Avondale College of Higher Education

THE DAY OF ATONEMENT

IN THE BOOK OF REVELATION

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Principal Supervisors: Steven Thompson PhD, David Tasker, PhD

Associate Supervisor: Wendy Jackson, PhD

by

André Reis

September 2018

Statement of Original Authorship

I declare that the work contained in this thesis has not been submitted previously for a degree or diploma at this institution, an Australian or overseas university or any other institution of higher education. To the best of my knowledge and belief, this thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made.

Signed  Date **9/25/2018**

Statement of Copyright

I grant to Avondale College the rights to archive in the College library, and to make available my thesis in whole or in part for study now and in the future. I retain all propriety rights. I also retain the right to use in future works all or part of this thesis.

Signed  Date **9/25/2018**

© Copyright by André Reis, 2018

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT OF GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH

Avondale College

PhD Dissertation Title: "The Day of Atonement in the Book of Revelation."
Name of Researcher: André Reis
Name and degree of faculty adviser: Steven Thompson, PhD, David Tasker, PhD, Wendy Jackson, PhD
Date Completed: October 2017

The Levitical Day of Atonement (DA) was a day of penitence, confession and restoration for Israelites of loyal character and a day of covenant renewal for Israel. On this day, sin was removed from the sanctuary through sacrificial blood and the dismissal of the goat for Azazel which carried all sin away and rendered the people of Israel "clean before the Lord" (Lev 16:30).

As it became ingrained in the Jewish consciousness, the DA continued to reverberate in the Jewish pseudepigraphal literature making its way into the writings of the NT, where its typology is illuminated by "the Christ event." Surprisingly, despite its central place in the life of Israel and its impact on the NT, almost no scholarly attention has been dedicated to exploring the intersection of the DA and the book of Revelation. By utilizing a coherent inner-biblical hermeneutical method, this study explores how the themes surrounding the DA helped shape Revelation's message. In Revelation 1, Jesus is introduced as a high priest wearing DA clothing; the visions then move to the theme of holiness vs. uncleanness which suffused the DA's rituals and provide a framework for the letters to the seven churches (Revelation 2–3); the DA blood of the Lamb (Revelation 4, 5) whitens the robes of the saints (Revelation 7, 14); the intercession at

the altar of incense (Revelation 8–9) protects the followers of the Lamb while unleashing judgment on defiant mankind (Revelation 6, 15, 16); the ritual of the goat for Azazel functions as a type of the eschatological judgment on the dragon and his minions (Revelation 17–20) and the final eradication of sin. Finally, the descent of the new Jerusalem (Revelation 21)—whose square shape parallels the earthly Most Holy Place—inaugurates a new earth free from sin where, like the high priest on the DA, "his servants will worship him," dressed in white before the heavenly "mercy seat" and "reign for ever and ever" (Rev 22:3, 5).

For Francini, Pamela, Chloe & McKayla

Ἡ ἀγάπη οὐδέποτε πίπτει
εἴτε δὲ προφητεῖαι, καταργηθήσονται
εἴτε γλῶσσαι, παύσονται
εἴτε γνῶσις, καταργηθήσεται

(1 Cor 13:8)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT OF GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH v

TABLE OF CONTENTS viii

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS xiii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS xxi

CHAPTER 1: UNTYING REVELATION'S GORDIAN KNOT 1

Statement of the Problem 15

Literature Review 17
Kenneth Strand 19
Jon Paulien 20
David Aune 22
Gregory K. Beale 22
Margaret Barker 23
W. Gordon Campbell 24

Summary 24

Research Method 25
Intertextuality: An Overview 26
Intertextuality and the Book of Revelation 41
Gregory K. Beale 46
Steve Moyise 52
Comparison of Beale's and Moyise's Views 55

Summary 57

General Assumptions About Revelation 58
Authorship 58
Date of Composition 62
Literary Genre 65

Summary and Conclusion 67

CHAPTER 2: THE DAY OF ATONEMENT IN THE OLD TESTAMENT 69

The Theology of the Rituals in Leviticus 70
Definition of Ritual and Sacrifice 74
Defiling the Sanctuary 77
No Day of Atonement Purgation for High-Handed Sinners 85
חַטָּאת Purifications: A Multi-Phase Process 87

The Origins of the Day of Atonement 91
The Structure of Lev 16 93
Impurity, Sin and the Purification Rituals of Lev 16 93
The Day of Atonement in the Israelite Calendar 101

The Rituals of the Day of Atonement 101
The Role of the שׂוֹפָר 104
The Role of the People on the Day of Atonement 105
Self-Affliction or Self-Denial 105
The Prohibition Against Working 108
Sanctions for Violating Day of Atonement Self-Denial and Affliction 109
The Role of the High Priest 110
Day of Atonement as Confirmation of High Priestly Office 112
Ritual Ablutions for the High Priest 113
Ablutions for Those Leaving the Camp 115
The High Priestly Clothing on the Day of Atonement 116
The Sacrificial Animals for the Day of Atonement חַטָּאת 118
Casting of the Lots for the Two Goats 119
The First Purification of the Most Holy Place: The Sacrifice for the High Priest and His House 121
The Ritual of Incense 124
The First Purification of the Holy Place: The Altar of Incense 126
The First Purification of the Outer Altar 130
The Second Purification of the Most Holy Place: The Sacrifice for the People 131
The Second Purification of the Holy Place: The Altar of Incense 131
The Second Purification of the Outer Altar 131
The Rite of the "Goat for עֲזָאזֵל" 132
Confession of Sin over the Goat for Azazel 134
The Origins of the Israelite Elimination Ritual 137
The Greek φαρμακός Rites and the Ritual of the Goat for Azazel 138
The Identity of עֲזָאזֵל 143
After the Goat for Azazel Rite 160

The Day of Atonement Covenant Lawsuit 161

Summary and Conclusion 162

CHAPTER 3: THE DAY OF ATONEMENT IN JEWISH LITERATURE 165
The Day of Atonement in the Book of Jubilees 167
Azazel in 1 Enoch 172
The Day of Atonement in the Apocalypse of Abraham 173

Summary 180

The Day of Atonement in Josephus 180

The Day of Atonement in Philo 183

Summary and Conclusion 186

Comparison Between Lev 16 and the *Mishnah* Yoma 188

EXCURSUS: ALTERNATIVE VIEWS ON THE IDENTITY OF עֲזָאזֵל 194
עֲזָאזֵל as the Goat's Function 194
עֲזָאזֵל as a Place Where the Goat is Dispatched 195
עֲזָאזֵל as "Removal" 198
עֲזָאזֵל as "On Behalf of Azazel" 202
עֲזָאזֵל as the "Wrath of God" 202
עֲזָאזֵל in Christian Thought: A Type of Christ? 204

Summary and Conclusion 207

CHAPTER 4: THE DAY OF ATONEMENT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT 208

The Jewish Feasts and Nascent Christianity 208

The Day of Atonement in the New Testament 211

The Day of Atonement in the Gospels 214
The Release of Barabbas and the Goat for Azazel Rite in Matthew. 216
The Mocking of Jesus in Matt 27:27–31 217
The Rending of τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ (Matthew 27:50–54) 217
Jesus as Heavenly High Priest in the Gospel of John 223

The Day of Atonement in Acts and the Epistles 225
The Day of Atonement in Acts 225
The Day of Atonement in the Letters of Paul 228
The Day of Atonement in the Book of Hebrews 231

The περὶ ἁμαρτίας Passages in the New Testament 240

Summary and Conclusion 249

CHAPTER 5:THE DAY OF ATONEMENT IN THE BOOK OF REVELATION ...251

Overview ... 252

Revelation 1: Jesus as Heavenly High Priest ... 256
The Significance of "Blood" in Revelation 1 ... 257
"A Loud Voice as a Trumpet" ... 259
Day of Atonement Clothing in Rev 1:13 ... 264
The High Priestly Ποδήρης ... 265
Ποδήρης in the Epistle of Barnabas ... 280
Ποδήρης in Philo ... 281
The Golden Sash ... 282
The Day of Atonement as Validation of the Heavenly High Priest ... 283

Revelation 2–3: The Day of Atonement as Background for the Letters to the Churches of Asia ... 286

Revelation 4–5: Entering into the Heavenly Most Holy Place ... 295
The Four Creatures Around the Throne ... 297
The Offering of Incense ... 299
The Slaughtered Lamb Inside the Heavenly Most Holy Place ... 300

Revelation 6: The Souls Under the Altar of Incense ... 312

Revelation 7 and 14: The 144,000 ... 315
Purity Instead of "Forgiveness" ... 319

Revelation 8: The Seventh Seal and the Angel with the Golden Censer ... 322

Revelation 9: The Golden Altar of Incense and Defiant Humanity ... 337

Revelation 11: The Measuring of the Temple and the Altar and the Ark of the Covenant ... 343

Revelation 15: The Opening of the Temple in Heaven ... 349

Revelation 17: The Harlot, the Beast and the Ritual of the Goat for Azazel ... 352

Revelation 18: Babylon as an Eschatological φαρμακός ... 358

Revelation 19: Jesus as Conquering High Priest ... 360

Revelation 20: The Ritual of the Goat for Azazel as Background for the Judgment on the Dragon ... 366
Azazel in 1 Enoch ... 371

Revelation 21–22: The New Jerusalem as Priestly City ... 382

Revelation 20 and 22: Day of Atonement Retribution 386

Summary and Conclusion 392

CONCLUSION 395

Summary of the Research 395

Implications of the Research 400

Suggestions for Future Study 401

Conclusion 402

BIBLIOGRAPHY 404

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AAA	Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology
AASS	*Asia Adventist Seminary Studies*
AB	Anchor Bible
ABR	*Australian Biblical Review*
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
Akk.	Akkadian
ANE	Ancient Near East
ANET	*Ancient Near Eastern Texts*
ANRW	*Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. Edited by Wolfgang Haase. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1972– .
Ant.	*Antiquities* (by Josephus)
AOTC	Apollos Old Testament Commentary
AUSDS	Andrews University Seminary Dissertation Series
AUSS	*Andrews University Seminary Studies*
AYB	The Anchor Yale Bible
AYBD	*The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1992
b.	Talmud (Babylonian)
BBRSup	Bulletin for Biblical Research Supplements

BCE	Before the Christian Era
BDAG	W. Bauer, Danker, F. W., W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago, 2000
BDB	Brown, F., S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford, 1907
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
Bib	*Biblica*
BibInt	*Biblical Interpretation*
BibR	*Biblical Research*
BibSac	Bibliotheca Sacra
BIS	Biblical Interpretation Series
BFCT	Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie
BJS	Brown Jewish Studies
BN	*Biblische Notizen*
BRS	The Biblical Resource Series
BTB	*Biblical Theology Bulletin*
BTCB	Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible
BVC	*Bible et Vie Chrétienne*
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
BW	*The Biblical World*
BZNW	Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche
CE	Christian Era
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*

CBS	Continuum Biblical Studies
CH	*Church History*
ConNT	Coniectanea neotestamentica or Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series
CRINT	Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
DDD	*Dictionary of Deities and Demons*. Edited by Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking and Peter W. van der Horst. Grand Rapids, MI: 1999
EI	*Eretz Israel*
EncJud	*Encyclopaedia Judaica*. 16 vols. Edited by Cecil Roth and Geoffrey Wigoder. Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, 1972
EQ	*The Evangelical Quarterly*
ET	*Expository Times*
EUS	European University Studies
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FF	*Forschungen und Fortschritte*
FIOTL	The Formation and Interpretation of Old Testament Literature
HBS	*Herders Biblische Studien*
Heb.	Hebrew
HeytJ	*Heythrop Journal*
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
IBS	*Irish Biblical Studies*
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IDB	*The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by G. A. Buttrick. 4 vols. Nashville, 1962
IDBSup	The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible Supplementary Volume. Edited by Keith Crim and Victor Paul Furnish. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1976

Int	*Interpretation*
ISBE	*International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. Rev. ed. Edited by G. W. Bromiley et al. 4 vols. Grand Rapids, 1979–1988
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JAMS	*Journal of the American Musicological Society*
JATS	*Journal of the Adventist Theological Society*
JETS	*Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
JHS	*The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures*
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
JQR	*The Jewish Quarterly Review*
JQRS	The Jewish Quarterly Review Series
JTS	*Journal for Theological Studies*
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
JSOT	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JSPS	*Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha*
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplements
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
GOTR	*Greek Orthodox Theological Review*
Gr.	Greek

KuD	*Kerygma und Dogma*
LBC	Layman's Bible Commentary
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
LXX	Septuagint (the Greek Jewish Scriptures). The edition used is *Septuaginta*. Edited by Alfred Rahlfs. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979.
m.	*Mishnah*
MelT	*Melita Theologica*
mss.	Manuscripts
MT	Massoretic Text of the Hebrew Bible
MTZ	*Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift*
NA[27]	*Novum Testamentum Graece*. 27th rev. ed. Edited by E. Nestle, K. Barbara Aland et al. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993.
NAC	The New American Commentary
NASB	New American Standard Bible
NBL	Neues Bibellexikon
Neo	*Neotestamentica*
NIC	New International Commentary
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NIV	New International Version
NIVAC	The New International Version Application Commentary
NKJV	New King James Version
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*

NT	New Testament
NTA	Neuetestamentliche Abhandlungen
NTC	New Testament Commentary
NTL	New Testament Library
NTM	New Testament Monographs
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
OSt	Oudtestamentische Studiën
OT	Old Testament
OTP	*Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2010.
POT	*Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. Edited by R. H. Charles. 2 vols. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2004.
PVTG	Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece. Edited by A. M. Denis and M. De Jonge. Leiden: Brill, 1970
RB	*Revue Biblique*
RRJ	*The Review of Rabbinic Judaism*
RSR	*Religious Studies Review*
SA	*Studia Antiqua*
SBB	Stuttgarter Biblische Beiträge
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLSP	Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
Sc	*Scriptura*

SEL	*Studi Epigrafici e Linguistici sul Vicino Oriente Antico*
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SP	Sacra Pagina
ST	*Studia Theologica*
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha
UBS	*The Greek New Testament*. 4th rev. ed. Edited by Barbara Aland et al. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
TBN	Themes in Biblical Narrative
TS	*Theological Studies*
TDOT	*Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*
TOTC	Tyndale Old Testament Commentary
TWOT	*Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament.* Edited by R. L. Harris and G. L. Archer Jr. 2 vols. Chicago, 1980.
TynBul	*Tyndale Bulletin*
UF	*Ugarit Forschungen*
VE	*Vox Evangelica*
VerbE	*Verbum et Ecclesia*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WTJ	*Westminster Theological Journal*
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament

WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
y.	Talmud (Jerusalem)
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

After years of joys and hardships, it is deeply rewarding to come to the end of this journey. An enterprise of this scope could never have been accomplished without the help of several very important people. I am thankful first of all for my mother who from birth taught me to love the Scriptures, especially the eschatological oracles of the book of Revelation. She was a model missionary, she never travelled to far off lands, instead wherever she went, she preached the gospel and the Second Coming. She was loved and respected by all and the best role model I could have asked for. She passed away almost exactly eight years before the completion of this thesis; I am sure she would be proud to see me get here. I look forward to seeing her again when Jesus returns.

I also thank my family, my brothers and sisters, extended family and friends for the moral support to press on during the difficult moments. You have always believed in me; thank you!

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Dr. Steven Thompson for the expert mentorship he provided during most of this process. I will always remember fondly the gracious way he invited me to work with him on my PhD at Avondale several years ago. It was an honour to collaborate with him; his insights were always right and his knowledge encyclopedic. Most of all, he was incredibly patient and generous during the ups and downs of this journey. I wish you well in your well-deserved retirement.

I am also thankful for the expertise of Dr. David Tasker and Dr. Wendy Jackson extended to me in the very last stages of this dissertation. Your input was invaluable and this dissertation has no doubt been greatly improved by our collaboration. Thank you for taking me over the finish line!

I would like to thank Avondale's librarian par excellence, Michelle Down, for her expert advice on how to navigate Avondale's vast research resources and Roberta Matai, now also in retirement, for her patient guidance for dotting all the "i's" and crossing the "t's" of the academic process. And to all the staff at Avondale who have remained mostly anonymous to distance students: thank you!

I am also deeply thankful to Avondale College for the generous scholarship extended to me so that I could pursue my doctoral studies. I can only hope that the fruits of my labours will be rewarding also to Avondale as we jointly strive to make a contribution to theological knowledge.

I am eternally grateful to my wife Francini and my precious daughters Pam, Chloe and McKayla for their patience, love and support throughout the long years of this writing project. You are the joy of life; I love you more than anything in this world.

Finally, I give our gracious, loving God the glory for giving me the strength to continue when I wanted to give up and for allowing me to discover new depths of knowledge in the unfathomable treasures of his divine mind.

Soli Deo Gloria

CHAPTER 1

UNTYING REVELATION'S GORDIAN KNOT

As G. K. Chesterton so artfully put it, "Though St. John the Evangelist saw many strange monsters in his vision, he saw no creature so wild as one of his own commentators."[1] Like a deep lake of quiet waters, the book of Revelation has beckoned interpreters from time immemorial to look into its waters only to see their own image reflected in it. The tendency to see apocalyptic literature as a mirror of one's own times can be seen as early as the Jewish community of Qumran, an apocalyptic sect from around the first century BCE which saw their existence as the very fulfillment of Old Testament apocalyptic prophecies. In order to achieve this "self-actualized" reading, they applied the Jewish exegetical method known as *pesher* (meaning "solution" or "interpretation") to the book of Daniel and saw themselves as fulfilment of those prophecies.[2] Jon Paulien calls this "typological exegesis" which occurs when a text is

---

[1] G. K. Chesterton, *Orthodoxy* (New York, NY: John Lane Co., 1908), 29.

[2] For a helpful summary of how Jewish exegetes approached apocalyptic literature, see *Three Views on the New Testament Use of the OT*, eds. Stanley Gundry, Kenneth Berding and Jonathan Lunde (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2008).

reapplied as a type of a reader's present situation.[3] Towards the end of the second century CE, the Montanists, also known as the New Prophecy sect believed that the new Jerusalem described in the book of Revelation would come down on their cities, Peruza and Tymion in Phrygia.[4] "[I]nterpreters [of the Apocalypse]', writes Kevin Mills, "have always seen in its visions reflections of their own times and situations" because "the Apocalypse acts as a mirror of the historical, social and cultural conditions under which interpretations are produced."[5] Commenting on the Branch Davidian apocalyptic sect of Waco, Texas, in 1993, Kenneth Newport points out that in Revelation's symbols their leader David Koresh "saw reflected a picture of his own apocalyptic world, and in its words he found the voice of God."[6] In the same vein, Douglas Ezell perceptively suggests that "Revelation is highly vulnerable to being used for either confirming or

---

[3] Jon Paulien, "Dreading the Whirlwind: Intertextuality and the Use of the OT in Revelation," *AUSS* 29 (2001): 7: "In typological exegesis persons, institutions, and/or events described in an earlier text can be regarded as models or prefigurations [sic] of later persons, institutions, or events."

[4] William Tabberne, *Prophets and Gravestones: An Imaginative History of Montanists and Other Early Christians* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2009), 15–16, 20.

[5] Kevin Mills, *Approaching the Apocalypse: Unveiling Revelation in Victorian Writing* (Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 2007), 108. Maier, *Revelation*, 123–164 argues that Revelation has a "not yet" quality that leads reader to always seek a fulfillment which never quite arrives. For a similar view, cf. David L. Barr, "Waiting for the End that Never Comes: The Narrative Logic of John's Story," in *Studies in the Book of Revelation*, ed. Steve Moyise (Edindurgh: T&T Clark, 2001), 101–112.

[6] Kenneth G. C. Newport, *Apocalypse and Millennium: Studies in Biblical Eisegesis* (Cambridge: University Press, 2000), 2.

denying any figurative reading of world events which an expositor may desire to promote."[7]

This social-psychological phenomenon caused another scholar summarily to conclude that the "Apocalypse of John is arguably the most dangerous book in the history of Christendom in terms of the history of its effects."[8] "Wherever the Book of Revelation shows up," writes another, "trouble is not far behind."[9]

---

[7] Douglas Ezell, *Revelations on Revelation* (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1977), 16–19: "Such a procedure, then or now, is not an interpretation of the book but a process of 'event substitution'. The apocalyptic images of Revelation are not interpreted in light of their usage in the sources of Revelation. Rather, a modern event with similar features is located and then put forward as the meaning of the first century symbol. Most often the modern event is one that conjures up fear that the zero hour is near. For example, present-day followers of this method of event substitution see the symbols of Revelation as references to Red China, Russia, the European Common Market, drugs, and the revival of the occult. The conclusion drawn from this identification is that the end is at hand since the events in the Book of Revelation are finally being fulfilled. But the question must be asked—what meaning would the Book of Revelation have had for a first-century audience if it spoke of events which would not occur for 2,000 years? Not only would the events be so far in the future as to be irrelevant, but furthermore, the first-century reader would have had no ability to understand the Book since he knew nothing about rockets, atomic bombs, tanks, Red China, the Common Market, etc." For a case study on this approach, see Robert Surridge, "Seventh-day Adventism: Self-Appointed Laodicea," in *Studies in the Book of Revelation*, ed. Steve Moyise (Edindurgh: T&T Clark, 2001), 21–42.

[8] Loren Johns, *The Lamb Christology of the Apocalypse of John: An Investigation into Its Origins and Rhetorical Force*, WUNT, 2nd. ser., 167 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 5. Johns's Mennonite culture of nonresistance may have colored his reading of Revelation as "the Lamb's manifesto." For a critique of his work, see Robert M. Royalty, review of Loren Johns, *Lamb Christology of the Apocalypse of John: An Investigation into Its Origins and Rhetorical Force* and Christopher A. Frilingos, *Spectacles of Empire: Monsters, Martyrs, and the Book of Revelation*, *JBL* 124 (2005): 571–75.

[9] Harry O. Maier, *Apocalypse Recalled: The Book of Revelation after Christendom* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2002), 1: "The Christian Crusades, Savonarola's reform of the Florentine Republic, Radical Reformation movements to establish earthly theocracies of the Spirit, the discovery and colonization of the New World, the violent Christianization of the First Nations peoples—these troubling episodes name only some better-known flashpoints ignited by the Apocalypse's arrival." While Maier may have exaggerated Revelation's culpability in relation to these world events, such reading explains people's apprehensions and misunderstanding of Revelation's message.

Popular readings of the book of Revelation can be described as overly literalistic, tinged with certain allegorical tendencies. But as will be argued here, in order to understand the book of Revelation, one should prioritize reading it from the perspective of the immediate context of the original readers. Revelation is, first of all, a product of early Christianity. As we expand the circle of influence on the book of Revelation, the OT comes into focus: it is in God's relationship with Israel described there that John finds the stock imagery and language to express his visions for the seven churches of Asia Minor.[10] God's past actions—rather than future events distant from the author's time—become central to its interpretation.

The endeavor to unpack the book of Revelation from the perspective of the OT is not new or original; since at least the second half of the 19th century, scholars searching for the source of Revelation's unusual imagery have attempted to trace their origins back to the OT. In order to get ever closer to John's original intent, scholars in the 19th century approaching Revelation with the presupposition that perhaps it was more connected to the OT themes than previously thought. Revelation became a laboratory for theologians to probe their theories on the impact of the OT on early Christian literature. A whole new approach developed with the difficult task of untying Revelation's Gordian Knot.[11]

---

[10] Steve Moyise writes that reading Revelation with an eye to the OT is "an important way of doing justice to its complexity" (*The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation*, JSNTSup 115 [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995], 138). As Richard Bauckham, *The Climax of Prophecy: Studies on the Book of Revelation* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 201, puts it: "God's redemptive acts in the future are portrayed on the model of his past acts."

[11] For a helpful summary of new approaches to Revelation, see Otto Böcher, "Die Johannes-Apokalypse in der neueren Forschung," *ANRW* II.25.5:3850–3893.

In the words of Barnabas Lindars, "the Old Testament is the greatest single influence in the formation of New Testament theology"[12] and as I. Fransen argued in regards to Revelation, "The familiarity with the Old Testament, with the spirit which lives in the Old Testament, is a most essential condition for a fruitful reading of the Apocalypse."[13] In addition to the OT, other sources form the NT's literary background such as Second Temple Jewish apocalyptic literature[14] and in a lesser degree, the socio-political realities of first century Christianity.[15] An interest in John's immediate *milieu* was also a natural corollary of historical-critical readings of the biblical text as evidenced by the critical commentaries by German scholars in the 19th century.[16]

---

[12] Barnabas Lindars, "The Place of the Old Testament in the Formation of New Testament Theology: Prolegomena," *NTS* 23 (1976–7): 60.

[13] I. Fransen, "Cahier de Bible: Jésus, le Témoin Fidèle (Apocalypse)," *BVC* 16 (1956-7): 67 translated and quoted by Greg K. Beale, "Revelation," in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindas*, eds. D. A. Carson and H. G. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 333.

[14] For a helpful summary on Jewish apocalyptic, see John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic* BRS (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998); ibid., "Eschatological Dynamics and Utopian Ideals in Early Judaism," in *Imagining the End: Visions of Apocalypse from the Ancient Middle East to Modern America*, eds. Abbas Amanat and Magnus T. Bernardson (London; New York, NY: I. B. Taurus Publishers, 2002), 69–89.

[15] Many commentaries and tomes have explored the religious, cultural and political *milieu* or as commonly known the *Sitz im Leben*, lit. "the place in life," which gave birth to the book of Revelation. Foremost among these is Aune's commentary, a massive three-volume work which specializes in placing the book of Revelation in its immediate cultural, literary, political and religious milieu. This study will not focus on this aspect of Revelation but rather on Revelation's relationship with the OT. Cf. David E. Aune, *Revelation 1–5*, WBC 52a (Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1997); ibid., *Revelation 6–16*, WBC 52b (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1998); ibid., *Revelation 17–22*, WBC 52c (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1998).

[16] Cf. the list of critical commentaries by German theologians used by Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary of the Revelation of St. John*, clxxxvii–cxci.

Most of these recent approaches to the book of Revelation range from literary criticism[17], reader response criticism[18], rhetoric analysis,[19] sociology[20] and anthropology[21], politics[22], pastoral[23], narrative-critical theory[24], grammatical-historical[25], feminism[26],

---

[17] See Josephine Massyngbaerde Ford, *Revelation: Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, AB (New York, NY: Doubleday, 1975).

[18] Cf. Moyise, *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation*, 138.

[19] Cf. Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *Revelation: Justice and Judgment* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1998).

[20] See Leonard Thompson, *The Book of Revelation: Apocalypse and Empire* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1990), 202–210, for a discussion on approaches to the social setting of Revelation.

[21] Cf. Adela Yarbro Collins, *Crisis and Catharsis: The Power of the Apocalypse* (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1984).

[22] Cf. J. Nelson Kraybill, *Apocalypse and Allegiance: Worship, Politics, and Devotion in the Book of Revelation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2010); Steven J. Friesen, *Imperial Cults and the Apocalypse of John: Reading Revelation in the Ruins* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2001); David A. deSilva, *Seeing Things John's Way: The Rhetoric of the Book of Revelation* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009).

[23] Charles H. Talbert, *The Apocalypse: A Reading of the Revelation of John* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1994); cf. also Ferdinand Hahn, "Die Offenbarung des Johannes als Geschichtsdeutung und Trostbuch," *KuD* 51/1 (2005): 55–70, who considers the book of Revelation as "comfort" literature. .

[24] Cf. James L. Resseguie, *Revelation Unsealed: A Narrative Critical Approach to John's Apocalypse* (Leiden: Brill, 1998).

[25] Cf. Gregory K. Beale, *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999).

[26] Cf. Tina Pippin, *Death and Desire: The Rhetoric of Gender in the Apocalypse of John* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992); ibid., *Apocalyptic Bodies: The Biblical End of the World in Text and Images* (New York, NY: Routledge Press, 1999); Hanna Stenström, "Female Imagery in the Book of Revelation," in *Religion and Female Body in Ancient Judaism and Its Environments*, ed. Géza Xeravits (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2015), 213–224; ibid., "The Book of Revelation: A Vision of the Ultimate Liberation or the Ultimate Backlash?: A Study in 20th Century Interpretations of Rev 14:1–5, with Special Emphasis on Feminist Exegesis" (PhD diss., Uppsala University, 1999); ibid., "They have not defiled themselves with women...": Christian Identity According to the Book of Revelation," in *A Feminist Companion to the Apocalypse of John*, eds. Amy-Jill Levine and Maria May Robbins (London; New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2010), 33–54; Alison Jack,

preterist-idealist[27], and the historicist camps.[28] Despite the bias inherent in each of these approaches, the fact is that exegetes of the book of Revelation today stand on the shoulders of many others who have have attempted to deal with the unique literary aspects of the book of Revelation.[29]

Considering the foundational assumption that John of Patmos was a first-century Christian prophet (Rev 1:9), the present study proposes that a any reading of the book of Revelation must be done in the confluence of three streams: (1) OT theology, typology, language and imagery; (2) the impact of "the Christ event" in view of OT prophecies and typology; and (3) the religious *Sitz im Leben* of the seven churches of Asia. This

---

"Out of the Wilderness: Feminist Perspectives on the Book of Revelation," in *Studies in the Book of Revelation*, ed. Steve Moyise (Edindurgh: T&T Clark, 2001), 149–162; Edith M. Humphrey, *The Ladies and The Cities: Transformation and Apocalyptic Identity in Joseph and Aseneth, 4 Ezra, The Apocalypse, and The Shepherd of Hermas*, JSPSup 17 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).

[27] Cf. John Noë, "An Exegetical Basis for a Preterist-Idealist Understanding of the Book of Revelation," *JETS* 49/4 (Dec 2006): 796: "The idealists are right in that 'the Apocalypse is thus a theological poem setting forth the ageless struggle between the kingdom of light and the kingdom of darkness.' And in a preterist-idealist synthesis, the strength of idealism remains that it 'secures its relevance for all periods of the church's history'."

[28]Kenneth A. Strand, *Interpreting the Book of Revelation: Hermeneutical Guidelines with Brief Introduction to Literary Analysis* (Worthington, OH: Ann Arbor, 1976); Ranko Stefanovic, *Revelation of Jesus Christ: Commentary on the Book of Revelation* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2002). For a history and critique of historicism, see Kai Arasola, *The End of Historicism: Millerite Hermeneutic of Time Prophecies in the Old Testament* (Sigtuna: Datem Publishing, 1990). See Robert Mounce, *The Book of Revelation*, NIC (Grand Rapids, MI: 1998), 24–27 for a helpful summary of the various interpretive schools of Revelation.

[29] The seminal works in this area are Frederick Brodie, *The Revelation Viewed by the Light of the Old Testament Scriptures and Thus Criticizing Many of the Commonly Received Opinions Regarding the Meaning of its Prophecies* (London: Partridge & Co, 1880); Henry Barclay Swete, *The Apocalypse of John* (London: Macmillan, 1906) and R. H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary of the Revelation of St. John*, 2 vols., ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1920) and the comparatively more recent Ferrell Jenkins, *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1976).

study will focus on how the OT, whose waters, full of rich imagery and typology, were overtaken by the mighty waves of "the Christ event" thus filling the ocean of the book of Revelation with literary life. The present study represents yet another attempt to understand how the OT stream meandered through John's mind to form the book we call Revelation. Understanding this will help us unfold the book's rhetorical appeal to the seven churches of Asia Minor in the first century CE[30] Another important aspect of this first stream is how the OT was enhanced by the rich tributaries of Jewish literature. Jewish pseudepigraphal books, which provide important commentary and reflection on the OT tradition, are explored here as a potential source of imagery for the book of Revelation.

The notion that John, a first-century Christian, would depend on the OT is rather self-evident. As Merril C. Tenney suggests, "[t]he author of the Apocalypse must have been steeped in the Jewish Scriptures, and probably knew them in the Hebrew text as well as in the Greek,"[31] while R. H. Charles describes Revelation as containing

---

[30] David L. Barr writes: "By and large John used true symbols meant to evoke complex intellectual and psychological responses. Nevertheless, John's own interpretations refer us back to the mundane world he shared with his audience" ("The Apocalypse as a Symbolic Transformation of the World: a Literary Analysis," *Int* 38 [1984], 41). Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1979), 434, sees Revelation as the construction of an alternative symbolic universe for John's readers. Cf. Fiorenza, *Revelation*, 187–99. Collins describes Revelation as a manifesto for overcoming "the intolerable tension between reality and hopeful faith" (*Crisis and Catharsis*, 141).

[31] Merrill C. Tenney, *Interpreting Revelation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1957), 26.

"unadulterated Judaism"[32] and "a Semitic philosophy of religion."[33] Yarbro Collins describes this phenomenon in Revelation as "a massive assumption of continuity: that is, his [John's] failure to distinguish an old and a new Israel,"[34] "between Israel and the Church."[35] Further, Caird avers that "[t]he OT was indispensable to the understanding of the character and purpose of God, but it must be read in the light of the fuller illumination of Christ,"[36] and as Markus Tiwald writes, "using cultic metaphors was certainly not linked to abrogating the real temple in Jerusalem, but rather to opening up the broader horizon of an eschatological view."[37] Leonard Thompson even thinks that "[t]he book [of Revelation] would then have provided further liturgical material for the churches of Asia Minor."[38]

One of the problems facing exegetes is identifying the source of OT allusions. The use of a particular expression in the OT in Revelation will often be juxtaposed with

---

[32] R. H. Charles, *Studies in the Apocalypse* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1889), 347.

[33] Ibid., 144.

[34] Collins, *Crisis and Catharsis*, 46–47.

[35] Ibid., "Insiders and Outsiders in the Book of Revelation and its Social Context," in *To See Ourselves as Others See Us: Christians, Jews and "Other" in Late Antiquity*, eds. J. Neusner and E. S. Frerichs (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985), 208. Cf. Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, *The Impact of Yom Kippur on Early Christianity: The Day of Atonement from Second Temple Judaism to the Fifth Century* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 2.

[36] George B. Caird, *The Revelation of Saint John* (London: Hendrickson, 1966), 74.

[37] Markus Tiwald, "Christ as Hilasterion (Rom 3:25): Pauline Theology on the Day of Atonement in the Mirror of Early Jewish Thought," in *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretation in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*, eds. Thomas Hieke and Tobias Niklas, TBN 15 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 197.

[38] Thompson, *The Book of Revelation*, 72.

others, creating a colorful palette based on several passages. This makes it difficult to pinpoint exactly which OT background John has in mind and often leads to the "extravagance of parallelomania" as Sandmel warned exegetes not too long ago.[39] On this point, Caird writes:

> But can we really suppose that all this welter of ideas actually passed through his mind, and that he supposed his readers would be prompted into following his train of thought by the mere mention of the word trumpet? These are questions which we ought constantly to ask ourselves; for the history of exegesis of the Revelation shows how fatally easy it is for commentators to read into John's symbols ideas of their own culled from a variety of alien sources.[40]

Thus a corollary of the intersection of the OT and Revelation is the study of meaning and respect for the context of the OT language and imagery alluded to by John. Not only is the *way* in which John weaves the OT themes in Revelation important, i.e., by using the same phrases and words or echoing themes and images, but also *when*, *where* and *how* he uses OT themes in Revelation. This clearly has an impact on our understanding of John's respect for original OT authorial intention and what meaning his reading of the OT may have on his message. As Strand suggested, "the very multiplicity of the background images suggests, too, that the new image transcends the background entities or events, both individually and collectively."[41]

---

[39] Samuel Sandmel, "Parallelomania," *JBL* 81 (1962): 1–13.

[40] Caird, *Revelation*, 110.

[41] Kenneth A. Strand, "An Overlooked Old Testament Background to Revelation 11:1," *AUSS* 22 (1984): 319.

Perhaps a brief analogy will help illustrate the major points to keep in mind. John's use of the OT in Revelation may be compared to two pieces of Velcro, whose connection is made by hundreds of tiny hooks that attach to each other and thus strengthen the overall bond. Revelation's hundreds of images, words and echoes from the OT, Jewish tradition as well as the Graeco-Roman world) create a unique visual and an auditory landscape. The elements are all somehow interconnected because they are part of an overarching theme, and yet they manage to remain independent and unique. John utilizes imagery gleaned from these sources to galvanize his vision of the new covenant for the Christian community. In order to properly understand Revelation's unified message in all its rhetorical appeal, one needs to detach the Velcro pieces and look at all those tiny hooks that create Revelation's bond with these traditions. The process of pulling apart the Velcro pieces that form Revelation's landscape with this OT interconnectivity in mind should ultimately make the same basic, characteristic "apocalyptic" sound. Isolated, the Velcro sides are useless. Thus Revelation without the OT may appear to be a hodgepodge of disjointed, at times grotesque images, nothing more than the product of the author's wild imagination. By the same token, without the revelation of Jesus Christ which culminates in the book of Revelation, OT typology and prophetic thrust would lose its ultimate goal.

In a similar metaphor, Bandy compared Revelation's text to the layers of an onion that need to be peeled off in order to reveal the kernel of its message, much like a children's anatomy book which superimposes several transparent plastic layers, each containing a different set of organs which form the whole picture. Bandy suggests three

textual layers in Revelation's structure, the *surface* layer, the layer of *intertextual* connections with the OT and the *intratextual* layer which pertains to how John creates a web of internal allusions and motif cross-references.[42]

There can be little doubt then that Revelation is highly dependent on the OT, but what text of the OT specifically? Despite R. H. Charles' preference for a Hebrew source[43] of the OT and Swete's preference for the LXX,[44] scholars since then have continued to debate which text of the OT was the source of Revelation's allusions without a decisive answer to this question. Moreover, as previously explored at length, Revelation, in line with other NT writings, has undergone heavy Semitic influence which stems directly from the Hebrew OT as well as Aramaic spoken in first-century Palestine.[45] The seminal work on the Greek of the NT is Salomon Glassius' multi-volume, influential work *Philologiae sacrae* in which he shows how Semitic syntax was replicated in the Greek of the NT.[46] In the early 20th century, R. H. Charles sought to

---

[42] Cf. Alan S. Bandy, "The Layers of the Apocalypse: An Integrative Approach to Revelation's Macrostructure," *JSNT* 31/4 (2009): 469–499.

[43] R. H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John*, I:lxvi.

[44] Swete, *The Apocalypse of St John*, cl, clv.

[45] See the extensive discussion on the Semitic influence on the NT Greek in James W. Voelz, "The Language of the New Testament," *ANRW* II.25.2: 894-977; Max Wilcox, "Semitisms in the New Testament," *ANRW* II.25.2: 977–1029.

[46] Salomon Glassius, *Philologiae sacrae qua totius sacrosanctae Veteris & Novi Testamenti, scripturae, tum stylus & Literatura, tum sensus & genuinae interpretationis ratio expenditur*, 5 vols., 5th ed. (Frankfurt: 1686). Glassius' works was highly influential, although not without detractors such as Sebastien Pfochen's *Diatribe de linguae graecae Novi Testamenti puritate* (Amsterdam: Janson, 1629) who argued that the NT was written in "pure Greek." Glassius's work was followed by Georg Benedict Winer, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms als sichere Grundlage der neutestamentlichen Exegese*, 6th ed. (Leipzig: 1855) and more significantly the work of G. Adolf Deissmann who established how the Greek of the NT was "common" rather than a special

establish that "the chief Hebraisms in the Apocalypse … are sufficient to prove that it is more Hebraic than the LXX itself." Charles listed several examples where the Greek "needs at times to be translated into Hebrew in order to discover its meaning and render it correctly in English."[47] Greg Beale has argued that solecisms in the Greek of Revelation are intentionally designed to take readers back to specific OT backgrounds.[48] Thus the answer to the question of which OT text John was using lies in both approaches; the text of the LXX is clearly used and even cited while the Hebrew comes through in John's unusual Greek syntax in some passages.

Devorah Dimant has categorized the literary use of the OT in the NT as either "expositional" or "compositional."[49] The expositional method often carries an actual quotation by the author from the OT while the compositional method masks the allusion within the text. Based on Dimant's two categories, John's use of the OT is

---

"Christianized" Greek (*Bible Studies: Contributions Chiefly from Papyri and Inscriptions to the History of the Language, the Literature, and the Religion of Hellenistic Judaism and Primitive Christianity*, 2nd ed., trans. Alexander Grieve (Edinburgh, 1909).

[47] Charles, *Revelation*, cxliv. See also Steven Thompson, *Apocalypse and Semitic Syntax* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

[48] Gregory K. Beale, "Solecisms in the Apocalypse as Signals for the Presence of Old Testament Allusions: A Selective Analysis of Revelation 1–22," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel*, eds. C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders, JSNTSup 148 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997): 42–146. Cf. also T. Cowden Laughlin, *The Solecisms of the Apocalypse* (Princeton, NJ: University Printers, 1902). L. P. Trudinger, " 'O AMHN' (Rev III:14) and the Case for a Semitic Original of the Apocalypse," *NovT* 14 (1972): 277–279, concurs when he says that the semitic flavor of certain phrases in Revelation (i.e., ὁ ἀμήν in Rev 3:14) "have a 'by-word' or slogan-like quality."

[49] Devorah Dimant, "Use and Interpretation of Mikra in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. Martin Jan Mulder (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1988), 381ff.

clearly *compositional*. Building on this view, Jon Paulien contends that John is careful to allude to specific ideas from the OT at particular times and he is consistent in doing so; he is not creating a hodgepodge of images haphazardly, but has a specific plan in mind.[50] Paulien proposes that any author's choices for particular imagery and language "must be examined not only in terms of their inherent significance within the cultic system, but also in the light of alternatives that were not selected."[51] This point is important, although it is difficult to know what was "not selected" if we cannot know all the primary sources that were available to him to begin with. Be that as it may, Paulien's notion that John is not simply "picking images out of a hat" but always has both a clear intended *meaning* for an intended *reader* in mind is a helpful set of interpretative controls. For example, Revelation's "ideal reader" is very familiar with the Hebrew cultic language. Paulien suggests that "[t]he metaphorical use of cultic imagery was probably widespread among the early Christians"[52] and that the intended readership of Revelation may have been a "specific subgroup of Jewish Christians."[53]

This brief overview of some important preliminary questions about the book of Revelation paves the way for the subject of this dissertation to which we now turn.

---

[50] Jon Paulien, "The Role of the Hebrew Cultus, Sanctuary, and Temple in the Plot and Structure of the Book of Revelation," *AUSS* 33 (1995): 263.

[51] Ibid., 263.

[52] Ibid., 264.

[53] Ibid., 263.

Statement of the Problem

As a case study of the use of the OT in the NT, this thesis will explore how the Pentateuchal Day of Atonement (Yom Kippur) as described in Lev 16; 23:26–32 and Num 29:7–11 was received in the book of Revelation. As will be argued here, the typology of the Day of Atonement continued to play a vital role in the theological understandings and liturgical outlook of early Jewish-Christianity from which the book of Revelation emerged.

One of the elements deeply woven into the fabric of Revelation is the Hebrew cultus, i.e., the tabernacle and its rituals and feasts that accompanied them. This dependence on tabernacle imagery and language may be indicative of two things: (1) the Jewish feasts were central to Christian worship at its inception; and (2) the ideal reader of Revelation was a Christian from a Jewish background. According to Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, "Christian atonement theology and its festal calendar not only emerged under the influence of Yom Kippur … but also continued to develop in light of the ongoing challenge that the contemporary Yom Kippur posed to Christians."[54] It would be therefore surprising that a Christian work such as the book of Revelation would forgo the rich imagery of the Day of Atonement in his depiction of the "revelation of Jesus Christ." However, while the reception of Jewish cultic elements in the book of Revelation such as Passover and the Feast of Tabernacles has received several treatments, the Day of Atonement has been largely ignored. Lev 16 is not even officially

[54] Stökl Ben Ezra, *The Impact*, 2.

listed as a possible source of allusions in Revelation in any of the major New Testament apparatuses.[55] Despite the recent, heightened interest in the reception of the Day of Atonement in the NT as a whole, the intersection between the Day of Atonement and the book of Revelation has not been properly explored by scholars.[56] Therefore, this study will fill an important lacuna on the book of Revelation.

The main questions guiding this study are as follows. As one of the most important festivals of the tabernacle service, what was the Day of Atonement? What rituals did it entail? How did it come to be understood by early Christian authors? Furthermore, did this have an impact on the author of Revelation? How did it provide imagery and language which John used to describe his visions? Where and how does John incorporate such imagery?[57] What is the importance of such use in context and more broadly for the overall theology of the book of Revelation? The answers to these questions may not be found at the surface since John's style of conflating imagery and

---

[55] Massey H. Shepherd Jr, *The Paschal Liturgy and the Apocalypse* (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1951), 77, argued that Revelation is probably "laid out in a scheme that follows the order of the Church's Paschal liturgy." Otto A. Piper ("The Apocalypse of John and the Liturgy of the Ancient Church," in *CH* 20 (1951): 10, suggests that John's visions "are presented within a framework of liturgical activities" in such a way that "it is hardly possible to dissociate the acts of worship from the visions of the future."

[56] Cf. Alberto R. Treiyer, *The Day of Atonement and the Heavenly Judgment: From the Pentateuch to Revelation* (Siloam Springs, AR: Creation Enterprises International, 1992). Treiyer's work shows little intersection with the original language of the OT and its reception in the book of Revelation; he often makes assertions from a personal doctrinal standpoint rather than sound exegesis.

[57] Nicholas P. Lunn, "Jesus, The Ark and the Day of Atonement: Intertextual Echoes in John 19:38–20:18," *JETS* 52 (2009): 736, proposes a model that may be pertinent to our study of the book of Revelation: "Through allusive reference to OT passages relating to the ark and elements of the tabernacle service, John is building up a picture of Jesus in terms of Mosaic categories readily appreciated by a Jewish audience. More specifically, he is pointing us to the Day of Atonement ceremony, the primary expiatory ritual of ancient Israel."

language from a variety of OT sources makes it difficult to pinpoint one single source. Cultic themes central to the Day of Atonement related to blood, cleansing, purgation and judgment are present in Revelation but are often layered with other imagery. A primarily canonical, "close reading" approach which reads Revelation in context with an eye to the OT may provide the answers we seek.

Literature Review

In 1973 in a seminal doctoral dissertation entitled "The Impact of the Jewish Day of Atonement Upon the Thought of the New Testament,"[58] Norman H. Young convincingly argued that the Day of Atonement is the background for the discussions of the Mosaic tabernacle in the book of Hebrews. Young asserts: "By the time of the NT, the Day of Atonement had become the holy day par excellence in the contemporary Jewish liturgy..."[59] More recently, Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra's revision of his PhD thesis under the title *The Impact of Yom Kippur on Early Christianity: The Day of Atonement from Second Temple Judaism to the Fifth Century*[60] presents an extensive treatment of the reception of the Day of Atonement in early Christianity from a *Religionsgeschichte* point of view, although the book does not deal with the book of Revelation. Stökl Ben Ezra thinks that Young's work laid the foundation for his own research, although Young's

[58] PhD diss., Manchester University, 1973.

[59] Young, "The Impact," 11.

[60] Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

"canonical" approach differs from Stökl Ben Ezra's framework of Jewish "imaginaires" of the Day of Atonement around which builds his work.[61]

Despite the prominence of the Day of Atonement in Jewish thought, authors only sporadically hint at the reception of the Day of Atonement in Revelation. In an article published in the mid-1990s, Jon Paulien addresses several possible allusions to Day of Atonement in Revelation.[62] In a book about the temple in the book of Revelation, Gregory Stevenson mentions the Day of Atonement only twice.[63] More recently (2012) none of the contributors to a book entitled *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretation in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*[64] cite the book of Revelation in any of its chapters and the only "apocalypse" mentioned is *The Apocalypse of Abraham*. This dearth of interest signals the need for a deeper probing of the reception of the Day of Atonement language and imagery in the book of Revelation.

In this literature review I list selected works, such as articles and commentaries, that deal with the reception of the Day of Atonement in Revelation.

---

[61] Cf. Stökl Ben Ezra, *The Impact*, 146, 329.

[62] Cf. Paulien, "Hebrew Cultus," 247–255.

[63] Gregory Stevenson, *Power and Place: Temple and Identity in the Book of Revelation* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001), 31, 138.

[64] Thomas Hieke and Tobias Niklas, eds., *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretation in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*, TBN 15 (Leiden: Brill, 2012).

Kenneth Strand

One of the first scholars to recognize the presence of Day of Atonement language and imagery in Revelation was Kenneth Strand. In a 1984 article titled "An Overlooked Old-Testament Background to Revelation 11:1," Strand explores the most common OT backgrounds to Revelation 11, i.e., Zech 2:1–5 and Ezek 40–48, which deal with the "measuring" of Jerusalem as only marginally relevant to Revelation 11. He argues that Leviticus 16 seems to be a better background as it provides a "spiritual" measuring "of the priests themselves, the sanctuary, the altar, and the congregation (see vss. 6, 11, 16–18)."[65] Strand points to the "commonality in the order or sequence … the movement is from sanctuary/ temple to altar to worshipper."[66] Strand rejects Ezek 40 as a background because of what he sees as divergent objectives: while Ezekiel seems to speak of the building of a future temple, Revelation measures an existing one. On the elements to be cleansed, Lev 16:33 mentions the sanctuary, the tent of meeting, the priests (which are not mentioned in Revelation), the altar and the people. Aune considers Strand's comparison "impossibly subtle and not entirely correspondent."[67] According to the method proposed here, an actual verbal link between Leviticus 16 and Revelation 11 would strengthen actual dependence. It is more likely then that John is building an

[65] Strand, "An Overlooked Old-Testament Background to Revelation 11:1," 322. Cf. also Laurentiu Florentin Mot, "The Measurement Motif in Revelation 11:1-2," in *Earthly Shadows, Heavenly Realities: Temple/Sanctuary Cosmology in Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Jewish Literature*, eds. Kim Papaiouannou and Ioannis Giantzaklidis (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2017), 229–248, who also sees Daniel 7–8 as possible backgrounds.

[66] Ibid.

[67] Aune, *Revelation 6–16*, 604.

overall picture of "measuring" the current status of God's people which involved Jerusalem (Zech 2), the Temple (Ezek 40–48) as well as the tabernacle, priests and people, elements which are part of several "covenant lawsuit" passages of the OT prophets. Hence the "spiritual" measuring Strand proposes as part of the Day of Atonement could be part of several themes running in Revelation 11.

Jon Paulien

In an article titled "The Role of the Hebrew Cultus, Sanctuary, and Temple in the Plot and Structure of the Book of Revelation," Jon Paulien argues for a Jewish feasts background to Revelation, including the Day of Atonement.[68] Paulien builds on Strand's article and structures Revelation around the daily and yearly sacrifices. He sees Day of Atonement language and imagery in Revelation 11. He points out that a reference to the Day of Atonement in Revelation 11 could introduce the second half of the book as visions of "judgment." Following Strand, Paulien also argues for strong judgment language and activity in Revelation 11 because "[t]he association of the inner shrine of the temple with judgment in 11:18, 19 can point to no other aspect of the Hebrew cultus than the Yom Kippur liturgy."[69] "From these points on in the Revelation," he writes, "there is repeated focus on the *naos* or inner sanctum of the temple where the central

[68] Paulien, "Hebrew Cultus," 247–255.

[69] Ibid., 256.

activities of Yom Kippur took place. Judgment language and activity, a central theme of Yom Kippur, is also a major concern of the second half of the Apocalypse."[70]

Paulien sees Yom Kippur language and imagery of the grape harvest of Rev 14:7 "activity which typically occurred around the time of Yom Kippur."[71] Paulien also sees the division of people in Revelation in two groups: servants of God and the servants of the "counterfeit trinity (dragon, beast, and false prophet; Rev 16:13)" and suggests that "[s]uch a division along spiritual lines took place also in relation to the lots cast over the two male goats on Yom Kippur."[72] Finally, Paulien considers the whole section on the trumpets as "strongly supportive of an association with the cultic activities of Yom Kippur,"[73] a conclusion also reached by other scholars such as W. Gordon Campbell.

Considering Paulien's acceptance of Yom Kippur themes in Revelation, his assertion that "Passover is the only festival first-century Christians considered fulfilled by the earthly Christ (1 Cor 5:7)"[74] is puzzling, especially in light of the emphasis on Christ's priesthood in the book of Hebrews based on his Day-of-Atonement sacrifice on the cross (cf. Heb 6:19–20; 9:11, 12, 24).

---

[70] Ibid., 257, 260.

[71] Ibid.

[72] Ibid.

[73] Ibid., 253.

[74] Ibid., 258.

David Aune

In his monumental commentary on the book of Revelation, David Aune mentions the Day of Atonement in five places. For example, when commenting on the white robes of the twenty-four elders of Rev 4:4, Aune writes: "the high priest wore only a white linen ephod on the Day of Atonement when he entered the Holy of Holies."[75] When commenting on the slaughtered Lamb of Rev 5, he also links this imagery in part to the seven lambs sacrificed on the Day of Atonement (Num 29:7–11).

Gregory K. Beale

In his commentary on Revelation, Beale mentions the "Day of Atonement" when commenting on four passages: Rev 6:9; 8:4, 11:19 and 12:10. For example, on Rev 11:19 he states that "the appearance of the ark signals not only judgment but also God's gracious presence … On the Old Testament Day of Atonement the sacrificial blood was sprinkled on the mercy seat of the ark as a covering for the nation's sins."[76] On Rev 12:10, Beale suggests the death of the Lamb in Revelation "is based on the OT sacrificial background, especially of the Day of Atonement, where the sacrificial animal is a representative penal substitute for Israel."[77] Beale bases this assertion on the text of Numbers 29:7–11 which demands the sacrifice of "seven male lambs."

---

[75] Aune, *Revelation 1–5*, 293.

[76] Beale, *Revelation*, 619.

[77] Ibid., 660.

Margaret Barker

Margaret Barker is perhaps the only recent commentator to explore to a large extent the reception of the Day of Atonement in the book of Revelation. The expression "Day of Atonement" appears roughly sixty times in her commentary. Compare this high number of references to the five references in both Aune's and Beale's much larger works. Barker contends this dependence on the Day of Atonement as early as Revelation 1: "[T]he picture of Jesus as the great high priest in all his roles and aspects appears throughout the New Testament and is the key to understanding all early Christian teaching about him."[78] When commenting on the great multitude or Rev 7:9, she suggests that their palms and robes "are probably the twelve tribes assembled for the Feast of Tabernacles after the great Day of Atonement."[79] On the seven trumpets, she writes, "when the Book of Revelation was compiled, the seven trumpets became the trumpets of the Day of Atonement."[80] Barker's references to the Day of Atonement in her book are too extensive to explore here. In most cases, however, Barker merely states a connection without providing actual textual evidence for it. Her case would be strengthened by philological support for such allusions and echoes.

---

[78] Margaret Barker, *The Revelation of Jesus Christ: Which God Gave to Him to Show to His Servants What Must Soon Take Place (Revelation 1.1)* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 4; cf. ibid., *Temple Themes in Christian Worship* (London; New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2007).

[79] Barker, *Revelation*, 164.

[80] Ibid., 196.

W. Gordon Campbell

In an article titled "Findings, Seals, Trumpets, and Bowls: Variations Upon the Theme of Covenant Rupture and Restoration in The Book Of Revelation,"[81] W. Gordon Campbell suggests that the trumpets section (Rev 8:2–9:21) carries the same judgment overtones as the blowing of the *shofar* on the Day of Atonement. He avers that "the enacted judgments mesh with the accumulated seven-times-seven Sabbath blessings (Lev 25:8) and with the justice which characterizes the Year of Jubilee"[82] which started on the Day of Atonement. He follows this same approach to the Day of Atonement in his book, *Reading Revelation: A Thematic Approach.*[83]

Summary

The literature review above reveals that NT scholarship has only partially dealt with the potential presence of language and imagery of Day of Atonement in the book of Revelation. The mentions of the Day of Atonement in Revelation in the literature have not only lacked a comprehensive scope—they have been limited to a few passages—but they also lack a consistent methodology, as in the case of Margaret Barker. In the

---

[81] *WTJ* 66:1 (Spring 2004): 71–96.

[82] Campbell, "Findings," 85. Campbell structures Revelation in four series of septets: seven findings, seven seals, seven trumpets and seven bowls. Cf. Smalley, *Revelation*, 21–23 who structures Revelation in seven scenes: seven oracles (1:9–3:22); seven seals (6:1–17), seven trumpets (8:1–9:21), seven signs (12:1–14.20), seven bowls (16:1–21), seven visions (19:1–20:15), and seven prophecies (21:2–22:17).

[83] W. Gordon Campbell, *Reading Revelation: A Thematic Approach* (Cambridge: James Clark and Co., 2012), 251.

remainder of this introduction, a coherent hermeneutical method will be proposed and discussed in order to lay the foundation of this study.

Research Method

Our analysis of the reception of the Day of Atonement in Revelation will be based on OT passages that deal with the Day of Atonement such as Lev 16; 23:26–32 and Num 29:7–11. Building on previous research, this study explores the continuity between the theological/typological meaning of the Day of Atonement in the OT and the NT in the book of Revelation. As previously discussed, the reception of the Day of Atonement language and imagery in Revelation is a corollary of the broader questions of the influence of the OT on the book of Revelation.

Three main categories of intertextual references of the OT in the NT have been proposed: (1) *quotation*: "when an author clearly indicates that the words that follow are not his or her own but are taken from another source"[84]; (2) *allusion*: when the author "was consciously referring to previous literature,"[85] although no credit is given and; (3) *echo:* an "unconscious" allusion to a secondary text.[86]

On the foregoing, it should be pointed out that, according to most scholars, there

---

[84] Steve Moyise, "Quotations," in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*, eds. Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 15.

[85] Jon Paulien, "Elusive Allusions: The Problematic Use of the Old Testament in Revelation," *Biblical Research* 33 (1988): 40–41.

[86] John Hollander, *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1981), 64.

are no direct quotations of the OT in Revelation; as we'll explore below, most of extratextual references in the book of Revelation are in the "allusion" and "echo" categories. Further, the question of how John alludes to the OT in the book of Revelation intersects with "intertextuality" to which we now turn. The following is offered as an overview. Due to the voluminous output by scholars on the subject, it would not be possible to offer an exhaustive analysis without overstepping the delimitations of this study.

Intertextuality: An Overview

The common term for the use of the OT in the NT in current scholarship is "intertextuality." The term *intertextualité*[87] was coined by Bulgarian-French philosopher Julia Kristeva in 1969 in a quest for a new understanding of language couched in the political climate of the Parisian revolution of the 1960s and 1970s. Intertextuality was born as a reaction against rigid authorial intention and stable meaning, a sort of manifesto of reader-response to the detriment of authorial intention.

Kristeva was highly influenced by the work of Russian author Mikhail M. Bakhtin who said that "the word lives, as it were, on the boundary between its own

[87] Julia Kristeva, *Sèméiotiké: Recherches Pour Une Sémanalyse* (Paris: Le Sevil, 1969). Cf. Julia Kristeva, "Word, Dialogue and Novel," in *The Kristeva Reader*, ed. Toril Moi (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1986), 36; cf. Jonathan Culler, *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature and Deconstruction* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1976), 100–101; Willem S. Vorster, "Intertextuality and Redaktionsgeschichte," in *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings*, ed. S. Draisma, Festschrift Bas van Iersel (Kampen: Kok, 1989).

context and another, alien context."[88] Kristeva's definition of "text" sheds light on what she meant with the term *intertextualité:*

> The text is therefore a *productivity*, and this means: first, that its relationship to the language in which it is situated is redistributive (destructive-constructive), and hence can be better approached through logical categories rather than linguistic one; and second, that it is a permutation of texts, an intertextuality: in the space of a given text, several utterances, taken from other texts, intersect and neutralize one another.[89]

She goes on to say that any text can become a "mosaic of quotations"[90] which is at once influenced by other texts and is an influencer of texts. One notices the idea of the subversion of authorial intention in that the text can ultimately "neutralize" stable authorial meaning thus opening the doors for the reader to create meaning.

Inklings of the influence of intertextuality in biblical studies started appearing at in the early 1980's in the works of Michael Fishbane[91] and Richard Hays. Fishbane's seminal work on Jewish exegesis attempted to establish a vector of allusion framed by historical literary history of the Jewish canon. As he later defined inner-biblical allusions:

> Materials are always moving from one setting to another, being joined to different genres, and resulting in new redactional units for instruction. Indeed, we must take note of the fact that traditions were always being integrated and

---

[88] Mikhail M. Bakhtin, "Discourse in the Novel," in *The Novel: An Anthology of Criticism and Theory 1900-2000*, ed. Dorothy J. Hall (Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), 498.

[89] Julia Kristeva, *Desire in* Language (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1980), 36.

[90] Kristeva, *Desire*, 66.

[91] Michael A. Fishbane, "Revelation and Tradition: Aspects of Inner-Biblical Exegesis," *JBL* 99/3 (1980): 343–361; ibid., *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 285.

> moved from one sphere of instruction—be that oral, written, priestly, sapiential, or whatever—to another.[92]

Fishbane proposed four classes of inner-biblical allusions in the OT: scribal, legal, aggadic, and mantological. When discussing aggadic[93] exegesis, for example, Fishbane proposes a method based on recognizing "multiple and sustained lexical linkages between two texts." As an example, Fishbane points out how Ps 8:5–7 is alluded and exegeted in Job 7:17–18.

Richard B. Hays's seminal work on the use of the OT in the NT titled *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (1989).[94] In his exploration of intertextuality in the letters of Paul, Hays suggests that "the voice of Scripture, regarded as authoritative in one way or another, continues to speak in and through later texts that both depend on and transform the earlier.[95]

But the arrival of intertextuality in biblical studies was not warmly received by all. Scholars have since debated how useful traditional intertextual theory really is to biblical studies. The idea of a text open to fluid, dynamic meaning poses significant challenges to exegetes interested in maintaining what they perceive as original authorial intention

---

[92] Michael Fishbane, "The Hebrew Bible and Exegetical Tradition," in *Intertextuality in Ugarit and Israel*, ed. Johannes C. De Moor, OSt 40 [Leiden: Brill, 1998], 25.

[93] Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 281, defines aggadic exegesis as "moral and theological homilies, didactic expositions of historical and folk motifs, expositions and reinterpretations of ethical dicta and religious *theologoumena* and much more."

[94] Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989).

[95] Hays, *Echoes*, 14.

in the biblical text, especially as it concerns the use of the OT in the NT. Thomas R. Hatina, for example, criticized the use of the term "intertextuality" as inextricably linked to a "political agenda" which attempts to "subvert the traditional approaches [to literature] by undermining the idea of a unified and accumulative sense."[96] He pointed out the "irony" that, although the "context" in which a text arises is central to historical criticism, adopters of intertextuality have tended to ignore the very context in which "intertextuality" arose originally, namely, in the political and ideological framework of poststructuralism. Such politically-charged agenda displaces "traditional structures" and reduces the relationship between readers and authors as "a struggle for power and authority." He writes: "intertextuality was associated with an antagonism toward the contemporary hermeneutical struggle, characterized by a crisis of representation which could no longer guarantee meaning, centrality and reference."[97] When discussing Hay's use of "intertextuality," Hatina suggests that were Hays to omit the term "intertextuality", his contribution would not be impaired.[98] Hatina is rightly preoccupied that "traditional hermeneutics," which works from a "work (and author-) oriented perspective" is destabilized by a deconstructive approach in which the "denial of an ultimate referent

---

[96] Thomas R. Hatina, "Intertextuality and Historical Criticism in New Testament Studies: Is There a Relationship?," *BibInt* 7/1 (1999): 30.

[97] Ibid.

[98] Ibid., 36.

immediately leads to the instability of texts"[99] and where it is ultimately the reader who creates meaning. This elevates reader-response to the detriment of determinate authorial intention which is a valid concern for exegetes exploring the reception of the OT into the NT for authorial intention. The role of the reader in intertextuality, says Hatina, "creates immediate discord with the historical critic who focuses on the author and written text."[100] For all intents and purposes, biblical scholars still consider the biblical authors as the ultimate authority in creating meaning. Whatever "intertextuality" occurs within the biblical canon, it always occurs within the confines of stable, discoverable meaning. At the same time, Hatina does concede a role for the reader "limited only to self-analysis" because the reader reads "as not simply investigating a past tradition but as one who participates in the tradition."[101]

Hatina's objections to the use of "intertextuality" terminology in biblical studies highlight the question of whether it is possible to rescue the biblical text from the grips

---

[99] Ibid., 30. Hatina defines the major premises of traditional hermeneutics thus: "(1) the potential of language to create stable meaning; (2) the existence of meaning within established forms; (3) the artist's control of meaning; (4) a work's closure and (5) the ancillary activity of criticism as separate from literature." Intertextuality on the other hand, Hatina continues is based on premises which are "inimical" to traditional hermeneutics: "(1) language is not a medium of thought or a tool for communication; it is nebulous, arbitrary and leads to infinite interpretations; (2) all texts—having no closure, resolution and self-sufficiency—refer endlessly to other texts; (3) the author is never in control over the meaning of the text; (4) meaning is supplanted by the idea of signification, whereby the signifier remains without a corresponding signified; (5) criticism is part of the text and contributes to the creation of meaning; (6) disciplinary boundaries are discarded, leaving all disciplines as part of the discursive environment and ultimately inseparable from literature; and (7) the rules of reason and identity are replaced by the notion of "contradiction" which refers to the fallacy of identity—that the concept does not exhaust the thing conceived. (Ibid., 32).

[100] Ibid., 35.

[101] Ibid.

of radical intertextual theory which nowadays goes uncomfortably hand-in-hand with traditional historical critical hermeneutics. Ultimately, Hatina questioned whether intertextuality could ultimately become "functional" in biblical studies, namely, by contributing "new content and insights to traditional approaches of studying the use of Scripture of other traditions in the New Testament."[102] The solution, he thinks, is for biblical scholars to differentiate between "intertextuality and influence,"[103] a distinction that was resisted by both Kristeva and other proponents of intertextuality. By influence, Hatina means "the relationship between an anterior text and a posterior text—the connections may be literary, social or psychological."[104] This relationship seems to be particularly pertinent for biblical authors who formed the social cloth Judeo-Christianity.

More recently (2016), Oropeza and Moyise answered Hatina's challenge to make intertextuality "functional" by arguing that intertextuality as it is used in biblical scholarship "has become an umbrella term for a diverse range of reading strategies" because the traditional terms of quotation, allusion and echo resist 'precise

---

[102] Ibid.

[103] Ibid., 37.

[104] Ibid. Eric Rothstein, "Diversity and Change and Literary Histories," in *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History*, eds. Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), 117, argues that such relationship is clarified and strengthened by social-historical factors, especially when both readers and authors are "culturally produced producers of texts sharing a common pool of desires, beliefs and practices, as well as having the power of agency."

definition.'"[105] Oropeza and Moyise's work explores no less than seventeen modalities of intertextual practice in Scripture.[106]

Such a daunting number of intertextual approaches explored by recent scholarship prevents us from offering an exhaustive analysis of the subject here.[107] Early on, perhaps sensing the difficulties of applying an open-ended definition of intertextuality in biblical studies, Hays proposed exploring the "phenomenon of intertextuality in Paul's letters in a more limited sense, focusing on his actual citations of and allusions to specific texts."[108] He sees Paul's dependence on "Israel's Scripture" as a dominant, limiting factor of intertextuality in his epistles and proposes reading them "against this background of 'inner-biblical exegesis'" in order to understand Paul's place within Judeo-Christian tradition.[109] To this end, Hays builds on Hollander's definition of

---

[105] Oropeza and Moyise, *Exploring Intertextuality*, xvii. Cf. also Peter D. Miscall, "Isaiah: New Heavens, New Earth, New Book," in *Reading Between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible*, ed. Donna N. Fewell (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992), 44, who defines intertextuality as a "covering term for all relations that can be established between texts."

[106] E.g., dialogical intertextuality, hypertextuality, metalepsis, rhetoric of quotations, *midrash*, shadows and sealities, mimesis, poststructural intertextuality, categorical cemiotics, cociorhetorical intertexture, narrative transformation, orality, enunciation and personification, relevance theory, multidimensional intertextuality, reference-text-oriented allusion, probability of intertextual borrowing.

[107] For an extended discussion, see Robert L. Hubbard Jr, "Reading through the Rearview Mirror: Inner-Biblical Exegesis and the New Testament," in *Doing Theology for the Church: Essays in Honor of Klyne Snodgrass*, eds. Rebekah A. Eklund and John E. Phelan Jr. (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2014), 125–139.

[108] Hays, *Echoes*, 15.

[109] Ibid., 14.

an echo as an "unconscious" allusion to a secondary text[110] occurring within a "cave of resonant signification", in this case, Scripture. Hays finds resonance in Hollander's definition because it "allows for an appreciative valuation of continuity within the tradition, as poets honors the voices of the dead even while forming echoes that transform their word in new acoustincal environments."[111] "Sometimes," writes Hays, "the echo will be so loud that only the dullest or most ignorant reader could miss it."[112] An example of such unmistakable echoes may be found in Rom 10:5-10 where Paul echoes several passages from the Pentateuch in his discourse about the "law." Hays proposes that the task of textual criticism is "(a) to call attention to them so that others might be enabled to hear; and (b) to give an account of the distortions and new figuration that they generate."[113] And yet, warns Hays, the study of Paul's intertextual allusions "is less a matter of method than of sensibility" to the "internal resonances of the biblical text."[114] If we are to understand Paul (and John) as a first-century Jew, we need "to situate his discourse appropriately within what Hollander calls 'the cave of resonant signification' that enveloped him: Scripture."[115]

---

[110] Hollander, *The Figure of Echo*, 64.

[111] Hays, *Echoes*, 19.

[112] Ibid., 29.

[113] Ibid., 19.

[114] Ibid., 21.

[115] Ibid.

Hays's method provides an attractive model for our exploration of intertextuality to the book of Revelation. Hays proposes five possible sources of echoes in the letters of Paul: (1) Paul's mind; (2) his original readers; (3) the text itself; (4) a contemporary act of reading and; (5) an interpretive community.[116] An in order to verify the validity of the echoes, Hays proposes seven "tests" for verifying the presence of such echoes in the text: (1) *Availability*: Was it familiar/available to the author and original readers?; (2) *Volume*: How distinctive (loud) is it?; (3) *Recurrence*: How often does the echo appear in the new work?; (4) *Thematic Coherence*: Does the echo "fit" the context of the new work?; (5) *Historical Plausibility*: How likely was the author to have known and used the material in the new work?; (6) *History of Interpretation*: Have others heard the same echoes?; (7) *Satisfaction*: Does the presence of the echo help clarify the passage's meaning?[117]

Building on—and at times critiquing[118]—Hays's work, Stanley E. Porter proposes five categories of "extratextual reference" in the text of the NT: formulaic quotation, direct quotation, paraphrase, allusion and echo.[119] Because the use of the OT in

---

[116] Ibid., 26.

[117] Ibid., 29–32.

[118] Porter has critized Hays's proposed five sources theory as well as his seven tests as "problematic" because they seem to conflate contemporary "interpretation" of said echoes with original authorial intention. Porter writes: "It is perplexing that the most important criterion [satisfaction] is not in fact a criterion for discovering echoes, only for interpreting them, leaving the question of definition and determination unresolved." (Porter, "Allusions and Echoes," 39).

[119] Stanley E. Porter, "Further Comments on the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," in *Intertextuality of the Epistles: Explorations of Theory and Practice,* eds. Thomas L. Brodie, Dennis R. MacDonald and Stanley E. Porter, NTM 6 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007), 98–110.

Revelation occurs mostly in the form of "allusions" and "echoes", we can disregard the previous three categories for the time being and focus on the last two. Porter defines an "allusion" as "a figure of speech that makes indirect extratextual references" and is used "to bring an external person, place, or literary work into the contemporary text."[120] In order to be literarily effective, writes Porter, an allusion must meet three criteria: (1) it must be intentional; (2) it must come from a "common pool of shared knowledge":[121] both author and reader will "grasp" the allusion, and; (3) it is functional, not merely ornamental, i.e., it must address a "particular literary problem."[122] Significantly—especially in the case of the deep symbolism in Revelation—an allusion "does not constitute a solution to the problem, but it does offer a potentially new orientation to the problem so that a new solution can be found." According to Paulien, by alluding to a previous text, "the author intends to point the reader to a previous work as a means of expanding the reader's horizons. The portion of the text alluded to can only be fully understood in the light of its context within the original work."[123] In the case of Revelation, the solution for its mysteries can often be found by a close look at their potential OT sources.

---

[120] Stanley E. Porter, "Allusions and Echoes," in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*, eds. Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 30, 40.

[121] Porter, "Allusions and Echoes," 36.

[122] Ibid.

[123] Jon Paulien, *Decoding Revelation's Trumpets: Allusions and the Interpretation of Rev* 8:7–12, AUSDS, vol. 11 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1988), 39.

An "echo," writes Porter, "is reserved for language that is thematically related to a more general notion or concept."[124] Paulien on the other hand suggests that an echo occurs when the author "picked up an idea that can be found in previous literature but was probably unaware of the original source. The idea was in the air of the environment in which the author lived."[125] We need to be careful however in attempting to "guess" how much the author actually knew or was aware of. For this reason, *allusions* and *echoes* are often conflated because the dividing line can be easily crossed (Hays, for example, talks about "allusive echoes"). The problem can be illustrated by asking the question: If we could somehow prove that the author *intentionally* echoed a previous work, would the echo then become an allusion? Porter is not so convinced of the usefulness of an assumed lack of "awareness" on the part of the author when he argues that "the use of both concepts [allusion and echo] seems to imply an intentional use by the author for a particular textual purpose, such as exemplifying or supporting a particular concept."[126] Since it is not possible for us to satisfactorily assume what the author was "consciously" alluding to, Porter's assumption of intentionality in allusions and echoes is more on target.

Now that we appear to have definitions in place, we can ask: How do we go about establishing that allusions or echoes are present in the text? Since there are

---

[124] Porter, "Allusions and Echoes," 39.

[125] Jon Paulien, *Decoding Revelation's Trumpets*, 40.

[126] Porter, "Allusions and Echoes," 40.

differing opinions on what exactly constitute NT quotations and allusions to the OT in Revelation, Paulien has argued that "there needs to be a greater consensus on the criteria for assessing potential allusions and a more consistent use of such criteria."[127] He proposes that determining an author's allusive method depends on "weight of evidence, both external and internal."[128] External evidence refers to knowledge about the author while internal evidence rises from the text itself. Since we seem to know little about our author, John of Patmos, we'll focus on internal evidence here. Paulien proposes three basic criteria for "accumulating internal evidence" of intertextuality between two texts: (1) verbal parallels: two or more words of significant, shared importance between texts; (2) thematic parallels: similarity of thought and theme, and; (3) structural parallels: themes or words used in the same order as a previous text.

In a helpful case study, Jeffery Leonard[129] proposed a set of eight principles to categorize shared language (Paulien's verbal parallels) in inner-biblical allusions. I summarize the main tenets of each principle below. (1) Shared language is the single most important factor in establishing a textual connection. Leonard builds on Fishbane's

---

[127] Jon Paulien, "Criteria and the Assessment of Allusions to the Old Testament in the Book of Revelation" in *Studies in Revelation*, ed. Steve Moyise (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2001), 128.; ibid., review of Beate Kowalski, *Die Rezeption des Propheten Ezechiel in der Offenbarung des Johannes*, *JBL* 124/4 (December 1, 2005): 782–785; ibid., "New Testament Use of the Old Testament," in *Hermeneutic, Intertextuality and the Contemporary Meaning of Scripture*, eds. Ross Cole and Paul Petersen (Adelaide: Avondale Academic Press, 2014), 29–49.

[128] Jon Paulien, "Elusive Allusions," 41.

[129] Jeffery M. Leonard, "Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions: Psalm 78 as a Test Case," *JBL* 127/2 (2008): 241–265.

"multiple and sustained lexical linkages"[130] between texts because "verbal parallels provide the most objective and verifiable criteria for identifying these allusions."[131] (2) Shared language is more important than non-shared language. This principle explains the implications of the first, i.e., the presence of shared language indicates the direction and strength of the "vector of allusion"[132] while non-shared language does not necessarily diminish the force of shared language. (3) Shared language that is rare or distinctive suggests a stronger connection than language that is widely used. This builds on the previous principles by stressing the importance of unique lexical markers shared by two or more texts or traditions. In sum, common words would make an allusion weak or non-existent since it is not possible to determine an allusion as a unique lexical marker would. (4) Shared phrases suggest a stronger connection than do individual shared terms. Not only are shared terms important, but their presence in an actual phrase makes the allusion virtually undeniable. A phrase requires that certain terms are used in a sequence that is rather unique. (5) The accumulation of shared language suggests a stronger connection than does a single shared term or phrase. This principle is self-explanatory: the more lexical markers present, the stronger is the allusion. (6) Shared language in similar contexts suggests a stronger connection than does shared language alone. Leonard explains it thus: "The overlap in context tends to strengthen the

---

[130] Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 285.

[131] Leonard, "Identifying," 247.

[132] Lyle Eslinger, "Inner-Biblical Exegesis and Inner-Biblical Allusion: The Question of Category," *VT* 42 (1992): 52.

possibility that the two texts are connected" and the "overlap of (relatively) rare terms and identical context strongly suggests a textual connection."[133] In other words, words used in the same manner in both contexts suggest the presence of an allusive vector. (7) Shared language need not be accompanied by shared ideology to establish a connection. This point seems to be the most applicable to studies of inner-biblical allusions in the book of Revelation since John appears to make little effort to interpret or illuminate the meaning of any given OT passage. Leonard explains: "The fact that these later writers advanced ideologies different from those of the original authors *has no bearing* on the question of whether they allude to their writings."[134] (8) Shared language need not be accompanied by shared form to establish a connection.

Leonard's criteria present a helpful set of controls to determine the use of the OT in the book of Revelation. In this study, the application of these guidelines will be accomplished by a survey of potential philological parallels of the *koine* Greek of the any given passage in Revelation with the Greek text of the LXX. In addition to the Greek OT, the Hebrew OT will also be explored in order to possible translational directionality between Hebrew and Greek terms in the OT which can then be detected in Revelation. This comparison will help establish the consistency of use of specific terms, variations in translation and contextual significance.

---

[133] Leonard, "Identifying," 255.

[134] Ibid., 256.

Moreover, in order to keep this study within feasible methodological boundaries, our assessment of the presence of Day of Atonement language and imagery in Revelation will build on four of the seven tests of intertextual echoes proposed by Hays which are most useful for discovering echoes in the text, namely: *availability*, *loudness*, *thematic coherence* and *historical plausibility*. As far as *availability* and *historical plausibility* go, this study assumes that all echoes of the Day of Atonement were both readily available to and plausibly known by the original hearers of Revelation as members of Jewish-Christian communities familiar with the day's rituals. Secondly, as a fine-tuning of Hays's *loudness* test, echoes will be given three settings of loudness: soft, medium, loud. The loudness of an echo is measured by two aspects: (1) the *number* of thematic reverberations present in a given passage in Revelation and; (2) the *importance* of the thematic reverbertation. Assessing the "loudness" of an echo goes hand-in-hand with Hays' *thematic coherence* test, which is presented as a list of the common themes shared by the Day of Atonement and the respective context being analysed in Revelation.[135] The plausibility of the presence of an echo of the Day of Atonement in a given passage appears in the form of a table at the end of each passage analysed in Revelation.

In sum, intertextual theory has opened a new hermeneutical world in biblical studies. Without necessarily subscribing to intertextuality's most radical presuppositions such as the destabilization of authorial meaning, the tools intertextuality affords exegetes

[135] Hays, *Echoes*, 29–32.

are especially useful for interpreting Revelation where Kristeva's "mosaic of quotations" can be vividly seen, perhaps more than in other NT writings. To this end, we now turn to the question of intertextuality in the book of Revelation.

Intertextuality and the Book of Revelation

It is important to remember that the preceding discussion of intertextuality was not concerned with how *we* read Revelation today but rather asks the question: How did *John* read (or hear) authors and how did this "mosaic of quotations," both of the OT and other sources, become part of the text of Revelation? Only after we understand how intertextuality applies to Revelation can we ask how *we* should interpret it.

In order to ground this investigation in sound hermeneutical principles, a brief analysis of some key concepts of the relationship between the Hebrew Scriptures and Revelation is crucial. When it comes to Revelation, the influence of the OT on the NT may involve determining what other texts, traditions and influences may have had an impact on the NT and consequently influenced John. This field of study has yielded

several major works by Beale,[136] Dumbrell,[137] Vogelgesang,[138] Bauckham,[139] Paulien,[140] Fekkes,[141] Ruiz,[142] Moyise,[143] Porter,[144] Gundry,[145] and Kowalski.[146]

As our study will reveal, the book of Revelation, perhaps more so than any other NT writing, fits Kristeva's "mosaic of quotations." Each of the images and ideas retrieved from the author's imagination—suffused, as it was, by OT, Jewish as well a Greco-Roman imagery—receives a specific, designated place in the tapestry of images which

---

[136] Gregory K. Beale, *John's Use of the OT in Revelation*, JSNTSup 166 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 13–59; ibid., ed., *Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts: Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1994).

[137] William J. Dumbrell, *The End of the Beginning: Revelation 21–22 and the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1985).

[138] Jeffrey Marshall Vogelgesang, "The Interpretation of Ezekiel in the Book of Revelation" (PhD dissertation, Harvard University, 1985).

[139] Bauckham, *The Climax of Prophecy*.

[140] Jon Paulien, *Decoding Revelation's Trumpets: Allusions and the Interpretation of Rev* 8:7–12.

[141] J. Fekkes, *Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions in the Book of Revelation: Visionary Antecedents and Their Development*, JSNTSup 93 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994).

[142] Jean-Pierre Ruiz, *Ezekiel in the Apocalypse: The Transformation of Prophetic Language in Revelation* 16, 17–19:10, EUS 23, vol. 376 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1989).

[143] Steve Moyise, *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation*, JSNTSup, 115 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).

[144] Stanley E. Porter, ed., *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2006).

[145] Stanley Gundry et. al, eds. *Three Views on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2008).

[146] Beate Kowalski, *Die Rezeption des Propheten Ezechiel in der Offenbarung des Johannes*, SBB 52 (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2004).

forms the book. John appears to transplant and plug them into his "epistle," allowing each image to add to the palette while still maintaining its original coloration, meaning and impact on the viewer. The image continues to "echo" in its new context adding to the palette of "sound." This allows John to at times confer new meaning or reinterpretation of an OT image without necessarily negating its original meaning.[147] Thus Revelation becomes a "picture made of pictures"—the kind we frequently encounter in magazines and other media—where each photo remains the same but when seen from the distance, contributes, along with a plethora of other images, to form another, new photo which, for John, is the portrait of Jesus Christ. To John, all previous revelation coalesces to form God's final *revealing* achieved in Jesus. On this point, Schüssler Fiorenza writes:

> [John] does not interpret the OT but uses its words, images, phrases, and patterns as a language arsenal in order to make his own theological statement or express his own prophetic vision. He adapts or borrows whole OT sequences as patterns for his original compositions but never refers to the OT as authoritative Scripture.[148]

An example of such use of imagery transplanted from the OT in Revelation are the symbols of "Lion" and "Lamb" in Rev 5:5–6:

> Then one of the elders said to me, "Do not weep. See, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, has conquered, so that he can open the scroll and its

[147] E.g., Moyise argues that John's use of temple imagery in Rev 21:22 is a "denial" of its meaning in Ezekiel 43 (Moyise, "Dialogical Intertextuality," 6–7). He writes: "[E]ven when a source is negated, its 'voice' is not completely silenced and can bring associations and connotations that contribute to the interpretation of the text." Moyise is correct that an image's "voice" continues to speak in new readings, but is this "negating" or expanding the imagery of the eschatological temple? The latter seems to be case in John, for the OT promise of an eschatological temple is not necessarily denied but rather expanded to encompass an entire city which holds not only Israel but the faithful from the entire world.

[148] Schüssler Fiorenza, *Justice and Judgment*, 135.

> seven seals." [6] Then I saw between the throne and the four living creatures and among the elders a Lamb standing as if it had been slaughtered, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven spirits of God sent out into all the earth.

What we see in this passage is not an amalgam of two animals into one, i.e., a lamb with the head of a lion or vice-versa, but both animals are drawn from their original OT contexts and the imagery remains unchanged. The phrase "Lion of the tribe of Judah" alludes to Jacob's deathbed speech about Judah (Gen 49:9) while and lion imagery is also used to describe Yahweh in Job 10:6; Isa 31:4; Jer 50:44; Hos 5:14. The imagery of a slaughtered lamb comes from several moments in the life of Jews: the missing lamb of Abraham's sacrifice (Gen 22:8), the Passover lamb (Exodus 12), the daily sacrifice of two lambs in the tabernacle service (Ex 29:38), the prophetic oracle of Isa 53:7 as well as at least two sources from Jewish literature which describe the Messiah as a horned lamb (1 *Enoch* 90 and the *Testament of Joseph* 19).

Moyise calls this a "juxtaposition" of symbols[149] while Caird suggests: "Wherever the OT says 'Lion', read 'Lamb. Wherever the Old Testament speaks of the victory of the Messiah or the overthrow of the enemies of God, we are to remember that the gospel recognizes no other way of achieving these ends than the way of the Cross." [150] The best solution is to allow each symbol to add "speak" in Revelation. Thus, Frederick Murphy avers that Christ won the victory "through suffering and death" (as a Lamb) but will act

---

[149] Moyise, "Dialogical Intertextuality," 8.

[150] Caird, *Revelation*, 75.

against the wicked "and will punish them as they deserve"[151] (as a Lion)." Similarly, Beale argues that these images refer to Christ's death and the judgment meted out at the Parousia.[152] This is an example of "dialogical intertextuality," concludes Moyise, where "the alluded text adds a 'voice' to the alluding text, so that the reader is forced to configure multiple 'voices.'"[153]

But something else occurs in Revelation 5. Although the images of lion and lamb are used similarly to their meaning of sacrifice and vengeance as in the OT, John sees a lamb inside the throne room in heaven. This is unusual, for if John draws the image of a lamb from the tabernacle service, then his placement of a sacrificial lamb inside the heavenly Most Holy Place signals shift in the application of the symbol. As we shall see below, by expanding the symbol of a sacrificial lamb from the "daily" sacrifices to a lamb sacrificed inside the Most Holy Place, John creates a composite sacrifice which encompasses all of the sanctuary service, including the "daily" sacrifices, the Passover lamb as well as the Day of Atonement sacrifices (of goats!) whose blood solely entered inside the Most Holy Place of the tabernacle the throne room of the earthly sanctuary on Yom Kippur.

In the early- to mid-1980s and 1990s, *nouveau* theologians made several attempts to develop new ways of understanding the literary relationship between the OT and the

---

[151] Frederick J. Murphy, *Fallen is Babylon. The Revelation to John* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity International, 1998), 193.

[152] Beale, *John's Use of the OT*, 46.

[153] Moyise, "Dialogical Intertextuality," 14.

book of Revelation. At the time this represented groundbreaking research that helped fill a lacuna in Revelation studies. However, the lack of consensus on a standardized approach and the continuous debate between the proponents of the various existing approaches prompted at least one commentator to conclude that the "definitive work on the use of the Old Testament in the Apocalypse is yet to be written."[154] The impasse derives mostly from the disagreement about the way the book of Revelation was constructed: John does not seem to be bound by a single, formulaic method of alluding to the OT, and this makes the task of finding the specific passages as source of the imagery and theology of Revelation all the more difficult.

As a case study, below I briefly review two main approaches to the reception of OT in Revelation as proposed by Gregory K. Beale[155] and Steve Moyise.[156]

Gregory K. Beale

After decades in which little attention was given to how John used the OT in Revelation, Gregory K. Beale broke new ground in 1980 with his Cambridge dissertation

---

[154] Grant R. Osborne, *Revelation*, BECNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2002), 2.

[155] Gregory K. Beale, *John's Use of the Old Testament in Revelation*, JSNTSup 166 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998).

[156] Moyise, *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation*. The conversation was once moderated by Jon Paulien in "Dreading the Whirlwind: Intertextuality and the Use of the OT in Revelation," *AUSS* 39 (2002): 5–22. Beale responded in "A Response to Jon Paulien on the Use of the Old Testament in Revelation," *AUSS* 39 (2002): 23–34; ibid., "Questions of Authorial Intent, Epistemology and Presuppositions and Their Bearing on the Study the OT in the New: A Rejoinder to Steve Moyise," *IBS* 21 (1999): 151–180; Steve Moyise, "Authorial Intention and the Book of Revelation," *AUSS* 39 (2002): 35–40; ibid., "Recent Developments in the Study of the Book of Revelation," *AUSS* 26 (1988): 159–170.

on the use of Daniel in Revelation.[157] Beale's work was followed by Jon Paulien's dissertation on the trumpets in the mid-1980s and by Steve Moyise's work on the use of the OT in the New Testament in the early 1990s.[158] In his definitive work on the subject, *John's Use of the Old Testament in Revelation* (recently updated as *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*[159]), Beale aligns his views with past scholarship when he quotes Bauckham's statement that "[a]llusions are meant to recall the Old Testament context, which thereby becomes part of the meaning the Apocalypse conveys."[160] This in turn influences the interpretation of OT prophecy.[161] In his earlier work on the use of Daniel in Revelation[162] he contended that the use of Daniel by Jewish apocalyptic writers was not "mechanical dependence nor copying but a creative use."[163] Revelation, according to Beale, is an elaborate literary work which "is not the result of a

---

[157] Gregory K. Beale, *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1984).

[158] Beale, however, was not original in his quest, cf. A. Schlatter, *Das Alte Testament in der johanneischen Apokalypse*, BFCT Jahr. 16 Heft. 6: (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1912); F. Jenkins, *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation* (Marion, IN: Cogdill Foundation Publications, 1972).

[159] Gregory K. Beale, *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2012).

[160] Bauckham, *The Climax of Prophecy*, xi.

[161] Beale, *John's Use of the OT*, 23, n. 24.

[162] Beale, *The Use of Daniel*, 15.

[163] Ibid., 15. Beale muses whether the Apocalypse is a visionary experience or literary endeavor, and he leans for both citing that the visions would be "colored both unconsciously and consciously by the traditions which had exerted a formative influence on the author's thinking.' (Ibid., 65). See also the analysis of M. Rissi, *Time and History:* A *Study on the Revelation* (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1966), 18–21, of several views on John's visionary experiences and his literary use of them.

mere recording of the actual visions themselves which would have been influenced by the author's learned tradition, but also a result of subsequent reflection on the OT during the writing down of the vision."[164] Themes and keywords from the OT are linked and combined by John, showing an intention to develop earlier prophets' themes while using the OT freely and creatively.[165]

Beale has proposed that in order to avoid the pitfalls of reader-response criticism, a corollary of the deconstructionism of intertextuality, the terms "influence" or "inner-biblical allusions" may be better descriptors of John's use of the OT.[166] Such "inner-biblical allusions, proposes Beale, come in the form of (1) *clear allusion:* when the verbal parallel is almost identical to the OT source and has the same meaning and authorial intention as no other source; (2) *probable allusion:* the idea or structure is the same as the potential OT source; or (3) *possible allusion:* verbal and thematic parallels are not exact but similar to the potential OT passage.[167] Moreover, he posits, "the validity of an allusion is the demonstration that the author could have had familiarity with the body of

---

[164] Beale, *John's Use of the OT,* 66.

[165] See Ibid., 65–71 for a discussion of why John's large use of the OT was not only intentional but also appropriate for his readers.

[166] Cf. Gregory K. Beale, *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2012), 51–52. The problems of bagging all allusions under the term "intertextuality" have been pointed out Moyise, who suggests there is a need for more qualified categorizations of the different uses of a text within a text. Cf. Steve Moyise, "Intertextuality and the Study of the Old Testament in the New Testament," in *The Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J. L. North,* ed. Steve Moyise, JSNTSup 189 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 16.

[167] Ibid., 62.

literature from which the purported allusion is a part."[168] Beale argues that "John appears to display varying degrees of awareness of literary context, as well as thematic context and, perhaps, historical context, although appeal to literary and thematic contexts is predominant."[169]

As an example of interpretation of symbols present in alluded OT sources—which is a corollary of the categories above—Beale suggests three additional helpful criteria: (1) how symbols are used in the OT source; (2) how symbols are used in the Jewish exegetical tradition; and (3) how symbols are used in the immediate NT context. He warns that failure to pay close attention to these criteria may result in a Pandora's Box of interpretations disconnected from an OT source already identified.[170] Beale's assessment of the impact of OT eschatological prototypes on Revelation will likely prove to be aligned with the goal of this study. For example, when commenting on OT eschatology, Beale offers the following conclusions: (1) OT patterns of fulfillment provide forms on how future eschatological fulfillment will occur; and (2) OT eschatological prototypes are lenses through which present fulfillments are to be understood.[171] Beale also grants that it is not possible to say precisely how John uses the OT prototypes because there is uncertainty about when they are a "means" or the

---

[168] Ibid., 20.

[169] Ibid., 74.

[170] Ibid., 20–21.

[171] Ibid., 79.

"object" of interpretation; to him there may be an interplay between the two. Beale argues that changes of "application" of a certain OT text do not necessarily mean "disregard" for the OT context.[172] What others see as a break from the OT context, Beale considers as "escalated analogy"[173] which requires a broader theological construct in order to be understood properly. He examines the allusion to Isa 22:22 in Rev 3:7, in which Eliakim is a symbol of Christ, and proposes that John's "paratactic" thinking must be taken into consideration, i.e., that his Semitic mind allowed contradictory notions to stand side by side more easily than our modern mind allows.[174] What other scholars call apparent disregard for the OT context on the part of John, Beale also calls "interpretative distillation" in addition to "escalated analogy" and "interpretative expansions"[175] of the OT prototypes. He applies this in the discussion of how John uses the imagery of a temple from Ezek 40 while adding a new application to the vision: there is no temple in the New Jerusalem.

Beale places importance on maintaining the preponderance of the original context as well as authorial intention of the OT allusions in Revelation thereby avoiding what he considers the extremes of reader-response criticism that permeate modern

---

[172] Ibid., 73.

[173] Ibid.

[174] Ibid., 48.

[175] Ibid., 78–79.

literary criticism of the NT. Beale's approach is attractive to exegetes from a conservative background because it allows them to maintain the unity and authority of Scriptures.

Perhaps the most helpful contribution made by Beale towards a better understanding of Revelation's use of the OT is his study of the impact of OT eschatological prototypes on Revelation which he calls a "propositional lens." Exegetes need to utilize the correct lens in order to understand how potential OT prophecy could be fulfilled in the book of Revelation.[176] In other words, "the Old Testament interprets the New Testament, and the New Testament interprets the Old Testament."[177] This tenet as will be later probed may have important implications for how Revelation's message is understood as "prophecy." The careful exegete will pay close attention not only to the source of the OT allusion, but also to how John keeps Revelation together by framing his message around OT eschatology.

Throughout his published works, Beale offers detailed exegesis of several passages which illuminate the approach he proposes. Based on the notion of "propositional lenses," Beale's exegesis of the use of the OT in the NT is based mostly on what he sees as a "change of application"[178] of the OT sources used in Revelation, whereas other scholars such as Vos see a disregard for the OT source original contextual meaning.[179]

---

[176] Ibid.

[177] Ibid.

[178] Ibid., 72–73.

[179] L. H. Vos, *The Synoptic Traditions in the Apocalypse* (Kampen: Kok, 1965), 21–37, 41.

Beale's approach is attractive because it allows one to maintain John's unity of purpose when using the OT while carefully avoiding an exegetical "no-man's land" which detaches the language and imagery from the OT from its firm contextual moorings allowing it to float freely in a sea of disjointed and at times contradicting interpretations.

Steve Moyise

Steve Moyise's book *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation* is a revision of his PhD dissertation submitted at the University of Birmingham, UK. In addition to his published thesis, Moyise has written substantially on the reception of the OT in the NT.[180] Moyise seeks to apply reader-response criticism to Revelation and contends that

[180] Cf. Ibid., *Evoking Scripture: Seeing the Old Testament in the New* (New York; London: T&T Clark, 2008); ibid., "Ezekiel and the Book of Revelation," in *After Ezekiel. Essays on the Reception of a Difficult Prophet*, eds. A. Mein and P. M. Joyce, Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament 535 (New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2011), 45–57; ibid., "Does Paul Respect the Context of his Quotations?" in *Paul and Scripture: Continuing the Conversation*, ed. C. D. Stanley (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 97–114; ibid., "Does Paul Respect the Context of his Quotations? Hosea as Test-case," in *What Does the Scripture Say? Studies in the Function of Scripture in the Gospels and Letters of Paul*, eds. Craig A. Evans and H. D. Zacharias (New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2012), 1–12; ibid., "Jesus and Isaiah," *Neo* 43:2 (2009): 249–270; ibid., "Scripture in the New Testament: Literary and Theological Perspectives," *Neo* 42 (2008): 305–326; ibid., "Word Frequencies in the book of Revelation," *AUSS* 43 (2005), 285–299; ibid., "Intertextuality and historical approaches to the use of Scripture in the New Testament," *VerbE* 26 (2005): 447–458; ibid., "The Language of the Psalms in the Book of Revelation," *Neo* (2003): 68–83; ibid., "Intertextuality and the Use of Scripture in the Book of Revelation," *Sc* (2003): 391–401; ibid., "The Language of the Old Testament in the Apocalypse," *JSNT* 76 (2000): 97–113; ibid., *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995); ibid., *The Old Testament in the New* (London; New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2001); ibid., *Paul and Scripture* (London: SPCK, 2010); ibid., *Jesus and Scripture* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2011); ibid., *Was the Birth of Jesus According to Scripture?* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2013); ibid., ed., *The Old Testament in the New Testament* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000); ibid., and Maarten Menken, eds., *The Psalms in the New Testament* (London; New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2004; ibid., and Maarten Menken, eds., *Isaiah in the New Testament* (London; New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2005); ibid., and Maarten Menken, eds., *Deuteronomy in the New Testament*, LNTS 358 (New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2008); ibid. and Maarten Menken, eds., *The Minor Prophets in the New Testament* (New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2009); ibid., and Maarten Menken, eds., *Genesis in the New Testament* (London; New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2012); ibid., "Models for Intertextual Interpretation of Revelation," in *The Book of*

"[a]ny description of John's use of Scripture must do justice to both the continuities and the discontinuities."[181] Moyise writes: "No text is an island and contrary to structuralist theory, it cannot be understood in isolation. It can only be understood as part of a web or matrix of other texts, themselves only to be understood in the light of other texts."[182] He defines biblical intertextuality as a dynamic "in which the new affects the old and the old affects the new."[183] He writes: "the task of intertextuality is to explore how the source text continues to speak through the new work and how the new work forces new meanings from the source text."[184] Moyise posits that "the presence of a quotation or allusion means that the clues that enable interpretation to take place are coming from two separate sources"[185] and that "the OT reflects on the New Testament context, even as the New Testament context absorbs and changes the OT allusion."[186] In the case of Revelation, the OT sources used by John may gain new meaning in light of their

---

Revelation: Theology, Politics and Intertextuality, eds. R. B. Hays and S. Alkier (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2012), 31–45.

[181] Moyise, *The OT in the Book of Revelation*, 22.

[182] Steve Moyise, "Dialogical Intertextuality," in *Exploring Intertextuality*, eds. B. J. Oropeza and Steve Moyise (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2016), 3.

[183] Ibid., 19. See also Jeremy Punt, "Inhabiting the World in Front of the Text: The New Testament and Reception Studies," *Neo* 34 (2000): 207–24, who compares the process of writing to creating a "palimpsest" with traces of old, partially erased texts still visible in the new text.

[184] Ibid., 111.

[185] Ibid., 19.

[186] Ibid., 116.

Christian rereading in Revelation.[187] He follows Vogelgesang's suggestion that John expects "dialogue with the text and with the texts within the text."[188] He argues this point by saying that Jesus weaves two concepts from the Pentateuch into one by quoting Deut 6:4 and Lev 19:18 in one breath, thus creating a new interpretation that summarizes the law in the new covenant.

Moyise argues that John's use of words and phrases from the OT creates "inviting connections"[189] which the reader then must negotiate and sometimes, even leave unresolved. Moyise maintains that interpretative tensions must remain for two reasons: (1) we do not have access to the mind of the author; and (2) reader response is not measurable.[190] Therefore, each reader decides how to solve the tension. This leads him to the sweeping conclusion that "[b]y utilizing past texts, the author has produced a fresh composition which invites the reader to participate and *create meaning*."[191] He concludes, for example, that the Lion-Lamb portrayal of Jesus in Revelation must stay unresolved since both come from the OT without resolution on the part of John. Moyise also concludes that contradictory readings may indicate either that meaning is not

---

[187] Ibid., 19: "In the search for this correlation between Christian apocalyptic and the Jewish feasts, we will often find ourselves driving on the two-way street of the Testaments proposed by Moyise where "the new affects the old and the old affects the new."

[188] Vogelgesang, "The Interpretation," 520.

[189] Moyise, *The OT in the Book of Revelation*, 43.

[190] Ibid., 43, 132.

[191] Ibid., 142.

recoverable or that both interpretations are complementary.[192] Moyise's position then seems more preoccupied with the overall effect of the book of Revelation on the reader than exegesis and interpretation of every verse in search for authorial intention. He thinks this is because "emphasis on the author's intention has been largely abandoned in New Testament study and replaced by a focus either on the text itself or on the role of the reader."[193]

Comparison of Beale's and Moyise's Views

While Beale argues forcefully for basic continuity between OT contexts (as can be seen in his extensive analysis of potential OT source passages in Revelation in his works), Moyise contends that this cannot be applied generally.[194] In contrast to Beale, Moyise has been influenced by an intertextual approach that can be seen as destabilizing to authorial intention and which elevates the reader's role in creating meaning. The main difference in Beale's and Moyise's approaches can be illustrated by the choice of analogies used. Beale compares the use of the OT to a fruit removed from a "fruit basket" which still maintains its qualities while removed from the original context. Moyise expands the fruit analogy by using a "fruit salad" analogy, arguing that although there are different fruits in the bowl, they are now part of a larger whole and it is impossible to extricate them from it without changing its substance. Beale contends

---

[192] Ibid., 53.

[193] Ibid., 142.

[194] Ibid., 52.

that Moyise is redressing old traditional hermeneutical approaches to John's Apocalypse with new terminology (reader-response theory)[195] a charge that can be reversed on Beale himself when he uses different expressions to describe the same thing. Beale sees as problematic Moyise's notion that "in a technical manner all OT allusions are taken out of context in the sense that they are removed from their original literary context in the Old Testament and placed into a new literary context in the New Testament."[196]

Beale contends that Revelation's allusions to the OT are strictly bound to their original contexts and original OT authorial intentions but receive new "significance" in light of "the Christ event," while Moyise argues that John's use of the OT is more creative and less bound to OT contexts, which invites a deeper involvement by the reader in creating meaning. The only difference is *how* this dynamic occurs. For Beale, "the Christ event" illuminates the OT context and gives it renewed significance while somehow maintaining the original meaning, while Moyise argues that the "new context has a significant effect on the interpretation" of the allusion and breaks with the previous one while allowing, if not forcing, a new meaning.[197] Moyise's position is articulated as respect for the book's continuities and discontinuities with OT prophetic oracles. In this sense, Beale's statement that "the Old Testament interprets the New Testament, and the

---

[195] Beale, *John's Use of the OT*, 47.

[196] Ibid., 41; Moyise, *The OT in the Book of Revelation*, 9–20, 112–13.

[197] Moyise, *The OT in the Book of Revelation*, 19.

New Testament interprets the Old Testament"[198] is the same as Moyise's view that "new affects the old and the old affects the new." Beale's concern however is to keep respect for the original context and meaning while Moyise does not think John has such preoccupations. This is not a matter of more or less "respect" in the sense of reverence or authority, but rather that both authors approach biblical criticism from two different schools of thought. Moyise seems more interested in the literary phenomenon created by John's inner-biblical allusions while Beale seems concerned with maintaining the unity of Scripture in terms of typology, themes and interpretation.

At bottom, the debate between Beale and Moyise is about the tension present in book of Revelation's between continuity and discontinuity with the OT. This study will attempt to explore how John may have used the OT in both continuous and discontinuous ways in the process of crafting such a complex text.

Summary

The discussion above demonstrates how scholars can differ in understanding John's use of the OT in the book of Revelation. The difficulties in resolving this apparent impasse can be seen in Paulien's moderation of the debate between the two authors where he compares the debate to a "whirlwind."[199] Perhaps, a solution is to consider John's use of the OT as containing aspects from several approaches. Thus, in the words of Paulien, both Beale and Moyise could be right in what they affirm but

---

[198] Ibid.

[199] Paulien, "Whirlwind," 5–22.

wrong in what they deny.[200] We could largely agree with Beale that, by depending on the OT for the description of his visions, John could not reasonably dismiss the original context but in the process creates a new, updated *application*. Thus the OT meaning of a particular imagery remains as an anchor for new reading in light of "the Christ event." Conversely, and in agreement with Moyise, it is undeniable that the reader has an important role in the process of reading and interpreting Revelation, for John expects him to relate to his book in a way that overwhelms preconceived notions of Jesus, God and the world. In this way a new, personal interpretation may be created in the process, one that is, however, rooted in the divine encounters occurring since the days of the OT.

General Assumptions About Revelation

The previous discussion has laid a preliminary groundwork for the methodological approach taken in this study. In the next section, we deal briefly with three important aspects of Revelation that may impact this study: (1) Revelation's authorship; (2) date of composition and; (3) literary genre.

Authorship

Several 'Johns' have been proposed as the potential author of Revelation: (1) John, the apostle; (2) John, the "Elder"; (3) John, the Baptizer; (4) John Mark; (5) Cerinthus; and (6) an unknown first century John. The view of the authorship of Revelation by John the apostle is supported by church tradition starting with Justin

[200] Ibid., 19.

Martyr (*Dialogues with Trypho* 81.4) and Irenaeus (*Adversus Haeresus* 30) in the mid-second century CE But despite the strong tradition behind this hypothesis, many scholars remain unconvinced of this possibility, mostly on philological grounds: the Fourth Gospel and Revelation are clearly not written by the same person, or, at least, not by the same hand.[201] R. H. Charles thought John was a "Palestinian Jew who emigrated to Asia Minor."[202] Even John the Baptizer was entertained as the author in the 19th century but this idea was discredited by the end of that century. It was revived in 1976 with the publication of J. Massyngbaerde Ford's controversial commentary in which she proposed John the Baptizer as the author of chapters 4–11 and one of his disciples as the author of chapters 12–22.[203]

Building on the Christian tradition of a Johannine authorship of Revelation, Prigent argues that both the Gospel of John and Revelation come from the same "*milieux*," the only element separating the two is obviously "*le genre literaire*."[204] Ladd

---

[201] See Mounce, *Revelation*, 8–15 for a helpful, concise discussion on the authorship of the book of Revelation.

[202] Charles, *Revelation*, xxxviii; cf. Collins, *Crisis*, 46–50; Aune, *Revelation* 1–5, l.

[203] Massingbaerde Ford, *Revelation*, 28–41, 50–56. Adela Yarbro Collins, review of Josephine M. Ford, *Revelation*, *CBQ* 38 (1976): 555, criticizes Massingbaerde Ford's peculiar and unsupported conclusions because they show lack of "dialogue with either older or more recent scholarship on Revelation."

[204] Pierre Prigent, *Flash sur l'Apocalypse* (Neuchatel; Paris: Collection Flèches, 1974), 13: "La tradition de l'eglise a affirmé qu'il s'agissait du même Jean que celui auquel nous sommes redevables du quatrième evangile. II y a une grande part de verité: L'evangile selon saint Jean et l'Apocalypse sortent certainement des mêmes milieux. Le style, les mots et les images sont souvent les mêmes; la théologie est trop souvent voisine pour que le hasard seul puisse en être cause. Cependant des nuances importantes separent nos deux écrits, pour ne pas parler de la difference la plus évidente: le genre littéraire."

thinks John the apostle wrote Revelation using his "own rough Hebraic Greek" while a disciple of his wrote the Gospel.[205] John and Peter are indeed called "uneducated and ordinary men" (Acts 4:13) which may point to John's limited grasp of Greek. The conclusion that John did not have classical training in Greek is an intriguing possibility, since Revelation's Greek does show deficiencies characteristic of a Semitic thinker having limited knowledge of Greek. The extensive Semitism in the syntax of the Greek of the book of Revelation has been explored in Steven Thompson's seminal work.[206]

Böcher concludes that "despite the difference in the literary genre as well as in the eschatology," we find clear "parallels" between Revelation and the Fourth Gospel.[207] Böcher considers the "Bildmaterial" of both books to be "identisch" and lists dozens of such parallels in imagery in matters of Christology, pneumatology, satanology, ecclesiology and eschatology.[208] Yet, despite the many similarities, Böcher remains cautious, suggesting that the relationship between Revelation and the fourth Gospel must "vorläufig offenbleiben," i.e., remain open for the time being.[209] But despite

---

[205] George Eldon Ladd, *A Commentary on the Revelation of John* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972), 8. So also R. H. Charles, *Apocalypse*, 1.xxx–xxxvii.

[206] Cf. Steven Thompson, *Apocalypse and Semitic Syntax*. John's Greek was called "barbarous" by Dionysius of Alexandria (quoted by Eusebius, *Historia Eclesiastica*, 7.25.24.27).

[207] Otto Böcher, "Das Verhältnis der Apokalypse des Johannes zum Evangelium des Johannes," in *L'Apocalypse Johannique et l'Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament*, ed. J. Lambrecht (Duculot: Leuven University Press, 1980), 291.

[208] Ibid., 295–301; cf. also Raymond E. Brown, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, ABRL (New York, NY: Doubleday, 1997), 804.

[209] Böcher, "Das Verhältnis," 291.

Böcher's caution, several recent scholars have been more assertive in favour of Johannine authorship. Robert Mounce thinks that because

> internal evidence is not entirely unfavourable to apostolic authorship and external evidence is unanimous in its supports, the wisest course of action is to accept as a reasonable hypothesis that the Apocalypse was written by John the apostle.[210]

Simon J. Kistemaker concludes "on the basis of nearly solid external evidence and helpful internal evidence that the apostle John is the author of the Apocalypse,"[211] while Grant R. Osborne thinks that "Johannine authorship makes the best sense."[212]

However, while knowing the author of Revelation might help in the interpretation of Revelation, the upside of this lack of certainty is that readers can concentrate on the message of the book without running the risk of imposing artificial presuppositions on its text based on their particular understanding of a potential author's background or the community which he represented. On this point, Beale proposes that pinpointing the author is not that important since it does not affect the message of the book.[213] Conversely, if a date for Revelation earlier than 70 CE is preferred on the grounds of the intersection between Judaism and Christianity that we find in the book and also in regard to the book's extensive use of OT material then the hypothesis of a Johannine authorship of Revelation could be strengthened. Around that time, John

---

[210] Mounce, *Revelation*, 12–15.

[211] Simon J. Kistemaker, *Revelation*, NTC (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2001), 26.

[212] Osborne, *Revelation*, 2–6.

[213] Beale, *Revelation*, 36.

could be in a prominent position amongst the churches of Asia. His modesty in not revealing that he was the "beloved" disciple in the Gospel may correspond to the fact that nowhere in Revelation does he reveal that he was also one of the "twelve apostles." Be that as it may, this study will follow Böcher's suggestion to allow the question of authorship to remain "open."

Date of Composition

Although the most popular date for the composition of Revelation is about 95 CE, that date has not been unassailable.[214] Preferences vary wildly. Several scholars favour a pre-70 CE date[215] because of what they see as key internal evidences in the book, while at least one author places the composition between 110–130 CE[216] Sweet says that "the earlier date *may* be right, but the internal evidence is not sufficient to outweigh the firm tradition stemming from Irenaeus."[217] In support of the early date is the matter of

---

[214] Cf. John A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2000).

[215] Stephen S. Smalley, *The Revelation to John. A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Apocalypse* (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press Academic, 2012), 2–3, argues for a Johannine authorship and a pre-70 CE dating of Revelation. See also Gonzalo Rojas-Flores, "The *Book of Revelation* and the First Years of Nero's Reign," *Bib* 85 (2004): 375–392; Albert A. Bell, "Date of John's Apocalypse: The Evidence of Some Roman Historians Reconsidered," *NTS* 25 (1978): 93–102; J. Christian Wilson, "The Problem of the Domitianic Date of Revelation," *NTS* 39 (1993): 587–605; K. L. Gentry, *Before Jerusalem Fell: Dating the Book of Revelation. An Exegetical and Historical Argument for a Pre-A.D. 70 Composition* (Tyler, TX: 1989); Robert B. Moberly, "When Was Revelation Conceived," *Bib* 73 (1992): 376–393; Thomas B. Slater, "Dating the Apocalypse to John," *Bib* 84 (2003): 252–258; Mark Wilson, "The Early Christians in Ephesus and the Date of Revelation, Again," *Neo* 39/1 (2005): 163–93.

[216] Cf. J. V. M. Sturdy, *Redrawing the Boundaries: The Date of Early Christian Literature* (Oakville, CT: Equinox Publishing, 2007), 81–82.

[217] J. P. M. Sweet, *Revelation*, SCM Pelican Commentaries (London: SCM Press, 1979), 27.

determining *who* are Revelation's "ideal readers" because the book requires a high level of audio, visual, theological and historical engagement. First-century CE Christian heretic Marcion refused to include Revelation in his canon because it was too Jewish.[218] More recently, Revelation's debt to Judaism prompted Massingbaerde Ford to conclude that the book has only a very thin Christian message.[219]

Perhaps a closer look at the potential ideal readers of the book of Revelation may point us in the right direction to reach a preferred date for the book's composition. Paulien argues that "the cultic imagery of Revelation suggests that the ideal reader of the book is one who, through shared competency in the texts and liturgical practices of the Hebrew cultus, is enabled to enter more deeply into the world of the text."[220] He calls them the "historical readers, perhaps a specific subgroup of Jewish Christians, already educated in the cultic intricacies of the author's conceptual world" because "shared experience between an author and his or her implied audience provides the context in which a work is to be understood."[221] Richard Bauckham even contends that " … the seven messages provide seven different introductions to the rest of the book. John has designed a book which, very unusually, is intended to be read from seven explicitly

---

[218] Tertullian, *Adversus Marcion*, IV.5; III.1 in "The Five Books Against Marcion," translated by Holmes, Peter in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Volume III: Latin Christianity: Its Founder, Tertullian* (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Company, 1885): 332, 333, 367–368.

[219] Massingbaerde Ford, *Revelation*, 40.

[220] Paulien, "Hebrew Cultus," 263.

[221] Ibid., 246.

different perspectives."[222] David Mathewson argues that Revelation's ideal reader knows the basic relationship between new and old meanings[223] while Barr states that Revelation's stories echo the reader's "mythic expectations."[224] Gilchrest proposes that Revelation can have two ideal readers, one Jewish and the other Greco-Roman.[225]

Following this rationale, John W. Marshall argues that "Rev 17:9–11 suggests strongly that the vision narrative is set in the period between June 68 and April 70 CE"[226] He calls the designation of Revelation as a "Christian" book as a particularly troublesome obstacle to historical-critical interpretation"[227] Marshall proposes that "suspending the category 'Christian' and employing the category 'Judaism'" to the book of Revelation can impact its interpretation.[228] In fact, with its Jewish themes and

---

[222] Richard Bauckham, *The Theology of the Book of Revelation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 14.

[223] David Mathewson, *A New Heaven and a New Earth: The Meaning and Function of the OT in Revelation 21:1–22:5*, JSNTSup 238 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 31.

[224] David L. Barr, "The Story John Told," in *Reading the Book of Revelation: A Resource for Students*, ed. David L. Barr (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 23.

[225] Eric J. Gilchrest, *Revelation 21–22 in Light of Jewish and Greco Roman Utopianism*, BIS 118 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 3–9, 21–22; Susan R. Suleiman, "Introduction: Varieties of Audience-Oriented Criticism," in *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation*, eds. Susan R. Suleiman and I. Crosman (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980), 1–45, Susan Suleiman suggests the following categories of readers of any given text: actual reader, ideal reader, mock reader, implied reader, informed reader.

[226] John W. Marshall, *Parables of War: Reading John's Jewish Apocalypse* (Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2001), 92. For a discussion of Revelation in relationship with other Jewish apocalypses, see David E. Aune, "The Apocalypse of John and Palestinian Jewish Apocalyptic," *Neo* 40 (2006): 1–33.

[227] Marshall, *Parables of War*, 4–5.

[228] Ibid., 74.

unapologetic Christological focus, Revelation could have provided the ideal liturgical bridge between Judaism and early Christianity (cf. Acts 2:44).[229] The marked Jewish background for the book implies or, rather, necessitates a closer proximity to Christianity's Jewish roots.

In sum, Revelation's Judeo-Christian overtones seem to point to a composition by a Jew converted to Christianity in the early stages of the formation of the Christian church. Thus this study assumes that the ideal reader of the book of Revelation is a mid-first-century CE Christian who is largely familiar with the Hebrew Scriptures.

Literary Genre

Notwithstanding the several studies, symposia and monographs[230] dedicated to the study of the literary genre of Revelation in the last three decades, the book continues to defy a simplistic categorization of genre. Although it was the book of Revelation that gave birth to the genre of *apocalyptic*, attempts to put it into a "Christian apocalyptic" genre in the style of its contemporaneous Jewish apocalypses have met an impasse. For one, Revelation is not (or does not seem to be) pseudonymous, a common trait of Jewish

---

[229] Cf. Bebis, "Influence of Jewish Worship," 138.

[230] For a representative sample of studies on the genre of the Apocalypse, see Frederick David Mazzaferri, *The Genre of the Book of Revelation From a Source-critical Perspective*, BZNW 54 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989); David Aune, "The Apocalypse of John and the Problem of Genre," *Semeia* 36 (1986): 65–96; David Hellholm, "The Problem of Apocalyptic Genre and the Apocalypse of John," *Semeia* 36 (1986): 13–64; Joel Musvosvi, "The Issue of Genre and Apocalyptic Prophecy," *AASS* 5 (2002): 43–60; David L. Barr, "Beyond Genre: The Expectations of the Apocalypse," in *The Reality of the Apocalypse*: *Rhetoric and Politics in the Book of Revelation*, ed. David L. Barr (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 71–90; Robert Michael Kuykendall, "The Literary Genre of the Book of Revelation: A Study of the History of Apocalyptic Research and its Relationship to John's Apocalypse" (PhD diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1986).

apocalypses. The author writes as a personal friend of the Christian churches of Asia, a prophet and member of a guild of Christian prophets and a leader of the early church. Further, the book is at once an "epistle," a "revelation" and "prophecy" and even "parable."[231]

The working definition of an apocalypse used here was initially proposed in 1979 by John J. Collins et al.:

> "Apocalypse" is a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world.[232]

Collins' definition clearly stems from a critical awareness of other *apocalypses* circulating in John's time which share these characteristics. But this definition has been far from settled. Collins himself qualified this by observing that "the apocalyptic myth not always corresponds to what we find in actual apocalypses."[233] Aune calls Revelation an "anomaly"[234] *vis à vis* other Christian apocalypses such as *The Shepherd of Hermas*, *The Apocalypse of Peter* and *The Apocalypse of Paul*. Harrington categorizes Revelation

---

[231] Cf. Marshall, *Parables of War*.

[232] John J. Collins, "The Morphology of a Genre: Introduction," *Semeia* 14 (1979): 1–19. David Hellholm has perceptively observed that a definition of genre needs a definition of its *function* in Hellholm, "The Problem of Apocalyptic Genre and the Apocalypse of John," 26.

[233] Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 2.

[234] Cf. Aune, "Palestinian Apocalyptic," 1.

under "a mixed genre … a prophetic-apocalyptic writing, in the form of a letter to specific Christian communities."[235]

David Hellholm critiqued Collins' definition because it lacks a statement on the "function" of an apocalypse which he describes as: "intended for a group in crisis with the purpose of exhortation and/or consolation by means of divine authority."[236] Others have attempted to add to Collin's definition, however, Hellholm's addition completes the picture as the defininion now seems to encompass most of Revelation's features and settles this issue for the time being.

Summary and Conclusion

The foregoing discussion on intertextuality in the book of Revelation indicates that continued effort must be put forth on the part of scholars to discover John's authorial intention in the use of extratextual references in his book. The development and application of a coherent method of identifying and classifying the allusions and echoes of the OT in Revelation continues to be the exegete's most pressing need. Without "special revelation," exegetes must continue to pay close attention to the textual and audio-visual "layers" of the book of Revelation in order to extract a cogent reading of

---

[235] Willfrid J. Harrington, *Revelation*, SP 16 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1993), 6–7. For a summary of the book of Revelation in its early Christian context, see Helmut Koester, *History and Literature of Early Christianity* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2000), 253–262.

[236] Hellholm, "The Problem of Apocalyptic Genre," 23, 27. He considers "authorization" as "*the* characteristic function" of the Apocalypse of John because the source and authority of his vision are God" (ibid., 45). See also Willem S. Vorster, "Genre and the Revelation of John: A Study in Text, Context and Intertext," *Neo* 22 (1998): 103–23.

this intriguing work. In this sense, keeping Revelation in closer proximity to the OT and its literary environmen is the best avenue for interpreting the book. By working within this methodological template, unbalanced readings of Revelation can be avoided.

In sum, two major presuppositions emerge from this introduction: (1) Revelation cannot be properly read and interpreted without proper visualization of the linguistic and theological landscape of the OT; and (2) although stemming from OT language and imagery, Revelation should be consistently interpreted in light of "the Christ event" and through Christian "lenses."

With this in mind, this thesis is structured as follows. In Chapter 2 the Day of Atonement in the OT is explored. A close-reading, inductive, exegetical approach is employed to discover the themes, language and imagery present in the OT Day of Atonement passages. This chapter forms the basis of Day of Atonement imagery and language that will be explored in the book of Revelation.

Chapter 3 explores and the Jewish Second Temple pseudepigraphal literature for Day of Atonement influence. In Chapter 4 the reception of Day of Atonement language and imagery in the NT as a whole is examined, while in chapter 5 specific Day of Atonement allusions in the book of Revelation are investigated. Chapter 5 provides the results of a search for allusions and echoes of Day of Atonement language and imagery in the chapters of Revelation.

In Chapter 6 the conclusions drawn from this research and the important contribution this thesis makes to the knowledge of the book of Revelation are presented.

CHAPTER 2

THE DAY OF ATONEMENT IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

In the introduction to this study, issues related to the reception of the OT language and imagery in Revelation were reviewed. I proposed that an overlooked subject of study of the use of the OT in Revelation is the Jewish Day of Atonement described in Lev 16; 23:26–32 and Num 29:7–11.

The present chapter explores the rituals of the Day of Atonement as they are described in the OT, more specifically in Lev 16. In the discussions, the text of the OT is taken in its present literary form as this would probably have been the way John read the Pentateuch.

This analysis is paramount because, in order to deal adequately with the reception of Day of Atonement language and imagery in the book of Revelation, it is necessary to understand what this occasion entailed within the confines of the Israelite tabernacle service. This chapter will guide this thesis in at least two important ways: (1) it will clarify and decode the rituals, actions and actors as well as the theological themes which suffused the Day of Atonement's activities in its original, *in situ* practice; and (2) it will provide a solid springboard from which one can decode later literary connections arising out of its original practice as the Day of Atonement underwent a reshaping in

later Jewish writings, even as it arrived at the dawn of the NT times and the book of Revelation.

The Theology of the Rituals in Leviticus

The book of Leviticus in the Rabbinic literature is called תורת כהנים "instructions for the priests"[1] and in the Hebrew Bible it is called וַיִּקְרָא, "and he called," from the first word of the book (Lev 1:1). The English title Leviticus comes from the LXX where it is titled Λευιτικον, although it has nothing to do with the "Levites" per se.

According to John Hayes, the rituals and theology of Leviticus belong to the category of "rituals of restoration and reintegration."[2] Bernd Janowski calls the Day of Atonement "the high point and culmination of the priestly purification and sin rituals"[3] because it "provides the answer to the question of how Israel will overcome their sins and impurities in order to live in the proximity of a holy God."[4]

---

[1] Cf. *m. Megillah* 3:5; *m. Menahot* 4:3.

[2] John H. Hayes, "Atonement in the Book of Leviticus," *Int* 52 (January 1, 1998): 5–15.

[3] Bernd Janowski, "Das Geschenk der Versöhnung: Leviticus 16 als Schlussstein der Priestliechen Kulttheologie," in *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretation in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*, eds. Thomas Hieke and Tobias Nicklas, TBN 15 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 13: "Der Hohe- und Schlusspunkt der priesterlichen Reinigungs- und Sühneriten ist der Große Versöhnungstag." Cf. Bernd Jürgens, *Heiligkeit und Versöhnung; Levitikus 16 in seinem literarischen Kontext*, HBS 28 (Freiburg: Herder, 2001), 425: "Die verschiedenen Sühneriten, die *ḥaṭṭā't* der *'asam* und natürlich das in Lev 16 beschriebene Ritual haben die Funktion, die *Heiligkeit* des Heiligtums nach einer Sünde wiederherzustellen und damit die Möglichkeit der Begegnung zwischen JHWH und seinem Volk zu sichern."

[4] Bernd Janowski, "Das Geschenk der Versöhnung," 14: "will auch Lev 16 eine Antwort auf die Frage geben, wie Israel seine Sünden und Unreinheiten überwinden und so in der Nahe seines heiligen Gottes leben kann."

More specifically, in regard to the Day of Atonement, the Mishnah reserves one full tractate, *Yoma* (lit. "the Day") to the priestly instructions for the day's rituals.[5] In Christianity, Lev 16 has enjoyed a rich tradition of commentary by theologians, the first of whom was the church father Origen. But it was the Jewish scholar Jacob Milgrom who perhaps best grasped the ritual system's significance and who in turn influenced a new generation of scholars to dig deeper in the book of Leviticus. This chapter draws primarily on Milgrom's reading of the rituals of the Day of Atonement, along with the contribution of other authors.

"Theology," said Milgrom, "is what Leviticus is all about. It pervades every chapter and almost every verse. It is not expressed in pronouncements, but embedded in rituals."[6] According to him, the purgation offerings intend to answer the question of "theodicy": "Now we know what the priestly theodicy is. It is found not in utterances but in rituals, not in legal statutes but in cultic procedures—specifically, in the rite with חַטַּאת blood."[7] Milgrom writes: "Because impurity and holiness are antonyms, the identification of impurity with death must mean that holiness stands for life … Israel is

---

[5] See Günter Stemberger, "Yom Kippur in Mishnah Yoma," in *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretation in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*, eds. Thomas Hieke and Tobias Nicklas, TBN 15 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 121–137. According to Stemberger, it is not possible to distinguish in the *m. Yoma* between what is purported commentary on actual practice of the Day of Atonement based on the Pentateuch or idealized practice based on Second Temple period practices. See the table at the end of this chapter for a comparison between Lev 16 and the *Mishnah*.

[6] Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AYB (New York, NY: Doubleday, 1991), 42.

[7] Ibid., 260.

enjoined to control the occurrence of impurity lest it impinge on his [Yahweh's] realm."[8]

With meticulous attention to detail, sin and holiness to Yahweh, the author(s)[9] of the book of Leviticus expound on the promise of Yahweh to make Israel a nation of priests as given in Exod 19:5–6: "Indeed, the whole earth is mine, but you shall be for me a priestly kingdom and a holy nation. These are the words that you shall speak to the Israelites." Milgrom considers Leviticus and parts of Numbers as "the foundation of Israel's life"[10] and Hartley considers Leviticus specifically to be central to Israel's "*raison d'être*."[11] Holiness in Israel was deeply connected to creation; according to Janowski, while creation separated light, darkness, heaven and earth, God's purpose in the Levitical system is the separation between "clean and unclean" and "holy and profane."[12]

---

[8] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 46–7.

[9] For a discussion on the authorship of Leviticus, cf. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 13–34; Gleason Archer Jr., "The Chronology of the Old Testament," in vol. 1 of *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, ed. Frank E. Gaebelein (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1979), 359–374; idem, *A Survey of OT Introduction* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1964); M. Segal, *The Pentateuch: Its Composition and Its Authorship and Other Biblical Studies* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1967), 47.

[10] Ibid., 61.

[11] John E. Hartley, *Leviticus*, WBC (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1992), xxx.

[12] Janowski commenting on the relationship between Creation and Leviticus concludes "Diese Relation von Schöpfung und Tempell Kult lässt sich noch an einem anderen Sachverhalt festmachen. So begegnet der Akt des Unterscheidens der für den priesterlichen Schöpfungsbericht Gen 1:1–2:3 leitend ist (vgl. 1:4.6.7.14.18) (s. dazu Janowski 2009, 34 ff.), auch im Bereich des Kults, literarisch gesprochen in Lev 11–15 (PS) und in Lev 17–26 (H). Unterschieden wird jetzt aber nicht zwischen Licht und Finsternis oder Himmel und Erde, sondern zwischen *Rein und Unrein* bzw. *Heilig und Profan*. Die Entscheidung darüber, was heilig und profan bzw. rein und unrein ist, obliegt danach dem Priester (Lev 10:10f.), der den Laien diese Grundkategorien im Rahmen der Speisevorschriften zu erlautern hat" (Janowski, "Das Geschenk der Versöhnung," 22).

The Levitical system of rituals, says Milgrom, differs sharply from the contemporary Ancient Near Eastern (ANE) pagan world of gods and demons because the "driving force behind this impurity reduction is Israel's monotheism."[13] And although the Syrian rites uncovered at Ebla do point to a carefully planned purgation ritual, most of the ANE expulsion rites were emergencial and "apotropaic," the Day of Atonement was a carefully planned, yearly ritual. Israel's system of rituals and feasts stress personal responsibility in maintaining a relationship in good standing with Yahweh. As Merrill Unger writes, "In Genesis we see man ruined; in Exodus, man redeemed; in Leviticus, man cleansed, worshiping and serving."[14] Harrison calls Leviticus "a work of towering spirituality, which through the various sacrificial rituals points the reader unerringly to the atoning death of Jesus, our great high priest."[15] The responsibility for one's actions remains with the individual, who alone possesses "demonic power" and who can "drive God out of the sanctuary by polluting it with their moral and ritual sins."[16] Kiuchi proposes that the main theme running through the book of Leviticus is "the nature of human beings, the symbolic meanings of cleanness, uncleanness and

---

[13] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 45.

[14] Merrill Frederick Unger, *The Hodder Bible Handbook* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1984), 85.

[15] R. K. Harrison, *Leviticus: An Introduction and Commentary*, TOTC (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1980), 9.

[16] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 43.

holiness, and the wrath of God."[17] This does not mean however, that a metaphysical entity responsible for humanity's plight is not present in Leviticus. This can be seen in the Azazel ritual, which by its very antiquity points to a shared responsibility for the effects of sin both on the part of the human beings as "actors" and of the "goat for Azazel" as an "originator."

Definition of Ritual and Sacrifice

The most recent and comprehensive approach to the rituals of Leviticus is provided by Milgrom's student, Roy E. Gane, in his book *Cult and Character: Purification Offerings, Day of Atonement and Theodicy* (2005). A ritual according to Gane is a physical, "symbolic activity"[18] with meaning attached to it and it is "a privileged activity that is believed to carry out a transformation process involving interaction with a reality ordinarily inaccessible to the material domain."[19] Although rituals are *symbolic*, they are not necessarily *abstract* in the sense of lacking connection with reality. Thus Gane writes, "in a ritual a nonmaterial entity (e.g., sin) can be treated as if it belongs to the material domain, so that it can be subject to physical interaction

---

[17] N. Kiuchi, *Leviticus*, AOTC (Nottingham, England; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2007), 33.

[18] Gane, *Cult and Character*, 7. Cf. also ibid., "Schedules for Deities: Macrostructure of Israelite, Babylonian, and Hittite Sancta Purification Days," *AUSS* 36 (1998): 231–44; Alfred Marx, *Les systèmes sacrificiels de l'Ancien Testament,"* VTSup 105 (Leiden: Brill, 2005); cf. the helpful summary of view on defilement in Judaism in Jonathan Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 13–20.

[19] Gane, *Cult and Character*, 15, 18.

and manipulation."[20] It is important that the actions of a ritual have meaning, because "change from one unknown to another unknown does not yield something that is known."[21] Gane explains: "Thus the full significance of an individual ritual or ritual activity can only appear within the context of the ritual system to which it belongs."[22] He argues that rituals need meaning that is not dependent on the ritual action *per se*, rather, it is connected to non-ritual sphere of meaning.[23] The purpose of ritual in the Day of Atonement is to effect a transformation through purgation and purification.[24] Such purification is achieved by the application of sacrificial blood (vv. 14–15).[25]

According to Gane, a ritual's importance lies in the fact that "not only is its meaning acted out as potent dramatic expression, it is also believed to result in transformation that non-ritual activity cannot achieve."[26] In this way, "nonphysical pollution, consisting of ritual impurities and moral faults, is purged from the sanctuary

---

[20] Ibid., 8.

[21] Ibid., 11.

[22] Ibid., 9 states that meaning comes from "clues" found in the ritual. This is what Douglas Davies calls a "conceptual element" which gives the rite its meaning. (Cf. Douglas Davies, "An Interpretation of Sacrifice in Leviticus," *ZAW* 89 (1977): 392; cf. L. Shelton, "A Covenant Concept of Atonement," *WTJ* 19 (1984): 92–96; Gerald A. Klingbeil, *Bridging the Gap Between Ritual and Ritual Texts*, BBRSup 1 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 14–18.

[23] Gane, *Cult and Character*, 12.

[24] Cf. B. Wilson, *Systems, Concepts, Methodologies, and Applications* (New York, NY: Wiley, 1984), 16, 26, quoted by Gane, *Cult and Character*, 12.

[25] Cf. Gane, *Cult and Character*, 12: "So it is not the activities that define the system but the goal that determines which activities are necessary to achieve the desired change."

[26] Ibid., 17.

of supra-mundane Yahweh on behalf of the Israelites."[27] These activities then "serve as a vehicle for transformation that takes place on the level of symbolic meaning."[28] In turn, Gane defines a sacrifice as "a religious ritual in which something of value is ritually transferred to the sacred realm for utilization by a deity."[29] Each ritual action has a function; for instance, Lev 16:31 explains that the burning of the carcass, the suet and the sprinkling of the blood are the way by which "the priest shall effect purgation on his behalf, that he may be forgiven." Kiuchi writes that the rituals of Leviticus "are aimed to convey a certain message through their formulation, and not least through the symbolic meaning of the rituals found therein.[30]

Hundley defines a ritual as "a way of meaningfully interacting with God, to bring about a transformation or change of state of the world in some way, generally concerning the immaterial (e.g., sin and impurity)."[31] To Janowski rituals such as those of the Day of Atonement give "Orientierungen" to the life of the individual offerer as well as to his social relationships.[32] But in order to have the desired effect, Janowski explains, "Riten

---

[27] Ibid.

[28] Ibid.

[29] Ibid., 16.

[30] Kiuchi, *Leviticus*, 25–26.

[31] Michael B. Hundley, *Keeping Heaven on Earth: Safeguarding the Divine Presence in the Priestly Tabernacle*, FAT, 2nd ser., 50 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 20.

[32] "Um einen Zugang zu dieser Welt der Rituale zu finden, müssen wir uns vorab klar machen, dass der Mensch, der tierische Opfer darbringt, sich im Kontext bestimmter Handlungsabläufe (Riten) bewegt, die die Bewältigung kritischer und emotionaler Situationen ermöglichen und damit Orientierungen für das individuelle und soziale Leben geben" (Janowski, "Das Geschenk der Versöhnung," 4).

besitzen eine große performative Intensität und müßen korrekt—eben *rite*—ausgeführt werden, um wirksam zu sein."[33]

The efficacy of any given ritualistic elements in the Israelite sanctuary service rests solely on the authority of Yahweh, says Gane,[34] while the driving force behind the people's acceptance and compliance with the whole ritual system is "belief." "To accept the rules and efficacy of the rituals, the priest and his people would need to believe in the existence of Yahweh, the reality of the pollution that needed to be removed, and the effectiveness of the prescribed ritual actions required to carry out the desired transformation."[35] These regulations, Gane contends, are not solely about "cult" but ultimately about "character."[36]

Defiling the Sanctuary

Despite the many and divergent propositions pertaining to redactional features of the book of Leviticus, most scholars accept that the book reflects a unified authorial effort. Milgrom points out that the system of the חַטָּאת [*ḥaṭṭā't*] offerings found in both

[33] Ibid.

[34] Gane, *Cult and Character*, 9.

[35] Ibid.

[36] Ibid., 162: "By bringing together the views of sin as legal wrong as pollution the Israelite ritual system addressed not only the legal *standing* of Yahweh's people but also their moral *state*. It showed the way not only to freedom from *condemnation*, but also to development of healthy *character*."

Lev 4 and Lev 16 points to the unity of the book.[37] The Hebrew term חַטָּאת is the *pi'el* form of חט which means "to cleanse," "to purge," or "to purify." Rooker writes that Lev 11–15 is a basis for what occurs in chapter 16,[38] while Hartley contends that without chapter 16, the "holiness code" (H) of chapters 17–26 would not make any sense."[39] This highlights the centrality of Lev 16 to the book as a whole.

The חַטַּאת prescriptions found in Lev 4 pertain to what Gane calls the "outer-sanctum" and "outer-altar" purification offerings[40] while the Day of Atonement purifies those sections of the tabernacle as well as the "inner sanctum" of the sanctuary compound. Milgrom has corrected the notion that the חַטָּאת system of sacrifices are "sin offerings" arguing instead that they should be called "purification offerings."[41] Milgrom considers the translation "sin offering" to be "inaccurate on all grounds: contextually, morphologically, and etymologically."[42] "The blood," he explains, "acts like

---

[37] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 2.

[38] Mark F. Rooker, *Leviticus,* NAC 3a (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2000), 212.

[39] According to Hartley, Lev 16 "prepares for the coming material on holy living. It may be said that the moral and spiritual energy for the people to fulfill the laws in chaps. 17–26 comes out of their finding complete expiation on the Day of Atonement" (*Leviticus*, 217).

[40] Gane, *Cult and Character*, 46.

[41] Cf. Jacob Milgrom in "Sin-offering or purification-offering?" *VT* 21 (1971): 237–239, although he does allow for the connotation of "expiation" as in Lev 16:16, 20, 33; cf. 4:18, 27, 32.

[42] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 253. For one, חַטַּאת "is prescribed for persons and objects who cannot have sinned" (Ibid.) such as a woman recovering from childbirth (Lev 12), the Nazirite (Num 6) and a newly constructed altar (8:15; see Exod 29:36–37). Secondly, morphologically, חַטַּאת is in the pi'el form which means "to purge." Lastly, the waters of חַטַּאת (Num 8:7) are for cleansing (cf. Num 19:19; see Ezek 26:25). Schwartz posits that "[a]s a result of the work of Milgrom and others, it is

a detergent and removes the impurity that affects the sanctums."[43] The sacrifices "purify the sanctums on behalf of persons" because "it is people who cause the impurity in the sanctuary; that is, when they sin or suffer severe impurity, the sanctuary is soiled."[44] For this reason, the ritual on the tenth of Tishri, traditionally known as the Day of Atonement, is best defined as the "day of purgation" because the ritual entails more than "forgiveness" or "reconciliation" (cf. the at-one-ment analogy). In support of this notion, Gane points out, the Hebrew term for forgiveness, סלח is not found in Lev 16: "contrary to ubiquitous misconception, no corporate or individual forgiveness is attested in the Bible as a goal of the Day of Atonement rituals."[45] The rituals do not entail "pardon" or "forgiveness" but only כפר, "purification,"[46] while forgiveness by Yahweh is only implied in the rituals.[47] In Second Temple literature the Day of Atonement assumes the

---

universally acknowledged today that the חַטָּאת, the main ritual by which *kippur* accomplished in the Priestly texts, is not a 'sin-offering' i.e., a gift presented to the deity in the hope of securing divine forgiveness for an offense, but rather a process of 'removal' by which the odious matter created by certain offenses and by bodily impurities is either eradicated or at least absorbed and discarded" (Baruch J. Schwartz, review of Roy Gane, *Cult and Character, AUSS* 45 [2007]: 268).

[43] Cf. Jacob Milgrom, "The Preposition מן in the חַטָּאת Pericopes," *JBL* 126 (2007): 161–163.

[44] Milgrom, "The Day of Atonement," 72.

[45] Gane, *Cult and Character*, 154.

[46] Cf. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 1079–1080, for a discussion on the correct translation of כִּפֶּר. Cf. also B. Lang, *TDOT*, s.v., כִּפֶּר. On this point, Janowski, "Der Geschenk der Versöhnung," 26 writes: "Beide Riten—der Sündenbock wird *nach außen* in die Wüste geführt und das Sündopferblut wird *nach innen* an die *kapporet* gebracht—verhalten sich komplementar zueinander und propagieren zusammen die Botschaft vom versöhnungswilligen Gott, der seinem Volk die Gabe kultischer Versöhnung schenkt."

[47] While Gane is correct to point out that סלח does not appear in Lev 16, the notion of "forgiveness" does occur in the parallel purgation rites in Lev 4. The sprinkling of the blood of a bull in front of the veil and the daubing of the blood on the horns of the incense altar during the

connotation of "forgiveness," as found in *Temple Scroll* 26:9–10: "(for it is) the sin offering [חַטָּאת] for the assembly; and he shall atone with it for all the people of the assembly, and they shall be forgiven [נִסְלַח]." This emphasis, however, as pointed out by Gane, stems from "interpretive development beyond the plain sense of Leviticus."[48]

The rationale for the חַטָּאת sacrifices is developed fully in Lev 4 where at least three basic principles of purification are established: (1) atoning for an unintentional sin; (2) the impact of an action by an individual Israelite on the status of the whole people of Israel; and (3) the need for restoration and removal of sin. Thus the sacrifices progress from the top leader of the people to the lowest member of the society. The first person to be summoned to offer חַטָּאת sacrifices is the הַכֹּהֵן הַמָּשִׁיחַ, the "anointed priest" (Lev 4:3) because it was possible for him to bring "guilt on the people" (Lev 4:3). The purgation process proceeds to the whole people guilty of sinning "unintentionally" (v. 13), then to a "ruler" of the people (v. 22) and finally to "anyone of the ordinary people" (v. 27). For all the חַטָּאת sacrifices in Lev 4, the mediator of the purification is the high priest (vv. 20, 26, 31, 35).

The question arises as to exactly what it is that is cleansed by the חַטָּאת rites described in Lev 4 and 16. The goal of all the חַטָּאת purgations of Leviticus is set forth

purgation are for the unintentional sin of the high priest and the congregation. The application of the blood of male and female goats to the altar of burnt offering on behalf of the ruler of Israel and regular members of the community effects "forgiveness" (cf. נִסְלַח in Lev 4:20, 26, 35).

[48] Gane, *Cult and Character*, 235.

in 15:31: "Thus you shall keep the people of Israel separate from their uncleanness, so that they do not die in their uncleanness by defiling my tabernacle that is in their midst." Milgrom argues that the blood purgatives purify the sanctuary; while Gane contends that both the sinner and the sanctuary are purged by the חַטָּאת rites, but on different occasions—during the year the sinner is purged while on the Day of Atonement the sanctuary is purged.[49] The difference in approach to the meaning of the חַטָּאת rites lies in how both scholars understand the preposition מן in the חַטָּאת passages. On the one hand Milgrom takes it to mean "for, on account of, because of." Thus the sprinkling of blood burning of the sacrificed animals which occur all year and on the Day of Atonement are done "for his impurity" (Lev 14:19) and "for his flow" (15:15), i.e., on behalf of the sinner.[50] Thus the application of blood only indirectly benefits the sinner. Gane on the other hand takes מן to mean "from," e.g., "from his flow" (Lev 14:19) meaning that the impurity is removed *from* the sinner. Gane argues that regular חַטָּאת offerings purges the sin from the person because only on the Day of Atonement are the sins of the people removed from the sanctuary; in the rest of the year, people only are polluted and need to be purged by the regular חַטָּאת rites. He writes, "an offerer who has כפר performed on his/her behalf 'from' a physical ritual impurity becomes pure

[49] Gane, *Cult and Character*, 15, 18.

[50] Milgrom, "The Preposition מן," 161–163.

'from' that impurity."[51] This occurs because "outer-altar and outer-sanctum purification offerings purge (כפר) evils from (privative מן) those who offer them rather than from the sanctuary."[52] This view is also espoused by Noam Zohar who argues that it is the person who is purged from sin.[53]

While recognizing a distinction, Milgrom argues that the verb כפר, when applied to people, "purifies" the sanctuary on behalf of the Israelite transgressor, not necessarily the person.[54] According to him the purification offerings laid out in Lev 4, 5 and 16 purge "moral impurity [and] physical impurity"[55] from the sanctuary, not from the sinner. He contrasts "impurities" which refer to the effect that Israel's sins had on the sanctuary from "iniquities" which were the effects of sins on the sinner. He concludes, "… it is clear that the blood purges the impurities of the sanctuary and the scapegoat purges the sins of the people."[56] Such contamination occurs "aerially" from a distance: "A sin committed anywhere will generate impurity that, becoming airborne, penetrates

---

[51] Gane, *Cult and Character*, 116.

[52] Ibid., 155. Gane rejects Milgrom's gradation of impurity from outer to inner sancta because it "does not work" (ibid.)

[53] Noam Zohar, "Repentance and Purification: The Significance and Semantics of חטאת in the Pentateuch," *JBL* 107 (1988): 609–618.

[54] Cf. Milgrom, "Day of Atonement," *IDBSup*, 83.

[55] Milgrom, *Leviticus (Continental)*, 30.

[56] Ibid., 171–172.

the sanctuary in proportion to its magnitude."[57] Milgrom rejects Gane's notion that the sacrificial blood becames impure when being offered by the sinner and then needs to be cleansed by the contact with the altar. He writes: "Holiness never sanctifies impurity. Only the reverse occurs—impurity defiles holiness."[58] He goes on to explain that the blood of חַטָּאת offerings is never applied on the person, rather its effect is indirectly applied on behalf of the person on the sanctuary.[59] The function of חַטָּאת therefore is to cleanse the sancta, not the person. He derives this reading in part from Lev 8:15: "Moses took the blood and with his finger put some on each of the horns of the altar, purifying the altar; then he poured out the blood at the base of the altar. Thus he consecrated it, to make atonement for it." Lev 20:3 [15:31] and Num 19:13, 20 present impurities which by their severity lead to the defilement of the sancta "from a distance." Lev 20:3 deals with the dedication of an offspring to Molek, an act which according to Yahweh defiles his

---

[57] Ibid., 31. Elsewhere (*Leviticus 1–16*, 257) Milgrom expands this notion: "The dynamic, aerial quality of biblical impurity is best attested by its graded power. Impurity pollutes the sanctuary in three stages: (1) The individual's inadvertent misdemeanor or severe physical impurity pollutes the courtyard altar, which is purged by daubing its horns with the *ḥaṭṭā't* blood (4:25, 30; 9:9). (2) The inadvertent misdemeanor of the high priest or the entire community pollutes the shrine which is purged by the high priest by placing the *ḥaṭṭā't* blood the inner altar and before the *pārōḵeṯ* (4:5–7, 16–18). (3) The wanton unrepented sin not only pollutes the outer altar and penetrates into the shrine but it pierces the veil and enters the adytum, housing the holy Ark and *kappōreṯ*, the very throne of God (cf. Isa 37:16)." Cf. Gane, *Cult and Character*, 160.

[58] Ibid., 162–163.

[59] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 255. The exception to this rule is the ritual of the red heifer (Num 19:1–13), whose ashes were sprinkled directly on the person who had come in contact with a corpse. According to Milgrom, this ritual betrays "pre–Israelite antecedents" because, like Mesopotamian purification rituals reveal "corpse contamination evoked an obsessive, irrational fear in individuals" (Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus: A Book of Rituals and Ethics*, Continental Commentaries [Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2004], 35–36).

sanctuary and desecrates his holy name, even though it occurs far from the sanctuary and does not involve encroachment on its premises. As Gane says, "the effect [impurity] is simultaneous with the cause."[60]

Not only does a particular action defile the sanctuary, but also "neglect inevitably defiles the sanctuary"[61] writes Gane. This is because the people have broken the commandments of Yahweh, both the "performative" commandments ("do") as well as the "prohibitive" commandments ("do not").[62] These transgressions, writes Milgrom, "set up reverberations that upset the divine ecology"[63] and generate "rays of impurity, which impinge upon God's sanctuary."[64] Thus the meticulous system of purification highlights Yahweh's high expectations for an ethical society in Israel.[65] Nevertheless, the choice to remove sin is Yahweh's only.

---

[60] Milgrom, *Leviticus (Continental)*, 31.

[61] Gane, *Cult and Character*, 148. Gane continues by explaining that such a concept of "remote defilement" "stretches our imagination, even in our modern technological age. Although we have telephones, radios, television, and now the internet, human physical contamination cannot be instantly transmitted in this way. Your computer may contract a devastating digital "virus" spawned halfway around the world, but your body cannot even catch a minor cold when you talk to a sick person on the telephone." He adds that "dynamics such as these defy ordinary norms of cause and effect is simply symptomatic of the fact that rituals reflect a conceptual system that transcends physical considerations" (ibid., 159).

[62] Milgrom, *Leviticus (Continental)*, 42.

[63] Ibid.

[64] Ibid. Additionally, Wenham writes that "uncleanness is not necessarily morally culpable; it does not always require a sacrifice to eliminate its effects." However, the problem is that, in the eyes of Yahweh, such "uncleanness" makes a person "unfit to enter the sanctuary" (*Leviticus*, 228).

[65] Kiuchi, *Leviticus*, 33: "They [the people] have to approach the Lord by making sacrifice, they have to be killed when they approach the holy realm without due qualifications, and, above all, are seen as having a strong tendency to defile themselves."

No Day of Atonement Purgation for High-Handed Sinners

The previous discussion leads to the important question of which violations were expiable by the purification offerings on the Day of Atonement. Milgrom argues that all manner of sins are removed from the tabernacle by the Day of Atonement rituals, including intentional, high-handed sins.[66] He explains:

> Intentional sins and presumably other unrectified sins and impurities pollute the adytum and the *kappōreṯ* and implicitly the ark. This is evidenced by the term *pišʿêhem* 'their crimes' in Lev 16:16a, which seems to refer to brazen, deliberate sins (cf. Num. 15:30–31) and which, together with impurities, is the express evil removed from the adytum.[67]

Removal of "all sins" from the sanctuary should not necessarily be construed as forgiveness/atonement for the sinner. Lev 5 and Num 15 make it clear that only unintentional and intentional, non-defiant sins are expiable by the חַטָּאת sacrifices, including those on the Day of Atonement: "But whoever acts high-handedly [בְּיָד רָמָה], whether a native or an alien, affronts the LORD, and shall be cut off from

---

[66] Cf. Wright, "Day of Atonement," *AYBD* 2:73: "In view of this scheme of pollution, the purpose of the Day of Atonement ritual becomes lucid: while throughout the year the impurity of individual or community sins may be purged as they arise (Leviticus 4), once a year a special rite must be performed that cleanses the sanctuary of impurity from deliberate sins and from any other lingering impurity not yet rectified." Klawans agrees: "But these [Day of Atonement] sacrifices do not appear to purify grave sinners, or the land upon which the grave sins were committed. Such sinners either live out their lives in a degraded state (like the guilty adulteress) or suffer capital punishment (like apprehended murderers). The land, it appears, likewise suffers a permanent degradation" (*Impurity and Sin*, 30).

[67] Ibid. Mark J. Boda, *A Severe Mercy: Sin and Its Remedies in the Old Testament* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 68, agrees that defiant sin was also atoned by the Day of Atonement: "Defiant sins could not be remedied for the individual by the sacrificial system, but because these sins defile the sanctuary and the community as a whole, a remedy for this impurity was provided once a year on the Day of Atonement."

among the people. Because of having despised the word of the LORD and broken his commandment, such a person shall be utterly cut off and bear the guilt [נֶפֶשׁ הַהִוא עֲוֹנָה בָהּ]" (Num 15:30–31). The transgressor's death acts as purgation, such as in the case of "anyone who presumes to disobey the priest" and whose death acts to "purge the evil from Israel" (Deut 17:12).[68] As Gane explains:

> [S]acrificial כפר through outer-altar or outer-sanctum purification offerings, a prerequisite to forgiveness, is not available to the offenders in such cases [i.e., high-handed sins]. While the sanctuary and camp are cleansed of such evils on the Day of Atonement (cf. Lev 16), the sinners themselves are condemned to terminal punishment.[69]

Moreover, the harsh punishment of high-handed sinners prescribed in Num 15:30–31 seems to preclude the possibility of remedy through repentance and penitence. Gane discusses the various characteristics of sins which seem to emerge in these passages: (1) intentional non-defiant vs. intentional defiant; (2) secret vs. detectable transgressions; and (3) expiable inadvertent vs. inexpiable defiant and deliberate sins. It is therefore the "nature of the sin"[70] as well as the attitude[71] of the sinner which defines whether it is immediately expiable or inexpiable. Thus he accepts that the חַטָּאת offerings prescribed

---

[68] Frank Crüsemann, *The Torah: Theology and Social History of Old Testament Law* (trans. A. W. Mahnke; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1996), 318, avers: "We find no example by which serious infractions of the fundamental cultic order—especially for cases for which "cutting off" is prescribed—can by confession and repentance be included among the offenses covered by the comprehensive forgiveness of the Day of Atonement."

[69] Gane, *Cult and Character*, 162.

[70] Ibid., 211. Cf. Gane's helpful discussion on pp. 204–213.

[71] Cf. Adrian Schenker, "Das Zeichen des Blutes und die Gewissheit der Vergebung im Alten Testament," *MTZ* 34 (1983), 205.

in Lev 5 can cover non-defiant deliberate sins because "repentance is demonstrated through voluntary confession."[72] Conversely, defiant sinners, even those who have "confession" forced out of them (cf. Achan, Josh 7) face dim prospects: they must be cut-off. "Freedom from condemnation" is only guaranteed "for those of loyal character (Lev 16:29–31),"[73] even on the Day of Atonement.

The foregoing discussion provides an important foundation for understanding how impurity impacted the relationship between Yahweh, the tabernacle and the people of Israel. We now turn to analysing the process of removal of these impurities.

חַטָּאת *Purifications: A Multi-Phase Process*

The whole system of חַטָּאת offerings moves from voluntary, free-will offerings to offerings that "purify" and "atone" for actions that threaten to break the relationship between the people and Yahweh. The relationship is restored via sacrifices which carry the כפר על atonement "formula" introduced in the first chapter of Leviticus: "Then he shall put his hand on the head of the burnt offering, and it will be accepted on his behalf to make atonement for him [וְכִפֶּר עָלָיו]" (Lev 1:4, NKJV). As seen previously, the חַטָּאת offerings atone for unintentional, non-defiant sins as opposed to sins committed "high-handedly" (cf. Num 15:30–31; Deut 17:12). This חַטָּאת offering is brought "to the Lord" (Lev 6:6; cf. Ps 51:7; "Against you, you alone, have I sinned") in order to restore

[72] Gane, *Cult and Character*, 162, 211.

[73] Ibid., 161.

the relationship which has been jeopardized. As Wright posits, "the implication following from this is that were the sanctuary left sullied by these impurities, God's presence, which manifests itself in the tent, could not dwell there and would leave (cf. Ezek 8–11)."[74] As a result of the purification rituals, God would continue to reside with Israel because his temple and people were once again pure.[75] The oft mistranslated "sin offering" was in fact a purgation offering (cf. Lev 12:6–8; Num 5:7; 6:14; 8:14–15) and the blood was always applied to the sanctuary, not the offender. This view is seen in *m. Sebuoth* 1.4 where the rabbis speak of "uncleanness that befalls the Temple and Hallowed Things."

What distinguishes the חַטָּאת sacrifices from other sanctuary rites is how the blood is manipulated: while the blood of whole offerings and well-being offerings is splashed around the altar (Lev 1:5, 11; 3:2, 8, 13), in the case of חַטָּאת, the blood is applied according to the severity of the offense as well as who commits the offense. In the case of offenses by the congregation and the high priest, the חַטָּאת blood is "sprinkled" seven times before the curtain of the Most Holy Place and put on the horns of the altar (cf Lev 4:25, 30, 34). Moreover, the חַטָּאת sacrifices are the only case in which the blood is brought inside the sanctuary and on the Day of Atonement, it is

---

[74] Wright, "Day of Atonement," *AYBD*, 2:73.

[75] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 50, 51. Elsewhere Milgrom argues: " … Israel as a whole, priests included, enhances or diminishes its holiness in proportion to its observance of all of God's commandments."[75] (Jacob Milgrom, "The Changing Concept of Holiness in the Pentateuchal Codes with Emphasis on Leviticus 19," in *Reading Leviticus: A Conversation with Mary Douglas*, ed. John F. A. Sawyer, JSOTSup 227 [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996], 67).

brought even inside the Most Holy Place. The חַטָּאת blood, writes Alfred Marx, "follows a movement which goes from the most holy to the less holy, and from top to bottom."[76] These חַטָּאת purification rituals, writes Rendtorff, involve seven distinct actions: (1) presentation of the animal (*Darbringen*); (2) laying on of hands (*Handaufstemmen*); (3) slaughter (*Schlachten*); (4) application of blood (*Blutritus*); (5) removal of fat (*Fettabheben*); (6) burning of the fat (*Fettverbrennen*) and; (7) disposal of the carcass (*Beseitigung des Übrigen*).[77] The *Blutritus* writes Rendtorff, is "the concluding kipper sentence"[78] and is central to the Day of Atonement rituals.

The effects of these חַטָּאת offerings, proposes Milgrom, are based on three principles inherent to the חַטָּאת system: (1) blood acts as a detergent, a ritual cleanser to purify the sanctuary from the offenses of the offerer; (2) sins cause impurity which reaches the sanctuary from afar (airborne); and (3) God will not abide in a polluted sanctuary.[79]

The presentation of חַטָּאת blood writes Milgrom, achieves purification/purgations in two phases: (1) a display of remorse on the part of the sinner;

---

[76] Alfred Marx, "The Theology of Sacrifice According to Leviticus 1-7," in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*, eds. R. Rendtorff and R. A. Kugler, VTSup 93 (Leiden: Brill, 2003): 116.

[77] R. Rendtorff, *Studien zur Geschichte des Opfers im Alten Israel* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967), 212.

[78] Ibid., 212.

[79] Ibid., *Leviticus (Continental)*, 31.

and; (2) a purification offering whose blood purges the sanctuary from the sinner's impurity.[80] The concept of "remorse" can be seen in the Hebrew root שם in Lev 4:13, 22, 27 which, according to Milgrom, in the absence of a preposition of direct object, "denotes the suffering brought on by guilt … to be conscience-smitten or guilt-stricken."[81] Milgrom proposes a progression of defilement of the sanctuary: different types of violations by the Israelites affect different areas of the sanctuary. An "involuntary, communal violation," i.e., by the whole people (cf. Lev 4:27–35) defiles the sacrificial altar located in the outer court of the sanctuary. In turn, an "involuntary, individual violation" (cf. Lev 4:13–21), defiles the incense altar of the Holy Place. The Most Holy Place is in turn defiled by "brazen and unrepented offenses." Milgrom's application of the ritual to impenitent sinners is made because throughout the religious year, "the pious have been bringing purification offerings which prove effective because their impurity was caused inadvertently."[82] Lastly, the "brazen and unrepented violation (Lev 16:11–19)" defiles the Most Holy Place of the sanctuary. For these, only the rites of the

---

[80] Cf. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 339–45. Hayes criticizes Milgrom because "he has perhaps delineated these aspects too sharply. His emphasis on the function of the purification offering as purging the sanctums and not the offender has probably led to splitting apart what was really a single, complex phenomenon" ("Atonement in the Book of Leviticus," 10).

[81] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 343.

[82] Ibid., 162; ibid., *Leviticus 1–16*, 254–8. Rodríguez suggests that the daily sacrifices "[t]hrough the ritual [חַטָּאת] sin is brought to the sanctuary. There it is kept until its final removal on the Day of Atonement" (Ángel Manuel Rodríguez, *Substitution in the Hebrew Cultus*, AUSDS 3 [Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1979], 136, 219, 305–7). This notion may have the support of the Hebrew expression כָּל־חַטֹּאתָם "all their sin," namely, the sin that has accumulated in the sanctuary. This is also the view of several scholars, cf. J. H. Kurtz, *Sacrificial Worship* of *the OT* (trans. J. Martin; Minneapolis, MN: Klock & Klock, 1980), 386; S. Kellogg, *The Book of Leviticus* (New York, NY: Funk & Wagnalls, 1900), 257; Kiuchi, "*The Purification Offering*," 159.

Day of Atonement could provide purification. This view is akin to that of R. Rendtorff who concludes that on the Day of Atonement "the sanctuary is cleansed from the impurity caused by all the happenings for which atonement could not be made."[83] Conversely, Gane posits that "all other purification offerings (discounting the ritual of Azazel's goat, which is not an offering) remove evil from their offerer(s), rather than from the sanctuary,"[84] while the חַטָּאת rituals required of individuals (and those required of the community) in specific circumstances purify the offerer and only the annual Day of Atonement purges the sanctuary. Despite some disagreements, both Milgrom's and Gane's views highlight the importance of the Day of Atonement rituals to purge the sanctuary and renew the covenant with Yahweh.

The above analysis has clarified not only the meaning of the rituals of Leviticus as whole, but also the centrality of the purgation rites on the Day of Atonement. We now move to specific aspects of the day's rituals.

The Origins of the Day of Atonement

Several theories for the origins of the Day of Atonement regulations in Lev 16 have been proposed. Wellhausen did not consider Lev 16 to be original to the composition of the book merely because of the lack of mention of an "incense altar."[85]

---

[83] Rolf Rendtorff, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1985), 146.

[84] Gane, *Cult and Character*, 142.

[85] J. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1963), 136–39, 147–49; cf. Gane, *Cult and Character*, 26. Hartley writes: "The lack of historical reference to this day and the prominence given to Aaron in this

Jewish scholar Y. Kaufmann writes: "In every detail, P betrays its antiquity,"[86] a position with which Milgrom agrees: "There is no reason to doubt the antiquity of an annual purgation rite for the sanctuary on the tenth and final day of the New Year Festival, which, in accordance with Israel's ancient agricultural calendar, began in the autumn"[87] and "the mounting evidence culled from the study of comparative institutions in the ANE has demolished the hitherto regnant theory that P's institutions are a late Israelite 'creation'."[88] In support of this conclusion, Milgrom adduces several lines of argument based on philological evidence in favour of a pre-exilic date for P: (1) the semantics of twenty-two Hebrew terms from P which fall into disuse after the post-exilic era; (2) "not a single Priestly term has been shown to be of post-exilic coinage"[89]; (3) no archaizing of

---

regulation led the Wellhausen school to place the origin of the Day of Atonement well into the post-exilic era" (*Leviticus*, 217).

[86] Yehezkel Kaufmann, *The Religion of Israel, from Its Beginnings to the Babylonian Exile* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1960), 206.

[87] Milgrom, *Leviticus (Continental)*, 165.

[88] Ibid., *Leviticus 1–16*, 3.

[89] Ibid., 8. Milgrom also states that "The replacement of P terms by others indicates not only that the former belong to an earlier age but also that their cumulative effect—twenty-two attestations in all—makes it unlikely that their absence in late Hebrew is purely an accident." Milgrom disagrees with B. A. Levine who posits that some P terms are clearly post-exilic, such as *misha/mosha* and *degel* and *ahuzza*. For a discussion of some of the arguments for a literary development of Lev 16 see Gane, *Cult and Character*, 34–36. Hartley discusses several reasons why he thinks the Day of Atonement is an ancient ritual: (1) the overtones of antiquity which suffuse the rite; (2) the goat for Azazel rite has early counterparts in Ugarit and the Hittites; (3) the loss of the meaning of the term "Azazel"; and (4) the importance of the *kappōreṯ*, which disappeared after the exile (cf. Jer 3:16 where the ark is said to be forever lost). Despite this, Hartley posits that the Day of Atonement may have lost its significance during the kingdom era, having been revived after the exile (cf. *Leviticus*, 218). Contrary to some views, Neh 9:1–3 does not deal with a reestablishment of the Day of Atonement after the exile since the fast not only does not occur on the same day (24th of the seventh month) but the activities of the people do not resemble anything that must have occurred during the Day of Atonement according to levitical law. See Jacob Milgrom, "Day of Atonement," *IDBSup*, 82–83.

P's language; and (4) terms such as קֹדֶשׁ and מִקְדַּשׁ הַקֹּדֶשׁ (Lev 16:33) for the Most Holy Place (cf. בְּקֹדֶשׁ הַקָּדָשִׁים in Exod 26:33, 34[90]).

The Structure of Lev 16

Wenham proposes the following structure in Lev 16:[91]

16:1–2	Introduction
16:3–5	Animals and priestly dress needed for the ceremonies
16:6–10	Outline of the ceremonies
16:11–28	Detailed description of the ceremonies
16:11–19	The blood–sprinkling rites
16:20–22	The release of the scapegoat
16:23–28	Cleansing of the participants
16:29–34	The people's duty[92]

Because the structure of the chapter is not determinant to our discussions of the imagery and rituals, Wenham's concise outline will suffice for our purposes here.

Impurity, Sin and the Purification Rituals of Lev 16

As Gane artfully describes it, the Day of Atonement "portrays the character of Yahweh, not by theological assertions, narrative, or even poetry, but by instructions for

[90] Cf. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 1063. Young, "The Impact," 36, writes that the notion of Leviticus 16 being "pre-exilic rather than the invention of P is now incontestable. Neither can one read Lev 16 and not be impressed by its unity of thought, even if one may feel compelled to doubt its literary unity." Cf. Gane, *Cult and Character*, 36.

[91] Wenham, *Leviticus*, 228.

[92] Cf. Ángel Manuel Rodríguez, "Leviticus 16: Its Literary Structure," *AUSS* 34 (1996): 269–286. Rodríguez attempts to see a chiastic structure in Lev 16 which highlights the blood sprinkling passages as the culmination of the rites. However, it is the final removal of sin through the transfer of sins to the goat for Azazel and its final sending away which form the apex of the day's rituals, and not the sprinkling and the purification of the sancta *per se*.

cultic deeds to be performed in his presence."[93] James Mays notes that the Day of Atonement is "the climax and crown of Israel's theology of sanctification."[94] Hieke calls it "Gottes Gnadengeschenk,"[95] God's gift of mercy. The sheer number of references to blood on this day indicates its importance: for the purgation of the sanctuary, blood was daubed on the utensils and sprinkled in the sanctuary a total of forty-nine times, possibly indicating the completeness of the purification. Milgrom points out that the total number of times of the application and sprinkling of blood is forty-nine (7 x 7 via Hebrew Gematria) which may indicate the "thoroughness of the rite's effects"[96] (cf. Exod 29:12; Lev 4:6–7, 17–18, 25, 30, 34; 5:9; 8:15; 9:9; Ezek 43:20; 45:18).

Lev 16 presents "compositional and conceptual" elements which stand at the centre of the book of Leviticus.[97] More importantly, as Rendtorff argues, Lev 16 is about "life and death"[98] and presents a bird's eye view of the process of purifying and reconsecrating the whole nation of Israel: the people, the high priest, his household

---

[93] Gane, *Cult and Character*, xix.

[94] James Luther Mays, *The Book of Leviticus, The Book of Numbers*, LBC (Atlanta, GA: John Knox, 1977), 52.

[95] Thomas Hieke, *Levitikus*, Zweiter Teilband 16–27 (Freiburg: Herder, 2014), 557–611.

[96] Ibid.

[97] Cf. Janowski, "Der Geschenk der Versöhnnung," 6: "Zusammen mit Lev 17 bildet dieses Kapitel die kompositorische und konzeptionelle Mitte des Leviticusbuchs, die die Botschaft vom Versöhnung stiftenden Gott propagiert."

[98] "Dieser Rückverweis auf die Episode mit Nadab und Abihu (Lev 10:1–3) hat nicht nur redaktionelle Bedeutung, sondern macht sofort die grundlegende Bedeutung des im folgenden Text Behandelten deutlich: Es geht um Leben und Tod" (Rolf Rendtorff, "Leviticus 16 als Mitte der Tora," *BibInt* 11 [January 1, 2003]: 255).

priests and the entire sanctuary.[99] Feinberg calls Lev 16 "one of the mountain peaks of the Scriptures" for its clarity and power.[100]

At least one recent author has connected the Day of Atonement with the story of Joseph. Carmichael argues that "[t]he Israelite ritual is a product of the nation's own narrative history and moral reflection."[101] This view is based on the reference by the author of the *Book of Jubilees* to a connection between the Day of Atonement and the story of Joseph's brothers' killing a goat and dipping Joseph's clothes in its blood. There are aspects of corporate sin, transference of sin, substitution and remembrance, which are all present in the Day of Atonement ritual. Efraim Radner captures the ethos of the Day of Atonement perceptively:

> Here is where the summary character of the Day of Atonement finds its illumination: the approach of a family's mourning and diminution, the tabernacle's form, the articulating veil, the separated day each year, the priestly exclusions, the cosmic clothing, the victim beasts, the two goats, the divergent landscapes, the turmoil of angels, the world's unrest—all is laid out as a display by which the great chasm that is creation's grace is overcome somehow by God himself.[102]

The rituals presented in Lev 16 are set up primarily by Lev 4 and secondarily by the events of Lev 10:1–2, the profanation of the sancta by Nadab and Abihu.[103] The day's

---

[99] Rolf Rendtorff, *Theologie des Alten Testaments: Ein kanonischer Entwurf,* Band 1 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1999), 118.

[100] E. L. Feinberg, "The Scapegoat of Leviticus Sixteen," *BibSac* 115 (1958): 320–333.

[101] Calum M. Carmichael, "The Origin of the Scapegoat Ritual," *VT* 50 (2000): 167–182.

[102] Ephraim Radner, *Leviticus*, BTCB (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2008), 168.

[103] Cf. Hartley *Leviticus*, 233: "[t]he first observance of this day may have been to purge the sanctuary from the pollution of the transgression of Nadab and Abihu." However, Milgrom elsewhere

rituals involved purgation, purification and cleansing; such cleansing was a "prerequisite" for forgiveness in the חַטָּאת offerings of Lev 4 (cf. 4:21: "The priest shall make atonement for them, and they shall be forgiven").[104] The notion of a sacrifice that purifies, cleanses and sanctifies is also present in Exod 29:36, Lev 8:15, Ezek 43:20, 22, 23 and 45:18. The Day of Atonement, on the other hand, prescribes rituals of public atonement for collective transgression; it does not contain "forgiveness" rituals, but rituals for the removal of sin from the sanctuary on behalf of the collective nation of Israel (Lev 16:16, 18–19). This "purgation" is necessary according to Milgrom because "Israel's sins have been polluting the sanctuary" as he puts it:

> The sanctuary is polluted (read: society is corrupted) by brazen sins (read: the rapacity of the leaders) and also by inadvertent sins (read: the acquiescence of the "silent majority"), with the result that God is driven out of his sanctuary (read: the nation is destroyed). … Thus, an initial widely attested purgation rite of the temple was broadened and transformed into an annual day for the collective catharsis of Israel.[105]

(*Leviticus*, [*Continental*], 167) points out that the mention of Nadab and Abihu in Lev 16 should simply be seen as an "emergency measure" precaution in regards to the sanctity of the sanctuary. Cf. Rooke: "The way the narrative is constructed implies that there is a very practical purpose for giving the Day of Atonement legislation at that particular juncture, namely, the need to cleanse the sanctuary from the pollution caused by the corpses of Nadab and Abihu" (Rooke, "The Day of Atonement," 345). See also John C. H. Laughlin, "The 'Strange Fire' of Nadab and Abihu," *JBL* 95 (1976): 559–65; Roland Gradwohl, "Das 'fremde Feuer' von Nadab und Abihu," *ZAW* 75 (1963): 288–96; Nobuyoshi Kiuchi, *The Purification Offering in the Priestly Literature*, JSOTSup 56 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987), 77–85.

[104] Cf. Gane, *Cult and Character*, 49–52.

[105] Milgrom, *Leviticus, (Continental)*, 162; Boda, *A Severe Mercy*, 52–54, categorizes sin in Israel as: (1) ritual vs. morality; (2) commission vs. omission; (3) inadvertence vs. defiance; (4) deity vs. humanity; and (5) communal vs. individual. Cf. Wenham, *Leviticus*, 228: "the sanctuary from the pollutions introduced into it by the unclean worshippers."

The rituals of the Day of Atonement are established in Lev 16 with a reprise in Lev 23:26–32 and Num 29:7–11. Its name does not appear in Lev 16 but is given in Lev 23:27 in the context of the feasts of Israel: "The tenth day of this seventh month is the day of Atonement [יוֹם הַכִּפֻּרִים]. Hold a sacred assembly and deny yourselves, and present an offering made to the LORD by fire" (cf. also Lev 16:29). The LXX translates יוֹם הַכִּפֻּרִים as ἡμέρα ἐξιλασμοῦ (cf. τῇ ἡμέρα τοῦ ἐξιλασμοῦ, Lev 25:9). Incidentally, the phrase "the purgation offerings," חַטַּאת הַכִּפֻּרִים performed on the Day of Atonement, is translated καθαρισμός "purgation" in the LXX (cf. Exod 30:10; Num 29:11).

The applications of blood for purification on the Day of Atonement are an expansion and culmination of the חַטָּאת regulations, i.e., "purification offerings", given in Lev 4 and stated in Lev 16:16: "Thus he shall *kipper* [כִּפֶּר, "purge, purify"[106]] the sanctuary, because of the uncleannesses of the people of Israel, and because of their transgressions, all their sins; and so he shall do for the tent of meeting, which remains with them in the midst of their uncleannesses."

Gane[107] lists several textual reasons why the text of Lev 16 as it stands is part of the larger, unified and concomitant חַטָּאת ritual system: (1) Lev 16 is introduced by referring to what happened recently, related in chapter 10; (2) Yahweh appears on the cloud over

---

[106] Cf. ibid., *Leviticus 1–16*, 1079–1080 for a discussion on the correct translation of כִּפֶּר. Cf. also B. Lang, *TDOT*, s.v., כִּפֶּר.

[107] Gane, *Cult and Character*, 29–30.

the ark; (3) Lev 16:16 assumes activities that occur elsewhere in the chapter (vv. 14–15) and are explained elsewhere in the Pentateuch (cf. Exod 30:10); (4) Lev 16:16 assumes knowledge of evils mentioned in other chapters (4–5, 11–15); (5) Lev 16:24 assumes regulations present in Lev 1; (6) Lev 16:27 depends on 4:12 for the location of the burning of the חַטָּאת. Gane also cites allusive activity pertaining to the Day of Atonement in Exod 30:10; Lev 20:3, 23:27–30, 25:9 (the year of jubilee coincides with the Day of Atonement); Num 19:3, 20, 29:7–11.

The ultimate goal of the rituals of the Day of Atonement was to preserve Yahweh's presence in the midst of a pure Israel. Levine writes: "An impure, or defiled, sanctuary induced God to withdraw His presence from the Israelite community."[108] The implications of failing to maintain the holy relationship with Yahweh are spelled out in the prophets: Yahweh could abandon the sanctuary and annul the covenant (cf. Lam 2:7).[109] Thus the focus of the rituals, according to Hartley, was "to expiate the priests' and the people's sins and to cleanse the sanctuary so that the people may be in fellowship with God and continue to have access to him at the altar, which has been cleansed to

---

[108] Baruch A. Levine, *The JPS Torah Commentary: Leviticus* (Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society, 1989), 99. Cf. Deborah W. Rooke, "The Day of Atonement as a Ritual of Validation for the High Priest," in *Temple Worship in Biblical Israel*, ed. John Day (New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2007), 354: "the function of the rites on the Day of Atonement is to purge the Temple (cf. Lev 16.16, 18–19), so that it remains habitable for the deity." For a full treatment on this subject see Hundley, *Keeping Heaven on Earth*, 39–52.

[109] Cf. Bergsma, *The Jubilee*, 32: "The presence of uncleanness in the tabernacle/temple was understood to prevent or impede YHWH from inhabiting it." See also, Jacob Milgrom, "Israel's Sanctuary: The Priestly 'Picture of Dorian Gray'," *RB* 83 (1983): 390–99.

keep it operational."[110] Such purgation as suggested by Hartley is accomplished in the bipartite process involving the goat for Azazel which "carried away the congregation's sins" and the blood rite of the goat for Yahweh which purged the sanctuary.[111] The implications of the whole process are clear, "no man, however holy, can approach the presence of God without appropriate atonement being made."[112] As a "boundary" between the human and the divine, the tabernacle needed to be purged of the human element periodically so that the divine could deign to be in their midst (cf. Exod 25:8).[113]

Two general purification rites are prescribed for the Day of Atonement: (1) the חַטָּאת sacrifices, involving the application of blood in the tabernacle for atonement for the high priest and the people (Lev 16:3–19); and (2) the dispatch of the goat for Azazel to the desert bearing the sins which have been transferred to it by the high priest (Lev 16:20–22). The distinctions between these two phases lie mainly in the fact that the "goat for Azazel" is not killed sacrificially and its blood is never used to purge the sanctuary. Only by its dismissal from the camp to the desert (and assumed later death) is the "purging" ultimately attained. The goat for Azazel is led away from the camp in order to signify the dispatch or dismissal of sin from the people. According to Hartley, both

---

[110] Hartley, *Leviticus*, 224.

[111] Ibid., 228.

[112] Ibid., 236.

[113] Stevenson, *Power and Place*, 220: "The temple exposes humans to transcendence through the mediation of divine revelation. It is transformative in that the temple establishes boundaries between the sacred and the profane, between the human and the divine."

phases are "necessary for full expiation of the community from all the consequences of their sins."[114] Furthermore, Hartley considers Lev 16 to be a preparation "for the coming material on holy living"[115] of chapters 17–26.[116] In Lev 16, holiness has "spatial" connotations in that the sanctuary building is in view, while in the subsequent section, holiness is "coextensive with the land."[117]

The preceding analysis points to the unity of Lev 16 within the whole of Leviticus, for not only does it stand as the culmination of the purgation offerings initiated in chapter 4 but also because it is only after the ritual purgations prescribed for the Day of Atonement have effectively occurred that the covenant with Yahweh has been revalidated and Israel can be expected to maintain its relationship with Yahweh by keeping him in his sanctuary. Only after all the חַטָּאת offerings presented throughout the whole year and those made on the Day of Atonement have been offered and

---

[114] Hartley, *Leviticus*, 237.

[115] Ibid., 217.

[116] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 48, considers Lev 1–16 (P) and Lev 17–26 (H) as presenting "contrasting concepts of holiness." For example, he describes P's concept of holiness (of which Lev 16 would be part) as "static" while H's approach to holiness (Lev 17–26) is "dynamic." In P, only the priests are called "holy" (cf. Num 5:8–22; Lev 8), while in H, all Israel is called to be holy (Lev 21:7). More importantly, on the matter of how impurity and pollution occur, while P considers pollution as moral and ritual, H expands the concepts of pollution to a breach of covenant; pollution in H is "non-ritualistic," the land when polluted cannot be expiated, it must be abandoned (cf. Lev 18:24–29; 20:2). But are these distinctive approaches to holiness in Leviticus contrasting or "complementary"? The way one answers this question may impact the notion of whether the book is divided into different and diverging sources (P and H) or not. Be that as it may (since this question is outside the purview of this study) Milgrom's description of the approaches to holiness in Lev 16 and 17–26 may indicate an increasing and expanding degree of holiness in the book.

[117] Hartley, *Leviticus*, 217.

accepted, does Israel have a chance to remain as Yahweh's holy people until the next חַטָּאת offering is called for and until the next Day of Atonement. This provides the basis for the holiness as laid out in Lev 17–26; without Lev 16, the holy living prescribed in Lev 17–26 would not be possible and the sacrifices in Lev 1–15 would be rendered ineffective, because Israel as a nation of priests would eventually cease to exist. Yahweh would have withdrawn from their midst, abandoned his sanctuary and the people left to receive all the curses that come from disobedience and separation from Yahweh (cf. Lev 26:14–68).

The Day of Atonement in the Israelite Calendar

The Day of Atonement was to take place once a year, "in the seventh month, on the tenth day of the month" (Lev 16:29). According to Lev 25:8–12, the Day of Atonement also marked the commencement of the year of jubilee, "the tenth day of the seventh month, the day of atonement" (Lev 25:8-11) which also coincided with the New Year.[118] The prescriptions to the people to "deny themselves" (Lev 16:31) lasted a full twenty-four hours (Lev 23:32), although the rituals did not take a full twenty-four hours to perform.

The Rituals of the Day of Atonement

The purgation of the rooms, utensils and court of the tabernacle on the Day of Atonement is divided into three phases, which more or less mirror each other and

[118] Cf. John S. Bergsma, *The Jubilee from Leviticus to Qumran: A History of Interpretation*, VTSup 115 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 190; Jonathan D. Safren, "Jubilee and the Day of Atonement," in *Proceedings of the 12th World Congress of Jewish Studies, Division A: The Bible and Its World*, ed. Ron Margolin (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1999), 107-113.

occurs, according to Wright, in "pairs."[119] Some elements of the rituals of the Day of Atonement are shared with the rites prescribed in Lev 4 for purification from the unintentional sins of the high priest, the congregation, the ruler and common members of the community, except that these never involved the Most Holy Place. On the Day of Atonement, the purification is achieved by going from the most holy to the "less" holy section. The purgation of the adytum (the Most Holy Place) is achieved by sprinkling only (the high priest is not to touch any of the furniture inside the holy of holies), once on the east side of the כַּפֹּרֶת, "mercy seat," and seven times in front of it. According to rabbinic tradition the sprinkling occurred in front of the veil.[120] (Lev 4:6, 7; 16:14b–16). The purgation of the outer room, the Holy Place, is done "likewise," by daubing the blood of the goat on the four horns of the altar of incense, sprinkling blood on the altar seven times and in front of the veil another seven times (Lev 4:6, 7; 16:18–19; cf. Exod 30:10). In the court, purgation is made by daubing blood on the four horns of the altar of burnt offering and sprinkling on it seven times (Lev 4:25, 30, 34; 16:18–19).[121] The common element in all three phases is the sprinkling of the blood seven times. On the

[119] Wright, "Day of Atonement," *AYBD*, 2:72.

[120] Cf. Gane, *Cult and Character*, 71, 228, 280: "Combining these assumptions results in agreement with Ibn Ezra's interpretation of 16:16b: the high priest sprinkles seven times "before the veil" and then puts blood once on the horns of the incense altar" (ibid., 71).

[121] Ibid., 228.

Day of Atonement sin was removed from the sanctuary and by proxy from the community of Israel.[122]

The Day of Atonement described in Lev 16 contains a detailed sequence of rituals that should be performed only by Aaron, the high priest. No one else but the high priest should be inside the tabernacle during the rituals (Lev 16:17). The order of the ritual was of utmost importance to the meaning of the Day of Atonement. The rabbis in *m. Yoma* 5:7 state: "if he did one part of the rite before its fellow, he has done nothing whatsoever" because "each of them constitutes an act of atonement unto itself" and should not be repeated because of an error in the order. It has also been recognized that Lev 16 does not and cannot contain all that was performed on the Day of Atonement. Hartley argues that the chapter is directed to the people rather than being the main high priestly instructions, which seems a plausible explanation despite its laconic nature. He writes:

> The intent of this speech then was to instruct the laity in order that they might understand the liturgical procedures of this day and their purposes, because the achievements of this day were essential to their continued well-being as the forgiven people of God.[123]

There is significance in the structure of the directions given by Yahweh in Lev 16. On the Day of Atonement all three sections of the tabernacle are purified twice, once with

---

[122] Pace Kalimi who states: "In fact, atonement of the people is the core of the Yom Kippur ritual (Lev 16:6–11, 15, 17, 21–24, 30–32), while the atonement of the Temple and the altar is mentioned just secondarily (Lev 16:16, 18–20, 33)" ("The Day of Atonement in the Late Second Temple Period: Sadducees' High Priests, Pharisees' Norms, and Qumranites' Calendar(s)," *RRJ* 14 [2011]: 72).

[123] Hartley, *Leviticus*, 225.

the blood of the bull (Lev 16:11–14) and once with the blood of the goat for the Lord (Lev 16:15–19). Starting with the Most Holy Place (or "holy of holies"), the high priest moves outwards, purifying first the כַּפֹּרֶת in the Most Holy Place, then the incense altar in the Holy Place (Lev 16:18–19) and then the courtyard altar (Lev 16:20). As a last חַטָּאת offering, "all of their iniquities of the people of Israel's, and all their transgressions, all their sin" (Lev 16:21) are transferred to the head of the goat for Azazel through confession and the goat is sent away from the community to a "barren region" אֶל־אֶרֶץ גְּזֵרָה (Lev 16:22).

The Role of the שׁוֹפָר

The Day of Atonement's activities start with the loud sound of a trumpet, שׁוֹפַר תְּרוּעָה (Lev 25:9). The word for "trumpet" here is שׁוֹפָר which describes an instrument to produce sound that is made of a ram's horn. It did not produce multiple musical notes but only a single note at a characteristic pitch. The sound of the שׁוֹפָר was connected with the early history of Israel; on the third day after they had gathered around Mount Sinai after the Exodus, they experienced "the voice of the shofar sounding very loud," וְקֹל שֹׁפָר חָזָק מְאֹד (Exod 19:16, 19; 20:18). The sound caused the people to tremble with fear and as the days progressed, the sound of the שׁוֹפָר "grew louder" (Exod 19:19). Later the שׁוֹפַר was also used in times of war (Josh 6:4; Judg 3:7; 7:20) and, possibly because of its connection with the Day of Atonement, it was used in calls to reconsecration (e.g., 2 Chr 15:14; Zech 9:14; Joel 2:1, 15) and in worship (e.g., Ps

47:6; 98:6; 150:3).

The sound of the שׁוֹפָר had deep spiritual meaning to Israel and it was quite fitting that it should be played during such an important day as the Day of Atonement, both as an historical reminder of Israel's history and as a call to penitence and holiness.

The Role of the People on the Day of Atonement

The corporate character of the rituals of the Day of Atonement spring to high relief in that this is the only ritual in Leviticus where all the people are called to take part in. The activities required of the people to ensure that the Day of Atonement achieves its purification goals are detailed in Lev 16 as follows: (1) bring two male goats for the "purification offering" and one ram for the "burnt offering" (v. 5); (2) practise "self denial" (v. 29); and (3) do no work (v. 29), a prescription that applies to all citizens and extends even to the "alien who resides among you" (v. 29). The importance of the requirement to abstain from work is reinforced by its repetition in v. 31.[124]

We now turn to the most important of these corporate functions, the command to "afflict oneself."

Self-Affliction or Self-Denial

The prescription for self-denial is given twice in Lev 16:29, 31 and repeated in Lev 23:27. In time, the notion of denial or self-affliction on the Day of Atonement coalesced

[124] Kiuchi, *Leviticus*, 32, comments on the need for personal involvement in the rituals of Leviticus: "In other words it is vitally important to recognize that the Lord commands the observance of the symbolic meaning through one's involvement in outward actions."

into the idea of "fasting" (cf. Dan 10:12, Ezra 8:21; Ps 69:10 and Rabbinic literature which expanded "denial" to include abstinence from sexual relations on the Day of Atonement).[125]

Similar to the prohibition against working, the prescriptions to afflict oneself go "from evening to evening" (Lev 23:32), i.e., from sunset to sunset. But their importance undoubtedly reached their climax during the rituals performed by the high priest, which commenced "as soon as the sun rose" according to the Rabbinic tradition. This could explain the rabbinic commentary that maidens would dance in a procession to invite young men to choose a bride in the afternoon of the Day of Atonement, after the rituals were completed.[126] Such a processional would not be in keeping with the spirit of "afflicting oneself" in the earlier part of the day but could have symbolic meaning after the rituals were performed successfully by the high priest, which meant that Israel had renewed successfully its covenant with Yahweh. These celebrations in the latter part of the day would commemorate the reaffirmation of Yahweh's and Israel's "marriage" vow.

---

[125] *m. Yoma* 8:1: "On the Day of Atonement it is forbidden to eat, drink, bathe, put on any sort of oil, put on a sandal, or engage in sexual relations. But a king and a bride may wash their faces." The Rabbinic discussions hinged around the verbal form of the verb תענה. See Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The Case of the Day of Atonement Ritual," in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use & Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Proceedings from the First International Symposium of the Orion Center, 12–14 May 1996, eds. Michael E. Stone & Esther G. Chazon (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 181–188.

[126] Cf. *Talmud Taanit* 4:8; 26b; 31a. For an alternative explanation of the festivities of the Day of Atonement, cf. Safren, "Jubilee and the Day of Atonement," 112–113.

Wenham[127] says that the prescription to afflict oneself is rare and is in contrast to another "perpetual" commandment, to serve the Lord "joyfully and with gladness" (Deut 28:46–47; cf. Ps 100:2). The majority of the commentators agree that "fasting" is meant in the expression "afflict yourselves" (cf. Acts 27:9). One must admit however that merely "fasting," i.e., abstaining from food and from working does not necessarily encompass all the range of meaning in the expression "afflict oneself." Certainly not working and not fasting were a corollary of the process of "self-affliction" but implicit in this is the notion that, in addition to abstaining from work and food, the people had to engage in soul-searching and in solemn reflection on what this day meant for them individually and as a nation. Milgrom suggests that the people's part in the process was to "purge themselves through rites of penitence."[128] Such a rite of penitence is exemplified in Ps 35:13, which, although not dealing with the Day of Atonement, offers a glimpse of what afflicting oneself might entail: "I wore sackcloth; I afflicted myself with fasting. I prayed with head bowed on my bosom." As Wenham writes, "The law insists that if they are to be effective, the whole nation, Israelites and foreigners alike, must demonstrate true penitence."[129] This can be seen in Luke 1:8–13 in which the people are said to pray while Zechariah officiates at the altar of incense.

---

[127] Wenham, *Leviticus*, 236.

[128] Milgrom, *Leviticus* 1–16, 51.

[129] Wenham, *Leviticus*, 236.

The Prohibition Against Working

The prohibition against work "and you shall do no work" is given once in Lev 16:29 and implied in "it is a sabbath of complete rest" (v. 31). It is a שַׁבַּת שַׁבָּתוֹן, "a complete rest." The prohibition is repeated three times, in Lev 23: 28, 30 and 31, and again implied in the שַׁבַּת שַׁבָּתוֹן formula in v. 32. Three gradual elements are in effect: (1) personal affliction (fasting and penitence); (2) prohibitions against working; and (3) complete rest.

While the prohibition to work is also a major feature of the other feasts in Lev 23 (vv. 7, 8, 21, 25, 28, 31, 35) and work on one's עֲבֹדָה, "occupation," is usually prohibited, the prohibition to "do no work" on the Day of Atonement is different in Lev 16. It is the same as the prohibition that applied to the weekly Sabbath (Lev 23:3) and both days are called שַׁבַּת שַׁבָּתוֹן, a "day of complete rest" (v. 31). The superlative expression שַׁבַּת שַׁבָּתוֹן, (lit. "a most restful rest"[130]) pertaining to the weekly "Sabbath" rest is found in Exod 31:15 and 35:2 and once in connection with the seventh or sabbatical year in Lev 25:4. It is also noteworthy that the year of jubilee, "the fiftieth year", should also commence on the Day of Atonement (Lev 25:9: "Then you shall have the trumpet sounded loud; on the tenth day of the seventh month—on the day of atonement—you shall have the trumpet sounded throughout all your land").

[130] Cf. Karl William Weyde, *The Appointed Feast of Yahweh: The Festival Calendar in Leviticus 23 and the Sukkot Festival in Other Biblical Texts* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 97.

But while the commandment to rest on the Sabbath is based on creation (Gen 2:1–13; Exod 20:11), the reason for the prohibition to work on the Day of Atonement is because "it is a day of atonement, to make atonement on your behalf before the LORD your God" (Lev 23:28).[131] In similar fashion to the commandment to refrain from work on the weekly Sabbath (cf. Ex 31:12–17; Num 15:35), the prohibition against working also assumes life and death consequences on the Day of Atonement (Lev 23:30: "And anyone who does any work during that entire day, such a one I will destroy from the midst of the people").

The repetition of the Day of Atonement stipulations in Lev 23:26–32 and Num 29:7–11 emphasizes different elements of the day's activities. First, Lev 23 does not mention the חַטָּאת offerings but stresses four times the need to do "no work" (v. 28, 30, 31, 32) as well as to practise "self-denial". Second, Num 29:7–11 mentions the prohibition to work only once and goes on to focus on the animal and grain offerings:

> one young bull, one ram, seven male lambs a year old … flour mixed with oil, three-tenths of an ephah for the bull, two-tenths for the one ram, one-tenth for each of the seven lambs; with one male goat for a sin offering, in addition to the sin offering of atonement, and the regular burnt offering and its grain offering, and their drink offerings.

Sanctions for Violating Day of Atonement Self-Denial and Affliction

Violations of the prohibitions against working and prescriptions for afflicting oneself carried severe punishment: violators would be cut off from the people and

[131] This rest "of atonement" is taken up by the author of Hebrews (Heb 4) who frames the σαββατισμὸς (v. 9) with the work of Jesus as high priest.

destroyed (Lev 23:29–30). Weyde avers that "since the prohibition against working on the day of atonement is all-embracing, including every kind of work, the penalty for its violation is most severe: *YHWH* will react, and he will *destroy*, *exterminate* from the midst of the people anyone who works during that entire day."[132]

The Role of the High Priest

The responsibility of mediation by the high priest on the Day of Atonement was not to be taken lightly. This is demonstrated in the fact that Lev 16 is introduced by the story of Nadab and Abihu, who died for bringing "strange fire" (v. 2) before Yahweh. The chapter contains two explicit warnings about the risk of death when performing the rites on the Day of Atonement (vv. 2, 13) in addition to the veiled warnings embedded in the detailed instructions.[133] According to Milgrom, chapters 11–15 act as a prelude to Lev 16.[134]

In Deut 33:10 the role of the Israelite כֹּהֵן is explained: "They teach Jacob your ordinances, and Israel your law; they place incense before you, and whole burnt offerings on your altar" (cf. Deut 24:8); "[the priest] is the cultic counterpart of the

---

[132] Weyde, *Feasts*, 99.

[133] Milgrom, "Day of Atonement," 72, is correct to point out that the mention of Nadab and Abihu should simply be seen as a precaution in regards to the sanctity of the sanctuary. This is contrary to Rooke's suggestion that their death was the very basis for the establishment of the Day of Atonement at that juncture when she writes: "The way the narrative is constructed implies that there is a very practical purpose for giving the Day of Atonement legislation at that particular juncture, namely, the need to cleanse the sanctuary from the pollution caused by the corpses of Nadab and Abihu" (ibid., 345). Moreover, there is no indication that the sanctuary was thus cleansed, especially when considering that the date of the festival is given in Lev 16:29–34, which does not appear to signify that the ritual followed the instructions.

[134] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 1011.

prophet."[135] Although all the other priests had authority to officiate at the outer altar, the high priest had specific roles; for instance, only he ministered at the incense altar (Exod 30:7–8) and at all the rites on the Day of Atonement. The high priest bore responsibility for the people; he carried the names of the tribes on his shoulder and on his breast (Exod 28:29). The Urim and Thumim located inside his breastplate were there "for judgment" (Exod 28:30) and established the will of Yahweh (Num 27:21; 1 Sam 14:36–42, 27:6; 10:20–24).[136] The high priest was also responsible for medical diagnosis (cf. Lev 13:1–2).

On the Day of Atonement, all the other priests fade into the background and the high priest rises to prominence. Although all priests ensure the sancta were not to be profaned, only the high priest had to offer a sacrifice for himself on the Day of Atonement to be able to dispense with the responsibilities of his office legitimately on this most important day.[137] During this period, the utmost care was to be taken to preserve his eligibility to perform the rites on the Day of Atonement. One example should suffice to illustrate this point: on the night before the Day of Atonement, he was not permitted to sleep lest he have a nocturnal emission and become defiled (cf. Deut 23:10–11). These meticulous preparations lasted for seven days, possibly mirroring the

---

[135] Ibid., 56.

[136] John R. Spencer, "Aaron (Person)," *AYBD* 1:5.

[137] On this point, Milgrom writes: "Thus, the collective responsibility of all Israel not to pollute the sancta … is matched here by the collective responsibility of all of the priests (and levites; cf. Num 18:2–3) to prevent encroachment by one of their own" (*Leviticus 1–16*, 55).

seven days between Moses' ascent to Sinai and his audience with Yahweh (cf. Exod 24:16). The *m. Yoma* 1:1–3:2 highlights several steps for the preparation of the high priest for the Day of Atonement in addition to those described in the Pentateuch, all with the intent of keeping him "qualified" to perform his duties:

> Seven days before the Day of Atonement, we sequester the high priest from his house to the chamber of the officials, and we prepare for him another priest in his place, [for] perhaps there will occur in him a disqualification.

According to the rabbis, they all slept in a large room with their mattresses on the floor, not wearing their consecrated garments. In the event that one had a nocturnal emission, he had to immerse himself and go home for the day when the gates were opened at dawn. He was unclean until evening.

Day of Atonement as Confirmation of High Priestly Office

Rooke's suggestion that clothing served as confirmation of priestly office is based on the transfer of power from Aaron to Eleazar by the putting on of the garments (Num 20.23–28).[138] She also suggests that " … the Day of Atonement ceremonial in Leviticus 16 can be seen as the first official duty that Aaron undertakes after his consecration, which in turn could imply that the Day of Atonement is to be regarded as the validation of Aaron's high priesthood, the proof of his ordination and consecration."[139] Thus "the Day of Atonement functions as a yearly ritual confirmation of his high priesthood."[140] She

---

[138] Rooke, "The Day of Atonement," 350.

[139] Ibid., 347.

[140] Ibid., 345.

continues by saying that "he has moved from a state of impurity to purity but that he has moved from a state of compromised priesthood to certain priesthood.[141] The wearing of the Day-of-Atonement vestments alone seemed to have qualified "appointed" priests in case there were no "official" high priests or if the high priest became unable to perform the day's duties.[142] Rooke's hypothesis that there was a confirmed office/privileged position for the high priest based on obedience to Levitical regulations seems to be confirmed by Zech 3:7: "If you walk in my ways and observe my service, it is you who shall rule my house and keep watch over my courts, and I will give you right of entrance among those who are standing here."

Ritual Ablutions for the High Priest

Ritual ablutions were an important part of the rituals of the Day of Atonement. The specific instructions on what the high priest should wear on the Day of Atonement are accompanied with the order to "bathe his body in water, and then put them on", as if the order to bathe was a reminder that this should not be passed over. Two ablutions are prescribed for the high priest on the Day of Atonement: (1) before the rituals of the day commence (Lev 16:4) and (2) after the Azazel ritual and before the burning of the sacrifices at the outer altar (v. 24).

---

[141] Ibid., 357.

[142] Cf. Vasile Babota, *The Institution of the Hasmonean High Priesthood* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 134–139.

The second ablution and changing of clothes by the high priest between the Azazel ritual and the burning of the carcasses of the sacrifices implies a "decontamination from holiness, a ritual airlock, so to speak."[143] Milgrom explains that the purpose of the ablution after entrance into the adytum is to remove "the super-holiness that he contracted" by entering the adytum.[144] Hartley concurs when he writes: "By bathing, the high priest removes some of the holiness that has penetrated him from being in the Holy of Holies so that he may function at the altar of the whole offering without endangering the congregation standing in that area."[145] According to Hartley, by officiating in the adytum, the Most Holy Place, the high priest is infused with extreme holiness from the presence of Yahweh which should not be allowed to "leak" into the Holy Place or the outer altar when he officiates there or even be seen by the congregation. Just as there are compartments in the sanctuary, their differing levels of holiness are also compartmentalized in order to protect the people. Even though as Milgrom explains, the rituals are based on the notion that the "holiness never sanctifies impurity only impurity defiles holiness,"[146] holiness can also be dangerous to the unclean as exemplified by the severe punishment for the violation of the sanctuary by Nadab and Abihu (Lev 10).

---

[143] Rooke, "The Day of Atonement," 355.

[144] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 1049; ibid., "Day of Atonement," 73.

[145] Hartley, *Leviticus 1–16*, 242.

[146] Milgrom, "Day of Atonement," 162–163.

Ablutions for Those Leaving the Camp

Two other ablutions are prescribed for the Day of Atonement: one for the person who leads the goat for Azazel into the desert (Lev 16:26) and one for the person who burns the carcasses of the sacrifices outside the camp (Lev 18:28). Such bathing for the one who leads the goat for Azazel was done in order to avoid contamination of the holy with the unclean (cf. Num 19:8), since the goat was loaded with "all the sins" of Israel, a toxic and noxious load. Because the Israelite camp was now holy and purified, the person who dealt with Azazel was required to undergo symbolic purification with water before being re-united with the community. This may be due to the fact that the person responsible for leading Azazel had left the camp which had been purified.

Similarly, the person who burns the carcasses of the animals outside the camp (v. 28) must bathe after the rite. The reason for requiring these ablutions is not spelled out clearly in the text. For one, there is no indication that the person leading the goat for Azazel ever touched it, but could have pulled it by a rope instead. Moreover, the burning of the sacrificial carcasses of the Day of Atonment should presumably follow the instructions given in Lev 4:11–12: they should occur in a "clean place outside the camp" (cf. Lev 2:9) and such sacrifices should be dedicated to the Lord and thus considered to be "holy" (cf. Lev 4).[147] Kiuchi avers that the requirement for bathing was due to the

[147] This possibly reflects Second Temple practice, Pseudo-Jonathan explains that the animals "will be carried out *with poles by young men who will be priests, and they will carry them* outside the camp" (Lev 16:27).

contact with death.[148] However, against this is the fact that the high priest also comes in contact with the sacrificial carcasses by handling the dead animal (since no instruction is given that he not touch it) but a third ablution is not prescribed for the high priest. A more plausible explanation may be that the person who burns the holy sacrifices should bathe not because they have come in contact with the sacrifices but because anyone who leaves the Israelite camp on the Day of Atonement for any reason while the purification rites are taking place within the sanctuary should be considered to be unclean because the camp has been purified from all the sins of the community. Whoever leaves the holy and purified environment of the camp must be decontaminated before re-entering. The importance of maintaining the purity of the camp is set out in several of the Pentateuchal stipulations during the year, but even more so on the Day of Atonement. This highlights the importance of the sense of community and collectivity attached to the day's rituals.

The High Priestly Clothing on the Day of Atonement

On the Day of Atonement, before the high priest starts the day's activities, he must bathe, ostensibly inside the sanctuary compound and then put his ritual garment on (Lev 16:4). The clothing for this day is "the holy linen tunic," כְּתֹנֶת־בַּד קֹדֶשׁ, the "linen undergarments," מִכְנְסֵי־בַד, next to his body, "the linen sash," אַבְנֵט בַּד, and "the linen turban," מִצְנֶפֶת בַּד; these are the "holy vestments," בִּגְדֵי־קֹדֶשׁ (Lev 16:4; cf.

[148] Kiuchi, "The Purification Offering," 135–141.

Lev 8:7). The recurring material in all these pieces is בַּד, "linen". The term is also used in descriptions of heavenly beings in Ezek 9:2–3, 11; 10:2; Dan 10:6; 12:3; Mal 2:7.[149]

Why such simple clothing on the Day of Atonement? Several hypotheses have been advanced. The *y. Yoma* 7:3 says the purpose of wearing sinple clothing is to show humility on the part of the high priest. Wenham adds that on this day, "in the presence of God even the high priest is stripped of all honor."[150] The implication is that without the privileged position conferred by his full regalia, his communication with Yahweh would be severed (cf. Exod 28.30). The ancient Jewish commentator, Rashi, considers these garments to be the same as the clothes of the regular priest.[151] Hartley conjectures that "on this solemn day he approaches God dressed humbly and contritely. 'White' stands for simplicity, purity, and holiness; this symbolism is especially appropriate for his entering into Yahweh's presence."[152]

After he offers the goat for Azazel but before ceasing the day's activities, the high priest changes back into his regular clothes (Lev 16:23–24) and offers a burnt offering,

---

[149] Cf. W. H. Brownlee, "The Priestly Character of the Church in the Apocalypse," *NTS* 5 (1959): 224–225.

[150] Wenham, *Leviticus*, 230.

[151] Cf. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 1015. But there are differences in the clothes of the regular priest and the garments of the high priest on the Day of Atonement. For one, the turban of the regular priest is always referred to as the מִגְבָּעֹת (cf. Exod 29:9; 39:28) while the high priest's turban is always called the מִצְנֶפֶת (Lev 16:4). Even when the headgear of Aaron and his sons is mentioned in the same context, the terms are distinct (cf. Exod 39:28). So the evidence points to a simpler high priestly dress, but not necessarily that of the regular priest.

[152] Hartley, *Leviticus*, 236.

which brings the day to a close (someone else, perhaps an attending priest, burns the carcass of the sacrificed animals, cf. Lev 16:27–28). Despite the fact that there is not much difference in the Hebrew terms for Aaron's garments, a complete change of clothes, from the linen vestments, בִּגְדֵי הַבָּד to his full regalia ("golden garments," *m. Yoma* 7:3) seems to be intentional. The same concept of "transferring holiness" is apparent here, as Rooke writes, "changing clothes signifies the transition between the sphere of the exceedingly holy and the sphere of the moderately holy."[153]

The Sacrificial Animals for the Day of Atonement חַטָּאת

Lev 16 prescribes the sacrifice of a "young bull for a purgation offering," לְחַטָּאת, two rams "for the burnt offering," one for the high priest and one for the people לְעֹלָה (vv. 3, 5, 24); and "two male goats for a purgation offering" שְׁנֵי־שְׂעִירֵי עִזִּים לְחַטָּאת (v. 5).[154] The young bull and the ram are brought forth by the high priest and are offered on behalf of himself and his household (vv. 3, 6, 24). The two goats and the ram are brought by the people and are offered on their behalf (vv. 3, 5, 15,

[153] Rooke, "The Day of Atonement," 354. D. P. Wright suggests that the change of clothes had mere practical purposes when he says that "[t]he reason for the change of clothes may simply be to remove the soiled clothes and put on the clean, regular high priestly clothing." Cf. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 1017.

[154] Cf. the helpful discussion about both he-goats being called "לְחַטָּאת" in Gane, *Cult and Character*, 246–261.

24). The two male goats are separated by lots;[155] one is "for the Lord," לַיהוָה and the other goat is "for Azazel," לַעֲזָאזֵל (v. 5).

Although not specified in Lev 16, the animals selected for the sacrifices on the Day of Atonement should be "without blemish", according to Num 29:8. This follows the standard set for the original Passover lamb (Exod 12:5): any animal for sacrifice in the sanctuary must be "without blemish." This applied also to the purification offerings on the Day of Atonement (cf. also Lev 4:3, 22, 28).

Casting of the Lots for the Two Goats

In Lev 16:7–8 it is directed that two goats are to be brought to the entrance of the tent and "Aaron shall cast lots[156] on the two goats, one lot for the LORD and the other lot for Azazel." The goat for the Lord is to be brought along with a goat for Azazel, as well as the ram for the burnt offering from the congregation (16:5). The ritual of the choice of the two goats "by lots" is described in Lev 16:7–10:

> He shall take the two goats and set them before the LORD at the entrance of the tent of meeting; and Aaron shall cast lots on the two goats, one lot for the LORD and the other lot for Azazel. Aaron shall present the goat on which the lot fell for the LORD, and offer it as a sin offering; but the goat on which the lot fell for Azazel shall be presented alive before the LORD to make atonement over it, that it may be sent away into the wilderness to Azazel.

---

[155] The casting of the lots for the goats in Lev 16:7–10 seems to be an explanation of what occurred sometime within the ritual and does not represent a precise sequence. The casting of the lots at this point of the ritual seems unnatural and appears to be an interpolation, as it explains a ritual that must have occurred prior to the slaughtering of the bull. As Gane concludes, "The order in which activities are presented in a ritual prescription does not always indicate the chronological sequence of their performance" (*Cult and Character*, 23). For a discussion on the literary flow of Lev 16, see Martin Noth, *Leviticus* (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1977), 114–115.

[156] Cf. *m. Yoma* 3:9; 4:1 for the rabbinical tradition on how the lots were cast.

The goats are placed לִפְנֵי יְהוָה, "before the Lord," which indicates that the choice of which goat does what belongs solely to Yahweh.[157] Milgrom explains the rationale: "…otherwise, if the high priest chose the animals, it would appear that he and the people he represented were offering an animal to Azazel."[158] Whether Aaron takes the goats himself after he has bathed and changed his clothes or whether it is brought to him before the ablutions is not clear in the text. Both goats are called חַטָּאת, "purification offerings" (Lev 16:5).

Scholars have seen in "one lot for the LORD and the other lot for Azazel" (גּוֹרָל אֶחָד לַיהוָה וְגוֹרָל אֶחָד לַעֲזָאזֵל, Lev 16:8) the foundational statement about an evil entity which stands in distinction to "the Lord." Milgrom reads the ל here as a *lamed auctoris* after Cazelles[159] while Gane reads the *lamed* as "belonging to YHWH" and "belonging to Azazel."[160] This seems to be the position of non-canonical Jewish literature of the late first and early second century CE (cf. 3 *Enoch* 4:6; *Pirqe R. El.* 16; d. Ibn Ezra, Ramban). Milgrom concludes: "The plausible explanation is that Azazel is the name of a demon who has been eviscerated of his demonic powers by the Priestly legislators."[161]

---

[157] Cf. Milgrom, *Leviticus*: *A Book of Rituals*, 168; Gane, *Cult and Character*, 249.

[158] Ibid., *Leviticus 1–16*, 1020

[159] Ibid.; cf. Henri Cazelles, "La question du 'lamed auctoris'," *RB* 56 (1949): 93–101.

[160] Gane, *Cult and Character*, 248.

[161] Milgrom, *Levititus 1–16*, 1021.

This is explored more fully in a later section in which the rite of the goat for Azazel is examined.

Although the biblical text says nothing of the sort, the *m. Yoma* 4:2 reveals that both goats had to be identical and lie in wait at the entrance of the tent until the time for its sacrifice/ritual had come. According to *m. Yoma* 3:9; 4:1–2, the process of choosing which goat is to be for the Lord and which for Azazel is to be done by lots and the ascriptions, "for the Lord" and "for Azazel", are to be affixed to each goat respectively. The ribbons are to be placed on the head of the goat for Azazel and also the throat, although this reading is debatable.[162] The goat for Azazel is to have a "crimson thread on the head." This process of selection most likely takes place before the sequence of the rituals starts in v. 11 (since v. 11 appears to repeat the prescriptions made in v. 6). Henry Hayman suggests that the "two lots of the two goats seem to express the double issue of 'life and death, blessing and cursing' set before Israel in Deut 30:19."[163] This concept also emerges in the following discussion of the identity and function of each of the goats.

The First Purification of the Most Holy Place: The Sacrifice for the High Priest and His House

The high priest had to offer a bull "for himself" in order to effect atonement for "himself and for his house" (Lev 16:6, 11). The blood of the goat "for the Lord" is brought מִבֵּית לַפָּרֹכֶת, "inside the veil," i.e., inside the Most Holy Place, and sprinkled on the

[162] Stemberger, "Yom Kippur," 126.

[163] Henry Hayman, "The Book of Enoch in Reference to the New Testament and Early Christian Antiquity," *BW* 12 (1898): 43.

כַּפֹּרֶת, "mercy seat," and in front of the פָּרֹכֶת "veil" seven times (v. 14). This purification offering by the high priest is followed by the sacrifice of the goat to purge the sanctuary (vv. 15–20; cf. Lev 4:3–12). The sacrifices for the high priest and for his house and the sacrifice for the people follow the exact same pattern; the blood of the bull for the high priest and his household and the blood of the "goat for the Lord" offered for the people is sprinkled on the כַּפֹּרֶת and before the כַּפֹּרֶת (or before the veil). The implication of this חַטָּאת sacrifice is that the high priest is obviously not "sinless": he is responsible for the whole congregation; his personal sins could "bring guilt on the people" (Lev 4:3). In order to be able to intercede for the entire people, the high priest first needs to be be purified, along with his household.

Inside the Most Holy Place was the כַּפֹּרֶת, usually translated as "mercy seat."[164] There is little consensus on how to translate כַּפֹּרֶת.[165] Rooker follows the traditional view that it stems from the root כפר, "to atone," because "[t]he importance of the cover was due to its function as the place of expiation, not merely that it covered the ark."[166] This is an attractive reading although not a decisive one since the function of the כַּפֹּרֶת is not explained anywhere in the Pentateuch.

---

[164] In 1 Chr 28:11 the Most Holy Place is called וּבֵית הַכַּפֹּרֶת, "the house of the *kapporet*."

[165] Cf. R. L. Harris כַּפֹּרֶת, *TWOT* 1:453, and M. Jastrow, כַּפֹּרֶת, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*, 2 vols. (Brooklyn: P. Shalom, 1967), 658.

[166] Rooker, *Leviticus*, 214.

Milgrom prefers to leave it "untranslatable."[167] Kiuchi argues that "[i]n the light of LXX (*hilastērion*), it probably means 'propitiatory cover'."[168] In support of this is the LXX text of Exod 25:17, where at its first appearance כַּפֹּרֶת is rendered as ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα, in which ἐπίθεμα means "lid," although this is the only time where the gloss ἐπίθεμα is used. Milgrom disagrees with the rendering of "mercy seat" or "cover" despite the antiquity of this use as, for example, in the targum 4QtgLev, which renders it "cover." M. Görg[169] suggests כַּפֹּרֶת as a loanword from the Egyptian *kappuri(e)t*, "footstool." This view is also attractive since the ark of the covenant is frequently referred to as Yahweh's footstool (cf. Ps 132:7; 1 Chr 28:2).[170] All these views are in agreement with the position that the כַּפֹּרֶת is the abode of the "LORD of hosts, who is enthroned on the cherubim," יֹשֵׁב הַכְּרֻבִים צְבָאוֹת in 1 Sam 4:4 (cf. Ps 99:1). The כַּפֹּרֶת is where the Day of Atonement is initiated and, as Yahweh's dwelling, is a focal point. Hartley translates כַּפֹּרֶת as "the Atonement slate"; it "both reveals and

[167] Milgrom, *Leviticus: A Book of Rituals*, 167.

[168] Kiuchi, *Leviticus*, 290.

[169] M. Görg, "Eine neue Deutung für kapporet," *ZAW* 89 (1977): 115–118.

[170] Cf. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 1014. See the discussion of *kapporet* in Michael L. Brown, "Kipper and Atonement in the Book of Isaiah," in *Ki Baruch hu, Ancient Near Eastern Biblical, and Judaic Studies in honour of Baruch A. Levine*, eds. Robert Chazan, W. W. Lalo and L. H. Schifma, (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999), 191–194.

conceals his presence"[171] and has special cultic function as a boundary between God and the tablets of the covenant.[172]

The Ritual of Incense

Between the slaughtering of the bull and the presentation of its blood on behalf of the high priest inside the holy of holies, Yahweh inserts yet another ritual: the incense ritual. Although not explicitly stated, the incense ritual must of necessity also occur before the high priest goes into the holy of holies a second time with the blood of the "goat for the Lord" (Lev 16:15–19) to make atonement for the people. On the basis of this understanding, it appears that Aaron gathers the bull's blood from the altar of burnt offering (implied in Lev 16:14), gathers coals from the altar of incense which is located just immediately outside the Most Holy Place, places the coals in the censer (v. 12), puts a large amount of "crushed sweet incense" (v. 12) on top of the coals and immediately enters the Most Holy Place.[173] This sequence would be hard to perform without some assistance, which must have occurred outside of the tent since no one should be within the tent when the high priest is inside (v. 17). This amount of incense produces a large cloud around him (Exod 30:34–38) and is meant to "cover the mercy seat that is upon the covenant" (Lev 16:13). It may also point to the amplified need for confession and

---

[171] Hartley, *Leviticus*, 234: "Yahweh looks down on the covenant through the blood dabbed on the Atonement Slate, leading him to govern his people out of mercy and forgiveness."

[172] Ibid.

[173] See Noth, *Leviticus*, 122 for a discussion on the apparent discrepancy in the timeline.

intercession (cf. Luke 1:8–13 where prayers accompany the incense ritual). The reason for this may be explained as follows: by entering the Most Holy Place, the high priest is exposed to the presence of Yahweh residing in the כַּפֹּרֶת; without this "shield" of incense, the high priest "will die" (v. 13). The shield of smoke has also been interpreted as representing the prayers of the people.[174] The use of incense during the rituals of the Day of Atonement is representative of intercessory prayer, as indicated in Ps 141:2: "Let my prayer be counted as incense before thee, and the lifting up of my hands as an evening sacrifice."[175]

---

[174] C. F. Keil, F. Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament*, The Pentateuch, vol. II (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1951), 399.

[175] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 238: "In Israel, the ascent of the smoke of incense became the visible manifestation of prayer." Milgrom also connects the use of incense here with the vision of the angel by the altar of incense in Revelation: "The symbolism is even more explicitly stated in later periods: 'And another angel came and stood before the altar who had a golden censer and he was given abundant incense to add to the prayers of all the holy ones on the golden altar before the throne. And the smoke of the incense arose with the prayers of the holy ones from the hand of the Angel of the Presence, And the angel took the censer, and filled it from the coals on the altar and hurled them onto the earth. And there were claps of thunder, and voices and streaks of lightning, and an earthquake' (Rev 8:3–5). The burning of incense in the various cults presumably carried the same symbolic values. Burning of incense to the queen of heaven was accompanied by requests for fertility and well-being (Jer 44:17). The presence of incense altars and burners in the same archaeological context as fertility figurines attests the popularity of such cults in Israel" (ibid.). For discussions on the use of incense in Israel, cf. C. Houtman, "On the Function of the Holy Incense (Exodus xxx 34–8) and the Sacred Anointing Oil (Exodus xxx 22–33)," *VT* 42 (1992): 458–65; J. Kügler, ed., *Die Macht der Nase* (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2000); U. Bechmann, "Duft im Alten Testament," in *Die Macht der Nase* (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2000), 49–98; Ian D. Ritchie, "The Nose Knows: Bodily Knowing in Isaiah 11.3," *JSOT* 87 (2000): 59–73; M. Haran, "The Uses of Incense in the Ancient Israelite Ritual," *VT* 10 (1960): 113–29; P. Heger, *The Development of Incense Cult in Israel*, BZAW 245 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997), 458–65; K. Nielsen, *Incense in Ancient Israel*, VTSup 38 (Leiden: Brill, 1986).

Lastly, the episode involving Korah, Dathan and Abiram described in Numbers 16:16–50, when a censer was used to stop a plague, indicates that incense also functioned as כִּפֶּר "atonement" for the people (Num 16:46–47).

The First Purification of the Holy Place: The Altar of Incense

The purification of the Holy Place was achieved by the purification of the altar of incense in the same manner as the Most Holy Place (implied in Lev 16:15, 20). According to Milgrom,

> The shrine [holy place] should be purged in the same manner as the adytum. Specifically, one object (the incense altar) is to be purged by direct contact with the purgation blood, and the rest of the shrine is to be purged by a seven-fold sprinkling of the blood on the shrine floor.[176]

This may be seen in Lev 16:20, in which "holy place, tent of the meeting and altar" represent the outward sequence of purification. After offering the bull for himself and for his house inside the Most Holy Place, Aaron must proceed to purify the altar of incense inside the Holy Place. There are questions as to which section of the tabernacle the phrase "tent of the meeting" refers (cf. Lev 16:18–19). Both Wenham[177] and Milgrom[178] agree that "the tent of the meeting" (Lev 16:20) refers specifically to the Holy Place. This conclusion is based in part on Exod 30:10: "Once a year Aaron shall perform the rite of atonement on its horns. Throughout your generations he shall perform the atonement

[176] Milgrom, *A Book of Rituals*, 171.

[177] Wenham, *Leviticus*, 232.

[178] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 1034–5.

for it once a year with the blood of the atoning sin offering [חַטָּאת]. It is most holy to the LORD."[179] The manner by which the "atonement" for the incense altar may be accomplished is not explained fully in Lev 16:18, but it most likely follows the same rite as purification prescribed for the sins of the hight priest in Lev 4:7, 18. From Lev 4, Milgrom avers that "There is, however, no need to specify [in Lev 16] how the purgation of the incense altar takes place … The purging of the shrine took place with the blood of the bull and goat separately, just as in the adytum."[180] Several pieces of philological evidence of the use of מִזְבֵּח, "altar", in Leviticus support this conclusion, mostly hinging on the expression לִפְנֵי יְהוָה, "before the Lord." Although not a technical term for the inner shrines, the expression refers mostly to the interior of the shrines of the tabernacle (cf. Exod 27:21; 28:35; 30:8; 34:34; 40:23, 25), especially in conjunction with מִזְבֵּח.[181] An exception may be found in 2 Chr 1:6: "Solomon went up there to the bronze altar before the LORD, which was at the tent of meeting, and offered a thousand burnt offerings on it." This clearly refers to the exterior altar where burnt offerings where made. But although the use of לִפְנֵי יְהוָה here is similar to its use in Lev 4 and 16, the altar used by Solomon is עַל־מִזְבַּח הַנְּחֹשֶׁת, "the altar of bronze," which is clearly not the incense altar, made out of acacia wood (Exod 30:7), and on which no sacrifices were

[179] Ibid., *Leviticus (Continental)*, 171.

[180] Ibid.

[181] Ibid., 238.

offered. So the pattern of seeing the לִפְנֵי יְהוָה + מִזְבַּח as referring to the incense altar seems to hold, unless a gloss is added to מִזְבַּח which then points to another altar. A similar expression is used in Lev 16:18: "Then he shall go out to the altar that is before the Lord [אֶל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ אֲשֶׁר לִפְנֵי־יְהוָה] and make atonement on its behalf, and shall take some of the blood of the bull and of the blood of the goat, and put it on each of the horns of the altar." This indicates that the conjoining of מִזְבַּח and לִפְנֵי־יְהוָה in Lev 16 refers to the altar of incense that is in the holy place. Evidence gathered from elsewhere in the OT also demonstrates this point. A sequential cleansing from the innermost shrine to exterior altar and the goat for Azazel rite is described in Lev 16:20: "When he has finished atoning for the holy place and the tent of meeting and the altar, he shall present the live goat." The altar of incense has to be purified with the blood of the bull and the blood of the goat "for the Lord." There are differences however. In the regular חַטָּאת rites on the incense altar the blood of a bull was sprinkled in the direction of the curtain seven times and daubed once on each of the four horns, while on the Day of Atonement the blood of the bull and goat was not only daubed once on its four horns but sprinkled seven times on the incense altar itself (Lev 16:18–19). It appears then that on the Day of Atonement the double processes of blood application have distinct meanings, both for "purification" and "consecration" (cf. Exod 29:36–37).[182] The

[182] Cf. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 1037. Milgrom believes the horns of the altar signify "the horns of a powerful animal (e.g., a bull or a ram) and are symbols of strength and force. Indeed, *qeren* in the Bible is invested with the same symbolism (1 Sam 2:1, 10; 2 Sam 22:3; Jer 48:25; Zech 2:4; Pss 75:5–6, 11; 89:18, 25; etc.). In Israel, the altar horns were clearly essential; to cut them off was to

objective of rites on the incense altar seems to be to atone for the high priest's transgression so that he becomes worthy to intercede for the people when presenting the incense.

As pointed out above, stipulations for the cleansing of the incense altar had already been given in Lev 4:7; the daubing of blood on the incense altar is attested in the חַטָּאת offerings for the anointed priest: "The priest shall put some of the blood on the horns of the altar of fragrant incense that is in the tent of meeting before the LORD; and the rest of the blood of the bull he shall pour out at the base of the altar of burnt offering, which is at the entrance of the tent of meeting." This ritual involved a sin by the high priest and required a purgation of the incense altar. The instructions are repeated verbatim in Lev 4:18, which deals with a grave sin committed by the whole congregation: "He shall put some of the blood on the horns of the altar that is before the LORD in the tent of meeting and the rest of the blood he shall pour out at the base of the altar of burnt offering that is at the entrance of the tent of meeting." The purgations of the incense altar are both intended to purge it from sins of the high priest and congregation in a similar fashion to the Day of Atonement. In both instances, the incense altar in the holy place is to be distinguished from the "altar of burnt offering that is *at the entrance* of the tent of the meeting" (italics supplied). In summary, the purification of the altar of incense represented a purification of the place where intercession is made for the people (cf. Luke 1:8–13). The validity of the intercession offered with incense at the altar

desecrate it (Amos 3:14). Their daubing with the purification blood meant the purgation of the entire altar, by the principle of *pars pro toto*" (Ibid., 236).

depends on the people's ability to demonstrate humility, sincere repentance and "affliction" through confession on the Day of Atonement and after reoccurring, unintentional sin (Lev 4). Displaying the incorrect attitude (e.g., as done by King Uzziah who "was false to the LORD his God" and attempted to offer incense; 2 Chr 26:16–21) could lead to swift judgment. Unrepented sin contaminates the altar of incense and intercession made there is invalid and allows impurity to encroach on the divine. Those who commit defiant and deliberate sins are to be cut off from the people (Lev 23:29; Num 15:30–31). Their sin is not to be allowed to continue to jeopardize the covenant.

The First Purification of the Outer Altar

The purification of the outer altar, i.e., the altar of burnt offering, is not spelled out in detail in Lev 16 but is rather implied in v. 20: "When he has finished atoning for the holy place and the tent of meeting and the altar, he shall present the live goat." The movement from inner shrine to outer shrine and outer altar appears clear here: after he has applied the blood of the bull and goat on the כַּפֹּ֥רֶת "so he shall do for the tent of meeting" (v. 16) which should be taken to mean the holy place. After this cleansing of the "tent of the meeting," i.e., the holy place, then he goes out and purifies the altar of burnt offering (v. 18) which is in the tabernacle's court. For this reason, the third element of the sequence, the "altar" most likely refers to the outer altar, which also undergoes purification by a seven-fold sprinkling on it (v. 19).

The Second Purification of the Most Holy Place: The Sacrifice for the People

After the high priest offers the bull for himself and applies its blood in the Most Holy Place, the Holy Place (the incense altar) and the outer altar, he slaughters the "goat for the Lord." The blood of the goat "for the Lord" is again brought "inside the veil," מִבֵּית לַפָּרֹכֶת, i.e., inside the Most Holy Place, and applied "as he did with the blood of the bull," i.e., seven times on top of the כַּפֹּרֶת and in front of the veil; this effects purgation for the Most Holy Place (vv. 15–16).

The Second Purification of the Holy Place: The Altar of Incense

Again, the second purification of the Holy Place is only implied in the text. It most likely follows the same seven-fold pattern detailed in the purification rites prescribed Lev 4:6, 7 and 18. Purification is achieved by daubing the blood of the "goat for the Lord" on behalf of the people on the four horns of the incense altar and sprinkling it before the פָּרֹכֶת seven times (cf. Lev 16:15, 20).

The Second Purification of the Outer Altar

The second purification of the altar of burnt offering is implied in v. 20, which describes a double process of purification with the blood of the bull of the high priest and the blood of the goat for the Lord.

The Rite of the "Goat for עֲזָאזֵל"

The most distinctive ritual of the Day of Atonement is the dismissal of the goat for Azazel. In the Day of Atonement ritual, the goat for Azazel,[183] also called the "live goat", is presented "before the Lord" after the blood purifications of the Most Holy Place, the Holy Place and the outer altar: "When he has finished atoning for the holy place and the tent of meeting and the altar, he shall present the live goat" (Lev 16:20; 21, 10), presumably in order to contrast it with the goat that was sacrificed "for the Lord" (vv. 8, 9). One goat is to be killed "for the Lord" and the other is "presented alive before the Lord" but sent "for Azazel."

So goes the ritual: after the high priest has presented the goat for the Lord in the three-pronged purification of the entire tabernacle by the application of the blood, he must present the "goat for Azazel."

---

[183] For a summary of the views on the meaning of "for Azazel," cf. Hartley, *Leviticus*, 236–238; Rooker, *Leviticus*, 216–217; Hayim Tawil, "Azazel The Prince of the Steppe: A Comparative Study," *ZAW* 92 (2009): 43–59; Dominic Rudman, "A Note on the Azazel-goat Ritual," *ZAW* 116 (2005): 396–401; Wolfgang Fauth, "Auf den Spuren des biblischen Azazel (Lev 16). Einige Residuen der Gestalt oder des Namens in jüdisch-aramäischen, griechischen, koptischen, äthiopischen, syrischen und mandäischen Texten," *ZAW* 110 (1998): 514–534; T. K. Cheyne, "The Date and Origin of the Ritual of the "Scapegoat," *ZAW* 15 (1895): 153–156; G. R. Driver, "Three Technical Terms in the Pentateuch," *JSS* 1 (1956): 97–105; O. Loretz, *Leberschau, Sündenbock, Asasel in Ugarit und Israel* (Altenberge: CIS Verlag, 1985), 50–57; Aron Pinker, "A Goat to go to Azazel," *JHS* 7 (2007): 1–25; Giovanni Deiana, "Azazel in Lv. 16," *Lateranum* 54 (1988): 16–33; Paolo Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History*, JSPSup 20 (Sheffield: Shefield Academic Press, 1990), 211–231; M. Görg, "Beobachtungen zum sogenannten Azazel-Ritus," *BN* 33 (1986), 10–16; Jean Noël Guinot, "L'Exégèse du bouc emissaire chez Cyrille d'Alexandrie et Theodore de Cyr," *Augustinium* 28 (1988): 16–33; R. Helm, "Azazel in Early Jewish Literature," *AUSS* 32 (1994): 217–26; Zane D. Hodge, "A historical and grammatical examination of Azazel in biblical and extra-biblical sources with special emphasis given to its meaning with the Hebrew preposition L'" (PhD diss., Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary, 2004); Aloo Osotsi Mojola, "The Chagga Scapegoat Purification Ritual and Another Rereading of the Goat of Azazel in Leviticus 16," *MelT* 50 (1999) 57–83.

This last ritual entails several steps: (1) the high priest lays both hands[184] on the head of the goat (v. 21); (2) the high priest confesses "over it all the iniquities of the people of Israel" (כָּל־עֲוֹנֹת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאֶת־כָּל־פִּשְׁעֵיהֶם לְכָל־חַטֹּאתָם, v. 21); (3) the goat is sent away to a "barren region" (אֶל־אֶרֶץ גְּזֵרָה, v. 22), first by the high priest and then by "the hand of a designated man" (בְּיַד־אִישׁ עִתִּי, v. 21), after it leaves the tabernacle compound;[185] (4) once the goat is sufficiently removed from the community and has arrived in the "desert" (בַּמִּדְבָּר) it is set free; and (5) it is sent "for Azazel," not "for the Lord." Although the "goat for Azazel" is also called a חַטָּאת (Lev 16:5), its purification effect differs from the goat of the Lord; no atoning blood is spilled and therefore, its חַטָּאת function is not effected by blood transfer or manipulation, but rather by the transference of the impurity from the sanctuary and from the Israelite camp into a "barren region" to where it belongs (v. 22).

The *m. Yoma* 6:2–6 describes additional activities in regard to the goat for Azazel rite that are not present in the biblical text. The order of events in the Mishnah is: (1) the

---

[184] For a discussion on the significance of placing both hands on the goat's head, cf. R. Péter, "L'imposition des mains dans l'Ancien Testament," *VT* 27 (1977): 48–55; see also Gane, *Cult and Character*, 244–246.

[185] Raymond Westbrook, "Who Led the Scapegoat in Leviticus 16:21?" *JBL* 127/3 (2008): 417–422, argues that the person designated to lead Azazel was also a criminal, similarly to ancient Hittite rituals. But this view is countered by the fact that the person leading the goat to Azazel had to bathe in order to return to the camp (Lev 16:26) and the Rabbinic tradition (*m. Yoma* 6:3) reveals that another priest was designated as the אִישׁ עִתִּי (Lev 16:21). Westbrook's case is built on thin and questionable implications of the Hebrew. For example, he simply states that "Thus *ish itiî* could designate a criminal man" (p. 421), but does not argue precisely why the suffix "*î*" should be thus interpreted.

goat for Azazel is led to a cliff; (2) the goat for Azazel is tied; and (3) the goat is pushed off and it dies. While this is occurring, the high priest waits for confirmation that the goat for Azazel has reached the desert in order to proceed with the ritual.[186]

Confession of Sin over the Goat for Azazel

The most striking feature of this ritual is that confession is made on the head of the "goat for Azazel."[187] According to D. P. Wright, "the means of designating the focus of the ritual action … in the case of the scapegoat it signifies: 'This goat is the recipient of the sins of the people.'"[188] In this transfer, the goat for Azazel receives the entire toxic load of sins from Israel (Lev 16:21–22) which have been accumulating throughout the year in the sanctuary and were just removed from it by the blood of the sacrifices; it receives those iniquities and bears them into a "barren region" (v. 22).[189] It is worth noting that the idea of placing one's sins "on their [own] heads" is found elsewhere in the OT (cf. Ezek 9:10; 11:21; 16:43; 22:31). Lev 16:21 contains what scholars call a "cultic confession motif" which entails "confessing one's sin, making some form of reparation,

---

[186] Cf. the discussion by Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 1046.

[187] Young, "The Impact," 371, suggests that the rite of confessing over the goat לַעֲזָאזֵל is "the feature of the DA which epitomized all they [the Rabbis] believed concerning expiation; that is, the forgiveness of all Israel's sins through repentant confession."

[188] D. P. Wright, "The Gesture of Hand-Placement in the Hebrew Bible and in Hittite Literature," *JAOS* 106 (1986): 436.

[189] The process of purification of the sanctuary by sending Azazel away with its load of sins is similar to emptying the kitchen trash (which was gradually filled with refuse) onto a garbage bin outside. Periodically, when the garbage bin is full to the brim, it is taken to the curb and hauled away by the garbage truck. The goat for Azazel functions as the garbage truck which hauls away the sins of Israel. (I thank my friend Dr. Gudmundur Olafsson for this useful comparison).

and offering an atoning sacrifice to expunge the sin."[190] This may have influenced post-exilic confession of sin as can been seen in Ezra 9:6–15; Neh 9:6–38.[191]

A comparison of the preceding purification rituals through the blood of the bull and the goat seems to indicate that the ritual of the "goat for Azazel" is somewhat disconnected from the process of purification with blood of the inner shrines and the outer altar. Considering Milgrom's reading that the blood of the purification offering acts as a "detergent"[192] which removes the sins from the sanctuary, it would seem more appropriate if that contaminated blood containing the sins removed from the sancta were to be applied to the "goat for Azazel." But not only does this ritual *not* involve the shedding of the goat's blood, the transfer of the sins is not achieved by means of contact with the contaminated blood previously used in purgation, but rather, the transfer of the sins is accomplished by "confession."[193] Baruch Schwartz attempts to resolve this

---

[190] Cf. Richard J. Bautch, "The Formulary of Atonement (Lev 16:21) in Penitential Prayers of the Second Temple Period," in *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretations in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*, eds. Thomas Hieke and Tobias Nicklas, TBN 15 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 34ff. According to Milgrom, confessing one's sins is a method to "convert deliberate sins into inadvertencies, thereby qualifying them for sacrificial expiation (Jacob Milgrom, *Cult and Conscience: The Asham and the Priestly Doctrine of Repentance* [Leiden: Brill, 1976], 119).

[191] Cf. D. K. Falk, "Scriptural Inspiration for Penitential Prayer in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Seeking the Favor of God Vol. 2: The Development of Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism*, eds. Mark J. Boda, D. K. Falk, R. A. Werline (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), 127–157.

[192] Cf. Milgrom, "The Preposition מִן," 161–163; ibid., "The Day of Atonement," 72.

[193] Kjell Aartun, "Studien zum Gesetz über den grossen Versöhnungstag Lv 16 mit Varianten: Ein ritualgeschichtlicher Beitrag," *ST* 34 (1980): 84–86, argues that in both rituals the "goat for the Lord" and the "goat for Azazel" function as one sacrifice. However, as Gane observes, one ritual is the result of the former (*Cult and Character*, 255).

conundrum by suggesting that the חַטָּאת rituals in the inner shrines transfer the sins of Israel onto the high priest and he then transfers them to the goat.[194] However, the notion that the high priest assumes any of this responsibility is not found anywhere in Lev 16. Here again Gane's position seems more on target; to him both rituals present "discontinuity" because of the addition of a new element in the Azazel ritual, namely, עָוֹן, which he takes to mean "guilt" or "culpability" (Lev 16:22).

As for why the live goat is not sacrificed, a plausible reason may have been to avoid confusing it with the goat "for the Lord", which was sacrificed. Spilling the blood of the live goat could easily construe its function as a blood purification "for the Lord", which clearly was not the intent of the ritual. Hartley posits that the goat is not to be killed because "it carries the people's sins, this goat was unclean, thus disqualifying it as a sacrifice."[195] Another possibility is that, since the goat is not led to the wilderness by the high priest himself, any intentional killing by someone else could be perceived as an attempt to usurp the office of the high priest. Thus, in this ritual the goat for Azazel is considered part of an "elimination" ritual embedded in the Day of Atonement, to which we now turn.

---

[194] Baruch Schwartz, "The Bearing of Sin in the Priestly Literature," in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom*, eds. David P. Wright, D. N. Freedman and A. Hurvitz (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 17–18.

[195] Hartley, *Leviticus*, 238.

The Origins of the Israelite Elimination Ritual

Janowski avers that the Azazel rite "belongs to the oldest core of the ritual tradition of Lev 16."[196] In several ways, the ritual of the goat for Azazel is in line with contemporary Canaanite elimination rites. At the occasion of the discovery in 1937 of an ivory plaque of Megiddo from the 13th century BCE, depicting a sphinx fighting a capride deity, Eissfeldt concluded that the discovery puts both images, the ritual of the goat for Azazel and the plaque, in the same "homely" environment of Canaan.[197] According to Wright, the fact that the ritual of the goat for Azazel shares roots with elimination rites in South Anatolia-North Syria and Mesopotamia may attest to its antiquity.[198] In these rites, animals such as cattle, sheep, goats, donkeys or mice, were utilized. Moreover, Janowski and Wilhelm posit that it is clear ("deutlich") that the rite has its roots in Ugaritic and Greek rites of elimination.[199] Schmuel Ahituv points out the similarities between the Babylonian New Year festival of *akîtu* and the ritual of the goat

---

[196] Bernd Janowski, "Azazel" in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999). Janowski and Wilhelm propose only three possible *Grundtypen* for the goat for Azazel rite: (1) Der nomadisch Ritualtyp; (2) der ägyptische Ritualtyp; and (3) der südanatolisch-nordsyrisch Ritualtyp. For a discussion of these possible influences on the goat for Azazel rite, cf. Janowski and Wilhelm, "Der Bock," 109–169.

[197] Cf. O. Eissfeldt, "Zur Deutung von Motiven auf den 1937 gefundenen phönizischen Elfenbeinarbeiten von Megiddo," *FF* 26 (1950): 1–4.

[198] David P. Wright, *The Disposal of the Impurity: Elimination Rites in the Bible and in Hittite and Mesopotamian Literature*, SBLDS 101 (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1987), 31–74.

[199] Janowski and Wilhelm, "Der Bock," 161: "Wie immer man sich den Überlieferungsweg dieser Ritualtradition vom spätbronzezeitlichen Nordsyrien ins eisenzeitliche Palästina/Israel im einzelnen vorzustellen hat—deutlich ist, daß sie religionsgeschichtlich zu dem hinter Lev 16, 10.21f stehenden Konzept der rituellen Elimination von Unheil paßt. Wie es auch in Ugarit und in Griechenland belegt ist."

for Azazel.[200] Furthermore, ancient Akkadian myths describe the guardian of the netherworld, Mamitu, as having the head of a goat.[201] Yet another similar rite occurs in a Hittite ritual that prescribes that a ram be driven away from a land afflicted with a plague in order to transfer the plague to the land of the enemy.[202]

The Greek φαρμακός Rites and the Ritual of the Goat for Azazel

The use of goats for purgation rituals in ANE cultures is well attested. At least one such custom involves the "expulsion" of a goat for purification. Sumerian tablets excavated at Ebla in 1975 brought to light textual evidence of rites very similar to the Israelite expulsion of the goat for Azazel. One such text reads: "[And] we purge the mausoleum. Before the entry of Kura and Barama a goat, a silver bracelet [hanging from

---

[200] Schmuel Ahituv, "Azazel," *EncJud*, 3:1001: "Within the Babylonian *akîtu* festival, a goat was substituted for a human sacrifice to Ereshkigal, goddess of the abyss. Here we see another instance of the rocky pit, though in a different mythic setting. Even more notable in this connection is an Akkadian magical text, which prescribes that a goat be tied to the bed of an afflicted individual, whose sickness would be transmitted to the goat which in turn would be driven to a desolate place, where it would be decapitated, and cast into a pit." Cf. Bergsma, *The Jubilee*, 31: "Of some significance *for yom kippur* and the jubilee is the *akîtu* festival. This festival, celebrated in the first and seventh months, was widespread throughout Mesopotamia from the mid-third millennium BCE through Hellenistic times, and concerned the ritual reentry of the patron deity into his or her city. The rituals included the purification/purgation of the temple, the enthronement of the deity, and ceremonial acts of 'justice' by which the deity asserted his authority over the city. In at least some cities, the high priest dragged the king before the deity, where he was made to prostrate himself and give account for his administration of affairs both of the cult and of social justice. The nature of the *akîtu* festival is yet another indication that in ancient Near Eastern societies there was not a divorce between cult and (social) ethics." Cf. also Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 1067–1070.

[201] Cf. E. A Speiser, "A Vision of the Nether World," in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, ed. James B. Pritchard (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969), 109.

[202] Cf. Albrecht Goetze, "Hitite Rituals, Incantations and Description of Festival," in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, ed. James B. Pritchard (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969), 347; cf. Sir James G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (London: Macmillan, 1914), 354–412; David Ferguson, "'I Never Did an Evil Thing': An Examination of Hittite Sin and Religious Sensibility," *SA* 8/1 (2010): 55–60.

the] goat's neck, towards the steppe of Alini we let her go."[203] The similarity between this rite and the purification of the sanctuary by the purgation of sin is quite striking. The term used for the purgation of the cell of the god Nabu on the fifth day of the feast is *kuppuru*, which most likely is connected to the Hebrew *kipper* from which is derived *kippurim*. The use of blood for purgation is also present in the Hittite *Ulippi* ritual.[204]

Jane Harrison describes the purification rite that accompanied the festivities of the ancient Ionian harvest festival of Thargelia, a feast to Apollo that took place in Ionia and Athens to celebrate the θαργελός, a term referring either to the first loaf of bread or a bowl with the first fruits of the harvest. Part of the celebrations of the Thargelia festival consists of a purification rite described as the φαρμακὸς rite, a name that seems to have the acquired the connotation of "refuse" and is used in connection with κάθαρμα, "cleansing", in ancient Greek sources.[205] The rite occurred on the 6th day of the month of Thargelion and was meant to cleanse the city or the harvest of impurity.[206] It involved

---

[203] Cf. Ida Zatelli, "The Origin of the Biblical Scapegoat Ritual: The Evidence of the Two Eblaite Texts," *VT* 48, no. 2 (1998): 254–263; Jan N. Bremmer, "Scapegoat Rituals in Ancient Greece," in *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion*, ed. Richard Burton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 271–93; Richard E. DeMaris, "Jesus Jettisoned," in *The New Testament in Its Ritual World,* ed. Richard E. DeMaris (London: Routledge, 2008), 91–111.

[204] Zatelli, "The Origin of the Biblical Scapegoat Ritual," 260.

[205] Cf. Jane E. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion* (Cleveland, OH: World Pub. Co., 1966), 97; ibid., "The Pharmakos," *Folklore* 27/3 (1916): 298–99. Morley Roberts, "The Pharmakos," *Folklore* 27/2 (1916): 218–24, believes that φαρμακός originated from the Turkic *vourmak* which means to "beat." He concludes that the later meaning of φαρμακός as "magician" stems from the meaning of expelling evils based on the φαρμακός rite. See also Deborah Steiner, "Diverting Demons: Ritual, Poetic Mockery and the Odysseus-Iros Encounter," *Classical Antiquity* 28/1 (2009): 71–100; Jacob Stern, "Scapegoat Narratives in Herodotus," *Hermes* 119/3 (1991): 304–11.

[206] Cf. Robert Parker, *On Greek Religion* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2011), 216–7.

choosing two φάρμακοι considered undesirable, ugly, destitute or "useless" (ἀχρήστους[207]) entities to act as "purifiers." These people were for a time treated in a special way and fed at public expense,[208] after which they were led out of the city, taking with them the impurity of the city. Ancient sources describe the rite in this manner:

> It was the custom at Athens to lead in procession two *pharmakoi* with a view to purification (καθαρμός); one for the man, one for the woman. The *pharmakos* for the men had black figs round his neck the other has white ones, and he [Helladios] says they were called *Sybachoi*. This purification was of the nature of an apotropaeic ceremony to avert pestilential diseases, and it took its rise from Androglos, the Cretan, when at Athens the Athenians suffered abnormally from a pestilential disease, the custom was observed of constantly purifying the city by pharmakoi.[209]

Hughes explains the effects of this rite thus: "The expulsion of pharmakoi was thought, it seems, to effect the cleansing of the polis from all defilements, which might bring crop failure, drought, or famine, but which also posed the more direct threat to humans of pestilence."[210] On the basis of the ancient sources' descriptions of the φαρμακός rite, Richard E. DeMaris proposes five characteristics which are shared by such "scapegoat" rites: (1) A threat is made to the community, in this case, an external one; (2) in response a community-member is designated to undergo status transformation over the course of

---

[207] Cf. *Scholia on Aristophanes, Knights* 1136c.

[208] Cf. Parker, *On Greek Religion*, 217; Bremmer, "Scapegoat Rituals in Ancient Greece," 273–277; B. H. McLean, *The Cursed Christ: Mediterranean Expulsion Rituals and Pauline Soteriology*, JSNTSup 126 (Shefield: Sheffied Academic Press, 1996), 65–104.

[209] Helladios in Photius *Bibl.* 534a quoted in McLean, *The Cursed Christ*, 89. For an extended discussion of the sources, see David D. Hughes, *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece* (London: Routledge, 1991), 139–165.

[210] Hughes, *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece*, 140.

the rite; (3) a ritual action that concentrates and directs divine power; (4) entails the exit of the designee from the community toward the enemy; and (5) the designated person's vicarious action that diverts disaster away from his community.[211] According to Burkert:

> The common pattern emerging from Hittite, Greek, and Roman ritual and myth is of course a familiar one, that of the 'scapegoat', a term which has become so familiar that some may not even remember that it goes back indeed to a ritual, described in the Old Testament, of Yom Kippur, the Day of Atonement.[212]

There seems to be an echo of this in *m. Yoma* 6:3–5, which bears some resemblance to the ancient φαρμακός rite. The Rabbis said:

> They delivered it to him that should lead it away … And they made a causeway for it because of the Babylonians who used to pull its hair, crying to it, "Bear [our sins] and be gone! Bear [our sins] and be gone!" Certain of the eminent folk of Jerusalem used to go with him to the first booth. There were ten booths from Jerusalem to the ravine [which was at a distance of] ninety *ris* (which measure seven and a half to the mile). At every booth they used to say to him, "Here is food, here is water," and they went with him from that booth to the next booth, but not from the last booth; for none used to go with him to the ravine; but they stood at a distance and beheld what he did.[213]

---

[211] DeMaris, "Jesus Jettisoned," 103. David Dawson, *Studies in Violence, Mimesis and Culture: Flesh Becomes Word: A Lexicography of the Scapegoat or, the History of an Idea* (East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 2013), 47, is off the mark when he suggests that what unites both the Azazel rite and the Greek φαρμακός is the idea of "vicarious sacrifice." The goat for Azazel rite did not constitute a "sacrifice" as the goat was not killed but simply carried evil to a distant location.

[212] Walter Burkert, *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual*, Sather Classical Lectures 47 (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press 1979), 65; Cf. Bradley McLean, "On the Revision of Scapegoat Terminology," *Numen* 37 (1990): 168–73, considers the historical background for the φαρμακός rite and proposes "scapeman" as a preferable term instead of "scapegoat."

[213] Cf. the commentary on Leviticus 16:10, 21–22 in the *Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan*: "The goat on which the lot for Azazel fell shall be set alive before the Lord to make atonement for the sinfulness of the people of the house of Israel, (and) to be sent to die in a rough and stony place […] which is in the desert of Soq, that is Beth Haduri […] And he [Aaron] shall let (it) [the scapegoat] go, in charge of a man who has been designated previously, to go to the desert *of Soq, that is Beth Haduri*. (22) The goat shall carry on himself all their sins to a desolate *place* […] and *the man* shall let the goat go into the desert *of Soq, and the goat shall go up on the mountains of Beth Haduri, and a blast of wind from before the Lord will thrust him down and he will die*" (Michael Maher, ed.,

Not all scholars, however, are convinced of the merits of the parallel between the ancient Greek rite and the goat for Azazel rite. Mary Douglas calls the Greek view a "Hellenized distortion" and instead thinks that the "right place to start" looking for a parallel is the book of Genesis "where the theme of conspicuously uneven destinies occurs prominently."[214] She refers here to the stories of Isaac and Ishmael and Jacob and Esau and thinks these present a better origin for the goat for Azazel rite because "atonement points to the central theological theme of the Pentateuch, a chosen people and the contrast with the people who have not been chosen."[215] Douglas rests on the story of Joseph as an ideal parallel to the go-away by capitalising on the *Book of Jubilees* where this view seems to have support. But by rejecting the view of Azazel as a demonic entity Douglas merely prefers *Jubilees* to the detriment of other Jewish texts where Azazel as a demonic figure is clearly in view, such as 1 *Enoch*. These intriguing possibilities will be analysed in the ensuing Excursing as well as in the next chapter where we deal with the Day of Atonement allusions in Jewish pseudepigraphal literature.

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan Leviticus, The Aramaic Bible, vol. 3 (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1994), 168–169.

[214] Mary Douglas, "The Go-Away Goat," in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*, eds. Rolf Rendtorff and Robert A. Kugler, FIOTL 3/VTSup 93 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2003): 134–135.

[215] Ibid.

The Identity of עֲזָאזֵל

The expression, "for Azazel," עֲזָאזֵל, remains one of the most elusive appellations in the OT.[216] It appears only four times in the OT, all of them in Lev 16 in connection with the rituals of the Day of Atonement (vv. 8, 10 [2x] and 26). There is marked disagreement on the etymology and meaning of עֲזָאזֵל and at least four interpretations have been proposed.[217] These may be categorized as: (1) the goat's function; (2) the place to which it was dispatched; (3) "removal"; and (4) a supernatural, demonic figure. Additional views on the identity of עֲזָאזֵל are presented in the *excursus* in the next chapter. In this section, the view taken in this study is explored, i.e., that עֲזָאזֵל is a symbol of a demonic figure that receives the culpability of Israel's sin on the Day of Atonement.

Keil and Delitzsch are categorical when they write: "The lots, one lot for Jehovah and one for Azazel, require unconditionally that *Azazel* should be regarded as a personal being, in opposition to Jehovah."[218] This view has the support of some Rabbis.

---

[216] Cf. Judit M. Blair, *De-Demonising the OT: An Investigation of Azazel, Lilith, Deber, Qeteb and Reshef in the Hebrew Bible* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009); Lester L. Grabbe, "The Scapegoat Tradition: A Study in Early Jewish Interpretation," *JSJ* 18 (1987): 152–167.

[217] Simon K. Landersdorfer, *Studien Zum biblischen Versöhnungstag* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1924), 19–20; Cf. Hartley, *Leviticus*, 237; Rooker, *Leviticus*, 216–217.

[218] C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary*, 398. By rejecting the impersonal notion of a "demonic figure," they continue by arguing that here they think "of the devil himself, the head of the fallen angels, who was afterwards called Satan; for no subordinate evil spirit could have been placed in antithesis to Jehovah as *Azazel* is here, but only the ruler or head of the kingdom of demons. The desert and desolate places are mentioned elsewhere as the abode of evil spirits (Isa Xiii, 21, xxxiv. 14; Matt Xii, 43; Luke xi. 24; Rev xviii. 2). The desert, regarded as an image of death and

In *b. Yoma* 67b, Azazel is considered to be a fallen angel: "Azazel—[it was so called] because it obtains atonement for the affair of Uza and Aza'el"[219], a view that also appears in Jewish pseudepigraphal literature. David P. Wright, following several others,[220] suggests that "understanding עֲזָאזֵל as an epithet of a demonic personality is the most reasonable"[221] view. Four arguments which support this view are: (1) if one goat is לַיהוָה and the other to לַעֲזָאזֵל (Lev 16:8), then it follows that עֲזָאזֵל is meant to represent an entity that stands in opposition to יהוָה;[222] (2) evidence from elsewhere in the OT that the wilderness is usually seen as the abode of demons (cf. Isa 13:21–22; 34:11–15 and Lev 17:7 which mentions sacrifices to שְׂעִירִם, goat-demons; see also *Baruch* 4:35; *Tob* 8:3; Matt 12:34; Luke 11:24; Rev 18:2); (3) the development of a demonic persona around the name עֲזָאזֵל in Jewish pseudepigraphal literature (cf. *1 Enoch* 8:1; 9:6l 10:4–8: 13:1; 54:5–

---

desolation, corresponds to the nature of evil spirits, who fell away from the primary source of life, and in their hostility to God devastated the world, which was created good, and brought death and destruction in their train" (ibid.). See also M. H. Segal, "The Religion of Israel before Sinai," *JQR* 53 (1962/63): 250.

[219] Isidore Epstein, *Soncino Hebrew-English Talmud*, Yoma 67b (London: The Soncino Press, 1948).

[220] Cf. Wenham, *Leviticus*, 234. Wenham lays out three reasons why Azazel should be understood as a demon who lived in the wilderness: (1) Azazel is in direct contrast with the Lord (v. 8); (2) later Jewish literature sees Azazel as a demon; and (3) the OT looks on the wilderness as the haunt of demons and similar creatures (Lev 17:7; Isa 13:21; 34:14; cf. Matt 12:43).

[221] D. P. Wright, "Azazel," *AYBD*, 1:536.

[222] Cf. Hartley, *Leviticus*, 238: "Azazel is some type of being rather than a place."

6: 55:4; 69:2 *Apoc Ab* 13:6–14223; 14:4–6; 20:5–7; 22:5; 23:11; 29:6–7; 31:5); and (4) the etymology of the word which appears to point to a "metathesized form" of "*zz*," "strong" and an alternative rendering the ל in לַעֲזָאזֵל not as a *lamed auctoris* but as the noun, "god," i.e., "strong god."[224]

We now turn to the four OT passages quoted above which mention שְׂעִירִם, "goat-demons". (1) In Lev 17:7 the Israelites are warned against sacrificing outside of the confines of the tabernacle, "so that they may no longer offer their sacrifices for goat-demons [שְׂעִירִם], to whom they prostitute themselves." (2) King Jeroboam's wickedness is described in 2 Chr 11:15 thus: "… and [he] had appointed his own priests for the high places, and for the goat-demons (שְׂעִירִם). (3) Isaiah 13:21 is part of an oracle against Babylon in which it is predicted that in its ruins, "ostriches will live, and there goat-demons [שְׂעִירִם] will dance". (4) In a similar oracle against Edom, (Isa 34:14) it is prophesied that "wildcats shall meet with hyenas, goat-demons [שָׂעִיר] all call to each

[223] Cf. Andrei A. Orlov, "The Eschatological Yom Kippur in the Apocalypse of Abraham: Part I: The Scapegoat Ritual," in *Symbola Caelestis. Le liturgique et paraliturgique dans le monde Chrétien*, eds. A. Orlov and B. Lourié, Scrinium 5 (Piscataway, NY: Gorgias Press, 2009), 3–35.

[224] Cf. B. Janowski and G. Wilhelm, "Der Bock, der die Sünden hinausträgt: Zur Religionsgeschichte des Azazel-Ritus Lev 16,10, 21f," in *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien und dem Alten Testament*, eds. K. Koch and G. Wilhelm (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 109–169; M. Görg, "Beobachtungen zum sogenannten Azazel-Ritus," *BN* 33 (1986): 10–16; ibid., "Asasel," NBL 1 (1991): 181–182; Grabbe, "The Scapegoat Tradition," 195–233.

other; there too Lilith [a female demon-goddess, [225]לִילִית] shall repose, and find a place to rest." It is important to note that the coupling of goat-demons and Lilith led the LXX translators to render both words as δαιμόνια, "demons." A fifth passage could be added to this list, 2 Kgs 23:8, in which is described the reforms of king Josiah: "he broke down the high places of the gates [הַשְּׁעָרִים] that were at the entrance of the gate of Joshua the governor of the city." Scholars have pointed out that the "high places of the gates that were at the entrance of the gate" does not make sense and have proposed different readings.[226] In 1882 Hoffmann proposed that the הַשְּׁעָרִים be read as "high places of the [הַשְּׂעִירִם] goat-demons", a reading that persisted among scholars until recently.[227] Considering the fact the שְׂעִירִם seem to be associated with Israel's idolatrous practices, this reading is plausible.

In Matt 12:43, Jesus expresses the view of the desert as being the abode of demons: "When the unclean spirit has gone out of a person, it wanders through waterless regions looking for a resting place, but it finds none." This is a concept borrowed from the OT (cf. Isa 13:21–22; 34:11–15). According to the synoptic gospels,

---

[225] Cf. Walter C. Kaiser, "לִילִית," in *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, eds. R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke (Chicago: Moody Press, 1999), 479.

[226] N. Snaith, "The meaning of שׂעירם," *VT* XXV/1 (1975): 115–118; J. A. Emerton, " 'The High Places of the Gates' in 2 Kings XXIII 8," *VT* 44 (1994): 455–67; Lauren A. S. Monroe, "A 'Holiness' Substratum in the Deuteronomistic Account of Josiah's Reform," *JHS* 7 (2011): 45–49.

[227] H. Hoffmann, "Kleinigkeiten," *ZAW* 2 (1882): 175. Hoffmann does not present philological evidence for reading הַשְּׂעִירִם in 2 Kgs 23:8 but simply points to "comparable" ("vgl.") usage in Lev 17:7 and 2 Chr 11:15.

Jesus was led εἰς τὴν ἔρημον, "into the desert," in order to be tempted ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου (Matt 4:1; Mar 1:12-13; Luke 4:1–2, ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ). The connection between ἔρημον and διάβολος (Mark 1:13 has ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ) in the passage seems to corroborate the ancient Jewish view that the desert was the abode of demons.

Although it appears clear that Leviticus and Isaiah acknowledge the existence of "goat-demons" (Lev 17:7; Isa 13:21; 34:14), of which Azazel may have been an early symbol, the idea that Azazel was a fallen angel developed slowly in Judaism, appearing only in the intertestamental pseudepigraphal literature. Hyam Maccoby calls such a notion "scandalous" to Israel's monotheism.[228] It is however virtually undeniable that the identity of the goat for Azazel evolved from sin-bearer in the Pentateuch to a carrier of sins to their demonic originator. Gruenwald acknowledges this fact: "Whether we like it or not, what has become the central ritual in the Jewish calendar—the Day of Atonement—engages in a ritual that takes for granted the realness of the demonic."[229]

The OT passages discussed above that refer to "goat-demons" appear to indicate a pervasive notion that Israel was surrounded by demons which inhabited desolated places. Levine's study of Akkadian *uttukû lemmuti* ("evil spirits" or "incantations") texts

---

[228] Hyam Maccoby, *Ritual and Morality: The Ritual Purity System and its Place in Judaism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 90–91: "That the Scapegoat is sent into the domain of a demon or minor deity called Azazel, carrying the sins of the community, is too much of a scandal to be admitted into monotheistic consciousness."

[229] Ithamar Gruenwald, *Rituals and Ritual Theory in Ancient Israel* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 220.

shows that the belief in demons as denizens of the "netherworld" was widespread in ancient Mesopotamia.[230] One such *uttukû lemmuti* brings the following incantation:

> Let your pure and exalted mouth say, from the body of the sufferer go away. O all evil, arise and depart to the place of Ereskigal, take away the skin of the scapegoat from the body of the sufferer, into the carrefour, into the wide street [i.e. underworld] throw [it], so that all evil return to the netherworld.[231]

Tawil[232] has analysed in detail Akkadian and Ugaritic purification rites. His list of Akkadian parallels to the goat for Azazel rite and incantations could be summarized as follows:

1. Demons, entities from the "netherworld," are the source of evil, destruction and desolation, iniquities and sins, diseases and sicknesses;
2. Demons inhabit the realm of lack of life and vitality;
3. Demons are described as "fierce" (e.g., Akk. *ezzu*);
4. This netherworld has easy access to the upper, real world, perhaps through a crack in the ground;
5. The netherworld where these evil spirits roam is known as the "steppeland";
6. Such demons must not be allowed to remain in the land of the living, but must be sent back to their place of origin;
7. Disease and evil can be transferred to a substitute, often an animal such as a

---

[230] Cf. Baruch Levine, "Kippurim," *EI* 9 (1969): 88–95.

[231] Cf. O. R. Gurney, *Babylonian Prophylactic Figures and Their Rituals*, Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology 22 (Liverpool: University Press, 1935), 86.

[232] Tawil, "Azazel," 48–52. Cf. also Hanson, "Rebellion in Heaven," 205.

goat in Babylonian *utukkû lemmuti* texts;

8. Healing comes when the demons are sent away;

9. Demons must be sent back to their specific localities in order for the evil to stop.

Tawil points out how these incantation rites have a clear parallel with the punishment of Azazel described in 1 *Enoch* 10:3–8:

> And now instruct him in order that he may flee, and his seed will be preserved for all generations. And secondly the Lord said to Raphael, "Bind Azaz'el hand and foot (and) throw him into the darkness!" And he made a hole in the desert which was in Duda'el and cast him there; he threw on top of him rugged and sharp rocks. And he covered his face in order that he may not see light; and order that he may be sent into the fire on the great day of judgment. And give life to the earth which the angels have corrupted. And he will proclaim life for the earth: that he is giving life to her. And all the children of the people will not perish through all the secrets (of the angels)," which they taught to their sons. And the whole earth has been corrupted by Azaz'el's teaching of his (own) actions; and write upon him all sin.[233]

The last clause, "to him ascribe all sin", is strikingly similar to the transfer of sins to the goat for Azazel. Tawil draws several important comparisons between the description of the banishment of Azazel in 1 Enoch and the *uttukû lemmuti* texts above: (1) the use darkness as a description of the netherworld; (2) the imagery of binding up the demon; (3) the casting away of the demon to the netherworld; (4) the imprisonment of the demon in the netherworld (lit. grave); and (5) the dispatch of the demon and the substitutionary elements to the steppeland—to dig/open a hole therein.[234] In conclusion,

---

[233] *OTP*, 17–18.

[234] Tawil, "Azazel," 53.

Tawil states: "Accordingly, in the light of the Akk. magical/incantation texts involving a formulaic prescription against demons/diseases, one may venture to assume that the story employed in the Book of Enoch may well go back to an antique source."[235] For Tawil, the rite of the goat for Azazel points to the god Môt, "the god of death and Hades."[236]

The above is significant for our study of Azazel for two main reasons: (1) it involves the notion of removal of sin to its source in a desolate place; and (2) the receiver is a demonic character. Tawil writes: "the demonic fallen angel Azazel is being disposed of in a similar way that demons and other hostile powers are treated in the above Akk. magical and incantation texts."[237] In light of these, in addition to seeing Azazel as the conjunction of עז and זז, Tawil identifies Azazel with the notion of a fierce god, more specifically, Môt, the Canaanite god of the underworld. He cites compelling philological evidence for his case: (1) in Job 1:7 and 2:2, when dealing with the roaming around of הַשָּׂטָן, the expression מִשּׁוּט בָּאָרֶץ וּמֵהִתְהַלֵּךְ בָּהּ is used. This expression echoes the Akk. *alaku-šâtu*, i.e., "verbs used to describe the movement of demons in the steppeland"[238]; (2) Ugaritic texts use the expression *kbd ars* for the "bottom of the netherworld," which is semantically equivalent to מִבֶּטֶן שְׁאוֹל, "belly of sheol" in Jonah

---

[235] Ibid., 55; cf. also page 47.

[236] Ibid., 56.

[237] Ibid., 52.

[238] Ibid., 49.

2:3; (3) the Ugaritic *gr//gb'* parallels the Akk. *šadû-huršanu* referring to the Mesopotamian "cosmic mountain of the netherworld"; and (4) the Hebrew בַּמִּדְבָּר is equivalent to the Akk. *seru* "the steppeland of the steppe." Some of the examples given by Tawil are less convincing than the evidence brought to bear on the meaning of Azazel by the Akk. terms describing the demons of the underworld such as *ezzu*, *šamru*, *nadru*, *gassu*, *gaspu*, *dannu* which mean, respectively, "fierce, furious, raging, ferocious, overbearing, savage." At least one such incantation goes thus: *gallê šamruti ana erset la târi atarrad kakkeya ezzuti elšunu ušazzaza*—"I shall drive the raging demons to the netherworld, I will array my furious weapons against them."[239] Tawil points out that the notion of raging demons is described using the Akk. *gasasu*. The semantic relationship between *ezzu/gasasu* and the Hebrew זז in עֲזָאזֵל seems unmistakable, which leads Tawil to conclude that עֲזָאזֵל can only mean "fierce god."[240] He concludes that עֲזָאזֵל is "an epithet of Môt which may also signify the location of his domain, the netherworld itself."[241]

Tawil's philological evidence in support of rendering עֲזָאזֵל as "a fierce god" is intriguing. What is less convincing is his attempt to pinpoint exactly to which "god" the term refers, in this case, the Mesopotamian Môt. Tawil follows H. Bauer's suggestion

---

[239] Ibid., 57.

[240] Ibid.

[241] Ibid., 59.

that the god Môt is in view in the name Azmaveth, עַזְמָוֶת, given to several OT persons.[242] However, Bauer argues that Môt is the "Getreidegott," i.e., the "god of the grain." This poses a serious problem for Tawil's attempt at precision, for if Môt is the "god of the grain," how can he be associated with a god who actually inhabits the desert in Lev 16? Moreover, if Môt as the "god of the netherworld" is in view in the name עַזְמָוֶת, this could weaken the possibility that עֲזָאזֵל is a reference to Môt, since it seems unlikely, or at least, without evidence, that the Levitical law-giver would attempt to "veil" his name in the Day of Atonement rite.

Despite some weakness, however, it is possible to agree with most of the philological evidence articulated by Tawil and disagree with Blair when she states that "[w]hile Tawil's study is valuable in highlighting the parallels between the Enoch material and ancient Mesopotamian magical texts, it does not illuminate the passage in Lev 16."[243] She accepts that Azazel is viewed as a demon in Second Temple Judaism, while concluding that this "does not mean that this must be the case in Leviticus 16."[244]

---

[242] H. Bauer, "Die Gottheiten von Ras Schamra," *ZAW* 51 (1933): 95. Cf. 2 Sam 23:31; 1 Chr 11:33; Ezra 2:23–24; 1 Chr 8:36; 9:42; 12:3; 27:25; Neh 7:28; 12:29.

[243] Blair, *De-Demonising the OT*, 23.

[244] Ibid. Blair is unclear about which position she herself takes on Azazel when she states at one point: "The live goat was sent away for *Azazel* into the desert, so *Azazel's* dwelling place was the desert. Thus *Azazel* was a lesser supernatural being who lived in the desert" (*De-Demonising the OT*, 60), while elsewhere she states that "[d]espite the various efforts of scholars to prove otherwise, there is no evidence that a mythological figure was behind this term *Azazel's* significance in Lev 16 is its 'symbolic' function" (62). Indeed, Azazel can only be understood as a "symbol" since most of the Day of Atonement ritual was symbolic of earthly vs. heavenly realities, and because we do not possess more information on its precise identity. However, this does not detract from the fact that it may have symbolized a supernatural entity, which was somehow involved with Israel's sin, impurity and guilt since it is at the very center of the removal ritual. As she herself admits, "The significance of *Azazel* is

Contrary to Blair's assessment, Tawil's parallels with Cananite deities, when viewed in light of the development of Jewish understanding of Azazel as a demonic figure in later Jewish literature, provide the next best "internal" evidence, from the point of view of Jewish tradition and the best explanation for the presence of a demonic figure as the carrier/remover of Israel's sins, iniquities and guilt to its rightful place. The use of Azazel by the author of *1 Enoch* as a demon may in fact bely its very antiquity, something that may not have been fully explored by the Levitical law-giver in his laconic explanation of the Day of Atonement in Lev 16. In support of the antiquity of the view of Azazel as a demon of the desert, medieval rabbi Ramban brings the illuminating comment:

> Now the Torah has absolutely forbidden to accept them as deities, or to worship them in any manner. However, the Holy One, blessed be He, commands us that on the Day of Atonement we should let loose a goat in the wilderness, to that "prince" which rules over wastelands, and this [goat] is fitting for it because he is its master, and destruction and waste emanate from his power, which in turn is the cause of the stars of the sword, wars, quarrels, wounds, plagues, division and destruction ... Also in his portion are the devils called "destroyers" in the language of our Rabbis, and in the language of our Scripture "satyrs [demons]."[245]

Israel Schur calls Azazel the "König aller Wüstendämonen … der schrecklichen Azazel."[246] But O. Loretz warns that Lev 16 does not quickly allow rendering Azazel as a

---

not who he [sic] is but what he [sic] symbolizes. In many ways his role is the opposite of Yahweh's. Like Yahweh, he is a deity, though it is made clear that he does not possess the same power. Yahweh receives sacrifice, *Azazel's* goat is not a sacrifice; Yahweh dwells in the very centre, the Holy of Holies, *Azazel's* place is on the outside, the desert; Yahweh's dwelling place is pure, the desert is where all impurities can be found; worshipping Yahweh brings life to his people, following other gods brings death to them. Yahweh establishes order, *Azazel* is the bringer of chaos" (61).

[245] H. D. Shevel, ed., *Ramban's Commentary on the Pentateuch* (Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kcok, 1969), li, 89; cf. Pinker, "A Goat to Azazel," 6.

[246] Cf. Israel Schur, *Versöhnungstag und Sündenbock: Jom-ha-kippurim und Sair-la-'azazel* (Helsingfors: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 1933), 46.

Wüstendämon, "desert demon." According to him, Azazel is portrayed in Lev 16 as "eine Potenz neben Jahwe und gleich diesem ohne Ortsbestimmung."[247] In support of Azazel's supernatural, demonic identity, Fauth quotes Late Antiquity Aramaic incantation bowls containing the letters עזה, *Aza*, Greek texts of the Logos of Selene which contain αζα and αζαζ(α) as well as a medicinal amulet which reads αζαζ αραθ βαχυ.[248]

Considering the above analysis, the question that immediately emerges is, if the belief in "goat-demons" was common in Mesopotamia at this time, why does the writer of Lev 16 choose to ignore the more common שְׂעִירִם in favour of the cipher עֲזָאזֵל? Several possibilities could be advanced. First, the Levitical law-giver could be trying to avoid the association of a purification rite connected to the holy tabernacle of Yahweh with a pagan deity and mythological figure that has severe negative connotations, such as the term שְׂעִירִם. Second, using עֲזָאזֵל could be an attempt to avoid the notion of an "offering" to a pagan deity while maintaining the reference to a being in opposition to Yahweh in a purification rite. Finally, the more obscure term עֲזָאזֵל could be a useful alternative employed in order to ascribe the ultimate origin of sin and impurity to a

---

[247] Loretz, "Asasel in Ugarit," 52: "a power lower than Yahweh and as he, without a specific location."

[248] Fauth, "Auf den Spuren des biblischen Azazel," 517. Cf. J. B. Segal and E. C. D. Hunter, *Aramaic and Mandaic Incantation Bowls in the British Museum* (London: British Museum Press, 2000); Erica D. Hunter, "Who Are Demons?," *SEL* 15 (1998): 95–115. Hunter quotes several such demonic entities such as devils, demons, spirits, amulets-spirits, idol-spirits, goddesses and *liliths* (96). To these we could add the *'aluqah* of Prov 30:15 which according to Shearman and Curtis is a vampire-demon, an interpretation based on the Targum rendering Ps 12:8. (Susan Lee Shearman and John Briggs Curtis, "Divine-Human Conflicts in the OT," *JNES* 28/4 [1969]: 234).

demonic figure yet unknown to Israel. In this case, the choice of a goat to send back to עֲזָאזֵל may offer a limited, highly controlled parallel with the contemporary pagan goat-demon mythology, while at the same time maintaining the integrity of the Israelite purification rite and its broader implications in theodicy.[249] In other words, if the sin is removed from the offender and from the sanctuary, its effects and consequences must be ultimately transferred somewhere or to someone. The popular expression, "there is no such thing as a free lunch", is appropriate at this point: sins do not simply disappear into thin air; someone must pay the ultimate penalty for them. Hartley suggests perceptively:

> If Azazel was a demon, this rite means that the sins carried by the goat were returned to this demon for the purpose of removing them from the community and leaving them at their source in order that their power or effect in the community might be completely broken.[250]

This view is also corroborated by the Shmuel Ahituv when he writes: "The demonic identification would indicate that the original purpose of the ritual was to get rid of the evil by banishing it to its original source."[251] Duhm explains this phenomenon thus:

> Wie allmählich die fremden Götter zu Ungöttern, zu Nichtsen wurden, so verloren die früher mehr oder weniger selbständing gedachten Kakodämonen mehr und mehr ihre Unabhängigkeit, wurden zu Dienern Jahves degradiert oder auch wohl ganz beseitigt.[252]

---

[249] Cf. Hartley, *Leviticus*, 238: "The fact that these satyrs were thought to be goat-like favors the possibility that Azazel stands for one of these demons, especially given the fact that part of the name Azazel in Heb. means "goat. … While the Old Testament is very careful not to personify evil in a figure such as Satan, it does recognize that there are cosmic forces hostile to Yahweh."

[250] Hartley, *Leviticus*, 238.

[251] Ahituv, "Azazel," 1002.

[252] Hans Duhm, *Die bösen Geister im Alten Testament* (Tübingen, Leipzig: Mohr/Siebeck, 1904), 32. Cf. also William Caldwell, "The Doctrine of Satan: I. In the OT," *BW* 41/1 (1913): 29–33.

Duhm's conclusion that the Canaanite "evil spirits" (Kakodämonen) had been stripped of their "divine" prerogatives and become degraded to entities inferior to Yahweh seems on target. Milgrom writes: "Elimination rites are ... employed to drive the demons from human habitations and back to the wilderness, which is another way of saying that the demons are driven back to their point of origin, the underworld ..."[253] A similar interpretation is given by the rabbis in the *Siphra* (Torat Kohanim) when commenting on the "calf of the herd" in Lev 9:2: "You must give [it] into the mouth of Satan. Send a gift ahead, before you enter the Temple, lest he hates you upon your entering the Temple."[254]

If Azazel in fact represents a demon or a supernatural being within the confines of the tabernacle ritual, the author of Lev 16 is careful to relegate this demon to a much lower status than Yahweh. Milgrom agrees: "The plausible explanation is that Azazel is the name of a demon who has been eviscerated of his demonic powers by the Priestly legislators."[255] This can be verified in several ways in Lev 16. First, the precise identity of Azazel is not clear in the text. Thus the author avoids dedicating any special attention to explaining who this entity entails. Yahweh remains at the centre of the Day of Atonement. Second, the goat's blood is not spilled and since life is in the blood in the Jewish ritual system (Lev 17:11), this entity, whoever it is, is not seen as worthy of

---

[253] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 1072.

[254] Cf. Gruenwald, *Rituals and Ritual Theory in Ancient Israel*, 219.

[255] Ibid., 1021; ibid., *Leviticus (Continental)*, 168–169.

receiving any type of atonement through blood. Third, because the sins are transferred to the goat, indeed, "all the iniquities of the people of Israel, and all their transgressions, all their sins" (Lev 16:21), the only thing this entity is worthy of receiving is the toxic load of the sins of Israel. This is not an "appeasing" offering or an honourable gift. Hertz objects to this view on the basis that Lev 17:7 prohibits offering of sacrifices to demonic entities. He concludes that "homage to a demon of the wilderness cannot therefore be associated with the holiest of the Temple rites."[256] But the goat for Azazel can hardly be construed as an "homage" to a wilderness demon.[257] The live goat is full of the sins of the people which have been transferred to it by the laying on of Aaron's hands. A similar transfer of culpability is part the condemnation of the blasphemer in Lev 24:14 as well as in the personal responsibility of sinners for their own faults (cf. Ezek 9:10; 11:21; 16:43; 22:31). The goat carries a toxic load of sins. Fourth, the goat is not a substitute for Israel; a vicarious sacrifice is not implied in this ritual since the goat for the Lord has already assumed this place. Azazel only carries the notion of punishment and judgment.[258]

---

[256] J. H. Hertz, *Leviticus* (London: Oxford University Press, 1932), 156.

[257] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 1021: "Azazel himself is deprived of any active role: he neither receives the goat nor attacks it."

[258] Cf. ibid., *Leviticus 1–16*, 1020. Ibid., *Leviticus 1–16*, 1041 writes: "The two-handed ceremonial instead serves a transference function: to convey, by confession, the sins of Israel onto the head of the goat." Cf. also ibid., *Leviticus (Continental)*, 171. The meaning of "transference" is attested in other occurrences of the two-handed ceremonial in the OT, cf. Num 27:18–23; Deut 34:9); ibid., *Leviticus 1–16*, 43: "The goat is simply the symbolic vehicle for dispatching Israel's sins to the wilderness (16:21–22)"; Hugh Nibley, *Temple and Cosmos: Beyond This Ignorant Present* (Salt Lake City; Provo: Deseret Book, 1992), 75: observes: "In the scapegoat, Israel recognized that the enemy they were driving with stones and curses was the evil that was in themselves. They were the bad guys."

Milgrom explains: "Azazel suffers the fate of all angels and spirits in Scripture. They can represent the powers of the physical world (e.g., Ps 104:4; 148:8) but they are not deified (Deut 4:19; 17:3; Job 5:1) and their worship is prohibited (Exod 20:4–5; 22:9; Deut 5:7–8)."[259] This view is supported by Zatelli when she writes that the Azazel "rite is not a sacrifice; it represents a struggle against chaos, against transgressions and disorder, which threaten the harmony and safety of man, and it expels them to the desolation to which they pertain."[260]

The view of Azazel as representative of a demonic entity can be seen as early as the pseudepigraphal book of 1 *Enoch*. This view also influenced other Jewish writings of the time. In the Christian *Apocalypse of Abraham* Azazel is called a "dragon" (*Apoc Ab* 23:7). Hall argues that the *Apocalypse of Abraham* indicates that Azazel continued to be viewed as one who deceives in later Jewish/Christian literature.[261] From the standpoint of Christian theology, this view has been argued since at least the time of Origen[262] and has been followed by a number of scholars at least since Keil and Delitzsch[263], Nestle[264] and

---

[259] Milgrom, *Leviticus (Continental)*, 169.

[260] Zatelli, "The Origin of the Biblical Scapegoat Ritual," 263.

[261] Cf. Robert G. Hall, "The 'Christian Interpolation' in the Apocalypse of Abraham," *JBL* 107/1 (1988): 107–112.

[262] *Contra Celsum* 6:43.

[263] Keil and Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary*, 398.

[264] E. Nestle, "Azazel," in vol. 2 of *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, ed. J. Hastings (New York, NY: Charles Scribner and Sons, n.d.), 282–283.

more recently Gane.[265] Feinberg objects to this view, saying that "[i]t cannot be shown that the name Azazel occurs in the OT as the name of Satan or any evil spirit for that matter."[266] Conversely Nestle argues that "[i]f one reads Lev. chap. 16, with an open mind, the impression is that Azazel must be related to Yahweh in something of the same way as Ahriman to Ormuzd, or Satan."[267] The appellation שָׂטָן as used in the OT simply means "adversary" (cf. Num 22:22; 1 Sam 29:4; 1 Chr. 21:1; 2:1; Zech 3:1, 2). Its use with the article הַשָּׂטָן in Job 1:6; 2:2 is credited with giving this entity a personality and could be the Vorlage for seeing him as the one who opposes "the Lord" in Lev 16.

The use of the Greek term ἄβατος in Lev 16:22 and in several passages of Jeremiah in contexts of restoration seems to imply that removal of sin and spiritual renewal are interconnected.[268] Hartley conflates both the "living bird" (Lev 14:7) ritual and the "living goat" ritual as having "the same basic intent."[269] He continues by saying that "[t]he initial meaning of this ritual was to provide a visual representation to the assembly of the reality that on this day their sins had been completely wiped out and the

---

[265] Cf. Gane, *Cult and Character*, 247; ibid., *Leviticus and Numbers* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2004), 288–290.

[266] Feinberg, "Scapegoat," 330.

[267] Nestle, "Azazel," 283.

[268] Cf. Albert Pietersma, "Greek Jeremiah and the Land of Azazel," in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran and the Septuagint*, eds. Peter W. Flint, Emanuel Tov and James C. VanderKam, VTSup 101 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 403–413.

[269] Hartley, *Leviticus*, 238.

power of these sins was terminated forever."[270] This is especially important because these occurrences also coincide with the presence of ἔρημος, ἐρήμοσις, ἀρά and κατάρασις in the LXX (cf. Jer 2:6; 12:10, cf. 28:43; 32:4; 51:6, 22; 29:14; 39:43 49:18; 51:22). As Hanson avers:

> Comparative data would suggest that Azazel was originally more than a desert location to which a scapegoat was sent, but was instead a god (or demon) perhaps consigned to the netherworld and appearing in desert places, to whom sacrifices had to be made to placate a malevolent disposition and satisfy a voracious appetite. [271]

The view of Azazel as a demonic figure counters the almost consensual, evangelical view that Azazel is a type of Christ. As will be argued in this study, Azazel is most likely an equivalent to הַשָּׂטָן in Jewish literature and especially in Revelation (cf. the *excursus* for the additional views on the identity of עֲזָאזֵל).

After the Goat for Azazel Rite

Aaron is instructed to return to the tabernacle after the goat for Azazel is led into the desert, (Lev 16:23), to remove his ritual garments (the plain linen garments), bathe himself "in a holy place"[272] (v. 24), which is presumably inside the compound of the

---

[270] Ibid.

[271] Paul D. Hanson, "Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel, and Euhemeristic Heroes in 1 Enoch 6–11," *JBL* 96 (1977): 222.

[272] Milgrom, *Leviticus (Continental)*, 172 explains the final washing: "This is the only time that immersion after sacrifice is mentioned. Its purpose cannot be the removal of the impurity that the high priest purportedly removed from the scapegoat; he is immune to the impurity that he removes. Only one plausible reason remains: to remove the 'super-holiness' that he contracted by entering the adytum. This premise would account both for the discarding of his supercharged

tabernacle, and to put on "his garments," אֶת־בְּגָדָיו (Lev 16:24; notice the absence of בַּד), which Milgrom understands as his regular "ornate garments."[273] *M. Yoma* 7:3 describes these as the "golden garments" which indicates a change back to the regular high priestly attire. The significance of the change of clothing back to the regular high priestly garments after the banishment of the goat for Azazel is that it indicates a return to the daily ritual, as a sort of re-dedication of the tabernacle. Aaron then comes out and offers the "burnt offering of the people and makes atonement for himself and for the people" (v. 24).

The Day of Atonement Covenant Lawsuit

In Lev 16:29–34 the Day of Atonement instructions are followed by a covenantal formula[274]. The people are instructed to keep the Day of Atonement as a "statute forever" חֻקַּת עוֹלָם (v. 29). This is a day of penitence, affliction (fasting), self-denial and rest (vv. 29, 31). At the centre of what is often called a "convenantal lawsuit" stands the promise that by performing this ritual once a year, Israel "shall be clean before the LORD from all their sins" (Lev 16:30). This stands as the fundamental principle of all the rituals in

---

garments inside the tent and for the need to wash when he resumes his usual operations on the lower level of holiness within the shrine."

[273] See Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 1046–48 for a discussion of the questions raised by this sequence of events.

[274] Fishbane argues that the pericope in Lev 16:29–34 is transplanted from Lev 23:34–42 since both sections start with "statute forever" which in turn quotes Exodus 23:13. This may point to a beginning of a "written" tradition according to Fishbane in which personal communications with Moses were mixed with instructions to the whole nation. This appears to indicate a late stage redaction of the text in an early case of inner-biblical allusion. (Fishbane, "The Hebrew Bible and Exegetical Tradition," 25).

Leviticus: purification from sin's effects, i.e., transgressions and impurity as well as its guilt, as symbolized by the dismissal of the goat for Azazel. Once the Day of Atonement rituals are successfully carried out, the people are then able to live "clean before the Lord," לִפְנֵי יְהוָה תִּטְהָרוּ (Lev 16:30).

Conversely, while the tabernacle and its sancta are purged from sin on the Day of Atonement and loyal Israelites enjoy the benefits of this atonement, high-handed sinners are not eligible to enjoy its effects but must be cut off from the community (Num 15:30–31). Ultimately, this cutting off can also be the final punishment meted out on the whole nation should they choose to become defiant and unrepentant. The final section of Leviticus (26:14–46) carries a warning against failing to follow Yahweh's statutes: "If you continue hostile to me, and will not obey me, I will continue to plague you sevenfold for your sins" (Lev 26:21). In Deut 28:15–68, this warning takes the form of curses that will ensue following a breach of the covenant. In Rev 15:1, a similar punishment in the form of seven plagues is poured out on unrepentant humanity.

Summary and Conclusion

The most important of these concepts for the study of the reception of the Day of Atonement in Revelation are:

1. The need to seek and maintain a relationship of being in good standing with Yahweh;

2. The need to remove impurity, sin and guilt in order to preserve the covenantal relationship with Yahweh;

3. Yahweh's demand that his people be holy, with impurity and sin removed constantly from "their midst" (Lev 16:30);

4. Purification and purgation through the manipulation of vicarious blood;

5. The grace of Yahweh in providing atonement for sin;

6. Vicarious substitution;

7. Retribution for sin in the ritual of the goat for Azazel. The sins removed from the tabernacle and transferred to the goat's head by the high priest's confession. The "goat לַעֲזָאזֵל" is dispatched to the desert, an area connected with the abode of demons in the OT (Lev 17:7; 2 Chr 11:15; Isa 13:21, 34:14) and;

8. Total restoration of the relationship with Yahweh after the successful performance of the day's rituals. After the goat לַעֲזָאזֵל and its noxious load is sent away, Israel can finally be "clean before the Lord," לִפְנֵי יְהוָה תִּטְהָרוּ (Lev 16:30).

The preceding themes found in the rituals of the Day of Atonement encapsulate the spiritual ethos and ideals of the entire Levitical system of sacrifices and focus on maintaining the divine presence within the community of Israel through purity and holiness. As we shall see in the following chapters, the theological concepts embedded in the rituals of the Day of Atonement as laid out in Lev 16 provided fodder for continued theological reflection in Judaism and reverberated in the life of Jews leaving Judaism and joining the Christianity, as we see in early Christian writings of the NT culminating in the visions of the book of Revelation.

The next chapter explores how the Day of Atonement was received in Jewish literature which in turn influenced the NT's view of this important day.

CHAPTER 3

THE DAY OF ATONEMENT IN JEWISH LITERATURE

The importance of the Day of Atonement to Israel is partly evident from the fact that the *Mishnah*[1] reserves one full tractate, the *Yoma*, lit., "the day," for the priestly instructions and commentary on the Day of Atonement.[2] Despite some added material in the *Mishnah*,[3] there is information that appears to fill in some of the gaps left by the laconic Levitical account of the day's rituals and enhance the picture explored in the previous chapter.

Rabbinic literature describes in detail several of the aspects of the Day of Atonement. On the clothing of the high priest, the Rabbis explain: "At dawn he would put on garment of Pelusium linen worth twelve *manehs*, and at dusk, he wore Indian

---

[1] All quotes from Mishnah from Jacob Neusner, *The Mishnah: A New Translation* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1988), 267.

[2] See Günter Stemberger, "Yom Kippur in Mishnah Yoma," in *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretation in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*, eds. Thomas Hieke and Tobias Nicklas, TBN 15 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 121–137. According to Stemberger, it is not possible to distinguish between what is purported commentary on actual practice of Yom Kippur based on the Pentateuch or an idealized practice based on Second Temple period practices. Cf. Nafatali S. Cohn, *The Memory of the Temple and the Making of the Rabbis* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, Inc., 2013), 41–48. Cohn concludes that "from the perspective of the narration, these interventions assert rabbinic narrational control and insert the rabbinic presence into the sacred places and sacred ritual acts" (70).

[3] E.g., the "five acts of immersion and ten acts of sanctification of the hands and feet" on the Day of Atonement (3:3).

linen worth eight hundred *zuz*" (*m. Yoma* 3:7). Both the *b. Talmud* and the *m. Yoma* reveal that the high priest offered the תָּמִיד, "daily" or "continuous" sacrifices on the Day of Atonement (cf. *b. Talmud*, 3:4, 5; cf. Exod 29:38–42; 30:7). The *m. Yoma* 1:2 explains that the high priest performs the תָּמִיד rituals on the Day of Atonement: "All seven days he tosses the blood, offers up the incense, trims the lamps, and offers up the head and the hind leg [of the daily whole offering]" (cf. *m. Tamid* 7:3). This is not surprising, since the תָּמִיד is described a "perpetual ordinance" (Exod 27:21; cf. Num 8:3). The Rabbis explain that the functions of the high priest are to offer "the incense of the morning, to trim the lamps, and to offer the head and limbs, baked cakes, and wine. The incense offering of the morning was offered between the tossing of the blood and the offering up of the limbs" (*m. Yoma* 3:4–5). This is described in Exod 30:7: "Aaron shall offer fragrant incense on it; every morning when he dresses the lamps he shall offer it." *M. Yoma* 4:1 indicates that the people participated in the ritual. For instance, when the high priest offers the bull for himself and for his family, he says a prayer:

> O Lord, I have committed iniquity, and sinned before you, I and my house. O Lord, forgive the iniquities, transgressions and sins which I have done by committing iniquity, transgression and sin before you, I and my house. As it is written in the Torah of Moses, your servant, for on this day atonement be made for you to clean you. From all sins shall you be clean before the Lord (Lev 16:30). And they [purportedly the people of Israel] respond to him, "Blessed is the name of the glory of his kingdom forever and ever."

This seems to indicate that the people participated attentively during the day's activities. As the high priest leaves the tent, the high priest prays a short prayer upon leaving the Most Holy Place "lest he put Israel in terror" (*m. Yoma* 5:1). The successful completion

of the day's rituals no doubt had the effect of spreading joy in the camp as evidenced by the "marriage" games in the afternoon of the Day of Atonement.

Pharisees and Sadducees differed on their reading of the incense ritual. The Sadducees followed the biblical text that requires the high priest to come to the Most Holy Place already shielded by the curtain of smoke, while the Pharisees insisted that this would take place after he had entered the Most Holy Place. The *b. Yoma* 53a (cf. *y. Yoma* 1:8) reveals that one certain high priest died because he did not perform this rite correctly. Yoma concludes that it is God who atones and not the rites.[4] (See the table at the end of this chapter for a comparison of Lev 16 and the *m. Yoma* tractate.) Nevertheless, readers should avoid concluding that the *m. Yoma* is a precise depiction of what occurred in the Second Temple.[5]

The Day of Atonement in the Book of Jubilees

The *Book of Jubilees* is a Jewish pseudepigraphon from the second century BCE written in Hebrew and well-known to the early church, even considered canonical by the Ethiopian Orthodox Church. The only complete manuscript of the *Book of Jubilees* is in Ethiopian with fragments in Hebrew, Syriac and Greek.[6] Charles called it "the most advanced pre-Christian representative of the midrashic tendency"[7] in Jewish

---

[4] Stemberger, "Yom Kippur," 135.

[5] See Stökl Ben Ezra, *The Impact*, 23.

[6] Cf. *POT* 2:1; OTP 2:41–43.

[7] Ibid.

intertestamental literature and "an enlarged Targum on Genesis and Exodus, in which difficulties in the biblical narrative are solved, gaps supplied, dogmatically offensive elements removed, and the genuine spirit of later Judaism infused into the primitive history of the world."[8] The *Book of Jubilees* effectively intertwines biblical material with traditional Jewish lore. In the introduction to the book, its author acknowledges that "God had made known to Moses more than what one reads in Genesis-Exodus or even Genesis-Deuteronomy."[9] This additional material makes it a midrash on Genesis 1–Exodus 24.

The *Book of Jubilees* contains at least two direct allusions to the Day of Atonement. The first one is in *Jub* 5:1–32, a section that deals with the flood narrative. The allusion to the Day of Atonement in *Jub* 5:17–18 as a covenant lawsuit formula calling Israel to repentance is in anticipation of the Day of Judgment:

> [17]Regarding the Israelites it has been written and ordained: "If they turn to him in the right way, he will forgive all their wickedness and will pardon all their sins"; [18] It has been written and ordained that he will have mercy on all who turn from all their errors once each year.[10]

The allusion to the Day of Atonement in the passage above can be discerned in the expression "all their wickedness/all their sins/all their errors," which alludes to the three-pronged "wickedness" described in Lev 16:21: "Then Aaron shall lay both his hands on

---

[8] *POT* 2:1.

[9] James C. Vanderkam, "Moses Trumping Moses: Making the Book of Jubilees," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts*, eds. Sarianna Metso, Hindy Najman and Eileen Schuller (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 28.

[10] James C. Vanderkam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text* (Leuven: Peeters, 1989).

the head of the live goat, and confess over it all the iniquities of the people of Israel, and all their transgressions, all their sins" (cf. Lev 16:16: " … the uncleannesses of the people of Israel, and because of their transgressions, all their sins"; Lev 16:17: "all the assembly"). The purgation of "all their sin" is involved in both the sprinkling of the blood of the goat for the Lord as well as the transference of sin to the goat for Azazel. The concept of a "yearly ordinance" is present in Lev 16:34: "This shall be an everlasting statute for you, to make atonement for the people of Israel once in the year for all their sins."

Absent in the *Book of Jubilees* are the temple, the high priest, the goats and uncleanness. According to Anke Dorman, by omitting these elements and even specific aspects of the ritual, the author of the *Book of Jubilees* turns the Day of Atonement into "a very personalized day of remembering and confessing sins" and "an opportunity to escape judgment."[11] Dorman points out, "Whereas in Leviticus and Numbers, it is the high priest who obtains atonement for the people of Israel, the *Book of Jubilees* stresses that the people personally atone for their sins through repentance and mourning."[12] The absence of the temple and priest refer to the author's *Sitz im Leben* in the Maccabean period, when no temple was standing.

The second allusion to the Day of Atonement appears in *Jub* 34:18–19. The passage is a midrash on Genesis 37 which tells the story of Joseph's betrayal by his

---

[11] Anke Dorman, "Commit Injustice and Shed Innocent Blood. Motives Behind the Institution of the Day of Atonement in the Book of Jubilees," in *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretation in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*, eds. Thomas Hieke and Tobias Nicklas, TBN 15 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 52.

[12] Ibid.

brothers, his sale to the band of Ishmaelites and the killing of the goat in order to deceive Jacob about the real events. According to the author of *Jubilees,* the day when Jacob heard the news was the "tenth of the seventh month", the same date for the Day of Atonement:

> [18] For this reason it has been ordained regarding the Israelites that they should be distressed on the tenth of the seventh month—on the day when (the news) which made (him) lament Joseph reached his father Jacob—in order to make atonement for themselves on it with a kid—on the tenth of the seventh month, once a year—for their sins. For they had saddened their father's [feelings of] affection for his son Joseph. [19] This day has been ordained so that they may be saddened on it for their sins, all their transgressions, and all their errors; so that they may purify themselves on this day once a year.[13]

The overall thrust of the passage is in keeping with Dorman's assessment that the *Book of Jubilees* confers to the Day of Atonement a more personal dimension, for the story of Joseph's betrayal, his exile in Egypt, Jacob's harrowing experience and Israelites victory over Egypt are their own "family" story. Should Israel fail to repent, the thread that connects them to that ancient sin is reattached: they now must dread judgment. Thus, the *Book of Jubilees* connects the gravity of the sins of Jacob's sons with Jacob's own mourning for Joseph's death; personal affliction is contextualized in Jacob's experience. In order to highlight the Day of Atonement connection, the passage contains echoes of the sacrifice of the "goat for the Lord" which atones for their sin by being spilled and sprinkled on the (Lev 16:15–16).

---

[13] Vanderkam, *The Book of Jubilees,* Jub 34:18–19.

Two additional observations support the connection between the story of Joseph and the Day of Atonement. First, the term, שָׁחַט, "slaughter," while mostly reserved for the slaughter of sacrificial animals, including the goat for the Lord in Lev 16:15, appears in the killing of the goat by Joseph's brothers: "and slaughtered a goat," וַיִּשְׁחֲטוּ שְׂעִי (Gen 37:31). The word טָבַל, "dip," in this context is also used in reference to sacrificial rites (cf. Lev 4:6; 9:9; 14:6, 51). In addition, the story echoes the rite of the goat for Azazel in two ways: (1) Joseph's brothers transfer their guilt to the goat and remove it from their midst by sending its blood to Jacob; and (2) in reverse fashion, the separation of Joseph from his brothers represents the fundamental notion of the separation of the righteous (Joseph) from the wicked (his brothers) which underpins the sending away of Azazel with his load of sin into the desert. The striking aspect of this connection in the *Book of Jubilees* between the transfer of the brothers' sin and Azazel is that the killed goat stands also for the removal of the impurity from their midst (Lev 16:20–22), a function reserved for the goat for Azazel in Leviticus. Conversely, Dorman sees Joseph's going away from their midst with the Ishmaelites as symbolizing the goat for Azazel which was sent away with Israel's sin, however, the passage lacks notions of transfer of sin to Joseph. A better explanation, perhaps, may be that by killing the goat and sending Joseph's coat with its blood to their father, they thought to remove their own guilt from their midst.[14]

[14] Dorman, "Commit Injustice and Shed Innocent Blood," 55–56. Carmichael, "The Origin of the Scapegoat Ritual," 177, agrees when he writes that the goat for Azazel "… harks back to the brothers' deception in a number of ways. It points to their location in the wilderness where they perpetrate their offense. It recalls both the placement of the offense upon the goat, and the transformation of this domestic animal into a dangerous one."

Another seemingly overlooked echo of the Day of Atonement Azazel ritual is the notion of sending away evil in the form of "binding" it, which is seen in *Jub* 10:11–12:

> And we acted in accord with all of his words. All of the evil ones, who were cruel, we bound in the place of judgment, but a tenth of them we let remain so that they might be subject to Satan upon the earth.[15]

The context of this passage is a complaint by the sons of Noah about the influence of evil on his sons' sons (*Jub* 10:2). Noah prays that his sons may be protected from their influence; he asks God to "imprison them and hold them fast in the place of condemnation."[16] The significance of this passage is that it connects evil with the ancient, antedilluvian Watchers who are the "fathers" of these evil spirits (*Jub* 10:5). This notion seems to be based on the same tradition running through the book of Enoch that the Watchers, guided by the demon Azazel, led the world into transgression. Although Azazel is not directly mentioned in the *Book of Jubilees*, it is possible to link the condemnation decreed on the "Watchers" with the condemnation of Azazel in *1 Enoch*: they are to be bound in a "place of condemnation" which seems to parallel Azazel's banishment to the "wilderness/barren land" (Lev 16:22).

Azazel in 1 Enoch

Azazel is quite prominent in the book of *1 Enoch* (Enoch 8:1; 9:6; 10:4–8; 13:1–2; 54:5; 55:4; 69:2). In *1 Enoch*, Azazel is the leader of the fallen angels (54:4–6) and a "satan" or demonic adversary. Unfortunately, some sections of *1 Enoch* (such as chapter

---

[15] *OTP* 2:76.

[16] Ibid.

54) did not survive in their Greek version to allow us to analyse any lexical correlations with New Testament writings. This deficiency however should not deter us from probing the thematic relationship between these *1 Enoch* passages and the passages in Revelation. The intertextual connections between 1 *Enoch* and the book of Revelation are explored in chapter 3 in which Revelation 20 is discussed.

The Day of Atonement in the Apocalypse of Abraham

The *Apocalypse of Abraham* is a Jewish pseudepigraphon composed most likely in the first century CE and which only survives in an old Slavonic translation.[17] The book is considered a midrash on Gen 15, which deals with the calling of Abram. The book contains a few references to the Day of Atonement, made mainly by drawing on Azazel traditions in chapter 13. In this regard, according to Rubinkiewicz, "the author of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* follows the tradition of 1 *Enoch* 1–36. The chief of the fallen angels is Azazel, who rules the stars and most men."[18]

The context of this appearance of Azazel is as follows: as Abraham struggles to understand why his father Terah has given himself to idolatry and false gods, God appears to him as the "Before-the-World and Mighty, the God who created previously, before the light of the age. I am the protector for you and I am your helper" (*Apoc Ab* 9:3–5). God then tells Abraham to offer sacrifices and appoints the angel Yahoel to assist

[17] For a new translation of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* with Hebrew retroversions of some of the passages, see Alexander Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha: Toward the Original of the Apocalypse of Abraham*, Text-Critical Studies 3 (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004).

[18] Ryszard A. Rubinkiewicz, "Apocalypse of Abraham," *OTP* 1:685.

him. Abraham divides the animals and waits. An unclean bird flies over the carcasses. As the bird starts to speak and berates Abraham for coming to a holy place to sacrifice, Yahoel reveals to Abraham that this unclean bird is Azazel. Yahoel then casts a curse on Azazel.

Scholars differ on the liturgical framework underlying the *Apocalypse of Abraham*. Rubinkiewicz argues that "the author of *Apocalypse of Abraham* belongs to the priestly environment"[19] while arguing that the Feast of Tabernacles or Pentecost is prominent.[20] Orlov argues for a Day of Atonement background, stating that "the imagery of the distinctive rites taking place on the Day of Atonement might play a significant role in the authors' theological worldview."[21] Orlov bases this conclusion mainly on "the figure of the main antagonist of the story Azazel, as well as pervasive usage of the terminology of two lots."[22] Elsewhere, Orlov argues that the Hebrew term גּוֹרָל, "lots", found in Lev 16:8–10, could be the original for the Slavonic word for "lot" in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*.[23] Indeed, the presence of Azazel in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*

---

[19] Ibid., "Abraham, Apocalypse of," *AYBD* 1:42.

[20] Ibid., 43; see also ibid., *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en Vieux Slave: Édition Critique du Texte, Introduction, Traduction et Commentaire* (Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego: 1987), 98–255.

[21] Andrei A. Orlov, "The Eschatological Yom Kippur," in *Symbola Caelestis. Le symbolisme liturgique et paraliturgique dans le monde Chrétien*, eds. A. Orlov and B. Lourié, Scrinium 5 (Piscataway, NY: Gorgias Press, 2009), 7.

[22] Ibid.

[23] Andrei A. Orlov, "The Likeness of Heaven: The *Kavod* of Azazel in the Apocalypse of Abraham," in *With Letters of Light*, eds. Daphna V. Arbel and Andrei A. Orlov (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011), 237; see also ibid., *Heavenly Priesthood in the Apocalypse of Abraham* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 73–92; ibid., *Dark Mirrors: Azazel and Satanael in Early Jewish*

connects the book directly with the Day of Atonement, especially since Azazel was reworked in Jewish tradition to incorporate a demonic character. On this point Grabbe writes, "The figure of the evil archangel, the quintessential opponent of god, the Adversary *par excellence*, has become well developed by this time."[24] Moreover, the use of Azazel in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* largely follows the angelological reinterpretation of the goat for Azazel found in the 1 *Enoch*, which sees Azazel as the eschatological leader of the demons.[25] Moreover, the explicit use of Day of Atonement imagery in *Apocalypse of Abraham* is similar to the reconstructed text of 11Q*Melchizedek*. As pointed out by Stökl Ben Ezra, both "texts show that even in groups that could not (any longer) celebrate Yom Kippur in the temple the scapegoat ritual served as a source of inspiration to describe the cosmological struggle against evil."[26]

Orlov et al. observe that Yahoel's attire parallels that of the OT high priest: the linen around Yahoel's head recalls the Aaronide high-priestly headdress (Exod 28:39); his purple robe is reminiscent of the purple colour used in the OT high-priestly dress (Exod 23); his golden staff may have sacerdotal meaning as it suggests Aaron's budding rod (Num 17:16–26); the rainbow-coloured turban seems to recall the golden plate worn on his forehead which, according to Jewish tradition, "shone like a rainbow" (*b. Yoma* 37a).

Demonology (Albany, NY: State University Press, 2011), 27–46; ibid., *Divine Scapegoats: Demonic Mimesis in Early Jewish Mysticism* (New York, NY: State University Press Press, 2015).

[24] Grabbe, "The Scapegoat," 157.

[25] Cf. Andrei A. Orlov, "The Pteromorphic Angelology of the Apocalypse of Abraham," *CBQ* 71 (2009): 830–42.

[26] Stökl Ben Ezra, *The Impact*, 94.

Orlov concludes that Yahoel is not merely an *angelus interpres* but rather "a priestly figure initiating an apprentice into celestial sacerdotal praxis."[27] There are more parallels between Yahoel's description and the language utilized by John to describe the exalted, high priestly Christ. Yahoel has "the likeness of a man" (*Apoc Ab* 10:4), while Jesus is called the "Son of man" in Rev 1:13. Yahoel's hair is "like snow" (*Apoc Ab* 11:4) while Jesus' hair is "white as snow" (Rev 1:14). Yahoel's body is likened to precious stones (*Apoc Ab* 11:2) while Jesus' feet are like "burnished bronze, refined in a furnace (Rev 1:15). In sum, both books seem to draw on similar traditions of revelatory experiences and high priestly representations of heavenly beings (cf. Dan 10:5; Ezek 9:2–3, 10).

Chapters 13 and 14 of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* Yahoel performs activities which parallel those performed by the high priest on the Day of Atonement. (1) the context of sacrificed animals heightens the significance of the presence of Azazel in the passage pointing to a Day of Atonement background. (2) The passage is based on the idea of two lots, which parallels the casting of the lots for the two goats on the Day of Atonement. This overarching theme of the "two lots" is also attested elsewhere in the Dead Sea Scrolls: "For they are the lot of darkness but the lot of God is for [everlast]ing light (1QM 12:5–6)."[28] Although Leviticus does not mention on which side each goat is to be placed, the rabbinic tradition found in the *b. Talmud* 39a attests to this connection:

> Our Rabbis taught: Throughout the forty years that Simeon the Righteous ministered, the lot ["For the Lord"] would always come up in the right hand;

---

[27] Orlov, "The Eschatological Yom Kippur," 81.

[28] Florentino García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 135.

> from that time on, it would come up now in the right hand, now in the left. And [during the same time] the crimson—colored strap would become white. From that time on it would at times become white, at others not.[29]

(3) The transfer of Abraham's corruption to Azazel conveys the idea of atonement: "For behold, the garment which in heaven was formerly yours has been set aside for him [sc. Abraham], and the corruption which was on him has gone over to you (13:14)."[30] (4) Yahoel bids Azazel, "Depart this man!" (Abraham), which parallels the sending away of Azazel into the "wilderness" in Lev 16:22. (5) The "dwelling place of your impurity" alludes to the purgative effect the sending away of Azazel attains for the community. The goal here is to banish Azazel from "human habitation", says Milgrom.[31] The expression "inaccessible parts of the earth" may reflect the LXX εἰς γῆν ἄβατον, according to Stökl Ben Ezra.[32] (6) Shaming Azazel is parallel to the later practice of abusing the goat for Azazel as it left the camp, a practice which is attested in the rabbinic literature.

Yahoel's curses on Azazel are evocative of several descriptions of Satan in the gospels, the letters of Peter and in Revelation. In *Apoc Ab* 23:7–8, Azazel is described as the serpent who tempted Adam and Eve in Eden. This ascription is also reserved for Satan in Rev 20:2. Furthermore, Yahoel states that "Abraham's lot is in heaven while

---

[29] Isidore Epstein, *The Babylonian Talmud: Baba Bathra* (London: Soncino, 1938), 184.

[30] Cf. Grabbe, "The Scapegoat Tradition," 157; Helm, "Azazel in Early Jewish Tradition," 223: "the transference of Abraham's corruption to Azazel may be a veiled reference to the scapegoat rite."

[31] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 1045.

[32] Cf. Stökl Ben Ezra, *The Impact*, 94.

yours is on the earth" (13:8) which seems to parallel Satan's fate to dwell "on the earth" during the Millenium (Rev 20:3; cf. similar imagery in Isa 14:12–15). This connection is strengthened by Azazel's banishment to the "untrodden (or inaccessible) parts of the earth" (14:6; cf. Rev 20:3). In the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, Azazel is called "the firebrand of the furnace of the earth" (13:5; cf. also 31:3–5; cf. Satan being thrown into the "lake of fire" (Rev 20:10). Azazel is called a liar (13:9), the same ascription for Satan found in John 8:44; he possesses "wrath and trials" for the elect (13:9; cf. 1 Pet 5:8; Revelation 12). The author of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* also seems to be aware of the traditions underlying the struggle between Satan and God described in Jude 9 when he writes that "the Eternal, Mighty One did not allow the bodies of the righteous to be in your hand" (13:10), while Jude 9 reveals that "the archangel Michael contended with the devil and disputed about the body of Moses." The same rebuke given to Satan in Jude 9, "he did not dare to bring a condemnation of slander against him, but said, "The Lord rebuke you!" is described in the *Apocalypse of Abraham:* "You have no permission to tempt all the righteous. Depart from this man!" (13:12–13). Heaven is a temple in *Apocalypse of Abraham*, just as the author of Hebrews considers Jesus' entrance into the heavenly Most Holy place as an entrance into "heaven itself" (9:24) on the antitypical, celestial Day of Atonement.[33]

[33] Martha Himmelfarb writes that "the heaven of the Apocalypse of Abraham is clearly a temple. Abraham sacrifices in order to ascend to heaven, then ascends by means of the sacrifice, and joins in the heavenly liturgy to protect himself during the ascent. ... The depiction of heaven as a temple confirms the importance of the earthly temple. The prominence of the heavenly liturgy lends importance to the liturgy of words on earth, which at the time of the apocalypse provided a substitute

On the basis of the above, and as pointed out astutely by Orlov,[34] it appears that the whole of the *Apocalypse of Abraham* is built on a purgation rite such as the Day of Atonement: the sins of idolatry by Terah and Nahor jeopardize the covenant and thus echo the impurity brought into the Most Holy Place by Nadab and Abihu which stand as introduction and possible *raison d'être* for Lev 16.

The *quid pro quo* relationship between the earthly and heavenly sanctuaries can also be seen in 1 *Enoch* 14 and in *The Testament of Levi* 312, in which the high-priestly entrance to the holy of holies serves as imagery for describing heavenly ascents into the Holy of Holies of the heavenly temple and the offering of intercessory prayer or atonement there.[35] In the famous 11Q*Melchizedek* scroll (cf. II, 7–8), Melchizedek, as leader of the heavenly forces, will atone on the day of the Day of Atonement for all sins of the sons of light at the end of the tenth jubilee. Ben Ezra concludes: "1 Enoch and 11Q*Melchizedek* perceive Yom Kippur as an eschatological day of liberation."[36] The *Book of Giants* (4Q203) expands aspects of the punishment meted out on the goat for Azazel by making him suffer for the sins of all the fallen angels.[37]

---

for sacrifice, a substitute that in the apocalypse's view was to be temporary." Martha Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 66.

[34] Orlov, "The Eschatological Yom Kippur," 110.

[35] Stökl Ben Ezra, *The Impact*, 79, 82, 91.

[36] Ibid., 95.

[37] The text as reconstructed by García Martinez and Tigchelaar reads:and [yo]ur power [...] Blank Th[en] 'Ohyah [said] to Hahy[ah, his brother ...] Then he punished, and not us, [bu]t Aza[ze]l and made [him ... the sons of] Watchers, the Giants; and n[o]ne of [their] be[loved] will be forgiven [...] ... he has imprisoned us and has captured yo[u]... (Martínez and Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 411).

Summary

The above discussion explored how the rituals and ethos of the Day of Atonement were perceived by writers outside of the biblical canon via reflection of the Day of Atonement and Jewish history. It can be concluded that Jewish pseudepigraphal writers remain largely in consonance with the biblical account of the Day of Atonement, at times adding reflections which illuminate and enhance the picture. The use of the Day of Atonement by these authors is not necessarily exhaustive, while they seem to avoid deviating from the biblical meaning of the day's rituals and overall theological meaning. In several of these books, Azazel is a demonic entity, a reading that appears to betray its ancient significance in the book of Leviticus.

Below we explore the presence of the Day of Atonement on the works of Josephus and Philo, two important Jewish authors writing from the hellenistic perspective.

The Day of Atonement in Josephus

Despite the importance of the Day of Atonement in the life of Israel, it is rather surprising that Josephus does not deal with the Day of Atonement in any significant length in his works. There is only one passage in his *Antiquities* that deals with the Day of Atonement and two additional ones dealing with the rituals of the Temple in which he mentions the clothing of the high priest (*Wars*. 5.231–236, cf. *Ant.* 3.159–187). In *Wars* 5.236, he explains that the high priest did not wear his full attire when he went into the Most Holy Place alone, once each year and during the yearly fast. He writes: "However, the high priest did not wear these garments at other times, but a more plain habit; he

only did it when he went into the most sacred part of the temple, which he did but once a year; on that day when our custom is for all of us to keep a fast to God."[38]

> The main passage dealing with the Day of Atonement is *Ant* 3.240–243:
>
> > (240) On the tenth day of the same lunar month, they fast till the evening; and this day they sacrifice a bull, and two rams, and seven lambs, and a kid of the goats, for sins. (241) And, besides these, they bring two kids of the goats; the one of which is sent alive out of the limits of the camp into the wilderness for the scapegoat, and to be an expiation for the sins of the whole multitude; but the other is brought into a place of great cleanness within the limits of the camp, and is there burnt, with its skin, without any sort of cleansing. (242) With this goat was burnt a bull, not brought by the people, but by the high priest, at his own charges; which, when it was slain, he brought of the blood into the holy place, together with the blood of the kid of the goats, and sprinkled the ceiling with his finger seven times, (243) as also its pavement, and again as often toward the most holy place, and about the golden altar: he also at last brings it into the open court, and sprinkles it about the great altar. Besides this, they set the extremities, and the kidneys, and the fat, with the lobe of the liver upon the altar. The high priest likewise presents a ram to God as a burnt offering.[39]

In his analysis, it is clear that Josephus conflates Num 29:7–11 with Lev 16. There are however, minor discrepancies. For one, Josephus omits any discussion on the changing of garments by the high priest, offering of incense and confession that we find in Lev 16, the centrality of the high priest or the name Azazel. In *Ant.* 17.165–166, Josephus again mentions ἡ νεστεία, "the fast," in a passage dealing with the desecration of the Temple

---

[38] William Whiston, *The Works of Josephus: Complete and Unabridged* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1987).

[39] Ibid.

by Herod. According to Begg[40] and Stökl Ben Ezra[41], this "fast" refers to the Day of Atonement. Josephus's digression on the high priest Mathias's disqualification is important because it indirectly confirms the practice found in the *Mishnah* that the high priest should keep vigil on the night before the Day of Atonement in order to avoid situations that could preclude him from officiating on the Day of Atonement, such as his becoming unclean as a consequence of having had a nocturnal emission (Lev 15:16; cf. *m. Yoma* 1:7).[42]

---

[40] Cf. Christopher T. Begg, "Yom Kippur in Josephus," in *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretations in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*, eds. Thomas Hieke and Tobias Nicklas, TBN 15 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 110. Begg's contention that the fast "occurred during an iconoclastic episode that marked Herod's final days" is untenable. A closer look at the passage does not support the reading that the deposition of Mathias occurred around the Day of Atonement for several reasons: (1) nothing in Josephus allows us to pinpoint the precise date of the previous disqualification of Mathias to perform the Day of Atonement. It certainly was prior to this meeting with Herod, but how long we do not know. It could well have been recently, maybe a couple of months earlier, which could put the events of Herod's meeting around the time when the lunar eclipse Josephus mentions (*Ant.* 17.165) occurred, on January 9, 1 BC (cf. Cf. Filmer, "Chronology of the Reign of Herod the Great," *JTS* 17 [1966]: 283–298; John Pratt, "Yet Another Eclipse for Herod," *The Planetarian* 19/4 [1990]: 8–14, who proposes the eclipse of 29 of December of 1 BCE, because it was not only a total eclipse but was early enough in the night to be visible in most of Judea. If true, this possibility would not substantially impact the chronology of the events in question); (2) the passage seems to indicate that the mention of the dream of the high priest Mathias which disqualified him to perform his duties (*ipsis literis*, "a conversation with his wife," a euphemism for a sexual dream which led to a nocturnal emission) on the Day of Atonement is merely parenthetical and does not necessarily allow us to place in close proximity the last days of Herod with the preceding fast on the Day of Atonement. Josephus appears to be making an aside to explain that while high priest Mathias had once before been replaced by another high priest, this time, however, Herod deposed him for good (it is ironic that when dealing with Philo's statements on the Day of Atonement [Cf. "Yom Kippur," 115], Begg has recognized "parenthetical" explanations, just not in Josephus!); and (3) scholars have pointed out that Herod should have died much earlier than the eclipse of Adar 11th, because it is not possible to fit in all that ensued between Herod's death and his burial on Passover. This interpretation fits the external chronological data better. If the analysis above obtains, there is really no "chronological problem" as Begg (ibid., 111) implies and this is indeed a reference to the Day of Atonement.

[41] Stökl Ben Ezra, *The Impact*, 22, n. 16.

[42] So Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 1116.

The Day of Atonement in Philo

The Day of Atonement in Philo is called by the same name given in the book of Acts 27:9, ἡ νεστεία. The passage is in *De Specialibus Legibus* 1.186–188, in which Philo[43] describes the Day of Atonement rite in his time:

> On the tenth day the fast [ἡ νεστεία] takes place which they take seriously—not only those who are zealous about piety and holiness, but even those who do nothing religious the rest of the time. For all are astounded, overcome with the sacredness of it; in fact, at that time the worse compete with the better in self-control and virtue. The reputation of the day is due to two reasons: one that it is a feast and the other that it is purification and escape from sins for which amnesty has been given by the favors of the gracious God who has assigned the same honor to repentance that he has to not committing a single sin. Therefore, he declared that since it was a feast the sacrifices should be the same number as those of the feast, which begins the sacred month: a young bull, a ram, and seven lambs. In this way he mixed the number one with the number seven and lined the end up with the beginning, for the number seven has been appointed the end of things and the number one the beginning. He added three sacrifices since it was for purification. For he ordered that two he-goats and a ram be offered. Then he said that it was necessary to offer the ram as a whole burnt offering, but to cast lots for the he-goats. The he-goat selected by lot for God must be sacrificed, but the other was to be sent out into a pathless and inaccessible desolate place carrying on himself the curses of those who had committed offenses, but who were purified by changes for the better and who have washed themselves from their old lawlessness with a new sense of loyalty to the law.[44]

Several interesting features stand out in Philo's discourse on the Day of Atonement.

First, Philo's description of the day is striking because the high priest is conspicuously

---

[43] For a discussion on Philo's allusions to the Day of Atonement, see Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, *The Impact*, 107–114; J. P. Scullion, "A Traditio-Historical Study of the Day of Atonement" (PhD diss., Catholic University of America, 1990), 152–187; Giovanni Deiana, "Il giorno del *Kippur* in Filone di Alessandria," in vol. 2 of *Sangue e Antropologia Riti e Culto*, ed. Francisco Vattioni (Rome: Pia Unione Preziosissimo Sangue, 1987), 891–905.

[44] Charles Duke Yonge, *The Works of Philo: Complete and Unabridged* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995), 551.

absent. He goes on to state that even the non-religious among the Jews participate in ἡ νηστεία because of its solemnity. He also describes the day as both a "national feast" (ἑορτή) and a day for "purification and escape from sin" (καθάρσεως καὶ ψυγῆς ἁμαρτημάτων). According to Philo an important feature of this "purification" is accomplished by the grace of God to consider "repentance" (μετάνοιαν) as equal to not sinning at all.[45] The ἑορτή on this day is compared to the preceding feast of trumpets, because the same number of sacrifices is used. In his description of the animals used, he alludes first to Num 29:7–11 by using the same words for bull and ram as the LXX, μόσχον and κριὸν, while using ἀρνάς for the seven lambs instead of LXX's ἀμνοὺς. Referring to Lev 16, Philo explains that three "added" sacrifices, the two male goats (Lev 16:7) and the ram (Lev 16:3, 5), are ὡς κατάρσεως, for "purification." The process of choosing the male goats by casting lots is akin to that of the *m. Yoma*. The only difference is that in *m. Yoma* the goat for Azazel is killed by the one who carries it into the desert; Philo simply states that the goat carries ἀτριβῆ καὶ ἄβατον, "curses" and "offenses", into the desert—there is no mention of an execution *per se*. As Josephus, Philo forgoes any mention of the name Azazel. Philo ends this pericope by explaining that the "repentance" which legitimizes the offender's penitence escalates to a real, practical transformation on the Day of Atonement, when the offender "changes for the

[45] Cf. Milgrom: "The verbal confession of the high priest must be matched by the remorse of the people. Thus, repentance purges man, as the *ḥaṭṭā't blood* does the sanctuary. Unless man makes the initial effort toward his self-regeneration, the rite of Azazel is of no avail. Nor can his purgation by repentance be a perfunctory exercise" (*EncJud*, s.v. "Day of Atonement).

better." This is close in part to Milgrom's position that repentance is a key feature of the Day of Atonement.

There are also several direct allusions to Lev 16 elsewhere in Philo. In *De Plantatione* 61, Philo mentions the Azazel ritual:

> Indeed, it is a proof of what has been said, what happens every year on the day called the day of atonement; for on that day the people are enjoined "to take by lot two goats, one for the Lord, and one to be the scapegoat. [Τότε γὰρ διείρηται δύο τράγους διακληροῦν, τὸν μὲν τῷ κυρίῳ, τὸν δὲ τῷ ἀποπομπαίῳ].[46]

This is almost a *verbatim* quotation of the LXX text of Lev 16:8: καὶ ἐπιθήσει Ααρων ἐπὶ τοὺς δύο χιμάρους κλῆρον ἕνα τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ κλῆρον ἕνα τῷ ἀποπομπαίῳ. However, in Philonic fashion, his explanation for the ritual is highly allegorical: "[T]hat is to say, two reasons, the one in accordance with God, the other consistent with creation."[47] He references the Azazel ritual again in *De Posteritate Caini* 20, quoting Lev 16:10: "He shall place it living before the Lord, that he may offer prayers over it, and send it out into the wilderness[48] [Στήσει γὰρ αὐτόν, φησί, ζῶντα ἐναντίον κυρίου τοῦ ἐξιλάσασθαι ἐπ' αὐτοῦ, ὥστε ἐξαποστεῖλαι αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν ἀποπομπήν]."

Philo also mentions the high priest's entrance into the holy of holies described in Lev 16:17 in two separate texts: once in *Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres Sit* 16: "Καὶ ὁ ἱερεὺς μέντοι, ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἔσται κατ' αὐτόν, ὅταν εἰσίῃ εἰς τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων, ἕως ἂν ἐξέλθῃ";

---

[46] Yonge, *The Works of Philo*, 196.

[47] Ibid.

[48] Ibid., 138.

and twice in *De Somnis* 28, 34: "Ὅταν γάρ, φησίν, εἰσίῃ εἰς τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων ὁ ἀρχιερεύς, ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἔσται." In *Legum Alegoriae* II.56, Philo discusses the garment worn by the high priest on the Day of Atonement, stating that the high priest did not use his regular clothing to enter into the holy of holies (more on this passage in the next chapter). The other passages by Philo (*De Specialibus Legibus* 2:193–203) dealing with the high priest and the Day of Atonement are largely allegorical and offer little if any insight on the practice of the Day of Atonement as we find it in the OT. Apart from this aspect, Stökl Ben Ezra explains that when his references are literal, "Philo presents a Yom Kippur that is in almost every respect adapted to the religious life of the diaspora."[49]

Summary and Conclusion

This chapter explored how the rituals and ethos of the Day of Atonement continued to reverberate in Jewish life and impacted non-canonical Jewish literature, including several mentions in the secular works of Jewish authors Philo and Josephus. The Day of Atonement provided useful material for the *midrash* we read in Pseudepigraphal books.

More importantly, some of the references to the Day of Atonement outside the biblical canon provide clarity on how Jewish understanding of this day evolved as it became inseparable from the experience of Jews in all times and places and impacted Jewish authors and the readers of their works. As we shall see in the next chapter, the activities of the Day of Atonement as well as its actors—such as the high priest as well as

[49] Stökl Ben Ezra, *The Impact*, 114.

Azazel as a demonic entity responsible for sin and deserving of its punishment—appear throughout the writings of the early Christian and resurface in the book of Revelation thus adding important theological perspectives and clearer sources for John's visions.

Comparison Between Lev 16 and the *Mishnah* Yoma	
Yoma 1:1 (No Lev corresp.)	Seven days before the Day of Atonement, high priest sequestered ["Seven days before the Day of Atonement they set apart the high priest from his house to the councilor's chamber."]
1:2	High priest practises the Day of Atonement rituals ["All seven days, he tosses blood, offers up the incense, trims the lamp and offers the head and the hind leg."]
1:3	Elders or high priest read day of atonement rituals from the *tôrāh* and prepare for the Day of Atonement.
1:4	For seven days, high priest eats normally but eats less on the eve of the Day of Atonement ["for food brings on sleep"]
1:5	On the eve of the Day of Atonement, elders administer oath to high priest ["you will not vary in any way from all which we have instructed you."]
1:6	High priest expounds on the relevant Scriptures for the day ["Job, Ezra, Chronicles, Daniel"]
3:2	The Day of Atonement proceedings start at first light at dawn with *tāmîd* ministrations.

Lev 16:3; Num 29:7–11	"Thus shall Aaron come into the holy place: with a young bull for a sin offering and a ram for a burnt offering"; "one young bull, one ram, seven male lambs a year old."	**Yoma 1:3**	a. "In the eve of the Day of Atonement at dawn they set him up at the eastern gate and bring before him bullocks, rams, and sheep."
16:4	"He shall put on the holy linen tunic, and shall have the linen undergarments next to his body, fasten the linen sash, and wear the linen turban; these are the holy vestments. He shall bathe his body in water, and then put them on."	**Yoma 3:2–3**	b. The high priest is brought in for ablutions; "five acts of immersion, ten acts of sanctification of the hands" and feet."
		3:7	a. [high priest washes presumably in the outer court, separated from the people by a sheet of linen; b. Puts on white linen garments; c. Sanctifies hand and feet; d. Performs the *tāmîd* in this sequence: (1) animal brought; (2) high priest kills animal; (3) tosses blood; (4) offers incense in the Holy Place; (5) trims the lamps in the Holy Place; (6) comes out and offers up head and limbs and food offerings ["Baked Cakes and wine"].
		3:8	a. Approaches the bullock for sacrifice on his behalf; b. Puts both hands on head of bullock; c. Offers prayer of confession for his sins out loud; d. People respond with a blessing.

16:5, 7–9	"He shall take from the congregation of the people of Israel two male goats for a sin offering, and one ram for a burnt offering"; "He shall take the two goats and set them before the LORD at the entrance of the tent of meeting; and Aaron shall cast lots on the two goats, one lot for the LORD and the other lot for Azazel …"	**3:9; 4:1, 2**	a. Two goats presented; b. Each chosen by lots either for the Lord or for Azazel; c. high priest shakes wooden box with lots; d. Takes lot and raises hand with lot "for the Lord"; e. Places each lot on each goat; f. Both are called *ḥaṭṭā't*; g. Ties a crimson thread on the head of the goat for Azazel; h. Ties a crimson thread around the throat of the goat for the Lord.
16:6; 11	"Aaron shall offer the bull as a sin offering for himself, and shall make atonement for himself and for his house … he shall slaughter the bull as sin offering for himself"	**4:2, 3**	a. Comes again to bullock for sacrifice on his behalf; b. Puts both hands on head of bullock; c. Offers prayer of confession for his sins out loud; d. People respond with blessing; e. high priest slaughters bullock; f. Gathers blood into basin and hands to assistant to stir until the appropriate time; g. Gathers burning coal from altar into censer.

16:12–13	"He shall take a censer full of coals of fire from the altar before the LORD, and two handfuls of crushed sweet incense, and he shall bring it inside the curtain and put the incense on the fire before the LORD, that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy seat that is upon the covenant, or he will die."	**5:1**	a. Takes censer on right hand and ladle with incense on left; b. Walks into Holy Place towards the veil of the Most Holy Place; c. Walks the length of the veil in the Holy Place and turns around and enters the Most Holy Place, with the veil to his left; d. Stops in front of the ark and leaves censer on the top of the "kaporet" e. Offers a prayer and leaves the sanctuary
16:14	"He shall take some of the blood of the bull, and sprinkle it with his finger on the front of the mercy seat, and before the mercy seat he shall sprinkle the blood with his finger seven times."	**5:3**	a. Takes blood from the one stirring it; b. Goes directly into Most Holy Place; c. Sprinkles blood seven times on the *kappōreṯ* [Shettiyah] by counting, "One, two…" d. Leaves the Most Holy Place and leaves the blood basin on the golden stand;

16:15	"He shall slaughter the goat of the sin offering that is for the people and bring its blood inside the curtain, and do with its blood as he did with the blood of the bull, sprinkling it upon the mercy seat and before the mercy seat."	5:4	a. Slaughters goat for the Lord; b. Receives blood into basin; c. Enters Most Holy Place; d. Sprinkles blood seven times on the *kappōreṯ* [Shettiyah] by counting, "One, two…" e. Leaves Most Holy Place; f. Takes basin with the blood of the bull previously left in the Holy Place and sprinkles it seven times towards the veil of the Most Holy Place; g. Takes blood of the goat and sprinkles it seven times as previously; h. When done, he empties the blood of the bull into the basin of the goat's blood and then the full content back into empty basin;
16:18	"Then he shall go out to the altar that is before the LORD and make atonement on its behalf, and shall take some of the blood of the bull and of the blood of the goat, and put it on each of the horns of the altar. He shall sprinkle some of the blood on it with his finger seven times, and cleanse it and hallow it from the uncleannesses of the people of Israel."	5:5	a. Moves toward the incense altar [golden altar] in the Holy Place; b. Daubs blood on each of the four horns, from upper left to upper right ending where he started; c. Sprinkles the blood on top of the incense altar seven times;

16:20–22	"When he has finished atoning for the holy place and the tent of meeting and the altar, he shall present the live goat. Then Aaron shall lay both his hands on the head of the live goat, and confess over it all the iniquities of the people of Israel, and all their transgressions, all their sins, putting them on the head of the goat, and sending it away into the wilderness by means of someone designated for the task. The goat shall bear on itself all their iniquities to a barren region; and the goat shall be set free in the wilderness."	**6:2–6**	a. Comes to the live goat, the one for Azazel; b. Places both hands on goat and confesses sin in form of a prayer to Yahweh; c. People and priests outside the sanctuary kneel down when they hear the name of Yahweh and offer blessing; d. Hands live goat to man prepared to lead it to the desert ["all are valid to lead it out" but priests preferred]; e. Goat is led through ten booths (almost a mile) with food and water in order to lead him to the wilderness; f. Man prepared to lead him, splits the crimson thread from around his head, ties to rock and horns and pushes the goat down a ravine; g. Goat for Azazel dies
16:23–24	"Then Aaron shall enter the tent of meeting, and shall take off the linen vestments that he put on when he went into the holy place, and shall leave them there. He shall bathe his body in water in a holy place, and put on his vestments; then he shall come out and offer his burnt offering and the burnt offering of the people, making atonement for himself and for the people."	6:7 7:3	a. The high priest quarters animals for burnt offering, the bull and the goat. b. Puts on his "vestments of gold"

EXCURSUS

ALTERNATIVE VIEWS ON THE IDENTITY OF עֲזָאזֵל

This *excursus* explores alternative views on the identity of Azazel. These are representative of the diversity of views in understanding the name עֲזָאזֵל from ancient sources to current scholarship. The dominant view, which is considered last, is the Christian interpretation that the goat for עֲזָאזֵל was a type of the Messiah, Christ. In general, these views have not considered adequately how עֲזָאזֵל has been reworked in the Jewish literature as a demonic figure and therefore, while they are not necessarily spurious, they are not pertinent to the view adopted in this study.

עֲזָאזֵל *as the Goat's Function*

In this view, עֲזָאזֵל describes the goat's function, i.e., it is simply "to go away." Proponents of this view (since at least the time of Aquila and Theodotion[1]) have built their case on two Hebrew words, עז ("goat") and אזל ("to go away"). This view also has the support of the LXX which renders עֲזָאזֵל in Lev 16:26 as "the goat that has been set

[1] Cf. Hartley, *Leviticus*, 237.

apart to be sent away," and of the Vulgate, which renders the expression as "caper emissarius", "the goat that is sent". This translation, in turn, most likely influenced Tyndale's version, "scapegoat."[2]

Herbert Wolf explains עֲזָאזֵל thus: "Combined with *'ez* "goat" it makes the word *aza'zel*, 'Azazel,' 'the goat of going out' or 'scapegoat' of Lev 16."[3] However this view faces a serious challenge in that the goat itself is עֲזָאזֵל, the preposition ל, which accompanies every instance of the term, is a *lamed auctoris* or "sign of proprietorship."[4] This is all the more important since the preposition ל is always part of the designation of this male goat and therefore it is inseparable from its identity. This certainly precludes the reading that this goat itself "is" Azazel as this position requires. Moreover, Lev 16:10 states: לְשַׁלַּח אֹתוֹ לַעֲזָאזֵל הַמִּדְבָּרָה, lit. "to send it to Azazel in the wilderness," which would be incomprehensible if עֲזָאזֵל meant the goat itself.

עֲזָאזֵל *as a Place Where the Goat is Dispatched*

The notion that עֲזָאזֵל is a place has been defended by connecting עֲזָאזֵל to the אֶל־אֶרֶץ גְּזֵרָה, "barren region" (v. 22). But it is self-evident that אֶל־אֶרֶץ גְּזֵרָה here is

---

[2] This position has the support of medieval Rabbi David Kimhi (1160–1235) in *Book of Roots* breaks Azazel in two words contending that it is a combination of עז "goat" and אזל "to go."

[3] Herbert Wolf, s.v. "אָזַל," *in TWOT*.

[4] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 1020; cf. Henri Cazelles, "La question du 'lamed auctoris'," 93–101.

synonymous with מִדְבָּר, "wilderness," and not עֲזָאזֵל.[5] The conclusion is that the goat for Azazel was led to a separate region. Hoenig states but does not argue that "biblically," Azazel means "jagged rocks or precipice."[6]

This view also capitalizes on themes found in Jewish literature. The *b. Yoma*, 63b gives its meaning as "the hardest of mountains" and Rashi explains it as "a rocky precipice" (*b. Yoma* 67b; *m. Yoma* 6:6). This notion is transferred directly into the text of Lev 16:10 in *Pseudo-Jonathan* (original additions in italics): "The goat on which the lot for Azazel fell shall be set alive before the Lord to make atonement *for the sinfulness of the people of the house of Israel* (and) to be sent *to die in a stony and rocky place which is* in the desert *of Soq, that is Beth Haduri.*" Along the same lines, *Pseudo-Jonathan* renders Lev 16:22 as: "The goat shall carry on himself all their sins to a desolate *place*; and *the man* shall let the goat go into the desert *of Soq and the goat shall go up on the mountains of Beth Haduri, and a blast of wind from before the Lord will thrust him down and he will die.*"

In non-Jewish literature, Sa'adya, an Arabic commentator on the Pentateuch, writing against Hiwwi al-Balchi, argues that Azazel comes from the Arabic *azazu(n)*, "rough ground," *azazilu* (broken plural), "precipice", a position that G. R. Driver

[5] Cf. Hartley, *Leviticus*, 238.

[6] Sidney B. Hoenig, "The New Pesher on Azazel," *JQR*, new ser. 56/3 (1966): 249.

follows. This view capitalizes on taking *'z'z* to mean "rough ground"[7] but it requires some negotiating of the other letters in עֲזָאזֵל, such as considering the א as inconsequential and the final ל as an superfluous addition.

Medieval Jewish commentator Rashbam (ca. 1080–1174) diverges from *m. Yoma* by saying that the "goat for Azazel" is led to wilderness in order to graze and live there. He compares the dismissal of Azazel with the rite of the cleansing of the leper in Lev 14:7, in which a bird is set free, and contends that "the desert," מדבר, does not necessarily mean a desolate place. Indeed, if דבר is the root of the word, then it would connote "leading" rather than desolation.[8] Rashbam even uses מדברות with the meaning of "pastures" for undomesticated animals. However, the position of *m. Yoma* that the goat has to be killed may be supported by the observation that אֶל־אֶרֶץ גְּזֵרָה "separated, or cut-off land" (from the root גזר, "to cut off") is clearly synonymous with "desert," בַּמִּדְבָּר, in Lev 16:22. So the intent of the author of Leviticus points towards separation and ultimate annihilation of the goat, not that he would be set free to roam or risk coming back to camp bearing its toxic load.[9]

---

[7] Cf. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16,* 1020; Driver, "Three Technical Terms in the Pentateuch," 97.

[8] Cf. Martin I. Lockshin, *Rashbam's Commentary on Leviticus and Numbers*, BJS, ed. Martin I. Lockshin (Providence, RI: Brown Judaic Studies, 2001), 91–92.

[9] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16,* 1010, renders בַּמִּדְבָּר as "inaccessible region."

Moreover, Feinberg points out that the frequent mobility of Israel would not allow one specific place to be called עֲזָאזֵל.[10] However this challenge is weakened if the Rabbinic interpretation refers to any steep and jagged hill outside the Israelite camp, which does not necessitate it to be at any one specific location. But the Rabbinic view is not without problems, for it may be an anachronism, an attempt to read the Second Temple practice of pushing the goat for Azazel off a cliff back into the pre-exilic text of Leviticus.[11]

עֲזָאזֵל *as "Removal"*

This view sees עֲזָאזֵל, as an abstract term or a *terminus technicus* meaning "removal."[12] This is the meaning given by some lexicons[13] and is the position argued by Feinberg[14] based on the LXX rendering of עֲזָאזֵל, as ἀποπομπαῖος (Lev 16:8, 10) and διεσταλμένος (16:26), i.e., "to send away." Moeller's position is more contrived than

---

[10] Cf. Feinberg, "The Scapegoat," 325.

[11] Cf. Ahituv, "Azazel," *EncJud* 3:1002: "It does appear, however, that this is an attempt to reconcile the meaning of the word Azazel with the actual usage in the time of the Second Temple, namely to bring the goat to a cliff and to push it over."

[12] Cf. Feinberg, "The Scapegoat," 324. This view is criticized by Hartley on the grounds that the ritual system of Lev 16 "is a symbolic enactment of spiritual realities" (*Leviticus*, 236).

[13] Cf. Francis Brown, Samuel Rolles Driver and Charles Augustus Briggs, *Enhanced Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*, electronic ed. (Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research Systems, 2000); cf. "עֲזָאזֵל" in Robert L. Thomas, *New American Standard Hebrew-Aramaic and Greek Dictionaries: Updated Edition* (Anaheim, CA: Foundation Publications, Inc., 1998).

[14] Feinberg, "The Scapegoat," 320–31.

Feinberg's, for he argues that the idea of removal points rather to the entity's performing the removal. Thus he states: "Azalzel, or azazel, therefore, means one who removes by a series of acts ..."[15] But this conclusion, intriguing as it may sound, is untenable because if it is the Lord who, through a "series of acts", obtains the complete removal of the sins of the people, then the goat should not be removed by "Azazel" but rather "by the Lord." Moreover, Moeller's argument that עֲזָאזֵל comes from the Aramaic word אזל (via the Arabic "*azala*") is not compelling for several reasons. First, אזל does not appear elsewhere in the OT with the meaning of a ritualistic removal, but simply means "to go, to depart"[16] (cf. Deut 32:36; 1 Sam 9:7; 20:19; Job 14:11; Prov 20:14; Dan 2:17, 24; 6:19, 20; Ezra 4:23; 5:8; 15). Only by inference could one construe the meaning "removal" from this but one could hardly infer "removal by a series of acts."

More recently Rudman argues for this notion because the author of Leviticus does not subscribe to the notion of a demonic deity.[17] Rudman's view appeals to the "desert" motif found in Lev 16 and builds on the ANE duality between chaos and creation expressed through various symbols such as sea monsters, darkness, night and death, which can also be seen in the Hebrew Scriptures (Gen 1, 2, 6–8; Ps 5:22; 46:3–4; 74:12–17; 89:10–15; 104:6–7; Job 38:8–10). Israel then is a symbol of creation while the

---

[15] Willelm Moller, "Azazel," *ISBE* 1:344.

[16] Cf. "Azazel," BDB, 23.

[17] Rudman, "A Note on the Azazel-goat Ritual," 396–398.

desert is the "home of chaos"[18] because it encompasses the notion of a place "hostile to life," similar to night, darkness, the sea and death itself. Although Rudman argues that the desert is connected with the notion of "evil," he is reluctant to accept that עֲזָאזֵל may imply an actual demonic entity whose jurisdiction is the desert. He concludes that the live goat "acts in a symbolic way, carrying Israel's sins into the wilderness."[19] Because Israel is a microcosm of creation, "[n]ot only is the goat with its burden of sin removed from the camp of Israel (and creation's microcosm thereby purified of chaos), it is removed from creation proper."[20] On this point Rudman says that while the adytum was "a microcosm of creation," the desert where Azazel is sent is the "home of chaos."[21] Thus, by sending sin back to chaos via the goat, the rite delivers not only Israel from sin, but the whole creation.[22] By taking sin back to the wilderness, the ritual of the goat for Azazel signifies the purification not only of Israel but creation itself, since Israel represents creation. Removing sin from it is emblematic of a removal of sin from all creation. This is akin to Hartley's view that the wilderness is the source of Israel's sins;

---

[18] Ibid., 399. He writes: "Since Israel could be depicted as representing Creation as a whole in the Hebrew Bible, it is unsurprising that the attacks of its enemies were described using marine imagery (Jer 6, 23; cf. Isa 8, 5–8; 17,12–14; Ps 65, 8 [Eng. 7]), implying the chaotic nature of the nations that surrounded Israel" (ibid., 398).

[19] Ibid., 399.

[20] Ibid., 400.

[21] Rudman, "A Note on the Azazel-Goat Ritual," 398.

[22] Ibid., 396–401.

the goat for Azazel simply returns sin to its rightful place.[23] Gerstenberger articulates the notion of complete separation when he writes:

> The scapegoat must remain in the wilderness, dead or alive; under no circumstances is it permitted to return to the human society that has sent it out. Later generations of Jews saw to it that the scapegoat was guaranteed not to return; they had a non-Jew, if possible, push the animal into a ravine, where it broke its neck.[24]

This "sending away" means to purify Israel from evil. As Gruenwald writes, the ritual of the goat for Azazel rite "re-enacts the primordial principle of creation by separation, which is also present in the creation story in Gen 1."[25]

Although the philological evidence may be debatable, some aspects of this view may be coalesced with the view of Azazel as a demon and may have important implications for the role of the Day of Atonement and the goat-for-Azazel rite in the final removal of sin from creation as anticipated in Revelation. Hartley agrees partially when he writes: "Thus the goat takes these sins to the place of their origin and leaves them there, breaking the power that they had of binding and oppressing the people."[26]

---

[23] Hartley, *Leviticus*, 241.

[24] Erhard Gerstenberger, *Leviticus: A Commentary* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 221.

[25] Gruenwald, *Rituals*, 222.

[26] Hartley, "A Note on the Azazel-Goat Ritual," 241. Cf. the discussion on Azazel as the symbol of a demon in Bernard Hamburger, *Fallen Angels: Soldiers of Satan's Realm* (Philadelphia, PA: The Jewish Publication Society, 2006), 17–21, 24, 26, 46–9, 56, 75, 91, 116, 130, 139, 154–6, 186, 278. cf. "עֲזָאזֵל," in James Swanson, *Dictionary of Biblical Languages with Semantic Domains: Hebrew (OT)*, electronic ed. (Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc., 1997).

עֲזָאזֵל *as "On Behalf of Azazel"*

This view is espoused by Wyatt who states that "the expelled goat may not be "to Azazel" (or "for Azazel" in the same sense), but rather "on behalf of" or "in lieu of Azazel," that is, as a substitute for him."[27] The god implied here is "Attar" which, according to Wyatt, was rendered insignificant later in the tabernacle service. This view capitalizes on Num 29:7–11, which mentions only one goat being sacrificed as a "sin offering." In this case, the goat "for the Lord" is sacrificed as a substitute for Yahweh while Azazel is a substitute for Attar. However, as we have seen above, the *lamed auctoris* preceding both "owners" of the goats precludes the notion that the "goat for the Lord" is to be sacrificed "on behalf" of the Lord.

עֲזָאזֵל *as the "Wrath of God"*

This view is championed mainly by Görg who suggests that Azazel came to nomadic Israel via Seth, the Egyptian god of confusion. Thus Azazel is "the expelled or removed culprit" because "the guilty one belongs there whence his guilt ultimately comes."[28] The meaning עֲזָאזֵל "for [the elimination of] divine anger" ("für [die Beseitigung von] Gotteszorn")[29] has also been suggested by Janowski via Hurrian

---

[27] N. Wyatt, "Atonement Theology in Ugarit and Israel," *UF* 8 (1976): 429.

[28] Görg, "Beobachtungen," 13.

[29] Janowski and Wilhelm, "Der Bock,"162; cf. ibid., "Azazel" in *DDD*, 128–131.

elimination rites and the Akk. *ezezu*, "to be angry."[30] De Roo[31] renders עֲזָאזֵל as a metathesized form of '*zz'l*, i.e., "the powerful wrath of God" that is, Yahweh.

These views do not represent dramatic departures from the "fierce god" rendering which refers to a lesser demon, except that they shift the object of the goat back to Yahweh. This view is not convincing for several reasons. First, there would be no reason to contrast both goats, one for the Lord and the other for Azazel, if both were somehow intended to be ultimately לַיהוָה, "for the Lord." Second, since according to Lev 16:26 the goat for Azazel was not originally intended to be sacrificed or killed (although it apparently did meet that end in Second Temple and Rabbinic times), the function of this "live goat" could hardly be construed as one of "appeasement" of wrath since it did not suffer any intentional form of punishment or death as purgation offerings necessitated. The notion of appeasement of deity also depends on the notion that "'the goat for Azazel' evidently had an atoning function (Lev 16:10), it was a means to atone for sin (vv. 21–22)."[32] But this notion seems to be based on the incorrect rendering of חַטָּאת as "atonement" or "forgiveness" rather than as "purgation offering." According to Lev 16 only blood could obtain such purification. The ritual of the goat for Azazel, in which no blood is spilled or ritually utilized, is best understood as a rite of elimination for sins and

---

[30] Ibid.

[31] Jacqueline C. R. De Roo, "Was the Goat for Azazel Destined for the Wrath of God?" *Bib* 81 (2000): 233–242.

[32] De Roo, "Was the Goat for Azazel," 241.

impurities which had already been purified from the tabernacle and by which any notions of "wrath of God" had already been satisfied in the death of the "goat for the Lord." This distinction has important implications for the interpretation of Azazel.

עֲזָאזֵל *in Christian Thought: A Type of Christ?*

Both the early Christian writer of the *Epistle of Barnabas* and Tertullian make this comparison. They believe that both goats referred to in Leviticus 16 are types of Christ. Tertullian explicitly states: 'The two goats which were offered at the Fast, are not these also figures of Christ's two activities?" Considering the compelling evidence culled from the Pentateuch, Christian interpreters have been incorrect to consider Azazel a type of Christ. At least one author[33] quotes Isa 53:6, "and the Lord has laid on him the iniquity of us all", as a possible connection between Christ and Azazel. But this is not necessarily a technical expression for the Azazel ritual, because the iniquity of the people was placed on the goat "for the Lord" as well. Wenham is off target when he concludes that, "As it [the goat] was led out to die in the wilderness bearing the sins of the people, so Christ was crucified outside Jerusalem for the sins of his people."[34] Jennifer Maclean counters this assertion by pointing out that "for a number of early Christian writers the scapegoat's association with demons clearly precluded any

---

[33] Cf. Richard Boyce, *Leviticus and Numbers* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008), 57.

[34] Wenham, *Leviticus*, 238.

application to Christ."[35] Milgrom's conclusion is pertinent here: "Azazel suffers the fate of all angels and spirits in Scripture. They can represent the powers of the physical world … but they are not deified … and their worship is prohibited."[36] John 1:29 has been quoted to argue that Christ is symbolized by the goat which "takes away" the sin, i.e., by Azazel. But only the language seems similar: in its effects, only the death of the first goat really accomplished the cleansing.[37]

Although this has been the dominant view in biblical scholarship, it has been increasingly challenged because of philological and theological inconsistencies. Gane, based on close analysis of the goat for Azazel in its ritualistic context in Leviticus, argues that the goat עֲזָאזֵל receives the actual responsibility for the sins of Israel and takes it to its symbolic source, Satan.

> The customary rendering of כִּפֶּר as "atone," coupled with the powerful association between "atonement" and substitution in Christian theology, has obfuscated the meaning of the live-goat ritual for many Christians. But once we realize that כִּפֶּר refers to removal of evil and does not specify substitution, which

---

[35] Jennifer K. Berenson Maclean, "Barabbas, the Scapegoat Ritual, and the Development of the Passion Narrative," *HTR* 110:3 (2007): 317. Maclean argues that the Barabbas narrative is based on the Azazel ritual following DeMaris' "curative exit rite" criteria. For a critique of this reading, see Merrill P. Miller, "The Social Logic of the Gospel of Mark: Cultural Persistence and Social Escape in a Postwar Time," in *Redescribing the Gospel of Mark*, ed. Barry S. Crawford and Merrill P. Miller (Atlanta, GA: SBL Press), 382-383.

[36] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 1021.

[37] Cf. Young: "It must be stressed that this is far from saying that the scapegoat was a type of Christ; the evidence is such as to leave open the *possibility* that the language of taking away of sin in John 1:29 and 1 Pet 2:24 *may* have been behind the language of the scapegoat ritual. The scapegoat in the OT custom only portrayed what the blood application had wrought, there is, therefore no intrinsic objection to taking the language—but only the language—of this ritual to describe what the greater sacrifice of Christ accomplished, for this is just what it did in the OT" ("The Impact," 356).

> is only one kind of "atonement," the purification ritual of Azazel's goat makes good sense.[38]

The implications of Gane's conclusions are readily apparent: the ritual makes sense because the removal of "all sin" from Israel ultimately points to the final removal of "all sin" from the universe by casting it on the antitypical "goat for Azazel," the devil, that old serpent (Rev 20:2).

Nevertheless, it is not impossible that traces of the ancient Thargelian φαρμακός rite could have subsisted in first-century Roman culture. It is implausible that for outside observers, Jesus, along with the other two thieves could have been seen as φάρμακοι being led away and crucified outside of the city's gates in a sort of elimination rite. Caird suggests this may have been Isaiah's intention in Isa 53: "The sin-bearing goat was unclean and could not therefore be offered to God. But these two images had already coalesced in the prophetic vision of the Servant of the Lord, of whom it was said that the Lord laid upon him the guilt of us all, but also that he made himself a sacrifice for sin (Isa 53:6, 10)."[39] However, this was not how Christian writers understood his crucifixion outside of Jerusalem. For example in Rom 3:25, Paul compares Jesus to the *kappōret*, the mercy seat where the blood of the goat for the Lord was applied on the Day of Atonement. In his exposition of the meaning of the Jesus' death and ascension as a high priest, the author of Hebrews nowhere compares Jesus to Azazel.

---

[38] Gane, *Cult and Character*, 259.

[39] George B. Caird, *New Testament Theology* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 153.

Summary and Conclusion

This *excursus* serves to confirm that the most reasonable view of the meaning of the ancient cipher, עֲזָאזֵל, points to a dependence on ancient Canaanite notions of demonic entities which cause chaos and are responsible/guilty for people's diseases, plagues, misfortunes. In the case of Israel עֲזָאזֵל is a demonic entity which inhabits the "barren region" (Lev 16:22) and is responsible for "all sin." On the Day of Atonement, עֲזָאזֵל receives back what is duly his: not a "peace offering" offered to a god but a toxic load of sins and impurities that have been accumulating on the tabernacle and encroaching on the divine.

CHAPTER 4

THE DAY OF ATONEMENT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

In this chapter the presence of language and imagery associated with the Day of Atonement in the NT is examined. The chapter begins with a brief overview of the reception of Day of Atonement imagery and language in the NT as a whole and subsequently, the hermeneutical approach established in the introduction of this study is applied. Verbal allusions and thematic echoes from the OT Day of Atonement passages are explored in several passages of the NT.

The purpose of the following analysis is to explore the reception of the Jewish Day of Atonement in the writings of the NT and how the rituals and themes attendant to this day were incorporated and reworked in the early Christian writers' interpretation of the OT in light of "the Christ event."

The Jewish Feasts and Nascent Christianity

It is evident that early Christians understood the importance of the Jewish feasts; Paul dresses the Jewish Passover in Christian garb when he says that "Christ, our Passover lamb has been sacrificed" (καὶ γὰρ τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ἐτύθη Χριστός; 1 Cor 5:7).

He also explains the feast of First Fruits through the lens of "the Christ event" and refers to Christ's resurrection as the "first fruits of those who sleep" (1 Cor 15:20–23). He then urges the Christian community in Corinth to "celebrate the feast" (ἑορταζομεν, 1 Cor 5:8), which is a reference to the Passover based on the sacrifice of the typological lamb, Christ. In an allusion to the Feast of Unleavened Bread which preceded the Passover, Paul reminds the readers that leaven is a symbol of "malice and evil" (cf. Matt 16:6–12; Mark 8:15).[1] Paul's allusions to the Passover are parallel to that present in 1 Pet 1:19 in which the blood of Christ is compared to that of a lamb "without defect or blemish", referring to the one year-old Passover lamb. Paul uses "Pentecost" as a time referent in 1 Cor 16:8: "But I will stay on at Ephesus until Pentecost" (cf. Acts 20:16).

There is evidence in patristic literature that Christians kept the Passover from the inception of the movement; according to Irenaeus[2] Polycarp (ca. 70 CE) had kept the *pascha* from childhood. Even as the interest in the Jewish Feasts waned gradually with the passage of time, Stökl Ben Ezra avers that "a considerable number of third- and fourth-century Christians in Syria-Palestine celebrated Yom Kippur together with their neighbors"[3] and that, "[w]ithout evidence to the contrary, the working assumption

---

[1] See Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 406.

[2] Irenaeus, *Adversus Haeresus* iii. 3.4. Stökl Ben Ezra, *The Impact*, 221; see also Tiwald, "Hilasterion," 198.

[3] Stökl Ben Ezra, *The Impact*, 221, 227; ibid., "'Christians' Observing 'Jewish' Festivals of Autumn," in *The Image of the Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature*, WUNT 158, eds. Peter J. Tomson and Doris Lambers-Petry (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 53–72; Stökl

should be that most Christian Jews, after hearing about Jesus, continued to observe the same festivals as they had done before."[4] This can probably be strongly inferred from the community from which Luke-Acts emerged as evidenced in the mention of "the fast" in Acts 27:9.

However, important as the Jewish feasts probably were to nascent Christianity, one should not assume that the early Church followed the Jewish calendar *per se*. Fitzmyer posits that "only two of the great Jewish feasts seem to have become part of the Christian tradition, Passover and Pentecost."[5] Even then, there is little indication that they were followed precisely how the Jews observed them. It is more likely that Jewish feast imagery is used in the NT and Revelation as a way to maintain thematic, covenantal continuity and not necessarily as an injunction upon Christians. This view has the support of Paul's understanding that the Jewish feasts were a "shadow" (Col 2:16–17) of things that have been "fulfilled" in the life of Christ (cf. Matt 5:30); a Christian's

---

Ben Ezra, *The Impact*, 221; see also Tiwald, "Hilasterion," 198. Cf. Harold W. Attridge, "Study of the New Testament in the Pluralistic Context of the Twenty-First Century," in *Foster Biblical Scholarship: Essays in Honor of Kent Harold Richards*, eds. Frank Ritchel Ames and Charles William Miller (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010), 59.

[4] Stökl Ben Ezra, *The Impact*, 214.

[5] J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Ascension of Christ and Pentecost," *TS* 45 (1984), 430. George W. Buchanan, "Worship, Feasts and Ceremonies in the Early Jewish-Christian Church," *NTS* 26 (1980): 297, points out how the "…church fathers accused the Jewish-Christians of observing the feast days of the Jews. … They observed the Sabbath and also the Lord's Day. They celebrated Passover on the fourteenth of Nisan, but they may also have celebrated the resurrection at Easter. They may or may not have observed the Jewish Feast of Weeks instead of, or in addition to, Pentecost. It is uncertain whether they observed New Year's Day, the Day of Atonement, and the Feast of Tabernacles with popular Judaism in the fall." Caird, *Revelation*, 58, suggests that Christians replaced the ethos of Passover with the Lord's Supper.

experiential outlook and eschatological hope must be framed by that event. As Davies concludes, "the imagery shows … that early Christians exploited the festal traditions of Judaism for their own evangelistic and hortatory ends."[6]

Although Paul seems to criticize the idea that Christians could observe Jewish feasts when he says to the Galatians, "You are observing special days, and months, and seasons, and years" (Gal 4:10), it appears that these ἡμέρας καὶ μῆνας καὶ καιροὺς καὶ ἐνιαυτούς refer rather to pagan festivals. This interpretation is supported by Paul's statements in Rom 14:5–6 that the choice to consider some days better than others belongs to the individual Christian.[7] As Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* seems to indicate, by that time (second century CE) Christians did not follow a calendar of festivals or even the weekly Sabbath.

The Day of Atonement in the New Testament

The life, death and resurrection of Christ stand as the sunrise that illuminated the Day of Atonement rituals for the NT authors.[8] Jesus as high priest, according to Cullmann, "is not only present in Hebrews, but lies also behind the Christological

---

[6] W. D. Davies, "Reflections on Archbishop Carrington's "The Primitive Christian Calendar" in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology: Studies in Honor of C. H. Dodd (*Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956), 132.

[7] Cf. Stökl Ben Ezra, "Christians' Observing 'Jewish' Festivals of Autumn," 59–61.

[8] As Judson Davis put it, "Whatever purpose God meant for failed Israel at Sinai, he means to fulfill through his church and Christ" (Judson Davis, "Acts 2 and the OT: The Pentecost event in light of Sinai, Babel, and the table of nations" *CTR* 7/1 [2009]: 42).

statements of other New Testament passages."[9] Kiuchi writes: "Since the book [of Leviticus] contains rules and narratives concerning the relationship between God and humans, and more specifically the question of how humans can live in close proximity to the holy Lord, theologically it is most relevant to the atoning work of Christ."[10] He continues: "…while the literal observance of some parts of Leviticus is no longer necessary, the goal of such regulations (holiness) remains the same in both Leviticus and the NT."[11] Wenham observes that "[t]hough strictly speaking the Day of Atonement is no longer relevant to the Christian, from studying it he can learn a great deal about the nature of sin, the necessity of atonement, and the superiority of Christ's sacrifice."[12] Thus Rylaarsdam is correct when he states about the Day of Atonement: "The New Testament passion narratives, the Letter to the Hebrews and the writings of Paul are all in various ways under its impact."[13]

The rituals of the book of Leviticus have deep theological meaning, which often is not set out explicitly but is implicit in the descriptions. Hartley says that "[f]or the early Christians, the Day of Atonement played a significant role in their interpretation of Jesus' death. Good Friday became the Christians' Day of Atonement, so to speak, a day

---

[9] Oscar Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1959), 107.

[10] Kiuchi, *Leviticus*, 47.

[11] Ibid., 48.

[12] Wenham, *Leviticus*, 23.

[13] J. C. Rylaarsdam, "Day of Atonement," *IDB* 1:313.

of self-denial, penance, expiation, and reconciliation."[14] It is not surprising then that as Christianity emerged from Judaism it was strongly influenced by the rituals of the Second Temple which were still fresh in the memory of the NT authors as they wrote just a few decades after the death of Christ and the destruction of the Temple. Young avers that the Day of Atonement had a "grand place and pervasive influence in the contemporary Jewish world."[15] This can be clearly seen in the book of Hebrews whose author capitalizes on the Day of Atonement rituals to articulate the fact that Jesus was not only the sacrifice but the very typological high priest who by his blood achieved victory and assurance for believers (Heb 6:19–20; 9:12).[16]

Not only did Yom Kippur have important applications for the daily lives of the readers of Hebrews but, as Young writes, "The Day of Atonement attracted the eschatological-judicial zeal of the apocalypticist … It would again be a surprise if the New Testament ignored this viewpoint throughout its length, especially as it contains its own Apocalypse."[17] Tiwald agrees when he writes, "Yom Kippur had a strong apocalyptic

---

[14] Hartley, *Leviticus*, 220.

[15] Young, "The Impact," 6.

[16] David M. Moffit, "Blood, Life and Atonement: Reassessing Hebrew's Christological Appropriation of Yom Kippur," in *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretation in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*, eds. Thomas Hieke and Tobias Niklas, TBN 15 (Leiden: Brill, 2012): 219 writes: "Thus, if there is any focal point of Yom Kippur, it was on the sprinkling of the blood in the holy of holies. That is to say, it was the moment when the life of the animal was taken into God's presence."

[17] Young, "The Impact," 9.

connotation."[18] For Stökl Ben Ezra, "[t]he annual Yom Kippur was perceived, at least by some, as a ritual anticipation of the eschatological purification of God's creation from sin."[19]

Tiwald argues that the use of temple imagery in Paul and Jewish apocalyptic literature does not entail the abolishment of the temple, but rather a broadening of its typological horizons, especially its eschatological implications. Christ is both ἱλαστήριον, "mercy seat", and the high priest of the eschatological temple represented by the Christian church. As the eschatological ἱλαστήριον, Christ stands for what the temple stood for. The churches are represented as being inside this typological temple as the lampstands guided by stars.[20] For Tiwald, Paul's "mentioning Christ as *hilastērion* therefore does not mean an abrogation of the temple cult in Jerusalem, but it also might be more than the mere use of metaphorical language."[21]

The Day of Atonement in the Gospels

According to the authors of all four gospels, "the Christ event" stands as the fulfillment of ancient OT Messianic prophecies. But the rereading of the OT in light of Jesus' life was not limited to the prophets; the Jewish system of blood rituals and sacrifices

---

[18] Tiwald, "Hilasterion," 197.

[19] Stökl Ben Ezra, *The Impact*, 89.

[20] Cf. Tiwald, "Hilasterion," 198–201.

[21] Ibid., 201.

served as a springboard to explain Jesus' death. As Margaret Barker writes, "the picture of Jesus as the great high priest in all his roles and aspects appears throughout the New Testament and is the key to understanding all early Christian teaching about him."[22]

Actual allusions to OT Messianic prophecies occur mostly in the gospel of Matthew.[23] John mentions four feasts occurring in the time of Jesus: Sabbaths, the Feast of Passover (John 2:13–25; 6; 13:19); the Feast of Tabernacles (John 7) and the Feast of Dedication or ἐγκαίνια (John 10:22–42).[24] There is also some evidence, although not decisive, that early Christians may have continued to observe some of these feasts after the resurrection, such as Pentecost (Acts 2), and the fast of the Day of Atonement (Acts 27:9).[25]

---

[22] Barker, *Revelation*, 4. Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, STDJ 42 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 59. This concept can also be seen in Jewish pseudepigraphal literature: cf. 2 *En.* 22:8–10; 3 *En.* 12, Sir 50:6–7; 4QpIsad (4Q164); 4Q405 23 II, 7–10; 4Q175; *Let. Aris.* 97 as well as in Josephus, *Antiquities* 3:216–7.

[23] Cf. Isa 7:14 in Matt 1:22–23; Mic 5:2 in Matt 2:4–7; Hos 11:1 in Matt 2:15; Jer 31:15 in Matt 2:17–18; Jesus' birth in Nazareth in Matt 2:23; Isa 40:3 in Matt 3:3; Isa 9:1–2 in Matt 4:12–17; Isa 53:4 in Matt 8:16–17; Isa 42:1–4 in Matt 12:15–21; Isa 6:9–10 in Matt 13:13–15; Ps 78:2 in Matt 13:34–35; Isa 29:13 in Matt 15:7–9; Zech 9:9 in Matt 21:1–5; Ps 118:22–23 in Matt 21:33–43; Zech 13:7 in Matt 26:31; Zech 11:13 in Matt 27:3–10; Ps 22:18 in Matt 27:35.

[24] Cf. Gale A. Yee, *Jewish Feasts in the Gospel of John* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1989), 30: "John situates certain events in Jesus' ministry specifically during four Jewish festival seasons: Sabbath, Passover, Tabernacles, and Dedication. According to John, Jesus replaces these feasts in his special relationship to the Father, making them obsolete."

[25] John Dominic Crossan, *The Cross That Spoke: The Origins of the Passion Narrative* (San Francisco, CA: Harper and Row, 1988), Crossan proposed that all of the passion narratives are built on the Day of Atonement rituals via the *Gospel of Peter*. For criticism of this view, cf. Timothy P. Henderson, *The Gospel of Peter and Early Christian Apologetics: Rewriting the Story of Jesus' Death, Burial and Resurrection* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 26–42; Joel B. Green, "The Gospel of Peter: Source for a Pre-Canonical Passion Narrative?" *ZAW* 78 (1987): 293–301; R. H. Fuller, review of John Dominic Crossan, *The Cross That Spoke. The Origins of the Passion Narrative*, *Int* 45 (1991): 71–73.

The Release of Barabbas and the Goat for Azazel Rite in Matthew

The gospel of Matthew shows most use of imagery from the Day of Atonement and it is particularly associated with the events of the condemnation and death of Jesus. The first is the release of Barabbas in Matt 27:15–23, which appears to allude to the release of the goat for Azazel. Scholars are virtually unanimous that such a *privilegium paschalis*, i.e., the release of a criminal by a Roman authority before a Jewish feast, has not yet been historically attested. Therefore, a theological reason for such an unusual episode has been sought. In an article published in the nineteenth century titled "The Scapegoat-Barabbas,"[26] A. H. Wratislaw argues that all of the gospels' accounts of the release of Barabbas are based on the ritual of the goat for Azazel. More recently, both Jennifer Maclean[27] and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra[28] have independently reached the same conclusion. Here again the theme of the "two lots" which by this time had assumed eschatological meaning is evident in this passage.

---

[26] A. H. Wratislaw, "The Scapegoat-Barrabas," *ET* 3 (1891 /92): 400–403.

[27] Maclean, "Barabbas," 317: "the parallels [of the ritual of the goat for Azazel] to the Barabbas narrative are obvious: Two goats (men) are brought before the people; one is killed, the other is released."

[28] Stökl Ben Ezra, *The Impact*, 171: "As scapegoat they choose the wrong goat, Jesus Barabbas, who is released in their midst (and consequently pollutes them), and hence as sacrificial goat, the wrong goat, Jesus of Nazareth, whose blood, spilled at the wrong place, also pollutes them." Cf. Ibid., "Fasting with Jews, Thinking with Scapegoats on Yom Kippur in Early Judaism and Christianity, in Particular 4Q541, Barnabas 7, Matthew 27 and Acts 27," in *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretations in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*, eds. Thomas Hieke and Tobias Nicklas, TBN 15 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 183: "I suggest that these features of the Matthean Barabbas story were formed not only by Deuteronomy but also had the ritual of the goats of Yom Kippur as a catalyst."

The Mocking of Jesus in Matt 27:27–31

As discussed above, it is not altogether implausible that Jesus' procession to Calvary might contain aspects of the goat for Azazel rite via ancient Greek elimination rites, in which a φαρμακός is abused on the way out of the city after being clothed in fancy clothes.[29] If this is Matthew's intention, it could be interpreted rather Jesus's being seen as a φαρμακός in Greco-Roman eyes and not necessarily a Judeo-Christian interpretation of the event.[30]

The Rending of τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ *(Matthew 27:50–54)*

Matthew 27:50–54 appears to contain an indirect allusion to the Day of Atonement. It describes a series of phenomena that occur simultaneously with Jesus' death on the cross, such as an earthquake and the resurrection of "saints." One of these

---

[29] Cf. Robert Parker, *On Greek Religion*, 217; Bremmer, "Scapegoat Rituals in Ancient Greece," 273–277; B. H. McLean, *The Cursed Christ*, 65–104.

[30] Maclean, "Barabbas," 327–328 argues that the mob present during the trial could have been appealing to Roman sensibilities to eliminate unwanted characters when they ask Pilate to "eliminate" Jesus from their midst while taking Barabbas' fate (blood) into their own hands. This reading is suggested by Maclean because the Greek text is ambiguous: by saying "His blood be on us and on our children!" τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ἡμῶν (Matt 27:24). The mob could in fact be referring to Barabbas and not Jesus. Further, in support of a possible Roman elimination rite akin to the Greek φαρμακός rite, Koester observes that Matthew uses a different term for Jesus' "scarlet robe," χλαμύδα κοκκίνην in Matt 27:28 from Mark's "purple cloak," πορφύρα (cf. 15:17) which is also the "scarlet robe" used by Jesus in *Barnabas* 7:8, "τό ἔριον τὸ κόκκινον" a passage in which the author compares Jesus' humiliation to Azazel's dimissal. In this passage, Matthew could be conflating certain aspects of both the goat for the Lord and the goat for Azazel in his passion account in order to highlight the attitude of the Romans towards Jesus. But this rather loose allusion based solely on the word κόκκινον, if an allusion to the φαρμακός rite at all, appears to serve as a rhetorical device to enhance the role of Jesus' killers in light of that ancient rite instead of attempting to liken Jesus' sacrifice to that of the goat of Azazel (cf. Helmut Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (Philadelphia, PA: Trinity Press International, 1990), 225–226).

phenomena is the rending of "the veil of the temple," τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ, from top to bottom (v. 51). The tearing of the veil "from top to bottom," ἀπ ἄνωθεν ἕως κάτω, indicates a divine act,[31] especially considering there is early Rabbinic tradition found in the *Mishnah* according to which the veil of the Most Holy Place was about four inches thick.[32]

The rending of the καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ is the only element that is found also in Mark and Luke (Mark 15:33; Luke 23:45) but none of the synoptists explains its meaning.[33] Not surprisingly, scholars have given various interpretations of this occurrence. On the one hand, John Nolland sees it as a "signal of the coming doom of the temple" or the "symbolic beginning of the actual destruction" or even that "God comes forth to act in power."[34] Douglas A. Hagner, on the other hand. considers this rending as "the wrath and judgment of God against the Jewish authorities" and "to the

---

[31] Cf. Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, WBC 33b (Dallas, TX: Word, Inc., 1998), 849.

[32] Cf. *m. Shekalim* 8:5: "Rabbi Shimon b. Gamaliel says in the name of Rabbi Simeon son of the Prefect: The veil was a handbreadth thick and woven on [a loom having] seventy-two rods, and over each rod were twenty-four threads. Its length was forty cubits and its breadth twenty cubits; it was made by eighty-two young girls, and they used to make two every year; and three hundred priests immersed it" (Herbert Danby, *The Mishnah: Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes* [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers Marketing, 2011], 161).

[33] A comprehensive treatment on this subject has been done by Daniel M. Gurtner, *The Torn Veil: Matthew's Exposition of the Death of Jesus*, SNTSMS 139 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007). See also Ibid., "The Veil of the Temple in History and Legend," *JETS* 49/1 (2006): 97-114.

[34] John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005), 1212.

end of the temple, where God is no longer present."[35] Indeed, Caiaphas's rending of his robe in Matthew 25:65 as an act of outrage for "transgressions" inflicted on his office and the temple itself is eclipsed by God's rejection of the Jewish priesthood and the Temple altogether when the veil of the Temple is rent at the precise moment when Jesus finally gives his own "flesh" as a Day of Atonement sacrifice (cf. Heb 10:19–20).

Despite the silence on the part of the synoptic authors about the significance of this event, the importance of the reference to τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ in relationship to the death of Christ can be established by means of a closer look at the common tradition that appears to run through both Matthew and the book of Hebrews. Lindeskog connects the Matthean tradition with those underlying the interpretation of the Day of Atonement rituals in the book of Hebrews.[36] This tradition associates the shedding of Jesus' blood on the cross directly with the blood rituals of the sanctuary and, more specifically, with its καταπέτασμα, a central feature of the Day of Atonement blood rituals (see section below on the book of Hebrews). The logical conclusion that follows from this reference to the τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ is that the synoptists must be referring to the veil of the Most Holy Place since this is the only καταπέτασμα

---

[35] Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, 849.

[36] Gösta Lindeskog "Der Prozeß Jesu Im Jüdisch-Christlichen Religionsgespräch" in *Abraham Unser Vater: Juden Und Christen in Gespräch Über Die Bibel*, Festschrift für Otto Michel zum 60 Geburtstag, eds. Ott Betz and Marting Hengel (Leiden: Brill, 1963), 325–36; ibid., "The Veil of the Temple," in *In Honorem A. Fridrichsen Sexagenarii*, Edenda Curavit Seminarium Neotestamenticum Upsaliense, ConNT 11 (Lund: Gleerup, 1947), 132–37.

connected to "blood" rituals in the sanctuary service and is consequently the only veil that has any cultic meaning. By connecting both events, the rending of the veil and Jesus' death on the cross, Matthew is essentially connecting the blood rituals of the sanctuary involving the veil and the Most Holy Place with the "blood ritual" of the cross.

The foregoing conclusion is supported by at least two observations. First, the veil is a central element of the blood rituals and the Day of Atonement described in Lev 16; rituals took place either "outside of the veil" or "within the veil." Each purification of the Most Holy Place and the Holy Place involved seven sprinklings in front of the veil (cf. Lev 4: 6, 7, 18; 16:14, 15). Furthermore, although the LXX does use καταπέτασμα for the two curtains of the tabernacle building *per se*, the Hebrew terminology used in Exodus to describe the curtains of the sanctuary is quite specific: (1) the curtains that surrounded the entire sanctuary are called יְרִיעֹת (Exod 26:1); (2) the curtain at the door of the tabernacle which led into the Holy Place is also called יְרִיעֹת (Exod 26:9) and מָסָךְ (Exod 26:36); (3) the curtain at the door of the court of the tabernacle is also called מָסָךְ (Exod 27:16); (4) the curtains/hangings around the whole court which housed the entire tabernacle are called קְלָעִים (Exod 38:16); and (5) the veil separating the Holy Place from the Most Holy Place has a unique name which is not shared by any of the other curtains/hanging. It is called the פָּרֹכֶת and this term appears three times in Lev 16 (vv. 2, 12, 15) and once in Exod 26:33 in the expression מִבֵּית לַפָּרֹכֶת, "within the veil", to specify that the blood of the sacrifice is to be sprinkled inside the Most Holy

Place and to specify where the utensils of the Most Holy Place should be placed, i.e., "within the veil" or inside the curtain. This indicates that the technical term פָּרֹכֶת refers to "the" veil of the sanctuary *par excellence* and this seems to be the most logical meaning underlying the expression τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ in Matthew. The expression מִבֵּית לַפָּרֹכֶת is always translated as ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος in the LXX and it is used in the book of Hebrews to speak of Jesus's going "within the veil," ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος (cf. Heb 6:19–20; 10:19–20).

Nolland agrees that the veil of the Most Holy Place is the most important curtain of the tabernacle when he writes that "[i]n terms of graded holiness, the inner curtain must be considered the more important one,"[37] although he leans towards thinking that the curtain leading to the Holy Place only would be in the public view. But the publicity of the rending of the καταπέτασμα is not a strong objection to considering this καταπέτασμα as the veil to the Most Holy Place since some of these phenomena seem to come from a tradition developed later, as the interpolation of the resurrection of Jesus in this passage seems to attest. The testimony from the rending of the καταπέτασμα most likely comes from later sources whose authors are familiar with these events. While the curtains of the sanctuary veiled the sanctuary partially, the veil of the Most Holy Place veiled God's presence in the tabernacle continuously, except once a year on the Day of

[37] Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 1212.

Atonement. Thus, the rending of the veil at the time of the crucifixion turned the Most Holy Place of the earthly sanctuary into a common place. By exposing the Most Holy Place to ordinary eyes, Matthew invalidates the Day of Atonement rituals that occurred before the *shekinah* found "within the veil." But this at once invalidates the Day of Atonement and negates the meaning of the whole ritual system since it was through the yearly Day of Atonement that the sanctuary's purpose was reestablished and the covenant reconfirmed.[38] According to this tradition—apparently underlying both the synoptic gospels and the book of Hebrews—Christians can now enter the heavenly sanctuary "with confidence ... by the new and living way that he opened for us through the curtain [διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος] (that is, through his flesh)" (Heb 10:19–20).[39] As Craig Koester puts it, "Jesus secured access to God's presence 'by means of ' his flesh."[40] The connection of "flesh" here with the rending of the Temples' "veil" in Matthew at the moment of Jesus' death seems undeniable.

---

[38] R. D. Witherup "The Death of Jesus and the Raising of the Saints: Matthew 27:51–54 in Context," SBLSP 26 (1987): 580, sees the event as "salvation-historical indicator."

[39] For a discussion on how to take "διά" in this passage, see Joachim Jeremias, "Hebräer 10:20 τοῦτ' ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ," ZNW 62 (1971): 131; Ottfried Hofius, "Inkarnation und Opfertod Jesu nach Hebr 10, 19f," in *Der Ruf und die Antwort der Gemeinde: Festschrift Joachim Jeremias*, ed. E. Lohse (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970), 132–43; William G. Johnsson, "Defilement and Purgation in the Book of Hebrews" (PhD diss., Vanderbilt University, 1973), 353–355.

[40] Craig R. Koester, *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York, NY: Doubleday, 2001), 443.

In regard to the typology of sanctuary themes pointing to Jesus' sacrifice, the Gospel of Mark states that Christ gave his life as a "ransom," λύτρον, a word that carries atonement overtones (10:45; cf. Matt 20:28; Luke 24:21).

Jesus as Heavenly High Priest in the Gospel of John

Scholars have argued about whether Jesus is presented as high priest in the gospel of John. John P. Heil[41] presents compelling evidence for this in the following passages: (1) the plot by the high priest Caiaphas to kill Jesus (John 11:45–53); (2) Jesus' arrest and trial before Caiaphas (John 18:1–27); (3) Jesus' seamless tunic (John 19:23–24) as a high-priestly tunic.

Heil constructs his argument on the first two points from contrasts between Caiaphas and Jesus. While plotting to kill Jesus, Caiaphas's arrogance in calling the Sanhedrin "ignorant" (11:49–50) is contrasted with Jesus' humility in bestowing knowledge on his disciples (John 10:14–15). Furthermore, Caiaphas alludes to the sacrifice of one goat in Lev 16 when he says, "it is better for you to have one man die for the people than to have the whole nation destroyed" (John 11:50) because the Day of Atonement involved a ritual for corporate atonement. This is in fact John's own interpretation: Caiaphas, being the high priest, is under the influence of God himself (cf. "not of his own," 11:51) and utters a prophecy that Jesus, as a single sacrifice, would

[41] John Paul Heil, "Jesus as Unique High Priest in the Gospel of John," *CBQ* 57 (1995): 729–745.

die for the whole nation and not only for Israel but for all the "dispersed children of God" as a Day of Atonement sacrifice. John then connects the prophecy with its fulfillment in John 18:14 by reminding his readers that Caiaphas is the one who prophesied that it was better that one man die for the whole nation when Jesus is finally brought before Caiaphas (cf. John 18:24).

Heil also highlights the important link between this passage and Lev 16 that is made when John explains that Caiaphas was the high priest "that year," ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου (John 11:51). The word ἐνιαυτοῦ, "year," is the same word used in the expression "every year," ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ in the ordinance to perform the Day of Atonement in Lev 16:34. The implication in this echo of Lev 16 is that it fell on Caiaphas as high priest to perform the ultimate Day of Atonement sacrifice by having Jesus killed as the "goat for the Lord". Unwittingly, Caiaphas also confers to Jesus the status of high priest since his sacrificial death could, theoretically, redeem Caiaphas's murderous act as prescribed in the protection conferred in cities of refuge to murderers in Numbers 35:25: "The slayer shall live in it until the death of the high priest who was anointed with the holy oil."

The third passage in John containing high priestly echoes is Jesus' tunic in John 19:23–24 where he cites the messianic prophecy found in Ps 22:18. John intentionally describes Jesus' tunic: "now the tunic was seamless, woven in one piece from the top," ἐκ τῶν ἄνωθεν ὑφαντὸς δι' ὅλου.[42] The importance of the mention of Jesus' tunic by John

[42] Heil also points out the correspondence of the terms in this passage with OT passages describing the clothing of the high priest: the high priest's clothing was ἔργον ὑφαντὸν (Exod 28:6);

may be clarified by its relationship with the rending of the καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ ἐσχίσθη ἀπ' ἄνωθεν, "the veil of the temple from top to bottom" described in Matt 27:51 as we saw previously. The expression ἀπ' ἄνωθεν (from the top) appears to link the veil of the Temple with Jesus' tunic which was also woven ἄνωθεν. It would be hard for original readers of these passages to miss the parallel here. In fact, the book of Hebrews appears to capitalize on this tradition by conflating elements of the temple service to Jesus' own body: "by the new and living way that he opened for us through the curtain (that is, through his flesh)" (ἣν ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν ὁδὸν πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος, τοῦτ' ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, Heb 10:20).

The Day of Atonement in Acts and the Epistles

The Day of Atonement in Acts

The closest reference to the temporal passing of the Day of Atonement in the NT is the "fast," ἡ νηστεία, mentioned by Luke in Acts 27:9: "Since much time had been lost and sailing was now dangerous, because even the Fast [τὴν νηστείαν] had already gone by, Paul advised them..." This is a clear reference to the passing of the Day of Atonement since this occasion was the only feast that mandated a fast (νηστεία) for Israelites, as we read in Lev 16:29: "In the seventh month, on the tenth day of the month,

---

the tunic and the ephod were woven "whole," ἔργον ὑφαντὸν ὅλον (Exod 28:31; 36:29). Thus, by contrasting Jesus' seamless tunic with the torn robes of Caiaphas, Matthew, Mark and John confer a high priesthood on Jesus that is superior to that of Caiaphas, the high priest "that year."

you shall deny yourselves [or fast], and shall do no work, neither the citizen nor the alien who resides among you."

The context in Acts pertains to Paul's last travel to Rome under Roman guard for a hearing with Cesar. The passage of the Day of Atonement fast some time prior to the events described there (either in late September or early October according to the lunar calendar) indicates that conditions of travel by sea were quickly deteriorating. In fact, the use of "the fast" as a temporal marker here may indeed indicate the lateness of the Day of Atonement that year, most likely then in October for if even a late fast had already passed, they would already be in the no-travel period (November–February).[43] This helps elucidate Paul's admonition against setting out to sea at that time.[44]

Another possible allusion to Lev 16 is found in the description of the ascension of Jesus in Acts 1:9: "When he had said this, as they were watching, he was lifted up, and a cloud [νεφέλη] took him out of their sight." In Lev 16:2 Moses is instructed: "Tell your brother Aaron not to come just at any time into the sanctuary inside the curtain before the mercy seat that is upon the ark, or he will die; for I appear in the cloud [Heb. עָנָן;

---

[43] Cf. John B. Polhill, *Acts*, NAC 26 (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1992), 518.

[44] J. D. G. Dunn, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996), 338, avers: "We should not overlook the clear implication that Paul and his companions continued to observe this distinctive Jewish holy day (cf. 20.6, 16)." Cf. also Stökl Ben Ezra, *The Impact*, 215: "When he employed ἡ νηστεία as a chronological reference he apparently presumed his readers would understand what he was talking about."

Gr. νεφέλη] upon the mercy seat [ἱλαστήριον]." In Lev 16:12, Aaron is instructed to come into the Most Holy Place covered by a cloud of incense, "that the cloud [Heb. עָנָן; Gr. ἀτμὶς] of the incense may cover the mercy seat [ἱλαστήριον] that is upon the covenant, or he will die."

The presence of a cloud in the ascension of Jesus is significant for its verbal as well as thematic correspondence with the Day of Atonement ritual described in Lev 16. (1) The Hebrew term for cloud in both Lev 16 verses is עָנָן although translated variously as νεφέλη (v. 2) and ἀτμὶς (v. 12). These terms are therefore synonymous because they refer to the same Hebrew *Vorlage*. (2) The theme of a cloud hiding Yahweh above the mercy seat as well as a cloud hiding the high priest on the Day of Atonement present a parallel to a cloud that hides Jesus at his ascension. (3) There is a parallel between "entering" in a "cloud" into the Most Holy Place and Jesus' entrance into heaven with "a cloud." As the Aaronic high priest "entered" into the presence of Yahweh residing in the Most Holy Place, Jesus "entered within the veil," εἰσερχομένην εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος (Heb 6:19–20). As the high priest goes into the presence of Yahweh on the Day of Atonement, Jesus ascends into heaven itself (Luke 24:52; Acts 1:11; 1 Tim 3:16; Heb 9:24) to stand in the presence of the Father as high priest to intercede for his people (Heb 7:25; Rom 8:34; Eph 1:20–21). That this "entrance" occurred in the past from the perspective of the author of Hebrews is evidenced by the aorist εἰσῆλθεν, "entered" in Heb 6:20.

Moreover, this interpretation is supported by Rom 3:25 in which Paul compares Jesus' sacrificial death to the ἱλαστήριον, the mercy seat of the Most Holy Place, where blood is applied on the Day of Atonement. This interpretation is explored in more detail below.

The Day of Atonement in the Letters of Paul

According to George W. Buchanan, "The place to begin research on Paul's doctrine of redemption is not Luther's doctrine of salvation by faith alone, but in the Jewish understanding of sin, the land, legal and financial metaphors, and the function of the Day of Atonement."[45]

Calvin sees echoes of the Azazel purification rite in 1 Corinthians 4:13 in which Paul has the Greek purification rights in mind when he uses the term περικαθάρματα. Paul often argues that the Israelite system of sacrifices and feasts was merely a "type" (1 Cor 10:11) and a "shadow" (σκιὰ, Col 2:17), which pointed to Christ (cf. 1 Cor 5:7; 15:20; 1 Thess 4:13–18; Col 2:16–17; cf. also 1 Pet 1:19). Paul's use of the Paschal lamb in 1 Cor 5:7 evokes themes of vicarious suffering and links Passover feast and the Day of Atonement symbolism.[46] This dialogical approach is also evident in John's use of the lamb imagery in a Day of Atonement setting in Revelation 4–5.

---

[45] George W. Buchanan, "The Day of Atonement and Paul's Doctrine of Redemption," *NovT* 23/3 (1990): 236.

[46] Cf. Alumkal Jacob Paxy, *Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ Implied in the Image of the Paschal Lamb in 1 Cor 5* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2014), 127–131, 137.

In the same manner as in Mark, Paul employs the concept of "ransom" in the word ἀντίλυτρον: "Christ Jesus, himself human who gave himself a ransom for all" (ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων, 1 Tim 2:6).

Paul also makes use of Day of Atonement imagery when he compares Christ to the "mercy seat" (ἱλαστήριον). He says in Rom 3:25: "through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God put forward as a sacrifice of atonement by his blood, effective through faith" (Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον).[47] The term ἱλαστήριον in the LXX translates all the twenty-one appearances of the Hebrew כַּפֹּרֶת and refers to the top of the ark of the covenant in the Most Holy Place, most commonly known as the "mercy seat" (cf. "atonement cover" in the NIV). The Hebrew term כַּפֹּרֶת has the same root as *kippurim* the name of the Day of Atonement. As Young writes, the use of ἱλαστήριον "provides *prima facie* the most likely background for Paul's usage in Rom. 3:25."[48] The only time ἱλαστήριον is linked to any type of blood sacrifice is on the Day of Atonement. Lev 16:12–15 describes two sprinklings of blood on the כַּפֹּרֶת: the blood of the bull of the sin offering for Aaron and the blood of the goat "for the Lord" as the sin

[47] The question whether this is a clear allusion to Lev 16 has been discussed by Schreiber who compares Christ's death as a "votive offering" on our behalf. See S. Schreiber, "Das Weihegeschenk Gottes; Eine Deutung des Todes Jesu in Rom 3,25," *ZNW* 97 (2006): 88–110. Cf. also Norman H. Young, "Did St. Paul Compose Rom iii:24f?" *ABR* 22 (1974): 23–32.

[48] Norman H. Young, "Hilaskesthai and Related Words in the New Testament," *EQ* 55 (1983): 170. Cf. also T. W. Manson, "Hilasterion," *JTS* 46 (1945): 1–10.

offering. By connecting Christ to the כַּפֹּרֶת/ ἱλαστήριον, Paul alludes to the Day of Atonement.

Bailey argues that Paul has in mind the actual ἱλαστήριον of the tabernacle but his use is metaphorical.[49] Tiwald agrees when he writes that "an allusion to Lev 16:13–15 fits perfectly into the trajectory of argumentation in Rom 3 and into the whole theology of Paul: it is Christ's atoning and vicarious suffering that Paul explains here by using cultic imagery that refers to the Yom Kippur."[50] Furthermore, since the temple that stood at the time of Jesus, the Second Temple, did not have a ἱλαστήριον (the ark was lost at the time of the Babylonian invasion in 586 BCE), Paul's use of ἱλαστήριον seems to indicate that he understands Jesus' death on the cross as a fulfillment of the typologies attached to the Mosaic and Solomonic sanctuaries.[51] In the same vein, his attack on Jewish feast "days" in Gal 4:10 includes also the Jewish Day of Atonement made innocuous by the death of Christ. This would strengthen the view that he sees Christ's death as a fulfilment of all Israelite festivals and rituals.[52]

---

[49] Daniel Bailey, "Jesus as the Mercy Seat: The Semantics and Theology of Paul's Use of Hilasterion in Romans 3:25," *TynBul* 51/1 (2000):155; cf. Lace Marie Williams-Tinajero, *Reshaped Mind* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 75–88.

[50] Tiwald, "Hilasterion," 194.

[51] Paul's allusion to Day of Atonement imagery and the fact that this concept of ἱλαστήριον/ἱλασμός is repeated in 1 John 2:2: καὶ αὐτὸς ἱλασμός ἐστιν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν has given rise to the notion of the death of Christ as "ransom" reflects a pre-Pauline tradition (cf. ibid., 192).

[52] Daniel R. Schwartz, "Two Pauline Allusions to the Redemptive Mechanism of the Crucifixion," *JBL* 102/2 (1983): 261, suggests that Paul's use of the verb ἐξαποστέλλω points to two

Nevertheless, there is really no reason to disagree with Montefiore's conclusion that "Paul does not regard Jesus as a high priest"[53] in his verified writings, unless one accepts Pauline authorship of the book of Hebrews which contains several allusions to Jesus as high priest. (The question of the authorship of Hebrews will not be addressed herein). Neither does Baigent's claim that the use of ἱλαστήριον in Rom 3:25 "hardly proves that Paul thought of Jesus as a priest"[54] need to be refuted. These are not fatal objections for the reception of Day of Atonement imagery, for while the language of atonement is clearly present in the writings of Paul, he may not have been necessarily concerned with making Jesus into a high priest.

The Day of Atonement in the Book of Hebrews

The most careful treatment in the NT of the implications of the Day of Atonement rituals is given in the book of Hebrews.[55] "Christ as a high priest," writes

---

similar uses of the verb in the LXX (the Hebrew שלה, *pi'ēl*) which describes the same *quid pro quo* relationship Paul attempts to describe in Gal 3:13; 4:4–5, i.e., "sending X redeems Y." The two instances in the OT where the LXX uses ἐξαποστέλλω to translate שלה (*pi'ēl*) are Lev 14 and 16. From this Schwartz suggests that Paul uses the sending away of Azazel as a symbol of Christ's curse. He does so based in part in several such comparisons found in apostolic literature, perhaps reaching all the way to Paul (ibid., 262). However, the fact that apostolic literature compares Christ to Azazel does not mean this was the case for the biblical authors. Certainly, Revelation, by connecting Azazel to a demonic entity instead (Satan) possibly via an even earlier Jewish tradition than the apostolic fathers appears to undermine Schwartz's objections.

[53] H. W. Montefiore, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (London, 1964), 5.

[54] Cf. John W. Baigent, "Jesus as Priest: An Examination of the Claim that the Concept of Jesus as Priest may be Found in The New Testament Outside the Epistle to the Hebrews," *VE* 12 (1981): 38.

[55] Cf. Norman H. Young, "The Gospel According to Hebrews 9," *NTS* 27 (1981): 198–210; Mayjee Philip, *Leviticus in Hebrews* (Bruxelles: Peter Lang, 2011); Richard Ounsworth, *Joshua*

Donald A. Hagner, is the "central and unique theological emphasis in Hebrews"[56] while Knut Backhaus describes the Day of Atonement in Hebrew as a "motion picture" ("Bewegungsbild").[57] The exposition on the sanctuary ritual in Hebrews points solely to the sacrifice of Christ and his priesthood as the "better sacrifices" (cf. Heb 9:23) and this is based largely (although not exclusively) on Day of Atonement typology. This understanding has been held by scholars since Origen, who argued that the whole letter of Hebrews dealt with Lev 16 (cf. *Homilies on Leviticus*, 9:2). As Edgar V. McKnight describes it, "In Hebrews, the ritual of the Day of Atonement metaphorically describes Jesus' work of salvation as a Day of Atonement ceremony performed in heaven (Heb 6–9). Jesus is the high priest of a heavenly sanctuary."[58] Gellardini considers the Day of Atonement to have "major, if not fundamental importance for the interpretation of

---

Typology in the New Testament, WUNT 328 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 131–165; A. Mbamalu, "Jesus The Interceding High Priest: A Fresh Look at Hebrews 7:25," *HTS Teologiese Studies/ Theological Studies* 71(1) (2015), http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/hts.v71i1.2765. For a structuring of Hebrews based on the Day of Atonement, see Paula David Landgraf, "The Structure of Hebrews: A Word of Exhortation in Light of the Day of Atonement," in *A Cloud of Witness: The Theology of Hebrews in its Ancient Contexts*, eds. Richard Buckram, Daniel Driver, Trevor Hart and Nathan McDonald, LNTS 387 (London: T&T Clark, 2008), 19–27; Bryan Whitfield, "Pioneer and Perfecter: Joshua Traditions and the Christology of Hebrews," in *A Cloud of Witness: The Theology of Hebrews in its Ancient Contexts*, eds. Richard Buckram, Daniel Driver, Trevor Hart and Nathan McDonald, LNTS 387 (London: T&T Clark, 2008), 80–87.

[56] Donald A. Hagner, *Encountering the Book of Hebrews (Encountering Biblical Studies): An Exposition* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2002), 180.

[57] Knut Backhaus, *Der Hebräerbrief: Übersetzung und Erklärung* (Regensburg: Pustet, 2009), 61: "von dem großen Bewegungsbild des Versohnungstags, welches das Universum des Hebräers kennzeichnet."

[58] Edgar V. McKnight and Christopher Church, *Hebrews-James*, Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary, ed. Mark K. McElroy (Macon, GA.: Smyth & Helwys, 2004), 115.

Hebrews."[59] Indeed, the activity of the high priest on the Day of Atonement is front and centre to the author of Hebrews. And as Marie Isaac writes, "It is not to priests in general, but to ancient Judaism's high priest in particular, and even more particularly, to his part in the Day of Atonement ritual, that our author turns his thought."[60] Mason compares Hebrew and Qumran literature to support the view of the Messiah as high priest.[61]

The Day of Atonement's purgation by blood is crucial for the author's argument. Montefiore posits that the author of Hebrews "does not merely use sacrificial imagery: he gives an elaborate explanation of Jesus' death and ascension in terms of the most important of all sacrifices described in the Old Testament, that of the Day of Atonement."[62] The author of Hebrews builds his argument on a series of contrasts

---

[59] Gabriella Gelardini, "The Inauguration of Yom Kippur According to the LXX and its Cessation or Perpetuation According to the Book of Hebrews," in *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretations in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*, eds. Thomas Hieke and Tobias Nicklas, TBN 15 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 227.

[60] Marie Isaac, "Priesthood and the Epistle to the Hebrews," *HeytJ* 38 (1997): 55.

[61] Cf. Eric F. Mason, *You Are a Priest Forever* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 197–198: "One must consider whether presentations of Jesus in Hebrews and the priestly messiah of Qumran are actually similar. In both a priestly figure is discussed in the context of a Davidic figure, though the priestly and Davidic figures are synonymous in Hebrews. Both present priests appointed to their eschatological duty by God's divine decree…[I]n Hebrews Jesus' appearance in the world is dated to the 'last days' (Heb 1:2; in contrast, the Levitical system is said to be 'passing away'). Thus the theme of a priestly service—even described as heavenly—at the decisive point in history binds these traditions."

[62] Montefiore, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, 37. Contra Johnsson, "Defilement," 229, who argued: "Thus, it is a mistake to try to press the author's argument too rigidly into a framework of the Day of Atonement: while the ceremonies of this day do provide him with a point of comparison helpful to his purpose, they themselves are comprehended under the general rubric of blood."

between the Day of Atonement ritual and the sanctuary ritual in general and the death of Christ in particular. While the earthly priest entered "again and again/year after year" (πολλάκις/κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν, Heb 9:25) in the Most Holy Place, Christ entered "once for all" (ἐφάπαξ, Heb 9:12) by his death; he went into "the inner shrine behind the curtain" (τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος) as "a forerunner on our behalf (6:19–20), "not with the blood of goats and calves, but with his own blood, thus obtaining eternal redemption." In 12:24 the author calls the blood of Jesus "the blood of sprinkling" (αἵματι ῥαντισμοῦ) which in context is a clear allusion to the Day of Atonement ritual he has just discussed. The "blood of sprinkling" is also mentioned in 1 Pet 1:2: exiled Christians are destined to be "obedient to Jesus Christ and to be sprinkled with his blood" (εἰς ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ).[63]

While still discussing the implications of the ritual of the Day of Atonement as the background for the death of Christ, the author of Hebrews exhorts his readers to approach each other "with … hearts sprinkled clean from an evil conscience and … bodies washed with pure water" (ῥεραντισμένοι τὰς καρδίας ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς καὶ λελουσμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι καθαρῷ, Heb 10:22; cf. 9:13–14). Here the idea of purification with blood is coalesced with purification with water. These references to spiritual cleansing by sprinkling water are allusions to the "water of purification" (ὕδωρ

[63] Cf. Nicholas J. Moore, " 'Not to offer himself again and again': An Exegetical and Theological Study of Repetition in the Letter to the Hebrews," (PhD diss., University of Oxford, 2014).

ῥαντισμοῦ) in Num 19:9, 20–21 (cf. also Ezek 36:35: "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and you shall be clean from all your uncleannesses, and from all your idols I will cleanse you"). Moffit points out the relationship between blood and life in Hebrews and how blood is not connected with "death" on the Day of Atonement but rather with life. Jesus' blood in Revelation is connected with the benefits of his life as he lives as high priest and king. So also is blood on the Day of Atonement connected to life, a concept that is seen in Revelation's "washing of robes in blood" (Rev 7:14) which grants the saints life eternal. Moffit is correct when he writes:

> The offering of blood in the Mosaic cult did not symbolize the entry and presentation of death before the presence of God, but that of life. In the same way, Hebrews' emphasis on Jesus' living presence in heaven—the location where the author consistently claims Jesus made his offering—implies that it is not the death/slaughter of Jesus that atones, but the presentation of his life before God in the heavenly holy of holies.[64]

The verb, ἱλάσκομαι, appears in the conclusion of the pericope of Heb 2:5–17 on which the author argues that Jesus is a worthy sacrifice chosen by God to die in the place of unworthy human beings: "to make a sacrifice of atonement for the sins of the people," ἵνα ἐλεήμων γένηται καὶ πιστὸς ἀρχιερεὺς τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι. Later in the book, the author argues that Christ's death is the event to which the Jewish system of sacrifices pointed and through which its inadequacies are perfected (cf. Heb 6, 9, 10). As an introduction to the author's argument which runs through most of chapters 8–10, the

---

[64] Moffit, *Blood*, 221; cf. Christian Eberhardt, "Characteristics of Sacrificial Metaphors in Hebrews," in *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods-New Insights*, ed. Gabriella Gelardini (Leiden: Brill, 2005): 58.

author states that Christ presented his blood "within the veil," ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος, i.e., into the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary, in "heaven itself," in the very presence of God (Heb 6:19–20; 9:12, 24).[65] This rite of passage of sorts is parallel to the Israelite high priest's going in "within the veil" once a year on the Day of Atonement to offer blood inside the Most Holy Place. The Greek expression used in Hebrews, ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος, comes from the LXX where it always translates the Hebrew expression מִבֵּית לַפָּרֹכֶת (cf. Exod 26:33; Lev 16:2, 12, 15), which in turn always refers to the veil of the Most Holy Place. As Roy Gane convincingly demonstrated, "[t]he LXX phrase ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος exclusively renders the unambiguous Hebrew expression מִבֵּית לַפָּרֹכֶת, 'within the inner veil.'"[66] Because of this verbal parallel, the allusion to the activity of the high priest on the Day of Atonement seems unequivocal.[67]

---

[65] Kenneth Schenck, "Hebrews as the Re-Presentation of a Story: A Narrative Approach to Hebrews," in *Reading the Epistle to the Hebrews*, eds. Eric F. Mason and Kevin B. McCruden (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 179, wonders: "Is the event of atonement Jesus' death on the cross (e.g., 9:27–28), or is it his entrance into heaven itself (9:24)? The answer is probably both, but on different levels. The literal event that the earliest believers related to an atoning sacrifice was the death of Jesus on a cross (see Rom 3:25). However, the earliest Christians also believed that the resurrected Jesus had gone to God's right hand, implying in their cosmology an ascension through the various layers of sky to the highest heaven."

[66] Roy Gane, "Re-Opening Katapetasma ("Veil") In Hebrews 6:19," *AUSS* 38 (2000): 8. Cf. also Daniel M. Gurtner, "LXX Syntax and the Identity of the NT Veil," *NovT* 47/4 (2005): 345 who avers: "καταπέτασμα is the 'default' term for the inner veil in the LXX, and where καταπέτασμα is used for a curtain other than the inner veil, the LXX translator indicates so by the use of a locative genitive."

[67] F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, NICNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990), 214, puts it quite elegantly: "When on the cross he offered up his life to God as a sacrifice for his

In Hebrews 9, the author continues directly to draw allusions from the OT Day of Atonement ritual when he contrasts the limitations of the earthly ritual with the superiority of Jesus' sacrificial death. He begins by explaining that the activities of the "holy place," i.e. "the first tent," πρώτην σκηνὴν (v. 6; cf. v. 2), served as a "parable of the present time", παραβολὴ εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα (v. 9), because they symbolize the limitations of the access to God through rituals which occurred outside of the inner veil, or outside of the presence of God who dwelled in the Most Holy Place, "within the veil."[68] The way "into the sanctuary" (v. 8) was not yet disclosed because the same "gift and sacrifices," δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίαι, could not perfect the worshipper (Heb 9:9; cf. 10:4).

Jesus however, Χριστὸς δὲ (v. 11), in his sacrifice and subsequent entrance into the heavenly Most Holy Place (v. 24, "heaven itself") is in marked contrast to the earthly high priest. Jesus "entered once for all into the holy places" (εἰσῆλθεν ἐφάπαξ εἰς τὰ ἅγια, v. 11); his entrance "once for all" (ἐφάπαξ) is contrasted with the entrance by the high priest "once a year" (ἅπαξ, v. 7), into the "second tent" (εἰς δὲ τὴν δευτέραν) in order to

---

people's sin, he accomplished in reality what Aaron and his successors performed in type by the two-fold act of slaying the victim and presenting its blood in the holy of holies. ... And then "through his own blood"—that is, by virtue of the infinitely acceptable oblation of his life—he could appear before God, not on sufferance but by right, as his people's prevailing representative and high priest. The Aaronic high priests had to present themselves before God repeatedly, because such redemption as their ministry procured bore but a token and temporary character; but Christ entered in once for all, to be enthroned there in perpetuity, because the redemption procured by him is perfect in nature and eternal in effect."

[68] Cf. Steve Stanley, "Hebrews 9:6–10: The 'Parable' of the Tabernacle," *NovT* Vol. 37, n. 4 (Oct., 1995): 385–399.

perform his duties in the Most Holy Place on the Day of Atonement.[69] In order for the contrast to make logical sense, Christ's entrance must also be into the "second tent," i.e., the Mostly Holy Place, as is already explained by the use of ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος in Heb 6:19. This further clarifies the use of τὰ ἅγια instead of Ἅγια Ἁγίων, which points to a passage through the entire sanctuary, beginning with the Holy

[69] Felix H. Cortez, "From the Holy to the Most Holy Place: The Period of Hebrews 9:6–10 and the Day of Atonement as a Metaphor of Transition," *JBL* Vol. 125,/3 (2006): 527–547, considers this entrance into the heavenly τὰ ἅγια as a "metaphor of transition" while seeing Jesus' entrance "within the veil" in Heb 6:19 only a "possible" reference to Day of Atonement, despite the clear OT Day of Atonement background attendant to this passage. Cortez's attempt at explaining the "inconsistencies between the blood ritual of the Day of Atonement and Jesus' sacrifice as described by the author of Hebrews" (547) by rejecting "typology" in favor of a "parable" in the passage is not compelling. Cortez's objections to seeing the Day of Atonement as central to Heb 9 are based largely on the presence of additional references to the Hebrew cultus unrelated to the Day of Atonement in the chapter which he considers as "inconsistencies" which to him weaken the importance of the Day of Atonement comparisons with Jesus' sacrifice. Admittedly, Heb 9 has discrepancies in matters of rituals and the sanctuary building. But Cortez risks missing the forest for the trees: his line of argument ignores that the whole of the sanctuary service was dependent on and pointed to the celebrations of the Day of Atonement when the sanctuary was finally cleansed and the daily rituals reached their apex. Without the Day of Atonement, the daily rituals were meaningless since the tabernacle could no longer function as the abode of the deity. Despite the inacuracies in peripheral details in Heb 9, the author undeniably has the Day of Atonement when discussing the superiority of Jesus' sacrifice "with his own blood," "once and for all." Cortez concludes that "The exegetical difficulties of this passage have distracted scholars from giving due weight to the rhetorical function of this long period for the rest of the argument" (529). But could not the argument of "distraction" also apply to ignoring the Day of Atonement's importance to the author's argument based on presuppositions of what is unacceptable in the chapter, namely, a Day of Atonement entrance into the heavenly Most Holy Place at the time of his ascension? Cf. an expanded argument in Felix H. Cortez, "Atonement and inauguration at the Heavenly Sanctuary: A wider perspective to Jesus's ascension in Hebrews,"in *Earthly Shadows, Heavenly Realities: Temple/Sanctuary Cosmology in Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Jewish Literature*, eds., Kim Papaiouannou and Ioannis Giantzaklidis (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2017), 175–188.

Place culminating with his entrance into the Most Holy Place.[70] The New Covenant is bound primarily by Christ's Day of Atonement and not by the inauguration ceremony.[71]

The sabbatical rest of the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:32; 23:27) also provides the background of the "sabbatical" rest found in the book of Hebrews. Radner suggests that the Sabbath of the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:31) is expanded in Heb 3–4,[72] especially as the people of God look forward to the permanent "Sabbath" (σαββατισμὸς, Heb 4:9) procured through Christ's Day of Atonement blood.

At the end of his argument for Jesus' "better blood" in Heb 9, the author again uses terminology from the Day of Atonement ritual: "he has appeared once for all at the end of the age to remove sin by the sacrifice of himself (Heb 9:26b). For the author, Jesus' sacrifice of himself accomplishes the removal of sin and consummates the

---

[70] For the similarity of the Day of Atonement language in Heb 9, see the lively discussion between Norman H. Young and Richard M. Davidson in Norman H. Young, "Where Jesus Has Gone as a Forerunner on Our Behalf (Hebrews 6:20)," *AUSS* 39 (2001): 165–173 and Richard M. Davidson, "Christ's Entry 'Within the Veil' in Hebrews 6:19–20: The Old Testament Background," *AUSS* 39 (2001): 176–190. Norman H. Young, "The Day of Dedication of the Day of Atonement? The Old Testament Background to Hebrews 6:19–20 Revisited," *AUSS* 40 (2002): 61–68; Richard M. Davidson, "Inauguration or Day of Atonement? A Response to Norman Young's "Old Testament Background to Hebrews 6:10 Revisited," *AUSS* 40 (2002): 69–88.

[71] Cf. Frank Matera, "The Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews," in *Reading the Epistle to the Hebrews*, eds. Mason, Eric F. Mason and Kevin B. McCruden (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 197: "Playing on the meaning of *diathēkē*, which can mean 'will' as well as 'covenant,' Hebrews notes that a 'will' (*diathēkē*) only goes into effect when the person who made it dies (9:16–17). Thus it was necessary for Christ to die in order to inaugurate the new 'covenant' (*diathēkē*)."

[72] Ephraim Radner, *Leviticus*, BTCB (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2008), 168.

typology of the removal of all the "uncleannesses of the people of Israel and, because of their transgressions, all their sins" (Lev 16:16; 30) on the Day of Atonement.

Finally, an important thematic echo to the Day of Atonement is found in Heb 10:26: "For if we willfully persist in sin after having received the knowledge of the truth, there no longer remains a sacrifice for sins." This is an allusion to Num 15:30–31 where high-handed sinners are condemned to be "cut off" for their intentional defiant sin; not even the sacrifices of the Day of Atonement covered them. Although the tabernacle was cleansed from such sins, the sinners themselves must be "cut-off." In order to escape the judgment for high-handed, unrepentant, recalcitrant sin and not be covered by Jesus' Day of Atonement sacrifice, Christians must have the conscience "cleansed" (καθαρίζω, 9:28; 10:2, 12, 17) and demonstrate a life of loyalty.

The περὶ ἁμαρτίας Passages in the New Testament

As established in the previous overview of the reception of the Day of Atonement in the NT, it seems clear that the NT authors saw this day as an ideal source of imagery in which to frame the atoning sacrifice of Jesus. One of the most important indicators of this dependence on the Levitical cult, and possibly on Lev 16, is found in the recurring use of the expression περὶ ἁμαρτίας in the NT.

In the LXX, the expression περὶ ἁμαρτίας (and the variants τὸ περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, τὸ περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτίας and ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν) appears 54 times translating the various Hebrew expressions הַחַטָּאת / לְחַטָּאת / חַטָּאת (the common feature here is the

presence of חַטָּאת which at times means "sin" and at others "sin offering"). It is used as a substantive in the LXX meaning "sin/purgation offering."[73] This unique Greek expression occurs sixty-six times in the OT and three times in the prescriptions of the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:3, 5, 9, and τὸ περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας in 11 [2x], 15, 27 [2x], the latter simply being the arthrous version of περὶ ἁμαρτίας and once in Num 29:11) and also with a plural of ἁμαρτία in Lev 16:25: τὸ περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν. An example of περὶ ἁμαρτίας is Lev 9:2: "Take a bull calf for a sin offering and a ram for a burnt offering," (Λαβὲ σεαυτῷ μοσχάριον ἐκ βοῶν περὶ ἁμαρτίας καὶ κριὸν εἰς ὁλοκαύτωμα).

In the NT, we first encounter περὶ ἁμαρτίας in John 8:46: "Which of you convicts me of sin [τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐλέγχει με περὶ ἁμαρτίας]?" followed by two similar uses in John 16:8 and 9. The common feature in John is that all three occurrences have περὶ ἁμαρτίας alongside the verb ἐλέγχω "to convince, to expose," which requires one to take περὶ ἁμαρτίας not as a substantival phrase "sin offering" as in the OT, but rather take περὶ literally as "about/over/of." It would strain the Greek were we to take ἐλέγχω differently from its regular meaning in an attempt to read περὶ ἁμαρτίας as an allusion to "sin offering" as in the LXX. Most Bible versions translate ἐλέγχει με περὶ ἁμαρτίας in John literally as "convince of sin" and this is where we shall leave it.

[73] The exception is Isa 53:10 where περὶ ἁμαρτίας translates אָשָׁם.

It is, however, in Paul and in the book of Hebrews where we find περὶ ἁμαρτίας used in a sense that is closer to how it is used in the LXX. In a discussion of law and sin in Rom 8:3, Paul argues: "For God has done what the law, weakened by the flesh, could not do: by sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and to deal with sin [καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας], he condemned sin in the flesh" (NRSV). Other Bible translations translate περὶ ἁμαρτίας as: "on account of sin" (NKJV), "to be a sin offering" (NIV), "for sin" (ESV, YLT), "as an offering for sin" (NASB), "as a sacrifice for sin" (NEB, NJB) to name a few. Why the discrepancy?

The use of περὶ ἁμαρτίας in Rom 8:3 has elicited a vigorous debate with an almost equal number of scholars supporting the substantival "sin offering" translation as there are detractors.[74] Early on, T. C. G. Norton took καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας with κατέκρινεν (κατακρίνω, "to pronounce a sentence," "to condemn") instead of with πέμψας ("to send") because "περὶ with the genitive to mean 'on the charge of' or 'on the grounds of' in a judicial setting is common in the New Testament."[75] But even if we were to take περὶ ἁμαρτίας with κατέκρινεν, there is really no significant objection to conflating judicial imagery with sacrificial imagery in Paul's polemic against wicked living; in various instances he uses κρίνω and κατακρίνω alongside notions of "sin" and "spiritual

---

[74] Cf. N.T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant*, 220; Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (iBooks edition).

[75] T. C. G. Norton, "The Meaning of *kai peri hamartias* in Romans viii.3," in *JTS* 22 (1971): 516.

death," and "repentance," concepts which are hardly strictly "judicial" (cf. Rom 1:18–32; 2:1; 14:23; 1 Cor 11:32). Legal justification for Paul occurs in the divine courtroom through Jesus' sacrificial, substitionary death. In 2 Thess 1, God's righteous judgment (κρίσεως) on the wicked will not occur until the "day of the Lord" when they will be "cut off", as the defiant sinners were on the Levitical Day of Atonement.

Moreover, as Wright convincingly demonstrated, περὶ ἁμαρτίας has "inescapably sacrificial associations"[76] and James Dunn agrees that "Paul almost certainly intends it in this sense" in Romans 8:3.[77] Wright argues that the context of Rom 8:3 reflects a thematic linkage with the usage of לְחַטָּאת / περὶ ἁμαρτίας in Leviticus: Paul is dealing here with "unwilling" sin or "sin through ignorance," into which a sinner falls as a result of the "weakness of the flesh" (ἠσθένει διὰ τῆς σαρκός).[78] Wright points out how Rom 8:3

[76] Cf. N.T. Wright, "The Meaning of περὶ ἁμαρτίας in Romans 8:3," in *Papers on Paul and Other New Testament Authors*, ed. E. A. Livingstone, *JSNTSup* 3 (Sheffield: University of Sheffield, 1980), 454: "We may conclude that whereas περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας usually means 'for sin', and τὸ περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας means 'the sin-offering', περὶ ἁμαρτίας should usually be translated either 'sin-offering' or 'as a sin-offering.'" Wright is, however, incorrect when he states that περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας "usually translates על–הטאת and sometimes לחטאת" (ibid.) It may have been a typo since περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας actually mostly translates לחטאת and almost never על–הטאת, with the exception of Isa 30:1, but here, the use is different from the Pentateuch, namely "adding sin to sin," סְפוֹת חַטָּאת עַל־חַטָּאת. In the updated version of his article, Wright maintains the same statement (Cf. N.T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant* (London/New York: T&T Clark, 1991), 221.

[77] James D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, WBC 38A (Dallas: Word, Incorporated, 1998), 422.

[78] Cf. N.T. Wright, "The Meaning of περὶ ἁμαρτίας," 455.

has a similar syntax to Lev 9:2: a verb of sacrificing, the sacrifice followed by περὶ ἁμαρτίας which presents a "strong argument" for the "sin offering" translation.[79]

It may well be that Paul's christological claims hold the answer to this question. The presence of sacrificial language attached to περὶ ἁμαρτίας in Romans 8 points to the finality of the sacrifice of Jesus to "condemn sin in the flesh:" Christ is a superior sacrifice which stands in stark contrast to the repeated sacrifices required by the νόμος—the Torah—which included the daily and yearly Day of Atonement sacrifices (cf. Rom 4:13–15; 7:7) offered because of the "weakness of the flesh" of ancient Israelites. This weakness caused the law to have the reverse effect on sin: it caused sin to increase (5:20). This incurable condition, Paul states, was taken care of by the decisive offering of Jesus as a final περὶ ἁμαρτίας, a sin offering to take care of the sin problem.[80] (The presence of ἁμαρτία in the thematically similar 1 Cor 5:21 has led scholars to take it as "sin/purgation offering"[81] as in Rom 8:3).

---

[79] Ibid.

[80] Cf. Robert H. Mounce, *Romans*, NAC 27 (Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1995), 175: "Law can stimulate sin; but when it comes to overcoming it, our sinful nature undermines its best efforts." Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 422, writes: "Paul can merely allude to it [i.e., "sin offering"] since this way of thinking of Jesus' death was already well established in the Christian congregations." Cf. also Grant R. Osborne, *Romans Verse by Verse* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2017).

[81] Cf. Murray J. Harris, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI; Milton Keynes, UK: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co.; Paternoster Press, 2005), 454: "We conclude that in v. 21a Paul is not saying that at the crucifixion the sinless Christ became in some sense a sinner, yet he is affirming more than that Christ became a sin offering or even a sin bearer."

The preceding analysis begs the question of which "sin offering" ritual Paul has in mind when he uses περὶ ἁμαρτίας: Does Paul compare Jesus to the "sin/purgation offerings" required as emergency sacrifices for sins occurring daily throughout the year? Or could he have the Day of Atonement in mind, thus interpreting the cross as the book of Hebrews does, as a final, Day-of-Atonement sacrifice which solved sin's problem? The attractiveness of a Day of Atonement background to περὶ ἁμαρτίας in Rom 8:3 is certainly enhanced when compared to the alternatives. In light of Paul's comparison of Jesus with the ἱλαστήριον of the Most Holy Place earlier in the epistle (3:25) as well as his use of "once and for all" (ἅπαξ, 3:26), terms which are fraught with Day-of-Atonement overtones, it seems that in Rom 8:3 Paul is not merely contrasting Jesus' sacrifice with the rituals performed in the sanctuary as a whole but rather, it was Jesus' Day-of-Atonement, "once and for all" sacrifice that put an end to the entire requirements of that old system and freed sinners from condemnation. Similar to the decisive Day-of-Atonement rituals occurring year after year, Jesus died once for all inaugurating an eschatological Day of Atonement. Although scholars have not generally seen the Day of Atonement in Rom 8:3, it appears to provide an attractive background to frame the finality of what Jesus accomplished on the cross, especially in light of his of Day of Atonement language in Romans 3.

It is, however, in the book of Hebrews where the cultic meaning of περὶ ἁμαρτίας and its synonyms come into sharper focus. Heb 10:6 has: "in burnt offerings [ὁλοκαυτώματα] and sin offerings [περὶ ἁμαρτίας] you have taken no pleasure;" while

Heb 10:8 reads: "You have neither desired nor taken pleasure in sacrifices [θυσίας] and offerings [προσφορὰς] and burnt offerings [ὁλοκαυτώματα] and sin offerings [περὶ ἁμαρτίας]." These statements are made in the context of Jesus' surrender of his life as sacrifice to fulfill "God's will" and to abolish "the first to establish the second" (10:8-10; cf. 8:13). As in Heb 9:11, 24–25, Jesus' death in Hebrews 10 is again contrasted with the earthly sanctuary rituals offered "year after year" (κατ' ἐνιαυτόν, 10:1, 3), "day after day" (καθ' ἡμέραν, 10:11; 7:27) and "again and again" (πολλάκις, 10:11). Jesus' Day-of-Atonement sacrifice was offered "once and for all," ἐφάπαξ, (10:10; cf. 7:27), "a single sin offering" (μίαν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν, 10:12), "for all time" (εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς, 10:14; cf. 7:3) which saves "to the uttermost" (εἰς τὸ παντελὲς) "those who come to God through Him" (7:25).

In addition, the author of Hebrews uses the variant ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν synonymously with περὶ ἁμαρτίας in two passages: Heb 10:12: "But when Christ had offered for all time a single sacrifice for sins [μίαν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν], 'he sat down at the right hand of God;'" and Heb 5:1: "For every high priest taken from among men is appointed for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins [καὶ θυσίας ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν]."[82] Although ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν does not appear in the OT (except in

[82] See the distinct use of ὑπὲρ ... ἁμαρτιῶν in Heb 7:27: "who does not need daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifices, first for His own sins and then for the people's [ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰδίων ἁμαρτιῶν θυσίας ἀναφέρειν ἔπειτα τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ]." Heb 10:18 The last passage presents the exegete with a difficult choice: how to negotiate the use of "sin offerings" offered "daily," καθ' ἡμέραν for the high priest and for the people. It seems expensive, exegetically speaking, to question his use of "sin offering" here which is parallel with similar argument in other passages so that it may be more

pseudepigraphal *Odes* 12:10), ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτίας (sing. "sin") appears nine times in the OT, eight times in the book of Ezekiel, all of which are synonymous with the substantival use of περὶ ἁμαρτίας as "sin offering" elsewhere in the OT (cf. Ezek 40:39; 43:22, 25; 44:29; 45:17, 22, 23; 46:20; cf. 1 Esdras 7:8). This in light of the use of the plural περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν elsewhere in the epistle may indicate that our author is using ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν substantively meaning "sin offering," in which case θυσίας in both texts simply explains what type of ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν sacrifices these are: "sin[s] offerings" (cf. Heb 10:26: οὐκέτι περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπολείπεται θυσία).

In Heb 10:18, περὶ ἁμαρτίας is used in contrast with ἄφεσις, "remission": "Now where there is remission [ἄφεσις] of these, there is no longer an offering for sin [οὐκέτι προσφορὰ περὶ ἁμαρτίας]" (NKJV), where προσφορὰ stands as a description of what kind of sacrifice it is: περὶ ἁμαρτίας. In other words, where forgiveness (cf. "cleansing", 10:2) had been accomplished, there is no more need for περὶ ἁμαρτίας. The entire exposition on Jesus' sacrifice as περὶ ἁμαρτίας/περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν in Heb 10 comes full circle by the preposition "Therefore" (οὖν) used 13 times in Hebrews and meant to tie everything

palatable to think that "daily" here may be an imprecision. It remains theoretically possible that our author had the תָּמִיד offered daily in the sanctuary (Ex 29:38, 42), however, the high priest did not officiate daily. In this case, "high priests" here could be questionable, but then we start to wade into speculative waters. It may well be that the closest OT parallel to this offering of חַטָּאת sacrifices is the Day of Atonement, since only on this day were such sacrifices offered for the high priest and the people simultaneously (cf. Lev 16:6–10). In this case καθ' ἡμέραν could refer to the Day of Atonement rituals but that may stretch the meaning of the Greek. See William L. Lane, *Hebrews 1–8*, WBC 47A (Dallas: Word, Incorporated, 1998), 194, calls the presence of "daily" here "problematical".

together in order to move the argument to its natural conclusion. Also, the important "therefore" passage in Heb 10:19–20 stands in parallel with Jesus' entrance into the heavenly Most Holy Place described in Heb 6:19–20. Thus we have the following reading: "Therefore, brethren [Ἔχοντες οὖν], having boldness [6:19: "a sure and steadfast anchor"] to enter the Holiest [6:19: "within the veil"] by the [Day-of-Atonement] blood of Jesus, [20] by a new and living way which He consecrated for us, through the veil [cf. 6:19: "within the veil"], that is, His flesh, and having a High Priest [ἱερέα μέγαν] over the house of God, [22] let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water" (NKJV).

Lastly, the author utilizes the plural περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν also synonymously with περὶ ἁμαρτίας in two passages: Heb 5:3: "Because of this he is required as for the people, so also for himself, to offer sacrifices for sins [προσφέρειν περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν]," and Heb 10:26: "For if we sin willfully after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there no longer remains a sacrifice for sins [οὐκέτι περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπολείπεται θυσία], but a certain fearful expectation of judgment, and fiery indignation which will devour the adversaries." Significantly περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν the variant περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν is used in Lev 16:25 as a synonym for περὶ ἁμαρτίας: "The fat of the sin offering [τὸ περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν] he shall burn on the altar. In Heb 10:26, as in 5:1, 7:27 and 10:12, θυσία functions as a gloss to περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν rather than a separate type of sacrifice (as προσφορὰ in 10:18). The

"defiant sin" mentioned in v. 26, when read in parallel with Heb 10:18, is reminiscent of the ineligibility of defiant sinners to receive the cleaning benefits of Jesus' Day of Atonement: while those of loyal character are covered by Jesus' Day-of-Atonement blood—περὶ ἁμαρτίας is no longer *needed* (10:18)—defiant sinners must be "cut off" and await judgment"—περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν is no longer *available* (10:26). Just as defiant Israelites were to be "cut off" (Num 15:31) and were barred from the benefits of the חַטָּאת offerings on the Day of Atonement, defiant sin on the part of Christians also annuls the applicability of Jesus' Day-of-Atonement "sin offering" on their behalf.

In sum, in virtually all of the περὶ ἁμαρτίας passages in Paul and in Hebrews, the superior quality as well as the finality of Jesus' "sin/purgation offering" on the cross stand in high relief. This may indicate that the Day of Atonement is the background for these passages.

Summary and Conclusion

The preceding overview of the reception of the Day of Atonement in the New Testament shows that the day provided significant typology, language and imagery to which the NT authors found themselves periodically returning to to describe the "Christ event." The life, death and resurrection of Christ stand as the sunrise that illuminated the Day of Atonement rituals for the NT authors and provided a theological framework with which to explain Jesus' death as a "sin/purgation offering." Christ appears in the NT both as sacrifice—as evident in the use of "with his own blood" in Heb 9:12—and

heavenly high priest having entered "within the veil", the heavenly most Holy Place, where he intercedes for the faithful (Heb 6:19-20; 9:11; 7:25).

This use of the Day of Atonement by NT authors has important implications for the study of the reception the Day of Atonement in the book of Revelation as John capitalizes on high priestly Christology. In the next chapter, we will explore how the book of Revelation appears to draw not only on the themes, language and imagery from the OT passages dealing with the Day of Atonement but also builds on and expands on the Day's intersection with the NT in order to reveal Jesus in a unique way to the seven churches of Asia Minor.

CHAPTER 5

THE DAY OF ATONEMENT IN THE BOOK OF REVELATION

In this chapter the reception of the Day of Atonement in the book of Revelation is explored. As discussed in chapter 1, there are no actual "quotations" of any work in Revelation. Intertextuality in the book of Revelation takes the form of "allusions" (philological or lexical correspondence) and "echoes" (thematic or non-lexical allusions). While allusions are established through lexical parallels, echoes are based mostly on thematic "reverberations." While allusions are given the assessment of "clear" or "probable" following Beale's categories, echoes receive a strength rating of "soft," "medium," or "loud." The "loudness" of an echo is tentatively measured by the number of thematic "reverberations" present in a given passage. This method goes hand-in-hand with Hays' *thematic coherence* test, which is verified by the presence of common themes shared by the respective context being analysed in Revelation and te Day of Atonement.[1] The plausibility of the presence of allusions and echoes of the Day of Atonement in a given passage appears in the form of a table at the end of each passage being analysed.

[1] See Hays, *Echoes*, 29–32.

As we come to the main object of this thesis, it is important to note the following: (1) As the reader will notice, not all evidence of the presence Day of Atonement in Revelation has the same *weight*; some of the evidence presented in any respective chapter may be stronger or weaker than in other chapters. This is indicated by a "grade" of the quality of the allusion or echo at the end of each section, e.g., "loud echo," "certain allusion," etc. (2) Not all potential OT intertexts in a given passage in Revelation are discussed. The following analysis doest not necessarily elevate the importance of Day of Atonement intertextuality to the detriment of other OT intertexts in any given passage in Revelation. This limitation is necessary because it would be beyond the scope of this study to exhaust all possible intertextual relationships but rather, the focus here is on the Day of Atonement and how it may add important elements to a given passage which, in conjunction with other intertexts and themes, may enhance the understanding of the passage in question.

Moving sequentially through the chapters of the book of Revelation, this chapter will explore the presence of language and imagery of the Day of Atonement in the book of Revelation. The reader should be advised that not all chapters in Revelation are deemed to contain allusions or echoes of the Day of Atonement; excluded from the following analysis are chapters 10, 12, 13.

Overview

In keeping with the NT's use of the OT, Revelation is immersed in the themes that point typologically to Christ. As the Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Revelation

presents an "unveiling" of Jesus Christ: he appears in the first and the last lines of the book (Rev 1:1; 22:21). One of the themes John of Patmos uses to reveal Christ are the Jewish feasts[2], from the dawn of new covenant in "the Christ event" to the final establishment of the kingdom of God: Jesus is the Passover lamb/Day of Atonement sacrifice standing in the presence of God "as if slaughtered" (Rev 5:6). He continues his mediatory work as the heavenly high priest (Rev 1), offering a sacrifice superior to the one the high priest offered on the Day of Atonement. As a result of Christ's finished redemptive work, God will soon tabernacle (σκηνόω, cf. Rev 7:15; 21:3) forever with his people as He did with Israel of old. Based on his prerogative as "the firstborn of the dead" as celebrated in the feast of the First Fruits (Rev 1:5; cf. "the first fruit" in 1 Cor 15:23), Christ will one day resurrect all the dead saints (cf. the "first resurrection," Rev 20:5). The theme of harvesting present in the "first fruits" is reworked in the reaping of the wicked (Rev 14:15). The celebration of Pentecost, the fifty days of harvest and the covenant of the law (Exod 19:1) now symbolize the new covenant of the Spirit with the church during the first Pentecost (Acts 2): it is now the Spirit (τὸ πνεῦμα, cf. Rev 1:10; 2:11, 17; 4:5) who guides, comforts and rebukes the church (Revelation 2–3). The typology of the Jewish feasts for the people of God, while heralding good news for the new Israel, the Church, presents the omen of judgment on the wicked world. On the

[2] For a discussion of how the Jewish feasts are structured in Revelation, see Rabach Odek, "The Heavenly Sanctuary in Revelation: Context and Significance," in *Earthly Shadows, Heavenly Realities: Temple/Sanctuary Cosmology in Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Jewish Literature*, eds., Kim Papaiouannou and Ioannis Giantzaklidis (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2017), 217–227.

Day of Atonement, the people were purified from their sin, a theme that reverberates throughout Revelation in the pure white robes of the saints (Revelation 7 and 14): sin is never part of the description of the saints in Revelation. The judgment meted out on Azazel—an ancient, mysterious entity which developed into a demonic figure in later Jewish apocalyptic[3]—is echoed in the punishment of the harlot, the beast and the dragon (Revelation 17–20). The sound of the trumpets in the Feast of Trumpets reminds the people of their responsibilities and the sanctions for breach of the covenant of which the Day of Atonement was a culmination.[4]

That Jesus was considered as high priest in early Christianity is firmly established in the book of Hebrews, a position secured by his crucifixion and his resurrection.[5] Robert A. Briggs suggests that in Revelation "Christ is a priest there, certainly a high priest in light of His person."[6] Further on the theme of the Mosaic sanctuary, Paulien argues that Revelation's structure is largely influenced by the tabernacle service,[7] while

---

[3] Cf. *1 Enoch* 13:1–2; 9–10; 14:2–16:2.

[4] Gaon says that trumpets had the following connotation to the Jews: (1) the Creator; (2) the duty to return to God; (3) the revelation on Sinai; (4) the exhortation of the prophets; (5) the destruction of the temple; (6) the binding of Isaac for sacrifice; (7) an imminent danger; (8) the day of judgment; (9) the redemption of Israel; and (10) resurrection (cf. *EncJud*, 14:1447).

[5] Cf. Christian Wolff, "Die Gemeinde des Christus in der Apokalypse des Johannes," *NTS* 27 (1981): 189: "Das Präskript lässt also von vornherein erkennen, dass das gegenwartige und zukunftige Sein der Gemeinde vom gekreuzigten und auferstandenen Christus bestimmt ist."

[6] Briggs, *Jewish Temple Imagery in the Book of Revelation*, 54.

[7] Paulien, "Hebrew Cultus," 249. See also Robert A. Briggs, *Jewish Temple Imagery in the Book of Revelation* (New York, NY: Peter Lang, 1999), 54; Andrea Spatafora, *From the Temple of God to God as the Temple: A Biblical Theological Study of the Temple in the Book of Revelation* (Rome:

Jonathan Draper argues for an extensive reference to the feasts in particular passages, e.g., the Feast of Tabernacles in Revelation 7.[8] In keeping with the use of the Jewish feasts by NT author, it should be expected then, that if the Day of Atonement is understood by early Christian writers to point to the work of Christ, first in his sacrificial death and then in his work in a figurative heavenly sanctuary after his ascension ("heaven itself," Heb 9:24), we should encounter portraits of Jesus in the book of Revelation which reflect this understanding.[9] As John addresses the Christian communities in Asia, he presents to them the meaning of their standing in Christ as their heavenly high priest and he offers to them the opportunity to become royal priests. Just as in Lev 16:6 the high priest offers for himself first and his house so Jesus offers a superior sacrifice for his house, the church (Heb 6:19–20).[10]

Lastly, it seems natural that the Day of Atonement as the culmination of all the rituals of the sanctuary service would be attractive to John. And yet, rituals per se are not a concern in the mind of John. He may speak of "altars" and a "slaughtered" Lamb but the details of the rituals behind this imagery are left out; any specificity on this front is

---

Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1997).

[8] See Jonathan A. Draper, "The Heavenly Feast of Tabernacles: Revelation 7:1–17," *JSNT* 19 (1983): 133–147.

[9] Ibid., 190: "Der Gemeinde wird ihre in Christus gründende und nur in der Verbindung mit ihm auszuübende priesterliche Herrscherwurde vor Augen gehalten."

[10] Barker, *Revelation*, 49: "The Book of Revelation describes the process of the great atonement as it was realized in history in first-century Palestine. The Christian hope of the return of the Lord was identical with the hope of the culmination of the tent Jubilee and the restoration of the creation for the time of the Messiah."

possible. Thus the following discussions on the Day of Atonement in Revelation do not engage contemporary ritual theory or the relation between text and ritual. The main focus of this chapter will be to explore how language and imagery of the Day of Atonement from the OT and Jewish literature made its way into Revelation.

With this brief overview in mind, we now may turn to the subject of this thesis.

Revelation 1: Jesus as Heavenly High Priest

Jesus is introduced in Rev 1:5 as "the faithful witness, the firstborn of the dead, and the ruler of the kings of the earth". John explains that the glory due his name is because "by his blood" (ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ) he has freed mankind "and made us to be a kingdom, priests serving his God and Father, to him be glory and dominion forever and ever. Amen."[11] Noteworthy in this passage is the presence of "blood" (αἷμα) and "priests" (ἱερεῖς) which immediately establishes a sanctuary background to chapter 1.[12] We begin with an analysis of the presence of "blood" in Revelation 1.

---

[11] See Stefanie Schabow, *Gemacht zu einem Königreich und Priestern für Gott*, WMANT 147 (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlagsgesellschaft, 2016) for the latest discussion on the use of "priesthood" in Revelation 1; cf. also and earlier work by Elizabeth Schüssler-Fiorenza, *Priester für Gott. Studien zum Herrschafts- und Priestermotiv in der Apokalypse*, NTA 7 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1972).

[12] Barker, *Revelation*, 4: "The picture of Jesus as the great high priest in all his roles and aspects appears throughout the New Testament and is the key to understanding all early Christian teaching about him." See also by Margaret Barker, *Temple Themes in Christian Worship* (New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2007).

The Significance of "Blood" in Revelation 1

Among the potential echoes of Day of Atonement are the references to "blood" in Revelation 1 in the context of Jesus' high priesthood.[13] The sprinkling of blood was a general purification rite in the sanctuary service (cf. Exod 24:6–8; 29:20; Lev 1:5; 17:6; 2 Kgs 16:15) and accordingly, blood was the main element on the Day of Atonement described in Lev 16, where specific instructions are given as to its handling. On the Day of Atonement the cleansing of the sanctuary and its compartments was accomplished with the application of the blood of the goat for the Lord (Lev 16:29, 34) on several sections and furniture of the sanctuary followed by the dismissal of the goat for Azazel to the desert bearing the transgressions removed from the sanctuary to a "barren land."

As previously established, several references to blood in the NT may point to a Day of Atonement background and it appears that the book of Revelation is no different: as other NT authors understood the Day of Atonement ritual in light of the sacrificial death of Christ as a "sin offering," it appears John does too. One potential line of evidence of this may be the fact that the main element of the Day of Atonement ritual

---

[13] Cf. Paul B. Decock, "The Symbol of Blood in the Apocalypse of John," *Neotestamentica* 38 (2004): 157, categorizes the use of "blood" in Revelation in three categories: (1) the blood of Christ (as saving power); (2) the blood of the martyrs (as a cry for justice); and (3) and the blood of divine justice. Although categories 1 and 2 are helpful, category 3 may be questionable as he considers the blood on the robe of the rider of the white horse as the "blood of nations" which is not a decisive reading. See the discussion in the respective section of this thesis.

described in Lev 16, "blood" (αἷμα) appears ten times there and five times in Revelation specifically in connection with the blood of Christ (1:5; 5:9; 7:14; 12:11; 19:13). In fact, "blood" appears in the first few verses of the book; in John's greeting to the seven churches, he praises Jesus because he "freed us from our sins by his blood [ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ], and made us to be a kingdom, priests serving his God and Father" (Rev 1:5–6). As in the book of Hebrews, Jesus is introduced in Revelation as the perpetual high priest, having attained a perfect renewal of the covenant by "his own blood" (cf. Heb 6:19–20; 9:12).[14] Jesus is at the same time high priest and the "sin offering" sacrifice. The other fourteen references to αἷμα in Revelation appear in scenes of judgment arising from violence against the saints perpetrated by Babylon, in the harvest of the earth (6:10; 14:2; 16:3–4, 6 [2x]; 17:6 [2x]; 18:24; 19:2) and in cosmic/earthly cataclysms (6:12; 8:7–8; 11:6).

Initially, however, "blood" in Revelation 1 may point to an overarching sanctuary theme present in Revelation rather than specifically to a Day of Atonement background. However, as will be seen below, the presence of atoning blood in conjunction with other elements in the chapter, such as the robe, the candlesticks and the golden sash, may form a picture where the Day of Atonement is more prominent than just a regular sanctuary theme.

[14] It is important to note that any discussion of the thematic parallels between the book of Hebrews and Revelation does not necessarily assume knowledge of Hebrews by the seven churches of Asia to which the book of Revelation was addressed. These parallels may however, point to potential "shared" Christian traditions of christological understandings. The book of Hebrews is certainly not necessarily "foundational" to the understanding of the book of Revelation.

"A Loud Voice as a Trumpet"

Revelation 1 moves from the introductory remarks in vv. 1–9 to a vision of the resurrected Christ (1:10–20). While "in the spirit on the Lord's day" (ἐν πνεύματι ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ, 1:9), John describes hearing "a loud voice as a trumpet" (φωνὴν μεγάλην ὡς σάλπιγγος, Rev 1:10). A first observation to be made here is the fact that the first actual interaction between Jesus and John in the book occurs at the sound of the trumpet, a daily occurrence in the Second Temple service and in the annual festivals, including the Day of Atonement.[15] The trumpet is important not only for the Feast of Trumpets, but also in light of the fact that this feast is viewed as a prelude and preparation for the Day of Atonement. The blowing of trumpets announces the acts of God (cf. Num 10:10). Rabbinic literature points to the use of trumpets on Tishri 1 as a prelude to the Day of Atonement. Thus, the Feast of Trumpets and the Day of Atonement could be regarded as one large festival. As Paulien describes it: "In Jewish thought the seventh-month Feast of Trumpets ushered in the time of judgment that led up to the Day of Atonement…"[16]

The expression φωνὴν μεγάλην ὡς σάλπιγγος is significant, because underlying it is the Hebrew expression, "sound of the *shofar* " (קוֹל הַשֹּׁפָר) usually translated as τὴν

---

[15] Caird, *Revelation*, 110–112. Beale, *Revelation*, 203, sees here an allusion to Exod 19:16, 19, φωνὴ τῆς σάλπιγγος ἤχει μέγα; φωναὶ τῆς σάλπιγγος as an attempt on the part of John to bestow prophetic authority on his office, as did Moses at Sinai. This conclusion is doubtful as it seems to remove the focus of the passage from the exalted Jesus to John.

[16] Paulien, "Hebrew Cultus," 259.

φωνὴν τῆς σάλπιγγος in the LXX (e.g., Exod 20:18). This expression appears also in 2 Sam 15:10, translated by the LXX as φωνὴν τῆς κερατίνης, "sound of the horn," where κερατίνης translates שׁוֹפָר more literally. The sound of the שׁוֹפָר is used in other cases of theophanic revelations, calls to battle and festal celebrations (e.g., Ps 47:6; Isa 18:3; Joel 2:1; Zeph 1:16; Zech 9:14).

It should be observed that the imagery of a trumpet/ שׁוֹפָר by itself does not immediately require a Day of Atonement background since the word שׁוֹפָר is often translated in the LXX as φωνὴ τῆς σάλπιγγος in passages not dealing with the Day of Atonement. However, the presence of other elements in this passage, as shown below, appears to point to the Day of Atonement as a background for this imagery.[17] The main difference between the frequent OT expression קוֹל הַשֹּׁפָר, and the trumpet of Revelation 1 is the addition of "loud" (μεγάλη). This is not insignificant and appears to point to at least three passages of the OT. The first is the LXX text of Exod 19:16, which describes the loud sound of a trumpet on the third day of the gathering of the people of Israel at the foot of Mount Sinai. The expression used in Exod 19 is "the voice of the trumpet exceeding loud" (φωνὴ τῆς σάλπιγγος ἤχει μέγα) which is very similar to Revelation's φωνὴν μεγάλην ὡς σάλπιγγος. Strenghtening this connection with the loud

[17] Beale, in "The Descent of the Eschatological Temple. Part 1: The Clearest Evidence," *TynBul* 56 (2005): 100–102, argues that the OT theophanies are often connected with the temple and that Sinai is also portrayed as a temple.

trumpet sound at Sinai is the fact that, in similar fashion to the giving of the law on that occasion, Jesus appears "the ruler of the "kings of the earth" (ὁ ἄρχων τῶν βασιλέων τῆς γῆς, Rev 1:5) and consequently of the new Israel, the Christian church. In similar fashion to the giving of the law at Sinai, Jesus bears the new code of ethics so to speak in the form of the messages to the seven churches: "Write in a book what you see and send it to the seven churches" (Rev 1:11). Thus, as the blowing of the trumpet is connected to the binding of the Sinaitic covenant which culminated with the annual renewal of the covenant at the ritual of the Day of Atonement, Jesus' voice as a trumpet ushers in the new covenant "by his [Day of Atonement] blood."

If the trumpet blast in Revelation 1 is connected with the calling of Israel at Sinai (Exod 19:6, 16, 19–20), a calling that was daily reiterated by the trumpets at the sanctuary service, the call is now transferred to the church, which is called by the voice of the trumpet through the prophet John. Jesus speaks inside the Holy Place after having ministered inside the Most Holy Place on the inaguruated, eschatological Day of Atonement. That the church is called to be a witness of the acts of God to the world is also repeated in Rev 11:1–3, where it is again referred to as a "candlestick" purportedly acting as a light in the world. In the same vein, the mention of "keys" in Rev 1:18a: "I have the keys of Death and of Hades" (καὶ ἔχω τὰς κλεῖς τοῦ θανάτου καὶ τοῦ ᾅδου) may draw from the imagery present in the MT text of Isa 22:22a: "I will place on his shoulder the key of the house of David." The allusion to MT Isa 22:22b, "he shall open, and no one shall shut; he shall shut, and no one shall open", is more certain in Rev 3:7: "And to

the angel of the church in Philadelphia write: These are the words of the holy one, the true one, who has the key of David, who opens and no one will shut, who shuts and no one opens."[18] The use of these OT passages points to the confirmation of Jesus' exalted position as ruler/high priest in the sanctuary. As the high priest, Jesus confers the priesthood on the seven churches (Rev 1:6).

The second occurrence of a similar expression is Isa 27:13 where בְּשׁוֹפָר גָּדוֹל, "a great trumpet," is translated τῇ σάλπιγγι τῇ μεγάλῃ in the LXX. The Isaianic passage describes the redemption of Israel accompanied by the sound of a "great trumpet." The third OT source for φωνὴν μεγάλην ὡς σάλπιγγος is Lev 25:9, which prescribes playing the trumpet loudly (or trumpet blasts) on the Day of Atonement: "Then you shall have the trumpet sounded loud [שׁוֹפַר תְּרוּעָה] on the tenth day of the seventh month—on the day of atonement—you shall have the trumpet [שׁוֹפַר] sounded throughout all your land." The Hebrew text of "trumpet sounded loud" is שׁוֹפַר תְּרוּעָה, a meaning which is lost in the LXX's διαγγελεῖτε σάλπιγγος φωνῇ, lit. "proclaim with the trumpet." The Hebrew expression שׁוֹפַר תְּרוּעָה can be translated literally as "a blast of the *shofar*." As such, based on the Hebrew text, this passage could also have served as a background for the imagery of a φωνὴν μεγάλην ὡς σάλπιγγος we find in Revelation 1.

---

[18] This may also be an allusion to 2 Enoch 42:1: "I saw the key-holders and guards of the gates of hell standing, like great serpents, and their faces like extinguished lamps, and their eyes of fire, their sharp teeth." See similar imagery in *Apocalypse of Zephaniah* 6:11–15; Beale, *Revelation*, 215.

However, it appears that Leviticus 25:9 may be the best source for the trumpet imagery in Revelation 1 for two reasons: (1) the imagery is the same, i.e., a loud blast of the trumpet; and (2) Leviticus 25:9 provides the closest *thematic* context to that of Revelation, namely, a blast of the שׁוֹפָר at a time when the high priest comes into prominence (Day of Atonement) in connection with the sanctuary, such as we see in Revelation 1. Furthermore, the imagery of a blast of a trumpet in Revelation 1 in connection with ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ, "the day of the Lord", (Rev 1:10) is a parallel to the call of the prophet Joel to prepare for the "the day of the Lord" (יוֹם־יְהוָה): "Blow the trumpet in Zion; sound the alarm on my holy mountain! Let all the inhabitants of the land tremble, for the day of the LORD is coming, it is near" (Joel 2:1). Significant here is the fact that the prescriptions for the Day of Atonement are similar to Joel's preparations for the "day of the Lord" in that they call for self-affliction in the form of fasting, weeping, mourning and rending of hearts (2:12–13). Joel also mandates twice that the שׁוֹפָר is played (2:1, 15) throughout the land in order to summon the people so they can be "sanctified" (2:16) in preparation for this day. Thus, by connecting the sound of the שׁוֹפָר with the vision of the resurrected Christ, John appears to build on the OT's understanding of the שׁוֹפָר in connection with visions of judgment attendant on the expectation of "the day of the Lord" which, in turn, echo the sanctification required to participate on the Day of Atonement. The similarity of the themes of Revelation 1 and Joel may even point to an understanding of the expression "the day of Lord" in Rev 1:12

as an early Christian understanding of Christ's death in terms of an eschatological/cosmic Day of Atonement inaugurated at the cross and extending to the final/eschatological eradication of sin at the end of time and the judgment upon the wicked world. In addition, it is plausible that the substantial section of the trumpets (Rev 8:6–11:19), seals (Rev 6:1–7:8) and bowls (Rev 16:1–21) may be built on the importance and implications of the Day of Atonement for the Church since the Feast of Trumpets occurred in preparation for the Day of Atonement as we've seen previously. In an eschatological sense then, the trumpets of Revelation introduced in Revelation 1 are the harbingers of a cosmic Day of Atonement with calls for holiness (purity) for the church and judgment against the wicked world.

Day of Atonement Clothing in Rev 1:13

In a recent PhD dissertation, Ross Winkle[19] examined high priestly clothing in Revelation. He writes that John's "portrait of Jesus, including high priestly sartorial imagery, expands and enriches the NT understanding of Jesus as high priest."[20] It is contended here, however, that, following the tradition of other New Testament writers, John portrays Jesus in Revelation 1 not only as high priest, but as a high priest ministering on the very Day of Atonement. Martha Himmelfarb is correct when she

[19] Ross E. Winkle, "Clothes Make the (One Like a Son of) Man: Dress imagery in Revelation 1 as an Indicator of High Priestly Status," (PhD diss., Andrews University, 2012), 21: "Consequently, the attractiveness and potential usefulness of an exegetical approach to Revelation utilizing dress analysis for ascertaining a high priestly identity for Jesus is not only reasonable but self-evident."

[20] Winkle, "Dress," 366, 372.

writes, "the high priest's vestments were the object of considerable interest."[21] Josephus describes the importance of the high priest's attire in *Ant.* 15.403–409; 18.90–95; 20.6–16. The description of the clothes used by the high priest on the Day of Atonement are given in Lev 16:4:

> He shall put on the holy linen tunic, and shall have the linen undergarments next to his body, fasten the linen sash, and wear the linen turban; these are the holy vestments. He shall bathe his body in water, and then put them on.

The clothing of the priest gave him the authority to perform his duties.[22] In a similar way, Jesus is represented as a high priest ministering among the candlesticks, which represent the seven churches (καὶ αἱ λυχνίαι αἱ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαι εἰσίν, Rev 1:20), dressed in high-priestly clothing and interceding for the congregation of the new Israel, the church.

The High Priestly Ποδήρης

In Rev 1:13 Jesus is depicted as "clothed with a long robe and with a golden sash across his chest," ἐνδεδυμένον ποδήρη καὶ περιεζωσμένον πρὸς τοῖς μαστοῖς ζώνην χρυσᾶν (Rev 1:13). The term ποδήρης as we read it in Revelation is a *hapax legomenon* in the NT and in Revelation it carries adjectival weight. As the root of the Greek word implies, the

[21] Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 19.

[22] Cf. Menahem Haran, *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into Biblical Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 174: "These garments serve to indicate a kind of dialectical elevation into that sphere which is beyond even the material, contagious holiness characterizing the tabernacle and its accessories."

ποδήρης[23] reaches to the feet (πούς).[24] It is used *exclusively* in two contexts in the LXX: (1) it appears nine times in the LXX and is reserved for high priestly attire (Exodus 28:4, 27; 29:5; 35:8; Zech 3:4, where a ποδήρης is restored to the high priest Joshua); (2) in the vision of the heavenly being in Ezek 9:2, 3, 11. Outside the OT ποδήρης also appears in Wisdom of Solomon 18:24; Sirach 27:8; 45:8 and in the *Epistle of Aristeas* 96.

Beginning with Iraeneus, commentators agree that Rev 1:13 alludes to the priestly garment.[25] Scholars also agree on the dependence of Rev 1:13 on Dan 10:5 primarily and secondarily on Ezek 9.[26] Rev 1:13 conflates both concepts, i.e., high priestly attire with divine attire, by describing the resurrected Christ as a "heavenly" high priest, seen amidst the golden lampstands dressed in a heavenly, high priestly ποδήρης. Likewise, as a heavenly high priest, the term ποδήρης is reserved for Jesus Christ in Revelation. The term that describes the robe of the resurrected Jesus is not the same as the "white robes" promised to the churches of Sardis and Laodicea in Rev 3:5, 18 (ἱματίοις λευκοῖς/ἱμάτια

---

[23] Cf. BDAG, s.v., "ποδήρης."

[24] In addition to the accessories above, Exod 28:42 indicates that there was yet another accessory, the מִכְנְסֵי־בָד, "linen undergarment" which went from the "hips to the thighs." This is referred to by Josephus as the "Machanase, which means somewhat that is fast tied. It is a girdle, composed of fine twined linen, and is put about the privy parts, the feet to be inserted into them, in the nature of breeches; but above half of it is cut off, and it ends at the thighs and is there tied fast" (*Ant.* 3:152 in Whiston, *The Works of Josephus*).

[25] So Caird, *Revelation*, 25; Beale, *Revelation*, 210; Mounce, *Revelation*, 58; Kistemaker, *Revelation*, 95; pace Osborne, *Revelation*, 89.

[26] Beale, *Revelation*, 210; ibid., *Daniel in Revelation*, 160; Aune, *Revelation 1–5*, 93–94; Craig R. Koester, *Revelation: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, ed. John J. Collins, AYB 38a (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2014), 246.

λευκὰ), although they most likely share the characteristic white colour (or "bright and pure") of Jesus' robe, which stands for "righteousness" according to Rev 19:8.[27] The same expression is used to describe the robes of the twenty-four elders in 4:4—ἱματίοις λευκοῖς—while the robes of souls under the altar and the great multitude are στολὰς (6:11; 7:9, 13–14; cf. 22:14).[28]

According to Wollf, "Die Beschreibung des Menschensohns weist in v. 13, über die Anlehnung an Dan. 10. 5 f. hinausgehend, hohepriesterliche Züge auf die Gürtung des Gewandes über der Brust und die Bezeichnung des Gewandes als ποδήρης."[29] Aune, however, disagrees, maintaining that "the most common Hebrew term for the robes of the high priests and priests in the OT is כְּתֹנֶת, usually translated as χιτών"[30] and not ποδήρης. The full list of high priestly accessories is in the Hebrew text (MT) of Exod 28:4, 42, in which the priestly attire includes at least two robes, the linen undergarments (מִכְנְסֵי־בָד), a breastpiece, (חֹשֶׁן), an ephod (אֵפֹד) a robe (מְעִיל; LXX, ποδήρης), a

---

[27] It is also noteworthy that while Matthew describes the high priest as rending his ἱμάτιον (Matt 26:65), Mark uses χιτών (Mark 14:63).

[28] Cf. the helpful discussion of the interchangeability of the terms in Richard Chenevix Trench, *Synonyms of the New Testament* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1880), 184–187.

[29] Christian Wolff, "Die Gemeinde des Christus," 189: "The description of the Son of Man in v. 13 shows, while alluding to Dan. 19:5, the high-priestly features of the sash and the name of the garment is ποδήρης."

[30] Χιτών appears eleven times in the LXX, the first of which is in Gen 3:21 to describe the garments Elohim makes for Adam and Eve as well as in Gen 37:3, 23, 31, 32, 33; Exod 28:4, 39; 40; 29:5, 8; 40:14; Lev 8:7; 13; 10:5; 16: 2 Sam 13:18, 19; 15:32; Song 5:3; Job 30:18).

checkered tunic (כְּתֹנֶת; LXX χιτῶνα κοσυμβωτὸν), a turban (מִצְנֶפֶת) and a sash (אַבְנֵט). The implication here is that the robe, מְעִיל, and the tunic, כְּתֹנֶת, do not refer to the same piece of clothing, albeit they should both be understood as ποδήρης, reaching to the feet. The main difference is that the מְעִיל does not have sleeves (as does the כְּתֹנֶת) and is not white but "blue" with pomegranate adornments and bells at the hem (Exod 28:31–35). Josephus describes the כְּתֹנֶת as sitting close to the body and having sleeves (*Ant.* 3:153).

In order to probe the relationship between ποδήρης and the high priestly dress on the Day of Atonement in greater detail, it is important to observe that ποδήρης does not occur in the Greek text of Lev 16. The term for the priestly robe used in the LXX is χιτῶνα λινοῦν. However, the absence of ποδήρης in Lev 16 is not a fatal objection to seeing Jesus as a high priest in his Day of Atonement attire because, as indicated by Trench, ποδήρης is "properly an adjective"[31] more than a noun: it simply describes the length of Jesus' robe. Moreover, Rev 1:13 is an allusion to the description of the vision in Dan 10:5: "I looked up and saw a man clothed in linen [ἐνδεδυμένος βύσσινα], with a belt of gold from Uphaz around his waist."[32]

---

[31] Trench, *Synonyms of the New Testament*, 187.

[32] Cf. Beale, *Revelation*, 208; Koester, *Revelation*, 245. Cf. also Christopher Rowland, "A Man Clothed in Linen: Daniel 10.6ff. and Jewish Angelology," *JSNT* 24 (1985): 99–110. It should be noted that the LXX text of Daniel 10:5 does not follow the MT precisely, it renders וּמָתְנָיו חֲגֻרִים בְּכֶתֶם אוּפָז "sash of gold" as ἐκ μέσου αὐτοῦ φῶς, "with light in his middle." If this is

Winkle writes: "Despite the appearance that ποδήρη here translates כתנת, one cannot conclude that it stands for any high priestly dress item other than ומעיל. The issue however is not as decisive as it seems."[33] Josephus calls the priestly כְּתֹנֶת־בַּד (Lev 18:4) a "χέθον γὰρ τὸ λίνον" (χέθον being a transliteration of כְּתֹנֶת) and describes its length as ποδήρης χιτών, a robe that "reaches down to the feet, and sits close to the body" (*Ant.* 3:153). In the passage below, Josephus uses both ποδήρης and χιτών to describe the כְּתֹנֶת, the tunic that was under the מְעִיל הָאֵפֹד in the high priestly dress:

> Ἐπὶ δὲ τούτῳ λίνεον ἔνδυμα διπλῆς φορεῖ σινδόνος βυσσίνης, χεθομένη μὲνκαλεῖ τα, λίνεον δὲ τοῦτο σημαίνει: χέθον γὰρ τὸ λίνον ἡμεῖς καλοῦμεν. ἔστι δὲτοῦτο τὸ ἔνδυμα ποδήρης χιτὼν περιγεγραμμένος τῷ σώματι καὶ τὰςχειρῖδας περὶ τοῖς βρ αχίοσιν κατεσφιγμένος.[34] ("Over this he wore a linen vestment, made of fine flax doubled: it is called Chethone, and denotes linen, for we call linen by the name of Chethone. This vestment reaches down to the feet, and sits close to the body; and has sleeves that are tied fast to the arms").[35]

Plutarch uses a similar expression in his description of the Jewish high priestly attire ἐν ταῖς ἑορτάις, "on feast days," most likely a reference to the Jewish Yom Kippur in

---

really an allusion to Daniel, we can then be sure that John was using a Hebrew text at this point, not the LXX. Cf. Clement Taek Hahm, "The Priestly Influence upon Daniel 7–12" (PhD diss., The Claremont Graduate University, 2008).

[33] Winkle, "Dress," 181.

[34] *Ant.* 3:153, Greek text from B. Niese, *Flavius Josephus. Flavii Iosephi opera*, (Berlin: Weidmann, 1892).

[35] *Ant.* 3:153 in Flavius Josephus and William Whiston, *The Works of Josephus: Complete and Unabridged* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1987).

Symposiacs IV.6.[36] Despite some inaccurate descriptions in the passage (e.g., that his garment was made from the "skin of a hind"), Plutarch refers to the robe worn by the high priest on that "holiday" as χιτῶνα ποδήρη.

In Lev 16:4, the robe required for the Day of Atonement ritual is a כְּתֹנֶת־בַּד, translated in the LXX with terms very similar to those in the above passages—χιτῶνα λινοῦν. Since the undergarments of the high priest are the only pieces of his attire which do not reach to the feet, but are rather tied to his thighs (Exod 28:42; *Ant.* 3:152), it must be concluded that the כְּתֹנֶת־בַּד prescribed for the Day of Atonement rituals is not a special piece of clothing created solely for use on the Day of Atonement but rather, it is the regular כְּתֹנֶת worn by Aaron under the מְעִיל (as well as by the priests in their daily duty; cf. Exod 28:40; 39:27). Consequently, this כְּתֹנֶת־בַּד is also a ποδήρης, i.e., reaching to the feet. In fact, this is also found in the LXX text of Exod 29:5 which mentions only three items of the four in the MT, thus seeming to conflate the מְעִיל with the ephod when it speaks of the ἐπωμίδα, "the ephod," while translating the כְּתֹנֶת־בַּד as τὸν χιτῶνα τὸν ποδήρη. This conflation also appears in Sirach 45:8 in

[36] In the original Greek text: Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν εἰκότα φαίη τις ἄν εἶναι κατὰ χράτος δὲ τοὺς ἐναντίους πρῶτον μὲν ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐλεγχει, μιτροφόρος τε προϊὼν ἐν ταῖς ἑορτάις, καὶ νεβρίδα χρυσόπαστον ἐνημμένος, χιτῶνα δέ ποδήρη φορῶν καὶ κοθόρνους κώδωνες δὲ πολλοὶ χατακρέμανται τῆς ἐσθῆτος, ὑπκομποῦντες ἐν τῷ βαδίζειν (Gregorius N. Bernardakis, ed., vol. 4 of *Plutarchus Moralia* [Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1892)], 173).

which the מכנסים כתנת ומעיל in the Greek is περισκελῆ καὶ ποδήρη καὶ ἐπωμίδα, where ποδήρη stands for the כתנת and ἐπωμίδα for the ומעיל.

Having analysed Jesus' use of the ποδήρης as high priest and his location inside the holy place, Margaret Barker does not hesitate to see this introductory vision as portraying Jesus as the high priest coming out of the Most Holy Place having just ministered there on the Day of Atonement. She writes:

> On balance, we should probably assume that the robe in Revelation 1:13 was the white linen worn by the high priest when he entered the holy of holies as no other vestments are mentioned … The Man in the midst of the seven lamps is the high priest on the Day of Atonement who has just emerged from the holy of holies into the great hall. His face is radiant because he has been in the divine presence which has transformed him into the Lord.[37]

Aune disagrees that ποδήρης deals with priestly attire because this term is "hardly understood as a technical term" and in the LXX it translates five Hebrew words: חֹשֶׁן, "breastplate" (Exod 28:15, 22), מְעִיל "cloak" (Exod 28:4; 29:5), אֵפוֹד, "ephod" (Exod 28:31); בַּד, "linen" (Ezek 9:2, 3,11) and מַחֲלָצוֹת, "fine robe"[38] in Zech 3:4 (cf. Isa 3:22).[39]

---

[37] Barker, *Revelation,* 84–85.

[38] Cf. s.v., "מְעִיל", a "costly garment" in Wilhelm Gesenius and Samuel Prideaux Tregelles, *Gesenius' Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament Scriptures* (Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2003). This garment was probably "white" (cf. William Lee Holladay and Ludwig Köhler, *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the OT* [Leiden: Brill, 2000] and is translated as a "robe of state" in BDB and "festal robes" in the NRSV.

[39] Aune, *Revelation 1–5,* 93. In Isa 3:22 מַחֲלָצוֹת is translated as ἐπιβλήματα τὰ κατὰ τὴν οἰκίαν, which means literally, "a coat to remove at home" with the connotation of a garment for special occasions, or in the case of the high priest Joshua, his full priestly attire.

Against Aune's assessment it could be said that, although ποδήρης does translate several different terms related to the idea of "robe, cloak and covering" in the priestly attire, with a possible exception of בַּד in Ezek 9:2, 3, 11, ποδήρης never translates these terms when they are used in a context other than the high priestly garment. For example, the most common term for the blue priestly robe, מְעִיל (twenty-seven times in the MT), is variously translated in the LXX when not dealing with priestly garments as διπλοΐδα (2 Sam 2:19; 24:4, 11; 28:14; Job 29:14; Ps 19:29), στολῇ βυσσίνῃ (1 Chr 15:27), θώρακα (Isa 59:17) and ἱμάτιον (Ezra 9:5 and Isa 61:10). In addition, in Rev 15:6 the angels are described in the same way as Jesus is described in Rev 1:13, as wearing white, linen robes with a "golden sash," ζώνην χρυσᾶν, while their robe is not a ποδήρης but rather a λίνον καθαρὸν λαμπρὸν, "a shining, white linen robe." Thus we can reasbonaly conclude that ποδήρης is reserved for the description of Jesus' high priestly clothing in Revelation. With this in mind, we could consider בַּד in Ezek 9:2, 3, 11 not as an "exception" to the use of ποδήρης by Jesus as a priest, but rather as part of John's intention to attach "heavenly" qualities to the OT high priestly ποδήρης. This conclusion has been reached by other scholars who interpret the heavenly being in Ezek 9 as a priestly figure.[40] Not

[40] Cf. Marvin A. Sweeney, "Ezekiel: Zadokite Priest and Visionary Prophet of the Exile," in *Form and Intertextuality in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature*, FAT 45 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 136.

only is ποδήρης used to describe the earthly high priest's robe, but also that of a heavenly high priest revealed to the OT prophets Ezekiel and Daniel.

Aune goes on to say that because the other parts of the high priest's attire are not mentioned, there is "no clear indication on the part of the author to conceptualize the appearance of the exalted Christ in priestly terms."[41] Quite to the contrary, if ποδήρης denotes high priestly dress reaching to the feet as has been established above, it is precisely the *absence* of the other accessories of the characteristic high priest's attire that points to the simpler attire prescribed for the high prist on the Day of Atonement that is described in Lev 16:4. The attire for the ritual of the Day of Atonement is in the order of clothing: (1) the undergarment (מִכְנְסֵי־בָד, LXX περισκελὲς λινοῦν); (2) the linen tunic (כְּתֹנֶת־בַּד, LXX χιτῶνα λινοῦν); (3) the sash, (אַבְנֵט, LXX ζώνῃ λινῇ); and (4) the turban (מִצְנֶפֶת, LXX, κίδαριν λινῆν). On this day the high priest was stripped of his regular, colourful clothing and became a regular priest to perform the day's activities (Lev 16:4). Only when the high priest has completed the sacrifice of the first goat and released the goat for Azazel is he told to bathe again and put on his full high-priestly attire that included the blue tunic, the ephod and the name on the forehead. (Lev 16:24).

In Isa 22:21 the exaltation of Eliakim is described as follows: "On that day I will call my servant Eliakim son of Hilkiah, and will clothe him with your robe [כֻּתָּנְתֶּךָ] and

[41] Aune, *Revelation 1–5*, 94.

bind your sash [אַבְנֵט] on him." This passage resembles the vision of Jesus as exalted high priest in Revelation 1 as the linen robe and sash in that passage signify royal authority. The two pieces of garment given to Eliakim to wear are the כְּתֹנֶת and the אַבְנֵט, the same terms used to describe the high priestly attire in Exodus 28:4. Winkle concludes that:

> There is clear evidence that John's description of the ὅμοιον υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου specifically wearing a ποδήρης in 1:13 indicates that John intended to portray Jesus wearing the high priest's woolen, hyacinth-dyed, foot-length robe, thus communicating his high priestly identity.[42]

This rather surprising conclusion can be challenged on several fronts.

(1) The high priestly מְעִיל is never worn as a single piece of clothing. As the root מעל, "to cover,"[43] implies, it is meant to be worn as an outer garment, to cover an inner tunic, the כְּתֹנֶת, "the linen tunic" which in turn is worn over the מִכְנְסֵי־בָד, the "linen undergarments" (Exod 28:42). At least one Lexicon defines מְעִיל as a sleeveless accessory[44] based on the description of this item in Exodus 28.[45] John would have described Jesus as wearing two robes if he is wearing the high priestly מְעִיל, which he

---

[42] Winkle, "Dress," 304, 305.

[43] Cf. Victor P. Hamilton s.v. "מָעַל," in *TWOT*, 519.

[44] S.v. "מְעִיל" in Ludwig Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros* (Leiden, Brill: 1958).

[45] Although a מְעִיל with sleeves is mentioned in 2 Sam 13:18.

does not do.

(2) As an accompanying accessory, the high priestly מְעִיל is always worn in conjunction with other high priestly accessories, such as the אֵפֹד, the "ephod." It is in fact called מְעִיל הָאֵפֹד, the "robe of the ephod" (cf. Exod 28:31; 29:5; 39:22). The ephod supported the חֹשֶׁן, "breastpiece," which in turn housed the הָאוּרִים וְאֶת־הַתֻּמִּים, the Urim and the Thummim (Exod 28:30);[46] it also had shoulder pieces with two onyx stones, one on each side (Exod 28:12). The מְעִיל also had golden bells and pomegranates at the hem (Exod 39:24–26). A final accessory was the נֵזֶר a golden plate that was tied around the turban and contained the words: "Holy to the LORD" (Exod 28:36; 29:6; 39:30; Lev 8:9). However, despite this elaborate attire, there is no hint in Revelation 1 that the exalted Jesus is wearing a מְעִיל הָאֵפֹד along with all the other

[46] These accessories were a symbol of "judgment": "thus Aaron shall bear the judgment of the Israelites on his heart before the LORD continually" (Exod 28:3). This piece was also missing in Lev 16:4. What is the significance of not wearing the Urim and the Thummim on the Day of Atonement? Rooke suggests: "The obvious consequence is that he is rendered ritually deaf and dumb while inside the Tent of Meeting…the breastpiece as a symbol of communication between him and Yahweh (Exod 28.30) ... when the high priest undertakes this crucial and perilous rite, which is a prerogative due to him because he *is* high priest, he is deprived of everything that marks him out as high priest, and is left vulnerable" (Rooke, "Day of Atonement," 352). On the Day of Atonement, the guarantees afforded the high priest by his regular attire are not available. Not only do the ephod, the Urim and the Thummim remind him of his position, but they also keep him connected and protected by God's promises to all Israel. On the Day of Atonement however, those are not available. This may point to Isaiah's messianic prophecy in 63:2–3: "I have trodden the winepress alone; from the nations no one was with me. I trampled them in my anger and trod them down in my wrath; their blood spattered my garments, and I stained all my clothing."

accessories that composed the regular high-priestly attire.[47]

(3) The high priestly מְעִיל was not made of linen but rather of תְּכֵלֶת, which has been defined as "blue wool yarn."[48] In turn, the robes of all heavenly beings in Revelation are made of white linen, which had sacral connotations in the OT.[49] John uses "white," λευκός sixteen times in Revelation[50] (plus λευκαίνω, "to make white," in Rev 7:14) and provides the key to understanding its meaning: white means purity, righteousness (Rev 19:8).[51] Rev 19:13 depicts "the armies of heaven, wearing fine linen, white and pure," ἐνδεδυμένοι βύσσινον λευκὸν καθαρόν, following him on the white horse, ἵπποις λευκοῖς (Rev 19:14). We should rightly assume then that the rider of the horse who represents Jesus wears the same "fine linen, white and pure," βύσσινον λευκὸν καθαρόν. The new Jerusalem is "clothed with fine linen, bright and pure [i.e. "white"] for the fine linen [i.e., "white"] is the righteous deeds of the saints," περιβάληται

---

[47] Winkle admits this when he writes: "Consequently, it is significant to note that in translating the מְעִיל, the translators of the LXX typically used a word that was characterized by its relationship to another article of dress that the high priest wore" ("Dress," 159).

[48] James Swanson, *Dictionary of Biblical Languages with Semantic Domains: Hebrew (Old Testament)* (Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems, Inc., 1997), s.v., "תְּכֵלֶת"; cf. Ronald F. Youngblood, "תְּכֵלֶת," in *TWOT*.

[49] Cf. Exod 28:42; 39:28; Lev 6:10; 16:4, 23, 32.

[50] 1:14 (2x); 2:17; 3:4, 5, 18; 4:4; 6:2, 11; 7:9; 7:13; 14:14; 19:11, 14 (2x); 20:11.

[51] Cf. Felise Tavo, *Woman, Mother and the Bride: An Exegetical Investigation into the Ecclesial Notion of the Apocalypse* (Paris, Leuven, Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2007), 167: "Clearly, the act of being clothed in white, whether by robe, garment or linen, connotes a life of purity and integrity."

βύσσινον λαμπρὸν καθαρόν τὸ γὰρ βύσσινον τὰ δικαιώματα τῶν ἁγίων ἐστίν (Rev 19:8). The promise to the righteous in Sardis also sheds light on the colour of Jesus' ποδήρης in Rev 1:13: "they will walk with me, dressed in white, for they are worthy" (καὶ περιπατήσουσιν μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν λευκοῖς, ὅτι ἄξιοί εἰσιν, Rev 3:4).[52] The high priest's tunic worn on the Day of Atonement is called "the holy linen tunic," כְּתֹנֶת־בַּד קֹדֶשׁ and is white in color. This is confirmed by the *m. Yoma* 3:6, which indicates that the high priest's robe on the Day of Atonement is "white."[53] This attire did not include the blue/hyacinthine מְעִיל הָאֵפֹד but the simple, regular priestly כְּתֹנֶת which reached to the feet, plus the sash and the turban. After Aaron's work inside the tabernacle is completed, Lev 16:23 indicates that these "linen vestments," בִּגְדֵי הַבָּד, are substituted by Aaron's full high priestly attire, called simply בְּגָדִים without בָּד, "linen," since it is not all made of linen (cf. Lev 6:4; *m. Yoma* 3:7). The implication is that the service of the Day of Atonement is completed and accepted and that Aaron may wear his regular regalia again in order to offer burnt offerings on the altar in the outer court.

(4) Throughout Revelation, John displays a keen interest in the colour of things in his visions. In Revelation 1 there is the golden sash (1:13), hair white as wool, white as snow, the eyes as fire (1:14) and the feet as bronze (1:15). The colour of dress often is

---

[52] Note the presence of ἄξιοί, which is the same word used for the lamb in Revelation 5.

[53] Pace Dietmar Neufeld, "Under the Cover of Clothing: Scripted Clothing Performances in the Apocalypse of John," *BTB* 35 (2005): 72, who argues for a "golden" robe.

meaningful in describing the character of those who wear it: dark, aggressive colours (black, purple, scarlet, etc.) denote evil while white is reserved for the saints and heavenly beings.[54] It seems unreasonable therefore that he would simply "miss" the blue colour of Jesus' ποδήρης if it were in fact the blue, high priestly מְעִיל. We should assume that, had Jesus been wearing a blue/hyacinth robe, John would have indicated it as such.[55]

(5) The long robes of the heavenly beings in Ezek 9:2, 3, 11; 10:2, 6, 7 and Dan 10:5. 12:6, 7 are likewise made of בַּד. The fact that John is alluding to the Ezekiel and Daniel passages in Rev 1:13 points to the fact that, along with all other heavenly beings in Revelation, Jesus is clothed in pure, white linen. This parallel with Dan 10:5 appears to indicate that John also understands the terms ποδήρης, "long robe," and βύσσινος, "linen robe," to be synonymous. In other words, a βύσσινος, "linen robe", which is white elsewhere in Revelation, always reached to the feet, ποδήρης.[56]

---

[54] The harlot which rides the beast in Rev 17 is "clothed in purple and scarlet," περιβεβλημένη πορφυροῦν καὶ κόκκινον (Rev 17:4) a description identical to that of Babylon's attire with the exception of βύσσινον: "…the great city, clothed in fine linen, in purple and scarlet," περιβεβλημένη βύσσινον καὶ πορφυροῦν καὶ κόκκινον (Rev 18:16).

[55] Admittedly, the argument is ambiguous at this point, as John could have also indicated that the robe was "white," which he does not. However, this is not a fatal objection considering the additional evidence for a white linen robe in Revelation.

[56] Cf. Winfried Vogel, *Cultic Motif in the Book of Daniel* (New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing, 2009), 49: "In chaps. 10 and 12, Daniel meets 'a certain man clothed in linen,' pointing to a high-priestly figure officiating on the Day of Atonement, who engages him in lengthy dialogues that make up the main content of these chapters."

On the basis of his argument that ποδήρης in Revelation refers to the high priestly מְעִיל הָאֵפֹד, Winkle concludes that Rev 1:13 does not reflect the Day of Atonement high priestly attire when he writes: "Neither would it [ποδήρης] be the distinctive dress worn on Yom Kippur, since the foundational description of such clothing in Lev 16:4 does not include a מְעִיל/ποδήρης."[57] While Winkle is correct that ποδήρης does not appear in Lev 16:4 (the term there is χιτῶνα λινοῦν), ποδήρης translates מְעִיל only twice in the LXX (Exod 28:4, 31) while the Greek word ὑποδύτης translates מְעִיל nine times in the LXX (cf. Exod 28:31 [ὑποδύτην ποδήρη]; 33; 34; 36:29–33). For this reason, ποδήρης is hardly a *terminus technicus* for translating מְעִיל in the LXX, as Winkle seems to imply. Moreover, while מְעִיל is not exclusive to the priestly dress in the OT,[58] when it is used to describe the priestly attire it is often introduced as מְעִיל הָאֵפֹד (e.g., Exod 28:31; 29:5; 39:22), literally, "the robe of the ephod," because they were worn together as one piece as specified (cf. Lev 8:7; Exod 28:34; 39:23, 24, 25, 26).

To conclude, as stated above, it is highly unlikely, were Jesus wearing a מְעִיל הָאֵפֹד "the robe of the ephod," along with the other accessories of the high priestly full attire, that John would have omitted this important information. Thus, Jesus'

---

[57] Winkle, "Dress," 304.

[58] Cf. 1 Sam 2:19; 15:27; 18:4; 24:4, 11; 28:14; 2 Sam 13:18; 1 Chr 15:27; Ezra 9:3, 5; Job 1:20; 2:12; 29:14; Ezek 26:16.

ποδήρης most likely denotes a plain, long, white linen robe. This, along with the absence of the other regular high priestly accessories in Rev 1:13, most likely refers to the high priestly כְּתֹנֶת־בַּד קֹדֶשׁ, the white, long "holy linen tunic" worn with a sash by the high priest on the Day of Atonement.

Ποδήρης *in the Epistle of Barnabas*

Further support for the foregoing conclusion is found in the Christian traditions underlying the book of *Barnabas*, which uses ποδήρη to refer to Christ's garment. In a passage comparing the sacrifice of Jesus with the Azazel ritual, the author states: "For they shall see Him in that day wearing the long scarlet robe [ποδήρη] about His flesh, and shall say, Is not this He, Whom once we crucified [κατακεντήσαντες, lit. "pierced"] and set at nought and spat upon; verily this was He, Who then said that He was the Son of God" (*Barn.* 7:9).[59] The use of ποδήρη in *Barnabas* is relevant for our study of Revelation 1 for several reasons: (1) it connects ποδήρη to a Day of Atonement background, although the ποδήρη here is "scarlet" because the author connects it to the colour of Azazel's scarlet wool; (2) it connects ποδήρη to the appearance of the exalted Christ as John does in Rev 1:13; and (3) it connects ποδήρη to the lament of the nations who "pierced him" (κατακεντήσαντες) as does John in Rev 1:9, "even those who pierced

[59] Joseph Barber Lightfoot and J. R. Harmer, *The Apostolic Fathers* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1891), 276; Cf. Stökl Ben Ezra, *The Impact*, 152–3.

him" (ἐξεκέντησαν) which points to Christ's Day of Atonement death according to the book of Hebrews.

Ποδήρης *in Philo*

In *Legum Alegoriae* II.56, Philo states that the high priest never went in to the Most Holy Place wearing a ποδήρης:

> On this account the high priest "will not come into the holy of holies clad in a garment reaching to the feet [ἐν τῷ ποδήρει]; but having put off the robe of opinion and vain fancy of the soul, and having left that for those who love the things which are without, and who honour opinion in preference to truth, will come forward naked, without colours or any sounds, to make an offering of the blood of the soul, and to sacrifice the whole mind to God the Saviour and Benefactor…[60]

At face value, this seems to present a problem for the notion that a ποδήρης connects Jesus to a Day of Atonement setting. But ποδήρης is clearly used by Philo to describe the blue tunic (מְעִיל, Exod 28:31–35) which was part of the high priest's regular garment and which he did not wear on the Day of Atonement. Philo also uses ποδήρης in *De Vita Moysis* II.118 to describe the blue מְעִיל. It appears then that Philo and John both use ποδήρης adjectivally to describe garments that literally "reach the feet" while having different colours and functions. Furthermore, Philo is incorrect that the robe used on the Day of Atonement did not reach the feet; as we have seen above, the כְּתֹנֶת־בַּד קֹדֶשׁ "holy linen tunic" (Lev 16:4) was also a ποδήρης.

---

[60] Yonge, *The Works of Philo*, 43–44.

The Golden Sash

Further support for describing the resurrected Jesus as a high priest on the Day of Atonement in Rev 1:13 is provided by the "golden sash," ζώνην χρυσᾶν. This "sash" was one of the pieces of clothing prescribed for the high priest on the Day of Atonement: "He shall put on the holy linen tunic, and shall have the linen undergarments next to his body, fasten the linen sash [אַבְנֵט בַּד; LXX: ζώνῃ λινῇ], and wear the linen turban; these are the holy vestments" (Lev 16:4). This Hebrew term, אַבְנֵט, is found in the MT in Exod 28:4, 39, 40; 29:9; 39:29; Lev 8:7, 13 and 16:4, all of which deal with the priestly attire and all are translated in the LXX as ζώνη, the same term used in Revelation.[61] Here again, Josephus provides important details about how the sash is to be used:

> ὃν ἐπιζώννυνται κατὰ στῆθος ὀλίγον τῆς μασχάλης ὑπεράνω τὴνζώνην περιάγοντες πλατεῖαν μὲν ὡς εἰς τέσσαρας δακτύλους, διακένως δ᾽ ὑφασμένην ὥστε λεβηρίδα δ οκεῖν ὄφεως: ἄνθη δ᾽ εἰς αὐτὴν ἐνύφανται φοίνικικαὶ πορφύρᾳ μετὰ ὑακίνθου καὶ β ύσσου πεποικιλμένα, στήμων δ᾽ ἐστὶ μόνη βύσσος.
>
> [I]t [the כְּתֹנֶת־בַּד] is girded to the breast a little above the elbows, by a girdle often going round, four fingers broad, but so loosely woven, that you would think it were the skin of a serpent. It is embroidered with flowers of scarlet, and purple, and blue, and fine twined linen; but the warp was nothing but fine linen.[62]

This description matches exactly the position of the sash in Rev 1:13: "girded on the chest with a golden sash" (περιεζωσμένον πρὸς τοῖς μαστοῖς ζώνην χρυσᾶν). But Jesus' sash is golden, which seems to depart from the biblical prescription of a "linen sash"

---

[61] It is also found in Isa 22:21 but it is translated here as a στέφανόν.

[62] Whiston, *The Works of Josephus*, *Ant.* 3:154.

(אַבְנֵט בַּד). When commenting on the high priest's golden sash, Josephus confirms that although the other priests' sashes had many colours, only the high priest wore a golden sash with gold in it:

> The high priest is indeed adorned with the same garments that we have described, without abating one; only over these he puts on a vestment of a blue color. This also is a long robe, reaching to his feet [in our language it is called Meeir], and is tied round with a girdle, embroidered with the same colors and flowers as the former, with a mixture of gold interwoven.[63]

The order in which Moses puts on the garments as preparation for the installation of the priesthood in Lev 8:7 indicates that the כְּתֹנֶת is tied around with the אַבְנֵט. These two pieces then form a set that always go together and this is how John sees Jesus in Rev 1:13.

The Day of Atonement as Validation of the Heavenly High Priest

Rooke suggests that "the Day of Atonement ceremonial in Leviticus 16 can be seen as the first official duty that Aaron undertakes after his consecration, which in turn could imply that the Day of Atonement is to be regarded as the validation of Aaron's high priesthood, the proof of his ordination and consecration."[64] Thus "the Day of Atonement functions as a yearly ritual confirmation of his high priesthood."[65] This idea may be reflected in the fact that Jesus is introduced in Revelation as a high priest in a Day of Atonement setting. As his first act after his revelation to John, he exhorts,

---

[63] Ibid., *Ant.* 3:159.

[64] Rooke, "The Day of Atonement," 347.

[65] Ibid., 345.

condemns and offers cleansing from sin to the churches of Asia. Rooke states that "it is a rite of entrance that establishes Aaron's right of entry thereby functioning for Aaron as a rite of passage from lay person to high priest."[66] Rooke makes an important observation:

> However, once the Day of Atonement is understood as a Day of Purgation Rites, it becomes much easier to understand how the rites could function as the high priest's validation, because their successful completion depends on the high priest's competence as a ritual actor in carrying out the purgation and not on his ability to elicit pity from the deity (which is what is implied by saying that the high priest is good at atoning).[67]

Rooke also goes on to state that on the acceptance by Yahweh of his actions in the Most Holy Place, the high priest is confirmed and can now officiate in the tabernacle. The difference for Jesus is that, after the cross, his actions as "interceding forever" are mirrored in a continuous act of intercession (cf. Heb 7:25) mirrored in Day of Atonement rituals and symbols. Thus Rooke's proposal of a privileged position for the high priest based on his obedience to levitical regulations seems to be confirmed by Zech 3:7: "If you walk in my ways and observe my service, it is you who shall rule my house and keep watch over my courts, and I will give you right of entrance among those who are standing here."

The significance of the preceding discussion of Christ's high priestly clothing on the Day of Atonement lies in the fact that, typologically, as a high priest, he no longer needs to return to the daily priesthood clothes and the daily rituals, a return that in the

---

[66] Ibid., 349.

[67] Ibid., 354.

earthly sanctuary belied the inefficacy of the whole system (cf. Heb 10:5–18). Having done the high priestly work "once and for all" (Heb 9:12), Christ is depicted in Day of Atonement attire interceding for the seven churches of Asia Minor. A return to the regular high priestly dress would signal a return to the inadequacies of the old system and a denial of the efficacy of his own sacrifice. This John does not do, for he maintains the consistent sartorial symbolism, even in the depiction of Christ's return as conquering king in Revelation 19: his white robe is sprinkled with blood. Jesus is the high priest *par excellence* not only because he is wearing the high priestly garments but also because he purchased mankind with his own "blood." His redeeming sacrifice confers on him the authority to convey messages to new Israel, the Church, as we see him in Revelation 1.

Potential echoes of the Day of Atonement in Revelation 1 are best understood through the church's understanding of the typology of the Day of Atonement in light of "the Christ event." It is significant that Jesus is introduced in Revelation in sanctuary and Day-of-Atonement imagery which is very similar to the book of Hebrews. Although it is not possible to presuppose knowledge of the book of Hebrews by John's original readers-hearers, early Jewish-Christian readers familiar with the sanctuary rituals involving trumpet-blowing, the use of blood on Day of Atonement as well as high priestly clothing would be the ideal readers of Revelation 1.

Assessment: The Day of Atonement in Revelation 1		
Allusive Type: *Echo*	**Strength**: *Loud*	**Thematic Coherence:** *Sacrificial blood; sound of the trumpet; Day of Atonement high priestly clothing; sanctuary geography and furniture*

Revelation 2–3: The Day of Atonement as Background for the Letters to the Churches of Asia

As shown in chapter 2, the Day of Atonement ritual of Lev 16 stands at the gate of the section of Lev 17–26 known as "holiness code" which presents a series of detailed prescriptions for Israel to follow in order to maintain the covenant. The regulations pertain to the following areas: (1) regulations for the slaughtering of animals (17:1–9); (2) instructions on the consumption of blood (17:10–16); (3) instructions about sexual relations (18:1–29); (4) instructions on ritual and moral holiness (19:1–37); (5) sanctions for violations of holiness (20:1–27); (6) instructions for priestly holiness (21:1:24); (7) instructions on the use of offerings (22:1–16); (8) kinds of acceptable offerings (22:16–33); (9) the holy feasts: the Sabbath (23:1–3), Passover (23:4–5), the Feast of Unleavened Bread (23:5–8), the Feast of First Fruits (23:9–14), Feast of Weeks (23:15–22), Feast of Trumpets (23:23–25), repetition of prescriptions for the fast on the Day of Atonement and the prohibition to work (23:26–32), Feast of Tabernacles (23:33–44); (10) the care of the lampstand of the holy place (24:1–4); (11) the bread for the tabernacle (24:5–9); punishment for blasphemy (24:10–23); (12) the Sabbatical year (25:1–7); (13) the year of

jubilee (25:8–55); (14) rewards for obedience (25:1–13); and (15) sanctions for violations (26:14–46). Scholars have even viewed these chapters as a legal code separate from the rest of Leviticus, known as *Heiligkeitsgesetz,*[68] "holiness code", which are part of the OT covenant lawsuit. Brueggeman has gone as far as stating that the whole OT should be read against the backdrop of the covenant lawsuit. He sees the OT as full of "metaphor and imagery of the courtroom trial" which according to him frame "as a series of claims asserted for Yahweh, the God of Israel."[69] According to Alan Bandy, the OT "prophetic lawsuit" found in Deuteronomy 32 plays an important role in the book of Revelation, influencing even how John structured the book's message.[70] By exploring the covenantal themes of the Day of Atonement, John has asserted his authority as a successor of OT prophets.

Attempts to reach a consensus on any fragmentary view of this section as an independent corpus in relationship to the rest of the book of Leviticus based on redactional and historico-critical approaches have been unsuccessful.[71] For all intents

---

[68] The term was coined by A. Klostermann, *Der Pentateuch: Beiträge zu Seinem Verständnis und Seiner Entstehungsgeschichte* (Leipzig: A. Deichart [George Böhme], 1893), 385.

[69] Walter Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1997), xvi. Cf. also Richard M. Davidson, "The Divine Covenant Lawsuit Motif in Canonical Perspective," *JATS* 21 (2010): 45–84.

[70] Cf. Alan S. Bandy, *The Prophetic Lawsuit in the Book of Revelation*, NTM 29 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2010).

[71] For a full discussion on the various explanations for what scholars call a separate legal code known as *Heiligkeitgesetz*, "holiness code," see Henry T. C. Sun, "Holiness Code," *AYBD*, 3:254–258. Sun (256) summarizes arguments for the unity of this section with the rest of Leviticus thus: "The following formal considerations are not suggestive of an originally independent legal corpus: (1) the

and purposes, these chapters should be viewed as a unit with the rest of Leviticus, presenting rules and regulations aimed at turning Israel into a holy nation and keeping it so (cf. Exod 19:6). The first of these regulations is the institution of the Day of Atonement. It stood as the renewal of the covenant based on the reestablishment of the sanctuary as Yahweh's house amidst Israel. Therefore, the placement of these holiness regulations immediately following the institution of the Day of Atonement does not seem haphazard.

As the covenant is renewed at the end of the Day of Atonement, Israel should avoid jeopardizing the newly reaffirmed covenant. In turn, it is their continued effort to keep these regulations that makes the celebration of the Day of Atonement possible and even viable. The Day of Atonement reaffirms their status as Yahweh's holy nation. There is therefore a bi-directionality or codependency in the relationship of these holiness instructions and the Day of Atonement. Wenham writes, "God's call to Israel to be his holy people preceded the revelation of the law at Sinai, but only obedience could make holiness a living reality."[72] This concept seems to have been part of Jewish tradition as we read in the Gemara: "If a calamity or misfortune happens to a man before the Day of

---

plurality of speech report formulae (17:1; 18:1; etc.); (2) the two compliance reports (21:24; 23:44); and (3) the repetition of material within the corpus (e.g., 19:3 = 19:30; 19:4, 30 = 26:1–2; 19:5–8 = 22:29–30 [cf. Lev 7:15–18]; 19:9–10 = 23:22; 19:27–28 = 21:5; 19:31 = 20:6; 19:34 = 24:22; 20:6–8 = 20:27; 25:18–19 = 26:4–5)."

[72] Wenham, *Leviticus*, 31. On this point, Kiuchi argues that "holiness" refers to "a certain condition of the human heart, namely the absence of an egocentric nature" (*Leviticus*, 28).

Atonement, it is in virtue of a judgment passed on the last Day of Atonement; if after the Day of Atonement, of a judgment passed on the one just gone."[73]

Returning to the task of exploring the reception of Day of Atonement themes in Revelation, it is intriguing to note that John places the instructions, praises and reproaches of the seven churches of Asia immediately following the revelation of Jesus Christ as the heavenly high priest officiating inside the sanctuary in a Day of Atonement setting in Revelation 1. Jesus has successfully performed the antitypical Day of Atonement ritual by his death on the cross and his installment as heaven's high priest (cf. Heb 6:19–20; 9:11). The seven churches of Asia, as representatives of the "new Israel," are invited to follow a set of "holiness" prescriptions just as ancient Israel. The themes shared by the instructions in the Levitical code and the admonitions present in the messages to the seven churches "presume the existence of a spiritual gap between the Lord and the people"[74] as did the presence of impurities in Israel in Leviticus. Thus, it is only after Jesus is presented as the high priest on the Day of Atonement in Revelation 1 that he can purge the church so that it can continue to serve him on earth. The messages to the seven churches parallel Yahweh's desire that his people, now symbolized by the Christian church, should pursue holiness. The typology of the Day of Atonement rituals is fulfilled in Jesus' self-sacrifice for the church. The church is now invited to

---

[73] Cf. Caird, *Revelation*, 110.

[74] Kiuchi, *Leviticus*, 28.

maintain the relationship, not to jeopardize the new covenant that Christ had just reestablished and renewed with "his own blood" (Heb 9:11–12) as opposed to the OT high priest's use of the ineffective blood of animals (Heb 9:12). Not only does a particular action by the church defile the "sanctuary," meaning the covenant, but, in the words of Roy Gane, "neglect inevitably defiles the sanctuary."[75] The Christian churches were guilty of tolerating evil in their midst; the church of Thyatira was accused of tolerating Jezebel (Rev 2:20). As Milgrom writes,

> God's commandments can be divided into two categories: performative and prohibitive ("dos" and "don'ts"). The performative commandments are violated by refraining from them or neglecting to do them. … The violation of prohibitive commandments, by contrast, involves an act. It sets up reverberations that upset the divine ecology."[76]

The messages to the seven churches contain both concepts of "performative and prohibitive."

In Rev 1:6 there is an allusion to the Greek text of Exod 19:6: Israel was called to be a "kingdom of priests and a holy nation," (βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα καὶ ἔθνος ἅγιον; LXX Exod 19:6); the church is too a "kingdom, priests" (βασιλείαν, ἱερεῖς, Rev 1:6; cf. 1 Pet 2:9), "a royal priesthood, a holy nation" (βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον). This is repeated in Rev 5:10: "you have made them to be a kingdom and priests" (καὶ ἐποίησας

---

[75] Gane, *Cult and Character*, 148.

[76] Milgrom, *Leviticus (Continental)*, 42.

αὐτοὺς τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν βασιλείαν καὶ ἱερεῖς). The verb ἐποίησας echoes the "installation" of priests in 1 King 12:31: καὶ ἐποίησεν ἱερεῖς.[77]

By his perfect sacrifice in the antitypical Day of Atonement ritual, Jesus has confirmed his status as heaven's high priest once for all. Furthermore, by his confirmation as high priest on the merits of his perfect Day of Atonement sacrifice, Jesus is able to confer the priesthood on the "saints from every tribe and language and people and nation; you have made them to be a kingdom and priests serving our God, and they will reign on earth" (Rev 5:9–10). Before Jesus' antitypical act, God's covenant with Israel was ratified annually by means of the Day of Atonement ritual. If any Day of Atonement ritual had ever been rejected, the whole priesthood and sanctuary would have been put in jeopardy. Because Jesus as the Day of Atonement lamb is a perfect sacrifice, he is able to ratify the priesthood which now is conferred on the saints. As Rooke defines it,

> As a result of the ceremonies carried out in the holiest place, priesthood, people and Temple have all moved from a state of impurity to one of purity, and the burnt offerings made by Aaron at the end of the rites in the holy place are a confirmation of that new status. However, for the high priest the effect is not only that he has moved from a state of impurity to purity but that he has moved from a state of compromised priesthood to certain priesthood.[78]

The church's royal high priesthood (or priestly kingdom[79]) is established through Christ's blood shed at the Cross on the typological Day of Atonement as explained in the

---

[77] Cf. Fiorenza, *Revelation*, 43.

[78] Rooke, "The Day of Atonement," 357.

[79] See Beale, *Revelation*, 193.

book of Hebrews. As the successful completion of the Israelite Day of Atonement reconsecrates and renews the tabernacle's "lease" for Israel, so it is Christ's successful ministration of the typological Day of Atonement at the cross and his subsequent ascension that makes the church's priesthood possible and meaningful. According to Paul, Christ's rulership comes from victory in death (cf. Col 2:15: "and having disarmed the powers and authorities, he made a public spectacle of them, triumphing over them by the cross"), His victorious death has raised him up to the right hand of God (Col 3:1) where the church is also, as rulers-priests, "seated with Christ in heavenly realms" (Eph 1:20; 2:5; cf. 1 Cor 15:20; 1 Pet 3:18, 22).[80]

But John takes this OT promise of priesthood even further by conferring actual high priesthood status to the saints of Sardis: "they will walk with me, dressed in white, for they are worthy" (καὶ περιπατήσουσιν μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν λευκοῖς, ὅτι ἄξιοί εἰσιν, Rev 3:4).[81] This high priestly privilege of ministering before God alongside Jesus promised to the church of Sardis echoes Heb 6:19–20 in which the access to the heavenly Most Holy Place is now granted to all Christians: "where Jesus, a forerunner on our behalf, has entered." Such a promise is extended to all Christians, but theirs is not a high priesthood of blood sacrifices but of privileged access to the presence of God granted on the basis of

---

[80] Ibid., 194: "The high point of vv. 1–6, and of the whole chapter, is here: the achievement of God's glory through Christ's work and the service of his people as kings and priests. That God is to receive glory means that he alone is worthy to receive credit for the successful accomplishment of redemptive history."

[81] Noteworthy here is the presence of ἄξιοί, which is the same word used for the Lamb in Rev 5.

Christ's Day of Atonement sacrifice (cf. Gal 3:13). They serve and live continuously before a holy God like the high priests of old as they ministered inside the Most Holy Place on the Day of Atonement. This high priesthood will one day culminate in the New Jerusalem, God's high priestly city.

The relationship between the establishment of the priesthood in Exodus, Leviticus and Revelation can be given additional strength by noting that many of the themes found in the Levitical "holiness code" are also found in Revelation 2–3: the importance of ritual purity (e.g., the prohibition to eat animals sacrificed to idols), sexual purity (cf. Rev 2:22) and covenantal themes (e.g., the true Jews, Rev 2:9; 3:9). The notion of collective responsibility for sin we find in Leviticus can be seen in the messages to the seven churches, where not one "individual" person is cause for the sanctions against the churches but all admonitions are directed to the church at large. The self-denial present in the prohibition against eating food offered to idols, tolerance of false prophets which stands against the true worship of Yahweh on the Day of Atonement, and abstinence from sex (e.g., "afflict yourselves") as prescribed for the Day of Atonement. Sexual immorality is important in this context since this is used frequently by God to describe Israel's spiritual adultery (cf. Ezek 16:13–14; 23:1–4; Hos 1:2; 2:2–23; 4:12).

If the cross already stands as the eschatological Day of Atonement, what then is Jesus doing currently? He can only continue in that office through the continuous merits of his own blood; he lives perpetually to intercede (Heb 7:25). Hence he has purchased us and "washed us" by his blood, an action that continues long after the

initial sacrifice on the cross is finished. This can be understood in terms of the blood that is applied to the tabernacle subsequently to the sacrifice proper. It must be said, however, that the typology should not be overextended by creating an actual, parallel ritual in the heavenly sanctuary, which was subservient to rather than controlling the earthly ritual's typology. These are symbols of heavenly realities; Hebrews applied the Day of Atonement to the cross and Jesus' subsequent ascension (Heb 9:12, 24). In Revelation, the Day of Atonement is used to frame messages of purification and judgment, initially to the seven churches of Asia (Revelation 2–3) and then to whole world (Rev 14:6–11).

Not only is Jesus introduced as high priest giving instructions to the seven churches in Revelation 1–3 but we notice that John appears to assume the place of Aaron in a partial priestly role in transmitting the messages to the seven churches. Moses and Aaron represented the unity between priesthood and prophecy; Jesus and John stand as the confluence of priesthood and prophecy. This can be supported from Deut 33:10 which explains the role of the Israelite *kohen*: "They teach Jacob your ordinances, and Israel your law; they place incense before you, and whole burnt offerings on your altar" (cf. also Deut 24:8; 1 Sam 2:28). In Revelation we may see the same dynamics at play: Israel as a type of the Church is first addressed in exhortations (Revelation 1–3); in the second part of the book (4–22), it is the wicked world that receives the judgment. Thus the progression of the transmission of the holiness instructions found in the book of

Revelation seems to parallel that of the transmission of holiness instructions throughout the Israelite system:

God → Moses → Aaron → Chieftains → Israel → Heathen nations

God → Jesus → John → Elders → Church → Wicked world

As only the high priest could mediate between the people and God on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:17), Christ appears as the only mediator between the church and God in Revelation. Thus Revelation reinforces the message of the book of Hebrews (cf. 1 Tim 2:5).

Assessment: The Day of Atonement in Revelation 2–3		
Allusive Type: *Echo*	**Strength**: *Medium*	***Thematic Coherence:*** *Eschatological loyalty of character expected of the church*

Revelation 4–5: Entering into the Heavenly Most Holy Place

After the letter to the seven churches, the exalted Jesus ("the first voice … like a trumpet," 4:1) makes an invitation to John: "Come up here, and I will show you what must take place after this" (Rev 4:2). John finds himself immediately "in the spirit" (ἐν πνεύματι) in the heavenly throne room. He sees a throne surrounded by a rainbow with someone who looks like "jasper and carnelian" (ἰάσπιδι καὶ σαρδίῳ) seated on it (4:2–3) and, around the throne, twenty-four thrones and seated on the thrones "twenty-four elders, dressed in white robes" (πρεσβυτέρους καθημένους περιβεβλημένους ἐν ἱματίοις

λευκοῖς) with golden crowns on their heads (4:4). Dramatic atmospheric phenomena in the form of "flashes of lightning, and rumblings and peals of thunder" (4:5) fill the room where also are present the seven spirits of God symbolized by "seven lamps" (ἑπτὰ λαμπάδες πυρὸς καιόμεναι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου, ἅ εἰσιν τὰ ἑπτὰ πνεύματα τοῦ θεοῦ, 4:6). Around these thrones there are four "living creatures" (τέσσαρα ζῷα, 4:7) which defy description. They praise God without ceasing, singing "Holy, holy, holy, the Lord God the Almighty, who was and is and is to come" (ἅγιος ἅγιος ἅγιος κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, 4:8). The twenty-four elders follow with acclamations and cast their crowns before the throne (4:10–11).[82]

The scene is continued into chapter 5 where the sealed scroll which is in the hand of the God comes into focus (5:1). A mighty angel asks with a "loud voice" (ἐν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ)—"Who is worthy to open the scroll and break its seals?" (5:2). When no one is able to take the scroll John weeps bitterly but he is then comforted by one of the twenty-four elders who tells him that "Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David," is worthy to take the scrolls and open its seals (5:5). The focus of the scene then turns to the throne and to the Lamb standing "between the throne and the four living creatures and among

[82] The representative works on Rev 4–5 are Loren Johns, *Lamb Christology*, Ranko Stefanovic, "The Background and Meaning of the Sealed Book of Revelation 5" (PhD diss., Andrews University, 1995); Christopher A. Frilingos, *Spectacles of Empire: Monsters, Martyrs, and the Book of Revelation*. Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religions (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004); Matthias Reinhard Hoffmann, *The Destroyer and the Lamb: The Relationship Between Angelomorphic and Lamb Christology in the Book of Revelation*, WUNT 203 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005).

the elders … as if it had been slaughtered" (ἀρνίον ἑστηκὸς ὡς ἐσφαγμένον) and who takes the scroll (5:7), an event that elicits the praise of the four creatures, the twenty-four elders and all the angelic hosts (5:8–14).

Koester considers these chapters to be part of the "seals" pericope going from 4:1–8:5 and the vision acts as an introduction to the opening of the seals,[83] while Aune sees 4–6 as an unit discontinued at 7:1.[84] Beale presents compelling evidence for the dependence of chapters 4–5 on Dan 7 and, to a lesser degree, on Ezek 1–2.[85] Thus, as in the OT backgrounds, the main focus of the passage according to him is "Christ's exaltation on his throne as ruler over the church *and* the cosmos, which was accomplished by his death and resurrection."[86]

The Four Creatures Around the Throne

Another significant detail in the passage which echoes Day of Atonement language and imagery is the presence of "four living creatures (τέσσαρα ζῷα) around the throne" (κύκλῳ τοῦ θρόνου, Rev 4:6). The description of these creatures is based on both Ezek 1 and Isa 6, which describe כְּרוּבִים ("cherubim") with many wings around God's throne (cf., the use of κύκλῳ in Rev 4:6 and Isa 6:2). These כְּרוּבִים are also represented

---

[83] Koester, *Revelation*, 350.

[84] Aune, *Revelation 1–5*, 276.

[85] Beale, *Revelation*, 314–315.

[86] Ibid., 311.

by the two כְּרוּבִים placed on top of the ark's mercy seat inside the Most Holy Place (cf. Exod 25:18–22) in the tabernacle and in the inner sanctum of Solomon's temple (1 Kgs 6:23, 27), as well as engraved throughout the temple. All communication and revelations from Yahweh emanated from between these two כְּרוּבִים. Thus, their presence in the throne-room scene echoes the descriptions of the Most Holy Place in the OT. The term occurs only once in the NT, as Χερουβὶν δόξης, when the author describes the mercy seat in Heb 9:5.

In *Ant.* 3:137 Josephus corroborates John's use of the term "living creatures" to describe these כְּרוּבִים: "Upon this its cover were two images, which the Hebrews call Cherubims; they are flying creatures, but their form is not like to that of any of the creatures which men have seen, though Moses said he had seen such beings near the throne of God."[87] The "eyes" are a striking feature of the creatures inside the throne room. They could be interpreted as an indirect reference to God's all-seeing eyes from which the high priest was told to hide when coming inside the Most Holy Place. Aaron was told to create a curtain of smoke in great quantity when entering into the presence of God lest he die (Lev 16:13). The point here is the need to "hide oneself" from the eyes.

[87] Whiston, *The Works of Josephus*.

The Offering of Incense

The imagery of offering incense in Revelation 4 is also echoed in the high-priestly angel who holds the golden censer (Rev 8:3, cf. also 9:13), whose great quantity of incense also stands for the prayers of the saints in a Day of Atonement setting. The only time a large amount of incense is used in the tabernacle service is on the Day of Atonement. Beale avers that "in the OT and NT incense is always associated with sacrifices … Incense was added to the burning sacrifice to make it acceptable to God."[88] Using a double portion of incense on the Day of Atonement meant an escalation of the importance of the prayers of the people as well as heightened commitment on their that the day's sacrifice be pleasing to God (Lev 16:12–13).

That the Second Temple was understood by the Jews as a place for prayer and intercession can be seen in Jesus' description of the temple as a "house of prayer for all people" (Matt 21:13, alluding to Isa 56:7) and also in the attempt by the LXX translators to add this concept to the MT text of Exod 29:45.[89] The descriptions of the temple service by Jesus ben Sira in Ecclesiasticus 50 point to the practice of prayer in the temple.[90]

---

[88] Ibid., 456.

[89] cf. C. T. R. Hayward, "Understandings of the Temple Service in the Pentateuch Septuagint," in *Temple Worship in Biblical Israel*, ed. John Day (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 388.

[90] Cf. Hayward, "Understandings," 390.

The Slaughtered Lamb Inside the Heavenly Most Holy Place

Beale suggests that the Lamb's death in Revelation 5 points to the Day of Atonement, "where the sacrificial animal is a representative penal substitute for Israel, which receives God's wrath in place of the people and hence removes its threat from them."[91] In support of this conclusion is the fact that the same term for "slaughtering" the goat for the Lord in Lev 16:15, σφάξει, is used for the "Lamb as if slaughtered" in Rev 5:6, ἀρνίον ἑστηκὸς ὡς ἐσφαγμένον. Furthermore, the presence of "blood" (αἷμα; cf. Lev 16:15) in both passages suggests a sacrificial setting which is thematically linked to the Day of Atonement.[92]

Paulien disagrees that Day of Atonement is in view in Revelation 4–5, for the following reasons: (1) Rev 3:21 associates the scene of Revelation 5 with the cross and the enthronement of Christ, events that are linked with the establishment of the heavenly

---

[91] Ibid., 660–661.

[92] Norman R. Gulley, "Revelation 4 and 5: Judgment or Inauguration?" *JATS* 8 (1997): 60–64, summarizes the objections to a Day of Atonement background in Revelation 4–5 thus: (1) the chapters depict jubilation rather than judgment; (2) language pertaining to the most holy place is missing; (3) the scene describes the commencement of Christ's exaltation by receiving the scroll; (4) no authority is given to Christ in Revelation 4–5 (cf. Dan 7:14); (5) Christ's worthiness is connected to his death, which points to his original exaltation after the cross; and (6) the sealed scroll has little to do with judgment but a lot to do with the history of the world. Cf. also Robert D. Davis, *The Heavenly Court Judgment of Revelation 4–5* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1992); Treiyer, *The Day of Atonement*; Mario Veloso, "The Doctrine of the Sanctuary and the Atonement as Reflected in the Book of Revelation," in *The Sanctuary and The Atonement: Biblical, Historical and Theological Studies*, eds. A. V. Wallenkampf and W. R. Lesher (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1981), 407. Richard M. Davidson, "Sanctuary Typology," in vol. 1 of *Symposium on Revelation*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 1992), 112–126; John Paulien, "Seals and Trumpets: Some Current Discussions," in vol. 1 of *Symposium on Revelation*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 1992), 183–198; ibid., "The Role of the Hebrews Cultus," 245–264; Ranko Stefanovic, "The Background and Meaning of the Sealed Book of Revelation 5."

sanctuary service by the author of Hebrews; (2) Lambs are appropriate for sacrifice during the service of inauguration (Exod 40:29, cf. Lev 1:10, etc.) but on the Day of Atonement a male goat is required instead; (3) the linguistic codes associated most specifically with the inner room of the sanctuary (*naos* and *kibotos*) are absent and so is the language of judgment; and (4) the implicit structure of Revelation associates the Day of Atonement with a later portion of the book.[93]

Despite these objections, if one agrees to suspend the need to superimpose timetables on Revelation based on certain hermeneutical presuppositions on eschatology, it may be possible to find the presence of language and imagery of the Day of Atonement in Rev 4–5.[94] The foregoing discussion appears to undermine Paulien's argument in favour of an "inauguration" background for Revelation 4–5 for several reasons.

(1) The vision begins with an entrance into the heavenly throne-room, which echoes the entrance by the high priest into the earthly Most Holy Place on the Day of

---

[93] Paulien, "Hebrew Cultus," 251.

[94] One could argue against Paulien's assessment of Rev 4–5 as based on an "inauguration of the heavenly sanctuary" alone, which seems to contradict his previous conclusion that Revelation's imagery often points to several, not just a single idea and concept from the OT. This assessment seems to be based on the idea that there was an actual "inauguration" of the heavenly sanctuary at Christ's ascension. But is this a necessary conclusion? It appears rather that John is not attempting to literalize the heavenly sanctuary any more than the author of Hebrews is. John could be describing the death, resurrection and exaltation of Christ to the right hand of the Father in terms of several OT passages, without attempting to tether such exaltation to a point in time or a particular typological-chronological event in the OT or how he perceived the trajectory of the Christian church in history, past or future. Thus it remains plausible that Rev 4–5 could contain substantial Day of Atonement language and imagery as well.

Atonement. John's admittance into "heaven" (ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ) is a spiritual entrance (ἐν πνεύματι) into the heavenly Most Holy Place, where God's throne is situated. Favouring an interpretation of this throne-room as the heavenly Most Holy Place where the slaughtered lamb is found is the tradition running through the book of Hebrews that Jesus ascended as the high priest of the heavenly Most Holy Place "into heaven itself" (εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν, Heb 9:24). After arguing that Jesus entered heaven "within the veil" (Heb 6:19–20) "once and for all", in contrast to the annual entry "with his own blood" (Heb 9:12) in the earthly Day of Atonement (Heb 9:11), the author of Hebrews concludes: "For Christ did not enter a sanctuary made by human hands, a mere copy of the true one, but he entered into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God on our behalf" (Heb 9:24). The verbal correspondences running through both Revelation and Hebrews passages are "into heaven" (τὸν οὐρανόν) and the presence of God/God's throne (τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν). As the heavenly high priest, Jesus entered into the Most Holy Place of the heavenly sanctuary, namely, the heavenly throne room. By invitation, John is allowed to get a glimpse of the heavenly Most Holy Place;

(2) Paulien questions the view that the lamb in Revelation 5 echoes the Day of Atonement primarily because "lambs were appropriate for sacrifice during the service of inauguration."[95] However, at face value, this is not a valid objection because lambs were also sacrificed on the Day of Atonement, although they were part of the burnt offerings:

[95] Ibid.

"You shall offer a burnt offering to the LORD, a pleasing odor: one young bull, one ram, seven male lambs a year old. They shall be without blemish" (Num 29:8). While Paulien does acknowledge this, he points out that the lambs sacrificed on the Day of Atonement are simply part of the עֹלָה תָּמִיד, "the regular burnt offerings" (Exod 28:38–42; Num 28:1–8). These עֹלָה תָּמִיד only involve the sacrifice of two lambs, one in the morning and one in the evening (Exod 29:48–46; Num 28:1–8) along with grain offerings (Num 28:5), while the burnt offerings on the Day of Atonement require seven one-year-old male lambs (Num 29:7–11). The inauguration of the Mosaic tabernacle prescribes "one male goat" as a חַטָּאת, "purification offering," for the people while the lamb is for "burnt offering" and "an ox and a ram" for a "offering of well being" (Lev 9:3–4). The lamb required from the people is לְעֹלָה, "for burnt offering" (Lev 9:3) and not for "atonement" as Rev 5:9 clearly requires: "for you were slaughtered and by your blood you ransomed [atoned] for God saints from every tribe and language and people and nation …" A lamb was only prescribed as a "guilt offering" for Nazirites and lepers (Num 6:12; Lev 14). The people offer a lamb as "burnt offering" on their behalf; in Exod 29:28 the people's offerings are called תְּנוּפָה "contribution offering," and שְׁלָמִים, "peace offering," but never חַטָּאת. The inauguration sacrifices were part of the עֹלָה שְׁלָמִים system of burnt/peace/thanksgiving offerings which included grain offerings

(Lev 7:11–18; 8:21, 28 Num 15:2; 2 Chr 7:1–11; 1 Kgs 8:64).[96] The burnt offerings had the goal of invoking Yahweh's presence[97] and were offered as a gift, a "pleasing odor" (Lev 8:21, 28; cf. 1 Kgs 18:20–40).[98] Conversely, Paulien's argument cuts both ways as it can be argued that none of the inauguration sacrifices, regardless of which animal is in view, had the function of purgation/remission of sins as Revelation's slaughtered Lamb carries (Rev 5:9–10). The inauguration sacrifices were virtually all "peace offerings" (cf. Exod 20:22–26; 29:35–37). It is also important to note that the blood rituals that established the Aaronite priesthood do not reoccur in the Solomonic dedication (cf. 2 Chr 7).

(3) The "purification offering" and "guilt offering" have the same meaning כַּחַטָּאת כָּאָשָׁם (Lev 7:7; cf. Num 18:9). The word for "guilt offering," אָשָׁם, in Lev 7:7 also appears in Isa 53:10, a messianic passage that connects the suffering servant and the death of a lamb—"When you make his life an offering for sin," אִם־תָּשִׂים אָשָׁם נַפְשׁוֹ. The slaughtered Lamb of Revelation 5 dies as a "purification offering", not as a burnt offering.

---

[96] Cf. Gary A. Anderson, "Sacrifice and Sacrificial Offerings: Old Testament," *AYBD*, 5:877–878.

[97] Cf. Marx, *Lés Systemes Sacrificiels*, 151: "Holocauste et *šelāmîm* sont étroitement associés au Sinaï, et ce à un double titre. Ils sont, en effet, mentionnés pour la toute première fois dans le cadre de la loi sur l'autel d'Ex. xx 22–26, associés à la promesse faite par Yhwh de venir auprès de son peuple à l'occasion de l'offrande de ces sacrifices."

[98] Cf. Baruch Levine, *In the Presence of the Lord* (Leiden: Brill, 1974), 6. Lev 1:4 describes a rite where an offerer places his hand on a burnt offering in order "to make atonement": "You shall lay your hand on the head of the burnt offering, and it shall be acceptable in your behalf as atonement for you." But the placing of the hands on the sacrifice clearly has the connotation of transfer of sin and purgation, a notion that is missing in the inauguration burnt offering sacrifices.

(4) The bull calf as חַטָּאת, "purification offering", presented during the inauguration in Lev 9 is meant as "atonement" for Aaron and his sons at the establishment of the priesthood; this has functional implications so they could act as mediators in the tabernacle. In the dedication ceremony of the first tabernacle, a bull is sacrificed on each of seven consecutive days as a sin offering for the priests and for the altar (Lev 8:14–15, 33–35), which is similar to the Day of Atonement ritual for the high priest (Lev 16:14). On the eighth day, another "bull calf" is sacrificed as a חַטָּאת for Aaron as his sons (Lev 9:2, 8–9). According to Heb 7:27. the typology of the earthly tabernacle breaks down in light of Jesus' sacrifice: "Unlike the other high priests, he has no need to offer sacrifices day after day, first for his own sins, and then for those of the people; this he did once for all when he offered himself" (cf. also Heb 5:3; 9:7, 28; 10:2, 6, 8). The slaughtered Lamb of Revelation does not need a חַטָּאת to make "ransom" for himself: it dies as a חַטָּאת "for the people." The two rams were both a "burnt offering" (Lev 8:21) and an "ordination offering" (Exod 29:15–18; Lev 8:28).

(5) The death of the Lamb in Revelation 5 cannot be seen as a dedication "burnt offering" in the manner of the offerings on the day of inauguration. Its death is extolled as part of a redemptive sacrifice: "for you were slaughtered and by your blood you ransomed for God saints from every tribe and language and people and nation" (Rev 5:9).

Nevertheless, an important proviso must be added here, as the foregoing evidence may also pose questions to seeing the Lamb in Revelation 5 as a חַטָּאת since "lambs" were rarely thus used in sacrifices (except in Num 6:12; Lev 14). It is necessary to probe this connection further in order to decode fully the imagery of the slaughtered Lamb. Despite apparent discrepancies, what seems rather clear in Revelation 5 is that in the slaughtered Lamb the author has created a composite figure which draws from several OT sacrificial contexts. The vision portrays a slaughtered sacrifice inside the heavenly Most Holy Place and before the throne of God. The scene stands in parallel with the offering of blood of the goat for the Lord before the mercy seat (Lev 16:15). In this context the slaughtered lamb seems to point to a Day of Atonement חַטָּאת offering whose blood was applied inside the heavenly Most Holy Place.[99] However, despite the fact that the blood of bulls and rams is used to dedicate the altar and priesthood (cf. Lev 8:22–24), none of the OT dedication passages indicate that either the blood or any part of sacrificed animals is brought into the tent of the meeting in order to dedicate it. Instead, the dedication of the tabernacle is performed with the "holy anointing oil," שֶׁמֶן מִשְׁחַת־קֹדֶשׁ, a special formula of myrrh, sweet-smelling cinnamon, aromatic cane, cassia and olive oil (Exod 26:22–38; 37:29; 40:9). The instructions are to anoint the

[99] This conclusion was also reached by Aune: "The metaphor of Jesus as a sacrificial lamb whose blood (i.e., death) has atoning significance is based on the confluence of two traditions: Jesus as the (Passover) lamb (1 Cor 5:7; John 1:29, 36) and the conception of the death of Jesus as atoning in a way similar to the חטאת, "purification offering" (*Revelation 1–5*, 373).

tabernacle with oil: "the tent of meeting and the ark of the covenant, and the table and all its utensils, and the lampstand and its utensils, and the altar of incense and the altar of burnt offering with all its utensils, and the basin with its stand" (Exod 30:26–28; 40:9–11). Moses did this as indicated in Lev 8:10: "Then Moses took the anointing oil and anointed the tabernacle and all that was in it, and consecrated them."

The author of Hebrews appears to imply that the entire tabernacle was dedicated with blood when he writes: "And in the same way he sprinkled with the blood both the tent and all the vessels used in worship" (πάντα τὰ σκεύη τῆς λειτουργίας, Heb 9:21). The expression πάντα τὰ σκεύη λειτουργίας appears as πάντα τὰ σκεύη τὰ λειτουργικά two times in the LXX text of Num 4:12, 26 and refers unequivocally to the tabernacle equipment in the LXX. Moreover, the expression πάντα τὰ σκεύη also appears in Lev 8:11 and Num 7:1. It is likely then that the author conflated several Pentateuchal passages that deal with the dedication of the tabernacle and all its vessels with "blood," although not all vessels were thus dedicated. The dedication of the entire tabernable with blood is not attested in the OT; blood in the sanctuary rituals is consistently reserved for purgation/purification offerings while "oil" is reserved for "dedication" (cf. Lev 8:12, 23–24; Exod 29:23–24; 1 Sam 16:13; Ps 133:1). While both blood and oil were sprinkled/daubed on Aaron and his sons to accomplish a dual function, i.e., purgation-dedication, the interior compartments of the tabernacle were not dedicated by blood for an obvious reason: the tabernacle had not yet assumed its function of receiving the sins of the people and Yahweh had not yet descended into it. Therefore, no purgation was

necessary. Only the altar of burnt sacrifices was dedicated with blood during the dedication (Lev 8:11, 15) and the reason is self-explanatory: it had been contaminated for eight days by the sacrifices offered to dedicate the Aaronic priests and needed to have blood daubed on its horns and sprinkled on it. Only after fire from Yahweh consumed the sacrifices in the outer altar did the entire tabernacle assume its ritualistic function (Lev 9:24).

Furthermore, the mention of a dedication of the entire tabernacle "with blood" may be part of a list of imprecisions found in Heb 9 that pertain to the tabernacle building and its ritual. (1) In Heb 9:4, the author places the "altar of incense" (χρυσοῦν θυμιατήριον) inside the Most Holy Place when in fact it is in front of the veil of the Most Holy Place, in the Holy Place (Exod 30:6). (2) The author states that the ark of the covenant contained the "golden urn holding the manna, and Aaron's rod that budded" (9:6). The inclusion of these items inside the ark cannot be attested in the Pentateuch. (3) The use of "water, scarlet and hyssop" are not connected to the dedication of the tabernacle but rather to the purification of a leprous person (Lev 14:4) and the ritual of the red heifer (Num 19:6). (4) In the dedication, Moses reads from the book of the law (Exod 24:4) while the author of Hebrews states that he sprinkled it and the people (Heb

9:19).[100] Nevertheless, as the authors of the Pulpit Commentary on Hebrews state, "the force of the argument does not depend on these added details."[101]

Therefore, as an alternative reading, it is not altogether unreasonable to think that the author of Hebrews may be including Aaron and his sons in the definition of σκεύη, "vessel", who were, according to him, dedicated by "blood." The word is used to refer to people elsewhere in the New Testament. (1) Paul is called a "chosen instrument" (σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς, Acts 9:15; (2) Paul refers to the human body metaphorically as "clay jars" (ὀστράκινα σκεύη, 2 Cor 4:7); (3) The wicked are called "vessels of wrath" (σκεύη ὀργῆς, Rom 9:22); (4) Women are called "weaker vessel" (ἀσθενεστέρῳ σκεύει, 1 Pet 3:7); and (5) the Thessalonians are urged to "control their vessels [bodies]" (ἑαυτοῦ σκεῦος κτᾶσθαι, 1 Thess 4:4). If this is a possible use of σκεύη, then the author of Hebrews might have been conflating a dedication of the tabernacle with oil along with the dedication of the priests with both oil and blood when he says πάντα τὰ σκεύη τῆς λειτουργίας. Young negotiates the difficulty by suggesting that our author "is by no means averse to manipulating the type to fit the antitype"[102] and cites as a possible source

---

[100] Cf. Luke Timothy Johnson, *Hebrews*, NTL (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006), 241–245, for a helpful discussion of the discrepancies between Hebrews and the Pentateuch.

[101] H. D. M. Spence-Jones, ed. *Hebrews*, The Pulpit Commentary (London; New York, NY: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1909), 235.

[102] Young, "The Gospel According to Hebrews," 205.

b. Yoma 4a where according to the Rabbis the oil of dedication stood for the blood.[103] Be that as it may, the important conclusion here is that the blood of dedicatory sacrifices did not go into the Most Holy Place during any of the dedication ceremonies but rather, the entire sanctuary was dedicated with the "holy anointing oil."

It is important to note that the jubilation in the throne room does have dedication overtones. The expression of praise by the four creatures and the twenty-four elders is extended to all the angels in heaven who sing, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slaughtered to receive power and wealth and wisdom and might and honor and glory and blessing!" (Rev 5:12). This is a song sung by the entire universe, "every creature in heaven and on earth and under the earth and in the sea, and all that is in them, singing to the one seated on the throne and to the Lamb be blessing and honor and glory and might forever and ever!" (Rev 5:13) followed by an "Amen" by the four cherubim and the worship of the twenty-four elders (Rev 5:14). However, Jesus' installation as heavenly high priest in the form of a slaughtered lamb is based on the merits of his atoning blood taken inside the heavenly Most Holy Place (cf. Heb 6:19–20; 9:12, 24). It is his blood that makes him "worthy." Although the vision of Revelation 4 is introduced as "what must take place after this" (μετὰ ταῦτα), the vision portrays events that happened prior to John's writing, e.g., Jesus' exaltation and enthronement at his ascension (Ps 24:9). Thus

[103] See Johnsson, "Defilement,"338–51 for a discussion of the oil and blood in the sanctuary service.

"after this" need not be understood as indicative of a sequence of events, but rather the order of the visions, i.e., "Come and I'll show you the next vision."[104]

On balance, it seems that the "slaughtered lamb" seen inside the heavenly Most Holy Place in Rev 4:5 is not part of any single OT tabernacle/temple inauguration passage but is instead based on a conflation of imagery from several OT atonement themes: the Passover lamb (Exod 12:21; 1 Cor 5:7; John 1:29, 36), the sprinkling of blood inside the Most Holy Place on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:15) and the suffering lamb of Isa 53:7 (cf. Acts 8:32).[105]

It is then reasonable to conclude that the throne-room scene of Revelation 4–5 is grounded *primarily* in language and imagery of the Day of Atonement and may have only *secondary* or minor references to sanctuary inauguration rituals.

Assessment: The Day of Atonement in Revelation 4–5		
Allusive Type: *Echo*	**Strength**: *Loud*	**Thematic Coherence:** *Sacrificial blood inside the heavenly Most Holy Place; high priestly offering of incense; the cherubim; judgment language*

[104] As Beale, *Revelation*, 316–317, explains it: "Μετὰ ταῦτα ("after these things") does not place the events within the visions in chs. 4–5ff. after the events narrated in chs. 1–3. It indicates rather only that a new vision is coming after the vision in chs. 1–3. This is the order in which John saw the visions but not necessarily the historical order of their occurrence as events."

[105] Cf. a similar conclusion by Paxy, *Death and Resurrection*, 137; cf. the comprehensive excursus "Christ as the Lamb" in Aune, *Revelation 1–5*, 367–373.

Revelation 6: The Souls Under the Altar of Incense

The vision of "the souls under the heavenly altar of incense" (τὰς ψυχὰς ὑποκάτω τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, Rev 6:9; cf. 8:3–4) when the fifth seal is open is followed by the opening of the sixth seal in Rev 6:12 which unleashed a seismic cataclysm and presages the final punishment on the wicked (Rev 6:15-17).

The outcry for justice on the part of the souls who have been "slaughtered for the word of God and for the testimony they had given" has eschatological implications since the resurgence of their role in history after being slain points to the imminence of the judgment on their behalf (6:10). The urgency of time and the impending judgment is evident in the cry, "How much longer?" Their cry for justice is emblematic of the prayers of all the saints throughout the ages, fittingly represented by the incense that rises from the incense altar before God (cf. 5:8; 8:4).[106]

Admittedly, this imagery could have correspondence with other features of the tabernacle service, such as the offering of incense in the תָּמִיד rituals (cf. Exod 30:7–8). However, because the prayers are made in a context of eschatological judgment ("Sovereign Lord, holy and true, how long will it be before you judge and avenge our blood on the inhabitants of the earth?" (Rev 6:10; cf. Zech 1:12), it may be beneficial to

[106] Pace Beale, who argues that "the emphasis is on NT believers because the saints are described here as those who have been persecuted for their witness to God's revelation as it has come in recent history through Christ (*Revelation*, 390), these souls need not be limited only to "Christians" but may encompass saints from all ages.

probe the relationship of these prayers to the eschatological connotations of the Day of Atonement.

Since the prayers of these souls are directed to God, this altar, θυσιαστήριον, may be best understood as the same θυσιαστηρίου τοῦ χρυσοῦ τοῦ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ that we see in Rev 9:13.[107] This seems to be confirmed by the giving of the white priestly robes that signify fitness to serve before God (Rev 6:11). Such attire is identical to the high priest's attire on the Day of Atonement and that of the exalted Jesus in chapter 1—a long white, linen robe. In context, therefore, although the terms for "robe" are different (ποδήρης vs. ἱμάτιον), their receiving white robes is the preliminary answer to their prayer and could signify their fitness to be in the presence of the Lord while they await the final judgment, especially because the continuous offering on the incense altar in the holy place symbolized incessant supplication before Yahweh.

That this altar cannot be the altar of burnt offering or have any connotation of "sacrifice" whatsoever is evident from the fact that the souls are ὑποκάτω τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, "under the altar," not on it. Further, these "souls" should not be considered to be the same souls shown reigning with Christ in Rev 20:4 since the

---

[107] So Beale, *Revelation*, 391: "The mention of the 'altar' here in association with those slain evokes the sacrificial nature of their suffering. This altar is not the brazen altar of sacrifice, although the sacrificial blood was poured out at the base of that altar (Lev 4:18, 30, 34), and in Rev 6:10 the sacrificed saints are under the altar (also in Lev 17:11 the "blood" sprinkled on this altar is said to have "the *soul* of the flesh" in it). The better identification is with the golden altar of incense, which stood in the vicinity of the holy of holies (clearly referred to in 8:3–5 and 9:13 and in the developments of those references in 11:1; 14:18; and 16:7). The sacrificial blood of the Day of Atonement was poured on this altar, and incense was burned on it (Exod 30:1–10; Lev 4:7; Heb. 9:4)."

"testimony of Jesus" is not included in the description of the souls under the altar. Because their beheading involves the eschatological emergence of the beasts (20:4b), these souls include the eschatological Christian martyrs of which the first readers were potentially a part.

The imagery of the climactic judgment passed on the people of God as well as those outside the camp by the ominous rituals of the Day of Atonement appears to be echoed in this vision. The two groups, believers and non-believers, present in the outcry of the souls may also point to the separation of the two goats, the goat for the Lord and the goat to Azazel, in Lev 16. According to Paulien, the two goats used on the Day of Atonement are represented by the division of mankind into two groups in the second half of Revelation: "Such a division along spiritual lines took place also in relation to the lots cast over the two male goats on Yom Kippur. On that day individuals chose between two types of atonement, the one offered by the service and the one represented by their own ultimate death."[108]

The granting of "white robes" to the souls under the altar is contrasted by the judgment meted out on unbelieving/unrepentant humanity during the opening of the sixth seal. This contrast may be built also on the idea of separation of the impure from

---

[108] Paulien, "Hebrew Cultus," 257. Paulien posits that the "first half of the Apocalypse is subtly modeled on the daily liturgy of the תָּמִיד while the latter portion of the book reflects the annual liturgy of Yom Kippur Cf. Hayman, "The Book of Enoch in Reference to the New Testament and Early Christian Antiquity," 43: "The two lots of the two goats seem to express the double issue of 'life and death, blessing and cursing, set before Israel in Deut. 30:19."

the pure and the atoned from the unrepentant found throughout the tabernacle service which culminated in the corporate purification rituals of the Day of Atonement.

Assessment: The Day of Atonement in Revelation 6		
Allusive Type: *Echo*	**Strength**: *Medium*	**Thematic Coherence:** *Offering of incense at the altar of incense; separation of loyal and unloyal groups; eschatological judgment*

Revelation 7 and 14: The 144,000

Rev 7:9–17 describes the vision of the 144,000 (v. 4) and is parallel to the vision of the same group in Rev 14:1–5. According to the interpreting elder, the multitude is made up of those "who have come out of the great ordeal; they have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb" (v. 14). This description is parallel to that of Rev 14:2, 4–5: "[They] had his name [the Lamb's] and his Father's name written on their foreheads ... These are they who have come out of the great ordeal [τῆς θλίψεως τῆς μεγάλης]. It is these who have not defiled themselves with women, for they are virgins [παρθένοι γάρ εἰσιν]; these follow the Lamb wherever he goes. They have been redeemed from humankind as first fruits for God and the Lamb, and in their mouth no lie was found; they are blameless [ἄμωμοί εἰσιν]."

The first element in the passage that appears to echo Day-of-Atonement imagery is the reappearance of the slaughtered Lamb which connects this vision to Revelation 5 and its Day of Atonement themes. The vision of Revelation 7 places the 144,000 in the

throne room of Revelation 4–5, "standing before the throne and before the Lamb, robed in white, with palm branches in their hands" (Rev 7:4). Their white robes (στολὰς λευκὰς) connect them to the "white robes" (ἱματίοις λευκοῖς) of the twenty-four elders who minister as priests in the heavenly throne room in Rev 4:4; thus the 144,000 are probably representative of the "kingdom of priests" (βασιλείαν, ἱερεῖς τῷ θεῷ) established by Christ "through his blood" (ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ, Rev 1:6). An installation of priesthood "by blood" echoes the dedication of the Aaronide priests set apart by having blood applied directly on them (Lev 8:23, 24). The presence of one of the twenty-four elders-high-priests as an *angelus interpres* strengthens the connection of the 144,000 with a heavenly priesthood in Revelation 7.

The imagery of washing one's robes is also reminiscent of the purifications performed on the Day of Atonement both by the high priest as well as by the person who led away the goat for Azazel. While the high priest washed his body on the Day of Atonement, Lev 16:26 prescribes the only washing of clothes of the ritual: "The one who sets the goat free for Azazel shall wash his clothes and bathe his body in water, and afterward may come into the camp." The clothes in the LXX are ἱμάτια, a word which appears six times in Revelation (3:4; 5, 18; 4:4; 16:15; 19:13, 16), four of which are related to the eligibility of the saints to stand before God and two refer to the rider of the white horse. Thus the act of washing one's clothes in the cultic context of the Day of Atonement appears to be similar to the washing of the saints' clothes "in blood" in Revelation. Furthermore, the permission to "come into the camp" on the Day of

Atonement is thematically related to the saints' eligibility to be present "before the throne of God" and "within his temple" (Rev 7:15). The theme of finality in the purgation from sin on the Day of Atonement by the dismissal of "all their sins" by placing them on the goat of Azazel is related to the eschatological cleansing of sin that makes it possible for the saints to stand in God's presence. Similar to the one who led Azazel to the desert, the saints have actively participated in the eradication of sin from creation by washing their robes in the blood of the Lamb.

According to Aune the use of "blood of the Lamb" here is a metonymy for the atoning death of Christ: "Israelite sacrificial ritual placed great emphasis on the significance of blood and its use in various purifying and atoning rituals."[109] The cleansing blood of the Day of Atonement is efficacious only as it comes in actual physical contact with the tabernacle sections it is meant to cleanse. In the cleansing of the robes of the saved, the same dynamic is in view: they are washed by the atoning blood of Christ. As pointed out above, such blood imagery does not necessarily point exclusively to the Day of Atonement, however, in a context dealing with a final purification of the saints' robes, the "ultimate" purification of Israel on the Day of Atonement seems to be the best fit.

A second element in the visions is that the 144,000 who appear with the Lamb have "his name and his Father's name written on their foreheads" (ἐπὶ τῶν μετώπων, Rev

[109] Aune, *Revelation 6–16*, 475

14:1), which possibly refers to the sealing occurring in Rev 7:3–8.[110] The imagery of a name or seal on the forehead echoes the high priestly "golden flower" (NRSV "rosette"; Exod 28:36; 39:30) worn "always," תָּמִיד, on Aaron's forehead (LXX, ἐπὶ τοῦ μετώπου Ααρων), including on the Day of Atonement. This golden flower or "plaque" had inscribed on it קֹדֶשׁ לַיהוָה, "Holy to the Lord," and performed a similar function to the name on the foreheads of the 144,000: it indicates ownership and worth. Aaron could only perform on behalf of the people before God with this plaque on his forehead. The plaque on the foreheads of the 144,000 confers on them the same prerogatives as those of the OT high priest: they can serve before God before the throne, the heavenly Most Holy Place.[111] This, along with additional imagery in the passage may indicate a dependence on Day of Atonement imagery.

Beale considers the mention of virginity to be a "dominating metaphor"[112] in the scene while Bauckham considers the scene an "ironic holy war," which may have support in Rev 19:15: "And the armies of heaven, wearing fine linen, white and pure, were following him on white horses." In the vision of the 144,000 "virgins" of Revelation 7, John appears to be conflating the imagery of the priestly city, the new Jerusalem (Rev

---

[110] Cf. Aune, *Revelation 6–16*, 804.

[111] This plaque stands in sharp contrast with the "mark and the name of the beast" (τὸ χάραγμα τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θηρίου) which is on the foreheads of the wicked in Rev 13:16–17. Blount considers the imagery of a "seal" as "protected witness to the lordship of God and the Lamb" (*Revelation*, 266). Cf. Beale, *Revelation*, 736.

[112] Beale, *Revelation*, 738.

19:7, 21:2, 9; 22:17), with those who represent it: the church made up of the priestly 144,000.[113] Stefanovic argues this is related to purity of worship" : "The 144,000 are virgins in the sense that they do not defile themselves with the fornication of worshiping the beast, the great harlot Babylon and her daughters but have rather kept themselves faithful to Christ."[114] Thus, the mention of "virginity" in this passage is not connected specifically to the Day of Atonement but is rather a symbol of cultic purity and loyalty which suffused the Hebrew cultus as a whole.

Purity Instead of "Forgiveness"

As discussed above, the rituals of the Day of Atonement did not encompass the notion of "forgiveness" of sins, only their purgation from the sanctuary and consequently from the people.[115] Thus it is significant that the passages dealing with the purity of the saved and their ability to stand before God in the book of Revelation do not mention "forgiveness."

---

[113] An alternative view is proposed by William Klaassen, "The Ascetic Way: Reflections on Peace, Justice and Vengeance in the Apocalypse of John," in *Asceticism and the New Testament*, eds. Leif E. Vaage and Vincent L. Wimbush (New York, NY; London: Rutledge, 1999), 394: "Only seldom is it recognized that the sexual symbolism used everywhere in the book of Revelation 'is metaphorical, signifying that these pure ones have not participated in the idolatry of the imperial cult.' It does not often occur to us that perhaps the early Christians, including those in apocalyptic communities, and not only the author of Hebrews (13:4), saw the marriage bed as honorable for everyone and coitus as undefiled and undefiling. Therefore, the reference in Rev 14:4 could be to those who have been faithful to their spouses by refusing to commit adultery."

[114] For this view, cf. Stefanovic, *Revelation*, 437: "The 144,000 are virgins in the sense that they do not defile themselves with the fornication of worshiping the beast, the great harlot Babylon and her daughters but have rather kept themselves faithful to Christ."

[115] See section "No Day of Atonement Purgation for High-Handed Sinners" in chapter 2.

The word "forgiveness" in the NT translates two Greek words, ἄφεσις and ἀπολύω. BDAG defines ἄφεσις as "the act of freeing and liberating from someth. that confines, *release* fr. captivity" and "the act of freeing from an obligation, guilt, or punishment, *pardon, cancellation*"[116] (cf. Matt 26:28; Acts 2:38; 10:43; Col 1:14; Heb 9:22; 10:18). Conversely, the word ἀπολύω has similar meaning, i.e., "to grant acquittal, *set free, release, pardon*"[117] and even to "divorce" (cf. Matt 5:31) and similar meanings throughout the NT. Two exemplary passages utilizing ἄφεσις and ἀπολύω in the sense of "forgiveness" are Matt 26:28: "for this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for the forgiveness [ἄφεσις] of sins;" and Luke 6:37: "Forgive [ἀπολύετε], and you will be forgiven." Neither term appears in the book of Revelation.

Commenting on the washing of the robes in Rev 7:13, Beale writes: "This generally reflects the OT metaphor of cleansing polluted garments, which connotes forgiveness of sins in Isa. 1:18; 64:6; Zech. 3:3–5."[118] However, none of these OT passages seem to deal directly with the notion of "forgiveness" of sins per se, but rather with "purification" from them. Isa 1:18-19 promise that though Israel's "sins are like scarlet" and "red like crimson," they will be "like snow" and "wool" and allude to the Levitical formula of blessings and curses in the context of the purgations attached to the

[116] *BDAG*, 155.

[117] Ibid., 117.

[118] Beale, *Revelation*, 436.

tabernacle service; the passage appears to draw words from Lev 26 such as שָׁמַע, "obey," חֶרֶב, "sword" and אָכַל, "devour." Notice also the use of λευκανῶ in LXX Isa 1:18 and ἐλεύκαναν in Revelation 7. The word טָמֵא, "unclean" in Isa 64:6: "We have all become like one who is unclean" occurs 27 times in Leviticus. We come closest to "forgiveness" in Zech 3:4: "See, I have taken your guilt [עָוֹן] away from you, and I will clothe you with festal apparel," but even here, removing guilt (or iniquity) is synonymous with making "clean," especially because the passage deals with restoring high priest Joshua's eligibility to officiate in the sanctuary: "Let them put a clean [טָהוֹר] turban on his head" (v. 5).

The reason for the absence of the NT's central concept of "forgiveness" in the book of Revelation can only be speculated at this point. But the similar absence of "forgiveness" in the cultic setting of the Day of Atonement may present an attractive background for the cultic purity of the saved in the book of Revelation.

Assessment: The Day of Atonement in Revelation 7 & 14		
Allusive Type: *Echo*	**Strength**: *Loud*	**Thematic Coherence:** *Reappearance of the slaughtered Lamb connecting the scene with the Day of Atonement themes of 4–5; white clothing symbolizing cultic purity; character loyalty; enhanced sexual purity*

Revelation 8: The Seventh Seal and the Angel with the Golden Censer

Rev 8:1–5 describes the opening of the seventh and final seal of the scroll which the slaughtered Lamb takes from the hand of God in the throne-room vision (Rev 5:7). The opening of the seal is followed by "half an hour of silence" (v. 1). Seven angels "who stand before God" are then given "seven trumpets" (v. 2). At this point in the vision, "another angel" who is not one of the seven who have the trumpets, comes and stands by "the altar" (ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου) with a golden censer. He is given a "great quantity of incense" (θυμιάματα πολλά). The incense is offered "with the prayers of all the saints" (ἵνα δώσει ταῖς προσευχαῖς τῶν ἁγίων πάντων), which is echoed in the incense offered by the twenty-four high-priestly elders in Rev 5:8: "golden bowls full of incense, which are the prayers of the saints" (αἵ εἰσιν αἱ προσευχαὶ τῶν ἁγίων, cf. Luke 1:8–13).

An important term used in Revelation that is related to the Day of Atonement ritual and the tabernacle service in general is θυσιαστήριον, "altar," which appears eight times in Revelation (6:9; 8:3 [2x], 5; 9:13; 11:1; 14:18; 16:7). The phrase, "golden altar which is before the Lord" (τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τοῦ χρυσοῦ τοῦ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ) in Rev 8:3 (cf. Rev 9:13) follows almost verbatim the rendition of Lev 16:12 in the LXX: τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τοῦ ἀπέναντι Κυρίου, and slightly modified in Lev 16:18 as τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ ὂν ἀπέναντι Κυρίου.[119] In the MT, the expressions used in Lev 16:12, 18 are

[119] A similar expression is used in the LXX to translate Lev 17:6 "the altar of the Lord which is at the entrance of the tent of meeting" which could be construed as an exception to seeing θυσιαστήριον ἀπέναντι Κυρίου as referring exclusively to the altar of incense. But although the LXX

הַמִּזְבֵּחַ מִלִּפְנֵי יְהוָה and הַמִּזְבֵּחַ אֲשֶׁר לִפְנֵי־יְהוָה respectively—"the altar before the Lord" and "the altar which is before the Lord."[120] In the LXX, θυσιαστήριον τὸ χρυσοῦν is translated מִזְבַּח הַזָּהָב six times and refers to the golden altar of incense (Exod 39:38; 40:5; 40:26 [LXX 40:24]; Num 4:11; 1 Kgs 7:48 [LXX 7:34]; 2 Chr 4:19). The "golden altar," מִזְבַּח הַזָּהָב, is also called מִזְבֵּחַ מִקְטָר, "the altar of incense" (Exod 30:1; 27; 31:8; 35:15; 37:25; 1 Chr 6:34 [MT]; 2 Chr 26:16) which appears in the LXX as θυμίαμα, θυσιαστήριον θυμιάματος, θυσιαστήριον τοῦ θυμιάματος and θυσιαστήριον τῶν θυμιαμάτων. Ministering at the "altar of incense" is exclusively reserved for the high priest (Exod 30:7–9) because the altar is "most holy to the Lord" (Exod 30:10).[121]

---

text reads θυσιαστήριον κύκλῳ ἀπέναντι Κυρίου παρὰ τὰς θύρας τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου, the MT reads עַל־מִזְבַּח יְהוָה פֶּתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד. What becomes clear is that לִפְנֵי־יְהוָה "before the Lord" is missing from the MT text. The LXX is therefore not a good translation at this point.

[120] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 1025, considers the מִזְבֵּח in Lev 16:12 as the Tabernacle court altar in part because "only the former had a perpetual fire" and also because he considers both altars as being "before the Lord" in Lev 1:5 and 4:6. But Lev 1:5 does not describe an altar which is "before the Lord" but rather עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ סָבִיב אֲשֶׁר־פֶּתַח אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד and Lev 4:6 does not mention a מִזְבֵּחַ at all. Further, there's no mention in the text that this fire needed to be from the perpetual fire from the outer altar. Milgrom's conclusion is not inevitable. Kiuchi (*Leviticus*, 298) also considers this the incense altar. In favour of reading this altar as the golden altar is the possibility that the coals were gathered from the coals of the תָּמִיד sacrifices which also occurred on the Day of Atonement (cf. Exod 30:7–8; *m. Yoma* 3:4; *m. Tamid* 5:1–6:3). The *Yoma* is not clear from where the coals were gathered, it simply says "they brought the ladle and the fire pan out to him" (5:1). Since the instructions to get the coal are given to Aaron specifically and only he officiated on this day, it is doubtful that others took the coals from the altar or any part in the ritual.

[121] Massingbaerde Ford sees a reference to Day of Atonement in the expression "four horns" of the altar. Cf. *Revelation*, 145.

The distinguishing factor in the description of this altar is that it is לִפְנֵי־יְהוָה, "before the Lord." The gloss לִפְנֵי־יְהוָה occurs 224 times in the OT, and is variously translated in the LXX as ἔναντι Κυρίου (e.g., Lev 16:30), ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ (e.g., Exod 16:9), ἀπέναντι Κυρίου (e.g., Lev 16:12) and ἐνώπιον Κυρίου (e.g., Lev 4:4; 24:3). The designation of this altar as "before the Lord" reflects its position right in front of the פָּרֹכֶת, the veil that separated the holy place from the most holy place. The distinction between both altars is more clear in Lev 4:7:

> The priest shall put some of the blood on the horns of the altar of fragrant incense that is in the tent of meeting before the LORD; and the rest of the blood of the bull he shall pour out at the base of the altar of burnt offering, which is at the entrance of the tent of meeting.

This distinction is important, since the scene in Rev 9:13 also occurs "before the throne," a circumlocution that essentially means "before the Lord." It is relevant to remember that the word מִזְבֵּח is not used *exclusively* to refer to the "altar of incense" in the OT; it can apply to any altar. The only exception to reading מִזְבֵּח as the altar of incense is in Lev 16:25, in which it refers to the altar located in the court of the tabernacle. The reasons are twofold, one lexical and the other functional. First, the *terminus technicus* לִפְנֵי־יְהוָה that accompanies the description of the "altar of incense" is missing in Lev 16: 25, which indicates a different altar. This is confirmed by the fact that no burnt offering was offered on the altar of incense (Exod 30:10), making the altar in v. 25 the altar of the burnt offering which stood outside the tent of the meeting. In Maccabees 1:21

the altar of incense is described as the θυσιαστήριον τὸ χρυσοῦν which was along side the λυχνίαν τοῦ φωτὸς καὶ πάντα τὰ σκεύη αὐτῆς inside the sanctuary. This is also the same altar of incense mentioned in Heb 9:4.

Massingbaerde Ford sees in the trumpets of Rev 8:1–13 an allusion to the trumpets used in rituals throughout the OT which, in association "with the altar and throne, should suggest the instrument which was played during pauses in the psalms … and on special occasions"[122] such as the Day of Atonement. Aune connects the use of trumpets to introduce sections with the same practice used by the author of the *Apocalypse of Zephaniah* (1st century BCE–1st century CE). The trumpet serves in this work to introduce scenes of judgment. It is likely that John has in mind the same קוֹל הַשֹּׁפָר, "the sound of the shofar" (cf. Exod 20:18) as in the vision of the exalted Christ in Revelation 1, whose voice is like "a trumpet."

The great quantity of incense given to the angel in Rev 8:3 also echoes the two handfuls that the high priest carries with the censer on the Day of Atonement. A similar scene is described in the *Life of Adam and Eve (*Greek *Apocalypse of Moses*) 33:4–5: "I myself saw golden censers and three bowls, and behold, all the angels with frankincense and the censers and the bowls came to the altar and breathed on them, and the fumes of the incense hid the sky."[123] *The Testament of Levi* 8:10 connects the offering of a large

---

[122] Massingbaerde Ford, *Revelation*, 136.

[123] *OTP* 2:289; cf. *POT*, 2:149.

amount of incense with the notion of being fit to serve before the Lord: "The seventh placed on my head a diadem of priesthood, and filled my hands with incense, that I might serve as priest to the Lord God."[124]

Aune, however, considers the occurrences of θυσιαστήριον to refer specifically to the "altar of incense" only in Rev 8:3, 5 and 9:13, while the other five occurrences "apparently refer to the altar of burnt offerings."[125] But the other five do not necessitate an understanding other than "altar of incense." And because the term θυσιαστήριον unequivocally refers to the altar of incense in at least three passages in Revelation, it is reasonable to assume that, in the absence of another delimitation of which altar is being mentioned, all of the references to this θυσιαστήριον refer to the same "golden altar," the "altar of incense" which was before the veil of the Most Holy Place.[126]

Just as the angel in Rev 8:3 offers incense symbolizing the prayers of "all the saints," the high priest also ministers on behalf of all Israel on the Day of Atonement by offering a large amount of incense (Lev 16:16). On the Day of Atonement, the high priest

---

[124] Ibid.

[125] Ibid.

[126] *Pace* Ranko Stefanovic, "The Angel at the Altar (Revelation 8:3–5): A Case Study on Intercalations in Revelation," *AUSS* 44 (2006): 79–94, who thinks that the angel stands "on" the altar of burnt offerings. He does so by capitalizing on the expression ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου which invariably refers to someone standing on the altar of burnt offering. However, nothing in Rev 8:3 prevents seeing the angel as standing "on" the altar of incense. The presence of incense in connection with an altar should immediately point one to the offering of incense at the altar of incense rather than the altar of the burnt offering.

also purifies the altar of incense by daubing blood on its four horns and by sprinkling seven times in front of the veil of the holy of holies (Lev 4: 6, 7; 16:16).

There are in fact some critical lexical correspondences between Rev 8:3 and Lev 16:13 in the LXX which may point to a Day of Atonement background for Revelation 8. (1) Both events deal with a "golden altar which is before the Lord/throne" (τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τοῦ ἀπέναντι Κυρίου/θυσιαστήριον τὸ χρυσοῦν τὸ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου). (2) Both passages describe a large amount of incense (πλήσει τὰς χεῖρας θυμιάματος /θυμιάματα πολλά). (3) Both events occur "before the Lord" (ἔναντι Κυρίου/ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ). Language shared by both passages includes "altar" (θυσιαστήριον) "incense," (θυμιάματος) "hand" (χεῖρας) "before the Lord/God/the throne" (ἀπέναντι Κυρίου/ἔναντι Κυρίου; ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ/ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου). The comparison appears in the following table:

Comparison Between Lev 16:12–13 and Rev 8:3–4	
Lev 16:12–13	**Rev 8:3–4**
He shall take a censer full of coals of fire from the altar before the LORD, and two handfuls of crushed sweet incense, and he shall bring it inside the curtain	Another angel with a golden censer came and stood at the altar; he is given a great quantity of incense to offer with the prayers of all the saints on the golden altar that is before the throne.
and put the incense on the fire before the LORD, that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy seat that is upon the covenant, or he will die	And the smoke of the incense, with the prayers of the saints, rose before God from the hand of the angel
καὶ λήμψεται τὸ πυρεῖον πλῆρες ἀνθράκων πυρὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τοῦ ἀπέναντι Κυρίου, καὶ πλήσει τὰς χεῖρας θυμιάματος συνθέσεως λεπτῆς καὶ εἰσοίσει ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος	καὶ ἄλλος ἄγγελος ἦλθεν καὶ ἐστάθη ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου ἔχων λιβανωτὸν χρυσοῦν, καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ θυμιάματα πολλά, ἵνα δώσει ταῖς προσευχαῖς τῶν ἁγίων πάντων ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ χρυσοῦν τὸ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου.
καὶ ἐπιθήσει τὸ θυμίαμα ἐπὶ τὸ πῦρ ἔναντι Κυρίου· καὶ καλύψει ἡ ἀτμὶς τοῦ θυμιάματος τὸ ἱλαστήριον τὸ ἐπὶ τῶν μαρτυρίων	καὶ ἀνέβη ὁ καπνὸς τῶν θυμιαμάτων ταῖς προσευχαῖς τῶν ἁγίων ἐκ χειρὸς τοῦ ἀγγέλου ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ.

Beale agrees when he writes:

> Rev. 8:3–5 echoes Lev. 16:12–13: the priest "will take his censer full of coals of fire off the altar, which is before the LORD; and he will fill his hands with … incense … and he will put the incense on the fire before the LORD, and the smoke of the incense will cover the mercy seat" (LXX). Similarly, Exod. 30:8–10 virtually equates "incense" with "burnt offering" and "meal offering" and directly links it with the Day of Atonement.[1]

Rev 8:5 continues: "Then the angel took the censer and filled it with fire from the altar and he threw it to the earth." This passage has a strong verbal and thematic relationship with Ezek 10:2: "He said to the man clothed in linen, "Go within the wheelwork underneath the cherubim; fill your hands with burning coals from among the cherubim, and scatter them over the city." In Revelation, judgment is meted out on "the earth" while Ezekiel limits it to the people/city of God, "Jerusalem." The throwing described in Rev 8:5 also seems to be related to the practice of throwing the *magrepha* in the Herodian Temple. The *m. Tamid* 5:6, which deals with the daily rituals of the sanctuary explains: "One [of the priests] took the *magrepha* and cast it between the porch and the altar; no one in Jerusalem could hear his neighbor's voice because of the sound of the *magrepha*." Some Jewish scholars have understood this "magrepha" to be the shovel used by the high priest in the תָּמִיד rites of burning incense.[2] As pointed out in part by Yasser, the important thematic resonances between the *m. Tamid* and Revelation

---

[1] Cf. Beale, *Revelation*, 456.

[2] See Joseph Yasser, "The Magrepha of the Herodian Temple: A Five-Fold Hypothesis," *JAMS* 13 (1960): 24–42.

include: (1) the context of the sanctuary service (earthly and heavenly); (2) the indirect reference to the use of coals in the *m. Tamid* and "fire" in Revelation; (3) the throwing down of a sanctuary utensil; (4) the resulting effect in the form of noise/disturbances. The noise of the *magrepha* is given an exaggerated quality in the *m. Tamid*, and purportedly it could be heard from as far as Jericho, eighteen miles away. The implication of the throwing down of both utensils and the ensuing noise has to do with judgment. On the importance of this passage in the *m. Tamid* to Day of Atonement imagery, it is important to point out that the תָּמִיד rituals where also performed on the Day of Atonement. Thus, the throwing down of the *magrepha* also took place on the Day of Atonement, something with which John would no doubt be familiar.

It is also important to note that the atmospheric disturbances described in Rev 8:5 are parallel to those in Rev 11:19, which describes the scene of the ark of the covenant in the Most Holy Place of the heavenly temple. They first appear in the vision of the throne room in Rev 4:5 as "flashes of lightning, and rumblings and peals of thunder," (ἐκπορεύονται ἀστραπαὶ καὶ φωναὶ καὶ βρονταί). The absence of σεισμός in Rev 4:5 should be self-explanatory: the vision relates to events transpiring in heaven not on the earth (cf. Rev 4:1). It is significant that both passages deal with events that relate to the sanctuary service as pertaining to Day of Atonement imagery when they both describe βρονταὶ, φωναὶ, ἀστραπαὶ and σεισμός (with the addition of χάλαζα μεγάλη in Rev 11:19; cf. also Rev 16:8, ἀστραπαὶ, φωναὶ, βρονταὶ, σεισμὸς μέγας).

Aune suggests that the angel in this passage could be the archangel Michael. Indeed, this special angel is distinguished from the seven angels which receive the seven trumpets (8:2) in that it is the angel "which is before God" (τοῦ ἀγγέλου ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ). This makes this angel all the more similar to the archangel Michael, since both are distinct from other ἄγγελοι (cf. Rev 12:7). Michael's preeminence in divine affairs is also seen in other parts of the Scripture (cf. Dan 10:13, 21; 12:1; Jude 9).[3] In the *b. Hagigah* 12B, Michael is "the great prince" (השר הגדול) which appears to draw from the Dan 10:13: מִיכָאֵל אַחַד הַשָּׂרִים הָרִאשֹׁנִים (cf. Theodotion Dan 12:1: ὁ ἄρχων ὁ μέγας). In Rabbinic literature, Michael ministers before the throne of God,[4] a notion that seems to echo the book of Hebrews in which Jesus is portrayed as being in the presence of God (cf. Acts 7:56). Michael is the "chief of the holy angels" in the *Ascension of Isaiah* 3:16 (and possibly in the *Ascension of Moses* 10:2) a description which is echoed in Rev 12:7.

Alternatively, it could be asked whether this angel could be understood as Jesus himself. A. Y. Collins seems to open the door for this possibility when she suggests that Revelation "seems to portray the risen Jesus as an angel or at least in angelomorphic

---

[3] The popularity of the name Michael among Israelites which could be indicative of knowledge of this angelic tradition can be seen throughout the OT (cf. Num 13:13; Ezra 8:8; 1 Chr 5:13, 14; 6:25; 7:3; 27:18).

[4] Cf. Aune, *Revelation 6–16*, 515; *b. Menah* 110a; *b. Zebab*. 62a; *b. Hag.* 12b.

terms."[5] Margaret Barker is not so tentative, stating that the mighty angel is the Lord himself.[6] The idea that Jesus could be represented as an angel in Revelation is not so far-fetched as it seems. Jesus' identity in Revelation is often veiled, such as in Revelation 19. This imagery could in fact culminate with the vision of the rider of the horse which is followed by angels. Although this rider is not described as an "angel," such a conclusion is not implausible considering that other passages in Revelation describe a more-exalted heavenly being acting in conjunction but separate in function from the other angels, such as Rev 8:3–5. This rider has traditionally been interpreted as symbolizing Christ.

Indeed several verbal features in the vision involving the angel with the "mighty voice" seem to point to the possibility that the exalted, high-priestly Jesus is being represented in the symbol of a "mighty angel" in the second half of the book of Revelation. Such veiled references to Christ could stem from the book of Daniel which refers to Christ as the "Son of Man."[7] Utilizing the vision of the angel who has authority over the fire of the altar of incense in Rev 14:18 as background, this mighty angel may

---

[5] Adela Yarbro Collins and John J. Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of God* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2008), 189. For a discussion on the representation of Christ as an angel in Revelation, cf. also Robert H. Gundry, "Angelomorphic Christology in the Book of Revelation," in SBLSP 33, ed. Eugene H. Lovering, Jr. (Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1994), 662–78; ibid., "Angelomorphic Christology in the Book of Revelation," in *The Old is Better: New Testament Essays in Support of Traditional Interpretations*, WUNT 178 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 377–394; Charles Arthur Gieschen, "Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence" (PhD diss., University of Michigan, 1995).

[6] Barker, *Revelation*, 171.

[7] Cf. Beale, *Revelation*, 522.

symbolize a heavenly high priest (who in the OT was the only one allowed to officiate at the altar of incense) and is above all other angels in authority and power. This angel who stands at the altar of incense has a "a loud voice" (φωνή μεγάλη)[8]; the same "mighty voice" is heard again in Rev 18:2 (ἐν ἰσχυρᾷ φωνῇ) and in Rev 19:17 (φωνῇ μεγάλῃ) in the description of the rider of the white horse. These "mighty voices" stand in parallel and are probably synonymous with Christ's φωνὴν μεγάλην ὡς σάλπιγγος in Rev 1:10, 12, 15. It was this same voice, i.e., "the first voice" (ἡ φωνὴ ἡ πρώτη) which calls John to enter through a door open in heaven in Rev 4:1. Here Christ can only be recognized by his voice: that no description of the person is given indicates that Christ could be seen as assuming the role of a narrator in the book of Revelation, even in scenes which represent him in other symbols, such as the Lamb around the throne. Nevertheless, by itself, the expression "loud voice" does not entail divinity *per se* since other angels also possess "loud voices" (cf. 14:7, 9). It is only the context which must point to distinguishing features of these divine beings, such as the presence of ἐξουσίαν, authority and the high priestly ministration before the Lord.

The ἄγγελον ἰσχυρὸν (cf. ἐν ἰσχυρᾷ φωνῇ, 18:2) who inquires about the worthiness of the Lamb in Revelation 5 reappears in Rev 10:1, but now has characteristics similar to

[8] This Greek expression occurs twenty times in Revelation (cf. 1:10; 5:2, 12; 6:10; 7:2, 10; 8:13; 10:3; 11:12, 15; 12:10; 14:7, 9, 15, 18; 16:1, 17; 19:1, 17; 21:3) and betrays the Semitic influence of the expression הקול גדול. It occurs fifty times in the LXX which clearly points to a dependence on this text of the OT.

those of the exalted Christ seen in the vision of Revelation 1—his face is like the sun (τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος)—a description that is an almost verbatim match of ἡ ὄψις αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος in Rev 1:16 (cf. Matt 17:2). Around his head is a rainbow, ἶρις which also surrounds the heavenly throne in Rev 4:3 (cf. Ezek 1:26–28).[9] He is full of glory (δόξα) a term reserved either for God or Christ in Revelation (cf. 4:9, 11; 5:13; 7:12; 11:13; 14:7; 15:8; 16:9; 19:1; 21:11, 23; Christ in 1:6; 5:12–13). The description of his body is an allusion to Dan 7:13 where the Son of Man appears in a cloud (cf. Rev 1:7; Rev 14:14) which echoes the descriptions of the coming of Christ elsewhere in the NT (Matt 24:30; 26:64; Mark 13:26; Luke 21:27; Acts 1:9). He has the authority to announce when the end will occur (cf. 10:16). The loud voice coming from the temple, presumably from the altar of incense as in 14:18, now commands the seven angels with the seven the bowls to do their work; it also proclaims "it is done" (γέγονεν, 16:17). Following this are the same disturbances related to the throwing of the golden censer to earth in Rev 8:5.

The angel who ministers at the altar of incense in Rev 14:18 is said to have ἐξουσίαν over this fire, but having authority over "fire" alone would not allow the angel to give authority to another angel over the "harvest." It is possible then that these two scenes are in fact parallel, describing the same scene from a different perspective, and "fire" here probably refers to the fire of the altar of incense, since the scene involves

[9] Beale, *Revelation*, 524, considers the article before ἶρις to be "article of previous reference," tying the rainbow of the angel with the rainbow around the throne.

judgment on unrepentant humanity (in contrast with the petitions and confessions offered at this altar). The angel who has authority over the fire of incense, i.e., a heavenly high priest, now bestows the authority to reap the earth on "another angel" who also has a sickle (14:17), as did the previous "Son of Man" (14:14). That only divine beings have "divine authority" in Revelation is attested in the fact that only Christ (2:26) and two angels have ἐξουσίαν (cf. 18:1).[10] It is not unreasonable either to think that Jesus could in fact be the same angel who has "great authority" (ἐξουσίαν μεγάλην),[11] and "a mighty voice" (ἰσχυρᾷ φωνῇ) whose splendour fills the whole earth in Rev 18:1–2. This description is reminiscent of Paul's description of Christ's second coming: "For the Lord himself, with a cry of command, with the archangel's call and with the sound of God's trumpet will descend from heaven, and the dead in Christ will rise first" (ἐν φωνῇ ἀρχαγγέλου καὶ ἐν σάλπιγγι θεοῦ, 1 Thess 4:16). The ἐξουσίαν of this angel is given by God to control the plagues (16:9; cf. 11:6; Christ also possesses authority since he bestows it on everyone from the church of Thyatira "who conquers" to rule the nations, cf. 2:26). Further, the same ἄγγελον ἰσχυρὸν from Rev 5:2 and 10:1 now calls "my people" out of

[10] Aune, *Revelation 1–5*, 308, writes, "The phrase 'mighty angel' in Revelation seems to suggest a supernatural being relatively high in the angelic hierarchy."

[11] For an in depth study of the word ἐξουσία in Revelation, see Laszlo I. Hangyas, "The Use and Abuse of Authority: An Investigation of the ΕΞΟΥΣΙΑ Passages in Revelation" (PhD diss., Andrews University, 1997).

Babylon (18:3) and declares judgment on Babylon (v. 21).[12] A similar "voice" tells all the earth to "praise God" in Rev 19:5 and a mighty angel with power over the sun calls all birds for the feast in Rev 19:17. It appears then that these features do not apply to a regular angel; this angel who ministers in the heavenly temple at the altar of incense and who has great power, splendour, authority and a mighty voice can be understood to be none other than Christ himself.

It may be asked, what is the significance of this for a study on the impact of the Day of Atonement in Revelation when in fact the incense altar was used daily in the tabernacle? Since the altar of incense was purified on the Day of Atonement, the imagery of the mediation at the incense altar may be the most fitting source for the judgment scenes involving incense in Revelation (cf. Rev 11:19). The rite of the incense, of which the incense altar was a part, reaches the apex of its cultic significance on the Day of Atonement on which the high priest must bring the incense altar, together with a great quantity of incense, inside the Most Holy Place in order to create a screen between him and God so he will not die (Lev 16:12–13).

The preceding analysis appears to suggest that Lev 16:12 and 18 may be possible sources for the θυσιαστηρίου τοῦ χρυσοῦ τοῦ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ in Rev 8:3 and 9:13. This possibility in Revelation 9 is explored below.

---

[12] Pace Aune, who considers all three occurrences of ἄγγελον ἰσχυρὸν as referring to different heavenly beings (*Revelation 1–5*, 347).

Assessment: The Day of Atonement in Revelation 8		
Allusive Types: *Allusion*; *Echoes*	**Strength**: *Clear/Loud*	**Thematic Coherence:** *Reappearance of the Day-of-Atonement slaughtered Lamb; high priestly mediation at the altar of incense; large amount of incense; throwing of a sanctuary utensil and eschatological judgment based on character loyalty*

Revelation 9: The Golden Altar of Incense and Defiant Humanity

Rev 9:13 introduces the judgment on unrepentant humanity unleashed by the sixth trumpet: "Then the sixth angel blew his trumpet, and I heard a voice from the [four] horns of the golden altar before God" (Καὶ ὁ ἕκτος ἄγγελος ἐσάλπισεν· καὶ ἤκουσα φωνὴν μίαν ἐκ τῶν [τεσσάρων][13] κεράτων τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τοῦ χρυσοῦ τοῦ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ). All preceding trumpets indicate a gradual increase of damage to nature and to humanity (cf. 9:1–12); the sixth triggers a large-scale killing of humanity.

As pointed out above, the "golden altar of incense before God" mentioned in Rev 9:13 is the same "golden altar of incense before the throne" (θυσιαστήριον τὸ χρυσοῦν τὸ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου) of Rev 8:3. While the scene in Rev 8:3 relates to the opening of the seventh seal of the scroll, the scene in Rev 9:13 concerns the blowing of the sixth

[13] The word τεσσάρων is missing from some ancient manuscripts, cf. Nestle et al., *The Greek New Testament*, Rev 9:13.

trumpet. A "voice from the four horns," which is probably the voice of God, tells the angel who has the sixth trumpet, "Release the four angels who are bound at the great river Euphrates" (v. 14). They in turn unleash a cavalry of 200,000,000 [δισμυριάδες μυριάδων] dreadful soldiers (v. 6) who ride horses with lion-like heads that spew "fire and smoke and sulfur" (πῦρ καὶ καπνὸς καὶ θεῖον) from their mouths and have tails like serpents (v. 17). These elements are called the "three plagues" (v. 18; cf. 14:10; 19:20; 20:10; 21:8). This army and their hellish horses kill one third of humanity, ostensibly those who could no longer repent, since the implication of their judgment is that the rest of living humanity did not repent of their evil deeds (vv. 15–21).

Rev 9:13 adds additional elements which are not mentioned in Rev 8:3: the "[four] horns of the altar" (τῶν [τεσσάρων] κεράτων τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τοῦ χρυσοῦ τοῦ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ) and the "voice."[14] The scene in Rev 9:13–21 involves judgment framed in cultic language involving the horns of the golden altar of incense which is in the holy place of the tabernacle.

The horns of the altar of incense are a central element that is purified in the tabernacle rituals. As described in Leviticus, two rituals involve applying blood to the horns of the golden altar of incense: (1) the purification offering for the unintentional

[14] The text of some ancient mss. which do not bring the word "four," τεσσάρων, before "horns" and should be preferred since the OT only mentions "four horns" in connection with the altar of burnt offering (cf. Ezek 43:15, 20). This however does not deny that the altar of incense probably had four horns, one on each side as the altar of burnt offering (cf. Exod 27:2; 30:1–5). It is, however, intriguing that the [four] horns of the altar are connected with the four angels who unleash the judgment on the earth.

sins of the high priest and the people performed throughout the year (Lev 4:2, 6, 7, 18);[15] and (2) the blood rituals performed on the Day of Atonement and which require that this altar is purified twice, once with the blood of the bull offered for the sins of the high priest and his household and once with the blood of the "goat for the Lord" (Lev 16:11, 15, 16) offered on behalf of the people of Israel. As previously noted, the purification ritual on the four horns of the altar of incense in Lev 4 is intended to cover "unintentional" sins (Lev 4:1) that are committed throughout the year. On the Day of Atonement however, the entire tabernacle is cleansed from "all their sin" (Lev 16:16, 20), including brazen sins,[16] even though the perpetrators of said sins, the unrepentant sinners are cut-off (Num 15:30, 31).

However, because two rituals of purification of the four horns of the altar of incense are prescribed in Leviticus, it is necessary to ask the question, are there elements which point to the Day of Atonement rather than to the regular purification offerings? This question may be answered by examining the themes of final judgment attached to the Day of Atonement. These are clearly intended in Revelation 9. As discussed previously, the Day of Atonement was the ancient judgment day for the people of Israel. After the ritual "God would continue to reside with Israel because his temple and people

---

[15] The altar of incense should be purified for the sins of the high priest and the people with the blood of a bull. The sins of the "ruler" (Lev 4:22–26) as well as the sins of the "ordinary people (Lev 4:27–31) required that goats (male and female respectively) be offered and their blood is daubed on the fours horns of the altar of the burnt offering.

[16] Milgrom, "Day of Atonement," 73.

were once again pure."[17] Conversely, if any of the Day of Atonement rituals failed because the nation had turned unrepentantly away from Yahweh, Israel would be rejected and Yahweh would abandon the sanctuary (cf. Lam 2:7).[18] Repentance and obedience would lead to prosperity (Lev 26:3–13; cf. 2 Chr 7:14) while "hostility" towards Yahweh in the form of unrepentant sin, idolatry and other sins would bring utter destruction (Lev 26:14–39).[19]

The purification of the altar of incense represents a purification of the place where intercession is made for the people (cf. Luke 1:8–13). Intercession offered on the altar of incense is only binding when based on the people's ability to display repentance and "affliction" on the Day of Atonement and during reoccurring, unintentional sins (Lev 4). Unrepented sin contaminates the altar of incense and intercession made there allows impurity to encroach on the divine. Those who do not repent by showing self-denial and affliction, risk being cut off from the people (Lev 23:29; Num 15:30–31). Although the tabernacle and its rooms are purified on the Day of Atonement, including

---

[17] Ibid.

[18] Caird, *New Testament Theology*, 406, is off target when he bemoans the shortcomings of the Day of Atonement: "Even the Day of Atonement, which was intended to cover the national sin, only reinforced the sense of separation of the average Israelite from God. Only Passover maintained a vital connection with the life of the people, reminding them that God had redeemed them from slavery in Egypt." The Day of Atonement was an emblem of the lengths God was willing to go overcome the separation brought on by sin. By its rituals and intentions, the Day of Atonement reiterated God's closeness rather than separation from Israel.

[19] Gelardini suggests that covenant breaking at Sinai and Kadesh-Barnea was later in Jewish life considered the reason for the destruction for both temples. Cf. Gabriela Gelardini, "'*Verhärtet eure Herzen nicht:' Der Hebräer, eine Synagogenhomilie zu Tischa be–Aw*," BIS 83 (Leiden: Brill, 2007).

the four horns of the golden altar of incense, unrepentant sinners are condemned (cf. Num 15:30–31);[20] purification and restoration (Lev 16:30) are not available to them. Furthermore, idolatry is a major "cultic" abomination to be purged from the sanctuary on the Day of Atonement.

A significant element in this passage is the statement that wicked humanity continued "worshipping demons" (προσκυνήσουσιν τὰ δαιμόνια, Rev 9:21) which may be a possible echo of the ritual of the goat for Azazel that involves not the worship of a demon *per se* but points to a demonic entity involved in Israelite idolatry of "goat-demons" (Lev 17:7). Both Azazel and the worship of "goat-demons" are part of the same cauldron of idolatrous imagery. It is also significant that the LXX translates "goats" (שְׂעִירִים) in Isa 13:21 as δαιμόνια.

The judgment in Revelation 9 echoes the purification offering on the four horns of the altar of incense on the Day of Atonement. This ritual purified the sins of repentant, confessing Israelites but did not cover defiant sinners. Thus the vision of Rev 9:13–21, which depicts a final judgment being proffered from the four horns of the golden altar of incense on unrepentant humanity, may echo ancient cultic themes attendant to the Day of Atonement purification rituals which are intended to lead to repentance and purification (Lev 16:30). Twice in Rev 9:20 and 21 it is written that the rest of humanity not affected by the three plagues "did not repent of the works of their

[20] Gane, *Cult and Character*, 161–2.

hands [οὐδὲ μετενόησαν ἐκ τῶν ἔργων τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν] or give up worshipping demons and idols of gold and silver and bronze and stone and wood"; "And they did not repent [οὐ μετενόησαν] of their murders or their sorceries or their fornication or their thefts." This remaining group instead suffers under the pouring of the seven plagues (Rev 15:1) which are the seven bowls (Revelation 16) poured out on those "who had the mark of the beast and who worshiped its image" (Rev 16:2). Similar language of unrepentance is used to describe the victims of the pouring of the fourth bowl: "they were scorched by the fierce heat, but they cursed the name of God, who had authority over these plagues, and they did not repent [οὐ μετενόησαν] and give him glory" (Rev 16:9). Likewise, the victims of the "darkness" from the pouring of the fifth bowl "cursed the God of heaven because of their pains and sores, and they did not repent of their deeds [οὐ μετενόησαν ἐκ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν]" (Rev 16:11).

In sum, the judgment proceeding from the four horns of the altar of incense pronounced by the ominous voice of God points to the termination of probation on unrepentant humanity. Likewise, the purification of the four horns of the altar of incense purifies the altar so that intercession based on true repentance may be offered on it, on regular "purgation offerings" as well as on the Day of Atonement. The purification of the four horns offers covenantal restoration to repentant Israel but condemnation to high-handed, unrepentant sinners (Lev 23:29; Num 15:30–31). The judgment coming from the altar of incense on unrepentant sinners in Revelation 9 indicates that no further intercession is possible for them. Their lack of repentance leads

to the judgments of the seventh trumpet (Rev 11:15–19) and the seven bowls/plagues of Revelation 16. Here again, the overtones of eschatological judgment connected with intercessory imagery may indicate the presence of an echo to the themes connected to the Day of Atonement.

Assessment: The Day of Atonement in Revelation 9		
Allusive Type: *Echo*	**Strength**: *Medium*	**Thematic Coherence:** *High priestly mediation at the altar of incense; the four horns of the altar of incense; worshipping demons (Azazel); defiant sinners "cut off"; eschatological judgment based on character loyalty*

Revelation 11: The Measuring of the Temple and the Altar and the Ark of the Covenant

Rev 10:1–11:13 creates a hiatus between the blowing of the sixth and seventh trumpets.[21] Paulien sees in the second half of the Apocalpse introduce at this juncture "repeated focus on the *most holy* or inner sanctum of the temple where the central activities of Yom Kippur took place. Judgment language and activity, a central theme of Yom Kippur, are also a major concern of the second half of the Apocalypse."[22]

---

[21] Beale, *Revelation*, 520, considers this passage as "parenthethical": "Chs. 10–11 are put within the cycle of trumpets to connect the two halves of the Apocalypse together. This is a literary device of interlocking, which functions to introduce the second part of the book and to link it to the first part."

[22] Paulien, "Hebrew Cultus," 257.

Revelation 11 begins with the measuring of "the temple of God and the altar and those who worship there" (τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον καὶ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας ἐν αὐτῷ). This scene is parallel to the scene in Rev 21:15 that depicts the angel measuring the New Jerusalem with a golden rod. The use of "measuring" here is an allusion to Ezek 40–48[23] and denotes God's protection towards his people while the part not measured is trampled under foot (v. 2). The temple, ναὸς, refers solely to the heavenly temple in Revelation (3:12; 7:15; 11:19; 14:15, 17; 15:5–6, 8; 16:1, 17; 21:22). The "two witnesses" (δυσὶν μάρτυσίν) are the "two lampstands that stand before the Lord" (δύο λυχνίαι αἱ ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου) which clearly point to the holy place of the tabernacle wherein is the golden lampstand (Exod 25:31–40). In Rev 1:20 "the seven lampstands are the seven churches" (αἱ λυχνίαι αἱ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαι εἰσίν). The connection between the two witnesses and the seven churches is clear: the two witnesses are God's servants operating on earth. Rev 11:4–14 describes the two witnesses' authority to act on God's behalf and the judgment on those who attempt to silence them.

As briefly explored in the literature Review section, Kenneth Strand was the first to suggest that Lev 16 is the ideal background to the measuring seen in Rev 11. He writes:

> The ancient Day of Atonement was a sort of final day of "measuring" within the Israelite cultic year. It had an aura of final judgment about it, for on that day separation was to take place: The people were to "afflict" themselves, and "whoever is not afflicted on this same day shall be cut off from his people." (Lev 23:27–28, RSV).[24]

---

[23] Cf. Beale, *Revelation*, 559.

[24] Strand, "An Overlooked Old-Testament Background to Revelation 11:1," 322.

Strand points out correctly that the two places in Scripture where the terms "sanctuary", "altar" and "people" occur in combination are Lev 16 and Rev 11:1–2.[25] The theme of "measuring" in Revelation echoes the rituals of the Day of Atonement which stand as a judgment/measuring day for the people of Israel. The rituals are meant to cleanse them and purify them from "all their sin" so they can stand "clean before the Lord" (Lev 16:30). Since the NT high priest (Jesus Christ) needs no atonement, the reference to the measurement of the sanctuary, altar, and people appears to be a deliberate recollection of the Day of Atonement as a day when these are evaluated or "measured" in a spiritual sense (cf. 2 Sam 8:2 and Matt 7:2).

Rev 11:15 depicts the blowing of the seventh trumpet. It elicits mighty praise similar to the praise given by the four cherubim and twenty-four elders at the moment the Lamb takes the scroll (Rev 5:9–14). While the blowing of the trumpet evokes praise, it also foreshadows punishment for the wicked: "The nations raged, but your wrath has come, and the time for judging the dead, for rewarding your servants, the prophets and saints and all who fear your name, both small and great, and for destroying those who destroy the earth" (v. 18). On this point, Paulien writes, "In Jewish thought the seventh-month Feast of Trumpets ushered in the time of judgment that led up to the Day of

[25] Ibid. Cf. Paulien, "Hebrew Cultus," 256.

Atonement …"[26] and that consequently "fall festivals were understood in the first century as anticipations of the ultimate eschaton."[27]

Revelation 11 appears to indicate a transition from a holy place setting to a most holy place setting by the opening of the temple in heaven and the appearance of the "ark of the covenant within his temple" (ἡ κιβωτὸς τῆς διαθήκης αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ναῷ αὐτοῦ). The expression "ark of the covenant" (κιβωτὸς τῆς διαθήκης, or variations of κιβωτὸς and διαθήκης together) appears much more frequently in the LXX[28] than the synonymous expression κιβωτοῦ τοῦ μαρτυρίου (cf. Lev 16:2; Num 7:89; Exod 25:21 and its variations). The κιβωτὸς τῆς διαθήκης was visited only once a year by the high priest on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:2) and whenever the ark accompanies Israel in battle or is transported to new temples (2 Sam 6; cf. 1 Chr 13:1–14; 15:25–16:3). This sudden opening of the heavenly Most Holy Place triggers a series of judgments in the form of "flashes of lightning, rumblings, peals of thunder, an earthquake, and heavy hail" (ἀστραπαὶ καὶ φωναὶ καὶ βρονταὶ καὶ σεισμὸς καὶ χάλαζα μεγάλη, 11:19). This series of judgments has the same connotation of judgment as the "measuring" in 11:1. However, while the measuring in 11:1 is a positive sign for the people of God, the atmospheric disturbances that occur

---

[26] Ibid.

[27] Ibid., 261.

[28] Num 10:33; Exod 39:15; 31:7; Jer 3:16; 14:44; Deut 10:8; 31:9, 25, 26; Josh 3:3, 6, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17; 4:7, 9, 11, 14, 16, 18; 6:8,9, 11, 12, 13; 9:6 [MT 8:33]; Judg 20:27; 1 Sam 5:4; 6:3, 18; 7:1; 2 Sam 6:10; 15:24; 1 Kgs 2:26; 3:15; 6:17; 8:1; 1 Chr 15:25, 26, 27, 29; 16:4, 16, 37; 17:1; 22:19; 28:2, 18; 2 Chr 5:2, 7.

when the Most Holy Place opens announce punishment on the wicked. This vison of judgment is expanded by the vision of the dragon and the beast and those who have "the mark, that is, the name of the beast or the number of its name" (Rev 13:17).

Given that judgment motifs are used in Revelation 11, it does not appear to be coincidental when similar atmospheric phenomena are connected to the Day of Atonement imagery used in Rev 4:5: καὶ ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου ἐκπορεύονται ἀστραπαὶ καὶ φωναὶ καὶ βρονταί, καὶ ἑπτὰ λαμπάδες πυρὸς καιόμεναι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου, ἅ εἰσιν τὰ ἑπτὰ πνεύματα τοῦ θεοῦ. This occurs also in 8:5 (βρονταὶ καὶ φωναὶ καὶ ἀστραπαὶ καὶ σεισμός) and in the vision of the ark of the testimony in heaven in Rev 11:19 (καὶ ἠνοίγη ὁ ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ ὤφθη ἡ κιβωτὸς τῆς διαθήκης αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ναῷ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐγένοντο ἀστραπαὶ καὶ φωναὶ καὶ βρονταὶ καὶ σεισμὸς καὶ χάλαζα μεγάλη). The significance of seeing the ark inside the heavenly holy of holies is obvious: this happens only once a year and is seen only by the high priest on the Day of Atonement. The presence of the ark of the covenant provides protection for the people of God who have just been "measured" (Rev 11:1–2), but indicates that the final judgments on wicked, unrepentant mankind are about to begin.

The order of the disturbances in Revelation 4, 11 and 16 is the same, with the one difference that there is no earthquake in the vision of the heavenly courtroom of Revelation 4. The order of the elements is probably not relevant since their compounded effect does not change. The disturbances affect the earth starting with the blowing of the seven trumpets, which is a harbinger of judgment on unrepentant

humans not washed by the blood of the Lamb (Rev 7:14). The σεισμὸς occurs only when the angel throws the golden censer to earth (8:5, cf. Ezek 10:2), the seventh angel blows the seventh trumpet in a sequence of trumpet blasts that impact the earth directly (11:19), and when the seventh angel pours his bowl on the earth's atmosphere (16:18).

The addition of χάλαζα μεγάλη, "great hail", in 11:19 indicates a progression in the extent and intensity of the phenomena from the seventh trumpet to the seventh bowl: this hail affects the earth on a massive scale (μεγάλη). There is also a progression in the severity of the earthquake from the seventh trumpet to the seventh bowl: this is no doubt the greatest seismic event the earth has ever experienced (Rev 16:18). This is an expansion of the σεισμὸς μέγας, which destroys just a tenth of the great city from which the two witnesses ascend to heaven (cf. Rev 11:13), and the σεισμὸς μέγας triggered by the opening of the sixth seal as a cosmic cataclysm, a violent shaking which removes every mountain and island from its place and affects even the sun, the moon and the stars (cf. Rev 6:12–17).

Assessment: The Day of Atonement in Revelation 11		
Allusive Type: *Allusion*	**Strength**: *Clear*	**Thematic Coherence:** *Purification (measuring) of the "sanctuary," "altar" and "people" in Lev 16; the ark inside the heavenly Most Holy Place; themes of judgment as in Rev 4–5*

Revelation 15: The Opening of the Temple in Heaven

Another possible echo of the Day of Atonement is heard in Rev 15:5–8, which depicts the opening of the "temple, which is the tabernacle in heaven" (ὁ ναὸς τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ). Out of the temple come seven angels carrying the "seven last plagues" (πληγὰς ἑπτὰ τὰς ἐσχάτας). These "seven plagues" are an allusion to the "seven plagues" found in the "covenantal lawsuit" between Yahweh and Israel in Lev 26:21: "If you continue hostile to me, and will not obey me, I will continue to plague you sevenfold [πληγὰς ἑπτὰ] for your sins." The parallel passage in Deut 28:14–68 contains the curses for covenant failure and speaks of "the boils of Egypt" as punishment (v. 27; cf. 60, 68; cf. the similar plague in Revelation 16). These statutes form the whole of the cultic life of Israel which culminates each year on the Day of Atonement when the people could stand before the Lord "clean" (Lev 16:30).

The angels with the seven plagues are "robed in pure bright linen, with golden sashes across their chests" (ἐνδεδυμένοι λίνον καθαρὸν λαμπρὸν καὶ περιεζωσμένοι περὶ τὰ στήθη ζώνας χρυσᾶς, v. 6), a description that echoes the description in Rev 1:13 of the exalted Christ who is clothed with "a long robe and with a golden sash across his chest" (ποδήρη καὶ περιεζωσμένον πρὸς τοῖς μαστοῖς ζώνην χρυσᾶν). As in Revelation 1, the clothing of linen along with a golden sash parallels to the clothing worn by the high priest on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:4). These angels could be seen to be acting as

Christ's high-priestly representatives as they mete out judgment on the earth.[29] Likewise, Barker writes, "Seven angels emerge from the Holy of Holies and pour wrath on the creation—earth, sea, rivers and heaven—and the great city is destroyed."[30]

Another potential echo of the Day of Atonement is heard in Rev 15:8: "and the temple was filled with smoke from the glory of God and from his power [ὁ ναὸς καπνοῦ ἐκ τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ], and no one could enter the temple until the seven plagues of the seven angels were ended." Beale rightly avers that the appearance of the ark alongside cosmic phenomena signals "not only judgment but also God's gracious presence with his redeemed community and his provision of grace by atonement."[31] Paulien points out that Rev 11:19 functions as a pivot point in the book, marking the beginning of "an increasing focus on judgment."[32] This can be seen in an increased use of words of judgment such as "to judge" (κρίνω, 16:5; 18:8; 18:20; 19:2; 20:12; 20:13), "judgment" (κρίσις, Rev 14:7; 16:7; 18:10; 19:2), and "judgment" (κρίμα, Rev 17:1; 18:20; 20:4).[33]

---

[29] So Beale, *Revelation*, 804.

[30] Barker, *Revelation*, 259.

[31] Beale, *Revelation*, 619.

[32] Paulien, "Hebrew Cultus," 260.

[33] Ibid., 252.

Paulien[34] sees here an allusion to the inauguration of the tabernacle, especially as described in Exod 40:34–35: "Then the cloud covered the tent of meeting, and the glory of the LORD filled the tabernacle. Moses was not able to enter the tent of meeting because the cloud settled upon it, and the glory of the LORD filled the tabernacle"[35] (cf. also 1 Kgs 8:10–11; 2 Chr 5:13; Isa 6:1–4; Ezek 10:2–4; 11:23; 44:4). However, the evidence in support of there being an inauguration background in this passage is not so decisive. First, the prohibition to enter the tabernacle is not exclusive to the inauguration ceremonies. It was also applicable on the Day of Atonement: "No one shall be in the tent of meeting from the time he enters to make atonement in the sanctuary until he comes out and has made atonement for himself and for his house and for all the assembly of Israel" (Lev 16:17). This passage also matches the notion of not entering the tabernacle "until" something else occurs: the seven plagues have ended. Further, the sanctuary inauguration passages in the OT do not fit the context of "seven plagues"; God's glory is being revealed inside the heavenly temple in a context of judgment; this theme is missing in the tabernacle dedications. In addition, the word for smoke in Rev 15:8, καπνός, appears 28 times in the LXX but never in tabernacle/temple dedication passages; rather, καπνός is linked with the glory of God only in Isa 4:5 and 6:4, passages unrelated to the dedication services. Isaiah (6:4) has a vision of the heavenly Most Holy

---

[34] Ibid., 253.

[35] Beale, *Revelation*, 806–807, writes: "The description may be a collective echo of similar Old Testament descriptions of God's presence in the earthly temple."

Place in which he sees the hem of God's robe filling the whole temple. The vision suggests the idea of "affliction" for uncleanness (v. 5) and "purification" from "guilt" (עָוֹן) and "sin" (חַטָּאת) through a coal from the altar (most likely the altar of incense; vv. 6, 7). Finally, the prohibition to enter the temple in the context of the judgment of the seven last plagues indicates a cessation of intercession rather than the inauguration of the tabernacle. Again, the notion of not reentering the temple "until" the seven plagues are over may support this conclusion. Although it is feasible that the vision of Rev 15:8 merges OT Sinai and temple theophanies (cf. Exod 19:18), the theme of judgment along with other imagery in the passage (such as the high-priestly clothing of the angels in v. 6) may indicate that the filling of the heavenly temple with smoke points to judgment themes associated with an eschatological Day of Atonement.

Assessment: The Day of Atonement in Revelation 15		
Allusive Type: *Echo*	**Strength**: *Soft*	**Thematic Coherence:** *White robes signifying cultic purity; high priestly golden sash; cultic bowls used by "high priestly" angels; the ark of the covenant seen inside the heavenly Most Holy Place; judgment on defiant humanity*

Revelation 17: The Harlot, the Beast and the Ritual of the Goat for Azazel

The vision of the harlot and the beast in Revelation 17 follows the pouring of the seven bowls with the seven plagues on the earth in Revelation 16. The vision is probably surprising to John because he likely expects that the end of the seven last plagues would

signal the reinitiation of intercession in the heavenly temple interrupted by smoke filling the temple and the appearance of the ark of the covenant in heaven (Rev 15:8). John is not taken to the heavenly temple but instead to a desert (v. 3). The vision portrays a harlot riding on a beast in the desert and functions as a change of scene to introduce the punishment meted out on the harlot/Babylon, the beast, the dragon and the false prophet in Revelation 18–20. The symbol of the harlot who rides the beast is expanded in Revelation 18: it symbolizes Babylon, the great city that stands against God and his people. The harlot rides a beast with "seven heads and ten horns" and which is "full of blasphemous names"; she holds a cup "full of abominations and the impurities of her fornication" (βδελυγμάτων καὶ τὰ ἀκάθαρτα τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς, v. 4). The reference to "impurities" here is significant and points to cultic language; the Greek word for "unclean" (ἀκάθαρτος) appears 96 times in cultic settings in the book of Leviticus alone (LXX) and describes all that is cultically detestable. All of the purification rituals and offerings in the book of Leviticus are intended to separate the "holy" and "clean," טָהֵר from the "unclean" (ἀκάθαρτος). The rituals of the Day of Atonement epitomized the absolute removal of all ἀκάθαρτα from Israel (Lev 16:30).

The harlot has a name written on her forehead, "Babylon the great, mother of whores and of earth's abominations" (Βαβυλὼν ἡ μεγάλη, ἡ μήτηρ τῶν πορνῶν καὶ τῶν βδελυγμάτων τῆς γῆς, v. 5). She has become drunk with "the blood of the saints and the blood of the witnesses to Jesus" (αἵματος τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν μαρτύρων

Ἰησοῦ, v. 6). Thus the vision of Babylon in Revelation 18 is parallel to but also expands the description in Revelation 17. The vision of chapter 18 starts with the coming down of a mighty angel from heaven who fills the earth "with his splendour" (ἐκ τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ) which follows the Hebrew of Ezek 43:2 when describing the glory of Yahweh, although it differs in the LXX (καὶ ἡ γῆ ἐξέλαμπεν ὡς φέγγος ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης κυκλόθεν). The designation of δόξα to an angel here is unique and significant since δόξα is otherwise reserved for God throughout Revelation (cf. Rev 15:8; 21:11, 23). Because of the expressions associated with the angel of Revelation 8, who should most probably be understood as the exalted Jesus, this angel of chapter 17 is the same angel that has great authority in Revelation 8 and should be understand as Revelation's high-priestly Jesus. As Revelation's high priest, Jesus is responsible for achieving the purification of creation from Babylon's abominations on the eschatological Day of Atonement.

Babylon's "wine of the wrath of her [Babylon's] fornication" (τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ θυμοῦ τῆς πορνείας, v. 3), causes the kings and merchants of the earth to commit fornication with her; the merchants have become rich and powerful by colluding with her. God's people are called to "come out of her" so they don't participate "in her sins" (ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις αὐτῆς, 18:4). Her sins are so great that they are "heaped high as heaven" (αὐτῆς αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ἄχρι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, v. 5). Here again, the emphasis is on the clean vs. unclean couplet found in Leviticus.

The pericope of Revelation 17, 18 and 20 also has parallels in ancient Greek φαρμακός elimination rites that the rite of the goat for Azazel itself seems to echo.[36] In these ancient φαρμακός rites, an undesirable person is dressed in extragavant attire and fed before being sent out of the community to symbolize their desire to eliminate a plague or disease. This practice could be echoed in Rev 18:7: "As she glorified herself and lived luxuriously, so give her a like measure of torment and grief." The particular significance of this vision in connection with the rite of the goat for Azazel arises from the mention of "sins" (ἁμαρτίας) and "desert" (ἔρημος) in the passage. In LXX of Lev 16:22 the goat for Azazel is led into the ἔρημος after it receives the toxic load of the sins committed by the people of Israel: πάσας τὰς ἀνομίας τῶν υἱῶν Ισραηλ καὶ πάσας τὰς ἀδικίας αὐτῶν καὶ πάσας τὰς ἁμαρτίας. First, there is the portrayal of an animal connected with uncleanness and wickedness (abomination) in the scene: a "scarlet beast full of blasphemous names" (v. 3). Second, as the goat for Azazel, the harlot carries a counterfeit high-priestly bowl[37] full of sins in the form of "abominations and the impurities of her fornication" (βδελυγμάτων καὶ τὰ ἀκάθαρτα τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς, v. 4). As the goat for Azazel carries sin back to its origination, the desert (= chaos and the

[36] Beale describes this phenomenon thus: "Nevertheless, it is not implausible to see that the Old Testament, especially Daniel, is a filter through which extrabiblical traditions and myths are subordinated to biblical thought and accordingly transformed and applied to the dragon and to other figures in the Apocalypse" (*Revelation*, 634).

[37] Massingbaerde Ford, *Revelation*, 288, sees a parallel with the Day of Atonement in the golden cup that the harlot carries as reminiscent of the sacred utensils.

demonic), the harlot is sent to the desert and pairs up with a demonic beast. As in the ancient Greek elimination rights, she is dressed in "purple and scarlet" (πορφυροῦν καὶ κόκκινον) but instead of going to a palace or city, she is sent away to a desert, εἰς ἔρημον (cf. "barren region," "the desert" in Lev 16:22). All who once admired her will ultimately "hate the whore; they will make her desolate and naked; they will devour her flesh and burn her up with fire" (Rev 17:16–17; cf. 18:7). This echoes the abuse that the ancient Greek φαρμακός suffered as it was being driven away from the city, a practice that is also reflected in Rabbinic discussion of the ritual of the goat for Azazel.

Additional support for the presence of echoes of the ritual of the goat for Azazel in Revelation 17 is found in other "desert" passages which deal with punishment in Revelation. With possibly one exception (cf. Rev 12:6, 14), John follows the Jewish notion that the desert is the abode of evil in Rev 17:3. In the OT the "desert" has negative connotations as the habitation of evil entities, the place to dispose of sin and a place of judgment (cf. Lev 16:22; Isa 6:11; 13:21; 32:15; 34:14; 64:9; Jer 4:27; 9:11; Ezek 29:9; 35:4).[38] Significantly the vision of the fall in Babylon foretold in Isa 21:1 is brought by the winds of the desert of Negeb, a "desert," "a terrible land."[39] The NT associates the desert with

[38] Beale's argument on the "desert" is convoluted at this point; at the same time that he accepts that the passage contains "symbolic geography" he then argues that John was taken into the desert because "it is the place of spiritual security and detachment from the world's dangers (cf. *Revelation*, 852). But since the center of the vision is the harlot and the beast, "desert" here seems to be a sign of rejection and chaos.

[39] Cf. Fekkes, *Isaiah in Revelation*, 204–5, 213–14.

the habitation of demons in a manner that betrays ancient Canaanite myths; in Matt 4:1 Jesus is led "into the desert," the putative habitation of the devil (cf. Matthew 12:43 and Luke 11:24, where ἄνυδρος "without water" is a synonym for ἔρημος).

At a philological level, we may notice that "desert" (ἔρημος), an important element in the dispatch of the goat for Azazel, appears three times in the LXX text of Lev 16:10, 21 and 22, and three times in Revelation: twice as the place to which the pregnant woman flees and is protected and fed (12:6, 14); and once in the scene of judgment against the harlot who rides the scarlet beasts (17:3). According to Lev 16 ἔρημος is the place where Azazel operates. It appears that the harlot operates in the desert while the pregnant woman is protected and fed there (12:6; 14). Since the woman's presence in the desert requires the provision of special protection for her (e.g., "wings," "a place prepared"), John's use of ἔρημος in Revelation 12 may not be an exception to seeing "desert" as the abode of evil, a notion which suffused the Levitical cult.

The vision of Revelation 17 also presents significant contrasts to the cultic language of Revelation 19, a passage that carries thematic parallels with the Day of Atonement. The harlot riding the beast is the counterpart of the rider of the white horse in Revelation 19. In contrast to her purple clothing, the rider of the white horse is clothed in linen. On his robe and on his thigh he has a name "King of kings and Lord of lords" (Βασιλεὺς βασιλέων καὶ κύριος κυρίων, 19:16). In contrast, on the harlot's forehead is "written a name, a mystery: 'Babylon the great, mother of whores and of earth's abominations'" (Βαβυλὼν ἡ μεγάλη, ἡ μήτηρ τῶν πορνῶν καὶ τῶν βδελυγμάτων τῆς γῆς).

Her royal attire disguises her real character, that of a prostitute; she is drunk with the blood of the saints, and offers the drink of her wrath and fornications." The harlot's cup is full of "sin," while the rider of the white horse offers his own blood as a cleansing and purifying gift (cf. Rev 7: 14). This at once echoes and contrasts the high priest's cup which brought purgation from sin on the Day of Atonement[40] (cf. Heb 9:11–12). The name on the harlot's forehead also echoes the name on the forehead of the high priest (Exod 39:30).

Overall, the scene of the harlot in Revelation 17 echoes important aspects of the Day of Atonement ritual, especially the ritual elimination of sin into the desert through the goat for Azazel.

Assessment: The Day of Atonement in Revelation 17		
Allusive Type: *Allusion*	**Strength**: *Clear*	**Thematic Coherence:** *A beast full of sins banished to the desert*

Revelation 18: Babylon as an Eschatological φαρμακός

In Rev 18:1–24 John expands the description of the destruction of the harlot who rides the beast in Revelation 17 by using the metaphor of the fall of Babylon. The divine judgments against the city have turned it into "a dwelling place of demons, a haunt of

[40] Massingbaerde Ford, *Revelation*, 288.

every foul spirit, a haunt of every foul bird, a haunt of every foul and hateful beast" (v. 2). As for the harlot of Revelation 17, the threefold repetition of "foul" identifies Babylon with all of the cultic impurity that was removed on the Day of Atonement: "uncleannesses of the people of Israel, and because of their transgressions, all their sins" (Lev 16:16). Fallen Babylon is a desolate, barren, deserted place full of "abominations and the impurities of her fornication [τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς]" (Rev 17:4). This language is reminiscent of the goat for Azazel that carries the "impurities" into a "barren region", the desert, which is perceived in the OT as the abode of demons (Lev 16:22; 17:7; Isa 13:21; 34:14).

With its load of sin, fornications and abominations, Babylon stands in stark contrast to the high-priestly bride of the Lamb, the new Jerusalem, which is clothed in "fine linen, bright and pure" (Rev 19:8). While Babylon is full of "sin," no "unclean thing" is allowed inside the new Jerusalem (Rev 21:27; cf. Isa 35:8). The warning, "Come out of her [Babylon], my people, so that you do not take part in her sins" (v. 4), presents the recurring theme of the separation of the holy and the unclean in Leviticus which culminates in the Day of Atonement rituals and is eschatologically reworked in Revelation. The warning to "come out" echoes the call to holiness and purity couched in cultic terminology found in Isa 52:11: "Depart, depart, go out from there! Touch no unclean thing; go out from the midst of it, purify yourselves, you who carry the vessels of

the LORD" (cf. Jer. 50:8; 51:6, 45). Thus the separation of holiness from Babylon's sin as the central theme of the Day of Atonement may be in view.[41]

Additional echoes of the Day of Atonement suggested by Massingbaerde Ford are the "fine linen" in Rev 18:11: the high priest wore Indian linen on the Day of Atonement (*m. Yoma* 3:7) and the colours blue and scarlet may echo the high priest's regalia (*m. Yoma* 3:4), only here they stand for a false, end-time priesthood of Babylon.

Assessment: The Day of Atonement in Revelation 18		
Allusive Type: *Echo*	**Strength**: *Loud*	**Thematic Coherence:** *The judgment on the abomination, impurities and sin from creation in the eschatological destruction of Babylon; a call to loyalty of character in the call to "come out" of Babylon and condemn her sin*

Revelation 19: Jesus as Conquering High Priest

After the judgment against Babylon in chapter 18, Revelation 19 introduces the marriage supper of the Lamb (vv. 1–10). The clothing of the bride of the Lamb is "fine linen, bright and pure [βύσσινον λαμπρὸν καθαρόν], for the fine linen [βύσσινον] is the righteous deeds of the saints" (19:8). These are the "garments of salvation" and "the robe of righteousness" promised in Isa 61:10. This attire echoes the clothing of the high-priestly angels of Rev 15:6 who are "robed in pure bright linen [λίνον καθαρὸν λαμπρὸν],

[41] Cf. Beale, *Revelation*, 898.

with golden sashes across their chests" and who carry the seven high-priestly bowls containting the seven last plagues. The "wife of the Lamb" (γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀρνίου) is the new Jerusalem (Rev 21:2, 9), the high priestly city whose cubic measurements parallel those of the Most Holy Place of the tabernacle. The purity of the clothing of the bride reflects the purity that suffuses all who live inside its walls because "nothing unclean will enter it" (Rev 21:27).

The notion of warrior-high-priest is presented in the second song of Moses in Deut 32:43b: "For he will avenge the blood of his children, and take vengeance on his adversaries; he will repay those who hate him, and cleanse the land for his people [וְכִפֶּר אַדְמָתוֹ עַמּוֹ]." Compare this with Deut 33:2: "With him were myriads [μυριάσιν] of holy ones; at his right, a host of his own)." The "myriads of holy ones" (μυριάσιν = μυριάδες μυριάδων καὶ χιλιάδες χιλιάδων) in Rev 5:11, the host of holy ones who surround God's throne (cf. Rev 9:16). What is significant in Deut 32 is the use of כִּפֶּר, the main verb of the purification rites in Lev 16, which conflates cultic purification imagery with the imagery of war. This provides a compelling thematic background for the portrayal of Jesus in Revelation 19 as a conquering high priest.

One of the most intriguing references to αἷμα in Revelation is the description of the rider of the white horse, a clear symbol of Christ (ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ) whose robe is blood-stained (ἱμάτιον βεβαμμένον αἵματι, Rev 19:13). This passage may be an allusion to Isa 63:1–3 but the source of the blood appears to differ, for while Isaiah talks about the

blood of the "peoples," the blood that stains Christ's white robe in Revelation 19 likely refers to his own blood. That is because the theme of conquering by shedding one's own blood in death is common in Revelation (cf. 1:5; 5:5–10; 12:11). Furthermore, the imagery of clothing and blood has already appeared in the purification of the robes of the 144,000 by the blood of the Lamb (Rev 7:14) so the imagery here may be the same. Other scholars have suggested four additional arguments that may be offered in favour of this reading.[42] (1) The imagery of the "wine press", which pertains to a scene of judgment, appears only after the rider and his army are introduced and already riding (19:15). (2) While the "wine press" from Isa 63 is alluded to in v. 15, there is no mention of blood in conjunction with wine press. (3) The actions described in v. 15 are in the future, not the past.[43] (4) "The armies of heaven, wearing fine linen, white and pure were following him on white horses" (v. 14). Their robes are not blood-stained but are described as "fine linen, white and pure" (βύσσινον λευκὸν καθαρόν), something not expected of an army that comes from battle. Thus it appears that verses 13 and 15, although drawing some imagery from Isa 63, may expand the meaning in light of the sacrificial death of Christ: he is introduced as a dying warrior who through his own blood obtains redemption for

---

[42] Cf. A. F. Johnsson, "Revelation," *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, ed. F. E. Gabelein (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2006), 758–59; Boring, *Revelation*, 196–97; Harrington, *Revelation*, 192–93.

[43] So Caird, *Revelation*, 242: "In that case the winepress in verse 15 is a symbol for divine retribution synonymous with the symbol of annihilation in battle; and this interpretation must be adopted also in the parallel passage (xiv. 18–20). The obvious and insuperable objection is that the Rider's garment is already soaked in blood before the battle begins."

this people by his death and, at the same time, announces judgment on the nations (v. 15).[44] John may be drawing imagery from Isa 63 but he appears to be reinterpreting this imagery in light of the cross of Christ and according to the reinterpretation of the Day of Atonement in the book of Hebrews.

The blood here appears to be the blood of atonement and restoration, not that of violence. The imagery of clothes dipped in blood is also found in Genesis 49:11: "He washes his garments in wine and his robe in the blood of grapes" (cf. Jerusalem Targum: "his garments will be dipped in blood)."[45] The significance of the passage in Genesis is that it compares Judah to a "lion's whelp" (σκύμνος λέοντος, Ἰούδα), which is the imagery present in the title "Lion of Judah" (ὁ λέων ὁ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα) one of the titles of Christ in Rev 5:5 ("Do not weep. See, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, has conquered, so that he can open the scroll and its seven seals"). Here again the notion of victory through death and the shedding of blood is in view. Thus Christ, much like the conquering slaughtered Lamb, rides and conquers by the authority of his own blood shed on the eschatological Day of Atonement; it is Christ's blood that stains

---

[44] Pace Beale, *Revelation*, 957, who argues that the imagery of blood in Rev 19:13 and 15 are both drawn from Isa 63 and that the blood is the blood of "judgment." For example, he calls the objection that the rider's clothes are stained before the battle begins as "too mechanical" (*Revelation*, 959). But the same can be said about his reading of Isa 63 in Rev 19, for John may not be so strictly bound to Isaiah's original intention, as Revelation repeatedly demonstrates. John's use of imagery is often free and independent. Moreover, the Christ event not only illuminates but overrides the meaning of original OT messianic prophecies. Beale's defense of John's total respect for original intention of possible OT sources may come to bear on this conclusion.

[45] Cf. Aune, *Revelation 6–16*, 475; P. Trudinger, "The Apocalypse and the Palestinian Targum," *BTB* 16 (1986): 78–79.

his clothes and which ties the imagery to Jesus as having freed the saints "by his blood" (1:5–6; 7:14). In the same way his victories must be understood in light of the atonement blood shed on the cross.[46]

The preceding construct may also be supported by observing that "dipped" (βεβαμμένον), is a *varia lectio* as manuscripts read variously ῥεραντισμένον, ῥεραμένον, περιρεραμμένον and ἐρραμμένον, i.e., "sprinkled."[47] By using what Nestle-Aland call the "local–genealogical" method, it appears that the meaning "dipped" may be a derivative of "sprinkled," since it is unlikely that the idea of sprinkling would have originated from dipping. As Tischendorff avers, "Ceterum βεβαμμένον potius *intinctum* quam *aspersum* est."[48] Furthermore, *pace* Mounce,[49] it appears unlikely that βεβαμμένον originated the several different verbal forms of the reading ῥαντίζω in the manuscripts, which appears also in church fathers of the second and third century (e.g., Origen, Irenaeus,

---

[46] Caird is on target when he writes: "Wherever the Old Testament speaks of the victory of the Messiah or the overthrow of the enemies of God, we are to remember that the gospel recognizes no other way of achieving these ends than the way of the Cross" (*Revelation*, 75).

[47] See *NA*[27], "ρεραντισμ– P (1006.1841), 2329 *al* | περιρεραμμ– **א**[(2)] | ερραμμ– (1611).2053.2062 | *txt A* 051." Nestle-Aland's preference for the Alexandrian text (A 051) as well as the Majority text may be questionable here.

[48] *Novum Testamentum Graece*, eds. Constantin von Tischendorf, Caspar René Gregory and Ezra Abbot (Lipsiae: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869–94).

[49] Mounce states that the reading βεβαμμένον "can account for the variants better than any of the six forms of ῥαινω ῥαντίζω listed in the UBS apparatus" (*Revelation*, 353). It is more likely that another scribal phenomenon may be at play here: the scribe may have confused β and ρ thus ῥεραμένον in time became βεβαμμένον, a possibility that may explain the several variants of ῥεραμένον.

Hyppolitus and Cyprian) as well as in the Vulgate's "*vestem aspersam sanguine*" ("clothes splashed with blood").

Significantly, the reading "sprinkled" instead of "dipped" is also strengthened by the fact that the MT of Isa 63:3 to which Rev 19:13–15 alludes uses the verb "sprinkle": "their juice spattered [וַיֵּז נִצְחָם] on my garments, and stained all my robes." Significantly, the verb נָזָה in Isa 63:3 is the same verb used in Lev 16 for the blood sprinklings inside the tabernacle. John's re-reading of Isa 63:1–3 in light of the blood of Christ may also indicative of a common tradition with the community from which the book of Hebrews arose in which the καταπετάσματος, the veil of the sanctuary, where the blood was sprinkled on the Day of Atonement, is compared to the body of Christ: "by the new and living way that he opened for us through the curtain (that is, through his flesh)" (τοῦ καταπετάσματος, τοῦτ' ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, Heb 10:20). The conflation of clothing and the veil of the Most Holy Place used here may point to the rituals of the Day of Atonement which involved going "within the veil" and sprinkling blood in front of it seven times. This may connect the blood in the rider's clothes with the sprinkling of the blood on the veil on the Day of Atonement thus signifying the rider's sacrificial, atoning death.[50]

---

[50] Barker, *Revelation*, 308, agrees that the blood-sprinkled robe of Rev 19 points to the Day of Atonement when she writes, "This is the high priest emerging after taking blood into the holy of holies. His robe has blood stains, not from the battle which has yet to begin, but from the atonement sacrifice." Caird hints at this possibility when he writes, "The Rider bears on his garment the indelible traces of the death of his followers, just as he bears on his body the indelible marks of his own passion" (Caird, *Revelation*, 243).

Assessment: The Day of Atonement in Revelation 19		
Allusive Type: *Echo*	**Strength**: *Soft*	**Thematic Coherence:** *Blood sprinkled; white high-priestly clothing*

Revelation 20: The Ritual of the Goat for Azazel as Background for the Judgment on the Dragon

After the fall of Babylon announced in Revelation 18, the focus in Revelation 20 is on the final punishment meted out on the "dragon." John describes another angel coming down from heaven having a key to the bottomless pit (ἄβυσσος) and a great chain (20:1). The scene echoes the one described in Revelation 9, where several similar elements are present: "angel," "key," "bottomless pit." Since the "star from heaven" (ἀστέρα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) mentioned in chapter 9 is given control over the ἄβυσσος, it is best understood as being the same "Abaddon" (meaning "destruction," cf. 9:11), "the angel of the abyss" (τὸν ἄγγελον τῆς ἀβύσσου).[51] The fall of the "star" parallels the description of the dragon falling with a third of the "stars" of heaven given later in Rev 12:9. In a nightmarish scenario, this "star from heaven" opens the bottomless pit to release smoke and locusts on the earth (9:3). The locusts are given the power to torture

[51] For divergent views, see Aune, *Revelation 6–16*, 525 and Koester, *Revelation*, 455–456. The representation of demons as stars falling from heaven has parallels in the OT (Isa 14:12) as well as in Luke 10:18 where Jesus describes seeing Satan falling down from heaven. This metaphor for fallen angels is also seen in Jewish literature: *1 Enoch* 18:11–16; 86:1–2; 88:1–3; 90:23–26. Cf. Beale, *Revelation*, 491–492.

the inhabitants of the earth for five months (9:5). These demonic beings are led by "Abbadon" (9:11) the commander of the ἄβυσσος. On the basis of the foregoing analysis, it appears that the "dragon" of Revelation 20 is probably the same entity, i.e. Abbadon, "that ancient serpent, who is the Devil and Satan" (20:2), but now the one who once controlled the abyss, the star from heaven, is made subject to the horrors of the same abyss.

The angel of Revelation 20 lays hold of the dragon and binds him for a thousand years (v. 2). The binding is achieved by throwing him into the bottomless pit. As previously discussed, in Revelation the abode of the demonic and abominable is the "bottomless pit" and the "desert" and these are reserved for demonic entities such as the "beast" described in Revelation (Rev 11:7; 17:4, 8). Thus, Revelation 20 represents a reversal of Revelation 9; while Abbadon is released from the bottomless pit to inflict chaos on the earth in Revelation 9, in chapter 20 he is sent back into the pit "in order that he might not deceive the nations" (v. 3). In Rev 20:4 John tells the reader that this binding will be over after the "thousand years" and Abaddon/Satan will again go out and deceive the nations (vv. 7–8).

The judgment on the dragon in Revelation 20 is pregnant with thematic parallels to the ritual of the Day of Atonement, primarily as it relates to the goat for Azazel. Janowski's conclusion is correct: "The Jewish and Christian history of interpretation of

the figure of Azazel stands in no relationship to its laconic treatment in Lev 16."[52] On the Day of Atonement, the second purgative ritual is the dispatch of the goat to Azazel into the desert bearing "all the iniquities of the people of Israel, and all their transgressions, all their sins" (Lev 16:20–21). The view taken here is that Azazel represents the demonic entity which causes the people to sin and who is ultimately responsible for those transgressions. The fate of the goat symbolized the fate of Azazel himself. As Gane elucidates, the goat for Azazel not only takes the actual sins, it also bears their "guilt."[53] As previously noted, this demonic entity had parallels in the mythology of nations surrounding ancient Israel and can be seen in the mention of the שְׂעִירִם in Lev 17:17, the goat-demons of the desert, to which the goat for Azazel was also sent "back."

As previously discussed in chapter 1, echoes of the goat for Azazel ritual reach Revelation mainly through the reflections on the Day of Atonement as found in pseudepigraphal Jewish literature. According to Young, "John's use of this motif is not taken directly from the OT but as the Aza'zel figure was understood in certain quarters of Jewish apocalyptic."[54] Young comes to this conclusion because "when we find them already synthesised in a pre-Christian apocalyptic text it is dubious procedure to say John is uninfluenced by such traditions and independently gathered his material from the

---

[52] Cf. Janowski, "Azazel," 128–131.

[53] Gane, *Cult and Character*, 259.

[54] Young, "The Impact," 358.

OT."[55] Gregory Jenks sees the "Azazel myth" in early Christian writings as part of a "combat myth" tradition that gave rise to the Antichrist in early Christianity.[56]

Stökl Ben Ezra illuminates the issue when he concludes that "one has to go beyond the biblical text and take later traditions of the scapegoat ritual into consideration, as they are reflected in texts of the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods."[57] As previously explored in this thesis, the Jewish understanding of Azazel appears to have evolved from a mysterious, possibly demonic desert figure in the Pentateuch to a full-fledged, named demon in Second Temple literature (1 *Enoch* 8:1; 9:6; 10:4–8; 13:1; 55:4; 69:2; *Apoc Ab* 13:6–14; 14:4–6; 20:5–7; 22:5; 23:11; 29:6–7; 31:5).[58] Allusions to Azazel in Jewish apocalyptic literature are important because they confirm the suspicion that the ritual of the goat for Azazel had eschatological and judgment day overtones involving the source of evil, Satan (שָׂטָן, 1 Chr 21:1; הַשָּׂטָן in Job 1:6; 2:2). As the goat for Azazel takes sin to the desert, which symbolizes chaos and the habitation of demons (cf. Isa 13:21–22; 34:11–15; Matt 12:43), so Satan, represented by the dragon and

---

[55] Ibid., 359–360.

[56] Gregory C. Jenks, *The Origins and Early Development of the Antichrist Myth* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011), 285–288, 358.

[57] Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, "Yom Kippur in the Apocalyptic Imaginaire and the Roots of Jesus' High Priesthood: Yom Kippur in Zechariah 3, 1 Enoch 10, 11QMelkizedeq, Hebrews and the Apocalypse of Abraham 13," in *Transformations of the Inner Self in Ancient Religions*, eds. Jan Assman and Gary Stroumsa (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 353.

[58] Cf. Orlov, "Eschatological Yom Kippur in the Apocalypse of Abraham," 3–35; Ibid., *Dark Mirrors*, 27–46.

the beasts of Revelation, is the cause of the chaos in creation because his *modus operandi* is to deceive the nations (Rev 20:8), a deception which in the OT signified the sin of idolatry. Chaos is also connected with the machinations of the wicked (Isa 57:20; Jude 13); darkness, represented by evil acts, is part of this "chaos" which undermines and compromises the created order (cf. Prov 2:13; Job 24:14; Jer 49:9; Rom 13:12–13). The dragon and the beasts persecute and kill the saints (Rev 12:12, 17).

The dismissal of the goat for Azazel carrying away the sins of Israel appears to be built on the idea that separation from sin leads to creation or re-creation; e.g., in Revelation, the separation and destruction of the dragon lead to a new creation in Revelation 21. As in the separation of the two goats on the Day of Atonement, one for Yahweh and one for Azazel, John separates those marked with the mark of the beast from those marked with the name of the city of God.[59] Paulien sees in this division of mankind into saved and lost an echo of the separation of the two goats on the Day of Atonement, one "for the Lord" and the other "for Azazel".[60] Barker also sees in Revelation 20 an allusion to the Day of Atonement: "The judgement implied in 20.4 is the Day of the Lord, the Day of Atonement when Satan has been bound and the Lord has come with his saints to judge the living and to establish his kingdom."[61]

---

[59] Marshall, *Parables of War*, 179: "those who dwell on earth and those who dwell in heaven."

[60] Paulien, "Hebrew Cultus," 257.

[61] Barker, *Revelation*, 343.

Azazel in 1 Enoch

Perhaps the most relevant background for the themes of judgment against fallen angels as seen in Revelation 20 can be found in the pseudepigraphal book 1 *Enoch* (c. 200 BCE–100 CE). At least one citation of 1 *Enoch* in the NT appears to indicate that it was accepted in some Christian circles as authoritative in the first century CE The judgment on the fallen angels described in Jude 6–7, 14–15 (cf. 2 Pet 2:4; Gen. 6:1–4) appears to draw largely on 1 *Enoch*:

> [6]And the angels who did not keep their own position, but left their proper dwelling, he has kept in eternal chains in deepest darkness for the judgment of the great day. [7]Likewise, Sodom and Gomorrah and the surrounding cities, which, in the same manner as they, indulged in sexual immorality and pursued unnatural lust, serve as an example by undergoing a punishment of eternal fire.
>
> [14]It was also about these that Enoch, in the seventh generation from Adam, prophesied, saying, "See, the Lord is coming with ten thousand of his holy ones, [15]to execute judgment on all, and to convict everyone of all the deeds of ungodliness that they have committed in such an ungodly way, and of all the harsh things that ungodly sinners have spoken against him."

Jude 14–15 is a direct quotation from 1 *Enoch* 1:9:

> Behold, he will arrive with ten million of the holy ones in order to execute judgment upon all. He will destroy the wicked ones and censure all flesh on account of everything that they have done, that which the sinners and the wicked ones committed against him.[62]

The judgment of being cast into darkness, which symbolizes an eternal verdict of condemnation in the eschatological parable of Matt 22:1–14 appears to draw on imagery

[62] *OTP* 1:14–15. Cf. *POT* 2:189: "And behold! He cometh with ten thousand of ‹His› holy ones to execute judgement upon all, and to destroy ‹all› the ungodly: And to convict all flesh of all the works ‹of their ungodliness› which they have ungodly committed, ‹And of all the hard things which› ungodly sinners ‹have spoken› against Him."

present in 1 *Enoch* 10:4 as found in its[63] Greek text in Codex Panopolitanus (Gizeh fragment)[64]:

> Matt 22:13a: "Then the king said to the attendants, 'Bind him hand and foot, and throw him into the outer darkness…"
> τότε ὁ βασιλεὺς εἶπεν τοῖς διακόνοις· δήσαντες αὐτοῦ πόδας καὶ χεῖρας ἐκβάλετε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων
>
> 1 Enoch 10:4a: "And secondly the Lord said to Raphael: 'Bind Azaz'el hand and foot, and throw him into the darkness."
> Καὶ τῷ Ῥαφαὴλ εἶπεν Δῆσον τὸν Ἀζαὴλ ποσὶν καὶ χερσίν, καὶ βάλε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ σκότος[65]

It appears then that judgment imagery found in the imprisonment of Satan in Revelation 20 could be drawing from Jewish traditions about the role of Azazel in the rituals of the Day of Atonement as described in 1 *Enoch*.[66] Stökl Ben Ezra points out the

---

[63] Orlov suggests that several traditions underpinning Q in connection with the temptation of Jesus (Matt 4) reflect an influence of the Enochic descent traditions (cf. Orlov, *Dark Mirrors*, 107–112).

[64] Cf. Henry Barclay Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek: According to the Septuagint*, vol. 3 (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1909), xvii; *OTP*, 1:6.

[65] 1 *Enoch* 10:4 in Matthew Black, ed., *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*, PVTG 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 24. Cf. the Greek text in Syncellus: Καὶ τῷ Ῥαφαὴλ εἶπε Πορεύου, Ῥαφαήλ, καὶ δῆσον τὸν Ἀζαήλ· χερσὶ καὶ ποσὶ συμπόδισον αὐτόν, καὶ ἔμβαλε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ σκότος (ibid.). Scholars have also discerned similarities between Matt 19:28 and 25:31. See Johannes Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter: Untersuchungen zum traditionsgeschichtlichen Ort der Menschensohnsgestalt der Bilderreden des Äthiopischen Henoch*, SUNT 12 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), 56–63; cf. the discussion of this evidence by Michael A. Knibb, review of Johannes Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter: Untersuchungen zum traditionsgeschichtlichen Ort der Menschensohnsgestalt der Bilderreden des Äthiopischen Henoch*, *JSS* 21 (1976): 197–200; ibid., *Essays on the Book of Enoch and Other Early Jewish Texts and Traditions* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 151–158.

[66] For a discussion on the use of *1 Enoch* imagery in Revelation and in the NT, see Darrell D. Hannah, "The Throne of His Glory: The Divine Throne and Heavenly Mediators in Revelation and the Similitudes of Enoch," *ZNW* 94 (2003): 68–96; Willem S. Vorster, "1 Enoch and the Jewish Literary Setting of the New Testament: A Study in Text Types," *Neo* 17 (1983): 1–14; Grant Macaskill,

similarities between the punishment meted out on the goat for Azazel and the demon Azazel in 1 *Enoch*: "the punishment of the demon resembles the treatment of the goat in aspects of geography, action, time and purpose."[67] Aune points out the shared motifs between 1 *Enoch* and Rev 20:1–10:

> (1) God sends an angel (Raphael). (2) Azazel (an alias for Satan) is bound by the angel. (3) Azazel is thrown into darkness and imprisoned "forever." (4) The time of imprisonment, however, will actually end at the great day of judgment. (5) On the great day of judgment Azazel is thrown into the fire. A similar sequence is evident in *1 Enoch* 10:11–13: (1) God sends an angel (Michael). (2) The angel binds Semyaza (another alias for Satan) and his associates. (3) They are imprisoned under the earth. (4) The period of imprisonment is limited to seventy generations. (5) On the day of judgment they are thrown into the abyss of fire.[68]

In 1 *Enoch* 9:5–6, Azazel (or Asael) is portrayed as a fallen angel operating in the antediluvian world.[69] Azazel teaches "unrighteousness" and reveals "the eternal secrets which were (preserved) in heaven, which men were striving to learn." The judgment on

---

"Matthew and the Parables of Enoch," in *Parables of Enoch: A Paradigm Shift*, eds. Darrell Bock and James H. Charlesworth (London; New York, NY: Bloomsbury, 2013), 219–230; Leslie Walck, "The Parables of Enoch and the Synoptic Gospels," in *Parables of Enoch: A Paradigm Shift*, eds. Darrell Bock and James H. Charlesworth (London; New York, NY: Bloomsbury, 2013), 231–268.

[67] Stökl Ben Ezra, *The Impact*, 87.

[68] Aune, *Revelation 17–22*, 1078. Steven Thompson, "The End of Satan," *AUSS* 37/2 (1999): 259, argues that "1 Enoch does not describe the end of Satan and that the binding and destruction of the fallen watchers is a separate event from the end of Satan described in Rev 20." Even if we with Thompson that the end of Azazel in 1 *Enoch* is not eschatological but rather refers to "the problem of evil in the present world, not its elimination prior to the inauguration of the next" (260), it is highly likely that John is drawing on a Jewish tradition which links Azazel and Satan.

[69] On the fact that Asael and Azazel deal with the same entity, Deborah Dimant writes, "In my judgment such an identification (of Asa'el and Az'azel) is already assumed in the adaption of the material in chap 10, where the punishments are commanded" ("1 Enoch 6–11: A Methodological Perspective," SBLSP 17 [1978]: 327); cf. also Michael A. Knibb, *Essays on the Book of Enoch and Other Early Jewish Texts and Traditions*, SVTP 22 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 56–76.

Azazel described in 1 *Enoch* 10:4–6 is strikingly similar to the judgment on the dragon in Rev 20:1–3, 7–10:

Rev 20:1–3, 7–10	**1 *Enoch* 10:4–6**
1Then I saw an angel coming down from heaven, holding in his hand the key to the bottomless pit [ἀβύσσου] and a great chain [καὶ ἅλυσιν μεγάλην]. 2He seized the dragon, that ancient serpent, who is the Devil and Satan, and bound him [καὶ ἔδησεν αὐτὸν] for a thousand years, 3 and threw him [καὶ ἔβαλεν αὐτὸν] into the pit [ἄβυσσον], and locked and sealed [ἔκλεισεν καὶ ἐσφράγισεν] it over him, so that he would deceive the nations no more, until the thousand years were ended. After that he must be let out for a little while.	4And secondly the Lord said to Raphael: 'Bind [δῆσον] Azaz'el hand and foot and throw him [καὶ βάλε αὐτὸν] into the darkness." And he made a hole in the desert [τὴν ἔρημον], which was in Duda'el, and cast him there; 5he threw on top of him rugged and sharp rocks. And he covered his face [καὶ ἐπικάλυψον αὐτῷ] in order that he may not see light;
10And the devil who had deceived them was thrown into the lake of fire and sulfur [εἰς τὴν λίμνην τοῦ πυρὸς] where the beast and the false prophet were, and they will be tormented [βασανισθήσονται] day and night forever and ever.	6and in order that he may be sent into the fire on the great day of judgment [εἰς τὸν ἐμπυρισμὸν].[70]

A similar fate awaits Semjâzâ and his companions in 1 *Enoch* 10:11–13:

> And the Lord said unto Michael: 'Go, bind [δήλωσον] Semjâzâ and his associates who have united themselves with women so as to have defiled themselves with them in all their uncleanness. 12 And when their sons have slain one another, and they have seen the destruction of their beloved ones, bind them fast for seventy generations in the valleys of the earth, till the day of their judgement and of their consummation, till the judgement that is for ever and ever is consummated.13 In

[70] *OTP* 1:17.

> those days they shall be led off to the abyss of fire [τὸ χάος τοῦ πυρὸς]: [and] to the torment and the prison in which they shall be confined for ever.[71]

This imagery is expanded in the *Similitudes of Enoch*[72] (1 *Enoch* 54:1–6) in which the visionary sees "the kings and the mighty" being cast into a deep valley burning with fire. In this valley, similar to Revelation 20, iron chains of "immeasurable weight" are made and these will be used in the execution of judgment on the kings and mighty (cf. 1 *Enoch* 53:3–4). Unfortunately, no Greek text of 1 *Enoch* 54:4–6 exists so we read in Charlesworth's version:

---

[71] *POT* 2:194. Cf. *OTP* 1:18: "Make known to Semyaza and the others who are with him" instead of "Bind Semyaza" because of variants in some manuscripts. Both could work as the judgment is ultimately the same as Azazel's as "binding" (v. 12) indicates.

[72] The date of *The Similitudes of Enoch* or *Book of Parables* (1 *Enoch* 37–71) is a contested issue. Charles (*POT*, 2:171), contends that "the date of the Similitudes could not have been earlier than 94 B.C. or later than 64 B.C." Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 178, dates the *Similitudes* to "early of mid first century CE, prior to the Jewish revolt of 66–70 CE to which it makes no reference." This position is similar to that of James C. Vanderkam, "1 Enochic, Enochic Motifs and Enoch in Early Christian Literature," in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*, eds. James C. Vanderkam and W. Adler, CRINT 4 (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1996), 33–101. J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments from Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 89–98 gives it a third century CE date based partly on its absence in Qumran but this theory has not been widely accepted. This study takes the majority position that the *Similitudes* is a Jewish work from the first century BCE to early 1 first century CE For a discussion on this issue, see James. H. Charlesworth, "The Date and Provenience of the Parables of Enoch," in *Parables of Enoch: A Paradigm Shift*, eds. Darrell Bock and James H. Charlesworth (London; New York, NY: Bloomsbury, 2013): 37–57; Darrell L. Bock, "Dating the Parables of Enoch: A Forschungsbericht," in *Parables of Enoch: A Paradigm Shift*, eds. Darrell Bock and James H. Charlesworth (London; New York, NY: Bloomsbury, 2013): 58–113; Michael A. Knibb, "The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review," *NTS* 25/3 (1979): 345–359; David W. Suter, "Weighed in the Balance: The Similitudes of Enoch in Recent Discussion," *RSR* 7 (1981): 217–21; J. C. Greenfield and M. E. Stone, "The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes," *HTR* 70 (1977) 51–65; Ted. H. Erho, "Historical–Allusional Dating and the Similitudes of Enoch," *JBL* 130 (2011): 493–511; ibid., "The A-historical Nature of 1 *Enoch* 56:5–8 and Its Ramifications upon the *Opinio Comunnis* on the Dating of the *Similitudes of Enoch*," *JSJ* 40 (2009): 23–54; ibid., "Internal Dating Methodologies and the Problem Posed by the *Similitudes of Enoch*," *JSPS* 20 (2010): 83–103; J. C. Hindley, "Towards a Date for the Similitudes of Enoch," *NTS* 14 (1968): 551–65; G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah* (London: SCM, 2005).

> And I asked the angel of peace, who was going with me, saying, "For whom are these imprisonment chains being prepared?" And he said unto me, "These are being prepared for the armies of Azaz'el, in order that they may take them and cast them into the abyss of complete condemnation, and as the Lord of the Spirits has commanded it, they shall cover their jaws with rocky stones. Then Michael, Raphael, Gabriel, and Phanuel themselves shall seize them on that great day of judgment and cast them into the furnace (of fire) that is burning that day, so that the Lord of the Spirits may take vengeance on them on account of their oppressive deeds which (they performed) as messengers of Satan, leading astray those who dwell upon the earth.[73]

It is important to note that "Satan" in the passage above is probably not to be differentiated from Azazel and another demonic entity called "Satan." This is because "Satan" is used four times in *Similitudes* and two of them are in the plural, "Satans" (40:7; 53:3; 54:6; 65:6–7), which likely indicates that all fallen angels are "Satans." This reading may be based on the use of the word in the OT to indicate a demonic adversary (e.g., 1 Sam 29:4; 2 Sam 19:23; Num 22:32; 1 Kgs 5:18; Job 1:6; 2:2; 1 Chr 21:1; Zech 3:1). This may be compared to *2 Enoch*, which shows yet another development of the connection between Azazel and the demonic. In *2 Enoch*, the demonic roles ascribed to Semihaza and Azazel as leaders of the fallen angels are now transferred to Satanael. According to Orlov, this is an allusion to the Adamic story of Gen 3 which is also echoed in Rev 20:2 where the author connects the dragon to "that old serpent," a clear allusion to Gen 3.

The cause for Azazel's judgment is given in *1 Enoch* 13:1–2:

> As for Enoch he proceeded and said to Azaz'el, "There will not be peace unto you; a grave judgment has come upon you. They will put you in bonds, and

[73] *OTP* 1:38; cf. *POT* 2:220–221.

> you will not have (an opportunity for) rest and supplication/ because you have taught injustice and because6 you have shown to the people deeds of shame, injustice, and sin."[74]

Significantly, before the final judgment on Azazel and his angels described 1 *Enoch* 54:1–5, the author(s) inserts a war between the "kings" and the saints in 1 *Enoch* 54:6–8, repeated in 62:3–5.[75] This parenthetical description of a worldwide war with Azazel and his angels immediately before judgment day bears a striking thematic and verbal resemblance to the war described in Rev 20:7–9 in which Satan deceives the nations, "Gog and Magog, in order to gather them for battle" (v. 8) one last time against "the camp of the saints and the beloved city" (v. 9). Similarly, in 1 *Enoch* 56, Azazel's angels "shake up the kings (so that) a spirit of unrest shall come upon them"; they rise up "like lions" and "hungry hyenas" and "trample upon the land of my elect ones" (v. 5–6) and the "city of my righteous ones." The large number of "corpses" (v. 7) resulting from this war is similar to the wicked who number as the "sands of the sea" (Rev 20:8). In 1 *Enoch* 56:8, it is said that Sheol "shall open her mouth" and they will be "swallowed up into it and perish" a judgment which is echoed in the "burning furnace" in 54:6 and the "lake of fire" in Rev 20:10, 14–15. The judgment passed on the wicked kings/kings of the earth, βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς, is mentioned in several passages in Revelation: Rev 6:15[76]; 16:12, 14; 17:2,

---

[74] *OTP* 1:19.

[75] See Aune, "Palestinian Jewish Apocalyptic," 4–8.

[76] Robert H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1912), xcv–ciii, lists Rev 6:15 as one of several NT passages showing dependence on the *Book of Enoch*. Conversely, Charlesworth does not connect Revelation with the *Book of Enoch*.

9, 12, 18, 18:3, 9; 19:18, 19. These passages referring to the defeat of Satan and his armies are probably dependent on 1 *Enoch* 55:4: "Kings, potentates, dwellers upon the earth: You would have to see my Elect One, how he sits in the throne of glory and judges Azaz'el, and all his company and his army, in the name of the Lord of Spirits."

Several remarkable similarities between the judgment of the fallen angel Azazel in 1 *Enoch* and that of the dragon in Revelation 20 are apparent. First, the mention of a judgment executed by an angel of the Lord is clear in both passages. Second, the binding of Azazel is done by the use of "chains" (1 *Enoch* 54:3, 4, 56:1; 69:28; 103:8) while Satan is bound with a "great chain" (ἅλυσιν μεγάλην, Rev 20:1). Third, the binding of the dragon echoes the command for Raphael to "bind Azazel" (1 *Enoch* 10:4). Fourth, the "darkness" and "hole in the desert," "sharp rocks" and the cover of darkness in 1 *Enoch* 10:5 are echoed in the "bottomless pit" which is sealed over the dragon in Rev 20:2. The "darkness" and the "abyss" in 1 *Enoch* 54 are synonymous with the ἄβυσσος, the "bottomless pit" in Rev 20:2. Fifth, the Lord's order in 1 *Enoch* to "let him [Azazel] abide there for ever, and cover his face that he may not see light" (1 *Enoch* 10:5; cf 13:1) is echoed in the dragon's long sentence of "a thousand years" (Rev 20:2) in the abyss. Sixth, the corruption of "the whole earth…by Azaz'el's teaching" (v. 8) is echoed in the dragon's deception of the nations (Rev 20:3). Seventh, the reference to making "swords and knives, and shields, and breastplates" under the guidance of Azazel in 1 *Enoch* 8:1 echoes the dragon's gathering of the nations "for battle" in Rev 20:8 and is parallel to the description of the worldwide war on the saints and the "city of my righteous" in 1 *Enoch*

56:6 as discussed above. The valley of burning fire into which the kings and the mighty are thrown, together with Azazel (1 *Enoch* 54:1; cf. 56:8), is echoed in the "lake of fire" in Rev 20:10–15. Azazel's fiery end—"on the day of the great judgment he shall be cast into the fire" (1 *Enoch* 10:6) is the same as the dragon's end in Rev 20:10: "And the devil who had deceived them was thrown into the lake of fire and sulfur."

As occurred on the Day of Atonement, the punishment on Azazel described in 1 *Enoch* inaugurates an era when "the whole earth will be worked in righteousness" (δικαιοσύνη, 1 *Enoch* 10:17–22). This may indicate a dependence on the imagery of the cleansing of the people on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:30), a new era of righteousness which is a forerunner of the "new heaven and new earth" (Rev 21:1) following the final destruction of Satan. And, quite significantly, at the end of this judgment passage, cultic language is used in 1 *Enoch* to describe the absolute purification of creation: "And the earth shall be cleansed from all pollution, and from all sin, and from all plague, and from all suffering, and it shall not happen again that I shall send (these) upon the earth from generation to generation and forever" (10:22). The Greek text of the Gizeh fragment reads: καὶ καθαρισθήσεται πᾶσα ἡ γῆ ἀπὸ παντὸς μιάσματος καὶ ἀπὸ πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας καὶ ὀργῆς καὶ μάστιγος, καὶ οὐκέτι πέμψω ἐπ' αὐτοὺς εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος.[77] Echoes of Lev 16 can be heard in the references to "cleansing" (καθαρισθήσεται) "all defilement" (παντὸς μιάσματος) and "all impurity" (πάσης

[77] 1 *Enoch* 10:22 in Black, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*, 26.

ἀκαθαρσίας) the latter commonly translated as "all sin."[78] This is "all sin" which had been ascribed to Azazel: "And the whole earth has been corrupted through the works that were taught by Azâzêl: to him ascribe all sin [καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ γράψον τὰς ἁμαρτίας πάσας] (1 *Enoch* 10:7). The imagery of placing "all sin" on Azazel is probably an allusion to Lev 16:21: "and confess over it all the iniquities of the people of Israel" (ἐξαγορεύσει ἐπ' αὐτοῦ πάσας τὰς ἀνομίας)." The reference to the sins of demonic Azazel evokes 1 John 3:8: "Everyone who commits sin is a child of the devil; for the devil has been sinning from the beginning." In Revelation, "that ancient serpent, who is called the Devil and Satan" is called "the deceiver of the whole world" (Rev 12:9). In his judgment, he receives back the sins of the whole world. This echoes the "transfer" of culpability for sins to the dragon as occurred with the goat for Azazel. The dragon, the beast and the harlot/Babylon form an unholy partnership that pour "abominations" on the earth and they suffer the same fiery end (Rev 18:4, 5; 20:10). As Stökl Ben Ezra suggests, "the restoration of the earth by removing the sin (10:7–8) and the destruction of the evil forces in a war incited by Gabriel (10:9–10) allude to the cathartic rationale behind Yom Kippur."[79]

Cultic language is used again when a similar sentence is given to Azazel's companion, Semjâzâ: "Go, bind Semjâzâ and his associates who have united themselves

---

[78] Cf. *OTP* 1:19; *POT* 2:195.

[79] Stökl Ben Ezra, *The Impact*, 87.

with women so as to have defiled themselves with them in all their uncleanness [ἐν τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ αὐτῶν]" (1 *Enoch* 10:11). This is in stark contrast with the description of the 144,000 who have not "defiled themselves with women, for they are virgins" (Rev 14:4). The author's use of the Day of Atonement's themes of purification from "uncleanness" as a harbinger for the eschatological cleansing of creation is significant.

The sequence of the "purification" of creation from Satan's "sins" by the Lamb's blood cleansing the saints and the fire of judgment purging creation also echoes the sequence of the rituals on the Day of Atonement in which the goat for the Lord is sacrificed first (Rev 1:5; 4–5; cf. Lev 16:11, 20) followed by judgment on Azazel. Satan, as both originator and final trustee of all sin, is judged at the end of time with the penalty for all transgression (Rev 12; 20), as the goat for Azazel was dismissed last. On this point, it is significant that the locking up of the dragon in Revelation 20 comes after the depiction of the rider on a white horse, which has been almost universally understood as symbolizing the *parousia* when the returning Jesus and his angels inflict the final judgment on unrepentant humanity.[80] If Revelation 19 is based in part on the Day of Atonement's themes of purification by blood and triumph over enemies, then it follows that the rite of the goat for Azazel could be echoed in the binding and imprisonment of the dragon in Rev 20:1–3

[80] E.g, Beale, *Revelation*, 949–950; Koester, *Revelation*, 753ff; Aune, *Revelation*, 1053; Caird, *Revelation*, 240–248; Mounce, *Revelation*,

Assessment: The Day of Atonement in Revelation 20		
Allusive Type: *Allusion*	**Strength**: *Clear*	**Thematic Coherence:** *Judgment on the dragon (Satan) based on the "judgment" on Azazel as a demonic figure responsible for "all sin*

Revelation 21–22: The New Jerusalem as Priestly City

The judgment on Satan, the beast, the false prophet and all who follow them in the "lake of fire" (Rev 20:15) ushers in the vision of the "new heaven and a new earth" (Rev 21:1; cf. 1 *Enoch* 10:17–22). The marriage supper of the Lamb promised in Revelation 19 is consummated by the descent of the "holy city, the new Jerusalem coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband" (v. 2). God is present in the new Jerusalem the holy city (cf. Isa 52:1): "He will dwell with them as their God; they will be his peoples, and God himself will be with them" (21:3). God's presence in the new Jerusalem is a fulfilment of the promises of the covenant found in Lev 26:3, 11: "If you follow my statutes and keep my commandments and observe them faithfully … I will place my dwelling in your midst, and I shall not abhor you." This is especially true on the Day of Atonement when the whole nation is purged from sin and is offered a new beginning. As Stökl Ben Ezra concludes, "The annual Yom Kippur was perceived, at least by some, as annual anticipation of the eschatological purification of God's creation from sin."[81]

[81] Stökl Ben Ezra, *The Impact*, 89.

Beale suggests that the new Jerusalem is described as a type of the Most Holy Place. He writes, "The whole community of the redeemed is considered priests serving in the temple and privileged to see God's face in the new holy of holies, which now encompasses the entire temple-city."[82] These eschatological saints-priests are modelled after the high priest, since "the Lamb's" name is written on their foreheads (Rev 22:4). This echoes the "rosette" on the forehead of the high priest (Exod 28:36; 39:30).

The measuring of the new Jerusalem in Rev 21:15 is a parallel to the measuring of the temple in Revelation 11: "The city lies foursquare, its length the same as its width; and he measured the city with his rod, fifteen hundred miles; its length and width and height are equal" (Rev 21:16). Scholars have seen in this cubic shape a reference to the holy of holies of the Temple (20 cubits square in Solomon's Temple; 1 Kgs 6:20; 2 Chron 3:8; cf. Ezek 41:4). Beale considers both the Exodus and the Ezekiel passages to be the most likely background to the description of the measurements of the new Jerusalem.[83]

More significantly, the chronological information in Ezek 40:1 connects this prophecy of the new temple with the Day of Atonement: "In the twenty-fifth year of our exile, at the beginning of the year, on the tenth day of the month, in the fourteenth year after the city was struck down, on that very day, the hand of the LORD was upon me, and he brought me there." The only other passage in the OT where the year begins on the

[82] Beale, *Revelation*, 1113–14.

[83] Ibid., 1075–1076.

"tenth of the month" and coincides with the Day of Atonement is Lev 25:9–10. Further, the vision comes in "the twenty-fifth year" which as pointed out by some scholars can only be explained as the middle of a jubilee period.[84] In the new temple, "My dwelling place shall be with them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people." (Ezek 37:27)." The importance of this allusion to Ezekiel's temple prophecy should be clear: the eschatological city-temple, the new Jerusalem, ushers in a jubilee inaugurated by the Day-of-Atonement sacrifice of the Lamb which sits on the throne.

In this city-temple, writes T. Desmond Alexander, "[t]he entire New Jerusalem is an expanded Holy of Holies."[85] The implication of the echoes of the dimension of the holy of holies is that, although only the high priest entered the Most Holy Place on the Day of Atonement, the saints now enjoy the continuous presence of God inside the ultimate, heavenly Most Holy Place, the new Jerusalem. As Koester writes, "The massive size of the cubic city exhibits holiness on a cosmic scale."[86]

As the high priest on the Day of Atonement must go through a decontamination process, so must the inhabitants of the new Jerusalem. They have washed their robes "so that they will have the right to the tree of life and may enter the city by the gates" (Rev

---

[84] Cf. Bergsma, *The Jubilee*, 188–190.

[85] T. Desmond Alexander, *From Eden to the New Jerusalem* (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Academic, 2008), 20; cf. Smalley, *Revelation*, 552: "the cubic shape of Jerusalem is a clear reminder of the holy of holies, also a cube, which stood at the heart of the Temple in the old city of Jerusalem." Cf. Koester, *Revelation*, 816: "[l]ike the holy of holies, the walls of the New Jerusalem are covered in gold."

[86] Ibid.

22:14). As with God's presence in the earthly holy of holies, the holy city must be free of undesirables such as "anyone who practises abomination of falsehood" (Rev 21:17) as well as "dogs, sorcerers and fornicators and murderers and idolaters and every one who loves and practises falsehood" (Rev 22:15).

Bergsma connects the Day of Atonement with the year of jubilee in passages dealing with the eschatological restoration of creation such as Isa 40–48 and 61. Not surprisingly, these same themes are echoed in Revelation 21–22: (1) cultic purity (Isa 44:1–31; Rev 21:7, 27); (2) renewed presence of God (Isa 43:1–9; Rev 21:3–4; 22:5); (3) restoration to ancestral land (47:13–48:35; cf. the "new earth" Rev 21:1) and; (4) social equity (45:9–12; 46:18; 47:21–23).[87] Moreover, suggests Bergsma, the prophecy of a future messiah in Dan 9:24, who would rise to "put an end to sin, and to atone for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness," coincides the end of ten jubilees with the dawn of a final Day of Atonement by combining the number 7 (7 x 70) with the number 10 (490 = 10 jubilees), thus forming a "period of quintessential completeness."[88]

John sees "no temple in the city, for its temple is the Lord God the Almighty and the Lamb" (Rev 21:22). The new Jerusalem does not have a temple because the city itself is the new holy of holies: the abode of God and the Lamb replaces the need for and

[87] Cf. Bergsma, *The Jubilee*, 190.

[88] Ibid., 227: "It may be significant that the Day of Atonement, on which the jubilee was proclaimed, fell on the *tenth* day of the *seventh* month. At the end of the period of ten jubilees, then, all will be complete: sin will be finished, iniquity atoned for, and "eternal righteousness" ushered in (Dan 9:24)."

function of a temple. What we see in Rev 21:22 is an affirmation of the Lord's presence amidst Israel, which echoes what occurred both on the yearly Day of Atonement as well as on the inauguration of the temple of Solomon, which occurred on the same day that year (1 Kgs 8:6–11). By removing the temple from the new Jerusalem, Rev 21:22 fulfills the words of Solomon: "But will God indeed dwell on the earth? Even heaven and the highest heaven cannot contain you, much less this house that I have built!" "[G]lory and holiness are on earth in the new Jerusalem, where there need be no longer any Temple," writes Rowland.[89]

Assessment: The Day of Atonement in Revelation 21		
Allusive Type: *Echo*	**Strength**: *Loud*	**Thematic Coherence:** *The new Jerusalem as a heavenly Most Holy Place; universal cultic purity; continued presence of God with the saints*

Revelation 20 and 22: Day of Atonement Retribution

In Revelation, the retributive aspects of the Day of Atonement are set in the context of the punishment of the dragon and its followers (Rev 20:12). All those who are not covered by the atoning blood of Christ but rather have the mark and the name of the beast are the target of divine judgment.

[89] Christopher Rowland, "The Temple in the New Testament," in *Temple Worship in Biblical Israel*, ed. John Day (London, New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2007), 478.

Furthermore, the concept of ritual purgation inherent in the rituals of the Day of Atonement may be present in Rev 22:11, 14: "Let the evildoer still do evil [ὁ ἀδικῶν ἀδικησάτω], and the filthy [ῥυπαρός] still be filthy, and the righteous still do right, and the holy still be holy … Blessed are those who wash their robes, so that they will have the right to the tree of life and may enter the city by the gates." The warning resembles the warning given by Isaiah to Israel to "turn and be healed" (Isa 6:9–10; cf. Ezek 2:2–7; 3:27: "let those who will hear, hear; and let those who refuse to hear, refuse"). It is given in the context of the "unsealing" of Revelation's visions (v. 10) which implies that not all is fulfilled and that a probation period may be in view.

Beale and other scholars see here an allusion to Dan 12:10: "Many shall be purified, cleansed, and refined, but the wicked shall continue to act wickedly. None of the wicked shall understand, but those who are wise shall understand." However, the passage in Daniel only provides a partial, thematic link with Revelation while lacking lexical correspondences.[90] Thus a better OT source for the couplet "filthy-washed" must be sought. This may be found in the word "filthy" (ῥυπαρός) in Rev 22:11; while it is a *hapax legomenon* in the NT it occurs in the LXX of Zech 3:3, 4 where the high-priest Joshua's "filthy clothes" are ἱμάτια ῥυπαρὰ (it does not occur in Dan 12). In the vision, Joshua's ἱμάτια ῥυπαρὰ are replaced with a מַחֲלָצוֹת translated as ποδήρη in the LXX which, as noted earlier, is reserved for the high-priestly attire in the LXX and in Rev 1:13

[90] Beale, *Revelation*, 1132; Koester, *Revelation*, 840; Aune, *Revelation 17–22*, 1117.

refers to Jesus' robe for the Day of Atonement. The use of מַחֲלָצוֹת in Zech 3 probably indicates a white linen robe; together with the high-priestly "clean turban" it could indicate the high priest's righteousness enabling him to officiate on behalf of the people on the Day of Atonement. The context of Satan's accusations of unrighteousness against Joshua in the vision certainly fits the imagery. Joshua's status as ῥυπαρός stands for cultic uncleanness or "guilt" (v. 4) while the ποδήρη symbolizes his "righteousness" as a high priest (vv. 4–7; cf. the use of this imagery in Job 29:14). This connection is apparent in that ῥυπαρός is a gloss of ὁ ἀδικῶν, lit. "the unrighteous" in Rev 22:11. This OT background could indicate that John has cultic uncleanness in mind when he refers to the wicked's ῥυπαρός in Rev 22:13, especially since the reference here probably involves clothing. It is so used in Zech 3:3, 4. Cultic uncleanness is also suggested in John's contrast of ῥυπαρός with the washed robes of the saints (22:14) as is also done in reference to the high priest Joshua. The connection with the Day of Atonement in this passage lies in the fact that the robes of the saints are washed with the blood of the Lamb slain on the Day of Atonement, while unrepentant sinners are barred from the benefits of this blood.

The ultimate goal of the Day of Atonement is to purify the people from "all sin" so they may stand before God and God can stay in their midst. While the cleansing of the sanctuary removes impurities from the sanctuary and from the people, unrepentant sinners are condemned to bear their guilt (Num 15:30–31). The purgation on the Day of Atonement has no effect for them, their relationship with the community of God is

severed and they are cut off. Thus Rev 22:11 echoes the implacable judgment achieved on the Day of Atonement: there is no midway, Israelites are judged as either clean or unclean. According to Paul such retribution/reckoning does not include the saints: theirs is a reckoning of reconciliation accomplished through Christ's Day-of-Atonement sacrifice (2 Cor 5:19; Col 1:22; 2:13; Rom 5:8–10; Heb 6:19–20; 9:12, 24).[91] This may also echo the separation of the goat for the Lord from the goat for Azazel by means of lots. The retributive character of the Day of Atonement in Rev 22:11 is also apparent in Rev 20:12: "See, I am coming soon; my reward is with me, to repay according to everyone's work." This punitive background can be seen in the fact that the stipulations for the day's rituals were framed by the sudden death of Nadab and Abihu when they attempted to enter the Most Holy Place drunken and with "strange fire" (Lev 16:1). The notion that Yahweh is attentively looking for compliance at the risk of inevitable (and at times sudden) retribution must have been seared into the Jewish mind.

By descending from heaven into the new Earth, the new Jerusalem, the high-priestly city consummates the holiness ideals of the Day of Atonement in that "nothing unclean will enter it, nor anyone who practises abomination or falsehood, but only those who are written in the Lamb's book of life" (Rev 21:27). The scale of such purity was only attained on the Day of Atonement when the whole nation of Israel was purged of impurities and made "clean" to stand before the Lord (Lev 16:30); this in turn invited

[91] Cf. Buchanan, "Paul's Doctrine of Redemption," 244–245.

Yahweh's presence in their midst (Lev 26:11). The cleanness achieved on the yearly Day of Atonement is a foretaste of the holy society envisioned by the OT prophets Isaiah and Ezekiel (cf. Isa 35:8 and 52:1; Ezek 44:9; cf. also Zech 3:7).

Revelation ends with an echo of the name on the forehead of the high priest: "they will see his face, and his name will be on their foreheads" (Rev 22:4). The saved now walk as high priests with Christ the high priest in the new Jerusalem, dressed as he in white linen (Rev 3:4). The same characteristics that separated the high priest from the regular priests and people now characterize the saved: they are Holy to the Lord.[92] Rev 22:15 lists those who are excluded from the new Jerusalem: "Outside are the dogs and sorcerers [φάρμακοι] and fornicators and murderers and idolaters, and everyone who loves and practises falsehood." The standard lexicon definition of φάρμακοι is "sorcerer."[93] It is significant, however, that John places outside the city the φάρμακοι, a term connected with elimination rites that sent the φάρμακοι to a place outside of ancient Greek cities. Mark Bredin[94] contends that Jesus' death as a φάρμακος is re-worked by John as a critique of violence and revenge in society, a reading that is based on the Greek elimination rites that blamed an individual for society's woes. Although

---

[92] Massingbaerde Ford, *Revelation*, 367: "They bear the name of Yahweh and stand in His presence, a privilege denied to all save the high priest on the Day of Atonement."

[93] Cf. BDAG, s.v., "φάρμακος."

[94] Mark R. Bredin, "Hate Never Dispelled Hate: No Place for the *Pharmakos* (Revelation 22:15)," *BTB* 34/3 (2004): 105–113.

this is an intriguing rendering of φάρμακοι in the passage, its use elsewhere in Revelation as "sorcery" (cf. 9:21; 18:23; 21:8) probably precludes a different meaning here. Nevertheless, the double meaning of φάρμακος as both "sorcerer" and "scapegoat" would be hard for first-century Greek readers of the book of Revelation to miss. Further, according to Roberts, the connection of φάρμακος with "sorcery" is a later semantic change from its original connotation of cleansing, purifying and healing attached to the φάρμακος elimination rite.[95] Thus it remains plausible that a secondary meaning for φάρμακοι in Rev 22:15 could pertain to an expulsion in terms of an eschatological elimination rite which excludes from the new Jerusalem all those who followed the harlot, Babylon and the dragon, the "φάρμακοι μεγάλοι" who "deceived the nations" and were banished to the lake of fire. Under this reading, the reference to the φάρμακοι in Rev 22:15 could also be an echo of the goat-for-Azazel rite on which John built the destruction of the harlot, the dragon and the false prophet and their followers in Revelation 17–20.

After the final Day of Atonement cleansing is performed on the created order at the appearance of the "new heaven and a new earth" (Rev 21:1), the saved will inhabit the new Jerusalem, the heavenly Most Holy Place and high-priestly city where "no

---

[95] Cf. Roberts, "Pharmakos," 221. Roberts adduces geographical evidence for the ancient meaning of "expulsion" for φάρμακος by mentioning Islands in the Mediterranean Sea used for banishing undesirables named Pharmacussae and Pharmacusa. It is very possible that John himself was a φάρμακος banished to the Island of Patmos.

unclean thing will enter" (Rev 21:27). Only those who have "washed their robes" (Rev 22:14) in the Day-of-Atonement blood of Christ will live therein and worship and "reign for ever and ever" ministering as high priests before the "throne of God and of the Lamb" (Rev 22:3, 5).

Assessment: The Day of Atonement in Revelation 22		
Allusive Type: *Echo*	**Strength**: *Loud*	**Thematic Coherence:** *Character loyalty expected from those who will abide in the new Jerusalem; eschatological elimination rite of "all sin" and sinners*

Summary and Conclusion

As the yearly culmination of the tabernacle service, the Day of Atonement was an important day of personal penitence, confession, fasting and praying for Jews and of covenant renewal for the nation of Israel. The day's ethos was so deeply ingrained in the life of Jews that its overtones continued to reverberate in the life of Israel and became a predominant theme of the Jewish life, whose heroes and villains continued to play roles in the Second Temple literature and the New Testament.

The intersection between the Levitical Day of Atonement and the book of Revelation occurs mostly in the form allusions (Rev 8; 11) and echoes language, imagery as well as Jewish traditions of the Day of Atonement ritual (while no actual OT quotations occur). Throughout most of Revelation, particular focus is given to the theme of the separation of holiness from uncleanness which suffused the Day of Atonement

and became an important typological lens through which John saw the eschatological separation of God's people from wicked humanity. The judgment on the "dragon" and his minions is framed by the rite of the goat for Azazel and its enduring typology of the eschatological eradication of sin and retribution for its guilt (Revelation 20).

More importantly, perhaps, are the implications of our study for the "high priestly Christology" undergirding the book of Revelation. When discussing Jesus as high priest in the NT, Richard N. Longenecker argues that "[a]ll of the elements brought together in such a conception—messianic priesthood, the association of Melchizedek with the Messianic Age, redemptive sacrifice, and heavenly intercession"[96] are present in the NT. Not surprisingly, these elements can be found in Revelation as well. Longenecker continues:

> Knowing the character of his person and experiencing reconciliation with God through his sacrifice, believers within at least certain sectors of the early church seem to have found the categories of high priest and priestly ministry to be appropriate to some extent of Jesus as well."[97]

As explored here, as a Christian steeped in the life of Israel and the typology of the Hebrew cultus, John sought continuity between the symbolism of the rituals of the sanctuary and their culmination in Jesus Christ. The seven churches of Asia are part of a "priesthood" and Jesus is the high priest mediating for the churches garbed in Day of Atonement clothing (Rev 1). Jesus is a high priest who offers "his blood" as a redeeming

---

[96] Richard N. Longenecker, "The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity," SBT 17 (Naperville, UK: Alec R. Allenson Inc., 1970), 116.

[97] Ibid.

sacrifice "from our sins" (Rev 1:5), a "sin offering." The Day of Atonement blood of Jesus, the slaughtered Lamb—a composite of all sanctuary blood offerings—presented inside the heavenly Most Holy Place, the throne room, cleanses the robes of the saints who are able to stand "clean before the Lord" (Revelation 7; cf. Lev 16:30) as the Israelites of old did on the Day of Atonement. Jesus, our high priest is the rider of the white horse dressed in white robes sprinkled his own, "sin offering" sacrificial blood. He is the high priest of the new Jerusalem, whose dimensions parallel those of the the Most Holy Place. It descends from heaven and overwhelms the old earthly order, completing the picture of a universe free from impurity and sin where "his servants will worship" Christ (Rev 22:3) before the heavenly "mercy seat" forever.

CONCLUSION

In this study the reception of the themes, language and imagery of the Day of Atonement in the book of Revelation has been examined. The following is a summary of the most salient findings of this investigation.

Summary of the Research

In the introduction the book's relationship to the biblical canon, more specifically the Old Testament, was explored. We also discussed the challenge of establishing John's authorial intention and how to interpret book. By means of a review of the literature, the most appropriate hermeneutical method to be adopted in order to establish thematic or philological relationships between Revelation and the Old Testament was sought. Some of the previous research on the intersection between the book of Revelation and the Day of Atonement was reviewed.

Foremost among the hermeneutical tenets proposed here is the notion that the book of Revelation seeks continuity with the Old Testament, even as its author at times seeks discontinuity with it by presenting new readings of major Old Testament events, rituals and typology. While Revelation is firmly anchored in the world and ideas of the

Old Testament, it seeks to take its readers into new interpretative horizons in light of "the Christ event" and the impending judgment day.

With this in mind, I proposed a hermeneutical method for investigating the book of Revelation that stands in the confluence of three streams: (1) Old Testament theology, typology, language and imagery; (2) the impact of "the Christ event" in *Heilsgeschichte* as related to messianic Old Testament prophecies and typology, especially in connection with the tabernacle service; (3) the spiritual *Sitz im Leben* of the seven churches of Asia. These three basic presuppositions provided a hermeneutical basis for this thesis.

In chapter 2 the Day of Atonement stipulations found in Lev 16; 23:26–32 and Num 29:7–11 were analysed, resulting in the development of a clear picture of what the ancient Day of Atonement entailed: (1) the role of the high priest, including his preparation, clothing, actions and spirit on the Day of Atonement; (2) the precise function of the blood rituals when applied to the tabernacle (e.g., purification vs. sin offering); (3) the ritual of the goat for Azazel, its meaning and function; (4) the people's responsibilities on the Day of Atonement, i.e., confession and self-affliction (fasting) and cessation from work (e.g., Sabbath); (5) the absolute purification of confessing, non-defiant members of the community (Lev 16:16, 30); (6) the fate of intentional, defiant sinners not covered by the Day's rituals. Anyone who did not participate in the Day's self-affliction and self-denial would die (Lev 16:29).

In Chapter 2 I also investigated how the Day of Atonement continued to be reworked and reshaped in the Jewish writings as found in Jewish literature, more

specifically rabbinical literature (the *Mishnah* and the *Talmud)* and pseudepigraphal writings such as 1 *Enoch*, the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, the *Book of Jubilees*, 11Q*Melchizedek* and the *Book of Giants*. In this analysis I explored in particular the recurring midrash of the ritual of the "goat for Azazel," especially in the book of Enoch. The ritual's eschatological overtones continued to reverberate throughout intertestamental Jewish literature, especially the view that the fate of the goat for Azazel was a type for the eschatological judgment to be meted out on הַשָּׂטָן, the Old Testament adversary of God's people and deceiver of humanity. By connecting Azazel with הַשָּׂטָן, Jewish writers understood Azazel to be a demonic entity responsible for humanity's woes and the ancient Day of Atonement ritual of banishing the goat for Azazel to be a symbol of the eschatological purification of the earth from transgression caused by his actions. This theme is later picked up by John in connection with the judgment on the harlot, the beast and the dragon. In a brief *excursus* I explored several alternative views on the identity of Azazel and discussed why they are not compelling.

In chapter 3 I explored the presence of Day of Atonement language and imagery in the New Testament. This provided a better understanding of the early Christian writers' use of Day of Atonement in their reflections of "the Christ event." In Hebrews, an overarching theme emerges: the sprinkling and daubing of atoning blood on the Day of Atonement typified the shedding of Jesus' blood on the cross and his subsequent entrance, "with his blood" (Heb 9:11) and its sprinkling and daubing in the heavenly sanctuary, especially in the Most Holy Place (Heb 6:19–20; 9:11–12; 24, 25). As in the

tabernacle in the desert, this figurative heavenly ritual signifies the confirmation of Jesus' high priestly ministry and his enthronement at the right hand of Father (Heb 8:1–2).

Chapter 4 contains the culmination of this investigation: an exploration of the themes, language and imagery of the Day of Atonement in book of Revelation. In Chapter 4 it is clearly demonstrated that throughout the book of Revelation, John continues to appeal to the themes associated with the Day of Atonement when describing his visions. Important among these themes are: (1) Jesus' introduction as a high priest ministering inside the heavenly sanctuary, dressed in attire appropriate for the high priest on the Day of Atonement (Rev 1:13); (2) the clarion call to holiness and removal of uncleanness given in the letters to the seven churches (Revelation 2–3); (3) the imagery of the blood of the slaughtered Lamb (Revelation 5) offered inside the heavenly throne-room, the heavenly Most Holy Place, a theme which is used repeatedly throughout the book to point to the connection between Jesus' blood and the sacrifice of the Day of Atonement; (4) the recurring themes of judgment attached to the Day of Atonement introduced in the atmospheric disturbances originating from the heavenly Most Holy Place (Rev 4:5) and repeated in subsequent scenes of judgment in the seven trumpets, seals and bowls (Rev 8; 11; 16); (5) the cleansing of the robes of the saved in the Day of Atonement blood of the Lamb (Rev 7; 14), which points to the theme of holiness; (6) the centrality of confession, penitence and intercession in the repeated use of incense and the altar of incense imagery in Revelation, which points to the purification of the altar of incense on the Day of Atonement (Revelation 8 and 9); (7) the judgment

of the beast, the harlot/Babylon and the dragon which echoes the ritual of the goat for Azazel ritual, especially in light of ancient Greek elimination rites, and evokes Day of Atonement cultic language and imagery (Revelation 17–20); and (8) the descent of the high-priestly new Jerusalem, which evokes the Most Holy Place, both in its dimensions and in the fact that those who live in it have been "cleansed" from "all their sin" (cf. Lev 16:16, 30) through the blood of the slaughtered Lamb (Revelation 21–22), but more importantly because Yahweh dwells in it (Rev 22:3).

As a result of this study, an intriguing pattern in the book of Revelation has been revealed: as the Levitical system of purification offerings culminate in the Day of Atonement on which the whole nation is purged from sin and cleansed and stands "before the Lord" without sin (Lev 16:30), so the dawn of the eschatological kingdom of God is framed by the separation of the impure from the holy (Rev 21:27; 22:11, 15). As the observance of the Day of Atonement confirmed Israel's status as the people of Yahweh, the church's relationship with Yahweh in light of "the Christ event" continues to function on the basis of separation of holiness from uncleanness and prospect of future judgment.

As Milgrom perceptively observed, "Holiness never sanctifies impurity. Only the reverse occurs—impurity defiles holiness."[98] The eschatological purification from sin and vindication in judgment may only be achieved by washing one's robe in the Lamb's

---

[98] Milgrom, "Day of Atonement," 162–163.

Day-of-Atonement blood (Rev 7:14; 22:14). The blood of Christ frees his people from sin and makes them into a holy kingdom, a high priesthood (Rev 1:5–6; Rev 3:4). All who confess and repent may have the Day of Atonement blood of the Lamb and heavenly incense offered on their behalf (Rev 5:8; 8:3; 9:13), while unrepentant, defiant humanity suffers the punishment contained in the seven-fold trumpets and plagues (Revelation 8–11; 16; Lev 26:21). The final act in this eschatological "cleansing" culminates with the destruction of the dragon and his minions (the beast, Babylon, the false prophet) in the lake of fire (Rev 20:10). This final cleansing is framed by the ritual of the goat for Azazel, which Jews understand as a symbol of Satan, who is ultimately responsible for humanity's sin. The separation of the goat for the Lord from the goat for Azazel is also echoed in the ominous eschatological warning, "Let the evildoer still do evil, and the filthy still be filthy, and the righteous still do right, and the holy still be holy" (Rev 22:11).

Implications of the Research

The findings of this study have important implications for potential future studies on the book of Revelation:

(1) It is important to pay careful attention to the OT as a source of theological themes utilized by John in Revelation and it is necessary to establish this directionality through a sound philological approach. A well-balanced, responsible exegesis of the book of Revelation must include extensive probing of OT language and themes and their possible use, first in the NT as a whole, and more specifically in the book of Revelation.

(2) In this study, the application of a coherent inner-biblical hermeneutical method has established the importance of the Day of Atonement in the book of Revelation, a neglected area of study in scholarship. As one of the tabernacle service's most important feasts, it is surprising that little attention has been paid to references to the Day of Atonement in the book of Revelation. Thus, by demonstrating the presence of language and imagery of the Day of Atonement in the book of Revelation this study fills an important lacuna while inviting new research in areas seemingly exhausted by previous research on Revelation.

(3) The advantages of applying a careful hermeneutical method to the book of Revelation in order to avoid wild apocalyptic interpretations are reaffirmed. This approach may be employeded in future studies and will be rewarding to serious exegetes engaged in the interpretation of the book of Revelation. Extreme readings, which are often the cause of confusion and unrealistic eschatological expectations, may be avoided and therefore the approach used here has important ecclesiological implications.

Suggestions for Future Study

In this study the focus has been on the main aspects of specific passages in the book of Revelation which held material relevant to the task at hand. Thus, an exhaustive, "commentary" style of approach has been avoided. Because the book of Revelation appeals to much stock imagery, a strict focus on the Day of Atonement language and imagery is necessary to avoid delving into tangential elements in the respective passages.

The seminal conclusions presented here will undoubtedly make a lasting contribution for future studies on the book of Revelation. Nevertheless, it is altogether possible that additional echoes of the Day of Atonement may be discerned in the book of Revelation. This will continue to require careful study of the original languages in related passages in order to establish philological and thematic commonality between passages in the Old Testament and the book of Revelation that describe or allude to the Day of Atonement.

A possible future subject of research could be to examine the influence of the Day of Atonement on the structure of the book of Revelation, particularly in relation to the progression on the Day of Atonement from present purification from sin in the life of the church (Rev 2–3) to sin's final, eschatological eradication.

Conclusion

The hermeneutical approach used in this thesis has clearly demonstrated that the Day of Atonement is part of the stock of Old Testament imagery, language and themes utilized by John in the book of Revelation. It has also provided clarity on the question of why the Day of Atonement's themes of confession, penitence, cleansing, holiness and judgment provided an attractive source for Revelation's dramatic, eschatological imagery. This thematic intersection is framed by the Pentateuchal themes of the separation of holiness from uncleanness and judgment for sin that suffuse the tabernacle service, culminating in the annual rituals of the Day of Atonement which removed "all their sin" from the community of Israel. This became one of the important typological

lenses through which John the Revelator sees God's actions in history as he zooms in on the first advent of Christ and out into his second advent. As a microcosm of God's eschatological plan for the redemption of mankind, the Day of Atonement stands as a type of the eschatological judgment day when sin is to be eradicated from the tabernacle/temple, the people of Israel are "cleansed" (Lev 16:30), the culpability for sin is laid on the goat for Azazel and carried away from the camp, and Yahweh's covenant with Israel is renewed.

Likewise, after the final cleansing of the cosmic Day of Atonement is performed and the dragon is destroyed, the present created order is subverted by the appearance of the "new heaven and a new earth" (Rev 21:1). Finally, the descent of the new Jerusalem (Revelation 21)—the cubic dinensions of which parallel the earthly Most Holy Place—overwhelms the old created order and inaugurates a new earth free from sin where, like the high priest on the Day of Atonement, "his servants will worship him" (Rev 22:3) before the heavenly "mercy seat" dressed in white and shall "reign for ever and ever" (Rev 22:3, 5).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aartun, Kjell. "Studien zum Gesetz über den grossen Versöhnungstag Lv 16 mit Varianten: ein ritualgeschichtlicher Beitrag." *Studia Theologica* 34 (1980): 73–109.

Ahituv, Shmuel. "Azazel." *Encyclopaedia Judaica*. Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, 1972. 3:999–1002.

Albl, Martin. *Essential Guide to Biblical Life and Times*. Winona, MN: Saint Mary's Press, 2009.

Alexander, T. Desmond. *From Eden to the New Jerusalem*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Academic, 2008.

Anderson, Gary A. "Sacrifice and Sacrificial Offerings: Old Testament." In *The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman, 870–886. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1992.

Arasola, Kai. *The End of Historicism. Millerite Hermeneutic of Time Prophecies in the Old Testament*. Sigtuna: Datem Publishing, 1990.

Archer Jr., Gleason. *A Survey of the Old Testament: Introduction*. Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1964.

_____. "The Chronology of the Old Testament." *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Edited by Frank E. Gaebelein. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1979. 1:359–374.

Arndt, William, Frederick W. Danker, and Walter Bauer. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Attridge, Harold W. "Study of the New Testament in the Pluralistic Context of the Twenty-First Century." In *Foster Biblical Scholarship: Essays in Honor of Kent*

Harold Richards, edited by Frank Ritchel Ames and Charles William Miller, 53–64. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.

Aune, David E. "The Apocalypse of John and Palestinian Jewish Apocalyptic." *Neotestamentica* 40 (2006): 1–33.

_____. "The Apocalypse of John and the Problem of Genre." *Semeia* 36 (1986): 65–96.

_____. *Revelation 1–5*. Word Biblical Commentary 52a. Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1997.

_____. *Revelation 6–16*. Word Biblical Commentary 52b. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1998.

_____. *Revelation 17–22*. Word Biblical Commentaries 52c. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1998.

Babota, Vasile. *The Institution of the Hasmonean High Priesthood*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Bakthin, Mikhail M. "Discourse in the Novel." In *The Novel: An Anthology of Criticism and Theory 1900-2000*, edited by Dorothy J. Hall, 481-510. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.

Backhaus, Knut. *Der Hebräerbrief: Übersetzung und Erklärung*. Regensburg: Pustet, 2009.

Baigent, John W. "Jesus as Priest: An Examination of the Claim that the Concept of Jesus as Priest may be Found in The New Testament Outside the Epistle to the Hebrews." *Vox Evangelica* 12 (1981): 34–44.

Bailey, Daniel. "Jesus as the Mercy Seat: The Semantics and Theology of Paul's Use of Hilasterion in Romans 3:25." *Tyndale Bulletin* 51/1 (2000): 155–158.

Bandy, Alan S. "The Layers of the Apocalypse: An Integrative Approach to Revelation's Macrostructure." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 31 (2009): 469–499.

_____. *The Prophetic Lawsuit in the Book of Revelation*. New Testament Monographs 29. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2010.

Barker, Margaret. *Great High Priest: The Temple Roots of Christian Liturgy*. London; New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2003.

_____. *The Revelation of Jesus Christ: Which God Gave to Him to Show to His Servants What Must Soon Take Place (Revelation 1.1)*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000.

Barr, David L. "Beyond Genre: The Expectations of the Apocalypse." In *The Reality of the Apocalypse: Rhetoric and Politics in the Book of Revelation*, edited by David L. Barr, 71–90. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.

_____. "The Apocalypse as a Symbolic Transformation of the World: A Literary Analysis." *Interpretation* 38 (1984): 39–50.

_____. "The Story John Told." In *Reading the Book of Revelation: A Resource for Students*, edited by David L. Barr, 11–24. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

_____. "Waiting for the End that Never Comes: The Narrative Logic of John's Story." In *Studies in the Book of Revelation*, edited by Steve Moyise, 101–112. Edindurgh: T&T Clark, 2001.

Bauckham, Richard. *2 Peter, Jude*. Word Biblical Commentary 50. Dallas, TX: Word Incorporated, 1998.

_____. *The Climax of Prophecy: Studies on the Book of Revelation*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.

_____. *The Theology of the Book of Revelation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Bauer, H. "Die Gottheiten von Ras Schamra." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 51 (1933): 94–96.

Bautch, Richard. "The Formulary of Atonement (Lev 16:21) in Penitential Prayers of the Second Temple Period." In *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretations in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*, edited by Thomas Hieke and Tobias Nicklas, 33–45. Themes in Biblical Narrative 15. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Beale, Gregory K. "A Response to Jon Paulien on the Use of the Old Testament in Revelation." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 39 (2002): 23–34.

_____. *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2012.

_____. *John's Use of the Old Testament in Revelation*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 166. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

_____. "Questions of Authorial Intent, Epistemology and Presuppositions and Their Bearing on the Study of the Old Testament in the New: A Rejoinder to Steve Moyise." *Irish Biblical Studies* 21 (1999): 151–180.

_____ ed., *Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts: Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1994.

_____. "Revelation." In *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scritpure. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindas*, edited by D. A. Carson and H. G. Williamson, 318–336. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

_____. "Solecisms in the Apocalypse as Signals for the Presence of Old Testament Allusions: A Selective Analysis of Revelation 1–22." In *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel*, edited by Craig A. Evans and J. A. Sanders, 42–146. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 148. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

_____. *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999.

_____. "The Descent of the Eschatological Temple. Part 1: The Clearest Evidence." *Tyndale Bulletin* 56.1 (2005): 73–102.

_____. *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1984.

Bebis, George S. "Influence of Jewish Worship on Orthodox Christian Worship." *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 22 (1977): 136–42.

Bechmann, U. "Duft im Alten Testament." In *Die Macht der Nase*, edited by Joachim Kügler, 49–98. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 187. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2000.

Beetham, Christopher A. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians*. Biblical Interpretation Series 96. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Begg, Christopher T. "Yom Kippur in Josephus." In *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretations in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*, edited by Thomas Hieke and Tobias Nicklas, 97–120. Themes in Biblical Narrative 15. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Bell, Albert A. "Date of John's Apocalypse: The Evidence of Some Roman Historians Reconsidered." *New Testament Studies* 25/1 (1978): 93–102.

Bergsma, John S. *The Jubilee from Leviticus to Qumran: A History of Interpretation*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 115. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Bernardakis, Gregorius N., ed. Vol. 4 of *Plutarchus Moralia*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1892.

Black, Matthew, ed. *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*. Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece 3. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

Blair, Judit M. *De-Demonising the Old Testament: An Investigation of Azazel, Lilith, Deber, Qeteb and Reshef in the Hebrew Bible*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.

Blount, Brian K. *Revelation: A Commentary*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009.

Böcher, Otto. "Das Verhältnis der Apokalypse des Johannes zum Evangelium des Johannes." In *L'Apocalypse Johannique et l'Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament*, edited by J. Lambrecht, 289–301. Duculot, BE: Leuven University Press, 1980.

_____. "Die Johannes-Apokalypse in der neueren Forschung." In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. Edited by Wolfgang Haase. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1988. II.25.5: 3850–93.

Bock, Darrell L. "Dating the Parables of Enoch: A Forschungsbericht." In *Parables of Enoch: A Paradigm Shift*, edited by Darrell Bock and James H. Charlesworth, 58–113. London; New York, NY: Bloomsbury, 2013.

Boda, Mark J. A *Severe Mercy: Sin and Its Remedies in the Old Testament*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009.

Boring, M. Eugene. *Revelation: Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching*. Lousville, KY: John Knox Press, 1989.

Boyce, Richard. *Leviticus and Numbers*. Louisville; London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008.

Bremmer, Jan N. "Scapegoat Rituals in Ancient Greece." In *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion*, edited by Richard Buxton, 271–293. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Briggs, Robert A. *Jewish Temple Imagery in the Book of Revelation*. New York, NY: Peter Lang, 1999.

Brodie, Frederick. *The Revelation Viewed by the Light of the Old Testament Scriptures and Thus Criticizing Many of the Commonly Received Opinions Regarding the Meaning of its Prophecies*. London: Partridge & Co, 1880.

Brown, Francis, Samuel Rolles Driver, and Charles Augustus Briggs. *Enhanced Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*, electronic edition. Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research Systems, 2000.

Brown, Raymond E. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1997.

Brownlee, W. H. "The Priestly Character of the Church in the Apocalypse." *New Testament Studies* 5 (1959): 224–225

Bruce, F. F. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990.

Brueggemann, Walter. *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1997.

Buchanan, George W. "The Day of Atonement and Paul's Doctrine of Redemption." *Novum Testamentum* 23 (1990): 236–249.

_____. "Worship, Feasts and Ceremonies in the Early Jewish-Christian Church." *New Testament Studies* 26 (1980): 279–297.

Burkert, Walter. *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual.* Sather Classical Lectures 47. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1979.

Caldwell, William. "The Doctrine of Satan: I. In the Old Testament." *The Biblical World* 41/1 (1913): 29–33.

Campbell, W. Gordon. "Findings, Seals, Trumpets, and Bowls: Variations Upon the Theme of Covenant Rupture and Restoration in the Book of Revelation." *Westminster Theological Journal* 66/1 (Spring 2004): 71–96.

_____. *Reading Revelation: A Thematic Approach.* Cambridge, UK: James Clark and Co., 2012.

Carmichael, Calum M. "The Origin of the Scapegoat Ritual." *Vetus Testamentum* 50 (2000): 167–182.

Carrington, P. *The Meaning of Revelation*. London; New York; Toronto: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; Macmillan, 1931.

_____. *The Primitive Christian Calendar.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1952.

Caird, George B. *New Testament Theology*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.

_____. *The Revelation of Saint John.* Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1966.

Cazelles, Henri. "La question du 'lamed auctoris'." *Revue Biblique* 56 (1949): 93–101.

Charles, R. H. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary of the Revelation of St. John.* 2 vols. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1920.

_____. ed., *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament.* 2 vols. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2004.

_____. *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1912.

Charlesworth, James. H. "The Date and Provenience of the Parables of Enoch." In *Parables of Enoch: A Paradigm Shift*, edited by Darrell Bock and James H. Charlesworth, 37–57. London; New York, NY: Bloomsbury, 2013.

Chesterton, G. K. *Orthodoxy*. New York, NY: John Lane Co., 1908.

Cheyne, T. K. "The Date and Origin of the Ritual of the "Scapegoat." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 15/1 (1895): 153–156.

Clarke, E. G. et al. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of the Pentateuch: Text and Concordance*. Hoboken, N.J., 1984.

Cohn, Naftali S., *The Memory of the Temple and the Making of the Rabbis*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, Inc., 2013.

Collins, John J. "Eschatological Dynamics and Utopian Ideals in Early Judaism." In *Imagining the End: Visions of Apocalypse from the Ancient Middle East to Modern America*, edited by Abbas Amanat and Magnus T. Bernardson, 69–89. London; New York, NY: I. B. Taurus Publishers, 2002.

_____. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. The Biblical Resource Series. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.

_____. "The Morphology of a Genre: Introduction." *Semeia* 14 (1979): 1–19.

Congar, Yves M. J. "Church, Kingdom, and the Eschatological Temple." *Letter & Spirit* 4 (2008): 289–317.

Cortez, Felix H. "Atonement and inauguration at the Heavenly Sanctuary: A wider perspective to Jesus's ascension in Hebrews,"in *Earthly Shadows, Heavenly Realities: Temple/Sanctuary Cosmology in Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Jewish Literature*, edited by Kim Papaiouannou and Ioannis Giantzaklidis, 175–188. Berrien Springs, MI, Andrews University Press, 2017.

_____. "From the Holy to the Most Holy Place: The Period of Hebrews 9:6–10 and the Day of Atonement as a Metaphor of Transition." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 125 (2006): 527–547.

Crossan, John Dominic. *The Cross That Spoke: The Origins of the Passion Narrative*. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1988.

Crüsemann, Frank. *The Torah: Theology and Social History of Old Testament Law*. Trans. A. W. Mahnke; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1996.

Culler, Jonathan. *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature and Deconstruction*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1976.

Cullmann, Oscar. *The Christology of the New Testament*. ET London: SCM Press, 1959.

Danby, Herbert. *The Mishnah: Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers Marketing, 2011.

Davidson, Richard M. "Christ's Entry 'Within the Veil' in Hebrews 6:19–20: The Old Testament Background." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 39 (2001): 176–190.

_____. "Inauguration or Day of Atonement? A Response to Norman Young's "Old Testament Background to Hebrews 6:19–20 Revisited." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 40 (2002): 69–88.

_____. "Sanctuary Typology." In *Symposium on Revelation, Book 1: Introductory and Exegetical Issues*, edited by Frank B. Holbrook, 99–130. Daniel and Revelation Committee Series 6. Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute of Seventh-Day Adventists, 1992.

_____. "The Divine Covenant Lawsuit Motif in Canonical Perspective." *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 21 (2010): 45–84.

Davies, Douglas. "An Interpretation of Sacrifice in Leviticus." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 89 (1977): 387–399.

Davies, W. D "Reflections on Archbishop Carrington's "The Primitive Christian Calendar." In *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology: Studies in Honor of C. H. Dodd*, edited by W. D. Davies and David Daube, 124–152. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956.

Davis, Carl Judson. "Acts 2 and the Old Testament: The Pentecost Event in Light of Sinai, Babel, and the Table of Nations." *Criswell Theological Review* 7/1 (2009): 29–48.

Davis, Robert Dean. *The Heavenly Court Judgment of Revelation 4–5*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1992.

Dawson, David. *Flesh Becomes Word: A Lexicography of the Scapegoat or, the History of an Idea*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 2013.

_____. *Studies in Violence, Mimesis and Culture: Flesh Becomes Word: A Lexicography of the Scapegoat or, the History of an Idea*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 2013.

Decock, Paul B. "The Symbol of Blood in the Apocalypse of John." *Neotestamentica* 38 (2004): 157–82.

Deiana, Giovanni. "Il giorno del *Kippur* in Filone di Alessandria." Vol. 2 of *Sangue e Antropologia Riti e Culto*, edited by Francisco Vattioni, 891–905. Rome: Pia Unione Preziosissimo Sangue, 1987.

Deissmann, G. Adolf. *Bible Studies: Contributions Chiefly from Papyri and Inscriptions to the History of the Language, the Literature, and the Religion of Hellenistic Judaism and Primitive Christianity*. 2nd ed. Translated by Alexander Grieve. Edinburgh, 1909.

DeMaris, Richard E. "Jesus Jettisoned." In *The New Testament in Its Ritual World*, edited by Richard E. DeMaris, 91–111. London: Routledge, 2008.

deSilva, David A. *Seeing Things John's Way: The Rhetoric of the Book of Revelation*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009.

Dimant, Devorah. "1 Enoch 6–11: A Methodological Perspective." *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* (1978): 323–339.

_____. "Use and Interpretation of Mikra in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha." Vol 1 of *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, edited by Martin Jan Mulder, 379–419. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1988.

Dorman, Anke. "Commit Injustice and Shed Innocent Blood. Motives Behind the Institution of the Day of Atonement in the Book of Jubilees." In *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretation in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*, edited by

Thomas Hieke and Tobias Nicklas, 49–61. Themes in Biblical Narrative 15. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Douglas, Mary. "The Go-Away Goat." In *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*, edited by Rolf Rendtorff and Robert A. Kugler, 121-141. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2003.

Draper, Jonathan A. "The Heavenly Feast of Tabernacles: Revelation 7:1–17." *Journal for The Study of the New Testament* 19 (October 1, 1983): 133–147.

Driver, G. R. "Three Technical Terms in the Pentateuch." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 1/2 (April 1956): 97–105.

Duhm, Hans. *Die bösen Geister im Alten Testament*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1904.

Dumbrell, William J. *The End of the Beginning: Revelation 21–22 and the Old* Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1985.

Dunn, James D. G. *Romans 1–8*. World Biblical Commentary 38A. Dallas: Word, Incorporated, 1998.

_____. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996.

Eberhardt, Christian. "Characteristics of Sacrificial Metaphors in Hebrews." In *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods-New Insights*, edited by Gabriella Gelardini, 37–64. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Eissfeldt, O. "Zur Deutung von Motiven auf den 1937 gefundenen Elfenbeinarbeiten von Megiddo." *Forschungen und Fortschritte* 26 (1950): 1–4.

Emerton, J. A. "'The High Places of the Gates' in 2 Kings XXIII 8." *Vetus Testamentum* 44 (1994): 455–67.

Enns, Peter. *Exodus*. The New International Version Commentary Series. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 2000.

Epstein, Isidore. *The Babylonian Talmud. Baba Bathra*. London: The Soncino Press, 1938.

_____. *Soncino Hebrew-English Talmud.* London: The Soncino Press, 1948.

Erho, Ted. M., "Historical-Allusional Dating and the Similitudes of Enoch." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 130 (2011): 493–511.

_____. "The Ahistorical Nature of *1 Enoch* 56:5–8 and Its Ramifications upon the *Opinio Communis* on the Dating of the *Similitudes of Enoch*." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 40 (2009): 23–54.

_____. "Internal Dating Methodologies and the Problem Posed by the *Similitudes of Enoch*." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 20 (2010): 83–103.

Eslinger, Lyle. "Inner-Biblical Exegesis and Inner-Biblical Allusion: The Question of Category." *Vetus Testamentum* 42 (1992): 45–58.

Ezell, M. Douglas. *Revelations on Revelation*. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1977.

Falk, D. K. "Scriptural Inspiration for Penitential Prayer in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Vol. 2 of *Seeking the Favor of God: The Development of Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism,* edited by Mark J. Boda, D. K. Falk, R. A. Werline, 127–157. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007.

Fitzmyer, J. A. "The Ascension of Christ and Pentecost." *Theological Studies* 45 (1984): 409–440.

Fauth, Wolfgang. "Auf den Spuren des biblischen Azazel (Lev 16). Einige Residuen der Gestalt oder des Namens in jüdisch-aramäischen, griechischen, koptischen, äthiopischen, syrischen und mandäischen Texten." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 110/4 (1998): 514–534.

Feinberg, E. L. "The Scapegoat of Leviticus Sixteen." *Biblioteca Sacra* 115 (1958): 320–333.

Fekkes, Jan. *Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions in the Book of Revelation: Visionary Antecedents and their Development,* Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 93. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

Ferguson, David. "'I Never Did an Evil Thing': An Examination of Hittite Sin and Religious Sensibility." *Studia Antiqua* 8/1 (2010): 55–60.

Fishbane, Michael A. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.

_____. "Revelation and Tradition: Aspects of Inner-Biblical Exegesis." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99/3 (1980): 343–361.

_____. "The Hebrew Bible and Exegetical Tradition." In *Intertextuality in Ugarit and Israel,* edited by Johannes C. De Moor, 15–30. Oudtestamentisch Studiën 40. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T. *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 42. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Ford, J. Massyngbaerde. *Revelation*: *Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible 38. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co, 1975.

Fransen, I. "Cahier de Bible: Jésus, le Témoin Fidèle (Apocalypse)." *Bible et Vie Chrétienne* 16 (1956–7): 66–79.

Frazer, Sir James G. *The Golden Bough*. London: Macmillan, 1914.

Frilingos, Christopher A. *Spectacles of Empire: Monsters, Martyrs, and the Book of Revelation*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

Friesen, Steven J. *Imperial Cults and the Apocalypse of John: Reading Revelation in the Ruins.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Fuller, R. H. Review of: John Dominic Crossan, *"The Cross That Spoke: The Origins of the Passion Narrative." Interpretation* 45 (1991): 71–73.

Gane, Roy. *Cult and Character: Purification Offerings, Day of Atonement and Theodicy*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005.

_____. *Leviticus and Numbers*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2004.

_____. "Re-Opening Katapetasma ("Veil") In Hebrews 6:19." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 38 (2000): 5–8.

_____. "Schedules for Deities: Macrostructure of Israelite, Babylonian, and Hittite Sancta Purification Days." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 36 (1998): 231–44.

Gelardini, Gabriella. "The Inauguration of Yom Kippur According to the LXX and its Cessation or Perpetuation According to the Book of Hebrews." In *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretations in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*, edited by Thomas Hieke and Tobias Nicklas, 225–254. Themes in Biblical Narrative 15. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

_____. *"Verhärtet eure Herzen nicht:' Der Hebräer, eine Synagogenhomilie zu Tischa be–Aw*. Biblical Interpretation Series 83. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Gesenius, Wilhelm and Samuel Prideaux Tregelles. *Gesenius' Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament Scriptures*. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2003.

Gentry, K. L. *Before Jerusalem Fell. Dating the Book of Revelation. An Exegetical and Historical Argument for a Pre-A.D. 70 Composition*. Tyler, TX: Institute for Christian Economics, 1989.

Gerstenberger, Erhard. *Leviticus: A Commentary*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.

Gieschen, Charles Arthur. "Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence." PhD dissertation, University of Michigan, 1995.

Gilchrest, Eric J. *Revelation 21–22 in Light of Jewish and Greco-Roman Utopianism*. Biblical Interpretation Series 118. Boston: Brill, 2013.

Glassius, Salomon. *Philologiae sacrae qua totius sacrosanctae Veteris & Novi Testamenti, scripturae, tum stylus & Literatura, tum sensus & genuinae interpretationis ratio expenditure*. 5th ed. 5 vols. Frankfurt: 1686.

Goetze, Albrecht. "Hittite Rituals, Incantations and Description of Festival." In *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, edited by James B. Pritchard, 346–364. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969), 347

Görg, M. "Eine neue Deutung für kapporet." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 89 (1977): 115–118.

_____. "Beobachtungen zum sogenannten Azazel-Ritus." *Biblische Notizen* 33 (1986): 10–16.

Grabbe, Lester L. "The Scapegoat Tradition: A Study in Early Jewish Interpreation." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 18 (1987): 152–167.

Gradwohl, Roland. "Das 'fremde Feuer' von Nadab und Abihu." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 75 (1963): 288–96.

Green, Joel B. "The Gospel of Peter: Source for a Pre-Canonical Passion Narrative?" *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 78 (1987): 293–301

Greenfield, J. C. and M. E. Stone. "The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes." *Harvard Theological Review* 70 (1977): 51–65.

Gruenwald, Ithamar. *Rituals and Ritual Theory in Ancient Israel*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Gulley, Norman R. "Revelation 4 and 5: Judgment or Inauguration?" *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 8 (1997): 59–81.

Gundry, Robert. "Angelomorphic Christology in the Book of Revelation." In *Society of Biblical Literature 1994 Seminar Papers*, edited by Eugene H. Lovering, Jr., 662–78. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers Series 33. Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1994.

_____. "Angelomorphic Christology in the Book of Revelation." In *The Old Is Better: New Testament Essays in Support of Traditional Interpretations*, 377–398. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 178. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

Gundry, Stanley et. al., eds. *Three Views on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2008.

Gurney, O. R. *Babylonian Prophylactic Figures and Their Rituals*. Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology 22. Liverpool: University Press, 1935.

Gurtner, Daniel M. "LXX Syntax and the Identity of the NT Veil." *Novum Testamentum* 47/4 (2005): 344–353.

_____. *The Torn Veil: Matthew's Exposition of the Death of Jesus*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 139. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

_____. "The Veil of the Temple in History and Legend." *Journal of the Evangelical Society* 49/1 (2006): 97–114.

Hagner, Donald A. *Encountering the Book of Hebrews (Encountering Biblical Studies): An Exposition*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2002.

_____. *Matthew 14–28*. Word Biblical Commentary 33b. Dallas, TX: Word, Incorporated, 1998.

Hahm, Clement Taek. "The Priestly Influence upon Daniel 7–12." PhD dissertation, The Claremont Graduate University, 2008.

Hahn, Ferdinand. "Die Offenbarung des Johannes als Geschichtsdeutung und Trostbuch." *Kerygma und Dogma* 51/1 (2005): 55–70.

Hall, Robert G. "The 'Christian Interpolation' in the Apocalypse of Abraham." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 107 (1988): 107–112.

Hangyas, Laszlo I. "The Use and Abuse of Authority: An Investigation of the ΕΞΟΥΣΙΑ Passages in Revelation." PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 1997.

Hannah, Darrell D. "The Throne of His Glory: The Divine Throne and Heavenly Mediators in Revelation and the Similitudes of Enoch." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 94 (2003): 68–96.

Hanson, Paul D. "Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel, and Euhemeristic Heroes in 1 Enoch 6–11." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 96 (1977): 195–233.

Haran, Menahem. *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into Biblical Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.

_____. "The Uses of Incense in the Ancient Israelite Ritual." *Vetus Testamentum* 10 (1960): 113–29.

Harrington, Willfrid J. *Revelation*. Sacra Pagina 16. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press/Michael Glazier, 1993.

Harris, Murray J. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI; Milton Keynes, UK: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co.; Paternoster Press, 2005.

Harrison, Jane E. *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*. Cleveland, OH: World Pub. Co., 1966.

_____. "The Pharmakos." *Folklore* 27/3 (1916): 298–99.

Harrison, R. K. *Leviticus: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentary. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1980.

Hartley, John E. *Leviticus*. Word Biblical Commentary 4. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 1992.

Hatina, Thomas R. "Intertextuality and Historical Criticism in New Testament Studies: Is There a Relationship?" *Biblical Interpretation* 7/1 (1999): 28-43.

Hayman, Henry. "The Book of Enoch in Reference to the New Testament and Early Christian Antiquity." *The Biblical World* 12 (1898): 37–46.

Hayward, C. T. R. "Understandings of the Temple Service in the Pentateuch Septuagint." In *Temple Worship in Biblical Israel*, edited by John Day, 385–400. London: T&T Clark, 2007.

Hays, R. B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989.

Hayes, John H. "Atonement in the Book of Leviticus." *Interpretation* 52/1 (January 1, 1998): 5–15.

Heger, P. *The Development of Incense Cult in Israel*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 245. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997.

Hellholm, David. "The Problem of Apocalyptic Genre and the Apocalypse of John." *Semeia* 36 (1986): 13–64.

Helm, R. "Azazel in Early Jewish Literature." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 32 (1994): 217–26

Heil, John Paul. "Jesus as Unique High Priest in the Gospel of John." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 57 (1995): 729–745.

Henderson, Timothy P. *The Gospel of Peter and Early Christian Apologetics: Rewriting the Story of Jesus' Death, Burial and Resurrection*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

Hertz, J. H. *Leviticus*. London: Oxford University Press, 1932.

Hieke, Thomas. *Levitikus*. Zweiter Teilband 16–27. Freiburg: Herder, 2014.

_____ and Tobias Niklas, eds. *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretation in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*. Themes in Biblical Narrative 15. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Himmelfarb, Martha. *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Hindley, J. C. "Towards a Date for the Similitudes of Enoch." *New Testament Studies* 14 (1968): 551–65.

Hodge, Zane D. "A Historical and Grammatical Examination of Azazel in Biblical and Extra-biblical Sources with Special Emphasis Given to its Meaning with the Hebrew Preposition ל." PhD dissertation, Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary, 2004.

Hoenig, Sidney B. "The New Pesher on Azazel." *The Jewish Quarterly Review*. New Series 56/3 (Jan. 1966): 248–253

Hoffmann, H. "Kleinigkeiten." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 2 (1882): 175.

Hoffmann, Matthias Reinhard. *The Destroyer and the Lamb. The Relationship between Angelomorphic and Lamb Christology in the Book of Revelation*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 203. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

Hofius, Ottfried. "Inkarnation und Opfertod Jesu nach Hebr 10, 19f," in *Der Ruf und die Antwort der Gemeinde: Festschrift Joachim Jeremias*, edited by E. Lohse, 132–43. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970.

Holladay, William Lee and Ludwig Köhler. *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Hollander, John. *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1981.

Hongisto, Leif. *Experiencing the Apocalypse at the Limits of Alterity*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Houtman, C. "On the Function of the Holy Incense (Exodus xxx 34–8) and the Sacred Anointing Oil (Exodus xxx 22–33)." *Vetus Testamentum* 42 (1992): 458–65.

Hubbard Jr., Robert L. "Reading through the Rearview Mirror Inner-Biblical Exegesis and the New Testament." In *Doing Theology for the Church: Essays in Honor of Klyne Snodgrass*, edited by Rebekah A. Eklund and John E. Phelan Jr., 125–139. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2014.

Hughes, David D. *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece*. London: Routledge, 1991.

Humphrey, Edith M. *The Ladies and the Cities: Transformation and Apocalyptic Identity in Joseph and Aseneth, 4 Ezra, The Apocalypse, and the Shepherd of Hermas*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplements 17. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Hundley, Michael B. *Keeping Heaven on Earth: Safeguarding the Divine Presence in the Priestly Tabernacle*. Forschung zum Alten Testament 2nd ser., 50. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

Hunter, Erica D. "Who Are Demons?" *Studi Epigrafici e Linguistici sul Vicino Oriente Antico* 15 (1998): 95–115.

Isaac, Marie. "Priesthood and the Epistle to the Hebrews." *Heythrop Journal* 38 (1997): 51–62.

Jack, Alison. "Out of the Wilderness: Feminist Perspectives on the Book of Revelation." In *Studies in the Book of Revelation*, edited by Steve Moyise, 149–162. Edindurgh: T&T Clark, 2001.

Janowski, Bernd. "Azazel." In *Dictionary of Deities and Demons.* Edited by Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking and Peter W. van der Horst. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999. 128–131.

_____. "Azazel." In *Iconography of Deities and Demons in the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Jürg Eggler. http://www.religionswissenschaft.unizh.ch/idd/prepublications/e_idd_azazel.pdf (accessed Feb 28, 2013).

_____ and G. Wilhelm, "Der Bock, der die Sünden hinausträgt. Zur Religionsgeschichte des Azazel-Ritus Lev 16,10, 21f." In *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien und dem Alten Testament*, edited by K. Koch and G. Wilhelm, 109–169. Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.

_____. "Der Geschenck der Versöhnhung." In *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretation in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*, edited by Thomas Hieke and Tobias Niklas, 3–31. Themes in Biblical Narrative 15. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Jastrow, M. כַּפֹּרֶת. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. 2 vols. Brooklyn, NY: P. Shalom, 1967.

Jenks, Gregory C. *The Origins and Early Development of the Antichrist Myth*. Meuchen: Walter de Gruyter, 2011.

Jenkins, Ferrell. *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1976.

Jeremias, J. "Hebräer 10:20 τοῦτ' ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 62 (1971): 131.

Johns, Loren. *The Lamb Christology of the Apocalypse of John: An Investigation into Its Origins and Rhetorical Force*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2nd ser., 167. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

Johnsson, A. F. "Revelation." *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Edited by F. E. Gabelein, 758–59. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2006.

Johnsson, Luke Timothy. *Hebrews*. New Testament Library. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006.

Johnsson, William G. "Defilement and Purgation in the Book of Hebrews." PhD. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1973.

Jürgens, B. *Heiligkeit und Versöhnung: Levitikus 16 in seinem literarischen Kontext*. Herders Biblische Studien 28. Freiburg: Herder, 2001.

Kaiser, Walter C. "לִילִית." In *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. Edited by R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke. Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1999. 1:479.

Kalimi, Isaac. "The Day of Atonement in the Late Second Temple Period: Sadducees' High Priests, Pharisees' Norms, and Qumranites' Calendar(s)." *The Review of Rabbinic Judaism* 14 (2011): 71–91.

Kaufmann, Yehezkel. *The Religion of Israel, from Its Beginnings to the Babylonian Exile*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Keil, C. F. and F. Delitzsch. *The Pentateuch*. Vol. 2 of *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1951.

Kellogg, S. *The Book* of *Leviticus*. New York, NY: Funk & Wagnalls, 1900.

Kiuchi, Nobuyoshi. *Leviticus*. Apollos Old Testament Commentary. Nottingham, England; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2007.

_____. *The Purification Offering in the Priestly Literature*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 56. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987.

Kistemaker, Simon J. *Revelation*. New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2001.

Klaassen, William. "The Ascetic Way: Reflections on Peace, Justice and Vengeance in the Apocalypse of John." In *Asceticism and the New Testament*, edited by Leif E. Vaage and Vincent L. Wimbush. 393–410. New York; London: Rutledge, 1999.

Klawans, Jonathan. *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Klingbeil, Gerald A. *Bridging the Gap between Ritual and Ritual Texts.* Bulletin for Biblical Research Supplements 1. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007.

Klostermann, August. *Der Pentateuch: Beiträge zu Seinem Verständnis und Seiner Entstehungsgeschichte*. Leipzig: A. Deichart (George Böhme), 1893.

Knibb, Michael A. "The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review." *New Testament Studies* 25/3 (1979): 345–359.

_____. *Essays on the Book of Enoch and Other Early Jewish Texts and Traditions.* Boston: Brill, 2008.

_____. Review of *Der auserwählte Richter: Untersuchungen zum traditionsgeschichtlichen Ort der Menschensohnsgestalt der Bilderreden des Äthiopischen Henoch* by Johannes Theisohn. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 21 (1976): 197–200.

Koehler, Ludwig and W. Baumgartner, eds. *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros.* Leiden: Brill, 1958.

Koester, Craig R. *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary.* New York, NY: Doubleday, 2001.

_____. *Revelation: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, edited by John J. Collins. Anchor Yale Bible 38A. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2014.

Koester, Helmut, *Ancient Christian Gospels. Their History and Development.* Philadelphia and London: SCM Press, 1990.

Kowalski, Beate. *Die Rezeption des Propheten Ezechiel in der Offenbarung des Johannes.* Stuttgarter Biblische Beiträge 52. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2004.

Kraybill, J. Nelson. *Apocalypse and Allegiance: Worship, Politics, and Devotion in the Book of Revelation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2010.

Kristeva, Julia. *Desire in* Language. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1980.

_____. *Sèméiotiké: Recherches Pour Une Sémanalyse*. Paris: Le Sevil, 1969.

_____. "Word, Dialogue and Novel." In *The Kristeva Reader*, edited by Toril Moi. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1986.

Kügler, J., ed. *Die Macht der Nase. Zur religiösen Bedeutung des Duftes*. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 187. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2000.

Kulik, Alexander. *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha: Toward the Original of the Apocalypse of Abraham*. Text-Critical Studies 3. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004.

Kurtz, J. H. *Sacrificial Worship of the Old Testament*. Minneapolis, MN: Klock & Klock, 1980.

Kuykendall, Robert Michael. "The Literary Genre of the Book of Revelation: A Study of the History of Apocalyptic Research and its Relationship to John's Apocalypse." PhD dissertation, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1986.

Ladd, George Eldon. *A Commentary on the Revelation of John*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972.

Landersdorfer, Simon K. *Studien Zum biblischen Versöhnungstag*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1924.

Landgraf, Paula David. "The Structure of Hebrews: A Word of Exhortation in Light of the Day of Atonement." In *A Cloud of Witness: The Theology of Hebrews in its Ancient Contexts*, edited by Richard Buckram, Daniel Driver, Trevor Hart, Nathan McDonald, 19–27. Library of New Testament Studies 387. London: T&T Clark, 2008.

Lane, William L. *Hebrews 1–8*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 47A. Dallas: Word, Incorporated, 1998.

Lang, B. "כִּפֶּר." *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry. Translated by David E. Green. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003. 7:288–303.

Laughlin, John C. H. "The 'Strange Fire' of Nadab and Abihu." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 95 (1976): 559–65.

Laughlin, Cowden T. *The Solecisms of the Apocalypse*. Princeton, NJ: University Printers, 1902.

Leonard, Jeffery M. "Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions: Psalm 78 as a Test Case." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127 (2008): 241–265.

Lestringant, Pierre. *Essai sur l'unité de la révelation biblique*. Paris: Editions Je Sers, 1942.

Levine, Baruch A. "Kippurim." *Eretz Israel* 9 (1969): 88–95

_____. *In the Presence of the Lord*. Leiden: Brill, 1974.

_____. *The JPS Torah Commentary: Leviticus*. Philadelphia; New York; Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society, 1989.

Lightfoot, Joseph Barber and J. R. Harmer. *The Apostolic Fathers*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1891.

Lindars, Barnabas. "The Place of the Old Testament in the Formation of New Testament Theology: Prolegomena." *New Testament Studies* 23 (1976–7): 59–66.

Lindeskog, Gösta. "Der Prozess Jesu Im Jüdisch-Christlichen Religionsgespräch." In *Abraham Unser Vater: Juden Und Christen in Gespräch Über Die Bibel*. Festschrift für Otto Michel zum 60 Geburtstag, edited by Ott Betz and Marting Hengel, 325–36. Leiden: Brill, 1963.

_____. "The Veil of the Temple." In *In Honorem A. Fridrichsen Sexagenarii, Edenda Curavit Seminarium Neotestamenticum Upsaliense*. Coniectanea Neotestamentica 11, 132–37. Lund: Gleerup, 1947.

Litwak, K. D. *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 282. London; New York, NY: T&T Clark: 2005.

Lockshin, Martin I. *Rashbam's Commentary on Leviticus and Numbers*. Brown Judaic Studies, edited by Martin I. Lockshin. Providence, RI: Brown Judaic Studies, 2001.

Longenecker, Richard N. *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity*. Studies in Biblical Theology, vol. 17. Naperville, UK: Alec R. Allenson Inc. 1970.

Loretz, O. *Leberschau, Sündenbock, Asasel in Ugarit und Israel*. Altenberge: CIS Verlag, 1985.

Lunn, Nicholas P. "Jesus, the Ark and the Day of Atonement: Intertextual Echoes in John 19:38–20:18." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 52/4 (2009): 731–746.

Macaskill, Grant. "Matthew and the Parables of Enoch." In *Parables of Enoch: A Paradigm Shift*, edited by Darrell Bock and James H. Charlesworth, 219–230. London; New York, NY: Bloomsbury, 2013.

Maclean, Jennifer K. Berenson. "Barabbas, the Scapegoat Ritual, and the Development of the Passion Narrative." *Harvard Theological Review* 110 (2007): 309–34.

Maccoby, Hyam. *Ritual and Morality: The Ritual Purity System and its Place in Judaism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Maier, Harry O. *Apocalypse Recalled: The Book of Revelation after Christendom*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2002.

Malina, B. *Christian Origins and Cultural Anthropology: Practical Models for Biblical Interpretation*. Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1986.

Manson, T. W. "Hilasterion." *Journal of Theological Studies* 46 (1945): 1–10.

Marshall, John W. *Parables of War: Reading John's Jewish Apocalypse*. Studies in Christianity and Judiasm/Études sur le Christianisme et le Judaïsme 10. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2001.

Martínez, Florentino García and E. J. C. Tigchelaar. *The Dead Sea Scrolls, Study Edition.* 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Marx, Alfred. *Les systèmes sacrificiels de l'Ancien Testament.*" Supplements to Vetus Testamenutm 105. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

_____. "The Theology of Sacrifice According to Leviticus 1-7." In *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*, edited by Rolff Rendtorff and Robert. A. Kugler, 103-120. Supplements to Vetus Testamenutm 93. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Mason, Eric F. *You Are a Priest Forever*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Matera, Frank. "The Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews." In *Reading the Epistle to the Hebrews*, edited by Eric F. Mason and Kevin B. McCruden, 189–208. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.

Mathewson, David. *A New Heaven and a New Earth: The Meaning and Function of the Old Testament in Revelation 21:1–22:5*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 238. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003.

Mazzaferri, David. *The Genre of the Book of Revelation from a Source-critical Perspective.* Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 54. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989.

Mays, James Luther. *The Book of Leviticus. The Book of Numbers.* Layman's Bible Commentary. Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1977.

McKnight, Edgar V. and Christopher Church. *Hebrews-James.* Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary, edited by Mark K. McElroy. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2004.

McLean, B. H. *The Cursed Christ: Mediterranean Expulsion Rituals and Pauline Soteriology*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 126. Shefield: Sheffied Academic Press, 1996.

McLean, Bradley. "On the Revision of Scapegoat Terminology." *Numen* 37/2 (1990): 168–73.

McNamara, Martin and Michael Maher, eds. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan Leviticus*. Vol. 3 of The Aramaic Bible, 168–169. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1994.

Milgrom, Jacob. "Atonement, Day of." In *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Supplementary Volume, 82–83. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1976.

_____. *Cult and Conscience: The Asham and the Priestly Doctrine of Repentance*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity. Leiden: Brill, 1976.

_____. "Day of Atonement." In *Encyclopaedia Judaica*. Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, 1972: 5:1384–1387.

_____. "Day of Atonement." *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1976.

_____. "Israel's Sanctuary: The Priestly 'Picture of Dorian Gray'." *Revue Biblique* 83 (1983): 390–99.

_____. *Leviticus: A Book of Ritual and Ethics*. Continental Commentaries. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2004.

_____. *Leviticus 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, 1st ed., The Anchor Bible. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1991.

_____. *Leviticus 17–22: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, 1st ed., The Anchor Bible. New York, NY: Doubleday, 2000.

_____. *Leviticus 23–27: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, 1st ed., *The Anchor Bible*. New York, NY: Doubleday, 2001.

_____. "Sin-offering or Purification-offering?" *Vetus Testamentum* 21 (April 1, 1971): 237–239.

_____. *Studies in Cultic Theology and Terminology*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity. Leiden: Brill, 1983.

_____. *Studies in Levitical Terminology*. University of California Publications Near Eastern Studies 14. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1970.

_____. "The Changing Concept of Holiness in the Pentateuchal Codes with Emphasis on Leviticus 19." In *Reading Leviticus: A Conversation with Mary*

Douglas, edited by John F. A. Sawyer, 65–75. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 227. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Milik, J. T. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments from Qumrân Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.

Miller, Merril P. "The Social Logic of the Gospel of Mark: Cultural Persistence and Social Escape in a Postwar Time." In *Redescribing the Gospel of Mark*, edited by Barry S. Crawford and Merril P. Miller, 207-399. Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2017.

Mills, Kevin. *Approaching the Apocalypse: Unveiling Revelation in Victorian Writing*. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 2007.

Miscall, Peter D. "Isaiah: New Heavens, New Earth, New Book." In *Reading between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible*, edited by Donna N. Fewell, 41–56. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992.

Mbamalu, A. "Jesus the Interceding High Priest: A Fresh Look at Hebrews 7:25." *HTS Teologiese Studies/ Theological Studies* 71(1) (2015). http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/hts.v71i1.2765 (accessed March 9, 2017).

Moberly, Robert B. "When Was Revelation Conceived?" *Biblica* 73 (1992): 376–393.

Moffitt, David M. "Blood, Life, and Atonement: Reassessing Hebrews' Christological Appropriation of Yom Kippur." In *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretation in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*, edited by Thomas Hieke and Tobias Niklas, 211–224. Themes in Biblical Narrative 15. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Moller, Willelm. "Azazel." In *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. Edited by James Orr. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1939.

Monroe, Lauren A. S. "A 'Holiness' Substratum in the Deuteronomistic Account of Josiah's Reform." *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 7 (2011): 45–49.

Montefiore, H. W. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1964.

Moore, Nicholas J. "'Not to Offer Himself Again and Again': An Exegetical and Theological Study of Repetition in the Letter to the Hebrews." PhD dissertation, University of Oxford, 2014.

Mot, Laurentiu Florentin. "The Measurement Motif in Revelation 11:1-2." In *Earthly Shadows, Heavenly Realities: Temple/Sanctuary Cosmology in Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Jewish Literature*, edited by Kim Papaiouannou and Ioannis Giantzaklidis, 229–248. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2017.

Mounce, Robert H. *Romans*. New American Commentary 27. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1995.

_____. *The Book of Revelation*, rev. ed. The New International Critical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.

Moyise, Steve. "Authorial Intention and the Book of Revelation." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 39 (2002): 35–40.

_____. "Dialogical Intertextuality." In *Exploring Intertextuality*, edited by B. J. Oropeza and Steve Moyise, 3-15. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2016.

_____. "Does Paul Respect the Context of his Quotations?" In *Paul and Scripture: Continuing the Conversation*, edited by C. D. Stanley, 97–114. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012.

_____. "Does Paul Respect the Context of his Quotations? Hosea as Test-case," In *What Does the Scripture Say?' Studies in the Function of Scripture in the Gospels and Letters of Paul*, eds. Craig A. Evans and H. D. Zacharias, 1–12. New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2012.

_____. *Evoking Scripture: Seeing the Old Testament in the New*. New York; London: T&T Clark, 2008.

_____. "Ezekiel and the Book of Revelation." In *After Ezekiel: Essays on the Reception of a Difficult Prophet*, edited by A. Mein and P. M. Joyce, 45–57. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament 535. New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2011.

_____. "Intertextuality and Historical Approaches to the Use of Scripture in the New Testament." *Verbum et Ecclesia* 26 (2005): 447–458.

_____. "Intertextuality and the Study of the Old Testament in the New Testament." In *The Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J. L. North*, edited by Steve Moyise and J. L. North, 14–41. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 89: Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

_____. "Intertextuality and the Use of Scripture in the Book of Revelation." *Scriptura* 84 (2003): 391–401.

_____. "Jesus and Isaiah." *Neotestamentica* 43 (2009): 249–270.

_____. *Jesus and Scripture*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2011.

_____. "The Language of the Old Testament in the Apocalypse." *Journal for Study of New Testament* 76 (2000): 97–113.

_____. "The Language of the Psalms in the Book of Revelation." *Neotestamentica* 37/1 (2003): 68–83.

_____. *Paul and Scripture*. London: SPCK, 2010.

_____ and Maarten Menken, eds. *Deuteronomy in the New Testament*. Library of New Testament Studies 358. New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2008.

_____ and Maarten Menken, eds. *Genesis in the New Testament*. London; New York, T&T Clark, 2012.

_____ and Maarten Menken, eds. *Isaiah in the New Testament*. London; New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2005.

_____ and Maarten Menken, eds. *The Minor Prophets in the New Testament*. London; New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2009.

_____. and Maarten Menken, eds. *The Psalms in the New Testament*. London; New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2004.

_____. "Models for Intertextual Interpretation of Revelation." In *The Book of Revelation: Theology, Politics and Intertextuality*, edited by R.B. Hays and S. Alkier, 31–45. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2012.

_____. "Quotations." In *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley, 15–28. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.

_____. "Recent Developments in the Study of the Book of Revelation." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 26 (1988): 159–170.

_____. *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation*. Journal of the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 115. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

_____. *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

_____. *The Old Testament in the New*. London, New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2001.

_____. ed., *The Old Testament in the New Testament*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

_____. "Scripture in the New Testament: Literary and Theological Perspectives." *Neotestamentica* 42 (2008): 305–326.

_____. *Was the Birth of Jesus According to Scripture?* Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2013.

_____. "Word Frequencies in the Book of Revelation." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 43 (2005): 285–299.

Murphy, Frederick J. *Fallen is Babylon. The Revelation to John*. Harrisburg: Trinity International, 1998.

Musvosvi, Joel. "The Issue of Genre and Apocalyptic Prophecy." *Asia Adventist Seminary Studies* 5 (2002): 43–60.

Nestle, E. "Azazel." *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*. Edited by J. Hastings, 282–283. New York, NY: Charles Scribner and Sons, n.d.

Neufeld, Dietmar. "Under the Cover of Clothing: Scripted Clothing Performances in the Apocalypse of John." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 35 (2005): 67–76.

Neusner, Jacob. *The Mishnah: A New Translation*. New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1988.

Newport, Kenneth G. C. *Apocalypse and Millennium: Studies in Biblical Eisegesis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Nibley, Hugh. *Temple and Cosmos: Beyond This Ignorant Present*. Salt Lake City; Provo, UT: Deseret Book, 1992.

Nickelsburg, G. W. E. *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*. London: SCM, 2005.

Nielsen, K. *Incense in Ancient Israel*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 38. Boston: Brill, 1986.

Niese, B. *Flavius Josephus. Flavii Iosephi Opera*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1892.

Noë, John. "An Exegetical Basis for a Preterist-Idealist Understanding of the Book of Revelation." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 49/4 (Dec 2006): 767–96.

Nolland, John. *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005.

Norton, T. C. G. "The Meaning of *kai peri hamartias* in Romans viii.3." *Journal of Theological Studies* 22 (1971): 515-517.

Noth, Martin. *Leviticus*. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1977.

Novum Testamentum Graece. 27th ed. Edited by Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993.

Odek, Rabach. "The Heavenly Sanctuary in Revelation: Context and Significance." In *Earthly Shadows, Heavenly Realities: Temple/Sanctuary Cosmology in Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Jewish Literature*, edited by Kim Papaiouannou and Ioannis Giantzaklidis, 217–227. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2017.

Orlov, Andrei A. *Dark Mirrors: Azazel and Satanael in Early Jewish Demonology*. Albany, NY: State University Press, 2011.

_____. *Divine Scapegoats: Demonic Mimesis in Early Jewish Mysticism*. New York, NY: State University Press, 2015.

_____. *Heavenly Priesthood in the Apocalypse of Abraham*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

_____. "The Eschatological Yom Kippur in the Apocalypse of Abraham: Part I: The Scapegoat Ritual." In *Symbola Caelestis. Le symbolisme liturgique et paraliturgique dans le monde Chrétien*, edited by A. Orlov and B. Lourié, 3–35. Scrinium 5. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2009.

_____. "The Likeness of Heaven: The *Kavod* of Azazel in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*." In *With Letters of Light*, edited by Daphna V. Arbel and Andrei A. Orlov, 232–253. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011.

_____. "The Pteromorphic Angelology of the Apocalypse of Abraham." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 71/4 (2009): 830–42.

Osborne, Grant R. *Revelation*. Baker Exegetical Commentary of the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2002.

_____. *Romans Verse by Verse*. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2017.

Ounsworth, Richard. *Joshua Typology in the New Testament*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 328. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Parker, Robert. *On Greek Religion*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2011.

Paulien, Jon. "Criteria and the Assessment of Allusions to the Old Testament in the Book of Revelation." In *Studies in Revelation*, edited by Steve Moyise, 113–130. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2001.

_____. *Decoding Revelation's Trumpets: Allusions and the Interpretation of Rev 8:7–12*. Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series 11. Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 1988.

_____. "Dreading the Whirlwind: Intertextuality and the Use of the Old Testament in Revelation." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 29 (2001): 5–22.

_____. "Elusive Allusions: The Problematic Use of the Old Testament in Revelation." *Biblical Research* 33 (1988): 37–53.

_____. "New Testament Use of the Old Testament." In *Hermeneutic, Intertextuality and the Contemporary Meaning of Scripture*, edited by Ross Cole and Paul Petersen, 29–49. Cooranbong: Avondale Academic Press, 2014.

_____. "The Role of the Hebrew Cultus, Sanctuary, and Temple in the Plot and Structure of the Book of Revelation." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 33 (1995): 245–264.

_____. "The Seven Seals." Vol. 1 of *Symposium on Revelation*, edited by Frank B. Holbrook, 199–229. Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 1992.

_____. Review of Beate Kowalski, *Die Rezeption des Propheten Ezechiel in der Offenbarung des Johannes*. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 124/4 (December 1, 2005): 782–785.

_____. "Seals and Trumpets: Some Current Discussions." Vol. 1 of *Symposium on Revelation*, edited by Frank B. Holbrook, 183–198. Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 1992.

Paxy, Alumkal Jacob. *Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ Implied in the Image of the Paschal Lamb in 1 Cor 5*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2014.

Pfochen, Sebastien. *Diatribe de linguae graecae Novi Testamenti puritate*. Amsterdam: Janson, 1629.

Philip, Mayjee. *Leviticus in Hebrews*. New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2011.

Pietersma, Albert. "Greek Jeremiah and the Land of Azazel." In *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran and the Septuagint. Presented to Eugene Ulrich*, edited by Peter W. Flint, Emanuel Tov and James C. VanderKam, 403–413. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 101. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Pinker, Aron. "A Goat to Go to Azazel." *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 7 (2007): 1–25.

Piper, Otto A. "The Apocalypse of John and the Liturgy of the Ancient Church." *Church History* 20 (1951): 10–22.

Pippin, Tina. *Apocalyptic Bodies: The Biblical End of the World in Text and Images*. New York, NY: Routledge Press, 1999.

_____. *Death and Desire: The Rhetoric of Gender in the Apocalypse of John*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992.

Polhill, John B. *Acts*. The New American Commentary 26. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1992.

Porter, Stanley E. "Allusions and Echoes." In *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley, 29–40. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.

_____. "Further Comments on the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament." In *Intertextuality of the Epistles: Explorations of Theory and Practice*, edited by Thomas L. Brodie, Dennis R. MacDonald and Stanley E. Porter, 98–110. New Testament Monographs 6. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007.

_____. *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2006.

Prigent, Pierre. *Flash sur l'Apocalypse*. Neuchatel and Paris: Collection Flèches, 1974.

Punt, Jeremy. "Inhabiting the World in Front of the Text: The New Testament and Reception Studies." *Neotestamentica* 34/1 (2000): 207–24.

Radner, Ephraim. *Leviticus*. Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible. Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2008.

Rendtorff, Rolf. "Leviticus 16 als Mitte der Tora." *Biblical Interpretation* 11/3–4 (January 1, 2003): 252–258.

_____. *Studien zur Geschichte des Opfers im Alten Israel*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967.

_____. *The Old Testament: An Introduction*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1985.

_____. *Theologie des Alten Testaments: Ein kanonischer Entwurf*. 2 vols. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1999/2001.

Resseguie, James L. *Revelation Unsealed: A Narrative Critical Approach to John's Apocalypse*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Ritchie, Ian D. "The Nose Knows: Bodily Knowing in Isaiah 11.3." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 87 (2000): 59–73.

Rissi, M. *Time and History: A Study on the Revelation*. Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1966.

Roberts, Morley. "The Pharmakos." *Folklore* 27 (1916): 218–24.

Robinson, John A. T. *Redating the New Testament*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2000.

Rodríguez, Ángel Manuel. "Leviticus 16: Its Literary Structure." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 34 (1996): 269–286.

_____. *Substitution in the Hebrew Cultus*. Andrews University Seminary Dissertation Series 3. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1979.

Rojas-Flores, Gonzalo. "The Book of Revelation and the First Years of Nero's Reign." *Biblica* 85/3 (2004): 375–392.

Rooke, Deborah W. "The Day of Atonement as a Ritual of Validation for the High Priest." In *Temple Worship in Biblical Israel*, edited by John Day, 342–364. London, New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2007.

Rooker, Mark F. *Leviticus*. The New American Commentary 3a. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 2000.

Rothstein, Eric. "Diversity and Change and Literary Histories." In *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History*, edited by Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein, 114–145. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991.

Rowland, Christopher. "A Man Clothed in Linen: Daniel 10.6ff. and Jewish Angelology." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 24 (1985): 99–110.

_____. "The Temple in the New Testament." In *Temple Worship in Biblical Israel*, edited by John Day, 489–483. London, New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2007.

Royalty, Robert M. Review of Loren Johns, *Lamb Christology of the Apocalypse of John: An Investigation into Its Origins and Rhetorical Force* and Christopher A. Frilingos, *Spectacles of Empire: Monsters, Martyrs, and the Book of Revelation. Journal of Biblical Literature* 124/3 (2005): 571–75.

Rubinkiewicz, Ryszard. "Abraham, Apocalypse of." In *The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary*, edited by David Noel Freedman, 41–43. New York City, NY: Doubleday, 1992.

_____. "Apocalypse of Abraham." Vol. 1 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, edited by James H. Charlesworth, 681–705. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1985.

_____. *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en vieux slave. Édition critique du texte, introduction, traduction et commentaire*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1987.

Rudman, Dominic. "A Note on Azazel." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* (2004): 396–401.

Ruiz, Jean-Pierre. *Ezekiel in the Apocalypse: The Transformation of Prophetic Language in Revelation* 16, 17–19,10. European University Studies Series 23 376. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1989.

Rylaarsdam, J. C. "Atonement, Day of." *International Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by George Arthur Buttrich. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1981. 1:313–316

Safren, Jonathan D. "Jubilee and the Day of Atonement." In *Proceedings of the 12th World Congress of Jewish Studies, Division A: The Bible and Its World*, edited by Ron Margolin, 107-113. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1999.

Sandmel, Samuel. "Parallelomania." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 81 (1962): 1–13.

Schenck, Kenneth. "Hebrews as the Re-Presentation of a Story: A Narrative Approach to Hebrews." In *Reading the Epistle to the Hebrews*, edited by Eric F. Mason and Kevin B. McCruden, 171–188. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. "The Case of the Day of Atonement Ritual." In *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use & Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Proceedings from the First International Symposium of the Orion Center, 12–14 May 1996, edited by Michael E. Stone & Esther G. Chazon, 181–188. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Schreiber, S. "Das Weihegeschenk Gottes; Eine Deutung des Todes Jesu in Rom 3,25." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 97 (2006): 88–110.

Schmemann, Alexander. *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*. Portland, n.d.

Scullion, J. P., "A Traditio-Historical Study of the Day of Atonement." PhD dissertation, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., 1990.

Schabow, Stefanie. *Gemacht zu einem Königreich und Priestern für Gott*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 147. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlagsgesellschaft, 2016.

Schlatter, A. *Das Alte Testament in der johanneischen Apokalypse*. Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie. Jahr 16, Heft 6. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1912.

Schreiner, Thomas R. *Romans*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. iBooks edition.

Schur, Israel. *Versöhnungstag und Sündenbock: Jom-ha-kippurim und Sair-la-'azazel*. Helsingfors: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 1933.

Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. *Priester für Gott. Studient zum Herrschafts- und Priestermotiv in der Apokalypse*. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 7. Münster: Aschendorff, 1972.

_____. *Revelation: Justice and Judgment*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1985.

_____. *Revelation: Vision of a Just World*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburger Press, 1998.

Schwartz, Baruch J. Review of Roy Gane, *Cult and Character. Andrews University Seminary Studies* 45 (2007): 267–272.

_____. "The Bearing of Sin in the Priestly Literature." In *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom,* edited by David P. Wright, D. N. Freedman, and A. Hurvitz, 3–21. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995.

Schwartz, Daniel R. "Two Pauline Allusions to the Redemptive Mechanism of the Crucifixion." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 102/2 (1983): 259–268.

Segal J. B. and E.C.D. Hunter. *Aramaic and Mandaic Incantation Bowls in the British Museum*. London: British Museum Press, 2000.

Segal, M. H. *The Pentateuch: Its Composition and Its Authorship and Other Biblical Studies*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1967.

_____. "The Religion of Israel before Sinai." *The Jewish Quarterly Review New Series* 53 (July 1962/63): 226–256.

Schenker, Adrian. "Das Zeichen des Blutes und die Gewißheit der Vergebung im Alten Testament: die sühnende Funktion des Blutes auf dem Altar nach Lev 17.10–12." *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift* 34 (1983): 195–213.

Shearman, Susan Lee and John Briggs Curtis. "Divine-Human Conflicts in the Old Testament." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 28/4 (1969): 231–242.

Shelton, L. "A Covenant Concept of Atonement." *Westminster Theological Journal* 19 (1984): 92–96.

Shepherd Jr., Massey H. *The Paschal Liturgy and the Apocalypse.* Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1951.

Shevel, H. D, ed. *Ramban's Commentary on the Pentateuch*. Jerusalem: Mossad HaRav Kook, 1969.

Sim, D. C. "The Man without the Wedding Garment (Matthew 22:11–13)." *Heythrop Journal* 31 (1990): 165–78.

Slater, Thomas B. "Dating the Apocalypse to John." *Biblica* 84 (2003): 252–258.

Smalley, Stephen S. *The Revelation to John: A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Apocalypse.* Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2005.

Snaith, N. "The meaning of שׂעירים." *Vetus Testamentum* 25 (1975): 115–118.

Spatafora, Andrea. *From the Temple of God to God as the Temple: A Biblical Theological Study of the Temple in the Book of Revelation*. Rome: Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1997.

Speiser, E. A. E. A Speiser, "A Vision of the Nether World." In *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, edited by James B. Pritchard, 109–111. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969.

Spence-Jones, H. D. M. ed. *Hebrews*. The Pulpit Commentary. London; New York, NY: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1909.

Spencer, John R. "Aaron (Person)." The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1992. 1:5.

Stanley, Steve. "Hebrews 9:6–10: The 'Parable' of the Tabernacle." *Novum Testamentum* 37 (Oct., 1995): 385–399.

Steiner, Deborah. "Diverting Demons: Ritual, Poetic Mockery and the Odysseus-Iros Encounter." *Classical Antiquity* 28/1 (2009): 71–100.

Stefanovic, Ranko. *Revelation of Jesus Christ: Commentary on the Book of Revelation*. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 2002.

_____. "The Angel at the Altar (Revelation 8:3–5): A Case Study on Intercalations in Revelation." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 44 (2006): 79–94.

_____. "The Background and Meaning of the Sealed Book of Revelation 5." PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 1995.

Stemberger, Günter. "Yom Kippur in Mishnah Yoma." In *Day of Atonement: Its Interpretation in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions,* edited by Thomas Hieke, Tobias Nicklas, 121–137. Themes in Biblical Narrative 15. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Stenström, Hanna. "Female Imagery in the Book of Revelation." In *Religion and Female Body in Ancient Judaism and Its Environments*, edited by Géza Xeravits, 213–224. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2015.

_____. "The Book of Revelation: A Vision of the Ultimate Liberation or the Ultimate Backlash? A Study in 20th Century Interpretations of Rev 14:1–5, with Special Emphasis on Feminist Exegesis." PhD dissertation, Uppsala University, 1999.

_____. "They Have Not Defiled Themselves with Women ...": Christian Identity According to the Book of Revelation." In *A Feminist Companion to the Apocalypse of John*, edited by Amy-Jill Levine and Maria May Robbins, 33–54. London; New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2010.

Stern, Jacob. "Scapegoat Narratives in Herodotus." *Hermes* 119/3 (1991): 304–11.

Stevenson, Gregory. *Power and Place: Temple and Identity in the Book of Revelation*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001.

Strand, Kenneth A. "An Overlooked Old-Testament Background to Revelation 11:1." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 22 (1984): 317–325.

_____. *Interpreting the Book of Revelation: Hermeneutical Guidelines with Brief Introduction to Literary Analysis*. Worthington, OH: Ann Arbor, 1976.

Stökl Ben Ezra, Daniel. "'Christians' Observing 'Jewish' Festivals of Autumn." In *The Image of the Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature*, WUNT 158, edited by Peter J. Tomson and Doris Lambers-Petry, 53–72. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

_____. "Fasting with Jews, Thinking with Scapegoats on Yom Kippur in Early Judaism and Christianity, in Particular 4Q541, Barnabas 7, Matthew 27 and Acts 27." In *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretation in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*, edited by Thomas Hieke and Tobias Niklas, 165–188. Themes in Biblical Narrative 15. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

_____. *The Impact of Yom Kippur on Early Christianity: The Day of Atonement from Second Temple Judaism to the Fifth Century*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2nd ser., 163. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

_____. "Yom Kippur in the Apocalyptic Imaginaire and the Roots of Jesus' High Priesthood: Yom Kippur in Zechariah 3, 1 Enoch 10, 11QMelkizedeq, Hebrews and the Apocalypse of Abraham 13." In *Transformations of the Inner Self in Ancient Religions*, edited by Jan Assman and Gary Stroumsa, 349–366. Studies in the History of Religions. Supplements to *Numen* 83. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Sturdy, J. V. M. *Redrawing the Boundaries: The Date of Early Christian Literature*. Oakville, CT: Equinox Publishing, 2007.

Suleiman, Susan R. "Introduction: Varieties of Audience-Oriented Criticism." In *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation*, edited by Susan R. Suleiman and I. Crosman, 1–45. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980.

Sun, Henry T. C. "Holiness Code." In The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary. Edited by David Noel Freedman, 254–258. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1992.

Surridge, Robert. "Seventh-day Adventism: Self-Appointed Laodicea." In *Studies in the Book of Revelation*, edited by Steve Moyise, 21–42. Edindurgh: T&T Clark, 2001.

Sutter, David W. "Weighed in the Balance: The Similitudes of Enoch in Recent Discussion." *Religious Studies Review* 7 (1981): 217–21.

Sweeney, Marvin A. "Ezekiel: Zadokite Priest and Visionary Prophet of the Exile." In *Form and Intertextuality in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 45. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

Swanson, James. *Dictionary of Biblical Languages with Semantic Domains: Hebrew (Old Testament)*. Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems, Inc., 1997.

Sweet, J. P. M. *Revelation*. SCM Pelican Commentaries. London: SCM Press, 1979.

Swete, Henry Barclay. *The Apocalypse of John*. London: Macmillan, 1906.

Tabberne, William. *Prophets and Gravestones: An Imaginative History of Montanists and Other Early Christians*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2009.

Talbert, Charles H. *The Apocalypse: A Reading of the Revelation of John*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994.

Tavo, Felise. *Woman, Mother and the Bride: An Exegetical Investigation into the Ecclesial Notion of the Apocalypse*. Paris; Leuven; Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2007.

Tawil, H. "Azazel the Prince of the Steepe: A Comparative Study." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 92 (1980): 43–59.

Tenney, Merrill C. *Interpreting Revelation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1957.

Thiselton, Anthony C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000.

Tiwald, Markus. "Christ as Hilasterion (Rom 3:25): Pauline Theology on the Day of Atonement in the Mirror of Early Jewish Thought." In *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretation in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*, edited by Thomas Hieke and Tobias Niklas, 189–20. Themes in Biblical Narrative 15. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Theisohn, Johannes. *Der auserwählte Richter: Untersuchungen zum traditionsgeschichtlichen Ort der Menschensohnsgestalt der Bilderreden des Äthiopischen Henoch*. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.

Thompson, Leonard. *The Book of Revelation: Apocalypse and Empire*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Thompson, Steve. *Apocalypse and Semitic Syntax*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

_____. "The End of Satan." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 37/2 (1999): 257–268.

Trench, Richard Chenevix. *Synonyms of the New Testament*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1880.

Treiyer, Alberto R. *The Day of Atonement and the Heavenly Judgment: From the Pentateuch to Revelation*. Siloam Springs, AR: Creation Enterprises International, 1992.

Trudinger, Paul. " 'O AMHN' (Rev III:14) and the Case for a Semitic Original of the Apocalypse." *Novum Testamentum* 14 (1972): 227–279.

_____. "The Apocalypse and the Palestinian Targum." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 16 (1986): 78–79.

Unger, Merrill Frederick. *The Hodder Bible Handbook*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1984.

Vanderkam, James C. "1 Enochic, Enochic Motifs and Enoch in Early Christian Literature." In *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*, edited by James C. Vanderkam and W. Adler, 33–101. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 4. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1996.

_____. "Moses Trumping Moses: Making the Book of Jubilees." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts*, edited by Sarianna Metso, Hindy Najman and Eileen Schuller, 25–44. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

_____. *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*. Leuven: Peeters, 1989.

Veloso, Mario. "The Doctrine of the Sanctuary and the Atonement as Reflected in the Book of Revelation." In *The Sanctuary and The Atonement: Biblical, Historical and Theological Studies*, edited by A. V. Wallenkampf and W. R. Lesher, 394–419. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1981.

Voelz, James W. "The Language of the New Testament." In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt.* Edited by Wolfgang Haase. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984. II.25.2: 894-977.

Vogel, Winfried. *Cultic Motif in the Book of Daniel*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing, 2009.

Vogelgesang, Jeffrey Marshall. "The Interpretation of Ezekiel in the Book of Revelation." PhD dissertation, Harvard University, 1985.

Vorster, Willelm S. "1 Enoch and the Jewish Literary Setting of the New Testament: A Study in Text Types." *Neotestamentica* 17 (1983): 1–14.

_____. "Genre and the Revelation of John: A Study in Text, Context and Intertext." *Neotestamentica* 22 (1998): 103–23.

_____. "Intertextuality and Redaktionsgeschichte." In *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings*, edited by S. Draisma, 15–26. Festschrift Bas van Iersel. Kampen: Kok, 1989.

Vos, L. H. *The Synoptic Traditions in the Apocalypse*. Kampen: Kok, 1965.

Walck, Leslie. "The Parables of Enoch and the Synoptic Gospels." In *Parables of Enoch: A Paradigm Shift*, edited by Darrell Bock and James H. Charlesworth, 231–268. London; New York, NY: Bloomsbury, 2013.

Wellhausen, J. *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1963.

Wenham, Gordon J. *The Book of Leviticus*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1979.

Westbrook, Raymond. "Who Led the Scapegoat in Leviticus 16:21?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127 (2008): 417–422.

Weyde, Karl William. *The Appointed Feast of Yahweh: The Festival Calendar in Leviticus 23 and the Sukkot Festival in Other Biblical Texts*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.

Whiston, William. *The Works of Josephus: Complete and Unabridged*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1987.

Whitfield, Bryan. "Pioneer and Perfecter: Joshua Traditions and the Christology of Hebrews." In *A Cloud of Witness: The Theology of Hebrews in its Ancient Contexts*, edited by Richard Buckram, Daniel Driver, Trevor Hart, Nathan McDonald, 80–87. Library of New Testament Studies 387. London: T&T Clark, 2008.

Wilcox, Max. "Semitisms in the New Testament." In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. Edited by Wolfgang Haase. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984. II.25.2: 977–1029.

Williams-Tinajero, Lace Marie. *Reshaped Mind*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Winer, Georg Benedict. *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms als sichere Grundlage der neutestamentlichen Exegese*, 6th ed. Leipzig: 1855.

Wilson, B. *Systems, Concepts, Methodologies, and Applications*. Chichester West Sussex; New York, NY: Wiley, 1984.

Wilson, J. Christian. "The Problem of the Domitianic Date of Revelation." *New Testament Studies* 39 (October 1, 1993): 587–605.

Wilson, Mark. "The Early Christians in Ephesus and the Date of Revelation, Again." *Neotestamentica* 39/1 (2005): 163–93.

Winkle, Ross E. "Clothes Make the (One Like a Son of) Man: Dress Imagery in Revelation 1 as an Indicator of High Priestly Status." PhD dissertation, Andrews University, 2012.

Witherup, R. D. "The Death of Jesus and the Raising of the Saints: Matthew 27:51–54 in Context." *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* (1987): 574–85.

Wolff, Christian "Die Gemeinde des Christus in der Apokalypse des Johannes." *New Testament Studies* 27 (1981): 186–197.

Wolf, Herbert. "אָזַל." In *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. Edited by R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer, Jr. and Bruce K. Waltke. Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1999.

Wratislaw, A. H. "The Scapegoat-Barrabas." *Expository Times* 3 (1891/92): 400–403.

Wright, David P. "Day of Atonement." In *The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman, 2:72–76. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1992.

_____ et al. *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995.

_____. *The Disposal of the Impurity: Elimination Rites in the Bible and in Hittite and Mesopotamian Literature*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 101 Atlanta, GA: 1987.

_____. "The Gesture of Hand-Placement in the Hebrew Bible and in Hittite Literature." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 106 (1986): 433-446.

Wright, N.T. *The Climax of the Covenant*. London/New York: T&T Clark, 1991.

_____. "The Meaning of περὶ ἁμαρτίας in Romans 8:3." In *Papers on Paul and Other New Testament Authors*, edited by E. A. Livingstone, 453–459. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 3. Sheffield: University of Sheffield, 1980.

Wyatt, N. "Atonement Theology in Ugarit and Israel." *Ugarit Forschungen* 8 (1976): 415–430.

Yamauchi, Edwin. "טָהֵר." *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. Edited by R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke. Chicago: Moody Press, 1999.

Yarbro Collins, Adela. *Crisis and Catharsis: The Power of the Apocalypse*. Philadelphia, PA: The Westminster Press, 1984.

_____ and John J. Collins, eds. *King and Messiah as Son of God*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2008.

_____. "Reading the Book of Revelation in the 20th Century." *Interpretation* 40 (July 1, 1986): 229–242.

_____. Review of Josephine M. Ford, *Revelation (Anchor Bible)*. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 38 (1976): 555–557.

_____. "Insiders and Outsiders in the Book of Revelation and its Social Context." In *To See Ourselves as Others See Us: Christians, Jews and "Other" in Late Antiquity*, edited by J. Neusner and E. S. Frerichs, 187–218. Chico, CA: Scholars' Press, 1985.

Yasser, Joseph. "The Magrepha of the Herodian Temple: A Five-Fold Hypothesis." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 13 (1960): 24–42.

Yee, Gale A. *Jewish Feasts in the Gospel of John*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1989.

Yonge, Charles Duke with Philo of Alexandria. *The Works of Philo: Complete and Unabridged*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995.

Young, Norman. "Did St. Paul Compose Rom iii:24f?" *Australian Biblical Review* 22 (1974): 23–32.

_____. "Hilaskesthai and Related Words in the New Testament." *The Evangelical Quartely* 55 (1983): 169–76.

_____. "The Day of Dedication of the Day of Atonement? The Old Testament Background to Hebrews 6:19–20 Revisited." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 40 (2002): 61–68.

_____. "The Gospel According to Hebrews 9." *New Testament Studies* 27 (1981): 198–210.

_____. "The Impact of the Jewish Day of Atonement Upon the Thought of the New Testament." PhD dissertation, Manchester University, 1973.

_____. "Where Jesus Has Gone as a Forerunner on Our Behalf (Hebrews 6:20)." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 39 (2001): 165–173.

Zatelli, Ida. "The Origin of the Biblical Scapegoat Ritual: The Evidence of the Two Eblaite Texts." *Vetus Testamentum* 48 (1998): 254–263.

Zohar, Noam. "Repentance and Purification: The Significance and Semantics of חטאת in the Pentateuch." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 107 (1988): 609–618.