

RICHARD OUNSWORTH

Joshua Typology
in the New Testament

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe*

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

Herausgeber / Editor
Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors
Friedrich Avemarie (Marburg)
Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford)
James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala)
Hans-Josef Klauck (Chicago, IL)

328



Richard Ounsworth

Joshua Typology in the New Testament

Mohr Siebeck

RICHARD OUNSWORTH OP, born 1972; 1995 joined the Order of Preachers (Dominicans); 2005–10 Masters and Doctorate at Oxford University; since 2003 teaching Old and New Testament Studies and New Testament Greek at the Dominican Studium and Blackfriars Hall, Oxford.

Nihil obstat: Very Revd Dr Aidan Nichols O. P., S. T. M., *Censor deputatus*
Imprimi potest: Very Revd Dr John Farrell O. P., Prior Provincial

e-ISBN 978-3-16-152144-7

ISBN 978-3-16-151932-1

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>

© 2012 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany.

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

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

Printed in Germany.

For my parents, with all my love

Preface

This monograph is a moderately revised version of a doctoral thesis presented to the Theology Faculty of the University of Oxford in May 2010. The work of which it is the culmination was undertaken under obedience to various religious superiors, without whose support it would have been quite impossible: I should mention in particular Frs Allan White and John Farrell, successive Priors Provincial, and Fr Richard Finn, the Regent of Studies and head of house at Blackfriars Hall, Oxford. Fr Benedict Viviano spent a year at Blackfriars undertaking all my teaching responsibilities so that I could have the time to write up the thesis, and for this remarkable example of fraternal support I offer profound thanks. Fr Aidan Nichols acted as Censor of this book with his customary generosity, and I was touched by his kind words. For the period of my graduate studies I was in receipt of very generous support from the Arts and Humanities Research Council, to whom I and the entire community at Blackfriars are grateful.

The initial inspiration for the central thesis of this work came about in an undergraduate tutorial on the Letter to the Hebrews with Dr John Mudiman, and I am indebted to him both for nourishing my love of New Testament studies in those earlier years and for enthusiastically undertaking to supervise my graduate studies. When he was obliged to hand me over to another supervisor on account of the burdens of university bureaucracy, I was received with equal enthusiasm under the wing of Prof. Chris Rowland. The hugely enjoyable debates between us forced me to sharpen the presentation of my work, especially of its theological import, while stirring my own enthusiasm still more. Prof. Rowland also presided with his inimitable combination of warmth, gentleness and acuity over the New Testament Graduate Seminars, where I spent many happy and rewarding hours in the stimulating company of fellow graduate students. This scholarly companionship, in the finest traditions of the University, provided a wonderful opportunity to make connections between my work and the wider world of biblical and theological scholarship. I should like to thank in particular Tom Wilson, Mary Marshall, Chris Hayes and David Lincicum for their helpful responses, stimulating suggestions and invaluable friendship.

My thesis was examined by Prof. Frances Young and Prof. Markus Bockmuehl, and I am grateful to both for their probing questions. My debt to Markus is indeed inestimable, and it is to him more than anyone else that I owe the opportunity to publish this work. I am grateful also to Prof. Dr. Jörg Frey for accepting it for publication in this series, and to Dr. Henning Ziebritzki and the infinitely patient Dominika Zgolik at Mohr Siebeck for their help in bringing it to print.

Notwithstanding the support of many colleagues, supervisors and mentors, the work of producing a monograph such as this is inevitably a somewhat lonely task. My continued sanity is owed to the many people whose love and support I have received over the last few years: to my non-Dominican friends, and those who live far from the ivory tower of the academy, for their sometimes bemused but always unconditional love; to my brothers, especially at Blackfriars, for their fraternal charity, their endless patience and the sheer joy of living with them in community – it really is like oil upon the beard; my sister Louise, her husband and my friend Paul, and their beautiful and hilarious children Patrick and Katie, are an endless source of delight. But above all, I thank my parents Lin and Tony, to whom this book is dedicated. The depth of my gratitude to them is inexpressible.

Oxford, 14 May 2012

Richard Joseph Ounsworth OP

Table of Contents

Preface.....	VII
Table of Contents.....	IX
Chapter 1. Introduction.....	1
A. Origins and Overview.....	1
B. Joshua Typology in Later Christian Literature.....	10
i. Jude 5.....	10
ii. Post-Apostolic Literature.....	13
Chapter 2. The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in Hebrews.....	19
A. Introduction.....	19
B. Authorial Intention and Reader Competence.....	20
C. The Case of Hebrews – Author and Audience.....	26
D. The Old Testament in Hebrews.....	28
E. Defining New Testament Typology.....	32
F. The Background to New Testament Typology.....	40
i. The Old Testament.....	40
ii. Intertestamental Literature.....	46
G. Conclusion.....	51
Chapter 3. Joshua as a Type of Christ in Hebrews 3 and 4.....	55
A. Introduction.....	55
B. Psalm 95 and Numbers 14 – Faithlessness and Exclusion.....	56
C. On the Threshold of the Promised Land.....	59
D. The Exceptional Faithfulness of Joshua and Caleb.....	62
E. The Nature of the Promise Borne by Joshua and Caleb.....	66
F. The Striking Coincidence of the Name of Jesus.....	71

G. Faith Superior to that of Moses.....	74
H. A Typology of Similarity and Difference.....	78
I. Theological Implications of the Joshua/Rest Typologies.....	89
J. Conclusion.....	95
 Chapter 4. Hebrews 11 and the Joshua-Shaped Gap in Israel's History.....	 98
A. Introduction.....	98
B. The Place of Hebrews 11 within the Epistle.....	99
C. A Description of Faith.....	101
D. The Structure of Hebrews 11 and its Rhetorical Function.....	109
i. Overall Structure.....	109
ii. From Creation to Abraham: Those who Live by Faith are Sojourners.....	111
iii. Into Egypt: Is Moses Faithful?.....	117
iv. The First Lacuna: Joshua's Absence from the List of Faith- Heroes.....	119
v. The Second Lacuna: The Conquest and the Wilderness Generation.....	125
 Chapter 5. Passing Beyond the Veil.....	 131
A. Introduction.....	131
B. The Sacred Geography of Hebrews.....	132
C. Hope that Enters within the Veil: Hebrews 6.19f.....	138
i. Preserving Ambivalence.....	139
ii. Which Veil?.....	142
D. A New and Living Way: Hebrews 10.19f.....	145
E. The Cleansing of the Heavenly Sanctuary.....	152
F. The Two Tents.....	157
G. Jesus, Pioneer and Perfector of Faith.....	165
 Chapter 6. Conclusions and Prospects.....	 173
A. Review.....	173
B. Typological Readings and Supersessionism.....	176
C. Theological Prospects.....	184
 Bibliography.....	 189

Index of Ancient Sources.....	203
Index of Modern Authors.....	210
Index of Subjects.....	212

Chapter 1

Introduction

A. Origins and Overview

The suggestion I wish to offer is that a greater sense of the unity of the Letter to the Hebrews can be achieved by inferring from the Letter a typological relationship between Joshua the son of Nun and Jesus. The seeds of this idea were sown in my own mind when I read the Letter in Greek for the first time as an undergraduate, and stumbled over the meaning of 4.8: *εἰ γὰρ αὐτοὺς Ἰησοῦς κατέπαυσεν, οὐκ ἂν περὶ ἄλλης ἐλάλει μετὰ ταῦτα ἡμέρας*. Why this impugning of the salvific efficacy of Jesus in a discussion about the exodus? It was only when I turned to the RSV that I discovered that it was not Jesus but Joshua, the son of Nun, who had not given rest to the people of Israel. The use of Jesus's so-familiar name to refer to another Ἰησοῦς caused a double-take and left me with the lasting impression that there might be some deeper theological significance to the fact that Jesus's name is Joshua.

At the time, I made little of this, noting only that “what Jesus has achieved is what the first Jesus – i.e. Joshua, for the names are the same in Greek and in Aramaic – could not achieve, namely ... permanent entry into the heavenly resting place, the promised land” and that “the story of the wilderness wanderings is the story of act after act of disobedience forgiven by God, and brought to its culmination under the leadership of the first Joshua, an anti-type of Jesus.” This seemed to be rather more, indeed, than was made of this possible hint of a relationship between Joshua and Jesus in the various commentaries I consulted.

However, my attention was drawn to the suggestion of Austin Farrer¹ that Matthew's Gospel has not a pentateuchal but a hexateuchal structure, with the final chapters describing Christ's entry into Jerusalem, his passion, death, resurrection and farewell to his disciples being Matthew's “Book of Joshua”:

The new Jesus comes through Jericho, indeed, but it is Jerusalem he condemns to utter overthrow, so that not one stone shall remain upon another. The fall of the city is the sign

¹ In Farrer 1955; cf. Farrer 1954; I am hugely indebted to John Muddiman for this insight.

and the condition of the gathering of Israel into the true land of promise under the leadership of Jesus (23.37 – 24.2, 24.15–31).²

If Farrer is right, then Matthew implicitly presents Jesus as a new Joshua, and therefore conversely invites us to infer that the former Joshua's life, and in particular his achievement in leading the people of God into the promised land, was a foreshadowing of the person of Jesus Christ and the salvation he wrought. Farrer appears not to have built upon his tentative suggestion, strangely making nothing of the fact that the Messiah's human father is instructed "you shall call his name Joshua, for he shall save his people from their sins" (Matthew 1.21); and I am aware of only one work that links it to the possible hint offered by the Letter to the Hebrews³; but the fact that these two otherwise very different NT texts both point, albeit subtly, to some sort of relationship between Jesus and Joshua is perhaps reason enough to see whether further investigation might bear fruit.

It is necessary at once to emphasise the modesty of my proposal: I am not claiming to demonstrate that the author of Hebrews intended to invoke a Joshua typology, only that the Epistle invites its audience to infer one. Secondly, and relatedly, I am not insisting that Joshua typology is "the key" to unlocking the mystery of Hebrews. The Epistle has been read fruitfully for centuries without such an inference. I hope only to offer a helpful supplement to this *Wirkungsgeschichte*, highlighting certain aspects of the theology of Hebrews that might have been more strongly emphasised, and shedding a little more light thereby on some particular exegetical difficulties.

This leads then to four specific objectives:

1. In the light of recent research and debate into the use of the Old Testament in the New, to consider what criteria might legitimise reading Hebrews in such a way;

2. To clarify what kind of typological relationship might be inferred from Hebrews between Jesus and Joshua;

3. To investigate, through detailed exegesis of particular passages, whether such an inference aids this exegesis;

4. To see whether this exegesis, being so illuminated, helps us to read Hebrews in a satisfyingly consistent way that offers valuable answers to some of the theological questions being posed to the Epistle in recent discussion.

The bulk of this work will concern the third of these objectives, in chapters three to five. This exegesis will take place, however, against the

² Farrer 1955 cited from <http://www.markgoodacre.org/Q/farrer.htm> accessed 9th March 2010.

³ Ounsworth 2003

necessary backdrop of the following chapter, which begins by suggesting that “authorial intention” is not the most helpful locus of meaning with regard to the interpretation of Hebrews. One reason for this is obvious: we do not know who the author of the Epistle was, nor indeed anything about him beyond the little that can be directly inferred from the text. In recent scholarship on Hebrews the attempt to identify the author has largely been abandoned, as has the desire to date the text with any accuracy or to pinpoint a specific occasion or community problem as the background to the Epistle.⁴ But this does not mean that the historical-critical recognition of the gap between ourselves and the text is to be overlooked in favour of a purely “synchronic” or “reader-response” interpretation. Perhaps more than any book of the New Testament – with the probable exception of the Apocalypse – Hebrews makes the reader aware of the historical distance between himself and the text’s own time and place, that the Epistle emerges from a world of ideas and symbols far removed from our own. No text demands more help from the methods of historical criticism, and yet none is more resistant to those methods, since it is, as is often remarked, rather like Melchisedek “ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος” (Hebrews 7.3).

There is nevertheless a criterion other than authorial intention that might provide the historical objectivity to legitimise interpretation and avoid an exegetical free-for-all, and that is the concept of a plausible first audience. The word “audience” is used deliberately, since I accept the view that the Epistle to the Hebrews is misnamed in two respects, being neither addressed to Hebrews but to Hellenists (that is, Greek-speakers, though not necessarily therefore Gentile rather than Jewish Christians) and being, at least in its origins, a sermon of some sort rather than a letter. To an extent this distinction is meaningless, inasmuch as – apart from Philemon – none of the Epistles in the NT are *personal letters* but rather they appear to have been intended to be read aloud to an ecclesial gathering; but the readily apparent rhetorical intent of Hebrews, as well as its self-description as a “word of exhortation” (13.22) should especially incline us to treat it as something to be heard rather than something to read. Moreover, the sermonic nature of Hebrews makes it more reasonable that it was first encountered against the background not so much of a community in crisis as of a set of scriptural texts; if there is an “occasion” for Hebrews it is likely to be a liturgical one rather than a now-lost historical event⁵. Nevertheless, this occasion is at a distance from us, and to hear Hebrews with the ears of a plausible first audience requires historical-critical effort.

Discussion of the use of the Old Testament in the New has tended to be dominated by the question of authorial intention, although more recently

⁴ See Ounsworth 2009

⁵ I deal with the specific proposal of Gelardini (2005) briefly below, p. 30.

the question of what the addressees of NT texts might have picked up on has come more to the fore, as I will outline briefly in the next chapter. Specifically, I suggest that our plausible audience is less likely to hear *verbal* cues pointing to some overarching *literary* structure and more likely to find itself immersed in a re-telling of the story of Israel's *Heilsgeschichte*. Thus, less emphasis should be placed on identifying verbal parallels between our text and some book of the OT, leading to the suggestion that this or that particular allusion evokes, for example, a deuteronomic or an "Isaian New Exodus" context; rather, we will investigate how Hebrews offers a fresh understanding of the broad sweep of the story of the Old Testament, and of particularly significant moments in it.

Such an approach to the relationship between the testaments is, I shall argue, especially conducive to typological readings, but it will be necessary to ask what sort of "typological" understanding of the relationship between Joshua and Jesus our audience may have been able to infer. Following a suggestion of Frances Young⁶ I will use occurrences of the word *τύπος* and its cognates in the NT as a heuristic device for developing a concept of typology which, though it may not be identical to any explicit definition of typology that our audience would have known, was a way of relating to their scriptural history that would have been comprehensible to them: it describes a mode of relationship between events, persons, places and practices that they would have been ready to infer, whether or not they would have labelled it "typology". At the heart of this working definition is the notion of divinely intended isomorphic correspondences: by God's providence, there are formal similarities between, for example, the crossing of the Red Sea and the crossing of the Jordan, Noah's escape from the flood and Christian baptism, or the garden of Eden and the Jerusalem temple. In many and various ways, God has stamped the character of his saving power into the life and history of his chosen people.

These isomorphisms are therefore "real" rather than "verbal". That is to say, while similarities in the wording of scripture may serve to highlight correspondences between different aspects of the story of Israel's relationship with her God, our audience would understand that these correspondences are not created, as it were artificially, by a literary device, but only brought to light by verbal similarities. We can distinguish, then, between a "weak" or literary typology and a "strong" or ontological one. In the former, an author uses his literary skill to illustrate one thing by referring his reader (or hearer) to something else to which is it *not* intrinsically related. But in the latter, the relationship is real, and the literary art is there to draw attention to it; indeed, the relationship may be there even if there are no

⁶ See below, p. 33.

verbal parallels. The citation from Tertullian on p. 15 is a particularly clear example of this ontological relationship, but I will suggest that the concept was found already in the OT itself, and developed in later Jewish literature which, though we cannot be sure that our audience knew it, testifies to the kinds of ideas with which they may have been familiar.

In particular, there are two developments in the intertestamental period of profound interest for a study of Hebrews: the first is an increasing tendency to associate typology with the temple and its cult – so, for example, in the Book of Jubilees the various annual feasts are re-enactments of particular events in salvation history. More commonly the temple is involved, however, in a vertical typology: a strong sense that the divinely-ordained structure of the temple is modelled on and somehow makes present the heavenly sanctuary, or heaven conceived *as* a sanctuary, and the liturgy is a participation in the eternal liturgy of the heavenly court. The second, and even more important, development is an increasing intertwining of this vertical dimension with the horizontal one of historical correspondence.

The intertwining of these two dimensions will prove most significant when we turn to the main part of this monograph, the exegesis of the Letter to the Hebrews. The Letter may be said to have two controlling images: that of Christ as High Priest entering the heavenly sanctuary, and that of the Christian community as the People of God on their pilgrimage to the Promised Land. At the risk of over-simplification we may say that the first, christological, image is a vertical one and the second, ecclesiological, image is a horizontal one, and each in two senses: that of the movement that is conceived, and that of the typology upon which the image depends. Christ goes “up” from earth to heaven, is exalted to take his seat at the right hand of the Father (1.3; 2.9; 6.19f; 8 and 9 *passim*); and this is imagined in terms of the “vertical” correspondence between the earthly and the heavenly sanctuaries. The People of God move “forward” into the eschatological Promised Land (4.1, 6; 12.1, 22), and this is pictured via the “horizontal” typological relationship of the historical entry of the Israelites into Canaan to the real “rest” of God made available in Christ. Again simplifying somewhat, we may say that the vertical image is the dominant one in the central part of the Letter – roughly speaking chapters five to ten – while the horizontal prevails in chapters 3f and 11f. A key task of the exegete wishing to present a consistent theological vision that emerges from a holistic reading of Hebrews is therefore to explore how these two dimensions interrelate, to see how the christological and the ecclesiological typologies are woven together into a soteriological tapestry.

It should be emphasised at this point, and this will be made clear in much greater detail in the following chapter, that by “typologies” here I

mean more than a hermeneutical device. Certainly “typology” can be used to speak of a form of exegesis of the scriptures of Israel, or the use of examples from those scriptures, to illustrate the significance of the salvation that has been wrought in Christ. But my claim is that this hermeneutical practice may plausibly give rise to the inference, by those two whom such use of the OT is directed, of an ontological relationship between the two poles of the exegetical typology: if for example the crossing of the Red Sea is used to illustrate the significance of the return from exile, one might infer from this that the correspondences or isomorphisms between the two salvation-historical events are not coincidental, neither are they an arbitrary juxtaposition on the part of the interpreter, rather they reveal a profound theological truth concerning the divine character. The shape of salvation history is formed by the nature of God and his providential love for his people, and so we find the same patterns repeated again and again in that history: the ontological relationship arises from the fact that these related events are both stamped with the same character (*χαρακτήρ*) of God’s nature; and this relationship is uncovered, not created, by typological exegesis.

This kind of ontological relationship between the terms of a typology is clearly more apparent in those typologies that operate on the vertical axis, and in particular the typological relationship that is established within the OT itself between the earthly and the heavenly sanctuaries. The high-priestly Christology of the central section of Hebrews may be said to depend upon the understanding that the temple in Jerusalem (or at least, the earthly sanctuary as depicted and ordained in the OT, and especially in Exodus and Leviticus) is a shadow and sketch of the heavenly sanctuary, its reality being established by the higher reality of God’s supernal dwelling-place. Thus actions within the earthly sanctuary, and for Hebrews especially the actions of the Aaronic High Priest on the Day of Atonement, mirror *and are established by* the realities of the heavenly sanctuary. Hebrews explicitly calls the relationship between these two sanctuaries typological (8.5) and uses throughout chapter 9 language that establishes this ontological relationship, and it is probably fair to say that there is broadly accepted to be what I am calling an ontological typology on this vertical axis in the central section of Hebrews⁷. I would acknowledge that it is more contentious to infer horizontal typology of the ontological kind, both in Hebrews in particular and in the Epistle’s theological context more broadly. Horizontal typology is not so explicitly referred to, and its workings are more complex: while the ontological relationship between heavenly and earthly sanctuaries is a direct one, that between moments of

⁷ See especially Cody 1960, Hofius 1970a and Isaacs 1992.

salvation history is indirect, relying upon a shared dependence upon the divine character. Put more bluntly: the temple is the way it is because it is conformed to the heavenly sanctuary; the return from exile is like the Exodus because they are both conformed to some same aspect of the divine character.

One of the most important aspects of the Jewish theological context of Hebrews' use of typology in the way I am proposing is the increasing intertwining of the horizontal and vertical dimensions.⁸ This becomes especially important in Christian literature, because of its claims of eschatological realisation⁹: those aspects of the salvation achieved by and in Christ which are at one pole of the typologies implied are not merely another example of what God is like, but the supreme example and, I will suggest, the sources of all the others – the die, as it were, which has stamped its impression upon salvation history and upon the ongoing cultic life of God's people hitherto. This is as much the case with the vertical as with the horizontal typologies. The isomorphism between Christ's entry into the heavenly sanctuary and the entry of the High Priest into the Holy of Holies on Yom Kippur is ultimately the same as the isomorphism between Christ's heavenly exaltation at the head of his people and the entry of the People of Israel into the Promised Land. Moreover the claim that I shall be making is that Hebrews invites us to understand that the reason why both Joshua's conquest and the Day of Atonement are good illustrations of the meaning of Christ's death-and-exaltation is that under providence both of these, along with other aspects of the relationship between God and his people to which the Epistle happens not to draw our attention, were shaped *by* the death-and-exaltation of Christ, though this had not yet taken place in time.

From this point of view it is at least as difficult to unpick the vertical aspect as the horizontal of the kind of typological reading that I am proposing, and therefore to begin with the horizontal is not a case of beginning with the more difficult and moving to the easier, but if anything the opposite. Moreover, working in this direction helps us to solve what I consider is a key problem in Hebrews: it is clear that the Epistle proposes that upon (and by) his death Christ entered into heaven, into the presence of God, and that this is advantageous to us inasmuch as he is better able there to make intercession for us (7.25); I take it as axiomatic that this entry into heaven is something the Epistle proposes as the real significant consequence of Christ's death. It is also clear that the paraenetic motive of

⁸ See below pp. 45–51.

⁹ I agree entirely with Barrett (1954: 373) that “For Hebrews [...] eschatology is alive and determinative, and it was this which gave the author his creative understanding of the OT.”

Hebrews is to encourage the audience on a pilgrimage to join Christ in that same heavenly presence of God. What is less clear is how Christ's death and entry into heaven (the High Priestly Christology) is salvific for us – how it makes possible for us our own entry into heaven at the end of this pilgrimage (the People of God ecclesiology). What this boils down to is the problem of the atonement – how does Jesus's death make a difference to me? And a very helpful aspect of Hebrews' distinctive answer to this question is, I suggest, the historically-plausible inference of a Joshua-typology of the kind I propose.

Thus the exegesis falls into three chapters: the first deals with 3.7–4.11, in which the superiority of Jesus over Moses with which Hebrews 3 begins is explored through an exegesis of Psalm 95 relating it to the events of Numbers 13f. One of the key aspects of this part of the story of Israel's wilderness sojourn is the condemnation of all the exodus generation, including Moses himself, to die without entering the Promised Land. Only two, Joshua and Caleb, because of their exceptional faithfulness, will be permitted to enter God's rest. Significantly, the superiority of Jesus over Moses is also couched in terms of faithfulness. This next-generation entry under the leadership of the faithful Joshua is, we are told, not the final fulfilment of God's promise of rest, for the rest that he holds out to his people is no earthly dwelling place but a participation in his eternal Sabbath. I will attempt to show that the inference of a typological relationship between Jesus and Joshua is justified by, and simultaneously helps to clarify, the detailed exegesis of this key ecclesiological passage.

Support for this inference is then adduced from a study of Hebrews 11, in which the salvation history of Israel is proposed as a model of faithful living. This faith is a matter of fixing one's sight on the invisible and eternal realities which are revealed only via visible and temporal things; and such faith is, I will argue, not just characteristic but *constitutive* of God's holy people. A careful examination of the rhetorical structure of the chapter shows that it creates two *lacunæ*: the crossing of the Jordan is omitted, as is the person of Joshua himself, and these two gaps occur precisely where the rhetorical structure begins to collapse. The overall effect of the chapter is to imply that salvation history came to a stop, in a certain sense, when the people were on the threshold of the Promised Land; and this is precisely the location in which 3.7–4.11 implicitly locates the audience of the Letter. Thus we may infer that it is for a more real, eternal and eschatological Joshua, now made visible at the end of the age, to complete the conquest of which the entry into Canaan was but a visible and temporary sign.

If my exegesis is correct, then these two sections of Hebrews invite us to infer a Joshua-shaped christology to accompany the conquest-generation

ecclesiology; the question remains how to relate this to the more overt High Priest christology. My starting point will be three chiastically related passages that concern the veil of the sanctuary: 6.19f, 10.19f and 9.1–14. I will suggest that the crossing of the Jordan is to be co-ordinated with the passing through the curtain, which evokes not only the ritual of Yom Kippur, in which the Aaronic High Priest enters annually into the Holy of Holies, but also the original inauguration of the sanctuary by Moses, of which the Day of Atonement ritual may be seen as an annual recapitulation. Thus to pass beyond the veil connotes the inauguration of a new covenant, the eschatological covenant-relationship with God to which the Christian community is granted access via the fleshly life and death of Jesus. Once again, I hope to show that the inference of a Joshua christology provides a valuable lens through which some of the most profoundly difficult exegetical *crucis* of Hebrews, especially in chapter 9, can helpfully be seen. I will conclude by arguing that the first two verses of chapter 12, again arranged chiastically, provide a powerful summary of the inter-relationship of the vertical and the horizontal, the christological and the ecclesiological, centring on the name Ἰησοῦς.

The Epistle thus offers us a hint that the name of Jesus is a key that unlocks the mystery of salvation in Christ. The concluding chapter will summarise my exegetical proposals, clarify their implications for the reading of the Epistle as a whole and offer some prospects for theology on the basis of them. I will demonstrate that the inference of a Joshua typology from the Letter to the Hebrews not only aids in the exegesis of the Epistle, especially in regard to a number of particularly difficulty *crucis*, but also highlights very clearly the unique contribution of the Epistle to the theology of the atonement. This contribution has, I suggest, been blunted by an unwillingness in the post-enlightenment period to find in Hebrews something that cannot be proved to have been intended by the author, something only hinted at and not made explicit in the text. I hope to demonstrate that a willingness to discern and follow these hints leads to a plausible holistic reading that makes a valuable contribution to theology.

In the following section, before embarking upon my own exposition, I will briefly show that, if there is Joshua typology in the Letter to the Hebrews, it did not disappear thereafter in the history of Christian literature. On the contrary, it became more explicit in the post-apostolic period. This might be an argument against reading it out of Hebrews: if when it is used later, it is used explicitly, then might it not be that when it is not used explicitly it is simply not there? But in some of the cases dealt with below, it is at least possible that the explicit Joshua typology seems to emerge from an engagement with Hebrews, and with precisely those passages of the Letter where I argue for an implicit Joshua typology.

B. Joshua Typology in Later Christian Literature

It is not my intention here to give a full account of Joshua typology in the writings that came after the Epistle to the Hebrews: such a task would require a monograph-length treatment. However, it is worthwhile first to draw attention to the existence of this typology, sometimes very explicit and at other times more subtle; secondly, towards the end of this section I will suggest briefly that at times the use of such typology contains indications that it may have been influenced by readings of Hebrews. In other words, it is possible that two Syrian writers, Aphraates and Ephrem, as well as Origen, have themselves inferred a Joshua typology from Hebrews, and indeed with particular reference to those parts of the Epistle whence I too am suggesting we might infer it.

i. Jude 5

Possibly one of the earliest examples of arguable Joshua typology occurs in the Epistle of Jude, which may even pre-date Hebrews.¹⁰ Like Hebrews 3f and 1 Corinthians 10, Jude 5 offers the example of the deaths of the wilderness generation as a warning to the present generation of Christians of the possible consequences of faithlessness. The majority of commentators see ἅπαξ λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν as a reference specifically to the punishment imposed upon all but Caleb and Joshua in Numbers 14.26–38, which I argue below¹¹ is central to Hebrews' interpretation of Ps 95 in chapters 3f.

In order to argue for Joshua typology here we need, first, to accept the variant reading Ἰησοῦς for κύριος as the subject of the clause cited above. This reading is certainly well attested, occurring in Codices Alexandrinus and Vaticanus and numerous other uncials as well as the best of the versions, Vulgate, Ethiopic and Syriac. It is also cited in Origen and Jerome, among others.¹² Moreover it appears to be the *lectio difficilior* (“difficult to the point of impossibility”, according to the UBS committee¹³) since it is so difficult to make sense of. This reminds us that the criterion of *lectio difficilior* can only be taken so far: we can only in fact accept this reading if we can find a non-impossible reading of it; but con-

¹⁰ The reader is directed to any modern commentary on Jude for discussion of its date and the related question of authorship: e.g. Neyrey 1993; Bauckham 1983 and cf. Bauckham 1990. On the date of Hebrews see below pp. 26–27.

¹¹ See pp. 56–66

¹² See Metzger 1971: 725f. for a fuller list.

¹³ Metzger 1971:726; Metzger and Wikgren dissent from the majority opinion and prefer to read Ἰησοῦς.