

Cynthia Westfall's monograph represents another full-length discourse analysis of Hebrews. Whereas Neeley applies the model of functional grammar to her analysis of Hebrews, Westfall adopts M. A. K. Halliday's method of systemic-functional linguistics (Halliday 2014) for her discourse analysis of Hebrews. Crucial to

Westfall's discourse methodology are the following areas: linguistic concepts of discourse structure; linearization of the text; grouping, or chunking, material together into discreet units of text; the use of prominence to highlight peaks in a discourse unit; the cohesion of individual units of text as well as their connection to the lager discourse as a whole; and lastly, the why and how the discourse make sense, that is, how a text coheres with itself (2005:22-87). Taking these linguistic concepts into account, Westfall outlines Hebrews according to a tripartite structure: 1.1-4.16; 4.11-10.25; and 10.19-13.25.

The final study to consider is George Guthrie's *The Structure of Hebrews* (1998a). Guthrie builds on the studies of Vanhoye and others for his structuring of Hebrews, utilizing their strengths within the broader linguistic framework of text-linguistics. Similar to Westfall, Guthrie's study is concerned with the discourse of Hebrews above the sentence level, focusing on those linguistic features that give shape to the overall theme and message of the homily. As Guthrie notes, the theme of a discourse is determined by a number of textual factors or language choices. These choices determine elements of semantics, syntax, word order, mood, voice, aspect, which give shape to the paragraph and ultimately the whole discourse (1998a:46-49). Another way to refer to this process of language choice is succinctly summed up by the phrase "choice implies meaning" (Runge 2010:5-7). The choices an author makes at the level of the sentence or the paragraph are products of the author's intend communicative goal.

Guthrie also highlights the significance that exposition and exhortation has in the overall structure of Hebrews. He posits that while Hebrews is a cohesive and coherent whole, there nevertheless should be a sharp demarcation between these two genres. The reason for such a demarcation is because of the shift in the discourse. The author of Hebrews goes from christological exposition to addressing his audience with warnings to remain faithful. For Guthrie, the exhortations are to be set apart as distinct from the expositions, but not in such a way as to cause a division between them (1998a:113). Guthrie's study of the structure of Hebrews produces a bipartite outline, with and introduction in 1.1-4, followed by two main sections in 1.5-4.13 and 4.14-13.21, and ending with a conclusion in 13.22-25.

3.9 Conclusion

This chapter has surveyed the letter to the Hebrews within it historical and literary context. Beginning with historical matters, the question of authorship was addressed first. This included a discussion of potential candidates and the worldview which shaped the author and informed his writing. Following this discussion on authorship was an examination of the date of composition and destination of Hebrews. Shifting focus from author to audience, the next section examined the historical setting of the audience as well as their socio-religious context. The final section examined the literary context of Hebrews. This began first with a survey of the various genres in which to situate Hebrews and concluded with a discussion of the various ways that commentators have structured and outlined the letter to the Hebrews.

Before moving on to the next chapter, it will be helpful to layout conclusions that have been drawn from the historical and literary issues addressed in this chapter. This thesis assumes that the author of Hebrews is a well-educated Hellenistic Jew who has a firm grasp on the Greek language and the rhetorical techniques practiced in the first century. The original audience is most likely located in Rome, to which the author wrote his homily sometime after the fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE. The original purpose for Hebrews is meant to encourage the readers to remain faithful to their confession of faith in light of their present suffering. With regard to genre, this thesis assumes the genre of a Jewish-Christian homily, with an appended closing chapter that conforms to the style of a Greco-Roman letter. Finally, the tripartite structure of Nauck is adopted, while also relying on the works of Guthrie and Westfall help to flesh out the discourse structure and message of Hebrews.

These conclusions form the foundation and heart of this study, that of an exegetical analysis of atonement, purgation, and the heavenly tabernacle in Hebrews 9. Hebrews 9 breaks down generally into two parts: the inability of the Levitical cult to permanently deal with sin and impurity (9.1-10), and finality of the once-for-all sacrifice of Christ (9.11-28). The next chapter will begin with a brief discussion regarding preliminary issues surrounding the context and message of Hebrews 9. This includes establishing the context for the periscope of Heb 9.1-10, a theological analysis of Hebrews' high priestly Christology, and finally, a detailed exegetical and theological analysis of Heb 9.1-10. Chapter five will conclude this exegetical analysis

by focusing on Heb 9.11-14 and 22-28 and the effectiveness of Christ's offering for sin.

CHAPTER 4

Exegetical and Theological Analysis: Hebrews 9.1-10

4.1 Introduction

With the historical background and cultural context of Hebrews sufficiently situated in chapter three, the focus of the present chapter is to provide the historical background necessary for answering the following question: how does Yom Kippur and the procession of the high priest relate to the sacrificial work of Christ and his entrance into the heavenly sanctuary, and at what moment in the divine drama does atonement take place? Traditionally, when speaking about atonement the cross has been the *raison d'être* for all theological discourse with respect to the sacrificial theology of the New Testament. This study will contend, in line with the cultic practices outlined in Leviticus, that the provision for atonement is not situated in the immolation of the victim—be it an animal or the body of Christ. Instead, atonement is secured through the offering and manipulation of blood within the sanctuary. In the Old Testament this is accomplished through the manipulation of blood upon the altar or mercy seat. In the New Testament, Christ accomplished atonement by means of his entry into the heavenly sanctuary and the offering of his sacrifice before the throne of God.

The objective of this chapter is to provide a contextual basis for an exegetical and theological analysis of Christ's high priestly work of atonement and its connection with the heavenly sanctuary and purgation of sin. Hebrews 9.1-10 is important in the argument of Hebrews because it provides a historical and theological understanding of the Old Testament tabernacle and its accompanying appurtenances, as well as insight into the ministry of the priests within the Holy Place (Attridge 2010:277-78). This brief historical and theological survey of the Levitical cult lays the foundation for chapter five of this thesis and the continuity that exists between the sacrificial

underpinnings of the Levitical cult and that of the priestly work of Christ, both on the cross and in the heavenly sanctuary.

The breakdown of this chapter is as follows. After the introduction in 4.1, a thematic overview of Hebrews 1-8 is offered in 4.2 that provides background for the subsequent exegesis of Hebrews 9 in the present chapter and the chapter that follows. Following the overview of in 4.2, section 4.3 deviates slightly in order to discuss the installation of Christ as high priest, specifically the question regarding the timing of his installation. The nature of timing with respect to Christ's installation as high priest is important for the exegesis of Hebrews 9 and its appropriation of the Yom Kippur ritual. Section 4.4 begins the exegesis proper of Hebrews 9, consisting of a two-part exegetical analysis of Hebrews 9.1-10. Part one surveys the earthly place of worship (9.1-5), while part two, the priesthood and its Levitical liturgy (Heb 9.6-10). In these ten verses the author of Hebrews lays the foundation for his comparison between the atoning sacrifice under the old covenant and the sacrifice of Christ which inaugurates the new covenant.

Before embarking on an exegesis of Heb 9.1-10, a brief explanation for the rationale of dividing the whole of Hebrews 9 into two separate chapters for this thesis is in order. First, the purpose of this thesis is to answer the following question: how does an exegetical and theological analysis of Hebrews 9 connect the sacrificial work of Christ to the heavenly sanctuary and the purgation of sin? While the background of Heb 9.1-10 is detrimental to a proper understanding of the Christ-event, the heart of this thesis is found in the exegesis of Heb 9.11-28, particularly the pericopes of 9.11-14 and 9.22-28. It is in the context of these two pericopes that the problem this thesis attempts to solve resides. With respect to Heb 9.1-10, Johnsson wisely notes that "[o]ne should not endeavor to attach too much significance to these verses; nor, on the other hand, should they be put aside" (1973:275). This study has taken these words to heart in its exegesis of the first ten verses of Hebrews nine.

This leads to the second rationale for a two-part exegesis of Hebrews 9, namely the amount of verses to be analyzed and the possibility of an unwieldly chapter. Due to the length of Hebrews 9 and the intense amount of attention that will be applied to the latter half of the chapter, the necessity of a two-part exegesis will allow for a more sustained focus on the central section of Hebrews 9. Therefore, in order to

ensure a detailed exegetical analysis of the problem at hand, it is wise to dedicate a whole chapter to Heb 9.11-14, 22-2, and to the central question regarding the sacrifice of Christ and its connection with the heavenly sanctuary.

4.2 Hebrews 1-8: A Thematic Overview

The reader is first introduced to the priestly work of Christ in the opening exordium of the homily, "where it comes almost at once, like a *motif* in a piece of music" (Nairne 1913:136, emphasis in original). In Heb 1.3, Christ is introduced as both the sacrifice for and the mediator of purification of sins. This brief statement on the priestly work of Christ has important implications for the main argument of Hebrews, which is fleshed out as the homily progresses, culminating in the eschatological sacrifice of the Son in Hebrews 9-10 (Johnsson 1973:214; Mackie 2017:259).

The reader is first introduced to the "merciful…and faithful high priest" [ἐλεήμων…καὶ πιστὸς ἀρχιερεὺς] in Heb 2.14-18. For the Son to be qualified to serve as high priest it is necessary that he not only take on the nature of his brothers and sisters [κεκοινώνηκεν αἵματος καὶ σαρκός] (Heb 2.14a), he must also experience the suffering of temptation [ἐν ᾧ γὰρ πέπονθεν αὐτὸς πειρασθείς] (Heb 2.18a). Therefore, by taking on the nature of humanity he destroys the very one who has power over death [ἵνα διὰ τοῦ θανάτου καταργήσῃ τὸν τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου], thereby freeing humanity from their fear of death [καὶ ἀπαλλάξῃ τούτους, ὅσοι φόβῳ θανάτου διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν ἔνοχοι ἦσαν δουλείας] (Heb 2.14b-15). Not only did the death of the Son bring the long-awaited freedom for God's people, it also, more importantly, procured for them expiation of their transgressions. A conclusion to this unit is signaled by the inferential particle ὅθεν in Heb 2.17 (Westfall 2005:103; see Vanhoye 1989:24-26, who suggests that Heb 2.17 is an announcement of the second part of Hebrews, which extends from Heb 3.1-5.10). The Son's incarnation is a necessity [ὤφειλεν], and through his obedient life and sacrificial death he satisfies the wrath of God by providing a propitiation for the sins of the people [εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ] (Heb 2.17).

After a brief reference to the theme of priesthood in Heb 3.1, the author does not return again to the subject until the end of Hebrews 4. Hebrews 4.14-16 signals a return to the subject of the high priesthood of Christ, as well as forms the front end of an inclusio with Heb 10.19-23 (Nauck 1960:200-3; Guthrie 1998a:79-82). In this central section of Hebrews (Heb 4.14-10.23) the author resumes his discussion of Christ's high priesthood that was deactivated in Heb 3.1 (Westfall 2005:140-41). Hebrews 4.14-16 also introduces two themes that are the focus of the discourse unit of Hebrews 5.1-10.18: the appointment of the Son as high priest (Heb 5.1-7.28) and the Son's priestly ministry in the heavenly sanctuary (8.1-10.19).

The first theme, that of the Son's appointment as high priest, consists of a self-contained unit marked by the inclusio in 5.1-3 and 7.26-28 (Guthrie 1998a:82), thus bookending the unit together as a cohesive whole. Within this discourse unit are three sub-units: the appointment of Christ as high priest (Heb 5.1-10); an exhortation/digression (5.11-6.20); and the priestly order of Melchizedek (7.1-28).

The author of Hebrews begins his exposition in Hebrews 5 with a description of the requirements and duties of the Levitical priests. Each priest is chosen from among his fellow countrymen and appointed to act as a representative of the people before God, in order to offer gifts and sacrifices for sins [ἵνα προσφέρῃ δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν] (Heb 5.1) Because of his own weakness and proclivity towards sin, the high priest is able to deal gently with those for whom he intercedes. Furthermore, because of his weakness and bent towards sin, he is under obligation to offer sacrifices for himself [προσφέρειν περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν] and for the people [καθὼς περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ] (Heb 5.2-3). This appointment as high priest is an honor bestowed upon him solely on the basis of God's calling (Heb 5.4).

In Heb 5.5-10, the author transitions from a brief description of the Levitical priesthood to a discussion of Christ's calling and appointment as high priest. At the center of this pericope are two theologically pregnant Old Testament quotations: Psalms 2.7 and 110.4. These royal Psalms provide scriptural precedent for the development of the author's high priestly Christology as well as the foundation upon which to build a contrast with the Old Testament priesthood and related cult. In Heb 5.7-9 the readers get a glimpse into the life of the historical Jesus. He is described

as offering up [προσενέγκας] prayers and supplications, echoing similar sacrificial language in Heb 5.1, 3. Likewise, Jesus also experiences human frailty and suffering, and this experience is the catalyst by which he not only learns obedience [ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν τὴν ὑπακοήν], but also the means by which he is perfected, thereby becoming the source of eternal salvation [ἐγένετο...αἴτιος σωτηρίας αἰωνίου]. The author's return to the subject of Melchizedek at the end of this brief exposition functions not only as a conclusion to Heb 5.1-10, it also operates as a discourse marker, along with Heb 6.20, thus marking out 5.11-6.20 as a single discourse unit.

With the reactivation of the person of Melchizedek in Heb 6.20, the author circles back again to this enigmatic figure first introduced in Heb 5.6. Hebrews 7 provides the longest sustained discussion of the nature of the priesthood by way of a midrash on Gen 14.17-20 (see Heb 7.1-10) and Ps 110.4 (Heb 7.11-28) (Caird 1959:47-48; Fitzmyer 1963:305; Cockerill 1976:18; 288-307; Horton 1976:12-53; Thompson 1977:209-23; Ellingworth 1983:258; Parsons 1988:212-13; Attridge 1989:186; Lane 1991:158-59; Rooke 2000:81-94; Mason 2008:25-26; Granerød 2009:194-95). The entirety of Hebrews 7 consists of a prolonged exposition highlighting the discontinuity between Levi, along with his successors, and the type/antitype Melchizedek and his sole successor, the person of Jesus Christ. Hebrews 7 plays an important role in the development of the author's high priestly Christology, as it serves to elaborate on the Son's status as the risen and exalted high priest while also preparing the way for a detailed exposition of the high priestly ministry of Christ in Hebrews 8-10 (Longenecker 1978:172). This connection between Melchizedek and the Son of God will play out in more detail as the argument of Hebrews unfolds, particularly the relationship between the Old Testament cult and the nature of Christ's heavenly work as high priest (Attridge 1989:187).

Hebrews 8.1-10.25 is the central exposition and Christological heart of Hebrews (Stanley 1994:11). Hebrews 8.1-6 not only marks a transition from the discussion of the Melchizedekian priesthood of Christ, it also serves as an introductory paragraph for 8.1-10.25 (Attridge 1989:217). Moving on from the priesthood of Christ (Heb 5.1-7.28), the author now turns his attention in this central section towards the ministry of the Son in the heavenly sanctuary (Lane 1991:202; see Vanhoye 1963:138-61). This transition is marked by the presence of Κεφάλαιον δὲ in Heb 8.1. The use of

Κεφάλαιον δὲ indicates both a transition from Heb 7.26-28, as indicated by the use of the particle δὲ (see BDAG: s.v. δέ 2), as well as a development in the author's priestly Christology, with Κεφάλαιον summarizing the preceding exposition in Hebrews 7 as well as setting the stage for the discussion regarding the priestly ministry of the Son in the heavenly sanctuary (Westfall 2005:190-91; see Löhr 2005:203).

Following the thesis statement of Heb 8.1, the author transitions from his exposition of Ps 110.4 and the Son's status as high priest to a discussion of matters relating to the old covenant and cultic regulations (Heb 8.2-6). Jesus is referred to as a minister in the true tent [τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργὸς καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς], one of the Lord's making and not of an earthly nature [ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος], where he presents his offering before God as high priest [ὅθεν ἀναγκαῖον ἔχειν τι καὶ τοῦτον ὃ προσενέγκῃ] (Heb 8.2-3).

The high priestly offering which Jesus offers in the true tent can only be offered in the heavenly sanctuary. God established an earthly order for cultic worship, with a priesthood birthed from the loins of Levi. Because Jesus is a descendant from the tribe of Judah, he is unqualified to serve as high priest under the old covenant (Heb 8.4-5; see Heb 7.14). But now [νυνὶ δὲ] in light of his appointment as high priest after the order of Melchizedek, the Son is a mediator of a better covenant [κρείττονός ἐστιν διαθήκης μεσίτης], one that is far superior to the old, as it is enacted on better promises [ἥτις ἐπὶ κρείττοσιν ἐπαγγελίαις νενομοθέτηται] (Heb 8.6). Westfall rightly concludes that "[t]his short, heavily marked passage orients the reader to Jesus' sacrifice, the heavenly tabernacle and the new covenant which are topics linked to Jesus' priesthood that will be developed in [Hebrews 9]" (2005:191).

A new paragraph begins at Heb 8.7, introducing the promised new covenant of Jeremiah 31. The author introduces his lengthy quotation from Jeremiah first by way of contrast (Heb 8.6), and second, by highlighting the inability of the old covenant to accomplish what it was intended for (Heb 8.7). It is precisely this inability of the old covenant that warranted a need for a more perfect and blameless covenant, one that would be written not on tablets of stone, but on the hearts of God's redeemed

people. The promise that God foretold by the prophet Jeremiah is the very thing that he put into motion via the sacrificial atonement of his own Son.

The author concludes the discussion regarding the promised new covenant with a rather bold and controversial declaration regarding the covenant he made with Israel at Sinai. In his brief exposition of Jer 31.31-34, the author of Hebrews shows no concern for the promises described in Jeremiah's prophecy, but instead his focus is squarely on the phrase "new covenant," with a particular emphasis on the word "καινήν" (Lane 1991:210). Therefore, the inauguration of the new covenant has in turn rendered the first covenant obsolete [πεπαλαίωκεν]. Further, not only is the old covenant now obsolete, its destruction is on the coming horizon as well [γηράσκον ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ] (Heb 8.12).

In spite of its diminished authority and inability to effectively and completely purge sin, the author of Hebrews does not discard the old covenant *in toto*, nor does he adopt a supersessionist hermeneutic with regard to the Old Testament law and its cultic and ritual regulations (see Hays 2009:151-73; Skarsaune 2009:174-82; 2011 Mitchell 2011:251-67; Thiessen 2019:183-94). According to the author of Hebrews, the old covenant and its liturgy forms the foundation upon which the new covenant and priestly ministry of Jesus is modeled after. Rather than denigrating the Sinaitic covenant, the author of Hebrews builds upon it in such a way that the Christ-event is the fulfillment of the promises that were but a shadow of the true reality, a reality that is now operative in the life and worship of the New Testament church.

4.3 The Installation of Christ as High Priest

The importance of the priesthood for the author of Hebrews cannot be overstated. In fact, Nairne goes so far as to suggest that the priesthood of Christ is the central theme of the entire letter (1913:136). As evidenced in the author's central section (Hebrews 8-10), where the focus is on the once-for-all sacrifice of Christ, the office and function of the priesthood lingers under the surface; just as there is no offering without an officiant, in Hebrews, there is no sacrifice of atonement without a great high priest serving at the altar. Moving outside the testimony of Hebrews the references to Christ as high priest become fainter, with no more than possible echoes to activities associated with the priesthood attached to the person of Christ

(this topic will be taken up in depth below in chapter six). And while there is some debate as to whether Christ is functioning in a priestly capacity outside of Hebrews, the testimony of Hebrews is clear in its affirmation that Christ is unable to serve at the altar (see Heb 7.13-14; 8.4).

This section will address the following question: is there a discernable point in time when Christ was appointed and installed as high priest? To answer this question, four main views on the timing of Christ's installation will be discussed in turn: Christ, the *eternal* high priest; Christ, the *incarnational* high priest; Christ, the *sacrificed* high priest; and Christ, the *resurrected* high priest. In light of the oath made by God to appoint Jesus high priest after the order of Melchizedek (see 5.6; 6.20; 7.17, 21), does Hebrews give any indication of *when* this oath was made, and consequently *when* Christ took his place as high priest? While it may appear that such a question is making a distinction without a difference, it will be argued that this is in fact not the case; the timing of Christ's installation as high priest is directly connected to the question of *when* and *where* the atonement occurred. Therefore, formulating a hypothesis with respect to the timing of Christ's installation serves a crucial part in the overall cultic theology of Hebrews.

4.3.1 Eternal High Priest

One answer proposed for the question of *when* Christ became high priest is to understand his priesthood as eternal. In this manner, the installation took place before the creation of the cosmos. The use of Ps 110.4 (109.4 LXX) in conjunction with Ps 2.7 in Heb 5.5-6 may be taken as support for such a view. As seen earlier in the catena of Heb 1.5-13, the author establishes the exalted status of the eternal Son by means of two royal Psalms: 2.7 and 2 Sam 7.14 (see also Heb 1.3: ὃς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ). Therefore, by connecting God's declaration [ὀμνύω] of an eternal priest [Σὺ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα] with that of a declaration of Jesus's eternal Sonship, it can be deduced that Christ was both Son and priest from all eternity (see Büchsel 1922:15; Moffatt 1924:64; Bates 2015:55).

Also providing support for such a reading is the author of Hebrews' midrash on the person of Melchizedek in Hebrews 7. Take for instance the opening verses historical recounting of the meanings of Melchizedek's royal names and lack of lineage (7.1-3).

Of importance to the topic at hand is the author's assertion that Melchizedek has "neither beginning of days nor end of life" [μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν μήτε ζωῆς τέλος ἔχων]. Alongside the lack of genealogical record, such vague and ambiguous declarations by the author of Hebrews provides just enough scriptural precedent for the possibility of Christ's preincarnate priesthood. For the author of Hebrews, the lack of parentage and genealogy provides for him the exegetical soil necessary for the comparison between Melchizedek and the Son of God, while also allowing just enough room for speculation with regard to the eternality of Melchizedek and the nature of his priesthood.

4.3.2 Earthly High Priest

Another way to answer the question regarding the timing of Christ's installation as high priest is to perceive of Christ's installment as high priest as an event occurring prior to his crucifixion. Chrysostom states in no uncertain terms that Christ became high priest at the moment of his incarnation: "And observe the mystery. First it was royal, and then it is become sacerdotal: so therefore also in regard to Christ: for King indeed He always was, but *has become Priest from the time that He assumed the Flesh*, that He offered the sacrifice" (*Hom*. *Heb*. 13.2, emphasis added; see Spicq 1953:2.211; Cody 1960:97; see Loader 1981:245-47; O'Collins and Jones 2010:49-50; Richardson 2012:42; 47-48). Kistemaker and Scholer, on the other hand, are a bit more ambiguous, concluding at most that the Son functions as a priest during his earthly ministry (Kistemaker 1984:252-53; Scholer 1991:87-89; see Schreiner 2015:160).

4.3.3 High Priest at the Cross

A third answer to this question of timing suggests that Christ is installed as high priest at the cross. In this manner, the cross functions not only as the place where atonement is accomplished, but also as the "starting point for the high priest's atoning work" (Käsemann 2002:223; see Peake 1879:137; Peterson 1982:195; Ellingworth 1993:397; Wallis 1995:146; Fuhrmann 2007:102-17; 2008:94-96). This view of Christ's installation coheres nicely with the more traditional understanding of the cross functioning as the place of atonement. In order to be consistent with the role of a priest and the presentation of his offering before God, it is necessary to hold to a view of installation that coincides with the cross. For the death of the Son of God

to be considered as an offering for sin, Christ must also be high priest in order for such an offering to be acceptable to God.

4.3.4 Resurrected as High Priest

A final answer offered, and the one affirmed in this thesis, is the installation of Christ as high priest upon his entrance into the heavenly sanctuary and subsequent exaltation to God's right hand (Brooks 1970:207; Eskola 2001:259; 264; Moffitt 2011:194-208; Filtvedt 2015:85-87; Kibbe 2016:162-63; Jamieson 2019:25). One of the earliest proponents of this view can be traced back to the Italian theologian Faustus Socinus. Socinus rightly grasps the logical connection between the activity of the Levitical high priest (immolation → entry into the tabernacle → manipulation of blood) with that of Christ in Hebrews (cross → entry into heavenly sanctuary → offering of sacrifice). This leads him to conclude that the cross is the not the location of Christ's self-offering; instead, Christ's self-offering occurs is in heaven. It is not until his glorification and attainment of an indestructible life that Christ is inaugurated as high priest and thus able to offer his sacrifice as high priest (see Demarest 1976:22 n.2; Kibbe 2014:25-61; 2017:134-55).

While on earth, Jesus is barred from serving as high priest. This is due in part to two important factors. First, Jesus's genealogy prohibits him from serving in the earthly sanctuary. As Hebrews makes clear, Jesus is a descendant from the tribe of Judah, a tribe that has no priestly representation (7.13-14). This distinction is important for the development of the author's cultic theology, particularly in its relationship with the inauguration of a new covenant, and with it, a new priesthood (see Heb 7.11-22; 8.7-13; 9.15-21). The second factor that prohibits Jesus from serving as a priest while on earth is the presence of the Levitical priesthood itself. As long as the Mosaic covenant and Levitical priesthood were operative in Jerusalem, the Melchizedekian high priest is unable to offer gifts or sacrifices within the holy sanctuary (Heb 8.4). Moffitt rightly notes that the problem Jesus faces with regard to his role as high priest while on earth is a problem created by the incarnation. Although he is the Son of God and appointed by God to be high priest, his elevation to that office is prohibited by his tribal genealogy (Moffitt 2019:160). Therefore, for these reasons the priesthood that Christ assumes must be one that has no geographical or genealogical connection to the Mosaic covenant or Levitical cult.

If it is the case that Christ is unable to present his offering for sin while on earth, where then is his offering made? Because a priest is appointed "to offer gifts and sacrifices for sins" [ἵνα προσφέρῃ δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν] (5.1), and Christ is genealogically barred from presenting such an offering while he is on earth, the logical conclusion, and one that is supported by the text of Hebrews, is that Christ presents his offering for sin upon his ascension into the heavenly sanctuary (8.1-4; see Moffitt 2017:162). Such a line of reasoning implies that Christ obtains his role as high priest sometime after his resurrection.

This conclusion is supported by the author of Hebrew's declaration that the priesthood which Christ receives is not because of genealogy, but instead is based on the "power of an indestructible life" [ἀλλὰ κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου] (7.16). The word ἀκατάλυτος occurs only here in the New Testament, carrying the sense of "endless" or "perpetual" (BDAG: s.v. ἀκατάλυτος; GE: s.v. ἀκατάλυτος; LSJ s.v. ἀκατάλυτος). The only occurrence of ἀκατάλυτος in related literature is found in 4 Macc 10.11, where it refers to eternal torments [ἀκαταλύτους βασάνους]. At the resurrection of Christ, God declares the Son a high priest in perpetuity, which enables him to present his offering upon his ascension into the heavenly sanctuary.

The author of Hebrews organizes his homily in such a way as to illustrate the Son of God's qualification to serve as high priest. The various qualifications for appointment to high priest can be grouped together under one rubric in Hebrews: the author's use of τελειόω and its related cognates. Perfection is the requisite characteristic that is required for the Son to function as the Melchizedekian high priest.

In Hebrews 5.7-10 outlines the steps the historical Jesus took on his way to perfection, and ultimately his installation as high priest. In Heb 5.7, the author provides a snapshot of the earthly life of Jesus [ὃς ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ], along with his Passion [δεήσεις τε καὶ ἱκετηρίας πρὸς τὸν δυνάμενον σῴζειν αὐτὸν ἐκ θανάτου μετὰ κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς καὶ δακρύων προσενέγκας], and because of his reverence/fear [ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας] he is heard by God [εἰσακουσθεὶς]. There is some debate as to the precise meaning of ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας in the context of 5.7. Most

translations take ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας as a reference to Christ's piety, hence the translation "because of his reverence/piety/reverent submission."

Another possible meaning is to understand the noun εὐλαβείας as a reference to fear, which provides the following translation, "because of his fear." The fear referenced here points back to the prepositional phrase πρὸς τὸν δυνάμενον σῴζειν αὐτὸν ἐκ θανάτου in 5.7. This fear of death is similar to Heb 2.14-15 and the universal fear of death [φόβῳ θανάτου] that has plagued mankind since the Garden. By sharing in our humanity, Jesus likewise agrees to take on the shared experiences of humanity, none more universal than the fear of death. It is this fear of death that the Son experiences during his Passion, for which he prays for deliverance from and is heard (Ellingworth 1993:290). The content of Jesus's prayer is important in the context of perfection and installation as high priest; it is the plea of the Son for deliverance from death [ἐκ θανάτου]. But what precisely does the prepositional phrase ἐκ θανάτου refer to in 5.7, and how does it relate to perfection and priestly installation?

In the context of 5.7 Jesus is praying for a deliverance from his impending crucifixion ("Bitte um Bewahrung vor dem Tod," Braun 1984:142). But this understanding introduces an inherent contradiction within Heb 5.7, namely that Jesus's prayer went unanswered. Montefiore attempts to solve this by proposing that his prayer is in fact answered, just not in the way one would expect. Montefiore suggests instead of the cross, the deliverance that is granted to Jesus is from the fear of death itself (1964:98-99). Given the context of Heb 2.14-15 and the reference to fearing death, this is a plausible interpretive option. While not addressing the exact issue as Montefiore, Bruce likewise suggests a possible double entendre for ἐκ θανάτου in 5.7, offering Hos 13.14 as a possible example of such an occurrence (1990:129 n.51). Attridge attempts solve this conundrum by delaying God's answer to prayer until the time of Christ's exaltation (1989:150; see Jeremias 1953:109-110). Unfortunately, none of these options adequately solve the contextual problem of Hebrews' affirmation that Christ is in fact heard and his prayer answered.

In the context of Heb 5.7-10, it would appear what Jesus prays for, and which God answers, is to be saved *out of* death and not from the actual moment of death (Easter 2014:122-24; see Kurianal 2000:70; Moffitt 2008:69-71; Richardson 2008:60). The answer to Jesus's prayer is granted in the act of his resurrection out of the realm of death (see Sir 48.5: ὁ ἐγείρας νεκρὸν ἐκ θανάτου). The earthly life of Jesus is one learning obedience through suffering (5.8). This all culminates in 5.9, where "after Christ is perfected, he became the source of eternal salvation." This perfection, indicated by the aorist passive participle τελειωθεὶς, refers to the earthly completion of Christ's sufferings in 5.8, after which he became the source of eternal salvation [ἐγένετο…αἴτιος σωτηρίας αἰωνίου]. The sequence of events in 5.7-10 are laid out in a sequential manner: Passion, suffering and death, perfection/resurrection, source of eternal salvation, and installation as Melchizedekian high priest. At his resurrection, Christ achieves perfection and is made fit to enter the heavenly sanctuary and offer his sacrifice before the altar of God (Jamieson 2019:25-35; see Moffitt 2011:194-214).

The timing of the Son's appointment to high priest is intimately tied to the place of the atonement in the argument of Hebrews 9. As this chapter and the next progresses, this connection between the timing of Christ's installation and the place where he secures atonement will become more apparent, as well as key to the overall argument of this thesis. At his resurrection Christ is made fit to serve as the Melchizedekian high priest, upon which he enters the heavenly sanctuary to present his offering for atonement before the throne of God.

4.4 Hebrews 9: An Exegetical and Theological Analysis

The focus of this chapter and the next is to examine the association between the Levitical cult and its relationship to the cross, the heavenly sanctuary, and the purgation of sin. Hebrews 9 contains perhaps the most detailed discussion in the New Testament concerning the function and liturgy of the Levitical cult. Immediately one is confronted with an abundance of cultic terminology that builds into a crescendo and ultimately peaks with the arrival of Christ within the heavenly sanctuary as the Melchizedekian high priest. The argument of Hebrews 9 is built upon an understanding of the nature of the priesthood, the function of sacrifice and

offerings, Yom Kippur and sacred space, defilement and purgation, and the question of how to access God on earth and in heaven (Johnsson 1973:222).

Hebrews 9 plays a significant role in the author's formation of his high priestly Christology. In this pivotal chapter the author's detailed theological discussion regarding the priesthood of Christ arrives at its peak—the sacrifice and ensuing priestly offering of the risen Messiah in the heavenly sanctuary. What makes this chapter particularly important is that it is the culmination of everything the author has been leading up to in his homily. Throughout the letter the author has laid the foundation for what has become the focal point of Hebrews 9, namely the sacrifice of Christ and his high priestly ministry in the heavenly sanctuary.

The significance of this chapter is highlighted in the commentaries on Hebrews. One prime example is the important work of Vanhoye. In his literary analysis on Hebrews, Vanhoye demarcates chapter nine as part of the central section of the homily (Heb 8.1-9.28). Vanhoye goes so far as to postulate that the appellation "Χριστός" in Heb 9.11 is the "centre même de toute l'Épître" (1963:237; see 1989:36; Ellingworth 1993:445). Although it is best to see the argument extending into Hebrews 10, Vanhoye is correct in his assessment on the importance of Hebrews 9 to the overall message of the homily. Johnsson as well highlights the significance of Hebrews 9, referring to both chapter nine and ten as the highpoint of the author's cultic reasoning and the Everest of the epistle (1973:206). According to Johnsson, the central theme of Hebrews 9-10 is that of blood. The need for and necessity of blood for the purging of defilement is what binds these two chapters together (1973:222-379).

The remainder of this chapter comprises of an exegetical and theological analysis of Hebrews 9. The intent of this chapter is to provide a methodical examination of the author's cultic theology in light of the sacrifice and self-offering of the Son of God. Building on an exegesis of Hebrews 9, the focus will shift from the more abstract to that of direct and personal application of the Christ-event—the relationship of Christ's sacrifice to act of purgation of sin. Simply put, does ἄφεσις carry a profane sense, which is the more common usage in Hellenistic Greek, referring to a *release*, or does it have the more specific cultic nuance of *purgation* (see Ribbens 2016:154-60)?

Hebrews 9 as a whole is organized into four sections: Heb 9.1-10, 9.11-14, 9.15-22, and 9.23-28. The first section explores Israel's sacred space and the cultic activity that occurred within it. The purpose of this cultic survey is to set the stage for the great high priest and his ministry inside the heavenly sanctuary. The discussion of sacred space and cultic worship segues into the second section, with the reader transported from Israel's earthly place of worship to the heavenly sanctuary and divine throne room of God in heaven. Hebrews 9.11-14 displays the theological mastery of the author. Contained in these four verses is a theological masterpiece on Christ's self-offering and atoning work in the heavenly sanctuary. The third section of Hebrews 9 returns again to a discussion on the old covenant, first introduced in Heb 8.8-13, and how the blood of Christ is necessary for the inauguration of the new covenant as predicted in Jeremiah 31. The fourth and final section returns once again to the divine throne room, first introduced in Heb 9.11, and a discussion on the self-offering of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary.

4.4.1 Hebrews 9.1-10

Hebrews 9.1-10 introduces a new pericope and a transition from a discussion regarding the first covenant and its ineffectiveness to a prolonged argument regarding the nature of the Old Testament cult, its regulations for worship, and the transformative Christ-event that inaugurated a new covenant and provided purgation of sin. Although the author concludes his midrash on Jeremiah's new covenant in a rather harsh manner, a la Heb 8.13, he nevertheless returns to the theme of covenant, specifically elements of sacred space and cultic service, by means of a detailed description of the tabernacle and the duties performed therein by the Levitical priesthood (Ellingworth 1993:420).

A number of elements provide a cohesive frame to the discourse unit of 9.1-10. To begin with, the programmatic statement in 9.1 functions as the thesis statement for the argument of 9.2-10. The subject matter of this thesis statement focuses on Israel's stipulations for worship [δικαιώματα λατρείας] and her sacred space [τό…ἅγιον κοσμικόν], which the author will examine in reverse order: first, bringing the reader inside τό ἅγιον κοσμικόν where Israel's sacred appurtenances are housed (9.2-5a), and second, exploring the cultic liturgy of the priesthood within the tabernacle (9.6-10).

A few other linguistic features help provide cohesion within the discourse unit. One such example is found in 9.1 and 9.10, where δικαίωμα functions as an inclusio, thus marking the unit as one coherent paragraph (Heil 2010:213). Another example of cohesion within the discourse unit of 9.2-10 are terms that connect the liturgy of the priests with that of sacred space. These include λατρεία/λατρεύω (9.1, 9) and κατασκευάζω (9.2, 6) (Koester 2001:401). A final example of cohesion between the two sub-units is the "orientation statement" περὶ ὧν οὐκ ἔστιν νῦν λέγειν κατὰ μέρος in 9.5b (Westfall 2005:202). This prepositional phrase simultaneously cuts short the discussion regarding the earthly place of worship and the appurtenances, while also effectively supplying a bridge in the discourse from a discussion of sacred space to the priestly liturgy that takes place within it its boundaries.

4.4.1.1 Hebrews 9.1-5: The Earthly Place of Worship

(1) So now [also][1] the first covenant had regulations for worship as well as an earthly place of worship. (2) For a tent is furnished, the first section, in which resided the lampstand and the table and the bread[2] of the presence. This section is called the Holy Place.[3] (3) But behind the second curtain there is a second section called the Holy of Holies, (4) which contained the golden altar of incense and the ark of the covenant layered with gold on all sides, in which resided a golden jar filled with manna, the rod of Aaron which budded, and the tablets of the covenant. (5) Above the

[1] It is questionable whether καί is part of the original reading of Heb 9.1. καί is included in such manuscripts as ℵ A D, but is absent from the readings in 𝔓46 B and a few other later manuscripts and translations. The presence of καί suggests a close connection with the first covenant and the old order of things, whereas the thrust of Heb 9.1ff is to contrast the old order with the new order that is inaugurated by the Christ-event (Zuntz 2007:209-14; Attridge 1991:230 n.1; Lane 1991:214; see Ellingworth 1993:420 for a discussion on the originality of καί in Heb 9.1).

[2] A few manuscripts add the reading και το χρυσουν θυμιατηριον after ἄρτων (B cop^{fay} eth^{ro} sa^{mss}). This is most likely an attempt to correct the misplacement of the altar of incense within the Holy of Holies as it is represented in 9.4. These same witnesses omit the phrase και το χρυσουν θυμιατηριον in 9.4, leaving only the participle ἔχουσα (B sa^{mss}) (Metzger 1994:598; see Ellingworth 1993:423).

[3] The anarthrous Ἅγια is unique in its usage in Hebrews (Salom 1967:67). This has no doubt led to the divergent readings within the textual history of this verse. The reading Ἅγια, as found in the critical text, has support from ℵ^{2} D^{1} I P K L 0278 33 81 104 630 1241 1505 1739 1881 2464 𝔐. The reading τα αγια is found in Codex B, which conforms to the author of Hebrews' normal usage elsewhere. The reading αγια αγιων finds support in early witnesses like 𝔓46 A and D*. This reading has a significant effect on the meaning of 9.2. Instead of referring to the first tent as the Holy Place, it is a reference to the Holy of Holies. In the critical text of Heb 9.3 the text reads αγια αγιων. This is changed in 𝔓46 to the reading αγια, thus referring to the second tent as the Holy Place.

ark were the cherubim of glory overshadowing the mercy seat. Of these things we cannot at the moment speak in detail.

As noted above, the ninth chapter of Hebrews begins with an announcement of the topics that will be addressed in 9.2-10. This transition to a new discourse unit is marked by the author's use of the explanatory particle μὲν (Denniston 1954:369-74; see Runge 2010:74-76 who labels the discourse feature of μὲν as anticipatory, with the expectation of a related point soon the follow in the discourse). The combination of μὲν οὖν is used both as a marker of transition (see BDF 450.4; 451.1; LN 91.8; Smyth 2901.a-b; see Thrall 1962:34; Neeley 1987:18; Westfall 2005:197 n.22), as well as resumptive in nature, continuing the author's discussion on the nature of the of two covenants in 8.7ff (Ellingworth 1993:420; see Spicq 1953:2.247; Moule 1953:162-63; Attridge 1989:231).

There is some debate as to which occurrence of δέ forms the contrast with μέν in Heb 9.1. The δέ in 9.3 indicates a new development and not a contrast with 9.1 (Ellingworth 1993:424). With regard to the δέ in 9.7, this completes the contrast first marked by μέν in 9.6b. This leaves two final possibilities: 9.6 and 9.11. Some commentators take the δέ in 9.6 as the complement to the contrast begun in 9.1 (Westcott 1903:245; Spicq 1953:2.247; Johnsson 1973:220, 280; Ellingworth 1993:420).[4] Westcott suggests that the liturgical nature of the priesthood corresponds more closely with ἡ πρώτη and the δικαιώματα λατρείας τό τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν, while the δέ in 9.11 introduces a contrast between the old order and its cultic and legal regulations with that of the newly inaugurated Christian order and its spiritual institutions and universal blessings (1903:245).

Although Westcott's interpretation is plausible, it is best to associate the μέν…δέ contrast with Heb 9.11 (Vanhoye 1963:150; Braun 1984:265). First, the transitional statement in 9.5b already marks a smooth transition between the author's discussion regarding sacred space and a description of the liturgy performed daily by the priests and the yearly entry of the high priest into the Holy of Holies on Yom Kippur. Second,

[4] Interestingly, Ellingworth later asserts that the δέ in 9.6 is not contrastive, but rather marks a new development in the argument, (1993:433).

while δέ often marks a contrast between two discourse units, it can equally signal a new development in a discourse, as is the case with the δέ in 9.2 (Runge 2010:31). In light of the cohesive ties that exist in the discourse that confine this unit together as a coherent whole, it is more probable that the contrast that began with μέν in 9.1 is syntactically related with the δέ in 9.11.

Alongside the discourse marker μὲν οὖν, the articular ἡ πρώτη likewise provides cohesion with the previous section by functioning as a hook word (see Guthrie 1998a:100-2. Also referred to as chain-linking or catchwords, see Longenecker 2005; Blomberg and Markley 2010:99). Here, the author's use of a hook word provides cohesion between the discourse units of Heb 8.7-13 and 9.1-10 (see Heil 2010:213; Schreiner 2015:257; Kleinig 2017:416). In Hebrews, πρώτη occurs ten times, all within the main section of the argument of Hebrews (8.1-10.25). The articular ἡ πρώτη in 9.1 shares its meaning with the previous two occurrences in 8.7 and 8.13, both of which modify διαθήκη in 8.6 (*pace* Kleinig 2017:401, who suggests that πρώτη modifies διαθήκη in 9.15). Similarly, In *Homiliae in epistulam ad Hebraeos*, Chrysostom likewise concurs, catechizing: Ἡ πρώτη τίς; Ἡ διαθήκη (PG 63:117b).

The content of the first covenant includes two primary elements: "regulations for worship as well as an earthly place of worship" [Εἶχεν…δικαιώματα λατρείας τό τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν]. The author describes these elements in the past tense by the use of the imperfect Εἶχεν. The imperfect Εἶχεν implies that the liturgy in the temple is ongoing and habitual in nature (see Wallace 1996:548). Whereas in several places in Hebrews sacrificial language is often referred to in the present tense (see Heb 5.1-4; 8.3-5; 9.6-7, 25; 10.1-3; 13.10-11), the use of the imperfect here "betont im linearen Sinn die mit den Kultsatzungen gegebene Grundlage der „ersten" Heilsordnung" (Weiss 1991:450 n.4; see Spicq 1953:2.247). The use of the past tense in describing the liturgical activity of the Levitical cult infers that the old covenant is superseded by the arrival of a new covenant and its new priesthood (Moffatt 1924:112; *pace* Westcott 1903:245).

Fundamental to the Levitical cult are the requirements for how the people were to worship and approach God. This is summed up in the phrase δικαίωμα λατρείας. The term δικαίωμα has several different senses in both the LXX and the New Testament (see Schrenk, *TDNT* 2.219–23). For example, it occurs alongside similar legal terminology and refers to a legal statute (see Gen 26.5; Exod 15.25-26; Num 36.13; Deut 4.1; 4.5-6; 2 Kgs 17.13; Lk 1.6; Rom 2.26). It can also refer more specifically to the law in general (see Num 15.16 [תּוֹרָה]; 2 Macc 2.21; *Det*. 67-68). In Romans and Revelation, δικαίωμα carries the sense of righteous acts (Rom 5.18; Rev 15.4; 19.8).

The genitive λατρείας modifies δικαίωμα and gives specificity to the author's meaning of δικαίωμα in the context of 9.1-10. The first covenant contained ordinances for how the priesthood is to conduct its liturgy within the tabernacle. Ellingworth notes that both the noun [λατρεία] and cognate verbal form [λατρεύω] are used in an exclusively cultic sense in the New Testament (1993:406). The noun λατρεία occurs eight times in the LXX. In Exod 12.25-26, the people are instructed to both keep and to pass on the Passover service [λατρεία]. This same charge is given one chapter over with regard to the feast of unleavened bread, where again the people are reminded of the necessity of keeping this monthly service [λατρεία] (Exod 13.5).

In the New Testament, λατρεία occurs five times. In John 16.2, Jesus foretells the impending end of some of his disciples, which he describes as a service offered to God [λατρείαν προσφέρειν τῷ θεῷ]. The use of λατρεία in close conjunction with another highly cultic term, προσφέρω, clearly indicates a cultic sense of the word λατρεία. Paul uses λατρεία twice in Romans, both of which likewise exhibit a cultic sense. First, In Rom 9.4 λατρεία is listed among the exclusive benefits that belonged to Israel, which also includes "the covenants and the giving of the law" [αἱ διαθῆκαι καὶ ἡ νομοθεσία]. In Rom 12.1, the presentation [παρίστημι] of the body is a living sacrifice to God and an act of spiritual worship [τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν]. The final two occurrences of λατρεία occur here in Hebrews 9. In Heb 9.1, λατρεία has a more generic sense and refers to the codified rules of worship for the people of God. In 9.6, λατρεία has a more definite sense and refers to the activity performed by the

priests within the tabernacle. Taken together, δικαιώματα λατρείας expresses the ongoing cultic activity that occurs within the earthly sanctuary, this includes the design of the tabernacle, the role of the appurtenances, and the ministry of the priesthood, all of which feature prominently in 9.2-10 (Ellingworth 1993:421).

Not only are the people given regulations for how to worship, they were also given an earthly place to live out their liturgical lives. The first covenant's stipulations for worship all took place within a designated area chosen by God to be Israel's sacred space, first in the form of a mobile desert tent, and then later, as a permanent temple building in Jerusalem. The author's use of the singular τό ἅγιον in reference to the entirety of the tabernacle is a unique reading in Hebrews, occurring only here in the homily (Lane 1991:219). In the LXX, τό ἅγιον most commonly refers to the Holy of Holies (see Exod 28.30, 35; 36.3; Lev 16; see Exod 36.3 and Num 3.38 for exceptions to this normal meaning; see Salom 1967:67; Johnsson 1989:42).

The adjective κοσμικός occurs only twice in the New Testament, here in Heb 9.1 and also in Titus 2.16, where the sense of κοσμικός is determined by the noun it modifies [ἐπιθυμίας], thus coloring its meaning to reflect an evil connotation (Titus 2.16; see 2 Clem. 5.6; 17.3). Outside the New Testament, the meaning of κοσμικός is nuanced by its particular context. For example, it can carry the more neutral sense of "worldly," and refer to activities of an earthly manner (T. Jos. 17.8; T. Ab. (A) 7.9; *J.W.* 4.324; Did. 11.11), or it can take on a cosmic meaning as seen in the work of Philo (see *Aet*. 53).

The meaning of κοσμικός in 9.1 is likewise constrained not just by the context in which it appears, but also by the surrounding co-text of Hebrews 8-9 and the contrast that is made between the earthly tent and the tent which resides in heaven. Hebrews 8.2 refers to this tent as the true tent [τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς], one pitched by the Lord and not by man [ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος]. By modifying τό ἅγιον with the attributive adjective κοσμικόν, the author sets up a contrast between the earthly tabernacle and its priesthood with that of the heavenly tabernacle and the high priestly ministry of Christ (Peterson 1982:132). This contrast is perceived in the way the author portrays the heavenly tabernacle as otherworldly. For example, the

heavenly tabernacle is not a product of human hands [χειροποίητος], neither is it a part of God's earthly creation [ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως] (9.11, 24). Instead, this otherworldly tabernacle appears to be the very throne room of God in heaven [εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν] (9.24; see 4.14; 6.19-20; 10.19).

After offering his thesis statement in Heb 9.1, the author provides by way of a single, complex sentence a brief catalogue of the temple vessels and their placement within the tabernacle in 9.2-5. This sentence consists of the main verb κατεσκευάσθη and the appositional ἡ πρώτη, followed by two relative clauses listing the contents and status of the Holy Place (9.2). This is followed in 9.3-4 by two participial clauses and a third relative clause. Similar to the relative clauses in 9.2, these two participial clauses mark the status of the Holy of Holies and provide details of the contents within. The relative clause in 9.4b provides further information regarding the contents of the ark of the covenant. The author completes his sentence with a prepositional phrase depicting the presence of cherubim above the ark (9.5a). Alongside the elevated style of 9.2-5, some commentators have also suggested a chiastic structure for these verses. Ellingworth identifies the following chiastic outline of 9.2-5 (1993:422):

A	Contents of outer tabernacle	2a
A'	Contents of inner tabernacle	4-5
B	Name of outer tabernacle	2b
B'	Name of inner tabernacle	3b
C	Curtain between the two	3a

Table 4-1: Chiastic Outline of 9.2-5

The author of Hebrews views the earthly place of worship as one unified structure. This is clear from the author's use of the articular τό ἅγιον in 9.1 to refer to the entirety of the sanctuary without any reference to its various parts (Spicq 1953:2.248; see Westcott 1903:246; Young 1981:198). With the introduction of the earthly tabernacle in Heb 9.1, the author weaves in and out of the various parts of the tabernacle, discussing both its sums as well as its parts. The earthly tent is partitioned into two parts. The first section [ἡ πρώτη], the Holy Place, is the location

of regular priestly activity, the place where the priests perform their regular duties (9.6). This most likely consists of maintaining the oil for the lamps and the weekly changing of bread upon the table (Lev 24.1-9; see Kleinig 2017:423). The second section [τὸ δεύτερον], which is separated from the first by means of a curtain [καταπέτασμα], is where the presence of God resides. Entrance into this section is prohibited for all, except for the high priest and that once a year on the Day of Atonement (9.7-8).

The author's designation of these two sacred spaces as Ἅγια (9.2) and Ἅγια Ἁγίων (9.3) have led to a number of interpretive difficulties. As noted above, the unique reading of Ἅγια in 9.2 led to the introduction of several variant readings within the textual history Hebrews 9.2 and 9.3 (see footnote 3 above for manuscript evidence). One solution to this conundrum is the addition of the article τὰ before Ἅγια. The addition of the article is most likely an attempt by the copyist to conform the reading Ἅγια with the other occurrences in Hebrews. For example, in 9.11-12 Christ enters through [διὰ] the greater and more perfect tent [τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς] and into the Holy Place [εἰς τὰ ἅγια].[5] In 9.24-25, Christ enters a holy place not made with hands [εἰς χειροποίητα εἰσῆλθεν ἅγια], but into heaven itself [ἀλλ' εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν). This one-time event stands in stark contrast with the Levitical high priest's yearly (κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν) entrance into the Holy Place (εἰς τὰ ἅγια).[6] Lastly, Heb 13.11 refers to the discarding of animal carcasses after their blood is brought into the Holy Place (εἰς τὰ ἅγια) by the high priest as a sacrifice for sins (περὶ ἁμαρτίας).

The textual history of Ἅγια Ἁγίων in 9.3 is not as complex as that of 9.2, with the only significant difference being the placement of the article.[7] The reading Ἅγια Ἁγίων is a transliteration of the Hebrew קֹדֶשׁ הַקֳּדָשִׁים, which occurs six times with reference to the Holy of Holies (Exod 26.33; 1 Kgs 8.6; Ezek 41.4; 1 Chr 6.34; 2 Chr 3.10; 5.7).

[5] One manuscript contains the reading των αγιων after ἅγια (P).

[6] The reading των αγιων is found after ἅγια in א^{2} and sa^{mss}.

[7] The reading αγια των αγιων is attested to in P 1739. The reading τα αγια των αγιων is found in א^{2} B D2 K L 0278 1241 1505. As mentioned already above, 𝔓^{46} reverses the readings of 9.2 and 9.3, with αγια αγιων now the reading in 9.2, and αγια the reading in 9.3.

The reading Ἅγια Ἁγίων itself is found ten times in the LXX, none of which function as a *terminus technicus* for the Holy of Holies. In the absence of a definitive example of Ἅγια Ἁγίων referring to the Adytum in the LXX stands a number of other uses where the adjective ἅγιος is employed by the translators of the LXX as a *terminus technicus* for the inner most sanctum. One such example is the transliteration of קֹדֶשׁ הַקָּדָשִׁים as τοῦ ἁγίου τῶν ἁγίων or ἁγίου τῶν ἁγίων (Exod 26.33; 2 Chr 3.8; 3 Kgdms 7.36). Another such reference to the Holy of Holies is the articular τὸ ἅγιον, used exclusively for the inner shrine room in the narration of Yom Kippur in Leviticus 16.

The description and arrangement of the appurtenances as outlined in 9.2-5a are essentially taken from the accounts of Exodus 25-26 and Lev 24.1-9 (Spicq 1953:2.248). Each vessel mentioned by the author of Hebrews serves a specific function in the daily ministry and maintenance of the tabernacle. While the placement and function of these cultic instruments are essential elements of the old covenant, the author of Hebrews spends no more than a brief moment identifying each of the vessels that were housed within tabernacle. This cursory overview of the sacred instruments has led some scholars to suggest a symbolic meaning for the appurtenances inside the tabernacle.

One such example of a symbolic interpretation of the sacred vessels is found in the writings of Josephus. As mentioned in chapter two of this thesis, Josephus views the tabernacle and its furnishings as symbols of the created universe, giving cosmic meaning to the sum and its parts (see *Ant*. 3.180). In his lengthy description of the tabernacle, Josephus includes a rather detailed catalogue of the appurtenances housed inside (*Ant*. 3.139-50). Notable are his interpretations of some of these vessels. According to Josephus, the cherubs affixed to the top of the mercy seat are copies of the cherubs upon the throne of God which Moses saw in a vision (*Ant*. 3.137). A little while later, Josephus assigns a cosmic meaning to the golden lampstand, with each branch representing the sun and its planets (*Ant*. 3.144-46; *Ant*. 3.182; see *J.W*. 5.217). In *Ant*. 3.182, Josephus likens the twelve loaves of bread on the table to the twelve months in a year (see *J.W*. 5.217). Even the

materials used to sew together the tapestries are given a rather elaborate cosmic interpretation of earthly elements (*Ant*. 3.183-84; see *J.W*. 5.212-14).

One also finds the same affinity towards a cosmic meaning for the temple appurtenances in the writings of Philo. With regard to the ark of the covenant, the two cherubim upon the ark symbolize the two hemispheres above and under the earth (*Mos*. 2.98). He goes on to give an allegorical interpretation of these two angelic beings as representatives of God's creative and kingly attributes, symbolized by the names *God* and *Lord* (*Mos*. 2.99-100). The vessels inside the Holy Place also take on cosmic symbolism. For example, the altar of incense represented the elements of earth and water. The symbolism of the golden lampstand is that of the sun and its planets, matching the cosmic reading shared by Josephus. And lastly, the north-facing table and bread of the presence are meant to represent the north facing winds (*Mos*. 2.101-4).

A more modern example of a symbolic reading is found in the novel interpretation of Heb 9.2 offered by Swetnam. In an attempt to read the Eucharist tradition into 9.2, Swetnam argues that the relative clause ἥτις λέγεται Ἅγια refers back to its nearest antecedent, ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων, which in turns allows for a possible translation of Heb 9.2 along the following lines: "which is called (i.e. the bread of the presence) *Holy*" (1970:205-221). While Swetnam's proposal is grammatically possible, contextually it falls short of the argument of Hebrew 9. The relative pronoun functions in a similar fashion as the participial phrase ἡ λεγομένη Ἅγια Ἁγίων in 9.2, which identifies the second part of the tabernacle, which is behind the curtain, as the Holy of Holies. In order to adopt the reading of Swetnam one must break with the context and the structure of Hebrews 9. In these verses the author is very organized and calculated in the way he lays out his description of the tabernacle and its various vessels, and unfortunately Swetnam's novel reading fails to take the overall argumentation of 9.2-5 into account.

For the author of Hebrews, cosmic or allegorical interpretations of the appurtenances were of no benefit to his theological argument (Hughes 1977:318). This lack of interest is given prominence in the prepositional phrase found in 9.5b (Westfall 2005:205). This rather terse transitional phrase highlights the author's lack of interest

in the temple instruments along with any attempt at deciphering some sort of cosmic or spiritual meaning. Johnsson rightly concludes that the author of Hebrews does not engage in any sort of spiritualized or allegorized exegesis of the tabernacle and its vessels. In fact, the author has no concern with showing any similarities between the earthly tabernacle and its heavenly counterpart, or with trying to ascertain a homiletical application of each vessel to the work of Christ (Johnsson 1973:276).

While it is no doubt probable that the cosmic significance attached to the tabernacle was understood by the author of Hebrews, the author does not entertain for himself such an interpretation in his exposition of the tabernacle and appurtenances. Instead, the author of Hebrews moves his discussion entirely along Old Testament cultic terms and themes, attaching a literal meaning in his description of Israel's sacred space and cultic vessels (Ellingworth 1993:431; see Attridge 1989:238). The brief taxonomy in 9.2-5 of sacred vessels within the tabernacle is designed in such a way as to establish the context of 9.6-10. For the author of Hebrews, the daily liturgy performed by the Levitical priesthood within the earthly place of worship is symbolic of the present age, and as long as it continued, entry into the holy places remained inaccessible.

4.4.1.2 Hebrews 9.6-10: The Priesthood and Regulations for Worship

> *(6) Now, with these preparations having thus been made, the priests go regularly into the first section in order to perform their ritual duties, (7) but into the second section the high priest enters alone, and only once a year, and not without blood, which he offers for himself and for the unintentional sins of the people. (8) In this way the Holy Spirit indicates that the way into the holy places has not yet been revealed so long as the first section is still standing (9) (which is symbolic for the present age). According to this arrangement, gifts and sacrifices are offered which are unable to perfect the conscience of the worshipper, (10) but relate only food and drink and various furnishings, regulations[8] for the body imposed until the time of reformation.*

Hebrews 9.6 marks the beginning of a single sentence that stretches through 9.10. This sentence—or period (Young 1981:200; Lane 1991:216)—centers on the role

[8] The reading βαπτισμοῖς, δικαιώματα, which is the reading in critical text, has the support of $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ ℵ* A I P 0278. 33. 81. 104. 1739. 1881. 2464 b sa Didymus^{vid} Cyril. The reading και δικαιωμασιν is found in D^1 K L 365. 630. 1241. 1505 $\mathfrak{M}$ ar vg sy^h. This reading is most likely due to δικαιώματα assimilating to the preceding datives βρώμασιν καὶ πόμασιν καὶ διαφόροις βαπτισμοῖς. The reading και δικαιωματα that is found in ℵ^2 and B is due to a scribal conflation and "provides no satisfactory sense" (Metzger 1994:598; see Ellingworth 1993:444).

and rituals of the Levitical priesthood within sacred space (9.6-7) and the interpretation of this priestly activity by the Holy Spirit as a parable for the present age (9.8-10). As previously mentioned, these five verses contain the author's explanation of the "regulations for worship" [δικαιώματα λατρείας] cited in 9.1. Along with this, 9.6-10 also sets the stage for the *synkrisis* between the old covenant sacrifices and the sacrificial offering of Christ within the heavenly tabernacle that begins in 9.11 (Johnson 2006:216, 218).

Structurally, Heb 9.6-10 is a single sentence consisting of twelve clauses. The period is divided into two antithetical parts, with each part introduced by a genitive absolute (9.6 and 9.8). The first part (9.6-7), introduced by Τούτων δὲ οὕτως κατεσκευασμένων, includes a number of important juxtapositions that are tightly held together by the μὲν…δὲ construction. These contrasts include multiple priests [οἱ ἱερεῖς] versus one high priest [ὁ ἀρχιερεύς]; continuous entry [διὰ παντὸς] versus a single entry [ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ]; and open access [τὰς λατρείας ἐπιτελοῦντες] versus the necessity of blood for entry [οὐ χωρὶς αἵματος] (Cortez 2006:536). It is also in 9.7 that the author introduces the Day of Atonement sacrifice and the procession of the high priest into the Holy of Holies. As will become clear as this study progresses, the theme of Yom Kippur and its typology forms the backbone upon which the author constructs his sacrificial theology and high priestly Christology (Thompson 2008:183).

In the second section of the period (9.8-10), once again introduced by a genitive absolute [τοῦτο δηλοῦντος τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου], the discussion turns from the historical events of Yom Kippur to one that is focused on the spiritual significance of these historical events. In 9.8, the Holy Spirit's interpretation of the priestly procession into the holy places is one of failure, a failure of the first covenant to deal *in toto* with the problem of sin and its failure to provide direct access to God for all people. In these three verses the author offers his illustration [παραβολή] of the two sections of the sanctuary as a representation of the present age.

While the first covenant is able to deal with regulations of the flesh [σαρκὸς], through food, drink, and various kinds of furnishings [βρώμασιν καὶ πόμασιν καὶ διαφόροις βαπτισμοῖς], it lacks the ability to cleanse the inner part of humanity which remains

tainted with sin and in need of decisive purgation (Johnsson 1973:227-379). Here humanity remains until the time of reformation [μέχρι καιροῦ διορθώσεως ἐπικείμενα], the time in which God returns and forever does away with the power and corruption of sin. While the institutions of the old covenant are established by God to assist in the purgation of sin, they nevertheless are limited in their ability to provide full and total purgation of sin.

As noted above, Heb 9.7 introduces for the first time Yom Kippur typology and the high priest's yearly procession into the Adytum. Although the author hinted at this important event as early as Heb 1.3, it is not until here in chapter nine that he unpacks the significance and implications theological of this imagery and its relationship to the sacrifice of Christ and his subsequent entry into the heavenly sanctuary. In order to provide context for the author's sacrificial theology and high priestly Christology, the following brief overview of Leviticus 16 and Yom Kippur is provided below.

Yom Kippur stands as the apex of Israel's holy days and the *sine qua non* of its sacred liturgy. On this sacred day, while the people anxiously gather outside the tabernacle, the high priest would make his yearly entrance into the Holy of Holies, and through a cloud of incense sprinkle the blood of the sacrifice upon the mercy seat. Leviticus 16 is arranged into four sections: the preparation rites (16.3-10); the high priest's entrance into the Holy of Holies and the purification of the tabernacle and altar (16.11-19); the releasing of the scapegoat into the wilderness (16.20-22); and the closing rites (16.23-28) (Stökl 2003:28-33). The chapter finishes with directions for when Yom Kippur is to be observed, along with directions for future high priests (16.29-34).

The necessity of Yom Kippur is two-fold. First, due to the buildup of sin and ritual impurity the tabernacle incurred throughout the year, the sanctity of God's dwelling place is endangered and if left unchecked would lead to God's departure from the tabernacle (Wenham 1979:228; Milgrom 1991:258; Kleinig 2003:346; see Ezek 5.11; 8.6). Milgrom remarks that Israel's transgressions led to the accumulation of impurity that attached itself to the sanctuary, which in turn led to the pollution of Israel's sacred space. The purging of the sanctuary lies at the heart of Yom Kippur, with the manipulation of blood acting as the purifying agent that purges the sanctuary of its

ritual and moral pollution (Milgrom 1991:1033; *pace* Greenberg 30-32, 51-91). The seriousness of this matter is encapsulated well in the warning of R. Simeon: “More grievous is imparting uncleanness to the sanctuary and its Holy Things than all the other transgressions which are listed in the Torah” (t. Šebu. 1.3).

The second issue addressed by Yom Kippur is the removal of sin and ritual uncleanness from the people. This removal of sin and impurity is facilitated by means of a scapegoat. As the representative of the people, the high priest places his hands upon the goat while confessing the corporate guilt of Israel, thus transferring the sin and impurity built up over the past year to the goat. This confession of sin is immediately followed by the goat’s release into the wilderness to Azazel. While the various sacrifices proscribed in Leviticus 1-7 were effective in their ability to provide temporary purification and atonement for individual sin, these were only meant for ritual impurities and unintentional sin. Yom Kippur is established in order to remove the defilement that attached itself to the tabernacle due to unconfessed sin and impurity.

While it is clear the author of Hebrews incorporates Yom Kippur into the argument of Hebrews 9, nevertheless, the integration of Yom Kippur typology into Hebrews 9 is incomplete and missing some key aspects that shape this important ritual (see Cortez 2006:528-29). The author of Hebrews highlights only one element of Yom Kippur liturgy in 9.6-10, that of the necessity of blood (9.7b). The high priest is permitted to enter the Holy of Holies once a year, and with him he took blood as an offering for himself and for the unintentional sins of the people [ὃ προσφέρει ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ] (9.7c). Although the author of Hebrews does not elaborate on the purpose of blood, the use of the cultic προσφέρω alludes back to εἰσφέρω and the account of Yom Kippur in Leviticus 16 and fills in the missing details regarding the manipulation of blood on and in front of the mercy seat (see Lev 16.14-15). It is probable that instead of omitting these important elements of Yom Kippur, the author of Hebrews’ use of litotes and emphatic insistence upon blood is meant to be taken as a synecdoche for the entire ritual act. What is clear in the argument of Hebrews 9 is the necessity of blood for the atonement of sin and the purgation of the heavenly tabernacle (see Lev 17.11; b. Yoma 5a).

4.5 Conclusion

The intent of this chapter was to provide the context necessary for addressing the issue of how the sacrifice of Christ on the cross connects to author of Hebrews' theology of a heavenly sanctuary. The author's brief survey of the earthly tabernacle and its appurtenances in 9.2-5 situates sacred space within a temporal setting and negates any attempts of an allegorical or spiritual exegesis of the earthly τό ἅγιον and its various sacred vessels, à la the cosmic reading of Philo and Josephus, and the liturgical reading of Swetnam. A temporal reading of the earthly sanctuary is important for later exegesis of passages that speak of Christ's entry into the heavenly sanctuary and his offering for atonement.

In Heb 9.6-10, the author of Hebrews' introduces into his discourse the theme of Yom Kippur by means of highlighting the regulations for worship which were abided by the Levitical priests upon entering sacred space. The structure of 9.6-10 highlights the discontinuity that exists between the daily, on-going service of the multitude of priests and their access to sacred space, with that of the yearly access and service of the high priest inside the Holy of Holies. For the author of Hebrews, the Day of Atonement functions as a parable for the present age in which access to the holy places is prohibited while the first section still stands. As long as the present age is operative, the ability for accessing the holy places remains blocked for the people of God.

Perhaps the most important concept introduced in 9.1-10 is the necessity of blood within the cultic experience of worship and service. As will be examined in more detail in the following chapter, blood serves as the medium for access to God. In the Old Testament, access came by means of the sacrificial blood of animals. While the blood of animals is effective in its own right and guaranteed the continued presence of God among his people, it nevertheless was unable to eradicate fully the stain of sin and ritual impurity. Further, the presence of blood is necessary for the inauguration of the old covenant. Its purpose is to purify the sanctuary and related vessels, along with the people, so that they could be used in the service of God. The importance of blood comes to a head in the so-called blood rule in 9.22. The medium of blood is vital for both the sanctification of objects and people for service to God, as well as for the removal of sin and ritual impurity. Without the medium of blood, there

is neither access to God nor a means of purgation of sin (Kuma 2012:272). The necessity of blood, as evidenced in the important role it plays in the cleansing from ritual impurity and covenant inauguration, is one of the central cohesive ties that binds the chapter together as a coherent unit of discourse.

Hebrews 9.1-10 also serves an important role in the development of the argument of Hebrews 9 by providing the Old Testament context for the Day of Atonement ritual. The contextual background of Yom Kippur in turn provides the requisite typology needed in order to connect the Levitical cult to the sacrificial work of Christ within the heavenly sanctuary and its application to the purgation of sin. These ten verses not only provide a brief historical survey of Israel's sacred space and the role of the priesthood, they also align the cultic ministry of Christ within the confounds of Israel's theology of sacred space and cultic ritual. Although there is a denigration of the Old Testament cult and priesthood, it is not entirely depreciated, serving as a sign of good things to come (Johnsson 1973:289-90). This grounding of the cultic work of Christ within Old Testament theology is significant, given the author of Hebrews' prolonged discussion of the superiority of Christ over all that defined Israel's regulations for worship and sacred space.

In the next chapter, the focus shifts from the earthly place of worship to that of the heavenly sanctuary. The exegesis of Heb 9.1-10, with its emphasis on the necessity of blood, plays a foundational part in each of the major sections that follow, particularly the function blood plays in providing a cohesive theme that runs through the entire ninth chapter of Hebrews, climaxing with the blood rule in 9.22. As will be seen, this verse serves as a summary of 9.11-21 as well as a bridge for the discussion of the cleansing of the heavenly tabernacle (9.23ff). While the old covenant and its cult provides a temporary purgation from sin and defilement, a purgation that only went as deep as the flesh, what is needed is a total cleansing able penetrate into the inner person and provide a definitive purgation of the conscience. It is this promise of the good things to come that will be the focus of the following chapter.

CHAPTER 5

Exegetical and Theological Analysis: Hebrews 9.11-28

5.1 Introduction

The focus of the present chapter is to address the question of how the death of Christ on the cross relates to the offering he presents within the heavenly sanctuary and its relationship to the purgation of sin. In the previous chapter, the historical context of the tabernacle, its appurtenances, and the ministry of the Levitical priesthood were discussed with the aim of providing a foundation upon which an examination of the priestly work of Christ can be analyzed in greater detail. As seen in the latter half of Heb 9.1-10, the events of Yom Kippur are construed as a parable, with access to the holy places barred while the present age is still operative (9.8-9). As will be discussed in more detail below, the events surrounding the life of the historical Jesus, which ultimately led to his crucifixion, are the catalyst for the inauguration of the eschaton, and with this inauguration came unlimited access to the very presence of God (4.16; 6.19-20; 10.19-22).

A key motivation for this chapter is to challenge the common misconception that when Hebrews uses cultic terminology associated with the act of atonement he is referring exclusively to the cross and the death of Christ. One of the more prevalent misconceptions in Hebrews centers on the authors use of blood and its cultic significance. Outside of Heb 2.14 and 12.4, blood [αἷμα] is used in a cultic context of sacrificial death, either with regard to livestock (9.7, 12-13, 18-22, 25; 10.4; 11.28; 13.11) or with respect to death of Christ (9.12, 14; 10.19, 29; 12.24; 13.12, 20).

Traditionally, the use of blood in Hebrews has often been taken as a metaphor for Christ's death. For example, Stibbs relates the blood of Christ with his death as a "true sin-offering" (1970:26-27). Stott, in no uncertain terms, is clear that whatever

the author of Hebrews means by Christ's blood, it is most certainly in reference Calvary (1962:64). Referring to the uniqueness of Christ's sacrifice as it relates to his blood, Hughes writes, "[t]he preciousness of the blood of Christ inheres not in the physical blood as such but in the perfection of the unique sacrifice of himself which he offered and of which the precious blood is a synonym (1977:334; see Peterson 1982:138). Attridge, although entertaining the possibility that Christ's blood represents his life offered to God, nevertheless concludes that a metaphorical reference to the death of Jesus is more likely (1989:248). Similarly, Ellingworth correctly perceives of blood as the "principle of life," but rather than Jesus offering this *life* to God upon entering the heavenly sanctuary, Ellingworth locates Jesus's offering on the cross, effectively turning blood into a metaphor for Jesus's death (1993:456). Cockerill likewise refers to the blood of Jesus in metaphorical language, with the shed blood a reference to Christ's obedient self-offering on the cross (2012:397). Lastly, Schreiner similarly refers to Jesus's blood as a metaphor for his death, noting that the offering of blood is synonymous with Christ's willingness to surrender his life in death for his people (2015:268; see Mitchell 2007:183).

Although it will be argued in this chapter that blood refers not to Jesus's death but to the life he offers to God in the heavenly sanctuary, such a conclusion does not suggest that the death of Jesus is insignificant in the author's theological argument. The author of Hebrews does in fact allude to Jesus's death three times in his writing: 9.15, 9.28, and 13.12. In 9.15, the death of Jesus is necessary for the inauguration of the new covenant and redemption from transgression committed under the first covenant. The reference to Jesus's death in 9.28 is implied from the maxim of in 9.27, where death and judgment go hand in hand. The final reference to Jesus's death, Heb 13.12, is tied directly to the disposal of the corpse at the end of Yom Kippur. While the death of Jesus is important for the author's theology of the atonement, the death of Jesus itself is not the *sine qua non* of his cultic theology.

Therefore, if the cross of Christ is not the means that procures redemption, nor the place where atonement is achieved, what significance does the cross of Christ then have in the cultic theology of Hebrews? Moffitt sums up the important role the cross plays in the argument of Hebrews, affirming that the death of Christ "is *both* the chief example of how God's people should faithfully endure suffering, *and* the event that

triggers the process that results in [Jesus] being qualified to offer his indestructible life to God" (2011:220, emphasis in original; see Nelson 2003:253-55). The remainder of this chapter will attempt to illustrate how Hebrews 9 does in fact support Moffitt's claim that the death of Christ is the match that lit the flame of atonement. What follows is an exegetical analysis that addresses not only the questions of *when* and *where* the atonement took place, it also addresses the relationship between the Christ-event and purgation of sin. Does Hebrews apply the death and sacrifice of Christ to the forgiveness of sin, or is Christ's offering for sin a purgation from the defilement of sin? These questions will be taken up and answered below.

5.2 Hebrews 9.11-14

For some commentators, Heb 9.11 represents the highpoint of the author's homily (Lane 1991:235; Weiss 1991:462; Ellingworth 1993:445; Gräßer 1993:2.142; Koester 2001:411; Gäbel 2006:283). According the Vanhoye, when arriving at Heb 9.11 the reader finds oneself at the epicenter of the entire homily. Vanhoye insists that the author's use of Χριστός ἀρχιερεύς is deliberate and functions as the cornerstone of the entire structure of Hebrews (1989:36, 40a-b). Whether one agrees or disagrees with Vanhoye's summation, what can be delineated are the boundaries of Heb 9.11-28. This pericope forms one discourse unit that is divided into three distinct sections: 9.11-14; 9.15-22; 9.23-28. At the macro-level, 9.11-28 is marked by an inclusio that centers on the two appearances of Christ in 9.11 and 9.28. In 9.11, Christ arrives at the heavenly sanctuary as high priest to put away sin once and for all; whereas in 9.28, Christ emerges from the heavenly sanctuary not to deal with sin, but to save those who eagerly wait for his return (Guthrie 1998a:86-87).

The first section, Heb 9.11-14, marks the transition from a discussion of the earthly place of worship and its related cult to that of the heavenly sanctuary and the cultic work of the Melchizedekian high priest. Along with introducing the heavenly locale of Christ's sacrifice, 9.11 also introduces Christ into the discourse as a participant by means of the anarthrous Χριστός and the participle παραγενόμενος (Levinsohn 2000:134, 150). Whereas the cultic institutions and sacred space of the old covenant

are unable to offer little more than external cleansing from the impurities of sin (9.9-10, 13; see 10.1-4), the one-time offering of Christ within the heavenly sanctuary has provided the necessary sacrifice to put an end to the defiling power of sin once and for all (9.12,14, 26b; see 10.10-14, 18). In contrast to the earthly tabernacle the priests enter to offer sacrifices, Christ enters into a tent [σκηνῆς] that is far better [μείζονος], more perfect [τελειοτέρας], and one that is not made with human hands, and thus not of this creation [οὐ χειροποιήτου, τοῦτ' ἔστιν οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως]. The contrast with the earthly place of worship also touches on the nature of the sacrifice. Instead of an offering from the blood of goats and calves [αἵματος τράγων καὶ μόσχων], or the blood of bulls and the sprinkling of ashes from a heifer [τὸ αἷμα τράγων καὶ ταύρων καὶ σποδὸς δαμάλεως ῥαντίζουσα], the sacrifice that brings complete and total purgation is the blood of Christ, which he offers through the eternal spirit [τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃς διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου ἑαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν].

In Heb 9.15-22 the focus shifts from that of cultic sacrifice to one of covenant inauguration. This shift facilitates a return to the subject of the new covenant first introduced in Heb 8.6, which is backgrounded in 9.1 in favor of Yom Kippur. The shift is marked textually in 9.15 by the emphatic compound conjunction διὰ τοῦτο, which functions cataphorically (Westfall 2005:206-07; *pace* Deibler 2017:143 who takes διὰ τοῦτο as anaphoric, referring back to 9.12). The reference to Christ as mediator of a better covenant [διαθήκης καινῆς μεσίτης ἐστίν] in 9.15 echoes 8.6 (see 7.22), further solidifying a return to the topic of the new covenant. The use of the emphatic ὅθεν οὐδὲ in 9.18 not only marks the beginning of the conclusion to the discourse unit of 9.15-22 (Westfall 2005:208), it also relates to the preceding discussion regarding the nature of the διαθήκη and its relationship with the death of Christ (Ellingworth 1993:465). Once again, the necessity of blood is highlighted, this time with reference to covenant inauguration (9.18). The importance of blood in the inauguration of the covenant in 9.18-22 provides a cohesive tie with the previous two discourse units of 9.1-10 and 9.11-14, and again relays to the reader the necessity for blood and the important role that it has in both the old and new covenant.

Hebrews 9.22-28 sees the author return once again to the theme of Yom Kippur and the priestly ministry of Christ. This final discourse unit of chapter nine expands on Heb 9.22 and the so-called blood rule. The author of Hebrews provides cohesion between 9.22 and 9.23ff in a few specific ways. First, the author marks cohesion by means of the inferential conjunction οὖν in 9.23. The conjunction οὖν not only provides cohesion, it also indicates the beginning of a new paragraph as well (Westfall 2005:211; Deibler 2017:143).[1] A second element of cohesion is the repetition of καθαρίζω in 9.22 and 9.24. The recurrence of καθαρίζω functions in the discourse as a hook word, connecting the sub-units of 9.15-22 and 9.23-28 together, thus providing coherence in the discourse (Guthrie 1998a:102-4). A final way in which the author of Hebrews provides cohesion is seen in the manner in which 9.22 introduces the topics of 9.23-28 but in reverse order, similar to 9.1.

5.2.1 Hebrews 9.11-12

(11) But when Christ arrived as high priest of the good things to come,[2] through the greater and more perfect tent (not made of human hands, that is, not of this creation) (12) he entered once for all into the holy places[3], not with the blood of goats and calves, but with his own blood, thus securing and eternal redemption.

---

[1] In his structural analysis of Hebrews 9, Vanhoye includes 9.23 with the preceding sub-unit of 9.15-22 (Vanhoye 1963:154). The difficulty with taking 9.23 with the prior sub-unit is how to account for the explanatory γὰρ in 9.24. In 9.24, the author of Hebrews is further elaborating on the heavenly things in 9.23.

[2] The reading of the critical text [τῶν γενομένων ἀγαθῶν] and the variant reading των μελλοντων αγαθων both have strong manuscript support. γενομένων by itself is found in 𝔓46 (γεναμενων; see MHT 1.51; 2.213) B D* 1739 syr^{p,h}. The reading μελλοντων is found in ℵ A D^{2} I^{vid} 0278 33 𝔐. Although the external evidence for both readings are almost equal in terms of their support, the internal evidence suggests that the reading which is found in the critical text is most likely the original reading. Contextually, the "good things that have come" [τῶν γενομένων ἀγαθῶν] is a direct response to 9.10 and the promised time of reformation. In Heb 9.11, the author moves from promise to fulfillment. Everything that is foreshadowed in the old covenant and its cult finds its fulfillment in the Christ-event, which is the main point of 9.11ff. The reading των μελλοντων αγαθων implies that while some benefits have been experienced by believers in the present, the culmination of their salvation still awaits its completion at the return of Christ (Montefiore 1964:151). One possible cause for the inclusion of μέλλω is the author's frequent use of the word elsewhere in the homily (1.14; 2.5; 6.5; 8.5; 10.1, 27; 11.8, 20; 13.14; see Buchanan 2006:272). The most likely cause of μελλοντων finding its way into the reading in 9.11 is due to scribal assimilation with the similar reading found in 10.1, where the law is described as a shadow [σκιά] of the coming good things [των μελλοντων αγαθων] and not the reality itself (see Cody 1960:138-41; Attridge 1989:244 n.1; Ellingworth 1993:449-50; Metzger 1994:598; Zuntz 2007:119; Kleinig 2017:411).

[3] One manuscript (P) adds the reading των αγιων after τὰ ἅγια.

Hebrews 9.1-10 closes with the anticipation of the coming time of reformation [καιροῦ διορθώσεως]. In 9.11, this promised time of reformation appears upon the stage of salvation history with the arrival of Christ, the high priest of the good things that have come [ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν γενομένων ἀγαθῶν]. The arrival of Christ sets into motion the last days which the author of Hebrews introduced in exordium of his homily (1.3: ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων; see 9.26). Beginning in Heb 9.11 and moving through the remainder of the chapter, the author focuses his attention towards the priestly work of Christ within the heavenly sanctuary. This is especially the case in 9.11-14 and 9.23-28, where the focus is on the priestly ministry of Christ and the nature of his once-for-all sacrifice and the effects that spring from his offering, particularly purgation of sin. It is here in Heb 9.11 that answers begin to take shape regarding the question of *where* Christ's atonement occurred and its application to the problem of human sin.

Hebrews 9.11 marks an important temporal contrast in salvation history with respect to the means of atonement, between the liturgy of the Levitical cult in 9.1-10 and the priestly work of the Melchizedekian high priest in Heb 9.11-28 (Lane 1991:236). This contrast is signaled by the adversative conjunction δέ, which marks a topic shift in the discourse while also forming the second half of the μέν…δέ construction that began in 9.1 (Westfall 2005:199; see Michel 1957:201-2; Young 1981:202; Braun 1984:265; Lane 1991:229; Deibler 2017:138; *pace* Spicq 1953:2.247; Johnsson 1973:220, 280; Miller 1988:251; Ellingworth 1993:420; Buchanan 2006:259-60). A further marker of transition is the fronted anarthrous Χριστός, which is emphatic and reintroduces Christ into the discourse for the first time since Heb 5.5 (see Levinsohn 2000:150 on the function of anarthrous names). Within the discourse unit of 9.11-28, Χριστός occurs three more times: 9.14, 9.24 and 9.28, all in connection with the offering of Christ within the heavenly sanctuary.

The appellation "Christ" is appended to another familiar title, that of high priest [ἀρχιερεύς]. In Hebrews, Jesus is referred to as high priest no less than ten times, with the more generic title of priest [ἱερεύς] occurring four times. The significance here in 9.11 is the coupling of these two titles together. This coupling matches a

similar designation in Leviticus, where the high priest is referred to as “the anointed priest” [הַכֹּהֵן הַמָּשִׁיחַ / ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ κεχρισμένος; ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ χριστὸς]. For example, in the discussion of the *ḥaṭṭaʾt* sacrifice in Leviticus 4, it is the responsibility of the anointed priest [ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ χριστὸς] to bring the blood of the *ḥaṭṭaʾt* offering into the tent of meeting to procure purification for the unintentional sins of the priests and the people (Lev 4.3, 5, 16; see 6.15[LXX]). In the New Testament, the titular Christ is normally associated with divine sonship (see Matt 16.16; Mark 1.1; Luke 4.41; John 11.27; Rom 1.4; 1 Cor 1.9). This association is also found in Heb 3.6, where the author refers to Christ as a faithful Son over God’s house. However, the more common use of Christ in Hebrews is in association with his office of high priest, of which Heb 9.11 is the summit of such a use in the whole of the homily (Kleinig 2017:158).

Further contrast with Heb 9.1-10 is found in the author’s description of the heavenly tabernacle as “greater” and “more perfect”, not made by human hands and not part of this creation [τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς οὐ χειροποιήτου, τοῦτ’ ἔστιν οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως]. Unlike the earthly tabernacle, which is divided into two sections, the Ἅγια and Ἅγια Ἁγίων, with access limited to the Levitical priesthood, when Christ arrived as high priest of the good things that have come [Χριστὸς δὲ παραγενόμενος ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν γενομένων ἀγαθῶν], sacred space is transformed and access is granted to all through the sacrifice of Christ (Heb 4.16; 10.19-22; 11.6; see John 14.6; Rom 5.1-12; Eph 3.12; 2 Pet 3.18). An important question is introduced here with regard to Christ’s arrival: is the arrival of Christ as high priest a reference to the earthly ministry of Jesus, or does his arrival refer to his entrance into the heavenly sanctuary?

As noted above in section 4.3, one of the main concerns of this thesis centers around the timing of Christ’s installation to the office of high priest. The structure of Hebrews 9.11-12, one complex sentence in Greek, outlines the progression of events surrounding Christ’s movement towards his installation as high priest. The following sentence flow diagram illustrates the nature of Christ’s arrival as high priest, the means by which his entrance took place, and the outcome of his arrival within the holy places:

11a	Χριστὸς δὲ παραγενόμενος ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν γενομένων ἀγαθῶν
11b	διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς
11c	οὐ χειροποιήτου, τοῦτ’ ἔστιν οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως
12a	οὐδὲ δι’ αἵματος τράγων καὶ μόσχων
12b	διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος
12c	εἰσῆλθεν ἐφάπαξ εἰς τὰ ἅγια
12d	αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος

5-1: Sentence Flow Diagram of Hebrews 9.11-12

The central issues addressed in 9.11-12 are 1) the *location* of Christ’s arrival as high priest, 2) the *manner* by which Christ gains access into God’s presence, and 3) the *resultative effects* of his entry into the heavenly places. The way the author portrays the progression of events, from the Son’s arrival to the securing of redemption, is encoded in the grammatical placement of two anarthrous participles [παραγενόμενος, εὑράμενος] and their relationship to the main verb they modify [εἰσῆλθεν]. This grammatical structure, along with the semantics of the verbs themselves, illustrate the following movement within 9.11-12: Christ *arrives*…Christ *enters*…Christ *secures*. Key to understanding the movement of events in Heb 9.11-12 is the location of the participles within the sentence. Porter observes that “when the participle is placed *before* the main verb, there is a tendency for the action to be depicted as antecedent, and when the participle is place *after* the main verb, there is a tendency for the action to be seen as concurrent or subsequent” (1989:381, emphasis added; see Mathewson and Emig 2016:211-12). Therefore, the choice to grammaticalize the action of the participles in such a manner has the effect of encoding a progression of events into the meaning of 9.11-12.

The encoded movement in 9.11-12 begins with the arrival of Christ as high priest. The participle παραγενόμενος with δέ at the beginning of sentence denotes a meaning of arrival at a particular place rather than a general appearing (see Luke 7.20; Acts 5.21-22; Koester 2001:407; *pace* Ellingworth 1993:448-49; BDAG: s.v. παραγίνομαι 2). The participle παραγενόμενος is antecedent to the action of the main verb εἰσῆλθεν and functions in a temporal manner (“*After* Christ arrived…he entered the holy places”; see Wallace 1996:624; Porter 1999:188; *pace* Ribbens 2016:113). The location of Christ’s arrival is marked by the temporal function of the participle παραγενόμενος and its antecedent relationship with the main verb in 9.12, and

contextually refers to the heavenly arrival of Christ and not to his appearance on earth (Braun 1984:264; Attridge 1989:245; Weiss 1991:464; Mackie 2007:91; Mitchell 2007:181; Moffitt 2011:220-25; *pace* Gräßer, who posits that παραγενόμενος "meint...der irdischen Auftritt, nicht der himmlischen," 1993:2.143-44).

Christ's arrival as high priest is followed by his once-for-all entry into the holy places [εἰσῆλθεν ἐφάπαξ εἰς τὰ ἅγια], which in turn is modified by three prepositional phrases beginning with διά: διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς, δι' αἵματος τράγων καὶ μόσχων, and διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος. The meaning and function of this prepositional triad has caused no lack of interpretive conundrums for commentators of Hebrews. How one chooses to interpret the meaning and function of these prepositional phrases will have a significant impact on one's view of the sacrifice of Christ and the cosmology of the heavenly sanctuary imagery that the author invokes in 9.11-12 and 9.23-28. Before exploring the wider implications of these prepositional phrases and their significance to the argument of this thesis, each prepositional phrase will be examined on its own.

5.2.1.1 Through [διά] *the Greater and more Perfect Tent*

This first of three prepositional phrases expands on previous comments in Heb 8.1-2, where the author briefly introduces the readers to the priestly ministry of Christ in the holy places [τῶν ἁγίων], which the author describes as the true tent [τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς] erected by the Lord [ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος]. Unlike the Levitical priests, who go in and out of an earthly tent, Christ's enters through a celestial tent [διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς] made without human hands [οὐ χειροποιήτου, τοῦτ' ἔστιν οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως]. How one interprets διά in Heb 9.11 plays an important role in the meaning of τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς and its relationship with the priestly work of Christ.

One possible way to understand the prepositional phrase διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς is that it modifies either the adjective ἀγαθῶν (Nairne 1910:561-62) or the titular Χριστὸς (Seeberg 1912:100). Even further, it is likewise possible to take διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς as modifying the attributive participle τῶν

γενομένων (Wickham 1910:67). While these possibilities may be grammatically feasible, stylistically they disrupt the natural and logical flow of 9.11-12, where all three prepositional phrases modify the verb εἰσῆλθεν in 9.12 (see Young 1981:202; Attridge 1989:245-46; Schenck 2007a:161 n.62 for criticisms against these options).

A second way to read the preposition διά is with an instrumental sense (Young 1981:204; Lindars 1991:94; Koester 2001:408-9; Vanhoye 2015:144; Cortez 2008:353-55[4]). The instrumental use of διά is quite common in Hebrews, making up the majority of uses for the preposition in the homily. An instrumental meaning for διά in 9.11 gives the sense that Christ enters "*by means of* the greater and more perfect tent." In this manner, τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς is understood as the means by which Christ entered into the holy places. One reason the instrumental meaning for διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς is favored is due to the symmetry it provides with the two succeeding prepositional phrases governed by the preposition διὰ in 9.12. Westcott views διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς as instrumental, suggesting that all three prepositional phrases be taken together as modifying εἰσῆλθεν in 9.12. Interestingly, Westcott also suggests a dual connotation for διά, with a spatial sense subsumed under the wider instrumental meaning (Westcott 1903:258; see Cody 1960:164-65; 165 n.33 and Vanhoye 2009:194 for a dual meaning for διά). Montefiore likewise takes διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς as instrumental, suggesting that it would be unparalleled, not to mention against stylistic norms, to have three recurring prepositions of the same case not share the same meaning (Montefiore 1964:152).

[4] Cortez offers an instrumental reading of διά that modifies εἰσῆλθεν *and* the participial clause αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος in 9.12. Cortez avers that his instrumental reading of διά does not require a metaphorical meaning of διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς, referring to BDAG: s.v. διά 3.c for support (2008:353 n.4). The difficulty with Cortez's reading is two-fold. First, while he is correct regarding the relationship of διά with εἰσῆλθεν, it is a stretch to suggest such a similar relationship with διά and αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος, given the distance between the preposition and the participial clause. And second, his suggestion that διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς be conflated into the meaning of τὰ ἅγια seems to be influenced by the syntax of Heb 8.2, where τῶν ἁγίων…καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς is understood by commentators as a hendiadys, with the "holy places and true tent" taken together as one entity, more so than by the actual context and syntax of 9.11-12.

The arguments of Westcott and Montefiore hinge upon a symmetrical reading of all three occurrences διά in 9.11-12, which in this case is one of instrumentality. While it is semantically feasible to understand διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς in an instrumental sense, when read in context with the main verb and its object [εἰσῆλθεν ἐφάπαξ εἰς τὰ ἅγια], this prepositional phrase provides a rather clumsy and repetitive reading of the 9.11-12, one that finds Christ entering the holy places by means of or through a tent (Montefiore 1964:153). Further, although Montefiore emphatically denies any possibility of three recurring prepositions having different meanings, this is simply not the case. For example, in Rom 4.25 Paul declares: "[Jesus] is delivered up for our sin [διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν] and is raised for our vindication [διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν]." The preposition διά in the first clause is most likely causal, with διά in the second clause final (Cranfield 1975:1.252; Dunn 1988:225; see Moo 2018:314-15, who takes the first διά as *retrospective*, and the second as *prospective*). A further example is the use of ὑπὲρ in Heb 5.1. In the first clause of the verse, ὑπὲρ indicates that the appointment of the Levitical high priest is for the benefit of the people as a whole (5.1a), and in the second clause, ὑπὲρ illustrates the purpose of the cultic liturgy (see also the use of εἰς in 7.25). Be that as it may, Montefiore's somewhat emphatic claim regarding the impossibility of sequential prepositions having differing meanings is not supported by the evidence and therefore violates no stylistic norms.

Perhaps the best way to interpret the prepositional phrase διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς is with a spatial sense. The prepositional phrase in 9.11, along with the main verb in 9.12, describes Christ moving through the superior tent [σκηνῆς] and entering the holy places [εἰσῆλθεν ἐφάπαξ εἰς τὰ ἅγια]. The movement in 9.11-12 is tied directly to the previous pericope and the discussion of sacred space and priesthood, specifically the movement from the Holy Place into the Holy of Holies (Moffatt 1921:121; Koester 1962:309; Michel 1957:310-11; Andriessen 1971:84-89; Johnsson 1973:293-97; Braun 1984:265; Attridge 1989:245-47; Lane 1991:237-38; Weiss 1991:465-67; Gräßer 1993:2.147 n.40; deSilva 2000:304; Mitchell 2007:182; Moffitt 2011:222; Ribbens 2016:115; Harris 2019:222; Jamieson 2019:60).

The progression through the greater and more perfect tent in 9.11 is in contrast with the movements of the high priest through the first section [σκηνὴ…ἡ πρώτη; τὴν πρώτην σκηνὴν] in 9.2 and 9.6. The movement through the superior tent culminates with the entrance of Christ into the holy places and the procuring of an eternal redemption (9.12). Once more, the intended contrast with the previous pericope is made, this time with reference to the high priest's yearly entry into the Holy of Holies (9.7). The spatial reading in Heb 9.11 has largely been the meaning adopted for the prepositional phrase among most commentators on Hebrews, and it is the one that best fits the context of 9.11-12. Not only does the spatial meaning cohere with the semantics of the predicates [παραγενόμενος and εἰσῆλθεν] and the syntactical structure of 9.11-12, it also provides a level of coherence with 9.1-10 and the movements of the priests within the tabernacle, as well as a contrast between the liturgy of the old covenant and the liturgy of Christ (Vanhoye 2018:78).

The spatial reading is further supported by two other passages in Hebrews that share a cultic background. The first is in Heb 4.14, in which the author begins a prolonged discussion on the priesthood of Christ with an exalted description of Jesus, the great high priest [ἀρχιερέα μέγαν], passing through the heavens [διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς] (*pace* Church 2017:373-78[5]). The participle διεληλυθότα with the accusative carries the sense of moving or passing through something, which in this case, the movement is *through* the heavens [τοὺς οὐρανούς] (see BDAG: s.v. διέρχομαι 1.b.α; GE: s.v. διέρχομαι A). The movement of the Son of God through the heavens in 4.14 is synonymous with his entering through the greater and more perfect tent in 9.11 (see 6.19 and 7.25, and the movement behind the curtain). In

[5] Church presents a novel reading of the participle διεληλυθότα in 4.14 (2017:373-78). Instead of the traditional "passing through" the heavens, which is argued for in this study, Church takes διεληλυθότα as "moving about" (374). He cites Acts 20.25 in support of his reading (see also Luke 9.6; Acts 10.38). This reading of the participle provides Church with a unique translation of 4.14a, where instead of Christ moving through the heavens, he is moving about or ministering before God within the heavenly tabernacle. Church argues that there is an echo to 1 Sam 2.30, 35 in Heb 4.14. His argument hinges on the presence of the verb διελεύσεται in 1 Sam 2.30, 35, which refers to the priest going "in and out [διελεύσεται]" before the Lord; the promise to raise up a faithful priest [ἱερέα πιστόν] in 1 Sam 2.35 echoes a similar description of Christ in Heb 2.17; 3.1-6; and 4.14; and the reference to the sure house [οἶκον πιστόν] in 1 Sam 2.35 may also be in the mind of the author of Hebrews in 3.6 and 10.21 (377). While this interpretation is illuminating, it unfortunately does not stand on exegetically solid ground—Church himself readily admits that his reading is "novel" and unsupported by any other commentator on Hebrews (374).

both 4.14 and 9.11, Christ is moving *through* something on his way to a final destination, which in this case is the holy places referred to in 9.12.

The final passage in Hebrews that sheds light on the spatial reading in 9.11 is found in Heb 10.19-20. Similar to 4.14, Heb 10.19-20 is part of an exhortation to draw near to God in confidence, a confidence that is rooted in the priestly work of Christ and his presence before the throne of God. This confidence calls believers to enter the holy places [τὴν εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων] by means of the blood of Jesus [ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ] (10.19). This access to the presence of God is made possible through the curtain [διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος], that is through his flesh.[6] Christ enters heaven itself, through the tent, and in so doing opens the way for his followers to follow behind him, right into the very throne room of God (Thompson 2008:186).

In light of the various interpretations of the preposition διά explored in this section, the spatial reading provides the best sense of διά in the context of Heb 9.11-12. As will be discussed further in the next section, an instrumental understanding of διά would supply a metaphorical reading for σκηνή, which in turn leads to a number of interpretive difficulties as it relates to the meaning of σκηνή. So then, with a spatial sense solidified for the preposition διά, attention now shifts to the interpretive conundrum surrounding the meaning and location of σκηνή.

5.2.1.2 Meaning of σκηνή: Metaphor or Analogy?

A number of interpretive possibilities have been put forth to try and explain the meaning of σκηνή in 9.11. Chapter two of this thesis surveyed a number of Second Temple writings that went into detail regarding the earthly tabernacle and its relationship to a heavenly counterpart. As noted above in section 2.3, two basic views regarding the relationship between the earthly and heavenly sanctuary

[6] The interpretation here of Heb 10.19-20 concurs with that of Hofius, who argues that a second διά is to be supplied in the epexegetical statement τοῦτ' ἔστιν [διὰ] τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ in 10.20b. Hofius concludes that the διά in 10.20a is to be read spatially (*through* the curtain), and the second διά, which is supplemented in 10.20b, is understood with an instrumental sense, and refers back to the verb ἐνεκαίνισεν in 10.20a (1972:81-82; see Hofius 1970:132-41). With this is mind, 10.19-20 reads as following: "Therefore, brothers and sisters, because we have confidence to enter into the holy places by means of the blood of Jesus, by the new and living way which he opened for us *through* the curtain, that is, *by means of* his flesh."

emerged. While some scholars have argued for as many as five different views regarding the meaning of σκηνή in 9.11 (Swetnam 1966:91-106; Kubo 1992:97-109; Vanhoye 2018:76-99; see Vanhoye 2015:144-47), these can be organized into two main categories, that of metaphor or analogy.

Briefly defined, metaphor is “a figure of speech in which a word or phrase is applied to something to which it is not literally applicable” (COED). In *Poetics*, Aristotle defines metaphor as “the application of a strange term either transferred from the genus and applied to the species or from the species and applied to the genus, or from one species to another or else by analogy” (*Poet*. 21.7; see *Rhet*. 3.4.1-3). Metaphors are literary devices that help paint vivid images of implied comparison between fundamentally different associative networks (Moffitt 2016:259-79, particularly 261-67).

When used in the context of religious language, metaphors are valuable tropes that provide comparison between two parallel thoughts or ideas. This is illustrated nicely by Caird in *The Language and Imagery of the Bible*. Caird posits that the language of sacrifice used by the writers of the New Testament is simply a metaphor for the death of Christ. Taken literally, the crucifixion is a criminal execution on a Roman cross that carries with it political ramifications for both the Jewish leadership and the followers of the teacher from Galilee. It is Christ himself who infused metaphorical meaning into this historical event, thus giving his death sacrificial meaning by transforming his tragic death into something he could offer as a sacrifice to God (1980:157).

When applied to the argument of Hebrews chapter nine, metaphorical language is that which refers to the sacrifice of Christ within the semantic field of cultic sacrifice. Instead of explicitly outlining in great detail the crucifixion of Jesus in his homily, the author of Hebrews instead chooses to use the language of cultic sacrifice as the semantic domain for his discussion of atonement, priestly liturgy, and the heavenly Holy of Holies (Stegemann and Stegemann 2005:13). Therefore, when the author of Hebrews refers to the priesthood of Christ, he is “*by definition* speak[ing] metaphorically of Christ’s work on the basis of a comparison with the earthly cultus” (Schenck 2007a:92, emphasis in original).

When referring to the use of analogy, the meaning shifts from that of a comparison between two different referents, as is the case with metaphor, to a comparison between two similar subjects. In her excellent study, *Metaphor and Religious Studies*, Soskice refers to two types of models, homeomorphic and paramorphic models. According to Soskice, homeomorphic models are “those in which the subject of the model is also its source,” whereas for the paramorphic model, “the source and subject differ (Soskice 1985:101-103; here, 102). As defined above, metaphor is a figure of speech, consisting of a comparison of two unrelated subjects, and as such, classifies as an example of a paramorphic model.

An analogy, however, is far more complex than a metaphor. Its purpose is to describe how two objects that share similar characteristics are alike. In order to do this, both the *source* and *subject* must be similar enough so that what is said about one can be understood in the same manner when applied to other. Moffitt supplies a helpful way to illustrate this by comparing a model plane with that of a commercial airplane. In this example, the subject, that is the model plane, is similar in every way to the source it represents. It has two wings, a cockpit with all its navigational instruments, four engines, and a tail. If one were to use terminology to describe a particular feature are instrument of this model plane, it could likewise be used to describe the source it is modeled after, that of the commercial plane. As can be seen from this example, analogy compares two objects in a manner that would be easily understood as a fitting correspondence between the source and its subject (Moffitt 2016:262).

One of the cornerstones of this thesis is the belief that Jesus assumes his position as high priest upon his entrance into heaven. The reason for such a conclusion is founded on an analogical reading of Hebrews, specifically chapters five through ten. Those passages that provide a comparison between the Levitical high priest and the great Melchizedekian high priest are not metaphors to explain how Christ functions in a manner similar to his Levitical counterpart. Rather, the language used to describe the priestly ministry of Christ is analogous to that of the earthly priests. Because Christ is unable to assume his role as priest on earth (Heb 8.4), this affects how one understands the nature and location of the heavenly sanctuary. If the language used to describe Christ’s priestly ministry is analogical, it would then be fair

to assume that this analogy extends to the heavenly sanctuary, were Christ ministers on behalf of his people (8.1-6; see 7.25).

What follows is an examination of three of the more significant interpretations of σκηνή in 9.11. The first two interpretations, the body of Christ and the cosmological reading, are examples of a metaphorical reading of σκηνή. The final interpretation, that of a literal heavenly sanctuary, understands the meaning of σκηνή as analogous to the sanctuary that exists in heaven. How one interprets the language used in 9.11-12, particularly with regard to the meaning of σκηνή (9.11) and τὰ ἅγια (9.12), will have a direct correlation with how one understands the nature of atonement in the overall theological program of the letter to the Hebrews.

5.2.1.2.1 Body of Christ

The adoption of a metaphorical meaning of σκηνή in 9.11 allows for a number of possibilities as it relates to the meaning of σκηνή within the sacrificial context of Hebrews 9. One of the earliest such metaphorical readings understood σκηνή as a reference to the body of Christ. Some of the earliest such readings are found in the patristic writings of Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Augustine. Over a millennium later, stalwarts such as the great Catholic theologian Thomas Aquinas and the French Reformer John Calvin likewise favored such a metaphorical meaning of σκηνή. Even the great Puritan, John Owen, understood σκηνή as a reference to the humanity of Christ.

Such an interpretation is not foreign to Second Temple or Early Christian theology. For example, Paul describes the contrast between the earthly body [σκῆνος] and the heavenly one [οἰκοδομὴν ἐκ θεοῦ], the latter not made with human hands [οἰκίαν ἀχειροποίητον] (2 Cor 5.1-4). Peter likewise refers to the earthly body as a temporary residence, waiting for the day when it is put off [ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματός] (2 Pet 1.13-14). Similar metaphors are also found in Second Temple and Early Christian writings such as Isa 38.12; Wis 9.15; 4 Bar. 6.6-7; 9.13; and Diogn. 6.8. The description of the earthly body as a temporary residence is a common theme and

metaphor that was in use in both the writings of Second Temple Jews as well as Early Christians.

In his detailed study of the heavenly sanctuary and liturgy in Hebrews, Cody affirms a metaphorical reading of σκηνή in Hebrews. For Cody, the body of Christ represents the whole of Christ's humanity and is the new and living way that penetrated through the veil and achieves for humanity access to God. Further, the tent is a symbol which elicits the humanity of Christ and is an instrument in the work of salvation (Cody 1960:161-65).

Vanhoye holds a similar view as Cody, but with one important caveat. While σκηνή is indeed a metaphor for the body of Christ, it is the post-resurrected glorified body of Christ that is in view in the reference to σκηνή in Hebrews 9.11. Vanhoye sees in the reference to διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς Jesus's promise to rebuild the temple after three days (John 2.19; see Matt 26.21; Mark 14.58; Acts 6.14). While the incarnation and death of Christ on the cross are essential for salvation, it is nevertheless through the glorified body of Christ that access to God is guaranteed to humanity (Vanhoye 2009:193-96; 2018:92-97; see Healy 2016:174-75).

Other commentators take the metaphor of Christ's body even further. One such interpretation of σκηνή is found in a number of fascinating articles from James Swetnam. Not fully satisfied with Vanhoye's analysis of Heb 9.11, Swetnam proposes that while σκηνή does refer to the body of Christ, it is the Eucharistic body of Christ that σκηνή points to. Swetnam finds support for his interpretation by taking the prepositional phrase διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς in parallel to διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος, which for Swetnam is a reference to the Eucharistic blood of Christ (1966a:91-106; see 1966b:155-73; 1970:205-21).

While a metaphorical reading of σκηνή as a reference to the body of Christ is plausible, it is unlikely the case in Heb 9.11. The prepositional phrase διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς is negated by οὐ χειροποιήτου, which is further defined by the appositional clause τοῦτ' ἔστιν οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως (see Heb 8.2). The emphatic reference to σκηνή in 9.11 as otherworldly [οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως] goes against the

metaphorical reading of σκηνή as a reference to the body of Christ. To read σκηνή as a reference to the incarnation requires that one interpret οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως in such a way as to suspend the natural understanding of this phrase in the context of Heb 9.11. The author previously made his case for the Son sharing in both flesh and blood [κεκοινώνηκεν αἵματος καὶ σαρκός], which is necessary for him to both destroy the devil by removing the fear of death, as well as fulfilling the requirements necessary to serve as the great high priest (2.14-18). The humanity which Christ takes on is the very same humanity that God breathed life into in the Garden.

This is not to say that Hebrews has a diminished view of the incarnation. Quite the contrary! For the author of Hebrews, the incarnation is a necessary element in his overall theological program. Perhaps one of the definitive sections in Hebrews that outlines this necessity is in Hebrews chapter two. In Heb 2.11-18, the author notes the importance of the incarnation and the fundamental role it plays in Christ assuming the role of high priest. In order for Christ to function as high priest he first needs to experience the suffering and temptation that besets all of humanity. The incarnation provides him with this necessary element, and as a result, solidarity with humanity. It is obligatory for the Son to become like his brothers and sisters in every way, to the point that he not only is able to sympathize with their weaknesses, but also taste death on their behalf (2.14-18; 4.14-16; see Phil 2.6-8). The necessity of the incarnation and full participation in all that makes humanity what it is does not allow for a metaphorical reading of σκηνή that has in view the humanity of Christ in 9.11.

5.2.1.2.2 Created Cosmos

As noted above in section 2.3, certain Second Temple writings speak in great detail about the temple and its furnishings. Authors like Philo and Josephus view the earthly sanctuary as a metaphor for the created cosmos, with each part of the earthly temple and its appurtenances represented by some element or force of the created cosmos. This cosmological interpretation of the earthly temple is largely influenced by a Platonic worldview that tends to interpret these symbols in a vertical or spatial manner, in which the earthly symbol represents by a heavenly archetype.

In his introduction to a prolonged discussion of the symbolism of the tabernacle and their corresponding vestments, Josephus affirms that these objects are the "imitation and perfect form of the whole cosmos" [ἀπομίμησιν καὶ διατύπωσιν τῶν ὅλων] (author's own translation, *Ant*. 3.180; see *J.W*. 5.458; *Tranq*. *an*. 477C: ἱερὸν μὲν γὰρ ἁγιώτατον ὁ κόσμος ἐστὶ καὶ θεοπρεπέστατον). Josephus argues that the portioning of the tabernacle is meant to imitate the cosmos [τὴν τοιαύτην τῆς σκηνῆς καὶ μίμησιν τῆς τῶν ὅλων], with the third section, the Holy of Holies, representing a heaven devoted to God [ὡς οὐρανὸς ἀνεῖτο τῷ θεῷ] (*Ant*. 3.123-24). The appurtenances located in the first section of the tabernacle also have symbolic meaning. The seven branches of the golden lampstand represent planetary objects; the twelve loaves represent the number of months in a year; and the altar of incense represents the superiority of God in all things (*J.W*. 216-18).

Philo likewise shares a similar view to that of Josephus with respect to the symbolic nature of the temple. In *De somniis*, Philo suggests that there are in fact two different temples. The first temple is the universe [ὁ κόσμος], where his firstborn high priest, the divine Logos [ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ πρωτόγονος αὐτοῦ θεῖος λόγος] serves. The Second Temple is what Philo refers to as the rational soul [λογικὴ ψυχή], whose priest is the true man [ἧς ἱερεὺς ὁ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἄνθρωπος] (*Somn*. 1.215; see *QE* 2.51; *Spec*. 1.66-67). For Philo, the world [τὸν κόσμον] is God's house [οἶκον θεοῦ] which has been prepared for him in the realm of sense-perception [αἰσθητὸν], a sanctuary [ἁγίασμα] made by the world-creation hands of God [τὸ ἡτοιμάσθαι ὑπὸ χειρῶν θεοῦ, τῶν κοσμοποιῶν αὐτοῦ δυνάμεων] (*Plant*. 50).

The Old Testament writings also share a similar cosmic meaning for Israel's sacred space, with the tabernacle and later temple a microcosm of heaven and earth (Levenson: 1984:275-98; Beale 2004:29-80; 2005:15-19; 2011:627-30; Lioy 2010:36; Walton 2006:113-34; 2011:100-10). One finds perhaps the clearest example of this in Ps 78(77).69, where the creation of heaven and earth model that of his sanctuary. This pattern in Ps 78.69 is the foundation for what would become God's earthly habitat. While on Sinai, Moses is given God's commands for Israel's sacred space and liturgy, specifically instructions on how to construct the tabernacle

with its associated appurtenances. Moses is commanded four times to follow the exact pattern that is shown to him while on the mountain (Exod 25.9, 40; 26.30; 27.8; see Num 8.3). God's creating power is also tied to the creation of the cosmos. For example, God alone stretches out the heavens [נֹטֶה שָׁמַיִם // ὁ τανύσας τὸν οὐρανὸν] (9.8; see Job 26.7). Likewise, the Psalmist describes God as one clothed with splendor, covered in a garment of light, and stretching out the heavens like a tent [נוֹטֶה שָׁמַיִם כַּיְרִיעָה // ἀναβαλλόμενος φῶς ὡς ἱμάτιον] (104.1-2). Similar type of similes can also be found in the prophetic writings (Isa 40.22; 44.24; Jer 10.12; 51.15; Zech 12.1).

The meaning of σκηνή as the created cosmos fits well with a spatial understanding of the διὰ in 9.11, where Christ passes through the cosmos upon his entrance into heaven. This reading is supported by passages in Hebrews that describe spatial movement within a heavenly sanctuary. For example, in Heb 4.14 Jesus passes through the heavens [διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς]. The spatial movement "through the heavens" may be understood metaphorically, thus lending support to a cosmological reading in which Christ enters through [διὰ] the σκηνή [= τοὺς οὐρανούς] before entering into God's presence [i.e. τὰ ἅγια; see οἰκουμένη in Heb 1.6; 2.5; see ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν in 7.26].

Another example of spatial movement inside a heavenly sanctuary is found in Heb 6.19. The hope of Christians rest upon their forerunner, who enters into the inner place behind the curtain [εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος]. The image here recalls the movement of the high priest on Yom Kippur and his entrance into Holy of Holies through the curtain that separates the Holy Place from the Holy of Holies (see ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος; Lev 16.2, 12, 15; see Heb 10.20). The movement of the Son of God is through the cosmos and curtain, whereby he enters into the heavenly realm. Hebrews 9.24 likewise references spatial movement when it speaks of "Christ…enter[ing]…into heaven itself to appear before God on our behalf" [εἰσῆλθεν…Χριστός…εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν νῦν ἐμφανισθῆναι τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν]. However, while the spatial movement of these verses lend themselves to

a cosmological meaning of σκηνή in Heb 9.11, are they conclusive enough to support such a reading?

The evidence against a cosmological reading of σκηνή is in the author's own description of what the σκηνή is not: it is not made with hands, and, more importantly, it is not of this creation [τοῦτ' ἔστιν οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως]. In order for a cosmological reading of σκηνή to be adopted here, the interpreter of Hebrews must also accept that the author of Hebrews is identifying part of the heavenly sanctuary with the created order, which is a rather tall task to undertake (Ribbens 206:117).

Similarly, Vanhoye correctly points out that not only does the author of Hebrews not emphasize the importance of σκηνή for the achievement of salvation, nowhere in the New Testament is there found any type of soteriological significance directly associated with any aspect of the created cosmos (2018:82). Furthermore, the appurtenances used in the cultic liturgy have salvific significance only in that they represent the old order and its means of purgation and purification. Therefore, instead of employing cosmic symbolism into the meaning of σκηνή, thus creating a metaphor for the created cosmos, the author of Hebrews clearly defines what he means by his use of σκηνή within his discourse, thus distinguishing between the earthly tabernacle and a concrete heavenly structure. The author of Hebrews views the heavenly sanctuary as an analogical reality, one that both the wilderness tabernacle and the temple in Jerusalem were based on and patterned after.

5.2.1.2.3 Heavenly Sanctuary

Although attaching a cosmological meaning to the tabernacle is common in Old Testament and Second Temple writings, Hebrews suggests a different conceptual background for σκηνή and other related words that refer to the heavenly sanctuary (*pace* Hagner 2005:260). Much like the apocalyptic texts in section 2.3.3 above, the author of Hebrews understands the heavenly sanctuary as a real structure existing in heaven and consisting of two sections: one section where the angels were present and ministering to God (Heb 1.6-7, 13-14), and a second section, where God dwells and where Christ presents his offering (9.12, 24). Rather than a metaphorical reference to the body of Christ, or a representation of the cosmos, the author of

Hebrews aligns himself with the apocalyptic tradition of a literal sanctuary existing in heaven.

Turning to the vocabulary of Hebrews, a semantic study of terms that refer to the heavenly sanctuary reveals that the author of Hebrews consistently uses either σκηνή[7] or [τὰ] ἅγια[8] when highlighting the heavenly sanctuary in his homily.[9] Even more so, when referring to certain parts of the tabernacle or heavenly sanctuary the author of Hebrews establishes a relatively consistent pattern with regard to how each term is used in his writing. Typically, the author of Hebrews uses σκηνή when referring to the tabernacle as a whole, and [τὰ] ἅγια when referring to the Holy of Holies or inner sanctuary (Barnard 2012:91-94, here 93; see Attridge 1989:218; Koester 1989:157-59; *pace* Salom 1967). The question as it relates to Heb 9.11 is whether σκηνή refers to a second chamber in the heavenly sanctuary. Answering this question will require an exegesis of both Heb 8.2 and Leviticus 16.

Outside of Heb 9.11-12, Heb 8.1-4 represents the clearest example in Hebrews of a two-part heavenly sanctuary. While a cursory reading of 8.2 reveals on the surface two distinct locations, the holy places and the true tent [τῶν ἁγίων…καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς], commentators nevertheless disagree on their interpretation of whether in fact this verse does describe two compartments within the heavenly sanctuary. The reason for this dispute is two-fold. First is the question regarding the use of the conjunction καὶ in the nominal phrase τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργὸς καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς, and second, is the relationship between the relative clause ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος and its antecedent.

[7] See Heb 8.2, 5; 9.2, 11, 21; 13.10. σκηνή occurs three more times in Hebrews, twice modifying the spatial adjective πρῶτος (9.6, 8), and once as the subject of the attributive participle ἡ λεγομένη (9.3).

[8] See Heb 8.2; 9.3, 8, 12, 24-25; 10.19; 13.11 The one instance where ἅγια does not follow the typical pattern is at 9.3. There, Ἅγια is clearly a reference to the Holy Place, as marked by the inclusion of the appurtenances that resided in the first chamber of the tabernacle.

[9] This is true also of the earthly tabernacle as well. The plural ἅγια used as a title for both the earthly Holy Place in 9.2, and the Holy of Holies [with the partitive genitive Ἁγίων] in 9.2. σκηνή is used to mark a division in the earthly tabernacle in 9.2-3, 6, 8, 21; 13.10.

With respect to the conjunction, some commentators argue that καί functions either epexegetically, in which case the substantive τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς further defines the nature of τῶν ἁγίων (BDF 442.9). Others commentators suggest that καί is explicative, thus forming a hendiadys (BDF 441.16; see Westcott 1903:216; Moffatt 1924:105; Spicq 1953:234; Montefiore 1964:133; Hughes 1977:181 n.55; Peterson 1982:130-31; Lane 1991:200-01; Ellingworth 1993:402; Koester 2001:375-76; Cockerill 2012:354-57; Schenck 2016b:246-52).

Regarding the relative clause ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος, some interpreters argue that because ἣν is singular this supports the author's use of hendiadys, thus making ἅγια and σκηνή a reference to a single heavenly structure, one lacking an outer chamber similar to the Holy Place in the earthly tabernacle (Hughes 1977:289; Peterson 1982:131; Koester 2001:376). This exegetical decision is seen in a number of English translations, where the conjunction καί is omitted and the relative clause is translated so that it modifies the noun σκηνή: "[Christ is] a minister of the sanctuary, the true tent that the Lord pitched and not man" (see the ESV, NIV, NLT, TNIV).

While this translation is grammatically feasible, the author of Hebrews' consistent use of terminology regarding the tabernacle and the Holy of Holies as two distinct sections lends support for a heavenly sanctuary that consists of two chambers, much like the tabernacle and later temple (Michaelis, *TDNT* 7.376-77; Koester 1962:309; Brooks 1970:210-11; Hofius 1972:55-58; Loader 1981:183; Attridge 1989:218; Lane 1991:237-38; Stökl 2003:182; Mitchell 2007:160; Jamieson 2019:59-60). As noted above, the author of Hebrews typically utilizes σκηνή as a reference to the tabernacle as a whole, while reserving [τὰ] ἅγια as a designation for the Holy of Holies or inner sanctuary. The author's distinction between these two terms is most likely due to the influence of Leviticus 16 and the Day of Atonement within the larger narrative substructure of Hebrews 9.

In chapter sixteen of Leviticus the author refers to the σκηνή six times, all of which are specific references to the tent of meeting as a whole and are distinct from the author's reference to the Holy of Holies (16.7, 16-17, 20, 23, 33). It is the occurrence in 16.20 that is of interest here. Similar to the grammatical structure in Heb 8.2,

where the coordinating conjunction καί links τῶν ἁγίων and τῆς σκηνῆς together, in Lev 16.20 one finds the same occurrence, where the author of Leviticus refers to the atonement of the "Holy Place *and* the tent of meeting *and* the altar" [τὸ ἅγιον καὶ τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου καὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον]. The coordinating conjunction καί is marking out a distinction between each of the elements of Israel's sacred space, all of which are involved in the high priest's ritual of purification for the purgation of the Sanctum Sanctorum.

This distinction is also upheld in Lev 16.16. After slaughtering the goat, the high priest takes the blood of the goat and sprinkles it upon the mercy seat in the Holy of Holies. By doing so the high priest makes atonement for the Holy Place [ἐξιλάσεται τὸ ἅγιον]. He also does the same for the tent of meeting [ποιήσει τῇ σκηνῇ τοῦ μαρτυρίου], with the implication being that he will likewise make atonement for its uncleanness as well. This distinction between the Holy of Holies and the tent as a whole in Leviticus 16 is picked up by the author of Hebrews and is maintained in the extended discussion on the heavenly tabernacle and its earthly counterpart in Hebrews 8-10 (Hofius 1972:57-60; Gräßer 1993:2.82).

Regarding the meaning of σκηνή in Heb 9.11, given that in 8.2 and Leviticus 16 the author refers to two separate aspects of Israel's sacred space as noted above, it makes the best sense contextually that σκηνή in 9.11 likewise represents part of a two-part heavenly sanctuary, with τὰ ἅγια in 9.12 representing the Holy of Holies (Delitzsch 1876:2.80-81; Koester 1962:309-10; Héring 2010:76-77; Andriessen 1971:83-85; Scholer 1991:163; Moffitt 2011:223; Barnard 2012:93, 113; Ribbens 2016:115-17, *pace* Hofius 1972:57-60; Schenck 2007:147-49, 158-63; Ellingworth 1993:446-48). In Heb 9.11, Jesus passes through the first section, which is occupied by angels, and into the throne room of God. The author of Hebrews alludes to this earlier in his writing, where he speaks of bringing the Son again into the οἰκουμένη and the ministering angels worshiping him upon his arrival (Heb 1.6, 7).

The presence of angels ministering in the heavenly sanctuary is a common theme in the apocalyptic writings of Second Temple Judaism. As noted above, 1 Enoch, Testament of Levi, and Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice all mention the presence of

angels ministering and offering sacrifices to God in heaven. The author of Hebrews' description of events in 9.11-12 mirrors that of the apocalyptic writings, where Christ himself passes through the first section and into the Holy of Holies where God dwells. It is here that Christ presents his offering for sin and takes his seat at the right hand of the Majesty on High.

Additionally, in the discussion regarding the earthly place of worship and its liturgical regulations, the bi-part structure of the tabernacle is stressed by the author as a way to lay the foundation for a comparison between the old covenant and its cult with that of the new covenant. For the author of Hebrews, the procession of Christ from the cross, through the tent, and into the heavenly sanctuary is analogous to that of the high priest on Yom Kippur. Just as the high priest moves through the tent and into the Holy of Holies, Christ too enters through the tent and into the inner chamber, offering his sacrifice to God and taking his seat at the right of the Majesty on high. It is through the sacrifice of Christ that sin is put away and access to God is opened up to all who believe.

5.2.1.3 By Means of [διά] *the Right Kind of Blood*

The dual occurrence of διά in 9.12 takes on a different sense than its previous counterpart in 9.11. Whereas in 9.11 διά represents Christ's spatial movement through the tent and into the holy places, both δι' αἵματος τράγων καὶ μόσχων and διὰ…τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος convey an instrumental meaning and represent the *means by which* Christ is able to enter the holy places through the tent (Jamieson 2019:61). Furthermore, both prepositional phrases form a contrast between the old covenant and the new; between the oft-repeated blood offering of sacrificial victims and Christ's once-for-all offering of his own blood.

The instrumental use of the repeated preposition διά in 9.12 provides the means by which access to the holy places is granted to Christ, first in the negative and then in the positive. Under the old covenant, access to the Holy of Holies is granted only to the high priest and only by means of the blood of goats and calves [οὐδὲ δι' αἵματος τράγων καὶ μόσχων]. While the author of Hebrews' reference to the blood of goats and calves is no doubt a reference to Yom Kippur, specifically to the sin offering for

both the people and the priests, the pairing of τράγων καὶ μόσχων itself does not occur in the account of Yom Kippur in Leviticus 16 (see Heb 9.19 for a reoccurrence of this pairing). In Leviticus 16, the requisite animals for sacrifice includes a bull (μόσχος; 16.3, 5), two he-goats (χίμαρος; 16.5), and one ram (κριός; 16.3). The use of τράγος for χίμαρος in Heb 9.12 may be the result of the author's dependence upon a different Greek translation of Leviticus than what is found in modern critical editions (see Westcott 1903:260, who notes that Symmachus and Aquila substitute τράγος for χίμαρος in Leviticus 16; Guthrie 2019:221).

5.2.1.4 The Centrality of Blood

The lack of exactitude in Hebrews concerning the animals sacrificed for a sin offering on the Day of Atonement is a minor issue at best. What is of concern to the author of Hebrews is the access of blood, which in turn provides access to God. This lack of concern is observed in the author's alternating changes to the pairing of sacrificial animals in 9.13 from that of τράγων καὶ μόσχων to τράγων καὶ ταύρων (see 10.4 for same pairing, but in reverse order).

While neither pairing is found in Leviticus 16, the oscillating between sacrificial victims used for sin offerings under the Levitical cult is significant only with regard to what each animal represented corporately. A goat (τράγος, χίμαρος) is the victim that represents Israel as a corporate offering (Lev 9.15; Num 28.15, 22, 30; 29.5). At the same time, a bull (μόσχος, ταῦρος) signifies a corporate offering that represents the priests (Exod 29.10-14; Lev 8.14-17; 9.8-11; 16.11-14). Commenting on the significance of the goat and bull, Kleinig notes that Heb 9.12 is focused not on the type of animal in and of itself, but rather the symbolic importance of their blood. The blood of both goat and bull is the medium by which the high priest gains access to the Holy of Holies, along with the offering for purgation of sin (2017:412).

Dissimilar to the blood of goats and calves, which is unable to provide total purgation of sin and access to God, the blood of Christ, offered through the eternal spirit, not only purifies the conscience, it also grants eternal access to the throne of God.

> Unlike the repeated offering of goats and calves [τράγων καὶ μόσχων], signified by the author's use of the plural, the offering of Christ is a singular event [ἐφάπαξ] in which

Christ's own blood functions as the medium by which Christians now have direct access to God through Christ's high priestly sacrifice (Davies 1968:387).

As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, it is often commonplace to supply a metaphorical interpretation for the blood of Christ. It is unfortunate that this is the case, given that the author of Hebrews gives no indication that this is what he intended. Rather than a metaphor for death, the blood of Christ represents the resurrected life of Christ offered to God in the heavenly sanctuary. This interpretation equating Christ's blood with his resurrected life finds support in Leviticus 17, which contains the most concise rationale for the necessity of blood in the entire Old Testament. Leviticus 17.11 succinctly sums up two important elements of blood within the Levitical cult: first, that blood *equals* life, and second, it is this life, offered upon the altar, that provides both a ransom and expiation for sin (Moffitt 2011:257-58; see Kiuchi 2007:321).

In Hebrews, the first reference to the use of blood within a cultic context is found in the brief description of the high priest's liturgical duties on Yom Kippur. In Heb 9.7, the high priests enters the Holy of Holies with the blood of the sacrifice, which he offers [προσφέρω] upon the mercy seat to atone for the sin of the priests (see Lev 16.6, 11), for the people (Lev 16.16, 30, 33-34), and for the purification of the sanctuary, the tent, and the altar (see Lev 16.16-19, 33) (for a detailed description of these events, see Milgrom 1991:1009-84; 1987:143-59; Gane 2004:270-91).

Important to note in Heb 9.7 is the lack of a metaphorical meaning in the presentation of the high priest on Yom Kippur. Instead, the blood of the sacrifice is the medium by which the high priest gains access into the inner sanctuary. While the slaughter of goats and calves are a prerequisite for gaining access to blood, what is important for the author of Hebrews is not death per se, but rather the power that blood has to provide safe passage through the Holy Place and into the Holy of Holies (Moffitt 2011:223-24; *pace* Riggenbach 1913:279).

This same emphasis on blood as a medium for access to God and purgation of sin forms the background of the author's theology of blood. In a similar manner as the high priest on Yom Kippur, Christ gains access to the heavenly sanctuary not by means of the blood of goats and calves but by his own blood [διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου

αἵματος], moving through the σκηνή and passing through the curtain (see Heb 6.19; 10.20), where he presents his offering to God, thus securing an eternal redemption (Moffitt 2011:224). The offering which Christ presents is that of his own blood, offered without blemish to God [προσήνεγκεν ἄμωμον τῷ θεῷ, καθαριεῖ] (9.14; see Eskola 2001:253-54).

The centrality of blood in the theology of Hebrews is nowhere more evident than in the so-called blood rule of Heb 9.22: "And according to the law nearly everything is purified with blood, and without the pouring out of blood [αἱματεκχυσίας] there is no purgation." As will be seen below in section 5.3, the ritual of pouring out blood is the *sine qua non* of atonement in Hebrews. For the author of Hebrews, the necessity of blood is rooted firmly within the cultic tradition of the old covenant. Contrary to Attridge, who denies that Christ brings his blood into heaven and insists that it is clear that the author of Hebrews is speaking metaphorically (1989:248), there is reason to believe that this is exactly what the author intended to convey, just not in the way that Attridge understands.

Rather than the crimson red plasma that pours out from the mortal wound of a slain victim, what Jesus brings into the heavenly sanctuary as an offering is not his blood, but instead what that blood symbolizes, namely, life itself. Therefore, rather than interpreting the reference to the blood of Christ in Heb 9.12 as a metaphor for death, it is best to understand this in light of the author's earlier explanation of the liturgical movement of the high priest within the tabernacle on Yom Kippur. Instead of offering the blood of goats and calves, Jesus offers his *resurrected life* before the throne of God as an eternal offering for the purification and purgation of sin.

5.2.1.5 Securing an Eternal Redemption

In light of all that has been examined above—the significance and meaning of the thrice occurring διά; the meaning of σκηνή and its relationship to the heavenly sanctuary; and the theological importance of blood as life—this all culminates with Christ securing an eternal redemption [αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος] in 9.12b. There is some debate, however, as to the relationship between the participle εὑράμενος and the main verb εἰσῆλθεν. Both Moulton and Robertson dismiss any notion that the action of a participle that follows the main verb is subsequent to the main verb.

Moulton posits that such a case is one of either coincident or antecedent action (MHT 1.132-34). Robertson likewise agrees with Moulton, dismissing the possibility for a subsequent reading of the aorist participle (Robertson 2006:861-63). Moule is equally straight forward in his conclusion, remarking that the only way to make sense of the action of the participle εὑράμενος in 9.12b is to understand it as antecedent to εἰσῆλθεν (1953:100 n.1).

However, the conclusions of Moulton, Robertson, and Moule has been challenged by several modern grammarians. For example, Porter acknowledges the objections of both Moulton and Robertson, particularly their concern for attributing time to the participle itself. Nevertheless, Porter notes that because of the perfective aspect of the aorist and its grammaticalization of an event as a completed process the issue of time is moot, thus allowing for a subsequent reading for participles that follow their main verb (1989:385-87; here, 385; 1999:189; see Lee 1970:35-37). In the same vein as Porter, Runge highlights the discourse feature of participles that both precede and follow the main verb they modify, noting that unlike those that precede the main verb, the action of *elaborating* participles tend to modify the verb more directly by providing a more specific explanation of the action of the main verb (Runge 2010:262).

Regarding the participial clause αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος in Heb 9.12, there is syntactical precedent elsewhere in Hebrews to support a subsequent reading. For example, Heb 5.9-10 presents a similar pattern to the one found in 9.11-12, where the main verb is sandwiched between two modifying participles. In Heb 5.9, the action of the aorist participle τελειωθεὶς is antecedent to main verb ἐγένετο, with the action of the aorist participle προσαγορευθεὶς in 5.10 functioning as subsequent to the main verb. This sequence of events not only fits Porter's syntactical analysis, it also provides a reading of 5.9-10 that fits the overall theme of Hebrews 7-10: Christ is perfected by/at his resurrection/ascension, at which time he became the Melchizedekian high priest.

While the analysis of Porter and Runge proves to stand on solid ground syntactically, it is however the context of Heb 9.11-12 that must determine how the action of the participial clause αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος relates to the main verb εἰσῆλθεν. If one

agrees with the assessment of Moulton, Robertson, and Moule, then the action of the participle is antecedent to, or contemporaneous with, εἰσῆλθεν. This would give the participle a temporal (or possibly a causal) sense, providing the following translation: "Christ entered into the holy places *after/because he* secured an eternal redemption" (see Hughes 1977:327 n.84; Peterson 1982:137; Guthrie 1998:310; Witherington 2007:269 n.524; Cockerill 2012:394-95; Kuma 2012:273-74; Small 2014:204; Schreiner 2015:268-69). A further possible translation that conveys an antecedent sense of the participle is one that understands the action of the participle as attendant circumstance, thus rendering the clause: "Christ enters into the holy place *and* secures an eternal redemption" (see Westcott 1903:261; Moffatt 1924:121; Spicq 1953:2.256; Attridge 1989:248-49[10]; Ellingworth 1993:453; Healy 2016:173 n.16).

However, given the syntactical possibility as outlined in the analysis of Porter, but more importantly, the context of Hebrews 9, it is best to take the action of the participial clause αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος as subsequent to εἰσῆλθεν. Contextually, this aligns with the movement of the high priest on Yom Kippur and his entry into the Holy of Holies to apply the blood of the sacrifice upon the altar, *thus* obtaining atonement (see Lev 16.15-16). This movement of the high priest is also reflected in the brief statement of Heb 9.7, where once a year the high priest enters into the Holy of Holies [here: τὴν δευτέραν], not without blood [οὐ χωρὶς αἵματος], and offers [προσφέρει] it for himself and for the sins of the people. The progression of events culminates not in the death of the sacrificial victim—which interestingly enough is nowhere to be found in 9.7—but instead in the offering of blood for the sins committed by the high priest and the people (see Heb 13.11).

The progression of the Levitical high priest on Yom Kippur fits the context of Heb 9.11-12, where Christ enters the heavenly sanctuary [τὰ ἅγια] through the tent [διὰ…σκηνῆς], bringing with him his own blood and offering it to God, at which point

[10] Attridge presents an interesting case in that he also acknowledges the primacy of the manipulation of blood within the Holy of Holies: "This is another case of a 'coincident' aorist, and at least on the level of the basic image, the decisive atoning act is the *sprinkling of the blood within*" (1989:249, emphasis added). Attridge seems willing to entertain the possibility of a subsequent reading of the participial clause αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος, even if he does not label it as such.

he obtains an eternal redemption for his people (Brooks 1970:211-12; Guthrie 1983:189; Lane 1991:239; Koester 2001:406; Haber 2005:117; Gäbel 2006:288; Moffitt 2011:221-22; Kleinig 2017:427[11]; Jamieson 2019:58). While the death of Christ is necessary and detrimental to the whole program of atonement, the cross of Christ itself is not the *sine qua non* of the sacrificial act. As Vis rightly notes, it is by means of the presentation of blood that Christ achieves an eternal redemption (2012:263-66; here, 264). The subsequent action of the participial clause functions *as the result* of Christ's entering into the heavenly sanctuary. The offering which Christ offers for sin does not occur at the cross, neither is it contemporaneous with his ascension into the heavenly sanctuary. Instead, the decisive moment of atonement occurs in the heavenly sanctuary, where Christ presents himself alive to God as the once-for-all-time offering for sin.

Also, of significance is the meaning of λύτρωσις and its relationship to sin and atonement in Hebrews 9. The noun λύτρωσις occurs only two other times in the New Testament, both of which are found in Luke's Gospel (1.68; 2.38). In the LXX, λύτρωσις occurs eleven times (three more if the Septuagint's mistranslation of the Hebrew גְּלָה is counted). λύτρωσις and its related lexical family falls within the semantic domain of *release* or *set free* (see LN 37.127-38). More commonly, the word redemption when used in connection with the work of Christ often invokes images of the cross and the death of Christ. For example, Paul speaks of justification by grace that comes through the redemption [διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως] that is in Christ Jesus (Rom 3.24). Also, in Christ believers have redemption through his blood [τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ] and forgiveness of trespasses/sins [τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων/ἁμαρτιῶν] (Eph 1.7; Col 1.14).

In the context of Heb 9.11-12, one might expect the author to use a word that is associated with the semantic domain of cultic sacrifice. Such an expectation is

[11] Kleinig perhaps offers one of the clearest distinctions between the death of Christ on the cross and Christ's offering of himself in the heavenly sanctuary:

> "Hebrews therefore rightly distinguishes between Christ's death and his presentation of his blood. Christ brought the blood that he shed for sinners at his death on the cross into God's presence at his exaltation, so that he could use it to cleanse the conscience of sinners, provide them with access to God's presence, and sanctify those whom he had cleansed" (2017:427).

heightened by the author's use of such terminology as tent [σκηνή] (9.11), holy places [τὰ ἅγια] (9.12), and the blood of goats, calves, and bulls [αἵματος τράγων καὶ μόσχων…ταύρων] (9.12-13), aspects of cultic service associated with the act of atonement. Common examples of words that fall within this domain of cultic sacrifice are ἐξιλάσκομαι (ἱλάσκομαι), ἱλαστήριον, or ἱλασμός. The author of Hebrews has already made use of this cultic terminology twice in his letter, first with relationship to sin, noting that Christ made "propitiation for the sins of the people" [εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ] (2.17), and second, as a substantive [τὸ ἱλαστήριον] describing the mercy seat within the Holy of Holies (9.5).

In Heb 9.11-12, redemption blends into the concept of atonement; in the Old Testament—particularly the blood rule of Lev 16.11—the term commonly used for atonement (כִּפֶּר) also contains an element of ransoming life with life (Kleinig 2017:413; see Milgrom 1991:1082-83; 2000:1474; Kleinig 2003:357, 367; Sklar 2013:50, 221). This amalgamation of concepts is clearly evident in 1 Peter, where Peter reminds his readers that the cost of their redemption [λυτρόω] is not paid with perishable things like silver or gold [οὐ φθαρτοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ], but rather, it is paid with the precious blood of Christ, who is without blemish or spot [τιμίῳ αἵματι ὡς ἀμνοῦ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου Χριστοῦ] (1 Pet 1.18-19) (see Morris 1965:39-40).

The one common denominator between atonement and redemption is the use of blood, which has the power to both cleanse *and* ransom (Sklar 2013:53). The cleansing side of blood is evident in the author's use of ἁγιάζω and καθαρίζω in 9.13-14. However, what is unclear in 9.12 is the issue of ransom; perhaps this is because the author addresses this earlier in Hebrews 2 and the reader would have that understanding already in his mind here in 9.12. In Heb 2.14-15, the author recalls the necessity that the incarnation and death of Christ play in the destruction of the devil and his works [ἵνα διὰ τοῦ θανάτου καταργήσῃ τὸν τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου, τοῦτ' ἔστιν τὸν διάβολον]. This destruction brings about the release [ἀπαλλάξῃ] of all who were slaves through their fear of death. Significant here is the term release [ἀπαλλάσσω] in 2.15. As with λύτρωσις in 9.12, ἀπαλλάσσω shares a similar semantic meaning of *release* or *setting free* (LN 37.127). Therefore, when Christ enters the

heavenly sanctuary, he not only secures an eternal cleansing of the ritual impurities caused by sin, he also frees for all time his people from the fear of death which the devil used to ensnare them in his damning grip (Peeler 2014:131).

5.2.2 Hebrews 9.13-14

(13) For if the sprinkling of defiled people with the blood of goats and bulls and the ashes of a heifer sanctify for the cleansing of the flesh, (14) how much more will the blood of Christ, who through the eternal[12] spirit offered himself without blemish to God, purify our[13] consciences from dead works in order to serve a living God.

The author's focus in 9.11-12 is upon the movement of Christ through the greater and more perfect tent [διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς] and into the heavenly sanctuary [εἰς τὰ ἅγια]. This entry is facilitated by means of the right kind of blood, and as result of his sacrifice, Christ secures an eternal release from the fear of death as well as a permanent cleansing from the impurities of sin. In Heb 9.13-14, the emphasis shifts (indicated by the author's use of γὰρ in 9.13) from the procession of Christ into the heavenly sanctuary to the importance of blood and the effective power it contains to bring about a ritual cleansing from the impurities of sin and defilement.

The argument of Heb 9.13-14 includes two important discourse features that help shape the meaning of these passages. The first such feature is a literary device common in other Jewish writings of antiquity, namely *qal waḥomer* (Lane 1991:239; Ellingworth 1993:453; Mitchell 2007:183). The second discourse feature is the syntactical structure of 9.13-14 itself, which takes the form of a first-class conditional sentence (see Robertson 2006:1007-12; BDF 372; Young 1994:226; Wallace 1996:690-94; Lane 1991:230). The use of these discourse features highlight both the efficacy of the Levitical and it's ability to sanctify the flesh, as well as the superiority

[12] The reading in the critical text, πνεύματος αἰωνίου, is found in $\mathfrak{P}^{17vid.}$ $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ א* A B D^2 K L $\mathfrak{M}$. A number of manuscripts contain the reading πνεύματος ἁγίου (א² D^* P 81104 326 365 629 630 2464 ar vg sa^{mss} bo). The discrepancy between the two readings is most likely due to the uncertainty surrounding the identification of the πνεύματος in 9.14. The change from αἰωνίου to αγιου clearly illustrates that the Holy Spirit is the referent of πνεύματος.

[13] Some manuscripts contain the reading υμων (א² D^2 $\mathfrak{M}$ lat sy^h sa bo^{pt}). The evidence for both readings has strong support, but the reading ἡμῶν indicates the author's desire to include himself with his readers as benefiting from the sacrificial work of Christ (Attridge 1989:244 n.4; see Lane 1991:230; Metzger 1994:598-99). Moffatt, however, suggests that the reading ἡμῶν is due to liturgical usage (Moffatt 1924:125). This is unlikely the case, given that the author is found of using ἡμῶν in similar contexts with no hint of liturgical meaning.

of the blood of Christ and its ability to provide a cleansing from sin, specifically its power to purify the conscience (Kleinig 2017:427).

The greater to lesser comparison between the protasis in 9.13 and the apodosis in 9.14 forms the following parallelism:

9.13	τὸ αἷμα τράγων καὶ ταύρων καὶ σποδὸς δαμάλεως ῥαντίζουσα τοὺς κεκοινωμένους	9.14	τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃς διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου ἑαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν ἄμωμον τῷ θεῷ
9.13	ἁγιάζει πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα,	9.14	καθαριεῖ τὴν συνείδησιν ἡμῶν ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν θεῷ ζῶντι

Table 5-2: Parallel Structure of Hebrews 9.13-14

A significant development takes place in the author of Hebrews' appropriation of the Day of Atonement theme in Hebrews 9. Whereas his comparison of the Levitical cult with that of the priestly work of Christ has so far up to this point primarily focused on Leviticus 16 and Yom Kippur, with the introduction of the sprinkling of the ashes of the red heifer in 9.13 the author introduces an act of ritual purification that is distinct from the activities of Leviticus 16.

The red heifer ritual is introduced in Numbers 19 as a means of dealing with the impurity caused by corpse contamination (see Milgrom 1989:157; Levine 1993:457). There is some debate as to whether this ritual is exclusively for the purification of those who came into contact with a corpse, or if there is a sacrificial element involved as well. Some of the elements in Numbers 19 hint at the possibility of a sacrificial rite for the red heifer ceremony. Perhaps the most telling is the author's use of the חַטָּאת offering (see Exod 29.36; 30.10; Leviticus 4). Also, the supervision of Eleazar the priest over the red heifer ceremony lends credibility to a sacrificial rite as well (Wright 1992:3.115).

Nevertheless, there are aspects of the red heifer ritual that are noticeably absent from any other sacrificial context. For example, the חַטָּאת offering is slaughtered at the altar inside the camp, but in Num 19.3 the red heifer is taken outside the camp to be sacrificed (see Lev 17.11). Also, of note is the absence of the requirement that

the heifer be unworked (Num 19.2; see Deut 21.3; 1 Sam 6.7). Unlike the burning of the חַטָּאת offering, which is to eliminate the carcass of the now impure animal, the incineration of the red heifer is necessary for the provision of the ashes needed for purification. Finally, the use of cedar, hyssop, and scarlet material are items absent in sacrifice, but do however appear in other contexts that refer to purification rites (Lev 14.5-7, 51-52) (Wright 1992:3.115; see Sprinkle 2003:669-70).

The significance of the blood from goats and bulls [τὸ αἷμα τράγων καὶ ταύρων] and the sprinkling of the ashes from a red heifer [σποδὸς δαμάλεως ῥαντίζουσα] is in its effectiveness to sanctify only the outward disposition of the one who offers a sacrifice [ἁγιάζει πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα]. In Heb 9.13, the author focuses on the outward ritual purification of the officiant, which most likely explains the inclusion of the red heifer ritual into the cultic discourse of Hebrews 9 (Mitchell 2007:183). deSilva suggests that by introducing the red heifer rite into his discourse the author of Hebrews is linking it with the Day of Atonement as a means of transferring the external cleansing of the red heifer to the more internal sacrifice of atonement that resulted from the sacrificial ritual on Yom Kippur (2006:306). Although the sprinkling of blood and ashes were intended to be temporary agents of cleansing, able to penetrate as far as the flesh (see Heb 9.9-10), they were nevertheless effective in their ability to provide ritual purification for the worshipper.

The immensity of Christ's purifying work is expressed by the emphatic Πόσῳ μᾶλλον that is fronted for emphasis in Heb 9.14 (See BDAG: s.v. πόσος 1; See BDAG: s.v. μᾶλλον 2.b; see Olmstead 2019:148 for similar occurrence). At the clausal level, this emphatic marker of comparison introduces the conclusion to the *qal waḥomer* that is introduced by the conjunction εἰ in 9.13 (Ellingworth 1993:456). Whereas sacrifices under the old covenant is effective in so far as cleansing of the flesh is concerned, the once-for-all-time sacrifice of Christ, offered through the eternal spirit, penetrates all the way into the inner being of a person, effectively and sufficiently purifying the conscience of the worshiper so that they are able to serve the living God.

Unlike the blood of goats and bulls [δι' αἵματος τράγων καὶ μόσχων], the offering which Christ offers is through the eternal spirit [διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου]. There is some

debate as to the identification of the πνεύματος in Heb 9.14. As noted above, the textual evidence seems divided on the modifier of πνεύματος. While the reading found in the critical text is adapted here [αἰωνίου], other textual witnesses contain the reading ἅγιος instead. This uncertainty coincides with two possible meanings for the prepositional phrase διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου.

The first possible meaning for διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου is that it refers to the eternal spirit of Christ. Some commentators suggest that this is a reference to the divine nature of Christ. Westcott argues that the anarthrous πνεύματος refers not to the Holy Spirit, but to a power which Christ possessed, namely his own spirit. Thus, Christ's spirit is eternal by virtue of its divine nature (1903:263). Moffat argues along similar lines, noting that the offering of Christ is accomplished by his divine nature (1924:124). Spicq likewise takes a similar position, commenting, "[E]n vertu de sa personnalité même ou de sa puissance propre, d'une valeur transcendante, qui lui assurait une vie et un sacerdoce éternel même à travers la mort, et que l'on est en droit d'identifier d'après VII 16, 24, à la nature divine" (1953:2.258). Hughes, like Spicq, cites Heb 7.16 and 7.24 in support of a "divine nature" meaning for πνεύματος αἰωνίου. According to Hughes, Christ's offering is only acceptable because it is offered through Christ's divine nature, what the author of Hebrews refers to as Christ's "indestructible life" [ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου] in 7.16 (1977:358-59; see Moffat 1924:124; Montefiore 1964:154-55).

A second way commentators understand διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου in Heb 9.14 is in reference to the Holy Spirit. This interpretation is supported by the substitution of αἰωνίου for ἁγίου in the ℵ² D* P and other witnesses. Textually, a good case can be made in favor of reading the prepositional phrase as a reference to the Holy Spirit. In all, πνεῦμα occurs twelve times in Hebrews. Of these twelve, five refer to either angels (1.7, 14), the inner being of a person (4.12), God as creator of life (12.9), or the saints who currently reside in the presence of God (12.23). Of the seven remaining occurrences of πνεῦμα, six of them are modified by the familiar adjective ἅγιος, with the final occurrence of πνεῦμα modified by τῆς χάριτος, a reference to Zech 10.10 (see πνεῦμα χάριτος in T. Jud. 24.3) and the eschatological pouring out of

the Spirit (Kleinig 2017:516; see Attridge 1989:295 n.46; Lane 1991:294). If we consider this pattern of noun+modifier as the author of Hebrews' default for referring to the Holy Spirit, then the likelihood that πνεύματος αἰωνίου in Heb 9.14 is a reference to the Holy Spirit is high.

A further grammatical element in the debate over meaning is the lack of article before πνεῦμα in 9.14. In his defense of a divine nature reading of πνεύματος αἰωνίου, Westcott purports that the anarthrous πνεύματος is a reference to Christ's divine nature (1903:263-64). Unfortunately, Westcott may not have taken into account the other clear references to the Holy Spirit in Hebrews. For example, twice the anarthrous πνεῦμα appears as a genitive modifying its perspective head noun (2.4; 6.4). In both of these cases, it is without a doubt a reference to the Holy Spirit. On the other hand, Cockerill asserts that the omission of the article before πνεῦμα places emphasis on the quality of the Spirit, namely a quality of eternality [αἰώνιος] (2012:398; see the discussion in Wallace 1996:243-45 regarding the qualitative nature of anarthrous nouns). While Cockerill's assessment regarding the anarthrous πνεῦμα may in fact be applicable in 9.14, the more likely reason for the absence of the article is due to the presence of the preposition διά. As Ellingworth correctly notes, the absence or presence of the article has no real significance with regard to ascertaining a correct interpretation of διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου in 9.14 (1993:456).

While a reference to either the divine nature of Christ or to the Holy Spirit have merit, objections to both of these interpretations have been raised. First, if the author of Hebrews is implying that πνεύματος αἰωνίου is a reference to Christ's divine nature, this interpretation seems to be influenced more by later trinitarian debates than with the argument of Hebrews 9 (see Attridge 1989:250; Emmrich 2002:20). If a reference to either Christ's divine nature, or perhaps even his human nature, were in focus, the author could easily refer to this with the addition of a personal pronoun to the clause: διὰ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ αἰωνίου (see Emmrich 2002:20). Consequently, if the author of Hebrews is making reference to the Holy Spirit, the use of ambiguous terminology to do so seems rather out of place, considering that he just referenced the Holy Spirit in 9.8 with the more traditional τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου (*pace* Moffitt

2011:279-80 n.140). Instead of looking for an interpretation outside 9.14, perhaps the key to understanding the meaning of διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου is found in the nature of Christ's blameless offering of purification.

At the heart of this thesis is the assumption that cultic language in Hebrews, particularly Yom Kippur and its related sacrifices, are not metaphors for the cross or the death of Christ. Instead, the author of Hebrews follows rather closely the two-step pattern of the high priest described in Leviticus 16. As discussed above, Christ's entry through the tent and into the heavenly sanctuary is a necessary prerequisite for securing eternal redemption. In 9.14, the author fills in the details of Christ's high priestly journey in 9.11-12, disclosing what is until now implied by the use of the sematic domain of blood: Christ's offering to God in the heavenly sanctuary is an offering of himself [ἑαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν ἄμωμον τῷ θεῷ]. It is through this self-offering that Christ is able to secure an eternal redemption for those who believe in and embrace his self-sacrifice.

As mentioned above, commentators commonly interpret references to the blood of Christ as metaphors for Christ's death (Hughes 1977:334; Peterson 1982:138). However, to apply a metaphorical to meaning to the blood of Christ in 9.14 does not fit the context of 9.11-14. For example, the subsequent reading of the participle εὑράμενος in 9.12 clearly marks the action of Christ's procuring redemption as occurring after his entry into the heavenly sanctuary. The resultative action of the participial clause in 9.12 informs our understanding of the timing of Christ's self-offering. As a result of Christ securing an eternal redemption *after* his entry into the heavenly sanctuary, this would suggest that Christ's self-offering must occur subsequent to his entry. This is also in line with what the author of Hebrews stated earlier in chapter eight. The author notes that every high priest must have something to offer, and since Christ is unable to present his offering while he is on earth, the only suitable location for his self-offering is in the heavenly sanctuary itself (8.3-4; see 5.1-4).

Therefore, what Christ offers to God upon his entry into the heavenly sanctuary is his own blood. This blood does not represent a metaphor for the death of Christ. Instead, what the blood of Christ points to is Christ's resurrected life, perfected

through the suffering of death (2.9-10) and now indestructible (7.16). It is this life that Christ offers without blemish [ἄμωμον] to God for the purification of the conscience from dead works [καθαριεῖ τὴν συνείδησιν ἡμῶν ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων]. The once-for-all-time offering which Christ offers in the heavenly sanctuary not only secures an eternal redemption for his people, it also frees them to serve the living God [εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν θεῷ ζῶντι].

5.3 Hebrews 9.22

5.3.1 Hebrews 9.22

And according to the law almost everything is purified with blood, and apart from the pouring out of blood there is no purgation.

Hebrews 9.22 falls at the crossroads between a discussion of covenant inauguration in 9.15-21 and a return to Yom Kippur symbolism in 9.23-28 (Johnsson 1973:318-19). In this one small but seminal verse, the author of Hebrews succinctly summarizes two key themes of Hebrews 9: the necessity of blood and the purifying power it has to cleanse all that come into contact with it. Along with this, 9.22b ties directly into 9.23 and the need for purification of the heavenly things.

This section will first explore the meaning of the *hapax legomena* αἱματεκχυσία within the context of Hebrews 9. Does αἱματεκχυσία refer to the "shedding of blood," or perhaps does the phrase "pouring out of blood" capture the meaning of αἱματεκχυσία better in light of the emphasis on cultic blood? And second, does οὐ γίνεται ἄφεσις refer to the forgiveness of sin, or does Johnsson's circumlocutory translation of ἄφεσις as "a decisive purgation" better fit the cultic context of Hebrews 9? However, before answering these two questions, it will prove beneficial to briefly summarize 9.15-21 in order to provide a contextual background for the exegesis of 9.22.

Hebrews 9.15-21 is divided into two sections, 9.15-17 and 9.18-22. At the discourse level, these subunits are demarcated by the emphatic compound conjunction διὰ τοῦτο in 9.15 (Westfall 2005:206-7; Runge 2010:48-49) and the inferential conjunction ὅθεν in 9.18. As Westfall notes, διὰ τοῦτο grammatically functions

cataphorically, anticipating the conjunction ὅπως and its marker of purpose (2005:207; see Moffatt 1924:126). Further, there is a cohesive tie with the earlier discussion in 8.6-13, which is activated by the author's return to the subject of διαθήκη (Westfall 2005:207). Through his death [θανάτου γενομένου εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεων], Christ became mediator of a new covenant [διαθήκης καινῆς μεσίτης ἐστίν], and with the inauguration of this new covenant, those who are called receive the promise of eternal inheritance [τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν λάβωσιν οἱ κεκλημένοι τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας]. Furthermore, Christ's death is necessary for the establishment of this new covenant.[14] In order for a διαθήκη to go into effect, the death of the διαθήκη-maker [διατίθημι] must first occur. The διαθήκη is not operative [μήποτε ἰσχύει] so long as the διαθήκη-maker is still alive, for it is only in death that a διαθήκη goes into effect [διαθήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία].

In Heb 9.18 a topic shift is introduced in the discourse, which is marked by the inferential conjunction ὅθεν. Whereas in 9.15-17 the author of Hebrews highlights the mediatorial role of Christ under the new covenant, in 9.18-21 the topic shifts to a discussion of the old covenant and the necessity of blood in the inauguration of a covenant [ὅθεν οὐδὲ ἡ πρώτη χωρὶς αἵματος ἐγκεκαίνισται]. The importance of blood in the inauguration of the old covenant is illustrated by echoes to Old Testament Scripture that speak of the rituals involved in the establishment of the old covenant. Such echoes include references to the blood of calves and goats [τὸ αἷμα τῶν

[14] There is debate as to the exact meaning of διαθήκη in Heb 9.15-17. Most translations oscillate between "covenant" in 9.15 and "will/testament" in 9.16-17, while returning to "covenant" once again in 9.18ff. The only English translation that remains consistent is the NASB, rendering διαθήκη as "covenant" throughout 9.15-22. While the reading "will/testament" for διαθήκη is a perfectly good translation (see *Ant*. 13.349; 17.53, 78, 146, 188, 195, 202) and is supported by a number of commentators (see Behm *TDNT* 2.131-32 Moffatt 1924:127-28; Attridge 1989:253-56; Wiid 1992:149-56; Ellingworth 1993:462-63; deSilva 2000:308-10; Koester 2001:417-18, 424-26; Murray 2002:41-60; Mitchell 2007:188; Kleinig 2017:439-40), the context itself does not seem to support such a reading. While it is certainly the case that the author of Hebrews' rhetorical expertise would allow for such a play on words, Cockerill is correct to suggest that the likelihood of him doing so here at the expense thematic continuity is improbable (2012:404). This is also supported by the thorough studies of Scott Hahn, who argues rather conclusively that a translation of "covenant" for διαθήκη fits the context of Heb 9.15-22, specifically when read with both the legal implications and liturgical act in mind (Hahn 2004:416-36; 2005:65-88; see Hatch 1889:48; Westcott 1903:265-66; Hughes 1979:28-66; Morrison 2008:144-46). A mediating position is found in Campbell, who suggests that the author of Hebrews and its readers would have easily understood both meanings—that of will/testament and covenant—in the διαθήκη (1972:107-11).

μόσχων καὶ τῶν τράγων]; the presence of water, scarlet wool, and hyssop [ὕδατος καὶ ἐρίου κοκκίνου καὶ ὑσσώπου]; and the sprinkling of the book and people [βιβλίον καὶ πάντα τὸν λαὸν], along with the tent and all of the vessels associated with the tabernacle [τὴν σκηνὴν καὶ πάντα τὰ σκεύη τῆς λειτουργίας]. These ritual elements are summed up in the quotation from Exod 24.8: "This is the blood of the covenant that God commanded from you." Guthrie correctly concludes that the use of Exodus 24 reinforces the notion that covenants can only be established when there is sacrificial blood is involved (Guthrie 2007:973).

5.3.1.1 αἱματεκχυσία: *Shedding or Pouring out of Blood?*

The difficulty involved in deciphering the meaning of αἱματεκχυσία is due to the lack of textual evidence for αἱματεκχυσία available in the extant writings from antiquity. Further complicating matters is the question of whether or not this New Testament *hapax legomena* was coined by the author of Hebrews himself (see Moffatt 1924:130; Spicq 1953:2.265; Montefiore 1964:158-59; Thornton 1964:63-65; Johnsson 1973:320-21; 1978:104-8; Young 1979:180; Attridge 1989:259; Gräßer 1993:2.185; Koester 2001:420; Mitchell 2007:190; Kuma 2012:290; Kleinig 2017:444-45; Harris 2019:238). Consequently, the lack of diachronic or synchronic lexical usage makes it even more difficult to ascertain with any sense of certainty a definitive meaning for αἱματεκχυσία.

Regardless of whether the author coined this term or not, it is within the context of Hebrews 9 that one finds meaning for this highly cultic term (Gäbel 2006:418; *pace* Riggenbach 1913:279). Later usage by Christian authors can provide a helpful guidance with respect to how αἱματεκχυσία was understood, but even then, their usage of αἱματεκχυσία is no doubt influenced by the text of Hebrews and other early commentaries or homilies on Hebrews 9.22. Before examining the meaning of αἱματεκχυσία in Heb 9.22, it will prove helpful to analyze the etymology of this compound noun and explore the possible connections to relevant passages from the Greek Old Testament.

The compound noun αἱματεκχυσία consists of two words main words, αἷμα (blood) and ἐκχέω/ἔκχυσις (to pour out; pouring out). In some instances, the combination of

these two words used together in context refers to the act of shedding blood. This is the case in Gen 9.6 with regard to the prohibition against the shedding of human blood [ὁ ἐκχέων αἷμα ἀνθρώπου] and the price to pay for breaking such a command [ἐκχυθήσεται]. A similar instance occurs in the Joseph narrative, where Reuben warns his brothers not to murder Joseph [Μὴ ἐκχέητε αἷμα] (Gen 37.22; see Lev 17.4; Num 35.33; Deut 19.10; 21.7; 1 Chr 22.8; 28.3; Ps 105.38[LXX]; Prov 6.17; Sir 31.27; Jer 22.17; Ezek 22.12; Joel 3.19; a similar meaning is also found with the pairing of αἷμα and ἔκχυσις in 1 Kgs 18.28 and Sir 27.15).

However, when αἷμα and ἐκχέω are used in tandem in a cultic context, the meaning tends to shift from the act of killing to the pouring out of blood (Thornton 1964:64; Kuma 2012:291). This is the case, for example, in the description of the provisions for the *ḥaṭṭaʾt* offering in Leviticus 4. After the priest slaughters the victim, the blood is brought to the tent of meeting and sprinkled seven times before the Lord and placed upon the horns of the altar of incense. Upon the completion of the manipulation of blood upon the altar, the priest pours out the remaining blood at the base of the altar [πᾶν τὸ αἷμα τοῦ μόσχου ἐκχεεῖ παρὰ τὴν βάσιν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τῶν ὁλοκαυτωμάτων] (4.7, 18, 25, 30, 34; see Exod 29.12; Lev 8.15; 9.9; for a non-cultic sense, see 17.13; Deut 12.16; 15.23). Unlike the examples above, where the shedding of blood acts as a euphemism for murder, in the cultic context of Leviticus 4, the grouping of αἷμα and ἐκχέω together to refer to the pouring out of blood plays a larger part in the priestly liturgy of the *ḥaṭṭaʾt* offering.

In the New Testament, the pairing of αἷμα and ἐκχέω occurs twelve times. In five occurrences it carries the meaning of shedding blood (Matt 23.35; Luke 11.50; Acts 22.20; Rom 3.15; Rev 16.6). More important to this study, however, are the occurrences of αἷμα and ἐκχέω recorded in the Last Supper narrative in the Synoptic Gospels (Matt 26.82; Mark 14.24; Luke 22.20). It has even been proposed that the author of Hebrews coined αἱματεκχυσία under influence of this key event in the Synoptics Gospels (Kleinig 2017:444). Nevertheless, it is likely that the account of the Last Supper and the Eucharistic tradition of the early Church no doubt played some part in the shaping of the New Testament's theology of cross and atonement.

Outside of its initial occurrence in Hebrews, αἱματεκχυσία does occur in the writings of the church fathers. The earliest occurrence of αἱματεκχυσία is found in Tatian's *Oratio adversus Greacos*. In a chapter dedicated to the ungodly spectacle of gladiator combat, Tatian laments this form of entertainment, referring to it as "wicked and impious and abominable deeds" [πονηρῶν καὶ ἀθέων καὶ μιαρῶν ἔργων]. He goes on to condemn the purchasing of men in order to "supply a cannibal banquet for the soul" [τῇ ψυχῇ τὴν ἀνθρωποφαγίαν], a banquet that serves no other function than to nourish the soul with "impious blood-shedding" [αἱματοχυσίαις ἀθεωτάταις] (PG 6.857c; English translation is from *ANF*). Likewise, in Epiphanius's defense of orthodoxy, the *Panarion*, Epiphanius refers to the violent act of shedding blood as αἱματεκχυσίας (PG 41.676a; *Pan*. 39.9.2).

While etymological studies provide a helpful guidance for how a word is translated, it is nevertheless the context in which a word appears that ultimately supplies the meaning of a specific term in question. In Heb 9.22, αἱματεκχυσία occurs in a context that is ripe with cultic terminology and symbolism. As noted above, the term blood plays a significant part in the author's discourse, occurring nine times in Hebrews 9—ten, if you count αἱματεκχυσία. In all nine occurrences, αἷμα refers to the use of blood within the cultic liturgy, with no reference to slaughter or to the death of a sacrificial victim. However, when translating αἱματεκχυσία in 9.22, most translations opt for the more traditional translation of "shedding of blood" (note Johnsson's comment regarding this very thing, 1973:322; see Behm, *TDNT* 1.176–77; Ellingworth 1993:474; Thompson 2008:191-92; Cockerill 2012:410). However, does the translation "shedding of blood" best fit the context of Hebrews 9 and the author's emphasis on blood?

As noted throughout this study, the author of Hebrews heavily emphasizes the necessity of blood for access to God, atonement, and purgation from sin (Johnsson 1973:322). In fact, the author is more concerned with the application of blood within a cultic setting than he is with the act of slaughtering (Braun 1984:280; Lindars 1991:94 n.96; Eberhart 2005:52). The aphoristic statement of 9.22a highlights the role blood plays not only in the inauguration of the old covenant (9.18-21), but it also highlights the ritual importance of blood for the purification of Israel's cultic

appurtenances [σχεδὸν ἐν αἵματι πάντα καθαρίζεται κατὰ τὸν νόμον]. The general principle of 9.22a and its relationship with the Levitical cult is summed up in one basic truth: blood effects purification (Jamieson 2019:132-33). The author of Hebrews' emphasis on αἷμα in Hebrews 9 reinforces the main argument of this thesis, namely, that the author's sacrificial terminology is not a reference to immolation, nor is it a metonymy for Jesus's death. Instead, the use of αἷμα in Hebrews 9, when read in light of Israel's cultic liturgy, functions as the purifying agent that brings about the necessary cleansing that is required for approaching God in worship.

The second half of Heb 9.22, itself also axiomatic in nature, not only supports the truism in 9.22a, but also shares a similarity with the "blood rule" of Lev 17.11 (Lane 1991:246; Gräßer 1993:2.129; Ribbens 2016:155-56; Jamieson 2019:132). In Lev 17.11, blood is referred to as the "life of the flesh" [ἡ γὰρ ψυχὴ πάσης σαρκὸς αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐστιν / נֶ֣פֶשׁ הַבָּשָׂ֔ר בַּדָּ֑ם]. Even more important with regard to Heb 9.22 is the application of blood upon the altar for atonement and *not* the act of immolation [ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου ἐξιλάσκεσθαι περὶ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν, τὸ γὰρ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἀντὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐξιλάσεται / עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּ֗חַ לְכַפֵּ֛ר עַל־נַפְשֹׁתֵיכֶ֖ם כִּי־הַדָּ֣ם הֽוּא בַּנֶּ֔פֶשׁ יְכַפֵּֽר] (see Lev 4.7, 18, 35, 30, 34; 8.15; 9.9; see Exod 29.12; b. Zebaḥ 6a, 8a, 26b, 36a, 36b, 51a, 51b, 89b).

The immediate context of Hebrews 9, particularly 9.18-21, favors a reading of αἱματεκχυσία that is closer to the cultic "pouring out of blood" rather than one of violent death (Moffitt 2011:292-3 n.157). This is supported by the act of sprinkling [ῥαντίζω] blood upon the book, the people, and the tabernacle, all of three of which are purified by the sprinkling of blood (Ribbens 2016:156). For the author of Hebrews, the application of blood is what ultimately purifies and removes ritual impurity (Swetnam 1981:186). It is the ritual application of blood, both for purification [καθαρίζω] (9.22a) as well as for purgation [ἄφεσις] (9.22b), that is central to the author's cultic argument in Hebrews 9 (Kuma 2012:291). Furthermore, a contrast between the literal use of blood in 9.22a and a metaphorical use in 9.22b should not be forced upon the meaning of 9.22 (Johnsson 1974:322-23; see Lane 1991:246).

Instead, the author's use of blood is best understood within the cultic framework the author has consistently used throughout the Hebrews 9, one that views blood not as a metaphor for the cross, but instead as the agent that effects purgation and provides the means of access to God. This sentiment is also shared by Gäbel, who concludes that "Kreuzesgeschehen ist dagegen nicht gedacht" (Gäbel 2006:418).

5.3.1.2 ἄφεσις: *Forgiveness of Sin or Purgation?*

Whereas under the law almost everything is purified with blood, under the new covenant, the only way to achieve ἄφεσις is through the blood of Christ. Without blood [χωρὶς αἵματος] there is no access to God (Heb 9.8), no covenant inauguration (9.18), and ultimately, no ἄφεσις (9.22b) (Johnsson 1973:318-19). While 9.8 and 9.18 are fairly clear in what blood procures, this is not so the case in 9.22b, where the author rather vaguely identifies the result of αἱματεκχυσία is ἄφεσις. What exactly does the author of Hebrews imply by his use of ἄφεσις, specifically in the context of Hebrews 9?

A brief perusal of English translations of Heb 9.22b reveals some uncertainty as to a correct translation for ἄφεσις. Some versions translate ἄφεσις as simply "there is no forgiveness" (NASB; NIV; CEB; CSB; LEB), with a few adding the modifier "of sins" to the end. The addition of the modifier "of sins" no doubt is meant to limit the scope of meaning with regard to ἄφεσις (ESV; NRSV). Although this addition of the modifier is an emendation rooted in a biblical theology of forgiveness, the addition of sin in 9.22b unfortunately does not fit the context of Hebrews 9.

The substantive ἄφεσις carries two basic senses: a general sense of *release* and a cultic sense of *remission* (BDAG: s.v. ἄφεσις; see Ribbens 2016:156-58; Jamieson 2019:133-34). In the LXX the overwhelming occurrences of ἄφεσις carry the profane or general sense of meaning, with Lev 16.26 the only real possible usage of ἄφεσις that could be construed as having a cultic meaning (see Braun 1984:280; Ellingworth 1993:474; Bloor 2017). The only instance where ἄφεσις and ἁμαρτία are found together outside the New Testament occurs in the pseudepigraphal work Odes Sol.

13.77 [ἐν ἀφέσει ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν]. Here, ἄφεσις occurs in construct with ἁμαρτία, leaving no doubt that forgiveness of sins is in view.

In the New Testament, the majority of occurrences of ἄφεσις occur in construct with ἁμαρτία (and once with παράπτωμα). In the two occurrences where ἄφεσις is absolute, the context supplies the meaning of forgiveness. For example, in Mark 3.29 the genitive ἁμαρτήματος qualifies the meaning of ἄφεσις. A similar case is found in Heb 10.19, where the demonstrative τούτων functions anaphorically and points back to τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν in the quotation from Jeremiah 31 in 10.16-17. While both of these occurrences are grammatically identical with the absolute use of ἄφεσις in Heb 9.22b, the context of Mark 3.29 and Heb 10.19 imply that forgiveness of sin is what is in focus.

In the case of Heb 9.22b, the qualifying ἁμαρτία/παράπτωμα is missing from 9.22 as well as from the surrounding context. The absence of the modifying ἁμαρτία suggests that the author of Hebrews has a different meaning in mind in his use of ἄφεσις. While commenting on the meaning of ἄφεσις, Johnsson opines that to translate this as forgiveness of sins is "unfounded and insupportable." He goes on to point out that the absence of the qualifying ἁμαρτία, as well the context of Hebrews 9, both point to an interpretation of Hebrews 9 as one devoid of any notion "of sin as debt or broken relationship" (1973:325; 1978:106; 1989:89; see Lane 1991:232-33; Kuma 2012:291-92; *pace* Healy 2016:183). Johnsson's comment regarding the lack of debt or a fractured relationship with respect to sin is a keen observation. What one does find instead is a context of purification and inauguration. In 9.15-21, the emphasis falls on the establishment and inauguration of the covenant, both the new (9.15-17) as well as the old (9.18-21). This is followed by the axiomatic statement in 9.22 regarding the necessity of blood for purification [καθαρίζω] and purgation [ἄφεσις].

From the very outset of Hebrews, the author indicates that what the offering of Christ provides is complete and total purification (see καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος; Heb 1.3). The author shows concern not just for the ritual purity of the

worshipper (see τοὺς κεκοινωμένους, 9.13), but also for the purity of the sanctuary and appurtenances used in worship (9.1-4; 19-21). Hebrews 9.22 stresses the important role that blood plays in the purification of the appurtenances as well as in the total purgation of defilement. Under the old covenant blood cleanses almost all things [σχεδὸν…πάντα] (See Exod 19.10; Lev 15.5.12; 16.26, 28; 22.26; Num 16.46; 31.22-24; Isa 6.6 for exceptions to this general statement).

However, under the new covenant there are no exceptions to the rule. The author of Hebrews is emphatic in his declaration that without the ritual pouring out of blood [αἱματεκχυσία] there is no ἄφεσις whatsoever. The author's use of the absolute ἄφεσις reflects a desire to encompass all impurities under the rubric of *forgiveness* (Kleinig 2017:445-46; see Lane 1991:246-47; Kuma 2012:292). Under the old covenant, almost everything is purified with the sacrificial blood of animals; but now, under the new covenant absolutely everything is purified through the once-for-all-time offering of the blood of Christ.

What the author of Hebrews concerns himself with is not the canceling of sin's debt or the reparation of broken relationships, but rather with the complete and final purgation of sin (Johnsson 1973:327-28; 1978:106). Johnsson sums up the cultic argument of Hebrews in the following manner:

> One is not *redeemed* from defilement, just as one is not *forgiven* it, *reconciled* to it, or *justified* in spite of it. If one is defiled, he must be made clean—the stain, the corruption must be taken away. And, argues the author of Hebrews, the means of that purifying and purification is blood, the blood of Christ Himself, the purifying agent par excellence (1989:89, emphasis in original).

As this study transitions to the final section of this chapter, what will become clear is the power that the blood of Christ provides for the purgation of the conscience from dead works and its necessity for the cleansing of the heavenly things. Just as sin clung to the tabernacle and needs to be purged of ritual defilement, the author of Hebrews anticipates a purgation of the heavenly sanctuary. However, rather than a yearly and indefinite cleansing that was incapable of removing the permanent stain of sin, Christ enters into the heavenly throne room to once and for all purge the heavenly things of all ritual defilement through his own blood.

5.4 Hebrews 9.23-28

5.4.1 Hebrews 9.23

(23) Therefore, it was necessary that the copies of the things in heaven be purified by these sacrifices, but the heavenly things with superior sacrifices than these.

The final six verses of Hebrews 9 find the author of Hebrews once more returning to the imagery of Yom Kippur and Christ's offering within the heavenly sanctuary. In fact, Heb 9.23-28 is rightly understood as an elaboration of 9.11-12, where the subject of Christ's entry into the heavenly sanctuary is first introduced (Johnsson 1973:329). The imagery of Yom Kippur is first introduced in 9.1-10, where the author elaborates upon Israel's sacred space (9.1-5) and regulations for cultic worship (9.6-10). This elaboration in 9.1-10 mirrors 9.11-14 and the greater high priest's passage through the heavens and entry into the heavenly sanctuary through his own blood, whereby he secures an eternal redemption. In 9.15-22, the author outlines the necessity of blood for the inauguration of the covenant, surmising that while under the old covenant almost everything is purified with blood, under the new covenant there is total and complete purgation through the pouring out of Christ's sacrificial blood (9.22).

It is universally acknowledged by scholars commenting on Hebrews that Heb 9.23 presents the most peculiar and challenging statement in all of the author's homily. Commentators have long been perplexed by the author's puzzling assertion that the heavenly things are defiled and in need of cleansing. A.B. Bruce, while trying to side-step the straightforward meaning of this verses, passes this off as being more poetry than theology (1899:366). Moffatt, on the other hand, accuses the author of Hebrews of stretching the analogy of Yom Kippur past its limits, so much so that the idea of heaven's need for cleansing "becomes almost fantastic" (1924:132). Spicq dismisses any notion of an impure heavenly sanctuary as "non-sens" (1953:2.267). Montefiore avers that what one finds in 9.23 is "[a] rather unhappy comparison" between the heavenly things and their earthly copies (1964:160). Wedderburn suggests that perhaps the author of Hebrews left Plato's cave of shadows just long enough to come "under the influence of the logic of the cultic analogies and imagery," thus "present[ing] us with an image which is decidedly foreign to Platonic thought" (2005:400). Finally, Schenck suggests that any notion of a heaven that is tainted with

defilement is “preposterous” (2007a:168). From these examples it is clear that on the surface this verse is repulsive to a traditional understanding of heaven as the dwelling place of God. However, for the author of Hebrews there is a real sense of defilement in heaven that is in need of a cleansing which is only available through the better offering of Christ himself.

Hebrews 9.23 opens with a transition marked by the inferential οὖν. The conjunction οὖν highlights the axiom of 9.22 (blood purifies and cleanses), along with the inauguration of the old covenant (9.18-21), while at the same time pointing forward to the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary and the putting away of sin (9.23-28) (Cody 1960:184; Attridge 1989:260; Gäbel 2006:420; Jamieson 2016:573-74; Ribbens 2016:119-20). According to the author of Hebrews, the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary is one of necessity [ἀνάγκη]. This language of obligation is also found in the 9.16, where the author notes that the death of Christ is necessary [ἀνάγκη] in order for a διαθήκη to be ratified. Here in 9.23, the obligation in question is one of purification. Just as the earthly sanctuary, which is a copy of the heavenly sanctuary [τὰ μὲν ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς], is in need of cleansing from defilement [τούτοις καθαρίζεσθαι], so too is the heavenly sanctuary [τὰ ἐπουράνια] in need of cleansing, a cleansing made possible through the blood of Christ [κρείττοσιν θυσίαις παρὰ ταύτας].

However, by indicating the need for purification of the heavenly things the author of Hebrews introduces a number of interpretive conundrums. First, in what way can it be said that the heavenly sanctuary needs cleansing? Is one to conclude that heaven is in some way defiled by sin? Or, is καθαρίζω synonymous with ἐγκαινίζω (see 9.18), so that what the heavenly sanctuary needs is not cleansing from defilement, but rather a cleansing *for* inauguration. Second, what exactly does the author refer to when he speaks of the heavenly things [τὰ ἐπουράνια]? Is this, as some have suggested, as reference to human interiority, particularly the conscience, or does it in fact reference a literal sanctuary in heaven? And lastly, is there any significance to the author’s use of the plural in regard to the sacrifices needed to purify the heavenly things? Each of these questions will be addressed below.

On the surface, the idea of defilement in heaven is *a priori* foreign to what is revealed about the nature of God and his relationship to sin and defilement. Leviticus declares that God is holy, and all of his people are to be holy also (Lev 11.44-45; 19.2; [20.7]; 20.26; 21.28; Num 15.40; see 1 Pet 1.16). Likewise, the Psalmist affirms that God does not delight in evil, nor does evil dwell in his presence (Ps 5.4(5); 11(10).5; 92.15[91.16 LXX]). The prophet Habakkuk proclaims that God's eyes are too pure to look upon evil (Hab 1.13). Jesus himself echoes the Old Testament's portrait of God, reminding his disciples of God's standards for perfection (Matt 5.48). Finally, the author of Hebrews remarks that without holiness none shall see the Lord (Heb 12.14). The testimony of both the Old and New Testament is unambiguously clear that God is holy, and he demands holiness from all his people. Therefore, in light of the testimony regarding the holiness of God, what is a proper understanding of defilement language with respect to the heavenly things within the context of Hebrews 9?

Some commentators propose that the purification of the heavenly things in Heb 9.23 is a reference to the expulsion of Satan from heaven (Michel 1957:323-24; McRay 1980:4; Héring 2010:82; see Morris 1981:12.91). In light of Satan's residency in the heavenly places (see Eph 3.10; see Eph 6.12), heaven became defiled and in needed of cleansing (Job 15.15). The author of Hebrews describes this cleansing in 2.14 when he describes the Son of God's triumph over the devil and his end of tyranny over those who were his slaves (MacLeod 1995:67-68). Whereas before Satan presented himself before God in heaven (Job 1.6; 2.1; see Zech 3.1; Jub. 10.8; 17.16), he is now cast down in judgement (John 10.31; Col 2.15; 1 John 3.8; Rev 9.1; 12.8-9; see Luke 10.18) and the heavenly things have been purified of his defilement.

A second interpretation offered by commentators proposes that the cleansing that took place is not meant to be read literally as a reference to heaven, but rather is metaphorically speaking of the purification of the conscience mentioned earlier in 9.11-14 (see Isaacs 1992:212 n.2). For Milligan, the heavenly things represent the consciousness of sins, which stands as a barrier that hinders one's approach to God (Milligan 1899:157-58). It is through the better sacrifices [κρείττοσιν θυσίαις] of Christ offered that this barrier of sin is purified from the consciences of believers. Loader

likewise understands the heavenly things metaphorically as a reference to the conscience, referring to it as a “Reinigung der Menschen” (1980:169-70; here, 169). Attridge posits that Hebrews 9.23 forms a structural parallel with 9.11-14, specifically 9.14, where the author of Hebrews connects the blood of Christ with the cleansing of the conscience (Attridge 1989:260-262; see Schenck 2007a:168). According to Attridge, the author of Hebrews’ “language of cosmic transcendence is ultimately a way of speaking about human interiority,” where “true cultic cleansing is a matter of the heart and mind” (1989:262). Bruce concurs with Attridge, noting that what needs cleansing is the defiled conscience of humanity, a cleansing that belongs to the spiritual realm (1990:228-29).

A third interpretation offered by commentators, and perhaps the most literal reading of the text, understands the cleansing of the heavenly things not as a metaphor for the conscience, nor as the expulsion of Satan from heaven, but as a reference to the removal of sin from heaven itself. For example, Delitzsch insists that the cleansing of the heavenly things is a cleansing from the presence of sin in heaven (1876:2.125; see Buchanan 2006:290). Related to the presence of sin in heaven, Moffatt suggests that Christ’s priestly ministry of continuously forgiving sinners has in some way contaminated the heavenly tabernacle, thus causing defilement (1924:132).

While both Delitzsch and Moffatt make passing comments on this surprising phenomenon, it is Johnsson’s detailed study on defilement and purgation that helpfully bridges the gap between the heavenly things and their earthly copies (see Heb 8.5). Johnsson points out that the defilement in heaven is intimately connected with the defilement of the earthly place of worship (see Lev 16.16). Further, because sin is a contagion it’s spread does not stop at earthly matters; instead, its defilement extends throughout all creation and into the heavenly sanctuary (1973:257-60; 330-33; Dunhill 1992:232; Nelson 1993:150; Koester 2001:421, 427; Philip 2011:54; Kuma 2012:293-301). Lane, who is influenced greatly Johnsson’s study, notes that the cultic application of blood effects not only the purgation of the earthly tabernacle and its appurtenances, but it also has some type of effect upon the heavenly tabernacle as well. Therefore, just as sacrificial blood is necessary for the purgation of the earthly tabernacle, the blood of Christ is likewise necessary for the purgation

of the heavenly things (1991:247; see Braun 1984:281; Mackie 2007:177; Cockerill 2012:416).

A final interpretation offered for the cleansing of the heavenly things is symbolic in nature and is connected to the cultic inauguration language of 9.18-22. Commentators who put forth this interpretation tend to understand καθαρίζω as virtually synonymous with ἐγκαινίζω in Heb 9.18. Such is the case with Spicq, who asserts that "[l]a purification peut signifier simplement: dédicace…ce serait l'exact correspondant d'ἐγκαινίζεσθαι" (1953:2.267; see Lünemann 1882:344-45; Gäbel 2006:420-22[15]; Mason 2012:916). In support of his claims of synonymity, Spicq points to 1 Macc 4.36-59, highlighting that the three verbs καθαρίζω, ἐγκαινίζω, and ἡγίασαν apply to different rites of a similar liturgy (1953:2.267; see Ellingworth 1993:477). This latter claim, that of separate rites of a similar liturgy, could also help explain the meaning of the plural θυσίαις (a generic plural; see Hughes 1977:379; Ellingworth 1993:478; Gäbel 2006:420; Harris 2019:242) at the end of 9.23. In this manner, then, the better sacrifices [κρείττοσιν θυσίαις] offered Christ do not consist in a multiplicity of sacrifices, but rather in a multiplicity of application of a singular sacrifice.

In his monograph on the conceptual background of Hebrews, Hurst notes that the connection between the cleansing of the heavenly things is not with the Yom Kippur typology referred to in 9.11-14, but instead is to be read in light of the "initial purification of the newly built tabernacle at the inauguration of the first covenant" (1990:38; see Stanley 1994:154-55; Cortez 2008:383-85; Moffitt 2011:225-26 n.20; Ribbens 2016:122-23). Rather than reading 9.23 in light of Leviticus and the

[15] Gäbel proposes that Heb 9.23 actually supports all three possible interpretations listed above: inauguration, human interiority, and sanctuary cleansing:

> Bundesschluss, Reinigung des Volkes (als innere Reinigung) sowie Heiligtumsreinigung und -weihe gehören zusammen. Dem himmlischen Kultgeschehen entspricht der innere, dem irdischen der äußere Aspekt der Anthropologie: Das Gewissen ist dem himmlischen Heiligtum zugeordnet. In diesem Zusammenhang dominiert Reinigungsterminologie die Ausführungen zur Wirkung des Kultgeschehens. Sie erfasst die Wirkung auf Gegenstände bzw. Einrichtungen wie auf Personen. Kultische wie sittliche Reinheit sind darin zusammengefasst. Durch das himmlische Selbstopfer Christi ist das Gewissen der Adressaten und zugleich das himmlische Heiligtum von der zur Zeit der ersten διαθήκη aufgehäuften Sündenlast gereinigt und der himmlische Kult des Hohenpriesters Christus inauguriert (2006:424).

sprinkling of the blood for atonement, Hurst suggests that the cleansing of the heavenly things in 9.23 is to be read in view of consecration, similar to the consecration of the priests in Leviticus chapter eight. Following Spicq, Hurst also posits that καθαρίζω is interchangeable with both ἁγιάζω and ἐγκαινίζω (see Exod 29.36; Lev 8.10[LXX]). This leads Hurst to conclude that 9.23 is best viewed as "the inauguration of the new temple of Jewish apocalyptic" (1990:38).

However, the cleansing of the heavenly things that is described in Heb 9.23 is most likely similar to what is found in Leviticus 16, where the high priest not only makes atonement for the sins of the people, he also makes atonement for the Holy Place and the impurities that have accumulated due to the buildup of defilement throughout the preceding year (Lev 16.16). In light of this, the views of Johnsson, Lane, and others are correct in their assessment regarding the defilement of heaven. Because of the nature of sin as a contagion that spreads throughout creation, Christ's sacrificial offering within the heavenly sanctuary makes atonement for both the sin of the people as well as the heavenly sanctuary, just as the offering of the high priests made atonement for the people of Israel and the tabernacle. However, unlike the yearly sacrifice offered by the Levitical high priest on Yom Kippur, the once-for-all-time sacrifice offered by Christ has definitively and completely removed the defilement of sin from both the earthly and heavenly things.

5.4.2 Hebrews 9.24-28

(24) For Christ did not enter into handmade holy places, which are copies of the true things, but he entered into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God on our behalf. (25) Nor is it to offer himself continually, like the high priest who enters into the holy places[16] yearly with blood not his own, (26) for he would need to suffer repeatedly from the foundation of the world. But now, he appeared once and for all time at the end of the ages to put away sin[17] through his sacrifice. (27) Just as it is inevitable for humanity to die once, and after this comes judgement, (28) so also Christ, after being offered up to bear the sins of many, will appear a second time without reference to sin to those who eagerly await him for salvation[18].

[16] The reading των αγιων is found in ℵ^2 sa^{mss}.

[17] The article τῆς is missing in 𝔓^{46} C D^2 K L Ψ 𝔐. The reading αμαρτιων is found in D*.

[18] Some manuscripts contain the reading δια πιστεως after σωτηρίαν (A P 0285 81 1505 bvg^{mss} sy^h).

By his use of γάρ, the author of Hebrews returns once again to Yom Kippur typology in Heb 9.24 and the subject of Christ's entry into heaven and offering for atonement (Attridge 2010:278-79). The author again contrasts the repeated offering of the Levitical high priest with blood not his own (9.25; see 9.7, 13) with that of the once-for-all offering of Christ, an offering made through the blood of Christ (9.26; 9.12, 14). Whereas 9.11-14 refers to the sacrifice of Christ in the present, that is of his securing an eternal redemption through his sacrifice upon his entry into the heavenly sanctuary, Heb 9.24-28 looks forward to the eschatological benefits of Christ's redemptive death, specifically his second coming and the eschatological completion of salvation that Christ inaugurated at his first coming (9.27-28).

5.5 Conclusion

The intent of this chapter was to provide an exegetical analysis of Heb 9.11-28 that supports an analogical interpretation of Christ's sacrifice that is patterned after Yom Kippur and its priestly liturgy rather than understanding Christ's sacrifice and entry into the heavenly sanctuary as metaphors for the cross and the death of Christ. To do so involved a detail exegetical discussion regarding the nature of the heavenly sanctuary, the sacrificial offering of Christ, and the relationship of these topics with forgiveness/purgation of sin.

Beginning with the question of whether the author of Hebrews' reference to the heavenly sanctuary is meant to be taken as a literal structure in heaven or is metaphorical language for the cross, this chapter argues that language used to refer to the heavenly sanctuary is meant to indicate a very real place that existed in heaven. While it is popular for commentators to interpret language that refers to Christ's entry into a heavenly sanctuary in a metaphorical manner, this chapter insists that the author of Hebrews gives no real indication that this was his intention all along. In fact, when the author of Hebrews refers to the heavenly sanctuary he does so with the earthly counterpart in mind. For example, this is clearly seen in the author's description of the heavenly sanctuary as "the true tent that the Lord pitched, not man" [τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς, ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος]. In Heb 9.1-5, the author goes into great detail describing the earthly tabernacle and its appurtenances as a way to set up a comparison between the earthly high priest's

entry into the Holy of Holies (9.6-10) with that of Christ's entry into the heavenly sanctuary (9.11-14, 24-28).Therefore, in a very real sense the earthly tabernacle is but a copy and a shadow [ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ] of the heavenly reality (8.2-5).

Furthermore, it is in the heavenly tent that Christ ministers [τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργὸς] and offers his sacrifice [ὃ προσενέγκῃ] for atonement (8.2-3). Because his lineage permitted him from offering his sacrifice while alive on earth (7.14-16; see 8.4), Christ, as the Melchizedekian high priest, presents his offering of atonement in the heavenly sanctuary, at which time he secures an eternal redemption for those who follow him (9.11-14, 24-28). Unlike the traditional view, where the cross is viewed as the beginning and end of atonement, the author of Hebrews gives no indication that one is to understand the heavenly sanctuary as a metaphor for Christ's death. Instead, he is consistent in his application of the sacrificial language of the Levitical high priest to the priestly ministry of Christ and his mediatorial work as the Melchizedekian high priest.

The question of *when* and *where* atonement is made as it relates to the sacrifice of Christ is interwoven in Hebrews 9 with the typology of Yom Kippur and the liturgical nature of the high priest's ministry on the Day of Atonement. In chapter four of this study, the typology of Yom Kippur and the entry of the high priest into the Holy of Holies was examined in order to lay a foundation for the priestly ministry of Christ within the heavenly sanctuary. Rather than speaking metaphorically regarding the sacrifice of Christ, the author of Hebrews maintains a continuity between the old covenant and its cult with that of the new covenant inaugurated through the sacrifice of Christ upon his entry into the heavenly sanctuary.

As this thesis moves into the final chapter, this emphasis upon the place of atonement will be explored in light of relevant New Testament passages. It has been emphasized throughout this study that when the author of Hebrews refers to the sacrifice of Christ he does so through the lens of Yom Kippur. This is clearly seen in how the author of Hebrews' maps out the ministry of the Levitical high priest upon the priestly ministry of Christ, so that the slaughter of the sacrificial victim upon the altar is the initiation of the two-step process that culminated in the high priest's manipulation of blood within the Holy of Holies for atonement. In this manner, the

sacrifice of Christ makes the best sense if it is understood analogically rather than as a metaphor for the death of Christ on the cross.

As mentioned above, the concluding chapter of this thesis will broaden the scope of Christ's death and its relationship to atonement to include relevant passages from the New Testament in order to build a biblical theological picture of atonement in the New Testament and how the author of Hebrews' cultic theology Christ fits the larger panorama of atonement theology laid out by Paul and other writers of the New Testament. The goal of such a panorama is to tease out the pastoral implications of recognizing the connection between the priestly work of Christ and the purgation of sin.

Lastly, it is argued that what the author of Hebrews concerns himself with is not the cancelling of sin's debt, but rather a total purgation from the defilement of sin. Because of sin, humanity is defiled and in need of total purgation. Sin not only defiles the conscience of humanity, but as a contagion, sin also spreads throughout the created universe, defiling even the heavenly things. Therefore, it is necessary that a sacrifice is made that would totally and completely remove this defilement once and for all. And it is through the offering of Christ, who enters into the heavenly sanctuary by means of his own blood and procures an eternal redemption, that the universal defilement afflicting all of creation is totally and completely eradicated once and for all.

Although the author of Hebrews does not connect a judicial application of forgiveness to that of his cultic notion of purgation with regard to the atonement in Hebrews 9, the judicial sense does appear later in Hebrews 10, where the author connects forgiveness with the promise from Jeremiah that God will no longer remember the sins and lawless deeds of his people (10.17-18). However, when one broadens their scope beyond the letter to the Hebrews, the judicial element moves to the forefront while the cultic sense of purgation or cleansing takes a backseat. This is particularly the case when atonement is connected to the overtly judicial terminology of justification, specifically as it is found in Romans and other Pauline writings.

In closing, in pointing out the danger of interpreting the atonement in Hebrews through a traditional understanding of the cross, Westfall advises:

> If we are comfortable with reinterpreting the author's argument by overlaying it and reinterpreting it with our traditional theology of the cross and our devotion to it, as well as our own assumptions of the nature of reality, we might be able to support a metaphorical understanding of the argument of Hebrews in which the dominant view on the timing of the atonement stays in place. But I would count the cost. If you transform the heavenly tabernacle into a metaphor, what other aspects about the atonement of Jesus that the author claims as realities do you relativize by implication? (2019: 248).

A proper understanding of the sacrifice of Christ and the author of Hebrews' use of cultic terminology will go a long way in shaping one's understanding of the atonement, not only as it is outlined in Hebrews, but also as it is presented by the remaining authors of the New Testament writings. The final chapter of this thesis will explore the practical implications of the author of Hebrews' cultic theology, along with his high priestly Christology. This will allow for the teasing out of the conclusions that this study has put forth within the larger panorama of atonement theology as it is presented in the New Testament.

CHAPTER 6

Summary of Exegetical Findings and Theological Implications

6.1 Introduction

It goes without saying that the letter to the Hebrews offers some of the most theologically rich prose from Early Christian antiquity. The author's eloquent style and rhetorical flourish stands as a model for all future homilists to emulate. However, Hebrews also found itself at the forefront of early theological controversies. During the early centuries of Christianity's growth, the letter to the Hebrews was integral in the disputes regarding apostacy and the possibility for any "second repentance" and restoration into the Christian community (see *De Pudicitia* 20; *Panarion* 59.1.1-59.3.5; *Ep*. 51). At the heart of these disputes were the warning passages in Hebrews, which helped framed the debate regarding the issue of apostasy and readmission into the Christian community. These passages, with their severe warnings of recrucifying Christ and trampling underfoot the Son of God, were a catalyst in the debates regarding the possibility of restoration and repentance. For many, any notion of a "second repentance" was considered an absolute impossibility. Be that as it may, the author of Hebrews left for himself a legacy as not only one of the greatest theologically gifted orators in all of Christendom, but perhaps also the greatest theological mind of the apostolic period, rivaling even the apostle Paul himself.

Perhaps nowhere is the theological genius of the author of Hebrews clearly on display than in the heart of his homily. It is here, in Hebrews 7-10, that one is presented with the richest Christological exegesis of the high priesthood of Christ and his offering to God in the heavenly sanctuary. In these four chapters the author

of Hebrews masterfully weaves Yom Kippur typology, along with covenant inauguration, together with the death of Christ and his offering in heaven in such a way that highlights its continuity with the ministry of the high priest on the Day of Atonement. Similar to the Levitical high priest on Yom Kippur, who takes the blood of the immolated victim inside the Holy of Holies to obtain atonement, Christ also, after suffering outside the gate (Heb 13.12), enters into the heavenly sanctuary through his own blood and obtains an eternal redemption (Heb 9.11-12).

6.2 Summary of Exegetical Findings

The intent of this thesis was to address the question of *when* and *where* the atonement took place, along with the application of Christ's sacrifice. To provide an answer to these questions required an examination of the cultic theology of Hebrews 9, specifically the nature of atonement and its connection with both the heavenly sanctuary and subsequent purgation of ritual defilement. The outset of this study introduced the specific problem that was to be addressed in this thesis, specifically the nature of Christ's atonement in Hebrews and its application for Christians. A few recent studies were surveyed in order to test the waters of a much larger exegetical project that forms the heart of this study. Also, the exegetical methodology used in the exegesis of Hebrews 9 was outlined and clearly delineated. By providing a clearly defined methodology, this allowed for an organized synthesis of the cultic theology of Hebrews 9 and its application to the issue of purgation of sin.

Following the introduction of the issues to be addressed and strategy used to engage the text of Hebrews 9 in chapter one, chapter two undertook an extensive engagement with both primary and secondary literature related to the atonement and the heavenly sanctuary. Beginning with the nature of the atonement in Hebrews, this study surveyed three main views regarding the place and timing of the atonement in Hebrews. These three main views were referred to as the traditional view, the metaphorical view, and the two-step pattern. The survey of the three main views of the atonement in Hebrews illustrated how an understanding of the nature of Christ's sacrifice colors the way one interprets the priestly ministry of Christ as it relates to the Yom Kippur typology utilized by the author of Hebrews in his cultic theology.

Following an examination of atonement theories in Hebrews, focus shifted to a survey of key primary sources that addressed the nature and ontology of the heavenly sanctuary. One of the theoretical issues addressed in this thesis concerns a philosophy of language, particularly as it relates to metaphorical or analogical meaning. This is precisely the issue at hand when confronted with cosmological terminology used to describe part of the earthly place of worship. Both Philo and Josephus referred to this earthly structure in a metaphorical manner, correlating aspects of Israel's sacred space with different aspects of the visible heavens.

On the other end of the spectrum are the Second Temple writings of 1 Enoch, Testament of Levi, and Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. Each of these works presented a picture of the heavenly sanctuary along analogical lines, where God dwelt with his holy angels, who offered sacrifices before the presence of God. For these writers the worship that takes place in heavenly sanctuary in some sense mirrors the ministry of the priests within the earthly tent. For later commentators on Hebrews it became commonplace to interpret the author's use of cosmological language regarding the heavenly sanctuary along metaphorical lines. However, there is precedent within Second Temple Judaism, specifically within the apocalyptic genre, to speak of a very literal sanctuary in heaven, where God dwelt surrounded by ministering angels. It is within this latter group of writings that the letter to the Hebrews finds its theological framework for its description of the heavenly sanctuary.

In order to engage responsibly in an exegetical analysis of the cultic theology of Hebrews, one must first have a solid understanding of both the cultural and historical background of Hebrews as a whole. In undertaking this task, chapter three explored issues surrounding authorship, date, destination, audience, philosophical worldview, genre, and structure of the homily. It was concluded that while a number of plausible candidates have been put forth as possible authors of Hebrews, Origen's famed declaration still stands as the best way to approach this issue. While the identity of the author of Hebrews may be unknown to modern readers, the author does invite readers into his philosophical worldview. It is rather apparent that the author was a gifted orator, one who may have been formally trained and educated within the Greco-Roman educational system of his time. Such an educational upbringing also sheds light on the author's philosophical vocabulary. It was this vocabulary that led

commentators to suggest a link between the author of Hebrews and the Alexandrian Jewish philosopher, Philo. While textual similarities between the two authors do exist, these similarities are best explained by the broader Greco-Roman culture at large, rather than by assigning a Platonic worldview to the author of Hebrews. For the author of Hebrews, this shared vocabulary is for the service of the gospel and the expansion of the Christian movement within the larger Mediterranean world.

Alongside the difficulty of identifying the author of Hebrews is the question of composition. While most commentators generally agree on the boundary markers for when the letter could have been written, the jury is still out with respect to an exact date of composition. Therefore, the evidence for when Hebrews was written is at best conjectural, and the proposal offered in this thesis is a date shortly after the fall of Jerusalem. When ascertaining a destination for Hebrews, one is again confronted with a multiplicity of possible alternatives. Palestine, Zion, Jerusalem, and Rome have all been proposed as possible destinations for the letter to the Hebrews, with the latter having the best textual support.

Related to the issue of destination is the question of ethnicity. Some commentators suggested that the original recipients of Hebrews were Jewish Christians. Such a proposition is rooted in the author's extensive knowledge of the Levitical cult and the overabundance of references to the Old Testament scriptures. On the other hand, a Gentile audience has also been proposed. Commentators who argue in favor of this proposal do so in light of the author's high level of Greek and use of ancient rhetorical devices that were common among those with a basic familiarity with the progymnasmatists. Nevertheless, the text of Hebrews does not provide sufficient evidence in favor of one over the other, and the best that can be suggested for the recipients of Hebrews is a mixed audience of Jewish and Gentile Christians together in a single congregation.

Chapter three concludes with an examination of the genre of Hebrews, along with a discussion of various methodologies for structuring the homily as a whole. Beginning with genre, a number of possibilities were examined. Although no consensus has emerged, the best proposal that fits the evidence at hand is that Hebrews is an example of a first-century homily. While it is evident that the author of Hebrews incorporated rhetorical features throughout his homily, this alone does not warrant a

full-scale rhetorical classification for the homily *in toto*. When attempting to structure Hebrews into a meaningful and coherent whole, one is immediately confronted with the homily resisting any such attempts at a cohesive unit. The most common attempts at structuring Hebrews are those that organized the homily along the lines of "comparative language" interspersed throughout the homily. However, the advent of linguistic studies brought a more focused methodology for analyzing discourse features and their importance for determining cohesion within a text. Whereas before, tracing the structure of Hebrews moved along the lines of specific lexemes or concepts in the message of Hebrews, commentators now began identifying literary features repeated at key points in the discourse, and it was these literary devices that became prominent discourses features upon which outlines of Hebrews were constructed.

Moving on from the historical and cultural background in chapter three, chapters four and five represent the heart of this study and provide the exegetical underpinning needed to answer the two main questions introduced in chapter one: *when* and *where* did atonement occur, and what is its relationship to purgation of sin? Hebrews 9 revolves around two related issues, the Levitical cult and ministry of the high priest (Heb 9.1-10), and the high priestly ministry of Christ and his sacrificial offering (9.11-14, 23-28). To put it another way, Heb 9.1-10 highlights the inability of the Levitical cult to permanently deal with sin and impurity, while Heb 9.11-28 emphasizes the finality of the once-for-all-time sacrifice of Christ.

Chapter four begins with a contextual overview of Hebrews 1-8. Such an analysis proved necessary for establishing the theological content of Hebrews 1-8 and its relationship to Hebrews 9. This is followed by a discussion on the installation of Christ as high priest and its relationship to the nature of atonement in Hebrews' cultic theology. Because Christ's tribal lineage prohibited him from serving as high priest while he was alive, this necessitated a change in the priesthood, and this change is directly related to the *when* and *where* of the atonement. The remainder of the chapter consisted of an exegetical analysis of the various aspects related to the Levitical cult, specifically the high priest, the sanctuary with its varying degree of holiness, and the instruments used in Israel's sacred worship. Hebrews 9.1-10 provides the Old Testament background that informs the author's discussion of

Christ's entry into the heavenly sanctuary and subsequent self-offering. The abundance of cultic terminology that the author introduces into his homily builds into a crescendo that ultimately finds it apogee in the arrival of Christ within the heavenly sanctuary as the great Melchizedekian high priest.

With chapter five of this thesis, the comparison between the old covenant and the new is brought to its finale with the arrival of Christ as high priest of the good things that have come. The analysis of Heb 9.1-10 in chapter four provided the theological framework for the exegetical discussion regarding the sacrifice of Christ, his entry into heaven, and the resultant purgation of defilement. The motivation of chapter five was to challenge the misconception that when the author of Hebrews refers to the sacrifice of Christ within a heavenly sanctuary he does so as a metaphor for his death on the cross. This misconception also extends to the author's cultic use of blood in reference to the sacrifice of Christ. Rather than viewing blood as symbolic of death, and by extension a metaphor for the cross, the author of Hebrews utilized blood language in his discourse in a similar manner to that of the author of Leviticus, particularly the blood rule of Lev 17.11. Rather than a reference to the immolation of the sacrificial victim, and by extension its death, Lev 17.11 insinuates that blood is actually the life force of the animal, and it is this life that is offered on the altar for atonement. This same focus on "blood as life" stands behind the cultic references to blood in Hebrews 9, and it is this *life*, which the author of Hebrews referred to earlier in his homily as indestructible (Heb 7.16), that Christ presented as his offering to God in the heavenly sanctuary.

After concluding the sacrifice of Christ took place upon his entry into the heavenly sanctuary—thus answering the *when* and *where* of atonement—the issue of the application of aforementioned atonement was taken up and examined through an exegetical analysis of Heb 9.22. This examination centered around the meaning of two Greek words, αἱματεκχυσία and ἄφεσις, and how they are commonly translated in most English versions as "shedding of blood," and "forgiveness of sins." Due to the scant textual evidence remaining from antiquity, αἱματεκχυσία presented a unique challenge with regard to a fixed lexical meaning. While it was noted that some commentators posit that αἱματεκχυσία is a *hapax legomena* coined by the author of Hebrews, the lack of diachronic or synchronic usage prior to Hebrews render it rather

difficult to ascertain with any sense of certainty a definitive meaning for this compound noun. However, within the context of Hebrews 9, specifically 9.15-21 and 9.23, it was deduced that because of the author's emphasis on the application of blood within the cultic liturgy and not the immolation of the victim itself, a proper rendering of αἱματεκχυσία in 9.22 is one that focuses on the liturgical use of blood, thus supplying a translation of "pouring out of blood."

With respect to the meaning of ἄφεσις, two basic meanings were discussed for the meaning of this word. The first sense, which represents the majority of uses in the LXX, carried a profane or general sense of meaning, and could be translated as *release*. This could refer to a sending away (Exod 18.2), the year of jubilee (see Leviticus 25, 27, and 36), a release from debts/taxes (Deut 15.1; 31.10; Esth 2.18). It was also noted that the only possible occurrence of ἄφεσις with a cultic meaning was in Lev 16.26, while the only occurrence of ἄφεσις with the modifying ἁμαρτία is found in post-New Testament Odes Sol. 13.77. However, this is not the case with regard to the New Testament, where the majority of occurrences ἄφεσις are followed by the modifying ἁμαρτία (ἁμάρτημα in Mark 3.29; παράπτωμα in Eph 1.7). The occurrence of ἄφεσις in Heb 9.22 without the qualifying ἁμαρτία is significant for the meaning of ἄφεσις in this verse. Rather than a context of debt or a fractured relationship, as noted by Johnsson (1973:325), what the surrounding context suggests instead is that of purification and cultic inauguration, of which a meaning of *purgation* instead of *forgiveness* better fits the context of 9.22.

Closing out chapter five sees a return to the Yom Kippur typology that the author of Hebrews set aside in 9.14 in favor of a discussion on cultic inauguration. Hebrews 9.23 presents perhaps the most unusual and puzzling statements in all of the New Testament. If the heavenly things were in need of cleansing, what was the cause of their defilement? It was noted that a number of answers this eccentric question have been proposed, from that of a cleansing of the remnants of Satan's expulsion from heaven to an interior purging of the conscience. Once again, the answer to this enigma is found in Leviticus, where the liturgy of Yom Kippur not only dealt with humanities ritual impurities, it also provided the necessary purging of the defilement that clung to the tabernacle and its appurtenances (Lev 16.16). Lastly, whereas the

Yom Kippur typology in 9.11-14 served to emphasize the sacrifice of Christ in the present by highlighting his procuring of an eternal redemption, the closing verses of Hebrews 9 accentuates the eschatological benefits of Christ's redemptive death and the culmination of these benefits at his second coming (9.24-28).

6.3 Constructing a Biblical Theology of Priesthood and Atonement

The aim of biblical exegesis is to ascertain through historical and grammatical analysis the authorial intent as it was originally expressed by the author. Such an analysis will expose the reader to the original meaning as intended by the author, all the while recognizing an inability to satisfactorily grasp the authorial intent. This inability is due to the very simple truth that the reading of a text requires that a reader be an active participant in the process, and it is this participation, along with the distance of time passed between text and reader, that widens the gap between authorial intent and interpretation.[1] However, while the gap between author and reader is large, it nevertheless remains the responsibility of the reader to close this gap by means of all the hermeneutical tools at his disposal.

Another important implication of biblical hermeneutics is the application of the biblical text to the lives of modern readers. The goal here is to facilitate an encounter between the modern reader and the original meaning of the biblical text, a meaning encased in an ancient and sometimes foreign context (Fee 2002:37). As Croy rightly notes, "The work of Scripture is not complete until interpreters and their communities respond to its message and are transformed" (2011:161). Whereas exegesis employs tools that are used to derive the original meaning from the biblical text, the gap between original meaning and the modern reader must be bridged if the biblical text is to have any meaningful application in the lives of modern Christians.

The remainder of this section will endeavor to bridge the gap between the cultic theology as contained in the letter to the Hebrews and the cultic theology of the New Testament. While it is one thing to theoretically grasp the meaning of sacrifice, immolation, death, and the application of blood in Hebrews, it is quite another to

[1] While it is beyond the scope of this chapter to engage in a discussion on hermeneutics and the role the reader plays in the process of interpretation, the following sources are helpful guides for navigating the waters of this philosophical issue: Hirsch 1967; Thiselton 1980; 1992; 2009; Fish 1982; Vanhoozer 1998; Osborne 2006:465-99; Brown 2007:19-136; Bartholomew 2015:281-334.

assess how these antiquated rituals inform and shape one's biblical theological understanding of the sacrificial work and priestly ministry of Jesus as it is presented in other parts of the New Testament. Although differences between Hebrews' portrayal of Jesus as high priest and the nature of his atonement and portrayals of Jesus in select passages from the New Testament will be emphasized, these differences are not the subject of the following survey in and of themselves. Instead, by highlighting these differences it allows for the unique contribution that the author of Hebrews offers to have a seat at the table among his fellow New Testament voices (see Caird 1994:18-26; Tidball 2016:3-5).

Beginning with examples from the Synoptic Gospels, John 17, and the letters of Paul, the first part of this biblical theological analysis will compare the author of Hebrews' priestly Christology with that of other New Testament writings that are often assigned priestly connotations in connection with the person of Christ. If, as argued above, Christ was unable to serve as high priest while alive on earth (Heb 7.14; 8.4), what then is the significance of this prohibition in relationship with other passages that have often been intimated as having some type of priestly nuance?

The final biblical theological analysis will compare the view of atonement as outlined throughout this thesis with the more traditional understanding of Christ death, using Rom 3.21-26 as a test case for examining the atonement theologies of the author of Hebrews and Paul and their contribution towards a New Testament theology of atonement. Although each of these two brief surveys can serve as a thesis in their own right, the goal here is to provide a coherent analysis between the exegetical findings in chapters four and five and the testimony of select passages from the Gospels and the writings of Paul.

6.3.1 A Biblical Theology of the Priesthood of Christ

While the letter to the Hebrews is unique among its New Testament counterparts in its presentation of Christ as the great high priest, some scholars suggest that there are echoes in the Gospels and the letters of Paul of a Messiah functioning in a priestly manner (see Cullmann 1963:83-89; Feuillet 1975; Fletcher-Louis 2006:155-75; 2007:57-79; Pitre 2008:47-83; Wenkel 2014:195-201; Piotrowski and Schrock 2016:3-13; Perrin 2018a:81-99; 2019b). Although these echoes never rise to the

level of Hebrews' overtly high priestly Christology, they nevertheless introduce incidents in the life of Christ that may contain echoes to activities associated with the Levitical priesthood.

6.3.1.1 The Synoptic Gospels

Perhaps the definitive role associated with the Levitical priesthood is the officiating of the sacrifice and the duty of the high priest in assuming the burden of Israel's sin. The duty of bearing the burden of Israel's sin is first laid out to Aaron in a chapter focused on a description of the high priestly garments. Moses is command by Yahweh to make a pure plate of gold and engrave on it the words "Holy to the Lord," after which he is to fasten it upon Aaron's turban with a blue cord (Exod 28.36-37). By wearing the engraving upon his forehead, Aaron assumed the guilt of the people [וְנָשָׂא אַהֲרֹן אֶת־עֲוֹן / *ἐξαρεῖ Ααρων τὰ ἁμαρτήματα τῶν ἁγίων*], which transfers from the officiant to the high priest through by means of the sacrifice. This transfer of guilt is also seen in Lev 10.17, where Moses chastises Eleazar and Ithamar for not eating the flesh of the goat of the sin offering and thus "bearing the iniquity of the congregation [נָתַן לָכֶם לָשֵׂאת אֶת־עֲוֹן הָעֵדָה / *ἵνα ἀφέλητε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τῆς συναγωγῆς*]." What is of significance here is the transference of sin from one person/people group to that of the high priest, who alone is able to bear the transferred sin.

One such prominent New Testament account that illustrates this transfer of sin is located in Mark 2 (see Matt 9.1-8) and the healing of the paralytic man. Upon seeing the faith of the associates of the paralytic, Jesus pronounces a pardon of forgiveness for the paralytic man (2.3-6). This verdict causes immediate consternation among the religious leaders, who rightly acknowledge that it is only within the purview of God to declare one forgiven of sin (2.6-7). Jesus, knowing that the religious leaders were debating his pardon, provides the healing that was first sought as a testimony to his ability to not only declare such a pardon, but also the power to actualize the forgiveness pronounced (2.9-11). The man who came to Jesus paralyzed and believing that he could be healed left that house not only walking away from the mat that carried him there, but also from burden of his guilt (2.12).

In declaring the paralytic forgiven, Jesus appears to assume the duty of the high priest and his responsibility of bearing the burden of sin. However, the context of Mark 2 does not highlight a priestly connection with forgiveness of sin; instead, it is the ontology of Jesus that is emphasized in his declaration of forgiveness and its juxtaposition with the singular truth that only Yahweh has such authority to pronounce forgiveness of sin. When the religious leaders reason that forgiveness is God's prerogative alone, they are correct in their estimation. The Old Testament is emphatic in its insistence that God alone is able to forgive sin (Exod 34.7; Num 14.18; 2 Sam 24.10; Neh 9.17; Job 7.21; Ps 51.2; 130.4; Isa 43.25; 44.22; Jer 31.34; 36.3; Dan 9.9; Micah 7.18; Acts 5.31; Col 2.13). Jesus uses this event not only to provide temporal healing for a man long paralyzed, it is also a teaching moment to show the crowd that he is the long-promised Messiah, the very God incarnate. Therefore, while Jesus does in fact remove the burden of this man's sin, there is no indication in the pericope that what the author of Mark's Gospel had in mind was an allusion to the high priest's role in bearing the burden of the sin (France 2002:125-26). Instead, Jesus's declaration of forgiveness and its connection to the healing of the paralytic was affirmation of Christ's ontological claim to deity.

A further instance in the Gospels that differ from the priestly portrait found in Hebrews is Jesus's insistence that the observance of the Old Testament ritual laws be followed. In the account of the man healed of leprosy in Mark 1.44 // Matt 8.4 // Luke 5.14 (see Luke 17.14), Jesus commands that this man go and show himself to the priest and offer the appropriate sacrifice Moses commanded in light of his cleansing [προσένεγκε περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου ἃ προσέταξεν Μωϋσῆς] (see Lev 13.2-14.32). By pointing the healed man to the priest for cleansing, Jesus acknowledges the legitimacy of the Old Testament cult for ritual purification (Guelich 1989:76). For if Jesus had been high priest at this moment in his ministry, he would have been able to rectify this defilement himself, thus rendering the Levitical cult null and void (see Heb 8.13). However, as a faithful Jew Jesus was demonstrating to his detractors that he in fact kept the commandments of Moses.

In contrast with the Gospels, the letter to the Hebrews is clear that not only are people cleansed of the outward ritual defilement of sin, but more importantly they are also cleansed of the inward defilement caused by sin, a defilement of the conscience

now purified through the blood of Christ's sacrifice (9.13-14). By healing the man of his leprosy, Jesus is demonstrating to the people [αὐτοῖς] his power over death and disease and his role as God's Messiah (Collins 2007:179); but in the case of requisite ritual cleansing, he leaves this responsibility in the hands of those who are qualified to handle such matters of religious and social importance.

6.3.1.2 John 17

Perhaps the most famous passage of scripture outside of Hebrews given the designation of priestly is the so-called high priestly prayer of Jesus in John 17. Although the textual basis for such a title in John 17 is debatable at best, since the Reformer David Chyträus (see Hoskyns 1947:494; Cullmann 1963:105; Schnackenburg 1990:433; Keener 2003:2.1051) in the sixteenth century onward, many have concluded that the content of the prayer alone is more than enough to warrant such an appellation. This conclusion is no doubt heavily influenced by an overtly dependence upon the high priestly Christology outlined in the letter to the Hebrews (see Spicq 1950:258-69; Cullmann 1963:105; Ramsey 2010:873-74; Stevick 2011:310).

One of the earliest to ascribe priesthood to Jesus in their interpretation of John 17 is Cyril of Alexandria. In his exposition on John 17.9-11, Cyril refers to Jesus as "our truly and all-holy High Priest." Jesus is "the Sacrifice, and is Himself our Priest, Himself our Mediator, Himself a blameless victim, the true Lamb which takes away the sin of the world." As our high priest and mediator, Christ "prays for us as a Man," and "being a holy High Priest, blameless and undefiled, offered Himself not for His own weakness, as was the custom of those to whom was allotted the duty of sacrificing according to the Law, but rather for the salvation of our souls, and that once for all…" (*In Joh*. 11.8; PG 74:505).

While Cyril's exposition is on John 17.9-11, one cannot help but see the influence of Hebrews upon his reading of John 17. The most obvious example of this influence is the use of the title High Priest with reference to Christ. Outside of Hebrews, this title is nowhere to be found in connection to Christ, and any reading of this title in John 17 is without a doubt directly tied to one's familiarity with the high priestly Christology of Hebrews. Further evidence of the influence of Hebrews upon Cyril's exposition is found in the expression "not for His own weakness." According to Hebrews 7,

Jesus's sacrifice was once-for-all, and unlike the high priests of the Levitical cult, he was excluded from making any such sacrifice for himself. Also, because of the weakness of man—that is, because of their inevitable death—the sacrifices of the Levitical priests were in essence only operative so long as a high priest was serving in the sanctuary (7.27-28). Therefore, when Cyril refers to the lack of human weakness with respect to Jesus, he does so informed by Hebrews' high priestly Christology and its theology of atonement.

With regard to the structure and content of John 17, a number of points can be highlighted that have been used to support a priestly reading. The structure of Jesus's prayer in John 17 is organized around three sets of prayers: Jesus prays for himself (17.1-8); Jesus prays for his disciples (17.9-19); and Jesus prays for the world (17.20-26). Some commentators suggest a connection between the trifold structure in John 17 and that of the liturgy of the high priest on Yom Kippur (Attridge 2013:9-10; see Dodd 1953:417-23). On Yom Kippur, the high priest first offers a sacrifice for himself and his kin (Lev 16.6). This is followed by an offering for the people (16.15). Finally, there is the universal prohibition against entering the tent of meeting (16.17). While these similarities are curious, as Attridge notes, they are not "enough in itself to confirm that the evangelist is playing with priestly imagery" (2013:10).

Much has also been made of the intercessory nature of Christ's prayer in John 17. As noted above, Jesus engages in intercessory prayer for himself, his disciples, and future believers. However, such intercessory prayer could easily be understood in light of ancient farewell discourses often found in relevant Jewish literature (Carson 1991:550-51; Ridderbos 1997:546; Keener 2003:2.1051; Lincoln 2005:432). Both Genesis 49 and Deuteronomy 32-33 offer similar examples to that of John 17. Similar to Jacob in Genesis 49 and Moses in Deuteronomy 32-33, Jesus is likewise engaged in preparing for his departure from this world and return to his father in heaven (17.5, 11, 13, 24; see 7.33; 13.1, 3; 14.12, 28; 16.5, 28).

Such intercessory prayer is also common among the prophets. Moses on many occasions stood between God's wrath and the people, interceding on their behalf that God would spare them from destruction (Exod 32.11-14; Deut 9.18, 26-29; see Ps 106.23). Such is similar with the prophet Samuel as well. One such example is

found in 1 Samuel 7, where the people urge Samuel to cry out to the Lord on their behalf for deliverance from the hand of the Philistines (1 Sam 7.8-9; see 12.23). Likewise, another such instance of intercessory prayer on behalf of others is found in God's rebuke of his people in Jeremiah 7, "Do not pray for this people [אַל־תִּתְפַּלֵּל בְּעַד־הָעָם הַזֶּה], or lift up a cry or prayer for them [וּתְפִלָּה בַּעֲדָם רִנָּה וְאַל־תִּשָּׂא], and do not intercede with me [וְאַל־תִּפְגַּע־בִּי], for I will not listen" (7.16; see 11.14; 14.11; 2 Macc 15.14). Clearly, such intercession was not only a common occurrence among the prophets, it was also a duty of one's calling as a prophet.

Turning now to the content of Jesus's prayer, much has been made of Jesus's use of ἁγιάζω in 17.17 and 17.19. Ramsey posits that it is at this point in Jesus's prayer that one gets their first taste of priestly language (Ramsey 2010:872). In John 17.17, Jesus asks that his Father would "sanctify/consecrate [his disciples] in [his] word" [ἁγίασον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ]. In 17.19, Jesus sanctifies/consecrates himself [ἐγὼ ἁγιάζω ἐμαυτόν] so that his disciples would be sanctified/consecrated in truth [ἵνα ὦσιν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἡγιασμένοι ἐν ἀληθείᾳ]. While this language of sanctification and consecration are associated with the priests in the Old Testament (see Exod 19.22: ἁγιασθήτωσαν; 28.41: ἁγιάσεις αὐτούς, ἵνα ἱερατεύωσίν μοι), it is also used for consecrating prophets for their prophetic mission (Barrett 1978:510; Baigent: 1981:38). A clear example of this is Jer 1.5: "Before I formed you in the womb, I knew you, and before you came out of the womb I have consecrated you [ἡγίακά]; I have appointed [τέθεικά] you a prophet for the nations." Here in Jer 1.5, the prophet's consecration and appointment are parallel to one another and occur while Jeremiah was still in his mother's womb (see Gal 1.15a).

In John 10, similar language to that of 17.17 and 17.19 is used by Jesus in his confrontation with the Jewish leadership. In responding to the charge of blasphemy, Jesus comments that it is the Father who consecrated him and sent him into the world [ὁ πατὴρ ἡγίασεν καὶ ἀπέστειλεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον] (10.36). The language of consecration in 10.36 is connected to that of sending, so that what Christ is sanctified/consecrated for is his mission to the world. Further, the prayer of Jesus for his disciples in 17.17, and again in 17.19b is that they would be sanctified "in truth"

[ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ / ἐν ἀληθείᾳ]. In Jesus's self-consecration in 17.19a, this same purpose of consecration *in truth* is implied, so that what is explicit in his prayer for the disciples is understood in his prayer for himself (Brown 1970:766). Therefore, it is this sense of "consecration for mission" that Jesus certainly had in mind in both 17.17 and 17.19 (Barrett 1978:510; Ridderbos 1997:556; Keener 2003:2.1060-61).[2]

6.3.1.3 The Pauline Letters

Outside of the Synoptic Gospels and the Gospel of John (with the possible exception of Revelation), potential references to the priesthood of Christ become harder to identify with any precision. This is certainly the case with the writings of Paul, who speaks more about the sacrifice of Christ than he does about his priesthood. In fact, Montefiore emphatically insist that Paul does not even regard Christ as a priest anywhere in his writings (1964:5). Although lacking in explicit occurrences, as well as scant implicit references, there are a few verses that have been proposed as references to Christ's high priesthood.

6.3.1.3.1 Romans 8.34

Romans 8.34 is found within the crescendo of a prolonged discussion regarding justification by faith (Dunn 1988:497). This final pericope (8.31-39) is a celebration of that work of justification, and subsequent glorification, in the lives of those who have placed their faith in the work of Christ (Wright 2002:609). In 8.34, Paul concisely describes the work of Christ in the following manner: it is Christ who died [ὁ ἀποθανών], who was raised [ἐγερθείς], and who intercedes for his own [ἐντυγχάνει

[2] Some have suggested a different nuance for Jesus's self-consecration [ἐγὼ ἁγιάζω ἐμαυτόν] in 17.19. Rather than reading all three instances of ἁγιάζω in 17.17, 19 as parallel, the meaning of Jesus's self-consecration has been turned into a reference to his impending death on the cross. Ridderbos follows this train of thought, commenting that Jesus's self-consecration is a "*sacrifice* for his own" (1997:556, emphasis in original; see Beasley-Murray 1999:301; Ramsey 2010:873-74; Bruner 2012:995. Bultmann appears to suggest both the act of sending *and* sacrifice are in view in 17.19, 1971:510-11, n.5). Furthermore, it is through this self-sacrifice that Jesus's disciples are "truly consecrated to the sacred ministry for which Jesus has appointed them to speak his name" (Ridderbos1997:556; see Haenchen 1984:155). However, such a break from the parallel uses in 17.17 and 17.19 does not fit the context of what Jesus is praying for. As noted in the commentary on these verses above, what Jesus's is praying for is the consecration of both his and his disciples' mission to the world (see 10.36; 17.18). Lincoln correctly surmises, "When now Jesus speaks of sanctifying himself, this is in line with the way this Gospel portrays him as sharing what would normally be considered divine prerogatives and also as being in control of his own life and mission" (2005:438). Barrett likewise concludes along similar lines, noting that whatever one makes of the meaning of ἁγιάζω in 17.17 (and, it may be added, 10.36), the meaning of Jesus's self-consecration in 17.19 cannot mean something altogether different (1978:510).

ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν]. This rather formulaic statement (Dunn 1988:503; see Barrett 1991:162) rightly describes the procession of Christ, from death to intercession. Furthermore, the intercession of Christ echoes that of the Holy Spirit in 8.27 [ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἁγίων / ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν]. Rather than a priestly function, there is a legal element of advocacy [παράκλητος] involved in Christ's intercessory ministry on behalf of his followers (see 1 John 2.1; Jewett 2007:542; *pace* Cranfield 1975:1.439).

Therefore, Paul's confessional formula of Christ's death, resurrection, and intercessory activity in 8.34 supports the argument of this thesis, namely that Christ became high priest upon his entry into the heavenly sanctuary. In order for Christ to engage in a ministry of intercession, he first had to die and then rise from dead. Although the sequence of these events does not prove definitively the argument that Christ became high priest *after* his entry into the heavenly sanctuary, it does argue against the idea that Christ engaged in a priestly function of intercession *before* his death and subsequent resurrection.

6.3.1.3.2 1 Timothy 2.5-6

One final passage that may have priestly overtones is found in the creedal statement of 1 Tim 2.5-6 (see Kelly 1963:63; Mounce 2000:87; Belleville 2009:42). Similar in some respects to the formulaic statement in Rom 8.34, 1 Tim 2.5 portrays Christ as both a sacrifice and one who stands between God and humanity. Whereas Christ's activity of intercession is highlighted in Rom 8.34, in 1 Tim 2.5, Christ is specifically referred to as the "one mediator between God and humanity" [εἷς καὶ μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων]. While on the surface Christ's role as a mediator may conjure up images of priestly intercession, such an interpretation is most likely reading into 1 Tim 2.5 an idea not present in the context of the passage. Elsewhere, Paul uses the same word [μεσίτης] in reference to Moses's mediatorial work with respect to the giving of the law (Gal 3.19-20). A similar usage of the μεσίτης is to be found in Hebrews, but instead of Moses, it is Christ who is the mediator of a new covenant, one that is established by him and mediated through him (8.6; 9.15; 12.24). Therefore, rather than a priestly intercessor, Christ is the negotiator between God and humanity of the new covenant inaugurated through his sacrificial offering (Johnson 2001:191-92).

6.3.2 A Biblical Theology of Atonement: Romans as a Test Case

Without question, the death of Christ resides at the heart of New Testament theology and is one of the keystones of kerygmatic confessions found in texts like 1 Corinthians 15: “Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures…” (15.3-4). Not taking into account the historical record of Jesus’s death in the Gospels, the New Testament refers to the death of Christ no less than one hundred times, and nowhere is this more prevalent than in the writings of the apostle Paul.

The following section consists of an exegetical analysis of Rom 3.21-26, with a particular focus on 3.25 and the meaning of the verb προέθετο and the substantive ἱλαστήριον. While more ink has been spilled on Paul’s theology of the atonement than perhaps any other element of his theology, it is, however, beyond the scope of this study to engage in an in-depth exegetical analysis of every occurrence in the Pauline corpus that directly or indirectly refers to the death of Christ as atonement for sin. Instead, the purpose of the following exegetical examination of Rom 3.21-26 is to highlight key differences in Paul’s and the author of Hebrews’ presentation of atonement and their respective sacrificial contexts. By allowing these differences to stand on their own and resisting attempts at harmonization, this allows each author to contribute to a holistic New Testament theology of the atonement.

6.3.2.1 Romans 3.21-26

For many, Paul’s letter to the Romans represents the crown jewel of Christian theology. Martin Luther praises Paul’s letter to the Romans as the “chief part of the New Testament and the purest form of the gospel” (Luther 1976:xiii). Calvin avers that if one has a true understanding of Romans, the door to the most profound treasures of scripture stands wide open (Calvin 1960:5). Longenecker suggests that Romans is the “heartland of Christian thought, life, and proclamation” (2016:xi). What is clear from these and many other acclamations is the influence that Romans has had in the shaping of Christian theology down through the centuries, and this shaping has no doubt had an impact of the interpretation of New Testament texts that speak directly to the theology of the atonement as a whole. Perhaps most germane to the topic at hand is Rom 3.21-26. These six verses provide the clearest example in Romans that specifically addresses the nature of the atonement—while

also presenting an excellent point of comparison with Hebrews' own theology of atonement.

On the heels of Paul's extended discussion concerning the universal guilt of all humanity, Rom 3.21-26 breaks through the ominous clouds of God's wrath, offering its solution to humanity's plight. Paul begins with a declaration that "the righteousness of God has been revealed independent of the law [Νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ πεφανέρωται]" (3.21) Although the Old Testament [τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν] bore witness to the righteousness of God, it is now through faith in Christ [δικαιοσύνη δὲ θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ] that all humanity can experience God's righteousness (3.22). In 3.23, Paul again reiterates that humanity is guilty and has fallen woefully short of the perfection that God's nature demands, and it is this damning predicament that demands justice, a justice that Paul outlines in 3.24-26.

The solution to humanity's condemnation before God is by means of a freely offered gift of God, a gift received through faith in Christ (3.24a). It is by faith *in* Christ (διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is an objective genitive, *pace* Johnson 1982:77-90; Talbert 2002:107-10; Wright 2002:470; Witherington and Hyatt 2004:101; Campbell 2009:57-71; Longenecker 2016:409-13) that one is justified and receives God's gift of grace [δικαιούμενοι δωρεὰν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι].

Furthermore, this act of justification and reception of God's grace comes through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus [διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ]. The relative clause in 3.25 further defines the saving work of Christ, this time by highlighting God's activity of publicly putting on display Jesus Christ as a propitiation [ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον] (Moo 2018:251). By putting Christ forward publicly as a propitiation for sin, God demonstrates his righteousness [πρὸς τὴν ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ] and displays that he was both just and the justifier of those who have faith in Christ [εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ]. Of significance to this study is the relative clause in 3.25: ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ [τῆς] πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι. Two questions that will be addressed below are:

1) what does Paul mean when he refers to God's public display of Christ, and 2) what is the significance of the overtly cultic reference to the ἱλαστήριον?

Addressing first the issue of Christ's public crucifixion, the verb Paul uses to refer to this public event is προτίθημι. Occurring only three times in the New Testament, with each occurrence in the middle voice, this verb carries the meaning *to propose* or *set forth publicly* (BDAG: s.v. προτίθημι 2-3; GE s.v. προτίθημι 2bc; see M-M 544 who suggests that the meaning in Rom 3.25 is *offer* or *provide* for a propitiatory gift). There is some debate as to what nuance the verb προέθετο contains in 3.25.

Cranfield, for example, purposes that the meaning *to propose* best fits the context of Rom 3.21-26. He argues that because the other two occurrences of προτίθημι (Rom 1.13; Eph 1.9) carry the meaning *to propose*, this likewise must be the case in 3.25 (1975:1.208-10; see Kruse 2012:186). Cranfield's predecessors in the ICC series, Sanday and Headlam, disagree with Cranfield and propose that a meaning of *set forth publicly* better fits the context. Sanday and Headlam rightfully point out that the surrounding context is filled with words denoting publicity (πεφανέρωται, εἰς ἔνδειξιν, πρὸς τὴν ἔνδειξιν), and that the death of Christ is a visible manifestation of God's righteousness (Sanday and Headlam 1980:87; see Käsemann 1980:97; Dunn 1988:180-81; Barrett 1991:73; Jewett 2007:283-84; Schreiner 2018:199). By referring to the public display of Christ via his crucifixion, Paul answers the question of how redemption is in fact through Christ Jesus [διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ] (3.24b; see Gal 3.1; Harvey 2017:93).

The public display of Christ on the cross is an act of cultic sacrifice. This is no doubt evident in the language Paul uses to speak of Christ's death on the cross, where God displays Christ publicly as a ἱλαστήριον…ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι. There is no shortage of debate regarding the meaning of ἱλαστήριον in 3.25. In the context of Rom 3.25, ἱλαστήριον has been translated as *expiation* (RSV), *propitiation* (NASB; ESV), and *the mercy seat* (NET). The reading *sacrifice of atonement*/*atoning sacrifice* has also been used as a reading for ἱλαστήριον (NIV; NRSV; CSB); however, this reading will not receive any attention in the discussion to follow.

One of the more prominent supporters of expiation as the meaning of ἱλαστήριον is C. H. Dodd. Dodd argues along similar lines as the LXX, noting that nowhere is God the subject of the action of ἱλαστήριον. In fact, the overwhelming usage of this type of language in the LXX refers to the removal of some type of guilt associated with defilement. Dodd suggests that propitiation is misleading because it implies a placating of an angry God, a meaning common with pagan deities but not with the biblical God (Dodd 1932:54-55; 1935:82-95; see Büchsel *TDNT* 3.319-23; Dunn 1988:180-81; Fitzmyer 1993:349-50).

On a different note, in his commentary on Romans Hultgren argues that the best meaning of ἱλαστήριον is one that takes into account its usage in the LXX. Hultgren rightly highlights that of the twenty-eight occurrences of ἱλαστήριον in the LXX, twenty-one of them refer specifically to the כַּפֹּרֶת, [mercy seat] (see *Cher*. 25; *Mos*. 2.95, 97; *Fug*. 100-101; *Her*. 166; T. Sol. 21.2). Furthermore, in the only other occurrence of ἱλαστήριον in Heb 9.5, the mercy seat is without question in view. Here in Rom 3.25, Hultgren sees a connection between the type, which is the Old Testament mercy seat, and the anti-type, the crucified Christ, who God put forward as a public mercy seat for the atonement of sins (Hultgren 2011:157; see Manson 1945:4-6; Davies 1980:237-42; Stuhlmacher 1986:94-109; Bailey 1999; 2000:155-58; Stökl 2003:198-200; Carson 2004:129; Gathercole 2004:178 n.113).

The final meaning for ἱλαστήριον to be briefly discussed is that of *propitiation*. Since publication of the seminal work by Leon Morris, completed under the tutelage of Dodd himself, the reading of propitiation has gained wide support among many commentators and scholars writing on the issue of the atonement. Morris notes that in Rom 3.25, the use of ἱλαστήριον is best translated in light of the Paul's earlier indictment against ungodliness and unrighteousness in which the "wrath of God is revealed from heaven" [Ἀποκαλύπτεται γὰρ ὀργὴ θεοῦ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ἀσέβειαν καὶ ἀδικίαν ἀνθρώπων] (Rom 1.18). What is of significance here is that if God's wrath is being revealed from heaven, then it would follow that this very wrath be appeased or propitiated in some manner (Morris 1955:33-43; 1965:198-202; Cranfield 1975:1.214-18; 1983:151-76; see Porter 2015:96; Schreiner 2018:199-200).

Therefore, rather than a removal of guilt or defilement (i.e. expiation), God wrath is in fact satisfied, and by making propitiation through the cross of Christ, justice is served, and God is now the justifier of those who come to Christ by faith.

6.3.2.2 Hebrews' Theology of Atonement

While no attempt to solve the oft debated meaning of ἱλαστήριον in Rom 3.25 will be offered here, what is more relevant to this study is the manner by which Christ's death secured ἱλαστήριον and how it relates to the Hebrews' theology of the atonement. Paul is clear that what brings about atonement is the act of Christ's death on the cross. This is clear from Paul's use of the verb προτίθημι as an explanation for *how* redemption is through Christ [διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ] (Rom 3.24). The redemption of Christ is accomplished through the offering of Christ Jesus on the cross as a public sacrifice and display of God's justice. For Paul, Jesus death on the cross is a public spectacle, one which brought about atonement for sin, and with it, a legal declaration of not guilty. Although the context of Rom 3.21-26 and Hebrews 9 have their share of similar cultic motifs (see Ribbens 2012:548-67), in Hebrews, the achievement of atonement is something altogether different than what is found in Rom 3.25. As argued above, for the author of Hebrews, atonement is something that is secured not at the cross but upon Christ's arrival in heaven (see 9.11-12, 24-26).

On the surface, it may appear that tension exists between the theology of Hebrews and the theology of Paul. However, this apparent discrepancy is avoided if one takes into account the authors' respective contexts and use of sacrificial language. The surrounding context of Rom 3.25, specifically chapters 1-3, concerns itself with the universal guilt and condemnation of humanity before God. It is this problem that Paul must address, and in 3.21-26 Paul begins to answer the question of how God deals with the problem of universal guilt by introducing into his discussion a courtroom scene with accompanying legal terminology, particularly δικαιόω, δικαιοσύνη, and related δικ- words. By putting Christ forward publicly as a ἱλαστήριον for sin, God sufficiently satisfied his wrath and provides the means necessary for humanity to receive forgiveness of sin through faith in Christ.

The author of Hebrews, however, does not emphasize the legal implications of the death of Christ and its connection to atonement. Instead, as seen in chapter's four and five of this thesis, atonement falls within the semantic domain of cultic sacrifice and related cultic terminology, whereas for Paul, the death of Christ is often times couched within a discussion that utilizes legal terminology and related imagery. This contextual distinction between the two authors is clear, for example, in the only other occurrence of ἱλαστήριον in the New Testament. In the midst of his description of the tabernacle and its related appurtenances, the author of Hebrews refers to the "mercy seat" [τὸ ἱλαστήριον] residing in the Holy of Holies (Heb 9.5). What is significant about this occurrence is that not only is it articular—in Rom 3.25 it is anarthrous—it is also lacking any notion of propitiation, expiation, or related legal terminology that is present in Paul's usage of the word in Rom 3.25. The probable reason for this is that the author of Hebrews is following a usage of ἱλαστήριον more common in the LXX.

Also related to the use of ἱλαστήριον in Heb 9.5 is the conspicuous lack of any reference to the legal setting that is much more prominent in Paul's writings. While Heb 2.17 does approach a judicial background with its use of the cognate verb ἱλάσκομαι, here the focus of the infinitival clause εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι is not on the propitiation of God's wrath, but rather on the suitability of the Jesus to serve as humanity's merciful high priest [ἵνα ἐλεήμων γένηται καὶ πιστὸς ἀρχιερεὺς τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ]. As with the Levitical high priest, Jesus's focus as high priest is not on the removal of God's wrath or the redemption of believers from the bondage of sin, but instead on the removal and purging of sin's defilement (Kleinig 2017:125).

Also largely missing from Hebrews is the type of robust discussion of justification by faith that Paul is known for, signified in his writings by the use of the δικ- word group. The closest Hebrews gets to such a discussion is in Heb 10.38, where the author, similar to Paul in Rom 1.17 and Gal 3.11, quotes from Hab 2.4. However, for the author of Hebrews "the righteous one" of Habakkuk is one who endures persecution and remains faithful until the end, not shrinking back to destruction. This is quite contrary to how Paul uses Hab 2.4 in Gal 3.11, where Paul clearly connects justification by faith with "the righteous one" of Hab 2.4, emphatically stating that no

one is justified before God by the law [ὅτι δὲ ἐν νόμῳ οὐδεὶς δικαιοῦται παρὰ τῷ θεῷ δῆλον]. Therefore, the emphasis of Hab 2.4 in Heb 10.38 is eschatological in nature, not sharing the courtroom scene found in Paul's writing.

Finally, while the letter to the Hebrews has a high concentration of sacrificial language and imagery related to the sacrifice of atonement, for Paul, such vocabulary and imagery is not as prevalent as is that of the courtroom and its accompanying legal terminology. Take for example the word θυσία, which is commonly translated as sacrifice. In the Pauline literature θυσία occurs five times (Rom 12.1; 1 Cor 10.18; Eph 5.2; Phil 2.17; 4.18). However, in Hebrews this same word occurs three times as much, ten times of which are found in the heart of the author's cultic discussion of the sacrifice of Christ and the inauguration of the New Covenant (8.3; 9.9, 23, 26; 10.1, 5, 8, 11-12, 26). Another significant sacrificial term used in Hebrews, προσφέρω, occurs twenty times—nineteen of which are directly related to the act of sacrificial offering. Whereas προσφέρω is a common occurrence in Hebrews, it is nowhere to be found among the many references to the sacrifice of Christ, direct or otherwise, in the writings of Paul. Related to προσφέρω is the compound verb ἀναφέρω, which likewise occurs only in Hebrews and is absent from the Pauline literature altogether.

Another noteworthy example is use of αἷμα in relation to the death of Christ. In the writings of Paul, αἷμα is found in eight occurrences that refer to the death of Christ (Rom 3.25; 5.9; 1 Cor 10.16; 11.25, 27; Eph 1.7; 2.13; Col 1.20). In Hebrews, αἷμα is found seven times (9.12, 14; 10.19, 29; 12.24; 13.12, 20), and while αἷμα is sprinkled throughout the writings of Paul, the concentration of αἷμα in Hebrews alone is significant for the purposes here. One final example is προσφορά, which is found once in Ephesians (5.2) and twice in Hebrews 10 (10.10 and 10.14).

The forgoing examples of cultic terminology are helpful for establishing a conceptual background by which to interpret the meaning of atonement in both Romans and the letter to the Hebrews. Taken by itself, the comparison of a word or phrase that is shared between authors and their respective corpuses are insufficient in and of

themselves to provide a satisfying and universal meaning for the atonement and other related terms of cultic significance. Nevertheless, such statistical analyses can prove helpful for establishing preliminary meaning within the context of an author's linguistic milieu.

6.4 Areas for Further Research

While an attempt to provide a sample sketch of what a New Testament biblical theology of Christ's high priesthood and atoning death could look like was offered in this final chapter, there is nevertheless much more than can be teased out and expanded on. For example, missing from this survey is any serious interaction with Old Testament and related Second Temple literature. While scope and space prevented any such serious engagement with primary source material, in order to fully build out a robust New Testament theology it is vital that an exegetical analysis of any and all relevant primary source material be undertaken.

The conclusions reached in this study will also necessitate a revisiting of the discipline of systematic theology and the categories used for explaining and defining the cross, the extent of the atonement, the importance of the resurrection, the high priesthood of Christ, and his mediatorial work. From a brief survey of systematic theologies, the common way most of them speak of the sacrifice of Christ is within the realm of legal terminology, reminiscent to the way Paul speaks of the atonement in Romans and elsewhere in his writings. If, as it is argued in this thesis, the sacrifice of Christ in the theology of Hebrews must be understood not in a legal sense, but rather within a cultic framework, how would such a conclusion fit within the normative way systematic theologians speak of the cross and the atoning work of Christ? Furthermore, the question of *when* Christ became high priest is also in need of refinement. Because the author of Hebrews interweaves the sacrifice of Christ and his installation to high priest together in such a way that one event informs the other and vice versa, this will necessitate a reworking of the categories related to the mediatorial ministry of Christ. This current study is a step towards addressing these issues and revisiting the nomenclature commonly used by systematicians to define the atoning work Christ and his heavenly ministry.

Finally, on a more practical note, of much benefit would be a further study on how the conclusions of this thesis fit into a homiletical outline of the letter to the Hebrews as a whole. How can a preacher incorporate the findings of this study into their own preaching while also taking into account the verities of the other writings of the New Testament? Although the possibility of discrepancies that may arise while comparing the theology of Hebrews with that of the Gospels and Paul were warned of above in the discussion on constructing a biblical theology, there is still a need for addressing these in a more practical manner, one that provides a coherent explanation necessary for an exposition of not only Hebrews, but also of related texts that directly address the issues of Christ's sacrificial work and installation to the office of high priest.

6.5 Conclusion

The *raison d'etre* of this thesis was to offer by means of an exegetical analysis an interpretation of Hebrews 9 that follows more closely a reading of Leviticus 16 and the script of Yom Kippur, rather than reading Hebrews through the lens of Paul and a Pauline theology of atonement. Such an examination focused on three main topics: *when* and *where* did Christ present his offering for atonement; what is the nature of the heavenly sanctuary; and is the language of forgiveness appropriate in regard to the cultic emphases in Hebrews 9, or perhaps is purgation a more suitable term to use with respect to the removal of sins defiling power? Regarding the when and where of Christ's death, Hebrews presents the sacrifice of Christ and his offering in heaven as the apex of the Christ-event, the *sine qua non* of the entire sacrificial script. Unlike the more traditional view of Christ's death, one that is often associated with a Pauline theology, the author of Hebrews follows rather closely the Day of Atonement ritual and the activity of the high priest, where immolation is a means to an end, that end being the manipulation of blood on the altar for the atonement of sin. In a similar manner the cross is the necessary means to an end; it is the means necessary for accessing the blood of Christ, which Christ as high priest then offers to God in the heavenly sanctuary for the once-for-all-time purgation of sin.

It has been the goal of this thesis to not only provide a thorough exegetical defense of the timing of Christ's atonement and his installation to the office of high priest, along with the purgation of sin, but also open areas of further examination and

reflection on the intersection of Hebrews cultic theology and its important, but at times sadly overlooked, contribution to a New Testament theology of atonement, priesthood, and purgation of sin. To that end, this thesis is offered for consideration.

Bibliography

Allen, David L. 2010a. *Hebrews*. NAC. Nashville: B&H.

_____. 2010b. *Lukan Authorship of Hebrews*. NAC Studies in Bible and Theology 8. Nashville: B&H.

Andriessen, Paul 1971. “Das Grössere Und Vollkommenere Zelt (Hebr. 9.11).” BZ 15: 76–92.

Attridge, Harold W. 1989. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

_____. 1990. “Paraenesis in a Homily (λόγος παρακλήσεως): The Possible Location of, and Socialization in, the ‘Epistle to the Hebrews.’” *Semeia* 50: 211-29.

_____. 2010. “‘Heard Because of His Reverence (Heb 5.7)’” Pages 268-72 in *Essays on John and Hebrews*. WUNT 264. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

_____. 2010. “The Uses of Antithesis in Hebrews 8-10.” Pages 273-80 in *Essays on John and Hebrews*. WUNT 264. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

_____. 2013. “How Priestly is the ‘High Priestly Prayer’ of John 17?” CBQ 75.1: 1-14.

Aune, David E. 1987. *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment*. LEC. Edited by Wayne A. Meeks. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

_____. 2003. “Letters, Literary Genre of.” Pages 268-72 in *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Baigent, John W. 1981. “Jesus as Priest: An Examination of the Claim that the Concept of Jesus as Priest may be Found in the New Testament Outside the Epistle to the Hebrews.” VE 12: 34-44.

Bailey, Daniel. P. 1999. “Jesus as the Mercy Seat: The Sematics and Theology of Paul's Use of *Hilasterion* in Romans 3.25.” PhD diss. University of Cambridge.

_____. 2000. “Jesus as the Mercy Seat: The Sematics and Theology of Paul's Use of *Hilasterion* in Romans 3.25.” TynBul 51.1: 155-58.

Barnard, Jody A. 2012. *The Mysticism of Hebrews: Exploring the Role of Jewish Apocalyptic Mysticism in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. WUNT 2/331. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Barrett, CK. 1978. *Gospel According to St John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*. Second Edition. London: SPCK.

_____. 1991. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Revised edition. BNTC. London: A & C Black.

_____. 2017. “The Eschatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews.” Pages 146-70 in *The Letter to the Hebrews: Critical Readings*. T&T Clark Critical Readings in Biblical Studies. Edited by Scott D. Mackie. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.

Bartholomew, Craig G. 2015. *Introducing Biblical Hermeneutics: A Comprehensive Framework for Hearing God in Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Bates, Matthew W. *The Birth of the Trinity: Jesus, God, and the Spirit in New Testament and Early Christian Interpretation of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Beale, GK. 2004. *The Temple and the Church’s Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*. NSBT 17. Downers Grove: IVP Academic.

_____. 2005. “Eden, the Temple, and the Church's Mission in the New Creation.” JETS 48.1: 5-31.

_____. 2011. *A New Testament Biblical Theology: The Unfolding of the Old Testament in the New*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Beasley-Murray, George R. 1999. *John*. 2nd edition. WBC 36. Dallas: Word.

Belleville, Linda. 2009. “1 Timothy.” Pages 1-123 in *Cornerstone Biblical Commentary: 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus, and Hebrews*. Cornerstone Biblical Commentary 17. Carol Stream: Tyndale House Publishers.

Black, David Alan. 1986. “The Problem of the Literary Structure of Hebrews: An Evaluation and a Proposal.” GTJ 7.2: 163-67.

_____. 1994. “Literary Artistry in the Epistle to the Hebrews.” EFN 7.13: 43-51.

_____. 2013. *The Authorship of Hebrews: The Case for Paul*. Topical Line Drives 1. Gonzalez: Energion Publications.

Blomberg, Craig L. and Jennifer Foutz Markley. 2010. *A Handbook of New Testament Exegesis*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Bloor, Joshua DA. 2017. “‘Does Christ's sacrifice forgive sins?"’: A Brief Discussion Regarding Hebrews' Appropriation of ἄφεσις Within the Context of Sacrifice and Impurity.” Unpublished conference paper. *British New Testament Conference*. St Patrick’s College. 31 August 31st - September 2nd.

Bockmuehl, Markus. 2019. “The Dynamic Absence of Jesus in Hebrews.” JTS 70.1: 141-62.

Braun, Herbert. 1984. *An Die Hebräer* HNT 14. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.

Brooks, Walter E. 1970. “The Perpetuity of Christ’s Sacrifice in the Epistle to the Hebrews.” *JBL* 89.2: 205-14.

Brown, Jeannine K. 2007. *Scripture as Communication: Introducing Biblical Hermeneutics*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Brown, John. 1862. *An Exposition of the Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Hebrews*. Vol. 1. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co.

Brown, Raymond E. 1970. *The Gospel According to John (XIII-XXI): Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. AB. 29A. New York: Doubleday.

_____. 1983. “Not Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity but Types of Jewish/Gentile Christianity.” CBQ 45.1: 74-79.

_____. 1997. *An introduction to the New Testament*. AYBRL New York: Doubleday.

Bruce, AB. 1899. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: The First Apology for Christianity*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Bruce, FF. 1990. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Rev. ed. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Bruner, Frederick Dale. 2012. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Buchanan, George Wesley. 2006. *The Book of Hebrews: Its Challenge from Zion*. Intertextual Bible Commentary. Eugene: Wipf & Stock.

Büchsel, Friedrich. 1922. *Die Christologie des Hebräerbriefs*. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann.

Bultmann, Rudolf. 1971. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Translated by GR Beasley-Murray. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

Caird, GB. 1959. “The Exegetical Method of the Epistle to the Hebrews.” Canadian Journal of Theology 5.1: 44-51.

_____. 1980. *The Language and Imagery of the Bible*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

_____. 1994. *New Testament Theology*. Completed and edited by LD Hurst. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Calaway, Jared C. 2013. *The Sabbath and the Sanctuary: Access to God in the Letter to the Hebrews and its Priestly Context*. WUNT 2/349. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Calvin, John. 1960. “Romans and Thessalonians.” *Calvin’s New Testament Commentaries*. Translated by Ross Mackenzie. Edited by David W. Torrance and Thomas F. Torrance. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Campbell, Kenneth M. 1972. “Covenant or Testament? Heb 9.16, 17 Reconsidered.” EvQ 44.2: 107-111.

Campbell, Douglas A. 2009. “The Faithfulness of Jesus Christ in Romans 3.22.” Pages 57-71 in *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Exegetical, Biblical, and Theological Studies*. Edited by Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle. Peabody: Hendrickson.

Caneday, Ardel B. 2008. “The Eschatological World Already Subjected to the Son: The Οἰκουμένη of Hebrews 1.6 and the Son’s Enthronement.” Pages 28-39 in *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrews in its Ancient Contexts*. LNTS 387. Edited by Ricard Bauckham, et al. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.

Carlston, Charles. 1978. “The Vocabulary of Perfection in Philo and Hebrews.” Pages 133-60 in *Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology: Essays in Honor of George E. Ladd*. Edited by Robert A. Guelich. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Carson, DA. 1991. *The Gospel According to John*. PNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

_____. 2004. “Atonement in Romans 3.21-26.” Pages 119-39 in *The Glory of the Atonement: Biblical, Historical, and Practical Perspectives: Essays in Honor of Roger Nicole*. Edited by Charles E. Hill and Frank A. James III. Downer Groves: IVP Academic.

Church, Philip. 2017. *Hebrews and the Temple: Attitudes to the Temple in Second Temple Judaism and in Hebrews*. NovTSup 171. Leiden: Brill.

Cody, Aelred. 1960. *Heavenly Sanctuary and Liturgy in the Epistle to the Hebrews: The Achievement of Salvation in the Epistle’s Perspectives*. Meinrad: Grail Publications.

Cockerill, Gareth Lee. 1976. “The Melchizedek Christology in Heb 7.1-28.” PhD diss. Union Theological Seminary.

_____. 2012. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Collins, Adela Yarbro. 2007. *Mark: A Commentary on the Gospel of Mark*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Collins, John J. 1979. “Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre.” Semeia 14: 1-20.

Compton, Jared. 2015: *Psalm 110 and the Logic of Hebrews*. LNTS 537. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.

Cortez, Felix H. 2006. “From the Holy to the Most Holy Place: The Period of Hebrews 9.6-10 and the Day of Atonement as a Metaphor of Transition.” JBL 125.3: 527-47.

_____. 2008. “The Anchor of the Soul that Enters Within the Veil": The Ascension of the ‘Son’ in the Letter to the Hebrews.” PhD diss. Andrews University.

Cranfield, CEB. 1975. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Vol. 1. ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Croy, N. Clayton. 2011. *Prima Scriptura: An Introduction to New Testament Interpretation*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Cullmann, Oscar. 1963. *The Christology of the New Testament*. Revised edition. Translated by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

Davies, JH. 1968. “The Heavenly Work of Christ in Hebrews.” SE: 384–89.

Davies, WD. 1980. *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*. 4th edition. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Deibler, Ellis W. 2017. *A Semantic and Structural Analysis of Hebrews*. SSA. Dallas: SIL International.

Delitzsch, Franz. 1874-76. *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Demarest, Bruce. 1976. *A History of Interpretation of Hebrews 7,1-10 from the Reformation to the Present*. BGBE 19. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.

Denniston, JD. 1954. *The Greek Particles*. 2nd Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

deSilva, David A. 2000. *Perseverance in Gratitude: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on the Epistle "to the Hebrews."* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Dodd, CH. 1932. *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*. MNTC. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers.

_____. 1935. *The Bible and the Greeks*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

_____. 1953. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dunn, James DG. 1988. *Romans 1-8*. WBC 38A. Dallas: Word.

Dunhill, John. 1992. *Covenant and Sacrifice in the Letter to the Hebrews*. SNTSMS 75. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dyer, Bryan R. 2017. *Suffering in the Face of Death: The Epistle to the Hebrews and Its Context of Situation*. LNTS 568. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.

Easter, Matthew C. 2014. *Faith the Faithfulness of Jesus*. SNTSMS 160. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eberhart, Christian A. 2005. "Characteristics of Sacrificial Metaphors in Hebrews." Pages 37-64 in *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods-New Insights*. BINS 75. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. Leiden: Brill.

_____. 2011. *The Sacrifice of Jesus: Understanding the Atonement Biblically*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

_____. 2017. “To Atone or Not to Atone: Remarks on the Day of Atonement Rituals according to Leviticus 16 and the Meaning of Atonement.” Pages 197-231 in *Sacrifice, Cult and Atonement in Early Judaism and Christianity: Constituents and Critique*. RBS 85. Edited by Henrietta L. Wiley and Christian A. Eberhart. Atlanta: SBL Press.

Ellingworth, Paul. 1983. “‘Like the Son of God’: Form and Content of Hebrews 7.1-10.” Bib 64.

_____. 1993. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Emmrich, Martin. 2002. “‘Amtscharisma’: Through the Eternal Spirit.” BBR 12.1: 17-32.

Eskola, Timo. 2001. *Messiah and the Throne: Jewish Merkabah Mysticism and Early Christian Exaltation Discourse*. WUNT 2/142. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

_____. 2015. *A Narrative Theology of the New Testament: Exploring the Metanarrative of Exile and Restoration*. WUNT 350. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Fee, Gordon D. 2002. *New Testament Exegesis*. 3rd Edition. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Feuillet, André. 1975. *The Priesthood of Christ and His Ministers*. Translated by Matthew J. O’Connell. New York: Doubleday.

Filtvedt, Ole Jakob. 2015. *The Identity of God’s People and the Paradox of Hebrews*. WUNT 2/400. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Fish, Stanley. 1982. *Is There a Text in this Class?*: The Authority of Interpretive Communities. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1963. “‘Now this Melchizedek…’ (Heb 7,1).” CBQ 25.3: 305-21.

_____. 1993. *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 33. New York: Doubleday.

Fletcher-Louis, Crispin. 2006. “Jesus as the High Priestly Messiah: Part 1.” JSHJ 4.2: 155-75.

_____. 2007. “Jesus as The High Priestly Messiah: Part 2.” JSHJ 5.1: 57-79.

France, RT. 2002. *The New International Greek Testament Commentary: The Gospel of Mark*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Fuhrmann, Sebastian. 2007. *Vergeben und Vergessen: Christologie und Neuer Bund im Hebräerbrief*. WMANT 113. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.

_____. 2008. “Christ Grown into Perfection: Hebrews 9,11 from a Christological Point of View.” Bib89.1: 92-100.

Gäbel, Georg. 2006. *Die Kulttheologie des Hebräerbriefes: Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Studie*. WUNT 2/212. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Gane, Roy. 2004. *Leviticus, Numbers*. NIVAC Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Gathercole, Simon J. 2004. “Justified by Faith, Justified by his Blood: The Evidence of Romans 3.21–4.25.” Pages 147-84 in Carson, D.A., O’Brien, P.T. & Seifrid, M.A. eds., 2004. *Justification and Variegated Nomism Vol 2: The Paradoxes of Paul*. Edited by DA Carson; Peter T. O’Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Gräbe, Peter. 2008. “The New Covenant and Christian Identity in Hebrews.” Pages 118-27 in *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrews in its Ancient Contexts*. LNTS 387. Edited by Ricard Bauckham, et al. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.

Gräßer, Erich. 1964. “Der Hebräerbrief 1938-1963.” TRu 30. 2/3: 138-236.

_____. 1990-97. *An Die Hebräer*. 3 vols. EKKNT 17. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.

Granerød, Gard. 2009. “Melchizedek in Hebrews 7.” Bib 90.2: 188-202.

Greenberg, James A. 2019. *A New Look at Atonement in Leviticus: The Meaning and Purpose of Kipper Revisited*. BBRSup 23. University Park: Eisenbrauns.

Griffiths, Jonathan I. 2014. *Hebrews and Divine Speech*. LNTS 507. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.

Guelich, Robert A. 1989. *Mark 1-8.26*. WBC 34A. Dallas: Word.

Guthrie, Donald. 1983. *Hebrews: An Introduction and Commentary*. TNTC. Downers Grove: IVP Academic.

Guthrie, George H. 1998a. *The Structure of Hebrews: A Text-Linguistic Analysis*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

_____. 1998b. *Hebrews*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

_____. 2001. "The Case for Apollos as the Author of Hebrews." *Faith and Mission* 18.2: 41-56.

_____. 2007. "Hebrews." Pages 919-93 in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by GK Beale and DA Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

_____. 2019. "Time and Atonement in Hebrews." Pages 209-27 in *So Great A Salvation: A Dialogue on the Atonement in Hebrews*. Edited by Jon C. Laansma, George H. Guthrie, and Cynthia Long Westfall. LNTS 516. T&T Clark.

Haber, Susan. 2005. "From Priestly Torah to Christ Cultus: The Re-Vision of Covenant and Cult in Hebrews." JSNT 28.1: 105-24.

Haenchen, Ernst. 1984. *John 2*. Hermeneia. Translated by Robert W. Funk. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Hagner, Donald A. 2005. "The Son of God as Unique High Priest: The Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews." Pages 247-67 in *Contours of Christology in the New Testament*. McMaster New Testament Studies. Edited by Richard N. Longenecker. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

_____. 2011. *Hebrews*. UBNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Books.

_____. 2012. “Hebrews: A Book for Today—A Biblical Scholar’s Response. Pages 213-24 in *Christology, Hermeneutics, and Hebrews: Profiles from the History of Interpretation*. LNTS 423. Edited by John C. Laansma & Daniel J. Treier. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.

Hahn, Scott W. 2004. “A Broken Covenant and the Curse of Death: A Study of Hebrews 9:15-22.” CBQ 66.3: 416-36.

_____. 2005. “Covenant, Cult, and the Curse-of-Death: Διαθήκη in Heb 9.15-22.” Pages 65-88 in *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods-New Insights*. BINS 75. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. Leiden: Brill.

Halliday, MAK. 2014. *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 4th ed. Revised by MIM Matthiessen. London: Routledge.

Harris, Dana M. 2019. *Hebrews*. EGGNT. Nashville: B&H Academic.

Harvey, John D. 2017. *Romans*. EGGNT. Nashville: B&H Academic.

Hatch, Edwin. 1889. *Essays in Biblical Greek*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

Hay, David M. 1989. *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity*. SBLMS. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Hays, Richard B. 2009. “Here We Have No Lasting City”: New Covenantalism in Hebrews. Pages 151-73 in *The Epistle to the Hebrews and Christian Theology*. Edited by Ricard Bauckham, et al. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Healy, Mary. 2016. *Hebrews*. CCSS. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Heil, John P. 2010. *Hebrews: Chiastic Structures and Audience Response*. CBQMS 46. Ishington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America.

Héring, Jean. 2010. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Translated by AW Heathcote and PJ Allcock. Eugene: Wipf & Stock.

Hirsch, ED. 1967. *Validity in Interpretation*. New Haven: Yale Unibersity Press.

Hofius, Otfried. 1970. “Inkarnation und Opfertod Jesu nach Hebr 10,19f.” Pages 132-41 in *Der Ruf Jesu und die Antwort der Gemeinde: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias*. Edited by Eduard Lohse. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

_____. 1972. *Der Vorhang vor dem Thron Gottes: Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Hebräer 6,19 f. und 10,19f*. WUNT 14. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).

Horton, Fred L. 1976. *The Melchizedek Tradition: A Critical Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Century A.D. and in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. SNTSMS 30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hoskyns, Edwyn. 1947. *The Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Francis Noel Davey. London: Faber and Faber Limited.

Hughes, John J. 1979. “Hebrews IX 15ff. and Galatians III 15ff.: A Study in Covenant Practice and Procedure.” NovT 21.1: 27-96.

Hughes, PE. 1973. “The Blood of Jesus and His Heavenly Priesthood in Hebrews: Part II: The High-Priestly Sacrifice of Christ.” *BibSac* 130: 195-212.

_____. 1977. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Hurst, LD. 1990. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: Its Background and Thought*. SNTSMS 65. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hultgren, Arland J. 2011. *Paul’s Letter to the Romans: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Isaacs, Marie E. 1992. *Sacred Space: An Approach to the Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. JSNTSup 73. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Jamieson, RB. 2016. “Hebrews 9.23: Cult Inauguration, Yom Kippur and the Cleansing of the Heavenly Tabernacle.” NTS 62.4: 569-87.

_____. 2017. “When and Where Did Jesus Offer Himself? A Taxonomy of Recent Scholarship on Hebrews.” CurBS 15.3: 338-68.

_____. 2019. *Jesus' Death and Heavenly Offering in Hebrews*. SNTSMS 172. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jeremias, Joachim. 1953. "Hbr 5,7-10." ZNW 44.1: 107–11.

Jewett, Robert. 2007. *Romans: A Commentary on the Book of Romans*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Johnson, Luke T. 1982. "Romans 3:21–26 and the Faith of Jesus." CBQ 44.1: 77–90.

_____. 2001. *The First and Second Letters to Timothy: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 35A. New York: Doubleday.

_____. 2006. *Hebrews: A Commentary*. NTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Johnsson, William G. 1973. "Defilement and Purgation in the Book of Hebrews." PhD diss. Vanderbilt University.

_____. 1978. "The Cultus of Hebrews in Twentieth-Century Scholarship." ExpTim 89.4: 104-8.

_____. 1989. "The Heavenly Sanctuary—Figurative or Real?" Pages 35-*Issues in the Book of Hebrews*. DARCOM 4. Edited by FB Holbrook. Silver Spring: Biblical Research Institute of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.

Jones, CPM. 1955. "The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Lucan Writings." Pages 113-43 in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*. Edited by DE Nineham. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Joslin, Barry C. 2008. *Hebrews, Christ, and the Law: The Theology of the Mosaic Law in Hebrews 7.1-10.18*. Paternoster Biblical Monographs. Milton Keynes: Paternoster.

Käsemann, Ernst. 1980. *Commentary on Romans*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

_____. 2002. *The Wandering People of God: An Investigation of the Letter to the Hebrews*. Translated by Roy A. Harrisville and Irving L. Sandberg. Eugene: Wipf & Stock.

Keener, Craig S. 2003. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. 2 vols. Peabody: Hendrickson.

Kelly, JND. 1963. *The Pastoral Epistles*. BNTC. London: A & C Black.

Kleinig, John W. 2003. *Leviticus*. Concordia Commentary. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House.

_____. 2017. *Hebrews*. Concordia Commentary. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House.

Kibbe, Michael. 2014. “Is It Finished? When Did It Start? Hebrews, Priesthood, and Atonement in Biblical, Systematic, and Historical Perspective.” JTS 65.1: 25-61.

_____. 2016. *Godly Fear of Ungodly Failure?: Hebrews 12 and the Sinai Theophanies*. BNZW 216. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

_____. 2017. “‘You are a Priest Forever!’ Jesus’ Indestructible Life in Hebrews 7.16.” HBT 39: 134-55.

Kistemaker, Simon J. 1984. *Hebrews*. NTC. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Kiuchi, N. 1987. *The Purification Offering in the Priestly Literature: Its Meaning and Function*. JSOTSup 56. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

_____. 2007. *Leviticus*. ApOTC 3. Downers Grove: IVP Academic.

Klawans, Jonathan. 20606. *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Koester, Craig R. 1989. *The Dwelling of God: The Tabernacle in the Old Testament. Intertestamental Jewish Literature, and the New Testament*. CBQMS 22. Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America.

_____. 2001. *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 36. New York: Doubleday.

Koester, Helmut. 1962. "Outside the Camp": Hebrews 13.9-14. HTR 55.4: 299-315.

Kruse, Colin G. *Paul's Letter to the Romans*. PNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Kubo, Sake. 1992. *Scribes and Scripture: New Testament Essays in Honor of J. Harold Greenlee*. Edited by David Alan Black. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Kuma, Herman VA. 2012. *The Centrality of Αἷμα (Blood) in the Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews: An Exegetical and Philological Study*. New York: Edwin Mellen.

Kümmel, Werner Georg. 1975. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Rev. Ed. Translated by Howard Clark Kee. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Kurianal, James. 2000. *Jesus Our High Priest: Ps 110, 4 as the Substructure of Heb 5, 1–7, 28*. European University Studies 23/693. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2000.

Laansma, Jon. 2008. "Hidden Stories in Hebrews: Cosmology and Theology." Pages 9-18 in *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrews in its Ancient Contexts*. LNTS 387. Edited by Ricard Bauckham, et al. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.

Lane, William L. 1991. *Hebrews*. WBC 47A–B. Dallas: Word.

Lee, GM. 1970. "NT Gleanings: The Aorist Participle of Subsequent Actions (Acts 16,6)?" Bib 51.2: 35-37.

Levenson, Jon D. 1984. "The Temple and the World." JR 64.3: 275-98.

Levine, B.A., 1993. *Numbers 1-20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 4A. New York: Doubleday.

Levinsohn, Stephen H. 2000. *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek*. 2nd Edition. Dallas: SIL International.

Lincoln, Andrew T. 2005. *The Gospel According to Saint John*. BNTC. London: Continuum.

_____. 2006. *Hebrews: A Guide*. London: T&T Clark.

Lindars, Barnabas. 1989. “The Rhetorical Structure of Hebrews.” NTS 35.3: 382-406.

_____. 1991. *The Theology of the Letter to the Hebrews*. New Testament Theology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lioy, Dan. 2010. *Axis of Glory: A Biblical and Theological Analysis of the Temple Motif in Scripture*. StBibLit 138. New York: Peter Lang.

Loader, William RG. 1981. *Sohn und Hoherpriester: Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Christologie des Hebräerbriefes*. WMANT 53. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.

_____. 2018. “Revisiting High Priesthood Christology in Hebrews.” ZNW 109.2: 235-82.

Löhr, Hermut. 2005. “Reflections of Rhetorical Terminology in Hebrews.” Pages 199-210 in *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods-New Insights*. BINS 75. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. Leiden: Brill.

Long, Thomas C. 1997. *Hebrews*. IBC. Louisville: John Knox Press.

Longenecker, Bruce W. 2005. *Rhetoric at the Boundaries: The Art and Theology of New Testament Chain-Link Transitions*. Waco: Baylor University Press.

Longenecker, Richard. 1978. “The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews: A Study in the Development and Circumstantial Expression of New Testament Thought.” Pages 161-85 in *Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology: Essays in Honor of George E. Ladd*. Edited by Robert A. Guelich. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

_____. 2016. *The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Lünemann, Gottlieb. 1882. *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Luther, Martin. 1966. *Lectures in Genesis: Chapters 45-50*. Luther's Works. Vol. 8. Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan and Helmut T. Lehman. Saint Louis: Concordia.

_____. 1976. *Commentary on Romans*. Translated by J. Theodore Mueller. Grand Rapids: Kregel.

Mackie, Scott D. 2007. *Eschatology and Exhortation in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. WUNT 2/223. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

_____. 2017. "Experiential Cultic Soteriology and the Origins of Hebrews' High Priest Christology." Pages 249-67 in *Treasure New and Old: Essays in Honor of Donald A. Hagner*. GFS 1. Edited by Carl S. Sweatman and Clifford B. Kvidahl. Wilmore: GlossaHouse.

MacLeod, David J. 1995. "The Cleansing of the True Tabernacle." BibSac 152: 60-71.

MacRae, George W. 1978. "Heavenly Temple and Eschatology in the Letter to the Hebrews." Semeia 12: 178-200.

Manson, TW. 1945. "ἱλαστήριον." JTS 45: 1-10.

Manson, TW. 1949-50. "The Problem of the Epistle to the Hebrews." BJRL 32.1: 1-17.

Marshall, IH. 2009. "Soteriology in Hebrews." Pages 229-77 in *The Epistle to the Hebrews and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, et al. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Martin, Michael Wade and Jason A. Whitlark. 2018. *Inventing Hebrews: Design and Purpose in Ancient Rhetoric*. SNTSMS 171. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mason, Eric F. 2008. *"You are a Priest Forever": Second Temple Jewish Messianism and the Priestly Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. STDJ 74. Leiden: Brill.

_____. 2012. "'Sit at My Right Hand': Enthronement and the Heavenly Sanctuary in Hebrews." Pages 901-16 in *A Teacher for All Generations*. JSJSup 2.153 Edited by Eric F. Mason, et al. Leiden: Brill.

_____. 2017. "Heavenly Revelation in the Epistle to the Hebrews." Pages 277-91 in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition and the Shaping of the New Testament*. Edited by Benjamin E. Reynolds and Loren T. Struckenbruck. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Mathewson, David L. and Elodie Ballantine Emig. 2016. *Intermediate Greek Grammar: Syntax for Students of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

McKnight, Scot. 2005. *Jesus and His Death: Historiography, the Historical Jesus, and Atonement Theory*. Waco: Baylor University Press.

McRay, John. 1980. "Atonement and Apocalyptic in the Book of Hebrews." ResQ 23.1: 1-9.

Ménégoz, Eugène. 1894. *La théologie de L'Épitre aux Hébreux*. Paris: Fischbacher.

Metzger, Bruce M. 1994. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 4th Rev. Ed. New York: United Bible Societies.

Michel, Otto. 1957. *Der Brief an Die Hebräer*. KEK. 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Milgrom, Jacob. 1989. *Numbers*. JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.

_____. 1991. *Leviticus 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 3. New York: Doubleday.

Miller, Neva F. 1988. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: An Analytical and Exegetical Handbook*. Dallas: SIL International.

Milligan, George. 1899. *The Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Mitchell, Alan C. 2007. *Hebrews*. SP 13. Collegeville: Liturgical Press.

_____. 2011. "'A Sacrifice of Praise': Does Hebrews Promote Supersessionism?" Pages 251-67 in *Reading the Epistle to the Hebrews: A Resource for Students*. RBS 66. Edited by Eric F. Mason and Kevin B. McCruden. Atlanta: The Society of Biblical Literature.

Moffatt, J. 1924. *A Critical and Exegetical commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Moffitt, David M. 2008. "'If Another Priest Arises': Jesus' Resurrection and the High Priestly Christology of Hebrews." Pages 68-79 in *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrews in its Ancient Contexts*. LNTS 387. Edited by Ricard Bauckham, et al. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.

_____. 2011. *Atonement and the Logic of Resurrection in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. NovTSup 141. Leiden: Brill.

_____. 2016. "Serving in the Tabernacle in Heaven: Sacred Space, Jesus's High-Priestly Sacrifice, and Hebrews' Analogical Theology." Pages 259-79 in *Hebrews in Contexts*. Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 91. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini and Harold W. Attridge. Leiden: Brill.

_____. 2017. "Wilderness Identity and Pentateuchal Narrative: Distinguishing between Jesus' Inauguration and Maintenance of the New Covenant in Hebrews." Pages 153-71 in *Muted Voices of the New Testament: Readings in the Catholic Epistles and Hebrews*. LNTS 587. Edited by Katherine M. Hockey, et al. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.

_____. 2019. "It is Not Finished: Jesus's Perpetual Atoning Work as the Heavenly London: High Priest in Hebrews." Pages 157-75 in *So Great a*

Salvation: A Dialogue on the Atonement in Hebrews. LNTS 516. Jon C. Laansma, et al. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.

Monroe, Kenneth M. “Time Element in the Atonement.” EvQ 5: 397-408.

Montefiore, Hugh. 1964. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. BNTC. London: Adam & Charles Black.

Moo, Douglas J. 2018. *The Letter to the Romans*. 2nd ed. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Moret, Jean-René. 2016. “Le rôle du concept de purification dans l’Épître aux Hébreux: une réaction à quelques propositions de David M. Moffitt.” NTS 62.2: 289-307.

Morris, Leon. 1955. “The Meaning of ἱλαστήριον in Romans 3:25.” NTS 2.1: 33-43.

_____. 1965. *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross*. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

_____. 1983. *The Atonement: Its Meaning and Significance*. Downers Grove: IVP.

_____. 1981. “Hebrews.” Pages 3-158 in *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary*. EBC 12. Edited by Frank E. Gæbelein. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Morrison, Michael D. 2008. *Who Needs a New Covenant? Rhetorical Function of the Covenant Motif in the Argument of Hebrews*. PTMS. Eugene: Wipf & Stock.

Mosser, Carl. 2004. “No Lasting City: Rome, Jerusalem, and the Place of Hebrews in the History of Earliest ‘Christianity.’” PhD diss. Saint Mary’s College, University of St Andrews.

_____. 2013. “Torah Instruction, Discussion, and Prophecy in First-Century Synagogues.” Pages 523-51 in *Christian Origins and Hellenistic Judaism: Social and Literary Contexts for the New Testament*. Early Christianity in Its Hellenistic Context. Vol. 2. TENTS 10. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts. Leiden: Brill.

Moule, CFD. 1953. *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mounce, William D. 2000. *Pastoral Epistles*. WBC 46. Dallas: Word.

Murphy, Frederick J. 2012. *Apocalypticism in the Bible and the World: A Comprehensive Introduction*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Murray, Scott R. 2002. “The Concept of διαθήκη in the Letter to the Hebrews.” CTQ 66.1: 41-60.

Nairne, Alexander. 1910. “Two Questions of Text and Translation.” JTS 11: 560-62.

_____. 1913. *The Epistle of Priesthood: Studies in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Nauck, Wolfgang. 1960. “Zum Aufbau des Hebräerbriefes.” Pages 199-206 in *Judentum Urchristentum Kirche: Festschrift Für Joachim Jeremias*. BZNW 26. Edited by Walther Eltester. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann.

Neeley, LL. 1987. “A Discourse Analysis of Hebrews.” OPTT 3-4: 1-146.

Nelson, Richard D. 1993. *Raising up a Faithful Priest: Community and Priesthood in Biblical Theology*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

_____. 2003. “‘He Offered Himself:’ Sacrifice in Hebrews.” Int 57.3: 251-65.

Newsom, CA. 2000. “Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice.” Pages 1137-39 in *Dictionary of New Testament Background: A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical Scholarship*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter. Downers Grove: IVP Academic.

O’Collins, Gerald and Michael Keenan Jones. 2010. *Jesus Our Priest: A Christian Approach to the Priesthood of Christ*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Olbricht, Thomas H. 1993. “Hebrews as Amplification.” Pages 375-87 in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*.

JSNTSup 90. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Olmstead, Wesley G. 2019. *Matthew 1-14: A Handbook on the Greek Text*. BHGNT. Waco: Baylor University Press.

Osborne, Grant R. 2006. *The Hermeneutical Spiral: A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation*. 2nd edition. Downers Grove: IVP Academic.

Parsons, Mikeal C. 1988. "Son and High Priest: A Study in the Christology of Hebrews." EvQ 60: 195-216.

Peake, AS. 1879. *Hebrews*. London: T. C. & E. C. Jack.

Peeler, Amy LB. 2014. *You Are My Son: The Family of God in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. LNTS 486. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.

Perrin, Nicholas. 2018a. "Jesus as Priest in the Gospels." SBJT 22.2: 81-91.

_____. 2018b. *Jesus the Priest*. London: SPCK.

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.

Philip, Mayjee. 2011. *Leviticus in Hebrews: A Transtextual Analysis of the Tabernacle Theme in the Letter to the Hebrews*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Piotrowski, Nicholas G. and David S. Schrock. 2016. "'You Can Make Me Clean': The Matthean Jesus as Priest and the Biblical-Theological Results. CTR 14.1: 3-13.

Pitre, Brant. 2008. "Jesus, the New Temple, and the New Priesthood." *Temple and Contemplation: God's Presence in the Cosmos, Church, and Human Heart*. Letter & Spirit 4: 47-83.

Pitts, Andrew W. and Joshua F. Walker. 2012. "The Authorship of Hebrews: A Further Development in the Luke- Paul Relationship. Pages 143-84 in *Paul*

and His Social Relations. PAST 7. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Land. Leiden: Brill.

Porter, Stanley E. 1989. *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood*. SBG 1. New York: Peter Lang.

_____. 1994. “The Date and Composition of Hebrews and Use of the Present-Tense Form.” Pages 295-313 in *Crossing the Boundaries: Essays in Biblical Interpretation in Honour of Michael D. Goulder*. BIS 8. Edited by Stanley E. Porter, Paul Joyce, and David E. Orton. Leiden: Brill.

_____. 1995. “Discourse Analysis and New Testament Studies: An Introductory Survey.” Pages 14-35 in *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*. JSNTSup 113. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and DA Carson. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

_____. 1995. *The Letter to the Romans: A Linguistic and Literary Commentary*. New Testament Monographs 37. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press.

_____. 1999. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Ramsay, WM. 1908. *Luke The Physician and Other Studies in the History of Religion*. New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son.

Ramsey, J. Michaels. 2010. *The Gospel of John*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Reed, Jeffrey T. 1997. *A Discourse Analysis of Philippians: Method and Rhetoric in the Debate over Literary Integrity*. JSNTSup 136. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Regev, Eyal. 2019. *The Temple in Early Christianity: Experiencing the Sacred*. AYBRL. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Ribbens, Benjamin J. 2012. “Forensic-Retributive Justification in Romans 3:21-26: Paul's Doctrine of Justification in Dialogue with Hebrews.” CBQ 74.3: 548-67.

_____. 2016. *Levitical Sacrifice and the Heavenly Cult in Hebrews*. BNZW 222. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Richards, ER. 2004. *Paul and First-Century Letter Writing: Secretaries, Composition and Collection*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic.

Richardson, Christopher A. 2008. “The Passion: Reconsidering Hebrews 5.7-8.” Pages 51-67 in *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrews in its Ancient Contexts*. LNTS 387. Edited by Ricard Bauckham, et al. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.

_____. 2012. *Pioneer and Perfecter of Faith: Jesus’ Faith as the Climax of Israel’s History in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. WUNT 2/338. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Ridderbos, Herman. 1997. *The Gospel of John: A Theological Commentary*. Translated by John Vriend. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Riggenbach, D Eduard. 1913. *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. KNT 14. Leipzig: Deichert.

Robertson, AT. 2006. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. Bellingham: Logos Bible Software.

Rooke, Deborah W. 2000. “Jesus as Royal High Priest: Reflections on the Interpretation of the Melchizedek Tradition in Heb 7.” Bib 81.1: 81-94.

Rowland, Christopher. 2010. “Apocalypticism.” Pages 345-48 in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Edited by John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Runge, Steven E. 2010. *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis*. Bellingham: Lexham Press.

Rutgers, Leonard V. 2010. “Rome.” Pages 1164-68 in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Edited by John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Salom, AP. 1967. “*Ta Hagia* in the Epistle to the Hebrews.” AUSS 5: 59-70.

Sanday, William and Arthur C. Headlam. 1980. *The Epistle to the Romans*. ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Schenck, Kenneth L. 2003. *Understanding the Book of Hebrews: The Story Behind the Sermon*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

_____. 2007a. *Cosmology and Eschatology in Hebrews: The Settings of the Sacrifice*. SNTSMS 143. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. 2007b. "An Archaeology of Hebrews' Tabernacle Imagery." Pages 238-58 in *Hebrews in Contexts*. Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 91. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini and Harold W. Attridge. Leiden: Brill.

_____. 2019. *A New Perspective on Hebrews: Rethinking the Parting of the Ways*. Lanham: Lexington Books/Fortress Academic.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Gospel According to St. John*. Vol. 3. HTCNT. Translated by David Smith and GA Kon. New York: Crossroad.

Schreiner, Thomas R. 2015. *Commentary on Hebrews*. BTCP. Nashville: B&H.

_____. 2018. *Romans*. 2nd ed. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Scholer, John M. 1991. *Proleptic Priests: Priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. JSNTSup 49. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Scott, EF. 1922. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: Its Doctrine and Significance*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Seeberg, Alfred. 1912. *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer.

Skarsaune, Oskar. 2009. "Does the Letter to the Hebrews Articulate a Supersessionist Theology? A Response to Richard Hays." Pages 174-82 in *The Epistle to the Hebrews and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, et al. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Sklar, Jay. 2013. *Leviticus: An Introduction and Commentary*. TOTC 3. Downers Grove: IVP Academic.

Small, Brian C. 2014. *The Characterization of Jesus in the Book of Hebrews*. BibInt 128. Leiden: Brill.

Smith, Jerome. 1969. *A Priest For Ever: A Study of Typology and Eschatology in Hebrews*. London: Sheed and Ward.

Soskice, Janet Martin. *Metaphor and Religious Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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*. Richmond: John Knox Press.

Spicq, C. 1949. “Le Philonisme De L’Épitre aux Hébreux.” RB 56.4: 542-72.

_____. 1950. “L’origine johannique de la conception du Christ-prêtre dans l’Epître aux Hébreux.” *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne: Mélanges offerts à M. Maurice Goguel à l’occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire*. Bibliothèque théologique. Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé.

_____. 1952-53. *L’Épître aux Hébreux*. 2 vols. Études Biblique. Paris: Gabalda.

Sprinkle, JM. 2003. “Red Heifer.” Pages 669-70 in *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch*. Edited by TD Alexander & DW Baker. Downers Grove: IVP Academic.

Stanley, Steven K. 1994. *New Covenant Hermeneutic: The Use of Scripture in Hebrews 8-10*. PhD diss. University of Sheffield.

Stegemann, Ekkehard W., Wolfgang Stegemann. 2005. “Does the Cultic Language in Hebrews Represent Sacrificial Metaphors? Reflections on Some Basic Problems.” Pages 13-23 in *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods-New Insights*. BINS 75. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini. Leiden: Brill.

Sterling, Gregory E. 2001. “Ontology Versus Eschatology: Tensions Between Author and Community in Hebrews.” SPhiloA 13: 190-211.

Stevick, Daniel, B. *Jesus and His Own: A Commentary on John 13-17*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Steyn, Gert J. 2011. *A Quest for the Assumed LXX Vorlage of the Explicit Quotations in Hebrews*. FRLANT 235. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Stibbs, Alan M. 1970. *The Finished Work of Christ*. London: Tyndale Press.

Stökl Ben Ezra, Daniel. 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.

Stott, Wilfrid. 1962. “The Conception of ‘Offering’ in the Epistle to the Hebrews.” NTS 9.1: 62-67.

Stowers, Stanley K. 1986. *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity*. LEC. Edited by Wayne A. Meeks. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.

Strickland, Phillip. 2017. “‘Le style, c’est l’homme’: A Critical Assessment of the Use of Literary Stylistics in the Defense of Lukan Authorship of Hebrews.” EFN 30.50: 3–28.

Stuart, Moses. 1827. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Andover: Mark Newman.

Stuhlmacher, Peter. 1986. “Recent Exegesis on Romans 3.24-26.” Pages 94-109 in *Reconciliation, Law, and Righteousness: Essays in Biblical Theology*. Translated by Everett R. Kalin. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Svendsen, Stefan Nordgaard. 2009. *Allegory Transformed: The Appropriation of Philonic Hermeneutics in the Letter to the Hebrews*. WUNT 2/269. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Swetnam, James. 1966a. "‘The Greater and More Perfect Tent.’ A Contribution to the Discussion of Hebrews 9.11.” Bib 47.1: 91-106

_____. 1966b. “On the Imagery and Significance of Hebrews 9.9-10.” CBQ 28.2: 155-73.

_____. 1969. “On the Literary Genre of the ‘Epistle’ to the Hebrews.” NovT 11.4: 261-69.

_____. 1970. “Hebrews 9,2 and the Uses of Consistency.” CBQ 32.2: 205-21.

_____. 1981. *Jesus and Isaac: A Study of the Epistle to the Hebrews in Light of the Aqedah*. AnBib 94. Rome: Biblical Institute Press.

Talbert, Charles H. 2002. *Romans*. SHBC. Macon: Smyth & Helwys Publishing.

Thiessen, Matthew. 2019. “Hebrews and the Jewish Law.” Pages 183-94 in *So Great A Salvation: A Dialogue on the Atonement in Hebrews*. Edited by Jon C. Laansma, George H. Guthrie, and Cynthia Long Westfall. LNTS 516. T&T Clark.

Thiselton, Anthony C. 1980. *The Two Horizons: New Testament Hermeneutics and Philosophical Description with Special Reference to Heidegger, Bultmann, Gadamer, and Wittgenstein*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

_____. 1992. *New Horizons in Hermeneutics: The Theory and Practice of Transforming Biblical Reading*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

_____. 2009. *Hermeneutics: An Introduction*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Thompson, James W. 1977. “The Conceptual Background and Purpose of the Midrash in Hebrews VII.” NovT 19.3: 209-23.

_____. 1982. *The Beginnings of Christian Philosophy: The Epistle to the Hebrews*. CBQMS 13. Ishington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America.

_____. 2008. *Hebrews*. Paideia. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Thornton, TCG. “The Meaning of αἱματεκχυσία in Heb. IX. 22.” ExpTim 15.1: 63-65.

Thrall, Margaret E. 1962. *Greek Particles in the New Testament: Linguistic and Exegetical Studies*. NTTS 3. Leiden: Brill.

Tidball, Derek. 2016. *The Voices of the New Testament: Invitation to a Biblical Roundtable*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic.

Treat, Jeremy R. 2014. *The Crucified King: Atonement and Kingdom in Biblical and Systematic Theology*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Trotter, Andrew H. 1997. *Interpreting the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Guides to New Testament Exegesis 6. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Turner, Nigel and JH. 1976. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek: Style.* Vol 4. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Übelacker, Walter. 2005. "Hebrews and the Implied Author's Rhetorical Ethos." Pages 316-34 in *Rhetoric, Ethic, and Moral Persuasion: Essays from the 2002 Heidelberg Conference*. Edited by Thomas H. Olbright and Anders Eriksson. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.

Vaganay, Léon. 1940. "*Le Plan de L'Épître aux Hébreux*." Pages 269-77 in *Memorial Lagrange*. Edited by LH Vincent. Paris: Gabalda.

Vanhoozer, Kevin J. 1998. *Is There a Meaning in This Text?: The Bible, the Reader, and the Morality of Literary Knowledge*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Vanhoye, Albert. 1963. *La Structure Littéraire de l'Épître Aux Hébreux*. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer.

_____. 1964. "L'οἰχουμένη dans l'épître aux Hébreux." Bib 45.2: 248-53.

_____. 1989. *Structure and Message of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. SubBi 12. Translated by James Swetnam. Rome: Editrice Pontifico Instituto Biblico.

_____. 2009. *Old Testament Priests and the New Priest According to the New Testament*. Herefordshire: Gracewing.

_____. 2011. *"A Different Priest": The Letter to the Hebrews*. Rhetorica Semitica. Translated by Leo Arnold. Miami: Convivium Press.

_____. 2015. *The Letter to the Hebrews: A New Commentary*. New York: Paulist Press.

_____. 2018. "The *teleiōsis of Christ: Chief Point of Hebrews' Priestly Christology*." Pages 59-75 in *A Perfect Priest: Studies in the Letter to the Hebrews*. WUNT 2/477. Edited by Nicholas J. Moore and Richard J. Ounsworth. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

_____. 2018. "'By the Greater and More Perfect Tent (Heb 9.11).'" Pages 76-99 in *A Perfect Priest: Studies in the Letter to the Hebrews*. WUNT 2/477. Edited by Nicholas J. Moore and Richard J. Ounsworth. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Vincent, Taylor. 2009. *The Atonement in New Testament Teaching*. Eugene: Wipf & Stock.

Vis, Joshua M. 2012. "The Purification Offering of Leviticus and the Sacrificial Offering of Jesus.'" PhD diss. Duke University.

Walker, Peter. 2004. "A Place for Hebrews? Contexts for a First-Century Sermon." Pages 231-49 in *The New Testament in Its First Century Setting: Essays on Context and Background on Honour of B. W. Winter on His 65th Birthday*. Edited by PJ Williams, et al. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Wallace, Daniel B. 1996. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Wallis, Ian G. 1995. *The Faith of Jesus Christ in Early Christian Traditions*. SNTSMS 84. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Walton, John H. 2006. *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrews Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

_____. 2011. *Genesis 1 as Ancient Cosmology*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Weima, JAD. 2000. "Letters, Greco-Roman." Pages 640-44 in *Dictionary of New Testament Background: A Compendium of Contemporary Biblical*

Scholarship. Edited by Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter. Downers Grove: IVP Academic.

_____. 2016. *Paul the Ancient Letter Writer: An Introduction to Epistolary Analysis*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Weiss, Hans-Friedrich. 1991. *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. KEK 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Wenham, Gordon J. 1979. *The Book of Leviticus*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Wenkel, David H. 2014. “Jesus at Age 30: Further Evidence for Luke's Portrait of a Priestly Jesus?” BTB 44.4: 195-201.

Westcott, BF. 1903. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: Notes and Essays on the Greek Text*. 3rd ed. London: Macmillan.

Westfall, Cynthia Long. 2005. *A Discourse Analysis of the Letter to the Hebrews: The Relationship between Form and Meaning*. LNTS 297. London: T&T Clark.

_____. 2019. “Space and Atonement in Hebrews.” Pages 228-48 in *So Great A Salvation: A Dialogue on the Atonement in Hebrews*. Edited by Jon C. Laansma, George H. Guthrie, and Cynthia Long Westfall. LNTS 516. T&T Clark.

Wickham, EC. 1910. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: With Introduction and Notes* London: Methuen & Co.

Wiid, JS. 1992. “The Testament Significance of διαθήκη in Hebrews 9.15-22.” Neot 26.1: 149-56.

Williamson, Ronald. 1963. “Platonism and Hebrews.” SJT 16.4: 415-24.

_____. 1970. *Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews*. ALGHJ 4. Leiden: Brill.

Wills, Lawrence. 1984. “The Form of the Sermon in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity. HTR 77.3/4: 277-99.

Witherington, Ben III. 2007. *Letters and Homilies for Jewish Christians: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on Hebrews, James and Jude*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic.

_____. 2009. *New Testament Rhetoric: An Introductory Guide to the Art of Persuasion in and of the New Testament*. Eugene: Cascade Books.

Witherington, Ben III Darlene Hyatt, D. 2004. *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Wright, David P. 1992. "Heifer, Red." Pages 115-16 in vol. 3 of *The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday.

Wright, NT. 2002. "The Letter to the Romans: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections." Pages 395-770 in *The New Interpreter's Bible*. Vol. 10. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Young, Norman H. 1979. "Αἱματεκχυσία: A Comment." ExpTim 90.6: 180.

_____. 1981. "The Gospel According to Hebrews 9." NTS 27.2: 198-210.

Young, Richard A. 1994. *Intermediate New Testament Greek: A Linguistic and Exegetical Approach*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman.

Zuntz, Günther. 2007. *The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the "Corpus Paulinum."* The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1946. Eugene: Wipf & Stock.