Tyndale Bulletin 72 (2021): 49-71
https://doi.org/10.53751/001c.32272
ISSN 2752-7042 (Online)
ISSN 0082-7118 (Print)
www.tyndalebulletin.org

'The True Tabernacle' of Hebrews 8:2

Future Dwelling with People or Heavenly Dwelling Place?

Nicholas J. Moore
Academic Dean and Lecturer in New Testament
Cranmer Hall, St John's College, Durham University
nicholas.j.moore@durham.ac.uk

Abstract

Many scholars hold that the Letter to the Hebrews portrays heaven as God's true tabernacle, the original from which the Mosaic tabernacle was derived. Recently Philip Church, building on work by Lincoln Hurst, has argued that the heavenly tabernacle instead represents God's eschatological dwelling with his people, and that the Mosaic tabernacle (and the temple that followed it) was a prior sketch and foreshadowing of this yet-future reality. They advance a number of important arguments which have not been systematically addressed by those who read the true tabernacle as primarily heavenly in a spatial and 'vertical' sense. This article examines and rebuts the arguments of Hurst and Church. First, the case for the 'eschatological dwelling' position is outlined; then I make two wider points regarding the cosmological presuppositions that underlie this view; next, the meaning of the key terminology in Hebrews 8–9, especially ὑπόδειγμα, is examined; finally, Hebrews' perspective on the heavenly tabernacle is articulated with an eye to both cosmology and eschatology. Only by integrating spatial and temporal categories can a satisfactory account of God's heavenly dwelling be offered.

1. Introduction[1]

Many Jewish apocalyptic texts associate heaven with a sanctuary, or envisage a celestial temple within heaven. An analogy between universe and temple is also drawn by some Graeco-Roman writers (e.g. Cicero, *De rep.* 6.15; Plutarch, *Tranq. an.* 20), a notion that is developed in a distinctively Jewish direction by Philo of Alexandria (e.g. *Spec. Laws* 1.66-67). Within the New Testament, the book of

1. I am grateful to Philip Church for his gracious feedback on this piece, and more widely for our interactions on Hebrews over a good number of years. Thanks are also due to Scott Mackie, who gave useful comments on an earlier draft, and likewise to the anonymous reviewers.

Revelation and the Letter to the Hebrews offer the most extended presentations of this idea. However, beyond the clear association of heaven with sanctuary in both texts, a number of questions remain contested: is the heavenly sanctuary symbolic of something else (such as the new age, the people of God), or does it have a more actual, spatial referent? When does it come into existence, and when and how is it inaugurated? And (in the case of Revelation especially) does it persist into the age to come?

Philip Church has recently made an extensive and detailed case that temple imagery in Hebrews relates to the eschatological dwelling of God with his people.[2] In the course of his argumentation, he builds on work by Lincoln Hurst in the 1980s and 1990s.[3] Hurst emphasises the linear, temporal aspect of the Jewish apocalyptic outlook in order to argue that the true tabernacle is an eschatological reality, built and inaugurated through the work of Christ, and still future from the perspective of God's people. Church pushes Hurst's case further by laying greater stress on the futurity of the true tabernacle even 'in these last days' (Heb 1:2) and downplaying its spatiality in favour of a symbolic reference to believers.

While the weight of scholarship continues to favour a spatialised reading of the heavenly sanctuary in Hebrews as an extant reality from at least the time of Moses,[4] the arguments of Church and Hurst pose a problem for this reading and have not been systematically addressed. This is the task this article will undertake. After outlining Church's and Hurst's arguments, I first make two wider points about conceptualisations of a heavenly sanctuary in the Second Temple period. I then engage in detail with the core semantic arguments regarding key terminology

2. Philip Church, '"The True Tent Which the Lord Has Pitched": Balaam's Oracles in Second Temple Judaism and in the Epistle to the Hebrews' in *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrews in Its Ancient Contexts*, ed. Richard Bauckham et al. (London: T&T Clark, 2008), 145–157; Philip Church, *Hebrews and the Temple: Attitudes to the Temple in Second Temple Judaism and in Hebrews*, NovTSup 171 (Leiden: Brill, 2017).

3. L. D. Hurst, 'How "Platonic" Are Heb 8:5 and Heb 9:23f?', *JTS* 34 (1983): 156–168, https://doi.org/10.1093/jts/34.1.156; L. D. Hurst, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: Its Background of Thought*, SNTSMS 65 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

4. See, e.g., Georg Gäbel, *Die Kulttheologie des Hebräerbriefes: Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Studie*, WUNT 2.212 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006); David M. Moffitt, *Atonement and the Logic of Resurrection in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, NovTSup 141 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 220–228; Jody A. Barnard, *The Mysticism of Hebrews: Exploring the Role of Jewish Apocalyptic Mysticism in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, WUNT 2.331 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 88–118; Nicholas J. Moore, *Repetition in Hebrews: Plurality and Singularity in the Letter to the Hebrews, Its Ancient Context, and the Early Church*, WUNT 2.388 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 149–157; Benjamin J. Ribbens, *Levitical Sacrifice and Heavenly Cult in Hebrews*, BZNW 222 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016), 82–148.

applied to the heavenly and earthly sanctuaries and their relationship to one another. Finally, I offer a constructive account of how both spatial and temporal aspects of Hebrews' cultic conceptuality can be integrated.

2. Church on Temple as Church

The overarching case that Church argues is that the temple in Hebrews 'is not a structure, either in heaven or on earth. Rather, it is a metaphor for the eschatological dwelling of God with his people.'[5] This future reality is accessible now in a proleptic fashion, with the believing community constituting an interim temple.[6] The key difference in Church's argument vis-à-vis Hurst's is that he specifies the nature of the eschatological temple as God dwelling with his people after Christ's return.[7] Hurst, by contrast, regards the heavenly sanctuary as built and inaugurated at and through the ministry of Christ, who is 'the first to enter the sanctuary of the new age', although 'from the Christian viewpoint' it is 'still future'.[8] Hurst envisages the true tabernacle in more spatial and realised terms than Church, but he still lays the emphasis on linear and temporal aspects of Jewish eschatology, and thus lays the foundation for Church's case. Several planks make up this argument.

---

5. Church, *Hebrews and the Temple*, 435, and *passim*. Church's book makes two other major contributions, which I cannot engage with here: a taxonomy of Second Temple period attitudes to the temple (pp. 25–266) and a sustained case that Hebrews offers a veiled critique of the still-standing Second Temple. In this latter regard it expands on Stephen Motyer, 'The Temple in Hebrews: Is It There?' in *Heaven on Earth: The Temple in Biblical Theology*, ed. T. Desmond Alexander and Simon J. Gathercole (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2004), 177–189; also Peter Walker, 'Jerusalem in Hebrews 13:9-14 and the Dating of the Epistle', *TynBul* 45 (1994): 39–71.

6. Though this notion is 'at best, muted': Church, *Hebrews and the Temple*, 88.

7. At the outset, Church states that the phrase 'eschatological dwelling' deliberately leaves open whether this is the *location* of God in the present and his people in the eschaton, or the 'eschatological reality' 'when God would ultimately dwell with his people'; *Hebrews and the Temple*, 1 n. 1. In his primarily ecclesiological reading, Church seems close to G. K. Beale, who certainly regards temple in Hebrews as future and appears to see it as conforming to his wider biblical–theological schema in which temple primarily denotes the growth of the church: *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*, NSBT 17 (Leicester: Apollos, 2004), 293–312. (Beale also identifies Christ with the tabernacle and the veil, pp. 300–301.) Yves Congar regards the church in Hebrews as 'not so much the sanctuary as the family', the house(hold) (Heb 3:1–6), with the heavenly sanctuary representing 'the spiritual place of perfect communion with the Father'. See *The Mystery of the Temple: The Manner of God's Presence to His Creatures from Genesis to the Apocalypse*, trans. Reginald F. Trevett (London: Burns & Oates, 1962), 173–175.

8. Hurst, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 42.

2.1 Hebrews' Eschatological Setting

Hebrews is a thoroughly eschatological document.[9] This tone is set from the exordium, which notes God's speech through his Son 'in these last days' (1:2), and is sustained throughout, not least in the unusual use of οἰκουμένη to mean 'inhabited *future* world' (2:5), which is subject to the Son as the first human being to be exalted. Moreover, Hebrews evinces the mainstream Christian view that we are now in the overlap of the ages, a permutation on classic Jewish two-age eschatology: the last days have begun (1:2), but the last day is still to come (10:25). While I fully concur with Hurst and Church in this assessment, it is important to note a longstanding reading of Hebrews as committed to a Platonist worldview.[10] These claims are usually tempered in more recent scholarship by a recognition of the fundamentally Jewish–Christian nature of the text, with scholars claiming at most that aspects of Hebrews' thought and argumentation are expressed or elucidated in Platonist terms.[11] This is, then, not a point of contention between us, but the spectre of Platonism does affect Hurst's and Church's arguments in ways that I will draw out below.

2.2 Linear Apocalyptic

For both scholars this eschatological focus is primarily if not exclusively what Hurst calls 'linear apocalyptic', that is, 'those streams of thought within apocalyptic which seem to stress actions posited on a horizontal time-line'.[12] A number of positive arguments are adduced in support of the future orientation of the heavenly temple in Hebrews. For Hurst, language pertaining to covenant inauguration in Hebrews 9:15-23, including καθαρίζω and ἁγιάζω, echoes

9. Church, *Hebrews and the Temple*, 274–310.

10. The classic statement is Ceslas Spicq's commentary *L'Épître aux Hébreux*, 2 vols, *Études bibliques* (Paris: Gabalda, 1952). Spicq changed his view dramatically in the light of the Dead Sea Scrolls; his position was also refuted at length by Ronald Williamson, *Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews*, ALGHJ 4 (Leiden: Brill, 1970). Note the more recent treatment of middle Platonist thought in Hebrews by Wilfried Eisele, *Ein unerschütterliches Reich: Die mittelplatonische Umformung des Parusiegedankens im Hebräerbrief*, BZNW 116 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003). For more recent assessments of background, see Kenneth L. Schenck, 'Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews: Ronald Williamson's Study after Thirty Years', *SPhiloA* 14 (2002): 112–135; Jody A. Barnard, 'Ronald Williamson and the Background of Hebrews', *ExpTim* 124 (2013): 469–479, https://doi.org/10.1177/0014524613478092.

11. This is largely the position of James W. Thompson, *The Beginnings of Christian Philosophy: The Epistle to the Hebrews*, CBQMS 13 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1982); see the subsequent essays collected in *Strangers on the Earth: Philosophy and Rhetoric in Hebrews* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2020).

12. Hurst, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 11.

inauguration and consecration language in LXX Exodus 29:36 and Leviticus 8:15 (cf. Hebrews' use of ἐγκαινίζω in 9:18; 10:20). The description of the earthly tabernacle as the 'first tent' (9:8) implies that the heavenly is a second, subsequent tent. And the manifestation of a future city (13:14; cf. 11:10,16) naturally entails a future temple as well, in common with a number of apocalyptic texts (e.g. 1 En. 90:29; 4 Ezra 10:25-27).[13] For Church, the language of the Lord setting up or pitching his tent (ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος, 8:2) echoes wording in Balaam's third oracle about Israel camping in the desert (their encampment is ὡσεὶ σκηναί ἃς ἔπηξεν κύριος, LXX Num 24:6, reading אהלים as 'tents', not a kind of plant), and thus implies that Hebrews envisages God's eschatological dwelling among his people analogously to that oracle.[14]

2.3 Alternative Readings of Spatial Elements

In keeping with the linear understanding of Hebrews' eschatology, an alternative reading is offered of aspects of its argument that are commonly viewed as spatial. I will summarise these in three groups.

2.3.1 Minor Examples

Church offers alternative interpretations of several terms that could be taken spatially. Jesus has not 'passed through the heavens' (διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς, 4:14, NRSV), but rather moves about (to minister) before God, reading διέρχομαι as 'going about' (cf. 1 Sam 2:30, 35) and οἱ οὐρανοί as God's dwelling place rather than the created heavens.[15] Jesus is not a minister located *within* the sanctuary (τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργός 8:2) but a minister *of* the sanctuary, that is, in connection with or pertaining to it.[16] The neuter plural substantive adjective τὰ ἐπουράνια (8:5; 9:23) is not a shorthand for 'the heavenly sanctuary' (inferring τὰ ἐπουράνια [ἅγια]), but stands for 'heavenly realities'.[17] Approach to God, as exhorted in 4:16 and 10:22, refers to prayer rather than heavenly ascent or any other form of motion, and 'indicates that the heavenly temple encompasses both heaven and earth'.[18]

2.3.2 Bicameral Sanctuary in Heaven

Church argues that it is difficult to identify a coherent notion of a spatial heavenly sanctuary in Hebrews. Two phrases are especially significant here. In 8:2 reference

13. Hurst, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 38–41.
14. Church, 'True Tent', 403–404.
15. Church, *Hebrews and the Temple*, 372–377.
16. Church, *Hebrews and the Temple*, 399.
17. Church, *Hebrews and the Temple*, 410.
18. Church, *Hebrews and the Temple*, 381.

is made to Jesus as a minister of the sanctuary *and* the true tent/tabernacle (τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργὸς καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς); the question is, is καί functioning here as an explicative or a copulative? Is the sanctuary glossed as the true tent, or are two spaces envisaged, with τὰ ἅγια referring to the inner chamber and ἡ σκηνή the outer?[19] A decision cannot be reached without reference to the second key passage, where it is stated that Christ entered the sanctuary (τὰ ἅγια) 'through the greater and more perfect tent' (διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς, 9:11-12). If διά is taken locally, this would imply a bicameral heavenly structure with an outer compartment (σκηνή) through which Christ entered the most holy place (τὰ ἅγια), a reading which would be consistent with seeing Christ as minister of both the most holy place and the true tent in 8:2. Church argues that Hebrews does not make anything of the bicameral structure's importance within the Day of Atonement rite, because the author 'is more interested in the relationship between the earthly and heavenly sanctuaries than the relationship between supposed inner and outer compartments of the heavenly sanctuary'.[20] If on the other hand the two terms are seen as synonymous, 8:2 would appear to reflect a single-chambered heavenly sanctuary, whereas 9:11-12 is more challenging to untangle spatially: how can Christ pass through the sanctuary in order to enter it? Church's solution is to take διά instrumentally, and to understand the greater and more perfect tent as a symbol of the new order, yielding the sense: '"by means of" the new order [...] Christ entered the heavenly realms'.[21] A unicameral structure violates the logic of 9:11-12, and a bicameral structure is inconsistent with the letter's interest in the ritual significance of the most holy place alone. These difficulties are avoided if the heavenly sanctuary is understood as the new order.

2.3.3 Key Lexical Terms

The most substantial plank in Hurst's and Church's wider case that Hebrews' temporal language has been misread as spatially orientated concerns the meaning of a number of key lexical terms, particularly ὑπόδειγμα, which describes the earthly sanctuary in 8:5 and 9:23. This is commonly translated 'copy', a term which is open to a Platonising interpretation of the earthly tabernacle as a

19. As, e.g., Harold Attridge holds in *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989), 218.

20. Church, *Hebrews and the Temple*, 403.

21. Church, *Hebrews and the Temple*, 420. Hurst is less confident that the referent of the greater and more perfect tent can be so easily fixed and regards this as one of several difficult passages upon which a firm interpretation cannot be built (*The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 27–28).

material instantiation of an eternal idea or archetype. Yet, as Hurst argues, this term nowhere in extant Greek literature means 'copy'; rather, it means a sample, an outline, an example, a pattern, a basis for something that comes later.[22] In 8:5, where with 'shadow' (σκιά), ὑπόδειγμα characterises the earthly sanctuary, Hurst thus regards it as introducing a forward-facing nuance, and Church renders the phrase 'a symbolic foreshadowing' (cf. the future-orientated use of σκιά in 10:1). Hebrews 9:23 is similarly rendered 'sketches of the heavenly things' in the NRSV, the translation committee having opted for 'sketch' instead of the RSV's 'copy' on the basis of Hurst's *JTS* article (as also in Heb 8:5). By a similar token, Hurst notes that ἀντίτυπος can be an original as well as a reproduction, and on the basis of the (inverse) temporal parallel in 1 Peter 3:21 he translates ἀντίτυπα in Hebrews 9:24 as 'a *prefiguration* of the true sanctuary'.[23]

In all, then, Hurst and Church present an impressive and multi-faceted case which requires a response if interpreters are to maintain that, for Hebrews, the heavenly tabernacle is a pre-existent, cosmological, spatial reality.

3. Sanctuary and Cosmos in the Second Temple Period

Before responding to the more detailed aspects of Hurst's and Church's arguments, two broader points about heaven and temple in the period need to be made.

3.1 Cosmological Dualism

First (in response to point 2.2 above), *cosmological or spatial dualism is as equally at home in Jewish apocalyptic literature as it is in Platonist thought*, albeit very differently conceived. This is reflected in the widely referenced definition of apocalyptic from the SBL working group, which describes apocalypse as a genre that discloses 'a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, *and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world*'.[24] Although Hurst and Church acknowledge the spatial features of many apocalyptic texts – with which they engage in substantial detail – overall, they downplay spatiality in regard to Hebrews.[25] In dealing with Hebrews, they tend to gloss

22. Hurst, 'How "Platonic"'; *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 13–19.

23. Hurst, 'How "Platonic"', 166.

24. John J. Collins, ed., *Apocalypse: Morphology of a Genre*, Semeia 14 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979), 9 (emphasis added).

25. E.g. Hurst, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 21 and in greater detail on pp. 30–33; he goes so far as to suggest that the vertical aspect may even be required by the overlap of the ages, but does not develop this point (p. 22). He regards Heb 8:5a and 10:1 as horizontal, and allows that horizontal and vertical intersect only in 8:5b (p. 24). Church mostly avoids

heavenly language in futurist terms,[26] and when they oppose a spatial reading they primarily have in view a Platonic dualism despite their admission that spatial dualism is equally at home in Jewish apocalypticism.[27] As intimated above, while I concur that Hebrews should be read primarily within a Jewish apocalyptic frame, I do not think that the spatial aspects either of apocalyptic more generally or of Hebrews in particular can be so easily disregarded, particularly in relation to the concept of a heavenly sanctuary. Apocalyptic dualism, moreover, would suggest a hierarchical not oppositional relation,[28] and thus avoids the potentially denigratory implications of a Platonist reading of Hebrews.

In terms of the OT material, it is important to allow that Exodus 25:40 and related verses need not – and in original context almost certainly did not – reflect belief in a heavenly temple. Rather, Moses is shown a *pattern* (תַּבְנִית, παράδειγμα/τύπος), a blueprint for the tabernacle he then went on to construct. Similarly, Ezekiel's vision of a sanctuary (Ezek 40–48) might but need not necessarily reflect an actual heavenly structure; it could be simply a vision of a sanctuary to be built in the future. Indeed, it is arguable that the conception of a heavenly temple is found nowhere in the OT.[29] This does not particularly affect my argument; what matters is that *by the Second Temple period*, belief in a heavenly temple was widespread. This conception, moreover, certainly has roots in OT and wider ancient Near East

---

referring to the heavenly sanctuary as a place but allows that this is appropriate with regard to Heb 9:11-14; Church, *Hebrews and the Temple*, 416 n. 211.

26. E.g. Hurst speaks of 'the inauguration of the new temple (and *hence* new age)' in *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 39 (emphasis original); for Church, in *Hebrews and the Temple*, 420, the '"greater and more perfect tent" symbolises the new order'.

27. E.g. Church describes the view he opposes as 'an eternal archetype' in *Hebrews and the Temple*, 1. Gareth Cockerill makes a similar move in opposing the sense 'copy' for ὑπόδειγμα on the basis that Heb 8:5 is not Philonic; *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), 359–362. Hurst (*The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 34–35) is highly critical of C. K. Barrett for smuggling in Platonic ideas in speaking of 'eternal archetypes' and 'philosophical language'; 'The Eschatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews' in *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology*, ed. W. D. Davies and David Daube (Cambridge: CUP, 1956), 363–393. My argument chimes with Barrett's, without the Platonist hostages to fortune.

28. These terms are from Edward Adams, 'The Cosmology of Hebrews' in *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrews in Its Ancient Contexts*, ed. Richard Bauckham et al. (London: T&T Clark, 2008), 122–139 at 134.

29. Though Jon Levenson begs to differ; see his reading of Gen 1–2, 1 Kgs 6–8, Isa 6, Pss 92–93, and Third Isaiah in 'The Temple and the World', *The Journal of Religion* 64 (1984): 275–298.

understandings of the whole earth or cosmos as a temple established by God or gods at creation.[30]

Wisdom of Solomon 9:8 describes the temple as a 'copy of the holy tent (μίμημα σκηνῆς ἁγίας) that you prepared from the beginning'. This clearly envisages a heavenly tabernacle which the earthly sanctuary mirrors; it also likely shows the influence of Platonist thought in its choice of the term μίμημα.[31] Yet we find similar belief in a heavenly temple, without the Platonist overtones, in the Prayer of Azariah ('Blessed are you in the temple of your holy glory, […] Blessed are you in the firmament of heaven', 1:31,34) and in b. Hagigah 12b where the temple is located in Zebul, the fourth of seven heavens. The Enochic literature witnesses to a similar idea, with a temple structure in heaven in both the Book of the Watchers (1 En. 14:8-24) and the Book of Parables (1 En. 71:5,8). The interrelation of heavenly temple with temporal schemas is variable. Sometimes it is said to have been built before or at creation (Wis 9:8; 2 Bar. 4:2-3; Gen. Rab. 1.4); sometimes simultaneous with the earthly tabernacle or temple (e.g. Pesiq. Rab. 5); sometimes at the eschaton (e.g. 1 En. 90:28-36).[32] Conceptions of an already extant heavenly temple can be further divided into two, according to whether the cult is envisaged as taking place now or awaiting future inauguration, which again might occur at the eschaton. In the former case, it is usually angels but also on occasion an exalted human who serves in heaven (e.g. 1 En. 39:5; 39:12–40:2; 47:1; Jub. 30:18; 31:14; Rev 7:11-12). In the latter case, the expectation is generally that the heavenly temple will be inaugurated at the same time as it is established or replicated on earth (2 Bar. 4:6; 4 Ezra 10:25-28,51-55). This distinction between the time of a heavenly sanctuary's creation and the time of its inauguration will be important below; for now, the point that a present, spatial, heavenly sanctuary was a widespread idea in Second Temple Jewish literature has been sufficiently demonstrated.

---

30. See, e.g., Marduk's cosmic temple constructed following his defeat of Tiamat, Enuma Elish 6.47–72; Ningirsu's temple reaching from the primordial ocean deep, Apsu, to the heights of heaven, Gudea cyl. A, 562–616. Compare the linguistic parallels between Gen 1–2 and the construction of the tabernacle in Exod 24–40.

31. Winston describes this term as 'a *vox Platonica*' in *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1979), 203–205. On the connections between Wis 9 and Heb see Gert J. Steyn, '"On Earth as It Is in Heaven …": The Heavenly Sanctuary Motif in Hebrews 8:5 and Its Textual Connection with the "Shadowy Copy" [ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ] of LXX Exodus 25:40', *HvTSt* 67 (2011): 1–6, https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v67i1.885, at 2.

32. Barnard critiques Hurst's overreliance on 1 En. 90; even in this text the new house is not necessarily *de novo*, with the Ethiopic reading that it was '"brought" in by the Lord'; *Mysticism of Hebrews*, 15.

3.2 Construals of Cosmic Sanctuaries

The second broader point (in response to 2.3.2, above) is that *apocalyptic texts display a spectrum of views on the relationship of heaven to temple, ranging from cosmos as temple to multi-chambered sanctuaries within heaven*. Hurst distinguishes between metaphorical and actual referents for a heavenly temple, and places cosmos and heaven in the former and Platonic archetype and eschatological sanctuary in the latter.[33] Yet this distinction introduces an unhelpful and anachronistic distinction between 'real' and 'applied' references to the temple. Many scholars have instead distinguished between Hellenistic 'temple as cosmos' and Jewish 'temple in heaven' understandings,[34] but this is an overly dichotomous approach. Instead, it is better to regard conceptualisations of the heaven–temple relationship as forming a spectrum, ranging from temple as cosmos (an idea which chimes with Hellenistic ideas, e.g. Plutarch, *Tranq. an.* 20, but which finds a distinctively Jewish expression in Josephus, e.g. *Ant.* 3.180-182, and Philo, e.g. *Spec. Laws* 1.66-67) through temple as co-extensive with heaven (whether a single heaven, as in the Aramaic Levi Document, or multiple heavens, 3 Bar 11-15; Ascen. Isa. 7-9; 2 Cor 12:2), to a temple structure within heaven (1 En. 14; 71:5, 8; Apoc. Ab. 25:3).[35] It is the last of these that Church targets, as noted above; yet this is only one possible construal of a heavenly sanctuary.

The distinction between temple as heaven and temple within heaven can be illustrated by comparing the detail of certain texts. In Enoch's vision in the Book of the Watchers (1 En. 1–36), he is borne up to heaven on the winds, sees a wall enclosing a house, and on entering the house he sees into (but cannot enter) a second, greater house in which God sits on a throne (1 En. 14:8-24). Despite some protestations that this does not precisely match the architecture of the Jerusalem temple,[36] it is a clear visionary representation of a bipartite temple structure

33. Hurst, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 24–25. For a similar taxonomy, see Kenneth L. Schenck, 'An Archaeology of Hebrews' Tabernacle Imagery' in *Hebrews in Contexts*, ed. Gabriella Gelardini and Harold W. Attridge, AGJU 91 (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 238–258 at 238–241.

34. E.g., Jonathan Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: OUP, 2006), 211–244; George W. MacRae, 'Heavenly Temple and Eschatology in the Letter to the Hebrews', *Semeia* 12 (1978): 179–199; Paul Ellingworth, 'Jesus and the Universe in Hebrews', *EvQ* 58 (1986): 337–350; Kenneth L. Schenck, *Cosmology and Eschatology in Hebrews: The Settings of the Sacrifice*, SNTSMS 143 (Cambridge: CUP, 2007), 151–154.

35. For a fuller presentation of this spectrum, with examples, see Nicholas J. Moore, 'Heaven and Temple in the Second Temple Period: A Taxonomy', *JSP* (forthcoming).

36. Church, *Hebrews and the Temple*, 154–156; Philip F. Esler, *God's Court and Courtiers in the Book of the Watchers: Re-Interpreting Heaven in 1 Enoch 1–36* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock,

within heaven.[37] The Testament of Levi, which is dependent upon the Enoch literature,[38] develops the notion of a heavenly sanctuary in two notable ways: the temple imagery is made explicit, and the sanctuary has become co-extensive with heaven – or rather, with the multiple heavens[39] – and the 'uppermost heaven' is God's dwelling place, 'the Holy of Holies' (T. Levi 3:4). The key point of note is that there are numerous cosmological permutations on the notion of a heavenly sanctuary, and if Hebrews is shown not to hold one of these – Church most frequently mentions a '(bicameral) structure in heaven' – this does not automatically rule out all the others.

4. The Tabernacle as Representation of Heavenly Reality

In assessing the 'eschatological dwelling' reading of heavenly temple in Hebrews, I have so far indicated my broad agreement with point 2.1 (Hebrews' eschatological setting) whilst setting a wider context within which 2.2 (linear apocalyptic) and 2.3.2 (bicameral sanctuary in heaven) are seen as but one among several possibilities within the Second Temple period. I will not directly address the specific readings outlined in 2.3.1 as these are not decisive in either direction but rather follow the wider construal of Hebrews' argument. This leaves the crucial lexical points in 2.3.3, to which we now turn.

4.1 The Meaning of ὑπόδειγμα

As noted above, Hurst makes a strong case that in extant Greek literature ὑπόδειγμα never means a copy of something that already exists, but rather an example after which something subsequent is to be patterned. His case was deemed sufficiently convincing for the NRSV and BDAG to drop 'copy' as a possible translation. In its meaning of example, model, or indication, it is synonymous with παράδειγμα, albeit much less common. This can be seen in Josephus, who uses the two terms interchangeably, but prefers παράδειγμα (twenty-two occurrences) to ὑπόδειγμα (six occurrences). In Philo, by contrast, while παράδειγμα can mean

2017), 109–135.

37. So Martha Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (Oxford: OUP, 1993), 14–16; George W. E. Nickelsburg, 'Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee', *JBL* 100 (1981): 580–581, https://doi.org/10.2307/3266120.

38. Nickelsburg, 'Enoch, Levi, and Peter', 588–589. For connections between T. Levi and Hebrews, see Steyn, 'Heavenly Sanctuary Motif', 2–3.

39. T. Levi has three heavens, an apparent development from the Aramaic Levi Document's single heaven, and some recensions further develop this into seven heavens. See Robert A. Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*, EJL 9 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 180–183.

simply example or model, it more often has its technical Platonic sense of ideal archetype on which material things are based; he thus uses παράδειγμα (eighty-eight occurrences) far more than ὑπόδειγμα (four occurrences). These terms are related to the cognate verbs δείκνυμι, ὑποδείκνυμι, and παραδείκνυμι, which all mean to show or indicate (παραδείκνυμι can also mean to compare).[40] The basic idea is that of indicating or demonstrating what something else is like, without prejudice to whether that thing already exists or will come about on the basis of the demonstration. Etymology and cognate terms can only take us so far, however, and the decisive factor is usage.

There are two reasons why the author of Hebrews was not able to use the term παράδειγμα in 8:5. First, the potential Platonic nuance of this term denoting an eternal, ideal archetype would be inappropriate as applied to the material tabernacle, whether or not Hebrews' author was seeking to promote a Platonist worldview. Secondly, and more significantly, παράδειγμα occurs twice in Exodus 25:9 to denote the *heavenly* pattern that Moses is shown, translating תַּבְנִית (*tavnit*) which is rendered τύπος just a little later in Exodus 25:40, the verse Hebrews cites immediately following in Hebrews 8:5b. To denote the *earthly* thing that corresponds to the τύπος, Hebrews cannot use its LXX synonym παράδειγμα, and therefore instead opts for ὑπόδειγμα.[41]

In ancient usage, it is not true to say that the broadly synonymous words ὑπόδειγμα and παράδειγμα can never denote the imitation of something that already exists. In the *Persian Wars* 2.86, Herodotus (fifth century BC) uses παράδειγμα in a description of Egyptian mummification practices:

> οὗτοι, ἐπεάν σφι κομισθῇ νεκρός, δεικνύουσι τοῖσι κομίσασι παραδείγματα νεκρῶν ξύλινα, τῇ γραφῇ μεμιμημένα

40. δείκνυμι can also mean 'portray, represent' (of artists; LSJ, s.v. δείκνυμι, A1), 'to point out, show, make known' (BDAG, s.v. δείκνυμι, 1); ὑποδείκνυμι means 'indicate, point out', 'show' (BDAG, s.v. ὑποδείκνυμι, 1, 2), and can also mean 'set a pattern or example' (LSJ, s.v. ὑποδείκνυμι, II.1); παραδείκνυμι often means 'exhibit (side by side)', hence 'compare', and can also like δείκνυμι mean 'represent' (of a painter; LSJ, s.v. παραδείκνυμι, 1, 3).

41. To be clear, this is not an argument that the author 'had to' use ὑπόδειγμα, but an explanation of why he could not have used παράδειγμα. So also David T. Runia, 'Ancient Philosophy and the New Testament: "Exemplar" as Example' in *Method and Meaning: Essays on New Testament Interpretation in Honor of Harold W. Attridge*, ed. Andrew B. MacGowan and Kent Richards, SBLRBS 67 (Atlanta: SBL, 2011), 347–361, at 358; see his full discussion of this terminology in Hebrews on pp. 354–359.

> These [the embalmers], when a dead body is brought to them, show the bringers wooden models of corpses, painted in exact imitation[42]

There are three such models, displaying the different embalming options (which, in a wonderfully contemporary – or perhaps timeless – echo, reflect the three pricing levels!). These παραδείγματα are models for how the corpse of the deceased will be embalmed, but they are themselves *modelled* on the embalmers' knowledge and experience of previous mummified corpses.[43] A later example comes from the *Placita Philosophorum* (in its present form third–fourth century AD and traditionally ascribed to Pseudo-Plutarch, but in fact constituting an abridgement of the first-century AD philosopher Aëtius, and thus contemporary with Hebrews and Philo). In a description of the doctrines of the philosophers on creation, Plato's teaching is described as follows:

> Πλάτων τὸν ὁρατὸν κόσμον γεγονέναι παράδειγμα τοῦ νοητοῦ κόσμου (2.6)[44]
> Plato, that the visible world was made as a representation of the ideal world

Again, the basic point regarding correspondence unites this instance with the predominant usage of παράδειγμα, while at the same time the direction is reversed: the visible world reflects and represents the intellectual realm which is ontologically prior to it.

Turning to ὑπόδειγμα, this is rare in the Greek Bible (five occurrences in the LXX and six in the NT, including the two that are relevant here), but generally means an example, usually of an ethical kind. It is found, however, in LXX Ezekiel 42:15, where the angel 'measured the ὑπόδειγμα of the house [i.e. the heavenly temple] from all around in order' (διεμέτρησεν τὸ ὑπόδειγμα τοῦ οἴκου κυκλόθεν ἐν διατάξει). Its precise meaning here is hard to determine, with a nuance along the lines of 'dimensions' making most sense in the context; it corresponds to

---

42. Text and translation from Herodotus, *The Persian Wars*, ed. A. D. Godley, 4 vols, LCL (London: Heinemann, 1920), 2.86.

43. The passage contains a further instance of the terminology in question here: once the mourners receive back the embalmed body, they 'make a hollow wooden figure [ξύλινον τύπον] like a man'; τύπος denotes the sarcophagus made after the likeness of the deceased, and is thus used differently from Exod 25:40/Heb 8:5, but notably the basic sense of correspondence holds for both τύπος and παράδειγμα.

44. See LSJ, s.v. παράδειγμα. There is a variant reading πρὸς παράδειγμα; see *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia*, ed. Gregorius N. Bernardakis (Leipzig: Teubner, 1893), accessed via www.perseus.tufts.edu. This reading either leaves the sense unaffected ('was made as/for a representation') or, if it is understood as 'with reference to the ideal world's pattern', makes the sentence more consistent with Platonist usage of παράδειγμα and should be considered the easier and therefore later reading.

nothing in the MT, which has וּמְדָדוֹ סָבִיב | סָבִיב (*umedado saviv saviv*) 'and he measured it all around'.[45] It is likely a further indication of the synonymous nature of ὑπόδειγμα and παράδειγμα, and as such can perhaps be connected with LXX Exodus 25:9, identifying Ezekiel's maximalist vision of a heavenly temple with what Moses saw. In this case, the notion of correspondence again comes to the fore, as does the flexibility of these terms which can imply spatial as well as temporal relations. Another occurrence of ὑπόδειγμα is more significant for the discussion here: Aquila uses it to translate Deuteronomy 4:17 and Ezekiel 8:10, rendering תַּבְנִית (*tavnit*) which in both cases denotes idols or idolatrous wall carvings as copies or representations of animals. This is quickly shrugged off by Hurst, who claims that Aquila prefers 'the notion of structure ("*pattern* – or *outline* – of any creature") to that of imitation ("*likeness* of any creature")' as found in the LXX (ὁμοίωμα, 4:17).[46] Yet this distinction does not carry conviction: as with Herodotus's wooden funeral models, these idols are an *imitation* or *representation* made on the basis of prior knowledge of actual animals; moreover, unlike in Herodotus, they are not simultaneously the basis for things that will come later. Thus within two generations of Hebrews we find the term ὑπόδειγμα with the sense of copy, image, or representation, a sense rooted in the more basic notion of correspondence – showing what something else is like – without reference to whether such correspondence is future, past, above, or below.

This argument demonstrates that the sense 'representation' – a pattern of something prior and not only of something subsequent – is a latent possible meaning for ὑπόδειγμα (as also for παράδειγμα) throughout Greek antiquity, even if rarely used. At this point context must be decisive, and we return to Hebrews 8:5:

> They [those who offer gifts according to the law] worship at a ὑπόδειγμα and σκία of the heavenly [things/sanctuary], just as [καθώς] Moses was instructed when he was about to complete the tabernacle: for it says, 'See that you make all things according to the pattern [τύπος] that was shown you on the mountain.'

The connection between v. 5a and v. 5b is either one of comparison (the more common meaning of καθώς) or of cause (so NRSV, '*for* Moses was warned …'): ὑπόδειγμα and σκία characterise the earthly sanctuary as bearing some kind of

45. James Thompson, who stresses Hebrews' Platonist connections (see n. 11 above), reckons that ὑπόδειγμα in Heb 8:5 is probably due to the influence of Ezek 42:15; *Hebrews*, Paideia (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 169.

46. Hurst, 'How "Platonic"', 159.

relation to something heavenly, *just as* or *because* Moses was told when completing the tabernacle to do so in accordance with a heavenly pattern. On either reading the second half of the verse illuminates the first, whether directly (a grounding clause) or analogously (comparison).[47] Yet Hurst declares that 'viii. 5a and viii. 5b should not be so easily run together, nor is it certain that the author centres his interest in Ex. xxv. 40 upon the "make according to" element of the verse'.[48] Behind the Exodus 25:40 quotation, Hurst discerns Ezekiel 40:2-4[49] and 42:15 (see above). There is no question that there are significant intertextual links between Ezekiel's heavenly temple vision and Exodus 25 (and indeed 25–40). But it is not clear that a *possible* Ezekiel allusion behind an *explicit* Exodus citation can establish a controlling temporal framework, particularly as the direction in Ezekiel runs from heavenly structure/vision to earthly temple whereas (on Hurst's reading) Hebrews has in view an earthly structure as pattern for a heavenly (= eschatological) temple. Indeed, if the author of Hebrews had had the Ezekiel 42:15 reference in mind, this would have ruled out use of ὑπόδειγμα to denote an *earthly* reality, just as Exodus 25:9 rules out using παράδειγμα in this sense.

Church also divides the two halves of the verse, but relates 5b to the tabernacle and 5a to the Second Temple (which he regards as still standing when Hebrews was written), on the basis of the present tense of the verb describing the Levitical priests' service (λατρεύουσιν). The present tense form need not be taken to entail present time reference (as witness Josephus, who describes sacrifices using the present *after* the fall of Jerusalem, e.g. *Ag. Ap.* 2.77,193-198), but more difficult for Church's reading is the abrupt switch from reference to tabernacle (σκηνή, 8:2) to temple (8:3 or 4 to 8:5a) and back to tabernacle (σκηνή, 8:5b). He reckons that Hebrews cites Exodus 25:40 'probably because there is no text referring to the divine design of either Solomon's temple or indeed the second temple'. This is a surprising claim, as it is directly contradicted by 1 Chronicles 28:19: 'All this, in writing at the LORD's direction, he [David] made clear to me [Solomon] – the plan [תַּבְנִית / παράδειγμα] of all the works' (NRSV).[50] I think it unlikely that the

47. Paul Ellingworth states that καθώς 'introduces scriptural support for an argument' in *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 407.

48. Hurst, 'How "Platonic"', 161.

49. Hurst sees the connection with Ezek 40:2–4 as *gezerah shawah* on the basis of shared vocabulary of ὄρος, δείκνυμι, and πάς. The same three terms occur in Deut 34:1 as Moses is shown the whole promised land from Mt Nebo, indicating that they can just as easily denote an extant reality (cf. Matt 4:8).

50. Church, *Hebrews and the Temple*, 405. He acknowledges 1 Chron 28:19 in n. 170 but does not address it.

temple is in view in Hebrews 8:5a, certainly not directly, but even if we were to allow that there is a temple reference this makes no difference to the wider point that Hebrews is making. The earthly sanctuary reflects heavenly realities *because* or *in the same way* as Moses constructed the tabernacle after a heavenly pattern. It is simply not possible to avoid a 'vertical' or spatial nuance to 8:5a, on its own terms or in connection with 8:5b.[51] Thus ὑπόδειγμα must bear the nuance of an imitation or representation of a heavenly reality.[52]

4.2 The Meaning of Other 'Correspondence' Terminology

The other lexical items mentioned in 2.3.3 can be dealt with more briefly. The term σκία generally denotes a shadow, a spatial image even if it can be deployed temporally. This appears to be the case in Hebrews 10:1, which describes the law as having a shadow of good things *that are coming*; even so, the directional nuance is determined by the context, and the same word in 8:5 functions spatially, as argued above. Indeed (to anticipate my argument in the final section below), even in 10:1 it is possible to envisage the good things as heavenly realities that are also eschatological, and that therefore cast their shadow downwards and thus before them.

Throughout Hebrews the neuter plural τὰ ἅγια denotes the sanctuary (or likely just its inner part, though that is not important at this stage). Given that the two instances of the neuter plural τὰ ἐπουράνια (8:5; 9:23) occur in the close context of (τὰ) ἅγια (8:2; 9:24), as also the one neuter plural instance of ἀληθινός (9:24; cf. the feminine singular attributive to σκηνή in 8:2), it is hard to envisage any other likely meaning for these terms than 'the heavenly *sanctuary*' and 'the true *sanctuary*'. The one possible exception is αὐτὰ τὰ ἐπουράνια (9:23), which could suggest that 'the heavenly *things* themselves' (rather than 'the heavenly sanctuary itself') need cleansing with greater sacrifices;[53] this might conceivably refer to cultic vessels instead of or as well as the sanctuary, a possibility made more likely by the inclusion of 'all things' in the instruction given to Moses (Heb

51. While he argues that Heb 8:5a is only horizontal, Hurst allows that 8:5b 'could be said to contain both the horizontal and the vertical mode', but he attempts to downplay the vertical by further defining it as existing '*in God's purposes*', 'within God' in *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 23–24. This appears to redefine the heavenly sphere as 'within God', against the more usual terminology in the period of God dwelling within heaven.

52. So also, e.g., Samuel Bénétreau, who states that ὑπόδειγμα 'désigne nécessairement [...] la copie, l'imitation'; *L'Épître aux Hébreux*, 2 vols, CEB (Vaux-sur-Seine: ÉDIFAC, 1988), 2.54.

53. For interpretation of this verse, see R. B. Jamieson, 'Hebrews 9.23: Cult Inauguration, Yom Kippur and the Cleansing of the Heavenly Tabernacle', *NTS* 62 (2016): 569–587, https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688516000199, and on τὰ ἐπουράνια esp. p. 579, n. 32.

8:5, apparently importing πάντα from Exod 25:9, cf. Philo, *Alleg. Interp.* 3.102, who also includes πάντα in his citation of Exod 25:40). This meaning may be equally likely in the context, but it does not change the spatial sense.

As for the term ἀντίτυπος which occurs in 9:24, this describes the earthly sanctuary ('made by hands') and its relation to 'the true sanctuary' (ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν), 'heaven itself' (αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν, 9:24). As a τύπος can be both a mark made by striking something and a pattern or model for something else, so also ἀντίτυπος most basically indicates a corresponding thing: 'The exemplar and the mould are *mutually* ἀντίτυποι, and the mould and the moulded object are similarly mutually ἀντίτυποι, so that the first and the final term are in a perfect mimetic relationship.'[54] Within Hebrews, this general sense is more narrowly specified by the occurrence of τύπος in 8:5, which yields a coherent relation: on the mountain Moses saw a τύπος, and he constructed the tabernacle as its ἀντίτυπος. The only other NT occurrence of this term is in 1 Peter 3:21, denoting baptism as corresponding to the Noachic flood, which is implicitly the τύπος. This usage is not, *pace* Hurst, the inverse of Hebrews 8–9: in both cases the type is chronologically prior to the antitype, even if the ontological priority of the heavenly type (in Hebrews) differs from that of the flood (in 1 Peter).[55]

In the way that Hebrews deploys all of these various terms, the same basic conceptualisation can be identified: correspondence between items, in this case the heavenly and earthly sanctuaries construed primarily in a spatial sense.[56] They are not seen only in this light, however. Temporal categories have their role to play, as I will demonstrate in the final section.

5. Heavenly Tabernacle, Inauguration, and People of God

Church's construal of the function of sanctuary in Hebrews is fundamentally linear and temporal. God instructs Moses as to how the tabernacle should be built. This is then constructed, and forms a model for the temple which is implicit

54. Richard J. Ounsworth, *Joshua Typology in the New Testament*, WUNT 2.328 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 39 (emphasis original); see his wider discussion of typology, pp. 32–40, 51–54.

55. Hurst, 'How "Platonic"', 165–167; see Jared C. Calaway, *The Sabbath and the Sanctuary: Access to God in the Letter to the Hebrews and its Priestly Context*, WUNT 2.349 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 106.

56. Steve Stanley demonstrates that παραβολή in Heb 9:9 fulfils a similar function, establishing an earth–heaven correspondence that is mutually informing; 'Hebrews 9:6–10: The "Parable" of the Tabernacle', *NovT* 37 (1995): 390–391, https://doi.org/10.1163/1568536952663140.

throughout Hebrews. The temple, however, is not the true dwelling place of God. This function has now passed to the church as an interim temple, and it will be finally and fully instantiated in the eschaton when God comes to dwell with his people. As I have argued, this reading downplays the spatial, cosmological features of Hebrews' argument, often by glossing them in temporal terms. Yet Hebrews does not function solely on a 'vertical', spatial schema: as signalled above, the thoroughly eschatological nature of the letter is a point on which I agree with Hurst and Church. It remains, then, to give an account of how the temporal and spatial aspects of Hebrews' sanctuary intersect.

Hebrews coheres with the widespread Second Temple conceptualisation of heaven as a sanctuary, as outlined above. This is a present reality, with Christ having entered 'heaven itself' as opposed to an earthly sanctuary (9:24). It is not just that his priesthood (8:4) and his sacrifice (9:12) are heavenly inasmuch as they pertain to or are associated with the heavenly realm in some underspecified way; rather, they are so because their setting is a heavenly sanctuary, a place in which he offered himself and currently ministers. Yet this sanctuary was not constituted or created at the point of Christ's offering. He enters a sanctuary that already exists. It is this pre-existent sanctuary that Moses was shown. Hebrews tends towards a maximalist view of this sanctuary: Moses made *all things* (πάντα, 8:5; cf. Exod 25:9; Philo, *Alleg. Interp.* 3.102) according to the pattern shown him.[57] Shortly after this, Hebrews goes on to note the furniture that existed in the earthly tabernacle (9:1-5), breaking off with the comment 'of these things we cannot speak now in detail' (9:5), which implies that given the opportunity the author could have spoken eloquently and at length about the tabernacle furniture.[58]

The structure of this sanctuary is harder to ascertain, but it seems most likely that it is unicameral, for the following reasons.[59] First, Hebrews' primary

57. On minimalist vs maximalist readings of the heavenly sanctuary and its contents as shown to Moses among the Rabbis, see Mary Rose D'Angelo, *Moses in the Letter to the Hebrews*, SBLDS 42 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979), 206–235. For a comparison of Hebrews' citation of Exod 25:40 with Philo and the LXX, see Steyn, 'Heavenly Sanctuary Motif', 3–5.

58. Georg Gäbel demonstrates the rhetorical device of *brevitas* is at play here, which underscores the importance of this description for Hebrews' wider argument; '"You Don't Have Permission to Access This Site": The Tabernacle Description in Hebrews 9:1-5 and Its Function in Context' in *Son, Sacrifice, and Great Shepherd: Studies on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, ed. David M. Moffitt and Eric F. Mason, WUNT 2.510 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020), 135–174, at 137–147.

59. This is contested. For two chambers see e.g. Attridge, *Hebrews*, 222–224; Barnard, *Mysticism of Hebrews*, 110–113. In a later work, Attridge is content to describe Hebrews' mapping of earthly sanctuary to cosmos as 'imprecise'; 'Temple, Tabernacle, Time, and Space in John and Hebrews', *EC* 1 (2010): 261–274, at 270, https://doi.org/10.1628/ec-

interest is in the most holy place (τὰ ἅγια), entered by Christ on the model of Yom Kippur, and the dividing function of the curtain no longer applies. Secondly, 'heaven itself' is contrasted typologically with 'a sanctuary made by hands' in 9:24 (here we have ἅγια without the article), just as Christ's location 'in the heavens' in 8:1 is immediately specified as his being a minister in the sanctuary in 8:2. Thirdly, 'the true tabernacle' in 8:2 is most likely epexegetical to 'the most holy place' (τὰ ἅγια), with the two terms highlighting different aspects of the heavenly sanctuary: Christ's entrance on the model of the Day of Atonement, and its equivalence to the tabernacle that Moses built (8:5). Something similar can be said of 9:11-12: Christ has come as high priest by means of the greater and more perfect tabernacle (9:11),[60] which is further explained as him entering the sanctuary by means of his own blood rather than that of bulls or goats (9:12).

Hebrews does not comment on when the heavenly sanctuary was built, although from other texts mentioned above we have an idea of the options. Given the connection of rest with the completion of creation in Hebrews 3–4 (via Gen 2:2), it is tempting to locate the construction of the heavenly sanctuary at this point as well, although this must remain speculative. Whenever it was built, the heavenly tabernacle is both ontologically and temporally prior to the earthly one, which Moses builds subsequently and on the model of the heavenly. This tabernacle was at the heart of God's people, in the midst of the camp, and gave them access to him. It pointed upwards and backwards to the true tabernacle, God's transcendent dwelling place, heaven itself. Yet it also pointed upwards *and forwards*, showing by its ritual and (supremely, for Hebrews) the Yom Kippur rite, what was to come in the ministry of Christ. In this respect, although I disagree with Hurst's exclusion of a vertical or prior nuance to ὑπόδειγμα, I endorse his translation 'sketch' because a sketch can be both a representation of something

2010-0004. For one chamber see e.g. Schenck, 'Archaeology', esp. 246–251. *Contra* Schenck, however, I do not regard this as metaphorical or as entailing a Hellenistic conceptualisation: heaven-as-temple is attested in Jewish apocalyptic literature (e.g. T. Levi 2-5; 3 Bar 11-17; T. Abr. 10-11) including a unicameral heaven-temple in the Aramaic Levi Document. Annang Asumang and Bill Domeris regard the heavenly sanctuary as unicameral, although their reading is more metaphorical–symbolic than mine: 'Ministering in the Tabernacle: Spatiality and the Christology of Hebrews', *Conspectus* 1 (2006): 17–18. Cockerill offers extended support for a reading along the lines I am advocating here in *Hebrews*, 352–357.

60. Here I take διά modally, in the sense that Christ can serve as high priest only by way of the sanctuary that corresponds to his office; see Schenck, 'Archaeology', 250–251. This is the spatial correlate of 8:4, that Christ is a priest only because he is in heaven/not on earth.

that already exists, *and at the same time* a plan for something that is yet to come,[61] much as an artist might produce a sketch when *in situ* in a landscape as an interim for painting a masterpiece in studio.[62]

The earthly tabernacle thus images heaven, showing what it is like (structurally), and also showing what it will be like (ritually) *once inaugurated by Christ as priest through his sacrifice*. This is the key further and final step which recognises and incorporates Hebrews' eschatology: it is in these last days that Christ has come as high priest, entered the sanctuary, and sat down. Both the new covenant and with it the entrance to the heavenly sanctuary are inaugurated by Christ (ἐγκαινίζω 9:18; 10:20; cf. related language of καθαρίζω and ἁγιάζω). Hurst overreads the inauguration of the heavenly sanctuary as entailing its simultaneous construction, whereas in fact inauguration constitutes a further step following a prior creation. It is, moreover, precisely this inauguration of the new covenant, and the heightened access it entails, that enables God's people to commune with and draw near to him (4:14-16; 10:19-25). Access is construed more along the lines of an open heaven from which believers will be heard than as the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in God's people. Although the latter model is not excluded, in Hebrews the Spirit is not presented as constituting the church – either individually or corporately, now or in future – as the temple of God. Indications of the transformation which will occur at the eschaton are hard to pin down, but Hebrews speaks of a coming city with foundations (11:10; 13:14) which will remain even after the eschatological shaking (12:26-28). Whether this represents a transfer to the heavenly realm or a unification of heaven and earth (as in Rev 21–22) is hard to say, but it is evidently a cultic space in which perfection through the blood of Jesus the new covenant mediator is fully available (Heb 12:23-24).

6. Conclusion

Both Lincoln Hurst and Philip Church have made significant contributions to scholarship on Hebrews. This article has engaged with them on one specific area of disagreement, within the context of an agreement on Hebrews' wider setting within Second Temple Jewish literature, and especially within an eschatological, apocalyptic frame. The argument that, for Hebrews, the 'true tabernacle' refers

61. Runia suggests 'exemplar' on the same grounds, as it 'can mean both a model for something else or a special example based on a model elsewhere'; '"Exemplar" as Example', 359.

62. The analogy is chosen advisedly: artistic representation is a possible sense for δείκνυμι and παραδείκνυμι.

to God's future dwelling with believers is based on overemphasising temporal aspects of the letter's argumentation at the expense of spatial aspects. The most significant arguments relate to specific terminology, above all the term ὑπόδειγμα. While Hurst shows that this is primarily used to denote a pattern for something that will arise later, he neglects the basic meaning of indicating what something else is like, and therefore the latent possibility that it could also signal something prior or above. This possible meaning is actualised in a few extant uses of ὑπόδειγμα and its synonym παράδειγμα, as I have demonstrated. The strongest piece of evidence for the 'eschatological dwelling' reading is therefore subject to the weakness that runs through the entire case: Church adopts Hurst's argument and pushes it further, and thus takes temporal and eschatological nuances to *exclude* spatial, cosmological ones. Yet to demonstrate the former is not to disprove the latter, and the argument of Hebrews integrates both. The tabernacle is indeed the model for the eschatological sanctuary, but it is so because it is based on the pre-existent heavenly sanctuary. Only in this way can it point forwards *and* upwards to the heavenly sanctuary as inaugurated and inhabited by the risen, ascended Christ. The true tabernacle, heaven itself, is opened by Jesus, whom believers now see within it (Heb 2:9; 12:2), and thus provides assurance and confidence (10:22) that through their high priest they have enduring access to the very dwelling place of God.

Bibliography

Adams, Edward. 'The Cosmology of Hebrews'. Pages 122–139 in *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrews in Its Ancient Contexts*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Trevor Hart, Nathan MacDonald, and Daniel Driver. London: T&T Clark, 2008.

Asumang, Annang and Bill Domeris. 'Ministering in the Tabernacle: Spatiality and the Christology of Hebrews'. *Conspectus* 1 (2006): 1–25.

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

———. 'Temple, Tabernacle, Time, and Space in John and Hebrews'. *EC* 1 (2010): 261–274. https://doi.org/10.1628/ec-2010-0004.

Barnard, Jody A. 'Ronald Williamson and the Background of Hebrews'. *ExpTim* 124 (2013): 469–479. https://doi.org/10.1177/0014524613478092.

———. *The Mysticism of Hebrews: Exploring the Role of Jewish Apocalyptic Mysticism in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. WUNT 2.331. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Barrett, C. K. 'The Eschatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews'. Pages 363–393 in *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology*. Edited by W. D. Davies and David Daube. Cambridge: CUP, 1956.

Beale, G. K. *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*. NSBT 17. Leicester: Apollos, 2004.

Bénétreau, Samuel. *L'Épître aux Hébreux*. 2 vols. CEB. Vaux-sur-Seine: ÉDIFAC, 1988.

Calaway, Jared C. *The Sabbath and the Sanctuary: Access to God in the Letter to the Hebrews and its Priestly Context*. WUNT 2.349. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

Church, Philip. '"The True Tent Which the Lord Has Pitched": Balaam's Oracles in Second Temple Judaism and in the Epistle to the Hebrews'. Pages 145–157 in *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrews in Its Ancient Contexts*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, Trevor Hart, Nathan MacDonald, and Daniel Driver. London: T&T Clark, 2008.

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

Cockerill, Gareth Lee. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.

Collins, John J., ed. *Apocalypse: Morphology of a Genre*. Semeia 14. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979.

Congar, Yves. *The Mystery of the Temple: The Manner of God's Presence to His Creatures from Genesis to the Apocalypse*. Translated by Reginald F. Trevett. London: Burns & Oates, 1962.

D'Angelo, Mary Rose. *Moses in the Letter to the Hebrews*. SBLDS 42. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979.

Eisele, Wilfried. *Ein unerschütterliches Reich: Die mittelplatonische Umformung des Parusiegedankens im Hebräerbrief*. BZNW 116. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003.

Ellingworth, Paul. 'Jesus and the Universe in Hebrews'. *EvQ* 58 (1986): 337–350.

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

Esler, Philip F. *God's Court and Courtiers in the Book of the Watchers: Re-Interpreting Heaven in 1 Enoch 1–36*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2017.

Gäbel, Georg. *Die Kulttheologie des Hebräerbriefes: Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Studie*. WUNT 2.212. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

———. '"You Don't Have Permission to Access This Site": The Tabernacle Description in Hebrews 9:1-5 and Its Function in Context'. Pages 135–174 in *Son, Sacrifice, and Great Shepherd: Studies on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Edited by David M. Moffitt and Eric F. Mason. WUNT 2.510. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020.

Herodotus. *The Persian Wars*. Edited by A. D. Godley. 4 vols. LCL. London: Heinemann, 1920.

Himmelfarb, Martha. *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. Oxford: OUP, 1993.

Hurst, L. D. 'How "Platonic" Are Heb 8:5 and Heb 9:23f?' *JTS* 34 (1983): 156–168. https://doi.org/10.1093/jts/34.1.156.

———. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: Its Background of Thought*. SNTSMS 65. Cambridge: CUP, 1990.

Jamieson, R. B. 'Hebrews 9.23: Cult Inauguration, Yom Kippur and the Cleansing of the Heavenly Tabernacle'. *NTS* 62 (2016): 569–587. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688516000199.

Klawans, Jonathan. *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: OUP, 2006.

Kugler, Robert A. *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*. EJL 9. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.

Levenson, Jon D. 'The Temple and the World'. *The Journal of Religion* 64 (1984): 275–298.

MacRae, George W. 'Heavenly Temple and Eschatology in the Letter to the Hebrews'. *Semeia* 12 (1978): 179–199.

Moffitt, David M. *Atonement and the Logic of Resurrection in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. NovTSup 141. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Moore, Nicholas J. *Repetition in Hebrews: Plurality and Singularity in the Letter to the Hebrews, Its Ancient Context, and the Early Church*. WUNT 2.388. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.

———. 'Heaven and Temple in the Second Temple Period: A Taxonomy'. *JSP* (forthcoming).

Motyer, Stephen. 'The Temple in Hebrews: Is It There?' Pages 177–189 in *Heaven on Earth: The Temple in Biblical Theology*. Edited by T. Desmond Alexander and Simon J. Gathercole. Carlisle: Paternoster, 2004.

Nickelsburg, George W. E. 'Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee'. *JBL* 100 (1981): 575–600. https://doi.org/10.2307/3266120.

Ounsworth, Richard J. *Joshua Typology in the New Testament*. WUNT 2.328. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Ribbens, Benjamin J. *Levitical Sacrifice and Heavenly Cult in Hebrews*. BZNW 222. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016.

Runia, David T. 'Ancient Philosophy and the New Testament: "Exemplar" as Example'. Pages 347–361 in *Method and Meaning: Essays on New Testament Interpretation in Honor of Harold W. Attridge*. Edited by Andrew B. MacGowan and Kent Richards. SBLRBS 67. Atlanta: SBL, 2011.

Schenck, Kenneth L. 'Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews: Ronald Williamson's Study after Thirty Years'. SPhiloA 14 (2002): 112–135.

———. *Cosmology and Eschatology in Hebrews: The Settings of the Sacrifice*. SNTSMS 143. Cambridge: CUP, 2007.

———. 'An Archaeology of Hebrews' Tabernacle Imagery'. Pages 238–258 in *Hebrews in Contexts*. Edited by Gabriella Gelardini and Harold W. Attridge. AGJU 91. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Spicq, Ceslas. *L'Épître aux Hébreux*. 2 vols. Études bibliques. Paris: Gabalda, 1952.

Stanley, Steve. 'Hebrews 9:6-10: The "Parable" of the Tabernacle'. *NovT* 37 (1995): 385–399. https://doi.org/10.1163/1568536952663140.

Steyn, Gert J. '"On Earth as It Is in Heaven …": The Heavenly Sanctuary Motif in Hebrews 8:5 and Its Textual Connection with the "Shadowy Copy" [ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ] of LXX Exodus 25:40'. *HvTSt* 67 (2011): 1–6. https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v67i1.885.

Thompson, James W. *The Beginnings of Christian Philosophy: The Epistle to the Hebrews*. CBQMS 13. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1982.

———. *Hebrews*. Paideia. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.

———. *Strangers on the Earth: Philosophy and Rhetoric in Hebrews*. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2020.

Walker, Peter. 'Jerusalem in Hebrews 13:9-14 and the Dating of the Epistle'. *TynBul* 45 (1994): 39–71.

Williamson, Ronald. *Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews*. ALGHJ 4. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

Winston, David. *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1979.