



Goats, Calves, Bulls, and Heifer's Ashes: Heb 9:12–13 and the Day of Atonement in the Epistle to the Hebrews

ROBERT K. MCIVER
Avondale Seminary

This chapter explores in detail one of the major interpretive decisions facing an interpreter of Hebrews 9 and 10—the place of the Day of Atonement in the author's argument. In particular it examines the linking of τράγων (male goats) and μόσχων (calves, young bulls, oxen) in Heb 9:12, and τράγων καὶ ταύρων (bulls) together with the σποδὸς δαμάλεως (ashes of a heifer, young cow) in Heb 9:13.

At first sight the place of the Day of Atonement in Heb 9:12–13 seems secure. Hebrews chapter nine starts by giving a brief description of the layout of the wilderness tabernacle of the first covenant, and follows this by highlighting the daily and yearly services. Only the high priest goes into the second apartment, the holy of holies, and at that, only once a year, and not apart from blood (Heb 9:7)—a direct reference to the Day of Atonement ritual outlined in Lev 16. At this point the argument then moves abruptly to a consideration of how this should be compared with the achievements of Jesus. Thus the context of 9:12–13 has highlighted the Day of Atonement, and consequently one might well expect further reference to it.

Indeed, several aspects of the phrasing of Heb 9:12 suggest the Day of Atonement. Firstly, the goat and the calf may indeed refer to the two types of animals most directly involved in the Day of Atonement ceremonies—the young bull, a sin offering for the high priest, and the two goats—one for the Lord, and one for Azazel (Lev 16:3, 7–8). Secondly, the emphasis on ἰδίου αἵματος (his own blood), and εἰς τὰ ἅγια (into the holies) apparently also point to the Day of Atonement.¹ Heb 9:12 and Heb 9:25 appear to be

written in direct contrast. Heb 9:25 points out that the high priest goes εἰς τὰ ἅγια many times/yearly, with the blood of another. The comparison is clear, and undoubtedly intended. Thus several lines of evidence suggest that Heb 9:12–13 is making direct reference to the Day of Atonement, and such is the usual conclusion found in commentaries on Hebrews.²

But not everything points in this direction. For example, if Heb 9:12 directly relates to the Day of Atonement, then it appears to abruptly change the metaphor in saying that Jesus found αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν (eternal redemption). What was achieved in the Day of Atonement ceremony was “atone-ment” (cf ἐξιλάσεται, Lev 16:16, 17, LXX) and “cleansing of iniquity” (καθαριεῖ αὐτὸ καὶ ἀγιάσει αὐτὸ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀκαθαρσιῶν τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ—“he will cleanse it and restore it to holiness from the uncleannesses of the sons of Israel” Lev 16:19, LXX), not “redemption” as in Heb 9:12.

Another interesting item is that the key phrase, τὸ αἷμα τῶν μόσχων [καὶ τῶν τράγων] also occurs at Heb 9:19.³ The immediate context deals with the inauguration (ἐγκεκαίνισται) of the first covenant (Heb 9:18). Heb 9:20 actually quotes the words spoken by Moses at the Covenant-making ceremony in Exod 24:3–8, and thus this passage must be in the author’s mind. However, the only sacrificial animals specified on this occasion are oxen (LXX, μοσχάρια Exod 24:5). Moses is said to throw blood on the people but the scarlet wool and hyssop of Heb 9:19 are not mentioned anywhere in Exod 24. Rather, the combination scarlet wool and hyssop are found in connection with such ceremonies of cleansing lepers (Lev 14:4, 6), cleansing tainted houses (Lev 14:51–52), and the red heifer (Num 19:6).⁴

Yet another element appears to be added in Heb 9:21—the tent and all the vessels of service. The reference is clearly to the dedication of the wilderness tabernacle at its completion. Of this there are three accounts: Exod 40:2–38, Lev 8–9, Num 7–8. It is true that in Num 7 that the word τράγος is used repeatedly in the lists of sacrifices (Num 7:17, 23, 29, 35, 41, etc; τράγος is used only in this chapter in Numbers, and it is not used at all in Leviticus in the LXX), and that μόσχος also appears frequently (e.g. Num 7:15, 21, 27, etc), but it is hard to determine why the author has chosen only these two sacrificial animals of the different varieties—each list includes young bulls, rams, year old lambs, male goats, oxen, goats (e.g. Num 7:15–17: μόσχον ἓνα ἐκ βοῶν, κριὸν ἓνα, ἀμνὸν ἓνα ἐνιαύσιον εἰς ὀλοκαύτωμα, καὶ χίμαρον ἐξ αἰγῶν ἓνα περὶ ἁμαρτίας, καὶ εἰς θυσίαν σωτηρίου δαμάλεις δύο, κριοὺς πέντε, τράγους πέντε, ἀμνάδας ἐνιαυσίας πέντε...⁵).

Another possibility to be considered is that the reference is to the ceremonies mentioned in Lev 9. In the ceremonies associated with the ordination of Aaron and his sons the offerings were a bull (Lev 8:14, LXX, μόσχος) and

two rams (Lev 8:18, 22, LXX, κριός), and in the actual inauguration of the tabernacle on the eighth day the ceremonies involved a male goat, a calf, a lamb, and ox and a ram and a cereal offering (Lev 9:3–4⁶). But in the description contained in the rest of Lev 9, the only sacrifices that are mentioned are (in order): a calf (Lev 9:8, LXX, μοσχάριον), a goat (Lev 9:15, LXX, χίμαρος), a calf and a ram (Lev 9:18, LXX, μόσχος & κριός). It may be that the writer of Hebrews choose the calf and the goat as indicative of this particular ceremony (but why did he use the word τράγος instead of χίμαρος?). It is also difficult to trace a straight line between the ceremonies of inauguration of Heb 9:19–21, and the conclusion expressed in Heb 9:22, which speaks of how things are cleansed by the law (nearly always by blood). The language of the inauguration was not cleansing, but consecration (ἀγιάσεις in prospect in Exod 40:9, 10, 11; and ἡγίασεν in retrospect in Num 7:1).⁷

A third item which raises doubts about the exactness of the allusion to the Day of Atonement is the fact that the word τράγος is not used for “goat” at all in Leviticus, and certainly not in Lev 16, where the offerings are prescribed.⁸ The words used by the Septuagint in Lev 16 to describe the two main types of sacrificial animal are μόσχῳ ἐκ βοῶν (a calf from the bulls) and δύο χιμάρους ἐξ αἰγῶν (two he-goats from the goats), which reflect the MT כֶּבֶד בֶּקָרָה (a young bull from the cattle) and ^{הַשְּׂעִירִים שְׁנֵי} (two goats of the goats) at Lev 16:3, 5, 7, 8, 9, etc. One can only speculate on why the writer of Hebrews used τράγος instead of χίμαρος if he was indeed thinking of the Day of Atonement here. It could be that he was only making a passing allusion from memory and inserted a synonym (after all, both τράγος and χίμαρος refer to the same type of animal). In any event τράγος is only used in the book of Hebrews in the New Testament. The parable of the sheep and the goats uses ἐρίφος and ἐρίφιονω (Matt 25:32–33), and the only other time goats are referred to is Heb 11:37, where the word αἴγιος is used (which is from the same root as αἶξ, a word which is used in Lev 16, LXX; neither χίμαρος or αἶξ are used in the New Testament).

This question becomes even more acute in Heb 9:13, where neither of the words used (τράγος and ταύρος) are found in Lev 16 in the Septuagint. In fact neither τράγος nor ταύρος is found anywhere in Leviticus,⁹ and the only places in the Septuagint that the two words are used together are at Ps 49:13 (LXX), Deut 32:14 and Isa 1:11.¹⁰ All of these are in contexts which condemn the misuse of the cultus. Is this why this particular combination of words was used in Heb 9:13? Is the author merely using this language because it is used elsewhere to condemn the Old Covenant Cultus, and consequently they become appropriate vehicles with which to criticize the inadequacies of that cultus?

The ashes of the heifer in Heb 9:13 is a clear allusion to the ceremonies prescribed in Num 19. An unclean person, as part of the ritual of making him clean, had the ashes of a burn red heifer sprinkled upon him. The question remains as to why this ceremony was linked to that referred to by bulls and goats. They are both linked together in that they are efficacious in cleansing the flesh (Heb 9:13). The link between the red heifer and cleansing is very clear—the ashes are used in ceremonies connected with the cleansing of unclean people. If τράγος and ταῦρος is a reference to the Day of Atonement, then the reference to cleansing is equally clear (cf. Lev 16:19, 30). But, while Lev 16:30 does make this a general cleansing of the whole people, it is hardly a cleansing of individuals. Presumably the cleansing of individuals occurs at the presentation of their sin offering, which could be a bull, a goat, a lamb, or a turtledove or a young pigeon (Lev 4–5). In others words, Goats could be used for a sin offering (e.g. Lev 4:23, 28; Num 7:16, 22, 28, 34, 40). Yet, when a goat is used as a sin offering, it is consistently described as χίμαρον ἐξ αἰγῶν (e.g. Num 7:16, 22, 28, 34; 28:15, 22; 29:5, 11 etc; which translates שׁ, עִז־עֹזָיִם or χίμαραν ἐξ αἰγῶν (Lev 4:28; 56). The word τράγος, on the other hand, while it is used extensively of goats for the peace or well-being offerings offered during the dedication of the tabernacle in Num 7 (vv. 17, 23, 29, 35, 41, etc.), is only used rarely elsewhere.¹¹ Bulls are used for a variety of offerings but they feature prominently as sin offerings in places like the Day of Atonement ceremony, and the inauguration ceremonies. It may be that the reference to τράγος and ταῦρος in Heb 9:13 is indeed a more general reference to sin offerings, rather than only to the Day of Atonement. Certainly, their use in Ps 50:9 (Ps 49:9, LXX) and Isa 1:11 show that they could be used as a way of referring to sacrifices in general.

This, then, is the raw data concerning the terms used in Heb 9:12–13, and their possible references. At first sight they appear to be a clear reference to the Day of Atonement, but closer investigation, while it has not ruled out this possibility, has at least shown that the reference is not as direct as might be thought. Clearly, this should reveal something of how the author of Hebrews is making use of these allusions, and consequently reveal the meaning he meant to convey by them. But before comments are made about this, perhaps it is appropriate to make a brief survey of other possible references to the Day of Atonement in Hebrews, and what use is made of them. When all this has been gathered together, it should be possible to make a more informed judgment as to exactly what is intended in Heb 9:12–13.

There are some references and allusions to the Day of Atonement in Hebrews that are unmistakable. Heb 9:7 is clearly a description of the Day of Atonement service (the high priest going into the second apartment yearly),

and Heb 9:25 is a clear allusion to it. The presence of the phrase κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν [each year] in 10:1 also makes this almost certainly another such allusion. It is also possible that the very interesting reference to the necessity of the cleansing of the heavenly realities in Heb 9:23 is yet another allusion (in the light of the subsequent context which includes the unequivocal allusion of Heb 9:25, but on this see below). There are two other possible allusions at Heb 6:19, 10:20, which are problematic and need further comment. The possible allusion to the Day of Atonement in Heb 6:19 consists of the phrase, εἰς τὸ ἑσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος. The word καταπετάσματος is used in the Septuagint to refer to all three of the curtains of the wilderness tabernacle: 5 (out of a possible total of 6) times to the entrance to the court; 10 (out of 13) for the entrance to the Holy Place; and 20 (out of 22) times for the entrance of the Most Holy Place.¹² But what is significant is that the phrase ἑσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος is only used of the veil that separates the Holy and the Most Holy Places (Exod 26:33, Lev 16:2, 12, 15), and that three of these usages are found in reference to the Day of Atonement ceremonies. This statement needs to be somewhat modified by the fact that in Num 18:7 the LXX has ἐνδοθεν τοῦ καταπετάσματος and that at Num 3:10 it has ἔσω τοῦ καταπετάσματος and that in both of these cases the reference is to the veil between the courtyard and the Holy Place. But the balance of probability still remains that the phrase refers to the inner curtain, and that if the writer was conceiving of the heavenly sanctuary as divided into two sections at Heb 6:19 (something which may or may not be true) he intends the reference to be the inner veil.¹³ This does not answer the question as to whether this is a reference to the Day of Atonement.¹⁴ The phrase comes like a bolt out of the blue. In the context there is not the comparison with the old covenant cultus that is found elsewhere in Hebrews. The allusion seems to be to the physical setup of the Old Covenant tabernacle, and not necessarily to the Day of Atonement. The point that the writer wishes to make is this, surely: Christians have access to the very presence of God, where Jesus is. This also appears to be the point made in Heb 10:20. Jesus has inaugurated a new and living way through the veil.¹⁵ In other words the Christian has access right to the throne and presence of God, something which the Old Covenant cultus failed to provide. Whether or not the writer was even thinking in passing of the Day of Atonement here is not at all clear.

To what use does the author of Hebrews put these references and allusions to the Day of Atonement? At times Hebrews uses the language of typology, as for example Heb 8:5, where the priests of the Old Covenant cultus serve as examples and shadows of earthly realities. This statement is preceded by Heb 8:1–3 which summarizes the main point of the previous argument—that

the Christian readers of his letter have a high priest of the true tabernacle in heaven, which God pitched. In this passage there appears to be a close (almost one-to-one) correspondence between the sanctuary of the Old Covenant cultus and the heavenly sanctuary. They both are tents, they both have a high priest and services.¹⁶ The point being made is that of superiority. The readers have a choice between two competing cultuses, although the choice expected of the reader is patent: the heavenly cultus which has Jesus as high priest is superior in every way.

The argument at Heb 9:23 also appears to be typological (even using the terminology of typology in Heb 9:24: ἀντίτυπα). Just as it was necessary for the earthly sanctuary to be cleansed, so also the heavenly realities needed to be similarly cleansed. But it is right here that the one to one correspondence between earthly and heavenly breaks down. This is shown by the τούτοις of the phrase, Ανάγκη οὖν τὰ μὲν ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς τούτοις καθαρίζεσθαι (Heb 9:23a). The copy of the heavenly sanctuary had to be cleansed in this way. The τούτοις refers back to the previous statements which were about the inauguration of the Old Covenant cultus sanctuary and services. But, as has already been pointed out, the records of this service in Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers speak in terms of consecration (ἀγιάζω), not cleansing. Not only this, the succeeding comments in Heb 9:25 are indisputably making reference to the Day of Atonement—the high priest going each year into τὰ ἅγια, with the blood of another. Here again is yet another example of the apparent mixing of elements of different ceremonies connected with the Old Covenant cultus.

The author's fundamental thought structures throughout the Epistle to the Hebrews appears to be, "compare and contrast ..." He is concerned to show the relationship between the history and cultus of the Old Covenant and the New Covenant. He does this by showing their continuities and discontinuities. He notes striking continuities between the Christian and the previous people of God. For example, Moses considered the reproach of Christ to be greater wealth than the treasures of Egypt (Heb 11:26). The great religious figures of the Old Testament lived by faith, just as the Christian does. They too (like the Christian) look for that future city (Heb 11:10). There are also discontinuities. The Christian has a different altar from which to eat (Heb 13:10). These discontinuities are expressed mainly by comparison—the new is so much better than the old. The Old Covenant high priests had to make offerings for their own sins (Heb 5:3; 7:27), the new high priest, Jesus, is sinless (Heb 4:15; 7:26); the earthly high priest was mortal (Heb 7:8), and was prevented from continuing by death (Heb 7:23), while Jesus has endless life (Heb 7:16), and is eternal, everlasting, unchanging (Heb 6:20; 7:24–25).

The sacrifices of the Old Covenant cultus were not able to take away sin (Heb 10:4, 11), they were good only for cleansing the body, not the conscience (Heb 9:9, 13); while the sacrifice of Jesus was given once for sin (Heb 10:12), and is able to perfect the conscience (Heb 9:14). These comparisons could be multiplied, but those given are sufficient to establish the basic pattern. There is a comparison being made, the new is better than the old, the new even excludes the old. The reader of the Epistle to the Hebrews is challenged to make the choice to leave the old cultus, and partake of the new, to which even the priests of the old do not have access.

Nowhere in Hebrews does it appear that the writer gives any indication of how he would conceive of a heavenly Day of Atonement. He never says that this part of the service corresponds to that heavenly reality. What he concentrates on is the superiority of the new. This is the case in every possible allusion of the Day of Atonement (with the possible exception of Heb 9:23). In Heb 9:25 there are several points of superiority noted between the new and the old. The high priest entered frequently, yearly, but Jesus has ἀπαξ (once for all), dealt with sin by his own sacrifice (Heb 9:26). The high priest took the blood of another, while Jesus applies his own blood, which is superior in that it can cleanse the conscience from dead works (Heb 9:14).

The reference to the Day of Atonement in Heb 9:7 is also by way of comparison. Here the issue is access to God. Ironically, the very tabernacle that was meant to give Israel access to God turns out to be nothing more than a series of obstacles between the sinner and God when it is compared to the superior access provided by Jesus. Entrance to the holy place was restricted to the priests. Entrance to the very presence of God (where he appeared over the mercy seat, Lev 16:2) was restricted to the high priest, who could only enter once a year! Heb 9:8 makes clear that his is the point that is being made here. This is the way the Holy Spirit makes clear that μήπω πεφανερῶσθαι τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδὸν (the path of the holies is not yet revealed) while the first tent had existence. In contrast to this, the Christian is urged to have confidence εἰς τὴν εἰσοδὸν τῶν ἁγίων (to enter the holies) by the blood of Jesus, who has inaugurated a new and living way through the veil (Heb 10:19–20).

This leads directly to the thought expressed in the passage under primary consideration in this paper, Heb 9:11–14. The question still needs to be answered: what is the place of the Day of Atonement here in the thought of the author, and in what way does he use the Day of Atonement allusions?

There can be little doubt that the phrase οὐδὲ δι' αἱματος τράγων καὶ μόσχων in Heb 9:12 is at the very least, an allusion to the Day of Atonement.¹⁷ The presence of the two types of animals used in the Day of Atonement ceremonies, the reference to entrance into τὰ ἁγία and even the emphasis that Jesus did this

ἐφάπαξ all point in this direction. Furthermore, the direct comparison with Heb 9:25 makes this almost certain.¹⁸ Yet at the same time, while the allusion to the Day of Atonement is deliberate, what is of even greater interest is how the author understands the relationship between the death and heavenly ministry of Jesus and the ceremony outlined in Lev 16. The stress in Heb 9:12–13 is on the fact that Christ found eternal redemption. It seems to be saying that Jesus was able to go into the very presence of God by virtue of his own blood. It was there, as the superior high priest that he achieved something that was not available under the Old Covenant Cultus, eternal redemption. In vs. 13 the allusions appear to be to sacrifices in general, and to the ceremonies involved with the ashes of the red heifer. Here again, the stress is on the superiority of what Christ has achieved, and what is now available to the Christian, which had not previously been available to the worshipper under the Old Covenant. Jesus provides a superior cleansing, one that is able to perfect the conscience, not merely the flesh. These appear to be the main points that are being made here, and the sum total of the use of Day of Atonement allusions.

On the other hand, while it is clear that while the writer can at times envisage an almost one-to-one correspondence between the earthly and heavenly tabernacle and cultus, most of his argumentation—including the allusions he makes to the Day of Atonement—follows a different structure. He is concerned to take key concepts like cleansing and access to God and to draw out various aspects of the Old Covenant cultus that deal with this. In doing this he is inclined to mix together allusions to quite disparate events and cultic ceremonies. For example, in considering the inauguration of the Old Covenant he can mix together quite disparate elements from the actual covenant making ceremony and the inauguration of the tabernacle and the priests. Not only this, he can even change some of the details involved (e.g., the vessels of the temple were anointed with oil, not blood when they were dedicated, Exod 40:9–11, Lev 8:10–13; cf. Heb 9:21). The structure of his thought is based on the necessities of contrast and comparison, not on a careful presentation of the different ceremonies and what they might represent. Thus, rather than stating, “The high-priestly activity of Christ is modelled on the ritual of the Day of Atonement,”¹⁹ it would be more accurate to say that for the author of the book of Hebrews, the high priestly activity of Christ is used to understand the various sacrifices of the Hebrew Bible, if, that is, they are considered from a standpoint far removed from a consideration of the individual details of a one-to-one correspondence.²⁰ The old covenant cultus is, after all, a shadow of the new reality of salvation as it is found in Jesus’ death and resurrection (Heb 8:5). A shadow has a direct but incomplete and sometimes misleading relationship with its original.

A further matter is perhaps the more significant. It has been found that the Day of Atonement is but one among many ceremonies that are alluded to in Heb 9–10. More sensitivity needs to be developed as to exactly how these allusions are used in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Most commentators concentrate on the Day of Atonement, and use it to interpret most of Heb 9–10. This is perhaps approaching the interpretive task from the wrong perspective. In Hebrews various aspects of the Day of Atonement, and other ceremonies are alluded to with a specific purpose. The details that are chosen are determined by the specific point being made. Thus, while an understanding of the events and ceremonies that are the object of these allusions is necessary, they should not form the basis for interpreting Hebrews. The interpretation of Hebrews needs to start from a location of the point of comparison or contrast that is being made. The focus in Hebrews is on the new reality brought about by the sacrifice and heavenly ministry of Jesus Christ, and it is through this lens that the old covenant ceremonies are considered, not vice versa.

Notes

1. The Day of Atonement in Hebrews is a particularly appropriate topic to explore in a book in honour of my former teacher, long-time colleague and friend, Norman H. Young. Norm chose to write his PhD Dissertation on the topic of "The Impact of the Jewish Day of Atonement upon the New Testament," The dissertation was written under the supervision of F. F. Bruce at the University of Manchester in the U.K., and submitted in 1973. Norm published his mature conclusions on the matter in a 1981 *New Testament Studies* article, and in further articles in *Andrews University Seminary Studies* in 2001–2002 (Norman H. Young, "The Gospel According to Hebrews 9," *NTS* 27 (1981) 198–210; *idem*, "Where Jesus has gone as a forerunner on our behalf (Hebrews 6:20)," *AUSS* 39 (2001): 165–173; *idem*, "The Day of Dedication or the Day of Atonement? The Old Testament Background to Hebrews 6:19–20 Revisited," *AUSS* 40 (2002): 61–68).

Alan C. Mitchell, suggests that "As in v. 2, the inner sanctuary is designated by one word, *hagia*" that part of the wilderness tabernacle or Solomonic temple only entered on the Day of Atonement. *Hebrews* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2007), 182. On τὰ ἅγια see further: A. P. Salom, "Ta *hagia* in the Epistle to the Hebrews," *AUSS* 5 (1967) 59–70, and Kenneth L. Schenck, *Cosmology and Eschatology in Hebrews: The Settings of the Sacrifice* (SNTSMS 143; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 145–47. Schenck concludes, "The clearest association between the neuter plural of ἅγιος and the second room of the tabernacle occurs in 9:25. ... It seems likely that Hebrews' other references to entrance into τὰ ἅγια refer also to the holy of holies. For example, 9:12 ... The parallel to 9:7 and 24–5 imply once more that the author refers to the holy of holies" (p. 146). By way of contrast, Richard M. Davidson argues that: "The term *ta hagia* is the regular LXX term for the sanctuary as a whole, not for the Most Holy Place alone." "Christ's Entry 'Within the Veil,' in Hebrews 6:19–20: The Old Testament Background," *AUSS* 39 (2001) 180.

2. For example, James W. Thompson suggests, "The Day of Atonement ritual described in 9:1–10 provides the lens for interpreting the work of Christ in 9:11–14." *Hebrews* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008), 186; while I Howard Marshall says, "Christ's death is first depicted in terms of the day of atonement (9:11–13)" "Soteriology in Hebrews," in Richard Bauckham, et al, eds., *The Epistle to the Hebrews and Christian Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009), 264. Simon J. Kistemaker states, "The expression *goats and calves* is a reminder of the Day of Atonement," *New Testament Commentary: Exposition on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1984), 249. Harold W. Attridge expresses a slightly more nuanced view when he comments: "That Christ did not enter with the blood of 'goats and calves' (τράγων καὶ μόσκων) is the first of several references to the Yom Kippur sacrifices that appear throughout chaps. 9 and 10. All are inexact reminiscences of the atonement ritual where one bull, two rams, and one he-goat were involved." *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989), 248.
3. It is true that the phrase καὶ τῶν τράγων is omitted by some important manuscripts, and that *The Greek New Testament*, edited by Kurt Aland, et al, fourth revised edition (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1993) lists it only as a "C" reading, that is, open to doubt. However, it should probably stand in the text. For the reasons outlined in the rest of this chapter: it is certainly the more difficult reading of the two—it is hard to think why the phrase would be interpolated if it was not there in the original.
4. David A. deSilva interprets this linkage in the following manner: "In linking together the 'blood of goats and cows' with 'the sprinkled ashes of a heifer,' the author blends together the sacrifices offered on Yom Kippur with the procedure outlined in Numbers 19 for the preparation of the medium that removes the impurity contracted by corpse defilement. ... The linkage allows him to relegate the sacrifices of Yom Kippur to the level of 'purification of the flesh' (9:13)." *Perseverance in Gratitude: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on the Epistle 'to the Hebrews'* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 306.
5. *Septuaginta: With Morphology*, electronic ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979).
6. Lev 9:3–4, LXX: "...λέγων Λάβετε χίμαρον ἐξ αἰγῶν ἓνα περὶ ἁμαρτίας καὶ μοσχάριον καὶ ἄμνον ἐνιαύσιον εἰς ὁλοκάρπωσιν, ἄμωμα, 4 καὶ μόσχον καὶ κριὸν εἰς θυσίαν σωτηρίου ἔναντι κυρίου καὶ σερμίδαλιν πεφυραμένην ἐν ἑλαίῳ ... [Ibid].
7. The only exception to this being that the sons of Aaron were to be cleansed, Num 8:6. It may or may not be significant that the word used in the LXX here is ἀφαγνίζω which is to purify for cultic service, and not a form of καθαρίζω. But it is significant that Heb 9:21 only speaks in terms of the tent and the vessels, *not of the priests*.
8. As with most categorical statements about Hebrews this one needs to be somewhat qualified. It is true that the edition edited by Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*, vol. 1 (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935) shows no variation from χίμαρος in Lev 16, but his edition is based on codices Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus (p. xxxii). The fuller textual apparatus given in *The Old Testament in Greek*, ed. Alan England Brooke & Norman McLean, vol. 1, part 2 (Cambridge: University Press, 1909), gives a considerable number of manuscripts that do use τράγος instead of χίμαρος. For example, the cursives listed as e, g, j, o, s, v, and z, all have τράγος instead of χίμαρος at Lev 16:8, 9, 10, and one uncial (M) at Lev 16:8, 10. Thus, the possibility arises that the writer of Hebrews was using a manuscript of the Septuagint that did

not use χίμαρος in Lev 16, but used τράγος. It is still an unlikely possibility, though, for two reasons. Firstly, these manuscripts are more recent and consequently probably less reliable than the earlier uncials upon which the critical texts of Rahlfs, Brooke & McLean are based (τράγος is not used in the main texts of either edition). Secondly, the text of the Septuagint that the author of Hebrews appears to have used is related to the family represented by Codex Alexandrinus. In his unpublished ThD thesis presented to the Union Theological Seminary, NY, in 1964, "The Use of the Old Testament in the Epistle to the Hebrews," (Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms # 64-10,527), Richard Reid concludes, "As to the source of [OT] quotations, there can be no doubt that he is using the LXX ... As to the text of the LXX which the author uses, the answer seems to be that it was one similar to Codex Alexandrinus" (p. 51).

9. This observation was first noted using George Morrish, *A Concordance of the Septuagint*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1976), which lists words from codices Vaticanus, Alexandrinus, Sinaiticus, and Ephraemi. It was confirmed using Gramcord and Logos.
10. The MT of Isa 1:11 has בְּדָמַת בָּקָרִים וְכֶשֶׂם וְכֶזֶבֶת (blood of bulls and lambs and goats), while the LXX has the exact phrase, [αἷμα] ταύρων καὶ τράγων ([blood] of calves and goats).
11. τράγος in its various forms may also be found at in Gen 30:35; 31:10, 12; 32:15; Deut 32:14; Psa 49:13; Prov 30:31; Isa 1:11; 34:6; Ezek 34:17; 39:18; Dan 8:5, 7, 8, 21. Aside from Num 5, it is notable from its absence in Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers, all of which have extensive treatments of the tabernacle and its associated sacrifices.
12. These figures are taken from p. 76 of an unpublished MA thesis by John Douglas Livingston, presented to the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Washington, DC [now, Berrien Springs, MI], in 1949, entitled, "A Critical Study of the Greek Words Translated 'Veils' and an Application to the Book of Hebrews." The actual distribution of usages may vary slightly as these figures depend on interpretation at some points. But the basic pattern would change little. See also the "Excursus: The Veil and its Symbolism," in Attridge, *Hebrews*, 184-185.
13. "That which is within the veil" is the heavenly holy of holies (as is made clear in Ch. 9); it is the counterpart in the eternal order to the material holy of holies in the wilderness tabernacle, shut off from the outer sanctuary by the heavy curtain behind which dwelt the invisible presence of the God of Israel." So F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1964), 130. Compare the comments of William L. Lane: "The curtain before the Throne of God is described in terms borrowed from the LXX, where τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος, 'the inner sanctuary,' signifies the inner curtain that separated the sanctuary of God from the holy place in the tabernacle (Lev 16:2, 12, 15 ...). This area could be entered by the high priest alone, and then only on the occasion of the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:2)." *Hebrews 1-8* (Word; Dallas, TX: Word, 1991), 154. Ben Witherington III agrees that "The veil in question is the one that separated the holy of holies from the holy place (Lev 16:2-15; Ex 26:31-35)." *Letters and Homilies for Jewish Christians: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on Hebrews, James and Jude* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2007), 225. G. E. Rice, "Hebrews 6:19: Analysis of Some Assumptions Concerning Katapetasma," AUSS 5 (1987) 65-71, argues that within the LXX the phraseology ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος could refer to any of the three curtains used in the

- wilderness tabernacle. Roy E. Gane responds by noting that while this may be true in the LXX, the Hebrew phrase translated by ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος in the LXX—מִקְדָּשׁ מִקְדָּשׁ—unambiguously refers to the innermost curtain between the holy place and the most holy place. “Re-opening Katapetasma (‘Veil’) in Hebrews 6:19,” *AUSS* 38 (2000):6–8.
14. Richard M. Davidson notes that Moses was the other individual who had accessed the most holy place in Ancient Israel, this happening at the time of the inauguration of the wilderness tabernacle and Aaron as high priest. “Christ’s Entry ‘Within the Veil,’ in Hebrews 6:19–20: The Old Testament Background,” *AUSS* 39 (2001) 175–190, esp. pp. 176–77. For further discussion see Norman H. Young, “The Day of Dedication or the Day of Atonement? The Old Testament Background to Hebrews 6:19–20 Revisited,” *AUSS* 40 (2002) 61–68.
 15. ἦν ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν ὁδὸν πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος.
 16. Richard Davidson provides the following assessment of the usage of the terminology of τύπος and ἀντίτυπος in Hebrews 8:1–5; 9:24: “... the *prophetic structure* functions in the vertical as well as the horizontal dimension. In Heb 9:23, for example, the author argues from the cleansing of the earthly sanctuary to the necessity (*devoir-être*) of a cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary. By *divine design*, the earthly sanctuary, modeled after the heavenly original, with all its cultic functions becomes a prefiguration or *advance presentation* of the realities connected with Christ’s ministry in the heavenly sanctuary (8:5).” “... in Heb 9:24 he ... allows ἀντίτυπος to have the meaning ‘counterpart, corresponding to’ with the connotation of ‘copy.’” *Typology in Scripture* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981), 354–55, 361.
 17. Christopher A. Beetham defines an allusion as follows: An allusion is “A literary device intentionally employed by an author to point a reader back to a single identifiable source, of which one or more components must be remembered and brought forward into the new context it order for the alluding text to be understood fully.” *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 20.
 18. Cf. the table comparing Heb 9:7; 9:11–12 and 9:25 presented by Norman H. Young in his article, “The Gospel According to Hebrews 9,” *NTS* 27 (1981) 199.
 19. So Edgar McKnight and Christopher Church, *Hebrews-James* (Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2004), 198.
 20. Norm Young expresses this point in the following manner: “Because his exegesis is controlled by the fact of the Christ-event, the author’s contrasting parallel between the repeated blood-bearing entrance of the Levitical high priest and the once-for-all sacrifice on the cross may appear strained. But such forcing of the shadow to fit the substance is the common manner of the writer.” “Gospel According to Hebrews 9,” 209.