JARED C. CALAWAY

The Sabbath and the Sanctuary

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 349

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

349

Jared C. Calaway

The Sabbath and the Sanctuary

Access to God in the Letter to the Hebrews and its Priestly Context

Mohr Siebeck

Jared C. Calaway, born 1980; 2003 BA from Illinois Wesleyan University; 2005 MA, 2007 M. Phil and 2010 PhD from Columbia University in New York City; since 2010 visiting assistant professor of Religion at Illinois Wesleyan University in Bloomington, Illinois.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-152371-7
ISBN 978-3-16-152365-6
ISSN 0340-9570 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at *http://dnb.dnb.de*.

The book was printed by Laupp & Göbel in Nehren on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

For Stacy

Preface

The following study is a substantially revised version of dissertation research defended at Columba University in the summer of 2010. I had originally suggested the ideas of the relationships between sacred space and sacred time, between the sanctuary and the Sabbath in Hebrews and in other ancient Jewish and Christian documents in the fall of 2007. It is, however, difficult to look back at those original shadowy sketches and believe that this monograph is the same project due to the many transformations it is has undergone.

For such transformations, I have benefited from several conversation partners at different stages of this project. In the earliest stages at Columbia University, I had the benefit of input from Adam Gregerman and Asha Moorthy, as well as several faculty mentors, especially the members of my dissertation committee: the late Alan Segal, Celia Deutsch, David Carr, Gareth Williams, and Robert Somerville. Each of these gave valuable input in their various areas of expertise that have vastly improved this project and helped me from falling into silly mistakes. Alan, Celia, and David saw multiple stages of this project. David has been a source of intellectual encouragement, especially regarding my interpretations of passages in the Hebrew Bible. Celia has patiently read and offered critical advice on many drafts of the entire manuscript. Sadly, Alan, who was my dissertation advisor and with whom I have had so many conversations about this project at many stages of development, passed away in February 2011, and was unable to see this project in its current, more mature form. Although this project does not directly interact with any of his work, his influence can be found diffused throughout. May he enter his Sabbath rest.

This monograph would not be the same without the institutional support of my colleagues in the Department of Religion at Illinois Wesleyan University – Kevin Sullivan, Carol Myscofski, Tao Jin, and Bob Erlewine – and the office coordinator for Multi-Programs, Regina Linsalata. I have had the benefit of having a fellow Bible scholar, Kevin, as my chair. He has been helpful in multiple ways, from bouncing ideas off each other on particular exegeses and thinking about broad organizational and structural issues of the book to thinking about strategies for publication. I would also like to thank the Donald T. Olson Endowment for the Department of Religion Enrichment Fund helping me find money to help defray publishing costs.

I would especially like to thank April DeConick of Rice University, who has been instrumental in getting this monograph to see the light of day. If Alan Segal is my *Doktorvater*, then she could claim to be my *Doktormutter*. She originally inspired me to decide to become a scholar of ancient religion. With regard to this project, she has offered several critiques and helpful suggestions in terms of my argumentation, organization of material, and my concluding thoughts. I would further like to thank her and Carey Newman of Baylor University Press, who believed this project was important and placed my manuscript in the right hands at Mohr Siebeck.

At Mohr Siebeck, I would like to thank Henning Ziebritzki and Jörg Frey for considering the manuscript and ultimately accepting it for publication in the WUNT II series. I would also like to thank my anonymous readers for their careful reading and insightful suggestions, which have greatly improved this monograph. Several others at Mohr Siebeck, many unknown to me, have had a hand in making this book. I would especially like to single out Dominika Zgolik, who has been indispensable in transforming the rough manuscript into its current, polished formatting. Finally, Kellyann Falkenberg-Wolfe of Hiraeth Indexing has been an amazing copyeditor and has compiled for me an admirable index.

I finally would like to thank my family. Firstly, I want to thank my paternal grandmother, Ethel Corinne Calaway, and my maternal grandfather, Kenneth Cannon Wallace, who entered their final Sabbath rest before I went off to graduate school, but who would have been interested in this project. Their memory and their interest in the Bible and traveling have been sources of inspiration for me. My grandmother, Gertrude Anne Wallace, my sister and brother-in-law, Jaynanne and Ron Calaway-Habeck, and my parents, A. Gerald and R. Jane Calaway, have been continual sources of love and emotional support. My niece, Rebekah Jean Calaway-Habeck has been a new source of joy in the family. Finally, I met my wife, Stacy Camacho, just after I proposed this project in 2007, I married her just after I defended my dissertation in 2010, and now as I have transformed this project into a book we are marking a new stage in our life together. To thank her for her love, patience, understanding, and for the joy that she brings to my life, I have dedicated this book to her.

All of these dialogues with friends, family, and colleagues have improved this project through their intellectual, financial, and emotional support. The errata that remain are my own. For everything else, "what I have written, I have written."

Jared C. Calaway
29 May 2013
Bloomington, Illinois

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction: Accessing God through the Intersections of Sacred Space and Sacred Time in the Letter to the Hebrews and Its Priestly Context

1.1 Introduction

Who can approach the sacred and enter the divine presence? How is the sacred, and the divine presence within it, created, maintained, and accessed? For ancient Jews and early Christians, few traditional institutions illustrate the approach to the sacred as the dynamic entwinements of sacred space and sacred time in the priestly treatments of the Sabbath and the sanctuary. From the Hebrew Bible through late Second Temple Judaism, the sanctity of the sanctuary could be experienced through the Sabbath; sacred time provided the temporal access to sacred space.

This priestly framework had social consequences. Throughout the first century C.E., emergent Christians and Jewish priests contested who could mediate the access to the sacred. This debate originated at the earliest stages of the Jesus movement, but intensified in the convulsions during and surrounding the Jewish War (c. 60–75 C.E.), reaching new peaks in its aftermath (c. 75–115 C.E.) when questions of how the sacred could be accessed became more urgent.[1]

The Letter to the Hebrews joined this debate by appropriating and countering traditional priestly frameworks of sacred access, originating in the Hebrew Bible, that aligned the Sabbath with the sanctuary, and it did so in ways similar to its contemporary Jewish priestly accounts, most notably the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*. Through the tropes of Sabbath rest and the heavenly homeland, the heavenly tabernacle and the coming age, and the heavenly priesthood, Hebrews turned this priestly framework on its head. It deftly layered spatial and temporal dimensions upon both the Sabbath and the tabernacle; the Sabbath acquired spatial characteristics as the tabernacle gained temporal ones, collapsing sacred space and sacred time into a singular heavenly

[1] As discussed below, while 70 C.E. has typically been a benchmark year for dating Hebrews, it has led to an impasse. Instead, the focal point should be whether or not Hebrews was written during a state of upheaval surrounding the Jewish War (which includes the years before and just after 70), or in the wake of that upheaval.

reality denoting proximity to God's presence. Instead of entering God's sacred and heavenly sanctuary through the weekly Sabbath, as among its contemporaries, in Hebrews one only experiences the heavenly realities of Sabbath rest and the tabernacle through faithfulness and obedience to Jesus, who, in turn, is the faithful and obedient heavenly high priest who purifies, sanctifies, and perfects his followers. While picking up on earlier conflicts and contacts between priestly authorities and the Jesus movement, Hebrews most resembles postwar layers of the Christian tradition that implicitly or explicitly state that Jesus – not an earthly structure and its priestly attendants – provided access to the divine. None could enter God's holy and heavenly reality "apart from us" (Heb 11:4).

1.2 Trajectories of Research in Hebrews

Hebrews, with its excellent command of Greek and its fluid prose, interweaves several themes. Researchers have investigated the letter's distinctive Christology, which portrays Jesus as Son and as high priest after the order of Melchizedek, with its attendant cultic terminology;[2] its use of figures from the Hebrew Bible, such as Abraham, Isaac, and Moses as prototypes for Jesus' followers to emulate and for Jesus to fulfill and surpass;[3] its hermeneutical strategies and interpretations of particular parts of the LXX;[4] Sabbath-rest;

[2] The most extensive recent discussion is Georg Gäbel, *Die Kulttheologie des Hebräerbriefes: Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichliche Studie* (WUNT II 212; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006) about which see chapter 5 below; Harold W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989), 25–27, 97ff; Craig R. Koester, *Hebrews: A New Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 104–10; Barnabas Lindars, SSF, *The Theology of the Letter to the Hebrews* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); John Dunnill, *Covenant and Sacrifice in the Letter to the Hebrews* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992) moves in a new direction by building upon structuralist cultural anthropology. For a more recent discussion, see Thomas Södig, "'Hoherpriester nach der Ordnung des Melchisedek' (Hebr 5,10): Zur Christologie des Hebräerbriefes," in *Ausharren in der Verheißung: Studien zum Hebräerbrief* (ed. Rainer Kampling; Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 204; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2005), 63–110. For the ways in which Hebrews relates to other early Christian attitudes toward cult, see Knut Backhaus, "Kult und Kreuz: Zur frühchristlichen Dynamik ihrer theologishcen Beziehung," in *Der Sprechende Gott*: *Gesammelte Studien zum Hebräerbrief* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 239–61.

[3] Pamela Michelle Eisenbaum, *The Jewish Heroes of Christian History: Hebrews 11 in Literary Context* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997); James Swetnam, *Jesus and Isaac: A Study of the Epistle to the Hebrews in Light of the Aqedah* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1981); Mary Rose D'Angelo, *Moses in the Letter to the Hebrews* (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1979).

[4] Ceslas Spicq, *L'épître aux Hébreux* (2 vols; Paris: Gabalda, 1952–53), 1:330–50; Attridge, *Hebrews*, 22–25; David A. DeSilva, *Perseverance in Gratitude: A Socio-Rhetorical*

and a developed sense of a heavenly tabernacle (and heavenly Jerusalem), of which the earthly sanctuary was a shadow.[5] These and many more themes, skillfully woven within exhortative rhetoric and paranetic passages, develop interrelated threads, and, as such, there can be no single key to unlock the door of understanding for this sophisticated text.[6]

Most scholars recognize the need to consider how Hebrews creatively combines multiple strands (Jewish, emergent Christian, Hellenistic, and Roman), while focusing on a particular Jewish, emergent Christian, or Roman context.[7] One example is the relationship between Hebrews and Platonic or

---

Commentary on the Epistle "to the Hebrews" (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2000), 32ff; Koester, *Hebrews*, 115–18; in general, see Graham Hughes, *Hebrews and Hermeneutics: The Epistle to the Hebrews as a New Testament Example of Biblical Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979). This literature is massive, but perhaps most significantly, see David M. Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1989). See also Beate Kowalski, "Die Rezeption alttestamentlicher Theologie im Hebräerbrief," in *Ausharren in der Verheißung*, 35–62, who divides the reception and interpretation of the LXX in Hebrews between what text, text-types, or variations thereon Hebrews used and then how Hebrews understood that text.

[5] For bibliography, see discussion below (§ 1.4.1)

[6] One area of research has been the rhetorical elements of Hebrews; see Lawrence Wills, "The Form of the Sermon in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity," *HTR* 77 (1984): 277–99. See also C. Clifton Black, II, "The Rhetorical Form of the Hellenistic Jewish and Early Christian Sermon: A Response to Lawrence Wills," *HTR* 81/1 (1988): 1–18; Harold W. Attridge, "Paraenesis in a Homily (λόγος παρακλήσεως): The Possible Location of, and Socialization in, the 'Epistle to the Hebrews,'" *Semeia* 50 (1990): 211–26; Attridge, *Hebrews*, 20–21, for a summary of all of its rhetorical strategies; DeSilva, *Perseverance in Gratitude*, 33–71, who extends the rhetorical analysis to a socio-rhetorical analysis, building upon the work of Vernon Robbins; Koester, *Hebrews*, 87–96. Koester also notes rhetorical elements scattered throughout his commentary. For a nice summary of the scholarship on the rhetoric of Hebrews, see Hermut Löhr, "Reflections of Rhetorical Terminology in Hebrews," in *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods – New Insights* (ed. Gabriella Gelardini; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 199–201. For a list of all of the different types of exhortations and warning passages throughout Hebrews, see Hermut Löhr, *Umkehr und Sünde im Hebräerbrief* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994), 69–133. For the work's preference for speech and orality rather than "writtenness" see Gräßer, *An Die Hebräer* (3 vols; Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament; Zurick: Benziger, 1990–1997), 1:15–16. Gabriella Gelardini's monograph (*"Verhärtet eure Herzen nicht": Der Hebäer, eine Synagogenhomilie zu* Tischa be-Aw [Leiden: Brill, 2007]) further looks at rhetorical features and patterns of biblical quotations and allusions in order to place Hebrews within the Sitz im Leben of an ancient synagogue homily – specifically a *petichta* – for the Ninth of Av in the Palestinian Triennial cycle; see furthermore her English article summarizing her arguments, "Hebrews, an Ancient Synagogue Homily for Tisha be-Av: Its Function, Its Basis, Its Theological Interpretation," in *Contemporary Methods – New Insights*, 107–127.

[7] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 29–30; L. D. Hurst, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: Its Background and Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 132; Kenneth L. Schenck, *Cosmology and Eschatology in Hebrews: The Settings of Sacrifice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 2–3. Knut Backhaus repeatedly emphasizes that the background to He-

Philonic thought due to occasional use of allegory, Platonic terminology, the broader two-tiered spatial cosmology and, perhaps more convincingly, ontology.[8] The author does use Platonic language, but in un-Platonic ways (§ 4.2.2).[9] With the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls and increased interest in Jewish apocalyptic literature, scholars realized that this two-tiered cosmology was a prominent feature of such literature. C. K. Barrett argued for the letter's apocalyptic attitude, combined with Platonic frameworks, most robustly, and now there is widespread acknowledgment of it.[10] Hebrews divides time

---

brews is "vielfältig"; see, e.g., his "Der Hebräerbrief: Potential und Profil: Eine Hinführung," in *Die Sprechende Gott: Gesammelte Studien zum Hebräerbrief* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 8ff. Hans-Friedrich Weiß (*Der Brief an die Hebräer* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991], 114) notes the complexity of the synthesis of multiple strands of Hellenistic Jewish, gnostic and Platonic, and apocalyptic elements in Hebrews. Perhaps most helpful in this regard are the comments on social interactions (rather than literary influences) noted by Koester, *Hebrews*, 56, 58. He writes, "rather than positing trajectories of theological development, Hebrews invites us to think about the complex ways in which Christians with somewhat different points of view related to each other at a given time and place" (58). This, indeed, also applies to other Greco-Roman and Jewish interactions with Hebrews.

[8] This is an old observation, originating in 1644 by Grotius, but most vigorously argued by Spicq, *L'épître aux Hébreux* 1:39–91; see further L.K.K. Dey, *The Intermediary World and Patterns of Perfection in Philo and Hebrews* (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1975). More recently, Luke Timothy Johnson (*Hebrews: A Commentary* [New Testament Library; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006], 17–21) repeatedly emphasizes the Platonic framework in his commentary, not just in terms of a two-tiered cosmology, but mirrored in its ontology. Knut Backhaus generally presumes a Platonic background; see especially his "Per Christum im Deum: Zur theozentrischen Funktion der Christologie im Hebräerbrief," in *Der Sprechende Gott*, 49–75. Erich Gräßer draws attention to the ontological significance of terminology and conceptual frameworks in Hebrews that he believes ultimately derives from Platonic, Philonic, and even gnostic backgrounds, though this reader finds the last of these most unlikely. One should note the tendency, especially among select German scholars (such as Ernst Käsemann, Gerd Theißen, and Erich Gräßer), to discuss Philo as proto-gnostic in order to provide a broader gnostic background to Hebrews.

[9] R. Williamson, *Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Leiden: Brill, 1970); and Hurst, *Hebrews*, 7–42.

[10] C. K. Barrett, "The Eschatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews," in *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology* (ed. W.D. Davies and D. Daube; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964), 363–93. He organized the evidence in three parts: rest, faith and the heavenly city, and the heavenly temple, connecting them via an underlying eschatology; they are all "partly fulfilled and partly forward-looking" (384). He ultimately reads Hebrews dually: from one perspective, Platonic archetypes, and from another, eschatological events. This combination of Platonic and apocalyptic elements has become commonplace. E.g., George W. MacRae ("Heavenly Temple and Eschatology in the Letter to the Hebrews," *Semeia* 12 [1978]: 179–99) tried to maintain both apocalyptic and Platonic elements by postulating a Platonic author meeting an apocalyptically oriented audience halfway. Attridge (*Hebrews*, 223–24) recognizes an intersection of earthly-heavenly and old-new, seeing it as a combination of Philonic (or at least shared Hellenistic spatial conceptions) that have been Christianized in the Jewish apocalyptic with an emphasis on new-old, and argues that

into two ages, where access to the heavenly sanctuary is part of the age to come (2:5; 6:5); thus, the audience needs to be ready "in these last days" (1:2) for the approaching Day (see 10:24–25; see also 12:26–27).[11] There is likely some acquaintance with Platonic or even Philonic thought,[12] but it is passing.[13]

While a renewed interest in ancient Jewish apocalyptic literature, partly spurred by the discoveries of the Dead Sea Scrolls, has led to a greater general acceptance of the eschatological and Jewish apocalyptic elements in Hebrews, interest in the Qumran materials themselves has waned in the study of Hebrews. Beginning with a study by Yigael Yadin, there was an initial attempt

---

one should not try to subordinate one to the other. DeSilva (*Perseverance in Gratitude*, 9) notes that the letter has Platonic language in an apocalyptic framework. Koester, *Hebrews*, 98, notes that it operates with both, but fully fits neither. Gräßer, throughout his commentary, while suggesting a stronger Platonic/Philonic background than many, nonetheless indicates that the choice between apocalyptic/eschatological and Platonic is a false one. See also Johnson (*Hebrews*, 17–21), who argues that Hebrews was more familiar with Platonism, and generally has a Platonic worldview, but that the letter reworked this worldview in fundamental ways, by valuing temporality and appreciating Jesus' physical body. He writes that "Hebrews can be said to turn Platonism on its side" (20). Weiß (*Der Brief an die Hebräer*, 96–114) gives an overview of various positions on the Platonic-apocalyptic spectrum, categorizing them as Hellenistic-Jewish, gnostic, and apocalyptic. Wilfried Eisele (*Ein unerschütterliches Reich: Die mittelplatonische Umformung des Parusiegedankens im Hebräerbrief* [Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003]), responding to this tripartite division by Weiß, has extensively argued for a robust Middle Platonic framework in Hebrews yet with an eschatological orientation, focusing on the "Parousia" passages (Heb 1:6; 9:28; 10:25, 36–39, and 12:25–29) and drawing in evidence not only from Philo, but also from Plutarch, Seneca, and Alcinous. See further Gäbel (*Die Kulttheologie des Hebräerbriefes*, 3–16) who also recreates Weiß's general model, but comes down decisively on the apocalyptic side. Schenck, *Cosmology and Eschatology*, throughout strikes an exegetical balance.

[11] Hurst, *Hebrews*, 131–33. His monograph investigates various potential backgrounds for the thought-world of Hebrews, and submits those backgrounds to critique, but, tellingly, never does so for the apocalyptic perspective, which he prefers. See also comments by Attridge, *Hebrews*, 27n211 and 28n220; Desilva, *Perseverance in Gratitude*, 27–32.

[12] There is a particular citation pattern that could demonstrate that Hebrews had acquaintance with Philonic thought. In Heb 13:5 there is a form of citation that splices Josh 1:5, Deut 31:8, and possibly Gen 28:15 in a way that can only also be found in Philo, *Conf.* 166; see David Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 76; Schenck, *Cosmology and Eschatology*, 191.

[13] See Attridge (*Hebrews*, 26, 84ff), who says that there is a "superficial acquaintance." Koester (*Hebrews*, 98ff) helpfully charts the similarities and differences between Hebrews and Platonism regarding their usage of terminology. In his later commentary, Ceslas Spicq (*L'épître aux Hébreux* [Paris: Gabalda, 1977], 15) acknowledges the critique of the Philonic/Platonic view, yet remains stalwart: "Assurément l'auteur des *Hébraux* n'a rien d'un psittacist ni d'un plagiaire, c'est un maître qui a son style et ses idées propres. Mais sa forte personnalité a été marquee par cell de Philon, don't il a reçu un certain humus mental; leur 'table de préjugés' est commune, et l'on peut dire que l'auteur de l'Épitre 'est un philonien coverti au christianisme.'"

to align the audience of Hebrews with the Qumran community or the Essene movement,[14] focusing on angels, the priestly and kingly Messiah, the prophet like Moses, and Melchizedek. With the exception of the exalted Melchizedek in 11Q13,[15] most of these parallels can be found in the general ancient Jewish apocalyptic environment.[16] Most forays into the scrolls in Hebrews scholarship mostly note a specific, isolated parallel or refer to the richly variegated context of late Second Temple Judaism more generally.

Nonetheless, these studies and their critiques appeared before all of the Qumran documents had been published or fully assessed, especially the majority of the reconstructions from cave 4.[17] There are, therefore, new opportunities to discuss what additional insight – either to elaborate a general environment, or to investigate specific elements and more involved conceptual

[14] Yigael Yadin, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Epistle to the Hebrews" (*Scripta Hierosolymitana* IV [1958]) 36–53. See Hurst, *Hebrews*, 145–46n14; and the bibliography in Attridge, *Hebrews*, 29n222.

[15] The literature on this is massive, but see the monograph by Fred L. Horton, Jr., *The Melchizedek Tradition: A Critical Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Century A.D. and in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976).

[16] Attridge (*Hebrews*, 29–30) judiciously notes the significance and limits of Qumran studies on Hebrews: "There are . . . interesting parallels to the Qumran scrolls . . . but there are no indications in Hebrews of traditions or positions that are peculiar to or distinctive of the Dead Sea sect. . . . This rich Jewish heritage – which includes speculation on the divine world and its inhabitants, the world to come, and the eschatological agent or agents of God's intervention into human affairs – is an important part of the general background of Hebrews, but there is no single strand of Judaism that provides a clear and simple matrix within which to understand the thought of our author or his text." See the critique by Hurst, *Hebrews*, 43–66. Nonetheless, Attridge acknowledges the potential influence of works like the *Angelic Liturgy* and other apocalyptic works that present heavenly priests, saying, "it is from these notions of angelic priests that the Christian tradition of Jesus as heavenly priest is probably derived" (100); see further Hermut Löhr, "Throneversammlung and preisender Tempel: Beobachtungen am himmlishen Heiligtum im Hebräerbrief und in den Sabbatopferliedern aus Qumran" in *Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Welt im Judentum, Urchristentum und in der hellenistischen Welt* (eds. M. Hengel and A. M. Schwermer; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991), 185–205. See also the comments specifically directed toward the concept of a priestly Messiah and prophet like Moses in the scrolls and Hebrews in Södig, "Hoherpriester nach Ordnung des Melchisedek," 83–84, especially his statement, "Eine direct Linie zum Hebräerbrief wird sich nicht ziehen lassen. Aber es wird deutlich, dass dessen Hohepriester-Christologie in einem Kontext steht, der in der Diaspora wie in Palästina keineswegs nur einen kriegerischen Messias kennt, sondern gleichfalls einen priesterlichen."

[17] An exception is the much earlier publication and discussion of 4QFlor and Hebrews; see J.A. Fitzmyer, "4Q *Testimonia* and the New Testament," *TS* XVIII (1957), 513–37. See Gräßer (*An die Hebräer*, 1:72, 80–82), who also discusses potential continuities to rabbinic style arguments. Gräßer, interestingly enough given his preference for Philonic parallels, will often refer to Hebrews mode of exegesis as "Pescher-Exegese" (e.g., p. 1:112).

frameworks – the Dead Sea scrolls can give to the study of Hebrews and the New Testament.[18]

The *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* provide one such opportunity to learn more about the ancient Jewish matrix, within the Roman Empire, in which the author of Hebrews moved and with which that author engaged. The *Songs* have been occasionally cited in the studies of Hebrews to discuss the broader angelological speculation of late Second Temple literature, especially with regard to heavenly priests, when speaking of Jesus' superiority to the angels in Hebrews 1.[19] Nonetheless, these discussions typically rely upon preliminary reports from the 1950s through the 1970s, whereas a critical edition was not published until 1985 (§ 3.3.3.2),[20] and a full assessment of their importance is, in many ways, still underway. How the *Songs* and Hebrews deploy the priestly frameworks of the interrelationship of the Sabbath and the heavenly tabernacle to attain proximity to God has been overlooked. This is not to say that the author or audience was "Essene" or from the Dead Sea sect, but that the *Songs* open up new vistas for understanding the complex priestly frameworks within the social networks with which the author and audience of Hebrews interacted.

---

[18] Hurst (*Hebrews*, 85), who thinks Hebrews owes little to the Dead Sea scrolls, notes that pre-*merkabah* traditions within Jewish apocalyptic literature may have influenced Hebrews. The most prominent example of a pre-*merkabah* text, however, is the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* found at Qumran and Masada.

[19] Spicq (*L'Épitre aux Hébreux*, 2:14–61, especially 50–61) has an extensive discussion of angels in Hebrews, which was published too early for any possible knowledge of the importance of angels in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*. See, however, a passing reference in his later, more popular, commentary, Spicq, *L'épître aux Hébreux*, 63; Attridge, *Hebrews*, 100; cf. Gräßer (*An die Hebräer*, 1:71–72, 82–83), for a de-emphasis on angelic polemics, which he notes primarily in relation to gnostic speculation, in Hebrews, saying "Der Vergleich is hermeneutisch motiviert, nicht polemisch" (72); Koester, *Hebrews*, 200; Johnson, *Hebrews*, 83; Löhr ("Throneversammlung and preisender Tempel") is an exception, comparing and contrasting the terminology used for the heavenly realm in both documents, with a greater emphasis on the contrast. This terminological comparison is important, but he, too, does not engage in the broader priestly conceptual patterns and frameworks shared by Hebrews and the *Songs*, especially the relationships between sacred, heavenly space and sacred time, some of the elements of which are unique to these two documents in this period. Gäbel (*Die Kulttheologie des Hebräerbriefes*, 28) cites Löhr's study to emphasize the differences between Hebrews and the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*; see his more extensive discussion of these liturgies in his survey of Second Temple sanctuary theologies (60–69), where he discusses the heavenly liturgies as a way to legitimate the earthly "dissident" priests, which is how he characterizes many of the temple discussions from Qumran overall (75).

[20] Again, Löhr ("Throneversammlung and preisender Tempel") is an exception, impressively since his study was published just six years after the critical edition was published; nonetheless, much of the impact and importance of these documents has yet to be substantively explored.

Among other emergent Christian groups or writings, both Stephen's speech in Acts 7 and the First Letter of Peter have been promoted as showing a high level of resonance with Hebrews. The connection with Acts 7 was first suggested by William Manson and has also been promoted, with modification, by L. D. Hurst.[21] Manson pointed out eight correspondences, to which Hurst added a ninth, most of which handle attitudes toward cult, the covenant, the tabernacle, and temple.[22] Stephen, in Acts 7, treats the desert tabernacle glowingly, but turns negative when speaking of the temple, whereas Hebrews treats all earthly sanctuaries as surpassed. Both speak of the tabernacle as modeled off of the "type" that Moses saw (Exod 25:9, 40; Acts 7:44; Heb 8:5). Some of the contacts are more striking than others, but they do suggest a strong possibility that the writing of Hebrews and the speech of Acts 7 were part of related social networks.[23]

The correspondences between 1 Peter and Hebrews are massive when listed.[24] Hurst notes thirty-eight, which he explains away as an independent use of the Old Testament with a common Greek idiom, as common and general Christian elements, and as mutual Pauline influence in a similar environment of persecution, in order to argue that any direct dependence cannot be sustained.[25] Attridge more precisely suggests that it indicates that 1 Peter and Hebrews operated in a similar first-century milieu with a rich store of shared images and common concerns out of which they developed their exhortations.[26]

In addition to the employment of Hellenistic and Roman rhetoric, there has been increased interest in how Hebrews engages Hellenistic and Roman cul-

---

[21] William Manson, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: An Historical and Theological Reconsideration* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1951), 27–36; Hurst, *Hebrews*, 89–106. See also Spicq, *L'Épitre aux Hébraux*, 1:202-4.

[22] The list includes: (1) attitude to cult and law; (2) Jesus as a means to supersede these; (3) divine call to "go out"; (4) emphasis on constantly changing scene of Israel's life and ever-renewed homelessness of the faithful; (5) God's word as "living"; (6) allusion to Joshua in the promise of "rest"; (7) angels as ordaining the Law; (8) directing eyes to Heaven and to Jesus; to which Hurst adds (9) citation of Exod 25:40.

[23] Usually the direction of the relationship has been from the Hellenists in Acts 7 to Hebrews, but Schenck (*Cosmology and Eschatology*, 192–93) has reversed the direction, claiming that when the author of Acts came to Stephen's speech and considered how to portray him as a Hellenistic Christian Jew, the author turned to Hebrews, although elsewhere in Acts there is generally a more favorable attitude toward the Herodian temple. This observation gains greater credence if one reads Acts as an example of ancient historiography, in which the historian provided the speeches of what would likely have been said. See also the notes in Koester, *Hebrews*, 57.

[24] Spicq, *L'Épitre aux Hébraux*, 1:139–44.

[25] Hurst, *Hebrews*, 125–30.

[26] Attridge, *Hebrews*, 30–31; Spicq (*L'Épitre aux Hébraux*, 1:142) speaks similarly of a shared spiritual atmosphere.

ture and society. For example, David DeSilva has discussed how Hebrews participated in the cultural codes of honor and shame and borrowed concepts from Roman social practices, such as patron/client relationships and brokerage.[27] Patrick Gray has published on the portrayal of "Godly fear" in Hebrews, compared to Greek and Roman critiques of δεισιδαιμονία and *superstitio*.[28] Others take into account other aspects of Roman imperialism and consider Hebrews in the context of Roman domination.[29]

In sum, there is an emergent consensus on the apocalyptic nature of the text, its indebtedness to Greek and Roman cultural forms, particularly rhetoric, and the importance of the interpretation of the LXX to develop its distinctive Christology. Many scholars recognize some relationship between Acts 7 and Hebrews, but disagree on the nature of that relationship, also placing it within the generic milieu of 1 Peter, and often Pauline thought, as well.[30] These social, cultural, and political contexts are not mutually exclusive and should be seen as mutually embedded, since the author and audience interacted with other elements of the Jesus movement and among other Hellenistic Jewish groups, all operating within a broader matrix around the Mediterranean (including Diaspora and Palestine) and within the Roman imperial sys-

[27] See DeSilva, *Despising Shame: Honor Discourse and Community Maintenance in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995); *Bearing Christ's Reproach: The Challenge of Hebrews in an Honor Culture* (North Richland Hills, Tex.: BIBAL Press, 1999); "Despising Shame: A Cultural-Anthropological Investigation of the Epistle to the Hebrews," *JBL* 113.3 (1994): 439–61; "Exchanging Favor for Wrath: Apostasy in Hebrews and Patron-Client Relationships," *JBL* 115.1 (1996): 91–116; and *Perseverance in Gratitude*.

[28] Gray, *Godly Fear: The Epistle to the Hebrews and Greco-Roman Critiques of Superstition* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003).

[29] See Ellen Bradshaw Aitken, "Portraying the Temple in Stone and Text: The Arch of Titus and the Epistle to the Hebrews" in *Contemporary Methods – New Insights*, 131–48; Jason A. Whitlark, "'Here We Do Not Have a City That Remains': A Figured Critique of Roman Imperial Propaganda in Hebrews 13:14," *JBL* 131:1 (2012): 161–79.

[30] For Pauline thought see, e.g., Spicq, *L'Épitre aux Hébraux*, 1:144–68; Hurst (*Hebrews*, 107–24) sees it as more likely than most other contexts (excepting apocalypticism and perhaps Acts 7). See also Dieter Georgi, "Hebrews and the Heritage of Paul," in *Contemporary Methods – New Insights*, 239–44; Koester (*Hebrews*, 54–56) promotes a more interactive model in this case, which I would generalize to a broader socio-historical context. Backhaus, "Der Hebräerbrief und die Paulus-Schule," in *Der Sprechende Gott*, 21–48, also sets up a more sophisticated model of interaction; one that is not based upon the generic concept of "milieu," on the one hand, but also does not rely upon a direct literary dependence, on the other. Instead, he argues that Hebrews and the Pauline School can be placed in a "Traditionskontinuum," which is, however, not unmediated. Rather, the communities share a convergence of historical and social intercessions. Gräßer, *An die Hebräer*, 1:17–18, by contrast, states in no uncertain terms that Hebrews owes little to nothing to Paul, arguing that it is completely outside of the Pauline tradition. See further, Weiß, *Der Brief an der Hebräer*, 61–62, 86–89.

tem.[31] In such a model of interactivity, multiple concepts and their broader frameworks blended together and recombined within each new social group and sub-group and their respective writings, as they continued to interact and disseminate their beliefs and practices with others in their social, cultural, political, religious, and intellectual networks. This model explains why there are so many similarities between Hebrews and quite different works and groups, but also constant adaptation to altering circumstances.

Finally, recent treatments of Hebrews foreground methodological considerations. Older methods, such as form and tradition-historical criticism, are being juxtaposed with reader-response theory, intertextuality,[32] narrative, socio-rhetorical, social-scientific,[33] postcolonial, and post-structural criticisms.[34] This study's approach is primarily historical, but is also informed by the inter-

[31] It is a model that differs from Hurst (*Hebrews*, 132) and others, who argue that there is no interdependence or interaction, but that all these different groups are working with the same common stock of traditions in the same general circumstances at broadly the same time and that they independently developed similar works, ideas, and concepts.

[32]See, e.g., Sebastian Fuhrmann (*Vergeben und Vergessen: Christologie und Neuer Bund im Hebräerbrief* [WMANT 113; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2007]), who approaches Hebrews in terms of semiotics and intertextuality and who reads Jer 38:31–34 (LXX) as an intertext with Hebrews, not just in Heb 8:8–12 where this passage is cited directly, but throughout Hebrews as a whole, specifically in terms of covenant and soteriological "amnesty" through the death, purification, and sanctification of Jesus. See his methodological discussion on pp. 1–7. Backhaus ("Gott als Psalmist: Ps 2 im Hebräerbrief," in *Der Sprechende Gott*, 101–29) adapts the approach of intertextuality (which presumes a print or at least writing culture) to Hebrews, which, while it is a written text, participated primarily in a rhetorical and oral culture. In so doing, he emphasizes that texts do not speak or enter dialogue with one another, but people communicate by means of texts in terms of "living speech."

[33]John Dunnill (*Covenant and Sacrifice in the Letter to the Hebrews* [SNTSMS 75; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992]) has been a pioneer in the usage of sociological and anthropological methods for the study of Hebrews, mostly drawing upon the structuralist models (e.g., Claude Lévi-Strauss, Mary Douglas, and the early Victor Turner). Few have followed Dunnill's example of integrating anthropological models of sacrifice and cult into their studies of Hebrews. See, however, Scott W. Hahn, "Covenant, Cult, and the Curse-of-Death: Διαθήκη in Heb 9:15–22," in *Contemporary Methods – New Insights*, 65–88. An important desideratum to pursue would be the integration of more recent developments in anthropology to the study of cult in Hebrews. This study, to a limited extent, draws upon the insights of Catherine Bell's discussions of "ritual" and "ritualization." See especially chapter 5 of this study.

[34] See the collected essays in Gelardini, *Contemporary Methods – New Insights*, for examples. Cf. Rainer Kampling, "Sich dem Rätsel nähern. Fragen zu den Einleitungsfragen des Hebräerbriefes," in *Ausharren in der Verheißung*, 13-15; and Backhaus, "Potential und Profil," 10ff. Gelardini herself offers a recent example of the use of form criticism in Hebrews informed by recent trends, such as rhetorical criticism, intertextuality, and postcolonial criticism in *"Verhärtet eure Herzen nicht,"* 57–77; and "Hebrews, an Ancient Synagogue Homily for Tisha be-Av."

related discussions of spatiotemporality in the sciences, social sciences, and narrative/literary criticism (see § 1.4.2).

Given that Hebrews is such a highly sophisticated text, with complex social and intellectual interactions, there is no single key to understanding it. Nonetheless, how Hebrews engaged the priestly interconnections of the Sabbath and the tabernacle as the means of access to the divine presence can explain much, adding greater complexity and clarity to its conceptual frameworks and to those interconnections' particular social matrices.

1.3 The Place and Time of Hebrews in Current Scholarship

Hebrews appears to float without context, because its date and provenance have been notoriously difficult to determine. While Judea, non-Judean Palestine, Alexandria, and Rome have been the top proposals,[35] no origin or destination has solid grounding. Jerusalem has been proposed on the shaky evidence of the superscription "To the Hebrews" and the assumption that the audience was Jewish-Christian, but the title itself was likely ancient scribal conjecture and, as many have argued, the audience was likely a mixture of Gentile and Jewish members, a situation that could be true in many cities around the Mediterranean.[36] Occasionally Alexandria is proposed, due to possible similarities with Wisdom of Solomon and Philo,[37] but the most recent analyses have found that the similarities are more generic elements and, while Hebrews does often use Platonic-sounding language, the author em-

[35] Marie E. Isaacs's *Sacred Space*: *An Approach to the Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 22–45, tentatively prefers a Palestinian context, e.g. Caesarea or Syrian Antioch, but provides a nice overview of the strengths and weaknesses of each proposed location. See further Gräßer, *An die Hebräer*, 1:22–25.

[36] For a Jerusalem context, see Spicq *Hébreux*, 1:239n1; Attridge, *Hebrews*, 9n109; DeSilva, *Perseverance in Gratitude*, 1n3, 21; for critique of the superscription, see Attridge, *Hebrews*, 12; Gräßer, *An die Hebräer*, 1:41–445, has an interestingly positive spin on the title not being original: "Sie ist als solche der älteste und zugleich kürzest 'Kommentar' zu Hebr" (45); Koester, *Hebrews*, 171-73; cf. Kampling, "Sich dem Rätzel nähern," 25; Gelardini *("Verhärtet eure Herzen nicht,"* 201–2, 246) compares the title to the usage of "Hebrew" in later rabbinic midrash, particularly *Pesiqta Rabbati* to expand the meaning of "Hebrew" beyond an ethnic to a predominantly theological designation regarding correct behavior or response to receive God's promises; for a discussion of the social make-up of the addressees, including class and ethnicity, see Eisenbaum (*Jewish Heroes of Christian History*, 7–10), who argues for a mixed background; DeSilva (*Perseverance in Gratitude*, 2–23) further discusses a mixed ethnicity as well as other social indicators. For a Jewish audience, see Hughes, *Hebrews and Hermeneutics*, 26–51; Lindars, *Hebrews*, 4, 10–15; for other social indicators see Koester, *Hebrews*, 64–78; Kampling, "Sich dem Rätzel nähern," 25–32. See further Weiß, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, 66–75.

[37] Spicq, *L'Épitre aux Hébraux*, 1:209–19.

ploys it in un-Platonic ways; thus the similarities are of a general Hellenistic environment and could have been picked up anywhere in the Greek-speaking world.[38]

Rome has been proposed due to the ambiguous internal evidence of chapter 13 referring to those "from" or "away from Italy," suggesting Italy as an important center for the author and audience, but the phrase could mean it was sent to Italy, from Italy, or that neither author nor audience was in Italy but had Italian connections.[39] The Roman attribution is also due to the external evidence of *1 Clement*, which is the first text to allude to Hebrews (esp. *1 Clem*. 36.2–6), meaning Hebrews had been circulating in Rome by the late first to early second century. Nonetheless, due to the mobility of ancient Christians, including sending and receiving letters, it would not take very long for a letter from somewhere else in the Mediterranean to reach Rome.[40] General affinities to Roman documents, such as *1 Clement*, but also 1 Peter, may also suggest a closer geographical relationship with Rome. Sometimes canon is considered: the western church resisted putting Hebrews in the canon (it is absent in the Muratorian Canon), while the eastern church included it (as found in the Chester Beatty papyrus).[41] The argument is that the western church, i.e. Rome, recalled that it was not Pauline (Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.* 3.3; 6.20), whereas the eastern church regarded it as so, even though they, too, recognized its author was not Paul, but had Pauline "authority." Origen, fa-

[38] For Alexandria, see Spicq, *Hebreux*, 1.237n2; see also the critique by Lindars, *Hebrews*, 18–19; for the connection between Philo and Hebrews see above. Gräßer, *An die Hebräer*, 22–23, who generally links Hebrews with Alexandrian traditions from Philo to gnostic thought, ultimately claims that its Alexandrian provenance can neither be proven nor disproven.

[39] See, e.g., Gelardini, *"Verhärtet eure Herzen nicht,"* 98–99, 379–82. On the phrase's ambiguity, see Attridge, *Hebrews*, 10. For a fuller discussion promoting a Roman provenance, see Backhaus, "Der Hebräerbrief und die Paulus-Schule," 37–40. This point, however, is moot for those who think that Heb 13:22–25 is by a later hand, as in Gräßer, *An die Hebräer*, 1:17–18, 22; 3:409–16; see further Weiß, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, 37–38, 746–66.

[40] See Lionel Casson, *Travel in the Ancient World* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994), 149–62, 176–96, 219–25. Kevin Sullivan ("Ten if by Land, Less if by Sea: When were the Gospels Written?" Faculty Colloquium, Illinois Wesleyan University, September 23, 2011), based upon Casson's reconstructions of travel speeds between various cities within the Roman Empire, notes estimated travel times in antiquity: Rome to Jerusalem: 98 days by land; 42–77 days by sea; Jerusalem to Antioch: 18 days by land; Caesarea to Corinth: 84 days by land; 28–49 days by sea. One need not postulate many years between the writing of a text in one area and its dissemination elsewhere. Paul's letter writing should testify to this. Therefore, even if Hebrews were written elsewhere in the Roman Empire, one need not postulate that it would necessarily take long for the letter to be copied and circulated to other cities, such as Rome.

[41] Spicq, *L'Épitre aux Hébraux*, 1:169–96; Attridge, *Hebrews*, 1–3; Schenck, *Cosmology and Eschatology*, 97; Lindars, *Hebrews*, 17–19.