

Durham E-Theses

Eschatology and the epistle to the Hebrews

J. M. Hancock

How to cite:

Hancock, J. M. (1969) *Eschatology and the epistle to the Hebrews*. Masters thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/10233/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

The Epistle to the Hebrews is part of the eschatological kerygma of the early church (1-4). The way the Old Testament is used to show that the age of fulfilment has dawned is compared with Qumran's use of the Old Testament (4-11).

In Judaism and Qumran fulfilment of the promises of the past are still awaited in the future. In the New Testament they are in part realised and fulfilled in Christ, (11-14), but the eschatological tension between present fulfilment and final consummation is kept (16-22) and it is found in Hebrews (22-33). The Son is the key figure. Despite apparent contradictions He is superior to the angels (33-39). He is the perfect man, bringing men to perfection (39-41) through His perfect sacrifice and total identification with humanity (42-46). He is the New High Priest, fulfilling the promise of the Priest-King and is compared with Melchizedek (46-55). He is the Mediator of a new Covenant and is compared with Moses. The idea of the New Covenant differs radically from that found in Qumran (56-61). Christ's establishment of the New Covenant by His unique and perfect sacrifice means that the old sacrificial ritual is ready to fade away (61-64). Judaism and Qumran did not have the same approach (64-67) because they lacked the new eschatological perspective which allegiance to Christ had brought. The Tent takes the place of the Temple in this Epistle (67-74). The importance of the Temple varies in other parts of the New

Testament (75-76) and is in contrast when compared with Qumran (76-79).

Throughout the argument of the Epistle, the eschatological tension is present. In the Son, the End has become the present, the past fulfilled and the future consummation certain. The Christian, in via, is urged therefore to live victoriously following the Pioneer, who is the same, yesterday, today and forever (70-81).

ESCHATOLOGY AND THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

J. M. HANCOCK

SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE, MASTER OF ARTS

DECEMBER 1969

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION.

The value of the Epistle of the Hebrews is often lost for the Christian congregation because they only hear particular sections of it read in the course of the year. The Epistle was intended to be read as a whole and the weight of the argument is otherwise lost. But it is likely that we are meant to read it not only as a letter but also as a sermon. If this is so then the need to hear the whole is even more apparent. It is often felt that the Epistle differs markedly from the rest of the New Testament because of its manner of argument and its extended use of the Old Testament. Yet when it is treated as a sermon it follows to a remarkable extent the pattern of the kerygma drawn by Dodd out of the Pauline Epistles (I), though it is not in fact treated by Dodd. The six-fold pattern of the kerygma which he unfolded was -

- i. The age of fulfilment has dawned.
- ii. Through the ministry, death and resurrection of Jesus the prophecies have been fulfilled and God's saving act reaches its climax.
- iii. Jesus is raised to God's right hand as Lord.
- iv. The exalted Jesus sends the Holy Spirit to the Church.
- v. The inaugurated Messianic age finds its consummation at the return of Jesus.
- vi. In the light of this expectation and as a result of the first coming, the hearers are warned and exhorted.

We must briefly see how these themes recur in the Epistle we are considering. That the New Age replaces the old is the constant theme of the Epistle; the Covenant, its mediator, its ritual, tabernacle, and high priest are all superior to the old which is already to pass away. The Old Testament is used by the author as the basis of his argument. Five of the passages are amongst those listed by Dodd in his fifteen in connection with the primitive kerygma; (2) these are Psalms 2: 7, 8: 4-6, 110: 1, Jeremiah 31: 31, Habakuk 2: 3-4. They are not however the only passages alluded to in the Epistle. H. W. Montefiore (in his recent commentary) recognises that the Epistle is firmly based on the kerygma of the Early Church. This opened with the proclamation of the fulfilment in Jesus of the promises of the Old Testament; and this is particularly marked in our Epistle, where there are some thirty-seven actual and seventy virtual citations from the books of the Old Covenant. The author who seems to regard the Old Testament as the infallible word of God, is only interested in the passages which he quotes for their messianic sense. He gives meticulous exposition pointing out their fulfilment under the New Covenant.

The climax of the Old Testament fulfilment is found in the Incarnation. As Hoskyns and Davey pointed out (3) there are a great many suggestions in the Epistle of incidents in the earthly life of our Lord. The author knew that he had taken human flesh 2: 4, was sprung from the tribe of Judah 7: 14,

and, by inference from the quotations, from the line of David. He knew that he preached a message of salvation 2:3, that he lived as a man among men 2: 13-14, was tempted, yet, without sin 4: 15 (4), that he was obedient to the Father's will 5: 8 and that he endured the contradiction of sinners. In 5: 7+9 there is probably a reference to Gethsemane. His death is a leading thought in the Epistle (5). It was a shedding of blood yet at the same time, a voluntary self-offering in death. 9:14. (6)

His resurrection is mentioned only once, in 13: 20, but it is implied in the many references to the exaltation of Christ, and in the expression πάντοτε ζῶν 7: 25. Rather as in the Fourth Gospel, the Resurrection and Exaltation seem to be identified in the Epistle. The thought of exaltation recurs constantly 1: 3, 13, 8: 1, 9: 24, 10: 12, 12: 2.

While the presence of the Spirit is not prominent in the Epistle, this need not surprise us. Dodd noted that one speech contained elements not present in others, but that overall they presented a complete picture. The Spirit is not however completely absent. In 2: 4, after mentioning that the author has had the message of Christ confirmed to him by those who heard Christ, he goes on to say that God has borne them witness both with signs and wonders and gifts of the Holy Ghost.

Σημεῖα also occurs in Acts 2: 19-22. Σωτηρίας, Hebrews 2: 3 also corresponds to the last verse of the Joel quotation in Acts 2: 21. Again Hebrews 6: 4, γευσαμένους
...τὸ Ἅγιον may suggest Acts 2: 38.

The fifth element in the kerygma pattern, is the return of Christ. The eschatology of the Epistle will be more fully considered but certain clear references cannot be avoided. Prominent among these are 9: 28, ~~aa~~.10: 13, (Christ waiting for his final triumph) 10: 37 and possibly 10: 25 (¶). In the light of this eschatological context, the author, like the kerygma goes on to exhort and warn.

To sum up ; the kerygmatic pattern found in the Acts and Epistles is also present in Hebrews. The themes here briefly alluded to must now be considered in greater detail. They will then appear distinctively Christian, compared with Greek or Jewish parallels. They will be seen to spring out of the Old Testament but to be centred on the eschatological figure of Christ. While the preacher in Hebrews may use new colours and combinations, he is concerned like Peter and Paul, to present Jesus, the same yesterday, today, and forever.

The author presents the kerygma within the framework of the Old Testament. This is not only the framework for the kerygma, as Dodd maintains, but undergirds the whole argument of our Epistle. Westcott noted the centrality for the Old Testament in the Epistle (8). He calls attention to the range of quotations; twelve are from the Pentateuch, one from the historical books, four from the prophets, eleven from the Psalms, and one from Proverbs. Thus all three sections of the Old Testament are represented. These quotations reveal that the author regards God as the speaker. His use of *λαλέω* shows that to him the Old Testament was the voice of God

speaking to men, and where the writer has a human author in mind, (7:14, 9:19, 10:28), he still regards God as the author. This is confirmed by a close study of the introductory formulae, and the use made of the present tense. Out of twenty five tenses in these formula, fourteen are found to be in the present. For the author, the Old Testament is still speaking now. But now the word of God in the Old Testament is seen in a totally new light, since God has now spoken in a Son, ^{and} ~~which~~ while this does not undermine the value and relevance of His earlier words, it does put them in a new context. Now, since the catastrophic event of the Incarnation, God's words in the Old Testament are seen by the Christian authors of the New Testament to be prepared for this new Word, in whom they are fulfilled and given meaning. This view of the Old Testament is found elsewhere in the New Testament, notably in the Acts, 1 Peter and Matthew, but nowhere is so clear as it is in this Epistle.

The text used by the author seems to vary. Westcott (9) has examined the quotations and finds that out of the twenty-nine found in Hebrews fifteen agree with the Hebrew against the LXX., three differ from both the LXX. and the Hebrew, and three are free renderings. Westcott gives these as 12:20, 13:5, 1:6. (The last however has now been found in Hebrew. It is a quotation of Deuteronomy 32:43 found in the fourth cave at Qumran. (10).) The author regards the LXX. as authoritative but he seems to be more interested in the sense of the passage than in the exact wording used in the LXX..

B. Gärtner claims that the use of the Old Testament in Hebrews is similar to that found in the Qumran literature (11). He rejects the view of Stendahl that Matthew used the peshertype of interpretation, but claims in contrast that this usage is found in the Epistle to the Hebrews. In line with Stendahl, C.F.D. Moule has recently suggested (12) that Hebrews may have come from a school of apologetic concerned for the defence of the Gospel. Such a theory is further supported by the hortatory character of the Epistle (13), and the pupil-teacher relationship (5: 12, 6: 1.). Whether or not this is true, Gärtner's theory cannot be upheld. If he rejects Stendahl's theory in connection with Matthew on the ground that it lacks the formula "it says the explanation is.." which is typical for Qumran, then this objection also applies to Hebrews. He is not correct in claiming that the author has tendentiously altered ~~the~~^{the} LXX. text, as we have already seen. (p. 5). Finally the placing together of a number of texts is not peculiar to Qumran, since it occurs elsewhere in the New Testament (Romans 9: 11.). The use of the Old Testament in the Qumran literature has not yet been fully studied, but if we take the introductory formula, we find less emphasis upon God as the author than we do in Hebrews, where God is invariably seen as the author. From the Sect's* allusions to the Old Testament, little can be proved. It was, it seems, natural for them to allude to the Old Testament. When we turn to the Peshier interpretation Bruce suggests (14) that in the Sect's* commentaries on Psalm 37,

Isaiah 10, 11. Micah, Nahum and Habukkuk, we find 1) atomisation where "each text is made to fit into a new historical situation regardless of its contextual meaning. 2) the textual variants are designed to a meaning suitable for the sect, Wernberg-Moeller suggests two possible methods; taking words in a different sense from that intended, and by finding words suggestive of other words and expressions; 3) allegorisation and 4) reinterpretation. None of these methods however apply to Hebrews except perhaps in 10, 5, yet even here the quotation is not used in any sense which conflicts with the original context.

Wernberg-Moeller points out that the sect used the OT. in order to illustrate and justify the life and methods of the Sect. The actual historical application of the text was of no real interest. Eisegesis was used in order to illustrate and illuminate the present and immediate future. The author of Hebrews however, while concerned with the present and future, treats the past seriously as a true stage in God's educative process. He regards the OT. as a unity, a progressive revelation of God to man.

Fitzmeyer (15) draws attention to a further difference between the sect use of the OT. and that of Hebrews in their idea of fulfilment. While the sect see the fulfilment of certain past events, they are primarily concerned to look forward to future fulfilment. Significantly in Qumran there is no fulfilment formula. X 4 v only occurs once- C.D. 7; 10-11, 19; 7 and even here it differs from the NT. because

this refers to a future event. Once more we find that Hebrews takes the ^{fulfillment of the} past seriously, while Qumran is primarily concerned with the future.

To sum up therefore; though Hebrews and Qumran have some points in common in their use of the OT., these cannot be allowed to obscure the differences. We have no ground to suppose that the author or recipients of the Epistle were connected directly with Qumran. We have here two independent traditions.

How then does the author of Hebrews use the OT.? Four particular passages are essential to the authors argument. These are Ps. 8.95. 110 and Jer.31. C.H. Dodd gives three of these as among his primary testimonia, while he regards Ps.95 as an illustration of the way in which the author realised a messianic significance. The use of these OT. texts reflects the work of a "trained scholar of great and original individuality" (16).

Ps. 8; 4-6 controls the whole argument of ch. I. There the thought is that, in the Son, God has spoken the final word, for which the prophets were preparing; this voice of God was heard in the Incarnation, death and exaltation of Christ, who was not an angel, but man, the Son of Man, who in time would put all things in subjection under his feet. The second chapter presupposes the argument of the first where he quotes Ps. 2; 7 and 2 Sam. 7; 14. Dodd makes the important suggestion that Ps. 8; 4-6 and its application in Heb. 2; 6-8 is to be taken in

conjunction with ICor. 15; 27 "He hath put all things under his feet" Here we have an eschatological picture of final victory of the Son of Man, recalling that in Dan. 7; 13. (17) This connection is found again in MK. 14: 12 where Dan. 7 13 is conflated with Ps. 110: 1, a pivotal verse for the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews as well as with other Christian writers, and which may be said to govern the whole thought of the Epistle. It is quoted or referred to at least eight times in the Epistle (18). The whole conception of Christ's Highpriesthood depends on this verse. In Christ the victory of the New Age is already being realised. The old priesthood, the Old Covenant, the voice through the prophets, in short, the Old Age, is being superseded by the New.

It is often asserted at this point that the argument of the author depends not upon a contrast drawn between the Two Covenants, but upon the thought of Philo. We must pause to consider this before continuing our survey of the writer's thought. Moffatt based his view on the close similarity of words used, a common view of the inspiration of the LXX, and Nairne thought that the Melchizedek theme was Philonic. Others claim that the arguments have been overstated. Greek thought is used it is true, but only as a vehicle and there must be much more proof before we can go on and assume similarity of thought. Philo's conception of Moses as the King,

legislator, priest and prophet, does not seem to correspond to that of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews where he is thought of as the "faithful servant in all the house".

In Hebrews it is the Christians who are the House (3:6)

So too the idea of the sanctuary in Hebrews is not that of the universe as it is in Philo, but a spiritual realm barred to man by sin, but opened through the death of Christ.

Nor is the eschatological Sabbath rest of Hebrews found in Philo. (19). The so-called allegorical method in the use of Gen. 14. in the Epistle, is seen by others to be typological. The idea of the verbal inspiration of the LXX is also found in Rabbinic schools as well as in Alexandria. Narborough found the Greek idea of the Logos in I: 5 - πρωτότοκον - 3: 4, 5: 9. But the Logos theme^{also} has Jewish and OT. antecedents which predominate over the Greek background. The Melchizedek passage which is generally considered to be the nearest approach to Philo is in fact fundamentally different. In Philo the persons fade away into ideas and there is no real connection between the original story and the application given it by Philo. In Hebrews, the person of Melchizedek is all important, since in his person and work as High-Priest he foreshadowed Christ. Further, while these ideas are Greek, they have parallels in the OT., so that the concepts are not exclusively Greek. The Jews believed in the heavenly pattern behind the shadows which can be seen by man. Thus in Num. 8: 4, Moses is commanded to make the Tabernacle according to the pattern shown him in the mount. The Temple, circumcision and

the Passover were all thought to have pre-existed. Bruce holds that this Jewish concept sufficiently explains the thought behind the Epistle without any need to bring in Philo. (20). We have no adequate reason to suppose that here as elsewhere the author's thought is influenced by anything other than his view of the OT. which he sees in the light of the New Voice (21).

To sum up, in this Epistle we find the most extensive use of the OT.. Apart from the ethical and hortatory sections and the historical review in ch.II, the influence of the author's view of the OT. is found in every chapter. He does not merely take the points of correspondence which would buttress his argument against the Jews (22), but rather he uses the OT. because he recognises the voice of God speaking here through the events of the past which are now seen to have been pointing to Christ and are now fulfilled in Him. This use of the OT. is not peculiar to Hebrews (23), but while it has some superficial similarities with the methods of Qumran and Philo, it differs radically from them since they have fundamentally divergent views of the nature of history. Only the author of this Epistle sees that the old age is passing away, since the New Age has dawned in the coming of Christ. We must now turn to gain a fuller understanding of this fact in the New Testament as a whole and in the Epistle to the Hebrews in particular.

NOTES TO INTRODUCTION

Page
No:

1. Dodd. Apostolic Preaching. p.17. H.& S.1963.
2. Dodd. According to the Scriptures. Nisbet.1953.p31-51.
3. Hoskyns & Davey op.cit.p.166-9.
4. Whatever the explanation of this verse, it must refer to Christ's sinlessness.
5. The death is stressed in 2:9,10,14. 9:12,14f,22,28. 10:10-29. 12:24. 13:12,20.
6. $\pi\lambda\omicron\chi\omega$ is used several times in Acts and I Peter.
7. The Day could refer to the destruction of Jerusalem, but as these two are so often linked together in eschatological passages, it does not affect the argument.
8. Westcott. op.cit. pp. 469-495.
9. Westcott. op.cit. pp. 479.
10. NTS.ix. p.221. *see also N.T.S xii. p.270ff*
11. B. Gärtner. Studia Theologica. Vol. viii.p.13.
12. C.F.D. Moule. ~~op.cit.~~ p.161-74 in *Birth of the New Testament*.
13. This has frequently been noted - e.g. by Moffatt, Scott, Salmon, Carrington, Pierce.

The sermon style is particularly evident in 2:3, 5:11, 6:9, 8:1, 11:32, 12:35, 13:6,22.

A. Guilding JTS.n.s.3 1952 suggests that the Epistle was a Pentecost sermon, since Gen. 14 and Ps. 110 were both prescribed lectionary portions for Pentecost.
14. Bruce. Biblical Exegesis. p.11f.

15. Fitzmeyer. NTS. Vol.viii. 1962. p.62ff.
16. Dodd. According to Scriptures. p.21.
17. Dodd. According to Scriptures. p.117.
18. 1:3,13. 5:6. 6:20. 7:17. 10:12. 12:2. The Epistle might well be described as a sermon on this text.
19. Barrett. Background. p.368.
20. Bruce. op.cit. N.T.S. ix. p.229f.
21. H.W. Montefiore, p.6ff. gives a convenient summary of the points of contrast between Philo and the author of the Epistle. He concludes that while there are similarities, there can be no doubt that our author is a Christian; he is not a plagiarist. His Christian convictions have profoundly altered any Philonic background which he may have had.
22. Lampe & Woollcombe. op.cit. p.20. 22.
23. Lampe & Woollcombe. op.cit. p.25.

THE TWO AGES Chapter II

In the way Qumran made use of the Old Testament, we have already seen that the past was not treated seriously, as a stage in God's educative process. The Sect is primarily concerned with the future and they do not see any ^{lasting significant} fulfilment in the present; all fulfilment lies in the future. This view of history is in striking contrast with the NT. in general and with the Epistle to the Hebrews in particular. Here the past is of primary importance as a preparation for the tremendous present of which Jesus and the Kingdom are the crux (1). Likewise the present was of crisis importance and not simply a necessary bridge to the future, an evil to be endured (cp. Lk. 7:22, Mk. 2:19, Lk. 13:34-35.) The NT. finds fulfilment in the present; Qumran still looks for that fulfilment. An example of this is their view of the Torah, which for Jesus is fulfilled in Himself, but for which the Sect still waited in the future. W.D. Davies (2) regarded the view of some that the existing Torah would persist into the Messianic Age as only one expression of the Hope. He found that there were at the same time, elements inchoate in the Messianic hope of Judaism, which would make it possible for others to believe that the Messianic Age would be marked by a New Torah. This latter view has now received further support from IQ34ii2:5-8 (given by Milik J.T. page 154). Again in CD.12:23, 14:19 the difference between the Torah for the present and that for the future is made clear, since it said that these laws are only valid during the epoch of wickedness

until there shall arise the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel. With the coming of these eschatological figures the situation changes. For the Sect this remains in the future, but for the Gospels the law is already being fulfilled, and by Jesus the New Torah is already being given-" ... it was said by them of old but I say to you" The future hope of the Sect may be equated with the Kingdom of God of the Gospels, or the Rest of Hebrews. With the latter idea we shall be concerned in due course, when we shall again find fundamentally different views of history and eschatology emerging.

The term "Kingdom of God" is rarely found in the literature of the Sect or in Apocalyptic. Where it is found - Ps. Sol. 17: 13. Sib. Or. 3: 46. Ass.Mos. 10: I. IQM6: 6. 12:7-it always refers to the final decisive act of God in his intervention into history. This future intervention of God is the recurrent theme of the OT.. Here it was the prophets who were primarily concerned with an event in the future when God would reveal his saving activity, in a manner analogous to the salvation events of the past, but different from them in that the eschatological event will be the final and decisive event. This intervention to which the prophets look forward (Mic. 2:12, 4: 1-7, Is. 24:21-23, 33:22, 52: 7-10, Zeph. 3: 14-30, Obad.21). will vindicate God's righteousness and the faithful in Israel. Such a hope was based on the belief that God was eternally King (Ex. 15:18, Ps. 145: II) and that

He must ultimately reign and be seen to reign not only over Israel, but over all the nations. Many of the Psalms are concerned with the Kingship of Yahweh and this remains true whatever is thought about the existence, nature and content of the New Year festival in Israel. Whether or not such a festival existed, whether if it did, it was like that at Babylon and elsewhere (3) or concerned with the annual enthronement of the Davidic King in Zion (Kraus), or the annual festival of the Ark (4) or whether it was more like the Ugaritic myth of Baal's conflict with Mot found at Ras Shamra, it was centred on the salvation activity of God and His intervention into history, experienced in actual historical events. When for the Israelites this hope was not immediately realised, it removed further into the future, and out of the eschatology of the prophets, there emerged the eschatology of the Apocalyptists. Here the hope was fused with other elements, some of them Persian, and the resultant picture is very far from being either consecutive or consistent. (6)

Yet the hope remained that God would intervene in history in some way. With the coming of Jesus this event has taken place; God has intervened, not indeed as men had expected, but decisively. N. Perrin has shown how the actual terms used in Mt. 12: 28 become more intelligible when seen in the light of this hope, which for Qumran remained future. (7). What for Qumran was primarily a future expectation, has become actually present (Mk. I: 15, Lk. 10: 9-11, Mt. 10: 7, 17: 20) in the experience of the individual in contact with God's kingly

activity manifest in the ministry of Jesus and his disciples. The eschatological hope and its fulfilment is central to the NT. and Kasemann speaks of it as the groundwork of New Testament theology.

In the discussion of NT. eschatology, the centrality of the person of the King is being increasingly recognised by a number of otherwise widely differing scholars (for examples of this see Lundstrom and Perrin.) The key word here is *ἐπιτοβαβίην*. However present and future are to be related, eschatology is vitally Christocentric. This is one of the sure gains from the long debate over the Kingdom of God. Since the work of Schweitzer, it is no longer possible to view the Kingdom as a this-world ethical order, purely and simply, conceived of either individually or corporately. Nor can the views of Weiss, Schweitzer, Wrede, Dalman, Burkitt, Easton and others be accepted. The Kingdom is not to be thought of as something entirely in the future. This was an important corrective to the long period when in NT. scholarship, the eschatological character of the King and Kingdom was forgotten. But an exclusive emphasis upon the future of the Kingdom ignores those places where the Kingdom is spoken of as present and distorts the evidence of the NT.. But equally, an exclusive emphasis upon the eschatological presence of the Kingdom here and now in the person of Jesus, ignores the evidence and those places where the Kingdom is clearly still future. The tension and paradox present in the text of the NT. must be upheld. The both - and cannot be surrendered to either - or. It is for this reason

that the epoch-making work of Dr. Dodd while correcting the exclusive future emphasis, also required considerable modification. Others, while recognising the two poles in Jesus' thought, have attempted to clear up the problem by assigning each to a different stage in the biographical development of the ministry (Wernle). Some have supposed that the predictions of the near approach of the Kingdom belong to the later phase of his work, others that in Jesus' consciousness there was less and less concerned with the future hour of the kingdom's arrival and therefore latterly in his message a stronger emphasis on its present reality. Such theories are only possible when selected detached texts are imaginatively combined. The reason for dismissing all these various solutions is that they all in some way overlook or remove the indisputable juxtaposition in Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of references to both present and future. These cannot be separated or in any way disposed of. His own preaching links the present of his hearers to the coming judgement of the world; by men's attitude toward him here and now in his earthly ministry will their eternal destiny be determined when "the Son of Man shall sit on his glorious throne." J. Jeremias modified Dodd's view and in his work on the parables argued for both a present and future element in the teaching about the kingdom. He suggested that instead of Dodd's Realised Eschatology, we should speak of eschatology in the process of realisation (8). Fulfilment is here because the bringer of salvation is here; but there is also

a future in which that which has begun in the ministry of Jesus will reach its consummation. The Early Church remained faithful to the teaching of Jesus by preserving the dialectic. For W.G. Kümmel the ministry of Jesus is a time of eschatological fulfilment (9). Jesus understands His present to be a particular period in God's plan of salvation which is advancing swiftly towards the End. The present fulfilment in Him indicates the certainty of that moment in the future when what has begun in Him will be consummated in Him. Present and future are related as present fulfilment carrying with it the certainty of future promises. In Jesus we are confronted with an eschatological person and an eschatological act in history.

The Bultmann School has recognised this interdependence. There is less stress on the supernatural and superhistorical nature of the kingdom. There is a new preparedness to see God as already beginning his reign in the ministry of Jesus and the Kingdom as therefore being already experienced in history. Prenter and Bornkamm in particular see the decisive eschatological act taking place in the ministry of Jesus. Mt. II : 12 is taken to mean that John is the one who stands guard at the frontier between the aeons and yet is overshadowed by Jesus in whose words and works, the kingdom though hidden is breaking in. (10) Alike ~~with~~ others in the Neo-Bultmannian school, Conzelmann refuses to stress the time element; the future of God is salvation to those who recognise the presence of God in Jesus, whose present is the hour of salvation. The

imminence of the kingdom is bound up with his own person.

E. Fuchs draws the contrast which we shall note more fully later, between Qumran which called men to repent and gathered them into a monastery to await the future and Jesus who also called them to repent, but then celebrated with them the presence of the Kingdom. For Fuchs, the preaching of Jesus creates a new existential relationship for men with the kingdom, as God acts for them in the present. The future element is not to be overlooked or explained away, but the miracle of the call in the present is intimately related to the equal miracle of the coming of God in the future. The whole is involved in the beginning and the beginning is in the ministry of Jesus and in the fellowship of the called with him. (11)

The weakness of these positions is that they are existential and non-temporal. Fuchs is not concerned with chronological history but with men as the essential content of history. Kümmel rightly argues that while this approach of the Bultmann school is to be welcomed, we must insist that it is possible to get back to the oldest layer in the gospel tradition where the kingdom of God is spoken of in concrete historical, chronological terms. The temporal cannot be surrendered to the existentialists. There is in Mk. 9:1 though not defined, a restricted proximity which must be held in tension with a temporal present (Mk. 12:28.) Kümmel argues that this temporal paradox must have meaning; this he finds in the person of Jesus, the Son of Man, who not only has come but is to come again. Here once again we are compelled to recognise that the

person and message of the eschatological figure of Jesus are interdependent. The temporal framework cannot be removed because the eschatological act began in the past of history, will be finished in the unknown future of that same history, by the one and the same Son of Man.

Cullmann agrees with Kümmel in maintaining the importance of the chronological and temporal framework. In the ministry of Jesus the decisive battle has been fought and won, Satan has fallen and the power of the demons has been broken, but the war continues and will continue until the final victory day. J.A. Baird (13) expresses this same tension in terms of two dimensions; viz. the horizontal times of men and the vertical eternally present time of God. These two dimensions are interwoven by Jesus in His teaching and reflect his own divine - human consciousness. From the point of view of men i.e. horizontally, the kingdom is sometimes pictured as present, sometimes as future, and most characteristically as both present and future. For each life this kingdom has two points of special significance; the point at which that life enters the Kingdom and that point at the end of the Age, when for that life the Kingdom is consummated. From the standpoint of God however, shared by Jesus, the kingdom is a vertical reality present at every moment of time and in its eternity embracing history and the eschaton. These two planes are linked and fused in the person of Jesus. The tension and paradox in the teaching on the Kingdom, is also found in the use of the title of Son of Man. H.E. Todt recognises this.(14) The future of the Son of Man is

already anchored in the present; the coming of this Son of Man is the eschatological cosmic consummation of that which begins in the ministry of Jesus and the relationship to Jesus at the present determines one's fate at that consummation. Similarly in the teaching of Jesus on the Kingdom; it is known in the present infellowship with Jesus. The Kingdom has come for those who in their relationship with him are freed from the demons (Lk. II: 20) and know the healing power of God through him. This fellowship with Jesus in which the Kingdom is known will not pass away with this generation but will be confirmed by the Son of Man and authenticated in the presence of God at the consummation.(15).

Finally it may be worth while to let a Roman Catholic, R. Schnackenburg speak. (16) He argues that the presence of the Kingdom is for Jesus inextricably linked with his own person and work. God dynamically works salvation in the present in Jesus although the consummation as judgement and (final) salvation remains in the future. (17). On the subject of the presence sayings, he defines them as follows:- It would be too little to regard the teaching of Jesus, his healings and exorcisms as merely a presage of the coming of the Kingdom (18). They are rather signs of the presence. On the other hand it would be too much to speak of this kingdom as something completed or even actually institutional. By its very nature it indicates the coming of the perfected kingdom, makes it certain, demands it. On the first assumption, Jesus becomes no more than a prophet, on the second the world's perfecter. Both

conflict with the actual message of Jesus and ^{his} testimony about himself. Schnackenburg formulates his own views as follows:- "The kingdom of God as present in Jesus and his works is precursory because and in so far as it paves the way for what is to come and is not something complete or finished in itself. It may be spoken of as something hidden, but only relatively hidden, namely in comparison with the future relevation in glory, as on the other hand it is manifest in the words and miracles of Jesus. The expression that it has come in weakness is to be deprecated, since this is incompatible with the nature of the Kingdom. Jesus was here to proclaim God's powerful and perceptible eschatological offer of salvation." "The nearness of the kingdom is dynamic in the real sense of the word i.e. the kingdom is active now. The part played by Jesus in the coming of this kingdom is not merely passive. His person is important for the present breaking through of the Kingdom of God. His coming coincides with its coming as the forerunner of the perfected kingdom. It is only perceptible through his teaching and works."

This stress on the interlocking of present and future in Jesus' eschatological message is a valid and valuable counter-balance to the concept of realised eschatology with its elimination of the concrete eschatological future from the message of Jesus, and to all futurist interpretations which see in Jesus no more than the Son of Man designate or Messiah-designate. The tension we have emphasised is found not only in the Gospels, but throughout the NT. (compare AC. 3: 13-15 with

2:46 Rom. I:4. Here Acts reflects the truly primitive tradition. See also I Cor. II:26, Ac. 13:32, I:6, 17:31, I Jn. 3:18, Jn. 5:28, I Jn. 2:18, Jn. 3:18.) Our concern and interest is that this same tension is also found through the Epistle to the Hebrews. Both present and future elements in the text must be taken seriously; neither can be ignored without doing violence to the text. The key figure in this eschatological tension is the Son of Man himself. In him the kingdom is present but hidden and yet will be manifest in the future. In the present Jesus could proclaim the forgiveness of sins but it could be argued that he was blaspheming (Mk.2:1-12): he could interpret his exorcisms in terms of the coming of the kingdom, but his opponents could argue that the power was of Beelzebub, not of God. The Church shares in this apparent contradiction and tension. This will only be resolved when He who has come as Saviour comes again to judge men on the basis of their response to him in the interim period of paradox. The Church's problem was to work out how it should live in this mid-period between the two catastrophic points in time, neither of which, past or future, could be ignored in the present.

There have been those who have attempted to deny or minimise the eschatological element in the Epistle to the Hebrews - e.g. Salmon (19), Nairne (20). Davidson and Whickham thought that it was simply due to the imminent destruction of the Temple and Jerusalem. Others however have found it more prominent, e.g. W. Manson (21), C.K. Barrett (22). In what follows we are going to maintain that throughout the Epistle the eschatological

tension is fully present, against those who would either deny, or ignore it or eliminate the tension by viewing it as consistently present or futurist (H. W. Montefiore.) The terms used to express this tension may differ from those used in the Gospels, and the emphasis may be different, since the author of the Epistle is concerned with the life of the Christian in via between D-day and V-day, but the author is concerned with the same eschatological paradox.

The Epistle opens with the statement that a great event has occurred - God has revealed himself. He has done this in two different forms which the writer differentiates as "in the times past" $\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\iota$ and "in the last days" $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\chi\alpha\iota\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\omega\sigma\ \eta\mu\epsilon\rho\omega\upsilon\upsilon$. It is the same God who reveals himself, who speaks, but the writer clearly sees that in this latest revelation we have the final utterance of God. No further voice after the voice $\epsilon\upsilon\ \delta\iota\omega$ is to be expected. But this does not deny the value of the earlier revelations through the prophets. Yadin mis-understands the author if he supposes that he means that the only revelation of God has come through Jesus. The writer's meaning is only that in Jesus the final word has been spoken. To the author the OT. is equally the voice of God, mediated through many agents and in different ages, addressed especially to those who lived before the Son, and which has now been superseded by a new revelation in which the same God has spoken in a single person, a Son, to those who have lived since he appeared. It is this event in history that has changed the course of God's dealings with men. What has happened has caused these days to be "the

last days".

After this introduction the author then proceeds to demonstrate the superiority of the Son over the angels who were formerly God's agents. (I: I-14.) This superiority springs from the Son's relationship with the Father from all eternity. On the basis of this fact the writer then proceeds (2: I-4.) to exhort his readers lest they drift away from so great a salvation that has been made available to them in Christ. He resumes the Epistle to adduce further reasons for the Son's superiority - a word which recurs frequently in this section - and to explain how this salvation which he exhorts them to make their own, has been procured. This we find paradoxically is through the incarnation and suffering of the Son (2:5-3:I.)

This Son who has been manifested (23) is identified in this section with the Son of Man who is to rule over all things. (24.). Already he is seated at the right hand of God on an eternal throne with a kingdom (I:2,3.8:I. 10:12, 12:2.) This is a present accomplished fact, but at the same time the author recognises that all things are not yet in subjection to him (2:8. 10:13.) This is a paradox; Christ is King and exalted; this is D-Day but men must yet look forward to the time when all will acknowledge him as King at the final V-Day. The second paradox also emerges here since we are shown how and why the Son has been exalted. It was through suffering and humiliation. This close association of these two ideas however is already found in the Gospels under the figure of the Son of Man. While

there may have been in the minds of some the concept of a suffering Son of Man, Jesus through his clearer insight into the meaning of the Son of Man and by identifying him with the suffering Servant of Isaiah showed that he must suffer. It was this rare combination whereby exaltation was won through suffering that the Jews and Disciples found so hard to understand. It is likely that the ideas associated with the Son of Man by Jesus are in the author's mind here. Dodd connects 2:8 with ICor; 15:27, Eph.1:2. Dan.7:13.(25). Yet in this Epistle the dialectic between the deepest humiliation and the highest exaltation is represented in other terms, by the concept of the High-Priest. The danger which concerns the author is that while the Son is now exalted, the apparent contradiction which still exists, viz: - that all things are not yet in subjection to Him, may so obscure his actual victory that the readers will give up. Therefore despite the contradiction, or rather because of it, they are urged to give more earnest heed to the things they have heard, lest they drift away from so great a salvation. This salvation has been gained because the Son despite his position became the "Man for Others" as their great High Priest. (2:17.) Before the writer develops this thought any further, he takes up a comparison between Jesus and Moses, both of whom may be regarded as High-Priests. (3:1-7.).

The old Israel, journeying to the Promised Land under Moses, is compared to the New House of Israel under their new High-Priest also journeying to the Promised Land. This parallel

provides the author with a further argument with which to urge his readers to press on. (3:7-4:16.) Just as the Israelites who came out of Egypt did not enter the Promised Land because they failed to go forward believing the promises of God, so Christians must hold fast their boldness and the glorying of their hope, firm to the End. (3:6). H. Windisch in 1928, pointed out that the idea of conditions for entry in to the Promise has a long history. (26). Its roots are to be found in Dt. 4:1.6;17f. ^{and in} Dt.16:20, where obedience to the commandments is a condition for entry into the Promised Land. Conditions are also found in OT apocalyptic-Is.26:2 (entry into the holy city) and it plays a part in the Temple liturgy, where Ps.15 and 24 are concerned with conditions for entry into the Temple. The prophets reflect the same ideas in Is.33:13ff. 58:13f, and again in apocalyptic-II Ezra 7:14, Ps.Sol. 14:10. In the teaching of Jesus the conditions are for entry into the Kingdom Mt.5:20. 7:21. 21:31. Mk.9:47 10:23-25. While these sayings refer to the conditions for entry in the present, they also speak of the final state of the redeemed. In Hebrews the author speaks, not of entry into the Kingdom, but of entry into the Rest; the ideas are the same behind both, though the terms are different. In 3:12-4:16 it is primarily faith, in the same sense in which it is used in ch.II, which is the condition for entry, in 5:11-6:20, it is growth and maturity, and finally perfect holiness in all its practical implications is required (12:14-13:19). If these conditions are to be fulfilled, then a strong leader is needed.

Moses was the leader of the Old Israel, delivering his

house and mediating the Old Covenant. He leads them to the Promised Land. (27). In this he foreshadows the work of Christ. His House is the Church which is moving towards the spiritual Canaan, and which it has already partially entered in covenant with God. The parallel with Moses suggests the further comparison that just as those who came with Moses out of Egypt did not enter the rest because of their rebellion, so it will be with Christians who do not persevere in faith. Some however did enter the Land under Joshua, but this does not receive much attention because it was felt to detract from the glory of Moses. But our author argues that not even this is the final rest, since David still speaks of a rest in Ps.95. Jesus is the second Joshua, suggested by the use of the name in Greek (28) who would lead the people into the final rest - the sabbath of God's rest 4:9 (29), when his work is finished. Believers enter into the complete fulfilment of God's work in them and of their work in God (30). This rest is identified, as in the OT, with the inheritance. Just as Canaan was Israel's possession, so Israel is God's possession, "a people of inheritance" Deut.4:20. With this go responsibilities as well as blessings. The heathen too are to be the inheritance of God through the Messiah Ps.2:8; in Christ this is fulfilled. He is the new Joshua who has gone before his people into the promised land and secured their inheritance (4:8). This inheritance is salvation I:14, the rest of God, and is the equivalent of the possession of Canaan in a spiritual sense 4:II. It is something which can be entered and possessed proleptically now in this life, yet it is eternal

and man must strive to enter into it. Under the Old Covenant it was only foreshadowed, now under Christ it is partially realised. Westcott held that it is fully realised and quotes 4:3, which despite the Vulgate's translation (Ingrediemur), he takes literally. H. W. Montefiore on the other hand rejects this view and maintains that here and throughout the Epistle the writer's eschatology is consistently futurist. As in 12:22, the text does not mean that they have entered, but that they are in the process of entering and have drawn near. Montefiore, in order to correct the emphasis on the element of realised eschatology in the Epistle has leaned too far in the other direction and by doing so has overlooked the tension in the Epistle between the now and the not yet. Those who have taken both together instead of insisting upon an either-or choice between the two, have done greater justice to the Epistle and the writer's intention. This may not solve the academic problem for some, nor the practical problem of daily living in the here and now for others, but a recognition of this tension and paradox, makes best sense of the message of the NT. in general and of the Epistle to the Hebrews in particular. "The rest is and always remains a promise which some of the readers may fail through disobedience to achieve 4:1, and all are exhorted to strive to enter. The Rest, precisely because it is God's rest is both present and future; men enter it and must strive to enter it. This is a paradox, but it is a paradox which Hebrews shares with all primitive eschatology."(31). Here then emerges part of that unity in the NT.. The emphasis on both present and future

in the Epistle is found elsewhere and springs from the very person and teaching of Jesus. We are not faced here with the fabrication of the Early Church, which either failed to understand her Master or understanding him, was forced to adapt or modify his teaching. While the terms used by the various writers differ, they are all concerned with the basic paradox. (31a.) This Epistle is a clear witness to the fact that at the time this Epistle was written that particular section of the Church from which it came was concernēd to preserve the essential paradox of the Gospel faithfully.

In its view of history and eschatology, the Epistle differs radically from Qumran where similar themes are found. This community organised themselves on the pattern of the tribes in the wilderness. They called themselves the exiles of the wilderness, regarding the period in which they lived as the period of Belial. Their hopes were fixed on the New Land of Promise when they would be in Jerusalem. The wilderness period was a deliberately self-imposed withdrawal from the ordinary life of the Jewish nation. They felt that they could only survive by joining together and in company meditating upon the Scriptures. This retreat was necessary till the temporary victory of evil was reversed in the final conflict between the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness when they would be able to return to Jerusalem and renew the sacrificial system. In the Epistle the wilderness and rest are viewed differently. The former is a solemn warning against unbelief. For the Christian it is sin, not the ideal, to remain in the wilderness (32). In Qumran,

the wilderness, the forty years and the striving for the future are literal (33), not as in Hebrews, metaphorical. For the Sect the rest and the return to Jerusalem are all in the future, whereas in Hebrews both may be proleptically entered in the present. While therefore both the Epistle and the Sect use the same images, their interpretation is vastly different. (34)

After this digression (3:7-4:16) the author returns to the theme of Christ, the great High Priest (5:1-10), with which he had begun at the end of ch.2 and mentioned briefly in 3:17 and 4:15. The same theme of Christ's complete humanity is repeated. Having learned obedience by the things he suffered and been made perfect, he became to them who obey him, the author of salvation, named of God a High Priest after the order of Melchizedek. Their salvation is secure and an accomplished fact, yet again the author goes on (5:11-6:20.) with an exhortation. They ought to have progressed and become teachers leaving fundamentals behind. They have experienced the act of God, they have been enlightened and tasted the heavenly food. They have been made partakers of the Holy Spirit and tasted the good Word of God and the powers of the age to come. (6:4-5.) But they must beware lest they fail to receive no more than the first instalment. Perseverance as shown by Abraham, is needed if the promise is to be received. This persistence in spite of apparent contradictions, the writer virtually equates with faith (6:11-15.). The exhortation is not simply based on Abraham, but also on the work of Christ, our High Priest. He is the forerunner and Christians must strive to follow Him. The accomplished work of Christ has still to be

fully realised in the experience of Christians. The present and future are closely related. The proleptic possession of salvation must not blind men to the fact that they need to enter into the full gift. The argument of the writer is not simply a repetition of 2:1-3, 3:1-4:16. In 5:11-6:20, the need to persevere, the dangers of falling away and the encouragement to persevere are more explicit. The sin and disobedience which prevent progress are elaborated and the negative warning in 3:1-4:16 is reiterated as an exhortation to consider the faith of Abraham and God's faithfulness to the Old Israel. 5:11-6:20 takes us a step further forward in the author's argument, since while Christ was described as the High Priest after the order of Melchizedek in 5:10 it is not till 6:20 that the writer takes up this hint and develops it. Now he seeks to show how Melchizedek was superior to the Levitical line (7:1-10) and that Jesus following Melchizedek is superior to and replaces the levitical line (7:11-20.) He achieves this because unlike the old priests he lives for ever and has also offered a perfect sacrifice, once for all, which the old levitical line could not do. (7:20-28.) The New Covenant of which he is the New Mediator, (7:22. 9:15.) receives further treatment and comparison with the Old in 8:1-13. This is followed up by a more detailed discussion of the new place under this new covenant in which the High Priest performs his efficacious sacrifice 9:1-10, which is then in turn given fuller treatment (than it has so far received) in 9:11-10:18.

The whole point of the author's argument is that because Christ has lived, died, and risen the New Age is here and with

it there is the New Covenant, a New Temple a New sacrifice and a New High-priest, all of which replace the old and fulfil it. Montefiore (op.cit.p 151) however in order to maintain a consistently futurist position adopts an alternative reading in 9:11 τῶν μελλόντων the good things are thereby still to come and the tension and paradox eliminated. He produces little evidence in favour of this reading; it is not well supported by the MSS. and could well reflect the failure of some later hand to understand the Christian tension of the Epistle. The NEB. and RSV. prefer τῶν γενομένων and this would seem to fit in far better with the writer's thought than the alternative reading. In the light of this the writer can conclude "Having therefore brethren, boldness to enter into the Holy Place by the blood of Jesus.... and having a great high priest.... let us draw near with a true heart in the full assurance of faith.... let us hold fast the confession of our hope that it waver not, for he is faithful that promised.." In the final section, 10:19- end, the burden of the author again emerges, that while the work of Christ is well and truly done; there is still a road to be trodden before the full benefits can be enjoyed. Salvation is both present and future; but it can only be entered in the future on the strength of perseverance in the present, when it is enjoyed proleptically. It is for this reason that he goes on to exhort the readers to faith, hope and love. If the final rest is to be entered, they must be bold (10;19,35.) and patient (10:36) and faithful (ch.11.) This will carry them through all their trials and temptations (12:1-13.) In this progress from

present salvation to future salvation, the Christian in via can be sure of the help and understanding of their High-Priest, who being a man has gone before them and experienced all (and more) they meet. As they look to the pioneer of their faith (12:2), he will help them (4:14-16). Finally, as in the other Epistles, the practical implications are dealt with. (12:14-13:19.) The dawning and proleptic enjoyment of the powers of the New Age, bring with it a new society, the Koinonia, new obligations, and above all a new Law and a New Ethic. (35)

Here in this Epistle, we find the paradox of all New Testament eschatology. Christians must live in tension, poised between the eschatological event and the final end, yet at the same time enjoying a foretaste of the Age to come. This should encourage them to press on to inherit the full promises, trusting in God's faithfulness, knowing that their high-priest has been the way before them and will come again in judgement (9:27) to all who wait for him. In the meantime Christians, despite the fact that all things are not yet in subjection to him, must persevere. The present must not obscure the past or future. It is because of his first coming that Christians have a foretaste of what is to come, but since he has yet to come again, Christians in the meantime must strive to enter into the Final Rest which in Him is certain. (36).

NOTES TO 2.

1. Baird op.cit.p.97.
2. "The torah in the new age and/or the age to come."
JBL.1952.Vol.7. (Monograph Series).
3. Mowinckel. Psalms in Israel's worship.
4. H. Davies. op.cit. in a recent article published in a collection of papers and in lectures 1961-2.
5. J. Gray VT. 6. 1956. p.268-85.
6. There is considerable confusion in much of what is written over the terms apocalyptic and eschatology. H. Anderson, as a recent example, seems to use the terms synonymously (compare ^{Origine} p.143 & 146.) fluctuating from one to the other term. He can do this because he uses apocalyptic to describe the course of history as moving towards a goal. D.S. Russell (op.cit.) prefers, and I want to agree, to take apocalyptic as a particular type of eschatology. The characteristics of this type are listed by Russell and help to distinguish some books and parts of other books in the OT. as apocalyptic. We must then speak of apocalyptic eschatology; and see it as a form of eschatology which developed out of the prophetic eschatology when, through lack of fulfilment the prophetic hope was pushed further into the future. Both types of eschatology are found in the NT. books. R.E.Clements (op.cit.p.104ff.) makes a similar distinction. Eschatology is used as a wider term to refer to the purposes of God in history; apocalyptic as a narrower term for a particular way of describing that goal.

7. N. Perrin op.cit. p.171-4.
8. Jeremias. Parables. op.cit.p.159.
9. Kümmel op.cit.
10. Jesus of Nazareth p.51. N. Perrin p.120ff.
11. Fuchs. p.253f. 346-59.
12. J.M. Robinson in "Current Issues in N.T. Interpretation"
ed: Klassen & Synder. p.91
13. Baird op.cit.p. 100-140.
14. J.M. Robinson New Quest P.14-16.
15. Perrin op.cit.p. 110.
16. Lundstrom op.cit. p.266-78. Schnackenburg.p.127ff.
17. Perrin op.cit. p. 89.
18. R.H. Fuller tends to do this in p.35-47 of Mission and
Achievement. He speaks of the proleptic operation of the
powers of the Kingdom in Jesus. But so much emphasis is
placed upon the future decisive event that the close
interrelationship of present and future, and the real
eschatological presence of Jesus, is missed.
19. HDB. "Eschatology". Art..
20. Nairne op.cit.p.256.
21. W. Manson op.cit.p.55.
22. Barrett. Background of NT. and its eschatology. p.363ff.
23. Moffatt. op.cit.p.xxxiv.
24. The Son of Man is used only in 2:6, but the idea of
exaltation is also found in 2:7, 8.10.
25. Dodd. According to the Scriptures p.117.
26. Z.N.W. p.163-92. Vol XXVII

27. Dodd. Acc. to the Scriptures. p.53 cf. Dt.18:15,19.
28. Moffatt. op.cit.p.Lxiii.
29. Giverson contrasts the idea of rest. In Hebrews it is eschatological; in the Gnostic literature it is the cessation of seeking God by the gnostic.
30. Barrett op.cit.p.372.
31.
- 31a. see below
32. Barrett op.cit.p.373 pictures the Christian life as a pilgrimage, but the wandering is almost ended; they are on the borders of the Promised Land. His use of 12:1 hardly applies to the wilderness.
33. Bruce NTS. IX p.219-20. W.D.Davies. Setting of Sermon on Mount - points out the centrality of the New Exodus theme at Qumran op.cit.p.115. note 1. DSD 8¹²⁻¹⁶ CDC 7⁶. 13¹.
34. The sect thought of their organisation and worship as being part of an interim programme. D.S.D. 9⁹⁻¹¹ C.D.C. 1¹⁰⁻¹². Even their understanding of the law would be deepened and clearer in the future. DSD.4¹⁸⁻²⁶.
35. P. Lehman. Ethics in a Christian context. He gives a refreshing account of Christian ethics.
36. A similar division of the material is given by A. Vanhoye (quoted by Montefiore op.cit.p.31.) who built on an earlier suggestion of Vaganay. "The sermon is based on a most careful plan, whereby one section leads onto the next and a word used at the beginning of a subsection is usually used at its end."
- 31a. The author's use of ἐπαγγελία (14 times) and ἐπαγγέλλομαι (4 times) illustrates the same tension. The promises of God are sure in Christ.

Chapter III

TWO SONS

In chapter one of this Epistle, the author is concerned to demonstrate the superiority of the Son of God (whom he is careful not to refer to as...) over the Angels, (the Sons of God.) While God had revealed himself in many ways, the climax of the divine revelation was in a Son $\epsilon\upsilon\ \upsilon\iota\omega$. The writer omits the article, as Westcott says, to fix attention on the nature, not the personality of the Mediator of the New Revelation. (1)

The title Son is a favourite one with the author. He uses it nine times of Christ, apart from three other times in quotations from the OT. Four times it is the full title Son of God (2). The other title familiar from the Gospels, Son of Man, is in Hebrews only used in a quotation from Psalm 8 and in fact refers to Christ as Son of God. After the opening argument of the first chapter the title, Son of God is rarely used except in the exhortatory warnings.

The author seeks to describe the nature of the Son. He is pre-existent; it is he who was the creator of the two worlds or ages $\alpha\iota\omega\nu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, who is now upholding all things by the Word of His power. Since the Son reveals the eternal character of His Father, he can be described as the reflection of God's glory (3). In the OT. and NT. the revelation of God's glory is something which belongs to the Last Days, so that "glory" has a strong eschatological flavour. In the Son, therefore, the Last Days have arrived, and the Father has spoken in self-revelation

through the One who is in His image, His Son.

The sonship of Christ is unique, and to bring this out, the author contrasts it with the position of the angels, who are elsewhere called Sons of God. (4). Their nature, position and work are all vastly different from that of the Son of God. To press this point home, the author quotes passages which deal both with the status of the Son and with the relationship of the angels to God. (5). He is The Son, the first begotten and the object of worship of the angels 1;6. He is the one addressed as God in Ps.45:6, and as Lord in Ps.102:25.(6). It is He, unlike the angels, who is God's agent in creation. Yet it might appear that the Incarnation, life and death of Jesus, contradict or compromise the unique position of the Son. The author must therefore show how His humiliation, being made a little lower than the angels, was a necessary stage in His final exaltation. It was only when he had made purification for sins, by His self-sacrifice, that He could sit down at the right hand of the majesty on high. (1:3). Moreover the very way in which he gained this position through death and suffering, has given Him a name which is superior to the angels. (Phil.2:6-11.) The author's concern is lest his readers should fail to realise that the pre-existent Son, not despite, but because of His being made lower than the angels and suffering death, has now been crowned with glory and honour (2:9). Yet the reader sees little evidence that the Son is reigning, for all things are not yet in subjection under his feet. His exaltation is however a certain present fact, though temporarily obscured.

This interim state is one in which Christians are now living and the author writes in order to remind them of their need to persevere in faith despite the apparent paradox. Christ is King and the victory secure, though the present does not always make this apparent. At the very outset therefore, the eschatological paradox lies at the centre of the author's argument and it is for this reason that the comparison with the Angels is made.

There have however been other suggestions why the author has introduced the angels into his argument at this point. Some see no reason at all for it (7). T.W. Manson (8) and F.D.V. Narborough (9) thought that the author was combating a similar heresy to that found at Colossae, but there seems to be little reason for this suggestion and Bruce agrees with this, though he does admit that Heb. 1:2 might be intended as a corrective of the quasi-dualism of Qumran (10). It is more likely, however, that in Hebrews we have a Christological development of the Jewish wisdom concept, similar to that found in James 1:3, or Col.3: 15-18. Yadin (II) explains the introduction of the angels into the argument of the Epistle at this point in a different way. He claims that from the seven verses quoted by the author to prove the superiority of Jesus over the angels, much can be gathered about the beliefs of those to whom he is writing. He contends that the readers of this Epistle and the Qumran Sect would agree that in the world to come the angels would possess certain controlling powers over others. They would be directly under the control of God, not of any other

agent, and they would possess qualities of sonship in relation to God. The independent role of the angels is suggested by the fact that they are described as λειτουργικά πνεύματα sent out for the service of those who will be the heirs of salvation. This is the way in which the Qumran sect thought of the angels, and Bruce (12) notes a further parallel to Heb. 1¹⁴. in Test. Levi. iii: 5 where the ἀρχαγγελοι are described as οἱ λειτουργοῦντες καὶ ἐξιλασκόμενοι πρὸς Κύριον ἐπὶ πασῶν ταῖς ἀγνοίαις τῶν δικαίων. This view of the function of the angels, Yadin thinks, is also found in Heb. 2: 5, 7, 9, 16. Bruce points out that little can be deduced from the Test. Levi about its relationship with Qumran, since the relation of the recensions with the Sect is uncertain. Further, at least M. de Jonge rejects the passage as a Christian interpolation. Of the verses Yadin cites in support of his theory, the only one which carries any weight is verse 5. He takes this to refer to the Messianic age. Westcott explains the words of the Christian order. The γάρ links the verse with those preceding it, which contrast the old covenant with the voice of Christ at the present time. Thus under the New Covenant God's voice is not heard through an angelic ministry, but through the Son himself. There is no need for Westcott to exclude the eschatological meaning from the text, for in Christ the author sees the dawning of the Last Days, though the End is not yet. V-Day is still to come, but the outcome will not be essentially different from that already gained in Christ. Both now and in the future God's voice will be heard

through the Son only. Westcott misses the point by eliminating all future reference, Qumran through not knowing that God had already spoken in these last days by a Son. If, as Yadin suggests, the author was trying to refute ^{similar}(views) to those found at Qumran he would have chosen a much more direct method. There may be a superficial similarity, but the writer's chief concern is to stress the Son's supremacy now and for ever, despite the temporary eschatological paradox.

Yadin's second point concerned the relationship of the angels to God. These he shows are called Sons of God, as in the O.T.. Davidson though, might prevent any hasty conclusion, since he makes it clear that angels in the OT. are called Sons of Elim (Ps. 29:1) or Elohim (Job 1:6). Both these are plural nouns. There is therefore the possibility that we should speak not of Sons of God, but of the Sons of the Elohim or Elim, just as "sons of the prophets" means "prophets" (13). Yadin also suggests that the importance attached to Michael whom he identifies as the Angel of Light (14) is significant. He contrasts the position of Michael whom God has exalted over all the angels, with the position of the Messiahs. He claims that the chief priest and Prince of the whole congregation are in fact the priestly and lay Messiahs of Aaron and Israel. Although he may be right, it is surely unlikely that if any member of the Sect had become a Christian, he would have wanted to equate the person of Christ with these figures, as Yadin suggests when he speaks of the Epistle's efforts to prove that Jesus the Royal Messiah is, in fact the Priestly Messiah. (15).

Although Rabbinical writings suppose that Michael is the Heavenly High Priest, his position in the Sect does not seem to differ from that given him in Daniel and the Apocalypse, where he is the angelic being especially in charge of God's judgement. Naturally if the Messiahs are merely human figures, Michael will be superior to them.

There is a vast difference in the functions ascribed to the angels in the Sect writings and in the first chapter of this Epistle. In the former they are almost entirely confined to war-like functions connected with the final battle and in fact Michael's exaltation is for this very purpose. In the Epistle, they are not connected with war but with the service of nature, the worship of the Messiah and the help of man. The author contrasts the transitory nature of the service of the angels with the permanency of Christ's rule. Their service in Hebrews is present and peaceful. They have been introduced by the author, not because his readers had any expectation that the position of Christ as Messiah would be in danger from them, but because they must understand that the revelation in the past, in which the angels had a part, was now fulfilled in the Son to whom they and all creation were subject. Despite present appearances the Son reigns as he had done in the past and the seeming contradiction arising from the fact that they were living between the ages, must not blind them to the fact that he would reign till all things were in subjection to him.

Having established his point about the supremacy of Christ, the writer now proceeds to develop, in the second chapter, the

thought of his manhood through which he has gained this position. Again, it is against the background of the angels that his argument is built up (2:5.) The new order of things which began with the coming of Christ, the ideal man, in these last days, (16) is not to be subjected to angelic beings, but to Man. Again it is to Scripture that he turns to support his argument. The quotation from Ps. 8 refers back to the original creation, in which man was to have dominion over nature and so be in the position of one who rules. This high calling man did not attain to because he chose to be as God, rebelling against his creator. Through Christ's incarnation and life of perfect obedience, one man at least is restored and achieves the goal. The climax of this obedience was his death and it was through this, above all that he reached his present position, being crowned with glory and honour. No angel could achieve this. It could only be possible through the incarnation of the Son of God. It is for this reason that the humanity of Jesus is of such central importance in the Epistle. The author speaks of the man Jesus in shockingly human terms and though the possibility that this emphasis was intended to correct Docetic tendencies cannot be overlooked (Feine-Behm.), we must see it primarily as the next essential point in the author's argument by which he seeks to prove the superiority of the Son. In this section, 2: 5-3:6, the idea of the subjection of all things to Christ runs all through. But this Son who is superior to all things, only gained this position through being the "man for others". This paradox is beautifully expressed by the title Jesus, God's

Apostle and our High-Priest (3:11). Here the human Jesus is coupled with the titles of supremacy. In taking human nature upon himself, He becomes one with us and the originator of the process of salvation 2:10. He becomes a Son of Man 2:6, and so the leader of a vast crowd of sons 2:10 whom he is not ashamed to call brethren. Thus the author conceives of Christ as the originator ἀρχὴ γένεσ of a new creation in which man will fulfil what was his original destiny.

This theme is repeated and developed when the writer turns to consider fully Christ as High-Priest and Mediator of the New Covenant. These conceptions are unique in the NT.. That Christ was the second Adam had been brought out by Paul (17), but the thought is not developed as it is here. There it was concerned with the availability of the benefits of Christ's death to all and in I Cor. with the Resurrection. In Paul too there is the thought of a new creation (18), but here it is more of a new creation in the individual. In Rom. 8: 22-25 the thought is more of the restoration of inanimate nature. Hebrews is concerned to show Christ as the originator of a New Creation, fulfilling the destiny intended by God for mankind and perfecting humanity. Christ therefore is rightly seen to be the New Adam and connected with the concept of the Original Man, which C. K. Barrett sees as one of the sources for the High-Priest concept in Hebrews. As the Original Man, Jesus becomes the new prototype of man as he was intended to be - in Him man is finally brought to perfection.

Τελέσιω and its derivatives is used 14 times in Hebrews. The verb is used three times of the making perfect of

Christ. Three times it is used to say that the law could not make anything perfect. Twice it is used of man made perfect and once of Christ, who by one offering has perfected for ever those who are being sanctified. (19) With regard to the perfection of Christ, J. Kōgel and Michel suggest that it is the perfection of Jesus by the overcoming of earthly limitations. But in 2:10 the perfection is clearly connected with the sufferings of Christ and the Cross is looked at as the perfecting of Christ and the completion of his work. The Old Covenant was unable to perfect anything 7:19, it left those who came still imperfect 10:1. What then the law was unable to do, Christ by his one offering did 10:14 and did once $\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha$ $\pi\rho\omicron\varsigma$ $\Phi\omicron\rho\acute{\alpha}$ and for ever $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\tau\acute{o}$ $\delta\iota\eta\nu\epsilon\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$. The result of this offering was a perfect Tabernacle 9:11 and just men made perfect 12:23, including those under the old Covenant. Christ, who under the Old Covenant was the author $\alpha\rho\chi\eta\gamma\acute{o}\varsigma$ of faith, becomes under the New, the $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ of that faith. This being so, the readers of the Epistle who were only just emerging from the experience of the Old Covenant are to allow themselves to be borne on to the perfection of the New 6:1. The expression $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\tau\acute{o}$ $\delta\iota\eta\nu\epsilon\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ - the major theme of the second half of ch. 7 thus describes the present continuing work of Christ as our High-Priest (7:3,10,14,25. 9:24). Yet this present work is only possible and is indeed dependent upon and subordinate to the completed work in the past - the incarnation and death of Jesus. Through being tempted in all points like as we are tempted, yet without sin (4:15) and offering his life in voluntary self-sacrifice, Jesus the High-

Priest realises the *ΤΕΛΕΙΩΣΙΣ* . Consequently His humanity - howbeit a perfect humanity - receives remarkable emphasis in this Epistle. As a man he was tempted and tried and yet became perfect because he was completely obedient to the Father and remained sinless.

He became therefore a perfect High-Priest, since He had no cause to make any offering for his own sins. Elsewhere in the NT. Christ's sinlessness emerges, but here most clearly it is connected with the eschatological fulfilment of the first Adam and Original Man. The theme of the High Priest is used to show the true NT. dialectic between the deepest humiliation and the highest majesty. It is through the Incarnation, temptation, and sufferings that Christ's superiority is proved and humanity brought to perfection. Hebrews is interested not so much in Jesus becoming a man, as in his being a man. It was because he was chosen from amongst men (5:1) that he was able to be an effective High-Priest. He must be able to suffer with them if he is to be able to suffer for them.

Christ's work on the ground of his perfect humanity, is done once for all *ἑφάπαξ* } 9:12,26. 10:10. Unlike the continual repetition of the old High-Priest's work, Jesus' work is done once for all and in this fulfils and completes the Old Testament priesthood. Both the *ἑφάπαξ* } and the *εἰς τὸ διηνεκές* must be held together in describing the person and work of Christ. The final complete act in the past is the ground for the present and future work of the same High-Priest. In the present he ever lives to make intercession for us, seated at the right hand of the

Father. In the future the same High-Priest having once been offered to bear the sins of many, will appear a second time, not to deal with sin, but to save those who are eagerly waiting for Him. (9:28.) V-Day still lies in the future. This is the Climax of our perfection, made possible through the once for all work of the Perfect High-Priest, for which He is qualified being chosen ἐξ ἀνθρώπων 5:1.

The expression High-Priest (20) ἀρχιερεὺς appears in the Epistle first at 2:17 and recurs 17 times of which 12 refer to Jesus. The themes connected with it are already present in 1:3 καθαρῶν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιούμενος. Here the author turns from the Son's eternal being to summarise his relationship to men in sacrificial imagery. This interpretation of Christ's work in terms of sacrifice is found elsewhere in the NT. and probably derives from Jesus himself. The writer of this Epistle goes further by explaining Jesus' death in terms of the sacrifice on the day of Atonement. The Son is both Priest and Victim, and in virtue of His completed sacrifice, he has been exalted to the highest place in heaven, which belongs to Him by right. The pre-existent Son is also the Son incarnate in the man Jesus. He is the victim since he made (in the past) purification from sins. There is an implicit contrast, to be made explicit later in the Epistle, between the completed act of purification and the annually repeated act of the Levitical High-Priest (10: 11-14). Nairne believes that this theme of Christ's priesthood is the central and dominant thought of the Epistle (21). It recurs again in 5: 1-10, in connection with

the humanity and suffering of Christ. Here we are given (1-3) the definition of the High-Priest's work and his qualifications. He must be able to sympathise and must therefore be human. He is to appear before God for man and He is to offer sacrifice. Included in the passive *λαμβάνόμενος* is the thought that he is appointed by God, a thought-brought out in verse 4 - called of God -. This appointment is backed up by two passages from the OT., Ps. 2:7 and Ps. 110:4. Again the OT. is quoted. Again the writer sees Christ as both Priest and Victim. The latter thought he connects with His sacrifice on the Cross, the former with His intercession at the right hand of God after the Ascension. Here we see clearly how in the concept of the High-Priest, the deepest humiliation and highest majesty are combined. As in Philippians, it is through suffering and death that he, the pre-existent Son of God is exalted to the Father's right hand there to act on behalf of men as Intercessor. The idea of the suffering High-Priest is however absent from the OT. Day of Atonement. Cullmann(22) takes Heb. 9:28 to refer to Isaiah 53:12 and explains the reference to suffering as the result of the fusion of two OT. themes - the Day of Atonement and the Suffering Servant. This conjunction of suffering and exaltation under one figure is also found in Jesus' own use of the Son of Man. (23). Here in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the work of the High-Priest on the Day of Atonement is used as a type of the work of Christ, but it is modified in important details. First Jesus the High-Priest is also (implicitly) the Servant of Yahweh. It is he, the perfect and obedient Man who suffers.

Second, since this is a perfect offering, whereas before even a perfect animal was not wholly adequate, there is no need for the offering to be repeated. Consequently, therefore, our great High-Priest does not return to repeat the sacrifice, but remains at the right hand of God, there to appear on man's behalf. Not only need he not return to make a new sacrifice, he has also opened up forever the way to God, so that there is no longer any barrier which must be broken down by sacrifice.

From this consideration of the work of the High-Priest, the author goes on to consider his person, which in fact cannot be separated from his work. He turns from the Day of Atonement ritual to the figure of Melchizedek, who is said to resemble the Son of God (24), and contrasts his work with that of the Levitical line and particularly, that of Aaron. Westcott (25) gives seven ways by which the author draws a comparison between Christ and the Levitical priesthood (26). Aaron is only mentioned three times in the Epistle (5:4, 7:11, 9:4.), and only so that Christ may be shown to have replaced this line. Jesus belongs to a higher type of priest and for this reason resembles the mysterious figure of Melchizedek. (27). Apart from his exegesis of the inner meaning of the name, where he agrees with Philo, our author's exposition of Melchizedek is highly original. Philo only refers to him on two other occasions, one of which concerns an allegorical explanation of the bread and wine, and the other a mystical interpretation of Abraham's gift of tithes. Melchizedek does not seem to have figured at all in contemporary rabbinic speculations. This may well have been

due to the use made of this figure by Christians. Already by the end of the first century AD. the mystery of his origin had been dispelled by the assumption that he was the son of Shem.

In the OT. he appears in two places. One is Gen.14:18-20 and the other Ps. 110:4. Nowhere else is he mentioned (34). In Hebrews, he is first mentioned in 5:6,10, but this mention is not developed till 6:20-7:28.. In the latter passage it seems clear that the author's attention has been drawn first to the Psalm and from that to the passage in Genesis. The Psalm was quoted in 1:13 and is taken up again in 5:6 with the attention this time on the oath "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek". So it would seem that the writer has turned from what is said in the Psalm to Genesis 14 in order to find out what the order of Melchizedek was, and not from Genesis to the Psalm. Whatever date is given to the Psalm it seems clear that to the author himself it was a Davidic Psalm which pointed to the Messiah. As Kirkpatrick has well pointed out, "the priesthood in the Psalm is clearly something special, something distinct from the regular hereditary priesthood". He takes the bringing of the Ark to Jerusalem by David as the most likely occasion for the Psalm and goes on "the new King of Jerusalem must reproduce the twofold office of the Priest-King of Salem and become a type of the Messianic King". When David brought the Ark to Jerusalem, he laid aside his royal garments and wore an ephod, 2 Samuel 6:14. Both he and Solomon offered sacrifice or at least directed them to be offered (II Sam. 6:17, 18:24-5, I Kings 8:62) and blessed the people

2 Sam. 6:18, I Kings 8:14.55. David's sons were styled priests. But the priesthood is clearly distinguished from that of Aaron by the expression "after the order of Melchizedek". It is a permanent priesthood. The expression 'for ever' in the Psalm corresponds to the promise of eternal dominion in II Sam. 7:13.16.25.29. Made to an individual it is realised in his descendants (28). The author of Hebrews proceeds to show what the 'Order of Melchizedek' was. It was to be a rule of righteousness (7:2) and peace. As regards the priesthood of Melchizedek it was without any genealogy, unlike that of Aaron. Of the beginning or ending of the life of this priest of the Most High God, there is no record. (28) Something of the nature of Melchizedek's High Priesthood may be learnt from Genesis 14:18-20 and from the suggestions of A.R. Johnson (29). In Genesis 14:18-20 Abram is met by the Priest of God Most High who was worshipped by the Jebusites in Jerusalem. A.R. Johnson points out that the same root M L K recurs elsewhere (e.g. Joshua 10:1-2) in the Old Testament and in ~~Amarna~~ and Ras Shamra texts. Johnson prefers the translation "My King; (Lord) is Righteous" but whatever the precise rendering may be there is a clear connection between Righteousness - Jerusalem and the King-Priest. The King is constantly reminded of the heavenly counterpart and qualities which he was to establish in the people, fusing them into a model of national righteousness. It is perhaps dangerous to build too much upon some of the evidence and for our present purposes we need only to bear in mind the threefold connection. When David

captured Jerusalem, he did not obliterate the existing cult. This may suggest that he adopted the Jebusite worship passing it through the sieve of Yahwism and the sudden emergence of Zadok would be explained by supposing him to have been taken over from the Jebusite Cultus. Mowinckel and Bentzen perhaps go too far in suggesting that he was also the King of Jerusalem. While Zadok and Nathan headed the two groups - the priests and prophets, it was David himself who remained the overall head of both groups. In him therefore the line of Melchizedek is continued. In later Jewish developments the priestly and kingly aspects become separated and in the Old Testament are a cause of conflict. Furthermore, in the Jewish cultus the King, it seems, was in Covenant with Yahweh and the people to promote righteousness and this appears to have involved suffering. The evidence is not clear but Johnson seems to me to be right in suggesting that this was the case originally but that in time, the royal and priestly aspects became separated from suffering which was associated with the servant and largely ignored by Judaism. It is clearly not appropriate to deal at length with all the issues involved here, but it may be claimed that not only with the Son of Man concept, but also in that of the Priest-King, ideas of exaltation and humiliation are combined. This combination in latter Jewish thought, at least by the majority is lost and the two ideas become separated. When therefore Jesus was born, there were few who recognised in Him the fulfilment of the Priest-King and Servant of the Lord of Isaiah.

In David's greater Son the concept of exaltation through humiliation is once again given concrete expression.

Suffering and glory which had fallen apart are reunited in the Son of Man, the Original Man, the High-Priest King in the succession of Melchizedek who procures righteousness for his people by his own righteousness.

Behind the figure of Melchizedek, there lies a tangle of ideas, which in the author's thought have become fused. It is difficult to be certain ~~as to~~ which is his regulative concept. Besides the figure of the Priest King Melchizedek, there is that of the Son of Man, the Original Man and the High-Priest. The author has taken all these in order to explain and understand the person and work of Christ against the background of the Old Testament. In certain circles of Judaism itself the various concepts were modified and adapted. We must beware of presenting a monochrome picture of the thought of Judaism in the period immediately prior to the birth of Jesus. However involved the background may in fact be, it remains clear that the connection of Melchizedek with Jerusalem was an important influence in the thought of the writer of this Epistle. It was in Jerusalem that the New High-Priest made the final effective sacrifice and opened up the way into the New Jerusalem.

Rabbinic Judaism may have avoided identifying the Messiah with the Priest-King because of the use made of this idea by Christians. Aboth R. Nathan 34 expressly makes the Messiah superior to the High-Priest Melchizedek. Despite this however,

the identification found in the Epistle is in some sense prepared for. The Messianic interpretations of Psalm 110 provide evidence that there was a Jewish tradition which utilised the Priest-King concept. The midrash on the Song of Solomon also suggests that he is a Messianic Mediator. Elijah sometimes appears both as a prophet and as High-Priest of the End-Time (30). In certain speculations about Adam, the Priest-King assumes his characteristics, conceived as the Ideal Man. In Qumran, the Teacher of Rightousness has eschatological characteristics and in the Habakkuk commentary (II 8) is a Priest. Dupont-Sommer identifies the New Priest with the Teacher of Rightousness. The identification of the Messiah with the high-priest in Judaism is not straightforward because it would appear that there were at least two traditions current. In CDC. (12:23, 14:19, 19:10, 20:1) Jub. 30:18, 31:13 there are two Messiahs. (31). The same is true of Naph. 8:2-3, Reuben 7:12, but in Simeon 7:2 there is only one Messiah. The tradition of two Messiahs probably springs from the post-exilic situation, when the returning exiles were headed by a lay royal person - Zerubbabel, and a priest - Joshua. This dual tradition seems to have continued down to the time of the Hasmoneans, when the priestly family assumed royal power and united the royal and priestly functions, as they had been originally, in one person. But the Hasmoneans did not bring the original concept of a righteous Priest-King to fulfilment. By their imperfections they only prepared the way for the true Priest-King, the Son of Man himself in the succession of Melchizedek.

There was therefore at least in some circles, an expectation of a Royal Messianic figure who would fulfil not only the ideas connected with Melchizedek but also the hopes centred on David. In Jesus both Priest and King are present and fulfilled. Jesus, our author maintains, is the answer to these eschatological hopes. He is the New Adam, the Perfect Original Man in whom humanity is brought to fulfilment. He is the New High-Priestly King, who brings about the reconciliation of Man with God through His sacrifice. In this way, he fulfils and completes the ritual of the Aaronic priesthood (32), uniting in himself the work of both priest and King. In this way the Levitical line and the royal person of Melchizedek, both reach their richest and fullest expression. Through the suffering, he is exalted to God's right hand, but because he is also perfect Man, the benefits that he has gained as the suffering Priest-King of the New Israel, are always available for those who will enter into them.

Some however hold that the author's main intention in the Epistle is to prove to the readers that Jesus is not only the Royal Messiah but also the High Priestly Messiah in addition. His intention is to show that the two Messiahs (33) expected by the Sect were in fact combined in this one man. "By overemphasising the different parts of the Scriptures relating to Melchizedek and by applying Midrashic interpretation to some of the words and names thereof, he tried to present to his readers Jesus the Messiah, King and Priest ... to coincide with their ideas of the Messianic Priest and Messianic King" (34).

Christ must be shown to be superior to Aaron since, his readers looked for someone who was to be an eschatological High Priest of the House of Aaron, while Christ himself was apparently only the lay Messiah of the House of David, and there was no tradition of a priest of Judah's tribe, Heb.7:14. For the Sect it was the Anointed one of Aaron who after the conflict with the Sons of Darkness, will renew the animal sacrifices, which have been carried on only in a spiritual sense in the life of the Community. Both in the interim period and in the future it is the literal 'Sons of Aaron' who are all important to the life of the Community. (35).

In Hebrews the conception is entirely different. The Aaronic priesthood is treated only as a foreshadowing of something greater, as a temporary institution which in fact could only offer an outward ritual purity and was incapable of bringing about the remission of sins (Heb. 10:18). It was to be superseded by a High Priest, not from the Sons of Levi or Aaron, but from the tribe of Judah. This meant that there was to be a complete break with the past system of priesthood. This High Priest, unlike the Aaronic priests will not be changed, because he is not subject to death (whereas in the Scrolls it was apparently possible for the Messiah to die.) The high-priesthood of Jesus began at His anointing in Jordan, included the consummation on Calvary, (the real Day of Atonement) and its continuation in the Heavenly places. In Hebrews there is no thought of Jesus ever being superseded. In Qumran we have a literal priesthood of Aaronic descent, carrying on a system

of animal sacrifices which though broken for a time were to be renewed under a future new high priest. In Hebrews, the High-Priest does not merely renew the line, but fulfils and transcends it (36). It is a permanent role, dissociated from the temporary figure of Aaronic priests. This High Priest remains the same forever. Moreover, while the Apocryphon on Genesis includes ch.14, there is no evidence to suggest that Qumran thought of Melchizedek in a Messianic setting. This may not be true of the circles from which Ps.110 came, but in Qumran the figure of Melchizedek is avoided. One final difference may be noted; the functions of the Royal Messiah and the High Priest are in Hebrews different from those in the Sect. The former sees Christ performing His royal and sacerdotal functions in heaven in a glorified state, while the latter sees their Messiahs as merely human figures initiating a political movement in Palestine. The picture of Christ is much more like that in II Enoch, than in the Sect picture.

The author's view of the work of Christ springs from his conception of eschatology, and not from any concern to compare Christ with the Qumran concept or with the reigning High-Priests(37). The author mentions the theme before he begins to argue from it, it is true, (38), but in so doing he is assuming that his readers accept Christ and that he can draw deductions from this. He could not have argued in this way if he had been countering the views of the Sect. The theme is not forced upon his readers in order to correct their conception of an Aaronic priestly Messiah which made it impossible for them to accept

the authority and superiority of Christ (39). What in fact the author is doing is to assume the Royal High Priesthood of Christ and to show how the past, present and future work of his must influence the life of the Christian in via.

NOTES TO 3.

1. Westcott op.cit. p.7.
2. Heb. 4:14, 6:6, 7:3, 10:29.
3. ἀπαύγασμα = reflection or radiance
(i.e. effulgence). Nairne C.G.T. 27 prefers radiance
(cp. Wisd. 7:6.), H.W. Montefiore, p.34 reflection.
4. Job 1:6, 2:1, 38:7, Ps.82:6.
5. 1:5, 8, 9-13. cf. Ps. 104:4.
6. Ps. 102:28 κύριος = ἰη'η' , though not in the text
is evidently to be supplied.
7. R.V.G. Tasker The OT. in the NT. 1946 does not see why the
author is at such pains to prove Christ's superiority.
8. T.W. Manson B.J.R.L. Vol.32. J.B.Lightfoot Colossians.
In this Epistle the issue centres on the role of the angels
as intermediaries and not on the superiority of the Son.
9. F.D.V. Narborough. p.20f.
10. F.F. Bruce NTS.9. p.219. e.g. IQS. m 18. IQH. 1¹⁷.
11. Yadin op.cit. p.45.
12. NTS.9 p.219. The superiority of the Angels is clear in
W.13:9-10, 17:6-8.
13. Davidson op.cit.
14. Yadin op.cit.p.46. cf.W.7:8-18:15 for Micheal's position
15. It would seem that the writer is much more likely to have
had the book of Enoch in mind than the Dead Sea Scrolls.
In the apocalyptic work it states in 9:3, 10:7, 15:2, 20:1-8,
40:6, 61:10, that (implicitly) the angels are mediators
between God and man.

16. τὴν ἀκοιμῆσάν τὴν μέλλουσαν Westcott suggests the meaning of the New Covenant - that order which belongs to the complete work of Christ. op.cit. p.42
17. Rom. 5:12-19, I Cor. 15:22, ~~46~~
18. 2 Cor. 5:17, Rom.8:23, ~~Rev. 2:1~~
19. Of Christ - 2:10, 5:9, of lay - 7:19, 9:9, 10:1, of men - II:40, 12:23, of Christ's offering - 10:14.
20. ἀρχιερεῖς is rarely found in LXX. (cf. Num.35:25,28,32, Lev. 4:3, Josh. 22:3.) The title was not used before the Exile, and only long afterwards was it used regularly. Arndt & Gingrich (GK/Eng. Lexicon of the NT.) p.112. Jeremias' demonstration in "Jerusalem zur zeit Jesu" Stuttgart 1958 referred to by Arndt & Gingrich, that, *in the plural*, ἀρχιερεῖς does not mean "former high priests" but refers to a clearly defined set of superior temple officers, is now widely accepted. See De Vaux Ancient Israel D.L.T.1961 p.397.
21. Before this theme is taken up there are many hints of it. 3:1, 4:14, 5:6,10, 6:20. A. Nairne Epistle of the Hebrews CGT.p.LXXVII.
22. O. Cullmann Christology p.91.
23. cf. B.F. Westcott p.69. C.H. Dodd. According to the Scriptures p.93f. Hooker, (Jesus and the Servant p.123f.) ^{who} admits that Is. 53 very probably lies behind this N.T. passage.
24. 7:3 ἀφωιωμένος Moffatt ICC takes as middle but admits it may be passive (as Nairne CGT.)

25. Westcott op.cit. p.210.

26. While it is true that Philo identifies the Logos with Melchizedek, and calls him the priest King, and also that there were early Christian fathers whose speculations were of a Gnostic-Christian type, it is not necessary to look further than the OT. for the root of the identification made in this Epistle.

27. Westcott op.cit.p.199.

28. I.Macc. 14:41. Simon High Priest for ever $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \alpha\iota\omega\nu\alpha\varsigma$
28a. see after 39.

29. Johnson Sacral Kingship. *op.cit.*33.

30. The eschatological prophet mentioned in the NT. on the basis of Dt. 18:15 and also cited in Philo. and Ps-Clem., is similar to the prophet alongside the two Messiahs in the Qumran literature. In the intertestamental period the high priest becomes a future figure. He is the heavenly intercessor and mediator in heaven. (Michael, Enoch, Elijah). The Rabbis refused to confuse the sacerdotal and kingly roles. The rejection in Test. Levi 18 of a priest Messiah may however be a Christianised form. More usually we find a Priest of Levi and Messiah from Judah. The priest however always takes precedence. Test.Jud. 21^{2.4}.

31. J.F. Priest JBL.1963 suggested that the Sect had one lay Messiah, but that the eschatological prophet was gaining in importance, so that the lay Messiah had to be distinguished as the Messiah of Israel. This complex of two Messiahs is a peculiarity of Qumran. M. Black (Texte und Untersuchungen 1957 i.p.447) questions whether the High-priest is strictly

messianic. Naturally he takes the lead in the Temple meal as in IQSa. Whatever the position in Zech.6, where the LXX reverses the order of the MT., Qumran's emphasis on a lay Messiah closely resembles the place of the Nasi in Ezek. where the High-priest is subordinate when mentioned. Black suggests a dependence of Qumran on Ezekiel. The position with regard to the exact number of Messiahs at Qumran is difficult. W.D. Davies (Sermon on Mt.) finds two Messiahs possibly in DSD 9⁹⁻¹¹, but only one in 4 Qp. Is. 10^{22-11⁴}, CDC 14¹⁴⁻¹⁹, 8¹⁸⁻²⁰, 12²³, 19¹⁰, 20¹, IQSb. IQS2¹¹⁻²². He agrees with Kuhn that although there is only reference to one, there was originally reference to two. The plural has become singular as in CDC 2¹²⁻⁶. (see NTS 13. p. 215)

32. G.H. Box. JTS. April 1912 p.328.
33. As Burrows, Ginzberg, Milik, Barthelemy and Kuhn.
34. Yadin op.cit. p.44.
35. In the apocryphon on Genesis in cave I at Qumran (col.xxii 14-17) Melchizedek is briefly mentioned after the favourable midrash on the victory of Abraham which immediately precedes this reference. In Jub.xiii 25 a narrative has dropped out through loss or excision. It is possible that this happened because of the antipathy towards the Hasmonean dynasty, especially since Hyrcanus called himself (like Melchizedek) high priest of the God Most High. (Josephus, Antq. 15.2.4.). In these circles, to which Qumran may have belonged, the name and ideas associated with Melchizedek were therefore suspected and disliked.

36. Bruce. NTS.2 Vol. IX p.223.
37. The high-priests became puppets in the hands of the
Romans.
38. Yadin. op.cit.p.43. e.g. Heb.2:17, 3:1, 4:14.
39. Yadin. op.cit.p.44.
- 28a. The absence of a genealogy may be to stress the e
closeness to God.

Chapter IV.

THE TWO COVENANTS.

The figure of Melchizedek was used to show up the person of Christ. When we consider the work of Christ as the inaugurator of the New Covenant (7:22, 8:1, 8:7-13, 9:15), the High Priest in the new sanctuary (8:2-6, 9:1-10) with a new ritual (9:11, 10:18) we find that the figure of Moses and the Old Tabernacle is used for contrast and illustration. As he was the mediator of the Old Covenant so Jesus is seen to be the Mediator of a new and better Covenant. Unlike Paul, the writer seems only to have the Sinai Covenant in mind and never mentions the Abrahamic. In his mind there is a clear contrast between the new and old covenants and their mediators. Διαθήκη is used as the equivalent of מִוְדָּע and not συνθήκη, the classical word, (1) because the parties were not equal contractors, but in fact it was God who ordained and man who accepted the Covenant. The part of a μεσίτης in such a covenant was "to mediate between two parties to remove a disagreement or reach a common goal". So Moses is thought of as the one who was to stand between God and Israel at Sinai (2) to resolve the differences. The writer of Hebrews for this reason contrasts Christ with Moses. The contrast is hinted at in a number of places (3). The position of Moses as Mediator of the first Covenant, was

to appear before the people to see that the Covenant was carried out; so also Christ has appeared before God and Man.

It is this thought that merges with that of his High

Priesthood, 7:24-5. In the case of Christ, the writer sees

Him as appointed "on our behalf" ὑπὲρ ἁποστόλων (5¹.)

and as "ever living to make intercession for us" in contrast

to Moses who on one or two occasions intercedes for the

people to God.

So it would seem that to the writer Our Lord is the counterpart, in the New Covenant, to Moses in the Old. It is through Him that God has ratified this Covenant and He is the One through whom God has conveyed his terms to man and through whom man responds to God and carries out those terms. Yadin & Bruce (4) think that it is not so much Moses in the past as the Mediator of the Old Covenant of which the writer is thinking, as of some future role in which Moses as the prophet 'like unto me' will take a prominent part. He quotes a passage in DSD IX 11 "until the coming of a prophet and of the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel" and claims that 'the prophet' will constitute an integral part of the eschatological era. This is backed by the first three quotations from Testamonia Q4 (5). Whether 'the prophet' is to be identified with one of the Messiahs or is a different person, it seems clear that the Covenanters expected a prophetic person to appear, ~~but~~ who according to Yadin, would not be the interpreter of the law, but one to whom men would listen. He would like to see in a quotation from the Assumption of Moses Ch. 2 a confirmation of this, but

the passage hardly suggests that Moses himself would reappear, but that the Law, preserved in jars, would continue "until the Lord will visit them" in the consummation at the end of the days". In other words, Moses' law would survive. In 9:16, the A.V. gives for the Greek τοῦ διαθεμένου the translation "testator", thereby accepting a change of meaning for the word. Westcott argues against this view (6); Davidson (7) and Nairne (8) leave the point open. In any case the point of the argument is clear. Christ is seen as the one through whom the New Covenant is inaugurated and this involved his death. By inaugurating it he has guaranteed (ἡ ἐγγύη) that the terms of the Covenant will be carried out for those who enter; for no longer will it be something outside them, but written upon the heart. This guarantee is connected with His eternal priesthood. The first mention in the Epistle of the idea of the New Covenant comes in connection with the oath that Christ should be the new High Priest 7:22. His argument seems to be, in this passage, that in the inauguration of a new priesthood, there must therefore be a new Covenant. As there are priests on earth this must be a priesthood in heaven based on a New Covenant. The word διαθήκη is used 17 times in Hebrews. It is used of the Covenant at Sinai 4 times, of covenants generally 4 times, and of the new covenant nine times. The verb is used four times, twice in quotation from Jer. 31:31 and twice it is translated 'testator' and used there in a general sense. Of the nine times where the word is used of the New Covenant, in 3 cases it is used in the quotations of

Jer.31:31 and twice in 8:6;10, and once in 10:16. Four times it is connected with the blood of Christ 9:16, 10:29, 12:24, 13:20 and twice it is connected with the High Priesthood as we have noted (7:22, 8:6). In 8:6 the argument is that as this Covenant is better than the last, so the priesthood is of a higher order. The New Covenant is part of the eschatological era, as is clear from the quotation of Jer. 31:31 and its association with the Spirit. Moreover it is not referred to until the High Priesthood of Christ is established, as the death of Christ is the inauguration of the New Covenant. In this not only is the prophecy of Jeremiah fulfilled but a new decisive act has taken place once and for all ἐφ' ἑαυτῶν inaugurating a relationship into which men are invited to enter now and which is eternal and not like the Old Covenant, temporary.

D. Flusser points out (9) that the passage from Jeremiah 31:30-31 is in the mind of both Sect (though it is not quoted by them) and Christian and that both were attracted by the expression 'New Covenant' because of its eschatological content. He quotes Heb. 9:15 and claims that both Heb. 4:16 and (Zad.) C.D.C. 111:10 are parallel. The New Covenant is in both cases with the Remnant. So too, Flusser claims that the view of sacred history in the sect resembles the Christian view. The New Covenant was needed because the Old had been broken. He suggests that the one relevant difference is in the social significance of the Covenant in the Qumran sect (10). Each member in entering the New Covenant entered the Sect and this at Pentecost, when the Old Covenant had been given at Sinai.

He would admit however that in the Sect, the New Covenant did not abrogate the Old, but it did result in a complete separation from the rest of Jewry. He points out that Hebrews is unique in its emphasis upon the Covenant and that in both Heb. 13:20 and the Sect, it is the 'everlasting covenant'. In the Zadokite Document, while there is no quotation of Jer. 31:31, there are three references to the New Covenant, 6:19, 8:21, 20:12, which all speak of the Covenant in the land of Damascus. 8:21, 20:12 suggest that there was a falling away of some of those who originally made the Covenant. 20:12 also states that it was members of the Sect who established this Covenant. This offers an immediate point of contrast with the O.T. where it is not the individual or the people who take the initiative in the making of the Covenant, but God. This comes out clearly in Jeremiah 31:31 "I will make a new Covenant". There is no suggestion that Flusser finds any trace that it was God who initiated the New Covenant. The Sect usage is however not unlike that in the post-exilic period, when Ezra makes a Covenant (Ezra 10:3) and though the word Covenant is not used it looks as if the same thing is intended in Nehemiah 9. The reforms of the Sect and their interest in priests are also reminiscent of Ezra and Nehemiah (Neh. 13:28 Ezra 10:18). These covenants were not undertaken by all the people, they did not supplant the Old Covenant and indeed they were on a different level. They had not the same eschatological significance. The Sect's New Covenant is not the same as that in Hebrews. Here the whole outlook is different. The New High Priest is the Mediator of a New Covenant (8:6) and

this is necessary because the old one has failed, which was only the shadow of better things to come. The author takes pains by quoting Jeremiah 31 twice in Ch. 8 and 10 to show that this New Covenant was made by God's initiative, not man's. The covenant is sealed by Christ's death (11) and in His blood (13:2) and is an everlasting covenant, universal in its scope. The idea of the Covenant in Hebrews shares very little in common with the Sect. The one is a man-made arrangement initiated by the Sect; the other part of God's eschatological plan. In the one the Old Covenant is emphasised, in the other it is superseded and about to vanish (*ἔργα & φανισμαῖν*) (12). The one is with Sect Members, with the hope that all Israel may be included; the other with a New Israel and suggests the inclusion of all creation. It is therefore unlikely that Hebrews derived its views from the Sect. Hebrews is a radical rethinking of the whole relationship of Israel to its God, while the Qumran idea is little more than a reformation in a separatist group within the Old Covenant.

Like the theme of the Covenant and High Priest, that of Sacrifice is covered in this Epistle far more fully than anywhere else in the N.T. The pictures the author draws are largely from levitical ritual and particularly from the Tabernacle rather than the Temple, perhaps because it was in the wilderness when the Old Covenant was initiated and therefore suited the comparison he was making with the institution of the New Covenant.

Westcott points out that his references in fact cover almost the whole sphere of O.T. sacrifice. (13). As so often, the idea is

mentioned before it is fully taken up and developed. In 1:3 he mentioned Christ having made 'purification' καθάρσιμος for sins before "he sat down on the right hand of the majesty on high". The theme is not resumed till the middle of Ch.7 (14). The objective of the author is to draw a contrast between the O.T. sacrifices and that of Christ. He has already brought out the conception of Christ as the High Priest and goes on from this to show what the New High Priest does in contrast to what the Levitical High Priest did.

His attitude to the sacrificial system of the O.T. is quite clear. He is ~~mainly~~ interested in it, only so far as it is concerned with the removal of sins. It was something which God, not man had ordained. The High Priest was called by God 5:4, the tabernacle was planned and its erection directed by God 8:5; in its construction the Holy Spirit is shewing that the way is not yet open to full communion 9:8, the Old Covenant was ordained by God 9:20, the sacrifices are according to God's law 10:8, God's judgement fell on the broken law 10:27. Yet although he looks at the Old Covenant as God-given and its ritual system as God-ordained, he considers it as only able to give a ritual cleansing and not capable of satisfying the conscience 9:13 or granting forgiveness. It cleanses the copies of the heavenly things 9:23. The writer sees it too as only temporary 8:13 and about to pass away. God himself has found fault with it 8:8, in fact had done so long before the coming of Christ when he mentioned a New Covenant Jer. 31:31. The fact that these sacrifices are to be repeated was to the writer the surest proof

of their inability; three or four times the writer mentions the constant repetition of the sacrifices 7:21, 9:25, 10:1-2-3-11. In contrast to the O.T. sacrifices the writer emphasises the unique character of Christ's sacrifice. He uses the same sacrificial terms for this as for the O.T. sacrifices. It is connected with his position as High Priest 8:3, and also with the New Covenant. The writer sees Christ's sacrifice as the fulfilment of the Day of Atonement Ch. 9; of the sin offering Ch.13, and of the institution of the New Covenant Ch.10. The special purpose of the sacrifice is the forgiveness of sins and the carrying out of the moral requirements of the law, as had been foretold in Jer. 31:31. The writer sees this sacrifice as a single event. This is brought out strongly in the use of the aorist tense of Christ's sacrifice, in the contrast drawn with the O.T. repetition of sacrifices and in the use of $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\varsigma$, $\epsilon\phi\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\varsigma$ and the numeral $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\iota\varsigma$. To the writer the sacrifice is the death of Christ (15). He emphasises Christ's sufferings 2:9, 2:14, 9:15,18,19, 9:26 as connected with the sacrifice. The shedding of Christ's blood is the equivalent of the shedding of the blood of animals under the levitical system. This death is wholly effective in its objective and therefore need not be repeated 9:26. Christ's self-offering procured forgiveness and therefore there is no need for any further offering 10:18. It is important to notice that the sacrifice of our Lord is always connected with the problem of sin and the restoration of a broken relationship with God; in this Epistle - the Day of Atonement, the sin offering and the institution of the New Covenant are specially

connected with it. Thus he sees Christ fulfilling the whole levitical system. He is the one whose blood initiates the New Covenant 7:22, 9:15-18-21. He is also the victim of the Day of Atonement 9:7, 11-12 (16). So too he was the fulfilment of the sin offering 13:11-12. (17).

Flusser (18) claims that the Qumran sect also abandoned the sacrificial system when they abandoned the Temple ritual and reinterpreted the system spiritually. The whole life of the community with its strict rules and laws of purity were an offering to God which took the place of the animal sacrifices and made atonement. Quoting a passage from the Test of Levi. III:5-6 in which the angels are said to offer "a *λοκικῆν*" and bloodless sacrifice to the Lord", he argues that the Sect considered theirs to be also spiritual sacrifices *πνευματικὰ θυσία* and that this is the basis for the N.T. conception of spiritual sacrifices especially in I P.2:5-6 (19). Similar ideas may be found in Phil³. Special emphasis is laid upon the 'fruit of the lips' (*καρπὸς χειλέων*) in 13:15 which he claims is not used elsewhere in the N.T. and its association with praise, comparing it with IQS 9:26 10:6.14 and IQH 11:5. Bruce (20) also calls attention to IQS 9:3 which would support this contention. It is probable however that the Sect never lost their belief in the efficacy of animal sacrifice and Levitical ritual. If it is true that they had ceased to attend the Temple Services or to participate in that ritual, it was not from a conviction of its inadequacy but because they considered the Temple impure and the ritual celebrated by an unclean Priesthood (2.9.11.)

at the wrong time ~~owing to the two calendars still used~~.

They hoped and expected that this sacrificial system would in the future after the days of Belial be re-introduced (21).

Bruce moreover quotes IQM 11:5 where the ritual is actually restored (22). Meanwhile the life of the community with its implicit obedience and different lustrations was acting as an atonement for sin (23). It was itself a 'holy of holies' consisting of the priests of the community. In this there seems to be little difference from the attitude to sacrifice in the Old Testament in different passages connected with it. (24). God would rather have obedience than sacrifice and where there is obedience Sacrifice is of secondary importance. In Hebrews the approach is different, springing from a different approach to the High Priesthood. There seems to be a clear distinction in the Epistle between offerings 'for sin' and the 'offerings of praise and gifts'. As has often been pointed out, the Epistle centres round the Day of Atonement, and a sharp contrast is drawn between the repeated sacrifices of the Old Covenant and the single sacrifice of the New. In the former it was claimed the result was merely ritual cleansing which did not touch the conscience (25). In the latter an effective καθαρισμός of the conscience was made which resulted in a 'remission of sin'. This brought to an end the need for any further offering. Further sacrifices therefore under the New Covenant were irrelevant. Elsewhere in Ch. 13, the author speaks of those sacrifices not connected with sin, described here as θυσία and in 1 Pet. 2⁵ as πνευματικά. Elsewhere in the N.T. these are suggested, but never, as in the

Sect, connected with the Atonement. (26). They are always seen as a consequence of the final once-for-all effective sin offering.

In the sect's teaching on sacrifice, there remained a firm belief in the adequacy of animal sacrifice as an Atonement, although sacrifices were temporarily replaced by legal obedience and this considered as equally efficacious, until the sacrificial system can be re-introduced. In Hebrews, the animal sacrifices while having a real and valid authority for a ritual purification were only a shadow of something which would effectively deal with sin and through which the other would be rendered unnecessary and therefore obsolete. They would then vanish and no more sacrifice for sin would be necessary, but other sacrifices of praise and gifts still offered an opportunity to the Christian to show his devotion. It is quite inconceivable that the latter conception could have grown out of the former. The Epistle read by the Sect would simply show their inadequate explanation of the O.T.

One further difference has been noted. The sacrifice in Hebrews is closely connected with the death of Jesus and this is of crucial importance in the Epistle, since by it the old system is fulfilled and ready to fade away. In Qumran the death of the Teacher of Righteousness has no such significance attached to it. The death of the Teacher is scarcely mentioned and the texts are not unambiguous. In CDC 8:21, 19:35, 20:14 the Teacher is described as being gathered in; this is taken by most to refer to natural death. In IQp. Hab. Col.XI.5, Dupont Sommer finds a

reference to the martyrdom of the Teacher and Allegro sees a reference to crucifixion. Even if they are right, and there is no certainty that they are, the death of the Teacher (and of many more that have been crucified or martyred) has no soteriological or eschatological significance. The manner of death on its own does not put the death of the Teacher on the same level as that of Christ. (27). The eschatological nature of the death of Jesus thus distinguishes the Epistle from other comparable sources. It is this which revolutionises the concept of sacrifice and marks out the Epistle as distinctively Christian.

Jerusalem and particularly the Temple, is the scene of the eschatological drama. The latter is of especial importance as the place of sacrifice and the work of the High-priest. To this in our last section we must now turn.

Notes to Chapter IV

1. Westcott op.cit. p299. The word used as an equivalent of H17.7 is $\delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta$ not $\sigma\upsilon\nu\theta\eta\kappa\eta$.
2. Asc.Mos.; Moses calls himself $\mu\epsilon\sigma\sigma\acute{\iota}\tau\eta\varsigma\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta\varsigma$.
3. Eg.3:2,5,16. 8:5. 9:19. 10:28.
4. F.F. Bruce N.T.S. Vol. 9. p.222. 4Q Testimonia quotes Deut.18:15.
5. J.M. Allegro op.cit.J.B.L.75.p.184 identifies the Interpreter of the Law with the Messiah of Aaron. Wieder distinguishes between the prophet Moses redivivus and the coming of the prophets who follow the prophet.
6. Westcott op.cit.p.298-302.
7. Davidson op.cit.inaloco.
8. Nairne CGT. in loco.
9. Flusser op.cit.p.236.
10. op.cit.p.240.
11. Some argue that $\delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta$ has a double use in ch.9 viz: will and covenant, but cf. Westcott op.cit.p.298.
12. 8:9,10. 13.
13. Westcott op.cit.p.292. Gifts and sacrifices generally are not limited to the Day of Atonement. (5:1. 8:3. 10:11. 9:7,18. 13:12).
14. Farrar CGT.1888 p.31 suggests that the word here may have a reference to the Day of Atonement, called in the LXX the Day of Purification.
15. Westcott op.cit.p.293 differentiates between the death of Christ and the offering of blood (cf.p.298). He maintains that in Jewish thought "blood" stands for life, basing this on

23. IQS (DSD) viii 4-10.

24. I Sam. 15:22. Ps. 40:6. Is.I.

25. Heb. 9:13.

26. On Heb. 13:10 *Θυσιαστήριον* cf. Westcott op.cit.p.453-4 and 297.

27. Milik J.T. op.cit.p.79f.

In 1.Q.S.8:1-8, the council of 12 laymen and 3 priests must practise truth and righteousness and atone for the land. But no death is involved. Redemptive value is attached to the sufferings of the Servant and Son of Man but it is even doubtful whether either of these Figures are identified with the Teacher of Righteousness, (against Brownlee.) See G.R.Driver op.cit.passim.

Chapter V.

THE TWO TEMPLES

The Temple in which the work of the High-priest takes place is in the Heavenly Jerusalem. Though the city is only named in 12:22 the idea is found in II:10,16. 13:14. Outside Hebrews it is found in Rev. 3:13, 21:2,10. Gal.4:26. In the O.T. apart from the reference to Salem in Gen. 14 at which we have already looked (I), the name does not occur till Joshua and Judges. In II Sam. 5:5ff David occupied Zion, a wise political and military move, but also of great religious significance since this City provides a resting place for the Ark, which becomes permanent with^{the} building of the Temple by Solomon. Zion thus becomes the accredited capital of the kingdom, the centre for the worship of God, and the focal point of the nation's hopes. When these are threatened or shattered they are transferred to the future when a new and restored Jerusalem will take its place. This concept never however becomes a part of mythical primeval time, since the city's historical connections are kept firmly in mind. Only later in II Baruch (4:2-4) do we find any attempt at mythologisation. Yet at the same time we find in the prophets that Zion is to some extent identified with Eden (Is.11:6, 51:3, 32:15, 65:17. Ezek. 47:1). It was therefore to play a part in the eschatological renewal of the world. Not only was

Jerusalem the centre of worship to which the tribes would flow, but it was also the centre of the world - Gen. 2: 10-14. Ezek. 48:13, Zech. 4:10. Ps. 48:3. Some have taken seriously the human parallel of the umbilical cord; just as this is vital to life of the foetus, so is Jerusalem for the life of the world. (Ezek. 38:12. 40:1-4. Tob. 13:16-17). Yahweh would instruct his people from Jerusalem and from here the Torah would go out. This city, like much else in Jewish thought, was a copy of the heavenly reality. (Ps. 76:6,9. 48:3. Is. 14:3. Ex. 15:17. 25:9,40, 26:30. 27:8. Ps.122:3. Test. Levi 5:1. Test. Dan. 5:12.) This, together with the close association of the Temple - the resting place of Yahweh - with the city, led to a static conception of Jerusalem. The prophets raised their voices against this concept of a holy place isolated from and unrelated to, personal righteousness, which led to a false view of the inviolability of Jerusalem. When in fact this was disproved, the concept of a holy city housing Yahweh, was transferred to the future (II Bar. 4:3-6. 6:7-10. 32:2. IV.Ez. 7:26. 8:52. 13:16,36. Zech. 2:6-13.) In the earlier intertestamental books it is believed that Jerusalem will be purified as a preparation for the coming of the Messianic kingdom (I En. 6-30. cf 10¹⁶⁻¹⁹. 25¹. Ps.Sol. 17²⁵⁻³³.) or as the centre of the temporary Messianic kingdom (II Bar. 29³⁹⁻⁴⁰. 72-4 II Esdras 7²⁷⁻³⁰. 12³²⁻⁴); elsewhere it is said that it will be replaced by the New Jerusalem (I En. 83-90 cf. 70²⁸. Test.Dan. 5¹².) which comes down from God out of heaven and is a counterpart of the earthly Jerusalem (II Bar. 4³. 32³⁻⁴ II Esdras 7²⁶. 8⁵². 13¹⁶. 10²⁶. I En. 25⁵. 90²⁸.)

Ezek. 40-8. Is. 54^{11,12}. 60¹. Hag. 2⁷. Zech. 2⁶⁻¹³. Gal. 4²⁶.
Heb. 12²². Rev. 3¹². 2^{2.10}.). Glimpses of the heavenly
Jerusalem have been given beforehand to Abraham and Moses
(II Bar. 4⁴⁻⁵) and the apocalyptic seer himself sometimes
claims to have seen what is yet to be revealed (II Esdras 10²⁶
Rev. 21²). But its final revelation is reserved by God until
after the final judgement when that which has been kept hidden
in heaven will at last be made known. Again the City and
Temple are closely connected: the one involves and includes
the other. The latter is mentioned in En. 53:6. 90:28-29.
In another work represented by fragments in several caves (2),
there is a description of the New Temple, written in Aramaic
and obviously inspired by the vision of the Temple in Ezek. 40-48.
In the O.T. the idea is also found in Ezek. 37: 26-28. Is. 2:2
(=Mic. 4:1) Hag. 2:7. Rabbinic theology appears to have no
mention of an eschatological Temple (3) presumably since the
thought was taken over by the Christians. In the N.T. the idea
is most clearly found in Rev. 21:3 15:5 (C.K. Barrett suggests
that *στύλοι* refers to the pillars of the Temple of the New
Age. (4)). In Hebrews there is no explicit mention of the
Temple. It would however be reasonable to expect that the
eschatological High-priest would have a Temple in which to
officiate in the eschatological city. It seems as though the
author was thinking of this when he spoke of the Tent. Thus
in 9:7 the details fit the Temple much better than they do the
wilderness tent. These apparent anachronisms are not a
weakness in the author's case, for he is not concerned with

precise chronological details but with an overall concept. For him the Tent, Tabernacle and Temple are virtually synonymous. There may however have been reasons why he should have preferred to speak of the Tabernacle rather than the Temple. First, because it was divinely commanded and a divine pattern given. Secondly it was vitally connected with the first covenant, the guarantee of which was that God would abide with His people in their midst. Thirdly, the Tabernacle was connected with Aaron - the ideal High-priest, whereas the Temple at that time would have been connected with very unworthy examples of High-priesthood. Fourth, the tabernacle (and also, in a sense, the Temple) was connected with the idea of pilgrimage. Fifth, its temporary structure fits the idea of the fading away of the Jewish cult, 8:13. (5). The writer clearly thought that the Tabernacle in the wilderness was of divine origin and pattern. He conceived of it, as portrayed in the Pentateuch, as the mark of God's presence with Israel. Rebellion against God caused it to be withdrawn, but otherwise it was here that God was to be met through the High-priests and priests. The presence of this righteous God in conversation with his people was however limited, since only the representative member of the representative tribe could approach once a year into the presence of God (6) and in any case entry into the holy of holies was barred by the veil. (*κατεπέτασμα*) 6:19. 9:3. 10:20. The old tent was in fact a *παραβλή* 9:9, of something better which was to come - the new Tabernacle. The word *σκηνή* is used eight times - 8:5, 9:2,3,6,8, 13:10, 9:11, 8:2 - but it is

not the only word which is used to refer to that better thing to come. Such phrases as Sanctuary, Holy of Holies, and Holy Place must be taken into consideration. In the LXX σκηνή is used to translate both the more general word "habitation"

ἱερόν and the Tent (of Meeting) ἕβησκη, though the two are distinguished in Ex. 26:7, 35:II, 36:14. Nu. 9:15, 3:25. In the O.T. the σκηνή was not one building, but two in one, and if the argument of the Epistle is to be grasped, this fact must be clearly borne in mind. The tent was divided by a veil καταπέτασμα; into the larger section the priests were allowed to enter, Heb. 9⁶, but into the smaller, the Holy of Holies, only the High-priest was allowed to go once a year. From Exodus 26:31-4, we know the first

compartment was 20 cubits deep, the second 10. The first is called the Holy Place, i.e. ἱερόν = LXX. τὸ ἅγιον and the second the Holy of Holies, i.e. the most holy place ἅγιον ἅγιον = LX X. τὸ ἅγιον (τὰ ἅγια) τῶν ἁγίων but ἱερόν is also used for the Holy of Holies - Lev. 16:2-3.

Heb. 9:12, 10:12. This ambiguity therefore calls for close attention to be given to the context. In the Holy of Holies stood the Ark. (Ex. 25:10-12.) (7). In the Holy place in front of the veil was the altar of incense (Ex. 30: 1-10. 37:25-28) made of accacia wood and overlaid with pure gold - hence its name the golden altar. (8). Somewhere on the north side stood a table for the presence bread (Ex. 25:30. 37:10-16.) and on the south side, the lampstand (Ex.25: 31-40, 37:17-24, 40:24.) in Hebrews, these two compartments are further distinguished as the

outer and the inner, the first and the second. The writer relates both to person and work of Christ. Before we see the way in which he does this, it will be well to collect and classify our references. The author of the Epistle refers to the first tabernacle, the Holy place in 8:5, 9:2,6,8b,21. 13:10. The second or Holy of Holies is spoken of in 9:3,7,8a,25. 13:11. In 8:5 and 13:10 it seems likely that the first tabernacle is in mind, since 13:10 speaks in the plural of the priests, whereas if it referred to Holy of Holies it would have been in the singular. In 9:8,25, 10:19, 13:11 we find the ambiguity already referred to. It would seem best to accept this, implicit in the O.T. use, rather than as Moffatt and Koester suggest (9) exclude "Holy Place" from 9:2, where the first tabernacle is so described, as a textual gloss. The same ambiguity attaches to the word ^{rendered in the R.V. as} (sanctuary (τὸν ἅγιον; τὸ ἅγιον .) In 9:1 we have the only occurrence of τὸ ἅγιον in the N.T. In the MT. it is represented by שׂוֹרֵט in Nu. 3:38, Ezek. 45:4,8, 48:5 and rendered by שׂוֹרֵט in Ex. 26:33. Here in 9:1 it seems to refer to the whole tabernacle, i.e. both tents. Elsewhere it refers to the second or inner tent. In 9:1 and 13:11 this is the earthly Sanctuary, but in 6:19, 8:2,5, 9:8,12,24, 10:19 it refers to the actual prototype of which the earthly is only a copy. Westcott (10) however in 8:2 while he takes τὸν ἅγιον to refer to the Holy of Holies, does not distinguish between the tabernacle and the sanctuary. It would seem almost certain in view of the High-priest context that it is the inner sanctuary which is being spoken of. For some reason which I do not see, Koester

places 10:19 amongst the references to the first Tabernacle. Its reference to the inner sanctuary would seem perfectly clear. This is also the case in 9:12. But the inner sanctuary, the Holy of Holies, which is being spoken of is not Holy of Holies built by Moses, but the real inner sanctuary of which the earthly was but a shadow. There is therefore in the Epistle not only a distinction between the inner and outer Tents, but also between the heavenly and earthly inner and outer Tents. The heavenly inner tent clearly refers to Heaven itself, while the counterpart to the outer Mosaic Tent seems to be the actual life and death of Jesus which ushers in the New Age (9:8ff.). (11). Through His earthly and heavenly work, the old outer tent which prevented men from entering the inner, is replaced by a new and living way 10:20, and the old obstacles removed. Jesus is in truth The Way as St. John records and also clears and pioneers the Way for those who by identification with Him by faith are prepared to persevere in following Him who has gone before to prepare a place for them.

The theme of Jesus as the Pioneer or Leader ἀρχηγός, whatever the meaning of that term may be, is introduced in 2:10. The Christian is involved in the same paradox as his Master; the path to glory leads through suffering and humiliation. Not that the Christian is on a par with Christ, for Jesus is unique, but the believer must take the Way shown by the Leader and he can only do this by holding fast to what has been done and revealed in Jesus. (cf. 6:20, 12:2, 13:12.). For the Christian on this way the End is secure, but as it leads through suffering and

discouragement, he must press on and inherit the promises. The High-priest of the New Age offers in the Temple of the New Age the perfect sacrifice which enables others to share in the powers of the New Age. This is a complete work, once and for all, but because all things are not yet in subjection to Him, there remains the need to strive in order to enter the very presence of God. Here again we find the eschatological paradox noted before. The Way is open, but it is the Way of the Master; it is the way that leads from D-day to V-day. It is for this reason that the writer concludes the section 9:1-10:18 as he does in 10:19ff.

The use of the idea of the Tabernacle/Tent differs from that in other parts of the N.T.. In I Cor. 3:16, 6:19, II Cor. 6:16, Eph. 1:4, 2:21, Rev. 21:3, the thought is that of the spiritual community of believers and their Lord. The idea that the Temple would be replaced is found in the Johanne interpretation of saying of Jesus put by Mark in mouth of the false witnesses (Mk. 14:58.). What constituted the falsity of the witness lay in the misrepresentation of what Jesus had actually taught. Mark did not bother to correct this because perhaps he saw the deeper truth. By the time John and Luke wrote, there was no need to mention the false witnesses (12). Here the Temple is Christ's Body with the possibility of a corporate reference, especially if the Son of Man is a corporate figure. It is not clear whether Stephen's speech is a further elaboration of this idea or not. In Acts 15:13-18 we do find that the Church is presented as the New Temple, where the

tabernacle of David (Am. 9:11) while it has primarily a dynastic reference in the O.T., here is given a spiritual reference. The same text was so used by the Qumran Covenanters CDC. 3:9. The appeal to prophecy is particularly strong in II Cor. 6:16f. where we have an O.T. couplet (Lev.26:12, Ezek. 37:27) which was already in use in Jewish eschatological thought on the Messianic Temple, (Jub. 1:17). The same thought of Christians as the New Temple is found in I Peter 2:4. There is a strong corporate emphasis in these passages which links them closely with the other figure of the Church, the Body. These two seem to be fused when it is said that the body grows (Eph. 4:12,16.) The Temple image has no consistent use in the N.T.. While however the corporate reference we have been considering is less prominent in Hebrews than elsewhere, it is not completely absent. In 3:6, 10:21 the corporate aspect comes to the fore. Jesus becomes the new head of the New House, the New Israel. The possibility suggested by some, that this house is to be identified with the Tabernacle cannot be dismissed altogether. But the implications of these passages and the idea of the Temple found elsewhere in the N.T. must not be allowed to obscure or colour those passages in Hebrews where the thought connected with the Eschatological Temple is distinctive. The same is true of the ideas of the Temple found in Qumran. David Flusser has claimed (13) that there is a similarity between Qumran and the Epistle and this he bases on their use of the Temple concept. We have already seen that we must reject any suggestion that, on the grounds that both share a common view of

the Temple as a picture for the Spiritual Community, one is dependent on the other. The dominant idea in Hebrews is not of the Temple as the spiritual community of believers. This is found in Qumran CDC iii9,v5,viii4-10,ix5-6,xx2.5.7., where the writer is using the Temple in a spiritual and metaphorical sense. In DSD ix9,viii20, the members are described as the perfect ones and in IQS.viii5 the faithful~~ly~~ community is referred to as the House of God. Apart from Heb. 3:6 and 10:21 this view of the Temple is not found in the Epistle. It is as we saw, found elsewhere in the N.T., but this fact hardly provides evidence for any theory of dependence.

In Hebrews those passages which speak of the Temple as a distinct place into which Christ has entered and whither Christians must follow, must be taken seriously. While however the view of David Flusser must be rejected, there is a further alleged similarity which must be considered. M. Black (14) points to passages in the Qumran writings where the Temple is found in an eschatological role. In IQS.iv.23. CD.v.5-6 an eschatological meal is held in the Temple which is clearly part of the eschatological restoration of nature to its paradisaical state. (cf. Ezek. 37:26-27. 40-48. Zech. 3:7.) In IQS.b Cols.3-4, the eschatological Temple is explicitly referred to as "the dwelling place", where the Holy God himself may be approached by His people. IQS.b 4:25 describes the function of the priests in this New Temple. Finally in Qumran, the New Temple in Jerusalem represents the final state of eschatological blessedness into which the community will enter (4QFlor. I:I-7, 3-7. CD.3:19,

IQSb 4:25-27.). Whether this is a material city with a literal Temple and sacrifices as some fragments from Cave 2 and IQM.ii suggest, or a spiritual concept, seems at present to be uncertain. There is much here which on the surface appears to be similar to what we have already found in Hebrews. Where however the two differ, lies in their view of eschatology. For Qumran the Temple lay entirely in the future and the Sect organised themselves temporarily until all that they hoped for came true. In the Epistle to the Hebrews we have been at pains to point out that despite scholars' contentions to the contrary, the future is in part already present. It is not a pious dream and a distant hope, but in and through Christ's life and death, it is already present. Christians are urged not to enter into a Temple which does not yet exist, but into one here and now, by a New Way which has been made open to them. They are not urged to retreat so as to be ready for the advance when the time comes, but to advance since the Time has now in fact arrived.

Arising out of their view of the future Temple, is the attitude of the Qumran Sect to the existing Temple. This too we find differs from that reflected in the N.T.. It is generally agreed that the Essenes did not offer sacrifices (according to Philo.). This is significant for our purposes if as many (15) believe the Sect is either identical to the Essenes or at least closely related to them. Josephus 18: 1, 5, 19 agrees with Philo, but in the Greek MSS. the little word "not" is omitted. However, scholars like Lightfoot and Baumgartner

accept the reading which includes "not" and even if this were not correct, the evidence of Josephus alone could not be preferred to that of Philo. We must inquire further in order to discover why the Sect may not have made sacrifices.

Within the literature of Qumran there does not appear to be a unified attitude towards the Temple. In CDC. 6:11-16 the Temple is avoided because it is polluted. The Covenanters bound themselves under Covenant to keep away from the Temple and its ritual. This same attitude is found in the Ps.Sol. 8:10-12 and in the O.T. prophets, e.g. Amos 5:22-27. Now whether it is true as some (16) hold that the prophetic denunciations are total rejections of the whole cult or not, it is clear that Sect according to CDC. rejects the cult as it was in their day. In DSH the Temple is avoided because of the misbehaviour of the priests (DSH. 8:8-13). As a result of this they are not recognised as valid priests. With this attitude we might compare that of Ezra-Nehemiah.

Jaubert (17) has suggested that the Covenanters avoided the Temple because they used a different calendar. In DSD. and the Hymn Scrolls (18) there are no references to the Temple or its defilement and only figurative references to sacrifice in DSD. In DSW. (IQM.) (19) there is a reference to a future offering. Jaubert (20) now maintains that the Covenanters went to the Temple because one of the gates bears their name. This however does not mean that they actually sacrificed there and it is likely, ~~that~~ as with the laws relating to sacrifice and the privileges of the priests, that these relate to a time when they used to frequent

the Temple, and do not as Schechter held, indicate continuance at Temple ritual. Moreover the Sect does seem to look forward to a purified restored ritual in the future and these rules could well refer to this time in anticipation.

^{it is recorded,}
Jesus, ~~was~~ ~~the~~ ~~only~~ frequented the Temple. The closing stages of His ministry are set in the Temple (Mk. 12:41, Lk.19:47). The evidence of St. John's gospel would suggest that he spent more time in the Temple and at the festival rituals than the Synoptics would have led us to believe. He attacks the misuse of the Temple by the authorities but this does not deter Him from attending the Temple nor does He suggest that His Disciples should avoid the Temple either now or after His death. The Early Church clearly did not understand Him to intend them to avoid the Temple since we find them in the Temple (Acts 2:4,6, 3:1, 5:20,42). Yet Jesus taught and the Evangelists in part understood that the earthly Temple was only temporary and that it pointed to something greater. Jesus himself spoke of the imminent destruction of the Temple (Mk. 13:1-2. Lk. 13:35) which took place after his death. In the fourth gospel he warns the Samaritan woman that the day is coming when God will not be worshipped either in Mt. Gerizim or Jerusalem and such pronouncements at the Jewish feasts as "I am the Light..." suggest that He saw them in some sense fulfilled in Himself (Jn.7:37. 8:12). Just as the law and prophets were fulfilled in Him, so was the cult. The Temple ritual could not go far enough to be fully effective; in Jesus its shortcomings were overcome by His life and death and in Him it was rendered obsolete. Of this

we find hints in the gospels. The veil of the Temple is rent in Mt. 27:51 providing through His death, free access to God.

St. John and perhaps the Synoptics understood that by his Life and Death he replaced both the ritual ~~of~~, and the first Temple itself (Mk. 14:5-8. 15:29. Jn. 2:19). The inadequacy and misuse of the Temple however do not prevent Jesus or His disciples from attending the Temple. Unlike Qumran's sectarian hopes, Jesus does not look forward to a purified and renewed ritual, for he sees it fulfilled in Himself. While the Sect's ideas have some points of contact with the N.T. and this Epistle in particular, there are striking and significant divergencies.

These differences are due to the fact that the person and work of Jesus has completely changed the course of history. Both the O.T. Judaism and its fringes look forward to the consummation still only in the future. Many scholars have held that the argument of this Epistle is directed solely to the future. We have endeavoured to show that while the whole argument of the Epistle does look forward, it does so in a new way. The future to which the author points Christians is one which has been transformed into a certainty and which has broken into the present. This irruption of the Kingdom of God into history took place in the life and death of Christ, the King. In Him, the future becomes partially present, eschatology is inaugurated. Though only partial it is real: the time of the End has arrived. The sermon (or series of sermons) known to us as the Epistle to the Hebrews, is addressed to those who must live victoriously in the present, sure of the future as a result of the past and because of Him who is the same yesterday, today and forever.

NOTES TO CHAPTER V

1. Two Sons. p.46.
2. D. Barthélemy. op.cit.p.134. Not all the fragments from Caves 4 - 11 have yet been published.
3. Stewart. op.cit.
4. C.K. Barrett in Studia Paulina. p.1-19.
5. Barton JBL. 57.p.158.
6. cf. JN.1:14. Rev.7:15, 12:12, 13:6, 21:3. Contemporary Jewish thought was different; Josephus and Philo thought that it showed the creation of the universe.
7. Heb. 9:4, Ex.30:6, I Kgs.6:22, II Bar.6:7 seem to contradict this, but the explanation of Westcott and others is that while the altar of incense stood in the outer Tabernacle, it is described as belonging to the Holy of Holies because it stood in the equivalent place in the Holy place to the Ark in the Holy of Holies. Thus it could be described as belonging to the latter. In the same way the Altar of Burnt Offering could be described as belonging to the Holy Place.
8. Heb. 9:4 following Westcott p.246, "golden altar of incense" omitting 'censer'.
9. Koester. HTR.55.p.299.
10. Westcott op.cit.p.14.
11. The first Tent is therefore almost synonymous with the Veil 9:8-14; it is that which obstructs entry into the Holy of Holies. Moffatt and some Fathers identify the veil in 10:20 with Christ's flesh. But Westcott and others take it to

refer to the road not the veil; the Way has been opened up by Christ's incarnation and death. It is right to include His death here since as Montefiore (p.173) points out "His flesh" in v.20 is to be taken as the correlate of the blood mentioned in verse 19.

12. C.H. Dodd. Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel CUP.1963 p.90f.. The variations in the context of the saying in the four gospels, suggest that it originally belonged to oral tradition. In Jn. it is not used at the trial. In Jn. and Mt. the Temple restored is the same as the one destroyed. In Mk. the restored Temple is a new one. In Mk. the intention to destroy the Temple is expressed; in Mt. he claims the power to destroy, but not the intention. In Jn.2:19 $\lambda\upsilon\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \nu\alpha\omicron\iota\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ is understood as the protasis of a conditional sentence with the imperative replacing the indicative. "If you destroy this Temple, I will raise ^{it} up..." It is therefore not a threat, but a promise.
13. D. Flusser op.cit.p.
14. M. Black. Christian Origins and the Scrolls. p.110.
15. Eg. F.F.Bruce, Dupont-Sommer, M. Black, G. Vermes.
16. As Heaton, Skinner, Hyatt, Koehler, Volz and T.H. Robinson maintain.
17. Mlle. Jaubert, La Date de la dernière Cène.
18. Hölmi-Nielson, Psalms from Qumran 1960.
19. NTS.9 p.229. IQM.ii 5-6.
^{Bruce,}
20. Jaubert. NTS. 7. 1960. p.17.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books used in part or fully in the preceding pages:

- Allegro. J.M. Further Messianic references in the Qumran literature. J.B.L. Vol.35. 1956.
- Anderson. H. Jesus and Christian Origins. Oxford. 1964.
- Baird. J.A. The Justice of God in the Teaching of Jesus. SCM. 1963.
- Barrett. C.K. "The Eschatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews" in the Background of the N.T. and its eschatology. pp. 363-393. Cambridge 1956.
- "Paul and the Pillar Apostles" in Studia Paulina. p. 1-19. 1953.
- Barth. M. Current Issues in N.T. Interpretation p.53ff. ed:Klassen W. & Synder G.F. Sem. 1962.
- Barton. J.A. J.B.L. Vol. 57. p.198.
- Barthélemy & Milik. Discoveries in the Judean Desert I (SCM) 1955.
- Black. M. Gospels and Scrolls - Studia Evangelica 1955.
- Scrolls and Christian Origins London 1961.
- Texte ^{und} Untersuchungen 63 1957.
- Baumgarten. J.M. HTR. 1953. Vol.46. p.141.
- Black's Dictionary of the Bible 1957. "Eschatology".
- Box. G.H. JTS. April 1912 p.328.
- Bristol. L.O. Primitive Christianity and Hebrews JBL. Vol. 68. 1949.

- Bruce. F.F. Biblical Exegesis in Qumran texts -
Tyndale 1960. NTS. Vol.9. 1963 pp.217-32.
"Hebrews" in the New Peake (ed. Black & Rowley).
- Burrows. M. More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls. London 1958.
- Cullmann. O. Significance of the Qumran Schrolls for N.T.
Study. JBL. 1955.
Christology of the N.T. SCM. 1959.
- Clements. R.E. Prophecy and Covenant SCM. 1965.
- Davidson. A.B. Hebrews. T. & T. Clarke. 1882. Covenant
and Angels in HBD.
- Davies. H. Article in Promise and Fulfilment (Essays presented
to S.H.Hooke.) T. & T. Clarke 1963 p.51-61.
- Davies. W.D. The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount.
Cambridge 1964.
The Torah in the new age and/or the age to come.
JBL. Monograph Series. Vol.7. 1952
- Dodd. C.H. Apostolic preaching and its development.
H. & S. 7th imp. 1951.
According to the Scriptures. Nisbet. 4th imp.1957.
- Driver. S.R. &
White. H.A. Day of Atonement - HDB
- Du Bose. W.P. Highpriesthood and Sacrifice. London 1908.
- Farrar. F.W. Hebrews CGT. 1888.
- Fitzmeyer. J.A. NTS. Vol. 7. 1960-1. pp. 297-334.
- Flew. N. Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology.
Oxford Univ. 1934.
- Flusser. D. Dead Sea Sect & Pre-Pauline Christianity -
Scripta Hierosolymitana p.217.
- Fuchs. E. Studies of the Historical Jesus. London 1964.

- Moffatt. J. Hebrews ICC. 1924.
- Montefiore. H.W. Epistle to the Hebrews. Black (Com.) 1964.
- Moule. C.F.D. Birth of the New Testament. Black 1962.
- Mowinckel. S. Psalms in Israel's Worship. Blackwell 1963.
- Nairne. A. Epistle of Priesthood. T. & T. Clarke. 1913.
- Narborough. F.D.V. Hebrews (Clarendon) 1930.
- Neill. W. Hebrews. SCM. 1955. (Torch.).
- Nielson. H. Psalms from Qumran. 1960.
- Perrin. N. Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus.
SCM. 1963.
- Rabin. C. Zadokite Document 1958. Oxford..
- Rawlinson. A.E.J. N.T. Doctrine of ^{the} Christ. 1920. Longmans & Green.
- Robinson. T.H. Epistle to Hebrews (Moffatt Series). London 1933.
- Roth. C. Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls.
1958. Blackwell.
- Rowley. H.H. BJRL. Vol.44, 1961-2. p.119-56.
"Melchizedek & Zadok" in Festschrift Bertholet.
pp.461-470. Tübingen. 1950.
- Russell. D.S. The Method & Message of the Jewish Apocalyptic.
SCM. 1964.
- Salmond. G.D.F. Eschatology. HDB.
- Schnackenburg. R. God's Rule and Kingdom. Nelson. 1963.
- Schrenk. G. TWNT. p.230-48.
- Scott. E.F. Epistle to the Hebrews. Clark. 1922.
- Simon. M. Stephen and Jerusalem Temple. JEH. Vol.11. 1951.
- Stendahl. K. Scrolls & N.T. London 1957.
School of Matthew. Lund. 1954.
- Stewart. R. Rabbinic Theology. Oliver & Boyd. 1961.

- Taylor. V. Atonement in the N.T. Teaching. Epworth 1954.
- Tasker. R.V.G. The Use of the O.T. in the New. London 1946.
- Vermes. G. Dead Sea Scrolls in English. Pelican 1962.
- Wernberg Møller F. Some reflections on Biblical material in the
Manual of Discipline. - Studia Theologia Vol.9.
- Westcott. B.F. Epistle to the Hebrews. London 1889.
- Wickham. E.C. "Hebrews" Westminster Comm. 1916.
- Wikenhauser. A. N.T. introduction. Herder 1956.
- Yadin. Y. Dead Sea Scrolls and Epistle to the Hebrews.
Scripta Hierosolymitana Vol.4. Jerusalem 1958.
Message of the Scrolls London. 1957.

I owe a great deal of the information regarding the Qumran sect to the lectures of Professor G.R.Driver at Oxford. Some of this material is now available in his book, The Judean Scrolls. (Blackwell. 1965.)

ABBREVIATIONS

In most cases the standard abbreviations are used.

IQ	Documents from Cave I.
IQH (DSH)	Hymns of Thanksgiving.
IQIsa.	Isaiah Scroll.
IQM. (DSW)	War Scroll.
IQpHab.	Commentary on Habakkuk.
IQp.Mic.	Commentary on Micah.
IQS. (DSD)	Community Rule.
IQsb.	Benedictions.
4Q.	Documents from the Fourth Cave.
4Q.Isa.	Commentary on Isa. 10-12.
4Qp. Nahun.	Commentary on Nahun.
4Qp.Ps.37.	Commentary on Ps.37.
4Q.Flor.	Collection of Messianic texts.
Z. (CD.or CDC.)	Damascus or Zadokite Document.