

HTR 55(1962)
299-315

"OUTSIDE THE CAMP": HEBREWS 13.9-14

HELMUT KOESTER

HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL

HEBREWS 13.9-14 is among the most difficult passages of the entire New Testament. Here, in the context of a warning against "diversified and foreign doctrines" (*διδασκαί ποικίλαι καὶ ξέναι*), a Christological argument occurs (13.11-12). It is obviously the intention of the writer to ground his objection to the "foreign doctrines" on this Christological basis. But the character of the doctrines opposed in these verses has remained an enigma to commentators inasmuch as the function of the Christological argument in this polemical setting has not been recognized clearly.¹ However, a closer examination of the Old Testament passage which underlies the Christological argument in Hebrews 13.11 may provide a key for a fresh solution of the complex problems of this passage.

That Hebrews 13.11 is based upon Leviticus 16.27 is commonly known.

Hebrews 13.11 says: *ὡν γὰρ εἰσφέρεται ζῶων τὸ αἷμα περὶ ἁμαρτίας εἰς τὰ ἅγια διὰ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, τούτων τὰ σώματα κατακαίεται ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς*. This is an obvious reference to Leviticus 16.27: *καὶ τὸν μόσχον τὸν περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τὸν χίμαρον τὸν περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ὧν τὸ αἷμα εἰσηνέχθη ἐξιλάσασθαι ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ, ἐξοίσουσιν αὐτὰ ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς καὶ κατακαύσουσιν αὐτὰ ἐν πυρί, καὶ τὰ δέρματα αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ κρέα αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν κόπρον αὐτῶν*. The point of Hebrews' argument is usually seen in this verse. The corpses of the two animals sacrificed are not eaten, but are disposed of and burnt outside the camp. Thus Moffatt concludes: "His point is simply this, that the Christian sacrifice, on which all

¹ Out of the recent publications on Hebrews, I mainly refer to the commentaries of James Moffatt (ICC), Hans Windisch (Handbuch z.N.T. ed. by H. Lietzmann, 2nd. ed. 1931), Theodore H. Robinson (Moffatt Comm. 1933); Otto Michel (Meyer's Krit.-ex. Komm. 1956¹⁰). Cf. further W. Manson, The Epistle to the Hebrews, 1951, pp. 149 ff.; Ernst Käsemann, Das wandernde Gottesvolk, 2. ed. 1957. Earlier publications especially on Hebrews 13.9 ff: Oskar Holtzmann, Der Hebräerbrief und das Abendmahl, ZNW 10 (1909), pp. 251-260.

our relationship to God depends, is not one that involves or allows any connection with a meal."²

It cannot be doubted that Hebrews 13.11 refers to this verse from Leviticus. It is questionable, however, whether the point of the argument, drawn from the Old Testament, is exhausted, when it is only seen with respect to the Old Testament proviso that sacrifices must not be eaten. What has not been noticed, is the fact that the following verse from Leviticus, 16.28, is basic to an understanding of the following sentences in Hebrews 13.12-13.

Leviticus 16.28: ὁ δὲ κατακαίων αὐτὰ πλυνεῖ τὰ ἱμάτια καὶ λούσεται τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ὕδατι, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν παρεμβολήν.

Hebrews 13.12-13: διὸ καὶ Ἰησοῦς, ἵνα ἀγιάσῃ διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος τὸν λαόν, ἔξω τῆς τύλης ἔπαθεν. τοίνυν ἐξερχώμεθα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν αὐτοῦ φέροντες. Whereas Hebrews 13.11 simply paraphrases Leviticus 16.27, Hebrews 13.12-13 is formulated in conscious contrast to Leviticus 16.28.³

Leviticus: Whoever performs the burning *outside the camp* is *unclean*.

Hebrews: Jesus suffered *outside the gate* in order to *sanctify* his people.

Leviticus: After being *sanctified* he may *enter the camp* again.

Hebrews: Let us *go out* to him *outside of the camp* to bear his *reproach*.

Hence the quotation of Leviticus 16.27 in Hebrews 13.11 only introduces the Old Testament context on which the main argument is based; the author of Hebrews does not give this main argument until verses 12-13, where it occurs in contrast to the Levitical passage. This contrast is not yet apparent in the quotation in verse 11. But it is precisely this contrast which appears to

² Moffatt, op. cit., p. 234; cf. p. 235: "... showing how the very death of Jesus outside the city of Jerusalem fulfilled the proviso in that ritual (of Atonement-day) that the sacrifice must not be eaten." Michel, op. cit., p. 344: "also kennt schon das AT ein Verbot, den Priestern am Opfer Anteil zu geben: am grossen Versöhnungstag wird das Opfer nicht gegessen, sondern verbrannt. Hebr. sieht in dieser Anordnung einen theologischen Hinweis darauf, dass die Vertreter der 'fremden Lehren' von dem Abendmahlsgenuss ausgeschlossen sein sollen."

³ Even Michel, who comes very close to my interpretation, has not seen the contrast of Hebrews 13.12-13 to Leviticus 16.28. He mentions Miriam's exclusion from the camp (Numbers 12.14-15), and that men and animals outside the camp are unclean before God (op. cit., p. 344), also that guilty persons were to be killed outside the camp (p. 345).

be basic for the decisive Christological argument against the "foreign doctrines." The Levitical passage describes the holy camp of the wilderness people. To leave this camp, even in the performance of holy duties, rendered a man unclean (cf. also Leviticus 16.26), and excluded him from the holy fellowship. The writer of Hebrews, however, insists that the sacrifice of Jesus was performed *outside* of the holy place, and it is this sacrifice which sanctifies his people. This act of sanctification marks the abolition of the necessity of holy places for sanctification.

The mention of Jesus' sacrifice outside the gate is doubtless an allusion to the suffering and death of Jesus outside the city of Jerusalem. The historical fact of Christian revelation breaks through the symbolism of the terms "camp" and "sanctify" with the terms "gate" and "suffer."⁴ Thus it is finally the basic historical fact of the Christian revelation, which gives the clue to the argument against the doctrines opposed. Hebrews insists on the historicity, worldliness and profaneness of the Christian revelation.

Therefore, the argument continues, Christians who have been cleansed by Jesus' sacrifice are no longer to enter the sacred precincts, but are to go out of the holy camp and to bear his reproach, (13,13). Because of the peculiar character of Jesus' sacrifice "outside the camp" the place of the Christian is not in holy places with the security which is offered in cultic performances, but in the uncleanness of the world.⁵

It is necessary to clarify this interpretation by a confrontation with the two traditional explanations of Hebrews 13,13.⁶ The first of these understands this verse as a renunciation of the Jewish religion. This is unlikely, since the symbolism of this passage does not suggest the distinction between "false" and

⁴ Cf. F. C. Grant, "The Epistle to the Hebrews" (Harper's annotated Bible Series 15, 1957), p. 59. — Note that in this context the name "Jesus" occurs alone, without any Christological title; "Name ohne Zusatz als Zeichen seiner Niedrigkeit" (Michel, op. cit., p. 344).

⁵ Michel does not offer a solution, but leaves the alternatives open. However, he stresses one point that is in precise agreement with my interpretation: "Die Deutung dieses Verses muss wohl unsicher bleiben. Gewiss ist jedoch, dass dort, wo nach dem Gesetz 'Unreinheit' ist, fuer den Christen die wahre 'Reinheit' zu suchen ist" (op. cit., p. 347).

⁶ For these see Michel, op. cit., p. 347.

"true" religion, but rather that between "sacred" and "profane" or "cultic" and "secular." But I hasten to add that also the general question decides the possibility of this first traditional interpretation, i.e., the question, whether Hebrews as a whole and the 13th chapter in particular is directed against Judaism or rather against inner-Christian heretical opinions (which may very well have their roots in Judaism!). For this question see below.

The alternate traditional interpretation finds "in this fact about the death of Jesus a further illustration of the need for unworldliness."⁷ But it is precisely the disgrace of worldliness itself that Christians should be determined to bear, since, again, the distinction is not between "worldly" and "unworldly," or "outward" and "inward," but rather between "sacred" and "secular." Not in the participation in sacred and cultic performances, but in the acceptance of the secular reality the Christian finds his proper place.

The phrase "outside the camp" is the designation of Jesus' place of suffering and reproach, and therefore totally different from Philo's understanding of the same phrase: "so too Moses pitched his own tent outside the camp (*ἐξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς*, the reference is to Exodus 33,7) and the whole array of bodily things. . . . Then only does he begin to worship God and entering the darkness, the invisible region, abides there while he learns the secrets of the most holy mysteries" (de gig. 54).⁸ Here, in Philo's understanding, "outside the camp" is indeed the place of unworldliness, the presence of the divine as it is attainable already now in the seclusion from all worldly and secular things, i.e., in the initiation into the "mysteries."

For Hebrews, "outside the camp" is identical with the worldliness of the world itself and the place where men are exposed to the experience of this world rather than secluded and protected from it. In consequence of such understanding the secret presence of the divine in any present experience is denied in the following sentence: "For we have no lasting city here (in this world and

⁷ Moffatt, op. cit., p. 234; cf. p. 236: "only our author weaves in the characteristic idea of the shame which has to be endured in such unworldly renunciation."

⁸ Translation from F. H. Colson in Loeb Classical Library.

during this life), on the contrary, we seek the city to come" (Hebrews 13.14). Thus the anticultic antithesis "not sacred, but secular" is continued by an eschatological antithesis "not present, but future." Inasmuch as there is no abiding sacred refuge for Christians in the present, the "city" of the Christians is in the future and still to come. It is not in the first place the certainty but rather the futurity of the heavenly city which is emphasized here. Therefore the appeal is neither to lead an unworldly life as a member of a heavenly city, nor to escape from this world and life as soon as possible.⁹ On the contrary, both these appeals are consciously excluded or even refuted, and are to be found among the opponents of Hebrews rather than in what he wants to say himself. The eschatological expectation of the Christian here is identical with the radical openness to the challenges and sufferings that necessarily result from the existence "outside the camp." And since the refuge in sacred places and cultic performances is abolished for those people who stay "outside the camp" with Jesus, the sacrifices of God are rather thanksgiving and charity (Hebrews 13, 15-16).

II

It is the emphasis on the non-sacral historical sacrifice of Jesus on Calvary, and the stressing of the eschatological character of the Christians' life which provides the background for understanding the character of the "foreign doctrines" referred to in Hebrews 13.9. From what has emerged as the point of the Christological argument on the basis of the underlying Old Testament passage, it is generally clear that the doctrine opposed here must have spoken about unworldliness attainable by means which were related to a cultic and sacral interpretation of Jesus' suffering and death. They failed to recognize the paradoxical character of the historical appearance of the redeemer in the profaneness of this world.

This Christological distinction underlies the contrast *χάριτι* —

⁹ Windisch's definition "Scheidung von der irdischen Welt und vom irdischen Wesen überhaupt" (op. cit., p. 119) is as misleading as the often quoted passage 2 Clem 5,1: *καταλείψαντες τὴν παροικίαν τοῦ κόσμου . . . καὶ μὴ φοβηθῶμεν ἐξελθεῖν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*.

οὐ βρώμασιν in Hebrews 13.9. In this context, βρώματα seems to refer to cultic, sacramental, or ritual means by which the powers of Jesus' sacrifice were represented and being made available. An exact explanation of the term βρώματα, however, has great difficulties. The following possibilities have been proposed: ¹⁰

1) Ascetic or cultic diet regulations.¹¹ But since such regulations would usually stress that certain things must not be eaten, it is hard to see how Hebrews 13.10 states, against these doctrines, that Christians have an altar from which *the worshippers have no right to eat*.¹²

2) Pagan sacrifices.¹³ However, the distinction χάριτι, οὐ βρώμασιν does not indicate a controversy between two different religions, but rather a controversy about method of representation of one and the same revelation.¹⁴ This finds further proof in the fact that the argument in the following verses is about a problem in the Christological question.

3) Sacrificial offerings of the Jews. This hypothesis has the same difficulties as the preceding one. Furthermore, Hebrews was probably written when the Jewish temple had already ceased to exist. But also in other respects this explanation for the controversy is not tenable without important qualifications ¹⁵ which we will have to discuss later.

¹⁰ Cf. the Commentaries, especially the discussion of the various interpretations in Moffatt, op. cit., pp. 233 f; Robinson, op. cit., pp. 200 ff.

¹¹ Examples of such diet regulations can be found among the opponents of some of the deuterio-pauline epistles (e.g. Col. 2.16; 1 Tim. 4.3). For such understanding of Hebr. 13.9 see Windisch, op. cit., p. 118; very cautiously Hans Lietzmann, *Geschichte der Alten Kirche*, vol. I, p. 223 ("Das kann man wohl fragen, aber ohne die Hoffnung auf befriedigende Antwort"); also W. Manson, op. cit., p. 150 (but see below).

¹² On this question see already O. Holtzmann, op. cit., p. 254.

¹³ Considered by Moffatt, op. cit., pp. 233 f.

¹⁴ See also O. Holtzmann, op. cit., p. 252.

¹⁵ C. F. D. Moule, *Sanctuary and Sacrifice in the Church of the N.T.*, J. T. S., N. S. 1 (1950), pp. 36-39, believes that the epistle was written before 70 A.D. and that ch. 13 is directed "against the pressure to revert to Judaism" (p. 39), which he seems to define as both, the altar ". . . of the levitical system," and "the observance of food-taboos" (p. 38). But Moule has to consider verses 11-14 as "apparently intrusive," and says that the author must have been "sidetracked by a separate and secondary thought" (p. 38). He also realizes that there are some difficulties concerning such an early date for Hebrews. Cf. also Manson, op. cit., p. 150: ". . . Jewish regulations . . . , and that the propaganda owed the strength of its appeal, in the last resort, to the association of these regulations with the cultus of the past." Although Manson dates Hebrews before 70 A.D., he feels that a direct attack upon the Jewish temple-sacrifices is not a possible explanation of the passage. Cf. Windisch, op. cit., p. 118.

4) The Christian sacrament of the Lord's Supper in a more or less sacramentalist interpretation.¹⁶ The discussion of this hypothesis is burdened with the theological controversy about non-sacramental or sacramentalist understanding of Christianity. Some find no difficulty in identifying the opponents of Hebrews 13.9 ff. with advocates of the sacraments, whereas apologetical tendencies are obvious, whenever a scholar argues against such an understanding of the passage.¹⁷ But one should be prepared to face a result along the lines of a polemic against Christian sacramentalism — which does not necessarily constitute an argument in favor of "Spiritual Religion," — on the contrary!

Apart from 13.10 which in itself is a part of the very problem that concerns us here, the author in ch. 13 does not give any further information on the term *βρῶμα* and its contrast to the word *χάρις*. But there is a close parallel to 13.9 in Hebrews 9.9–10 where also the term *βρῶμα* is employed, as part of the designation that characterizes the ritual regulations of the Old Covenant, pointing out the insufficiency of the arrangements of salvation in the "first tent." We take Hebrews 9.9–10 as the point of departure for a reconsideration of some elements of the Epistle to the Hebrews that bear on the understanding of Hebrews 13.9–13.

III

The use of the term *βρώματα*, always in the plural, is one of the common features of Hebrews 13.9 and 9.10. In 9.10 *βρώματα* stands in parallelism to *πόματα* and *διάφοροι βαπτισμοί*.¹⁸ These three terms serve as a comprehensive description of the ritual and sacramental arrangements associated with the offerings and sacrifices (*δωρά τε καὶ θυσίαι*) of the "first tent," i.e., the covenant of the Jews in the wilderness.¹⁹

Such use of the word *βρῶμα* agrees with the common usage in Early Christian Literature. *βρῶμα* and the synonym *βρώσις*²⁰

¹⁶ See especially O. Holtzmann: "Die schillernde, neue Lehre behauptet also, dass die Christen durch ihr heiliges Mahl an dem einen für sie gebrachten Opfer teilhätten." (Op. cit., p. 255); also Moffatt, op. cit., pp. 232 ff.

¹⁷ E.g., recently in W. Manson, op. cit., pp. 51 ff.

¹⁸ Note that *διάφοροι* has a parallel in *ποικίλοι* in 13.9!

¹⁹ Concerning the meaning of the term *πρώτη σκηνή* in Hebrews, see below.

²⁰ Originally *βρώσις* is *nomen actionis* and as such also used frequently in the

frequently characterize Jewish food and diet regulations. Usually they occur together with other terms which also designate cultic regulations of Jewish origin:

Col. 2.16: *βρώσις, πόσις, ἑορτή, νεομηνία, σάββατα*, cf. also the discussion of *περιτομή* in Col. 2.11.²¹

Diogn. 4.1: *βρώσεις, σάββατα, περιτομή, νηστεία, νεομηνία*.

Barn. 7 ff., in the arrangement of his expositions, reflects a similar list of Jewish cult regulations: ch. 7–8 deal with sacrifices, ch. 9 with circumcision, ch. 10 with food laws,²² ch. 11 with water and washings,²³ ch. 15 continues with a discussion of the sabbath, ch. 16 of the temple.

The three sacraments of the Exodus to which Paul refers in 1 Corinthians 10.2–4 give witness to the same traditional terminology:

πάντες εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο. . . .

τὸ αὐτὸ πνευματικὸν βρῶμα ἔφαγον. . . .

τὸ αὐτὸ πνευματικὸν ἔπιον πόμα.

These examples show clearly that the term *βρῶμα*, if used in a technical way, together with *πόμα* and *βαπτισμός* belongs to the description of cultic regulations of the Jews or of the Old Testament.²⁴ On the other hand, *βρῶμα* (or *βρώσις*) is not a term commonly used for the Lord's Supper. It is worth noting that Paul, although he sets the sacramental *βρῶμα* and *πόμα* of the wilderness-generation into parallelism with the Lord's Supper, does not use the same terms for the Christian sacrament, but *ποτήριον* and *ἄρτος* instead (1 Cor. 10.16).²⁵ There is only one occasional use of *βρώσις* for the Lord's Supper, i.e., in the disputed section John

NT (e.g., 1 Cor. 8.4; 2 Cor. 9.10); but it can be used as synonym with *βρῶμα* = "food," as in Hebr. 12.16; Did. 6.3; John 6.55; cf. Diogn. 4.1; see also W. Bauer, *Wörterbuch* s.v.

²¹ See G. Bornkamm, "Die Häresie des Kolosserbriefes" in: *Das Ende des Gesetzes* (1958²), p. 147.

²² Cf. Barn. 10.9: *περὶ μὲν τῶν βρωμάτων*, 10.10: *περὶ τῆς βρώσεως*.

²³ Cf. Barn. 11.1: *περὶ τοῦ ὕδατος καὶ περὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ . . . τὸ βάπτισμα τὸ φέρον ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν . . .*

²⁴ Positively, for Christian food regulations, *βρώσις* is used only Did. 6.3: *περὶ δὲ τῆς βρώσεως, ὃ δύνασαι βάστασον*. References to heretics who practiced such (Jewish) food laws are: the above mentioned Col. 2.16 ff, and 1 Tim. 4.3; cf. also Rom. 14.15 ff.

²⁵ In 1 Cor. 8.4,8,13 Paul uses *βρώσις* and *βρῶμα* in a non-technical way in the context of the discussion of the eating of meat offered to the idols.

6.51-59: ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ μου ἀληθὴς ἐστὶν βρώσις (John 6.55). But here this term is employed with reference to John 6.27 where the same word is clearly used in a figurative meaning.²⁶

To conclude this survey of the use of the word βρώμα: there is no basis for taking βρώματα as a direct designation of the Lord's Supper in Hebrews. The technical use of the term in the context of the descriptions of the cultic arrangements of the Old Covenant also suggests that the author is concerned with more than ascetic food regulations when he says in Hebrews 13.9: οὐ βρώμασιν. The parallel passage Hebrews 9.10 shows that the polemic against βρώματα is to be understood in the context of the author's interpretation of the cultic arrangements of the "first tent."

The insufficiency of these arrangements for salvation is again expressed in corresponding terms in both passages:

Hebrews 9.9: μὴ δυνάμεναι κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι. . . .

Hebrews 13.9: βεβαιῶσθαι τὴν καρδίαν, οὐ βρώμασιν. . . .

The verbs τελειοῦν and βεβαιοῦν are almost synonyms in Hebrews. Both are descriptive of the process of divine action by which the quality is achieved to enter the heavenly rest. Whereas τελειοῦν emphasizes the purification and deification through which the believers become one with the Son,²⁷ βεβαιοῦν stresses more the giving of strength and security that rests upon the legal certainty and validity of the work of salvation.²⁸ The arrangements for salvation in the "first tent" were not able to supply the worshipper with these qualifications. They are therefore called δικαιώματα σαρκός Hebrews 9.10. The same thought is expressed

²⁶ It is necessary to distinguish between this figurative meaning in John 6.27 and the reference to the element of the sacrament in the later section 6.51b-59 which I believe to be an interpolation (for the best recent argument in favor of the interpolation-hypothesis see G. Bornkamm, "Die eucharistische Rede im Johannesevangelium," Z.N.W. 47 (1956), pp. 161-169). Apparently the interpolator of verses 51-59 has chosen this rather unusual word for the Christian sacrament in order to maintain a vocabulary consistent with the rest of the chapter.

²⁷ Cf. especially Hebr. 2.10; 5.9; 10.14; 12.2. See E. Käsemann, op. cit., pp. 82-90.

²⁸ βέβαιος = "legally authenticated and, therefore, valid" (rechts-kräftig-rechtsgültig), cf. H. Schlier, Th. W. N. T. I, pp. 602 f.; W. Bauer Wörterbuch, sv. See also Hebr. 2.3; 3.14; 6.16-19.

in the sentence (*βρώμασιν . . .*), *ἐν οἷς οὐκ ὠφελήθησαν οἱ περιπατοῦντες*, Hebrews 13.9.²⁹

In Hebrews 13.9 the opposite of *βρώματα* is *χάρις*. This latter term in Hebrews does not mean the "graciousness of God" in a general sense,³⁰ but is rather to be understood in the Pauline sense as God's "now occurring act of grace."³¹ This is particularly clear in Hebrews 10.29. *πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος* here stands in parallelism to *υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* and *αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης*. Thus, the "Spirit of grace" is the representation of the event of salvation which was accomplished by Christ when he suffered on Calvary (Hebrews 13.12), or, when he entered the heavenly sanctuary (Hebrews 9.11 ff.). We also note the close connection of *χάρις θεοῦ* with the death of Jesus in Hebrews 2.9: *ὅπως χάριτι θεοῦ ὑπὲρ παντὸς γεύσεται θανάτου*.³²

The contrast *βρώματα-χάρις* in Hebrews 13.9, consequently finds its explanation by the contrast of the arrangements of salvation in the "first tent" with the work of salvation in Christ (Hebrews 9.9–10 and 9.11 ff.). It is obvious that the Christological argument which we have considered above recurs here in the juxtaposition of *βρώματα* and *χάρις*. It is because of the redeemer entering the heavenly sanctuary through his suffering on Calvary in the midst of the profaneness of the world, that the cultic salvation in a sanctuary of sacrifices proves to be inadequate. In a pregnant formulation the difference of these two ways of salvation is expressed by means of the quotation from Psalms 41.7 (LXX) in Hebrews 10.5: *θυσίαν καὶ προσφορὰν οὐκ ἠθέλησας, σῶμα* ³³ *δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι*. In order to understand fully the implications of

²⁹ Whether this is a general statement, or only refers to a specific form of worship in the past, depends on the meaning of the term "tent" which is to be discussed later in this paper.

³⁰ For examples of such general use of the word see R. Bultmann, *Theology of the NT*, II, pp. 210 f.

³¹ R. Bultmann, *op. cit.*, I. p. 289; see further the entire chapter "Grace as Event," pp. 288 ff.

³² Some prefer the less well attested reading *χωρὶς θεοῦ* (M etc.) instead of *χάριτι θεοῦ* (= the vast majority of manuscripts); see O. Michel, *op. cit.*, p. 74. But see H. Windisch, *op. cit.*, p. 21 in support of the traditionally accepted reading.

³³ Recent LXX editions read here *ὥρτια* with LaGa = M (so Rahlfs in the Göttinger Ausgabe). But whether *ὥρτια* is the original LXX reading or not — I would judge *ὥρτια* as an obviously late correction according to M, and prefer *σῶμα* which is given by almost all Greek manuscripts of the LXX — "our author found *σῶμα* in his LXX text and seized upon it" (Moffatt, *op. cit.*, p. 138).

the rejected doctrines of cultic salvation we have to discuss the meaning of the term "first tent" and the symbolism of the tabernacle-sanctuary in Hebrews.

IV

In both passages discussed before, Hebrews 9 and Hebrews 13.10 the term (πρώτη)σκηνή occurs as a designation of a place of cultic performances. The term "tent" in Hebrews is used in a highly figurative meaning. The symbolism of the word is three-fold.

Firstly, in its direct meaning, σκηνή is the outer part of the tabernacle of the wilderness (= πρώτη σκηνή 9.2,6), never the tabernacle as a whole! It is clearly distinguished from the "second," "the inner tent," the Ἁγία Ἀγίων (9.3,7), or simply called Ἁγία.³⁴ Both are divided by the καταπέτασμα (9.3).

Secondly, since the inner part of the tabernacle, the Holy of Holies, is the type of the heavenly sanctuary, the "tent" becomes a symbol for the heavenly regions through which Christ was to pass to enter the heavenly sanctuary itself (9.11-12: διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς οὐ χειροποιήτου . . . εἰς τὰ ἅγια.) The same differentiation between heavenly sanctuary and the heavenly regions is apparent in Hebrews 8.2: τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργὸς καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς. This is not a hendiadys, but expresses that Christ's office includes both the service in the sanctuary of heaven itself (τὰ ἅγια) and the entering by passing through the heavenly regions (ἡ σκηνή) = the ascension!³⁵ It

³⁴ The remark *ἥτις λέγεται Ἁγία* referring to the "first tent" Hebr. 9.2 is very odd and not consistent with the word usage of the rest of the Epistle. In 9.3 Hebr. calls the inner tent Ἁγία Ἀγίων, but in all other places the simple Ἁγία is the technical term for the "inner tent," the earthly one (9.25; 13.11) as well as its heavenly prototype (8.2; 9.12; in both passages the inner sanctuary, called Ἁγία, is clearly distinguished from the σκηνή of the heavens; 9.23; 10.19; 9.9). The use of the term Ἁγία for the outer tent in 9.2 is either to be explained as due to the dependence upon a "Vorlage" in the description of the tabernacle, or, preferably, the sentence *ἥτις λέγεται Ἁγία* is a marginal gloss which later came into the text, that is at a wrong place; cf. Moffatt, op. cit., p. 113; "The phrase . . . would have been in a better position immediately after *ἡ πρώτη* . . . instead of after the list of furniture." Note also that the manuscripts vary: AD have Ἁγία Ἀγίων, B: τὰ ἅγια, P⁴⁶ the totally confusing designations Ἁγία Ἀγίων for the "first tent" (Hebr. 9.2) and Ἁγία for the inner tabernacle (9.3).

³⁵ Cf. also Hebr. 4.14: *ἔχοντες ἀρχιερέα μέγαν διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανοὺς*. For the ascension in Hebr. see H. Windisch, op. cit., pp. 69-71.

also becomes clear here that the author of Hebrews is more interested in the opening of the way into the heavenly sanctuary than in the performance of a service within the sanctuary of heaven.

Finally, "first tent," symbolically, designates the place of cultic performances which are not only insufficient for salvation, but also conceal the true way into the inner sanctuary: *μήπω πεφανερῶσθαι τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδὸν ἔτι τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς ἐχούσης στάσιν* (Hebrews 9.8). Christ's high-priestly sacrifice reveals this way through the "tent" into the heavenly sanctuary (9.11-12), i.e., Christ's sacrifice is the abolition of the "first tent." Here, the term *σκηνή* in this figurative meaning is almost synonymous with *καταπέτασμα*. The way into the true sanctuary (Hebrews 10.19³⁶), now open to the believers, is identical with the way through the "veil" (Hebrews 10.20)³⁷ However, since the "veil" between the "tent" and the inner sanctuary at the same time is both the wall between earth and heaven, and the flesh of Jesus (*διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος, τοῦτ' ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ*, Hebrews 10.20),³⁸ it is also clear why the sacrifice of priests who offer "something else" (not themselves) must remain ineffective.³⁹ It is through the sacrifice of his own body (Hebrews 10.10) that the real redemption, true access to the heavenly sanctuary is brought about. Of this true offering, the annual sacrifice of the high-priest in the inner sanctuary of the tabernacle is only the shadow, in itself ineffective (Hebrews 10.1 ff.). This description of Christ's work of salvation in such highly sacrificial language, however, actually refers to a work of salvation which has no cultic and sacrificial connotations and implications at all. On the contrary, here appears a salvation that is brought about exclusively within the dimension of man's suffering and death as opposed to the sacred dimension of cult and sacrifices.⁴⁰ This marks the termination of

³⁶ *τῶν ἁγίων* in Hebr. 10.19 as in 8.2 is the Gen. of the Neuter *τὰ ἅγια*, not of *οἱ ἅγιοι*.

³⁷ Cf. also Hebr. 6.19-20.

³⁸ For the understanding of the "veil" see Käsemann, *op. cit.*, pp. 140-151.

³⁹ See Hebr. 5.1-3; 7.27; 8.3; especially 10.1-18.

⁴⁰ It is, of course, impossible in our context to elaborate this point in greater detail. For references in Hebr. itself see 2.14 ff.; 5.7 f.; 10.1 ff. Such reinterpretation of a sacrificial language and symbolism has become possible for the author to the Hebrews on the basis of an underlying allegorical and mythological understanding of such sacrificial terms; as Käsemann has shown (*op. cit.*).

all cultic performances anywhere — and the author to the Hebrews is fully aware of this conclusion (Hebrews 9.10).⁴¹ What is abolished with the "first tent" is not specifically the Jewish understanding of cult and sacrifice as distinguished from an ongoing Christian cult. It is each and every way of salvation by means of cultic performances and sacrificial rites as such, that has become anachronistic and absurd now because Christ as a human being went through suffering and death obediently.

On the other hand, what the "inner sanctuary" of the Jewish tabernacle stands for symbolically, is not abolished but rather fulfilled positively by Christ's sacrifice of his own body since this "inner sanctuary" is a type of heaven itself.⁴² Of course the annual sacrifice in the inner sanctuary is obsolete now. Hebrews thinks that it was never meant to bring about forgiveness of sins, (10.2-3). Since forgiveness has come, not through this shadow-sanctuary, but by Christ's entering into the real sanctuary of heaven, offerings for sin have ceased (10.18).

When the author of Hebrews thus interprets the cultic arrangements of one part of the tabernacle, the "first tent," as obscuring the true salvation, but takes the other part, the inner tent, as a positive symbol for Christ's sacrifice, he clearly shows that he does not attack the Jewish cult as such. Rather, when he confines the *βρώματα* to the "first tent" arrangements, he attacks any performances of salvation which according to their character and intention belong to the "first tent."

Of some interest in this context is the phrase which is added to the mention of the first tent in 9.8-9: *ἥτις παραβολὴ εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα*. This might be an indication that the author understands present cults and religions as a continuation of that which the "first tent" stands for as a symbol. On the other hand, Hebrews considers the present time as the "time of reformation" (9.10). Consequently, the first tent is already abolished. There-

⁴¹ This also explains why Hebr. never describes Christ's present activity in the heavenly sanctuary as a performance of heavenly priestly function, but only as intercession, etc. (Hebr. 1.25) on the basis of the one "sacrifice" of entering the heavenly sanctuary. In his present dignity Christ is rather referred to as the *Kosmokrator* (Hebr. 1.3-4; 10.12-14, etc.); this is also implied, when he is referred to with the title high-priest (Hebr. 5.10).

⁴² See Hebr. 8.5.

fore, and with regard to the syntactical difficulties which this sentence provides,⁴³ it is rather to be taken as a marginal gloss.⁴⁴

In the context of the discussion of the meaning of the term *σκηνή* in Hebrews we have to try an explanation of the most difficult verse, 13.10, where the formulation *οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες* occurs. The verse is introduced by *ἔχομεν θυσιαστήριον*. This formulation reflects the style of credal statements,⁴⁵ although the formulation here is a literary device not an actual quotation of a "creed." Typical for these sentences in Hebrews, especially those which are his own formulations, is the use of cult terms from the Old Testament to describe the content of the possession of faith figuratively; cf. "we have such a high priest, who is seated on the right hand. . . ." Hebrews 8.1; ". . . since we have confidence for the entrance into the sanctuary . . ." Hebr. 10.19. Thus, *θυσιαστήριον* here is to be understood as an Old Testament term used to characterize the place of the Christian "sacrifice," i.e., Calvary. Such understanding is consistent with the word use of Hebrews⁴⁶ and also of the New Testament as such where *θυσιαστήριον* almost always is the altar of the tabernacle or the temple.⁴⁷

It is, therefore, rather difficult to find a reference to the Lord's Supper in the formulation *ἔχομεν θυσιαστήριον*.⁴⁸

But we have to ask positively: What is meant by this figurative statement in which an Old Testament term is the content of a formulation in the style of a credal formula? What does it mean, if Christians confess Calvary as their altar? The answer is implied

⁴³ See any commentary ad loc., especially Windisch, op. cit., and Michel, op. cit.

⁴⁴ Windisch, op. cit., p. 77, suggests putting the sentence in parenthesis.

⁴⁵ "Bekennnisaussage" for which *ἔχομεν* is typical (Michel, op. cit., p. 341). Basic for the recognition of the structure of the Homologia in Hebr. is G. Bornkamm, "Das Bekenntnis im Hebräerbrief," Studien zu Antike und Christentum (1959), pp. 188-204 (first published in Theologische Blätter 1942, pp. 1 ff.). To put the emphasis upon the word "have" ("We have an altar," Moule, op. cit., p. 37) is not justified in sentences of this style.

⁴⁶ The word *θυσιαστήριον* occurs elsewhere in Hebrews only in 7:13 with a non-figurative meaning. In the description of the tabernacle Hebrews does not mention an altar for sacrifices (*θυσιαστήριον*), but only one for incense (*θυμιατήριον* 9.4).

⁴⁷ There is no single instance in the New Testament in which the word refers to the table of the Lord's Supper.

⁴⁸ The first to use *θυσιαστήριον* as a term for the table of the Eucharist is Ignatius of Antioch, cf. Phld. 4:μία γὰρ σὰρξ τοῦ κυρίου . . . καὶ ἐν ποτήριον εἰς ἐνωσιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, ἐν θυσιαστήριον ὡς εἰς ἐπίσκοπος, see also Magn. 7.2.

in our exegesis of Hebrews 13.11-12: the sacrifice "outside the camp" puts an end to all cultic and sacred performances, and those who have this "altar" are not to dwell in sacred places and to deal with ritual regulations, but to go out into the world to bear his reproach (see above). The consequence is pointed out in 13.15-16: The Christian "sacrifice" is to praise God and to do good works.

On the other hand, οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες according to our interpretation of "tent" means those who are involved in the obsolete service of cultic and ritual performances for salvation.⁴⁹ Without the negation οὐκ, the second part of 13.10 is a citation of a cultic principle from the Old Testament: the priests had the right to eat the meat of the sacrifices.⁵⁰ The negation added to this citation says that in view of the Christian altar, i.e., Calvary, such participants have lost their claims which are only legitimate in the "first tent." This probably does not exclude Jewish priests in particular from Christian worship,⁵¹ and it does not apply to priests alone. In Hebrews 9.10 λατρεύειν is not used of priests in particular, but of the cultic worshippers in general. Thus the sentence 13.10 excludes all cultists and ritualists in general from the participation in the salvation accomplished at Calvary. If we, thus, try to translate this sentence which is packed with figurative terminology, we would have to interpret: Concerning the altar which we confess as ours, namely Jesus' sacrifice on Calvary, — those who are concerned with a cultic and ritual mediation of salvation, have no part in this "altar" (sc. Calvary); since all

⁴⁹ This excludes Holtzmann's exegesis, according to which οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες is a picture for the church of the New Testament: ". . . σκηνή der pneumatische neutestamentliche Tempel, bei dem der pneumatische Altar steht, auf dem Christus sich selbst geopfert hat. Da darf die feiernde Gemeinde von diesem Altar nicht essen." (Op. cit., p. 255.)

⁵⁰ Cf. Michel, op. cit., p. 343; this refers only to the guilt-and-sin-offerings for transgressions, not to the whole-offerings in the inner sanctuary; see Lev. 16.19-22; 7.6; Num. 18.9 f. The same principle is also used in Barn. 7.4; see also 1. Cor. 9.13; 10.18.

⁵¹ According to Michel the sentence says that Jewish and sectarian priests are excluded from the Lord's Supper (op. cit., p. 343); a more general interpretation is presented by Moule, op. cit., p. 38: "the Jews whose religion runs upon the lines of the Mosaic tabernacle . . . have not the privilege of eating from it," i.e., the real altar which the Christians have. But on the whole I agree with Moule's main point: "The sacrifice (of the Christians) is the Body of Christ, his obedient self-surrender," which is opposed to sacrificial performances as "really is opposed to symbolically" (p. 39).

this belongs to a way of participation which is obsolete now, i.e., that of the "first tent." The Lord's Supper is not specifically referred to, nor any other particular doctrine of ritual or cultic regulation. But we have to ask further: What are the polemical implications of these fundamental and radical Christological arguments in Hebrews 13.9 ff.?

V

Is it possible that 13.9 ff. implies an argument against some "neo-sacramentarians,"⁵² who misunderstand the Lord's Supper as a *βρῶμα* that gives direct communion with the divine? Was the author to the Hebrews then an antisacramentalist? It is strange that he never — except, perhaps in our passage — even mentions the Lord's Supper, although his highly liturgical and sacrificial symbolism could have given ample opportunity to argue in this direction positively. Furthermore his attitude to baptism is quite peculiar. In 9.10 he challenges the "baptisms" (*βαπτισμοί* = ablutions) of the "first tent" as "regulations of the flesh," without mentioning the Christian baptism with a word. In 6.2 he mentions the "teaching of baptisms" (*βαπτισμῶν* — plural! — *διδαχή*) among the initial, elementary doctrines of Christianity, which a Christian has to leave behind to advance to perfection. Nevertheless, there is a positive interpretation of baptism in Hebrews 10:22, but it is not a sacramental one. If there is really a criticism of the sacraments in Hebrews — and some indications are given for this — we have to be aware of one thing: sacramentalism is not criticized because "any such notion is, to him, a relapse upon the sensuous, which as a spiritual idealist he despises as 'a vain thing, fondly invented,' " as Moffatt says.⁵³ On the contrary, sacramentalism would be challenged because for the author of our epistle, it implies an escape from the dimension of human, i.e., historical, and secular reality. It is within this realm of human existence that Jesus suffered and died (cf., Hebrews 5.7). It is in this same realm of reality that the Christians as the true wandering people of God have no escape into performances

⁵² Moffatt, op. cit., p. 234.

⁵³ Moffatt, op. cit., p. 234.

and "sacraments" which are in themselves "religious" or divine. But they have to accept the challenges and sufferings of this human existence as their path to the city they are to inherit, which is, however, still in the future (cf., Hebrews 13.14). Hence, such criticism of a false "sacramentalism" would be very similar to 1. Corinthians 11, where the point of Paul's argument is the preaching of the Lord's *death* until he *comes* again.

But whether the passage Hebrews 13.9 ff. has such anti-sacramentalistic implications or not, basically it is directed against any mediation of the Divine that entailed a denial of the humanity and real suffering of the redeemer in this world, which did not take this life and world seriously, but takes refuge in the *sacred* rather than in the *human* appearance of God in the world.

What is attacked here as *βρώματα* is the Christian — but heretical — doctrine of direct communion with the divine in the sacrament or in any other regulations and rituals. This teaching failed to acknowledge the paradoxical character of the divine presence in the salvation focused in the cross of Calvary "outside the camp," and did not see the involvement of the Christian existence in the non-sacred character of this life as a necessary consequence from the "unholy sacrifice" of Jesus, upon which Christian faith rests. Therefore our author here in the paraenesis of the last chapter of his epistle points vigorously to the humanity of the redeemer and his suffering beyond the holiness of the camp as the basic fact of the Christian faith.

Our passage is not a key to Hebrews in the sense that the entire epistle is to be understood as a controversy with such heretics as are attacked in chapter 13.⁵⁴ But the basic Christological argument against heresy is, nevertheless, a clue to the problems of Christology in this epistle. The entire epistle is devoted to the Christological problem of salvation and of revelation of the divine power precisely in the man Jesus, and to the ecclesiological consequences of this Christological concept.

⁵⁴ Windisch, op. cit., p. 118. Moreover every attempt to fix the epistle as a whole in a specific situation of the church or a church group fails, because of the character of this writing, which is not a "letter" written for a specific situation (against Manson!), but by all means a fundamental theological treatise.