**true** (archetypal, *only true*, as so often in  
St, John, and in one passage of St. Luke,  
xvi. 11) **tabernacle, which the Lord** (here  
evidently the Father: see note on ch. xii.  
14) **pitched, not** [any] **man** (it is an important question, symbolically considered,  
whether any and what distinction is intended by the Writer, between **the holy  
place** and **the tabernacle**. Delitzsch has  
gone into it at length, and Hofmann has  
treated of it in two places. Both are  
agreed that **the holy place** betokens the  
immediate immaterial presence of God, the  
veritable Holy of Holies, beyond, and ap-  
approached through, the heavens, ch. iv. 14.  
But as regards **the tabernacle** they differ.  
Hofmann maintains it to be the glorified  
body of Christ, and argues that it alone  
will satisfy such expressions as that in  
ch. ix. 11, “*not of this creation:*” in order  
to satisfying which, this *tabernacle* must  
belong to the new creation, the *regeneration*, which commences with the glorification of Christ. This glorified body of His  
is the new and abiding temple of God, in  
which He dwells and meets with us who  
are united to and have put on that glorified  
body, our house, eternal in the heavens:  
for so Hofmann interprets 2 Cor. v. 1 ff.  
On the other hand, Delitzsch controverts  
this view, as inconsistent with the symbolism in ch. ix. 11, 12, where Christ,  
“through the greater and more perfect  
tabernacle .... entered into the holy  
place,” taking this connexion of the words:  
and also with our ver. 5, where the Mosaic  
tabernacle is set forth as the representation  
and shadow of the heavenly. Accordingly,  
he believes the *tabernacle* here to be the  
heavenly Jerusalem, the worship-place of  
blessed spirits [Ps. xxix. 9] and of those  
men who have been rapt in vision thither  
[Isa. vi.],–the “*temple of the tabernacle  
Of witness*,” of Rev. xv.5,—the place where  
God's *visible* presence [in contradistinction  
to His personal and invisible presence in  
the *holy places*] is manifested to his creatures angelic and human. In weighing  
these two opinions, I own they seem to me  
to run into one, and of that one by far the  
larger component is on Hofmann’s side.  
  
  
For what is the Heavenly Jerusalem ?  
What but the aggregate, in their persons  
and their glorious abiding-place, of the triumphant saints and servants of God? And  
what is this aggregate, but the mystical  
body of which Christ is the Head and they  
are the members, in its fulfilment and perfection? That glorified body of His, in  
which they are accepted before God, and in  
which as a heavenly temple they serve God,  
and God dwells, He has passed through,  
not by passing out of it, but by finally  
establishing it as an accomplished thing in  
God's sight, and in and as proceeding forth  
from it carrying on his intercession and  
*ministration in the true tabernacle*, in the  
*holy place* itself, See more on this subject,  
ch. ix. 11: and the views of Bleek, Tholuck, &c.:  
also a sermon of Schileiermacher’s  
on the text, vol. ii, of his Predigten, p. 504).

**3—6.**] This *heavenly office and work  
our High Priest must have, if He le  
veritably a High Priest.*

**3.**] **For  
every high priest is appointed to offer  
gifts and sacrifices** (see the very similar  
passage, ch. v. 1, and note there): **whence  
it is necessary that this (High Priest)  
also have somewhat which He may  
offer** (there is here considerable difficulty.  
For the Writer is evidently, from what  
follows, laying the stress on the *heavenly  
“ministry”* of Christ: and this “*somewhat to offer*” applies therefore to His  
work, not on earth, but in heaven, If so, how  
comes it to be said that He has somewhat  
to offer in heaven, seeing that His offering,  
of Himself, was made once for all, in  
contradistinction to those of the Levitical  
priests which were being constantly offered?  
See especially ch. x. 11, 12, which, on this  
view, brings the Writer here into direct  
contradiction to himself, In order to avoid  
this, Lũnemann and Hofmann attempt to  
make the “*somewhat to offer*” retrospective: “it is necessary for Him to  
have [there, in heaven] somewhat [viz.

His body] which he may have offered.”  
But surely this is a view which cannot  
be admitted. The straightforward construction of our sentence makes it necessary