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Abstract

The life, death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus are not often read against the backdrop of the sacrificial system of Leviticus, despite the fact that the Letter to the Hebrews and other New Testament texts do exactly this. Until recently, Hebrew Bible scholars had little insight into the function of many of the sacrifices of Leviticus. However, over the last thirty years, Jacob Milgrom has articulated the purgative and purificatory function of the התאנה offering ("purification offering") of Leviticus, the principal sacrifice offered for wrongdoing. The blood of the התאנה offering, which contains the animal’s דם, best understood as the animating force of the animal, acts as a ritual cleanser. Milgrom has insisted that the התאנה offering only cleanses the sanctuary, never the offerer. This conclusion likely has kept many New Testament scholars from seeing the impact this sacrifice had on various New Testament authors. Thus although Milgrom's work has had a profound impact on Hebrew Bible scholarship, it has had little effect on New Testament scholarship on the sacrifice of Jesus.

Using source criticism and a close reading of the relevant Hebrew Bible texts and New Testament texts, this study argues that the התאנה offering of Leviticus can purge the offerer, as well as the sanctuary. Moreover, the logic of the התאנה offering of Leviticus informs many New Testament texts on the sacrificial offering of Jesus. Leviticus demonstrates that there is a relationship between the Israelites and the sanctuary. The
wrongdoings and impurites of the Israelites can stain the sanctuary and sacrificial procedures done in and to the sanctuary can purge the Israelites. The purgation of the offerer takes place in two stages. In the first stage, described in Lev 4:1–5:13, the offerer moves from being guilt-laden to being forgiven. In the second stage, outlined in Lev 16, the sanctuary is purged of the wrongdoings and impurities of the Israelites. The Israelites shift from being forgiven to being declared pure. The Israelites cannot be pure until the sanctuary is purged and reconsecrated.

The Letter to the Hebrews, along with other New Testament texts, articulates the same process and results for the sacrificial offering of Jesus. The emphasis in Hebrews and elsewhere in the New Testament is on the power (typically the cleansing power) of Jesus’ blood. Jesus’ death is necessary but insufficient. Hebrews clearly asserts that it was through the offering of Jesus’ blood in the heavenly sanctuary that the heavenly things were cleansed, and more importantly, that believers were cleansed. Hebrews also articulates a two-stage process for the transformation of believers. In the first stage, believers are cleansed by Jesus’ sacrificial offering in heaven. However, believers anticipate a final rest after Jesus’ return when their flesh will be transformed as Jesus’ flesh was after his resurrection. This transformation allows believers to dwell in harmony with and in proximity to God. The logic of the שָׁנַח offering of Leviticus, then, informs the Letter to the Hebrews and other New Testament texts.
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1. Introduction

1.1 The Objective

This dissertation brings together two things not often believed to be in the same purview. Sacrificial procedure described in Leviticus is explicated and then brought into conversation with texts on the sacrifice of Jesus in the New Testament, above all the Letter to the Hebrews. Leviticus begins with seven chapters devoted solely to a description of various sacrifices and these sacrifices figure prominently throughout the rest of the book. Sacrifice is a central theme in the New Testament, especially in the Letter to the Hebrews. Jacob Milgrom’s work on the purgative and purificatory nature of the ἀφίλας offering (best translated as “purification offering,” but often unhelpfully translated as “sin offering”), as well as new work on the sacrificial offering of Jesus described in the Letter to the Hebrews, has created a unique opportunity to bring together these two areas of research. Using source-critical analysis of the Priestly Source (P) and the Holiness Code (H), as well as a close reading of the Hebrew Bible texts on the ἀφίλας offering, this dissertation focuses on uncovering the function and theology of the ἀφίλας offering of Leviticus. This work on the ἀφίλας offering is then utilized to shed new light on the explication of the nature and function of the sacrificial offering of Jesus described in the Letter to the Hebrews and other New Testament texts.
1.2 A Revival in the Study of Leviticus

Over the last fifty years, there has been a resurgence in the study of the book of Leviticus, which has resulted in significant advances in the understanding of the book. The central figure in this reawakening has been Jacob Milgrom, who has written a three-volume commentary on Leviticus, a culmination of thirty years of research on Leviticus.\(^1\) Milgrom’s work advanced three provocative theories on the book of Leviticus. First, Milgrom articulated a compelling analysis of the (im)purity system as stemming from a belief in the sanctity of life, and thus the avoidance of anything symbolizing death. Milgrom uncovered a discernible logic to what had appeared chaotic.\(^2\) Second, Milgrom offered a compelling new theory on the ḥalōt offering. Milgrom argued that the blood of the ḥalōt offering acts as a ritual detergent, cleansing the sancta of the wrongdoings and impurities of the Israelites. These wrongdoings and impurities have substantive reality and are attracted to the holy. Blood contains the ṣĕqĕ (which Milgrom translates as “life,” but which is better understood as “spirit,” the animating force of a creature\(^3\)) of an animal according to Lev 17:11. Blood, on account of the ṣĕqĕ that it contains, can cleanse

---


\(^2\) Mary Douglas, an anthropologist, also uncovered a discernable logic to the dietary laws of P in Lev 11. In her work *Purity and Danger* (first published in 1966), Douglas rather famously showed how the schema of creation in Gen 1:1–2:4a, where God divides the earth into different realms (water, land, air), appears to inform the logic of the dietary laws of Lev 11 (*Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* [Routledge Classics; London: Routledge, 2002], 51–71). Douglas’ work of using the theology and logic of the creation story of Gen 1:1–2:4a, which typically has been attributed to P, prompted many scholars to give Leviticus and other Priestly material another look.

the sancta of the stain of impurity and wrongdoing. Due to the fact that the sancta always receive the blood of the "tafj" offering, Milgrom contended that this offering always "purges" the sancta and never the offerer, a point with which I shall take issue.

Lastly, Milgrom, along with Israel Knohl, put forward a new proposal on the two "priestly" (P and H) sources. For more than a century, P has been viewed as the last Pentateuchal source and the redactor of the Pentateuch. For some time, then, the work of P was believed to be almost entirely post-exilic. H was understood as a much earlier "priestly" work that P preserved and finally incorporated into the Pentateuch, specifically into the second half of Leviticus (17–26). The emerging consensus, led by the work of Jacob Milgrom and Israel Knohl, inverts the traditional view, dating H after P and asserting that H is the editor of P. This reevaluation of the history of the two "priestly" sources, combined especially with Milgrom’s theory of the tafj offering, has opened new avenues of research into the Priestly Source and the Holiness Code.

1.3 The Scope and Methodology of the Project

Within Hebrew Bible scholarship, scholars are still absorbing Milgrom’s theory on the tafj offering, as well as his reevaluation of the historical order of P and H. Utilizing Milgrom, Knohl, and others, my work validates Milgrom’s understanding of the purgative function of the tafj offering and the reordering of P and H. However, my work expands upon and parts ways with these scholars in significant ways and these conclusions lead to provocative new ideas on the tafj offering. To reiterate, this
dissertation primarily engages in source-critical analysis of P and H and a close reading of the Hebrew text on the לְוָיָ֑יַא offering, explicated principally in Lev 4:1–5:13 and Lev 16, but also in Lev 17 and Lev 10. The results of this work are then brought into conversation with various New Testament texts, the Letter to the Hebrews principal among them, on the sacrificial offering of Jesus.

This renewed interest in Leviticus has yet to make a significant impact on the study of the New Testament. The ways in which New Testament authors draw upon sacrificial imagery when discussing the life, death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus have not been brought into conversation with the לְוָיָ֑יַא offering of Leviticus. In part, this may be due to the fact that Milgrom has concluded that the לְוָיָ֑יַא offering of Leviticus only purges sancta and not the offerer, a point I will dispute. The Letter to the Hebrews openly discusses the sacrificial system of Israel as it explains the sacrificial offering of Jesus. The author of Hebrews unquestionably draws upon the theology of the sacrificial practice of Leviticus, and principally the לְוָיָ֑יַא offering of Lev 16. Hebrews narrates Jesus bringing his blood into the heavenly sanctuary, resulting in redemption and cleansing for believers and even cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary. This is a startling adoption of the logic of the לְוָיָ֑יַא offering of Leviticus. Very recently, New Testament scholar David Moffitt has analyzed Hebrews in light of this new research on the לְוָיָ֑יַא offering of Leviticus, principally the work of Milgrom and Jay Sklar. Moffitt’s work will be utilized throughout my work on Hebrews in chapter five as I show how my
understanding of the מָזָּה offering, which differs in important ways from Milgrom’s and Sklar’s understanding, reinforces Moffitt’s work on Hebrews and casts new light on the sacrificial offering of Jesus.

While one motivation for this work is to understand how the texts of Leviticus on the מָזָּה offering might still function as Christian scripture, this work utilizes traditional methodologies (close reading of the Hebrew text and source criticism) of Hebrew Bible scholarship to do so. My presupposition is that the Hebrew Bible text should not be assumed to have a unique Christian message. In fact, I do not articulate a unique Christian interpretation of the Hebrew Bible texts treated in this work. In my estimation, few texts in the Hebrew Bible are open to or in need of a unique Christian interpretation. Rather, it is more useful and appropriate to attempt an interpretation that is unbiased in terms of faith, and then to take the extra step of deciding whether that interpretation has any use in one’s faith tradition.

In what follows, I present many new ideas about the מָזָּה offering of Leviticus and about the Priestly Source (P) and the Holiness Code (H), and these interpretations prove fruitful for understanding various New Testament texts, especially the Letter to the Hebrews. However, these ideas are rooted in my analysis of the Hebrew text of various passages in the Hebrew Bible, principally in the book of Leviticus. Christian theology is in no way explicitly or consciously imported into the exegesis of Hebrew Bible texts. By contrast, my conclusions on the function and theology of the מָזָּה
offering of Leviticus are openly imported into my reading of the Letter to the Hebrews and other New Testament texts. This is not to say that my interpretations of New Testament texts lack methodological controls. As in my work on the Hebrew Bible, the grammar, vocabulary, and syntax of the Greek text guide my work. However, the possibility that the New Testament authors are working with some of the same theological ideas that I articulate in my work on the נַחַל offering is explored throughout chapters five and six.

It is exactly in this direction that the work between the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament should flow. The New Testament writers unquestionably knew of and referred to the Hebrew Bible. Thus it is appropriate and useful to read New Testament texts against the backdrop of one’s understanding of the Hebrew Bible, especially when the New Testament text appears to assume such knowledge. The Letter to the Hebrews openly speaks of sacrificial procedure in Israel. This New Testament letter, then, lends itself to interpretation that is informed by Hebrew Bible texts on sacrifice. As this work will demonstrate, reading New Testament texts through one’s understanding of certain lines of thought in the Hebrew Bible is provocative and productive.

Source-critical analysis figures prominently throughout this work and is essential to its conclusions. The development and theology of the נַחַל offering explicated in chapters one through four are dependent upon my source-critical analysis. Source criticism is and has always been speculative work. Over the last fifty years much doubt
has been cast on its effectiveness and on the dating and identification of the Pentateuchal sources. That said, the existence of P in the Pentateuch is still widely affirmed, as is the existence of a unique “priestly” strand (H) in Lev 17–26. As indicated above, Milgrom and Knohl invert the traditional view, dating H after P and asserting that H is the editor of P. My work goes further than Milgrom and Knohl as I argue that H is the editor of the Pentateuch and the author of much of the material in Genesis, Exodus, and Numbers formerly attributed to P. The source-critical work that I undertake relies on the identification of stylistic, terminological, and theological tendencies unique to P and to H. Many of these tendencies are clearly recognizable (e.g., P prefers third-person speech for YHWH, while H prefers first-person speech for YHWH) and thus are not controversial. Without a doubt, however, there is a certain circular aspect to source criticism that is difficult to avoid completely. As certain texts are reassigned from P to H, these reassigned texts then help with the reassignment of other P texts to H. Nonetheless, I attempt to anchor my assessments and identifications in undisputed P and H texts. What emerges is too compelling to ignore.

1.4 Chapter Summaries

When it is shown that H is by far the larger “priestly” document, it becomes clear that P is a technical document that concentrates on cultic matters, principally the Tabernacle, its caretakers, and its ritual complexes. H, by contrast, is an expansive document that covers a wide range of ethical and historical matters, as well as cultic
issues. Within P itself, a development in the function of the ṭaqebū offering is evident. Leviticus 16, a text that evinces no knowledge of the inner altar (also known as the incense altar, but which I will exclusively refer to as the inner altar), is an earlier text than Lev 4:1–5:13. Leviticus 4:1–5:13, which clearly does know of the inner altar, utilizes linguistic structures and the conceptual/theological framework of Lev 16. The rituals of Yom Kippur (outlined in Lev 16) attest to the purgatory nature of the ṭaqebū offering, as well as the relationship between the Israelites and the sanctuary. Leviticus 16 quite clearly narrates the purgation of the sanctuary of the sins and impurities of the Israelites. This purgative function, in combination with the implied relationship between the Israelites and the sanctuary that Lev 16 articulates, is utilized by the Priestly writer of Lev 4:1–5:13 to craft a ṭaqebū offering that purges the offerer instead of the sanctuary. The author of Lev 4:1–5:13 has made this function clear through his utilization of certain collocations ($or$ and the use of the privative $n$) borrowed from Lev 16. The writer of H confirms this dual function of the ṭaqebū offering (purging sancta and purging offerers) in H’s addition to Lev 16, vv. 29–34a, and in the rationale on the function of sacrifice and ḥem in Lev 17:11, another H text. Thus, P and H are in agreement on the function of the ṭaqebū offering.

While chapter one focuses principally on source-critical issues, it also touches on the scholar who has most influenced my work. I engage the work of Jacob Milgrom extensively throughout chapters one through four. Milgrom is a skilled and careful
reader of the Hebrew text, which makes him a wonderful exegete and source critic. As explained above, Milgrom asserts that, in the conceptual world of P, an Israelite’s sin has a material presence that can be purged by blood application to sanctum, typically the altar. Blood is effective because it is a symbol of vitality, not a symbol of death. Leviticus 17:11 explains that blood contains "life," but which I have already said is better understood as “spirit,” the animating force of a creature. On account of this, blood effectively purges the sancta of the wrongdoings and impurities of the Israelites. In Milgrom’s schema, the *ta'af* offering always functions to cleanse sancta. While I do not agree that sancta are always purged by the *ta'af* offering, the idea of the material reality of sin is of paramount importance for my work. Milgrom also points out that there is a relationship between the Israelites and the sancta. Leviticus 16 quite clearly shows that the sin and impurities of the Israelites materialize as stains on the sancta, which are then purged of these stains by the *ta'af* offerings of Yom Kippur. The reality of this relationship between the sancta and the Israelites is also essential to my work in chapters two through five. Lastly, Milgrom identifies a number of stylistic and theological differences between P and H that are important to my work, especially in chapter one.
Likewise, Knohl’s work on the many texts in the Pentateuch that belong to either P or H inspired my reassignment of the P texts of Genesis to H. Knohl does not believe Gen 1 or Gen 17, the two texts that I examine most closely in chapter one, belong to H. Nonetheless, his identification of the importance of the Sabbath for the writer of H, as well as his identification of the dramatic ways in which the material typically attributed to P in Genesis differs from the P material in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, spawned my identification of H as the author of texts in Genesis traditionally assigned to P. Jonathan Klawans alerted me to the importance of the divine presence in the cult, a theme I return to again and again, be it in my work on the Hebrew Bible or my work on the New Testament. The central question for P, H, and many New Testament writers, principally the author of the Letter to the Hebrews, is as follows: How can humans and YHWH/God dwell together? According to all of these writers, this can only be achieved through the proper kind of sacrificial offering.

Chapter two focuses on the ritual acts of Yom Kippur described in Lev 16, the bulk of which (vv. 1–28) is the oldest P text on the ḥamatsa offering. My articulation of the use of הַכְּסֶם in this chapter, especially the particles (prepositions and the definite direct object marker) used with הַכְּסֶם throughout Lev 16, sets the stage for the rest of my exegetical work on the ḥamatsa offering. Principally, Lev 16 demonstrates that הַכְּסֶם and

---

are functionally equivalent and thus either collocation can be used to mark an object that is purged of sin, guilt, or impurity. This is not the case for מפר עליה, which is consistently used to mark the person on whose behalf a חטאת offering is performed, with the actual object purged being an item of the sanctuary. The use of the privative ב to mark the substances purged from the sanctuary is also identified and explicated.

Finally, Lev 16:29–34a, an addition from H, confirms that the function of the חטאת offering is purgation. The sanctuary, the Tent of Meeting, and the altar are purged, as is evident from Lev 16:1–28. However, according to H, the Israelites are also declared pure on account of the rituals of Yom Kippur. In part, the purity of the Israelites is dependent upon the purgation of Aaron through the ritual with the goat for Azazel. However, this declaration of purity also attests further to the relationship between the Israelites and the sanctuary. The people can only become pure when the sanctuary is purged.

Leviticus 4:1–5:13, discussed in chapter three, contains the instructions for the recurring חטאת offering. Drawing on the explication of the חטאת offering in Lev 16, the Priestly writer of Lev 4:1–5:13 has developed a חטאת offering that purges the offerer.

Throughout Lev 4:1–5:13, the author uses the collocation מפר עליה and the privative ב to communicate that the offerer of the חטאת offering is purged of the sin that s/he carries as a result of having committed wrongdoing. The verb מפרש appears throughout Lev 4:1–5:13 and it should be understood to mean “carry guilt.” Because of the inherent relationship between the Israelites and the sancta, blood applied to the sancta can purge
the offerer. This purgation leads to forgiveness, not purity. Purity is not achieved for the
Israelites until the sanctuary and Aaron are purged of the people’s sins on Yom Kippur.
Thus, purgation for the Israelites is a two-stage process. The first stage is explicated in
Lev 4:1–5:13 where the offerer is purged and forgiven. In the second stage, Aaron and
the sancta are purged, which results in the Israelites being declared pure.

Chapter four covers two more important texts on the לֵּֽנַֽוֹן offering, Lev 17:11 and Lev 10:17. Leviticus 17:11 puts forth a rationale on sacrifice and לֵֽנַֽוֹן. A majority of
scholars, Milgrom included, believe that לֵֽנַֽוֹן should be understood as “act as ransom”
here, instead of “purge,” the typical translation for לֵֽנַֽוֹן with the לֵֽנַֽוֹן offering
throughout much of Lev 1–16. Milgrom and others argue for the translation of “act as
ransom” due to the expression לֵֽנַֽוֹן, which does appear to mean “to ransom
for their lives” in two non-sacrificial settings in Exod 30:15–16 (P) and Num 31:50 (H).6
This understanding of לֵֽנַֽוֹן would be in disagreement with the understanding of לֵֽנַֽוֹן in
Lev 16:29–34a (an H addition, the same author as Lev 17:11) where it is clearly
understood as “purge.” Furthermore, the scholars who insist on the translation “to act as
ransom” acknowledge that it is entirely unclear why the Israelite offerer would be in
need of such ransom. I argue that לֵֽנַֽוֹן in Lev 17:11 be read as “purge,” as it is in almost

Israel Knohl suggests that Num 31:50 is from H (The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness
every other sacrificial context. What the H author has done is to further specify what
part of the offerer, the נֵיבָה, is purged.

Leviticus 10 discusses the function of the consumption of the outer-altar נֵיבָה offering meat by the priest(s). Leviticus 10:17, in particular, claims that this part of the
ritual has a purgative function. Milgrom argues that this consumption serves as an
elimination rite, similar to the burning of the carcass of other נֵיבָה offerings. The carcass
of the נֵיבָה offering is polluted through contact with the polluted altar, the object that
Milgrom believes is purged through the ritual process. I disagree with Milgrom on both
counts. The textual evidence suggests that the meat of the נֵיבָה offering is “most holy”
as opposed to polluted, thus this consumption cannot be for the elimination of impurity.
Leviticus 10:17 also clearly marks the Israelite community (ָלַעֲמַי לֹא), not the altar, as
the object of purgation. Lastly, the priests are to “enjoy,” not simply “consume,” the
meat of the נֵיבָה offering, which explains Aaron’s refusal to eat the meat of the נֵיבָה offerings after the deaths of his two sons.

In chapters five and six I turn to the New Testament. Chapter five focuses on the
Letter to the Hebrews, which contains the most explicit language on sacrificial practice
and procedure in the New Testament. Like Leviticus, in the Letter of Hebrews the
offering of blood in the sanctuary is stressed as the crucial element of sacrifice. Jesus
must present his blood and transformed flesh in heaven in order to accomplish
redemption/cleansing. As in Leviticus, the offering of blood in the sanctuary, here the
heavenly sanctuary, purges people and the heavenly sanctuary, confirming the relationship between persons and sancta. Jesus can only bring his offering after his resurrection and ascension into heaven. It is then that Jesus is qualified to be a high priest, as it is then that Jesus has “a power of indestructible life” (Heb 7:16). Jesus’ transformed flesh is necessary for his qualification of high priesthood, but also an important aspect of his sacrificial offering. Many scholars of Hebrews condense the entirety of Jesus’ sacrifice into his death on the cross, thus missing the crucial distinction between the death of the sacrificial victim and the application of the blood of the sacrificial victim. While the slaughter of the sacrificial victim is necessary, it is only one act of a sacrificial offering, and certainly not the most important act according to Leviticus or Hebrews. As is the case in Lev 4:1–5:13 and Lev 16, sacrificial purification in Hebrews is also a two-stage process. The move in Hebrews is from sinful to cleansed/perfected, and then from cleansed/perfected to transformed. After Jesus’ return, believers will receive transformed flesh and dwell with God, as Jesus now does.

Chapter six turns to an analysis of various references to the sacrifice and blood of Jesus in the Pauline and non-Pauline letters, and in Revelation. Almost without fail, New Testament scholars read any reference to the blood of Jesus as equivalent to a reference to the death of Jesus. These references should be understood, by and large, as references to the purgative quality of sacrificial blood, which is altogether separate from the death of the sacrificial victim. Thus many of these appearances of the blood of Jesus
in the New Testament assume sacrificial logic to be operative in the death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus. This includes Paul’s works, in spite of Paul’s frequent references to the death of Jesus. Paul clearly references sacrificial practice in Rom 3:25 as he speaks of the “mercy-seat,” which was housed in the Holy of Holies and featured in the rituals for Yom Kippur, and the blood of Jesus. Many New Testament letters speak of Jesus’ sacrifice and/or the importance of the blood of Jesus, which in places is said explicitly to have cleansing qualities. Lastly, references to the blood of Jesus in Revelation are examined. Revelation ends with a vision of humanity, God, and the Lamb, whose blood figures prominently throughout Revelation, dwelling together without the need for further sacrificial offerings. This vision has its roots in the Tabernacle tradition of P and H.

1.5 The Use of Hebrew and Greek

Throughout this work, any unmarked translations of Hebrew texts are mine, as are any unmarked translations of Greek texts. As for the many Hebrew words, phrases, and full verses that appear throughout this work, full verses and longer phrases from the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia will always be pointed. Single words and shorter phrases will generally not be pointed, unless pointing is deemed necessary or useful for comprehension.
2. Identifying and Dating the Priestly Source (P) and the Holiness Code (H) in the Pentateuch

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I will discuss the character, scope, and dating of the Priestly Source (P) and the Holiness Code (H). This includes an analysis of the work of some scholars of Leviticus who have helped to shape my understanding of the she’lah offering in P and H. This discussion will set the foundation for my work on the she’lah offering in subsequent chapters, in which I will argue, or sometimes assume, that H is later than P and builds on P’s conception of the she’lah offering. This work will also establish that the Priestly Source is a small, technical document with precise vocabulary and syntax. The work of Jacob Milgrom leaves an indelible mark on my work, even though I will disagree with Milgrom when he argues that the she’lah offering of Lev 4:1–5:13 purges the sancta and not the offerer. The she’lah offering of Lev 4:1–5:13 does purge the offerer. However, without Milgrom’s articulation of the purgative and purificatory function of the she’lah offering and the relationship between the impurities and sins of the Israelites and the sanctuary, my new ideas on Lev 4:1–5:13 would never have materialized.

Jonathan Klawans alerted me to the importance of the divine presence in sacrifice. The divine presence makes sacrifice necessary, but also effectual. Lastly, a few scholars, Klawans included, have stressed the importance of creation theology, as articulated in Gen 1:1–2:4a, in the conception of the sacrificial system. In this case, I am in
disagreement. There is lack of coherence between Lev 1–16 and the first creation account. This disagreement requires a reevaluation of Gen 1:1–2:4a and other Genesis texts typically attributed to P. I will argue below that two foundational texts in Genesis, the creation text of Gen 1:1–2:4a and the covenant with Abraham in Gen 17, which traditionally are attributed to P, should be understood as H texts. This source-critical work, both here in chapter one and throughout this work, will also show that many other P texts in Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, and even some in Lev 1–16, should be attributed to H. My suspicion is that all the texts in Genesis previously attributed to P actually belong to H, but I will not have the space here to defend this position. However, my analysis of Gen 1:1–2:4a and Gen 17 will add further confirmation to the emerging consensus, following the work of Milgrom and Israel Knohl, that H comes after P and is the editor of P and the entire Pentateuch. This reassignment of P texts to H, as well as the assignment of the editing of the Pentateuch to H, also leads to the important realization mentioned above about the Priestly Source. P is a small and technical document, concerned only with the building of the Tabernacle, the consecration of the Tabernacle and the priesthood, and the sacrificial, dietary, and purity laws. The technical nature of P is supported by the linguistic precision demonstrated in the Priestly Source, a precision that my analysis of the ֶּתֶנְּכָּנַּי offering in Lev 4:1–5:13 and Lev 16 will affirm. In contrast, the Holiness Code, which utilizes and follows upon P, is a wide-reaching, more diverse work, touching on a number of moral issues outside of the
cult. Lastly, I will argue that P and much of H are pre-exilic, while the H-redactor (Hₚ), who is responsible for much of the Genesis material and many other additions in the Pentateuch, began his work in exile and finished in post-exilic Yehud.

2.2 Jacob Milgrom

The impact of Jacob Milgrom’s work on Leviticus cannot be understated. He spent his entire career explicating the work of the Priestly Source and the Holiness Code.¹ Milgrom’s approach to the Priestly literature, including the sacrificial system, can rightly be characterized as sympathetic, as James Watts explains:

His [Milgrom’s] demonstration of the systematic relationship between purity regulations and sacrificial practices and his search for how such practices reinforce ethical norms have been major factors in moving biblical studies away from the derogatory assumptions of previous generations of scholars, just as these anthropological studies [E. E. Evans-Pritchard, Victor Turner, Mary Douglas] have placed a brake on generalizations about “primitive” beliefs and practices.²

---


This is not to say that Milgrom is biased or uncritical. Milgrom’s scholarship is firmly rooted in historical-critical scholarship. While Milgrom prefers synchronic analysis, he does not ignore source or redaction criticism. As Milgrom explains,

There are many places in which editorial sutures are clearly visible, thereby exposing a penultimate (or, occasionally, earlier) state in the development of the text. Stylistic, grammatical, and terminological anomalies by themselves, and even in concert, do not warrant the assumption of more than one source. These variations must be supplemented by jarring and irreconcilable inconsistencies and contradictions before the hypothesis of multiple strata is considered. In a word, source criticism is a last resort.³

Milgrom carefully analyzes aspects of style, grammar, and terminology. He only strays from traditional historical criticism when including comments from rabbinic sources. Milgrom’s operative presupposition is that the Priestly rituals make sense. As Watts notes, “His aim then was to demonstrate the rationality of P’s regulations within the context of ancient Israelite society.”⁴

Milgrom’s principal thesis regarding the Priestly theology and thus the ritual systems of Leviticus is as follows: “Humans can drive God out of the sanctuary by polluting it with their moral and ritual sins. All that the priests can do is periodically purge the sanctuary of its impurities and influence the people to atone for their

⁴ Watts, Ritual and Rhetoric, 4 (emphasis in original). Furthermore, Watts points out that Milgrom’s view of the rationality of Israel’s rituals can be traced to “the distinctive thesis of a particular school of anthropologists influential in the middle of the twentieth century. On the basis of Emile Durkheim’s arguments that societies generate their own symbolic representations, a series of researchers interpreted rituals and beliefs in such ‘functionalist’ terms to show that they are rational within the culture in which they are found” (Ritual and Rhetoric, 4–5).
The priests purge the sanctuary, surprisingly, with sacrifices, specifically the 
offerings. Milgrom postulates that the tafj offering should be understood as 
affecting not the offerer, but the sanctuary. The tafj offering, which Milgrom suggests 
be translated as “purification offering,” purges the sanctuary of the wrongdoings of 
Israel that collect on the appurtenances of the Tabernacle.

Milgrom’s thesis on the tafj offering rests on three main points. The first is the 
meaning of tafj and rpk. Both have meanings related to cleansing. “Morphologically, it 
[tafj] appears as a pi’el derivative. More importantly, its corresponding verbal form is 
not the qal ‘to sin, do wrong’ but always the pi’el (e.g., [Lev] 8:15), which carries no other 
meaning than ‘to cleanse, expurgate, decontaminate’ (e.g., Ezek 43:22, 26; Ps 51:9).”
As for rpk, Milgrom is on firm ground when he proposes “purge” as a translation, as it is 
well known that Akkadian has a cognate of כְּפֵר which clearly has this meaning.7 As Jay 
Sklar comments, “Akkadian attests kuppuru (‘to purify’), which is not only similar to כְּפֵר in form (D stem of kpr), it is also used in cultic texts in a way analogous to כְּפֵר.”
Secondly, Milgrom stresses that it is the sanctuary and its appurtenances that receive the 
blood of the tafj offering; therefore it must be these objects that are purged. “By 
daubing the altar with the [tafj] blood or by bringing it inside the sanctuary (e.g., [Lev]

---

5 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 43.
6 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 253.
7 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 1040, 1080–82; Baruch A. Levine, In the Presence of the Lord: A Study of Cult and Some 
8 Jay Sklar, Sin, Impurity, Sacrifice, Atonement: The Priestly Conceptions (Hebrew Bible Monographs 2; 
16:14–19), the priest purges the most sacred objects and areas of the sanctuary on behalf of the person who caused their contamination by his physical impurity or inadvertent offense.”

Lastly, Milgrom proposes an account of how the sanctuary is polluted. He contends that the sins of the Israelites become manifest as miasma on the sanctuary. Like her neighbors (Egypt, Hattia, Mesopotamia), Israel believed that “impurity was a physical substance, an aerial miasma that possessed magnetic attraction for the realm of the sacred.” The sins of the Israelites pollute the sanctuary and the blood of the offering acts as a ritual cleanser. Milgrom ingeniously describes how the status of the wrongdoer/wrongdoing correlates with the area of the sanctuary that it pollutes:

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 [טמא] blood ([Lev] 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 [טמא] blood on the inner altar and before the [תקרובות] ([Lev] 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 Ark and [תקרובות], the very throne of God (cf. Isa 37:16). Because the wanton sinner is barred from bringing his [טמא] (Num 15:27–31), the pollution wrought by his

---

9 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 256–57.
10 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 257. Milgrom goes on to say, “As will be shown below, Israel thoroughly overhauled this concept of impurity in adapting it to its monotheistic system, but the notion of its dynamic and malefic power, especially in regard to the sancta, was not completely expunged from P” (Leviticus 1–16, 257). This betrays Milgrom’s lack of comfort with the strong similarities between Israelite ritual beliefs and the beliefs of her neighbors.
11 Translated as “veil.”
12 Milgrom chooses not to translate the Hebrew word תקרובות because he concludes that it is “untranslatable, so far” (Leviticus 1–16, 1014). He notes that “mercy seat/throne” or “cover” cannot be defended “either on etymological or on semantic grounds: the verb תקרובות never implies mercy or cover, and the תקרובות never served an expiatory or covering function” (Leviticus 1–16, 1014).
offense must await the annual purgation of the sanctuary on the Day of Purgation, and it consists of two steps: the purging of the adytum of the wanton sins and the purging of the shrine and outer altar of the inadvertent sins ([Lev] 16:16–19). Thus the entire sacred area or, more precisely, all that is most sacred ...is purged on Purgation Day ([יִאְנָה הֶסֶרָת]) with the [חָטָא] blood.\textsuperscript{13}

The symmetry of Milgrom’s schema and his explanation for the application of blood to various parts of the sanctuary are appealing. The role of blood is the crucial aspect of this offering, and Milgrom offers an attractive explanation for this curious phenomenon.

\section*{2.3 Divine Presence and Sacrifice}

Jonathan Klawans has suggested that one of the organizing principles of the Priestly sacrificial system is “attracting and maintaining the divine presence.”\textsuperscript{14} One of the oft-repeated refrains in the instructions for sacrifice in Lev 1–16 is \textsuperscript{לֹאֶה יְהוֹיָה}, “before YHWH,” (49 times; 1:3, 5, 11; 3:1, 7, 12; 4:4, 6, 7, 15, 17, 18, 24; 5:26 [Eng. 6:14]; 6:7 [Eng. 6:14], 6:18 [Eng. 6:25]; 7:30; 8:26, 27, 29; 9:2, 4, 5, 21, 24; 10:1, 2, 15, 17, 19; 12:7; 14:11, 12, 16, 18, 23, 24, 27, 29, 31; 15:14, 15, 30; 16:7, 10, 12, 13, 18, 30). This Hebrew phrase stresses proximity to YHWH as a key aspect of Israelite sacrifice. Furthermore, as Klawans points out, “Of course the term ‘tabernacle’ ([כַּפָּר], with its connotation of indwelling—itself testifies to the importance of this concern [the divine present in the Israelite community]. Moreover, the priestly traditions’ favorite term for the sacrificial act— ‘offering’ ([נְדֵנָה]), with its connotation of closeness and nearness—is likely expressive of

\textsuperscript{13} Milgrom, \textit{Leviticus 1–16}, 257.

the same concern.”

Milgrom also touches on the importance of YHWH’s presence in the cult, specifically through the rituals of sacrifice.

In sacrificing, people felt a direct line of communication with God; the sight of smoke ascending heavenward could be seen as a physical symbol of personal prayers and wishes rising to God. By allowing laypersons to make their own sacrifices, under the auspices of the priests, the sacrificial laws gave people a degree of control over their spiritual lives. By inviting people into the sanctuary for the sacrifice, people felt themselves personally invited into God’s earthly home.

Milgrom affirms that sacrifice allowed for approach and proximity, even a relationship, with God. Divine immanence is desired, both by Israel and by YHWH, but divine immanence presents certain difficulties. Exodus 25:8 and 29:43–46 express YHWH’s desire to dwell with the Israelites. However, in Ezekiel 8–10 YHWH departs the Temple in Jerusalem because of the abominations being committed there. In accordance with Milgrom’s schema, the actions of the Israelites lead to YHWH’s departure. According to Milgrom’s analysis, and mine as well, it is the purgative abilities of the tafjoffering (which, in my view, purge the offerer, according to Lev 4:1–5:13, and the sanctuary once a year on Yom Kippur, according to Lev 16) that facilitate YHWH’s continued presence in the midst of the Israelites.

Klawans acknowledges that the odor of a burning sacrifice is said to be pleasing to God: “The purpose of the daily burnt offering—and perhaps some other sacrifices as

---

15 Klawans, Purity, Sacrifice and the Temple, 69.
16 Jacob Milgrom, Leviticus: A Book of Rituals and Ethics (Continental Commentary; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2004), 17.
well—is to provide regular and constant pleasing odors to the Lord, so that the divine presence will continually remain in the sanctuary.” Jacob Milgrom is quick to disregard the refrain, ”a pleasing odor to YHWH,” labeling it a “linguistic fossil.” Milgrom is certain that the Priestly Source was waging a polemic against anthropomorphism: “That the entire sacrificial ritual was conducted in silence can best be explained as the concerted attempt of P to distance the rites of Israel’s priest from the magical incantations that necessarily accompanied and, indeed, empowered the ritual acts of his pagan counterpart.” Perhaps, but the phrase “a pleasing odor to YHWH” occurs sixteen times in Leviticus (1:9, 13, 17; 2:2, 9, 12; 3:5, 16; 4:31; 6:15, 21; 8:21, 28; 17:6; 23:13, 18) and one of these occurrences (4:31) comes in the תָּמִּיס offering legislation. It cannot simply be dismissed. It is meant to emphasize the importance of the divine presence in the cult. There is no need to understand it literally. It could simply convey the idea that YHWH is pleased with the sacrificial offerings, while also conveying YHWH’s immanence in the cult.

2.4 Genesis 1:1–2:4a and the Sacrificial System of Leviticus

Frank Gorman and Samuel Balentine, and Klawans with them, advocate an approach that utilizes the Priestly worldview articulated in the creation account of Gen 1:1–2:4a to understand the Priestly rituals. Gorman states, “The present study takes these

---

18 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 59.
19 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 60.
works as its starting point and seeks to develop more fully the precise nature of the conceptual, ideological, and theological framework that informs specific priestly rituals and which is, in turn, constructed, in part, by those rituals. It is argued that the priestly ritual system is best understood as the meaningful enactment of world [sic] in the context of priestly creation theology.”20 Balentine commends Gorman’s approach and explains that “the worldview underlying priestly rituals rests on two crucial beliefs.”21 Both of these beliefs originate with the creation account of Gen 1:1–2:4a. “The first is the conviction that God has created the world and purposefully designed the rhythmic orders that keep it tuned to its capacity to be ‘very good.’ … The second priestly conviction is that God’s creational order is generative of and sustained by human observance of an imaging ritual order.”22 Similarly, Klawans argues that keeping the Temple/Tabernacle laws, which include sacrificial practice, was paramount to maintaining the cosmos. Maintaining the cosmos, of course, is clearly a divine task and thus the Israelites would be imitating God in their maintenance of the Temple/Tabernacle. Klawans concludes, “[I]f the temple symbolizes the cosmos, then

21 Samuel Balentine, Leviticus (Interpretation; Louisville: John Knox, 2002), 4.
22 Balentine, Leviticus, 4 (emphasis in original). In fairness to Balentine, he also believes that the Holiness Code reflects the creation theology of Gen 1:1–2:4a: “Thus, when readers embark on the journey through the instructions in the Holiness Code, they do so with these words as their guide: ‘In the beginning when God created the heavens and the earth, … God said, ‘Let there be…” (Gen. 1:1–2)” (Leviticus, 143).
maintaining the temple can easily symbolize maintaining the world, and the sacrificial activity that takes place there can be seen on some level as part of that effort.”

Israel Knohl enters this conversation in opposition to Gorman, Balentine, and Klawans. Knohl sees a major break in the conception and characterization of the God of Israel in the Priestly Source after the revelation of the name of the God of Israel, YHWH, in Exod 6. Many scholars have noted the difference in how the Priestly writer refers to the God of Israel in “the Genesis period” (אֱלֹהִים and יְהֹוָה) and in the “period of Moses,” but Knohl argues that the distinction goes much further than this. Knohl points out a number of changes in the characterization of the God of Israel that take place after the divine name is revealed. These changes call into question the extent to which theological or conceptual characterizations from the Genesis 1:1–2:4a creation account should be carried over into our understanding of the Priestly material of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers. Knohl notes that the God of Israel is presented much more impersonally in the “period of Moses” than in “the Genesis period.” In “the Genesis period,” God acts directly in a variety of ways. Knohl lists eighteen different active verbs, not including “speaking, ordaining, and reading,” for which God is the subject in the Priestly writings prior to the revelation of the name of YHWH. The attribution of direct activities to God in the “period of Moses” is greatly reduced: “God

---

23 Klawans, Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple, 112.
24 These terms for the two periods are used by Knohl (Israel Knohl, The Sanctuary of Silence: Priestly Torah and the Holiness School [Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007], 125).
25 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 125.
no longer forgives, cuts off, or shows; rather, the sin is forgiven (Lev 4:20, 21, 31, 35, 5:10, 13, 16, 18, 26); the sinner is cut off (Exod 30:33, 38; Lev 7:20, 21); Moses is shown the Tabernacle and its vessels (Exod 25:40; 26:30).”

Moses’ relationship with YHWH is unique. “Only in one area do we find a series of actions directly attributed to God—in verbs of speech, talk, meeting, and command. All of these appear in the description of the relation of God and Moses.” While Moses clearly has a very close relationship with God as YHWH—in fact it is fair to say that he is really the only human with any relationship with YHWH in P—nevertheless, “We never find in PT [Priestly Torah] a single instance of Moses addressing God!”

Knohl asserts that Moses’ frequent invitations to speak with God in the “Tent of Meeting” outweigh Aaron’s once-a-year approach behind the veil with its “painstaking preparations.” When God speaks to Moses, Moses stands inside the sanctuary (Exod 25:22; 29:42; 30:6, 36; Lev 1:1; Num 7:89; 17:19), either inside the Holy or Holies or just outside the veil of the Holy of Holies. Furthermore, for Aaron, P comments on the danger associated with his approaching the Holy of Holies, while any notion of danger “is completely absent

---

26 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 126.
27 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 126–27.
28 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 127.
29 Milgrom explains that there appear to be two traditions (one Priestly and the other Milgrom calls “the epic tradition”) concerning the “Tent of Meeting,” and that for the Priestly tradition this tent is “located in the very center of the camp (e.g., Num 2:17; 3:38)” (Leviticus 1–16, 140). Milgrom concurs with Knohl that with one exception, only Moses is privileged to hear God’s voice in the Priestly tradition. On one occasion both Moses and Aaron hear God’s voice (Num 16:18-20), but in this case they are in the courtyard (Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 140). Moses draws closer to God’s presence. When God speaks to Moses, Moses stands inside the sanctuary (Exod 25:22; 29:42; 30:6, 36; Lev 1:1; Num 7:89; 17:19).
30 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 127–8.
from descriptions of God’s communication with Moses.”\textsuperscript{31}

Knohl’s analysis is extremely helpful and insightful, but it fails to uncover the simplest explanation for this clear contrast between the P material after Exod 6 and the material that has been traditionally assigned to P before Exod 6 (a text that Knohl somewhat ironically, but correctly, attributes to H\textsuperscript{32}). Instead of assuming a drastic change in the conception of God in P, the texts of Genesis that have been identified as belonging to P should be understood as belonging to H. Milgrom makes a prescient observation when he writes,

Knohl also observes that in P, God’s contact with man is direct and unmediated prior to the revelation of the Tetragrammaton (Exod 6:2). Afterward, however (Exod 7ff.), his address to man is no longer in the first person (not even to Moses) but is distant, indirect, and mediated (e.g., “and the Glory of the Lord appeared to all of the people. Fire came forth from before the Lord,” Lev 9:23b–24a). \textit{H, by contrast, continues the Genesis pattern}: God’s revelation is direct and anthropomorphic (e.g., “I shall set My face against that man and his family and I shall excise him…” 20:5).\textsuperscript{33}

The vocabulary and style of the Genesis material typically attributed to P are consistent with H. Thus P’s conception of God/YHWH does not change (nor does H’s conception); rather, passages in Genesis, principally, but also Exodus and Numbers, have been incorrectly assigned to P.

\textsuperscript{31} Knohl, \textit{Sanctuary of Silence}, 128.
\textsuperscript{32} Knohl, \textit{Sanctuary of Silence}, 104.
\textsuperscript{33} Milgrom, \textit{Leviticus I–16}, 15 (emphasis mine).
2.5 Characteristics of P and H

The biggest stylistic difference between the two sources throughout the legal literature in Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers is the tendency of H to use first-person address by God, while P generally, perhaps exclusively, uses impersonal and indirect address by God. Thus H tends to describe God’s actions “as direct, active, and personal.” In the case of P, Knohl concludes, “In the PT stratum of Genesis, where the names אתו and אלוהים are used, God often speaks of himself as אב, and we find direct punishment at the hands of God. After the revelation of the divine name, the use of אב in God’s speech disappears completely (even from God’s speech to Moses), and punishment is always depicted as indirect....” My contention, of course, is that the texts in Genesis now attributed to P in which God speaks in the first person should be assigned to H. Speaking of P’s characterization of God before Exod 6, Knohl cites the first-person speech in Gen 1:29 and also cites various verses in Gen 17 (vv. 1, 2, 4–11, 13, 14, 19–21), both of which should be assigned to H.

Milgrom notes twelve ways in which H blurs the usage of terms used with great

34 Milgrom points to Lev 6:10–11 as a P passage where the deity speaks in the first person (Leviticus 1–16, 17). Of course, with H as the editor of P, it is always possible that these verses could be assigned to H. Against this, Milgrom asserts that “this verse carries no ideological freight identifiable with H. To the contrary, it contains the essential information that the offering is ‘most sacred,’ information that is included in other P pericopes in chaps. 6–7 (6:18, 22; 7:1, 6)” (Leviticus 1–16, 17).
35 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 107.
36 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 170.
37 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 107.
38 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 107 n 164.
39 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 107 n 164.
precision in P.40 One notable example, to which I will return when discussing Gen 17, is the use of אָמַר. “The term [אוֹמָר] in P strictly denotes ‘(ritually) impure,’ whereas H employs this term metaphorically in nonritualistic contexts, such as adultery (18:20), all sexual violations (18:24), Israel’s land (18:25–28), and necromancy (19:31; … 18:24–30).”41 Knohl states, “PT’s laws are scrupulous in their use of linguistic structures.”42 Knohl notes, for example, “There is a distinction between laws whose grammatical subject is אָכָל or אֶפְסָּה (purity laws) and those whose subject is נְשָׁה (sacrificial laws). PT takes great care not to mix the two subjects in a single law….”43 H, on the other hand, does not demonstrate the same care as P, as is clear from “the lack of consistency in the distinction between אֲכָל and נָשָׁה44 … and the carelessness in grammatical agreement in the ‘cutting off’ formulas45…. “46 H also tends to include “moralizing passages and ideological justifications”47 (e.g. Lev 19:2, 34, 36; 20:7, 8, 24, 26; 21:6, 7, 8, 12, 15, 23; Knohl includes Exod 31:13, 17; Num 15:22–26, 30–31, 39–41; 35:33–34;48). H has an affinity for the number seven manifested in its use of the same word seven times in a pericope, a

41 Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, 1327.
42 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 106.
43 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 106 n 159.
44 “The laws of sacrifice in Lev 17:3, 8; 22:18 begin with the phrase אָכָל נָשָׁה. In Lev 17:10; 20:5–6; 22:3, 4–6 we find a shift from אֲכָל to נָשָׁה in the text of the law. Compare 22:3 to the parallel law, Lev 7:20, where נָשָׁה is consistently used” (Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 87 n 83).
45 Knohl notes that H commonly “shows a lack of agreement in gender between the sinner and the receiver of the punishment” (Exod 12:15, 19; 31:14; Lev 7:25; 17:10; 19:8; 22:3; Num 9:13; 19:13, 20) (Sanctuary of Silence, 102 n 145).
46 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 107.
47 Milgrom discusses all passages in Lev 17–26 with a rationale in Leviticus 17–22, 1371–75.
48 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 107 n 163.
structural device that occurs in Lev 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, and 26.49 This is significant in light of my assertion that H is the author of Gen 1:1–2:4a and other Sabbath passages in Exodus and Leviticus. As for P, in the chapters that follow, I will study the language of P on the ṭanāḥ offering, ultimately concluding that the Priestly authors are in fact linguistically careful and consistent. This precision, especially in the use of prepositions, makes clear the different functions of the ṭanāḥ offering in Lev 16 and Lev 4:1–5:13.

Theologically, P and H differ in important ways. On holiness, H and P are not in full accord. As Milgrom notes, “H fully accepts the teaching of its own tradition (P) that holiness inheres in the sanctuary temenos, but it differs radically from P by extending holiness to the entire land and, potentially, to its occupants, every Israelite....”50 Thus the root ḫqr appears often in H as a noun, adjective, and verb, most often in the Piel. The root appears in P as well, but it is restricted to the sanctuary and priests, and it appears as though YHWH is never the subject of the verb ḫqr (this depends on how one labels some passages—P or H—in Genesis, Exodus, and Numbers). Likewise, H combines cult and morality, while P focuses exclusively on cultic matters. Leviticus 19 is a great example of H’s broader purview. This chapter contains instruction on the ṭaḥlāṭim (19:5–8) and ḫrēq (19:2–22), as well as the prohibition of combining wool and cotton (19:19), but also commands the Israelites not to steal or lie (19:11) and to act lovingly to their

49 Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, 1323–25.
50 Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, 1370.
neighbor (19:18) and to the resident alien (19:34). In contrast to P, H shows no aversion to depicting YHWH with anthropomorphic expressions. “Its literary production mentions various bodily parts of God, and attributes to him human actions, states and emotions.” Knohl notes that after the revelation of the divine name, P does not speak of YHWH’s covenant (ֵיהוה) with Israel, but solely of a pact (טַוָּדֹה), which demands “the worship of God without any expectation of reward—a worship completely detached from basic needs or the shaping of the social order.” H, on the other hand, uses the term covenant (ֵיהוה), maintaining “that a special covenant (ֵיהוה) exists between God and Israel, based on a unique relation of reciprocity” (Lev 26:9, 15, 44, 45). This is an important distinction between P and H to which we will return. Lastly, H mentions the (resident alien), in distinction from the (native), numerous times throughout Lev 17–26. P shows no interest in the .

---

51 Knohl lists the following examples: Exod 6:6, 8; 7:4, 5; Lev 17:10; 20:3, 5; 26:11, 17, 30; Num 6:25, 26; 14:30; 32:10, 13, 14 (Sanctuary of Silence, 171 n 13).
52 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 171. Knohl lists the following examples: Exod 12:12, 13; 20:11; 31:17; Lev 26:9, 11, 12, 13, 24, 28, 30, 31, 42, 44, 45; Num 14:28; 25:11; 32:10, 13, 14 (Sanctuary of Silence, 171 n 14).
53 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 173. The manna story of Exod 16 does show care for basic needs, but Knohl assigns this passage to H, whom he believes has reshaped “the ancient manna story of JE tradition and expanded it, adding matters of belief important to its viewpoint, particularly Sabbath observance” (Sanctuary of Silence, 17–18). The expression ֶהְצַדְיָהוּ יְהֹוָה וְיִשְׂרָאֵל (Exod 31:15 and 35:2) occurs in Exod 16:23 (Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 17). Finally, the reference to ֶהְצַדְיָהוּ in Exod 16:34 is not to the “pact” between YHWH and Israel, but to the ark. Both P and H, at times, simply use ֶהְצַדְיָהוּ as an ellipsis for ֶהְצַדְיָהוּ as in Lev 16:13 and 24:3 (Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 1031).
54 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 173.
55 Leviticus 16:29 (H addition); 17:8, 10, 12, 13, 15; 18:26; 19:10, 33, 34; 20:2; 22:18; 23:22; 24:16, 22; 25:23, 35, 47.
2.6 The Emerging Consensus that P precedes H

Julius Wellhausen placed H before P within his schema for the dating of the Pentateuchal sources. Wellhausen’s framework for the dating of the sources of the Pentateuch was informed by his belief that Israelite religion and worship was initially more spontaneous and joyful, with an attachment to land and agriculture. These features, most evident in J and E, eroded over the years and were dealt a decisive blow by the Babylonian exile. “Wellhausen believed that the end of this process was expressed in the creation of P, which he considered to be a code written in exile, totally lacking the natural and agricultural context of the early ritual worship.”\footnote{Wellhausen writes, “As in opposition to the Book of the Covenant and Deuteronomy, nay, even to the corpus itself which forms the basis of Lev. xvii.-xxvi., one can characterize the entire Priestly Code as the wilderness legislation, inasmuch as it abstracts from the natural conditions and motives of the actual life of the people in the land of Canaan and rears the hierocracy on the tabula rasa of the wilderness, the negation of nature, by means of the bald statutes of arbitrary absolutism, so also the festivals, in which the connection of the cultus with agriculture appears most strongly, have as much as possible been turned into wilderness festivals, but most of all the Easter festival, which at the same time has become the most important” (Prolegomena, 104).} Wellhausen’s placement of P in the exile was not totally dependent on his theory of Israel’s religious development. He also noted the near-total lack of knowledge of the specifics of P’s rituals throughout the historical books and prophetic books of the first Temple, to my mind still the biggest challenge to an early dating of P.\footnote{Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 4.} Because H retains an attachment to the land\footnote{Julius Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel With a Reprint of the Article “Israel” from the Encyclopedia Britannica (trans. J. Sutherland Black and Allan Menzies; Cleveland: Meridian Books, 1961), 52–75.} and because it has “a somewhat affected religious hortatory

\[\text{\footnotesize 56 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 4.}\]
\[\text{\footnotesize 57 Julius Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel With a Reprint of the Article “Israel” from the Encyclopedia Britannica (trans. J. Sutherland Black and Allan Menzies; Cleveland: Meridian Books, 1961), 52–75.}\]
\[\text{\footnotesize 58 Wellhausen writes, “As in opposition to the Book of the Covenant and Deuteronomy, nay, even to the corpus itself which forms the basis of Lev. xvii.-xxvi., one can characterize the entire Priestly Code as the wilderness legislation, inasmuch as it abstracts from the natural conditions and motives of the actual life of the people in the land of Canaan and rears the hierocracy on the tabula rasa of the wilderness, the negation of nature, by means of the bald statutes of arbitrary absolutism, so also the festivals, in which the connection of the cultus with agriculture appears most strongly, have as much as possible been turned into wilderness festivals, but most of all the Easter festival, which at the same time has become the most important” (Prolegomena, 104).}\]
tone, which harmonizes but little with the Priestly Code,” Wellhausen placed it historically after J, E, and D, but before P.\(^{59}\)

Knohl and Milgrom refute this and argue that H comes after P. Milgrom explains how he eventually came to the conclusion that H must be P’s redactor:

It has long been recognized that laws attributable to the Holiness Source can be found outside H (Lev 17–26), not only in Leviticus itself (e.g., 11:43–45) but in Exodus (e.g., 31:12–17) and Numbers (e.g., 15:37–41). Moreover, because these passages appear either at the end of a pericope or as links between pericopes, I had come to the conclusion that they constituted the final layers in the composition. Who, then, was responsible for their insertion? The evidence clearly pointed to their authors, the H tradents themselves. The implication was obvious: the school of H is later than P; indeed, H is P’s redactor.\(^{60}\)

Independently from Milgrom’s analysis, Knohl came to the same conclusion.\(^{61}\) Knohl’s principal argument for this new arrangement of these two sources is based on his analysis of Num 28–29 and Lev 23. There is general agreement that Num 28–29 is wholly P, while Lev 23 is a mix of P and H. The question is whether P edited/added to H’s work in Lev 23 or H edited P’s work of Num 28–29 in creating his work in Lev 23. Speaking of Lev 23, Israel Knohl sums up the differences in Lev 23, in comparison to Num 28–29, as follows:

\(^{59}\) Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, 376. See also pages 377–84.
\(^{61}\) William Gilders (*Blood Ritual in the Hebrew Bible* [Baltimore: John Hopkins Univ Press, 2004], 13) and Samuel Balentine (*Leviticus*, 142) also adopt this new position on P and H. Baruch Schwartz hints at his acceptance of this revised ordering of the “priestly” sources in an article on Lev 17 where he asserts that Lev 17:11 “is a case of inner-biblical exegesis, almost midrashic in nature” (“The Prohibitions Concerning the ‘Eating’ of Blood in Leviticus 17,” in *Priesthood and Cult in Ancient Israel* [JSOTSup 125; eds. Gary A. Anderson and Saul M. Olyan Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991], 59–60). Schwartz believes that the atonement logic of Lev 17:11, an H text, is at odds with the atonement logic of P. Leviticus 17:11 could only be a case of inner-biblical exegesis, drawing on but disagreeing with P, if H were written after P.
On one hand, there are several sections in this chapter that differ from the corresponding sections in Numbers 28–29 only in the absence of information about sacrifices.... On the other hand, there are other sections that clearly depart from the well-measured style of PT and list some ritual practices unmentioned in Numbers: the wave offering of the sheaf and the two loaves, and the “Four Kinds” to be taken on the feast of Tabernacles. Furthermore, one of the sections of Leviticus 23 which deals with the feast of Firstfruits explicitly contradicts instructions given elsewhere in PT regarding the festival offerings. Since these sections conclude with the formula “I am the Lord your God” (Lev 23:22, 43), which is characteristic of HS [Holiness School], it is only proper to conclude that they originated in that school.

So, who is responsible for these changes? Did later editors of P find old H passages and then add them to Lev 23? Or, was an independent P list given additions of H material by H writers editing the P material? Both Milgrom and Knohl, and now other authors coming after them as well, believe that there is convincing evidence that H comes after P and is the editor of P. It is highly unlikely that a P editor would put the H passage on

---

62 Knohl notes the following difference: “Whereas Num 28:27 requires that there be offered on this day one ram, two bulls, and seven sheep as a burnt offering, Lev 23:18–19 calls for one bull, two rams, and seven sheep as a burnt offering and two sheep as a sacrifice of well-being” (Sanctuary of Silence, 9 n 5).

63 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 9.

64 Knohl explains that logic of H as the editor of P in Lev 23:

Since their [Holiness School] innovations regarding Tabernacles did not contradict the PT laws and the description of that festival came last in the PT list, the HS editors could avoid tampering with the original PT list by simply appending their Tabernacle section to the end of the PT Tabernacles section, after the original conclusion (vv. 37–38). On the other hand, they had to cut the original PT text regarding the firstfruits festival in order to splice in the sections reflecting their innovative practices regarding the wave offerings and the two loaves. This also explains why it is in regard to this festival alone in Leviticus 23 that there are detailed prescriptions regarding sacrifices. Elsewhere, the editors from HS could let stand the original PT references “And you shall bring an offering by fire to the Lord,” which are meant to direct the reader to Numbers 28–29, as indicated by the conclusion of the festivals list (Lev 23:37): “Bringing offerings by fire to the Lord—burnt offerings, meal offerings, sacrifices, and libations, on each day what is proper to it.” Here, however, the HS editors had to change the original PT reference to the sacrifices listed in Num 28:27, because they had a different conception of the sacrificial ritual to be celebrated on this day. Additionally, they had to detail the ritual of the day on which the wave offering of the sheaf was performed, as this is nowhere described in Numbers 28 (Sanctuary of Silence, 11–12).
Tabernacles after P’s original concluding verses and even more unlikely that he would replace P’s own firstfruits passages with H’s firstfruits passage. Milgrom argues that two other passages, both in Numbers, are also based on P passages in Leviticus: “Num 15:22–25 is clearly dependent on Lev 4:13–21…, Num 5:5–8 on Lev 5:20–26…, and both Numbers’ pericopes are possibly the work of H…”

The case for H authorship of Num 15:22–25 is strong, and in fact, the entire chapter appears to be the work of H. Knohl notes that “J. Wellhausen and A. Kuenen already pointed to the associations between this entire chapter and the Holiness Code.”

On the specifics, Knohl asserts that “the ‘cutting off’ warning here—תומך חתה תמתא (‘that person shall be cut off from among his people’)—differs from the usual PT formula היה יוממ יוממ (‘he shall be cut off from his people’).” Along this same line, Num 15:28 uses נַפְּשׁ-ֹחְמַה in its נַפְּשׁ-ֹחְמַה-formula, which is only found again in Lev 17:11, an H text, where we have the only passage in the Hebrew Bible that explains the

65 Knohl explains that the unlikely P-last scenario would be as follows:

[S]ome members of the Priestly School came across some Holiness writings, including one unit that dealt with sheaf-waving and firstfruits festival, and another unit dealing with Tabernacles and its ceremonies. Since Tabernacles was the last of the festivals mentioned in the original list, the Priestly editors could attach the HS Tabernacles passage by merely adding it to the end of the list, after the concluding verses. But since the firstfruits passage was in the middle of the original list, this method could not be employed, and therefore the editors struck out the original PT firstfruits festival passage and replaced it with that of HS, along with the introductory passage dealing with the wave offering of the sheaf (Sanctuary of Silence, 10).

66 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 13.
67 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 53.
68 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 53.
rationale of כָּסָר in sacrifice. Lastly, and perhaps most tellingly, Num 15 ends with these two verses commenting on the importance of wearing tsitsit (tassles):

Num 15:40/ [You will have the tassles (לְשֵׁנִים)] so that you remember and do all my commandments and be holy to your God.
Num 15:41/ I am YHWH your God who brought you out of the land of Egypt to be your God. I am YHWH your God.

The call to holiness for the Israelites (the address is to all of the Israelites according to Num 15:38), as well as YHWH’s first-person speech, are two hallmarks of H.

More recently, Christopher Nihan has agreed with this new ordering of P and H, pointing out that H revises P in a number of ways.

[T]his analysis has also confirmed that in many aspects the holiness legislation in Lev 17–26 stands in tension with P, and apparently seeks to correct or revise it. On the level of individual laws, this is obvious, for instance in the reception of Lev 7:16–18 in Lev 19:5–8 and of Lev 11:39–40 in 17:15–16, or in the reinterpretation of Ex 27:20–21 in Lev 24:2–4. More generally, H revises P on many fundamental issues, such as the prohibition of profane slaughter..., the conception of holiness and its extension to the entire community (Lev 18–20), as well as the reinterpretation of the מָרָא לָהֶם in Lev 26. In addition, H is systematically characterized by a more “popular” form of theology than P, which is manifest in particular for the land’s fertility (Lev 26:4ff., but also more generally Lev 23), for brotherly ethics (see in particular Lev 19 and 25:8–55) or with a greater anthropomorphism in the representation of the deity, evidenced for instance in the description of the offerings as Yahweh’s “food” (למא) in Lev 21. ... [T]he differences between P and Lev 17–26 are best explained if the legislation is regarded as a later, post-P composition, as already argued by Knohl and Milgrom.69

69 Christophe Nihan, From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus (FAT 2, Reihe 25; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 546 (emphasis original).
Nihan’s work is principally concerned with the dating of sources and thus extremely comprehensive, and comes well after the work of Milgrom and Knohl. According to Nihan, H appears to address D as well, and attempts to reconcile D and P, further attesting that H comes after P. Only the priests (maybe only the vestments) and the sanctuary are holy in P. Exodus 29:21 and 33 speak of the priests, but these verses are not entirely clear since the emphasis is on the vestments. Exodus 26:33, 29:37, 30:29, and 40:9 speak of the holiness of the sanctuary, and even of the offerings in some of these verses. In D (14:2, 21), the people are holy because YHWH selected them. In H, the people are to strive to be holy as God is holy. This appears to be a middle ground between P and D.\(^70\) Lastly, Nihan notes that Lev 26, an H text, weaves together Priestly (in his view) and Deuteronomic motifs.\(^71\)

### 2.7 The Case for H authorship of Gen 1:1–2:4a

This new theory of dating has led to the reevaluation of passages typically attributed to P. Milgrom has suggested that the very famous creation story of Gen 1:1–2:4a is the product of the H as opposed to P, as has long been believed. Initially, Milgrom proposed that only two verses, Gen 2:2–3, are the product of H. Milgrom noted the work of Amit who points out that Gen 2:2–3 contains terms common to H, such as

---

\(^70\) Nihan, *Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 550–51.

\(^71\) Nihan, *Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 548.
and translated as "a metaphoric usage breaking with P’s cultic term, Num 28:9–10"). The term טבש is unquestionably important to H. The nominal form, in the plural and singular, appears 25 times throughout Lev 17–26 (19:3, 30; 23:3, 15, 16, 32, 38; 24:8; 25:2, 4, 6, 8; 26:2, 34, 43). Eventually, Milgrom came to believe that Gen 2:2–3 could not be extracted from the rest of the story, mainly because Gen 2:4a and Gen 1:1 form an inclusio “in chiastic order, thereby embracing and unifying Gen 1:1–2:4a. Within this unit, 2:1 serves a dual function: it is a minor inclusio of the prior six days, and it is an introduction to the seventh day.” Moreover, a number of other passages in Exodus and Leviticus on the Sabbath should be attributed to H instead of P. Leviticus 16:29–34a, which includes a requirement for Sabbath rest on Yom Kippur in v. 31, appears to be an addition from H as it shares numerous similarities with Lev 23:26–32. Writes Nihan:

Note in particular that the following expressions are distinctive of H: in v. 29, the inclusion of the native (יהודה) and the resident alien (נדי) in the law, as well as the phrase מתקדם בשמה; in v. 31, the phrase טבש is also H; the reference to the high priest in v. 32 corresponds to the description in Lev 21:10 (see further 35:25); the Priestly school, for its part, uses והCorreo (compare 4:3, 5, 16; 6:15). Moreover, Leviticus 23:2b–3 is an addition from the author of H into P’s list from Num

---

73 Jacob Milgrom, “Hs in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah,” in The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception (VTSup 93; ed. Rolf Rendtorff and Robert A. Kugler; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 34.
74 Nihan notes the following passages outside of Lev 17–26 that contain this phrase: Ex 31:15; 35:2; Ex 31:12 and 35:3 (From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch, 568–69).
75 Nihan, From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch, 348.
28–29. This addition has an important admission about the status of the Sabbath for H.

Lev 23:1/76 YHWH spoke to Moses, saying:
Lev 23:2/ Speak to the Israelites and say to them: (As for) the fixed times of YHWH, which you shall proclaim as sacred occasions, these are my fixed times.
Lev 23:3/ Six days’ work may be done, but the seventh day is a sabbath of complete rest, a sacred occasion. You shall do no work; it is a sabbath of YHWH throughout your settlements.
Lev 23:4/ These are the fixed times of YHWH, the sacred occasions, which you shall proclaim at their fixed times.

Both Milgrom and Knohl identify these verses as originating from H.77 Milgrom notes the significance of labeling the Sabbath a dowm, a distinction that P does not give to the Sabbath.78 Milgrom argues that this author, for Milgrom the H-redactor (Hᵦ), labeled the Sabbath a dowm because he was living in exile.

[H]e lived among the exiles in Babylonia, where the Temple and its sacrificial system and all of the [תִּירָשׁוֹת] of Lev 23:4–38 and Num 28–29 were inoperative. He there composed the supplements of Lev 23:2a–3 and Num 29:39 to indicate that the Sabbath is also one of the [תִּירָשׁוֹת] ‘the fixed times of the Lord’ (23:2a, 4a) and should be scrupulously observed (v 3). Further supporting my claim is the fact that the reference to the Sabbath sacrifice (Num 28:7–10) is omitted in Lev 23 … as distinct from the other festivals (vv 8, 12–13, 18–19, 25, 27, 36, 37).

76 This is Milgrom’s translation, and he uses the boldface and italics to indicate different authors: “[I]talic block type (as in v. 1) stands for H, boldface block type (as in v. 2b) for Hᵦ…” (Leviticus 1–16, 1932).
78 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 20.
This striking omission has one plausible explanation—Israel is in exile.\textsuperscript{79}

This analysis by Milgrom not only gives further evidence of H’s editing of P, but it also lends support to the contention that H was responsible for the creation passage of Gen 1:1–2:4a.

Bill T. Arnold argues for H authorship of Gen 1:1–2:4a, citing the importance of the Sabbath passage. Arnold accepts the “sequential priority of P to H” and asserts “that an H redactor is responsible for Genesis essentially as we have it now.”\textsuperscript{80} Arnold suggests that the Gen 1:1–2:4a creation story was composed by H in order “to supplement, nuance, and to some degree, correct the older and greatly venerated account of Gen 2,”\textsuperscript{81} and that the Sabbath was the most important issue H needed to address. The entire story has a seven-part structure to highlight the Sabbath, which comes at the conclusion “for rhetorical effect.”\textsuperscript{82} As stated above, Milgrom notes that the importance of the number seven for H is evident throughout Lev 17–26 where the author frequently repeats a word seven times in a passage.\textsuperscript{83} The Gen 1:1–2:4a creation story sets the stage for later texts on the Sabbath that prohibit work (Exod 20:11; 31:12–

\textsuperscript{79} Milgrom, \textit{Leviticus 1–16}, 27.


\textsuperscript{81} Arnold, “Genesis 1,” 333.

\textsuperscript{82} Arnold, “Genesis 1,” 334.

\textsuperscript{83} See footnote 46.
Arnold concludes that the intention of Gen 1:1–2:4a is to highlight God’s sovereignty “both over time and over Israel,” with the specifics of acknowledging this sovereignty to come later. Following Knohl, Arnold points out that the P material has no work prohibition for the Sabbath and that the only clear mention of the Sabbath in P (assuming H is the author of Gen 1:1–2:4a and is also responsible for Exod 20:11, 31:12–17, and 35:2–3) concerns the proper sacrifices to be offered on the Sabbath (Num 28:9–10). Against Knohl, who considers Gen 1:1–2:4a to be from P, Arnold notes that it would be odd for P to state that God “rested” on the Sabbath, “given P’s focus on the cultic sphere and the essential numinous dimension of God, along with its aversion for [sic] anthropomorphic and anthropopathic descriptions of God.”

Placed alongside the creation story of Gen 2, attributed to the Yahwist source (J), the creation story of Gen 1:1–2:4a appears more cosmic in scope. Instead of focusing on a garden and its inhabitants (principally, a created being that is charged to care for the garden), Gen 1:1–2:4a narrates the creation of the entire cosmos. On account of this broader vision, it has long been assumed that the author of Gen 1:1–2:4a was less

---

84 Knohl assigns these to H (Sanctuary of Silence, 14–19). Arnold points out that these verses are similar in style to Lev 25:1–7 (“Genesis 1,” 335 n 15), as shown by Knohl (Sanctuary of Silence, 122).
85 Arnold, “Genesis 1,” 335.
86 Arnold, “Genesis 1,” 336, citing Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 14–19, 162–63.
87 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 67.
concerned with agrarianism than the author of Gen 2. Mark Smith assesses it in this way:

In contrast, the priestly writer offers a cosmic perspective, in beginning with the heavens and the primordial lights, paralleled by the sun and the moon. As a whole, it builds a majestic literary architecture of cosmic wonder over the course of seven days. The ordered literary presentation of the creation recapitulates and creates a majestic and well-planned world in the imagination of its audience. As commentary, the priestly writer redirects the audience away from the earthly perspective of the Genesis 2 story and points it towards a majestic presentation of God as Creator of the entire cosmic universe beyond the ground-level view of the older account.  

Such an assessment accords with Wellhausen’s judgment, already cited above, that much of the legal material of P lacks a strong connection to the land. Moreover, God appears rather “priestly” in Gen 1:1–2:4a, as God divides things and makes distinctions and speaks the cosmos into existence. Again, Smith’s comments are helpful:

What is foundational in priestly thinking is represented as primordial in the divine plan of creation. God not only creates; God is also the one who inaugurates separation into proper realms, and these realms are maintained in terms that echo the priestly regimen of the Temple. In this respect, God is presented not simply as the first builder. Genesis 1 further intimates that the universe is like a temple (or more specifically, like the Temple), with God presented as its priest of priests.

Mary Douglas famously used Gen 1:1–2:4a, in which God divides the earth into different realms (land, water, air), to explain the dietary laws of Lev 11. Douglas’ analysis is informed by the extensive use of יֵשָׁבָה (“separate”) in Gen 1:1–2:4a, where it occurs in

---

five verses (Gen 1:4, 6, 7, 14, 18). The same verb occurs at the end of the list of dietary laws of Lev 11. In Lev 11:47, Israel is told “to distinguish” (לִדְחַר) between the clean and unclean.

Smith notes other verbal links between Lev 11 and Gen 1:1–2:4a:

Leviticus 11 mentions “the animals that are on the land” (Leviticus 11:2); those “that are in the waters” (11:9, 10); “the winged” (11:13); “all winged swarming” (11:20, 23); and “all that swarm on the earth” (11:41). Genesis 1 uses several of the same terms: “swarms of living creatures” (1:20) and “all the living creatures that move that swarm [sic] in the waters” (1:21); “the winged” (1:20) and “the winged bird” (1:21); “living creatures, animals, creepers” (1:24).92

Smith also rightly points out that Lev 20:25 also uses the verb לִדְחַר when calling for Israel to distinguish between clean and unclean animals.93 Smith fails to mention that this verse from H also uses some of the terms found in Gen 1:1–2:4a, such as מַעֲשָׂה, מַעְשָׂה, רִבְמָה, and רִבְמָה. Moreover, Lev 11:44, a clear interpolation from H,94 contains the phrase מַעֲשָׂה מַעֲשָׂה, two words used in Gen 1:20–21, 24, 25, 26, 28, and 30. Thus many references to the animals in the creation story occur in H texts. Furthermore, the verb לִדְחַר, which occurs in five separate verses in Gen 1:1–2:4a, occurs twice95 in the P material of Leviticus (Lev 11:47 and Lev 10:10) whereas it occurs three times in the H material of

---

92 Smith, Priestly Vision, 91–92.
93 Smith, Priestly Vision, 92. Furthermore, Smith notes the current controversy over the authorship of Gen 1:1–2:4a and ultimately refuses to make a decision on the source of this creation story, concluding only that the author is from the “priestly” (P or H) class (Priestly Vision of Gen 1, 42–43, ch 2 n 7, appendix n 63).
95 It also appears in Lev 1:17 and 5:8, but not with the idea of separating or distinguishing between things, but rather with the meaning of “to sever,” in reference to cutting a part of a sacrificial animal.
Leviticus (Lev 20:24, 25, 26). So both P and H have verbal resonances with the creation story of Gen 1:1–2:4a, a point often overlooked in the case of H. Furthermore, Arnold makes the case that H used P’s version of Lev 11 to craft Gen 1:1–2:4a, creating a creation account that supported P’s work on the dietary laws, the reverse of what Mary Douglas proposed.96

On two theological issues, Gen 1:1–2:4a and the Holiness Code appear more similar than Gen 1:1–2:4a and the Priestly Source. Ellen Davis has recently shown that the Gen 1:1–2:4a does not neglect issues of agrarianism. Davis points to the importance of plants and fruits with seeds (Gen 1:11–12, 29), be it in plants or fruit trees “seeding seed” (אָרְבָּא אָמֶר אֹרְבָּא) or various fruit trees whose fruit contains its seed (זָעַר זָעַר).97 In fact, the Hebrew of these verses is somewhat awkward and the effect is to emphasize “the variety and self-perpetuating fruitfulness”98 of the land. As Davis notes,

The whole description of the dry land is marked off by lengthy notices about plants: at the beginning, concerning their variety and self-perpetuating fruitfulness (vv. 11–12); and at the end, concerning their distribution on the food chain: plants with cultivatable seed for humans, all other “greenery” (yereq) for the animals (vv. 29-30).99

It appears likely that the writer stresses plants with seeds and fruit trees with seeds because it is exactly this type of plant that was most conducive to cultivation. If the head
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96 Arnold, “Genesis 1,” 336–38
98 Davis, Scripture, Culture, and Agriculture, 48.
99 Davis, Scripture, Culture, and Agriculture, 48.
of the plant retains that seed as opposed to scattering it upon maturity, then collection of
the seed for further cultivation is much simpler and controllable. Concludes Davis,

[I]t is evident that the seemingly otiose repetitions of the root z-r-ʽ, “seed” in
Genesis 1 are purposeful: They bespeak a poet’s alertness to the world. Far from
abstract analysis, this is liturgical celebration of the familiar yet inexhaustible
mystery of fruitfulness as it was experienced by the Israelites and other agrarian
peoples of the Near Eastern uplands.100

This insight on the importance of plants, fruit, and seeds for the writer of Gen 1:1–2:4a
rightly challenges the view that Gen 1:1–2:4a, in opposition to Gen 2, has no interest in
agriculture. But which “priestly” (P or H) writer’s ideology and rhetoric fits best with
this fresh understanding of Gen 1:1–2:4a?

While Davis does not delve into the finer points of source criticism, she
ultimately answers this question in the same way that I would.

Leviticus draws a direct threefold connection among Israel’s obedience, the
“fruitfulness” of both people and earth, and the immediate presence of God to
both. The verbal and thematic connections with the early chapters of Genesis are
unmistakable:

If you walk in my ordinances and keep my commandments and do them,
then I will give you your rains in their seasons,
and the earth will give her produce,
and the tree of the field will give its fruit.
For you, threshing will overtake vintage,
and vintage will overtake seeding…
And I will turn toward you,
And I will make you fruitful, and I will multiply you,
And I will establish my covenant with you… (Lev. 26:3–5a, 9).101

100 Davis, Scripture, Culture, and Agriculture, 50.
101 Davis, Scripture, Culture, and Agriculture, 60–61.
Davis quotes not from P, but from H, which has a much clearer attachment to the land.

The rightful owner of the land is God (Lev 25:23), and the importance placed on Sabbath is extended to the land, which also deserves a Sabbath rest (Lev 25:2, 4). In fact, if the appropriate Sabbath rest is not given to the land, then the Israelites will be expelled to ensure a Sabbath rest for the land while Israel is away (Lev 26:34, 35, 43). In Lev 18:25, 28 and Lev 20:22, the land is specified the agent of expulsion, just as the land is the agent of creation and production in Gen 1:11–12.

Lev 18:25/ Thus the land became defiled; and I called it to account for its iniquity, and the land vomited out its inhabitants.102

Lev 18:28/ So let not the land vomit you out for defiling it, as it is vomiting out the nation that was before you.103

Lev 20:22/ You shall heed all my statutes and all my regulations and do them, so that the land to which I bring you to settle in will not vomit you out.104

Gen 1:11a/ And God said, “Let the land sprout vegetation....”

---

102 Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22*, 1515
Gen 1:12a/ And the land brought forth vegetation....

In all of these verses, the land is the agent, either producing vegetation or vomiting out the inhabitants who have contaminated the land with their sins. I am not arguing that God in Gen 1:1–2:4a or YHWH in Lev 18 or 20 is not in control of the land. Leviticus 26:34, 35, and 43 make it clear the YHWH is indeed the catalyst for expulsion of the Israelites if they disobey, just as God is the catalyst for the land’s production in Gen 1:11–12. Nonetheless, the personification of the land in these passages in Lev 18 and 20 is further indication of H authorship of Gen 1:1–2:4a.

Another terminological correspondence between H and Gen 1:1–2:4a is אֱלֹהֵיָה. It famously occurs in Gen 1:2, then again in Exod 31:3 and 35:31, in both cases in reference to Bezalel, who is filled with divine spirit to carry out the construction of the Tabernacle. Knohl assigns both of these verses in Exodus to H.\textsuperscript{105} On Exod 31:3, Knohl writes,

The concluding section—Exod 31:1–11—contains unique terms that appear nowhere else in the set of instructions for the construction of the Tabernacle, but only in the unit on the actual building of the Sanctuary and in the Holiness Code. The link to the language of HS is evident also in the wording of v. 6: התוֹת נֶאֱלֹהֵיָה אֵל אָֽדָם, “Moreover, I have assigned to him.” God’s speech in the first person, presenting himself as “I” is very common in HS; the characteristic closing formula of this school is “I am the Lord.”\textsuperscript{106}

\textsuperscript{105} Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 125 n 2.  
\textsuperscript{106} Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 64.
Knohl asserts that in the P material on the construction of the Tabernacle YHWH addresses all ordinances to Moses, who alone is responsible for its construction. In contrast, H includes the people’s contributions (Exod 25:2–7; 27:20–21; 35:4–9, 21–29; 38:8; 39:36–38; Lev 24:2, 8) and skilled workers like Bezalel (Exod 28:3–5; 31:1–11; 35:10–19, 30–35; 36:1–2, 8–38; 37:1–39:43). Knohl does not, however, recognize the link between Exod 31:3, 35:31, and Gen 1:2.

While the agrarian impulse of the writer of Gen 1:1–2:4a has been neglected, the imago Dei passages have not been overlooked. What has been overlooked, or what has gone unexamined by those who use creation theology of Gen 1:1–2:4a to understand Lev 1–16, is how poorly the concept of imago Dei fits with the P material of Lev 1–16. Most of the material of Lev 1–16 is predicated upon the fact that humanity is so unlike YHWH that very specific provisions are necessary if YHWH is to remain in communion with the Israelites. For the purity regulations of Lev 12–15, Milgrom has proposed that all of the impurities covered in these chapters are symbolic of death and thus cannot be left untreated if Israel wishes to remain in the presence of YHWH, who is characterized by life. As for the sacrificial system, no one denies that אֱלֹהִים offerings are necessary because of the sinfulness/uncleanness of the people in contradistinction to YHWH.

Furthermore, the emerging consensus on the מִסְכָּנּוֹת is that on Yom Kippur it cleans the
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107 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 64.
108 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 193.
109 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 46.
sancta from the sins of the people so that YHWH can continue to dwell with Israel. As Milgrom rightly concludes, if this logic of sacrifice and sin/uncleanness is correct, then the Israelites have become a threat to YHWH.¹¹⁰ Their sinfulness and uncleanness can drive YHWH from the midst of the people.

Such struggle against outside forces is less reminiscent of Gen 1:1–2:4a than it is of some of the creation myths of the Ancient Near East, like Enuma Elish, or even other creation myths in the Hebrew Bible (Psalm 74:12–17; Psalm 89:11–13; Psalm 104:5–9; Job 26:7–13; Job 38:1–11). The writer of Gen 1:1–2:4a appears to have gone out of his way to make the opposite point. The primordial waters exist (Gen 1:2), as does “Deep” (מְדִינַת, a likely reference to Tiamat, whom Marduk kills and then utilizes to create the world in Enuma Elish). However these possible combatants to God’s sovereignty present no resistance to God in Gen 1:1–2:4a. God commands the waters to be gathered in one place and they gather (Gen 1:9). What’s more, God actually commands the waters to contribute to God’s creation of the world (Gen 1:20). God creates the sea monsters (םְיִןִיהָ) in Gen 1:21 and calls them “good.” The world is “very good” (Gen 1:31), and humanity is made in the image of God (Gen 1:26–27). None of this fits well with the theology of Lev 1–16.

It squares much better with the theology of Lev 17–26 from the Holiness writer. Again, Davis recognizes this correspondence: “As the Priestly vision unfolds through

¹¹⁰ Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 258–61.
Torah, it becomes evident that if the ideal form of human life is to be realized anywhere, it will be in Israel, and the form of life intended for Israel is specified as holiness: ‘You shall be holy, for I am holy’ (Lev. 11:44, 45; 19:2; 20:7, 26; cf. 21:6).” All of these references come from H. Smith too makes a correspondence between the creation account of Gen 1:1–2:4a and holiness in “priestly” (P and H) thought: “Within the priestly worldview, both aspects of ‘good’ [benefit and moral good] fall under the rubric of holiness. God is good in all these respects, and when God creates, creation is likewise good. So it appears that Gen 1 provides a picture for the origins of creation and its goodness, but it does not explain the origins of wickedness or evil in a moral sense.”

Even Balentine, who interprets the Priestly material of Lev 1–16 through the prism of the creation theology of Gen 1:1–2:4a, sees this correspondence: “Because human beings were created in God’s image, they have the assurance that even as God is actively sanctifying them for the task of living holy lives in this world ([Lev] 21:8, 15, 23; 22:9, 16, 32), they may also sanctify themselves and the world through the priestly-congregational partnership with which they have been entrusted.” As Balentine’s scripture references show, the concept of imago Dei fits much better with the writer of the Holiness Code than with the writer of the Priestly Source. There is no possibility of goodness or holiness for the Israelites in Lev 1–16. Sin and uncleanness are inevitabilities. By contrast, the writer
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111 Davis, Scripture, Culture, and Agriculture, 56.
112 Leviticus 11:44–45 is an insert by H. See footnote 93.
113 Smith, Priestly Vision, 62.
114 Balentine, Leviticus, 10.
of the Holiness Code sincerely believes that all of Israel can, and should, attain holiness analogous to the holiness of YHWH: “You shall be holy, for I am holy” (Lev. 11:44, 45; 19:2; 20:7, 26; cf. 21:6). In Lev 1–16, only the sanctuary and the priests can be holy. While sin and uncleanness continue to be a problem in the Holiness Code, they are not insurmountable. The Israelites can obey and strive for imago Dei.

In H, if Israel fails, the consequence is not the expulsion of YHWH from the sanctuary, the ultimate fear of Lev 1–16, but rather the expulsion of the people from their land. YHWH’s sovereignty is not in doubt. YHWH exercises dominion over the land that YHWH has given to the Israelites. As in Gen 1:1–2:4a, YHWH has no worthy adversaries in the Holiness Code. The Israelites have a choice to obey or to rebel, but the consequences of rebellion are that the land, under YHWH’s direction, expels the Israelites and then celebrates the Sabbaths it was denied by the Israelites (18:28; 20:22; 26:32–35).

The celebration of Sabbath rest, of course, echoes Gen 1:1–2:4a.

Finally, Exod 20:8–11 looks like an addition from H, which would make perfect sense given my identification of H authorship of Gen 1:1–2:4a.

Exod 20:8/ Remember the day of the Sabbath, to consecrate it.
Exod 20:9/ Six days you shall labor and do all your work.
Exod 20:10/ But the seventh day is a Sabbath to YHWH, your God. You shall not do any work—you, your son or your daughter, your male and female slave, your livestock, or the resident alien (גָּרוֹן) who is in your gates.
Exod 20:11/ For, in six days YHWH made the heavens and the earth, the sea and all that is in it, but rested on the seventh day. Therefore YHWH has blessed the seventh day and consecrated it.

The verses closely mirror Gen 2:2–3 (rest, consecration), and adds the provision of rest
for even the resident alien (גוי), a signature concern of H (Lev 16:29; 17:8, 10, 12, 13, 15; 18:26; 19:10, 33, 34; 20:2; 22:18; 23:22; 24:16, 22; 25:23, 35, 47). Israel Knohl believes that only Exod 20:11 comes from H, while also asserting that Gen 2:2–3 comes from P. The parallels between these two verse are very striking; thus assigning them to two different authors is odd. Knohl sees more “anthropomorphic flavor” in Exod 20:11 than is in Gen 2:2–3 because “the anthropomorphic image of God’s rest is lacking” in Gen 2:2. It is true that Gen 2:2 uses the root שֵׁבָה and Exod 20:11 uses the root כִּבְנָה, but considering the other connections between H and Gen 1:1–2:4a, this change in word choice does not seem crucial.

Moreover, Knohl believes that the two passages on Sabbath observance in Exodus (31:12–17 and 35:1–3) stem from the editorial activity of H. Knohl notes the use of שֵׁבָה (my Sabbaths, Lev 19:3, 30; 26:2) in Exod 31:13 as well as these closing words for 31:13, יִשָּׁחֵץ (I YHWH am consecrating you”) with YHWH speaking in the first person. Further, Exod 31:15a and Exod 35:2a are both very similar to Lev 23:3a.

Exod 31:15a/ Six days work shall be done, but on the seventh day there shall be a Sabbath of complete rest, holy to YHWH.

Exod 35:2a/ Six days work shall be done, but on the seventh day there shall be for
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you a Sabbath of complete rest to YHWH.

Lev 23:3a / Six days work shall be done, but on the seventh day there shall be a Sabbath of complete rest.

These three verses must be from the same hand. Couple this with my identification of the creation story of Gen 1:1–2:4a as an H story, and it becomes clear that H is the source that continually stresses the importance of the Sabbath.

The sacrificial system of Lev 1–16 cannot be read through the prism of the creation theology of Gen 1:1–2:4a. Thus the work of Gorman, Balentine, Klawans, and anyone else who reads the sacrificial system of Lev 1–16 as a reflection of Gen 1:1–2:4a, must be read with a cautious eye. The motivation for the נאום offering was not for the maintenance of good, well-ordered cosmos inhabited by a people made in the image of God. It was nearly the opposite, in fact. It was a ritual that assumed the repetitious creation of material substances that resulted from wrongdoing and that clung to individuals and to the sanctuary. This cosmos was constantly under threat of losing the divine presence due to the unavoidable uncleanness and sinfulness of the people in it. While the stains of sin could be dealt with, they could never be eradicated. This world and those who inhabited it enjoyed only one instance of purity, the moment after the rituals of Yom Kippur. While H does indeed affirm P’s theology of the נאום offering, it speaks very little of this offering. Even where it appears to speak of it and offer an explanation of it, Lev 17:11, it clearly demonstrates that YHWH has given this mechanism
to Israel, and that it is for the benefit of the Israelites. In H, the Israelites and their
sinfulness are still a problem, but not one that threatens YHWH. Furthermore, H sees the
possibility of holiness for the Israelites, and thus the possibility for a cosmos with no
need for הַזָּאת offerings, a cosmos much like that described in Gen 1:1–2:4a.

2.8 The Case for H authorship of Gen 17

Knohl recognizes elements of H in Gen 17 but does not go so far as to attribute
the entire story to H. Knohl identifies two phrases, highlighted below, in Gen 17:8 as H
additions.

Gen 17:8/ I will give to you and to your offspring after you the land where you
are a resident alien, all of the land of Canaan, for a perpetual possession; and I
will be their God.

The phrase הַזָּאת לֵבָנָה לְאַלְפָּה is never used in P, but is common in H (Exod 6:7; 29:45;
Lev 11:45; 22:33; 25:38; 26:12, 45; Num 15:41).117 The other expression to which Knohl
draws attention is מְדַלְּת הַזָּאת לְאַלְפָּה. Phrases very similar to this one in Gen
17:8 occur in two other places, Lev 14:34a and Deut 32:49b, both of which Knohl assigns
to H.

Lev 14:34a/ When you enter the land of Canaan, which I give you as a

117 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 102 n 145.
possession...\textsuperscript{118}

\texttt{Deut 32:49b}

\texttt{Deut 32:49b/ \ldots and see the land of Canaan, which I am giving to the Israelites as a possession.}

Milgrom notes the first-person speech for YHWH in Lev 14:34a, as well as the use of אָחוֹת, which H uses exclusively to refer to the land of Israel (Lev 25:10, 13, 24, 25, 32, 33, 34, 41, 45; 27:16, 21, 22, 28).\textsuperscript{119} Thus the use of אָחוֹת is an important indication of H authorship in Lev 14:34a, Deut 32:49b, and Gen 17:8. As I have shown in my discussion on Gen 1:1–2:4a, H unquestionably demonstrates great care for the land. Intriguingly, Lev 26:42 shows YHWH’s care for the land as being tied to the covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, thus reflecting one of the covenantal motifs in Lev 17: the promise of the land.

\texttt{Lev 26:42/ \ldots then I will remember my covenant with Jacob; also my covenant with Isaac and also my covenant with Abraham I will remember. And I will remember the land.\textsuperscript{120}}

When YHWH remembers his covenant with the patriarchs, YHWH also remembers the land. The importance of this connection between the covenant with patriarchs and the land is evident in Lev 26, where the land is preserved regardless of whether Israel obeys or not. The land will be desolate (26:33), but this desolation will allow the land to rest

\textsuperscript{118} Milgrom, \textit{Leviticus 1–16}, 828.

\textsuperscript{119} Milgrom, \textit{Leviticus 1–16}, 866–67.

\textsuperscript{120} This is my translation, which is at odds with Milgrom’s translation, as I discuss below.
and enjoy its Sabbath years (26:34).

Knohl points out that “the language of ‘cutting off’ used in Gen 17:14 (ננחתה) shows a lack of agreement in gender between the sinner and the receiver of the punishment in PT (Exod 30:33, 38; Lev 7:20, 27). This lack of agreement is common in the ‘cutting off’ exhortations of HS (see Exod 12:15, 19; 31:14; Lev 7:25; 17:10; 19:8; 22:3; Num 9:13; 19:13, 20).”

Gen 17:14/ An uncircumcised male who does not circumcise the flesh of his foreskin, that one shall be cut off from his people. He has broken my covenant.

As I will show in the exegetical chapters (see especially chapter four), the term่นחת is an important term for the author of H. It is not surprising, then, to see the H author use it here, even though่นחת is understood as grammatically feminine in Gen 17:14 (the verb with่นחת is Niphal, 3rd feminine singular and the possessive suffix on่นחת is 3rd feminine singular) and circumcision obviously applies only to males.

Knohl also points out that the phraseלHdrts btndh كل he ל onl occurs in Gen 17:7 and Exod 31:16, already identified as an H passage.

Exod 31:16/ The Israelites shall observe the Sabbath, to keep the Sabbath throughout their generations as a perpetual covenant.
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Gen 17.7/ I will establish my covenant between me and you and your offspring after you throughout their generations as a perpetual covenant to be God for you and for your offspring after you.

The phrase מַעַלֶ֖ה בֵּית, without מְדִינָה, occurs again in Gen 17:13 and once in Leviticus. Leviticus 24:8 uses the phrase in reference to the twelve loaves of bread with frankincense that are to be set out each Sabbath on the table described in Exod 25:30 (P), a text that Milgrom believes the H author took for granted. It is clear then that the phrase מַעַלֶ֖ה בֵּית appears to be unique to H. However, as I will discuss below, the issue of authorship of “priestly” (P or H) passages in Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers that use בֵּית מַעַלֶ֖ה is much simpler than this.

The promise of a son, as well as an abundant lineage from this son and Ishmael, is an important part of Gen 17. Genesis 17:2–6 focuses on the multitude of peoples that will come from Abraham, and Gen 17:18–20 focuses on the nation and many people that will come from Ishmael. An important phrase occurs in Gen 17:6a and 17:20a.

Gen 17:6a/ I will make you exceedingly fruitful....

Gen 17:20a/ I will make you exceedingly fruitful....

123 Lev 24:5 only references the table as מַעַלֶ֖ה בֵּית, literally “the pure table,” which Milgrom believes is an ellipsis of מַעַלֶ֖ה לִבְצֵק מַעַלֶ֖ה בֵּית מַעַלֶ֖ה כְּטָמֵא, “the table of pure gold,” since Exod 24:25 clearly shows that the table is overlayed with “pure gold,” as opposed to being “pure” (Milgrom, Leviticus 23–27, 2097).
Gen 17:20a/ And for Ishmael, I have heard you. Now I will bless him and will make him fruitful and multiply him exceedingly.

These are obviously reminiscent of Gen 1:1–2:4a, although in Gen 1:28 the roots הָּרָה and הָּרָה occur in the imperative. They are commands, not promises as they are her in Gen 17:6 and 20. In Lev 26:9 both roots, הָּרָה and הָּרָה (along with הָּרָה), occur again. In Lev 26:9, as in Gen 17:6a (only הָּרָה here) and Gen 17:20a (both verbs), these verbs are in the Hiphil.

Lev 26:9/ I will look with favor upon you, and will make you fruitful and multiply you; and I will uphold my covenant with you.124

These verbs occur nowhere in the P material of Exodus or Leviticus. Furthermore, I believe that the promise to Ishmael is more in line with the thinking of H, who is concerned for the אָדָם (native) and the גָּדוֹן (alien). Ishmael could have been cast aside. Furthermore, Ishmael plays an important role in this story. As will be discussed below, this story articulates the important difference between the circumcised גָּדוֹן and the circumcised Israelite, who must be circumcised on the eighth day.

Two more verbal links between the covenant with Abraham (and with Noah) in Gen 17 and H material appears in Lev 26. God commands Abraham, saying, “Walk before me and be blameless (כִּשְׁתֹּם),” in Genesis 17:1. In Genesis 6:9, Noah is

124 Milgrom, Leviticus 23–27, 2272.
described as blameless (חמתי) and as having “walked (הלך) with God.” Lev 26:12 also has this image of “walking with God.”

Lev 26:12/ I will walk among you, and I shall be your God and you shall be my people.

The verb הלך is in the Hitpael as it is in Gen 6:9 and 17:1. Though YHWH is the subject in Lev 26:12 (in Gen 6:9 and 17:1 Noah and Abraham are the subjects), the idea of YHWH and the people walking together is a reminder of the covenants with Abraham and Noah. Moreover, the idea of being blameless (חמתי) is certainly consonant with the call for holiness throughout Lev 17–26. As I stated above, Milgrom shows that in distinction from P, who only uses שׁבע to convey ritual impurity, H uses שׁבע metaphorically for nonritualistic behavior such as adultery.125 In Gen 17:1, חמתי, the antonym of שׁבע, is being used metaphorically to describe the behavior that God expects of Abraham. No such ideal is ever mentioned in Lev 1–16 or Exod 25–30, 35–40, and in fact this material stresses just the opposite: wrongdoing and impurity are a natural part of human existence.

Surprisingly, circumcision is referenced very little in P or H after Gen 17. There are only four references to circumcision in P or H literature outside of Gen 17 (Gen 21:4; Exod 12:44, 48; Lev 12:3). All four of these traditionally have been attributed to P. Knohl

125 Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, 1327.
does assign one of the verses of Gen 17, v. 14, which references the covenant of circumcision, to H. Moreover, Knohl believes that Exod 12:1–20, 43–49 (and Num 9:1–14), passages on Passover and Unleavened Bread, also belong to H. These verses can quite convincingly be assigned to H. Exodus 12:43–49 ends with this verse.

Exod 12:49/ There shall be one law for the citizen and for the alien who dwells with you.\(^{127}\)

As Knohl points out, “The principle of the equality of stranger or citizen is widespread throughout the Holiness Code…” (Lev 17:8, 10, 12, 13, 15; 18:26; 19:33, 34; 20:2; 22:18; 24:22).\(^{128}\) Moreover, Exod 12:43 mentions that the foreigner (יהוּדָּא) cannot eat of the Passover lamb. In all of the Pentateuch, יָדָא only occurs in three other passages, Gen 17:12, 27; Lev 22:25. Leviticus 22:25 is unquestionably an H text and I am, of course, arguing the same for Gen 17. When we add the references to circumcision in Exod 12:44 and 48, Exod 12:43–49 appears to be from the same hand as Gen 17.

Leviticus 12:3 is the last passage on circumcision in the “priestly” material. It appears to be an insertion into the text of Lev 12, cutting off the more logical sequence that would occur from 12:2 to 12:4.

127 This is Knohl’s translation (Sanctuary of Silence, 21).
128 Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 21, 21 n 35.
Lev 12:2/ Speak to the Israelites thus: when a woman at childbirth bears a male, she shall be impure for seven days; she shall be impure as during the period of her menstrual infirmity. —
Lev 12:3/ On the eighth day the foreskin of his member shall be circumcised. —
Lev 12:4/ She shall remain in [a state of] blood purity for thirty-three days; she shall not touch any consecrated thing, nor enter the sacred precinct until the period of her purification is complete. 

The switch in subject from the mother to her son is abrupt; the text includes no introduction or signal indicating the switch in subject. The verse also clearly interrupts the ritual prescriptions for the new mother. Circumcision cannot be claimed to be “a purificatory rite for the boy and thus comparable to the purificatory rites enjoined upon his mother, for there is no equivalent rite for a newly born girl.” Milgrom points out that the insertion is here not to stress the practice of circumcision, which was widespread amongst Israel’s Semitic neighbors, but to stress the timing of the rite, “which in Israel alone was performed in infancy and, precisely, on the eighth day.”

Genesis 17:12 also emphasizes circumcision on the eighth day. The fact that the new mother of a boy is impure for seven days created the perfect opportunity for an insertion about the importance of circumcision on the eighth day. Neither Knohl nor Milgrom attribute this insertion to H, but once Gen 17 is recognized as an H text, it becomes highly likely that H inserted this verse into the text of P.
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2.8.1 Covenant in Gen 17 and in P and H

Once it is realized that the passages that refer to Sabbath as a בְּרִית or a בְּרִית originates from H and that the story of the covenant of circumcision, Gen 17, also comes from H, it becomes quite possible that all passages formerly attributed to P that use the term בְּרִית should be assigned to H. The only three lengthy sections within the Pentateuch that are typically attributed to P are Exod 25–31, 35–40, and Lev 1–16. Knohl assigns much of Numbers to H and I am becoming increasingly convinced by his work.132 Within these thirty chapters of Exodus and Leviticus, the term בְּרִית occurs twice, in Exod 31:16 (already discussed above and assigned to H) and Lev 2:13. Even if the entire book of Numbers were to be assigned to P, this would add only five more references (one of which, Num 18:19, is another reiteration of the “covenant of salt” and is included in the quote from Milgrom below) to בְּרִית in the P corpus outside of Genesis.  

Lev 2:13/ You shall season all your cereal offerings with salt; you shall not omit from your cereal offering the salt of your covenant with your God: on all your offerings you must offer salt.134

Milgrom comments that the idiom בְּרִית “is used again to refer to the binding

---

132 Knohl assigns a majority of Numbers to H, only confidently assigning the following chapters and verses from Numbers to P: 5:11–31; 6:1–21; 19: 28–29. Furthermore, Knohl sees the work of the H editor in all of these sections (Sanctuary of Silence, 71–101, 105–06).

133 Num 10:33 and 14:44 refer to the “Ark of the Covenant” and Knohl does not identify these two verses as from the H author. Num 25:12 (“covenant of peace”) and 25:13 (covenant of perpetual priesthood) each have a reference to בְּרִית and Knohl assigns both verses to H (YHWH speaks in the first person in 25:12). Lastly, Knohl believes that the “covenant of salt” passage, Num 18:19 is from H (Sanctuary of Silence, 105).

134 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 178.
character of the priestly perquisites (Num 18:19) and of the Davidic dynasty (2 Chr 13:5).” Apart from these other references, Milgrom does not have any insight into why P would use the term חָרָם here. None of the references to covenant in Numbers is concerned with circumcision, Abraham/Isaac/Jacob or Noah, land, or offspring. Not one of the references from P material in Exodus or Leviticus refers to offspring/circumcision/land (Gen 17) or to the covenant with Noah (Gen 6:18; 9:9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17). Conversely, we have seen that not only does H refer to the Sabbath as a חָרָם, it also refers to circumcision, offspring, and land.

Knohl concludes that P ceases to use חָרָם after the revelation of the divine name in Exod 6. Instead, P consistently uses פֶּרֶשׁ, which unlike חָרָם “never denotes the bilateral obligation in the Bible. Its main implication is commandments, orders.” Knohl notes that the political documents of Assyria express a shift similar to what Knohl believes is happening in P as it shifts from חָרָם to פֶּרֶשׁ. In the second millennium B.C.E., treaties in Assyria and other areas of the ancient Near East were designated by a variety of legal terms and “[t]hese agreements—even though not always concluded between parties of equal status—dealt with matters of concern to both parties and generally specified mutual obligations.” However, this typical arrangement was altered in the early eighth century B.C.E.

137 Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 142.
138 Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 143.
The founding of the Assyrian empire under Tiglat-Pilesar (745–727 B.C.E.) and the rise of the Assyrian king to supreme ruler—the sole sovereign of western Asia—made changes in the texts of international agreements necessary. These changes were to reflect the unconditional sovereignty of the Assyrian emperor. The previous set of ancient covenantal terms was replaced by the ade—an oath of loyalty and unilateral obligation, imposed by the Assyrian ruler on his vassals, with no promise of reward for their loyalty. This term was borrowed by the Assyrians from the Aramaic word ידוע, which is the cognate of the Hebrew word ידועה.139

J. Joosten notes one of the major issues scholars have had with P on the topic of ידועה is that “the priestly code makes no reference to a covenant established in the time of Moses.”140 W. Zimmerli hypothesized that P neglected the covenant at Sinai because it did not agree with the idea of obedience to commandments as a condition of the relationship between Israel and YHWH, but instead insisted on a covenant of promise through the fulfillment of the promises made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.141 Knohl criticizes Zimmerli’s account, insisting that “to attribute the opposition to the divine dimension of command to PT, which places the fulfillment of the divine command at the heart of its system, would be a great distortion.”142 Furthermore, in Genesis 17, God demands of Abraham, “walk before me and be blameless” (וְהָאֹרֶץ הָיְתָה לְךָ הָעָם הָיוֹת [וְהָאֹרֶץ הָיְתָה לְךָ הָעָם הָיוֹת]), a fairly clear condition to the promise. Knohl suggests that P’s concept of covenant

139 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 143.
141 Joosten, People and Land, 111.
142 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 144 n 80.
changes at Sinai as the הַבְּרִית with the patriarchs is transformed into a one-sided pact (תִּבְרֵית).

I have already hinted at a much simpler explanation, supported strongly by the textual evidence: H is the author of the Genesis passages typically attributed to P that discuss הַבְּרִית (Gen 6:18; 9:12, 15, 16; 17:2, 7, 10, 11). Thus, P’s concept of the covenant does not radically change. Rather, P’s only concept of the relationship between YHWH and Israel is that of a one-sided pact (תִּבְרֵית). Exodus 2:24, which Knohl believes is the last reference to the covenant (הַבְּרִית) in P before the shift to תִּבְרֵית, can also be shown to come from H. Leviticus 26:42 is reminiscent of Exod 2:24 and Gen 9:13–15. In all three cases, God remembers (הַבְּרִית) his covenant, either with the ancestors or the earth, or both.

Exod 2:24b/ And God remembered his covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

Gen 9:13/ I have set my bow in the clouds and it shall be a sign of the covenant between me and the land/earth.

Lev 26:42/ …then I will remember my covenant with Jacob; also my covenant with Isaac and also my covenant with Abraham I will remember. And I will remember the land.

---

143 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 147.
Milgrom believes that the ב on מִלְחַת יַרֵד in Lev 26:42 is “explanatory” and shows that “the essence of the covenant with the patriarchs is the promise of the land.” Thus he translates the final phrase on the land as “namely, I will remember the land.”

Milgrom’s translation obscures what I contend is a reference to Gen 9:13, where God makes a covenant with the land/earth (מִלְחַת יַרֵד) never to destroy it again. Leviticus 26:42 repeats this promise, but here it is connected with the promise to the ancestors and thus applies only to the land promised to them. Commenting on Lev 26:43–44, the verses that immediately follow these remarks on the covenant with the ancestors, Milgrom does see that H is referencing the flood account here. Writes Milgrom,

Once again, earth (of Israel) is polluted by its residents, by depriving it of its sabbatical rest to recoup its depleted energies. The remedy is identical. The land must be rid of its inhabitants. This time, however, the purifying agency is not the flood—nor can it be, since God swore never again to flood the earth (Gen 9:15; Isa 54:9)—but exile.

Both Exod 2:24 and Lev 26:4 use the root כָּרַז, as God “remembers” his covenant. While כָּרַז is not used in Gen 9:13, it does appear only two verses later (9:15), as God promises to remember his covenant with Noah when he sees the bow in the clouds. Finally, Lev 26:45–46 connects the covenant with the ancestors to both the exodus and the covenant at Sinai.

144 Milgrom, Leviticus 23–27, 2335.
145 Milgrom, Leviticus 23–27, 2274.
146 Milgrom, Leviticus 23–27, 2336.
Lev 26:45/ But I will remember for their benefit the covenant with the former ones whom I freed from the land of Egypt in the sight of the nations to be their God: I am YHWH.

Lev 26:46/ These are the laws, the rules, and the rituals\textsuperscript{147} that YHWH established between himself and the people of Israel on Mount Sinai through Moses.

This reference to Sinai and the exodus brings the covenants of Genesis together with Sinai. While the reference to הָרְגָּבָה in 26:45 is not explicitly linked to Sinai in this verse, Milgrom concludes that it is indeed referring to Sinai: “[T]he covenant containing laws, rules, commandments, and the consequences of nonobservance, which can be only the Sinaitic covenant, is alluded to three times: vv. 15, 25a, 44a.”\textsuperscript{148}

Leviticus 26:46 explicitly mentions statutes, rules, and rituals that were given at Mount Sinai. This last verse also contains a phrase reminiscent of covenant formulas typically attributed to P. Writes Knohl, “The bilateral nature of the covenantal relation, as seen by PT, is represented by the phrase (קרית ביניים), which is frequently repeated in connection with the covenants of Noah and Abraham (Gen 9:12, 13, 15, 16; 17:2, 7, 10, 11).”\textsuperscript{149} As can be seen just above, Lev 26:46 uses this קרית phrase as it speaks of the Sinai covenant. In Lev 26:46, the קרית phrase is in the third person as opposed to the second person, as in Gen 9 and Gen 17. However, considering the many other links between H and Gen 9 and Gen 17, the use of this phrase is further confirmation of H

\textsuperscript{147} Milgrom suggests “the rituals” for תְּרוּםָה (Leviticus 23–27, 2274).
\textsuperscript{148} Milgrom, Leviticus 23–27, 2338.
\textsuperscript{149} Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 141–42.
authorship of Gen 9 and Gen 17. Furthermore, it appears that H does not view the
covenant at Sinai as wholly different from that made with Noah and Abraham, Isaac,
and Jacob, but rather a continuation of that covenant relationship. Nihan agrees with
this assessment, but misses the fact that the material on covenant in Genesis should be
reassigned to H.

In Lev 26, therefore, Israel’s restoration after the exile is not presented as a divine
initiative, as is systematically the case in the prophetic literature, but as a
consequence of the former covenant with the Patriarchs in P. This reference to
the נַחֲרָם concluded with the Patriarchs introduces a further reflection on God’s
covenant in Israel in vv. 43–45. Here, it is no longer the Priestly conception of the
which is reinterpreted from the perspective of the Dtr conception, as in vv.
3–13, but rather the Dtr conception that is integrated into the Priestly one. … Thus, the
possibility of the covenant’s break is acknowledged as a concession made to the
Deuteronomistic and prophetic traditions, but Yahweh’s נַחֲרָם eventually remains a נַחֲרָם
שָׁם יִשְׂרָאֵל, as in P. With this development, the two conflicting traditions on the
conclusion in the Torah are now united for the first time into a single, unified conception. This
development is apparently taken one step further in the next verse, v. 45, where
Yahweh’s “remembrance” is applied to the נַחֲרָם concluded with the exodus
generation, hence actually implying the equivalence of the two covenants. Therefore,
immediately before the final subscription in 26:46, Lev 26 (and with it, all of H)
ends by mediating between Sinaitic נַחֲרָם and Abraham’s נַחֲרָם and by defining
the nature of their relationship. Already here, the context for such a development
is transparent: it represents an attempt to solve the most obvious difficulty facing
the scribes who composed the Torah when they combined Priestly and non-
Priestly traditions into a single, comprehensive document.150

My only dispute with Nihan’s analysis here is that the textual evidence throughout Lev
17–26, including assigning Gen 1:1–2:4a and other passages in Genesis, Exodus, and
Numbers to H, clearly shows that the material in Genesis on the promises to (and

150 Nihan, Priestly Torah to Pentateuch, 542 (emphasis in original).
covenant with) Abraham (Gen 17) and to Jacob (Gen 28:3–4; 35:11–12; 48:3–4) originated from the author of H, not P. Thus H is reconciling his own work on the covenant with the patriarchs with the P material on the ritual instructions given at Sinai and the Deuteronomistic material on the covenant at Sinai. Nihan is only a few steps away from seeing the pattern that I am articulating.

Nihan has noticed many of the same important links between the material in Genesis and Exodus and Lev 26 that I have noted, although he continues to contend that H is linking his work with P’s work in these books. Nihan even points out another important link: “The use of מָריי Hiphil with the term רָבָי is characteristic of P, see also Gen 6:18; 9:9, 11, 17; 17:7, 19, 21; Ex 6:4; otherwise in the Torah only in Gen 21:32; Deut 8:18; 31:16.” Or, the use of מָריי Hiphil with the term רָבָי is characteristic of H, the author of these texts in Genesis and Exodus. The much simpler conclusion, and one

151 Writes Nihan:

The promise to “make you fruitful and multiply you” in 26:9a is typical of P and corresponds to the commandment given to humanity before (Gen 1:28) and after (Gen 9:1, 7) the Flood, resumed in the promise made to the Patriarchs (Abraham: Gen 17:6, 7; Ishmael: Gen 17:20; Isaac: Gen 26:4, 24; Jacob: Gen 28:3; 35:11; 48:4), and fulfilled by Israel during its sojourn in Egypt (Ex 1:7 P). The establishment (מָריי Hiphil) of the treaty (רָבָי) between God and the Israelites in 26:9b refers to the treaty concluded with Abraham in Gen 17 (cf. 17:7, 19, 21, and further Ex 6:4). The allusion to the dwelling (תִּישַׁב) established in the midst of Israel in 26:1a is a clear reference to the promises of Ex 25:8 and 29:45–46. Finally, Yahweh’s promise that he will “walk amidst” the Israelites (גֹּלַת הַשָּׁמֶשׁ) in 26:12 appears to conflate two different motifs in P. The term “in your midst” (בֵּיתךָ) is found, in P, in reference to the tent of meeting allowing Yahweh to reside in the midst of his community (cf. Ex 25:8; 29:45–46). The use of the verb “to walk” (לְדוֹחֵה) recalls, for its part, the relationship between God and men before the Flood in the P version of Gen 1–11, where certain privileged ancestors are described as “walking with Yahweh” (Gen 5:22, 24; 6:9). ... Whereas in P the establishment of Yahweh’s sanctuary in Israel represented a partial restitution of the divine presence, H’s concluding exhortation goes even further and alludes to the complete re-establishment of the initial relationship between God and man in Israel.

152 Nihan, Priestly Torah to Pentateuch, 538 n 564.
strongly supported by the textual evidence, is that in Lev 26 the H author is linking his own material (not P’s material) in Genesis and Exodus with the laws and rituals given at Sinai. Nihan shows that the covenant at Sinai does not annul or alter the covenants with Noah or Abraham, but rather represents “the complete re-establishment of the initial relationship between God and man in Israel.”

2.9 More Links Between H and Genesis

The promises made to Abraham are reiterated to Isaac (by J, in Gen 26:2–5, with no clear H material for Isaac) and Jacob (see below) in Genesis. The passages in which God speaks to Jacob show signs of H authorship. This is unsurprising if my analysis about H authorship of Gen 17 is accepted. One key verb that appears throughout the stories in Gen that I have assigned to H is קרב, “bless.” It appears three times in Gen 1:1–2:4a, where God blesses the animals (1:22), the first male and female (1:28) and the seventh day (2:3), a blessing which is reiterated in Exod 20:11. God blesses Noah and his sons (9:1), as he did the first male and female, commanding them to be fruitful and multiply in both cases. In Gen 17:16, God promises to bless Sarah and give her a son, while in Gen 17:20 God also promises to bless Ishmael. The blessing of Jacob in Gen 28:4 and 35:9, along with Jacob’s recounting of this blessing in 48:3, all contain the verb קרב and have typically been assigned to P. Along with these important verses, I add the

153 Nihan, Priestly Torah to Pentateuch, 539.
154 This blessing reoccurs in Gen 5:2.
“priestly” blessing of Num 6:22–27. Writes Knohl, “[W]e should attribute it to HS, inasmuch as God’s speech in the first person, יָדָע (v. 27), and the phrases [זָצִים] יִוָא and [זָצִים] יִבְרָע (vv. 25–27) appear elsewhere in HS,155 but are completely absent from PT.”156

In all of the cases mentioned in the previous paragraph, and assigned to H, God/YHWH is the subject who blesses. The verb דָּבָר only occurs in one clear P context, and its use there highlights a key difference between P and H. In Lev 9:22–23, דָּבָר is used twice, and in both cases the subject is a person (Aaron in 9:22 and Aaron and Moses in the case of 9:23), not YHWH. This same pattern is evident with the use of the verb שַׁדַּא, principally in the Piel and meaning “sanctify/consecrate.” In the eighteen undisputed cases of this verb in P (Exod 28:38 [Hiphil], 41; 29:1, 21 [Qal], 27, 33, 37 [1 Piel and 1 Qal]; 30:29 [1 Piel and 1 Qal], 30; Lev 6:11 in Eng. 6:18 [Qal], 20 in Eng. 27 [Qal]; 8:10, 11, 12, 15, 30; 10:3 [Niphal]; 16:19), YHWH is the subject just once (Lev 10:3, which P frames as a quote from an unknown and unspecified source157). Moreover, the things that are consecrated (Piel) or that become holy (Qal) are all associated with the cult (priests, priestly vestments, sancta, sacrifices) and are sanctified through ritual procedure. In the undisputed H texts (20:7 [Hitpael], 8; 21:8, 15, 23; 22:2 [Hiphil], 3 [Hiphil], 9, 16, 32 [1 Niphal and 1 Piel]; 25:10), YHWH is the subject in eight of the twelve

155 Knohl notes the following occurrences: יִזְכִּיר יִנָּא – Lev 17:10; 20:3, 5, 6; 26:17; cf. Lev 26:9), יִזְכִּיר יִבְרָע – Exod 6:3; Lev 18:21; 19:12; 20:3, 21:6; 22:2, 32; 24:11, 16 (Sanctuary of Silence, 89 n 95).
156 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 89
157 YHWH sanctifies himself (שַׁדַּא in the Niphal) through the punishment (their deaths) inflicted upon Nadab and Abihu (Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 602).
cases (Lev 20:8; 21:8, 15, 23; 22:9, 16, 32 [both occurrences]) and the cases are not
confined to the cultic sphere. In seven of these eight cases (all except one occurrence in
20:32), YHWH simply states, “I, YHWH, sanctify you/them” (םיה וְיִבְנֶה יִתְבָּרֵךְ), with no
clarification of how YHWH does so. In contrast to P, none of the cases in H involve
sanctification through ritual procedure, with the exceptions of Lev 22:2–3, which both
speak of the “sacred things” (כֶּדֶרֶשֶׁת) that the Israelites “consecrate” (מְקַדֵּשׁ) to YHWH.
However, these two occurrences (Lev 22:2–3) are unlike the examples in P, which
generally refer to a specific ritual act that effects consecration. In H, the Israelites are
sanctified by YHWH (20:8; 22:32), commanded to sanctify themselves (20:7), and also
commanded to sanctify the fiftieth year (25:10). These distinctions are helpful as we look
at Gen 1:1–2:4a. God sanctifies the seventh day in Gen 2:3, a verse which is echoed in
Exod 20:11. In Exod 20:8, the Israelites are commanded to remember the Sabbath to
sanctify it (קדשַה) just as the Israelites are commanded to sanctify the fiftieth year in Lev
25:10. In both cases, the action of the Israelites sanctifies time.

Genesis 35:11–12 is also cited by Knohl as a place where P has God speaking in
the first person\(^{158}\) and would rightly be attributed to H if my argument on H authorship
for Gen 1:1–2:4a and Gen 17 is accepted.

\(^{158}\) Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 107 n 164.
Gen 35:11/ God said to him, “I am El Shaddai. Be fruitful and multiply; a nation and an assembly of nations will come from you and kings shall come out from your loins.
Gen 35:12/ The land which I gave to Abraham and to Isaac, I will give it to you, and I will give the land to your offspring after you.”

The promise of the land is very similar to the promise in Gen 17:5–8 and the command to be fruitful and multiply is reminiscent of Gen 1:28, as well as Gen 17:6, in which God promises to make Abraham fruitful. Thus these verses should be assigned to the author of Gen 1:1–2:4a and Gen 17, as they have generally been. However, if my analysis of Gen 1:1–2:4a and Gen 17 is correct, then that author is H, not P.

As indicated above, the word הָזָּהַת (possession) occurs twelve times in Lev 25. It is an important word for H and appears to be the sole word H uses to refer to possession of the land of Israel. In Lev 25:23, YHWH makes it clear that the land is his; the Israelites are simply aliens and tenants (現代 הָזָּהַת). הָזָּהַת does not appear in Exodus and appears once in Lev 1–16, in an H addition. It does appear in Gen 17:8 and 48:4, which have been shown to have other H characteristics. In Gen 23, הָזָּהַת occurs in vv. 4, 9, and 20. Knohl mentions that הָזָּהַת also appears in Gen 23:4 and that all other ten appearances of this word in the Pentateuch occur in H texts (Exod 12:44; Lev 22:10; 25:6, 23, 35, 40,

160 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 866. Lev 14:34a is discussed above. YHWH speaks in the first person in this verse.
Joseph Blenkinsopp has pointed out that הָדוֹן appears mostly in later texts (15 times in Ezekiel, 4 times in Chronicles, once in Nehemiah) and thus argues that this is evidence for a late dating of P. In Numbers, it occurs nine times (27:4, 7; 32:5, 22, 29, 32; 35:2, 8, 28), and of these nine appearances, Knohl assigns five to H with certainty. Knohl does not treat the appearances in Num 32; however he does note H editorial activity in Num 32. I suggest these occurrences in Num 32 can fairly confidently be assigned to the H, probably H₆, working in the exilic and post-exilic periods. This precludes the possibility that P uses this word.

2.10 References to Yhwh/God

Source criticism has long utilized the way in which a passage refers to the deity to differentiate the sources. Primarily, the Yahwist uses the Tetragrammaton, while the Priestly Source, it was thought, only does so after the revelation of the divine name in Exod 6. After Exod 6, P is rather insistent upon using הָדוֹן, and avoiding אלוהים. According to traditional source criticism, this rule is betrayed in eighteen verses (Exod 6:7; 16:12; 29:45–46; 31:3, 18; 35:31; Lev 2:13; 4:22; 11:44–45; Num 10:10; 15:40–41; 16:9, 22; 25:13; 27:16). In contrast, H uses אלוהים quite liberally, forty-three times in only ten

---

161 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 103 n 150.
164 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 102 n 143.
165 Knohl has a list, but it strangely does not include Lev 2:13 and 4:22 (Sanctuary of Silence, 125 n 2).
chapters (Lev 18:2, 4, 21, 30; 19:2, 3, 4, 10, 12, 14, 25, 31, 32, 34, 36; 20:7, 24; 21:6, 7, 8, 12, 17, 21, 22; 22:25, 33; 23:14, 22, 28, 40, 43; 24:15, 22; 25:17, 26:1, 12, 13, 44, 45). Of the eighteen verses from P above, only Lev 2:13 and 4:22 have not been suggested as H additions. In five of the fifteen passages listed above (Exod 6:7; 16:12; 29:45–46; Num 10:10; 15:40–41), God speaks in the first person, a trademark of H. These verses also use a favorite phrase of H, “I am YHWH (their/your God)” (אֱלֹהֵיכֶם אַלְוָהֵי אָדָם), used with or without “their/your God” forty-nine times. Leviticus 11:44–45 also uses this phrase, as well as containing the command to the Israelites from YHWH to sanctify themselves (cf. Lev 20:7) and to be holy (cf. Lev 19:2; 20:7, 26). I will not rehearse all of Knohl’s arguments for the assignment of these verses to H. I mention this difference between P and H to suggest that the authentic P material always uses only YHWH, and not אלהים. Only in Lev 2:13 and 4:22 does P use אלהים, and only in 2:13 without also including YHWH.

In Gen 17:1, the narrative begins as follows: “And Abram was ninety-nine years old when YHWH appeared to Abram and said to him, ‘I am El Shadday.’ Walk before me and be blameless.” Richard Friedman explains the peculiarity of this verse.

This entire chapter is P, the Priestly version of the Abrahamic covenant. Those

---

166 As discussed above, Milgrom believes that Lev 11:44–45 is an H addition (Leviticus 1–16, 39, 686–88), as does Knohl (Sanctuary of Silence, 69). Knohl also identifies Exod 6:7; 16:12; 29:45, 46; 31:3, 18; 35:31; Num 10:10; 15:40, 41; 16:9, 22; 25:13; 27:16 as H additions (Sanctuary of Silence, 62–63, 66–68, 105, 125 n 2).

167 On H additions in Numbers, see Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 52–55, 71–106. For the other H additions to Exodus, see Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 63–68.
who misunderstand the matter of the name of God in the sources mistakenly think that the mention of God’s name, YHWH, in v. 1 is an exception to the hypothesis. On the contrary, this verse is precisely the point. The issue is not that the sources use different names for God. It is that the sources have different ideas of when God’s name was revealed to human beings. In J it is known from the early generations of human beings. In E and P it is not revealed until the generation of Moses. So in P God says to Moses, “I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob as El Shadday, and I was not known to them by my name, YHWH” (Exod 6:3). And, completely consistent with that, P says here that “YHWH appeared to Abram and said to him, ‘I am El Shadday.’” That is not an exception to the rule. That is the rule!168

Friedman’s point is valid, and certainly it is true that whoever wrote the stories typically attributed to P in Genesis did not believe that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob knew the divine name. However, I find it unlikely that the Priestly writer would have used YHWH here. This is confirmed, in part, by Milgrom, who has a long list of examples in which terms with very precise meanings in P are not used with such precision in H.169 Speaking generally on P and H, Milgrom goes so far as to conclude, “Indeed, P would have found H not only inaccurate but misleading! If P had incorporated H, it would have insisted on thoroughly overhauling it so that it would be consistent with P’s vocabulary.”170

Likewise, one might imagine that if the redactor of the Pentateuch were from the P tradition, he would have changed the J source to reflect his belief that the ancestors did not know God by the name YHWH. However already in Gen 2, the J creation account, YHWH is used and it appears as though the redactor of the Pentateuch simply added

168 Friedman, Bible with Sources Revealed, 56 n * (emphasis in original).
169 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 35–39.
170 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 38.
after every appearance of YHWH in the creation story of J. Perhaps the redactor has done so “to soften the transition”\textsuperscript{171} from Gen 1:1–2:4a which only uses אֱלֹהִים. However, if the rule for the Priestly Source on the use of אֱלֹהִים versus YHWH were as Friedman states (i.e. never let on that the divine name was known by humans before the exodus), then the author of the creation account of Gen 1:1–2:4a could have used, and perhaps even should have used, YHWH in order to make it clear that the God of this creation account is indeed YHWH, who brought Israel out from Egypt.

The redactor of the Pentateuch, as well as the author of Gen 1:1–2:4a and Gen 17, was not extremely bothered by the use of YHWH instead of אֱלֹהִים, or even YHWH along with אֱלֹהִים, as is evident in H and not in P. Knohl too notes H’s willingness to use YHWH and אֱלֹהִים together, concluding:

> The God who reveals himself to Moses and speaks directly to the people retains many of the dimensions of the God of Genesis, who is near to his creation and supervises his creatures personally. The very use of the common HS phrase אֱלֹהִים [הָאֱלֹהִים] expresses the relation of intimacy between God and Israel.\textsuperscript{172}

Above, Nihan notes that H brings together themes from Dtr and P (H’s own themes, in my opinion) on covenant, exodus,\textsuperscript{173} Sinai, exile, and restoration in Lev 26:42–46. The promises to the ancestors, the laws from Sinai, exile and return, all come together in H. Likewise, I would argue, H brings together and combines a variety of sources,

\textsuperscript{171} Friedman, Bible with Sources Revealed, 35 n **.
\textsuperscript{172} Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 173.
\textsuperscript{173} H mentions the exodus from Egypt twelve times, ten times in Lev 17–26 alone (Exod 29:46; Lev 11:45; 18:3; 19:34, 36; 22:33; 23:43; 25:38, 42, 55; 26:13, 45).
including his own, in the Pentateuch without altering them a great deal, since H appears to be less rigid in style. That is, the Pentateuch reflects an eclectic style that is unquestionably better suited to H than to P. Similarly, R. W. L. Moberly suggests that the editor of the Pentateuch was likely motivated by either “reverent tolerance” (reverence for the material led to preservation despite the presence of discrepancy) or a “desire to harmonize.” I prefer the explanation of “reverent tolerance,” while Moberly prefers the “desire to harmonize.” The statement in Exod 6:3 (an H text) that insists that the Patriarchs did not know the God of Israel by the name YHWH (a statement betrayed numerous times throughout Genesis), makes harmonization highly unlikely. In either case, however, H is much likelier to tolerate these inconsistencies than is P.

2.11 Dating P, H, and the H-redactor

My analysis of these two sources has greatly decreased the amount of material in the Pentateuch ascribed to P. By doing so, the possibility is heightened that the P material is overwhelmingly technical in nature, consisting only of instructions for the Tabernacle, its priests, its laws and rituals. This, in turn, has strengthened Knohl’s essential argument about the nature of the Priestly Source.

There is an essential difference between PT and HS: PT concentrates on its own inner world and has little interest in what takes place outside the Temple and the cult, whereas HS is concerned with the broader life and problems of the Israelite
congregation. ... In determining the historical framework of PT, Wellhausen cited the silence of the historical and prophetic writings on the cultic framework, described extensively in PT, as evidence for the late date of PT’s cultic system. But the Priestly texts are, by their nature, the concern of a small circle of “professionals,” and the silence of the non-Priestly sources may be explained by the detachment of those circles in which the prophetic and historical sources were created from the internal world of the priesthood.176

As noted above, Milgrom and Knohl both note P’s precision in vocabulary and linguistic structures. My work in this chapter has strengthened the likelihood of this high level of linguistic precision. There is no fundamental change in the conception of YHWH in P after the revelation of the divine name. Instead, the texts in Genesis previously attributed to P actually belong to H, revealing that the Priestly material is a rather small and technical corpus, focused on the cult of YHWH. On account of the insular nature of this material, it becomes quite difficult to assign a date to the material.

In chapters two, three, and four, I will argue that Lev 16 predates Lev 4:1–5:13 and Lev 10, both of which know of the inner altar. Leviticus 16 does not mention, and does not seem to be aware of, the inner altar, but only the outer altar (the altar of burnt offering) in the courtyard. Furthermore, the Azazel rite in Lev 16 has correspondence with the purgation and elimination rites of the Hittites. David Wright has identified five Hittite rituals that are similar to the Azazel rite.177 While there are, unsurprisingly,

176 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 203. Rolf Rendtorff concludes similarly: “My thesis is that the priestly language from the beginning was an internal cultic language used in the priestly circles in the temple of Jerusalem” (“Two Kinds of P? Some Reflections on the Occasion of the Publishing of Jacob Milgrom’s Commentary on Leviticus 1–16,” JSOT 60 (1993): 79.
177 David Wright, The Disposal of Impurity (SBL 101; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987).
notable differences between the Hittite rituals and the Azazel rite, the elimination of material symbolizing evil is attested in all five Hittite rituals. As for the †ewish offering of Lev 4:1–5:13, I suggest that although this particular legislation was conceived of and written before the exile, it was not well known until after the exile, as the biblical texts suggest (see Ezek 40–48; Ezra 8:35; 2 Chr 29:21–24), i.e., after Hš had collected and assembled the Pentateuch. 2 Kings 12:5–17 [Eng. 4–16] is the only clear reference to the †ewish offering in a pre-exilic text. It tells of repairs to the Temple in the twenty-third year of the reign of Joash (ca. 816 B.C.E.) and states that “silver of reparation offering [מְנַחֵם] and silver of purification offerings [מְנוּנֵי] was not deposited in the House of the Lord; it went to the priests” (v. 17 [Eng. 16]). Based on Lev 4:1–5:13, the purification offering was not commutable into silver. The reparation offering indeed was commutable into silver, according to Lev 5:15. Milgrom suggests that the silver was retained when Israelites purchased animals from the Temple for a purification offering, concluding, “Thus this pregnant verse in 2 Kings affirms that the people of Judah in the late ninth century came to the Temple to purchase purification and reparation offerings to make expiation for their sins.” This is certainly plausible and it likely means these offerings were conceived of in pre-exilic Israel. However, it does not mean that the text of Lev 1–16, or

178 Writes Milgrom, “The major difference between the Hittite and biblical rituals rest in the dissimilarity in the evils that are eliminated. In the Hittite text evils such as plague, witchcraft, and the evil tongue are being removed. In the Bible it is ‘the iniquities and transgressions of the Israelites, including all their sins’ (v 21)” (Leviticus 1–16, 1076).
179 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 288.
even just Lev 4–5, was known and utilized in Judah in the late ninth century. Milgrom believes that the “sacrificial procedures attested in P probably had their origins at Shiloh.” I do not wish to be so bold as to assign the writings of P to a specific era in pre-exilic Israel. The best indicator of a date for P is its use of נְדוֹם, which as my discussion above stated, arose during the time of Tiglat-Pilesar (745–727 B.C.E.). Principally, however, I am suggesting that P was a small, technical document known and preserved by H, and edited by H in an exilic and post-exilic setting, thus setting the terminus ad quem for P as the exile.

Milgrom argues for H redacting P and other H material in exile. Leviticus 23:3, an H text inserted into an older P text, discusses the Sabbath, which is labeled נְדוֹם, an H innovation, and more importantly, as discussed above, a הנס ימי, another H innovation. Milgrom believes that H labeled the Sabbath as a נס because he was living in exile and the Sabbath was a כיף that the Israelite community in exile could observe. Moreover, Milgrom notes that the concluding supplement, Lev 23:39–44, prescribes dwelling in כיף for all seven days of the festival, a prescription that, in contrast to a “Temple-anchored, sacrifice-laden Sukkot festival,” could be followed in exile. I would, of course, add to this that H also wrote the creation narrative of Gen 1:1–2:4a that served as the motivation for the concept of Sabbath rest.

---

180 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 34.
181 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 27.
Besides recognizing that the author of Gen 17 is from an author associated with the H tradition, the other key to determining the setting for this passage is its emphasis on circumcision on the eighth day. Matthew Thiessen has made a case for post-exilic authorship of Gen 17 that cannot be ignored. Thiessen argues that the prescription to circumcise on the eighth day is the key to understanding Gen 17, as well as the historical setting for Gen 17.

Thiessen’s argument begins by showing that the text of Gen 17:14 includes the prescription to circumcise on the eighth day.

\[
\text{Gen 17:14/ Any uncircumcised male who is not circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin (on the eighth day), that spirit shall be cut off from his people.}
\]

The Masoretic Text from BHS does not include the prescription that circumcision must be done on the eighth day after a boy is born, thus I have added this phrase in parentheses. As Thiessen points out, a majority of LXX witnesses include the phrase “on the eighth day” after “the flesh of his foreskin.” Furthermore, Philo, Justin Martyr, and Old Latin witnesses all reference this verse with the inclusion of “on the eighth day.”

The Samaritan Pentateuch attests to the inclusion of the eighth day, as does Jubilees, a

---

second century B.C.E. Palestinian Jewish work, in its rewriting of Gen 17:14.\textsuperscript{185} Genesis 17:12 also stresses that circumcision should take place on the eighth day. Lastly, as has been discussed above, Lev 12:3 stresses circumcision on the eighth day and is likely an interpolation from H. The case, then, for the inclusion of “on the eighth day” in Gen 17:14 is strong.

Thiessen demonstrates how the inclusion of the prescription to circumcise a boy on the eighth day in Gen 17:14, and not only in 17:12, is crucial to understanding the entire pericope. Only those circumcised on the eighth day are a part of the Abrahamic covenant with God. Anyone else is cut off, as Gen 17:14 states. Thiessen invokes the concept of sacred time, introduced in the creation story of Gen 1:1–2:4a to explain:

Through the category of sacred time, the priestly writer solves the problem created by according covenantal significance to circumcision in a region in which Israel was confronted by the existence of non-Israelite circumcision. The reference to Ishmael’s circumcision is not a mistake that unwittingly undermines the rite’s covenantal importance; rather, it serves as the author’s attempt to address the well-known fact that non-Israelites, in particular those thought to be the descendants of Ishmael, also practiced circumcision, and to distinguish their circumcision from Israelite circumcision. … The priestly writer achieves his goal of a sharp distinction between Israelite and non-Israelite circumcision through numerous explicit temporal references in the narrative.\textsuperscript{186}

Ishmael is circumcised, but as Gen 17:25 states, he is circumcised at the age of thirteen.

Ishmael will not be the child of the covenant. Thiessen rightly notes that Abraham

appears to realize that God’s commandment of circumcision on the eighth day excludes

\textsuperscript{185} Thiessen, “The Text of Genesis 17:14,” 632.
\textsuperscript{186} Matthew Thiessen, Contesting Conversion: Genealogy, Circumcision, and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Christianity (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 35.
Ishmael, and therefore he asks that Ishmael would live before God in 17:18. God agrees to bless Ishmael (17:20), but the covenant goes through Isaac (17:21), whom, as Gen 21:4 informs us, Abraham circumcises when he is eight days old “just as God had commanded him.”\(^{187}\)

Thiessen argues that this story of the exclusion of Ishmael from the covenant through the prescription of circumcision on the eighth day likely arose from a post-exilic setting. He compares it to the expulsion of Hagar and Ishmael in Lev 21, which is reminiscent of “the events narrated in Ezra-Nehemiah, which result in the expulsion of the Israelites’ non-Israelite wives and their half-Israelite offspring (Ezra 10; Nehemiah 13).”\(^{188}\) The story of the covenant of circumcision and Ishmael’s part in it creates a distinction between Israel and the surrounding circumcised nations. “Genesis 17 supports the genealogical distinction between Isaac and Ishmael, Israel and the nations, through the binary of eighth-day circumcision and non-eighth-day circumcision.”\(^{189}\)

Thiessen’s argument is somewhat surprising given the relatively great care that H shows for the רֹדֵה throughout his work. Milgrom explains, however, that the distinction between a רֹדֵה and an Israelite רָעָם is impermeable. The רֹדֵה has the same civil rights as an Israelite, with the exception of owning landed inheritance, which makes the רֹדֵה vulnerable. The רֹדֵה “had to work for an Israelite farmer as a hired hand. Moreover,

\(^{187}\) Thiessen, *Contesting Conversion*, 36.
\(^{188}\) Thiessen, *Contesting Conversion*, 40.
\(^{189}\) Thiessen, *Contesting Conversion*, 40.
having severed his ties with his original home, he has no family to turn to for support.” This likely accounts for H’s insistence that the Israelite should care for, even act lovingly to, the יָדָא (19:10, 33–34; 23:22). When it comes to religious law, however, the יָדָא does not have the same obligations as an Israelite. “He or she is obligated to observe only the negative commandments, the prohibitions, but not the positive commandments, the performative ones.” Only the violation of the prohibitive commandments, like sexual offenses, homicide, Molek worship and corpse-contamination, creates pollution. However as for the performative commandments, “[t]hese violations are not sins of commission, but of omission. They, too, can lead to dire consequences, but only for the Israelite, who is obligated by his covenant with God to observe them. The יָדָא, however, is not so obligated.” The יָדָא is not obligated because he is not included in the covenant, the sign of which, for males, is circumcision on the eighth day. He may, if he so desires, observe the paschal sacrifice, and he must be circumcised to do so (Exod 12:48). However, this circumcision does not change his status as a יָדָא. As Milgrom notes,

To be sure, some resident aliens managed to become rich (Lev 25:47) and achieve high social status. Note the cases of Doeg the Edomite (1 Sam 21:8), Zelek the Ammonite (2 Sam 23:37), and Uriah the Hittite (2 Sam 11:3)—all high officers in the royal court or army. However, though they totally assimilated into Israelite society, even to the point of being zealous worshipers of Israel’s God (a matter emphasized in the Doeg and Uriah accounts), they retained their ethnic label and

190 Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, 1417.
191 Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, 1417.
192 Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, 1417–18.
were not reckoned as Israelites.\textsuperscript{193}

Thus, although the Holiness Code shows great sensitivity for the Ἠρ, it never suggests that the Ἠρ was or could be an Israelite, just as Ishmael never was, nor could be (because of the requirement of circumcision on the eighth day) the heir to the covenant.

The identification of Gen 17 as the work of Ἔρ, working in post-exilic Yehud, situates the \textit{terminus ad quem} for the redaction of the Pentateuch after the exile. Milgrom does not believe any P or H writer, including Ἔρ, was working in post-exilic Yehud, due to the lack of a prohibition against intermarriage.\textsuperscript{194} This is indeed surprising. However we can see how Gen 17, and certainly Gen 21, set the stage for the prohibition against intermarriage. It is possible that while Ἔρ was clear about the status of a native Israelite versus a resident alien, he was not as stringent as Ezra about intermarriage. As for Ἔρ and his work, it is plausible that the redactor worked in exile in Babylon, but finished his work after returning to Yehud. This then would allow for the creation story of Gen 1:1–2:4a to be conceived in exile as a response, in part, to \textit{Enuma Elish}, the Babylonian creation myth. The references to exile in Lev 26:27–45 also point to a later date for at least some of this chapter. Milgrom only assigns 26:33b–35, 43–44 to Ἔρ mainly because Lev 26:31 refers to YHWH desolating the sanctuaries (plural) in the land of Israel, an odd reference for an exilic or post-exilic redactor. Thus I defer to Milgrom’s designation of

\textsuperscript{193} Milgrom, \textit{Leviticus} 17–22, 1417.
\textsuperscript{194} Milgrom, \textit{Leviticus} 17–22, 1361.
only 26:33b–35, 43–44 as belonging to Hr.

As for the bulk of H, both Milgrom and Knohl believe that it is pre-exilic. The references to Molek in H (Lev 18:21; 20:2, 3, 4, 5) do certainly point to a pre-exilic setting, as the other references to Molek come from pre-exilic books.\footnote{Milgrom notes the following references to Molek: “2 Kings 11:7 (where, however, for môlek, read milkôm, BHS); 23:10; Jer 32:35; and probably Isa 30:33; 57:9 and Zeph 1:5 (mêlek > môlek)” (Leviticus 17–22, 1555).} Knohl suspects that the references to Molek worship in H, along with the warnings against soothsaying and sorcery, suggest a setting in the “reign of Ahaz: at that time the worship of Molech and various forms of divining and magic were prevalent….”\footnote{Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 207.} Milgrom lists some eleven reasons for a pre-exilic dating of H,\footnote{Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 216.} none of which is definitive on its own. However, when combined with the references to Molek and the likelihood of redaction in an exilic and post-exilic setting, Milgrom’s arguments become more persuasive.

Knohl suggests that the moral and ethical character of H is born out of the prophetic critique of the mid-eighth century. “There was an urgent need to reformulate the theological and legal framework of the priesthood in response to the moral criticism of the prophets, but in a way that would preserve the principles of the cultic tradition. So arose the change in direction of Priestly thinking, as expressed in the writings of HS.”\footnote{Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 216.} More specifically, Knohl sees some ideological correspondence between Isaiah
and H, namely “in the nature and characteristics of the concept of holiness.” Both sources emphasize the holy nature of YHWH (Isa 1:4; 5:24; 6:3; 29:23 Lev 19:2; 20:26; 21:8; 22:32). Isaiah, like H, also “unequivocally expresses the moral dimension of holiness. Isaiah sees social-moral injustice as blasphemy against the Holy One of Israel and his word (Isa 1:4; 5:23–24) and expects that God will judge the wicked among the nation and save the poor and oppressed (Isa 3:14; 5:17).” Similarly, Milgrom notes that “H virtually ignores Judah’s cultic abuses,” instead focusing on ethical issues and social abuses (Milgrom identifies fifty-five individual ethical commandments). Considering the focus on cultic abuses in the work of the Deuteronomist (writing after the seventh century) in contrast to the concentration on social issues in the eighth-century prophets, Milgrom concludes that H is likely a product of the eighth century.

It is not crucial to my work that P or H be understood as pre-exilic, although I am convinced that both works are pre-exilic. What is crucial to my work is that P be understood to precede the work of H and Hs, thus assuring that the H texts of Lev 16:29–34a and Lev 17:11 on the tāfjof offering correspond conceptually with the P texts on the tāfjof offering. Further, as I have said, P should be understood as a relatively small, precise, technical document focused on the cult. Hs should be understood as the author of Gen 1:1–2:4a, as well as Gen 17, and perhaps all of Genesis material previously

199 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 213.
201 Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, 1362.
202 Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, 1362.
assigned to P. This identification, then, casts doubt on the work of those who read the sacrificial system of P as reflecting the creation theology of Gen 1:1–2:4a.

2.12 Conclusion

This chapter has stressed the importance of Milgrom’s understanding of the purgative and purificatory function of the ֶבּּוֹתָא offering through the application of blood to the sancta. Klawans’ principle of “attracting and maintaining” YHWH’s presence through sacrifice was also explicated and affirmed. However, despite the insistence of Gormon, Balentine, and Klawans, who analyze Lev 1–16 as though it were informed by the creation theology of Gen 1:1–2:4a, this creation story plays no role in the conception of the sacrificial practice of Lev 1–16. H is actually responsible for Gen 1:1–2:4a, as well as Gen 17 and Gen 23, and perhaps all of the Genesis material previously attributed to P. This analysis has added further support to the emerging consensus, first explicated by Milgrom and Knohl, that H comes after P and edits P. On account of my reassignment of the P material in Genesis (coupled with Knohl’s assignment of much P material in Exodus and Numbers) to H, the P corpus appears to be much smaller than previously believed. It concentrates solely on the Tabernacle, the priests, and the rituals of the cult. There is no major change in P’s conception of YHWH after the revelation of the divine name; rather all the P material is consistent in its portrayal of YHWH (mediated through Moses, the priesthood, and the cult) and precise with its technical language. H too is consistent in its more direct portrayal of YHWH and YHWH’s care for
the land and YHWH’s call for holiness in the cult and in Israelite society. With Knohl and Milgrom, I have dated P and H to the pre-exilic period, although P’s work was certainly not well known until after the exile. Lastly, due to H’s emphasis on the Sabbath and eighth-day circumcision, HR was working during the exile and into the post-exilic period. HR edited P and the pre-exilic H material and also wrote new material in the exilic and post-exilic periods. The Pentateuch, then, was completed in post-exilic Yehud.

Going forward, the purgative nature of the הַנַּחַל offering will be affirmed. Leviticus 16, which will be shown to purge the Tabernacle of the sins of the Israelites, will be treated as the oldest text on the הַנַּחַל offering, with Lev 4:1–5:13 using the linguistic structures and conceptual framework from Lev 16 to craft a הַנַּחַל offering that purges the offerer(s). Leviticus 17:11 will be understood as following upon Lev 16 and Lev 4:1–5:13, agreeing with, but specifying with greater detail, the conception that the הַנַּחַל offering purges the offerer(s). Leviticus 10, which must be later than Lev 16, but whose relationship with Lev 4:1–5:13 and Lev 17:11 is not entirely clear, will also be shown to support the notion that the הַנַּחַל offering purges the offerer(s), albeit in a different manner than does Lev 4:1–5:13. This development within the P source and then into the H source will then be brought into conversation with the Epistle to the Hebrews.

In the fifth chapter of this work, I will show how the articulation of Jesus’ sacrificial offering in the Epistle to the Hebrews is strikingly similar to my understanding of the function of the הַנַּחַל offering of Leviticus, both as articulated in Lev 16, Lev 4:1–5:13,
and Lev 17:11, and as articulated in Lev 10. The last chapter will reevaluate references to Jesus’ sacrifice and Jesus’ blood in the Pauline and non-Pauline epistles, and in Revelation. Traditional historical-critical, exegetical, and grammatical work (all staples of Hebrew Bible scholarship for centuries) is used to make an argument for the development of the הָעָה offering. This development culminates, in the context of the Christian canon, with the sacrificial offering of Jesus, which in many places, but especially in the Epistle of the Hebrews, adopts the logic of the הָעָה offering of Leviticus.
3. Purgation and Purification in Leviticus 16

3.1 Introduction

Leviticus 16:1–28 represents that earliest stage in the development of the ṭaḇaʿa offering. In the earliest stage, the ṭaḇaʿa offering is used only to purge the sanctuary. The goat for Azazel, on the other hand, functions to purge Aaron and thus represents the earliest purgation ritual for persons. The conclusions of this chapter rest, in part, on the premise that Lev 16:29–34a is a later insertion from the writer of the Holiness Code (H) and thus reflects the latest stage in the development of the ṭaḇaʿa offering. My argument for the development of the ṭaḇaʿa offering will only begin in this chapter. The next chapter, which focuses on the ṭaḇaʿa offerings of Lev 4:1–5:13, will expand on and clarify the initial conclusions of this chapter. Leviticus 16 attests to the relationship between the people, specifically the wrongdoings of the people, and the sanctuary. This relationship is assumed in Lev 4:1–5:13 and the ṭaḇaʿa offering of Lev 4:1–5:13 cannot be understood without reference to this relationship. Furthermore, a careful examination of the prepositions (לָא, מָזַן, ṭāhān) used with regard to the ṭaḇaʿa offerings in Lev 16, as well as the definite direct object marker ṭaʿāl, unlocks the key to understanding the ṭaḇaʿa offering throughout Leviticus. When the relationships between the prepositions and ṭaʿāl are understood correctly, the mechanics and theology of the ṭaḇaʿa offering of Lev 16 (containing material from both P and H), Lev 4:1–5:13, and Lev 17 become clear. Leviticus 16:2–28, then, sets the stage, both theologically and grammatically, for the
development of the הַתָּכֹת offering. Its purgative function will remain unchanged, while
the object of this purgative function will shift from the sancta to the offerer(s).

3.2 Translation of Lev 16

The translation below is a combination of my translation and the translation of
Jacob Milgrom. I use Milgrom’s translation as a foundation, only making changes when
I have important disagreements with Milgrom’s rendering. My changes appear in bold
and are inserted into Milgrom’s translation. In the footnotes, I include the Hebrew for
the parts I have emended, followed by Milgrom’s translation of these sections, and then
any comments I may have. I have chosen this arrangement because Milgrom is my
primary conversation partner throughout this work, thus the contrast will be beneficial
for the reader.

Leviticus 16

1/ YHWH spoke to Moses after the death of the two sons of Aaron who died when they
encroached upon the presence of YHWH.
2/ YHWH said to Moses: Tell your brother Aaron that he is not to come whenever he
chooses into the adytum, inside the veil, in front of the הַכֹּתֶל that is upon the Ark, lest
he die; for by means of the cloud I shall appear upon the הַכֹּתֶל.
3/ This is how Aaron shall enter the adytum: with a bull of the herd as a purification
offering and a ram for a burnt offering;

---

2 Milgrom renders the tetragrammaton as “the Lord,” while I prefer YHWH. I will make this change
throughout the translation without further comment.
3 Milgrom chooses not to translate the Hebrew word הַכֹּתֶל because he concludes that it is “untranslatable, so
far” (Leviticus 1–16, 1014). He notes that “mercy seat/throne” or “cover” cannot be defended “either on
etymological or on semantic grounds: the verb יַכְבֹּד never implies mercy or cover, and the הַכֹּתֶל never
served an expiatory or covering function” (Leviticus 1–16, 1014).
4/ he shall put on a sacral linen tunic, linen breeches shall be on his body, and he shall gird himself with a linen sash, and he shall don a linen turban. These are the sacral vestments he shall put on after bathing his body in water.
5/ And from the Israelite community he shall take two he-goats for a purification offering, and a ram for a burnt offering.
6/ Aaron shall bring forward his own bull of purification offering to effect purgation on his own behalf and on behalf of his household;4
7/ and he shall take the two he-goats and set them before YHWH at the entrance of the Tent of Meeting.
8/ Aaron shall place lots upon the two goats, one marked “for YHWH” and the other “for Azazel.”
9/ Aaron shall bring forward the goat designated by lot “for YHWH” to sacrifice it as a purification offering,
10/ while the goat designated by lot “for Azazel” shall be stationed alive before YHWH to purge him [Aaron]5 by sending off into the wilderness to Azazel.
11/ When Aaron shall bring forward his bull of purification offering to effect purgation on behalf of himself and on behalf of his household,6 he shall slaughter his bull of purification offering.
12/ He shall take a panful of fiery coals from atop the altar before YHWH, and two handfuls of finely ground perfumed incense, and bring [these] inside the veil.
13/ He shall put the incense on the fire before YHWH so that the cloud from the incense covers the [תּוֹרָה] that is over [the Ark of] the Pact, lest he die.
14/ He shall take some of the blood of the bull and sprinkle it with his finger on the [תּוֹרָה] on its east side; and in front of the [תּוֹרָה] he shall sprinkle some of the blood with his finger seven times.
15/ He shall then slaughter the people’s goat of purification offering, bring its blood inside the veil, and manipulate its blood as he did with the blood of the bull; he shall sprinkle it upon the [תּוֹ�וָא] and before the [תּוֹרָה].
16/ Thus he shall purge the adytum7 of the pollution and transgressions of the Israelites, including all of their sins; and he shall do likewise for the Tent of Meeting, which abides with them in the midst of their pollution.

---

4 פָּהלָה לִבְּבוֹ וְלִבְּבֵי-וֹ his household (Milgrom). Due to the importance of understanding the prepositions correctly in this chapter and throughout Leviticus, I have used the more precise rendering of “on behalf of” for throughout this chapter.
5 לְמַעַן לִפְנֵי-וֹ to perform expiation upon it (Milgrom).
6 פָּהלָה לִבְּבוֹ וְלִבְּבֵי-וֹ for himself and for his household (Milgrom).
7 מֵרְאָיָה יִשְׂרָאֵל יִבְּעוֹר מִזְרָעְיָא Milgrom and I agree about the proper translation of this Hebrew phrase, but Milgrom does not render מֵרְאָיָה in the same way throughout the rest of this chapter or elsewhere in Lev when it appears in connection with the הַשָּׁמָרָה.
17/ No one shall be in the Tent of Meeting when he goes in to effect purgation inside the adytum until he comes out. Thus he shall effect purgation on behalf of himself and his household and on behalf of the entire congregation of Israel.9
18/ He shall then come out to the altar that is before YHWH and purge it.10 He shall take some of the blood of the bull and of the goat and put it upon the horns around the altar;
19/ and he shall sprinkle some of the blood upon it with his finger seven times. He shall declare it clean11 of the pollution of the Israelites and consecrate it.
20/ When he has finished purging the adytum, the Tent of Meeting, and the altar,12 he shall bring forward the live goat.
21/ Aaron shall lean both of his hands upon the head of the live goat and confess over it all of the iniquities and transgressions of the Israelites, including all of their sins, and put them on the head of the goat; and it shall be sent off to the wilderness by a man in waiting.
22/ Thus the goat shall carry upon it all of their iniquities to an inaccessible region. When the goat is set free in the wilderness,
23/ Aaron shall go into the Tent of Meeting, take off the linen vestments that he put on when he entered the adytum, and leave them there.
24/ He shall bathe his body in water in a holy place and put on his vestments; then shall go out and sacrifice his burnt offering and the burnt offering of the people, רֶפֶן on his own behalf and on behalf of the people.13
25/ The suet of the purgation offering he shall turn into smoke on the altar.
26/ He who sets free the goat for Azazel shall launder his clothes and bathe his body in water; after that he may reenter the camp.
27/ The purification-offering bull and purification-offering goat whose blood was brought in to purge in the adytum shall be taken outside the camp; and their hides, their flesh, and their dung shall be burned in fire.
28/ He who burned them shall launder his clothes and bathe his body in water; and after that he may reenter the camp.

---

8 I will be arguing for the privative הַ, which Milgrom sees here as well.
9 לְהַ, “for himself and his household and for the entire congregation of Israel” (Milgrom).
10 חָוָה, “and effect purgation upon it” (Milgrom).
11 נָא, “Thus he shall purify” (Milgrom).
12 נָא הַ, Here we have the definite direct object marker הַ instead of the preposition לְ to mark the direct objects of הַ.
13 נָא הַ, “effecting atonement for himself and for the people” (Milgrom). I have chosen not to translate הַ in this case because I do not know what it signifies here with the burnt offering.
29/ And this shall be for you a law for all time: In the seventh month, on the tenth day of the month, you shall deny your spirits (מְרַכְּבָּתָהּ)14; and shall do no manner of work, neither the native-born nor the alien who resides among you.
30/ For on this day he shall purge you15 to purify you of all of your sins; you shall be declared pure16 before YHWH.
31/ It shall be a sabbath of complete rest for you, and you shall deny your spirits (מְרַכְּבָּתָהּ)17; it is a law for all time.
32/ The priest who has been anointed and ordained to serve as priest in place of his father shall effect purgation. He shall put on the linen vestments, the sacral vestments.
33/ He shall purge the holiest part of the sanctuary and the Tent of Meeting and the altar; he shall purge the priests and all the people of the congregation.18
34/ This shall be for you a law for all time: to purge the Israelites of all their sins19 once a year. And he [Aaron] did as YHWH had commanded Moses.

3.3 The Use of Prepositions in Lev 16

The prepositions used in relation to the tafj offering and verb כָּפָר give us a clear picture of the function of the tafj offering throughout the ritual. Aaron consistently effects purgation (כָּפָר) “on behalf of,” (16:6, 11, 17) himself/his house and the congregation with the tafj offerings on Yom Kippur. Furthermore, Aaron purges (כָּפָר) parts of the sanctuary, which are marked either with the definite direct object marker, הָא (16:20, 33 [H]), or with לְךָ (16:16, 18), which clearly is functionally

---
14 מְרַכְּבָּתָהּ מְרַכְּבָּתָהּ, “you shall practice self-denial” (Milgrom). I will show that מְרַכְּבָּתָהּ is an important term for the author of the Holiness Code, one best rendered as “spirit” (an animating force, but not distinct from the body). I will discuss it some in this chapter, but in greater detail in my chapter on Lev 17.
15 כָּפָר, “shall purification be effected on your behalf to purify you” (Milgrom).
16 מְרַכְּבָּתָהּ מְרַכְּבָּתָהּ, “you shall become pure” (Milgrom).
17 מְרַכְּבָּתָהּ מְרַכְּבָּתָהּ, “you shall practice self-denial” (Milgrom). See footnote 14 above.
18 כָּפָר אֲמַר אֲמַר מְרַכְּבָּתָהּ מְרַכְּבָּתָהּ, “he shall effect purgation for the priests and for all the people of the congregation” (Milgrom). I have included all of the Hebrew of the verse. The P author uses the definite direct object marker הָא to mark the substances of the sanctuary that are purged, but the preposition לְךָ to mark the people that are purged. I will demonstrate below that כָּפָר and מְרַכְּבָּתָהּ are functional equivalents in the Priestly source and in the Holiness Code.
19 כָּפָר אֲמַר אֲמַר מְרַכְּבָּתָהּ מְרַכְּבָּתָהּ, “to effect purification on behalf of the Israelites for all their sins” (Milgrom).
equivalent to נ and marks the object of כפר. Throughout Lev 16:1–28, the prepositions נ and ל are never used interchangeably; that is, a person is never the object of ל, and the sancta are never the object of ב. However in the addition from the writer of the Holiness Code, the Israelites are the object of the preposition ל with the verb כפר (16:30, 33, 34). The shift from various sancta as the objects of כפר (marked either by נ or ל) to the Israelites as the objects (marked by ל) is a somewhat surprising shift that will require explanation. Nevertheless, just as in 16:1–28, Lev 16:30, 33, and 34 also clearly show that the objects of purgation can be marked with כפר+ל or כפר+נ.

Milgrom muddies the waters on the use of prepositions in Lev 16 when discussing his hypothesis on the function of the הָמָא offering.

When the object is nonhuman, כפר takes the preposition ל or נ or a direct object. For example, all three usages are attested in the purging of the adytum on the Day of Purgation (16:16, 20), and they must be understood literally, for the כפר rite takes place on (ל) the כפר and on the floor before it, in (נ) the adytum, or it can be said that the entire room (נ) is purged (כפר; cf. also 6:23; 16:10, 33; Exod 30:10)…. When the object of כפר is a person, however, it is never expressed as a direct object but requires the prepositions ל or כפר. Both signify “on behalf of” (16:6, 24, 30, 33; Num 8:12, 21), but they are not entirely synonymous. The difference is that ל can only refer to persons other than the subject, but when the subject wishes to refer to himself he must use כפר (e.g. 9:7; 16:6, 11, 24; Ezek 45:22).20

With one exception (Exod 30:10), which I will discuss below, the preposition ל after the verb כפר marks the object/person for which כפר is accomplished, i.e. the object/person purged. Milgrom’s example above, where he states that “the כפר rite takes place on

20 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 255.
“the [?] is misleading. Although is used with קפרה in 16:14 (a verse Milgrom neglects to list), appears nowhere in this verse, thus קפרה is not used with קפרה as Milgrom appears to indicate above. Furthermore, Milgrom’s last point concerning קפרה cannot be accepted. In Leviticus 16:1–28, every קפרא offering for a person, be it the priest, his family, or the people, is done “on behalf of,” קסר, the person. The preposition קסר is not simply reserved for sacrifices Aaron makes on his behalf. As Lev 16:17 shows, קסר is not used only to mark Aaron and his household, but also is used to mark “the entire congregation of Israel.” The crucial difference in usage between קסר and קפרה is that קפרה, along with the definite direct object marker (א), can mark the object/person that is purged. The preposition קסר+person appears with קפרה not only in Lev 16:6, 11, 17, but also in Lev 9:7 where it takes the 2nd person singular pronoun (referring to Aaron) as its object, and also the entire people of Israel as an object. If the Priestly writer wishes to communicate that קפרה is done “on behalf of” a person, meaning another object is purged on a person’s behalf, קפרה is used, not קפרה.

Milgrom fails to mention that קפרה is also used to mark sancta as the object of קפרה, as in Lev 16:16 קפרה קפרה (קפרה קפרה) and Lev 16:18 קפרה קפרה (קפרה קפרה), with the 3rd masculine personal pronoun referring back to קפרה. Milgrom clearly believes that in Lev 16:16 קפרה is functioning like the definite direct object marker (א) as he translates the phrase in this
way, “Thus he shall purge the adytum....”21 Curiously, Milgrom does not translate טלא in Lev 16:18 in this same way. Instead he concludes, “Whereas the preposition [אל] after [כמש] always means ‘for, on behalf of’ if the object is human, it can literally mean ‘on, upon’ if the object is nonhuman (see vv 10, 16 and chap. 4 Comment B).”22 Leaving aside 16:10 and Lev 4 for now, Milgrom translates this same construction in 16:16, quoted just above, as if אלכמש functions like the definite direct object marker אן. While it is true that כמש+אל can sometimes function to mean literally “on, upon,” this cannot be the case in Lev 16:18. Leviticus 16:20 settles it when it marks הרהוה and הרהוה with the definite direct object marker (אן) after the verb כמש. Therefore, in both 16:16 with כמש+אל and in 16:18 with כמש+אל, the phrase about which Milgrom and I disagree. Milgrom

Further proofs for reading כמש+אל כמש+אל as functionally equivalent to כמש+אל in Lev 16:1–28 (as well as 16:29–34a) can be adduced. Milgrom notes that the placing of blood on the horns of the altar in 16:19 purifies it (הכרים), while the seven-fold sprinkling of blood on the altar consecrates it (כדרש, 16:19).23 Preceding all of this is the command in 16:18 to כמש+אל, the phrase about which Milgrom and I disagree. Milgrom

---

21 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 1010.
22 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 1036.
23 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 1037.
notes this same sequence in Exod 29:36–37, where the altar is first purged (Milgrom cites both the verb הָגָה and הָכַר to support the notion of purging) and then consecrated.24

Exod 29:36/ And you shall do a purification offering bull every day as a purgation. You shall sacrifice a purification offering upon the altar when you purge it. And you shall anoint it to consecrate it.
Exod 29:37/ Seven days you shall purge the altar and consecrate it. The altar shall become very holy; all that touches the altar will become holy.

In both Lev 16:18–19 and Exod 29:36–37, Milgrom is arguing that the altar is purged, but denying that הָכַר is the key phrase alerting the reader to purgation and to the object of this purgation. We need only look to the rest of 16:18 and the following verse to see: 1) one of the two goals of these הָגָה offerings (a combination of the blood of the bull for Aaron and his house and the blood of the goat for the people) is to declare it (the altar) clean (יהָכַר); 2) the only action done “upon” the altar is a seven-fold sprinkling of blood (16:19), which must be the action of (re)consecration, the second goal of these הָגָה offerings. “The daubing of the altar’s horns purifies the altar and the sevenfold sprinkling of the altar consecrates it.” Milgrom continues, “Support for this sequence is found in the prescription for the altar’s consecration (Exod 29:36–37): first it is purged

24 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 1037.
and then it is consecrated (אֲזֶה, לַמַּחֲטֵא).”

Milgrom’s distinction is certainly correct, but such a distinction requires that הבֶּסֶר be rendered as “and purge it [the altar].” Exodus 29:36–37 confirms this reading by demonstrating that the order of operations is purge and then consecrate. Furthermore, both of these verses have the combination of את-סֵר functioning equivalently to את-סֵר with the altar as the object of purgation. Exodus 29:36 has this phrase (הָעַטְּרַה לֵךְ הַבֶּסֶר יְסֹרוּ) and the next verse, 29:37, has this phrase (שַׁבֵּשָׁת יָאֵם הַבֶּסֶר לַעֲשֹׂר הַמִּנְעָת אֲזֶה). In both phrases, the altar (הַמִּנְעָת) is the object of על, not את, and yet in both verses, it is clear that the understanding is “when you purge it/you shall purge the altar.” In the second phrase (Exod 29:37), the הָעַטְּרַה-phrase precedes, but is paired with, the אֲזֶה-phrase, and the clear sense is that the altar is purged and then consecrated. In Exod 29:36, we have את-סֵר with the altar as the object, and again על functions as את, with the proper rendering of the phrase as follows: “You shall offer a sin offering upon the altar when you purge it....”

In Exodus 29:36 it is possible that the following phrase, את-סֵר וְאֶת-מִנְעָת, communicates that the altar is purged. However, this is unlikely since this would be the only case in which את-סֵר, instead of את-סֵר (Lev 8:15, 14:49, 52; Ezek 43:20, 22; 45:18), is translated as “purge or purify,” instead of “offer a sin offering upon.” The same issue arises in Lev 16:18–19, this time with הבֶּסֶר and את-סֵר. In Leviticus 16:18, we are told that

25 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 1037.
Aaron “shall go out to the altar that is before YHWH and purge it (הָכֵרָה כְּלֵי). He shall take some of the blood of the bull and some of the blood of the ram and put it on the horns of the altar all around.” Leviticus 16:19 reads: “He shall sprinkle some of the blood with his finger seven times. Thus he shall declare it clean (שָׁפֵר) and consecrate it from the uncleanness of the Israelites.” Milgrom renders שָׁפֵר as “Thus he shall purify it,” which is indeed a possible translation. However, throughout Lev 1–16, this same verb, in the Piel (in places, with the exact same pointing and 3rd masculine singular objective suffix, as marked below with an asterisk), appears a number of times and is rendered by Milgrom as “he shall declare it/him clean” (13:6*, 13, 17, 23*, 28*, 34, 37*, 58; 14:7*, 48).

Ezekiel 43:26 has the same construction with רָפַק followed by רַפּוּת. The altar (הָמות) is marked by the definite direct object marker, leaving no confusion about the proper translation of רָפַק and the entire phrase: “They shall purge the altar.” This makes it highly unlikely that the רַפּוּת-phrase after the רָפַק-phrase both here in Ezek 43:26 and in Lev 16:18–19 should be translated as “and cleanse it,” as Milgrom renders it, but rather “and they/he shall declare it clean.” The altar is not cleansed twice, but purged and then declared clean.

One final textual component provides support for my reading of Lev 16:18. Leviticus 16:19b sums up what Aaron has accomplished. First, he purges the altar through the placing of blood upon the horns of the altar and declares it clean from the uncleanness of the Israelites. Then, he (re)consecrates the altar by sprinkling blood on it.
seven times, which matches the sevenfold sprinkling of oil done by Moses in Lev 8:11 at the original consecration of the altar. As was mentioned above, Milgrom asserts that the procedure is purgation and then consecration. What Milgrom has neglected to see is that the only action done on (נָשָׂא) the altar is the sprinkling of the blood (יִזָּהַר יִזָּהַר), the action of (re)consecration. The other actions were done on the horns of the altar (קֹרֶן קֹרֶן), not the altar itself. And as Milgrom himself states, “[T]he notion that the same application of the blood of the purification offering can simultaneously decontaminate and consecrate is intrinsically wrong. The realms of impurity and holiness are incompatible with each other and their admixture is lethal (e.g., 15:31; chap. 4, Comment C).”

Yet Milgrom’s translation of Lev 16:18–19 requires such an equation. If purgation is effected “upon the altar,” as Milgrom would have us believe, then the sevenfold sprinkling would have to be the action effecting this purgation, as it is the only action done “upon the altar.” But this cannot be so. Clearly it is the placing of blood upon the horns of the altar that “effects purgation,” thus purgation is not effected “upon the altar,” but “upon its horns.” The only possible explanation, then, is that כָּפֶר מִלְתָּה in Lev 16:18 and כָּפֶר מִלְתָּה in Exod 29:36–37 communicates “purge it/the altar” just as it does in Lev 16:16. In Leviticus 16:1–28, then, כָּפֶר מִלְתָּה can be used to communicate direct purgation of an object.

---

While I discovered the equation of \( \text{ךָּפַּר+לָלִּי} \) and \( \text{ךָּפַּר+אָחָה} \) apart from Baruch Levine’s analysis of these same phrases, Levine and I largely agree about this equation.

Levine concludes:

In fact, in the cultic texts even the older construction, i.e. \( \text{ךָּפַּר+דַּיָּה} \) + direct object seems to have the same functional force as \( \text{ךָּפַּר+אָחָה} \) + indirect object, when it conveys the spatial process. Thus, \( \text{ךָּפַּר+דַּיָּה+שָׁפַּר} \) “from purifying the sanctuary”, in Leviticus 16:20 (compare verse 33) refers to the same ritual acts to which \( \text{ךָּפַּר+אָחָה+שָׁפַּר} \) in verse 16 refers. The graphics of the direct object construction are admittedly more binding physically, but as the relationship between action and consequence is concerned, there is no difference.

It is not clear to me why Levine views the \( \text{ךָּפַּר+לָלִּי} \) equation as older than \( \text{ךָּפַּר+אָחָה} \), for as he notes, they both appear in Lev 16 and I see no reason to suppose that Lev 16:20 reflects an older tradition (and thus an older construction) than does Lev 16:16. Levine seems to be making this determination based on the fact that “[in Akkadian, \( \text{קַּפַּר/קַּפּוּרְו} \) tends to take the direct object, whereas in biblical Hebrew more often than not, \( \text{ךָּפַּר+דַּיָּה} \) is constructed with an indirect object, introduced by the independent prepositions \( \text{ל+לָלִּי} \) and \( \text{ל+אָחָה} \), and with the prefixed preposition \( \text{ל+לָלִּי} \).” First, as Levine notes, \( \text{ל+לָלִּי} \) occurs only once in P or H in Num 35:33 (an H text), which is not a cultic context. Even in Numbers 35:33, \( \text{ל+לָלִּי} \) occurs because this text is focused on the blood,
the defiling material that must be purged from the land, and not on the land, the object that needs purgation.

Num 35:33/ For it is the blood that pollutes the land, and as for the land, it will not be purged of the blood that was shed on it except by the blood of the one who shed it.

Thus, ל is not used similarly to either כָּפֶרֶת or כָּפֶרֶת כֶּבֶר, nor does it appear frequently in the Priestly material. Furthermore, כָּפֶרֶת כֶּבֶר is quite infrequent, occurring only in Lev 9:7 and three times in Lev 16 (vv. 6, 11, 17, and 24). I will argue in chapter four that although כָּפֶרֶת כֶּבֶר in Lev 9:7 appears to refer to both the purification offering and the burnt offering, as in 16:24 it is a reference only to the burnt offering. Regardless, this combination of כָּפֶרֶת כֶּבֶר is very infrequent and should not be viewed as equivalent to the use of כֶּבֶר, which is the preferred particle with כָּפֶרֶת throughout the Priestly material and which is used differently than כֶּבֶר. Furthermore, neither כָּפֶרֶת כֶּבֶר nor כָּפֶרֶת כֶּבֶר are ever used in a situation where either construction could be seen as equivalent to כָּפֶרֶת כֶּבֶר (also very rarely used in P, it should be noted; only 16:20, 33). Levine, then, errs only in not recognizing that, in P, it is only כָּפֶרֶת כֶּבֶר that is functionally equivalent to כָּפֶרֶת כֶּבֶר.

Surprisingly, although Roy Gane concludes that the offerer is purged in Lev 4:1–5:13, he misses the equation of כָּפֶרֶת כֶּבֶר and כָּפֶרֶת כֶּבֶר. Instead, Gane agrees with Milgrom concerning the equation of כָּפֶרֶת כֶּבֶר.
Whereas כְּפֶר is always followed by בְּטָלָה in cases of physical impurities, formulas concerned with moral faults also employ the preposition בְּטָלָה in contexts that include officiating by the high priest on behalf of himself (9:7; 16:6, 11, 17, 24). So it appears that lack of בְּטָלָה in formulas of הָעָנָא sacrifices that are solely for physical impurities is due to the lack of a case in which a priest reflexively removes his own physical impurity by simultaneously functioning as offerer and officiant.31

Gane’s adoption of Milgrom’s hypothesis about בְּטָלָה and כְּפֶר is not only surprising given that Gane argues for the purgation of offerers in all cases but Yom Kippur (the same argument I will make), but also because recognizing the equation of כְָפֶר+בְּטָלָה and כְּפֶר+חַטָּאת allows for a simple refutation of what Gane says here. First, it should be pointed out that not all of the verses where כְָפֶר+בְּטָלָה occurs (Lev 9:7; 16:6, 11, 17, 24) use this phrase to refer to an offering of the high priest on his own behalf.

In each verse, כְָפֶר is indeed used to indicate the offering by the high priest on his own behalf, but in every case, בְָטָלָה is also used to indicate the offering by the high priest on behalf of his house (16:6, 11, 17) or on behalf of the Israelites (9:7; 16:17, 24). One could

31 Roy Gane, Cult and Character: Purification Offerings, Day of Atonement, and Theodicy (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 123.
argue that the offering for the house of the high priest benefits the high priest, and indeed the same animal is used in Lev 16 to accomplish כֶּפֶר for both, and thus כֶּפֶר is rightly used with בֵּית. But even if this is so, the same explanation cannot be made in the case of the offerings for the Israelites in 9:7, 16:17, and 16:24. If כֶּפֶר is reserved for offerings that benefit the high priest, then כֶּפֶר should have been used to mark מִנָּה in 9:7 and 16:24 and מִנָּה in 16:17. This is not the case, however, because כֶּפֶר+כֶּפֶר is used to mark an offering offered on a person’s or persons’ behalf for the benefit (the purgation) of the sanctuary. This is certainly the case in Lev 16 (something upon which Milgrom, Gane, and I agree). Furthermore while Lev 16 is concerned with moral faults, it is also concerned with impurity (16:16 contains מְפָתִיאת מֶנָּה יִשְׂרֵאֵל along with מְפָתִיאת). This fact calls into question this statement from Gane: “Whereas כֶּפֶר is always followed by בֵּית in cases of physical impurities, formulas concerned with moral faults also employ the preposition כֶּפֶר…” Gane, like Milgrom, has simply misunderstood the distinction between the usage of כֶּפֶר+בֵּית and כֶּפֶר+כֶּפֶר. The combination of כֶּפֶר+כֶּפֶר is neither reserved for the high priest’s offering a sacrifice on his own behalf, nor is it only used for offerings concerning moral faults. This verb-and-preposition combination is used when a כֶּפֶר offering is brought on behalf of an Israelite or a group of Israelites for the purpose of purging some part of the sanctuary.

A few other texts outside of the Priestly texts merit mention. Ezekiel 43:25–26, mentioned briefly above, is similar to Exod 29:36–37. Both texts command a seven-day
cleansing of the altar through מהא לְאַרְרוֹמָה offerings, as well as its consecration (Ezek 43:26 uses מַתִּיר אָרְרָו, while Exod 29:37 uses the Piel of סְכִּין). As has been stated, Ezek 43:26 uses אֶזְכָּר to mark the altar as the object of מַתִּיר (סְכִּין אָרְרָו מַחֲכֶר), while Exod 29:37 uses סְכִּין and מַחֲכֶר, again attesting to the fact that מַחֲכֶר and מַתִּיר are functionally equivalent.

Jeremiah 18:23 (מלַתִּיר אָרְרָו לְאַלָּם נֶשֶׁר) and Psalm 79:9 (יָרַעְתָּנָה מַלַּי אָרְרָו מַחֲכֶר) also both clearly use מַחֲכֶר as “purge” and with לְאַל marking the object. In Jeremiah 18:23, מַלַּי אָרְרָו (“do not purge their iniquity”) is followed by and in partial parallelism with מַלַּי אָרְרָו (“and do not blot out their sin from before you”). Pairing a מַחֲכֶר-phrase with a phrase containing מַלַּי certainly seems like an intentional allusion to sacrifice. This parallelism also attests to a relationship between מַחֲכֶר and מַלַּי, which has such meanings as “wipe, blot out.” While the meaning of “purge” for מַחֲכֶר in many instances is now firmly established, this verse adds additional proof to the legitimacy of this meaning. Thus מַלַּי can unquestionably be equal to מַחֲכֶר, מַלַּי is not similar to מַחֲכֶר. When the relationships between the prepositions and אֶזְכָּר are understood in this way, then the understanding of the function of the מַלַּי offering here in Lev 16, as well as in Lev 4:1–5:13 and Lev 17, becomes much clearer, as the following section will begin to explain.

### 3.4 The Goat for Azazel and the Purgation of Aaron

The goat for Azazel is the most puzzling feature of Lev 16, if not the entire book of Leviticus. The identity of Azazel is unknown, although in all likelihood Azazel is
some kind of supernatural being. My concern is with the function of Azazel, especially in regards to לָכֵּס. Leviticus 16:10 states that the goat for Azazel “is stationed alive before YHWH…. I will argue that the proper understanding of לָכֵּס is “to purge him (Aaron).” Aaron functions as the representative of the people, bearing their sins, and he is purged from these sins by placing them on the goat for Azazel, who then takes the sins away. In this way, the ritual of the goat for Azazel is the first purgation rite, a non-sacrificial rite, for the Israelites. Lastly, the phrase לָכֵּס, which occurs in Lev 16:21 (and similarly in Lev 16:16) and comes at the end of a list describing what is put upon the goat for Azazel, is best understood as defining הָדַע as an umbrella term encompassing all of the various terms in the list. This determination will help clarify why the H addition at the end of Lev 16, vv. 29–34a, states that the people are purged of all of their sins (לָכֵּס).

Leviticus 16:10 has already stated that this goat helps effect לָכֵּס: “But the goat upon which the lot for Azazel came up shall be stationed alive before YHWH to effect purgation (or expiation) upon it/to purge him (לָכֵּס) by sending it away into the wilderness to Azazel.” There are two possibilities for the translation of לָכֵּס:

---

Exodus 30:10 contains both possibilities. Speaking about the inner altar, the verse is as follows.

Exodus 30:10/ Aaron shall effect purgation upon its [the inner altar] horns once a year. With the blood of the purgatory purification offering, he shall purge it [the inner altar] once a year throughout your generations.

As the verse makes clear, the blood application to the horns of the inner altar purges the altar. As my analysis above has shown, לֹֽאֲרָכָּם typically functions in the same way as לְאָרָכָּם. This pattern holds true for the second occurrence of לֹֽאֲרָכָּם in Exod 30:10, but not for the first. However in Exod 30:10, while the two occurrences of לֹֽאֲרָכָּם cannot be rendered identically, the item affected is identical, the inner altar. Thus there has to be some suspicion about rendering the phrase as “to perform purification/expiation upon it [the goat]” without also concluding that this ritual affects the goat, which no one believes to be the case. Milgrom opts for “to effect expiation upon it” and argues that “the purgation of the sanctuary is completed when the goat, laden with the sanctuary’s impurities, is dispatched to the wilderness.”

Not only does Exod 30:10 make such an understanding unlikely, the enactment of the ritual of the goat for Azazel comes after the rituals for cleansing the sanctuary are finished: “When he has finished purging (אֲרִיסֵר) the sanctuary, the Tent of Meeting, and the altar, he shall bring forward the live

30 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 1023.
goat (Lev 16:20).” Thus this rite should not be viewed as the second part of the sacrificial offering that comes before it. Gane recognizes that the sanctuary cannot be the object of purgation for the ritual with Azazel’s goat, but he still opts for a translation of “to perform בְּפֹן upon it.” However Gane does not articulate a clear vision of what the goat is accomplishing. “As a corporate community the Israelites do receive a kind of benefit from the ritual of Azazel’s goat,” writes Gane. Further, Gane concludes, “This is the final stage in the process of בְּפֹן, removal of evil that interferes with the relationship between YHWH and his people.” However, in the end, Gane does not believe that the goat plays a role in the moral purification of people or the purgation of the sanctuary, which leaves its purpose unclear. Thankfully, a clearer explanation can be articulated.

The goat for Azazel is not the entity being purged, but is rather the vehicle through which purgation is accomplished. It is possible, however, that “to purge him” refers to Aaron. Kiuchi makes the case for Aaron as the object of purgation and the goat as the agent of purgation. He notes the use of the passive construction ( الماضي, Hophal) in Lev 16:10. In Leviticus 16:9, Aaron is the subject, but in Lev 16:10, the goat becomes the subject due to the passive construction.

\[
\text{Kiuchi,若安, (בְּפֹן, Hophal) in Lev 16:9}
\]

\[
\text{Kiuchi,若安, (בְּפֹן, Hophal) in Lev 16:10}
\]

34 Gane, Cult and Character, 262.
35 Gane, Cult and Character, 262.
36 Gane, Cult and Character, 262.
37 Gane, Cult and Character, 263.
Lev 16:9/ Aaron shall bring forward the goat designated by lot “for YHWH” and shall make it a purification offering,
Lev 16:10/ while the goat designated by lot “for Azazel” shall be stationed alive before YHWH to purge him [Aaron] by sending it off into the wilderness to Azazel.

It becomes possible, then, that the subject-object relationship of Lev 16:9 (Aaron=subject, goat=object) is switched in Lev 16:10 (goat=subject, Aaron=object) in the case of the phrase לְכַפֵּר עִלָּי, which comes after the passive construction.\textsuperscript{38} To support this hypothesis, Kiuchi points to a similar construction in Lev 1:4 (לְכַפֵּר וּלֶךָ), where the same Hebrew phrase (לְכַפֵּר עִלָּי) follows a passive construction (וּלֶךָ), with the sacrifice/sacrificial animal (לֶךָ), not the priest, as the agent that effects purgation. Moreover, Kiuchi notes another parallel:

[T]he offerer who lays his hand on the sacrifice (v. 4a) becomes the beneficiary of the atonement made by the sacrifice (v. 4b). This relationship in the imposition of a hand between the offerer and the sacrifice perfectly suits Lev. 16:10, 21–22, where, we argue, the Azazel goat makes atonement for Aaron.\textsuperscript{39}

However, it must be pointed out that Aaron leans two hands upon the goat while the offerer of a burnt offering in Lev 1:4 leans only one hand. Nonetheless the syntactical structures of Lev 16:10 identified by Kiuchi are solid.

The purpose of the gesture of leaning one hand on the head of a sacrificial animal is highly debated, but it is critical in the discussion of the goat for Azazel. We need to

\textsuperscript{38} Kiuchi, Purification Offering, 151.
\textsuperscript{39} Kiuchi, Purification Offering, 152.
establish the relationship, if any, between leaning one hand for all other animal sacrifice and leaning two hands upon the goat for Azazel. Milgrom concludes that the gesture of leaning one hand was meant to signify ownership.40 Roy Gane affirms ownership identification but also adds transfer of the victim from the offerer to YHWH.41 Kiuchi believes the idea of substitution is conveyed: “By placing one hand on the animal, the offerer is indicating that the animal is taking his place in the ritual.”42 Kiuchi makes much of the phrase יָּנָה可能出现, which he translates, “‘it will be accepted on his behalf.’”43 Kiuchi’s interpretation of the hand-leaning gesture is possible in the case of the burnt offering, but not in the case of all sacrifices. The well-being offering also includes hand-leaning (Lev 3:2), but has no purificatory (כְּפֶר) function, nor any other function for the offerer. The concept of substitution simply does not fit the well-being offering in any way. Furthermore, I do not believe that the concept of substitution is at play anywhere else in the sacrificial system. It may have been operative at an early stage with respect to the מֹשְׁר, but it does not apply to the rest of the sacrifices of Lev 1–16. Furthermore, in Lev 16:24, after the purgation of the sancta and after the Azazel ritual, Aaron offers two burnt offerings (one for himself and one for the people) and these are said to effect כְּפֶר “on behalf of” (כְּפֶר) Aaron and the people. I find this verse very perplexing. Milgrom

40 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 152.
41 Gane, Cult and Character, 245.
42 Kiuchi, Purification Offering, 118.
43 Kiuchi, Purification Offering, 117 (emphasis in original).
simply states that the burnt offering can atone, but not purge.\textsuperscript{44} It seems entirely perfunctory and I have no ready explanation about its purpose. This is yet another reason to be cautious in applying concepts from the burnt offering to other offerings.

Only the identification of the owner of the sacrificial animal could apply to all sacrifices, including the הֵילָה.

With no clear understanding of the significance of the single-handed lean, it is equally as difficult to identify the significance of Aaron’s two-handed lean. Ownership cannot be the purpose in this case, because ownership was decided earlier by casting lots.\textsuperscript{45} Milgrom believes that the two-handed lean “serves a transference function: to convey, by confession, the sins of Israel onto the head of the goat.”\textsuperscript{46} Gane too speaks of transfer:

Confession plus double hand-leaning appears to be the means by which the sins of the entire nation are transformed from abstraction, as if out of the air, into a concentrated, quasi-spatially containable form, gathered to the high priest, and channeled through his hands to the goat.\textsuperscript{47}

Transference is indeed taking place through the hand-leaning and confession, but these sins do not come out of the air. Rather, Aaron is transferring the sins that he bears onto the goat, which then carries them away. Aaron bears the iniquities of the Israelites according to Exod 28:38, which Milgrom translates thus:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{44} Milgrom, \textit{Leviticus 1–16}, 1049.
\item \textsuperscript{45} Gane, \textit{Cult and Character}, 245.
\item \textsuperscript{46} Milgrom, \textit{Leviticus 1–16}, 1041.
\item \textsuperscript{47} Gane, \textit{Cult and Character}, 245.
\end{itemize}
Exodus 24:38/ It (the gold plate) shall be on Aaron’s forehead, that Aaron may remove any iniquity arising from the sacred things that the Israelites consecrate, from any of the sacred donations; it shall be on his forehead at all times, to win acceptance for them before YHWH.\textsuperscript{48}

Milgrom concludes that the function of the לְשׁוֹן (the gold plate) is to expiate “any impurity or imperfection in the offerings brought by the Israelites to the Tabernacle….”\textsuperscript{49}

This verse certainly speaks of and stresses the לְשׁוֹן, but it is still Aaron that removes/bears iniquity (נָשָׁא אֵין נָשָׁא). Numbers 18:1 also attests to the priests’ role in “removing/bearing iniquity.”

\[\text{Numbers 18:1/ YHWH said to Aaron, “You and your sons and the house of your father with you shall bear away the iniquity of the sanctuary. You and your sons with you shall bear the iniquity of your priesthood.”} \]

Finally, Milgrom’s comments on Exod 24:38 appear in his comments on Lev 10:17, another place where it is stated that it is the priest’s duty to remove/bear iniquity (לְשׁוֹן אֵין) of the community. Here, “removing/bearing the iniquity” is accomplished through the eating of the meat of the הַכֹּסֶם offering, and I will discuss this passage in detail in chapter four. Leviticus 10:17 is a later convention that comes after the invention of the הַכֹּסֶם offering for the purgation of the individual offerer of Lev 4:1–5:13 and stresses the

\textsuperscript{48} Translation from Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 623.

\textsuperscript{49} Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 623.
joyful consumption of the meat. Nonetheless, Lev 10:17 also attests to the idea that the priests “remove/bear iniquity.” Exodus 28:38, Lev 10:17, and Num 18:1, while not all in full agreement as to how the priests “remove/bear iniquity,” all attest that this is an important motif for the Priestly writers. One has to wonder then: Is it really just a coincidence that on Yom Kippur Aaron places (הַנַּצָּה) “all the iniquities of the Israelites” (אַחַר הַכֹּל הַיַּאֲלֹות הַבְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל) onto the head of the goat (Lev 16:21), who then “bears upon himself all their iniquities” (נַעֲשֶׂה חֶפְשֶׁה כָּל אַחַר הַכֹּל הַיַּאֲלֹות 16:22)? I suspect that these three texts (Exod 28:38; Lev 10:17; Num 18:1) alert us to an important function of the priests: to remove/bear iniquity. Leviticus 16:21–22 seems to be showing us one way in which the priest disposes of these iniquities every year.

On Yom Kippur, Aaron dresses like an ordinary Israelite. Milgrom notes that the phrase, “these are sacral vestments,” of Lev 16:4 “needed to be added because these linen garments could be and were worn by laymen.”50 Aaron confesses all the sins of the Israelites, priests and laity. Milgrom notes that throughout Lev 16 the term הַנַּצָּה is used (as it is in Lev 16:21) “whenever the priests are included with their fellow Israelites.”51 This confession for priests and laity, combined with the wearing of ordinary vestsments, points to the high priest acting as a representative of all of the Israelites. Only Aaron can fulfill this transfer because he is the one who bears the iniquities of the

50 Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 1017.
51 Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 1044.
people. Thus, it makes perfect sense that he, Aaron, be the object of purgation as Lev 16:10 states. Aaron is purged not by sacrifice, but by transfer. Just as Aaron bore the sins of the Israelites, now the goat bears them for Aaron and their removal is complete.

The last issue to be resolved concerning the goat for Azazel is the identity of the substances purged from Aaron and placed on the goat. Leviticus 16:16 (which reports what parts of the sanctuary are purged) and Lev 16:21–22 (which report what things are carried away by the goat for Azazel) share two terms for wrongdoings (טֵאָם, פָּטָם). Each verse also contains a distinct term that describes what is purged by each ritual complex. Leviticus 16:16 twice mentions מְטָאָם, “impurities,” as having been purged from the sanctuary, while Lev 16:21–22 together twice mention יִנְאָה, “iniquities,” as having been carried off by the goat. “Thus,” writes Milgrom, “it is clear that the blood purges the impurities of the sanctuary and the scapegoat purges the sins of the people.”

Unfortunately, the issue is not solved quite this simply, especially when Lev 16:30 and 34 (H additions) are considered. These verses near the end of Lev 16 assert that the Israelites are purged (16:30, 34) and/or purified (16:30) from their sins (מִטָא אֲלֹהִים). Only מְטָא אֲלֹהִים is listed as an item that is purged/purified from the Israelites in these two verses. As I stated above, these verses come from a different source than Lev 16:16 and 16:21–22, but this alone cannot account for the discontinuity.

52 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 1043.
Leviticus 16:16 and 16:21 both list מִיָּוְתָּן as one of the substances being removed. Both verses also contain the identical phrase מִיָּוְתָּן at the end of the list of substances being removed. Both Milgrom and Gane conclude that מִיָּוְתָּן refers to a category of a morally wrong act that is done defiantly. Furthermore, Gane points out that “scholars such as Milgrom, Gormon, and Wright identify the מִיָּוְתָּן of Lev 16:16 as the inexpiable ‘high-handed’ category of wrong condemned in Num 15:30–31.” Gane also links Molek worship (Lev 20:3) and the purposeful neglect to purify oneself from corpse contamination (Num 19:13, 20) to מִיָּוְתָּן, since both acts are “said to defile the sanctuary when they are committed.” However these acts, including the “high-handed” acts mentioned in Num 15:30–31, are never labeled as מִיָּוְתָּן, a term that occurs nowhere else in P (or H). Even if this equation is correct, Gane points out, “YHWH can save people from their מִיָּוְתָּן by bearing/forgiving, expiating, blotting out, and not remembering these offenses if the sinner repents (e.g., Exod 34:7; Num 14:18; Ps 32:1; 51:3 [1]; 65:4 [3]; 103:12; Isa 43:25; Ezek 18:22; Mic 7:18; cf. 1 Kgs 8:50; Ps 25:7; 2 Chr 33:1–13).” Gane overstates his case when he also concludes, “However, this clemency is

53 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 1034; Gane, Cult and Character, 294–298.
54 Gane, Cult and Character, 296. Gane lists the following citations from the authors listed above: Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 257; Jacob Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AYB 38; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991), 1425; Gorman, Ideology of Ritual, 82; David Wright, “The Spectrum of Priestly Impurity,” in Priesthood and Cult in Ancient Israel (JSOTSup 125; eds. G. A. Anderson and Saul M. Olyan; JSOTSup 125; Sheffiled: JSOT Press, 1991), 163.
55 Gane, Cult and Character, 296.
56 This particular verse from the Psalms pairs מִיָּוְתָּן with רָפָא in its assertion that “our transgressions (מִיָּוְתָּן), you purge them (רָפָא).”
57 Gane, Cult and Character, 297.
granted directly by YHWH and goes beyond the reconciliation that he offers through rituals. So the passages just cited should be clearly distinguished from Lev 16:16 and 21." \(^{58}\) Gane’s conclusion can only be true if Yom Kippur does not include purification and purgation for persons from מַעְטָרֵי, a point Gane and others have not adequately proven. To the contrary, Leviticus 16:16 certainly narrates that מַעְטָרֵי are removed from the sanctuary through rituals. Gane agrees with Milgrom who asserts that the various parts of the sanctuary are purged from the מַעְטָרֵי of the people. \(^{59}\) Gane believes that this is accomplished by the goat for Azazel, a conclusion I have rejected.

Gane’s hypothesis on the cleansing of the sancta is as follows:

The inner-sanctum offerings purge the sanctuary and its sancta of “impurities,” “sins,” and “transgressions” (Lev 16:16), resulting in purification of “sins” from the people (v. 30). \(^{60}\) The impurities are destroyed with the inner-sanctum מַעְטָרֵי carcasses, but the “sins” and “transgressions” reappear along with a third moral fault: “culpabilities,” often rendered “iniquities.” These three require additional containment and banishment to their source (i.e., Azazel) by means of a live goat. \(^{61}\)

As I have shown, the goat for Azazel is not concerned with the sanctuary, whose purgation is finished before the Azazel ritual commences, as Lev 16:20 clearly states. The substances listed in Lev 16:21 are purged from Aaron who has borne them for the people. The sanctuary does not “bear iniquity,” מַעְטָרֵי, for this phenomenon only

---

\(^{58}\) Gane, *Cult and Character*, 297.

\(^{59}\) Gane, *Cult and Character*, 296; Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 1034.

\(^{60}\) This may be correct, but it is speculative. Leviticus 16:16 only lists sancta as having been purged and Lev 16:30 does not specify how the people become clean.

\(^{61}\) Gane, *Cult and Character*, 266.
occurs with persons.\textsuperscript{62} Schwartz asserts that while נושא is the most common form of this idiom throughout the Hebrew Bible, נושא also occurs with תאן and נושא (in the Priestly literature, only נושא and נושא occur). Thus it is not surprising that נושא includes תאן and נושא as it does in Lev 16:22. The final piece to this puzzle is the proper translation of the phrase נושא - לֵבַל, which occurs at the end of the list of substances in both 16:16 and 16:21.

The main issue to be resolved with the phrase נושא - לֵבַל is whether this phrase is meant as an inclusive term or a category unto itself. The typical understanding of the use of לֵבַל at the end of a description is that it is inclusive. This usage is common in P, with the noun modified by לֵבַל carrying “a generalizing force.”\textsuperscript{63} In fact, Lev 11:42 is a perfect example of this usage.

Lev 11:42/ You shall not eat anything that crawls on its belly, or anything that walks on all fours, or anything that has many legs, comprising all creatures that swarm on the earth (לֵבַל - לֵבַל)…. It is clear that לֵבַל (“comprising all creatures that swarm”) is meant to encompass any creature that might swarm, including all the specified creatures listed before it. This


same phrase (X®rDaDh_lAo XérOÚvAh X®rRÚvAh_lDk ◊ w) occurs in 11:41, this time with lDk ◊ w instead of lDkVl due to the fact that the phrase in 11:41 is pointing forward while lDkVl in 11:42 is pointing backward. “The purpose of the repetition,” concludes Milgrom, “is not just literary but ideological. It stresses that in contradistinction to the other animal categories (quadrupeds, birds, and fish), which have permissible species, all of the swarming creatures are forbidden as food.”64 Turning to Lev 16:16, Milgrom translates lDkVl as “including all of their sins,” similarly to the way he translated lDkVl in Lev 11:42. In his comment on this translation, he writes, “A catchall phrase that incorporates all of the wrongs except for the [םשנשנ], the brazen sins....”65 The syntax, which Milgrom recognizes and affirms, clearly calls for the inclusion of מיהן פשעים under the term חטא. Milgrom and Gane exempt מシーン not on syntactical grounds, but on terminological grounds, asserting that in P חטא can only refer to “an expiable nondefiant sin” while פשעים is “an inexpiable defiant sin.”66

Milgrom makes an important point about the provenance of Lev 16:2–28, a point similar to the one I have made about this material; that is, it represents an earlier stage than the Priestly material on sacrifice. Milgrom sums up the issue nicely:

Verses 2–28 contain unique terms that differentiate them from P: (1) [םשנשנ] ‘transgressions’ (vv 16, 21), in other words, wanton, brazen sins (contrast Num 15:30–31); (2) [סנף] ‘shrine’ (vv 16, 17, 20, 23), whereas in P, this term stands

---

64 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 683.
65 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 1034.
66 The quoted text is from Gane, Cult and Character, 292 and 294. Milgrom concurs, as evidenced from the quote from him above (Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 1034).
for the entire Tent; (3) P’s term for the shrine, [כַּדְרוֹן] (e.g., Exod 28:29, 35) here designates ‘the adytum’ (vv 2, 3, 16, 17, 20, 23, 27), which P labels exclusively by the term [כַּדְרוֹן כַּדְרוֹנָה] ‘the holy of holies’ (e.g., Exod 26:33, 34). Hence, vv 2–28 must stem from an earlier source, which was only subsequently incorporated into P.67

Thus Milgrom would agree that Lev 4:1–5:13, in which מָטַא is first defined as “an expiable nondefiant sin,” is a later text than Lev 16:2–28. Therefore, we cannot assume that מָטַא in Lev 16:16 and 16:21 represents a specific category of sin that excludes מַטַא. This is possible only if Leviticus is read synchronically, and not diachronically. Milgrom tends to read synchronically and while he does so in this case, he seems to admit above that the diachronic reading goes in the other direction. He assigns Lev 16:2–28 to an earlier source even than P, let alone the P author of Lev 4:1–5:13. Leviticus 4:1–5:13 should be understood in light of Lev 16:1–28, not the other way around. It is possible that a later redactor has harmonized these two passages, but the syntax suggests otherwise. The syntax of Lev 16:16 and 16:21 leads to the conclusion that indeed מָטַא is meant to convey that the term מָטַא is a summarizing category that includes מַטַא and all other kinds of sin, certainly מַטַא (in 16:21 and 22) and perhaps even מַטַא (in 16:16). This reading is not only the most straightforward reading of the syntactical structure of these two verses, but it also clarifies Lev 16:30 and 16:34. Both of these verses simply state that the Israelites are cleansed (16:30)/purged (16:34) from all your (16:30)/their (16:34) sins (מַטַא מַטַא). Clearly the H author who

67 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 1063.
inserted these verses at the end of Lev 16 understood that Lev 16:16, 21 were asserting that the term נִשָּׁיָּה was functioning as summarizing category and thus the H author simplified his text by using the umbrella term נִשָּׁיָּה.

The conclusion, then, is clear. The goat for Azazel effects purgation for all of the Israelites (priests and laity) from all of their sins on Yom Kippur. The high priest, Aaron, acts on behalf of the entire community to purge them all of their iniquities. Thus, the goat for Azazel appears to be the earliest rite of purgation for the people of Israel in the Priestly literature.

### 3.5 Leviticus 16:29–34a: Understanding the Addition from H

The final section of Lev 16 comes from the Holiness Code. The first clue is the shift in addressees in 16:29. The people are addressed directly for the first time. Remarks Milgrom:

Heretofore, they were referred to in the third person. Moreover, they played no part whatever in the sanctuary ritual. Even their offerings were brought not by them but by Aaron. … Thus this switch to second-person, direct address to Israel is the first of several signs that this and the following verses comprise an appendix to the text.68

Furthermore, Christophe Nihan points to a number of terminological changes here in Lev 16:29–34a:

In particular, the inner-sanctum is referred to as קֶפֶרֶה (v. 33) instead of קֶפֶרֶה in v. 2–28 (see v. 2, 3, 16, 17, 20, 23, 27); the community is referred to by the phrase לֹא לְחָרֵד (v. 33) instead of לֹא (v. 15, 24) or קָחַל (v. 17); the verb בָּשַׁה Piel,

---

when it has persons as subjects, is systematically constructed with לְ (see v. 30, 33, 34), whereas Lev 16:1–28 always uses בָּשָׂר.

Specific mention of the native (אֲדֹנָי) and the resident alien (נָשִּׁי) in 16:29 is further proof of H authorship. These two nouns appear together in H five times (Lev 17:15; 18:26; 19:34; 23:42; 24:16) and neither noun appears in Lev 1–16:28. Finally, Lev 16:29–34a is unmistakably similar to Lev 23:26–32. Nihan notes, “The parallel is particularly striking in 16:31, which is the literal equivalent to Lev 23:32a, but there are numerous additional similarities between the two laws, especially in 16:29–31.”

Aside from the terminological differences, some important and surprising thematic and theological differences emerge. Leviticus 16:30 asserts that the aim of Yom Kippur is “to purify you (the Israelites) (לְשָׁוֶת אַתָּה) of all your sins (לִפְשָׁר אָתָּה).” The full verse (16:30) reads: “For on this day, he shall purge you (לָשׁוּר אָתָּה) to purify you (לְשָׁוֶת אַתָּה) of all your sins (לִפְשָׁר אָתָּה); you shall be declared pure before YHWH.” For the first time in Lev 16, the people (here, referred to with the 2nd person plural pronominal suffix) are the objects of ברך. The construction is ברך + לְלָשׁוּר אָתָּה, but as in Lev 16:16 and 16:18, the sense is clearly the same as ברך + לְשָׁוֶת אַתָּה. Leviticus 16:34a also supports my reading of 16:30. While Lev 16:30 has the verb לָשׁוּר (to purify) between ברך (he shall purge you) and לִפְשָׁר אָתָּה (of all your sins), Lev:16:34a has

---

69 Nihan, From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch, 347.
70 Nihan, From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch, 348.
71 Although the atnach appears on מִלַּהוּ, I am translating it as though the proper break comes after מִלַּהוּ. I simply disagree with the Masoretes on this. Milgrom also renders the break as I do (Leviticus 1–16, 1011).
in which the preposition מִן follows directly after the phrase. In both cases, along with translating מֵהֶזֵע as functioning as does מֵהֶזֵע+אָה, the מִן should be understood as privative. This translation creates a clear cause and effect between the action of מֵהֶזֵע and the result of cleanliness for the people. If one were to translate this as Milgrom does, “shall purgation be effected on your behalf to purify you of all your sins (Lev 16:30)” and “to effect purgation on behalf of the Israelites for all their sins (Lev 16:34a),” one still must account for the odd fact that 16:30 asserts that the people are purified. Moreover, not only does Milgrom’s translation of the מִן differ in each verse, but his translation leads to a disconnected cause and effect; purgation is effected for the people (meaning that sancta are actually purged), which somehow leads to the purification of the people.

Roy Gane discusses the use of the preposition מִן in conjunction with מֵהֶזֵע phrases throughout the Priestly material. His discussion is instructive in a number of places where מֵהֶזֵע occurs in Lev 1–16, but here I want to shed light on Lev 16:30 and 16:34a. Gane begins with two passages on physical ritual impurities (Lev 12:7; 14:19) and shows that in each case the proper reading of the מִן is privative. Leviticus 12:7 is the case of the new mother, and Gane points out that the result clause for the מֵהֶזֵע process is מֵתַם+דָּוִד+רָפַד. In this case, מִן must be translated as “from,” as in the woman “shall be pure from the source of her blood.” Gane explains,

[F]ollowing מֵתַם+דָּוִד+רָפַד, ‘and then she shall be pure,’ מִן does not refer to impure blood coming ‘from’ its genital source. Rather, the real force of מִן here can only be
privative, a usage derived from the overall concept of separation that is basic to this preposition…: as a result of the priest’s performing 

\[ \text{הכש רכון על בירתו} \] \( ^{72} \)

the parturient becomes pure in the sense that she is freed/separated ‘from’ \( ^{\text{יוו}} \) her physical ritual impurity, which is identified in terms of its physical cause as her ‘source of blood.’ This does not refer to physical healing, of course, because her flow of blood had already stopped before she brought her sacrifices (vv. 4–6). Rather, the sacrificial process removes residual ritual impurity from her.\(^ {73} \)

Milgrom too translates as Gane suggests here, rendering \( \text{נפב ידיה} \) as “from her source of blood.”\(^ {74} \) In this case, then, we have a very clear example of a 

\[ \text{нима אודר} \]

offering, along with an \( \text{עילא} \) offering, benefiting the offerer, and not the altar.\(^ {75} \) Gane goes on to show that the same construction occurs in Lev 14:19, which has the following:

\[ \text{לכו דא ולו דא ורוא נל} \]

Here again we have the preposition \( \text{ביה} \) in a very similar construction as Lev 12:7. This time, however, \( \text{ביה} \) marks the result of the verb 

\[ \text{כהר} \]

whereas in Lev 12:7 it marked the result of the verb 

\[ \text{כתר} \]

In Lev 14:19, Milgrom renders \( \text{ביה} \) as “for” (a causative sense of \( \text{ביה} \)), with Milgrom’s translation of the entire Hebrew phrase above as: “The priest shall then offer the purification offering and effect purgation for the one being purified for his impurity.”\(^ {76} \) I disagree with Milgrom’s translation of 

\[ \text{כתר עילא ולו ועדה} \]

which should be rendered “and purge the one being purified.”

Moreover, Milgrom’s rendering of \( \text{ביה} \) as causative is highly unlikely. As Gane points out,

\[ ^{72} \text{Here again \( \text{לכ} \) is functioning like \( \text{כה} \) and thus marking the woman as the one for whom \( \text{כהר} \) is effected. Thus the priest is not performing \( \text{כהר} \) on her behalf, but rather the priest “purges her.”} \]

\[ ^{73} \text{Gane, Cult and Character, 112.} \]

\[ ^{74} \text{Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 761.} \]

\[ ^{75} \text{Gane, Cult and Character, 114.} \]

\[ ^{76} \text{Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 828.} \]
the dynamics of Lev 12:7 and Lev 14:19 are the same, and so too are the results. Not only does Lev 14:19 identify the offerer as רהוּמ (the one being purified), but the following verse ends with the pronouncement רהוּמ. “And he shall be pure.” Gane rightly concludes,

The bottom line for Lev 14:19 is that a privative meaning of נמי in מִנַּיִם makes perfect sense in this context, where the idea of removing evil from the offerer is implied anyway. Therefore, there is no reason to complicate the plain sense by understanding this preposition differently than in 12:7, where the privative meaning is positively required.78

Coming back to Lev 16:34a, the same construction occurs: רהוּמ. Remarking on Lev 16:30, Gane writes,

But Lev 16:30 provides direct evidence that is overpowering: נמי follows the verb מַעֲשֵׂה in the ‘result’ column, where it can only be privative, as in 12:7. … Leviticus 16:30 is stronger than 12:7 because it has רהוּמ in pi’el, followed by the direct object that refers to the collective offerer (here the entire Israelite community) as in Num 8:21 (the Levites). The conclusion is inescapable: the רהוּמ process removes moral faults from the offerer(s).79

In the same way that the privative נמי in Lev 12:7, coming after the verb מַעֲשֵׂה, sheds light on Lev 14:9 (נמי following directly upon the רהוּמ-phrase), Lev 16:30, also with privative נמי and מַעֲשֵׂה, sheds light on Lev 16:34a, which has נמי following directly upon the רהוּמ-phrase. Leviticus 16:30 has already stated that the main goal of Yom Kippur, according to H, is to purify (רְפֵא) the Israelites so that they (here literally 2nd person plural, “you”)

77 This is too strong a term. There is no evidence that impurity is evil. Gane labels it as such because he is accepting Milgrom’s translation of רהוּמ in Lev 14:20 as “make expiation for him.”
78 Gane, Cult and Character, 115.
79 Gane, Cult and Character, 125–26.
will be declared pure (ד '&#39;קחיו). In Lev 16:34a, as in Lev 12:7, and 14:9, using the causative sense of יַקְּטָל clearly “complicate[s] the plain sense.”

My reading, in which the people are purged and thus clean, is internally coherent, but it still faces the difficulty of explaining why and how H reports that the people are cleansed. Why does the writer of H conclude that the main goal of Yom Kippur is to purge the Israelites, making them clean? My analysis of Lev 16:1–28 concluded that only the goat for Azazel effected purgation for the Israelites by purging Aaron of the sins he carries on behalf of the people. Leviticus 16:33 does indeed confirm that the sanctuary, Tent of Meeting, and the altar are purged, just as Lev 16:20 states. In this way, the addition from H and the original Priestly text are in accord. Furthermore, Lev 16:29–34a lends further evidence to my theory that לֹא + נֶפֶשׁ and תָּא + נֶפֶשׁ are functionally equivalent. לֹא in Lev 16:30 and 16:34a clearly indicates that the proper translation is “to purge you (pl.)/the people” due to the existence of the privative יֵצֶר following the נֶפֶשׁ phrases in these verses. Leviticus 16:33 also confirms that כָּפָר + נֵעָל and כָּפָר + נֵעָל are functionally equivalent, as נֵעָל is used to mark the sancta that are purged, and לֹא is used to mark the persons that are purged. Milgrom, of course, sees this distinction between sancta marked with כָּפָר + נֵעָל and persons marked with כָּפָר + נֵעָל as an indication that what is accomplished for sancta and what is accomplished for persons is distinct. Milgrom translates 16:33 as: “He shall purge the holiest part of the sanctuary, and he shall purge the Tent of Meeting and the altar; he shall effect purgation for the
priests and for all the people of the congregation." Not only has the use of לֵּוָרפִיָּה in Lev 16:1–28 shown Milgrom to be in error, but Lev 16:30 and 34a have also decisively shown that one of the purposes of Yom Kippur, for the author of H, is “to purge the Israelites of (privative לֵוָרפִיָּה) all their sins” (לֵּוָרפִיָּה לֵּוָרפִיָּה). Only once a year can all of the Israelites “be declared pure before YHWH” (לֵּוָרפִיָּה לֵּוָרפִיָּה).

The final piece of the puzzle is to ascertain how it is that H believes the people become pure through the rituals of Yom Kippur. A few issues are in play and chapter three of this work will cover many of these issues in greater detail. For now, it will suffice to share some of my conclusions in advance in order to explain the H addition in Lev 16. One issue concerns the sanctuary, which I argue is purged only once a year, on Yom Kippur. Milgrom believes it is cleansed through every הָמָא offering, those of Yom Kippur as well as those offered throughout the year. Leviticus 4:1–5:13 explains the procedure for the הָמָא offerings offered throughout the year. These הָמָא offerings, however, will be shown to purge the offerer(s) and not the sancta. Just as לֵּוָרפִיָּה is used as a functionally equivalent alternative to הָמָא throughout Lev 16, so too does it function in this way in Lev 4:1–5:13. This fact, combined with the use of the privative לֵוָרפִיָּה on הָמָא (meaning “sin/wrongdoing” and following לֵּוָרפִיָּה in Lev 4:26, 5:6 and 5:10, as well as the use of the preposition לֵּוָרפִיָּה to mark the sins purged in Lev 4:35 and 5:13, further supports the conclusion that the offerer is purged by the הָמָא offerings of Lev

---

80 Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 1011.
4:1–5:13. This occasional purgation for persons results not in the offerer being declared pure (מַעֲנֵיָה), as in Lev 16:34a, but in the offerer being forgiven (נָאַלְלָה, see Lev 4:20, 26, 31, 35; 5:10, 13). Thus the rituals of Yom Kippur, in the eyes of H, are able to move the offerer from a state of being forgiven to a state of ritual purity. Gane, too, sees a two-phase movement for the Israelites, as sinners move from sinful to forgiven, due to the recurring purification offerings described in Lev 4:1–5:13, and then forgiven to “(morally) pure (מַעֲנֵיָה; v. 30 [Lev 16])” on Yom Kippur.81 However, as will be explained in the next chapter, while Gane recognizes the possibility that מַעֲנֵיָה may be functionally equivalent to מַעְרֵר, he does not argue for this.82 Even though Gane notes that מַעְרֵר followed by הֹרֶדֶשׁ in Lev 16:16 must mean simply “purge the adytum,” he is unwilling to part with Milgrom on the equivalency of מַעְרֵר and מַעְרֵר.83

My contention is that the purgation of the sanctuary, sullied from the sins of people, and the purgation of Aaron, the representative of the people, allows for the purification of all of the Israelites. There is a relationship between the Israelites and the sanctuary, and because of this, one cannot be clean while the other is stained. It is clear that the sins and uncleanness of the Israelites sullies the sanctuary. Leviticus 16 communicates this truth without equivocation. The actions of the people affect the sanctuary. Leviticus 4:1–5:13 shows that the reverse is also true. The actions done to the

81 Gane, Cult and Character, 275.
82 Gane, Cult and Character, 139.
83 Gane, Cult and Character, 139.
sanctuary can affect the people. The people can be purged of the sin/guilt they carry through the manipulation of sacrifices within and upon the sancta. The addition from H in Lev 16 communicates that the people can only be clean when the sanctuary is clean. Moreover the purgation of Aaron, Israel’s representative (and thus of all the Israelites), on Yom Kippur encompasses all of Israel’s sins. This covers any sins heretofore not dealt with in the sacrificial system, either through neglect or because of the inability to purge such sins within the system. Together, through the purgation of the sanctuary and the purgation of Aaron via the goat for Azazel, H communicates that the rituals of Yom Kippur allow the Israelites to be pure before YHWH.

This understanding of Leviticus 16:29–34a also informs the important H text of Lev 17:11, the only place in P or H where the rationale for sacrifice is explained. I will argue in chapter 3 that this verse agrees with the rest of Leviticus in its affirmation that כיסה means “purge.” I translate the key Hebrew phrase as follows: “And I have placed it [the blood] upon the altar to purge your spirits” (נמצא להדם על המזבח להמר את נשמה). In chapter four, I will explain my translation of נפש as spirit (not in the sense of something separate from the body, but as in the sense of “the animating force that sustains the creature”84) and why I believe that H concludes that it is specifically the נפש of the offerer that is purged. As was shown above, Lev 16:30 and 34a make it clear that

is done so as to cleanse the people. Thus in Lev 16:30 and 34a, an H text, the meaning of מְזַרְזָה must be understood as “purge.” The concept of ransom, which some scholars\(^{85}\) believe is the proper understanding of מְזַרְזָה in 17:11 (“to ransom for your lives”) cannot be the meaning of מְזַרְזָה in Lev 16:30. Furthermore, the commandment in Lev 16:29 to “deny your spirits” (קרובץ אֶת נְפָשָׁתְךָ) is given because it is exactly this part, the נְפָשָׁת of the people, that is cleansed on Yom Kippur.

3.6 Conclusion

The use of the prepositions (דְּבָר, לֹא, נְכֶר) with regard to the חֲמָתָא offering throughout Lev 16, as well as the definite direct object marker נְכֶר, give us a clear picture of the function of the חֲמָתָא offerings and the goat for Azazel in Lev 16:2–28, the earliest material on the חֲמָתָא offering. This analysis also gives us some insight into the addition from H. The primary insight gleaned from the Priestly writer of Lev 16:2–28 is that מְזַרְזָה and נְכֶר are functionally equivalent. Both mark the object/person that is purged. In Lev 16:2–28, only the adytum, the Tent of Meeting, and the altar are purged with the חֲמָתָא offerings, while the goat for Azazel purges Aaron. However, the addition from H, Lev 16:28–34a, claims that in addition to the purging of the substances of the sanctuary, the Israelites become pure before YHWH through the rites of Yom Kippur. The use of the privative נְכֶר after מְזַרְזָה in Lev 16:16 names all the sins of the Israelites as the

\(^{85}\) Jacob Milgrom, Baruch Schwartz, Jay Sklar, whose positions will be discussed at length in chapter four, take this view.
substances purged from the altar, and 16:30 and 16:34a have this same use of the privative ב, now marking all the sins of the Israelites as having been purged from the Israelites. Both purgations, for the various parts of the Tabernacle and the Israelites, are evidence to the unique relationship between the Israelites and the Tabernacle. As we turn to Lev 4:1–5:13, we will find further confirmation for this relationship, as well as further use of the privative ב and the phrase כ+ל as functionally equivalent to כ+א.
4. The Purification Offering of Leviticus 4:1–5:13

4.1 Introduction

The Priestly writers of Lev 4:1–5:13 have used the logic of the הַמַּטָּחָה offering first articulated for Yom Kippur in Lev 16:1–28. Whereas the הַמַּטָּחָה offering functions as a purification offering to purge the sancta of the stain of the sins of the Israelites on Yom Kippur, the הַמַּטָּחָה offering of Lev 4:1–5:13 functions to purge the offerer of the sin that s/he carries. This chapter will present evidence for the later authorship of Lev 4:1–5:13 in comparison to Lev 16. The explication of the use of the prepositions בְּ, צְ, נַלֶּ, and the definite direct object marker לְ in Lev 16 and Lev 4:1–5:13 will play a definitive role in distinguishing the function of the הַמַּטָּחָה offerings on Yom Kippur from the function of the הַמַּטָּחָה offerings described in Lev 4:1–5:13. A close analysis of these prepositions in Lev 16 and Lev 4:1–5:13 shows that בְּ and הַמַּטָּחָה are used interchangeably in Lev 16, attesting to their equivalency. When this equation is realized, it becomes clear that Lev 4:1–5:13 is articulating a הַמַּטָּחָה offering that purges persons, not the sanctuary, of sins. This purgation leads to forgiveness, not purity. The Israelites must wait for the purgation of the sanctuary and of Aaron on Yom Kippur. Only then can the Israelites move from being forgiven to being pure. The altar and the offerer are in a reciprocal, but unequal, relationship; the Israelite can soil the altar and the altar can purge the Israelite. Therefore the blood of the הַמַּטָּחָה offering, even when only physically applied to parts of the sanctuary, can affect the offerer. While the text of Leviticus does not explicitly state
that actions done to the sanctuary affect the Israelites (just as it never explicitly states how or why the sins of the Israelites stain the sanctuary), it does attest to the fact that a נאום offering applied to the sancta of the Tent of Meeting can function to purge its offerer(s) from sin.

4.2 Translation of Lev 4:1–5:13

As in the previous chapter, the translation below is a combination of my translation and the translation of Jacob Milgrom.¹ I use Milgrom’s translation as a foundation, only making changes when I have significant disagreements with Milgrom’s rendering. My changes appear in bold and are inserted into Milgrom’s translation. In the footnotes, I include the Hebrew for the parts I have emended, followed by Milgrom’s translation of these sections, as well as any clarifying comments I may have.

Leviticus 4:1–5:13

Chapter 4

1/ יְהוָה spoke to Moses, saying:
2/ Speak to the Israelites thus: When a person inadvertently does wrong in regard to any of יְהוָה’s prohibitive commandments by violating any one of them—
3/ If the anointed priest does wrong to the guilt-carrying of the people,³ he shall offer for the wrong he has done a bull of the herd without blemish as a purification offering to יְהוָה.

² Milgrom renders the tetragrammaton as “the Lord,” while I prefer יְהוָה. I will make this change throughout the translation without further comment.
³ אָבְדַת מַעְנֵי נָפָשׁוֹת, “If it is the anointed priest who so does wrong to the detriment of the people,” (Milgrom). The verb מַעְנֵי and its connotation of the objectification of guilt (in this verse expressed with a nominal form) will be discussed below.
4/ He shall bring the bull to the entrance of the Tent of Meeting before YHWH, lean his hand upon the head of the bull, and slaughter the bull before YHWH.

5/ The anointed priest shall take some of the bull’s blood and bring it into the Tent of Meeting.

6/ The priest shall dip his finger in the blood, and sprinkle some of the blood seven times before YHWH against the veil of the shrine.

7/ The priest shall put some of the blood on the horns of the altar of perfumed incense, which is in the Tent of Meeting, before YHWH; and all the rest of the bull’s blood he shall pour out at the base of the altar of burnt offering, which is at the entrance of the Tent of Meeting.

8/ He shall set aside all of the suet from the bull of the purification offering; the suet that covers the entrails and all of the suet that is around the entrails;

9/ the two kidneys and the suet that is around them, that is on the sinews; and the caudate lobe on the liver, which he shall remove with the kidneys—

10/ just as it is set aside from the ox of the well-being offering. The priest shall turn them into smoke on the altar of burnt offering.

11/ But the hide of the bull, and all its flesh, together with its head and shins, its entrails and dung—

12/ all the rest of the bull—shall be taken away to a pure place outside the camp, to the ash dump, and burned with wood; it shall be burned on the ash dump.

13/ If it is the whole community of Israel that has erred inadvertently and the matter escapes the notice of the congregation, so that they violate one of YHWH’s prohibitive commandments, they shall carry guilt.\(^4\)

14/ But [if] the wrong that they committed in regard to it becomes known,\(^5\) the congregation shall offer a bull of the herd as a purification offering and bring it before the Tent of Meeting.

15/ The elders of the community shall lean their hands upon the head of the bull before YHWH, and the bull shall be slaughtered before YHWH.

16/ The anointed priest shall bring some of the bull’s blood into the Tent of Meeting, and the priest shall dip his finger in the blood and sprinkle of it seven times before YHWH, against the veil.

---

\(^4\) יִשָּׁנֵן, “and they feel guilt” (no punctuation here as Milgrom believes it flows right into the next verse). See footnote 3 on יְשָׁנֵן.

\(^5\) יִשָּׁנֵן, “(and they feel guilt) when the wrong that they committed in regard to it becomes known”. Milgrom and I differ in our understanding of the verb יִשָּׁנֵן and this difference in opinion is the cause for our differing renderings here. I argue that they “carry guilt” because of the wrong they committed, but they must bring an offering to purge the guilt they are carrying only “if” the wrong committed becomes known. The “if [יְשָׁנֵן]” at the beginning of v. 13 carries over to the beginning of v. 14. This same issue arises in vv. 23 and 27, but in those verses “ metic must be understood as signifying “if.”
18/ Some of the blood he shall put on the horns of the altar that is before YHWH in the Tent of Meeting, and all the rest of the blood he shall pour out at the base of the altar of burnt offering, which is at the entrance of the Tent of Meeting.
19/ He shall set aside all of its suet from it and turn it into smoke on the altar.
20/ He shall treat this bull as he treated the [first] bull of the purification offering: he shall treat it the same way. Thus the priest shall purge them,⁶ that they may be forgiven.
21/ The bull shall be taken away outside the camp and it shall be burned as the first bull was burned: it is the purification offering of the congregation.
22/ When the chieftain does wrong by violating any of YHWH’s prohibitive commandments inadvertently, he shall carry guilt.⁷
23/ If he is informed of the wrong he committed, he shall bring as his offering a male goat without blemish.
24/ He shall lean his hand upon the goat’s head, and it shall be slaughtered at the spot where the burnt offering is slaughtered, before YHWH: it is a purification offering.
25/ The priest shall take some of the blood of the purification offering with his finger and put it on the horns of the altar of burnt offering; and (the rest of) its blood he shall pour out at the base of the altar of burnt offering.
26/ All of its suet he shall turn into smoke on the altar, like the suet of the well-being offering. Thus shall the priest purge him of his sin,⁹ that he may be forgiven.
27/ If any person from among the populace does wrong inadvertently by violating any of YHWH’s prohibitive commandments, he shall carry guilt.¹⁰
28/ If he is informed of the wrong he committed, he shall bring as his offering a female goat without blemish for the wrong he committed.

---

⁶ מְאֹד, “Thus the priest shall effect purgation for them,” (Milgrom). As I demonstrated, in Lev 16 and 23 are functional equivalents. Thus throughout this passage on the offerings should be understood as marking the offerer(s) as the object of purgation.
⁷ מְאֹד אָדָם, “and he feels guilt” (again, no punctuation here for Milgrom as he believes it flows right into the next verse). See footnotes 3 and 4.
⁸ הָא, “or”. Milgrom suggests that either the chieftain discovers his error on account of his guilt feelings, (Milgrom’s understanding of מְאֹד as “feel guilt” creates the possibility that the chieftain could speculate that he committed a wrong) or someone informs him of his error. I suggest that unless he is informed of (or remembers) his wrong, he would not bring a מְאֹד. Milgrom quotes a rabbinic understanding that teaches likewise: “Rabbi Joshua said: ‘he is informed of the wrong he committed’ teaches that he is not liable (for a purification offering) until he knows wherein he did wrong’ (Sipra, Hobah 7:7)” (Leviticus 1–16, 247).
⁹ מְאֹד אָדָם, מְאֹד אָדוֹן, “Thus shall the priest effect purgation on his behalf for his wrong,” (Milgrom).
¹⁰ מְאֹד אָדָם, מְאֹד אָדוֹן, “and he feels guilt” (Milgrom). See footnotes 3 and 4.
¹¹ הָא, “or”. See footnote 8.
29/ He shall lean his hand upon the head of the purification offering, and the purification offering shall be slaughtered at the spot (of the slaughter) of the burnt offering.
30/ The priest shall take some of its blood with his finger and put it on the horns of the altar of burnt offering; and all the rest of its blood he shall pour out at the base of the altar.
31/ All of its suet he shall remove, just as the suet was removed from the well-being offering; and the priest shall turn (it) into smoke on the altar as a pleasing aroma to YHWH. Thus the priest shall purge him,12 that he may be forgiven.
32/ If the offering he brings is a sheep, he shall bring a female without blemish.
33/ He shall lean his hand upon the head of the purification offering, and it shall be slaughtered for purification purposes at the spot where the burnt offering is slaughtered.
34/ The priest shall take some of the blood of the purification offering with his finger and put it on the horns of the altar of burnt offering, and all the rest of its blood he shall pour out at the base of the altar.
35/ And all of its suet he shall remove just as the suet of the sheep of the well-being offering is removed; and the priest shall turn it (lit., them) into smoke on the altar, with the food gifts of YHWH. Thus the priest shall purge him because of his sin that13 he committed, that he may be forgiven.

Chapter 5

1/ If a person were to do wrong in that14 he has heard a public imprecation (against withholding testimony)—and although he was a witness, either having seen or known (the facts)—yet does not testify, he will bear his iniquity.15
2/ If a person were to touch any impure thing—be it the carcass of an impure wild quadruped or the carcass of an impure domesticated quadruped or the carcass of an...
impure swarming creature—though the fact escapes him, he has become unclean and he shall carry guilt.17
3/ If he were to touch18 human impurity—any such impurity whereby one becomes impure—and the fact escapes him though he has known it, he shall carry guilt.19
4/ If a person were to blurt out an oath to bad or good purpose—whatever anyone may utter in an oath—and the fact escapes him though he has known it, he shall carry guilt20 in any of these matters.
5/ When he carries guilt21 in any of these matters, he shall confess22 that wherein he did wrong.
6/ And he shall bring as his reparation to YHWH, for the wrong that he committed, a female from the flock, sheep or goat, as a purification offering; and the priest shall purge him of his sin.23
7/ But if his means do not suffice for a sheep, he shall bring to YHWH as his reparation for what he has done wrong, two turtledoves or two pigeons, one for a purification offering and the other for a burnt offering.
8/ He shall bring them to the priest who shall offer first the one for the purification offering, pinching the head at its nape without severing it.
9/ He shall sprinkle some of the blood of the purification offering on the side of the altar, and what remains of the blood shall be drained at the base of the altar; it is a purification offering.

---

16 נַשֵׁת אֲרָעָה מַגֶּה, “Or when he touches” (Milgrom). As in 4:23, I believe the proper rendering is the less common “if” as opposed to “or,” and the English subjunctive best fits these hypothetical cases.
17 שֶׁכָּל אַהֲרֵשׁ בְּשִמְךָ וְיִשָּׂא הַנשָּׁה מָעָה, “and, though he has become impure, the fact escapes him but (thereafter) he feels guilt;” (Milgrom).
18 נְהַ, “Or” (Milgrom). See footnote 16.
19 מִשָּׁתַעַת שֶׁכָּל אַהֲרֵשׁ בְּשִמְךָ וְיִשָּׂא הַנשָּׁה מָעָה, “and, though he has known it, the fact escapes him but (thereafter) he feels guilt;” (Milgrom). This is mostly a matter of syntax, along with my assertion that the case ends with the notice of the carrying of guilt.
20 מִשָּׁתַעַת שֶׁכָּל אַהֲרֵשׁ בְּשִמְךָ וְיִשָּׂא הַנשָּׁה מָעָה, “and, though he has known it, the fact escapes him but (thereafter) he feels guilt;” (Milgrom). See footnote 19.
21 מִשָּׁתַעַת שֶׁכָּל אַהֲרֵשׁ בְּשִמְךָ וְיִשָּׂא הַנשָּׁה מָעָה, “When he feels guilt” (Milgrom). See footnote 3. This is a restatement (the same verb with corresponding phrase appears at the end of 5:4, the previous verse) of the apodosis at the end of the previous verse, but also the apodoses of all four cases introduced in ch. 5. It is the beginning of a more detailed and summary apodosis that includes the sacrificial procedure for all four cases.
22 מִשָּׁתַעַת שֶׁכָּל אַהֲרֵשׁ בְּשִמְךָ וְיִשָּׂא הַנשָּׁה מָעָה, “of these matters, he” (Milgrom). I believe that this entire verse is the beginning of the apodosis, just as מִשָּׁתַעַת בְּשִמְךָ marks the beginning of the apodosis throughout Lev 4:1–5:13.
23 מִשָּׁתַעַת שֶׁכָּל אַהֲרֵשׁ בְּשִמְךָ וְיִשָּׂא הַנשָּׁה מָעָה, “and the priest effect purgation on his behalf for his wrong” (Milgrom). See footnote 9.
10/ And the second he shall sacrifice as a burnt offering, according to regulation. Thus the priest shall purge him of his sin\(^{24}\) that he committed so that he may be forgiven.

11/ And if his means do not suffice for two turtledoves or two pigeons, he shall bring as his offering for what he has done wrong a tenth of an ephah\(^{25}\) of semolina for a purification offering: he shall not put oil upon it or place frankincense on it, for it is a purification offering.

12/ He shall bring it to the priest, and the priest shall scoop out a handful as a token portion of it and turn it into smoke on the altar, with YHWH’s food gifts; it is a purification offering.

13/ Thus the priest shall purge him because of his sin that\(^{26}\) he committed in any of these matters so that he may be forgiven. It shall belong to the priest, like the cereal offering.

4.3 Prepositions in Lev 16

Throughout Lev 4:1–5:13 (and throughout the entire book of Leviticus, save Lev 9:7; 16:6, 11, 17, 20, 33a), the preposition ל and its object follow directly or shortly after the verb כפר. The preposition ל is used with כפר only in Lev 9:7; 16:6, 11, 17, 20. In fact, the latter preposition is used nowhere else in Leviticus and occurs only twice in Exodus (8:24 [Eng. 8:28]; 32:30, with כפר here) and once in Numbers (21:7). Leviticus 16:20 and 33a use the definite direct object marker, נא, with כפר, and in both of these instances (the former from P and the latter from H) נא marks sancta. While it is true that persons are never marked with נא in כפר-phrases, it is also true that sancta (and other objects of purgation) are not always marked with נא. In places, כפר+נא is used to mark

\(^{24}\) ל כפר—ילך ותשפיחו יקרד. "Thus the priest shall effect purgation on his behalf for the wrong he committed" (Milgrom). See footnote 9.

\(^{25}\) כפר—לך ותשפיחו. "This is a Hebrew term for a specific measurement thus it is better left untranslated. Milgrom concludes that one-tenth of an ephah “would amount to 2.3 liters, which suffices for a day’s bread for one person (Ibn Ezra)” (Leviticus 1–16, 305-06).

\(^{26}\) ל כפר—ילך ותשפיחו נא יקרד. "Thus the priest shall effect purgation for the wrong he committed" (Milgrom). See footnote 13.
sancta as the objects of purgation, even when the understanding is clearly the same as when sancta are marked with מַעַשָּׁה. I have identified and discussed two of these instances in Lev 16:1–28 (the earliest text on the מַעַשָּׁה offering), Lev 16:16 and 18. In the case of Lev 16:16, while Milgrom does not comment on the use of מַכֶּר+עַל, he translates the Hebrew phrase, מַכֶּר עַל-הַשָּׁמֶש מִשְׁפָּטָּא בֶּן יִשְׂרָאֵל וּמְשֶׁפֶתָּה as “Thus he shall purge the adytum of the pollution and transgressions of the Israelites....”27 Milgrom’s translation acknowledges that in this case, מַכֶּר+עַל is functionally equivalent to מַכֶּר+עַל. This same construction occurs again in Lev 16:18 (מַכֶּר עַל יְדֵי), although in this case Milgrom incorrectly translates it “effect purgation upon it.”28 As was shown in the previous chapter, Lev 16:18–19 shows quite clearly that the altar is purged and declared clean and then (re)consecrated. This understanding was confirmed by the same sequence in Exod 29:36–37.

Exod 29:36/ And you shall do a purification offering bull every day as a purgation. You shall sacrifice a purification offering upon the altar when you purge it. And you shall anoint it to consecrate it.

Exod 29:37/ Seven days you shall purge the altar and consecrate it. The altar shall become very holy; all that touches the altar will become holy.

27 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 1033.
28 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 1036.
Both Lev 16:18 and Exod 29:36–37 (both verses) have the combination of הָכַ֧ר +וּלָּ֤א functioning equivalently to הָכַ֧ר +אֶת with the altar as the object of purgation.

Leviticus 16:16 contains another important preposition which further clarifies the function of the tafrj offering both here and elsewhere in Leviticus. The first half of the verse is as follows: In the previous chapter, the proper understanding of part A was shown to be, “Thus he shall purge the adytum.” Following upon this is a list of the items purged from the sanctuary, and the first two items both have the preposition נְמ attached to them. In other places throughout Lev 1–16 (see the table below this paragraph for reference) where the same construction appears, Milgrom incorrectly renders the נמ as causative. Here, however, Milgrom renders the נב as privative: “Thus he shall purge the adytum of the pollution and transgressions of the Israelites, including all of their sins....”29 This same construction appears twice more in Lev 16, both occurring in the addition from H, vv. 30 and 34a. The Hebrew of Lev 16:30 (along with Milgrom’s translation and my emendations in bold) is as follows:

\[
\text{לֹא יִפְטֵר בְּשָׁמְיָו אֶתְכֶם הַטֶּפֶן הָאָדָם לְשָׁמְיָו אֶתְכֶם אָדָם יִפְטֵר בְּשָׁמְיָו אֶתְכֶם חַנּוּן לָךְ חַנּוּן לָךְ מְלֹא חַנְנוֹת לָךְ חַנּוֹן לָךְ} /\text{Lev 16:30}
\]

Lev 16:30/ For on this day he shall purge you\textsuperscript{\text{30}} to purify you of all of your sins; you shall be declared pure\textsuperscript{\text{31}} before YHWH.\textsuperscript{\text{32}}

\textsuperscript{29} Milgrom, \textit{Leviticus 1–16}, 1010.

\textsuperscript{30} נְמ, “shall purgation be effected on your behalf to purify you” (Milgrom, \textit{Leviticus 1–16}, 1011).

\textsuperscript{31} נְמ, “you shall become pure” (Milgrom, \textit{Leviticus 1–16}, 1011).

\textsuperscript{32} Milgrom renders the tetragrammaton as “the Lord,” while I prefer YHWH (\textit{Leviticus 1–16}, 1011).
Milgrom again translates the נָמְלָק as privative. Lastly, the same construction appears in Lev 16:34a, and in this case it matches Lev 16:16 more closely than 16:30 did. The privative נָמְלָק follows the לוּ+𢄵 phrase directly:

Lev 16:34a/ This shall be for you a law for all time: to purge the Israelites of all of their sins once a year.

The structure of the second half of the verse mirrors Lev 16:16a in structure:

The similarity is striking, and yet Milgrom renders Lev 16:34a much differently. He does not read לוּ as marking the object purged (here, the Israelites) as he does in Lev 16:16 (here, the adytum). Moreover, he renders the נָמְלָק in 16:34a as causative instead of privative. Thus, whereas I render this half-verse similarly to Lev 16:16 (“This shall be for you a law for all time: to purge the Israelites of all their sins once a year”), Milgrom’s translation reads as if the structural similarity were not present (“This shall be for you a law for all time: to effect purgation on behalf of the Israelites for all their sins once a year”). Curiously, in Milgrom’s notes on the verse he concludes, “Its purpose is clear: only by observing all of the procedures detailed in this chapter can Israel be purged of its sins.”

---

33 Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 1011.
34 Leviticus 1–16, 1011. “to effect purgation on behalf of the Israelites for all their sins”
35 Again, the translation is from Milgrom with my emendations in bold (*Leviticus 1–16*, 1011).
that actually makes this purpose clear, especially when the grammar and syntax not
only allow it, but I daresay require it?

Table 1: Components of Language Governed by 입 in Leviticus with evil« prep.\(^{38}\) column defined or with result column defined and governed by \(\text{ג}'\)^{39}

I translate \(\text{ג}'\) as privative in all cases where \(\text{ג}'\) occurs in evil« prep. column or the result column in the case of 12:7 and 16:30. The highlighted columns indicate instances where Milgrom also translates \(\text{ג}'\) as privative.\(^{40}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ref.</th>
<th>kind of case</th>
<th>result</th>
<th>evil« prep.</th>
<th>locus</th>
<th>kind of obj.</th>
<th>obj.« prep. or direct obj.</th>
<th>כדר + subj.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L. 4:26</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>입הלה ל</td>
<td>מפוחמת</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>입הלה ל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. 4:35</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>입הלה ל</td>
<td>מפוחמת</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>입הלה ל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. 5:6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>입הלה ל</td>
<td>מפוחמת</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>입הלה ל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. 5:10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>입הלה ל</td>
<td>מפוחמת</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>입הלה ל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. 5:13</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>입הלה ל</td>
<td>מפוחמת</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>입הלה ל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. 12:7</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>입הלה ל</td>
<td>מפוחמת</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>입הלה ל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. 14:19</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>입הלה ל</td>
<td>מפוחמת</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>입הלה ל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. 15:15</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>입הלה ל</td>
<td>מפוחמת</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>입הלה ל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. 15:30</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>입הלה ל</td>
<td>מפוחמת</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>입הלה ל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. 16:16</td>
<td>M+P</td>
<td>입הלה ל</td>
<td>מפוחמת</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>입הלה ל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. 16:30</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>입הלה ל</td>
<td>מפוחמת</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>입הלה ל</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{38}\) “evil« prep.” signifies any Hebrew preposition marking the substance purged from a person or a sanctum.

\(^{39}\) This is a partial recreation of a table from Roy Gane’s work (recreated in full below, pp. 14–16), whose title is simply “Components of Language Governed by 입” (Cult and Character: Purification Offerings, Day of Atonement, and Theodicy [Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005], 110–111).

\(^{40}\) Reference the following pages in Milgrom to see his translations for these verses (Leviticus 1–16, 227–28, 293, 742, 828, 902–03, 1010–11).
Table Key: (ref.: L. = Leviticus), (kind of case: C = consecration, P = physical ritual impurity, M = moral fault), (kind of obj.: S = sanctuary/sancta, O = offerer)

4.4 Prepositions in Lev 4:1–5:13

Throughout these verses, which give instructions for the [הָאָשָׁנָה] offerings that can be offered throughout the year, the prepositions לֹ and נָמ continue to be of utmost importance. Unlike Lev 16:1–28, the preposition בָּנָא is never used. As was shown in the previous chapter, בָּנָא is used with מְפֹר to mark the person(s) for whom the purgation is carried out. It never marks the object of purgation. The exclusion of בָּנָא throughout Lev 4:1–5:13 is thus extremely telling, as is the use of לֹ and נָמ throughout. The Priestly authors of Lev 4:1–5:13 have used the logic of the [הָאָשָׁנָה] offering as a purgative offering in Lev 16, but they have shifted the object of purgation from the sancta to the offerer(s).

The authors of Lev 4:1–5:13, however, have not shifted the use of the phrase מְפֹר+לֹ (marks the object purged) or מְפֹר+בָּנָא (marks the person[s] for whom purgation is accomplished, not the object purged) or the preposition נָמ after the מְפֹר-phrase. If the offerers of Lev 4:1–5:13 were not the objects of purgation, as Milgrom suggests,41 the authors would have used מְפֹר+לֹ to mark the offerer, not מְפֹר+לֹ. Because of this grammatical consistency with Lev 16, the goal of the [הָאָשָׁנָה] offering of Lev 4:1–5:13 is clear. The reality of a relationship between the sancta and the Israelites as explicated in

Lev 16 is assumed, but the cause and effect is reversed. Whereas Yom Kippur attested to the people’s ability to soil the sancta, the recurring הֲנָאֹת offering attests to the ability of the sancta to purge the people. Similar ritual procedures as those carried out on Yom Kippur are utilized to purge the offerer.

Throughout Lev 4:1–5:13, the person for whom the priest effects כָּפֵר is always marked with לֹ+כָּפֵר. In fact, for every הֲנָאֹת-offering prescription in this section (4:20, 26, 31, 35; 5:6, 10, 13), the כָּפֵר formula is exactly the same: הֲנָאֹת כָּפֵר וְלֹ+כָּפֵר. The one exception is Lev 4:20, which has the entire congregation represented by the elders and thus has the masculine plural third person suffix on לֹ. I have already discussed my reasoning for reading these phrases as expressing the purgation of the offerer, which means translating the phrase as, “Thus the priest shall purge him.” While the use of הֲנָאֹת would make such a reading definitive, the Priestly writers used הֲנָאֹת and לֹ interchangeably as has been shown above (see Lev 16:16, 18, 30, 33, 34), and thus either can be used to mark the object for which purgation is effected. For the Priestly writers of Lev 16, there does not appear to be any conceptual difference between marking the adytum (הֲנָאֹת), for example, with כָּפֵר+לֹ (as in Lev 16:16) or וכָּפֵר+לֹ הֲנָאֹת (as in Lev 16:20). Thus the authors of Lev 4:1–5:13 would have known that כָּפֵר+לֹ הֲנָאֹת could be used interchangeably because they would have seen a text very similar to Lev 16.

Perhaps because of the indirect way in which offerers were purged, through rituals that only came into physical contact with sancta and not the offerer, these Priestly authors
chose to use לְשׁוֹן הָנֵסָא exclusively when the object of purgation was a person. With both לְשׁוֹן הָנֵסָא and לְשׁוֹן הָנֵסָא at their disposal, these Priestly authors chose the collocation that still expressed the novelty of this new use of the לְשׁוֹן הָנֵסָא offering (purging persons instead of sancta), while also acknowledging, ever so subtly, that the ritual process of this לְשׁוֹן הָנֵסָא offering achieves its desired effect obliquely on account of the relationship between the people and the sancta. Baruch Levine also notes that לְשׁוֹן הָנֵסָא and לְשׁוֹן הָנֵסָא “have the same functional force,” although he does not carefully articulate how these two phrases are distinct from לְשׁוֹן הָנֵסָא. However, Levine does speculate similarly as I have concerning לְשׁוֹן הָנֵסָא when he suggests “that לְשׁוֹן הָנֵסָא + direct object was not employed by the cultic writers in connection with humans or the substance of the sacrifices precisely because it was desired to avoid the associations of the older usage, wherein לְשׁוֹן הָנֵסָא meant simply ‘to wipe off, cleanse,’ implying automatic effects.” Certainly “wipe off” as a translation of לְשׁוֹן הָנֵסָא in Lev 4:1–5:13 would create confusion. “Cleanse” is not quite as problematic, although it too will not work in Lev 4:1–5:13, but not for the same reason that Levine thinks. While “purge” (my preferred translation of לְשׁוֹן הָנֵסָא) and “cleanse” are rather similar, the לְשׁוֹן הָנֵסָא of Lev 4:1–5:13 leads to forgiveness for the offerer. It does not result in the purity of the offerer, thus my preference for “purge.” Nonetheless, ...

42 Baruch Levine, In the Presence of the Lord: A Study of Cult and Some Cultic Terms in Ancient Israel (Brill: Leiden, 1974), 66.
43 See Levine’s discussion in Presence of the Lord, 63–67, as well as my critique of it in chapter 2.
44 Levine, Presence of the Lord, 66.
regardless of the correct understanding of כפר, presented with the choice of two functionally equivalent collocations, וesktopו and כפר+על, the authors of Lev 4:1–5:13 chose to use וesktopו exclusively in order to acknowledge the indirect nature of the purgation effected by this וה-sama offering.

In Lev 4:26; 5:6, 10, the use of the privative נב is further evidence for the understanding of וesktopו as functionally equivalent to כפר+על. The crucial phrases in these three verses are as follows:

Lev 4:26

Lev 5:6

Lev 5:10

In each of these cases, the preposition נב follows immediately after the כפר-phrase and is attached to the noun וahoma (his sin). I contend that the נב be understood as privative and thus translated as “from/of his sin.” In all three of these cases, then, I render the Hebrew as: “Thus the priest shall purge him of his sin…..” Gane also notes the importance of נב, which he too thinks is privative in these cases, as it is throughout Lev 1–16, whether the offering is for a moral or a physical problem. Gane produces a very extensive table in which he tabulates “components of language governed by כפר in pentateuchal prescription/descriptions of purification offerings, plus the results of כפר if they are
given.\textsuperscript{45} To be clear, in all of the cases below in which נמ occurs in either the evil=prep. column (4:26; 5:6, 10; 14:19; 15:15, 30; 16:16, 34) or the result column (12:7; 16:30), Gane, like me, argues that the נמ should be understood privatively.\textsuperscript{46}

Table 2: Components of Language Governed by כֶּפֶר\textsuperscript{47}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ref.</th>
<th>kind of case</th>
<th>result</th>
<th>evil=prep.</th>
<th>locus</th>
<th>kind of obj.</th>
<th>obj.=prep. or direct obj.</th>
<th>כֶּפֶר + subj.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. 29:36</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>כֶּפֶר...חלוה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. 29:37</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>כֶּפֶר...חלוה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. 30:10</td>
<td>M+P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>כֶּפֶר...חלוה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. 4:20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>נפשו...למח</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>כֶּפֶר...חלוה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. 4:26</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>נפשו...למח</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>כֶּפֶר...חלוה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. 4:31</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>נפשו...למח</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>כֶּפֶר...חלוה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. 4:35</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>נפשו...למח</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>כֶּפֶר...חלוה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. 5:6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>נפשו...למח</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>כֶּפֶר...חלוה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. 5:10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>נפשו...למח</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>כֶּפֶר...חלוה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. 5:13</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>נפשו...למח</td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>כֶּפֶר...חלוה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. 6:23</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>כֶּפֶר...חלוה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. 7:7</td>
<td>M/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>כֶּפֶר...חלוה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. 8:15</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>כֶּפֶר...חלוה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. 9:7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>כֶּפֶר...חלוה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. 9:7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>כֶּפֶר...חלוה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. 10:17</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>כֶּפֶר...חלוה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. 12:7</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>כֶּפֶר...חלוה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{45} Gane, \textit{Cult and Character}, 109.

\textsuperscript{46} Gane, \textit{Cult and Character}, 106–135.

\textsuperscript{47} Recreated from Gane, \textit{Cult and Character}, 110–111.
Gane leaves this space blank, but I have marked it as affecting the offerer. I demonstrated in chapter 2 that Aaron is the object of purgation in this case.
As the table makes clear, נ is the favored preposition for marking the problem for which מ is needed. Of the twelve places⁴⁹ where the problem is marked, in only two instances is another preposition used, which will be discussed below. Furthermore, Lev 12:7 and 16:30 should be included in this conversation. Despite the fact that these verses have נ governed by the verb מ, and thus they appear in their own column, they are clearly indications of the privative נ being used in connection with מ. These verses have מ in tandem with מ, and following מ is the preposition נ marking what is purged/cleansed from the offerer(s). As for Lev 4:26 and 5:10, which use the

---

⁴⁹ I include Lev 12:7 and 16:30 even though, as you can see, Gane places them in the “result” column of his table and not the “evil=prep.” column. However, Gane does discuss these two passages at length and believes that they do belong in the conversation about the privative נ.
privileged מ, we are also told that this purgation leads to the forgiveness of the offerer, the end result of all cases in Lev 4:1–5:13, as will be discussed below.

In the four other verses in Lev 4:1–5:13 that report that the priest effects בעל and the offerer is forgiven (4:20, 31, 35; 5:13), the preposition מ does not occur. In Lev 4:20 and 4:31, the text has no reference to the sin committed, but simply reports purgation and forgiveness (i.e., 4:20 – מפשה עליה הפשן עליה והפשן עליה מפשנת, מפשנת). However in Lev 4:35 and 5:13, the preposition על is used to specify the sin for which purgation is needed.

Lev 4:35

Lev 5:13

These two verses, and specifically the clauses beginning with על, represent a challenge to my theory of the function of the recurring מפשה offering. The challenge concerns the proper understanding of מ as privative (my reading) or causative (Milgrom’s reading). As Gane points out, “there is no privative מ.”50 For this reason, and to maintain the integrity of his thesis (i.e. sancta are purged by the מפשה offerings of Lev 4:1–5:13, not the offerers), Milgrom asserts that על in the cases above (4:35; 5:13) and מ (understood causatively) in 4:26; 5:6, 10 are equivalent.51 Thus, in all of these cases, Milgrom can translate the prepositions as “for.” However, Milgrom does not do so in all the cases involving מ. As we have seen, Milgrom translates the מ as privative in Lev

———

50 Gane, Cult and Character, 125.
51 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 251.
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here, then it must also be so in the many other places where it marks the evil purged from offerers throughout Lev 1–16. Therefore נֶבֶן and דֵל cannot be synonymous in Lev 4:1–5:13. While I agree with Gane on this last point, it must be noted that Lev 16:30 comes from H, while Lev 4:1–5:13 comes from P. Gane acknowledges this somewhat, and responds: “While 16:30, which Milgrom also assigns to H, involves factors that are unique to the Day of Atonement, my point here is that its use of נֶבֶן in language closely following כְּפֶרֶד is consistent with what we find elsewhere in pentateuchal cultic laws.”

Gane’s point is solid, but not unassailable. As he also points out, aside from the source critical issue, כְּפֶרֶד comes between נֶבֶן and the נֶבֶן in question. On this last point, Lev 16:34a is helpful. The phrasing is very similar to 16:30, but כְּפֶרֶד is not included here: בְּנֵוָה теָה לָכָה יִלֻּכֶּה שְׁלָלָה לָכָה שְׁלָלָה שְׁלָלָה כְּפֶרֶד כְּפֶרֶד אַלָּא לִשָּׁה. Considering Lev 16:30, I submit that the half-verse be rendered: “This shall be for you an everlasting statute: to purge the Israelites of all their sins once a year.” Combine this with the syntax of verses like Lev 12:7, 16:16, 15:15, 15:30, and the case for the privative נֶבֶן is very strong. As mentioned above, of the twelve cases in Leviticus where the source or problem for which כְּפֶרֶד is needed is stated, ten of these cases use נֶבֶן, while only two cases use דֵל (4:35; 5:13). In three of the cases with נֶבֶן (Lev 12:7; 16:16, and 16:30), Milgrom translates the נֶבֶן as privative. Thus even Milgrom does not think the נֶבֶן and דֵל are equivalent in

---

57 Gane, *Cult and Character*, 118.
all of these cases. I would also add that my work shows that כָּפֵר+אָתָה כָּפֵר+עָלָּי and כָּפֵר+אָתָה כָּפֵר+עָלָּי function equivalently, which only strengthens the case for the privative נֶן in Lev 4:26, 5:6, and 5:10. Ironically, my articulation of the equivalency of כָּפֵר+אָתָה כָּפֵר+עָלָּי and כָּפֵר+אָתָה כָּפֵר+עָלָּי also makes less crucial the issue of the privative or causative נֶן in comparison to the similar clauses with the preposition על in Lev 4:1–5:13. Once it is understood that the offerer is the object of purgation, which כָּפֵר+אָתָה כָּפֵר+עָלָּי makes clear throughout Lev 4:1–5:13, whether the offerer is purged “of/from” his sin or “because of” his sin (or both) is not crucial. Either way, the offerer is purged because the offerer committed wrongdoing.

4.4.1 Leviticus 8

Leviticus 8 narrates the purgation and consecration of the altar, as well as the ordination, annunciation, and consecration of the priesthood. Leviticus 8:15 ends with the phrase כָּפֵר+עָלָּי, and although the phrase is difficult to understand, it must be dealt with in this study. In Lev 8:14–17, a bull for a חַטָּאת offering is sacrificed, and this is clearly done for the benefit of the altar. The חַטָּאת offering, according to Lev 8:15, decontaminates the altar (וַיְחָטֵר לְכָפֵר עָלָּי) and consecrates it (וַיָּקָם לְכָפֵר עָלָּי). Milgrom renders כָּפֵר+עָלָּי as “to effect atonement upon it,” believing that the verse is referring to the future function of the altar.59 The altar is now ready to perform its function as the place of atonement/purgation. Milgrom is certain that purgation precedes consecration and thus does not want to render the phrase as “by purging it” or

“to purge it,” which would imply that purgation effects consecration or consecration effects purgation. Milgrom acknowledges, however, that Lev 8 contains some oddities, at least in comparison with Exod 29. Before the הַמִּטְנָה offering in Lev 8:14–15, Lev 8:10–11 clearly articulates the anointing and consecration of the altar.

Lev 8:11/ He sprinkled some of it on the altar seven times, and he anointed the altar, all of its utensils, and the laver with its stand, to consecrate them.60

Milgrom surmises that Lev 8:10–12 is attempting to resolve a discrepancy between Exod 29, Exod 30 and Exod 40.61 Exodus 29 does not contain a passage on the anointing of the Tabernacle, while Exod 30:26–29 and Exod 40:9–11 do. Milgrom believes Lev 8:10–12 to be an interpolation based on Exod 40:9–11.

Lev 8 (and Exod 40) inserted the notice about the anointing of the Tabernacle between Exod 29:7α and 7β. Moreover, Lev 8:11 and Exod 40:10, being in chiastic relationship, offer a clue to the puzzle of the mysterious sevenfold sprinkling of the anointment oil on the altar (Lev 8:11a). It corresponds to the statement..., literally, “[You shall consecrate the altar] so that the altar shall be most holy” (Exod 40:10b). This latter statement explicitly ranks the sacrificial altar as “most holy” in contrast to the Tabernacle and its other sancta, which are designated as [שָׁקָר] ‘holy’ (Exod 40:9). Moreover, whereas it is commanded that the altar and its vessels and the laver and its stand be anointed (Exod 40:10a, 11), it is only the altar (but neither its vessels nor the laver and its stand!) that is to achieve the status of “most holy.” This “higher” status of the altar is attained, according to Lev 8:11, by an additional application of the anointment oil. Rather, it seems more likely that the author or redactor of Lev 8 so interpreted Exod

60 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 493.
61 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 513–16.
40:10b, to wit—for the altar, along with all the Tabernacle sancta, to become “most holy” it required a second anointing.\(^62\)

Thus, whether Lev 8:10–11 is a later interpolation or not, Lev 8 clearly narrates the consecration of the altar before the purgation of the altar in 8:14–15.

Lev 8:14/ He had the bull of the purification offering brought forward. Aaron and his sons leaned their hands on the bull of the purification offering,
Lev 8:15/ and he slaughtered [it].\(^63\) Moses took the blood and with his finger put [some] on the horns around the altar, decontaminating the altar; then he poured out the blood at the base of the altar. Thus he consecrated it by purging it.\(^64\)

Milgrom notes that the phrase most out of place is the notice of consecration (דריה כְּרוּי) in 8:15. On this phrase, Milgrom writes:

This is a summary statement recalling vv 10–11, concerning the consecration of the altar. (See Exod 29:41 where this verb again performs a summarizing function). Still, the need to bring up the altar’s consecration here is hard to justify. First, it interrupts the sacrificial series. As the altar’s consecration was also essential for the burnt and ordination offerings that follow, one would have expected to find this summary notice after v 28. Furthermore, the account of the purification offering (vv 14–15) does not follow immediately upon the consecration of the altar (vv 10–11) but is preceded by the anointing of Aaron and the dressing of the priests (vv 12–13), to which there is no allusion in this purported summary. Thus the suspicion is aroused that [דריה כְּרוּי] does not refer to the account of the altar’s consecration, given five verses back, but may be the original text of a statement that the consecration of the altar took place at this point in the procedure—after the altar was decontaminated with the blood of the

\(^{62}\) Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 515.
\(^{63}\) The entire translation, except my emendations in bold, is from Milgrom (Leviticus 1–16, 493). “…and it was slaughtered.”
\(^{64}\) “to effect atonement upon it” (Milgrom).
purification offering (vv 14–15) and before the rest of the sacrificial service (vv 16–28). In light of this interpretation, the rendering of the word should be “Then he consecrated it.”

What Milgrom is doing here is explaining how to render the last half of 8:15 (לְכָֽאֵ֣שׁ לְנַלַיִּ֔ית וְלָכַ֖שׁ לְנַלַיִּ֔ית) as if the consecration in 8:10–11 were not present. In an older version of Lev 8, according to Milgrom, the only consecration of the altar occurred in the second half of Lev 8:15 after the purgation of the altar, similar to Exod 29:36–37.

With this reconstruction however, the phrase לְכָֽאֵ֣שׁ לְנַלַיִּ֔ית, which comes after the notice of consecration, is still problematic. In Exod 29:36 we are told that the altar is anointed, not purged, so as to consecrate it.

Exod 29:36/ And you shall do a purification offering bull every day as a purgation. You shall sacrifice a purification offering upon the altar when you purge it. And you shall anoint it to consecrate it.

The purgation and the consecration are separate acts. In Lev 8:15, if we accept Milgrom’s translation of “to effect atonement on it” for לְכָֽאֵ֣שׁ לְנַלַיִּ֔ית, then we are not told what was done as the act of consecration. My translation (“by purging it”) communicates that decontamination/purgation and consecration are accomplished through purgation.

There are not two acts, as in Exod 29:36, but only one act for both decontamination/purgation and consecration according to Lev 8:15. The altar is

---
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consecrated through purgation. This is also true, to some extent, in Exod 29:36–37, where decontamination/purgation is one necessary step (along with the anointing that follows purgation) toward consecration. Milgrom’s work on this chapter shows that in its current form, Lev 8 does not accord with Exod 29, in which purgation precedes consecration. Leviticus 8 narrates consecration twice, once before purgation and once during the altar’s purgation. I much prefer my rendering, not only because it accords with my understanding of מפכ+تعليق, but also because the verse is clearly speaking of the purgation of the altar. To bring in the concept of “atonement” here is entirely unnecessary. Furthermore, the future function of the altar is not solely “atonement/purgation,” as Milgrom’s translation would suggest. Even in the rest of Lev 8, a burnt offering is offered with no mention of מפכ (8:18–21). Moreover, the שלם+تعليق (well-being offering) never deals with מפכ in any way, but does utilize the altar. Thus, while Lev 8 clearly presents problems in relation to purgation and consecration, we need not add to the confusion by rendering the מפכ in Lev 8:15 in a completely new and unattested way (“to effect atonement upon the altar [in the future]”). Rather, מפכ+تعليق in this text functions in the same way it does throughout the Priestly material and Holiness Code: מפכ+تعليق marks the object/person purged.

4.4.2 Ritual and Reality

As the previous chapter demonstrated, Lev 16:16 unquestionably states that the adytum (הַקְדִיש) is purged from the Israelites’ uncleanness and their sins (which includes
their transgressions, וְתַשְׁלֵךְ). How or why the uncleanness or sins of the Israelites clings to parts of the sancta is never stated. Likewise, the locale of the item purged or even its substance (even if one agrees that the offerer is purged “of [privative ה] his sin,” כָּל הָאָרֶץ) is not articulated precisely. Milgrom contends that the blood of the מָס נִמְנָה offering acts as a “ritual detergent,” and only cleans the objects with which it comes into contact, which are always sancta objects. However, even in the case of the offerings of Yom Kippur, which unquestionably purge sancta, the objects are not comprehensively coated with blood, as if the blood functioned like a typical detergent. An element of mystery remains, then, even in Milgrom’s schema. Milgrom explains that the element of pars pro toto is operative for the מָס נִמְנָה in Israel’s cult: “The daubing of the horns of the sacrificial altar with the blood of the purification offering implies that the entire altar is being purged, on the principle of pars pro toto.” The extremities are the most vulnerable parts of an object as they are the places where “a hostile force would strike first in attacking it.

In the ancient Near East, temples were periodically smeared with magical substances at precisely the same vulnerable points, such as entrances and corners, in order to expel the malefic force from those points and to protect against future demonic incursion.”

Milgrom’s explanation is a good one, but it implies that washing a part of an object functions to cleanse the entire thing. Not only is the stain not visible, but the detergent,
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the blood, need not be applied liberally. While the actions in the cult are very tangible, tactile, even logical (in their own way), what it is said to accomplish is still extraordinary.

Gane makes a helpful point on ritual and reality: “A ritual is a privileged activity system that is believed to carry out a transformation process involving interaction with a reality ordinarily inaccessible to the material domain.”69 Thus, the action of the ritual need not correspond perfectly or logically with what it accomplishes. Levine also comes to this conclusion:

In summary, the biblical cultic writers, building on general Hebrew usage, and aware of the non-cultic and religious idiom, amplified the use of הֶסֶד and its derivatives in a way that changed their force from physical causation to prerequisite activity, to the dynamic of action and consequence instead of cause and effect.70

In his commentary on Leviticus, Levine is a bit more straightforward. Commenting on the הֶסֶד clause in Lev 4:20, which he renders, “the priest shall make expiation for them,” Levine concludes that while הֶסֶד certainly must mean “to wipe clean.” However, הֶסֶד must be “less graphic” since it does not require any physical action be carried out upon the offerer.71 “The purification comes from God” writes Levine, “in response to the proper performance of required rituals in good faith.”72 I agree with Gane and

69 Gane, Cult and Character, 15.
70 Baruch Levine, In the Presence of the Lord, 66.
72 Levine, Leviticus, 24.
Levine only to a certain extent. The ταιφ-.offering rituals push the limits of cause and effect, but they still have a cause and effect. I contend that there is a discernible logic to the notion that blood can be applied to sancta and yet function to purge the offerer. Yet, even if such logic were not found or if my logic is not persuasive, the grammar, syntax, and terminology of Lev 4:1–5:13 (read in conjunction with other similar passages in Lev 1–16) still lead to the conclusion that the offerer is purged.

4.4.3 The Case of Anointed Priest in Lev 4

Unlike the other cases explicated in Lev 4:1–5:13, the case of the anointed priest (Lev 4:3–12) ends without a ῥπκ-formula and without a declaration of forgiveness. Milgrom has the most compelling argument concerning this anomaly. He argues that the case of the anointed priest (4:3–12) and the case of the community (4:13–21) should be understood as a single case. He writes, “The high priest has erred in judgment, causing ‘harm to the people’ (v. 3) whereby, in following the high priest’s ruling, the people also err. Because both errors comprise inadvertent violations of prohibitive commandments (vv. 2, 13)…, each party is responsible for purging the shrine with the blood of a similar sacrifice—a purification-offering bull.” Milgrom comments on a

---

73 Leviticus 5:6 also does not include an announcement of forgiveness. It does have the ῥπκ-formula, which is absent in the case of the anointed priest. However, Lev 5:7–13 speaks about the same situation as Lev 5:1–6, giving instructions about two other possible (and cheaper) offerings, two birds or grain, for those who cannot afford a sheep or the two birds. The instructions for both of these other options does end with a proclamation of forgiveness (5:10, 13). We can safely assume, then, that the offering of a sheep as detailed in Lev 5:1–6 also ends in forgiveness even though the text does not explicitly say so.

74 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 241.
specific phrase, which he translates as ‘harm to the people,’ in Lev 4:3 that is particularly
telling. The Hebrew here is מִדְשַׁנִּים מֵעָלָה, with the full phrase as follows:

```
... מִדְשַׁנִּים מֵעָלָה /Lev 4:3a
```

Lev 4:3a/ If the anointed priest sins, to the guilt-carrying of the people...

Based on my discussion to follow about the significance of the verb מַשֵּׁנָה, the translation I
have given above demonstrates more clearly what has happened. Thus I agree with
Milgrom that the consequences of the case of the anointed priest’s sin have affected the
people and thus two offerings are necessary. Thus, the רפָּק-formula and forgiveness
proclamation in Lev 4:21, which are both in the plural, applies to the community and the
anointed priest.

### 4.5 Understanding the Verb מַשֵּׁנָה in Lev 4:1–5:13

The verb מַשֵּׁנָה occurs regularly throughout Lev 4–5 (4:13, 22, 27; 5:2, 3, 4, 5, 17, 19,
23) and its exact meaning and implications have been debated. Jay Sklar explains the
various options for understanding the verb מַשֵּׁנָה in Lev 4–5:

The translations that have been proposed for מַשֵּׁנָה within the priestly literature
fall into four categories: (1) ‘to be/become guilty’, ‘to incur guilt’, ‘to be/become
liable for guilt’; (2) ‘to feel guilt’; (3) ‘to realize guilt’; and (4) ‘to suffer guilt’s
consequences’.75

Sklar argues for “to suffer guilt’s consequences.” Primarily, the verb מַשֵּׁנָה should be
understood as consequential.

75 Jay Sklar, Sin, Impurity, Sacrifice, Atonement The Priestly Conceptions (Hebrew Bible Monographs; Sheffield,
Milgrom argues for a consequential understanding of מֹס, asserting, “It has long been recognized that the biblical terms for good and bad behavior also connote their respective reward and punishment...”\(^7\) Milgrom argues for “to feel guilt” because he believes there is a psychological component to the verb מֹס in the cultic setting.\(^7\)

Milgrom explains,

The reason may well be that unexplainable suffering is held to be the result of sin, and the sufferer’s efforts are therefore directed toward the discovery of the specific offense that gave rise to his plight. The result is predictable: wrongdoing creates guilt and fear of punishment, and, conversely, suffering reinforces the presence of guilt feelings because it is interpreted as punishment for sin. Thus it is logical to expect that a language that, as observed, will express the consequential syndrome of sin-punishment by a single word will also have at least one root in its lexicon to express another consequential relationship, that which exists between sin-punishment and guilt feelings. This root, I submit, is מָס.\(^7\)

Milgrom’s proposal encounters its biggest problem in Lev 5:17–19, a text on the reparation offering. In this situation, a person sins, but doesn’t realize that s/he has sinned.

\[
\text{Lev 5:17/ If, however, a person errs by violating any of YHWH’s prohibitive commandments without knowing it and he feels guilt, he shall bear his responsibility...} \quad 79
\]

\(^{76}\) Milgrom lists the follow biblical terms: מָס, רַנְתָּם, נַע, פָּטָה, חָמָה (Leviticus 1–16, 339).

\(^{77}\) Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 342.

\(^{78}\) Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 343.

\(^{79}\) Milgrom renders the tetragrammaton as “the Lord,” while I prefer YHWH, thus I have made this one emendation to Milgrom’s translation (Leviticus 1–16, 319).
Concerning Milgrom’s understanding of the verb אָבוֹל, Sklar asks the obvious, “Why would people feel guilty if they were unaware of their sin?” Milgrom recognizes the problem and explains that “the subject is experiencing psychical (and perhaps even physical) suffering that, for lack of knowledge concerning its cause, he attributes to an unwitting offense against God…” Sklar takes issue with Milgrom here, stating, “And yet this explanation goes against his understanding of תֶּשׁוֹב elsewhere, where he sees the guilt as a result of recognizing sin, that is, the ‘psychical suffering’ is a response to the knowledge of sin.” Sklar argues that his translation of “to suffer guilt’s consequences,” which entails “some sort of general suffering” that the person suspects is due to some sin, can better account for why a person would bring a sacrifice concerning an act for which she has no knowledge. Sklar has a slightly better case here, but it does not totally solve the problem Lev 5:17–19 raises. Even physical suffering need not necessarily lead the Israelite to bring an offering, but it likely has a better chance of doing so than would guilt feelings. Neither case is unassailable.

It is the inclusion of והנה נתן at the end of 5:17 that is more telling.

This same phrase appears in Lev 5:1 and appears to be used equivalently to אָבוֹל in 5:2, 3,

---

80 Sklar, Sin, Impurity, Sacrifice, Atonement, 37.
81 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 37.
82 Sklar, Sin, Impurity, Sacrifice, Atonement, 39.
Milgrom denies this equivalence by asserting that the use of הָיָה in 5:1 is not only a later artificial incorporation, but that הָיָה in 5:1 is a part of the apodosis while הֵלֶב in 5:2, 3, and 4 occurs in the protasis. As for Lev 5:17, Milgrom again argues that הֵלֶב is part of the protasis and הָיָה is the beginning of the apodosis. While this is possible, I find it unlikely, especially when paired with the evidence of 5:1-4, which appears to be equating הָיָה and הֵלֶב. Sklar agrees, concluding that הֵלֶב and הָיָה are parallels “used to describe the general suffering that is brought on by sin.” Milgrom rejects this because the use of הָיָה and הֵלֶב as parallels in 5:17 would render הָיָה as a tautology. However, the הֵלֶב can be rendered as an epexegetical הֵלֶב, explaining that הָיָה and הֵלֶב are functionally equivalent. This reveals that indeed הָיָה in 5:1

and מ devuelve in 5:2, 3, and 4 are in parallel construction and either both are part of the protasis or both should be understood as the beginning of the apodosis. A compelling argument can be made for viewing the verb מ devuelve throughout Lev 4:1–5:19 as belonging to the apodosis.

Throughout Lev 4:1–5:19, the verb מ devuelve appears at the end of a verse, but more importantly, it comes after the explanation of the wrong committed, thereby explicating the consequence of the wrong. Furthermore, considering the close relationship that מ devuelve has with נאש, I propose it be understood and rendered as “to carry guilt.” This is certainly closest to Sklar’s proposal of “to suffer guilt’s consequences” with an important nuance. It can account for the variety of syntactical situations the verb is in throughout Lev 4–5, while also helping to explain what the מ devuelve offering of Lev 4:1–5:13 accomplishes for the offerer. That is, it purges the offerer of the guilt (a substantive object for P) that he is carrying. On a few occasions P states that the role of the priests is to carry away the sin of the people. Numbers 18:22–23a assigns this role to the Levites.

Here we see the two different uses of מ devuelve, as explicated by Baruch Schwartz.

Schwartz explains:
When the sinner ‘bears’ his sin, it weighs upon him; when someone else ‘bears’ it, the sinner is relieved of it. But there is a second difference: the sinner who bears his sin carries it about with him, as an encumbrance, an ever-present yoke, under whose strain he may eventually be crushed; even if he is not, he will die unrelieved of his burden. However, the sinner whose burden someone else bears has not transferred its weight to another; the bearer is not weighed down by the sin as the sinner formerly was. Indeed, when נְפָשּׁׁׂ֫֫שּׁׂ נִירָ֫הּ/ם/פֶּשֶׂלֶן means ‘free from guilt’, it appears that the נְפָשּׁׁׂ֫֫שּׁׂ no longer weighs upon anyone. It has disappeared.87

The people bear sin and the Levites bear away that sin. We also see support for Schwartz’ opinion that נְפָשּׁׁׂ֫֫שּׁׂ נִירָ֫הּ/ם/פֶּשֶׂלֶן simply means “to bear sin,” with the consequence of this sin-bearing open-ended. Here the Priestly writer adds that approaching the Tent of Meeting (approaching closer than the courtyard, we must assume, since Lev 1–16 makes it clear that the people bring their offerings to the courtyard) leads to the people “to bear sin and die.” The Priestly author adds the consequence of death because נְפָשּׁׁׂ֫֫שּׁׂ נִירָ֫הּ/ם/פֶּשֶׂלֶן simply implies “bearing sin,” which could end in death or could end when, as Num 18:23a states, the Levites “bear away the iniquity” of the Israelite.

Exodus 28:38a, as I discussed in chapter two, explains how Aaron “bears away iniquity” with the help of the gold plate (ןֶפֶשׁ) on his forehead. Aaron, not the gold plate, is the subject of נְפָשּׁׁׂ֫֫שּׁׂ נִירָ֫הּ.

Exod 28:38a/ It (the gold plate [ןֶּחֶל]) shall be on Aaron’s forehead, that Aaron may remove any iniquity arising from the sacred things that the Israelites consecrate, from any of their sacred donations….88

Milgrom explains, “Aaron’s permanent powers, which enable him to remove the iniquity ([תִּנָּא אָנָּא]) of Israel’s donations to the sanctuary, are completely compatible with the priests’ function, which requires them to remove the iniquity ([תִּנָּא אָנָּא]) of the community by effecting purgation on its behalf with the purification offering.”89 My reading of Lev 16 shows that this removal results in the high priest carrying iniquity until Yom Kippur, when the goat for Azazel purges Aaron (Lev 16:10) of the iniquities, transgressions, all the sins of the Israelites (16:21–22) that Aaron has carried. Note the clear objectification of sin and iniquity in the ritual of Azazel’s goat who is said to bear away, quite literally, all the iniquities of the Israelites (again the phrase [תִּנָּא אָנָּא] is used, מַחֲסֶת אָנָּא אָנָּא אָנָּא אָנָּא אָנָּא אָנָּא) as he is sent out from the midst of the Israelites.

The work of Yitzhaq Feder, who examines the meaning of הָמוֹם as deriving from a social situation in which one needs “removal of culpability for bloodguilt,”90 is also instructive for this discussion of the objectification of guilt/sin. While I do not agree entirely with Feder’s analysis, it is both compelling and helpful in uncovering the

---

88 Translation from Milgrom (Leviticus 1–16, 623).
89 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 624.
origins of the objectification of guilt and how it is connected to blood, even blood as a cleanser. Feder argues the following:

[T]he original attested sense of רֵעַ is ‘to appease,’ a meaning that corresponds to רֵעַ in the sense of ‘propitiatory gift’ or ‘bribe.’ However, in the context of the blood feud, these forms were employed in the sense of ‘compensation,’ particularly רֵעַ in the sense of ‘ransom’ and רֵעַ in the senses ‘to compensate’ or ‘to expiate (guilt).’ In light of these observations, I will presently argue that cultic usages of רֵעַ and its appearances in abstract contexts that employ terms for sin as objects should be understood as originating in the usage of רֵעַ in these concrete situations.91

In the case of Gen 32:21 [Eng. 32:20] and Prov 16:14, Feder concludes that the sense of רֵעַ is to appease a rival.

Gen 32:21/ “And you [Jacob speaking to his servants] shall say, ‘Moreover, your servant, Jacob, is behind us.’” For he [Jacob] said (to himself), “I may appease him [רֵעַ] with the gift that is going before me. Afterwards, I will see his face. Perhaps, he will receive me graciously.”

Prov 16:14/ A king’s wrath is a messenger of death and a wise man will appease it [רֵעַ].

This same meaning of רֵעַ occurs in Num 17:11–13 [Eng. 16:46–47], where “the burning of incense quells God’s anger and brings him to spare the rest of the congregation.”92

Phineas’ killing of an Israelite man and Midianite woman in Num 25:11–1393 also fits into the appeasement category. In two places in Numbers, then, “Aaron’s and Phineas’

---

91 Feder, Blood Expiation, 170–71.
92 Feder, Blood Expiation, 173.
93 It is possible that this verse fits with the sacrificial understanding of רֵעַ, purge. Numbers 25:13 ends with the following, לֹא יִתֵּן חָכְרוּ הָעָם לֵאמֹר לָכֶם. However, if לֹא is amended to לֹא, then the verse can be understood to end with a promise, “because he [Phineas] was zealous for his God, he shall purge the Israelites.”
acts of pacifying the Deity on behalf of the people are expressed by the form יִגְדַּל ה' על ה. 94

Feder believes that these stories represent the earliest understanding of וְכִפֵּר, in which it is used in contexts of appeasement.

However, there is a transition that comes about through the concept of blood retribution, in which propitiation is replaced by expiation. Feder quotes C. Brown to describe the difference between propitiation and expiation:

In propitiation the action is directed towards God or some other offended person. The underlying purpose is to change God’s attitude from one of wrath to one of good-will and favour. In the case of expiation, on the other hand, the action is directed towards that which has caused the breakdown in the relationship. It is sometimes held that, while God is not personally angry with the sinner, the act of sin has initiated a train of events which can only be broken by some compensatory rite or act of reparation for the offence. In short, propitiation is directed towards the offended person, whereas expiation is concerned with nullifying the offensive act. 95

Feder examines three biblical passages, 2 Sam 21:3, Exod 21:30, Deut 21:8b. All three passages involve homicide and show the beginnings of the transition “in the usage of the verbal forms of וְכִפֵּר in the context of bloodguilt, from appeasement to compensation.” 96 In the case of Deut 21, the elders of a city in which a dead body is found must carry out a ritual (in the presence of the priests) with a cow in order to avert any negative consequences that may come upon the people on account of the spilled blood. The blood of a victim of murder had to be appeased for the sake of the Israelite

94 Feder, Blood Expiation, 173.
96 Feder, Blood Expiation, 178.
community in order to avert “the threat of famine and other forms of collective retribution.” While the other two passages that Feder examines, 2 Sam 21:3 and Exod 21:30, deal with compensation, and not propitiation (Feder’s point) or purgation/cleansing, this passage from Deuteronomy contains the notion of purgation and cleansing in the root רפ, which Feder does not note. This is particularly intriguing when one notes the presence of priests in this passage. Feder translates Deut 21:5–9 as follows:

Deut 21:5/ The priests, the sons of Levi shall approach, for YHWH, your God, has chosen them to serve him and bless in the name of YHWH, and according to their command shall be every dispute and injury.
Deut 21:6/ All of the elders of the city that is closest to the corpse shall wash their hands in the stream over the broken-neck cow.
Deut 21:7/ They shall recite, saying: ‘Our hands have not spilled this blood and our eyes have not seen it.
Deut 21:8/ Expiate (רנפ) for your people [דנש,], Israel, that you have redeemed, and do not place innocent blood amidst your people, Israel,’ and the bloodshed shall be expiated (רנפ).
Deut 21:9/ Thus you shall purge [רנפ] the innocent blood from your midst when you act properly in the eyes of YHWH.

Feder has opted for “expiate” as the best translation of רנפ here. The passage unquestionably has allusions to purgation as the inclusion of the root רנ, which Feder translates as “purge,” shows. רנ in 21:8 is quite clearly paired with רנ in 21:9 and the two should be understood as synonyms. Moreover, the hand-washing in 21:7 is clearly an exercise of cleansing/purgation of the stain/guilt of the blood that was shed. Feder

\[\text{Feder, Blood Expiation, 174.}\]
\[\text{Feder, Blood Expiation, 180.}\]
recognizes the aspects of cleaning only in passing as he notes that “the bloodstain is assumed to bring infertility” and thus “the blood of the victim is expunged from the land.”\(^9\) In v. 8, you could easily replace “expiate” with “purge.” In fact, with “purge,” the result of the ritual becomes much clearer. We can conclude, then, that expiation (not ransom or propitiation) is mixed with the notion of purgation.

Numbers 35:30–34 also attests to the notion of purgation in the context of bloodguilt. There is now a broad consensus that this passage comes from H.\(^{100}\) The key verses in this passage are 35:33–34, which Feder translates as follows:

Num 35:33/ You shall not incriminate [ים נֶאָרָה] the land in which you live, for blood incriminates [יִמַּטְפָּה] the land and no expiation [רְעֹשׁ] can be made for the land for the blood that was shed on it except by means of the blood of him who shed it.

Num 35:34/ You shall not pollute [יֵשַׁם] the land in which you live, in which I myself dwell, for I, YHWH, dwell among the Israelites.\(^{101}\)

Feder’s rendering of יֵשַׁם as “incriminate” instead of “pollute” in v. 33 is highly unusual. The following verse, v. 34, uses יֵשַׁם, unquestionably meaning “pollute,” to describe what happens to the land. This connection of יֵשַׁם and יָפַט not only affects the rendering

\(^9\) Feder, Blood Expiation, 181.

\(^{101}\) Feder, Blood Expiation, 185.
of הָעַל, but also חֲפָר in v. 33. If the land is “polluted” by the bloodshed, as אֵמָר and make clear, then the rendering of יָם (Pual imperfect, 3rd masculine singular) should also be adjusted. Feder is correct when he writes, “Neither ‘land’ nor ‘blood’ can be the subject of this verb [יָם]. Aside from the fact that ‘land’ is feminine, both terms are preceded by the preposition ‐ל, designating them as indirect objects.” However, as his translation shows, it is the land that receives that action of the verb יָם. It seems clear, then, that the land is “purged” of the blood that was shed on it. Here, interestingly, it is the blood of the murderer that purges the land of the stain. Blood cleanses the land. Like Deuteronomy 21:8–9, which connect הבש and הבש, these verses in Numbers connect bloodshed and purgation/cleansing, here with blood as both the substance that stains and the substance that purges. The shift from “propitiation” to “expiation” that Feder is tracing also includes an element of “expiation” as “purgation.” Feder has missed this important nuance to the idea of “expiation” as it moves away from the idea of “propitiation.”

Commenting on how these verses are distanced from appeasement or propitiation, Feder writes,

[T]his verse also hints at the folkloric notion of appeasing the blood, and by extension, the land. However, the passage deliberately uses the terminology of incrimination (לֶאָר) and pollution (אָמָר) to distance itself from this idea. Correspondingly, it employs the passive form יָם to shift the emphasis from the protagonists to the guilt objectified. Strikingly, this transition finds expression in

102 Feder, Blood Expiation, 185 n 72.
the impersonal construct with the passive form רעה. This unusual syntax conveys the impression that the expiation is a mechanical process, focusing attention on the objective state of the bloodguilt, which can only be compensated by means of the blood of the murderer (cf. Gen 9:6).

While Feder misses the connection to purgation, Feder does make an important point concerning the focus on the objectification of guilt. This is not always the case when P or H uses פָּרַע. When פָּרַע is used in instances where it is understood, with little controversy, as “to act as ransom,” the guilt is not objectified. This could be a situation where the community is in danger because of sinful actions and thus action needs to be taken to ransom the community from God’s wrath. This is the case in Num 17 [Eng. Num 16] and 25, discussed above, where Aaron and then Phineas take specific action that halts God’s wrath. The other situations in P or H where פָּרַע is understood as “to act as ransom” are less clear. Exodus 30:11–16 uses the term פָּרַע, “ransom,” as well as the expression לְכַפֵּר עֲשֵׂה, which is typically understood as “to ransom for our lives.” Exodus 30:11–16 involves the danger, specifically a plague, involved in taking a census. In this case, each person gives “half a shekel” as a פָּרַע, “ransom,” and this effectively averts a plague. Numbers 31:50 also contains the phrase לְכַפֵּר עֲשֵׂה, this time in reference to the items given to YHWH from the bounty taken from the Midianites with no mention of פָּרַע, and no mention of a punishment if the Israelites do not give bounty to

---

103 Feder, Blood Expiation, 185. Considering this verse and those surrounding it (9:1–7) have so much in common not only with this H passage in Numbers, but also with Lev 17:11 (both explain the importance of the relationship between blood and פָּרַע), I believe this verse is from H. Furthermore, considering my identification of the Gen 1 creation story as an H story, the obvious similarities between Gen 9:1–7 and Gen 1 also point to H authorship for Gen 9:1–7.
YHWH “to ransom your lives” נמיס רע ותעמלים. For the purposes of my work, it is not necessary to understand what exactly is happening in Exod 30:11–16 or Num 31:50. I only want to note that there is no objectified guilt and the context is not sacrificial. Thus here is something different than it is in contexts where guilt and sin are objectified (Num 35:33–34; Lev 4–5, Lev 16).

Throughout Lev 4:1–5:13, then, not only does the use of נמיס כל and the privative נמיס point to the offerer as the object purged, but the repeated use of the verb נמיס (4:13, 22, 27; 5:2, 3, 4, 5) strengthens my case that the offerer is purged of the guilt or sin that he carries on account of the wrong he has committed. The pairing of נמיס with נמיס נמיס in Lev 5:1–4 and again in Lev 5:17 shows definitively that the authors of Lev 4–5 viewed the consequence of an inadvertent sin to be the literal, substantive carrying of guilt/sin. As Feder shows, the situation of bloodguilt may have given rise to the nuance of נמיס as expiation, even purgation, instead of propitiation. As this transition took place, the guilt/sin for which expiation or purgation was needed, was objectified. Once guilt/sin was objectified, the sense of purging it, instead of propitiating for it, from wherever it had accumulated, began to take root. It is exactly this sense of sin/guilt and נמיס that is on display in Lev 4:1–5:13, as it is in Lev 16. However, in Lev 4:1–5:13, the grammar, syntax, and vocabulary (much of which is used in precisely the same way in Lev 16) point decisively to the purgation of the offerer from his sin/guilt.
4.6 Two Blood Rites

One of the signature elements of Lev 4:1–5:13 is the presence of two distinct blood rites: the inner-altar and the outer-altar purification rites. Similar but distinct blood rites are required based on the offerer. The Priestly authors of Lev 4:1–5:13 have utilized the basic blueprint of Lev 16, which has an offering in the sanctuary and an offering on the outer altar, as their model for the tafj offerings prescribed in Lev 4:1–5:13. Milgrom explains the basic differences between the two rites: “They differ in that in one the blood is daubed on the outer, sacrificial altar and its meat becomes the perquisite of the officiating priest (4:30; 6:19), and in the other the blood is daubed on the inner, incense altar and sprinkled before the [תָּרָכִּים], but the animal, except for its suet, is burned on the ash heap outside the camp (4:6–7, 11–12).”¹⁰⁴ The text gives no explanation for the necessity of the different tafj-offering rites. Milgrom’s theory of the two separate rites of Lev 4 is based on the severity of the sin and his theory includes the tafj-offering rites of Lev 16.

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 [תָּרָכִּים] 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 [תָּרָכִּים] blood on the inner altar and before the [תָּרָכִּים] blood (4:5–7, 16–18). (3) The wanton unrepented sin not only pollutes the outer altar and penetrates into the shrine

¹⁰⁴ Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 261.
¹⁰⁵ “Veil.” It is not clear to me why Milgrom does not translate תָּרָכִּים here.
but it pierces the veil and enters the adytum, housing the Ark and [הַרְשָׁעָה], the very throne of God (cf. Isa 37:16).

The advantage of Milgrom’s theory is its comprehensiveness. With his three-staged pollution, he is able to incorporate both Lev 4 and Lev 16. It is an attractive thesis.

Nonetheless, there are some problems with Milgrom’s schema.

The stain of the third category must affect not just the adytum, as the schema would suggest, but also the outer altar and, according to Milgrom, the shrine. Leviticus 16 unquestionably prescribes the purgation of the adytum and the outer altar. As Milgrom admits concerning his third category of sin above, “wanton unrepented sin not only pollutes the outer altar and penetrates into the shrine but it pierces the veil and enters the adytum....” Thus the sin that pollutes the adytum, pollutes almost everything. As it makes its way into the adytum, so to speak, it pollutes the outer altar and the shrine. However, if sins always behaved in this way, then the sin of the entire community/high priest would also pollute the outer altar as it heads into the shrine to the inner altar. This then would require the purging of both the outer altar and the inner altar if the intention of Lev 4:1–21 was indeed to purge sancta.

---

106 Milgrom chooses not to translate the Hebrew word הַרְשָׁעָה because he concludes that it is “untranslatable, so far” (Leviticus 1–16, 1014). He notes that “mercy seat/throne” or “cover” cannot be defended “either on etymological or on semantic grounds: the verb [רָכֶב] never implies mercy or cover, and the [רְשָׁעָה] never served an expiatory or covering function” (Leviticus 1–16, 1014).

107 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 257.

108 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 257.
An even more serious problem, however, is the lack of explicit mention of the inner altar in Lev 16. Milgrom concludes that the purgation of the inner altar is included in Lev 16:16b, which reads: מִקְטַבּ אֶל-לֹא מַטְחֶית. Milgrom renders this as: “and he shall do likewise for the Tent of Meeting....”\textsuperscript{109} Milgrom explains what this phrase connotes:

In other words, the shrine would 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 sevenfold sprinkling of the purgation blood on the shrine floor. Thus, “likewise” refers to the $1 + 7$ sequence (but in reverse order, versus b. Yoma 56b) employed in the adytum.... There is, however, no need to specify how the purgation of the incense altar takes place, for the procedure was already given in 4:6–7, 17–18.\textsuperscript{110}

Milgrom’s explanation highly speculative. Nihan questions whether the phrase in question from Lev 16:16b conveys that any rights were done in the Tent of Meeting.

“The wording rather suggests that the same rite serving to purify the inner-sanctum also serves to cleanse the outer-sanctum.”\textsuperscript{111} This is the safest conclusion, as it seems unlikely that the Priestly authors would leave up to speculation the rite performed within the sanctuary.

Furthermore, to do “likewise,” that is, to perform a blood rite like the one done in the Holy of Holies, would not involve placing blood on the horns of the inner altar.

No such rite was done in the Holy of Holies; blood was not placed on any item, but only sprinkled. Leviticus 16:14 twice contains the verb מָטָח in the Hiphil. Milgrom renders the

\textsuperscript{109} Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 1010.
\textsuperscript{110} Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 1034–35.
\textsuperscript{111} Christophe Nihan, From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus (FAT 2, Reihe 25; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 163 n 247.
verse as follows: “He shall take some of the blood of the bull and sprinkle it with his finger on the [כַּפֶּר] on its east side; and in front of the [נִשָּׁה] he shall sprinkle some of the blood with his finger seven times.”112 If the inner altar existed for the authors of Lev 16, the rite for the inner altar would have been the placing, not sprinkling, of blood upon its horns, followed by a seven-fold sprinkling upon it, as is described for the outer altar in Lev 16:18b–19a. Finally, Lev 16:17 clearly narrates that the only rites performed in the sanctuary (here referred to as the Tent of Meeting) are those performed in the adytum, described in Lev 16:14. Leviticus 16:17: “No one shall be in the Tent of Meeting when he goes in to effect purgation inside the adytum until he comes out. Thus he shall effect purgation on behalf of himself and his household and on behalf of the entire congregation of Israel.”113 The inner altar is nowhere to be found and it seems clear that no ritual acts except those narrated for the adytum occurred in the inner sanctum. Thus even if Milgrom’s schema on how sin affects the Tent of Meeting is correct, not only does Lev 4:1–5:13 not narrate the purgation of sancta, but Lev 16 and Lev 4:1–5:13 do not appear to be dealing with the same Tent of Meeting.

Exodus 30:10 does indeed indicate that the inner altar should be purged once a year, but we cannot and should not assume that Lev 16:16 should be read in light of this verse. Nihan believes that Exod 30:10 was added later because of the lack of a provision

112 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 1010.
113 Milgrom’s translation with my emendations in bold: נַעֲרָה וְקַשֵּׁת שָׁוֶא פֶתַחְיוֹן וְחַלָּמִים פֶתַחְיוֹן, “for himself and his household and for the entire congregation of Israel” (Leviticus 1–16, 1010).
for the purgation of the inner altar in Lev 16.\textsuperscript{114} Considering that Exod 30:10 is the only verse in Exodus that references Yom Kippur, it is certainly surprising that Lev 16 neglects to prescribe explicitly the one rite that Exodus demands be done on Yom Kippur.

Exod 30:10/ Once a year Aaron shall effect purgation upon its [the inner altar]\textsuperscript{115} horns with the blood of the purification offering of purgation; he shall purge it [the inner altar] once a year throughout your generations. It is most sacred to YHWH.

Surprisingly, although Milgrom thinks Lev 16:16 can and should be harmonized with Exod 30:10, he admits that Exod 30:10 must be a late editorial addition from H, the editor of P.\textsuperscript{116}

That the sanctuary's purgation is fixed as “once a year” (v 34 [of Lev 16]) implies that, heretofore, it occurred more than once a year. This deduction is buttressed by the only other verse in which the phrase occurs, appearing there not once but twice: “Once a year Aaron shall perform purgation on its horns with the blood of the purification offering of purgation; purgation shall be performed upon it once a year throughout the generations. It is most sacred to the Lord” (Exod 30:10). What is striking in this wording is not only the double mention of “once a year,” implying that this rite should not be performed more than once a year, but that this annual day is clearly identified with the one fixed in chap. 16 by its reference to the “purification offering of purgation [םְפָרֹתָה מְפָרֹת], that is, the purification offering whose blood performs [םְפָרֹת] (an abstract plural noun), which at once identifies the rite with the annual [יּוֹם מְפָרֹת] ‘Day of Purgation’ ([Lev] 23:27, 28;

\textsuperscript{114} Nihan, Priestly Torah to Pentateuch, 163.

\textsuperscript{115} There is no debate that the item in reference is the inner altar. The original reference to the inner altar is, however, in Exod 30:1.

\textsuperscript{116} Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 1063.
25:29) on which a [טפשתות] ‘a purification offering of purgation’ (Num 29:11) is employed—all the work of the Holiness Source.  

As is clear from my translation, I disagree with Milgrom’s rendering of the second half of the verse, specifically the Hebrew phrase טפשתות עליה. I agree that in the first half of the verse, the על in the phrase עטילל עליה should be translated as “upon,” (the full translation is “Aaron shall effect purgation upon its horns”). However, in the second half of the verse, Milgrom also translates טפשתות עליה as “effect purgation upon [emphasis mine] it [the inner altar].” Purgation of altars is always enacted upon the horns of the altar. Thus, while I generally think that עטילל is functionally equivalent to טפשתות, in the first half of the verse it cannot be so. However in the second half of the verse, עטילל is functionally equivalent to טפשתות, as it typically is. Were it not so, we end up with a translation like Milgrom’s, in which the object of purgation, clearly the altar (Milgrom and I agree on this), is never specified. As for Milgrom’s source-critical work, with which I agree, I do not understand why this source-critical analysis does not prevail in his understanding of Lev 16:16. Due to a number of unique terms in Lev 16:2–28, Milgrom also believes that these verses “must stem from an earlier source, which was only subsequently incorporated into P.” Such analysis provides all the more reason, then, to conclude that the original authors of this section knew nothing of the inner altar.

---

117 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 1061–62 (italics in original).
118 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 1061.
119 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 1063.
Nevertheless, there is a connection between the וַיִּצְאֵם sacrifices of Lev 16 and those of Lev 4:1–5:13. As I said above, the Priestly authors of Lev 4:1–5:13 have used the blueprint of two distinct purgation rites in Lev 16 as their model for the וַיִּצְאֵם sacrifices prescribed in Lev 4:1–5:13. They reserve entrance into the Holy of Holies for Yom Kippur out of respect for the provision of Lev 16:2. The Priestly authors do, however, make use of the inner altar within the sanctuary. The וַיִּצְאֵם sacrifices of Lev 4:1–21, which utilize the inner altar, would seem to contradict Exod 30:10, which explicitly calls for בָּשָׂר with the inner altar once a year. As we saw above, Nihan and Milgrom both believe that Exod 30:10 is a later edition and Milgrom believes it comes from H. Why would H or a later Priestly writer add a prescription that appears to contradict the וַיִּצְאֵם offering of Lev 4:1–5:13? My interpretation of the וַיִּצְאֵם offering of Lev 4:1–5:13 does not contradict the prescription of Exod 30:10. Exodus 30:10 stipulates the purgation of the inner altar once a year, while the וַיִּצְאֵם sacrifices that utilize the inner altar in Lev 4 do not purge the altar; they purge the offerer. The inner altar is purged once a year, in accordance with Exod 30:10 (but not prescribed in Lev 16), while offerers are periodically purged of their sins through blood manipulation upon the horns of the inner altar.

---

120 Moses is told that Aaron is not to enter the adytum freely. Interestingly, the text here does not stipulate that Aaron is to enter only once a year, which is another reason that many authors believe this text originally described an emergency procedure as opposed to a set annual event.
In my schema, there is no disagreement. However, in Milgrom’s schema there is no explanation for why the inner altar would be periodically purged, and also purged on Yom Kippur. Milgrom recognizes this problem and offers this explanation:

The incense altar was purged not just annually but every time the sanctuary was seriously polluted by the inadvertent sins of the high priest or the entire community (4:1–21). Why, then, does this text insist (twice) that the incense altar was purged only “once a year”? A solution suggests itself that though conjectural, fits all of the preceding data. The possibility exists that the purging of the incense altar, indeed, of the entire sanctuary became a frequent phenomenon. One must bear in mind that the purging of the sanctuary was occasioned only by an impending or existing catastrophe of national dimensions. Even the purging of the incense altar would be mandated only if the community as a whole (or the high priest himself) was found to be in error (4:3–21). Moreover, the probability exists, as will be shown below, that the purging of the sanctuary was accompanied by a nationwide call to observe a public fast in addition to other abstentions. … Thus if the high priests’ declarations of “emergency” occurred too often, they may have proved annoyingly troublesome to priests and people alike. And a movement to reform this abuse may have led to an edict that henceforth the sanctuary was not to be purged [יְפַסֻּקֵהַ], whenever “he (the high priest) chooses” but only “once a year.”

Milgrom is forced into some complicated reconstruction due to his schema. Does Milgrom mean to say that the prescription to purge the inner altar “once a year” annulled the possibility of the occasional offerings for the inadvertent sins of the high priest or the whole community, as described in Lev 4:1–21? It is not entirely clear, but I do not think this is Milgrom’s point. Rather, Milgrom thinks that the prescriptions of Yom Kippur were at one time carried out whenever the high priest thought it was necessary, but that this became burdensome to the people. Therefore, it became an

121 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 1062–63.
annual ceremony. This could be so, but it would not explain the disagreement between Exod 30:10 and Lev 4:1–21. Even when Yom Kippur becomes an annual event, there is still the possibility of a periodic cleaning of the inner altar following the prescriptions of Lev 4:1–21. This is a major weakness of Milgrom’s hypothesis.

4.7 The Relationship between the Sancta and the Israelites

We can now see how the utilization of the inner altar for the נֵזָר offerings described in Lev 4:1–21 does not conflict with Exod 30:10. However, what is still unclear is the use of the inner altar for inadvertent sins of the high priest or community (Lev 4:1–21) and the use of the outer altar for the inadvertent sin of a ruler or an ordinary person. It is understandable that the sins of the high priest or of the whole community are deemed more serious than those of an ordinary person. The sin of a chieftain (כָּפֵן), however, is put ritually on par with the sin of an ordinary person. This is a surprise.

Milgrom describes the chieftain as “the established leader of his clan,”122 as opposed to the leader of the entire Israelite people. Milgrom explains that the sin of an ordinary Israelite or a chieftain constitutes an individual sin, while the sin of the high priest or the whole community can be shown to constitute a single case (more on this below) of communal sin. “Brazen and unrepented offenses” penetrate the adytum where the ark is housed.123 Thus, the issue is really one in which communal sin is greater than individual

122 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 246.
123 See Figure 6 in Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 258.
sin. I still hold that the various parts of the sanctuary are soiled by the wrongdoings of the Israelites, even while these wrongdoings are also manifest as guilt/sin that the Israelite must carry. The various sancta are only purged of the stain of these sins once a year. Thus Milgrom’s schema of the more grave sins penetrating deeper into the sancta is attractive. It is not surprising that P would have a gradation of sin. Philip Jenson has written extensively about the various gradations of holiness in the Priestly literature. He expounds four dimensions that exhibit gradation: spatial, personal, ritual, and time.124 “According to P,” writes Jenson, “Israel consisted of a harmonious hierarchy of clans and tribes, priests and laity, leaders and followers. Role and responsibility in the cult depended primarily upon one’s place in the hierarchy, although active participation in the cult required the appropriate status of purity.”125 While the sacrifices of Lev 4:1–5:13 and Lev 16 undoubtedly demonstrate the existence of this hierarchy, they also subvert it, to some degree. As Milgrom points out, “The outer altar is polluted though the wrongdoer is outside the sacred compound, the shrine is polluted though, he, a nonpriest, may not even enter it and, finally, the adytum is polluted though no man, not even the priest, may enter…. Despite the fact that the Israelites have had no access, the

125 Jenson, Graded Holiness, 116.
sancta must be purged ‘of the impurities of the Israelites’ (16:16).”126 There is, then, a “doctrine of collective responsibility” along with the hierarchy.127

Milgrom’s hypothesis on the gradation of sins can be retained and affirmed under my schema. The offerer is purged at the place where his/her sin materializes. For the high priest or entire community, this happens at the inner altar. For the ruler or ordinary person, it is the outer altar. As for the more serious sins that penetrate the adytum, nothing can be done for the offender. The adytum can be purged once a year from the stain of these sins, but the offerer cannot be purged. However, the addition from H at the end of Lev 16 indicates the possibility that these persons too could be purged when the adytum was purged. Leviticus 16:30 claims that the Israelites are cleansed from all their (literally, “your”) sins (מִכָּל הָאָדָם). The penalty for the deliberate sinner was that he must carry his sin until Yom Kippur.

What is clear throughout Lev 4:1–5:13 is that the purgation of the offerer(s) through the סמך offering leads to forgiveness, not purity. In every case except the case of the anointed priest (4:3–12), forgiveness for the offerer(s) is specifically articulated (4:20, 26, 31, 35; 5:10, 13). As the addition from H makes clear in Lev 16:30, the rituals of Yom Kippur lead to the Israelites being declared pure. Thus a synchronic reading of the סמך offering, which involves three different authors (1. Lev 16:1–28; 2. Lev 4:1–5:13; 3. 126 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 258. 127 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 260.
Lev 16:29–34a), articulates a two-step purgation process, one that involves a movement from guilt-laden to being forgiven, (Lev 4:1–5:13) and from being forgiven to being pure (Lev 16; esp. 16:30). Gane also believes the Israelites undergo purgation in two phases. Gane concludes that offerers are purged by the חטא offerings of Lev 4:1–5:13 and he very nearly articulates that יִנְדָּק is functionally equivalent to חַטָּאת when he writes:

The phrase יִנְדָּק could serve as a reminder that something is removed only because it serves as the functional equivalent of a longer version of the formula in which נִנָּה carries a privative sense. It is the presence or implied presence of נִנָּה, not a difference between יִנְדָּק and חַטָּאת, that is the determining factor.128

Gane’s and my articulation of the use of the privative נִנָּה to mark the substances purged from persons or the sanctuary is certainly important, but it is not the determining factor. The functional equivalency of יִנְדָּק and חַטָּאת is the critical syntactical component, with or without the privative נִנָּה. Gane also misses the relationship between the Israelites and the sanctuary, which accounts for both the defilement of the sanctuary and the purgation of the Israelites. Instead, Gane surmises that “the [חַטָּאת] offering material as a whole, whether it consists of an animal or grain item, absorbs evil from the offerer, thereby purifying him/her.”129 The sacrificial item brought for a חַטָּאת offering, then, transfers the defilement from its offerer to the sanctuary. Gane’s principal evidence for the impurity of the carcass is Lev 16:27–28. These verses state that the person who disposes of the carcass of the חַטָּאת-bull and the חַטָּאת-goat outside the camp must wash

128 Gane, Cult and Character, 142.
129 Gane, Cult and Character, 176.
before returning to the camp. The text does not state explicitly that the carcasses are impure.

Leviticus 10:17, a text dealt with extensively in the next chapter, specifically and unequivocally states that the meat of the tafjoffering is most holy (ךֵּשֵׁת כְּשֵׁת). This accords with Lev 6:22 (Eng 6:29), where the tafjoffering is also called most holy (ךֵּשֵׁת כְּשֵׁת). How can meat laden with impurity be called most holy? Milgrom supposes that there is ambivalence surrounding the nature of the tafjoffering, mainly due to the fact that Lev 6:20–22 has very specific rules for handling items that come into contact with the tafjoffering. A garment bespattered with the blood of the tafjoffering must be washed in a holy place (6:20). An earthen vessel in which tafj-offering meat is boiled must be broken, presumably because of its porous nature. A bronze vessel in which the meat of the tafjoffering is boiled must be scoured and rinsed (6:21). But as Nihan points out, “The reason why garments or vessels touched by blood or the flesh of the tafj must be washed or destroyed (6:20–21) is not that they have become unclean, but reflects the necessity to avoid the propagation of holiness, i.e., to preserve the separation between profane and holy.” Even the disposal of the carcass of the tafjoffering in Lev 4:1–5:13 does not indicate that any part of it is impure or contaminated. Leviticus 4:12 (principally) and 4:21 discuss what happens to the parts of the animal not burned

---

130 Gane, Cult and Character, 178.
131 Milgrom, Leviticus I–16, 403.
132 Nihan, Priestly Torah to Pentateuch, 192.
on the altar. The meat of these sacrifices for the anointed priest (4:3) and the entire congregation (4:13) are not eaten but burned outside the camp in a pure place (חכמ), another indication that the meat is not impure. Milgrom, also relying principally on Lev 16:27–28, concludes that the ashes of the ashe tafj offering cause contamination. This verse is not conclusive, however, and the washings can be explained as Nihan does above, that is “the necessity to avoid the propagation of holiness, i.e., to preserve the separation between profane and holy.” Thus, while Gane and I agree on a two-stage process for the purification of the Isrelites, Gane’s theory for the way in which offerers are purged in Lev 4:1–5:13 is not supported by the text of Leviticus.

Beyond the various texts of Lev 1–16 that attest to the occasional cleansing of the offerer with the tafj offering, which in turn attests to the relationship the offerers have with the sancta, two other texts outside of P and H merit attention. Exodus 24:1–8 narrates the covenant ratification ceremony. The sources of the text are highly debated, but no one argues that it is a Priestly text, mainly because 24:5 has “young Israelite men” offering up the sacrifices, burnt offerings and well-being offerings. The only non-priest that the Priestly Source allows to offer sacrifices is Moses, who could have done so here but who instead sent “young Israelite men” to do so. Nevertheless,

---

133 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 1053.
134 Nihan, Priestly Torah to Pentateuch, 192.
the text suggests a relationship between the altar that Moses builds\textsuperscript{135} at the foot of Mount Sinai (Exod 24:4) and the Israelites.

Exod 24:6/ And Moses took half the blood and put [it] in the bowls, and half the blood he cast against the altar.
Exod 24:7/ And he took the Book of the Covenant and read [it] in the ears of people. And they said, “All that YHWH spoke we will do and heed.”
Exod 24:8/ Then Moses took the blood and sprinkled [it] upon the people and said, “See: the blood of the covenant that YHWH has cut with you according to all these words.”

Blood on the people and blood on the altar is principally understood as a warning.

Writes Propp,

In 24:8, sprinkling the people is as much as to say, “If you do not keep the Covenant, your blood is forfeit like this blood” (Saadiah \textit{apud} ibn Ezra). It follows that the blood sprinkled against the altar in v 6 constitutes [YHWH’s] own bleeding wound. He, too, must keep his promises (cf. Ehrlich 1969: 187); compare the divine fire that passes amid the severed animals in Gen 15:17 to seal [YHWH’s] vows to Abram.\textsuperscript{136}

From the perspective of the Priestly authors who may have known this text, the text also could have taught that blood on the altar is like blood on the people. Commenting on this text in Exod 24, William Gilders writes, “Blood from the animals is divided into two parts and applied in an identical manner to the altar and to the people. Clearly, an

\textsuperscript{135} As William Gilders points out, “Since P insists that there was no sacrificial cult until the Tabernacle and its appurtenances had been constructed and consecrated, and Aaron and his sons had been ordained as priests, it is unlikely that P would have assumed a sacrificially constituted covenant” (Blood Ritual in the Hebrew Bible: Meaning and Power [Baltimore: John Hopkins, 2004], 90).

existential relationship is established in this way between the altar and the people.”

That the people’s sins are manifest as stains on the altar is clear evidence that the Priestly authors did envision an analogy, if not an existential relationship, between the Israelites and the sancta.

Mary Douglas highlights the importance of analogical thinking for the Priestly writers: “The actions which Leviticus describes for sacrifice unfold in spatial and temporal sequences, lessons are given by analogies between one physical object and another.” More specifically, Douglas concludes, “[T]he body of the worshipper is made analogous to the sanctuary and the altar. Whatever will render the altar impure will do the same for the Israelite’s body.” Ellen Davis likewise sees the importance of analogical thinking in the Priestly work. In this case, Davis points out an analogy between the edible animals (also the principal animals for sacrifice) and the Israelite people. She attests further to the importance of analogical relationships in P when she alerts us to the following:

[There exists a] correspondence between two acts of divine creation: of the quadruped who brings up cud, and of the people Israel, whom God brings up from Egypt. Unlikely as it seems, the distinctive anatomy of the edible animal is held up as a reminder of God’s greatest action on behalf of Israel. The inclusio

137 Gilders, Blood Ritual, 41.
139 Douglas, Leviticus as Literature, 134.
140 Leviticus 11:3 states, “Every one that has a hoof and a split of hooves and brings up cud [יֶרְגַּת...]
And Lev 11:45 states, “I am YHWH, who brings you up [יָדָעָת] from the land of Egypt to be God to you, and you shall be holy, for I am holy.” Translations taken from Davis (Scripture, Culture, and Agriculture: An Agrarian Reading of the Bible [New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009], 96–97).
is witty yet not frivolous; it “digests” the essential message of Leviticus 11: eating meat – a rare enough event for most Israelites – is an occasion for Israel to practice covenantal faithfulness. God’s own covenant loyalty, [טט], of which the exodus is the outstanding example, is discernible also in the availability of meat.¹⁴¹

Exodus 24:8 appears to confirm that another ancient author believed in this relationship between the people and the altar and this idea may have influenced the theology of the Priestly authors. Intriguingly, Propp discusses a few verses from the Letter to the Hebrews in his discussion of the significance of Exod 24:

Heb 9:19–22 makes explicit the analogy to purification rites by attaching the cleansing agents of wool, water and hyssop (cf. Lev 14) to the doings at Sinai:
For when every command of the law had been declared by Moses to all the people, taking the blood of calves and goats, with water and scarlet wool and hyssop, he sprinkled both the [Covenant] document itself and all the people saying, ‘This is the blood of the covenant which God commanded you.’ And in this way he sprinkled with the blood both the Tent and all the vessels for worship. Indeed, under the law almost everything is purified with blood, and without blood-shedding there is no forgiveness.¹⁴²

As I will show in chapter five, which focuses on the discussion of Israelite sacrifice and the sacrifice of Jesus in the Letter to the Hebrews, the author of Hebrews too sees a relationship between the heavenly sanctuary and believers. Jesus’ offering of his blood in the heavenly sanctuary functions to cleanse his believers.

¹⁴¹ Davis, Scripture, Culture, and Agriculture, 97.
¹⁴² Propp, Exodus 19–40, 309.
The other text that makes a connection between the Israelites and the altar occurs in Jeremiah 17:1.

Jer 17:1/ The sin of Judah is inscribed with a stylus of iron, engraved with an adamant point on the tablet of their hearts and on the horns of the altar.¹⁴³

Feder concludes, “This verse lends striking expression to the metonymic scheme—explicated by Milgrom in relation to the sin-offering texts—in which the Israelite’s sins are projected onto the altar as a record of their transgression.”¹⁴⁴ Feder fails to note that the text also asserts that the sin of an Israelite also leaves a mark on the Israelite. The verse is better seen as attesting to the intimate relationship between the Israelites and the sanctuary; specifically, in this text, it is the horns of the altar, the parts of the altar on which tafj-offering blood is placed. Moreover, Jer 1:1 claims that the words of the book of Jeremiah come from a man who was “from the priests who were in Anatot in the land of Benjamin,” thus this verse represents a “priestly” (P or H) vision on the relationship between sin, the sinner, and the altar. And this vision is very similar to the relationship articulated through the sacrificial procedures of the tafj offering throughout Leviticus and the covenant ceremony narrated in Exod 24.

¹⁴³ Feder, Blood Expiation, 266.
¹⁴⁴ Feder, Blood Expiation, 266.
4.8 Proximity to YHWH

Omnipresent, yet rarely openly explicated, throughout Lev 1–16 is the presence of YHWH. For all of the specificity of ritual action, the importance of YHWH’s presence throughout the process should not be forgotten. These actions have no efficacy without the presence of YHWH. The purpose of the Tabernacle is for YHWH to dwell with his people (Exod 25:8; 29:45–46). The completion of the Tabernacle, announced in Exod 40:33, is immediately followed upon in Exod 40:34–35 by the notice of the indwelling of YHWH, the central purpose of the structure. The completion of the consecration of the priesthood and the Tabernacle is marked by a theophany of YHWH and YHWH’s miraculous consumption by fire of the offering on the altar (Lev 9:23–24). Throughout Lev 1–16, the reader is alerted to YHWH’s continued and necessary presence through the repeated appearance of the phrase לְפָנַי יְהֹוָה, “before YHWH,” which occurs forty-nine times (1:3, 5, 11; 3:1, 7, 12; 4:4, 6, 7, 15, 17, 18, 24; 5:26 [Eng 6:14]; 6:7 [Eng 6:14], 6:18 [Eng 6:25]; 7:30; 8:26, 27, 29; 9:2, 4, 5, 21, 24; 10:1, 2, 15, 17, 19; 12:7; 14:11, 12, 16, 18, 23, 24, 27, 29, 31; 15:14, 15, 30; 16:7, 10, 12, 13, 18, 30). While the phrase occurs in every chapter that includes any kind of sacrifice, the phrase is especially frequent in the chapters in which the verb לְפָנֵנִי is used in relation to the מִנָּהאָמָר offering (Lev 4, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16), including the chapters Lev 17–26 (17:11; 23:28).145 All told, including Lev 17 and 23, of

---

145 Leviticus 17:4 has the phrase לְפָנֵנִי יְהֹוָה מִנָּהָאָמָר, while 23:28 has יְהֹוָה מִנָּהָאָמָר (as well as 23:11, 20, 40). The phrase also occurs in 19:22; 24:3, 4, 6, 8 (so in 10 verses in Lev 17–26).
the fifty-nine occurrences of הָלַעְתֵּר יְהוָה, twenty-six occurrences appear in circumstances
that involve the הָלַעְתֵּר offering. As for the two most important chapters on the
offering in Leviticus, the phrase appears seven times in Lev 4 and six times in Lev 16,
accounting for more than twenty percent of the occurrences of this phrase in all of
Leviticus.

The necessity of YHWH’s presence does not negate the importance of procedure,
as the story of the deaths of Nadab and Abihu makes clear (Lev 10:1–3). Rather, the
consistent repetition of this phrase along with the very specific instructions of procedure
remind us of the complex relationship between human action and divine action. Both
the presence of YHWH and the prescribed ritual action appear necessary for the
effectiveness of the הָלַעְתֵּר offering. This complexity is reflected throughout the Priestly
material. There are very specific instructions for ordination, recurring sacrifices, Yom
Kippur, etc., and yet, it is made clear that the effectiveness of these rituals also depends
on YHWH, even though how exactly YHWH facilitates the proper result of the ritual is not
explicated. Exodus 29:43–46 is a case in point. At the end of an extended explanation
(Exod 28–29) of the procedure for the consecration/purgation of the altar and the
consecration/ordination/purgation of Aaron and his sons, Exod 29 concludes with these
three verses: 146

146 It is very difficult to make a distinction between ordination, consecration, and purgation, especially as it
pertains to Aaron and his sons. Throughout Exod 28–29 (and Exod 40) and Lev 8, ordination, annunciation,
and consecration all take place, but the ritual actions that accomplish each cannot be parsed. For example,
Exod 29:43/ I will meet with the Israelites there [the entrance of the Tent of Meeting] and it [the entrance of the Tent of Meeting] will be consecrated by my glory.
Exod 29:44/ I will consecrate the Tent of Meeting and the altar, and Aaron and his sons I will consecrate to act as priests for me.
Exod 29:45/ I will dwell in the midst of the Israelites and I will be their God.

Exod 28:3 asserts that Aaron’s vestments consecrate Aaron, while in Exod 40:13 Aaron is clothed in the vestments and anointed and thus consecrated. In Lev 8:12, Aaron’s consecration is attributed to his anointing: נָחַת (And he [Moses] anointed him [Aaron] to consecrate him). Exodus 28:41 contains all three actions (anoint, ordain, consecrate, in that order) as it explains how Aaron and his sons are to be dressed with the vestments, but this verse articulates that anointing, ordination, and consecration come after the girding of the vestments. Exodus 29:1 opens with נָחַת (And this is the thing that you shall do to them to consecrate them), and the chapter goes on to explain how Aaron and his sons are washed with water (29:4), Aaron is anointed with oil (29:7), and Aaron’s sons are girded with tunics and sashes (29:8–9). Lastly, three offerings are made. A bull for a sin offering (29:10–14) and a ram for a burnt offering (29:15–18) are prescribed, but the text gives no indication what these offerings accomplish, except that the burnt offering is “a pleasing odor” (_MOUNT). Finally, another ram is prescribed, and the blood of this ram is applied to the right earlobe, the right thumb, and the right big toe of Aaron and his sons (29:20). Some of the blood from the altar is mixed with the anointing oil and sprinkled on the vestments of Aaron and his sons (29:21). Parts of the animal (mostly fat, but also part of the liver and the two kidneys, and the right thigh) (29:22) and some baked goods (29:23) are placed in the hands of Aaron and his sons. They raise these items as a wave offering (29:24) and then the items are burned on the altar (29:25). The breast of the ram is then raised as well (29:26) and then the thigh and breast are consecrated (29:27), but no procedure for the consecration of this meat is described. Finally, the flesh of the ram (no parts are specified) is boiled and eaten (along with a basket of bread) by Aaron and his sons at the entrance of the Tent of Meeting (29:31–32). The flesh of the ram, which is said to have effected נַעֲמַת (one would think that the blood application to the right earlobe, thumb and big toe is the purgative action) for the priests (יהוה נַעֲמַת) in 29:33 (the syntax is very difficult, but I believe it is the priests that are “purged;” Lev 8:34 appears to confirm this), is eaten to ordain (יהוה נַעֲמַת) and consecrate (יהוה נַעֲמַת) Aaron and his sons.

Leviticus 8:18–34 narrates largely the same actions, except that in Lev 8:14–17 the bull of the sin offering, whose function is not made clear in Exod 29:10–14, is said to benefit the altar. It decontaminates the altar (יהוה נַעֲמַת) and consecrates it (יהוה נַעֲמַת נָחַת) by purging it (יהוה נַעֲמַת נָחַת). Lastly, as in Exodus, Lev 8:34 states that the seven-day ordination/anointing/consecration purges Aaron and his sons: נָחַת נַעֲמַת נָחַת (And he [Moses] anointed him [Aaron] to consecrate him). Milgrom translates the verse as follows: “Everything done today, the Lord has commanded to be done, to make atonement for you” (Leviticus 1–16, 494). I contend that should be rendered “to purge you.” Milgrom notes that it was not the purgation offering that was applied to Aaron and the priests, but rather the ram of ordination (יהוה נַעֲמַת נָחַת). Milgrom believes that purgation is only accomplished by the נאומך, which is never applied to persons (Leviticus 1–16, 541). I do not see this as sufficient reason to conclude that the text is saying something different than it does in other places when it uses the same construction. נאומך marks the item/person purged. Here, purgation is effected with the ordination ram, a special offering for a special occasion. As is clear (at least somewhat), consecration, ordination, and purgation are impossible to separate in Exod 28–29 (and Exod 40) and Lev 8.
So despite the abundance of ritual actions carried out by Moses for the purposes of the consecration of the sanctuary and the priests, here it is YHWH alone who accomplishes consecration. As was discussed in chapter one, the author of H consistently has YHWH’s speech in the first person, while the Priestly material avoids this construction. Thus, these verses likely are additions from the author of H, a conclusion that Israel Knohl affirms.147 The writers of the Holiness Code are more explicit than the Priestly writers about the tension between divine activity and human activity, but this tension nonetheless accords with the same tension implied within the Priestly literature with its repetition of לֶֽעַלְפֵּי יְהוָה.

Much is made of the blood rite associated with theuttonshare offering throughout Leviticus. While it is indeed a very important and unique feature of theuttonshare offering, it cannot be the most important or single essential component of theuttonshare offering. Leviticus 5:11–13 makes clear that blood manipulation is not always an essential part of theuttonshare offering. While the typicaluttonshare offering is an animal (a bull for inner altar offerings [Lev 4:1–21]; a male goat for a ruler [4:22–26]; a female goat [4:27–31] or a female sheep [4:32–35] or two turtledoves or pigeons [5:7–10] for an ordinary Israelite), in circumstances of significant poverty, an Israelite can be purged with a grain offering.

Lev 5:11/ And if his means do not suffice for two turtledoves or two pigeons, he shall bring as his offering for what he has done wrong a tenth of an ephah of

147 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 64–65.
semolina for a purification offering; he shall not put oil upon it or place frankincense on it, for it is a purification offering.
Lev 5:12/ He shall bring it to the priest, and the priest shall scoop out a handful as a token portion of it and turn it into smoke upon the altar, with YHWH’s food gifts; it is a purification offering.
Lev 5:13/ Thus the priest shall purge him because of his sin that he committed in any of these matters so that he may be forgiven. It shall belong to the priest, like the cereal offering.¹⁴⁸

Milgrom notes:

It may be no accident that in ancient Mesopotamia, flour was indeed used in the kuppuru rituals…. In the Šurpu ritual from Assur, the priest wipes off (ukappar) the patient with flour, which he throws into the fire, afterward sprinkling the patient with water. The priest then performs various acts of sympathetic magic, such as peeling an onion and ripping apart dates, matting, and wool, which are thrown into the fire; finally, the patient wipes himself off (ukappar; probably with flour) and then throws it into the fire….¹⁴⁹

In the Israelite ritual the flour never touches the person. Milgrom speculates then, that the flour was allowed as a concession to the poor due to “the regular and frequently attested use of flour [in Mesopotamian religion] as a kpr agent.”¹⁵⁰ Regardless of the reason, this text attests to the possibility of purgation without blood. However, the offerer still draws near to the altar and the offering, although bloodless, still makes contact with the altar. Furthermore, the similarities between this נָשָׁה offering of flour and the נָשָׁה offerings of animals is principally the burning of a portion of it on the altar and the consumption of part of the offering by the priest, an aspect of the נָשָׁה offering that will be discussed in the next chapter.

¹⁴⁸ As above, the translation is from Milgrom, with my emendations (Leviticus 1–16, 293).
¹⁴⁹ Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 306.
¹⁵⁰ Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 307.
Christian Eberhart discusses the burning of some portion of the_OFFERINGS offering upon the altar. Eberhart points to some very compelling features in connection to the burning of some parts of the OFFERINGS animal upon the altar. He writes:

In the law of the sin offering..., the regulations detailing pieces of the victim to be burned on the altar are just about as long as those that indicate where the victim’s blood must be applied. Furthermore, it is worth mentioning that the formula about atonement and forgiveness (Lev 4:20b, 26b, 31b, 35b) is repeated not after each description of the blood rite, but after the description of how each offering is to be burned on the altar (Lev 4:19–20a, 26a, 31a, 35a).

Eberhart also notes that the OFFERINGS offering is labeled an offering (נָשָׁolesale) in Lev 4:23, 28, 32 and 5:11. “The root בָּרָפָס describes a dynamic movement through sacred space toward the center of holiness,” writes Eberhart, “and thus an ‘approach’ to God. This movement reaches its climax in the burning, which marks the transformation of the material offered by the individual or community, and ‘transports’ it to heaven in the smoke ascending from the altar.”

Eberhart is not stressing the burning rite above all other parts of the ritual, but rather pointing out, rightfully, that the various actions as part of the ritual act should be considered. Eberhart writes, “I want to clarify that a sacrifice, being composed of several ritual acts, is always a multivalent process with various functions. As such, its blood application rites can, for example, effect purgation (atonement) of sancta and human beings.” However, what all of the various sacrificial acts have in common is

that they must be done in the presence of YHWH. This holds true for blood application, the burning on the altar, and the enjoying of the meat of some הַמֵּאָה offerings (to be discussed in the next chapter), which must be consumed in a holy place in the court of the Tent of Meeting.

4.9 Conclusion

The authors of the הַמֵּאָה offerings detailed in Lev 4:1–5:13 have used key grammatical and syntactical features, as well as theological and relational ideas, drawn from the description of the הַמֵּאָה offerings in Lev 16. In chapter two, I showed that Lev 16:1–28 uses הָמַּכַר and הָמַּכַּר as functional equivalents. Furthermore, the identification of the privative, not causative, נָמָצַּא following the הָמַּכַר-phrase throughout Lev 16, strengthened my conclusion of the functional equivalency of הָמַּכַר and הָמַּכַּר. These same features appear throughout Lev 4:1–5:13, further attesting to the validity of my analysis in Lev 16. In Lev 4:1–5:13, the offerer of the הַמֵּאָה offering is marked by הָמַּכַר as the object being purged of (privative בֶּן) the sin/guilt the offerer is carrying. The verb הָמַּכַּר, at times in conjunction with the idiom מַעַּן נָא, is used consistently throughout Lev 4:1–5:13 to indicate that the offerer is carrying guilt/sin as a result of having inadvertently committed wrongdoing. This reading of הָמַּכַּר was strengthened by Feder’s analysis of the development of the verb הָמַּכַּר from a meaning of “to propitiate,” in earlier settings, to a meaning of “to expiate” or similarly “to purge.” This shift was accompanied by an objectification of the guilt that needed “to be expiated/purged.” As
Lev 16 indicated, the Israelite and the sanctuary, especially the altars of the sanctuary, are in a reciprocal relationship. The sin of the Israelite can stain the sanctuary and the sanctuary, through sacrifice offered within it and on parts of it, can purge the Israelite of his/her sin. Underlying all of this is the continued and necessary presence of YHWH in the Tabernacle. These ritual relationships and procedures rely on and must be realized in the presence of YHWH.
5. כפר in Leviticus 17 and Leviticus 10

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, my work will concentrate on two more texts in Leviticus on the כפר offering and the verb כפר. Leviticus 17:11, a text in the Holiness Code, gives a rationale for how blood on the altar can effect כפר for the offerer. As always, the best translation and understanding of כפר is difficult and thus the exact intention of the rationale is debated. Nonetheless, textual evidence will show that Lev 17:11 supports my understanding of the function of the כפר offering in Lev 4:1–5:13. The use of the כפר marks the object of purgation, which here in Lev 17:11 is the כפר of the offerer. In this way then, the author of H is not contradicting Lev 4:1–5:13 (or Lev 16, which contains interpolations from H) but instead is further specifying what part of the offerer needs purgation. For the author of H, it is the כפר of the offerer that is in need of purgation. I will argue that כפר should not be understood as “soul” (that is, something separate from the body), but that “spirit,” as in the “animating force of a creature,” is a better translation.1 Because YHWH, persons, and sacrificial animals have a כפר, and because blood contains the כפר, the blood of sacrificial animals manipulated in the Tent of Meeting can purge the כפר of the offerer.

---

The other text I will discuss below is Lev 10:17. This verse follows the narration of the consecration of the Tent of Meeting, the priesthood, and a variety of sacrifices, including the מזונות הפתיע offerings for the people and for Aaron (Lev 8–9). It also comes after the deaths of Aaron’s sons in Lev 10:1–3. All of this context is important as we try to understand Lev 10:17, in which Moses states that when the priests eat the outer-altar מזונות הפתיע offerings in the sacred area they “remove the iniquity of the community to purge them.” Various texts in Leviticus 1–16 show that the מזונות הפתיע-offering meat is not tainted and thus the eating of it is not an elimination rite. In fact, almost the opposite is the case: Eating the meat, which is holy, is to be enjoyed. It is a joyous occasion, which is exactly why Aaron did not want to carry through with it after the death of his sons. Finally, the holy meat is to be enjoyed in a holy place and “before YHWH.” Thus the presence of YHWH is a necessary element of this consumption for purgation.

5.1.1 Translating Lev 17:11

Lev 17:11 (My translation)/ For the spirit of the flesh is in the blood, and I have placed it for you upon the altar to purge your spirits; for it is the blood that purges by means of the spirit.

Lev 17:11 (Milgrom’s translation, which Schwartz, who does not offer a full translation of the verse, appears to affirm2)/ For the life of the flesh is in the

---

blood, and I have assigned it to you on the altar to ransom your lives; for it is the blood that ransoms by means of life.³

Lev 17:11 (Jay Sklar’s translation)/ For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I myself have bestowed it to you upon the altar to ransom your lives, for it is the blood that ransoms by means of/as the life.⁴

5.1.1.1 Understanding the Preposition ב in Lev 17:11

The preposition ב appears twice in this verse, and both appearances are crucial for understanding the verse correctly. There is broad consensus that the ב on בדם in the second half of Lev 17:11 is an instrumental beth;⁵ that is, blood purges ‘by means of’ the בדם. This reading suggests that although blood and בדם are intimately connected, they are not one and the same. This relationship between blood and בדם is confirmed in the first half of the verse when another ב, here on בד, reiterates the separate existence of בדם. Milgrom translates the phrase, נפש בדם התאו מדם, as ‘For the life of the flesh is in the blood…’⁶ Despite a translation that renders the ב as locative, Milgrom views it as a beth essentiae and explains that ‘it can be assumed that once life (breath) became equated with [בדם] (throat), it became inevitable that a similar equation would develop between

---

⁴ Jay Sklar, Sin, Impurity, Sacrifice, Atonement The Priestly Conceptions (Hebrew Bible Monographs 2; Sheffield, England: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2005), 173
⁶ Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, 1448.
and blood, the other life-containing organ.”⁷ For Milgrom, however, the blood-as-life equation (which reading the ב in the phrase בּּוּנַא פַּסְלָה יְהוָה in Lev 17:11 as a *beth essentiae* makes possible) is essential to his understanding of impurity and the function of the blood of the *תַּנְדַר* offering as a cleanser. “Impurity…is the realm of death… Only its antonym, life, can be its antidote. Blood, then, *as life* is what purges the sanctuary. It nullifies, overpowers, and absorbs the Israelites’ impurities that adhere to the sanctuary, thereby allowing the divine presence to remain and Israel to survive.”⁸

The various impurities are symptomatic of death, and YHWH is a God of life. Thus these impurities are opposed to the nature of YHWH and must be eradicated through ritual. For Milgrom, it is the equation of blood and life that explains how blood acts as a ritual cleanser.

Schwartz also translates the ב on בּּוּנַא as *locative* when he writes, “All three nouns—בּּוּנַא, בּּר, בּּד—possess the definite article, since they are generics, and the *beth* in בּּוּנַא means ‘in’, literally, ‘contained’.”⁹ However in the footnote to this sentence, Schwartz indicates that he reads the ב as a “*beth essentiae*, in this case functioning as a copula: ‘the life of the flesh *is* the blood’…”¹⁰ Schwartz explains the use of the *beth essentiae* in this way: “The point is not that blood *is* life, or that there is life-force, as a

---

⁷ Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17–22, 1472.  
⁹ Schwartz, “Blood in Leviticus 17,” 49. Sklar translates the ב on בּּוּנַא as *locative*, but in a footnote he states that it might be a *beth essentiae* (*Sin, Impurity, Sacrifice*, 166 n 9).  
force distinct from the body itself, in blood per se. The point is simply that when blood is gone, there is no life.”

Schwartz is defying logic by not equating blood and life and yet labeling the ב as a beth essentiae. While it is true that בshould not be understood as something that can exist outside the body, it is clearly understood here as a distinct entity within blood. Schwartz lists six other passages in which בfollows the verb מזר (Exod 29:33; Num 5:8; 35:33; 1 Sam 3:14; Isa 27:9; Prov 16:6).

While the בon הד in Lev 17:11a does not follow the verb מזר, the significance of the phrase, מזר, is dictated by the verb מזר (just as the second phrase with ב, מזר, is explained by the verb מזר that follows it. Two of the cases listed by Schwartz come from H (Num 5:8; 35:33) and one comes from P (Exod 29:33), thus I will concentrate on these three cases.

Exod 29:33/ They shall eat them [flesh of ram of ordination and bread] with which purgation is effected to fill their hand to consecrate them. But a foreigner shall not eat (them) for they [flesh and bread] are holy.

Num 5:8/ If the person has no redeemer to whom to bring the reparation, the reparation being brought goes to the Lord, that is, to the priest, separate from the ram of purgation with which he shall purge him.

Num 35:33/ For it is the blood that pollutes the land, and as for the land, it will not be purged for the blood that was shed on it except by the blood of the one who shed it.

In all three cases, the noun modified by the ב (all three are *instrumental beths*) is clearly an object with its own distinct existence (meat and bread in Exod 29:33; ram of atonement in Num 5:8; land in Num 35:33). The ב on הב in Lev 17:11a can only articulate that הב (blood) and הנש (spirit) are two distinct realities if the ב is understood as a *locative beth* and not a *beth essentiae*.

Lastly, the verse does not make good sense with a *beth essentiae* on הב and then a *beth instrumental* on הנש. If blood and הנש are one and the same, as the *beth essentiae* would render them, there would be no need to have the phrase הנש in the second half of the verse (כִּפְרֵי הָאָדָם נָשׁ). It could simply state, “For it is the blood that purges,” as opposed to “For it is the blood, by means of the spirit, that purges.” Clearly then, in the two prepositional phrases in Lev 17:11 where הנש is discussed, the use of the *beth locative* and *beth instrumental* demonstrates that the author believes that הנש is in the blood, yet still distinct from the blood.

5.1.2 כפר as “ransom” in Lev 17:11

The author of Lev 17:11 has not made it clear to which sacrifice or sacrifices this rationale applies. Milgrom argues that Lev 17:11 only applies to the שלמים offering. On
the face of it, this is a rather odd conclusion, since the שלמה offering is the only sacrifice in Leviticus that is never said to effect בֵּיתֵם. However, Leviticus 17:5 explicitly references the שלמה offering as it speaks of contexts in which an Israelite slaughters an animal for meat from among those used for sacrifice. Leviticus 17:10 begins a discussion on the prohibition against eating blood. Only the שלמה offering was eaten by Israelites, thus Milgrom thinks only the שלמה is in view in Lev 17:11. However in Lev 17:8, the author specifically mentions the שלמה offering.

In Milgrom’s translation, he adds “well-being” in parenthesis before “offering” due to the fact that כל (simply “offering”) can be shorthand for the שלמה offering. However in Lev 17:5 the author uses בֵּית (פַּרְשֵׁי) שלמה, “sacrifices of well-being,” thus showing a willingness to use the full phrase. Furthermore, Milgrom concludes that the phrase בֵּית שלמה is most likely “a merism for all the sacrifices.” Thus even in Milgrom’s understanding, we have an alert from the writer of Lev 17 that what follows after Lev 17:8 could apply to any sacrifice.

---

Leviticus 17:10 begins a general discussion of the prohibition against eating blood, not simply a discussion against eating the blood of sacrificial animals. Leviticus 17:13 includes animals or birds that might be hunted, and thus were not among those that could be brought as a sacrifice. Leviticus 17:15 discusses what is to be done with carrion. What begins in Lev 17:10, then, does not apply only to sacrificial animals and cannot be applied only to the šélámi offering. Instead, Lev 17:10–15 is split principally between what is to be done with the blood of sacrificial animals (17:10–12), and what is to be done with the blood of non-sacrificial animals (17:13–16). The blood of sacrificial animals is handled at the altar (17:11), while the blood of non-sacrificial animals is poured out on the ground and covered (17:13). Leviticus 17:15–16 permits the eating of carrion and assumes that some blood will be consumed, thus defiling the person who consumes it and requiring bathing to rid the person of the defilement. Schwartz concurs with this basic structure, explaining that because the general rule for the prohibition of the ingestion of blood in Lev 17:10–12 speaks of the blood of sacrificial animals, the author need not devote a separate verse or two on the blood of sacrificial animals as he does for hunted animals (Lev 17:13–14) and carrion (Lev 17:15–16).15

15 Schwartz, “Blood in Leviticus 17,” 41–42. On Lev 17:15–16, Schwartz explains, “This situation—the eating of carrion—arises in the wake of the previous two paragraphs that deal with the prohibition of ingesting blood. The fifth paragraph is an exception to this absolute prohibition, standing in contrast to what precedes it. It opens with a contrastive waw; this is not a new law but a continuation, a subcategory of the two preceding paragraphs” (“Blood in Leviticus 17,” 40–41).
Milgrom’s analysis is more fundamentally flawed than simply his assertion that this verse applies only to the מֵרֶיחַ offering. Milgrom argues that it is a capital offense to take the life of an animal, even when offering a sacrifice. Leviticus 17:4 does assert that it is a capital offense to slaughter a sacrificial animal away from the Tabernacle. Milgrom postulates that the same is true for sacrificial slaughter, but that the manipulation of blood at the altar atones for the killing of the animal.\textsuperscript{16} Thus, Lev 17:4 and Lev 17:11 must be read together to make sense of the rationale of 17:11. Milgrom, along with most commentators, reads 17:11 as saying that the life contained in the blood ransoms (כָּפָן) for (צָעִיר) the life of the offerer. The life of the offerer, which becomes forfeit on account of the murder of the sacrificial animal, is spared through the placing of blood on the altar.

Against Milgrom, Schwartz rightly points out the inconsistency, and even absurdity, of any argument that claims that the act of sacrifice at the Tabernacle could be a capital crime.

Milgrom and Levine both postulate that every time a man makes a sacrifice he commits a capital crime, and must atone for it immediately by means of blood. According to Milgrom the sin involved is that of slaughtering the animal itself, the very ‘murder’ spoken of in v. 4. The problem with this is that v. 4 proclaims killing an animal to be tantamount to murder only if it is done outside of the tabernacle; if performed inside the tabernacle it is a perfectly lawful act. According to Milgrom’s reading, our verse would make it a capital offense in all cases, and one which requires כָּפָן. According to Levine, the capital crime is the simple act of daring to approach the deity, whose wrath is known to be unstable. This too is problematic, its basic premise is foreign to the priestly view of sacrifice. Indeed the very notion that sacrifice can be intrinsically sinful, that one

\textsuperscript{16} Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 711.
cannot sacrifice to God without becoming, at least momentarily, guilty of a capital crime, is entirely foreign to Priestly thought.\(^{17}\)

Nowhere does the Priestly literature give any indication that bringing a prescribed offering, no matter what kind, constitutes a crime. It is counterintuitive for YHWH to command sacrifice if it results in the offerer committing a capital crime. Milgrom’s reading of Lev 17:11 must be rejected.

Despite this, Schwartz views the verse only slightly differently than does Milgrom. The presence of two other passages in which the phrase חָפֵן נָפֵל occurs—Exod 30:12,\(^{18}\) 15-16 and Num 31:50—confirms in Schwartz’s mind that “ransom/act as ransom” is the proper understanding of חָפֵן in Lev 17:11. Schwartz explains how the root חָפֵן can be understood as “act as ransom,” as opposed to “purge.” “It is clear” writes Schwartz, “that there are passages in the Bible, both cultic and non-cultic, both priestly and non-priestly, in which חָפֵן is a denominative verb, derived from the noun חֲפַר ‘ransom’, ‘payment’, and means ‘to serve as ransom for’ or ‘to be a payment in place


\(^{18}\) Exodus 30:12 contains the crucial phrase, חָפֵן נָפֵל. The presence of this phrase in v. 12 confirms the reading of חָפֵן נָפֵל in both v. 15 and v. 16 as “to act as ransom for your lives.” Therefore, the occurrence of the same phrase in Lev 17:11 leads Schwartz (“Blood in Leviticus 17,” 55 n 1), Milgrom (Leviticus 17–22, 1474), Baruch Levine (In the Presence of the Lord: A Study of Cult and Some Cultic Terms in Ancient Israel [Brill: Leiden, 1974], 67–68), and others to translate חָפֵן similarly here.

\(^{19}\) These are the only cases of חָפֵן as “act as ransom” in a cultic (but non-sacrificial) setting. In a non-cultic setting, Schwartz believes only 2 Sam 21:3 applies. Other passages identified as possibilities, but ultimately rejected by Schwartz are Isa 47:11; Gen 32:20; Num 25:13; 35:31; Jer 18:23 (“Blood in Leviticus 17,” 52 n 1). The root חָפֵן with the meaning “act as ransom” is thus not widespread in the Hebrew Bible.
of."  

Schwartz does not believe נפש and כפר are “etymologically and/or semantically related with each other,” but rather are “unrelated homographs.” Schwartz concludes that Lev 17:11 articulates a unique vision of atonement that applies to any sacrifice that is said to effect כפר, that is, the שמה, the ותא, and the שומן offerings:

[T]his verse advances a theory unattested elsewhere in P or anywhere else in the Torah: that ‘atonement’, i.e. כפר, is not a matter of purifying the sancta from the contamination generated by sin or physical conditions, nor is it a matter of casting off sin and sending it away, but rather a matter of redeeming oneself from extreme culpability before God: redeeming one’s life. What enables this passage to make this statement is the existence of an alternative meaning for the verb כפר and the existence of the verbal expression קיסר על כפר. The passage is reflective and interpretive: it puts forth a new theory of what sacrificial ‘atonement’ is and how it works, not a theory of why one needs it.

Schwartz’s reading presents its own unique problems. For one, Lev 24:18 states that no ransom is acceptable for animal life; the exchange must be equal, żeby נפשות. Furthermore, Num 35:31–34, which Schwartz and I believe is also from H, makes it clear that in the case of the murder of a human, no ransom is acceptable. The murderer must be killed. Nothing else will suffice. Thus YHWH is breaking his own rule by

---

20 Schwartz, “Blood in Leviticus 17,” 52. Schwartz lists the following verses as places where כפר means “to serve as ransom for”: Exod 30:12–16; Num 8:19; 2 Sam 21:3 (“Blood in Leviticus 17,” 52 n 1).
22 Schwartz uses the word “atonement,” by which he means the action of כפר, which here in Lev 17:11 Schwartz believes to be “act as ransom” while in all other cases in P or H it means “purge” (“Blood of Leviticus,” 59).
23 Schwartz believes that this is the role of the ‘scapegoat’ (his term) of Lev 16:8, 21–22.
accepting the blood of an animal as ransom for the life of the human offerer. Most importantly, Schwartz also has no answer for why the offerer’s life is on the line. In the quotation above, Schwartz concludes that the passage simply does not explain why an Israelite’s life would be in need of ransom. Perhaps this is not the correct reading of Lev 17:11. Schwartz does not consider this possibility, but I will do so below.

Jay Sklar argues that every occurrence of רַעֲפִיָּכַּה carries with it two meanings, “purge” and “ransom,” a conclusion which Schwartz refutes, as he concludes that רַעֲפִיָּכַּה and רַעֲפָא are “unrelated homographs.” However, Sklar agrees with Schwartz’s and Milgrom’s translation of רַעֲפִיָּכַּה in Lev 17:11, which clearly contradicts his proposal that the verb רַעֲפִיָּכַּה always signifies “ransom” and “purge.” With a translation of “to ransom,” the concept of purgation becomes impossible to perceive in Lev 17:11. The problem does not go unnoticed by Sklar and he responds in this way:

It may be asked: If רַעֲפִיָּכַּה refers primarily to ‘ransom’ in Lev. 17.11, does this not undermine the thesis that it refers to both ransom and purgation elsewhere? By no means. As noted above in Chapter 5, the emphasis of רַעֲפִיָּכַּה in some contexts (such as those addressing inadvertent sin [Chapter 3]) is upon ransom (רַעֲפָא), while the emphasis in other contexts (such as those addressing major impurity [chapter 4]) is upon purgation. The emphasis of Lev. 17.11 is in keeping with the former of these. In either context, however, it was seen that the end point of sin and impurity is the same: both endanger (requiring ransom) and both pollute (requiring purgation). As a result, it is not simply רַעֲפָא that is needed in some

---

28 “The passage is non-specific; neither murder nor a sexual offense, nor any of the other capital crimes in Priestly literature, is mentioned, and indeed none is intended, since the idea that man can escape the capital punishment of the human court by offering a sacrifice is preposterous in the priestly system” (“Blood in Leviticus 17,” 58).
instances and purgation that is needed in others, but ṭĕḇāḏ-purgation that is needed in both. In short, due to the similar ending points of sin and impurity, even when the emphasis is upon ransom (rRpO;k), it is a purifying ransom that is in view, and even when the emphasis is upon purgation, it is a ransoming-purgation that is in view. The verb that describes this dual event is ṭRpI;k, and the ability of the ṭRpI;k-rite to accomplish this dual event is due to the blood of the sacrifice which both ransoms and purifies.30

Sklar has answered this challenge as best he can so long as he desires to fit Lev 17:11 into his hypothesis about the dual meaning of ṭĕḇē. However, it is not so much that Lev 17:11 emphasizes “ransom” over “purge” as that it only emphasizes “ransom,” as Sklar, Milgrom, and Schwartz read it. While Sklar does not argue convincingly for the notion of “purge” in Lev 17:11, I will. Where Sklar has gone awry is in adopting the notion of “ransom” at all for ṭĕḇē in sacrificial settings. The meaning of “purge/effect purgation” for ṭĕḇē, at least in relation to the ṭaḇaḥ offering, is the only sure meaning in P, and I submit that H is not opting for a different meaning of ṭĕḇē in sacrificial settings. Rather, reflecting the later development in P (Lev 4:1–5:13), in which a ṭaḇaḥ offering purges the offerer, Lev 17:11 is specifying what part of the offerer, his/her ṭĕḇē, is purged.

5.1.2.1 Excursus 1: Hartmut Gese and Bernd Janowski on Lev 17:11

The work of Hartmut Gese and Bernd Janowski31 on the ṭaḇaḥ offering and the root ṭĕḇē is derived largely from their understanding of Lev 17:11. While their work is significant, their largely symbolic understanding of ṭĕḇē has not found many

30 Sklar, Sin, Impurity, Sacrifice, 182.
31 Gese served as Janowski’s dissertation supervisor.
proponents. Nihan, for example, utilizes Janowski’s (principally, but Gese’s as well) work much more than any of the other scholars of sacrifice in Leviticus, but even he rejects their work on בְּדֵד, blood, and Lev 17:11 with a couple of sentences and one footnote. For this reason, I have opted to include their work in an excursus and not as a part of the main body.

In the opinion of both Gese and Janowski, the hand-leaning and the blood ritual are the two key elements of the נָעַמה offering. They draw their ideas about the significance of the hand-leaning ritual largely from Lev 1:4b, as do most scholars. The consensus, discussed in chapter two, is that the hand-leaning simply signifies ownership. Gese and Janowski, however, assert that the hand-leaning gesture serves as an identification of the offerer with his sacrifice animal. This identification involves a “total substitutionary commitment of a life.” Janowski explains:

Das aber bedeutet: Weil der Opfernde durch das Aufstemmen seiner Hand auf das Opftier an dessen Tod realiter partizipiert, indem er sich durch diesen symbolischen Gestus mit dem sterbenden Tier identifiziert, geht es im Tod des Opftieres weder um dessen auf die satisfactio vicaria des Sünders zielende Straftötung noch um die Beseitigung oder Vernichtung des Tieres als eines rituellen Sündenträgers, sondern um den eigenen, von dem sterbenden Opftier stellvertretend übernommenen Tod des Sünders. Darum ist das Wesentliche bei der kultischen Stellvertretung nicht die Übertragung, die <<Abwälzung>> der

---

32 Nihan, From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch, 176, 176 n 294.
34 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 152; Gane, Cult and Character, 245.
Once this identification with the animal has taken place, the next crucial action is the blood manipulation. Through contact with the altar, blood, which contains the נפש ("life/soul" for Gese and Janowski) of the animal (associated now with the offerer through the hand-leaning gesture), brings the life of the offerer into contact with the holy. In this way, the life of the offerer is symbolically, but truly, given over to the sanctuary. Gese explains the significance of נפש in atonement:

The identification of the נפש of the one making the offering with the sacrificial animal is presupposed (we saw that it is effected by the laying on of hands), and through the shedding of the animal’s blood the life of the person who brings the sacrifice is symbolically offered up. The decisive factor for the cultic act of atonement is that this sacrifice of life is not a mere killing, a sending of life into nothingness, but it is a surrender of life to what is holy, and at the same time an incorporation into the holy, given expression throughout contact with blood. By means of the atoning rites in which blood is applied, the נפש is dedicated to and “incorporated into” the holy.

36 “This means, however: the offerer, through the leaning of his hand upon the sacrificial animal, participates in the reality of its death. By identifying himself through this gesture with the dying animal, the death of the sacrifice animal is not about killing as punishment with the aim of satisfactio vicaria of the sinner, nor is it about the elimination or annihilation of the animal as a ritual porter of sins. Instead, it is about the proper death of the sinner which the dying sacrificial animal took over vicariously. Therefore the essential aspect in this cultic vicarious act is not the transfer, the “shifting” of the materia peccans onto a ritual carrier of disgrace and its eventual elimination, but the giving of the life of the homo peccator, symbolically realized in the death of the sacrifice animal, into which the sinner is included by identifying himself with this living being by leaning his hand upon it” (Janowski, Sühne als Heilsgeschehen, 220–21).
38 Janowski, Sühne als Heilsgeschehen, 241.
Against Milgrom, then, Gese and Janowski do not believe that purgation is the proper understanding of the function of the ta'af'offering:

Selbstverständlich ist kultische Sühne auch Beseitigung der Sünde, sie ist es aber nicht deshalb, weil das Heiligtum ‘rituell gesäubert’, ‘gereinigt’ wird, sondern deshalb, weil durch die Applikation des ta[DÚfAj]-Blutes an Altar und Heiligtum eine stellvertretende Lebens-hingabe vollzogen wird, durch die der Sünde-Unheil-Zusammenhang aufgehoben wird....

Sin elimination certainly occurs but not through purgation of the sanctuary or even the person, but because the life of the offerer is vicariously given over to the holy.

Gese and Janowski understand ra[Rp;Ik as deriving from ra[Rp;Ok and always having the sense of “to make atonement” in cultic contexts throughout Leviticus. For Gese and Janowski, however, there is also a consecratory aspect to the ta'af'offering. Through contact with the holy, by means of the blood, the “damaged being is reconsecrated and healed.” Likewise, Janowski concludes that P understands atonement for humans as an act of consecration by which the blood is given to the sanctuary:

Indem die Priesterschrift den Vorgang der Entsühnung von Menschen auf diese Weise, d.h. unter der Aufnahme und weiterer Differenzierung der Blutriten, wesentlich von der Altar- und Heiligtumsweihe her bestimmt, hat sie das kultische Sühnegeschehen primär als einen Akt der Weihung verstanden, durch den

---

40 “Cultic atonement is certainly also sin elimination, but it is this not because of the ritual purging and purification of the sanctuary, but rather because the application of ta[DÚfAj-blood to the altar and sanctuary of the vicarious life-gift abolishes the sin-disgrace relationship” (Sühne als Heilsgeschehen, 241–42 n 287).
41 Nihan rightly criticizes this translation since it implies that sancta are capable of sinning (Priestly Torah to Pentateuch, 176).
The key to the theory of Gese and Janowski is that the הָעַט of the offerer, symbolically, yet truly, comes into contact with the holy. Their conception of הָעַט, then, is not consonant with Milgrom, Schwartz, and Sklar, none of whom believe that the offerer symbolically dies and is restored through the blood’s contact with the altar.

Janowski rejects the possibility that הָעַט could have the connotation of purgation because the Akkadian cognate, which does mean “wipe off,” is used in magical contexts as opposed to cultic contexts. However, הָעַט is used twice in Lev 16 (vv. 20 and 33) and marks objects of the sanctuary. In these two cases, הָעַט is done directly to objects of the sanctuary. Assuming that these objects are incapable of committing wrongdoing and thus would never be in need of expiation, the connotation of “wipe off” or “purge,” from the Akkadian, is clearly a better understanding of הָעַט than “to make atonement.” Furthermore, in chapters two and three, I showed that הָעַט (used throughout Lev 4:1–5:13) should be understood as functionally equivalent to הָעַט (see Lev 16:16, 18).

Leviticus 4:1–5:13 shows that inadvertent wrongdoing leads to the carrying of guilt by the wrongdoer (or the people, in the case of the error by the high priest), who is then

---

44 “Defining the act of the atonement of human beings this way, i.e. taking up the blood rites and differentiating them further, essentially from the consecration of the altar and the sanctuary, P understood the cultic atonement event primarily as an act of consecration, through which the הָעַט-blood is given to the sanctuary in a symbolic rite (blood sprinkling or blood application)” (Janowski, Sünhe als Heilsgezehehen, 241).
45 Janowski, Sünhe als Heilsgezehehen, 58.
purged of this guilt s/he carries through the הֵמָה offering. Milgrom also points out the absurdity of “the morality of a system which purportedly posits that the inadvertent wrongdoer (Leviticus 4) and the new mother (Leviticus 12) are deserving of death.”

Thus in the least, Gese’s and Janowski’s extension of their understanding of הֵמָה in Lev 17:11 to all other instances of פָּרָה in Lev 1–16 does not stand up to scrutiny. As for their rendering of Lev 17:11, it relies on a unique interpretation of the hand--leaning gesture, one which is not even mentioned in Lev 17. Furthermore, I will argue below that Lev 17:11 is not articulating a different understanding of פָּרָה from that of Lev 4:1–5:13 or Lev 16. In all cases discussing sacrifice in P or H, the proper understanding of פָּרָה is “purge.”

5.1.3 פָּרָה as “purge” in Lev 17:11

Milgrom, Levine, Schwartz, Sklar, and Gese/Janowski do not consider the possibility that פָּרָה in Lev 17:11 should be understood as “purge.” In this case, Lev 17:11 would not reflect an entirely different understanding of פָּרָה than occurs in Lev 1–16, but rather would be specifying what part of the offerer is affected by the sacrifice. My translation reflects this understanding: “For the spirit of the flesh is in the blood, and I have placed it for you upon the altar to purge your spirits; for it is the blood that purges by means of the spirit.”

Leviticus 17:11 clearly represents a situation in which the Israelite is offering a sacrifice for some offense, an offense which can be remedied at the altar. The point is not that YHWH makes an exception in logic by allowing for substitution in some cases, something never allowed (see Lev 24:18; Num 35:31–34). Rather, in some cases of sin, almost exclusively unintentional (as Sklar rightly points out, Lev 5:20–26 [Eng. Lev 6:1–7] and Lev 5:1 appear intentional47), YHWH allows for the objectified sin to be removed.

For P and H, the wrong action of an individual has concrete, objectified results that cling to the person (as evidenced by my work on the verb מנן in Lev 4–5), to the sanctuary, and, according to H, sometimes to the land (Lev 18:25, 27, 28; 19:29). For P, there are clearly cases in which the sin can be lifted from the person. In Lev 4:1–5:13 we have an articulation of how unintentional (and some intentional) wrongdoing leads to the carrying of guilt/iniquity (יִנְשַׁפְּט/יַנְשַׁפְּט). The wrongdoer can be purged of the burden he carries through the offering of a חַטַּאת. In Num 15:22–29, the author of H affirms this measure articulated in Lev 4:1–5:13.

Schwartz admits that although he concludes that the combination כָּפַר נַפְשָׁה is idiomatic and always conveys the sense of “to serve as ransom for,” “in all other passages dealing with the use of blood in sacrifices, the sense of כָּפַר is always … to purge, to expiate.”48 However even this supposed rule for the phrase כָּפַר נַפְשָׁה is

47 Sklar, Sin, Impurity, Sacrifice, 41 n 117.

Num 15:27/ If one person sins inadvertently, he shall bring a female goat as a sin offering.

Num 15:28/ The priest shall purge the spirit of the one who erred into sin unintentionally before YHWH to purge him, that he may be forgiven.

Num 15:29/ For the native among the Israelites and for the resident alien in your midst, you shall have one law for the one who errs inadvertently.

Knohl believes that the legislation of Num 15:22–31 is authored by H. This passage has some differences with the corresponding passages on the נַעֲשֶׁה offering in Lev 4. Knohl notes that Num 15:24, which discusses the נַעֲשֶׁה offering for the unintentional error of the congregation, commands a bull for a burnt offering and a goat for a purification offering, while Lev 4:14 commands only a bull for a purification offering for the same case. Also, Num 15:30–31 commands the punishment of חֵרִית for willful sinners. The punishment of חֵרִית, threatened in Num 15:30–31, is a popular punishment in H, and

---

50 Literally meaning “cutting off,” it is not clear what is signified when YHWH “cuts off” a person, usually “from his people.” Milgrom suggests two possible meanings: “no descendants in this world and no life in the next” or both (Leviticus 1–16, 460).
rarely, if ever, used in P. Furthermore, Num 15:26, 29, 30 all mention the הוהי (resident alien). Throughout the Holiness Code, the author mentions the הוהי and how Israelite laws apply to the הוהי (Exod 12:19, 48, 49; Lev 16:29; 17:8, 10, 12, 13, 15; 18:26; 19:10, 33, 34; 20:2; 22:18; 23:22; 24:16, 22; 25:23, 35, 47; Num 9:14; 15:14, 15, 16, 26, 29, 30; 19:10; 35:15).53 The Priestly material never uses this term. When Num 15:28 is understood as H’s version of the הוהי offering legislation for an individual, it is clear that H indeed does use הוהי in a sacrificial context in which it certainly means “to purge the spirit/ נפש.”

The addition from H in Lev 16, vv. 29–34a, twice states (16:30, 34a) that the result of הוהי is that the people are purged of their sins, clearly objectifying the people’s sins (as does Lev 4:1–5:13). Leviticus 16:30 makes this abundantly clear as it reads, “For on this day, he [the priest] shall purge you [הוהי] to purify you [הוהי] of all of your sins; you shall be declared pure before YHWH.” Leviticus 16:34a reinforces this same point: “This shall be for you a law for all time: to purge the Israelites [הוהי] of all of their sins once a year.” Why would the author of H, the editor of P and the Pentateuch, use the same verb (והי) with the same preposition (ל) differently in a sacrificial context less than one chapter later? It is more probable that Lev 17:11, from the same author as Lev 16:30, is also using הוהי in the sense of “purge,” with the object of

52 With H dated later than P it may be that passages formerly believed to be from P that contain the punishment of הוהי should now be understood as H additions (e.g. Lev 7:20, 21, 25, 27; Exod 31:14 has already been acknowledged as an H addition by Knohl [Sanctuary of Silence, 14–15]).
53 Knohl and I assign all of these verses to H (Sanctuary of Silence, 107–08).
cleansing being the offerers, and more specifically, the נאש of the offerers. Noam Zohar concludes similarly, “[I]t should not be doubted that the atoning power of blood is here related to its nature as the essence of animation (נפ) and to some connection between this and the animation (נפ) of those attaining atonement.”

5.1.3.1 The Use of נפ in Leviticus

In Lev 1–7, the explication of the sacrificial system, there is a noteworthy pattern involving the use of נפ. As Knohl observes,

We may divide the laws of PT [Priestly Torah] into two main groups: those whose syntactical subject (whose acts are described by the law) is designated by the word נא or a combination of those words— נא א or א נא. A clear distinction exists between the two groups. Use of the word נפ is restricted to the laws of sacrifice (see Lev 2:1; 4:2, 27; 5:1, 2, 4, 15, 17, 21; 7:18, 20, 21), whereas the purity laws solely employ subjects of the א נא or א נא group. We never find the two subjects, נפ and א נא mentioned in a single law in PT.

As the list of passages from P in Lev 1–7 shows, the use of נפ is most concentrated in the passages concerning the הָעָן offering with five of the twelve occurrences coming in הָעָן offering pericopes (Lev 4:2, 27; 5:1, 2, 4). Numbers 15:27–28, the only H text on the recurring הָעָן offering for an individual, uses נפ twice in reference to the individual

---

55 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, 87. Milgrom insists that Knohl’s point should be amended because of Lev 15:2, which uses א נא and Num 6:2, which uses א נא א נא (Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, 1328.). Leviticus 15:2 is easily explained by the fact that the law concerns an emission of semen. Numbers 6:2 could have used נפ, but since it is the case of the Nazarite while the other cases involve more routine life circumstances, this may explain this anomaly. Furthermore, both cases are not simply about sacrifice, but without question, primarily involve impurity.
who errs (15:27) and is purged (15:28). Numbers 15:27 even hints at the fact that the
prior case involving the whole congregation (15:22–26) should be understood as having
affected the נאם of each individual of the congregation/people (both כי 만나 and are
used in 15:22–26).

Num 15:27/ If one person sins unintentionally, she shall bring a year-old female
goat for a purification offering.

The inclusion of התא (one) indicates that the author viewed the previous case on the
congregation as involving multiple הנשים, whereas this case involves a single נאם.

In Lev 26, the H author uses the phrase “my spirit (נַפְשִׁי) shall (‘not’ in Lev 26:11)
loathe (נַפְשִׁי) you” two times with YHWH as the subject (26:11, 30). Milgrom suggests the
translation “I will (not) expel you,” because “[t]he idiom [נַפְשִׁי נְפַשׁ] means ‘gullet
expels’…”56 While נפש certainly does mean “throat” or “gullet” in some instances, the
other occurrences of the phrase נפש נפתל (Lev 26:15, 43; Ezek 16:45; Jer 14:19), two of
which also occur in Lev 26, do not allow for the rendering of “expel.” Thus this
rendering must be rejected. Milgrom appears to recognize that the use of נפש in
reference to YHWH here cannot be understood as entirely idiomatic when he writes,
“Here, however, [נפש] denotes the essence of the divine being.”57 I do not wish to

57 Milgrom, Leviticus 23–27, 2302.
speculate further about the character of שם, but it is noteworthy that the author who calls for the Israelites to be holy just as YHWH is holy asserts that both YHWH and humans have a שם. Furthermore, considering my argument for H authorship of the creation story of Gen 1, perhaps the H author believes it is the שם of humans that reflects the likeness and image of God (Gen 1:26–27).

5.1.4 The Sovereignty of YHWH in Lev 17:11

In my argument in chapter one for H authorship of Gen 1:1–2:4a, I noted that God appears unthreatened and in complete control in this creation narrative. God has no adversaries, creating with speech and declaring all creation as good. I argued that this elevated portrayal of God’s sovereignty fits better with H’s characterization of YHWH than with P’s characterization of YHWH. In P, humanity is constantly a threat to YHWH due to their natural impurity and wrongdoing, all of which could lead to YHWH’s departure from the Tabernacle. In H, the end result of disobedience and pollution is not the expulsion of YHWH from his earthly abode, but the expulsion of the Israelites from the land and from the presence of YHWH. In both cases, wrongdoing, impurity and pollution are problematic, but in H, YHWH is not threatened but rather is the threat. YHWH will cause catastrophe and exile if the Israelites disobey. Thus, I argued that the characterization of the sovereignty of God in Gen 1:1–2:4a better reflected H than P.

Schwartz points to a phrase in Lev 17:11 that further supports H’s high view of the sovereignty of YHWH. The Hebrew in the middle of the verse is as follows: שֵׁם ה' ולְכָּל יָדָיו ה' נִגְנֶה.
(“And I have placed it for you upon the altar”). Schwartz admits that the verse is speaking metaphorically; that is, YHWH does not literally “place” blood upon the altar. However, the implications of the decision to use נתן, the verb typically used to speak of the manipulation of blood on the altar, with YHWH as the subject instead of the priest, are noteworthy. “What our clause does,” writes Schwartz, “in its unique, metaphorically graphic way, is to take a set phrase, the ‘placing’ of blood on the altar, and to reverse the conceptual direction of the action: ‘It is not you who are placing the blood on the altar for me, for my benefit, but rather the opposite: it is I who have placed it there for you—for your benefit.’” It is no accident that the author of H has used נתן in this way in the first full chapter of his work in Leviticus.

The H author appears to be correcting the perception that the power to purge is in the hands of the priests, suggesting again that the sovereignty of YHWH is higher in H than in P. In Lev 1–7, an offerer is forgiven after bringing a sacrifice and the clause that declares the offerer forgiven is in the Niphal (יִלְּכָשׁ לִבְנֵי) (Lev 4:20, 26, 31, 35; 5:10, 13, 16, 18, 26 [Eng. 6:7]). Throughout Lev 1–7, the priest is quite clearly the agent who effects יִכְשָׁף, never YHWH. James Watts, writing on the rhetorical features of Lev 1–7, notes that the text unequivocally states that it is the actions of the priest, who carries out the נְאֵמוֹן ritual, that are of utmost importance. “According to P, neither offerings nor blood nor even God provide access to forgiveness and purification apart from the atoning action of

the Aaronide priest.” Somewhat surprisingly, YHWH is never specified as the subject who forgives. This construction gives the impression that the correct performance of the sacrifice ensures forgiveness for the offerer (ex opere operato). Most scholars reject this notion and instead assert that YHWH forgives regardless of the specifics of the performance of the ritual. Writes Milgrom, “Whereas the high priest is the agent of purgation (the verb is pi’el, active), the Lord alone is the agent of forgiveness—hence, the verb is Niphal, passive (contra Knohl 1988: 238 n. 42). The priest carries out the purgation rites but only God determines the efficacy.” This may be so, but the text is not clear, not nearly as clear as the other P texts that Milgrom cites (Num 14:19–20; 30:6 [Eng. 30:5], 9 [Eng. 30:8], 13 [Eng. 30:12]). In all of the cases in Numbers, יָנָלַח is in the Qal (active) and YHWH is clearly indicated as the subject, either as the speaker (Num 14:20, יָנָלַח יָנָלַח) or as the narrated subject (Num 30:6, 9, 13; יָנָלַח יָנָלַח). Thus, these cases hardly prove Milgrom’s conclusion. Milgrom’s best piece of evidence for YHWH as the forgiver is that nowhere else in the Bible does anyone but God offer יָנָלַח. Nowhere, of course, except for the nine places I have listed above where no subject is identified. Leviticus 4:1–5:13 does clearly indicate that the priest effects יָנָלַח. On this, there is no debate. While Lev 17:11 does not discuss forgiveness, in opposition to Lev 4:1–5:13, it

---

60 Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 245.
62 Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 245. I double-checked this assertion and aside from the twelve places in P, and one in H, where the niphal is used, God is indeed the only one who offers יָנָלַח.
Clearly indicates that YHWH is the one who effects כֶּ֣לֶם עַל-הַשָּׁמְעָהּ (ךֶּ֣לֶם עַל הַשָּׁמְעָהּ) here אֵֽנִי

5.1.5 Translation of Lev 10:16–20

Lev 10:16/53 Then Moses insistently inquired about the goat of the purification offering, and it had already been burned! He was angry with Eleazar and Ithamar, Aaron’s surviving64 sons, and said,
Lev 10:17/ “Why did you not enjoy65 the purification offering in the sacred precinct? For it is most holy and he has assigned it to you to remove the iniquity of the community to purge them66 before the Lord.
Lev 10:18/ Because its blood was not brought into the interior of the sacred precinct, you certainly ought to have enjoyed67 it in the sacred precinct, as I commanded.”
Lev 10:19/ And Aaron spoke to Moses, “See, this day they brought their purification offering and burnt offering before the Lord, and such things have befallen me! Had I enjoyed68 the purification offering today, would it have been good in the eyes of the Lord69?”
Lev 10:20/ And when Moses heard this, it was good in his eyes70.

---

63 As in the previous exegetical chapters, I am using Milgrom’s translation with one emendation (Leviticus 1–16, 596).
64 מִרְדְּתָנָּה, “remaining”.
65 מְרַבְּשׁ, “did you not eat”. In Lev 6:19, discussed below, Milgrom renders the verb בֹאֳלָה as “enjoy,” which I will argue is critical for understanding Lev 10:17 (Leviticus 1–16, 379).
66 לְאָכָל יִכְפֶּרֶת לֹאַ וּלְאָכּל, “to effect purgation on their behalf”.
67 מְרַבְּשׁ, “you certainly ought to have eaten”. See footnote 65.
68 מִרְדְּתָנָּה, “Had I eaten”. See footnote 65.
69 מְרַבְּשׁ, “would the Lord have approved”.
70 מְרַבְּשׁ, “he approved”.
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5.1.6 Argument Summary for Lev 10

Leviticus 10:16–20 discusses the significance of the consumption of the meat of הָנֹּק offerings whose blood is not brought into the interior of the sacred precinct. The priests consume this meat in the sacred precinct, and by doing so they remove the iniquity of the Israelites/purge the Israelites. Although these verses are difficult to understand fully, they do support the notion, explicated above and in the previous chapter, that one function of the הָנֹּק offering is to purge persons. These verses come at the end of the narrative (the only narrative in Lev 1–16) of the inauguration ceremony for the Tabernacle (described in Lev 8–10). The events move along without complication until the death of Nadab and Abihu (Lev 10:1–3), who are killed by fire that comes out from the presence of YHWH in response to their spontaneous offering of strange fire (טָבִיעָה). Exactly why Nadab and Abihu are killed is not relevant to this discussion, but that Lev 10:16–20 occurs immediately after Aaron’s sons are killed is relevant. Against N. Kiuchi, Lev 10:17 indeed is speaking of purgative function of the consumption of the הָנֹּק-offering meat, and not of the entire ritual complex of the הָנֹּק offering. The author of Lev 10 understood that the הָנֹּק formulas of Lev 9:7 applied only to the offerings and not to the הָנֹּק offerings which Lev 10 discusses. Thirdly, אֱלִי (typically meaning “eat”) should be understood as “enjoy” when referencing the meat of the הָנֹּק offering. This explains Aaron’s unwillingness to partake of this meat after the death of his two sons. Lastly, in an excursus, John Calvin’s work on the sacrificial practice of
Israel, which he declares a sacrament and compares to the Lord’s Supper (and baptism),
will be brought into conversation with logic of the לַחֲמָה offering, especially the concept
of the purgatory function of the consumption of the לַחֲמָה-offering meat.

5.1.7 The Sacrifices in Lev 9

The לַחֲמָה offering that Lev 10:16–20 references and discusses is described in Lev
9. Leviticus 8 narrates the purgation and consecration of the altar and the consecration of
the priests. Leviticus 9, then, is likely narrating the purgation of the people as part of the
inauguration of the tabernacle. Somewhat surprisingly, the text of Lev 9 is not
abundantly clear about what or who is purged by the offerings described in this chapter.
It is not until Lev 10:17–20 that it becomes clear that the people (and the priests) are the
objects of purgation of the לַחֲמָת offerings of Lev 9. The confusion is principally due to
the use of בִּשְׁעָה in Lev 9:7. Regarding the prepositions בִּשְׁעָה and בִּשְׁעָה, I have shown
how בִּשְׁעָה is used to mark the object of purgation and is thus functionally equivalent
to בִּשְׁעָה. My analysis broke from Milgrom’s view of the difference between the three
בִּשְׁעָה-phrases (בִּשְׁעָה), as Milgrom views בִּשְׁעָה and בִּשְׁעָה as
functionally equivalent. In Milgrom’s view, בִּשְׁעָה and בִּשְׁעָה mark the one for

71 Leviticus 9 also narrates the offering of a מִלְשָׁנָה and a מִלְשָׁנָה. Milgrom has no explanation for the offering
of a מִלְשָׁנָה here. I suggest that the initiation of the cult calls for the offering of all of the various sacrifices. No
מִלְשָׁנָה is offered here, but the מִלְשָׁנָה is a reparation offering brought for very specific incidents, thus its exclusion
is not entirely surprising. As for the מִלְשָׁנָה, Milgrom concludes, “The function of the well-being offering is
clarified by the announcement of the forthcoming theophany (v 4b). The joy and privilege of witnessing the
theophany are celebrated by a feast, as for instance in ‘They beheld God, and they ate and drank’ (Exod
24:11b; cf. v 5), which in this case was projected (10:14–15) but aborted (10:16–20)” (Leviticus 1–16, 573).
whom purgation is being effected but never mark the person/object that is purged (for
Milgrom it is always the sanctuary). However, Milgrom’s scheme—that the
offering only effects purgation for the sanctuary—is disrupted here in Lev 9. Milgrom
concludes that the המאשה offerings in Lev 9 must be understood to benefit the priests and
the people and translates בר as “make atonement,” instead of his usual rendering of
“effect purgation” for the result of a המאשה offering. Like Lev 16, the המאשה offering is
accompanied by the העלה offering in Lev 9. The Hebrew of Lev 9:7 and Milgrom’s
translation, with my emendations, is as follows:

Lev 9:7/

Then Moses said to Aaron, “Come forward to the altar and sacrifice your purification offering and your burnt offering and make atonement on behalf of yourself and on behalf of your household; and sacrifice the people’s offering and make atonement on their behalf—as the Lord has commanded.”

Milgrom understands the verse to be communicating that both the המאשה offering and
the העלה offering together accomplish בר, and for this reason Milgrom translates בר as
“make atonement.” Milgrom insists that the notion of purgation is absent when בר is

23 Milgrom notes, and I concur, “With the LXX, read [ךית] ‘your household’, on the analogy of 16:6, 11, 17, 24 LXX, where two sets of sacrificial animals are required, on to effect בר for the high priest and his household and the other for the people. The scribe’s error may have been caused by the [יתות] that appears four words later” (Leviticus 1–16, 578).
24 Milgrom’s translation with my emendations (Leviticus 1–16, 570).
25 “for yourself and for the people,” I always render בר as “on behalf of” due to the difficulty in understanding prepositions used with בר. Moreover, as footnote 70 indicates, the better reading is [ךית] ‘your household,’ which Milgrom suggests but then does not render in the English.
26 “for them”. Again, for the sake of clarity, I prefer to translate בר as “on behalf of.”
used with the שִׁילָח offering: “[W]ith the burnt offering (and, indeed, with every other sacrifice) it [כֵּּפָר] bears the general meaning of ‘atone,’ in other words, to reconcile the individual (or community) with God so that they become ‘at-one’…. The more inclusive rendering is clearly implied here.”\(^{76}\) While this is likely the best rendering of כֵּּפָר here, Lev 9 appears only to be communicating the effect of the שִׁילָח offering in this כֵּּפָר-formula, a fact that the author of Lev 10 has recognized.

Both offerings (כֵּּפָר and שִׁילָח) also appear in Lev 16, but in Lev 16, the Priestly author differentiates between what each offering accomplishes. The שִׁילָח offerings of Lev 16 purge various parts of the sanctuary, while the function of the כֵּּפָר שִׁילָח offerings is unclear. When כֵּּפָר is used in reference to the שִׁילָח offerings in Lev 16, it is clear that כֵּּפָר signifies that the offering is “on behalf of” the object of כֵּּפָר (always a person). It does not mark the object that is actually purged. However, כֵּּפָר is also used in Lev 16:24 to describe the effects of the שִׁילָח offerings that Aaron offers after having executed most of the other rituals of Yom Kippur. Milgrom translates כֵּּפָר in Lev 16:24 as “effect atonement” and explains that the burnt offering is “an expiatory sacrifice.”\(^{77}\) The effect of the שִׁילָח offerings and the שִׁילָח offerings are combined in Lev 9:7, and the author of Lev 9 may have used כֵּּפָר because this collocation is used in

\(^{76}\) Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 578.
\(^{77}\) Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 1049.
reference to both offerings (דבשא and ליויתא) in Lev 16. Milgrom, Roy Gane, Christophe Nihan and I all agree that in Lev 16, the sanctuary, not the people on whose behalf they are offered, is purged by the ליויתא offerings. The ליויתא offerings of Lev 9, however, must affect the people and not the sanctuary; Lev 8 has already covered the purgation and consecration of the sanctuary. Milgrom concurs and surmises that the inclusion of the ליויתא offerings means that purgation is not a possibility here. However, considering that Lev 10:16–20 revisits the ליויתא offering for the people and assigns the role of לזרה to the consumption of the meat of the ליויתא offering by the priests, I suggest that we should view the שיטל+ברכה phrases in Lev 9:7 as applying only to the effect of the דבשא offerings of Lev 9. The Priestly author who wrote Lev 10, and specifically vv. 16–20, was motivated in part by the realization that Lev 9 did not explain how the ליויתא offerings of Lev 9 functioned or what they accomplished. The author of Lev 10, then, understood the שיטל+ברכה-phrases in Lev 9:7 as applying only to the effect of the ליויתא offerings of Lev 9. When this is understood, there is no disagreement between the use of שיטל+ברכה in Lev 16 and in Lev 9.

The exact function or necessity of the ליויתא offerings in either chapter remains puzzling, but it is beyond the scope of this project to examine this in detail. My

78 Gane, Cult and Character, 123.
79 Nihan, From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch, 350–51
80 In Lev 16:6, שיטל+ברכה marks Aaron and his house and in 16:11 it marks Aaron and his house. In Lev 16:17, שיטל+ברכה marks Aaron, his house, and the entire congregation of Israel.
81 As for the ליויתא of the priest and his household in Lev 9, we are never offered an explanation as to its function.
presumption is that because Lev 16 and Lev 9 represent early stages of P, the Priestly writers were still struggling with the function of the ṣeḥat ū-qā til off erring and its distinction from the ṣeḥat ū-qā so errings that were to purge persons. This same struggle is evident throughout Lev 12–15 as well, since both the ṣeḥat ū-qā offering and the ṣeḥat ū-qā offering are included in all of the sacrificial complexes that effect (12:6–8; 14:18–20, 30–31; 15:14–15, 29–30).

5.1.8 Eating the Meat of the Outer-Altar ṣeḥat ū-qā Offering

Leviticus 10:17 is likely one of the later texts of P, in view of the emphasis on the eating of the ṣeḥat ū-qā-offering portion by the priest. Furthermore, unlike Lev 9, Lev 10 clearly knows of both the outer-altar and inner-altar ṣeḥat ū-qā offerings of Lev 4:1–5:13.

---

82 This passage hints at a shift toward the ṣeḥat ū-qā as the principal sacrifice of ṣeḥat ū-qā. Leviticus 14:19 reads: “The priest will perform the purgation offering and purge the one being cleansed from his impurity. Afterwards, he will slaughter the burnt offering.” The burnt offering plays no role in purgation.

83 Exodus 29:36–46, 30:1–10, and Lev 8:10–21 all describe the processes for purgation of an altar, be it the altar of burnt offering (Exod 29 and Lev 8) or the incense altar (Exod 30). While the ṣeḥat ū-qā is a part of the ritual for the altar of burnt offering (Exod 29:38–42; Lev 8:18–21), in neither case is the ṣeḥat ū-qā assigned the function of ṣeḥat ū-qā, as it is in Lev 9 and Lev 16. As for Exodus 30, the ṣeḥat ū-qā is explicitly prohibited on the incense altar, leaving no confusion that the ṣeḥat ū-qā offering is most important for the incense altar. Exodus 30:1–10 is a very straightforward text on the procedure for purging the incense altar on Yom Kippur, something missing from Lev 16. The scholarly consensus dates Exod 30:1–10 after the text of Lev 16. Furthermore, Exod 29 and Lev 8 are extremely difficult texts that discuss the same event. Exodus 29 gives instruction for the consecration of the priests and Lev 8 narrates the actual consecration. The two texts do not correspond perfectly; the procedures carried out in Lev 8 do not match exactly with the instructions in Exod 29. Moreover, Exod 29 and Lev 8 describe three different offerings, two of which occur in other places in the Priestly literature (ṣeḥat ū-qā, ṣeḥat ū-qā); the third of them is explained only in these two chapters, ṣeḥat ū-qā (ordination offering). These chapters and the issues they raise are beyond the scope of this project. I simply want to note that the ṣeḥat ū-qā plays no role in the purgation of sancta in either case. Furthermore, nowhere in Exod 29 or Lev 8 is the ṣeḥat ū-qā explicitly stated to accomplish ṣeḥat ū-qā for the priests either, although what exactly is responsible for the purgation of the priests in Exod 29 or Lev 8 is difficult to assess.

84 Both Milgrom (Leviticus 1–16, 637) and Nihan (Priestly Torah to Pentateuch, 599) identify Lev 10:16–20 as a later Priestly addition.
Moses’ comments in Lev 10:18 on the difference between a הָעַרְוָה offering in which blood is manipulated in the inner part of the sanctuary (Lev 4:1–26), and the הָעַרְוָה offering for an ordinary person, in which blood is manipulated on the altar of burnt offering (Lev 4:26–5:13).

Because its blood was not brought into the interior of the sacred precinct, you certainly ought to have enjoyed it in the sacred precinct, as I commanded.

In Lev 9:8–11, the offering for the priests is not brought into the inner-altar for manipulation, as it should be according to Lev 4:1–12, but its blood is placed on the altar of burnt offering, and then the flesh and skin are burned outside the camp. In all likelihood, then, the author of Lev 9 did not know of the inner-altar, while the author of Lev 10 did. Thus, a later dating for Lev 10 is highly probable.

While Lev 10:17 appears to connect the effectiveness of the purification offering with the eating of the priest’s portion of the offering, N. Kiuchi rejects this rather straightforward meaning of the verse. Kiuchi disconnects the first half of the verse from the second half of the verse. Leviticus 1:16–18 reads as follows:

---

85 Milgrom’s translation with my emendations (Leviticus 1–16, 596).
86 “you certainly ought to have eaten”. In Lev 6:19, discussed below, Milgrom renders the verb אָכָל as “enjoy,” which I will argue is very important for understanding Lev 10:17 (Leviticus 1–16, 379).
Lev 10:16 Then Moses insistently inquired about the goat of the purification offering, and it had already been burned! He was angry with Eleazar and Ithamar, Aaron’s remaining sons, and said,

Lev 10:17/ "Why did you not enjoy the purification offering in the sacred precinct? For it is most holy and he has assigned it to you to remove the iniquity of the community to purge them before the Lord.

Lev 10:18/ Because its blood was not brought into the interior of the sacred precinct, you certainly ought to have enjoyed it in the sacred precinct, as I commanded."

Kiuchi asserts that neither the word הָדְמֶא in Lev 10:17, nor the pronoun or pronominal suffix in Lev 10:17b, which refers back to הָדְמֶא, should be understood as a reference to the הָדְמֶא-offering meat. Therefore, Kiuchi concludes that the crucial sentence of Lev 10:17 (“For it is most holy and he has assigned it to you to remove the iniquity of the community to purge them before the Lord”) does not refer exclusively to the eating of the הָדְמֶא-offering meat, but instead refers to the entire הָדְמֶא-offering ritual. Kiuchi makes this case after concluding that the other verses in Leviticus that discuss the eating of the הָדְמֶא offering (Lev 6:19, 23) never equate the substantive הָדְמֶא, or a pronoun referring to the substantive הָדְמֶא, with the flesh that the priests eat. Instead, he concludes that the substantive הָדְמֶא (or a pronoun referring back to it) always refers to the entirety of the offering. He deduces this on the basis of Lev 6:19 [Eng. 6:26]:

---

87 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 596.
88 הָדְמֶא, “did you not eat”. See footnote 86.
89 הָדְמֶא, “to effect purgation on their behalf”.
90 הָדְמֶא, “you certainly ought to have eaten”. See footnote 84.
91 Kiuchi, Purification Offering, 49.
Lev 6:19 The priest who offers it as a purification offering shall enjoy it; it shall be enjoyed in a holy place, in the court of the Tent of Meeting.

As Milgrom points out, “the literal meaning [of אכלנה] cannot be maintained here because it is clearly impossible for a single priest to consume the entire animal….” Thus Milgrom translates אכלנה as “he shall enjoy it,” a very important point to which we shall return below. “Here,” writes Kiuchi, “אתה and אכלנה all refer to the המאה אכלנה mentioned in the previous verse, which refers to the sacrificial animal as a whole.

Moreover, in a single sentence like חנה את אתה, it appears forced to argue that the suffix on אתה [clearly referring to the המאה ה Özellikle ritual] is essentially different from the suffix on אכלנה [presumably referring to the meat of the המאה offering].” While I disagree with Kiuchi, in terms of grammar, Kiuchi’s point could be correct. However what sense can אכלנה (“he shall enjoy it”) make if “it” refers to the entirety of the ritual and not the meat?

The Priestly writer is not being specific about the meat of the המאה offering in Lev 6:19 or Lev 10:17. Kiuchi claims, as quoted above, that in Lev 6:19 it should not be assumed that the suffix on אתה (clearly referring to the המאה-offering ritual) and the

---

92 Milgrom’s translation with my emendations (Leviticus 1–16, 379).
93 Milgrom chooses to translate אכלנה as “enjoy” for first appearance of the verb, but not the second. I find that confusing and thus chose to be consistent with the translation of אכלנה.
94 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 402.
95 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 402.
96 Kiuchi, Purification Offering, 48.
suffix on נֵאָלֵת (presumably referring to the נָפָה-offering meat) refer to distinct entities (נָפָה-offering ritual and then נָפָה-offering meat). However, this can only be so if the Priestly writer risks being misunderstood through this shorthand. But when the verb is נָאָלֵת, the reference can hardly be to anything but the portion of the נָפָה offering that the priests eat. Furthermore, Lev 6:21 [Eng. 6:28] settles the matter.

Lev 6:21/ An earthen vessel in which it is boiled shall be broken; if it has been boiled in a copper vessel, that shall be scoured and flushed with water.⁹⁷

In this verse, any generic reference to the נָפָה could only be referencing the meat of the offering since only this part of the offering would be boiled. In both occurrences of the verb בל (boil) in 6:21, the verb appears in the third feminine singular (בָּלֶת, בָּלֶת). The only possible reference for this unspecified feminine subject is נָפָה in Lev 6:18. While the previous verse, Lev 6:20, mentions the flesh of the נָפָה (בָּרָה), the feminine subject of בל (boil) in 6:21 cannot refer back to בָּרָה, which is masculine.⁹⁸

The priest’s ingestion of the meat of the נָפָה is unquestionably being connected with בָּרָה, but how? The key phrase occurs within the second half of Lev 10:17: נַעְשֶׁה הָאָרָם לְהַעֲשׂוֹת לְךָ נַעְשֵׂה. As has already been discussed, the understanding of נַעְשָׁה is disputed, but there are basically two options. The sinner or someone else can “bear iniquity,”

⁹⁷ Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 380.
⁹⁸ Incidentally, בָּרָה (its flesh) has the third feminine singular suffix, also referring back to נָפָה in 6:18. In this case, the suffix could be referencing the offering in general or the portions kept for the priest.
meaning the person “bearing iniquity” is guilty. The other possibility, espoused by
Schwartz, is that it can mean “bear away iniquity” when it is transferred from one person
or thing to another, thus resulting in the removal of iniquity. So, do the priests continue
to “bear iniquity” after the ritual, or do they “bear away iniquity” through the ritual,
meaning it disappears?

Schwartz does not address the issue of whether the eating of the לֵאָם-offering
meat by the priests is being espoused as a part of the purgation process in Lev 10:17. He
simply wishes to apply his understanding of נַשֶּׁה to the verse. Schwartz contends that
the idea of נַשֶּׁה as referring to “punishment or bearing responsibility” can be cast
aside. Instead, Schwartz notes that לֵאָם is synonymously paralleled with
לֵאָם לֵאָם לֵאָם לֵאָם, and therefore the two must refer to the same process. Schwartz
follows Milgrom’s understanding of the לֵאָם offering: “With his [Milgrom’s] early
studies, there came the realization that the focus of the priestly לֵאָם is the
decontamination of the sanctuary from pollution caused by bodily impurities and by
Israel’s transgressions penetrating the sphere of the sacred from afar, and that this
indispensable task is the sole function of the לֵאָם sacrifice.” For this reason, Schwartz
concludes that “bearing away sin” and לֵאָם-purgation are synonymous, and both refer
exclusively to the removal of impurities or sins from the sanctuary, not from persons.100

100 Schwartz, “Bearing of Sin,” 16.
As I have already shown, **tafj** offerings can purge the offerer(s) or the sanctuary, depending on what is marked by the preposition ל or ע. In Lev 10:17, the phrase is הָעִילָה לְפָרָק, clearly referring to the Israelites as the object of purgation. Moreover, it is in parallel with **לְפָרָק אֲחָזֵיהָ לֵבָה**, which also has the Israelites as the object. Milgrom states that the translation of “remove iniquity” for נָשָׁה כַּפָּר is typically, but not solely, operative when God is the subject. In Exod 34:7, Num 14:18, Isa 33:24, and Hos 14:3, God removes iniquity from a person. However, the synonymous phrase נָשָׁה כַּפָּר occurs three times with the sense of “remove sin” and with a human as the subject: Joseph (Gen 50:17), Moses (Exod 10:17), and Samuel (1 Sam 15:23). “In each case a superior, but one who is assumed to be favored by God, is implored by an inferior (Joseph’s brothers, Pharaoh, Saul, respectively) for forgiveness.” Again, the iniquity is removed from a person, but this time not by God. By putting the phrase נָשָׁה כַּפָּר in parallel with הָעִילָה לְפָרָק in Lev 10:17, the Priestly author of this chapter clarifies that כַּפָּר, like נָשָׁה כַּפָּר, communicates the priest’s removal of iniquity from the offerer, the one whose action created the pollutant and the one who has borne the pollutant prior to the מִסָּף ritual. Thus while I agree with Schwartz’ reading of נָשָׁה כַּפָּר in Lev 10:17, I contend that the offerer(s) are purged by the eating of the מִסָּף meat by the priests.

---

5.1.9 The Status of the **תַּפְרָה**-Offering Meat

How one views the **תַּפְרָה**-offering meat, holy or impure, is crucial for understanding the narrative of Lev 10. Milgrom agrees that the eating of the **תַּפְרָה** offering effects **כְּפִירָה**, although Milgrom believes that the altar, not the offerer(s), is purged. For Milgrom, the carcass has absorbed the altar’s impurity and ingestion eliminates this impurity.\(^{103}\) Nihan agrees that the carcass is contaminated. “For the author of ch. 10,” writes Nihan, “the consumption of the flesh of the sacrificial victim in the case of the minor rite apparently has the same function, structurally speaking, as when this flesh is burnt outside the camp in the major rite, namely, to eliminate pollution absorbed by the animal’s carcass and thus to remove the community’s iniquity.”\(^{104}\) Nihan does not state from where (the Israelites or the sanctuary) the community’s iniquity is removed. Milgrom believes that the priest, “by the blood manipulation, draws out the pollution of the sanctuary caused by Israel’s impurities and iniquities.”\(^{105}\) Milgrom views the ingestion of the **תַּפְרָה**-offering meat as an elimination rite, comparable to the burning of the carcass of the **תַּפְרָה**-offering animal, as instructed in Lev 4:11–12. “Because a carcass bearing severe impurities is burned (4:12; 16:27), it must therefore follow that the carcass bearing lesser impurities is eliminated by

---

\(^{103}\) Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 625.

\(^{104}\) Nihan, *Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 600.

ingestion.” However, nowhere does the text of Leviticus indicate that the meat of the tafj offering becomes impure through the actions of the ritual. In fact, the key texts in Leviticus say just the opposite: the meat is most holy.

As I discussed in chapter three, Leviticus 10:17 clearly states that the meat of the tafj offering is most holy (پرنشر). This accords with Lev 6:22 [Eng. 6:29], where the tafj offering is also called most holy (پرنشر). How can meat which has absorbed impurity be called most holy? Milgrom contends that the very specific rules described in Lev 6:20–22 [Eng. 6:28–30] for handling items that come into contact with the tafj offering demonstrate that there was ambivalence about the nature of the tafj offering.107 A garment bespattered with tafj-offering blood must be washed in a holy place (6:20). An earthen vessel in which tafj-offering meat is boiled must be broken, presumably because of its porous nature (6:21). A bronze vessel in which tafj-offering meat is boiled must be scoured and rinsed (6:21). But as Nihan points out, “The reason why garments or vessels touched by blood or the flesh of the tafj offering must be washed or destroyed (6:20–21) is not that they have become unclean, but reflects the necessity to avoid the propagation of holiness, i.e., to preserve the separation between profane and holy.”108 Even the disposal of the tafj offering in Lev 4:1–5:13 does not indicate that any part of it is impure or contaminated. Leviticus 4:12 (principally) and

---

106 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 625.
107 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 403.
108 Nihan, Priestly Torah to Pentateuch, 192.
4:21 discuss what happens to the parts of the animal not burned on the altar. The meat of these sacrifices for the anointed priest (4:3) and the entire congregation (4:13) are not eaten but burned outside the camp in a pure place (להボード), another indication that this meat is not impure. Milgrom and Gane contend that the ashes of the חטאת offering cause contamination. They rely mainly on Lev 16:27–28, which explains that the person who burns the חטאת offerings of Yom Kippur must wash his clothes and bathe his body in water before returning to the camp. This verse is not conclusive, however, and the washings can be explained as Nihan does above, that is “the necessity to avoid the propagation of holiness, i.e., to preserve the separation between profane and holy.” Moreover, the burning of the carcass of the חטאת offering is never said to be the action that accomplishes הבש, either in Lev 16:28 or Lev 4:12, 21. In fact, in both Lev 16 and Lev 4, the burning of the animal is done after the text has declared that the priest has effected הבש. This is noteworthy since Milgrom and Schwartz believe the burning of the animal outside the camp to be analogous to the eating of the meat by the priests, which is said to effect הבש in Lev 10:17. While Milgrom concludes that impurity is communicated by the חטאת offerings of Yom Kippur, he admits that the text is not decisive. I suggest
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109 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 1053; Gane, Cult and Character, 178.
110 Nihan, Priestly Torah to Pentateuch, 192.
111 Milgrom writes, “The one who burns the Red Cow is also rendered impure (Num 19:8), and one can deduce that the burnt purification offering … always contaminates the one who handles it; this, indeed, is the tradition of the rabbis (m. Para 8:3; t. Yoma 3:16). They also transmit another tradition that neither the scapegoat nor the carcasses of burnt purification offering transmit impurity while they are still inside the sacred precincts (m. Yoma 6:6–7; t. Yoma 3:15–16)” (Leviticus 1–16, 1053).
that we rely on the texts we do have which explain that the הַמִּנְנֵי-וֹרֶשֶׁת-offering meat is most holy, not impure or contaminated. Moreover, even if the eating of the הַמִּנְנֵי-וֹרֶשֶׁת-offering meat is analogous to the burning of the carcass of the הַמִּנְנֵי-וֹרֶשֶׁת offering outside the camp, the analogy does not explain how the eating of the הַמִּנְנֵי-וֹרֶשֶׁת-offering meat could effect כּוּר.

5.1.10 Enjoying the הַמִּנְנֵי-וֹרֶשֶׁת-Offering Meat

Above I quoted Milgrom’s translation of Lev 6:19: “The priest who offers it as a purification offering shall enjoy it (אֶכְפָּר); it shall be enjoyed\textsuperscript{112} in a holy place, in the court of the Tent of Meeting.”\textsuperscript{113} Milgrom explains that “the literal meaning [of אֶכְפָּר] cannot be maintained here because it is clearly impossible for a single priest to consume the entire animal in a single day…. For the figurative use of [אֶכְפָּר] ‘enjoy, benefit, possess’, see Ps 128:2; Qoh 5:18 (Wessely, 1846).”\textsuperscript{114} Leviticus 6:22 allows the officiating priest to share the meat with other priests. This possibility of sharing the meat, according to Milgrom, appears to further confirm the idea of enjoyment in Lev 6:19.\textsuperscript{115} The idea is that the officiating priest must not, in the end, eat it by himself; thus the verb “enjoy” conveys this possibility of sharing the meat. When we bring the idea of enjoyment into Lev 10, it explains Aaron’s refusal to eat the meat. If the eating of the הַמִּנְנֵי-וֹרֶשֶׁת-offering meat is supposed to be “enjoyed” by one or many priests, then Aaron’s

\textsuperscript{112} Milgrom chooses to translate אֶכְפָּר as “enjoy” for first appearance of the verb, but not the second. I find that confusing and thus choose to be consistent with the translation of אֶכְפָּר.

\textsuperscript{113} Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 379.

\textsuperscript{114} Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 402.

\textsuperscript{115} Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 407.
refusal to “enjoy” the meat after the death of his two sons is understandable. Leviticus 10:19: “And Aaron spoke to Moses, ‘Look, this day they offered their purification offering and burnt offering before the Lord, and such things have befallen me! Had I eaten the purification offering today, would it have been pleasing in the eyes of the Lord?’” Moses agrees that in this case it was not possible to enjoy the meat, and thus it was better to burn it.

The priests are not eating meat that is loaded with the iniquity of the people; rather the holy priests enjoy holy meat in a holy place and this removes or purges the iniquity of the people. What is required is that the priests, those who can draw nearest to the presence of YHWH, draw near to YHWH in a sacred place in order to enjoy the meat of the outer-altar מִזְמָח offerings either alone or with other priests. No logical cause and effect is detectable, nor is the reason for the burning, instead of eating, of the inner-altar מִזְמָח offerings. However, the command to enjoy it in a holy place certainly implies that proximity to YHWH is an important part of this ritual, as it has been for all parts of the ritual.

5.1.10.1 Excursus 2: Calvin, Sacrifice, and the Lord’s Supper

The holiness of the meat and the joyous and yet very serious nature of its consumption described in Lev 10 are reminiscent of the Lord’s Supper. Furthermore, the uncertainty over what this consumption accomplishes and how it does so is also a part of the ongoing debate about the theological significance of the Lord’s Supper. John
Calvin sees similar theological concepts at work in the Lord’s Supper and the sacrificial practice of Israel. One of the key similarities Calvin articulates is the way in which both draw the worshipper into proximity to the deity. Surprisingly, Calvin also insists that the benefits of Christ’s sacrifice were available through the sacrifices of Israel as through the Lord’s Supper.

In his discussion of the Christian sacraments (baptism and the Lord’s Supper for Calvin) in the *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Calvin clearly states that sacrifice was a sacrament.

For circumcision was enjoined upon Abraham and his descendants [Gen. 17:10]. To it were afterward added purifications [Lev., chs. 11 to 15], sacrifice, and other rites [Lev., chs. 1 to 10] from the law of Moses. These were the sacraments of the Jews until the coming of Christ. … Yet those ancient sacraments looked to the same purpose to which ours now tend: to direct and almost lead men by the hand to Christ, or rather, as images, to represent him and show him forth to be known.

Calvin emphasizes the superiority of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ. This act accomplishes what is needed for forgiveness, reconciliation, and salvation. This act is definitive and
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116 Calvin’s magnum opus was composed over the course of about twenty-five years, with the first edition published in 1536 and the final edition published in 1559. The work is a monumental and wide-ranging explication of Protestant theology. It is divided into four books: “The Knowledge of God the Creator,” “The Knowledge of God the Redeemer in Christ, First Disclosed to the Fathers Under the Law, and Then to Us in the Gospel,” “The Way in Which We Receive the Grace of Christ: What Benefits Come to Us from It, and What Effects Follow,” and “The External Means or Aids by Which God Invites Us Into the Society of Christ and Holds Us Therein.” The comments on the sacrificial system of Israel come in book four in which Calvin discusses the sacraments of baptism and the Lord’s Supper. Calvin’s work expanded greatly from its first edition to the last (the 1559 title is *Institute of the Christian Religion, now first arranged in four books and divided by definite headings in a very convenient way: also enlarged by so much added matter that it can almost be regarded as a new work*). However, the 1536 edition included Calvin’s explication of the sacraments.

singular. However, Calvin sees value in the sacrifices of Israel. Again in the Institutes, Calvin compares the Lord’s Supper to sacrifice and the sacramental nature of sacrifice is affirmed.

If anyone diligently ponders, he will observe that this difference between the Mosaic sacrifices and our Eucharist is established by the Lord’s word, that, although the former represented to the Jewish people the same effectiveness of Christ’s death as is today shown to us in the Supper [Lev. 1:5], yet the form of representation was different. For among the Jews the Levitical priests were commanded to prefigure the sacrifice that Christ was to perform; the victim was brought forward to take the place of Christ; there was an altar on which it was to be sacrificed…. But after Christ’s sacrifice was accomplished, the Lord instituted another method for us, that is, to transmit to the believing folk the benefit of the sacrifice offered to himself by his Son. He has therefore given us a Table at which to feast, not an altar upon which to offer a victim….118

The value of the Israelite sacrifices is similar to the value of the Christian sacraments:

Therefore, whatever is shown us today in the sacraments, the Jews of old received in their own—that is, Christ with his spiritual riches. They felt the same power in their sacraments as we do in ours; these were seals of divine good will toward them, looking to eternal salvation.119

Israelite sacrifice and the Lord’s Supper are differentiated only in the form by which they present Christ.120
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118 Calvin, Institutes, 1440 (4.18.12).
120 In Calvin’s Commentaries on the Four Last Books of Moses: Arranged in the Form of a Harmony, Calvin chose to arrange Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy in the form of a harmony. The narratives of these four books are arranged into a chronological harmony, while all of the doctrinal and legislative material is arranged into a topical harmony (Raymond A. Blacketer, “The Mosiac Harmony and Joshua,” in Calvin and the Bible [ed. Donald K. McKim; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006], 36). When Calvin reaches Exodus 20, he switches from narrative history to the topical section in which “[t]he Decalogue provides the ten major loci or topics that give order and meaning to all of the legal and didactic material of the Pentateuch” (Blacketer, “The Mosaic Harmony,” 36). This section includes all of Calvin’s comments on the sacrificial system of Leviticus, which he places under his discussion of the second commandment (Exod
The key difference between sacrifice as sacramental and the Lord’s Supper as sacramental is time. For both, the effectiveness lies squarely with Jesus, specifically the key soteriological moments in the life, death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus. This is a hallmark of Calvin’s theology, in general, and his theology on the sacraments, particularly. However, Christ is present in the Lord’s Supper, which is a sign and seal of Christ’s atoning work. Thus, this act is not simply memorial or symbolic. Through the spirit, believers are unified with Christ. Still, the redemptive work of Jesus accomplished salvation, and no act of a believer or an officiant is necessary for this salvation to be effective. Christ did the redemptive work once and for all and nothing we do changes

20:4–6; Deut 5: 8–10). The truth of the sacramental quality of Israelite sacrifice is also explicated in Calvin’s Harmony, where he compares it to baptism:

The words which Moses continually repeats, “the priest shall make an atonement for him, and his iniquity shall be forgiven him,” some coldly restrict to external and civil cleansing, as if Moses only removed his condemnation before men; but God rather offers pardon to sinners, and assures them that He will be favourable to them, lest fear or doubt should prevent them from freely calling upon Him. And assuredly those who do not acknowledge that the legal rites were sacraments are not acquainted with the very rudiments of faith. Now to all sacraments, at any rate to the common sacraments of the Church, a spiritual promise is annexed: it follows, therefore, that pardon was truly promised to the fathers, who reconciled themselves to God by the offering of sacrifices, not because the slaying of beasts expiated sins, but because it was a certain and infallible symbol, in which pious minds might acquiesce, so as to dare to come before God with tranquil confidence. In sum, as now in baptism sins are sacramentally washed away, so under the Law also the sacrifices were means of expiation, though in a different way; since baptism sets Christ before us as if He were present, whilst under the Law He was obscurely typified. Figuratively indeed what applies to Christ only is transferred to the signs, for in Him alone was manifested to us the fulfillment of all spiritual blessings, and He at length blotted out sins by His one and perpetual sacrifice; but since the question here is not as to the value of the legal ceremonies in themselves, let it suffice that they truly testified to the grace of God, of which they were the types; and so let not that profane imagination be listened to, that the sacrifices only politically and as far as regarded men absolved those by whom they were offered from guilt and condemnation (John Calvin, Commentaries on the Four Last Books of Moses: Arranged in the Form of a Harmony [tran. Rev. Charles William Bingham; 4 vols.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1950], 344–45).
this. In the case of the sacrifices of Israel, however, they occur before Jesus’ redemptive sacrifice in history. This gives them a curious status. Christ’s salvific work is easily recalled when Christians celebrate the Lord’s Supper. No such thing was possible for the Israelites. Calvin acknowledges this issue with Israelite sacrifice and he offers this explanation.

[T]heir [the sacrifices of Israel] fulfillment had been, so to speak, held in suspense until the appearance of Christ. Then I say that this must be understood not of efficacy but rather of mode of signification. For until Christ was manifested in the flesh, all signs foreshadowed him as if absent, however much he might make the presence of his power and himself inwardly felt among believers.121

In this way, Calvin is consistent in his Christocentrism, while still professing significance to the sacrifices of Israel. The idea of “their fulfillment” being “held in suspense” is a curious, yet clever idea that allows Calvin to find use in the sacrifices, be it only as they are directed toward Christ and his atoning work.

Kevin Dixon Kennedy articulates the concept of “union with Christ” as an essential aspect of Calvin’s work on atonement. This aspect may appear rather far removed from a discussion of the sacrificial system of Leviticus and its influence on Calvin’s understanding of Jesus’ sacrifice. However, nearness or proximity to the presence of God is one of the key features of sacrifice. Certainly within the Tabernacle system articulated in Leviticus, Israelites are brought nearest to the presence of YHWH when offering a sacrifice. While the effect or importance of this proximity is not

articulated, maintenance of the presence of YHWH is paramount. Specifically, doing what is necessary to keep YHWH present in the Tabernacle is paramount. Thus, Calvin’s discussion of “union with Christ,” especially in the context of atonement and the sacraments, is pertinent.

Kennedy argues that being united with Christ is necessary for the benefits of Christ’s atoning work to be realized by an individual. Kennedy goes so far as to conclude: “Calvin identifies the extent of union with Christ rather than the extent of the death of Christ as the determining factor regarding the actual salvation of individuals.” 

Kennedy believes that Calvin is ultimately a universalist when it comes to the intention and effectiveness of Jesus’ atoning work.

Yes, Christ died for the whole world, but this does not mean that everyone for whom Christ died will be saved. Something further is required to make the death of Christ efficacious in the life of the individual. The missing element in our salvation, if I may so speak, is that each person must be united to Christ by the Holy Spirit.

This union with Jesus is a union of substance, “a union with the very flesh of Christ.”

Through this union with Jesus’ flesh, his humanity, an individual partakes of the benefits of Jesus and Jesus’ atonement.

Kennedy explains how the concept of union with Christ is critical in Calvin’s explication of the Lord’s Supper. Considering that the elements of the Lord’s Supper are

122 Kevin Dixon Kennedy, Union with Christ and theExtent of the Atonement (Studies in Biblical Literature 48; New York: Peter Lang, 2002), 113.
123 Kennedy, Union with Christ, 109.
124 Kennedy, Union with Christ, 115.
the body and blood of Jesus, a connection between the Lord’s Supper and union with Christ is not surprising. Calvin describes union with Christ through the Lord’s Supper in this way:

To summarize: our souls are fed by the flesh and blood of Christ in the same way that bread and wine keep and sustain physical life. ... Even though it seems unbelievable that Christ’s flesh, separated from us by such great distance, penetrates to us, so that it becomes our food, let us remember how far the secret power of the Holy Spirit towers above all our senses, and how foolish it is to wish to measure his immeasurableness by our measure. What, then, our mind does not comprehend, let faith conceive: that the Spirit truly unites things separated in space.\textsuperscript{125}

Though difficult to imagine and impossible to experience directly, Calvin asserts that in the celebration of the Lord’s Supper the Spirit unites participants with the risen Christ. Kennedy explains:

That our union with Christ is foremost a union with the humanity of Christ, the bread of life, is most clearly seen in Calvin’s discussions of the Eucharist. ... Calvin saw no material difference between the communion with Christ which comes through the preaching of the word and the communion which we experience through partaking of Christ in the Supper. Both entail our partaking of the very body of Christ, for both bring to us the life which is found in Christ.\textsuperscript{126}

According to Kennedy, the union with Christ necessary for atonement is achieved by the Spirit when it grants us faith through the preaching of the word. However this union is no different than the union experienced in the Lord’s Supper. Here in Calvin’s theology, atonement and the Lord’s Supper collide. The efficacy of both depends upon a union

\textsuperscript{125} Calvin, \textit{Institutes}, 1370 (4.17.10).
\textsuperscript{126} Kennedy, \textit{Union with Christ}, 123.
with Christ. Both are founded upon the sacrificial offering of Jesus. The end or function of Jesus’ sacrificial offering is to give benefits to his believers through a union with them. Because of a sacrificial act, believers can and indeed must approach God in order to be saved and sustained.

5.2 Conclusion

Leviticus 17:11 should be understood to describe how blood, due to the contained within it, purges the of the offerer. Thus the rationale given in Lev 17:11 should not be seen as contradictory to Lev 4:1–5:13, nor should the use of in Lev 17:11 be understood as different from how it is used in Lev 16:29–34a, where it clearly means “purge.” This important passage of the Holiness Code serves to specify what aspect of the offerer, his/her , is purged. is a common element shared between people, animals, and YHWH, and for this reason it can function to purge persons of their sins when applied to the altar.

Leviticus 10:17 attests to the importance of the consumption of the -offering meat. The purgation of the congregation is not complete without the consumption of the -offering meat by the priests in a holy place. The consumption of the meat should be understood as a joyous event, thus explaining Aaron’s reluctance to eat the meat after
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Somewhat surprisingly, while Kennedy does not mention union with Christ as it pertains to baptism, Calvin does apply the concept to baptism, although not as strongly as he does to the Lord’s Supper. Writes Calvin, “Lastly, our faith receives from baptism the advantage of its sure testimony to us that we are not only engrafted into the death and life of Christ, but so united to Christ himself that we become sharers in all his blessings” (Calvin, Institutes, 1307 [4.15.6]).
the death of Nadab and Abihu. The meat is not impure, but holy, thus its consumption is not an elimination rite. It must be eaten in a holy place before YHWH because YHWH’s presence is important. These same concepts were evident in John Calvin’s explication of Jesus’ atoning act and the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper.
6. The Sacrificial Offering of Jesus in the Letter to the Hebrews

6.1 Introduction

The logic of the \( \text{사임} \) offering as set forth in the Priestly Source and the Holiness Code underlies the explication of the sacrificial offering of Jesus in the Letter to the Hebrews. This logic asserts that there is a relationship between the Israelites and the sanctuary. The wrongdoing of the Israelite can stain the sancta; the sancta can purge the Israelite of the sin/guilt/iniquity that the Israelite carries on account of having committed wrongdoing. Principally, it is through the application of the blood, which contains the \( \text{ فمن} \) (spirit) of the sacrificial animal, to the sancta that the \( \text{ فمن} \) of the Israelite is purged of his/her sin (Lev 4:1–5:13; Lev 17:11). The \( \text{사임} \) offering for an individual leads to forgiveness for the individual (Lev 4:20, 26, 31, 35; 5:10, 13). On Yom Kippur (Lev 16), the \( \text{사임} \) offerings purge the sanctuary of the stains caused by the wrongdoings of the Israelites that have accumulated there. The goat for Azazel purges Aaron, the high priest, of the sins that he has carried for the people. This annual purgation rite leads to the purgation of the sanctuary and the purification of the Israelites. The Israelites cannot be pure until the sanctuary is purged. Purification for individuals, then, is a two-stage process, moving from guilt-laden to being forgiven and then from being forgiven to being pure.
The Letter to the Hebrews affirms the importance of blood manipulation for purgation and purification. It was not enough for Jesus to die on the cross. He needed to be raised and to ascend to heaven to offer his blood in the heavenly sanctuary. This offering of blood in the heavenly sanctuary leads to the cleansing of believers (and to the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary), thus affirming the relationship between persons and sancta. Furthermore, Jesus’ offering is wrapped up in his post-resurrection nature. The author of Hebrews describes Jesus as having “a power of indestructible life,” which is crucial for his offering and for his qualification as a heavenly high priest. Thus, the physical and material nature of sacrifice is also affirmed in Hebrews. Wrongdoings, which manifest themselves as stains or a burden of guilt on persons and on sancta, can only be purged through the very physical process of sacrifice. Hebrews also evinces a two-stage process for the purification of believers. Initially, in Hebrews, believers are purged/cleansed on account of Jesus’ sacrificial offering in heaven. This is similar to the initial purgation for persons in Lev 4:1–5:13, which leads to forgiveness. However, Hebrews also asserts that all believers anticipate a final “rest” in which they will not simply be purged but transformed so as to possess the same kind of indestructible, perfected flesh that Jesus gained after his resurrection. This is not unlike the second-stage of purification that the Israelites undergo each year at Yom Kippur where they move from a state of “forgiven” to “pure.” In Hebrews, it is this new humanity that finally allows humans and God to dwell together, the desired goal of Israeliite sacrifice
and the sacrificial offering of Jesus. The author of Hebrews, then, recognizes that the aim of Israelite sacrifice was to promote this proximity, and the author affirms that it is still God’s desire to dwell with humans. Furthermore, Hebrews asserts that it is through a physical sacrificial offering of flesh and blood that this proximity is finally achieved.

Lastly, in Hebrews, Jesus’ sacrificial offering assumes a temporal progression of events—the progression of events attested in all the Gospels and assumed in all of the books of the New Testament: incarnation/life, suffering/death, resurrection, ascension, exaltation. Put another way, like the נָחַל offering of Leviticus, Jesus’ sacrifice has a number of acts. The various acts of Jesus’ sacrificial offering mirror the different acts of sacrificial procedure for the נָחַל offering. Act one of the נָחַל offering is the presentation of the animal, which is equated with Jesus’ obedience all the way to the cross. Jesus’ death on the cross is the second act, equivalent to the slaughter of the sacrificial animal. Act three, the most important act, is the offering of the blood of Jesus in the heavenly sanctuary and this coincides with the manipulation of the blood of the animal in the earthly sanctuary. The last act (act four) is the burning or eating of the sacrificial animal. This act corresponds to the celebration of the Lord’s Supper. In both the נָחַל offering and Jesus’ sacrificial offering, the blood rite is the most important step.¹

¹ Leviticus 10:17 also puts emphasis on the purgatory action of the consumption of the outer-altar נָחַל meat. This action is clearly also important, but I would not elevate it to the same plane as the blood application. Nonetheless, I will touch on the aspect of eating and purgation in this chapter.
While I did not talk at length about the various steps of the sacrificial process in Lev 4:1–5:13, the process will receive more attention here because of the argument in Hebrews. The author of Hebrews narrates a process for Jesus’ sacrificial offering, stressing Jesus’ offering of blood in the heavenly sanctuary as the crucial moment. Many scholars of Hebrews often conflate this entire process into the singular historical event of Jesus’ death on the cross, thus missing the important corollaries with sacrificial procedure in Leviticus. While death is a necessary part of the sacrificial process described in Leviticus, it is the application of blood, which contains בּוֹד, that purges. The author of Hebrews concurs, stressing Jesus’ possession of “a power of indestructible life” as his qualification for priesthood in heaven, while also indicating that this quality was important to Jesus’ offering in the heavenly sanctuary.

6.2 Access to God

The Letter to the Hebrews stands apart from the other books of the New Testament. While sacrificial language is not unusual in the New Testament (Matt 20:28, 26:28; Mark 10:45, 14:24; Luke 22:20; Acts 20:28; Rom 3:25, 5:9; 1 Cor 10:16–18; Eph 1:7, 2:13, 5:2; Col 1:20; 1 Tim 2:6; 1 Pet 1:2; 1 John 1:7, 2:2, 4:10; Rev 1:5, 5:9), language that explicitly references cultic actions is unusual. Hebrews describes Jesus acting as a priest and functioning as an offering in the heavenly tabernacle. Hebrews describes the
significance of Jesus’ death, resurrection, and ascension almost entirely in the context of cultic sacrifice. The book often is read as a refutation of the sacrificial system of Israel. Certainly the author of Hebrews is critical of that system. The author deems it inadequate as compared to the accomplishments of Jesus’ sacrificial offering. However, the author affirms many of the principles of the Israelite sacrificial system. The issue is not about bad versus good, but about insufficient versus perfect. Jesus’ sacrificial offering achieves what the Israelite sacrificial system prized but could not fully accomplish: full and equal access to YHWH.

As discussed in chapter one, Jonathan Klawans has suggested that one of the organizing principles of the Priestly sacrificial system is “attracting and maintaining the divine presence.” How can humans and YHWH dwell together? The author of Hebrews is struggling with this same question. Benjamin Sommer draws a surprising, yet insightful, conclusion about the Priestly desire for divine immanence.

Yet it has become clear … that the P document is in fact the most Christian section of Hebrew scripture. As one reads through P beginning with Genesis 1, one can see that for all its attention to specifics, this narrative has a larger, overarching concern: the decision of a transcendent God to become immanent in the world this God created. It … necessitates the itemization of architectural features and the cultic rules that will make the paradox of the transcendent God’s immanence possible; we find these, respectively, in the last half of Exodus and throughout Leviticus and Numbers. Although the itemization might strike some readers as legalistic (or at least very, very detailed), it nonetheless describes an

---

2 Many argue that resurrection is not a part of the atonement equation for the author of Hebrews. I will argue for it.
3 As chapter one of this dissertation has shown, H is the author of Gen 1:1–2:4a. However, this does not negate Sommer’s important insight.
act of divine grace, for those rules provide the means for God to enter the world and thus humanity to approach God. In broad terms, P’s basic story and the New Testament’s are of the same type. Although they differ in many details..., their fundamental similarity renders deeply ironic many Christians’ aversion to this part of their scripture.\(^4\)

The Priestly writers developed a system that would allow YHWH to dwell with the Israelite people. It was a complicated system, but its goal was to allow for YHWH to dwell on earth with humanity. Sacrifice was the central component of this system. Like P and H, the author of Hebrews believes that the same component, sacrifice, offers the answer to this conundrum. God desires to dwell with humanity, and the New Testament begins and ends with a vision of God doing just that, first in the person of Jesus Christ and then in the New Jerusalem. Furthermore, in Hebrews especially, but also in many other places throughout the New Testament, it is the blood of Jesus (a reference to Jesus’ offering, not to Jesus’ death) that finally reconciles God and humanity, and one day will allow humans and God to dwell together.

Without a doubt, the writer elevates the sacrifice of Jesus over and above the repetitive sacrifices of Israel. The sacrificial system of Israel is subjected to scrutiny and found wanting. However, the fundamentals of the system are affirmed. Human sinfulness is a problem that is rightly addressed through sacrificial procedure; the whole letter is predicated upon this truth. The sacrifices of Israel were effective to a certain

extent. Throughout the text, Israel’s priests are said to offer sacrifices for themselves and
the community, and the efficacy of these sacrifices is not denied:

Heb 9:13/ Now if the blood of goats and bulls and the ash of a heifer sprinkled on
those who have been defiled sanctifies for the purification of the flesh,
Heb 9:14/ how much more does the blood of Christ, who through eternal spirit
offered himself blameless to God, cleanse our conscience from dead works so
that we might serve the living God! ⁵

Israelite sacrifice successfully purified the flesh in the eyes of the author of Hebrews.
This is similar to the understanding in Lev 4:1–5:13, where the blood of the ḥaṭṭaḥ
offering, though applied to sancta, purges the offerer of his sin or guilt. Contrary to the
assertion of the author of Hebrews, it does not purify his flesh. In the statement of Heb
9:13, the author of Hebrews asserts that the blood of goats and bulls and the ritual of the
red heifer, in which water is applied to a person, have the same result: the purification of
the flesh. I did not and will not discuss the ritual with the red heifer, which clearly does
involve purification through direct contact with the water for cleansing. However, the
blood of goats and bulls is consistently applied to sancta. ⁶ Thus the author of Hebrews
appears to be admitting that blood applied to sancta purifies the offerer, specifically, the
flesh of the offerer. While this explanation does not concord perfectly with my findings,
it does appear to affirm that blood applied to the sancta does affect the offerer.

⁶ In Lev 14, on scale disease, blood is applied to a person. However, neither a goat nor a bull is used in this ritual.
For the author of Hebrews, Jesus’ offering is preferred because of its ability to cleanse the conscience. Guido Telscher similarly concludes,

Die Opfer des ersten Bundes sind demnach für den Hebr nicht wertlos, jedoch als Riten dieser Schöpfung prinzipiell unvollkommen. Sie sind wie Abbilder und Schatten des Eigentlichen. Der Verfasser denkt platonisch, aber nicht antijüdisch. Mit Christus hat sich eine neue, letzte Dimension eröffnet, die den ersten Bund faktisch in den Schatten stellt, ohne ihn deswegen polemisch abzuwerten oder zu verurteilen.⁷

In other words, Jesus’ sacrificial offering is predicated upon the real and effective, but imperfect, sacrificial offerings of Israel. Hebrews should not be viewed as crudely supersessionist. Jesus’ offering is only effective because the sacrifices of Israel were effective. Jesus’ offering is different, unique, and not replicable, but it is not unprecedented.

6.3 Sacrificial Procedure in Leviticus and Hebrews

As Heb 9:11–12 demonstrates, the author of Hebrews is quite clear about what part of the sacrificial act achieves redemption:

Heb 9:11/ But Christ, having arrived as high priest of the good things which have come into being,⁸ entered, through the greater and more perfect tabernacle, which is not manufactured, that is, not of this creation,

---

⁷ “The sacrifices of the first covenant are for Hebrews, not worthless, but as rituals of this creation, principally imperfect. They are like shadows and images of the real thing. The author thinks platonically, but is not opposed to Judaism. With Christ, a new, final, dimension has opened, which stands in the shadows of the first covenant without polemically devaluing or condemning it” (Guido Telscher, Opfer aus Barmherzigkeit Hebr 9,11-28 im Kontext biblischer Sühnetheologie [Würzburg, Germany: Echter Verlag, 2007], 294).

⁸ Attridge explains, “Through Christ’s priestly act the good things that the Law and its cultic system foreshadowed have become a reality and the promises of the interior renewal in a new covenant are being realized” (Hebrews, 245).
Heb 9:12/ and not with the blood of goats and calves, but with his own blood, once for all into the sanctuary, obtaining an eternal redemption. 

Jesus’ death on the cross, while necessary, was not the entirety of the sacrificial act. It was also, even primarily, through the presentation of his blood that Jesus obtained eternal redemption. This accords well with sacrificial procedure in Leviticus. The slaughter and death of the victim is never presented as the act that accomplishes \( \text{הָשַׁלֵּם} \).

Throughout Lev 1–7, the Hebrew texts clearly indicate that the offerer kills the animal (1:5, 11; 3:2, 8, 13; 4:4, 24, 29, 33; 7:2). In the תָּהוֹרָה-offering legislation for an individual, for example, the sequence of active verbs in the third person masculine singular begins in Lev 4:27 with \( \text{שָׂם} \) (best translated as “anyone” here) as the hypothetical third person singular subject. This person brings (\( \text{נָשָׁה} \)) his offering (\( \text{רַכִּים} \)) in 4:28, and the sequence of verbs in the third person masculine singular continues through to Lev 4:29b, which reads: “…and he shall slaughter the sin offering at the place of the burnt offering” (\( \text{נָשָׂא} \...

---

9 Attridge, Hebrews, 244.
10 Milgrom renders the act of slaughtering the animal in the impersonal passive as he believes that “anyone was permitted to perform the immolation.” However, he admits that, literally, the text of Lev 1:5 reads, “and he [the offerer] shall slaughter” (Leviticus 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary, [AB 3, New York: Doubleday, 1991], 154).
11 Leviticus 4:15 is ambiguous about who kills the sacrificial animal. The hand-leaning is performed by the elders (plural) and thus the verb for “lean” is in the 3rd common plural of the Qal perfect (\( \text{נָשָׂא} \)). However the verb for slaughter that follows the hand-leaning prescription is in the 3rd masculine singular of the Qal perfect (\( \text{נָשָׂא} \)). This incongruity is surely due to the reality that only one person need carry out the slaughter. Clearly, designating specifically who was to perform this task was not necessary, and this fact strongly suggests that this act was less important than the acts specifically prescribed for the priests. Lev 6:18 [Eng. 6:25] twice has the verb for “slaughter” in the Niphal imperfect, 3rd feminine singular (\( \text{נָשָׂא} \)), leaving the identity of the slaughterer unknown. Here the priests (Aaron and his sons) are the subjects of the
passive, but the Hebrew is clearly active (םֶפֶשַׁע) and has the offerer (עַלְפָּה) as the subject. There is no description of the procedure for killing the animal. The fact that the priest is never indicated as the slaughterer almost certainly means that this part of the ritual is less critical than other parts of the sacrificial procedure. As Catherine Bell states, “Those rites in which specialists preside are generally seen as more central, powerful, encompassing, and integral to the welfare of the whole than those that employ more locally skilled practioners [sic] or none at all.”12 In Lev 1–7 (4:20, 26, 31, 35; 5:6, 5:10, 13, 16, 18, 16 [Eng. 6:7], 6:23 [Eng. 6:30]), when רֵפֶה is accomplished, the priest13 is always the actor who accomplishes רֵפֶה. And yet, the priest is never said to be the person who slaughters the animal. Thus, some other priestly action, namely the blood manipulation, must be what accomplishes רֵפֶה. Thus the slaughter alone is not the decisive atoning act.

Once a year, on Yom Kippur, the high priest enters behind the veil, into the Holy of Holies, to sprinkle blood before the ark. Hebrews 9:7 references this annual event as it lays out the differences between the Israelite sacrificial system and the offering of Jesus.

The primary difference is not one of procedure. Just as the high priest must enter the
course, and yet instead of stipulating them as the slaughterers, the text avoids identifying who slaughters the animal by using the Niphal, which can only be rendered in the passive. None of this detracts from my point about the slaughter/death of the animal, and in fact, Lev 6:18 strengthens my case. 12 Catherine Bell, Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 135. 13 Lev 1:4 does not specifically state who has accomplished רֵפֶה. This is the only place in Lev 1–7 where the burnt offering accomplishes רֵפֶה (usually it is the נַחַל or מְזָח that accomplish רֵפֶה) although the burnt offering does carry out this function again in Lev 16:24, in part of the Yom Kippur ritual. This verse, as well as the others which contain רֵפֶה, will be discussed in more detail in the exegetical chapters.
holy place to sprinkle blood before the mercy seat, so too Christ entered “not with the blood of goats and calves, but with his own blood, once for all into the sanctuary, obtaining an eternal redemption” (9:12). Further, just as the blood of the sacrifices of Yom Kippur purges the Tabernacle of the defilement of sin, Jesus’ blood cleanses the heavenly Tabernacle. Hebrews 9:23–26:

Heb 9:23/ It is necessary, therefore, that the copies of what is in the heavens be cleansed with these things [blood of animals], but that the heavenly things themselves be cleansed with sacrifices\(^{14}\) [blood of Jesus] better than these. 
Heb 9:24/ For Christ did not enter a sanctuary made by hands, a copy of what is real, but into heaven itself, in order to appear now before the face of God [τὸ προσώπον τοῦ θεοῦ] on our behalf. 
Heb 9:25/ [He entered] not so that he might offer himself many times, as the high priest enters the sanctuary yearly with another’s blood, 
Heb 9:26/ since otherwise it would have been necessary for him to suffer many times since the foundation of the world. But now once at the end of the ages he has been manifested for the abolition of [the] sin [offering] through his sacrifice.\(^{15}\)

The author’s adoption of the logic of the ἱδρυμα offering of Leviticus could not be clearer. Moreover, as will be discussed below, Jesus’ sacrifice also cleanses the conscience of his people.

In two places in the verses above (Heb 9:23–26), the author of Hebrews makes verbal reference to Lev 1–16. As I stated above, in Lev 1–7 and 16, the phrase, לֶּדֶנּ יָהָוִּ (“before YHWH”) appears 22 times. In Heb 9:24, we read that Jesus appeared “before the

\(^{14}\) It is odd that the author of Hebrews uses the plural here when the author has been so adamant about the singularity of Jesus’ sacrifice. It may be that the plurality of Israelite sacrifices cited just prior is the root of this inconsistency. Attridge sees no major problem here, concluding, “…the plural is used simply because he is stating a general principle” (Hebrews, 261).

\(^{15}\) Attridge, Hebrews, 260. The inclusion of [the] and [offering] will be discussed in detail below.
face of God” (τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ), which is a nearly literal translation of λίθος ידוהי.

While the Septuagint text of Lev 1–7 and 16 does not translate λίθος ידוהי as τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ, I still contend that the author of Hebrews is referencing this oft-used phrase from Lev 1–7 and 16. Secondly, Heb 9:26b reads: “But now once at the end of the ages he has been manifested for the abolition of [the, τῆς] sin [offering] through his sacrifice.” A majority of manuscripts include the definite article, τῆς, before ἁμαρτίας, “sin.”

Attridge claims that either way, with or without the article, it has the same meaning. I argue that with the definite article, it must be understood and translated as “the sin offering,” instead of “the sin.” Thus, as indicated in the translation above, Attridge’s translation of Heb 9:26 would be emended as follows (my emendations are in bold):

Heb 9:26/ since otherwise it would have been necessary for him to suffer many times since the foundation of the world. But now once at the end of the ages he has been manifested for the abolition of the sin offering through his sacrifice.16

This reading of Heb 9:26 is strengthened by another reference to ἁμαρτίας as “sin offering” in Heb 13:11. Translating τῆς ἁμαρτίας as “the sin offering” in Heb 9:26 lends credence to my argument for the importance of the entire sacrificial act. The sacrificial procedure for the ἁμαρτίας offering does not end with the slaughter of the victim because the slaughter of the victim is only a means to the most important part of the sacrificial procedure: the application of the blood of the sacrificial animal.

16 Attridge, Hebrews, 260.
17 Attridge, Hebrews, 260. My emendations are in bold.
Why does the heavenly sanctuary need cleansing? How does Jesus’ sacrifice function to cleanse both the sanctuary and the conscience of his people? Using the logic of Lev 4:1–5:13 and Lev 16, there is a relationship between believers and the heavenly sanctuary wherein the wrongdoings of believers can stain the heavenly sancta and, through the sacrificial offering of Jesus, the heavenly sancta can purge believers. Even with the sanctuary in heaven, the wrongdoings of believers can stain the sanctuary of YHWH. Moreover, the application of the blood of Jesus functions to cleanse the sanctuary, but also to cleanse the consciences of believers. This is a conflation of Lev 4:1–5:13, where offerers are purged and Lev 16, where the sanctuary is purged. That said, Lev 16:29–34a does indicate that the rituals of Yom Kippur do move the Israelites from a state of forgiveness to a state of purity. The author of Hebrews is explicating a single, all-encompassing sacrificial offering as opposed to a recurring הָעַטָּבֹת offering (as described in Lev 4:1–5:13) and the rituals of Yom Kippur (Lev 16). Nonetheless, as will be explained below, Hebrews, like Leviticus, does articulate two steps in its full explication of the transformation of believers: immediate cleansing, along with the promise of a future “rest” in which believers’ bodies will be transformed. This is not so unlike the two steps (guilt-laden to purged/forgiven and purged/forgiven to pure) in Leviticus, with the exception that Hebrews only narrates a single sacrifice to accomplish both steps. My understanding of the הָעַטָּבֹת offering of Lev 4:1–5:13 and Lev 16 offers an explanation of how Jesus’ sacrificial offering in the heavenly sanctuary can accomplish these
purifications and transformations. Most scholars of Hebrews have not recognized this equation. Many scholars of the Letter posit either a symbolic meaning for Jesus’ offering of blood in the heavenly sanctuary or equate it with his death on the cross.

6.4 An Offering in the Heavenly Sanctuary

Despite the fact that the author of Hebrews clearly narrates Jesus entering the heavenly sanctuary to bring his sacrificial offering, most scholars of Hebrews emphasize Jesus’ death on the cross and Jesus’ exaltation as the key moments. David Moffitt explains why scholars of Hebrews focus on cross and exaltation.

Because the writer’s [author of Hebrews] portrayal of Jesus as the great high priest intends to identify how it is that Jesus’ death on the cross functions as the act of sacrifice that ultimately atones for sin, the resurrection of Jesus, as a discrete event, is secondary or even unnecessary. In other words, by virtue of casting Jesus in the role of the high priest who enters the holy of holies with the sacrificial blood to accomplish atonement on Yom Kippur, the author is able to utilize the category of Jesus’ heavenly exaltation as a lens for clarifying the spiritual significance of the cross. The writer’s metaphorical appeal to Yom Kippur allows him to hold Jesus’ death and exaltation together as two moments that correspond to the central events of the atonement liturgy—the slaughter of the victim and the presentation of its blood in the holy of holies. It follows that these two crucial poles—Jesus’ death and subsequent exaltation as the priest-king in heaven—form the axes around which the argument of Hebrews turn.18

Moffitt goes on to show that the logic of sacrifice in Leviticus clarifies that Jesus’ presentation of blood is the most decisive moment, and this moment cannot be equated with Jesus’ death on the cross. As Moffitt concludes, “[T]he author of Hebrews himself

consistently identifies the presentation of Jesus’ offering in heaven as the event that effected atonement.”

Most exegetes of Hebrews condense the entire exposition of Jesus’ sacrificial offering into the event of the cross and his exaltation, often seeing the two as basically contemporaneous. F. F. Bruce states, “The two principal moments in the great sin offering of Old Testament times were the shedding of the victim’s blood in the court of the sanctuary and the presentation of its blood inside the sanctuary. In the antitype these two moments were seen to correspond to the death of Christ on the cross and his appearance at the right hand of God.” Thus while Hebrews describes Jesus offering his blood in the heavenly Holy of Holies, Bruce identifies only Jesus’ death on the cross and his appearance before God as parallels to sacrificial practice in Leviticus, with no mention of the exact correspondence of blood presentation in Leviticus and Hebrews. Craig R. Koester also concludes that the author of Hebrews describes “Jesus’ death and exaltation in terms of the high priest’s movements on the Day of Atonement.” Again, death and exaltation, with no mention of Jesus’ presentation of his blood in the heavenly sanctuary, are identified as the events that correspond to the movements of the high priest on Yom Kippur.

---

19 Moffitt, Atonement and the Logic of Resurrection, 2.
Others see the rather concrete description of Jesus as a high priest offering himself in the heavenly tabernacle as metaphorical language intended to explain the atoning significance of Jesus’ death on the cross. Kenneth Schenck concludes,

Christ’s death is an atoning sacrifice for sins and Christ does pass through the heavens to the throne of God … but it is on a metaphorical level that the author understands this sequence of events to be the slaughter of an animal that is brought through a sanctuary into a heavenly Holy of Holies. … References to this metaphorical event are thus a complex, yet relevant way for the author to argue that Christ’s death is an efficacious atonement for sins.22

Likewise, Harold Attridge claims that Jesus’ death, along with his exaltation and perfection, make the cross an atoning sacrifice consummated in heaven. Writes Attridge,

“Hebrews will finally be concerned not so much with a realistically conceived heavenly journey made by Christ as with the significance of entry into the realm where God is truly worshiped.”23 This comment, while a bit opaque,24 hints at Attridge’s hesitance to view Christ’s offering in heaven literally. Commenting on Heb 9:12, which claims that Jesus entered the heavenly sanctuary with his own blood, Attridge is conflicted, but ultimately stresses Jesus’ death on the cross.

Yet the image [of Christ entering the heavenly sanctuary with his own blood] should not be pressed here, or through the rest of chapter, to mean that Christ actually brought his blood into heaven. That “blood” is being used in a metaphorical way is clear, but the precise metaphorical significance is not immediately apparent and debates about the relationship between heavenly and

24 It is unclear what Attridge means when he says, “…the significance of entry into the realm where God is truly worshiped.” He likely is speaking of heaven, but he is not explicit about it.
earthly, between the exaltation and the cross, in Hebrews often play off one or another blood metaphor. Thus “blood” could be the life that Christ offers eternally in heaven, or more likely, the sacrificial death that precedes that entry.²⁵

Attridge does not offer any evidence for concluding that the image of Jesus offering his own blood in the heavenly tabernacle must be metaphorical. Why is it “clear” that blood is being used in a metaphorical way? Moreover, why should references to Jesus’ blood be understood as “the sacrificial death that precedes his entry”? This could only be so if the entire argument about Jesus as a high priest is metaphorical. However, if Jesus does not truly act as a high priest in the heavenly sanctuary, but instead this image is a metaphor for what is accomplished by the historical event of his death on a cross, why does the author of Hebrews bother to prove that Jesus is a high priest? Why should the author of Hebrews do the difficult work of arguing for Jesus’ high priesthood if his act as high priest is only a metaphor for what his death on the cross represents? If Jesus’ ascension was not for the purpose of his sacrificial offering, what was its purpose?

Attridge’s approach consistently conflates the terms “sacrifice, offering, and blood.” They all are understood to refer to Jesus’ death. Hebrews 9:14 offers the clearest indication, according to Attridge, of the metaphorical nature of sacrificial images in Hebrews.

Heb 9:14/ …how much more does the blood of Christ, who through eternal spirit [δι' ἅπειρον] offered himself blameless [ἀμώμον] to God, cleanse

²⁵ Attridge, Hebrews, 248.
our conscience \textit{[συνειδησία]} from dead works so that we might serve the living God!\textsuperscript{26}

The use of \textit{ἀμωμός} in Heb 9:14 is a clear reference to the physical aspect of sacrificial practice. The Septuagint uses \textit{ἀμωμός} to translate the Hebrew adjective \textit{פנימי} throughout the \textit{אכשיה}-offering legislation of Lev 4:1–5:13 (4:3, 14, 23, 28, 32). A sacrificial offering must be physically “without blemish” (\textit{ἀμωμός/פנימי}). Coming back to Attridge, this verse is crucial to Attridge’s reading of Hebrews. For him, it reveals that the author of Hebrews is speaking metaphorically about Jesus’ high priestly offering in the heavenly tabernacle. Commenting on the phrase “through eternal spirit,” Attridge writes:

On the one hand it suggests something about the ‘locale’ where the true sacrifice takes place, not in a temple of bricks and mortar, but in the spiritual realm. At the same time, it suggests something about the quality of the offering and helps to define what it is that is really being offered under the symbolism of Christ’s ‘blood.’ Although it would be anachronistic to find here a developed ‘two-nature’ Christology, the spirit here most likely refers to Christ and to the interior or spiritual quality of his sacrificial act. Christ’s self-offering was thus made with that portion of his being that was most truly himself.\textsuperscript{27}

Literarily, Attridge connects “through eternal spirit” (\textit{διὰ πνεύματος αἰώνιου}) of v. 14 with “through the greater and more perfect tabernacle” (\textit{διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειωτέρας σκήνης}) of v. 11 and “but with his own blood” (\textit{διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἷματος}) of v. 12. Attridge claims that the \textit{διὰ} of v. 14 “resume[s] and reinterpret[s] the two problematic prepositional phrases of vv. 11 and 12.”\textsuperscript{28} This verbal correspondence is

\textsuperscript{26} Attridge, \textit{Hebrews}, 244.
\textsuperscript{27} Attridge, \textit{Hebrews}, 251.
\textsuperscript{28} Attridge, \textit{Hebrews}, 251.
noteworthy. However, the διὰ phrase of v. 14 ("through eternal spirit") is the most curious, as even Attridge admits.29 Why should this curious phrase, found only here in all of the New Testament, be understood to correct or clarify the previous phrases, which make perfect sense when understood as Jesus’ heavenly reenactment of Yom Kippur? Instead, I suggest we read “through eternal spirit” in light of the other two διὰ phrases.

Attridge is onto something when he suggests that the reference to “eternal spirit” is a reference to Jesus, namely “that portion of his being that was most truly himself.” However this is far too opaque. Considering Lev 17:11, which states that ψυχή is contained in blood, I believe that the author of Hebrews may be referencing this idea when he mentions “eternal spirit.” Hebrews 4:12 articulates the close connection between soul (ψυχή) and spirit (πνεῦμα).

Heb 4:12/ For the word of God is alive and active and sharper than any two-edged sword, penetrating to the division of soul [ψυχή] and spirit [πνεῦμα], joints and marrow, and able to scrutinize the heart’s thoughts and intentions.30

Attridge explains that “it is possible to conceive of neither the points where soul and spirit nor those where joint and marrow join.”31 Throughout the Septuagint, ψυχή is rendered consistently as ψυχή, including in Lev 17:11. Here in Hebrews, we can see how the author conceives of ψυχή and πνεῦμα as related, such that only God’s word could

---

29 “The precise import of this phrase is difficult to determine” (Attridge, Hebrews, 250).
30 Attridge, Hebrews, 133.
31 Attridge, Hebrews, 135.
separate the two. Thus in Heb 9:14, the author of Hebrews may be acknowledging that it was on account of the “eternal spirit” (=ψυχή of Lev 17:11) that was contained in the blood of Jesus that Jesus was able to obtain redemption. Perhaps using ψυχή would have made this identification clearer, although the author chooses πνεῦμα because he believes that it is πνεῦμα that humans, Jesus, and God share. For the Holiness Code, the author of Lev 17–26, humans and YHWH both possessed ψυχή. In Hebrews, the author speaks of the Holy Spirit, which appears to be connected to God (Heb 2:4), and eternal spirit, which is connected to Jesus (Heb 9:14). Finally, Heb 12:23 mentions humans having spirits, which can be made perfect. For the author of Hebrews, then, πνεῦμα is the proper equivalent of ψυχή.

Attridge goes on to read the exposition of Jesus’ offering through the prism of his reading of Heb 9:14. Thus, when the author of Hebrews claims in 9:23 that the heavenly things are cleansed by Jesus’ offering, Attridge does not think this should be understood literally.

As the reflection on spirit and conscience in 9:14 suggests, the heavenly or ideal realities cleansed by Christ’s sacrifice are none other than the consciences of the members of the new covenant, the “inheritors of eternal salvation.” While our author uses imagery of a heavenly temple with roots in Jewish apocalyptic traditions, he does not develop that imagery in a crudely literalistic way. In Hebrews, as in Platonically inspired Jews such as Philo, language of cosmic transcendence is ultimately a way of speaking about human interiority.32

---

32 Attridge, Hebrews, 263.
Attridge is indeed pointing out a confusing aspect of the argument of Hebrews. Whereas in Heb 9:23 Jesus’ offering is said to cleanse the heavenly things, in other places in Hebrews Jesus’ offering is also said to affect his followers (1:3; 5:9; 9:14; 10:22). However, my work on the נאום offering demonstrates that this oddity actually makes perfect sense as Lev 4:1–5:13 and especially Lev 16:30, 33, and 34a show. After the rituals of Yom Kippur, wherein only the sancta receive the manipulation of blood, both the sanctuary and the Israelites are declared pure. Attridge’s solution equates this “language of cosmic transcendence” (a sacrificial offering of/by Jesus in heaven) with “human interiority,” not realizing the two are intimately connected. A very real offering in heaven can indeed cleanse a human of sin. Leviticus affirms this logic. Instead, Attridge forces everything into the event of the cross. All this talk of sacrificial procedure is theological explication of this singular event. Jesus’ death on the cross is the only, and thus the decisive, sacrificial act: “Despite this variegated apocalyptic and legal imagery, the event to which our author refers is still the death of Christ, as is clear from the reference to his ‘sacrifice’ (θυσίας).”

In the quote from Attridge immediately preceding, Attridge is referring to Heb 9:26, which states that Jesus “has been manifested for the abolition of the sin offering through his sacrifice.” Considering the context of this letter, it is extremely dubious to

---

33 Attridge, Hebrews, 265.
34 Attridge, Hebrews, 260.
equate sacrifice with death. Certainly, death is a part of sacrifice, but only one part in a sequence of actions (that includes and culminates with the application of blood), as the author of Hebrews knows and clearly demonstrates. Furthermore, I have included my corrections to Attridge’s translation of this verse, which I discussed above. Jesus’ sacrifice, which includes his offering of blood in the heavenly sanctuary, abolishes the sin offering, an offering that puts great emphasis on blood application. Therefore, it will not suffice to equate sacrifice with death, as sacrificial practice includes much more than the slaughter of the victim.

Attridge mentions two other places where the term “sacrifice” appears, outside of the context of Israelite practice. In Heb 10:12, Christ sits down at the right hand of God after making his “sacrifice.” To reiterate, Hebrews has shown that Jesus’ sacrifice has a number of acts and thus any mention of Jesus’ sacrifice has these many acts in mind. In Heb 13:15–16, believers are urged to offer a “sacrifice of praise,” for God is pleased with such “sacrifices.” Attridge, of course, does not assert that “sacrifice” in these verses should be understood as death. It is metaphorical, likely referring to prayer. This metaphorical usage lends some credence to viewing the entire exposition of Jesus’ sacrifice as metaphorical. However, Jesus undergoes the death part of sacrifice literally. Moreover, the singularity of his sacrifice is stressed time and again in Hebrews, thus implying that Jesus’ sacrifice differs significantly from any sacrifice a believer might offer. Jesus has put an end to literal sacrifice.
Moffitt argues that the soteriology and high-priestly Christology developed in Hebrews depends upon Jesus’ resurrection.\textsuperscript{35} It is only after his resurrection that Jesus has the necessary element for his unique priesthood and also for his offering in heaven: “power of an indestructible life” (δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου), as described in Heb 7:16. When this is understood, the parallels between the understanding of the role of Jesus’ sacrifice in Hebrews and the understanding of the role of the ταφή offering in Leviticus become even clearer. The ταφή offering of Lev 4:1–5:13 and Lev 16, in which blood that contains νίενε is applied to sancta, purges the offerer and the sanctuary. Likewise, Jesus offers his blood, containing the “power of an indestructible life” (perhaps identical to “eternal spirit”), in the heavenly sanctuary and purges believers and the heavenly sanctuary.

\textbf{6.5 Resurrection in Hebrews}

A reading of Hebrews that is informed by the sacrificial procedures of Leviticus supports the inclusion of bodily resurrection in the schema of Jesus’ sacrificial offering. This reading goes against the scholarly consensus on the sacrificial offering of Jesus in Hebrews. My argument combines a close reading of the text of Hebrews with my understanding of the function of the ταφή offering in Leviticus. Such a reading strengthens the inclusion of Jesus’ bodily resurrection in the soteriological model of Hebrews. As I have shown, the physical nature of the ταφή offering, as well as the

\textsuperscript{35} Moffitt, Atonement and the Logic of Resurrection, 2–3, 42–43.
physical consequences of wrongdoing that the מ Lester offering addresses, are crucial to understanding the function of the מ Lester offering in Leviticus. The very physical sacrificial procedure for the מ Lester offering correlates to the physical problem that it is addressing, be it the stains on the sancta or the guilt-carrying of the offerer. While the cause and effect of wrongdoing, its consequences, and its sacrificial remedy are somewhat mysterious, Leviticus makes it clear that all of these aspects are understood as having physical reality. Likewise, Jesus’ sacrificial offering in Hebrews should be understood as physical, which requires a bodily resurrection.

Moffitt has identified some major approaches among Hebrews’ scholars on the issue of resurrection in the letter: “passed over,” “spiritual ascension,” “agnosticism,” or “no resurrection.” The “passed over” (F.F. Bruce, William L. Lane) approach avoids the issue of the resurrection. “For these interpreters the resurrection of Jesus is not in any way denied in Hebrews. The event is simply not central for the writer because his particular soteriological concerns—and especially the elements of his priestly Christology—have led him to focus on the moments of Jesus’ death and exaltation.” Thus, the resurrection is passed over—not denied, but also not stressed. “Agnosticism” (William R.G. Loader, Craig C. Koester, Luke Timothy Johnson) is exactly as it sounds. These scholars neither deny its existence, nor stress its importance in their explication of the schema of Hebrews. Luke Timothy Johnson appears to affirm Jesus’ bodily

---

36 Moffitt, Atonement and the Logic of Resurrection, 4.
resurrection in Hebrews: “By his resurrection and exaltation, Jesus has entered into the true holy place, which is the presence of the eternal God, with his own blood, … which he offers for the sins of many.””37 However, regarding Heb 9:14, Johnson states, “If spirit is the realm of God’s existence, then Christ’s entry into that presence is appropriately described as ‘through eternal spirit.’”38 Johnson also insists that salvation is “transtemporal because [it is] also transmaterial.”39 Johnson appears conflicted about bodily resurrection and ascension. The “spiritual ascension” group (Hans Windisch, Otfried Hofius, Erich Grässer, Richard D. Nelson, Kenneth Schenck) leaves no gap for resurrection in between Jesus’ death and his priestly work in heaven. Resurrection and ascension are condensed into the same act, which essentially negates the notion of a bodily40 resurrection. The last group, “no resurrection” (Georg Bertram, Ernst Käsemann, Harold Attridge), denies resurrection in Hebrews. Writes Moffitt, “In place of the language/concept of resurrection, they argue, stands the idea of the transition of Jesus’ spirit out of the earthly realm and into heaven, or perhaps just the theological significance such an idea might imply. The author does not, in any case, conceive of this transition from earth to heaven in terms of resurrection.”41

38 Johnson, Hebrews, 236.
39 Johnson, Hebrews, 40.
40 For this group, if resurrection exists at all for the author of Hebrews, it is the notion of a spiritual/heavenly resurrection.
41 Moffitt, Atonement and the Logic of Resurrection, 27.
The author of Hebrews does not explicitly incorporate the resurrection in his narrative of Jesus’ sacrificial offering. The resurrection of the dead, however, is mentioned in a few places in the letter. The most telling reference occurs in Heb 6:2. The author is urging his audience to move on from the basic teachings about Jesus and he lists some of these basic teachings:

Heb 6:1/ Therefore, having left behind the initial message of Christ, let us move on to maturity, not laying down again a foundation of repentance from dead works and faith in God,
Heb 6:2/ a teaching about ablutions and the laying on of hands, about resurrection from the dead and eternal judgment.\(^{42}\)

The author of Hebrews states his intention to go beyond simple teachings like the resurrection of the dead. Thus, it should not surprise us too much if Jesus’ resurrection is not explicitly mentioned. However, as Attridge notes, “Belief in the resurrection was, of course, shared by Pharisees and early Christians.” In his view, then, this reference in Heb 6:2 may not necessarily include the resurrection of Jesus. However, Christian hope in resurrection was intimately tied to Jesus’ resurrection, and Heb 2:14–15 appears to make specific reference to it:

Heb 2:14/ Now since the children share in blood and flesh, he too likewise partook of the same things so that through death he might break the power of the one who holds sway over death, that is, the devil,
Heb 2:15/ and might release those who by fear of death were subject to slavery through all their lives.\(^{43}\)

\(^{42}\) Attridge, Hebrews, 155.
\(^{43}\) Attridge, Hebrews, 78.
Again, no explicit reference to resurrection occurs here, but surely Jesus’ resurrection lurks in the background of these verses. Is it not the promise of resurrection (labeled a basic tenet of faith in 6:2) that releases humans from the fear of death? And is it not through Jesus’ own resurrection that Jesus broke the power of the devil? This line of reasoning is supported by another passage that does refer to Jesus’ resurrection.

Hebrews 13:20 reads: “May the God of Peace, who, by blood of an eternal covenant, led up [ἀναγαγὼν] from the dead the great shepherd of the sheep, our Lord Jesus....”\(^{44}\) Attridge notes, “The affirmation that God raised Jesus ‘from the dead’ (ἐκ νεκρῶν) is, of course, widespread in early Christianity.”\(^{45}\) Yet, Attridge makes much of the verb that appears here. Typically the verb ἐγειρὼ (raise up) is used to describe God’s raising of Jesus. Indeed, this verb does occur in Heb 11:19: “He [Abraham] considered the fact that God is able even to raise [ἐγειρέω] someone from the dead—and figuratively speaking, he [Abraham] did receive him [Isaac] back.” Instead, in Heb 13:20 the author uses the verb ἀναγαγό,\(^{46}\) which Attridge views as deliberate and thus telling.

“It conforms to the tendency of Hebrews, which has so consistently used language of exaltation not resurrection for the act whereby Jesus’ sacrifice is consummated and he

---

\(^{44}\) Attridge, *Hebrews*, 404.

\(^{45}\) Attridge, *Hebrews*, 405.

\(^{46}\) BDAG lists the following definitions for ἀναγαγό: “to lead or bring from a lower to a higher point, lead, bring up” (Heb 13:20 is listed under this heading); “bring up for judicial process, bring before;” “to bring an offering, offer up;” (only 1Kings 3:15) “to begin to go by boat, put out to sea;” “to put back into a former state or condition, restore, bring back” (W. Bauer, F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* [3rd ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000], 61–62).
himself ‘perfected.’” While it is true that ἀνάγῳ is not the verb typically used when speaking of Jesus’ resurrection, this is not the only place in the New Testament where it is used thus.

In Rom 10:7, Paul writes, “[O]r ‘Who will descend into the abyss?’ (that is, to bring Christ up from the dead) [τούτ’ ἔστιν Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναγαγεῖν]” (NRSV). Both Robert Jewett and N. T. Wright affirm that Paul is making a point about the resurrection. Says Wright, “The two moments of the Messiah’s work that Paul highlights in vv. 6-7 are his ‘coming down’ and his ‘raising up.’ There is no problem about the latter; Jesus’ resurrection has been a main presupposition of this letter from its very opening (1:4), anchoring the argument at some of its most decisive moments (4:24–25; 8:11, 34; the descent into the abyss echoes Ps 107:26).” Wright is not at all bothered by the use of ἀνάγῳ, instead of ἐγείρω, a point he does not even mention. Jewett helps to explain some of the Jewish background of this passage in Romans. Writes Jewett,

The appropriate point of comparison to bringing the messiah up from the abyss needs to be sought in the messianic expectations being held by the Jewish community that had not accepted ‘the righteousness that comes from faith’ in Jesus as the Christ. There was a widespread expectation that Elijah, Enoch, and other deceased figures of Israel’s history would return from the dead at the inception of the messianic age. … This raises the possibility that Paul had in mind sectarian efforts to hasten the return of these figures in order to ensure that favorable arrival of the Messiah. For the believers in Rome, however, these allusions would have had a transparent reference in their own experience. In their view, the questions that preoccupied some branches of contemporary

---

47 Attridge, Hebrews, 406.
Judaism, about bringing Christ down from heaven or up from the abyss, were already answered by the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus.49

Thus, while Paul is speaking of commonly held beliefs about messianic anticipation, he knows that his audience will see that Jesus, the Christ, has been brought up from the dead.

The allusion to the exodus created by the use of ἀνάγω is likely another reason why the author of Hebrews chose this verb instead of ἔγειρο. In Heb 2:10, the writer speaks of Jesus as the forerunner (ἀρχηγός) for God in bringing (ἀγαγόντα) many sons to glory. The verb used in 2:10 and 13:20 are cognates: ἀνάγω=ἀνά+ἄγω, while 2:10 simply uses ἄγω. The author is likely alluding to the exodus from Egypt, an allusion made explicit in Heb 3–4. Hebrew 3–4 discusses the ancestors of the exodus who were unable to enter God’s rest due to their disobedience and unbelief (3:9–11, 16–19). God’s rest is still open for the people of God (4:1, 6, 9–10). In this context, the author of Hebrews explains that believers can finally enter God’s promised rest “for we have become partakers of Christ if we hold firm to the initial reality (τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως) until the end”50 (Heb 3:14). Believers only enter this rest through Christ, the pioneer. Interestingly, partakers of Christ are to hold firm to “the initial reality,” as Attridge translates it. The Greek word ὑπόστασις is difficult to understand, and BDAG lists the following definitions first and foremost: “the essential or basic structure/nature

50 Attridge, Hebrews, 113.
of an entity, substantial nature, essence, actual being, reality.”51 Attridge explains it as follows: “As the whole of Hebrews will indicate, faith puts the Christian in touch with what is ultimately true and real. Being in touch with that reality enables the life of fidelity to God that Christ exemplified and made possible.”52 This appears to be another indication of the kind of new category of indestructible life that Jesus’ sacrificial offering has made possible.

Hebrews 13:20 continues this exodus theme with its use of ἀνάγω in place of ἐγείρω to describe God’s action in the resurrection of Christ. Considering the Sinai imagery of the covenant ceremony in Exod 24 and Yom Kippur of Lev 16, the writer’s utilization of this verb is fitting. As Geoffrey W. Grogan points out,

He brings them to that glory as ‘the pioneer of their salvation’ (τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν). There is general agreement among scholars as to the importance of this expression. Contextual considerations make it almost certain that the term ἀρχηγός (translated ‘pioneer’ in the R.S.V.) is used here more in the sense of ‘Leader’ than of ‘Author’…. Moses is soon to feature in the author’s argument as is also the wilderness wanderings and the entry into Canaan through Joshua (3.1; 4.13), and from 2.10 he begins to use language which would remind his readers of that important period in the life of their nation. Jesus is the New Moses-Joshua who leads the people of God to the promised land, which now becomes fused in thought with that dominion over all things which God has ordained for man and which Psalm 8 celebrates. It is ‘the world to come’.53

The author of Hebrews is referencing Jesus’ resurrection in Heb 13:20 with the use of the verb ἀνάγω instead of ἐγείρω to stress, in part, how God’s resurrection of Jesus will

51 BDAG, 1040.
52 Attridge, Hebrews, 119.
finally bring about the promised rest that was unrealized by the Israelites whom God brought out of Egypt.

6.6 Jesus’ Nature in Comparison to the Nature of Angels

Moffitt argues that at the heart of the contrast between Jesus and the angels in Heb 1–2 is the humanity of the exalted Son, Jesus. Part of Jesus’ necessary qualification for session at the right hand of God and his exaltation above the angels is his literal blood and flesh (Heb 2:14), which he brings with him to heaven after his resurrection (Heb 9:12). The Greek text of Heb 2:14 has “blood and flesh” (αἷματος καὶ σαρκός) in that order. Attridge notes that this order is unusual in the New Testament (although attested elsewhere; Eph 6:12; cf. also John 1:13).54 He suggests, “The priority given to blood may evoke the suffering associated with the human condition.”55 I would suggest that the word blood is fronted in this pairing because the author of Hebrews is highlighting the crucial role blood plays in sacrificial procedure. Hebrews 1–2 highlights the material/human character of the Son as preferable to the spiritual nature of the angels/ministering spirits. It is Jesus’ perfected/exalted humanity that makes him uniquely suited to be a high priest and a sacrifice in the heavenly sanctuary. Furthermore, Jesus is the forerunner of all humanity, accomplishing the redemption needed for human beings to take their rightful place above the angels.

54 Attridge, Hebrews, 92.
55 Attridge, Hebrews, 92.
Commenting on the comparisons between the Son and the angels in Heb 1:5–14, Attridge concludes, “The explicit purpose that the catena serves in Hebrews is to demonstrate Christ’s superiority to the angels.”56 This is clearly so. But as Attridge admits, “Why the author should be concerned to make such a demonstration is unclear.”57 Attridge provides a couple of possible explanations: a problem of angel worship or angel Christology in the community being addressed, or the obviation of a possible objection to the imagery of Christ as a heavenly high priest.58 Ultimately, Attridge is not convinced by any of these explanations. Following Moffitt’s lead, I suggest that a key and overlooked part of the contrast between the Son and the angels is the entirely spiritual nature of the angels.

Once one recognizes that the argument begun in Heb 1 for the royal elevation of the Son over the angelic spirits continues to be developed in Heb 2, the central tenet for the author’s case for the Son’s exaltation above the angels comes into view. Specifically, the writer bases the fundamental contrast between the Son’s invitation to sit upon the heavenly throne and the angels’ lower position on the fact that the latter are spirits, while the former is a human being—blood and flesh (Heb 2:14).59

The Son’s superiority over the angels leads God to command that the angels worship the Son (1:6), who has been anointed by God above his [lit. “your”] peers (παρὰ τούς μετόχοις σου), according to 1:9. The strong contrast between the Son and the angels, suggests that the Son’s peers are not the angels. The author of Hebrews uses Psalm 8 to

---

56 Attridge, Hebrews, 50.
57 Attridge, Hebrews, 50.
58 Attridge, Hebrews, 51-52.
59 Moffitt, Atonement and the Logic of Resurrection, 52.
make the distinction between the angels and the Son clear, and to make it clear that the 
Son’s peers are human beings.

Psalm 8 speaks quite clearly of the status of humans, who are made a little lower 
than the angels. According to the author of Hebrews, who is using the LXX text of Psalm 
8, God “made him [the human being] for a little while lower than the angels.”

Hebrews 2:5–9

Heb 2:5/ Now it was not to angels that he [God] subjected the world to come, 
about which we are speaking.
Heb 2:6/ Someone bore testimony (to this) somewhere saying, “What is a man 
that you should remember him or a son of man that you watch over him?
Heb 2:7/ You have made him for a little while lower than the angels (ἡλάττωσας 
αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ’ ἄγγέλους); with glory and honor you have crowned him;
Heb 2:8/ you have subjected everything under his feet.” Now in “subjecting all 
things,” he left nothing unsubjectable to him. As of now we do not yet see all 
things subjected to him;
Heb 2:9/ but we do behold the one who “was made for a little while lower than 
the angels,” Jesus, because of his suffering death “crowned with glory and 
honor,” so that by God’s grace he might taste death for everyone.60

BHS

Psalm 8:6a/ You (Lord) have deprived him a little bit in comparison to gods.

LXX

Psalm 8:6a/ ἡλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ’ ἄγγέλους

Psalm 8:6a/ You diminished him a little in comparison with angels.61

60 Attridge, Hebrews, 69.
61 The New English Translation of the Septuagint.
The Hebrew text of Ps 8:6a does not connote a duration of time for the diminished status of the human being, but rather refers only to a slightly diminished rank. The Greek of the Septuagint, which the author of Hebrews is quoting, follows the Hebrew rather closely, with the exception of having “angels” instead of “gods.” The Greek of the Septuagint, and thus also of the quotation in Hebrews, can be and is typically translated much like the Hebrew. However, the NRSV and Attridge translate βραχύ τι in Hebrews and the LXX not as a reference to rank, but as a reference to time: “You have made them for a little while lower than the angels.” The translation of βραχύ τι as a reference to a short duration of time is due mainly to the presence of τι, which is paired with βραχύ in the Septuagint text of Is 57:17 and clearly denotes a short duration of time. In Heb 2, the author is utilizing the Septuagint text of Ps 8 to refer to “the humiliation and exaltation of Jesus.” Specifically, the author of Hebrews is using the possibility of βραχύ τι in Heb 2:9 to refer to a short duration of time, as a way to explain how Jesus was made lower than the angels for little while, but now is exalted. Attridge explains the subtle move that the author of Hebrews makes: “Thus the primary interpretive move is to drive a wedge between the third and fourth clauses of the text. Being ‘less than the angels’ is now not the equivalent of being crowned with honor and glory, but is, rather,

---

62 Attridge, Hebrews, 69 (emphasis mine).
63 BDAG, 886.
64 Attridge, Hebrews, 72.
its antithesis.”\textsuperscript{65} That is, as Heb 2:9 explains, it is not that a human was made a little lower than the angels and crowned with honor and glory simultaneously, but that Jesus was for a little while made lower than the angels, but then later was exalted and crowned. As Heb 2:5 has made clear: “Now it was not to angels that he [God] subjected the world to come, about which we are speaking.”\textsuperscript{66} Thus, the subjection quoted from the Septuagint text of Ps 8:6a is only temporary and will not apply in “the world to come” (τὴν οἴκουμένην τὴν μελλουσαν), and reading βραχύ τι as a reference to a short duration of time allows this exegetical move to work.

This subjected status still holds for humanity, but not for Jesus. While he was once lower than the angels, Jesus is now “crowned with glory and honor” (Heb 2:9). So Jesus clearly was a human and I would argue, through resurrection, continues to have human qualities. He is the first to achieve the exalted status promised to humankind.

Heb 2:8b/ Now in “subjecting all things,” he left nothing unsusceptible to him. As of now we do not yet see all things subjected to him,

Heb 2:9/ but we do behold the one who “was made for a little while lower than the angels,” Jesus, because of his suffering death “crowned with glory and honor,” so that by God’s grace he might taste death for everyone.\textsuperscript{67}

The author of Hebrews is implying that Jesus has achieved the crowning that is the destiny of all humanity in the world to come. Jesus is the forerunner of all humanity (the new Moses; Heb 2:10; 3:1–6), accomplishing the redemption needed for human beings to

\textsuperscript{65} Attridge, Hebrews, 72 (emphasis mine).
\textsuperscript{66} Attridge, Hebrews, 69.
\textsuperscript{67} Attridge, Hebrews, 69.
take their rightful place above the angels. Jesus is the Son, but God has “many sons and
daughters”\(^{68}\) (Heb 2:10), again attesting to Jesus’ close relationship to humanity.

### 6.7 Blood and Death in Sacrifice

In Israel, as anywhere, the sacrificial offering of an animal involves blood and
death. However, it also involves \(\pi\varepsilon\delta\iota\) (spirit), as Lev 17:11 shows.

Lev 17:11/ For the spirit of the flesh is in the blood, and I have placed it for you
upon the altar to purge your spirits; for it is the blood that purges by means of
the spirit.

The effectiveness of any offering that accomplishes \(\pi\varepsilon\delta\iota\) is dependent on the blood,
which contains the spirit of the animal. It is useful, then, to examine how the terms
“blood” and “death” are used in Hebrews.

“Death” (\(\theta\alpha\nu\acute{a}\tau\omicron\omicron\zeta\)) appears thirteen times in Hebrews (2:9 [two occurrences], 14
[two occurrences], 15; 5:7, 7:23; 9:15, 16, 17; 11:5, 37; 12:20). Of these, five refer to the
death of Jesus (2:9 [both occurrences], 14 [first occurrence]; 5:7; 9:15).\(^{69}\) “Blood”
(\(\alpha\acute{i}m\acute{a}t\omicron\omicron\zeta\)) appears twenty-three times in Hebrews (2:14; 9:7, 12 [two occurrences], 13, 14,
18, 19, 20, 21, 22 [two occurrence], 25; 10:4, 19, 29; 11:28; 12:4, 24 [two occurrences]; 13:11,
12, 20). Of these, eight refer to the blood of Jesus (2:14; 9:12, 14; 10:19, 29; 12:24; 13:12, 20)
and thirteen refer to the blood of sacrificial animals (9:7, 12 [first occurrence], 13, 18, 19,

---

\(^{68}\) The Greek text has only “many sons,” but Attridge concludes that “the term is certainly inclusive of all
members of the community of faith, which is clearly not a celibate monastic group. Cf. 13:4 on the value of
marriage, and 11:11, 30, 35 for female exemplars of faith” \(\textit{Hebrews}, 78, n\ 1)\.

\(^{69}\) The others refer to death in general (2:9, 14; 7:23; 9:16, 17; 11:5, 37; 12:20).
Incidentally, but not unimportantly, the death or slaughter of sacrificial animals is never mentioned. “Sacrifice(s)” (θυσία) occurs seventeen times (2:17; 5:1, 3; 7:27; 8:3; 9:9, 23, 26; 10:1, 5, 8, 11, 12, 26; 11:4; 13:15, 16) and “offering(s)” (προσφορά) five times (10:5, 8, 10, 14, 18). Between sacrifice(s) and offering(s), six refer explicitly to the sacrificial act of Jesus (2:17; 9:23, 26; 10:10, 12, 14). Only in one verse is it said that Jesus’ death is the source of redemption/salvation, forgiveness, or sanctification/cleansing. Hebrews 9:15 certainly stresses that Jesus’ death was necessary for redemption: “And therefore he is the mediator of a new covenant, so that once a death took place for the redemption of transgressions under the first covenant, those who have been called might receive the promise of the eternal inheritance.”

Hebrews 9:15 commences a discussion on covenants and wills. Jesus’ sacrificial death results in an eternal inheritance for his followers, similar to how one receives an inheritance upon the enactment of a will. The death must occur for the process of

---

70 Hebrews 12:4 references the possibility of martyrdom, reading: “You have not yet resisted as far as blood in your struggle against sin.” The second occurrence of blood in 12:24 refers to the blood of Abel.
71 With the exception of Heb 13:15, 16, which refer to a Christian believer’s sacrifice of praise, the rest of the occurrences refer to sacrifices or offerings in the Israelite sacrificial system.
72 Hebrews 2:10, 5:9, 7:25, and 9:28 speak of salvation and 9:12 also speaks of redemption in the context of blood manipulation. Hebrews 10:18 mentions forgiveness of sins. Hebrews 10:10 and 10:22 speak of sanctification and cleansing. In Heb 2:9b, Jesus is crowned with glory and honor because of his suffering and death, but his death is not said to achieve redemption. Again, in Heb 2:14, the author states that Jesus shared blood and flesh “so that through death he might break the power of the one who holds sway over death, that is, the devil.” Death is a necessary step in the sacrificial act of Jesus, but it is not the most important step. It is not the step that accomplishes redemption, forgiveness, or cleansing.
73 Attridge, Hebrews, 253.
inheriting to begin. Likewise, in sacrifice, a death must occur for the sacrificial process to begin. The verses that follow upon Heb 9:15 articulate that the importance of Jesus’ death is that it initiates a redemptive process, a process that includes blood manipulation. A conflation of covenant inauguration and Yom Kippur occurs in Heb 9, which does complicate the discussion some. Jesus’ sacrifice inaugurates a new covenant, cast in Heb 10:15–17 as the fulfillment of Jeremiah’s prophecy of a new covenant (Jer 31:31–34 MT; 38:31–34 LXX). Here in Heb 9:15–26, however, the author discusses the covenant ceremony of Moses and the Israelites at Sinai (Heb 9:18–22; cf. Exod 24), as well as the Yom Kippur ceremony (Heb 9:23–26; cf Lev 16).

Beginning in Heb 9:16, the author begins to bring together his discussion of a testament (διαθήκη) to a discussion of covenant inauguration.

Heb 9:16/ For where there is a testament, it is necessary that the death of the testator be registered.
Heb 9:17/ For a testament is valid (only) for the dead, since it is not yet in force while the testator lives.
Heb 9:18/ Wherefore, not even the first covenant was inaugurated apart from blood.\(^74\)

Not death, but blood is emphasized in covenant inauguration. The death must be registered, but blood is the key component in inauguration. In fact, before the discussion turns to Yom Kippur, this short section on covenant concludes in Heb 9:22 with a comment on the importance of blood: “Indeed, almost everything is cleansed with blood

\(^74\) Attridge, Hebrews, 253.
according to the Law, and apart from the effusion of blood there is no remission.”

Death is clearly not enough, which explains why death is described as what commences the enactment of a will, and ultimately why the analogy to a will is not enough. In order to stress the importance of blood, the author turns to the inauguration rites of Moses in Exodus and then finally to Yom Kippur, the author’s governing analogy.

Heb 9:22/ Indeed, almost everything is cleansed with blood according to the Law, and apart from the effusion of blood there is no remission.
Heb 9:23/ It is necessary, therefore, that the copies of what is in the heavens be cleansed with these things, but that the heavenly things themselves be cleansed with sacrifices better than these.
Heb 9:24/ For Christ did not enter a sanctuary made by hand, a copy of what is real, but into heaven itself, in order to appear now before the face of God on our behalf.
Heb 9:25/ (He entered) not so that he might offer himself many times, as the high priest enters the sanctuary yearly with another’s blood.
Heb 9:26/ since otherwise it would have been necessary for him to suffer many times since the foundation of the world. But now once at the end of the ages he has been manifested for the abolition of the sin offering through his sacrifice.

Thus, even in the section where the necessity of Jesus’ death is emphasized most, the author makes a point to stress the necessity of blood numerous times. The cross is not to be viewed as the focal point or entirety of Jesus’ sacrifice. As I have shown above, Jesus’ blood is referenced eight times, while Jesus’ death is referenced five times. Both are integral.

---

75 Attridge, Hebrews, 253.
76 Attridge’s translation with my two small emendations, as explained above (Hebrews, 260).
Finally, this letter ends with a blood reference. The benediction of the entire letter (13:20–21) stresses the importance of “blood of an eternal covenant” (which Attridge admits is “hardly a standard part of a traditional doxology”\(^{77}\)) and insinuates this blood was indeed part of what was resurrected.

Heb 13:20/ May the God of Peace, who, along with\(^{78}\) (ἐν) blood of an eternal covenant, led up from the dead the great shepherd of the sheep, our Lord Jesus,\(^{79}\) Heb 13:21/ furnish you with every good thing, so that you might do his will, as he effects in us what is pleasing in his sight through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory forever, Amen.

I have rendered ἐν as “along with” as opposed to “by,” as Attridge does. BDAG states that ἐν “can serve to introduce persons or things that accompany someone to secure an objective: ‘along with.’”\(^{80}\) Jesus was resurrected along with the blood he needed to make his offering in the heavenly tabernacle. How would God have led up Jesus from the dead by blood of an eternal covenant? Attridge attempts to explain: “This phrase … rehearses, in an extremely condensed way, the exposition of Christ’s sacrificial act. That was an act effected with the real shedding of Christ’s own, very human blood.”\(^{81}\)

Considering the rest of the letter, which clearly narrates Jesus entering the heavenly tabernacle with his blood, “along with blood of an eternal covenant” makes considerably better sense.

---

\(^{77}\) Attridge, Hebrews, 406. And yet much is made of the use of a synonym for “raising.” Clearly this author is somewhat unorthodox.

\(^{78}\) Attridge translates ἐν as “by” instead of “along with.” (Hebrews, 404).

\(^{79}\) Attridge, Hebrews, 404.

\(^{80}\) BDAG, 328.

\(^{81}\) Attridge, Hebrews, 406.
6.8 Jesus’ Priesthood and Sacrificial Offering in Relation to Jesus’ Perfection

The concept of perfection figures prominently in Hebrews. Jesus’ perfection (Heb 2:10; 5:7–10; 7:26–28; 9:9–14; 10:14; 11:39–40) allows Jesus to act as a high priest in heaven and offer himself once and for all as a sacrifice that perfects believers. Much of the language of the perfection of Jesus revolves around vocation. Jesus is perfected so as to bring redemption as heavenly high priest (Heb 2:10; 5:7–10). As David Peterson notes, Jesus’ perfection allows him to offer a unique sacrifice: “His human experience is presented as a preparation for his once-for-all act of atonement and the extension of this work into eternity (7:25).”82

Peterson, however, misses a key aspect of Jesus’ perfection and thus of his qualification for high priesthood: “a power of indestructible life.”83 The key verses in understanding Jesus’ priesthood and Jesus’ nature are Heb 7:15–16:

Heb 7:15/ And it is even more abundantly clear, if a different priest arises in the likeness of Melchizedek,
Heb 7:16/ who came to be not according to a law of fleshly command, but according to a power of indestructible life [κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου].84

82 David Peterson, Hebrews and Perfection: An Examination of the Concept of Perfection in the ‘Epistle to the Hebrews’ (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 103.
83 Peterson does not see Jesus’ nature/being or “metaphysics” (Peterson’s term) playing a role in Jesus’ perfection:
Christ’s obedience through suffering, leading to his self-offering, is what is said to render his human nature perfect, by establishing it in a new relationship with God and man. However, … our writer’s focus is not on the perfection of Christ’s humanity in such a metaphysical sense. The transfer to heavenly glory, which leads to his ‘appearance’ in the heavenly tabernacle and his heavenly session, may well imply such a concept, but this is not the essential meaning of the perfecting of Christ (Hebrews and Perfection, 124).
84 Attridge, Hebrews, 198.
“A power of indestructible life” is surely a description of “being,” a description that it is borne out of resurrection theology. Moffitt makes this same argument, concluding:

The qualification Jesus possesses to be the high priest that he is confessed to be is his perfection—i.e., his enduring life. More specifically, the morality of his humanity, which did suffer death, has been transformed. After his death he arose to an indestructible life—i.e., resurrection life. Because he always lives, he is not only fit to dwell in the heavenly realms, but also qualified to become (ἔγένετο, 5:9; γενόμενος, 6:20) the source of eternal salvation—the everlasting high priest in the order of Melchizedek. Because he has been perfected, Jesus is the ἄνθρωπος whom God called to be both the royal son (the Christ) seated on the throne at his right hand and the ἄνθρωπος who serves forever as the high priest of the eternal, heavenly priesthood (5:5–6; 8:1–2).85

Jesus’ sacrificial offering and his priesthood are dependent on his possession of “a power of indestructible life” (Heb 7:16), which only comes through his bodily resurrection.

The author of Hebrews makes it abundantly clear that Jesus was fully human, thus Jesus did not have indestructible life before his death. It is only after his resurrection that Jesus could be said to have “indestructible life.” Moffitt points to an important literary feature elsewhere in Hebrews when he writes:

[P]rior to his death, Jesus’ life was subject to death’s power. He can only be said to have a life that remains, a life that is indestructible, after God saved him out of the realm of death. It therefore follows that the affirmation of his resurrection must underlie the logic of the author’s argument here. The language of another priest “arising” in 7:15 is thus a reference to Jesus’ resurrection. The author has created a brilliant double entendre. Another priest has arisen—namely Jesus, who, in spite of the Law’s prescriptions with respect to tribal lineage, is qualified

85 Moffitt, Atonement and the Logic of Resurrection, 208.
to be a priest because God heard his cry and rewarded his faithful suffering with the promise of the better resurrection life.\footnote{Moffitt, \textit{Atonement and the Logic of Resurrection}, 203.}

Sacrificial procedure, specifically the practice of the slaughter of the victim as explicated in Lev 1–7 and discussed above, also supports reading Jesus’ qualifications for priesthood as taking place after his death on the cross. As has been shown above, the priest need not perform the slaughter of the sacrificial animal, but does need to perform the other sacrificial tasks. Moreover, as Leviticus clearly shows, the offerer slaughters the victim; thus Jesus need not become a high priest before his death. His priestly actions take place after his resurrection, because it is at that point that he has the quality of Melchizedek: that is, a power of indestructible life. Lastly, as the author of Hebrews notes, since Jesus was from the tribe of Judah, he clearly was not eligible before his death (Heb 7:14). His eligibility only was manifest after he left the earth. All this is further evidence for making a distinction between Jesus death on the cross and his offering of blood in heaven. Both were necessary, but there is a transition after death that makes Jesus eligible for priesthood and the resurrection brings about this transition. Jesus’ obedience and death are necessary components for his perfection, but it is not until he is raised that perfection is complete.

A proposal of the perfection of Jesus’ flesh must account for the highly debated understanding of the reference to Jesus’ flesh in Heb 10:20. Jesus’ flesh (σῶμα) is
referenced in connection with the veil leading to the heavenly Holy of Holies. Σάρξ can be read positively or negatively. Hebrews 10:19–23 reads as follows:

Heb 10:19/ Therefore, brothers and sisters, since, by means of the blood of Jesus, we have boldness for entrance into the sanctuary,
Heb 10:20/ which (entrance) he dedicated for us as a new and living way through the veil (διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος), that is his flesh (τοῦτ’ ἐστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ),
Heb 10:21/ and (since we have) a great priest over the house of God,
Heb 10:22/ let us approach with a true heart in an abundance of faith, having been sprinkled in our hearts from a wicked conscience and having had our body washed with pure water,
Heb 10:23/ let us hold fast to the confession of hope unwavering, for the one who has given the promise is faithful.87

How should we understand “through the veil, that is his flesh?” Ernst Käsemann represents the negative reading of σάρξ. He concludes that the veil represents a hindrance in access to God and thus so too does Jesus’ flesh because it is a component of the material world. Käsemann even sees a “remarkable alternation in Hebrews between Jesus’ σῶμα and σάρξ.”88 According to Käsemann, “It is called ‘body’ to the extent it serves to effect Christ’s self-sacrifice, and for which purpose—hence for that of death—it was prepared by God. But it is ‘flesh’ to the extent it is attached to the sphere of the earthly, and consequently does not allow access to God so long as it is borne.”89

In contrast to Käsemann, Craig Koester offers a positive reading of σάρξ, one informed largely by the literary features of these verses.

87 Attridge, Hebrews, 283.
89 Käsemann, Wandering, 226.
The preposition “through” [διό] governs both “curtain” [κατακεπτάσματος] and “flesh” [σαρκός], which are in the genitive case. Many take [διό] in a consistently local sense, so that Christ passed through his flesh to enter heaven. Alternatively, [διό] may function both locally and instrumentally. On the level of Levitical practice, the priest passes “through” the curtain, but on the level of Christ’s work, Jesus secured access to God’s presence “by means of” his flesh. The parallels between 10:19 and 20 are helpful:

Heb 10:19  
for an entryway
into the sanctuary
by the blood of Jesus

Heb 10:20  
a new and living way
through the curtain, that is
through his flesh

The parallel between “the blood of Jesus” and “his flesh” suggests that both should be taken instrumentally. To indicate this we can translate: “through the curtain, that is, [by means] of his flesh.” “Flesh,” like “body” (10:5, 10), can be taken positively as the means by which Jesus accomplishes salvation.90

Koester has a very strong case. Jesus’ offering of his blood as a high priest whose qualification is his power of indestructible life, i.e. resurrected life, opens “a new and living way” for believers. Jesus’ flesh is not a barrier to his entry, but it is a necessary element of his entry. The physical nature of Jesus’ sacrificial offering, like the very material sacrificial offerings of Leviticus, is affirmed. John Dunhill reads flesh similarly in Heb 10:20:

[T]he uniqueness of the access afforded by the Day of Atonement and its occurrence only in the context of the deepest penitence emphasize the normativeness of separation in the old covenant; under the new covenant, the same entry, with a greater claim to uniqueness, serves to establish access which is unrestricted and joyful. To argue, on the basis of word-order, that in 10:20 Jesus is being described as a ‘veil’ between humanity and God, is to plunge

Christian salvation back into the separative state of the old order: on the contrary, his flesh is the ‘new and living way’ through the veil into God’s presence.\(^91\)

The intended result of Jesus’ sacrifice is to allow humans to dwell with God. The point is not for humans to leave their flesh behind, but for the flesh of humans to be perfected, that is, for human flesh to become indestructible. The flesh of Jesus must be seen as a necessary element of his offering.\(^92\) Upon being resurrected, Jesus received new flesh,\(^93\) flesh that was not corruptible; thus Jesus could be said to have “a power of indestructible life” (7:16). Hebrews 10:22, which follows shortly after the verses on Jesus’ flesh and the veil, asserts: “Let us approach with a true heart in full assurance of faith,


\(^{92}\) Hebrews 10:10 also lends support to a positive reading of flesh and its necessity for Jesus’ sacrificial offering in heaven. While the author has rather consistently spoken of Jesus offering his blood, Heb 10:10 reads: “By this will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once and for all” (Attridge, *Hebrews*, 268). Hebrews 10:4 sets up a reference to blood in 10:10 as it states: “For it is impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sins” (Attridge, *Hebrews*, 268). Instead, we get a reference to “the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.” The author again has used a material reference to Jesus and his offering. Moreover, as I have explained, sacrifice is not one act, but a sequence of acts, of which the death of Jesus’ body on a cross constitutes the second act (act one=Jesus’ obedience all the way to the cross/presentation of the animal; act two=Jesus’ death on the cross/slaughter of the sacrificial animal; act three=offering of the blood of Jesus in the heavenly sanctuary/offering of the blood of the animal in the earthly sanctuary; act four=Lord’s Supper/burning or eating of the sacrificial animal). While blood is emphasized more often than death in Hebrews, I am not suggesting that this is all that mattered to the author. Jesus’ discipline to do God’s will, which in the opinion of the author meant dying on a cross, is a part of the sacrificial process. Through this entire procedure—obedience, death, offering of blood, and the Lord’s Supper—the need for further sacrifices is abolished.

\(^{93}\) Cf. the Gospel accounts of Jesus after his resurrection and before his ascension. In Luke 24:39 Jesus asserts that he is not a ghost, but has “flesh (σάρξ) and bones.” He also takes and eats a fish (24:43). In Matthew, when Mary Magdalene and the other Mary see the resurrected Jesus, they seize his feet and worship him (28:9). In John, Jesus has a bodily presence that bears scars that can be touched (20:27–28), but can also appear seemingly at will, not confined by the constraints of bodily presence (20:26).
with our hearts sprinkled clean from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water.” Believers, with hearts and bodies, can now approach God.

6.9 The Perfection of Believers

Peterson helpfully notes that the goal of Jesus’ sacrificial act is for humans to draw near to God, as Jesus now does. This is exactly what the sacrificial system of the Priestly source was intended to facilitate. The prevalence of the verb בַּנְבָּרָה, “bring near,” in the prescriptions of the sacrificial system of Lev 1–7 and 16, is further indication of this pursuit (Lev 1:2, 3, 5, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15; 2:1, 4, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14; 3:1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 12, 14; 4:3, 14; 5:8; 6:7 [Eng. 6:14], 13 [Eng. 6:20], 14 [Eng. 6:21]; 7:3, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 25, 29, 33, 35, 38; 16:6, 9, 11, 20). As Peterson shows, the Greek equivalent of this Hebrew verb appears many times, and at important points, in Hebrews.

The challenge to ‘draw near to the throne of grace’ (verse 16 [4:16]) is based particularly on the presentation of Jesus’ earthly experience in verse 15 [4:15] and his consequent ability to ‘sympathize with our weaknesses’. The verb προσέφυγεσθαι appears at a number of significant points in our writer’s argument (4:16; 7:25; 10:1, 22; 11:6; 12:18, 22; cf. ἔγγυιζεν 7:19) and I will show how closely the concept is related to that of the perfecting of believers. Description of the Israelites in 10:1 as τοὺς προσέφυγομένους — those who approach God in cultic worship — recalls a common application of this verb in the LXX. On the other hand, the use of the same verb in 11:6, to describe a relationship with God in a more general and non-cultic sense, should warn us against the interpretation of this concept in Hebrews in purely cultic terms. In 7:25, the context indicates that the sense of a new relationship with God through the mediation of Christ is primarily in focus (cf. 7:19). Nevertheless, such a definitive ‘drawing near’ to God is portrayed in terms of transformed cultic terminology: it is through the high-priestly mediation of Christ in his death and exaltation that one is enabled to
enter the heavenly sanctuary of God’s own presence.  

As has been shown, it is Jesus’ perfected flesh that permits him to draw near to God. And it is this perfected humanity of the risen Jesus that also allows believers to draw near to God. A number of verses in Hebrews stress this newfound ability to approach God in his sanctuary (4:16; 7:19, 25; 10:1, 19–22; 11:6; 12:18, 22).

Scholer concludes that the perfection of believers is multi-dimensional. While those still living can have a cleansed conscience (9:9; 10:19–25) through which they can enter God’s presence through prayer and worship and those already dead before Jesus’ sacrifice can have perfected “spirits” (12:23), a final “rest” awaits in the world to come.  

As was discussed above, this “rest” is linked to the exodus from Egypt (Heb 3–4). The exodus generation never entered God’s “rest” because of their disobedience and unbelief (Heb 3:18–19), thus a promise to enter God’s rest remains open (Heb 4:1). This articulation of two acts toward the full perfection of believers in Christ is reminiscent of Lev 4:1–5:13 and Lev 16. I have shown that while Lev 4:1–5:13 describes the purgation of the offerer(s), this purgation does not lead to purification, but to forgiveness. This, I am suggesting, is akin to the initial purgation believers can experience, be they alive (cleansed conscience) or dead (perfected spirit). However, the second stage, which

---

94 Peterson, Hebrews and Perfection, 78–79. Interestingly, like so many other interpreters of Hebrews, Peterson overemphasizes the role of Jesus’ death, even in relation to this important concept of approaching God. Peterson writes, “In 10:19–25, the death of Christ is made the basis for confidence to approach God [Hebrews and Perfection, 114].” Nowhere in these verses is the “death” of Jesus referenced. The “blood” and “flesh” of Jesus, both so pivotal to his offering (as shown above), allow humans to approach God.

95 Scholer, Proleptic Priests, 201–02.
would correspond to the Israelites being declared pure after the rituals of Yom Kippur, must wait for Jesus’ return. Scholer describes this second stage:

This access, entry, or perfection, however is not the final situation of the faithful. The eschatological dimension in Heb. cannot be ignored. Although the readers and the faithful dead have a present access to God, this is by no means the last word because the judgment has yet to take place (Heb. 6.2; 9.27; 10.27, 30–31; 11.6, 26; 12.23, 29; 13.4); Jesus still works (Heb. 7.25; 9.24; 4.10); and he is to come again for salvation (9.28; 1.6, 13; 2.5; 10.13, 25, 37). Thus, the present ‘salvation’ accessible through hope, and characterized by τελειωμόν, is to be transcended by a final salvation which will come at the parousia of Christ (Heb. 9.28).  

This second stage of salvation is connected with the “rest” promised in Hebrews (4:1, 3, 9, 11). Scholer asserts, “[F]or the author of Heb., the ‘rest’ is anticipated as the establishment of a renewed earth. This is suggested in Heb. by the future expectation of a ‘city’ (e.g. 13.14; 11.10, 13–16; 12.28, cf. Gal. 4.26; Rev. 3.12; 21.2), which corresponds to the ‘rest’.” This “rest” (Heb 4:11) in the “city which is to come” (13:14) represents the second and final stage of transformation for believers, at which they share in Jesus’ glorified nature. Such an adjustment makes perfect sense in the logic of Hebrews. Jesus, our forerunner, needs flesh in order to open “the new and living way” to God and his followers will ultimately receive this same flesh, which comes at the “rest.” This “rest” is analogous to the state of the Israelite community immediately after the rituals of Yom Kippur, which leave the sanctuary and the Israelites in a state of purity. Commenting on

96 Scholer, Proleptic Priests, 202.
the use of Ps 8 in Heb 2:5–9, Peterson concludes the following.

For Paul and the writer of Hebrews, however, this glory is the eschatological goal of man in Christ: it is the promise of becoming like Christ in his glorified state. G. Kittel observes:

> When the NT refers to the eschatological participation of believers in δοξα this is simply part of the general statement of salvation history concerning the connexion and parallelism between the resurrection of Christ and the resurrection and the new aeon of believers. Participation in δοξα, whether here in hope or one day in consummation, is participation in Christ.⁹⁸

When Jesus’ bodily resurrection is viewed as essential to the argument of Hebrews, participation in the glorified state of Jesus in the world to come (the promised “rest”) would mean a change in the nature of humanity’s flesh (now with indestructible life, like that of Jesus).

In Heb 13:10–11, the author of Hebrews shows how the consumption of the sacrifice of Jesus through the Lord’s Supper is open to any Christian believer. This attests not only to the author’s belief in the correlation between the ἔρημος offering and Jesus’ offering, but also to the author’s belief in the sacrificial nature of the Lord’s Supper. The privileged priestly class cannot eat from the table (the altar) of the Lord’s Supper because those from this class do not have faith in Jesus. Thus, while their status in the cult gave them access to the flesh of some purification offerings that no one else could consume, their status as non-Christian believers bars them from access to the commemorative feast of Jesus’ offering, which has no hierarchical barriers.

---

In Heb 13:10–11, the author of Hebrews appears to tie the purgatory function of the consumption of some ἁλυσί offerings to the consumption of the Lord’s Supper. The author alludes to the texts in Leviticus that discuss what is to be done with the carcasses of animals whose blood is manipulated inside the sanctuary.

Heb 13:10/ We have an altar from which those who serve the tabernacle do not have authority to eat.
Heb 13:11/ For the bodies of animals whose blood is brought as a sin offering into the sanctuary by the high priest are burned outside the camp.99

Leviticus 4:11–12, 4:21, 6:23 [Eng. 6:30], and 16:27 explain that the flesh of any ἁλυσί offering whose blood is brought into the sanctuary may not be eaten, but must be burned outside the camp. This is not the case with the rest of the ἁλυσί offerings, as my work on Lev 10 showed. The flesh of ἁλυσί offerings, the blood of which is manipulated only on the outer altar, is enjoyed by the priest who officiated the sacrifice or any other priests with whom he may choose to share the meat (6:19 [Eng. 6:26], 22 [Eng. 6:29]; 10:17). Thus if the meat of a ἁλυσί offering is ever consumed, it can only be consumed by a priest. The Lord’s Supper, in contrast, is open to any believer, regardless of status and regardless of the fact that Jesus’ blood was brought into the heavenly sanctuary. Jesus’ sacrificial offering need not be burned, and the hierarchical structure of the sacrificial system of Israel does not exist for the community that celebrates and partakes of the sacrificial offering of Jesus. As I have shown in chapter four, Lev 10:17 assigns purgatory

---

99 Attridge, Hebrews, 390.
function to the consumption of the νιππ οις-.offering meat. It may be that the author of Hebrews also envisions some purgatory function to the consumption of the Lord’s Supper. For this reason, the author stresses that the altar of Jesus’ sacrificial offering is open to any believer. Unlike the Israelites, whose purgation was dependent upon a human priestly class, Christian believers are dependent upon Jesus’ offering which is available to any believer through the celebration of the Lord’s Supper.

6.10 Conclusion

At the heart of both the sacrificial system of Leviticus and the sacrificial offering of Jesus in the Letter to the Hebrews is the issue of humanity’s access to God. How can God, YHWH, and humanity dwell together? The sacrificial system, as explicated in Leviticus, was the principal tool for facilitating this communion. YHWH’s people and YHWH’s dwelling place on earth required regular purgation of the pollution of sin and uncleanness. The νιππ οις offering purged the Israelites and the sanctuary of the sins that clung to the Israelites and to the sanctuary. While the Letter to the Hebrews ultimately concludes that the Israelite sacrificial system was unable to solve, fully and definitively, the issue of access to God, it does affirm many aspects of this system, specifically in relation to the νιππ οις offering. A sacrificial offering is still the proper institution through which to solve the issue of sin, and thus access to God. Jesus’ sacrificial offering, begun on earth but completed in heaven as Jesus offered his blood and indestructible flesh in the heavenly sanctuary, provided the definitive cleansing of believers, and even of the
heavenly sanctuary. Only after Jesus’ death and resurrection did Jesus have the qualifications to be high priest and to offer himself and his blood to God. Furthermore, like Leviticus, Hebrews stresses the very physical nature of sacrifice and sin. Jesus must present his blood and indestructible flesh in heaven in order to accomplish redemption. This offering cleanses the consciences of believers and even perfects the spirits of those already dead. However, this is not the final stage for believers. As my work on Lev 4:1–5:13 and Lev 16 showed, sacrificial purification is a two-stage process. In Leviticus the move is from guilt-laden to forgiven, and then forgiven to pure. For the author of Hebrews, the move is from sinful to cleansed, even perfected, and then from cleansed/perfected to transformed. In the final rest, after Jesus’ return, believers will share in Jesus’ indestructible flesh and will dwell together with God. This is the argument of Hebrews and this is the accomplishment of the sacrificial offering of Jesus.
7. The Sacrificial Offering of Jesus in the Pauline and Non-Pauline Letters, and in Revelation

7.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses many of the various references to the sacrifice of Jesus in the Pauline and non-Pauline letters, as well as in Revelation. The various references to the sacrifice of Jesus, especially to the blood of Jesus, show that Hebrews is not the only New Testament book that conceives of Jesus’ salvific work in sacrificial terms similar to that of the עונש מ francais offering in the writings of the Priestly Source and the Holiness Code. Although Paul clearly stresses Jesus’ death in his Letters, Paul also stresses the blood of Jesus and his resurrection. Paul references Yom Kippur in Rom 3:25. In 1 Corinthians, Paul affirms the relationship between the Israelites and the altar, comparing it to how believers in Jesus are participants in Jesus’ sacrifice.

In a number of places throughout the non-Pauline Letters, sacrificial imagery is applied to Jesus. The blood of Jesus appears in many places and the majority of these appearances should not be understood as a reference to Jesus’ death, in spite of the fact that most New Testament scholars do read these blood references as death references. Finally, Revelation clearly uses sacrificial language to speak of the salvific work of Jesus. Revelation makes it clear that Jesus’ salvific work leads to a rather extraordinary level of intimacy between God and believers, something both the writers of the Priestly Source and the Holiness Code, as well as the author of Hebrews all seek for God and God’s people.
7.2 Death, Sacrifice, and Blood in the Pauline Letters

Without a doubt, nowhere in the undisputed Pauline letters (Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, and Philemon) does Paul articulate Jesus’ life, death, resurrection, and ascension in overt cultic terms. Paul speaks of Jesus’ death often, much more often than the blood of Jesus. Furthermore, in the undisputed Pauline letters, Paul never speaks of Jesus as a “sacrifice” (θυσία) or “offering” (προσφορά). It may seem, then, as though Pauline theology and the theology I have espoused as that of Hebrews are divergent. However, the author of Hebrews does not overlook Jesus’ death. It is a crucial component of the sacrificial process, but it is not the sole component, nor even the most important component. Jesus’ offering of his blood, post-resurrection, is the most important part in the narrative of Jesus’ sacrificial offering in Hebrews. Paul, too, recognizes that although Jesus’ death was important and necessary, other elements such as Jesus’ blood and resurrection play a role in the redemption that Jesus secured.

Paul refers to the “death” (θανάτος) of Jesus ten times (Rom 5:10; 6:3, 4, 5, 10; 1 Cor 11:26; 2 Cor 4:10; Phil 2:8 [twice]; 3:10). He speaks of Jesus as “dead” (νεκρός) thirteen times (Rom 1:4; 4:24; 6:4, 9; 7:4; 8:11 [twice]; 10:7; 10:9; 1 Cor 15:12, 20; Gal 1:1; 1 Thes 1:10), although every one of these references is to Jesus being raised from the “dead.” Lastly, Paul refers to Jesus as having died (ἀποθανεῖσκω) fifteen times (Rom 5:6, 8; 6:10 [twice]; 8:34; 14:9, 15; 1 Cor 8:11, 15:3; 2 Cor 5:14, 15 [twice]; Gal 2:21; 1 Thess 4:14;
5:10), and of these, five also refer to Jesus’ resurrection. The list of references show that
the death of Jesus is important in Paul’s theology; so too is the resurrection. This is also
ture of Hebrews, although Hebrews does not emphasize Jesus’ death to quite the same
degree, nor does he often mention Jesus’ resurrection. Paul mentions the “blood” (αἵμα)
of Jesus five times (Rom 3:25, 5:9; 1Cor 10:16; 11:25; 11:27). As stated above, Paul does
not refer to Jesus as a “sacrifice” (θυσία) or “offering” (προσφορά) in the undisputed
letters. Overwhelmingly, then, in the Pauline letters, the numbers favor Jesus’ death as
the definitive theological act. However, Paul does speak of Jesus in sacrificial terms, at
times, including some references to Jesus’ blood that appear similar to how Hebrews
understood the importance of Jesus’ blood. Even some of the references to Jesus’ death
imply that it alone was not sufficient.

7.2.1 Romans

The Letter to the Romans constitutes Paul’s most complete (albeit complicated)
discussion of salvation. It is beyond the scope of this study to tackle this subject in detail.
I simply wish to discuss some of the key passages and show how our understanding of
them might shift in light of my reading of Hebrews. Rom 5:8–10:

Rom 5:8/ But God proves his love for us in that while we still were sinners Christ
died for us.
Rom 5:9/ Much more surely then, now that we have been justified by his blood,
will we be saved through him from the wrath of God.

---

1 The blood of Jesus is also mentioned in Eph 1:7 and 2:13, as well as Col 1:20. However, these letters are not
widely accepted as Pauline. These verses will receive comment below.
Rom 5:10/ For if while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son, much more surely, having been reconciled, will we be saved by his life (NRSV).

Paul clearly goes beyond (theologically, and even sequentially\(^2\)) Jesus’ death. Believers are reconciled to God through Jesus’ death, justified by his blood, and saved by his life. Most will hear the reference to blood and equate it with Jesus’ death, but why not view it as Hebrews does? Jesus offers his blood, post-mortem and post-resurrection. Clearly, Paul has resurrection in view when he says that believers will be saved by his life. But how so? Might this be similar to Hebrews’ assertion that it was “by means of his [Jesus’] flesh” that Jesus “dedicated for us a new and living way” into the sanctuary (10:20)? Or, could “saved by his life” (Rom 5:10) be an acknowledgment that it is through the offering of blood, which contains \(\pi\nu\varepsilon\) (spirit) that reconciliation is secured? The other references to Jesus’ death in Romans (see above) certainly put great emphasis on it. However, the resurrection is not without salvific significance, as evidenced in Rom 5:8–10. Romans 6:1–10 also emphasizes both the death and resurrection of Jesus as crucial to one’s redemption. Both the death and the new life of Jesus are important.\(^3\)

In addition to the reference in Rom 5:9, Jesus’ sacrificial act and his blood are mentioned twice more in Romans, in 3:25. The context is as follows:

---

\(^2\) Paul refers to the importance of the resurrection often. Thus when he speaks of Jesus’ life here in Rom 5:10, a post-resurrection life can be assumed.

\(^3\) Furthermore, as in Hebrews, Jesus obedience is critical. Rom 5:19: “For just as by the one man’s disobedience the many were made sinners, so by the one man’s obedience the many will be made righteous” (NRSV)
Rom 3:21/ But God’s righteousness that was attested by the law and the prophets has been manifested apart from the law,
Rom 3:22/ that is, God’s righteousness [has been manifested] through faith in Jesus Christ, in regard to all who have faith, (for there is no distinction,
Rom 3:23/ for all sinned and fall short of the glory of God,
Rom 3:24/ being set right freely by his grace) through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ,
Rom 3:25/ “whom God put forth as a mercy seat” (ιλαστήριον) through faith “in his blood” (διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἷματι) for a demonstration of his righteousness “because of the passing over of sinful actions previously committed
Rom 3:26/ by the forbearance of God”; to demonstrate his righteousness in the present critical time, so that he is righteous and makes righteous the one who has faith in Jesus.⁴

Jewett believes that these verses are rightly construed as one long sentence, with the words in quotation marks in these verses understood as a citation of a pre-Pauline Christological formula and with the additions coming from Paul.⁵ N.T. Wright does not believe that the passage has pre-Pauline material: “The dense and unusual language of 3:24–26 is best explained on the premise that Paul is here briefly summarizing an argument he could in principle have spelled out far more fully, and to which he also alludes in many other places both in Romans and elsewhere.”⁶

Whether Paul is quoting from a source or not, the sacrificial imagery cannot be ignored. The key phrase for my purposes is διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἷματι, which literally would be rendered as “through [the] faith in his blood.” Prior to this, the

⁵ Jewett, Romans, 269.
verse explains that God put forward Christ Jesus as a ἰλαστήριον, which is probably best translated as “mercy seat.” In the Septuagint, this Greek term is used to refer to the lid of the ark of the covenant, ῥάβδος in Hebrew. Thus it appears that Paul is referencing Jesus’ sacrificial offering here, similarly to the way in which Hebrews narrates Jesus entering the heavenly Holy of Holies (Heb 9:11–12). In fact, considering that ἰλαστήριον comes just before διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτίᾳ, Paul is certainly utilizing the imagery of the Yom Kippur ritual here. Wright agrees: “Paul’s other references to Jesus’ death indicate that sacrificial ideas, though not his only grid of reference, were not far from his mind when he thought of the cross.”⁷ Without a doubt, allusions to Yom Kippur exist, but what are these verses conveying about God, Jesus, and Jesus’ blood?

On Yom Kippur the high priest sprinkles blood upon/toward the mercy seat. While clearly articulating a correspondence between Jesus’ sacrificial act and the sacrificial acts of Yom Kippur, Hebrews in no way makes a correspondence between Jesus and the mercy seat. There are scholars that render ἰλαστήριον as “expiation” due to the lack of an article.⁸ Jewett notes an obvious difficulty with the text, namely “that it seems illogical for a person to be both the location and means of atonement.”⁹ However, Jewett rejects this argument and likewise the translation of ἰλαστήριον as “expiation,” explaining, “[T]he hymn celebrates the death of Jesus as having established a new ‘place

---

⁸ Jewett, Romans, 285.
⁹ Jewett, Romans, 285.
of atonement, epiphany, and the presence of God…’ The central claim in the hymn is that Christ provided a new means of access to God that reached beyond the sins of Israel.” I certainly agree with Jewett on this final point of access, and so does Hebrews. This verse may be similar to Hebrews assertion in 10:20 of “the new and living way through the veil” that Christ dedicated. Christ’s blood and flesh play a crucial role in Hebrews in securing this new access, as Hebrews shows in fairly straightforward cause-and-effect terms. Like the high priest on Yom Kippur, Jesus brings blood (in this case, his blood) into the heavenly sanctuary, and this offering is effective. If the same kind of logic applies to these verses in Romans, it is not clear how.

As stated above, Wright concludes that Paul is indeed employing sacrificial imagery here. He writes,

[O]n a broader canvas it is a natural Second Temple Jewish perception to see God’s faithfulness to Israel (and Israel’s answering loyalty to God) expressed through the sacrifices in general and the Day of Atonement in particular. To put it another way, if Israel is in trouble because of sin, the Day of Atonement will put things to rights. To that extent, what Paul has done is simply to declare that God has done the same thing on a once-for-all, grand scale; he is, in that sense, alluding to Jesus as the place where the holy God and sinful Israel meet, in such a way that Israel, rather than being judged, receives atonement.11

Wright is careful not to attempt to articulate the mechanics of this atonement. In fact, Wright does not think Paul was attempting such an articulation: “Paul’s purpose in 3:21–26 is not, then, to give a full ‘doctrine of atonement,’ a complete account of how

10 Jewett, Romans, 285–86.
God dealt with the sins of the world through the death of Jesus.”\textsuperscript{12} Surely Wright is correct in this and in his observation of the importance of resurrection in Paul’s atonement equation.

Wright and Jewett also see sacrificial imagery at play in the phrase “through faith in his blood.” Jewett surmises that Paul’s addition of through faith (διὰ τῆς πίστεως) “probably aimed to emphasize that access to this new institution of atonement through the blood of Christ was available to everyone through faith.”\textsuperscript{13} Wright believes that “through faith” and “by means of his blood”\textsuperscript{14} (ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι), should be seen as two separate modifiers of the noun ἱλαστήριον. For Jewett, “through faith” is an addition by Paul within a Christological formula and is a reference to the believer’s faith. Wright suggests that the faith in question is the faithfulness of Jesus, which Wright believes coincides with Rom 3:22 and 3:26, which he also reads as “faithfulness of Jesus.” Explains Wright:

Jesus’ faithfulness was the means by which the act of atonement was accomplished, by which there took place that meeting between God and the whole world of which the mercy-seat was the advance symbol. Furthermore, just as the mercy-seat fulfilled its function when sprinkled with sacrificial blood, so Paul sees the blood of Jesus as actually instrumental in bringing about that meeting of grace and helplessness, of forgiveness and sin, that occurred on the cross. Once again, the sacrificial imagery points beyond the cult to the reality of God’s self-giving act in Jesus.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{12} Wright, “Letter to the Romans,” 467.
\textsuperscript{13} Jewett, Romans, 288.
\textsuperscript{14} These are Wright’s translations of the phrases.
Wright acknowledges the sacrificial imagery here, even the emphasis on Jesus’ blood (it is hard to ignore here) as the key component. And yet, at the end of the section quoted above, Wright appears to balk at the possibility that it was indeed Jesus’ blood, like the blood of a sacrificial animal, that accomplished redemption: “Once again, the sacrificial imagery points beyond the cult to the reality of God’s self-giving act in Jesus.”

Wright’s hesitance is likely due to the lack of a clear explanation of how Jesus’ blood accomplished redemption. However, these verses, as opaque as they are, welcome a comparison to the sacrifices of Yom Kippur. When blood is not read as synonymous to death (and in a sacrificial context it should not be), and as long as the resurrection of Jesus is viewed as a part of the soteriological equation, then the death of Jesus can be rightly understood as part one of a sacrificial process. At one point, Wright, unintentionally I think, acknowledges this. He writes, “Justification in the present is possible, Paul argues, because the grace of God deals with the sins of the people through the death of Jesus.”

Wright means, I think, to emphasize the death of Jesus, and most will read this sentence and conclude that indeed Wright has done so here. It is the preposition “through” that I wish to highlight and read differently than was perhaps intended. Yes, to be a sacrifice, Jesus had to die, but that was not enough. The blood of Jesus also played a role, as did the resurrection and ascension of Jesus. The Letter to the Romans,

---

17 Wright, “Letter to the Romans,” 466.
Hebrews puts these all together fairly neatly in its soteriology (in order: death, resurrection, ascension, blood). In Romans, Paul only alludes to sacrificial imagery. He does not overlay it completely onto Jesus’ death and resurrection.

7.2.2 1 Corinthians

Paul’s first Letter to the Corinthians contains a few noteworthy and challenging references to the blood (and death and resurrection) of Jesus. In this letter, Paul discusses the blood and body of Jesus in the context of the Lord’s Supper, as well as the importance of the death and resurrection of Jesus.

Paul strongly suggests a sacrificial understanding of the blood and body of Jesus in the Lord’s Supper in his discussion in 1 Cor 10:14–22. The key verses are 1 Cor 10:16–18:

1 Cor 10:16/ Is not the cup of blessing that we bless a participation in the blood of Christ?
1 Cor 10:17/ Is not the bread that we break a participation in the body of Christ?
1 Cor 10:17/ Because there is one loaf, we, though many, are one body, for we all partake of the one loaf.
1 Cor 10:18/ Consider the people of Israel; are not those who eat of the sacrifices participants in the altar (κοινωνοὶ τοῦ θυσίαστηρίου)?

The rhetorical questions on the Lord’s Supper and the sacrificial practice of the Israelites set up an analogy between the Lord’s Supper and Israelite sacrifice. Specifically, the elements of the Lord’s Supper make those who partake of them participants in the blood and body of Christ, just as the Israelites who ate sacrifices were “participants in the...

---

altar” (κοινωνία τοῦ θυσιαστήριου). The blood and body of Christ are analogous to the altar. When Christians partake of the Lord’s Supper they are connected to the blood and body of Christ. Curiously, when the Israelites partake of the sacrificial animal they are connected to the altar. Paul asserts that Israelites (likely only Israelite priests) were “participants in the altar,” not the sacrifice. Christians, on the other hand, are participants in Jesus, the sacrifice.

The answer to the analogy is the blood. Typically, the blood of the ἁλοντά offering is placed on various parts of the altar, and some of the animal’s body is burned on the altar. This helps explain the oddity of Jesus instructing his followers to partake of his blood. Consuming blood is, of course, forbidden in Judaism, and this ban is attested in the Priestly Source (Lev 7:26–27), in the Holiness Code (Gen 9:4; Lev 17:12, 14; 19:26), and in Deuteronomy (Deut 12:16, 23; 15:23). Because partakers of the Lord’s Supper consume the blood of Jesus, and not just his body, and thus participate in both, Paul asserts that Israelites were “participants in the altar” (κοινωνία τοῦ θυσιαστήριου),

---

19 Marion L. Soards contends that altar be understood as a “typical, pious ancient Jewish circumlocution for God, whose name is avoided by mention of a clearly affiliated item” (1 Corinthians [NIBCNT; Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson, 1999], 212). Soards gives no sources for this claim, which I find untenable. It would make the analogy seem more consistent (cup and bread=Jesus, sacrificial meat=God). God’s abode in the Tabernacle/Temple is the Holies of Holies, not the altar. I know of no evidence for assuming a reference to the altar as a reference to God.

20 Raymond F. Collins suggests that the term “offerings” likely refers to the portion eaten by the priests (First Corinthians [Sacred Pagina 7; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999], 380). Collins is likely correct as only the priests partake of any portion of the ἁλοντά (Lev 6:19 [Eng. 6:26]) or ζυστήρ (Lev 7:7).

21 Michael J. Cahill discusses the oddity and lack of scholarly discussion of the oddity of Jesus, a Jew, suggesting that his disciples, all Jews, drink his blood (“Drinking Blood at a Kosher Eucharist? The Sound of Scholarly Silence,” BTB 32 no 4 (Winter 2002): 168–81). Cahill has hit on a major and crucial issue, but it is not one that I can tackle comprehensively in this work.
which received both blood and body parts of the sacrificial animal.\textsuperscript{22} Paul seems to be affirming the relationship between the Israelites and the sancta for which I argued in chapters two, three, and four. Joseph A. Fitzmyer suggests that this analogy shows that Christians are more closely connected to God through the Lord’s Supper than the Israelites were through sacrifice: “This means that Christians who partake of the Lord’s Supper are united with the Lord in intimacy undreamed of by the OT worshipper who (through the priest) poured the blood on the altar, or, at best, was sprinkled\textsuperscript{23} with it…. Since the association of ‘life’ with ‘blood’ is made clear in Lev 17:11, … the participation means a communal sharing in the life-blood of Christ.”\textsuperscript{24}

In 1 Cor 11:23–26, Paul discusses the tradition of the institution of the Lord’s Supper. This passage contains the earliest account of the institution of the Lord’s Supper.

1 Cor 11:23/ For I received from the Lord what I also handed on to you, that the Lord Jesus on the night when he was betrayed took a loaf of bread,
1 Cor 11:24/ and when he had given thanks, he broke it and said, “This is my body that is for you. Do this in remembrance of me.”
1 Cor 11:25/ In the same way he took the cup also, after supper, saying, “This cup is the new covenant in my blood. Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me.”
1 Cor 11:26/ For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord’s death until he comes (NRSV).

\textsuperscript{22} This might also help explain why Paul asserts that Jesus is \textit{ןָּשֶׁר} as it functions similar to the altar on Yom Kippur, receiving blood that effects purgation.
\textsuperscript{23} Israelites could be sprinkled with blood in certain circumstances, but they were rare, and did not involve the \textit{ןָּשֶׁר} sacrifices.
\textsuperscript{24} Fitzmyer, \textit{First Corinthians}, 390. As is clear from my work on Lev 17:11 in chapter four, I do not equate blood with life as Fitzmyer does in this quote.
It is the cup, the blood, that constitutes the new covenant. No effect is assigned here to the bread, the body, suggesting that perhaps the blood is more crucial than the body. The language here is of blood and covenant and is reminiscent of Exod 24:8, as well as Jer 31:31–34 (LXX 38:31–34), with its emphasis on “the new covenant.”

Raymond F. Collins asserts that Paul is not identifying “the contents of the cup with Jesus’ blood.” Rather, Collins sees this as a covenant ritual, with the cup and bread as part of a covenant meal. 1 Corinthians 10:16–18, discussed above, does suggest that the elements of the Lord’s Supper be identified with the body and blood of Christ, and that partaking of them is analogous to the sacrificial practice of Israel.

Expanding the scope of inquiry on the Lord’s Supper to the synoptic Gospels, Luke 20:22 is in accordance with 1 Cor 11:25 as it does not explicitly link the contents of the cup with Jesus’ blood. Mark and Matthew, however, do make the connection explicit. Furthermore, Mark includes “which is poured out for many” and Matthew adds to that phrase “for the forgiveness of sins,” clearly indicating a sacrificial setting, not only a covenant setting. The pouring out of blood is perhaps most strongly reminiscent of the ַתְּפִלָּה offering. While this offering also contains other, perhaps more important, blood manipulation, the blood not sprinkled or placed elsewhere the priest “shall pour out at

---

25 Fitzmyer, First Corinthians, 442-443.
26 Collins, First Corinthians, 433.
27 Collins, First Corinthians, 433.
28 Hans Conzelman agrees with Collins on the lack of connection between the cup and Jesus’ blood in 11:25 (1 Corinthians, [Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975], 199). However, Conzelman acknowledges that in 1 Cor 10:16 the cup/wine is identified with the blood of Christ (1 Corinthians, 171).
the base of the altar” (Lev 4:7; very similar wording in Lev 4:18, 25, 30, 34). The ἔκταφ
offering is the only offering that has both “pouring out of blood” and “forgiveness of
sins.” The issue, then, is whether Matthew’s addition should be assumed to apply in
Mark. Neither “pouring out of blood” nor “forgiveness” is present in the Pauline
formula in 1 Corinthians. Nonetheless, looking at the synoptic Gospels and Paul, it
becomes evident that a variety of sacrificial and covenental ideas were present in the
theology of the Lord’s Supper.

Somewhat surprisingly, Paul asserts that through the eating of the bread and
drinking of the cup, Christians “proclaim the Lord’s death until he comes” (1 Cor 11:26).
While I have consistently argued that a reference to the blood of Christ should not be
understood as a reference to his death, here the emphasis of the Lord’s Supper is on
Christ’s death. This is a good reminder that the death of Christ was an important piece,
even if not the whole puzzle.

Later in this letter, Paul asserts the necessity of Christ’s resurrection. In 1 Cor
15:17, Paul writes, “If Christ has not been raised, your faith is futile and you are still in
your sins” (NRSV). Shortly before this in 15:3–4, Paul asserts, “For I handed on to you as
of first importance what I in turn had received: that Christ died for our sins in
accordance with the scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he was raised on the
third day in accordance with the scriptures…” (NRSV). Thus although Paul stresses
Jesus’ death, both here (even concluding that “Christ died for our sins”) and in 1 Cor
11:26, he clearly articulates that Jesus’ resurrection is a necessary part of salvation. Why is the resurrection necessary? Paul does not say. Fitzmyer suggests that Rom 4:25 may be helpful: “[Jesus,] who was handed over to death for our trespasses and was raised for our justification” (NRSV). According to Fitzmyer, this verse has Jesus’ death and resurrection “in a literary parallelism in which both effects are ascribed to both the death and the resurrection….” 29 And yet, Fitzmyer concludes, “Now he [Paul] implies clearly that the removal of human sins is indeed an effect of Christ’s resurrection.” 30 Paul does not appear to have an entirely consistent soteriology. He was not a systematic theologian.

7.3 Sacrificial References in the Non-Pauline Letters and in Revelation

7.3.1 Ephesians

Ephesians 1:7, 2:13, and 5:2 have noteworthy references to the blood or sacrifice of Jesus. I begin with the last reference because it is the most explicit, and thus perhaps it should dictate how we read the other two verses. Ephesians 5:1–2 reads:

Eph 5:1/ Therefore be imitators of God, as beloved children,
Eph 5:2/ and live in love, as Christ loved us and gave himself up for us, a fragrant offering and sacrifice to God (προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ εἰς ὀσμὴν εὕωδίας) (NRSV).

29 Fitzmyer, First Corinthians, 564.
30 Fitzmyer, First Corinthians, 564.
This is an unambiguous reference to Jesus’ sacrificial offering, although surprisingly, the blood of Christ is not mentioned. In this case, the burning of the Jesus’ offering (presumably his body) is emphasized, which is a rather stark image. Nonetheless, this reference indicates that the author believed sacrificial logic was pertinent to understanding Christ’s work. Andrew T. Lincoln notes, “προσφορὰ καὶ θυσία (cf. LXX Ps 39:6) is a hendiadys employing two general terms, both of which included all kinds of sacrifices, grain and animal, while εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας utilizes the frequent LXX metaphor for a sacrifice which was particularly pleasing to God (e.g., Exod 29:18; Lev 2:9, 12; Ezek 20:41).”\(^{31}\)

The passage in Eph 1:7 reads, “In him we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses, according to the riches of his grace…” (NRSV). This is a clear reference to the important function of blood in sacrifice and should not be read as a reference to the death of Jesus. However, many scholars of Ephesians do not recognize this. Lincoln remarks, “As elsewhere in the NT, the blood of Christ signifies his violently taken life and stands for his atoning death…”\(^{32}\) Markus Barth actually chooses to translate the first half of Eph 1:7 in this way: “Through [the shedding of] his blood we possess freedom in him…”\(^{33}\) His interpretation of the blood reference is as expected; the


\(^{33}\) Markus Barth, *Ephesians* (AB 34; New York: Doubleday, 1974), 76.
reference to blood is a reference to Jesus’ death on the cross. Only Ernest Best takes a
different angle as he notes the sacrificial connotation of blood references.

It [blood] always carries some reference to the death of Christ but it is unlikely
that it simply indicates that death as bloody and violent. In most cultures it
carries overtones of power, defilement, cleansing, etc. (e.g. 1 Kgs 22:38, the
taurobolium, the drinking of blood, menstrual flow) and in particular is linked to
sacrifice.

Sacrificial procedure in Leviticus in no way equates the slaughter of the animal with the
blood manipulation. Furthermore, the material in Leviticus on the ταυροβόλιον offering
consistently indicates that the manipulation of blood was the most important element.
Shedding of blood, the death of the victim, was inevitable and necessary, but also
insufficient.

Ephesians 2:13 also mentions the blood of Christ: “But now in Christ Jesus you
who once were far off have been brought near (ἐγενήθης ἐγγύς) by the blood of Christ”
(NRSV). The “you” of this verse is the Gentiles, although Eph 2:17–18 stresses that
nearness and access to God is important for both Gentiles and Jews. Best concludes, “No
reason exists then either in 2.13 or in 2.11 to depart from the normal understanding
relating blood to Christ’s death, a conclusion supported by the semi-parallel of Col
1:20.” As with Eph 1:7, Hoehner asserts that the mention of Christ’s “blood” in 2:13
should be understood as a reference to “the sacrificial death of Christ which was

34 Barth, Ephesians, 83.
36 Best, Ephesians, 246.
necessary to propitiate God’s demand of holiness (cf. Rom 3:25; 5:9; 1 Cor 10:16; 11:25, 27; cf. Heb 9:12, 14; 10:19, 29; 13:12, 20; 1 Pet 1:2, 19; 1 John 1:7). Lincoln, too, agrees with Best and Hoehner. Barth, however, does not think “blood” is just another way of saying “death.” Instead, Barth considers “blood” in the context of sacrifice as the “means of making atonement and receiving forgiveness.” He goes on to assert:

[H]e [Christ] is the sacrificial victim. But because the verbs used in this context describe an activity of Christ, Christ cannot be understood as the victim only. … According to Eph 2, Christ is—as the epistle to the Hebrews also brings to light—priest and sacrifice at the same time. Eph 5:2 makes this explicit by reproducing one of those “traditional formulations” which may well have provided inspiration for the contents of Hebrews. …

Ephesians 2:13 is indeed reminiscent of Hebrews. Like Hebrews, Jesus’ blood secures access to God. The perfection of believers allows them to draw near to God. As has been stressed throughout this work, Leviticus underscores how sacrifice brings offerers near (בְּרֹקָח) to YHWH, literally “before YHWH” (לָפֶן יְהוָה). Ephesians also emphasizes the importance of Jesus’ flesh and body:

Eph 2:14/ For he is our peace; in his flesh he has made both groups into one and has broken down the dividing wall, that is, the hostility between us.
Eph 2:15/ He has abolished the law with its commandments and ordinances, that he might create in himself one new humanity in place of the two, thus making peace,
Eph 2:16/ and might reconcile both groups to God in one body through the cross, thus putting to death that hostility through it (NRSV).

---

37 Hoehner, Ephesians, 363.
38 Barth, Ephesians, 299.
39 Barth, Ephesians, 300.
40 See ch. 1, the section entitled “Divine Presence and Sacrifice,” and ch. 5, the section entitled “The Perfection of Believers.”
Somewhat surprisingly, nowhere in Ephesians is Jesus’ death unambiguously given soteriological significance. Even in the verses above, where the cross is mentioned, it is not said to be the place or moment of salvation. Jesus’ flesh is portrayed positively as the instrument through which Jews and Gentiles are reconciled. Furthermore, Jesus’ creation within himself of “one new humanity” is something akin to my assertion that Jesus’ resurrection creates a new ontological category of indestructible life/flesh.

7.3.2 Colossians

Colossians 1:19–20 has a reference to the blood of Jesus’ cross.

Col 1:19/ For in him all the fullness of God was pleased to dwell,
Col 1:20/ and through him God was pleased to reconcile to himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven, by making peace through the blood of his cross (NRSV).

According to Jerry L. Sumney, “Many New Testament interpreters identify these verses [1:15–20] as an early Christian hymn, often seeing it as an adaptation of an earlier pagan or Jewish hymn (e.g., Käsemann; Robinson; Deichgräber 146-54; Standhartinger 1999, 205-12).”41 Many interpreters argue that the phrase “blood of his cross” is one of the phrases inserted by the writer of Colossians.42 If it is an insertion, why did the writer use “blood,” as opposed to “death?” Sumney concludes, “‘Blood of his cross’ designates more specifically where the reconciling and peacemaking work of God in Christ takes

41 Jerry L. Sumney, Colossians (NTL; Louisville: WMJKP, 2008), 60.
42 Sumney, Colossians, 77.
place. The death of Jesus effects this change of relationship with God.” In this case, with the addition of the cross in the reference to Jesus’ blood, it may be that the equation of blood and death is correct. However, the cross as the place of slaughter is also the obvious place for the collection of the blood of the sacrificial victim, Jesus. “Making peace through the blood of his cross” (1:20) is an idea that is very reminiscent of Eph 2:16, where Jews and Gentiles are reconciled to God through the cross. In Eph 2:16, Jesus’ blood is not explicitly mentioned as it is in Col 1:20. Perhaps, then, even references to the cross should not be understood necessarily as references to Jesus’ death.

A few verses after this hymn, the writer of Colossians asserts that Jesus has “reconciled in his fleshly body through death” (1:22) those who were estranged. Even so, any mention of blood instead of death should lead readers to consider the possibility that the author is referencing the efficacy and importance of actual blood in sacrifice. Moreover, that Jesus’ blood is said to reconcile to God everything, whether in heaven or on earth, testifies again to the importance of blood in facilitating close interaction between deity and humanity.

7.3.3 1 Peter

1 Peter opens with a reference to the “sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ,” a very strong sacrificial motif.

1 Pet 1:1/ Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the elect strangers of the Diaspora in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia,
1 Pet 1:2/ [elect] according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through the sanctifying action of the Spirit, because of the obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ (ῥαντισμῶν αἷματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ).…

This appears remarkably similar to the sprinkling of believers’ hearts in Hebrews 10:22:

“with our hearts sprinkled (ῥεραντισμένοι) clean from an evil conscience” (NRSV), as well as Hebrews’ emphasis on the obedience of Jesus. Hebrews 5:8: “Although he was a Son, he learned obedience through what he suffered…” (NRSV). On the phrase “sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ,” John Elliot remarks:

The phrase is unique in the NT, and [ῥαντισμῶς αἷματος] occurs nowhere in the OT. The description of the sin offering for atonement in Lev 6:24–30 with its reference to the “blood” (of the sin offering) “sprinkled on a garment” (6:27) offers no real parallel. The closest equivalent is the only other instance of the combination of “sprinkling” and “blood”—namely, Heb 12:22–24 (“you have come … to Jesus the mediator of a new covenant and to the sprinkled blood [αἷματι ῥαντισμοῦ]”). This expression appears to allude to a motif derived from Exod 24 and its reference to the “blood of the covenant” by which the covenant between God and Israel was sealed (24:8; cf. also Heb 10:29 and Barn. 5:1). In 1 Peter, a similar association of election and covenant is later explicated in 2:4–10 through the use of the covenant formula of Exod 19:6 to affirm the election of the Christian community.44

As shown above, Heb 10:22 uses the same Greek verb, ῥαντίζω, as in 1 Pet 1:2. The blood of Jesus is not explicitly mentioned in Heb 10:22, but it can be safely concluded that Jesus’ blood is the cleansing agent. Hebrews 10:19 asserts that it is the blood of Jesus that gives us confidence to enter the sanctuary, and Heb 9:14 asserts that the blood of

44 Elliot, 1 Peter, 320.
Christ purifies our conscience. Thus, Heb 10:22 should be understood as a close parallel to 1 Pet 1:2.

The manipulation of blood in Leviticus also offers an important parallel with 1 Pet 1:2. While Elliot highlights Exod 24 with its reference to the “blood of the covenant,” this is not the most pertinent parallel. In Lev 4:1–5:13 and 16, the blood of the tafj offering is sprinkled numerous times (4:6, 17; 5:9; 16:14, 15, 19), and in all of these places the same Hebrew verb is used, הָצַו. The Septuagint typically uses ῥανίω where הָצַו occurs in the Hebrew (Lev 4:17; 5:9; 16:14, 15, 19), but in Lev 6:20 [Eng. 6:27] ῥαντίζω is used. Elliot confines his analysis of “sprinkling” to the one place where the exact same Greek verb (ῥαντίζω) occurs in the Septuagint. However, considering the sacrificial logic of Hebrews, with its narrative of Jesus’ offering in heaven, this aspect needs to be considered for 1 Peter as well. The author of 1 Peter is stressing Jesus’ obedience and the sacrificial offering of his blood as key, quite clearly referencing a sacrificial offering by Jesus similar to what is described in Hebrews.

7.3.4 1 John

1 John twice speaks of the cleansing quality of the blood of Jesus. The first reference occurs in 1 John 1:6–7:

1 John 1:6/ If we say that we have fellowship with him while we are walking in darkness, we lie and do not do what is true;
1 John 1:7/ but if we walk in the light as he himself is in the light, we have fellowship with one another, and the blood of Jesus his Son cleanses us from all sin (NRSV).
Like Hebrews, Jesus’ blood is the cleansing agent. Georg Strecker recognizes the sacrificial connotations of the “purifying power of the blood of Jesus,” and he insists that the blood of Jesus as a cleanser “is expressed in similar terms in the earliest Christian creedal formulas (e.g., 1 Cor 15:3–4; Rom 3:25) and in the tradition of the Lord’s Supper (Mark 14:24 par.).” In a long footnote, Strecker mentions Lev 17:11 and Heb 9:22, and ultimately concludes that the author of 1 John “finds himself confronted with a docetic teaching that demanded, in response, an emphasis on the reality of the atoning death of Jesus as well as of the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist.” Thus while Strecker recognizes the sacrificial overtones in 1 John 1:7, he sees this reference to Jesus’ blood as equivalent to a reference to his death. Judith M. Lieu also mentions Lev 17:11, as well as Lev 16:15–19 and Heb 9:22, in her discussion of 1 John 1:7. Lieu rightly notes that “to translate ‘blood’ in 1 John 1:7 by ‘sacrificial death,’ as do some (similarly Rom 3:25; 5:9), may obscure the origins of the image…” There is a relationship between blood and (Lev 17:11 makes this quite plain. Thus, to read death so heavily into the mention of Jesus’ blood, while common and understandable, is to read against the understanding of sacrificial blood set forth in Leviticus. While Lieu rightly notes that “how and why blood

---

45 This passage mentions the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus, but blood does not appear. Strecker likely sees blood and death as synonymous.
‘works’ is not clear, it is clear that simply shedding it is meaningless. No sacrifice allows for the blood to simply drain. Rather, it must be manipulated in some manner to have any effectiveness. Lieu neglects to mention this aspect of sacrifice, likely because she does not believe it has anything to do with the mention of Jesus’ blood in 1 John.

1 John 5:6–8 also emphasizes blood as a cleanser of sin.

1 John 5:6/ This is the one who came by water and blood, Jesus Christ, not with the water only but with the water and the blood. And the Spirit is the one that testifies, for the Spirit is the truth.
1 John 5:7/ There are three that testify:
1 John 5:8/ the Spirit and the water and the blood, and these three agree (NRSV).

These verses are highly disputed. Lieu gives three options for understanding the reference to the Spirit, the water, and the blood: Christological, soteriological, and sacramental. The Christological option views water and blood as references to Jesus’ baptism and death: “[S]o understood, the Son of God’s participation in human experience encompassed both his baptism and his death.” The soteriological option reads blood as salvific, similar to 1:7, where blood cleanses believers from sin. The soteriological option has more trouble with water, which could be a reference to Jesus’ baptism and thus his humanity, or a generic reference to life and thus Jesus’ ability to bring life. The sacramental approach views water and blood as references to the sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist. None of these options is optimal. A possible

---

49 Lieu, I, II, & III John, 57.
51 Lieu, I, II, & III John, 209.
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solution is that these verses are asserting the unity of water, Spirit, and blood in baptism, which is a symbol of the cleansing that Jesus secured for believers through his sacrificial offering. 1 John 1:6–7 speaks explicitly of blood as a cleanser. The water of baptism is a sign of that cleansing and it is through the work of the Spirit that such a cleansing is possible. John Calvin, whose work was discussed briefly in chapter four, suggests just this in his discussion of baptism. Finally, lest there be any question that the author of 1 John views Jesus’ death on a cross as sacrificial, both 2:2 and 4:10 speak of Jesus as Ἰλασμὸν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, “an atoning sacrifice for our sins.”

7.3.5 Revelation

Revelation has a number of references to the blood of Jesus. The first comes in the greeting to the seven churches in Asia. After the salutation from God, John continues, “and from Jesus Christ the faithful witness, the firstborn of the dead, and the ruler of the kings of the earth. To him who loves us and freed us (λύσαντι) from our sins by his blood, ...” (Rev 1:5 NRSV). Brian K. Blount notes a textual issue that is especially pertinent. A number of Greek manuscripts have λούσαντι (λούω), meaning “washed,” instead of λύσαντι (λύω), meaning “freed,” although Blount claims that there is stronger manuscript evidence for λύσαντι. David Aune also believes that λύσαντι (freed) is to

---

52 Notes Blount: “Scribes (TR, following P 1006 1841 1854 2053 1062 2086 lat bo) substituted [λούσαντι] (washed), but [λύσαντι] (loosed, liberated) is to be preferred not only because of the stronger manuscript evidence (𝔓¹⁸ Α C 1611 2050 2329 2351 2086 h sy Prim) but also because it fits the exodus emphasis on
be preferred to λουσαντι following the principle of lectio difficilior and because of its “accord with OT imagery, e.g., LXX Isa 40:2.”\(^{53}\) In Rev 5:9, John again mentions the blood of Jesus, and here Jesus’ blood is said to have “redeemed” or “ransomed” or “bought” (ἀγοράζω) saints. This gives further credence to reading λουσαντι.

Both Rev 1:5 and 5:9, however, do have other references nearby that suggest that the author was thinking of a cultic context. Having “freed us” (or “washed us”), Jesus “made us to be a kingdom, priests serving his God and Father, to him be glory and dominion forever and ever. Amen” (Rev 1:6 NRSV). This reference to a kingdom and to priests is reminiscent of Exod 19:6, where the phrase πριηνετα (“kingdom of priests”) used to describe Israel’s relationship with God. Why John chooses to use this particular phrase is unclear. However, its proximity to the reference of the blood of Jesus seems less ambiguous. Surely John has a sacrificial context in mind, with the blood of Jesus granting the highest state of holiness to Christians, that of priesthood. This conclusion is strengthened by the inclusion of βασιλείαν καὶ ἱερεῖς (Rev 1:6 reads βασιλείαν, ἱερεῖς) in Rev 5:10, where again the saints become “a kingdom and priests” through Jesus’ blood. Revelation 5:9βα reads: “for you were slaughtered and by your blood you ransomed for God” (NRSV). The Greek of Rev 5:9βα is as follows: ὁτι ἐσφάγης καὶ

... is used of the execution of Jesus only in Revelation (5:6, 9, 12; 13:8)....”\(^54\) This same Greek verb is used throughout the LXX text of Lev 1–7 and 16 when animals are slaughtered for sacrifice (1:5,11; 3:2, 8, 13; 4:4, 15, 24, 29, 33; 6:18 [Eng. 6:25]; 7:2; 16:11, 15). Combine this with the mention of blood and priests, and this appears to be a clear reference to sacrificial practice. In fact, Rev 5:9 clearly articulates the sequence of slaughter, followed by blood manipulation. Compared to Hebrews, John greatly condenses the imagery and sequence. Still, John has slaughter and then blood, and blood is articulated as the effective agent. Aune misses the sacrificial imagery because he equates blood and death. He goes so far as the translate èν τῷ αἷματί σου as “by your death,” and writes, “In Rev 5:9c, of course, the price is ‘by your blood,’ i.e., by your death.”\(^55\)

The blood of Jesus, the Lamb, is identified as a cleansing agent in Rev 7:14b:

“they have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb” (NRSV).

Aune ultimately concludes, “The metaphorical character of the white robes is evident in this passage, where they are washed white by the blood of the Lamb; i.e., the sin of those who wear them has been atoned for by the sacrificial death of Christ.”\(^56\) That the reference is metaphorical is likely, but nonetheless the metaphor makes a point: namely,

\(^{54}\) Aune, *Revelation 1–5*, 361.

\(^{55}\) Aune, *Revelation 1–5*, 361.

that the Lamb’s blood is cleansing. Here Jesus’ blood cleanses the robes, while in Hebrews it cleanses the conscience or the heart. However, the cleanser is always the blood of Jesus, just as it is the blood of the sacrificial animal that cleanses in Leviticus.

Blount suggests the following translation for the elder’s reply in Rev 7:14a–14b:

Rev 7:14a–14b/ οὗτοι εἰσίν οἱ ἐρχόμενοι ἐκ τῆς θλίψεως τῆς μεγάλης καὶ ἐπλυναν τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐλεύκαναν αὐτὰς ἐν τῷ αἷματι τοῦ ἄρνιου.

Rev 7:14a–14b/ These are the ones who went through the great tribulation, which is to say, they washed their robes; that is, they made them dazzling/white in the blood of the Lamb.

Blount believes that “the two uses of [καὶ] employed to link the three primary clauses should be treated epexegetically.” Thus the event of cleansing one’s robes in the blood of the Lamb happened as the elders went through the great tribulation. Speaking sequentially, John is not suggesting that the robes were washed when Jesus died on the cross, but were washed sometime in the context of John’s revelatory narrative, which takes place long after Jesus’ death on the cross. Again then, like sacrificial procedure in Leviticus, the blood is utilized after the slaughter of the sacrificial victim.

The last reference to the blood of Jesus occurs in Rev 12:11, and it is perhaps the most curious: “But they have conquered him by the blood of the Lamb and by the word

---

57 Somewhat ironically, Aune has a discussion of Israelite sacrifice and the importance of blood in his discussion of Rev 7:14. He even notes Lev 17:11 (“life is in blood”) and concludes that “blood derived from sacrificial animals both removes sin and consecrates only the persons or objects to which it is physically applied for purposes of purification...” (Aune, Revelation 6–16, 475).
58 Blount, Revelation, 154.
59 Blount, Revelation, 154.
of their testimony…” (NRSV). The power attributed to the blood of Lamb can be explained through the logic of blood in sacrifice. Through death (the dragon’s weapon) and resurrection, Christ can now utilize the power of his blood, which is not a symbol of death but of השם, the animating force of life (Lev 17:11). The power of the blood of the Lamb, like the power of any sacrificial blood, is that it contains השם. It is the השם of Christ that gives the blood the power to cleanse and overcome.

The final vision of Revelation stresses the importance of God dwelling with humanity:

Rev 21:1/ Then I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth had passed away, and the sea was no more.
Rev 21:2/ And I saw the holy city, the new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband.
Rev 21:3/ And I heard a loud voice from the throne saying, “See, the home of God is among mortals. He will dwell with them as their God; they will be his peoples, and God himself will be with them…” (NRSV).

The end goal is for God and humanity to dwell together on earth in Jerusalem. In Rev 21:3, John twice uses the Greek form of “tabernacle,” once nominally, σκηνή, and once verbally, σκηνώσει, thus clearly inviting the reader to picture this as the fulfillment of the Tabernacle of Israel. Furthermore, this city has no need of a Temple: “I saw no temple in the city, for its temple is the Lord God the Almighty and the Lamb” (Rev 21:22 NRSV). The ritual procedures that were formerly necessary have been removed or fulfilled by the sacrificial offering of Jesus, and thus now the presence of God (and the Lamb) is all that is necessary. Not only is the Lamb present in the city, but his servants
“will see his face, and his name will be on their foreheads”\textsuperscript{60} (Rev 22:4 NRSV). This is a stunning level of intimacy between the deity and humanity.

\textbf{7.4 Conclusion}

The references to the blood of Jesus throughout these books of the New Testament evince the same sacrificial connotations as does the Letter to the Hebrews. That is, references to the blood of Jesus should not be understood as references to the death of Jesus but to the sacrificial offering of Jesus. Although Paul stresses Jesus’ death, he also refers to the importance of the blood of Jesus in a clear sacrificial setting in Rom 3:25 and in his discussion of the Lord’s Supper in 1 Corinthians. Paul also affirms the necessity of Jesus’ resurrection in his letters. 1 Peter and 1 John note the cleansing quality of Jesus’ blood. Ephesians, which speaks explicitly of Jesus’ sacrifice, and Colossians explain how through the cross (specifically, “the blood of his cross” in Col 1:20), Jesus has accomplished peace and reconciliation. Ephesians 2:15 speaks of Jesus’ creation of “one new humanity,” possibly similar to “a power of indestructible life” in Heb 7:16, as critical to the reconciliation Jesus accomplishes. Finally, Revelation has multiple references to the power of the blood of Jesus, the Lamb, and ends with a vision of humanity and God (and the Lamb) dwelling together (a theme also evident in Eph 2:13) intimately and without any need for the Temple and its accompanying rituals.

\textsuperscript{60} Cf. Exod 26:36–38.
8. Conclusion

8.1 Summary

This work has put forward a new reading of the קֶשֶׁף offering of the Priestly Source and Holiness Code. This reading was then brought into conversation with relevant New Testament texts. The main findings of this work are as follows:

1. H comes after P and is the editor of P. Furthermore, H is the editor of the entire Pentateuch and responsible for Gen 1:1–2:4, Gen 17, Gen 23, and likely all of the Genesis material traditionally attributed to P. Both H and P are pre-exilic, while the H-redactor did his work in exile and in post-exilic Yehud.

2. P is a small, technical document focused on the Tabernacle, the priesthood, and the ritual complexes of the Tabernacle. P is very precise with terminology and syntax.

3. Within P, Lev 16:2–28 is the earliest text of the קֶשֶׁף offering. In this text, the קֶשֶׁף offering functions to purge sancta. This author uses קֶשֶׁף or קֶשֶׁף to mark the object that undergoes purgation, thus showing that these two collocations are functionally equivalent. Leviticus 16 also attests to the importance of the privative נַחֲשׁ, which follows after either קֶשֶׁף or קֶשֶׁף and lists the substances purged from sancta or people.

4. The P author of Lev 4:1–5:13, utilizing the text of Lev 16, crafted a קֶשֶׁף offering that purged the offerer of the sin that s/he carried on account of having committed a wrongdoing (as evidenced by the use of the verb פָרָת and the phrase יִנַּח נַחֲשׁ). Borrowing from Lev 16, the author used קֶשֶׁף to mark the offerer as the one who is purged, and he used the privative נַחֲשׁ to mark the substance purged from the offerer.

5. Both Lev 16 and Lev 4:1–5:13 demonstrate that there exists a relationship between the sanctuary and the Israelites. The Israelites can stain the sancta with their wrongdoings or impurities and through the קֶשֶׁף-offering ritual, principally the blood application to the sancta, the Israelites can be purged.

6. The H addition to Lev 16, vv. 29–34a, along with Lev 4:1–5:13 and Lev 16:2–28, explicates a two-stage process for the purification of the Israelites. In the first stage, explained in Lev 4:1–5:13, the offerer is purged and then forgiven. In the second stage, the sanctuary is purged through the קֶשֶׁף offerings of Yom Kippur and Aaron is purged of the sins he carries by the goat for Azazel. Together, this leads to the people being declared pure. This is further proof of the relationship
between the people and the sanctuary. The people cannot be declared pure until the sanctuary is purged.

7. Leviticus 17:11 explains that one function of the ἁρμανία offering is indeed “to purge” the offerer, adding that it is specifically the πνεῦμα of the offerer that is purged. Blood contains πνεῦμα (“spirit,” the animating force of a creature), and it is the πνεῦμα of the animal applied to the altar that purges the πνεῦμα of the offerer.

8. Leviticus 10:17 assigns a purgative function to the consumption of the ἁρμανία- offering meat by the priests. It confirms that the ἁρμανία offering can purge the offerer(s), but adds the idea of purgation through consumption. Only outer-altar ἁρμανία offerings were consumed, while the inner-altar ἁρμανία offerings were burned outside the camp in a pure place. The ἁρμανία-offering meat is never said to be tainted, but rather is declared “most holy.” Thus, its consumption cannot be understood as an elimination rite. Instead, the priests are to “enjoy” the ἁρμανία-offering meat and, by doing so, they purge the people, removing the iniquity of the people. This aspect of “enjoyment” explains why Aaron declined to eat this meat after the death of his two sons.

9. The Letter to the Hebrews utilizes the logic of the ἁρμανία offering in P and H. Jesus must offer his blood and his flesh in the heavenly sanctuary to cleanse the conscience of his followers. This can only be done after his resurrection when he attains “a power of an indestructible life” (Heb 7:16), which is necessary for his qualification to high priesthood and which is a necessary aspect of his offering. Jesus brings a material sacrifice of blood and flesh into the heavenly sanctuary.

10. Hebrews also narrates a two-stage process for the purgation of believers. Believers are initially cleansed/perfected by Jesus’ sacrificial offering, but they await Jesus’ return, at which time their flesh will undergo transformation, becoming indestructible like Jesus’ flesh.

11. The ultimate goal of Jesus’ sacrificial offering is to allow believers to dwell with God.

12. The Pauline letters speak of the importance of Jesus’ blood and resurrection. Romans 3:25 draws on the imagery of Yom Kippur in stressing the necessity of Jesus’ blood for salvation. Paul’s explication of the Lord’s Supper in 1 Corinthians puts greater emphasis on the blood/cup than the body/bread.

13. The non-Pauline letters contain a number of references to Jesus’ sacrifice and to his blood. The cleansing quality of Jesus’ blood is stressed in a number of places. Jesus’ blood also has the power to achieve reconciliation and the ability to facilitate closeness to God.

14. Revelation attests to the power of the blood of the Lamb, both as a cleanser and as a weapon against death and destruction. Through the Lamb and his sacrifice, believers will one day dwell with God in a city that has no need for a Temple or sacrifices.
According to P and H, and some of the New Testament writers (the author of the Letter to the Hebrews principal among them), sacrifice has the power to purge sancta and persons. The goal of this purgation is to allow humans and YHWH to dwell together. The “priestly” understanding of wrongdoing and its remedy is affirmed by the authors of the New Testament as they describe the sacrificial offering of Jesus, especially the offering of his blood. Jesus’ sacrificial offering accomplishes lasting purgation and even transformation.

8.2 Areas for Further Research

There are at least three areas that could benefit from further study along the lines of this work. The first is the לְפָנוֹ-offering (“reparation offering”) legislation, which follows upon the legislation for the לְפָנוֹ offering in Lev 5. Throughout the לְפָנוֹ-offering legislation, the result of this offering is the same as it is throughout the לְפָנוֹ-offering legislation. Lev 5:16, 18, and 26 [Eng. 6:7] contain the phrase לְפָנוֹ, seemingly marking the offerer as having been purged, as well as the same proclamation of forgiveness for the offerer that results from the לְפָנוֹ offering. Leviticus 7:7 reads as follows: “The reparation offering is like the purification offering. There is a single rule for both: it shall
belong to the priest who performs expiation therewith (כָּפָ רֵם טֵוּפָרָה).”¹ Milgrom does not believe that the מָזֵא offering is purgative, thus Milgrom does not translate כָּפָר as “purge” in this verse, even though Milgrom certainly does believe the הָלָא מַעֲנָא offering is purgative. My suspicion is that both the מָזֵא offering and הָלָא מַעֲנָא offering function to purge the offerer of the sin or guilt that s/he carries.

Second, my assertion that H is the editor of the Pentateuch is in need of further research and scrutiny. More texts in Genesis and texts elsewhere in the Pentateuch are in need of examination to confirm this conclusion. Furthermore, various texts in Exodus and Numbers need to be examined and assigned to either P or H. Knohl, Milgrom, Nihan, and Arnold are the only scholars that I have encountered who identify a number of H texts outside of Lev 17–26.

Third, much more work could be done on sacrificial imagery in the New Testament. I did not examine any of the Gospel material in this work; this area in particular is most urgently in need of analysis. Without a doubt, the Gospel texts on the Lord’s Supper should be examined in light of the הָלָא מַעֲנָא offering. In fact, general theological work on the Lord’s Supper could benefit from my work on the הָלָא מַעֲנָא offering, especially the material on the necessity of the consumption of the הָלָא מַעֲנָא-offering meat (Lev 10:17). Moreover, I have only scratched the surface on the use of sacrificial

imagery in the Pauline Letters, the non-Pauline Letters, and Revelation. When references to the blood of Jesus and the death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus are read in the light of the theology of the ἔρπεσις offering of Leviticus, they certainly sound much different. The blood of Jesus, an image that leads many to contemplate the cross, should also lead Christians and New Testament scholars to contemplate the sacrificial offering of Jesus in the heavenly sanctuary.
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