

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

## Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

---

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

---

5-31-1940

### The Day of Atonement and its Evaluation in the Epistle to the Hebrews

Theodore Stolp

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir\_stolpt@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Stolp, Theodore, "The Day of Atonement and its Evaluation in the Epistle to the Hebrews" (1940). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 48.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/48>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

\*\*\*\*\*

THE  
DAY OF ATONEMENT  
AND  
ITS EVALUATION  
IN THE  
EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

\*\*\*\*\*

*A Thesis submitted  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for  
the degree of Bachelor of Divinity*

*by Theo. Stolp*  
Approved: *W. Grundt.*  
*Theo. Lattich*  
May 31, 1940.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. **UNIQUENESS**
  - II. **THE RITUAL OF THE DAY**
    - The Annual Observance
    - The Special Rites
    - General Preparations
    - Preliminary Arrangement of the Animals
    - The Term "Azazel"
    - The Atonement in the Holy of Holies
    - The Atonement in the Holy Place
    - The Atonement at the Altar in the Court
    - The Rite of the Living Goat
    - Concluding Rites for the Day
  - III. **THE SIGNIFICANCE**
    - Only the High Priest Officiates
    - The Holy of Holies Entered
    - The Bath
    - The Linen Garments
    - The Incense
    - "First for His Own Person"
    - The Blood
    - The Twofold Manner of Sprinkling
    - The Disposal of the Carcasses
    - The Rite of the "Scape Goat"
    - The Burnt Offerings
    - The Fast and Sabbath Rest
    - A Mirror of Sin
    - A Mirror of Grace
    - A Picture of Limitations
    - A Promise of Greater Things to Come
  - IV. **ITS EVALUATION IN THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS**
    - A High Estimate
    - Insufficient Because of Nature of High Priest
    - Insufficient Because of Nature of Sacrifice
    - Insufficient Because of Place Where Rite Was Performed
    - Insufficient Because Part of a Covenant of Shadows
    - This Insufficiency Not Without Design on God's Part
    - Its Virtue Derived from the Work of Christ
    - Chapter 13, 10-12
    - Concluding Remarks
- Bibliography

## THE DAY OF ATONEMENT

### AND ITS EVALUATION IN THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

\* \* \* \* \*

Among the days appointed by God for the Old Testament faithful one occupies a unique position. Although not included in the three "great" festivals of the Jewish Church, it is so unique that in Jewish literature it is often called simply , The Day. Edersheim calls it "the day in which the Old Testament provisions for pardon and acceptance attained, so to speak, its climax" (The Temple etc., p. 303). This day, so important that "The Talmud devotes to it a special tractate" (ibid. p. 304), was the annual Day of Atonement,

#### ITS UNIQUENESS

Several circumstances point to the uniqueness and importance of this day in the Old Testament economy. One is its position in the Hebrew calendar. By divine appointment it occurred in the seventh month, Tishri, when the (symbolical) Sabbath of months had attained to its completeness, emphasized as a sacred month by the special ordinance of the Blowing of Trumpets for its new moon. The Day of Atonement was appointed to precede the annual Feast of Tabernacles, celebrated on the 15th of Tishri. This month also marked the beginning of the civil year. Secondly, the Day of Atonement was the day appointed for the proclamation of

the Year of Jubilee, Lev. 25, 9. Thirdly, this is the only day for which God commanded a fast and complete cessation of work. Therefore, it was known also among Jews simply as "The Fast"--so may be referred to in Acts 27, 9. Fourth, the position assigned its ordinances within the sacred record. Lev. 16, 1 shows that the instructions concerning this day were first announced in connection with the historical event recorded Lev. 10. Yet they are not recorded there, but later, as the conclusion and culminating feature of that entire section of the Book of Leviticus which "opened up to the people of Israel the way of access to the throne of grace" (Keil)--the institution of sacrificial offerings, of consecrated priests, of provisions for avoiding and removing defilements, chapters one to 16.

Still more does the uniqueness and importance of the Day of Atonement stand out, as we review the ordinances of the day, and as we consider the evaluation of its features in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Such review and consideration is the purpose of this essay.

#### THE RITUAL OF THE DAY

Three portions of the Pentateuch give the ordinances God appointed for the Day of Atonement. They are Leviticus 16 and 23, 26-32, and Numbers 29, 7-11. The latter two portions can best be considered in connection with Leviticus 16 with which we are chiefly concerned. This chapter divides naturally into two main sections, I. verses 1-28 which give instructions for the ritual of the day; and, II. verses

29-34, which ordain the annual observance of the day. We might also say, that the first section gives the instructions to be observed by the highpriest; the second, the instructions to the whole people. We therefore take up the second section, v. 29-34 first.

**THE ANNUAL  
OBSERVANCE**

Lev. 16, 29-34 reads: "And this shall be a statute forever unto you: that in the seventh month, on the tenth day of the month, ye shall afflict your souls, and do no work at all, whether it be one of your own country, or a stranger that sojourneth among you: For on that day shall the priest make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your sins before the Lord. It shall be a sabbath of rest unto you, and ye shall afflict your souls, by a statute for ever. And the priest, whom he shall anoint, and whom he shall consecrate to minister in the priest's office in his father's stead, shall make the atonement, and shall put on the linen clothes, even the holy garments: And he shall make an atonement for the holy sanctuary, and he shall make an atonement for the tabernacle of the congregation; and for the altar, and he shall make an atonement for the priests, and for all the people of the congregation. And this shall be an everlasting statute unto you, to make an atonement for the children of Israel for all their sins once a year. And he did as the Lord commanded Moses.

These words raise the observance of the day to a perpetual ordinance, (vs. 29, 31, 34), to be observed once

every year (v. 34), throughout Israel's national existence as the chosen people of the Lord. They set the date for the 10th day of the seventh month. They specify that this day is to be "a sabbath of sabbaths"  $\text{יְוֹם שַׁבָּת שַׁבָּתֹת}$  (v. 31) observed by "no work at all" (v. 29), and strict fast and penitential observance  $\text{וְיָצַקְתֶּם מַיִם בְּעַרְוֹתְכֶם וְלֹא תֹאכְלוּ וְלֹא תִשְׂתִּיּוּ וְלֹא תִשְׂכְּמוּ וְלֹא תִשְׁכְּבוּ וְלֹא תִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְלֹא תִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ וְלֹא תִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ$  (v. 29, 31), and that also strangers and sojourners are to comply with these. They decree that only the highpriest who has been anointed and consecrated shall perform the rites of the day (v. 32) and summarize in brief the purpose and significance of the day and its special rites (v. 30, 33). These provisions are repeated in chapter 23, 26-33 (where the position of this day in the procession of sacred days is fixed) and emphasized by the threat of "being cut off from among his people" for the soul that fails to observe them. The only additional feature is the specification of the fast as "from even to even". Numbers 29, 7-11 specifies that this day shall have a special set of festal sacrifices, since it was a special sabbath and occurring during the "sabbatical" seventh month. From this ordinance we must conclude that three sets of sacrifices were offered on this Day of Atonement: (1) the "continual" morning and evening sacrifice (Ex. 29, 38-42; Num. 28, 3-5); (2) the special festal sacrifice of "one young bullock, one ram, and seven lambs of the first year.....and their meat offering.....one kid of the goats for a sin offering"; and, (3) the expiatory sacrifices of atonement. This made a total of 15 animals. By

analogy we would conclude also that Edersheim is correct (Temple, etc., p. 307) that if the Yom Kippur fell on a Sabbath, then the sabbath sacrifices were also added.

THE SPECIAL  
RITES

Such were the general ordinances of the day of Atonement. Now as to the specific provisions concerning the specific expiatory rites of atonement. These are given in Lev. 16, 1-26, of which verses 1 and 2 are of an introductory nature. Connecting with the death of Nadab and Abihu, Aaron's sons, for their presumptuous attempt at non-ordained sacrifice (Ch. 10), the high-priest is forbidden entry "into the holy place within the veil before the mercy seat, which is upon the ark", except at the one time (vs. 29ff) and manner (v. 3ff.) appointed now. (1) The reason for this prohibition is that entry there is equal to "approach to the holiness of the all-holy God" (Keil). God says, let Aaron not come at all times into the holy place, etc., "for I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy seat". (On this, more later)

---

Note (1): This reference to the death of Aaron's sons is at times cited as showing a "mis-placement" of this chapter. However, apart from the evident arrangement of the chapters 1-16 to have this rite of atonement climax all these ordinances, the position of this chapter is also determined by the context. Verse 31 of the preceding chapter states that the uncleanness of the children of Israel "defile my tabernacle that is among them". And the cleansing of this defilement is provided for in the atoning ritual.



GENERAL PREPARATIONS  
FOR THE MINISTRATION  
BY THE HIGHPRIEST

Verses 3 to 5 first state the general preparations the highpriest is to make. He is to provide himself with certain animals, viz., with "a young bullock for a sin-offering and a ram for a burnt offering" (v. 3), and with a second set of animals taken "of the congregation", viz., "two kids of the goats (  $\square \text{ } \text{y} \text{ } \text{y} \text{ } \text{y}$  , he-goats, bucks of the goats) for a sin-offering, and one ram for a burnt-offering" (v. 5). Since the second set of animals is expressly to be provided by "the congregation", i. e., out of the common treasury, no doubt the first set was to be provided out of the personal means of the highpriest. The highpriest is also commanded to lay aside the elaborate "golden garments", the usual robes of his office. He is to bathe his body,  $\square \text{ } \text{y} \text{ } \text{y} \text{ } \text{y}$  --not merely his hands and his feet as he did for the ordinary service. He is to put on an all-white costume, --body-coat, drawers, girdle, and head-dress, all made of linen,  $\text{y} \text{ } \text{y}$  , called "holy garments". This is not the ordinary priest's dress, as that had not a white but a colored girdle. Yet the only thing reminiscent of the high priest's attire is the linen turban or "mitre".

PRELIMINARY ARRANGEMENTS  
OF THE ANIMALS

The use to which the specified animals are to be put is stated in general in verses 6-10. The bullock of the first set of animals, is to be "offered" by the high priest "and make an atonement for himself, and for his house". By comparison with the instructions for sacrificial offerings in chapter 1,

this means that the bullock had to be led (either by the highpriest personally or by his assistants) up to the altar of burnt-offering (Ex. 40, 6) where all the offerings were to be presented (Lev. 17, 8.9) "on the side of the altar northward" (Lev. 1, 11, cp. 3, 2. 8. 13 etc.), and then leaning with his one hand upon the head of the bullock he was to confess the sins of his own person and of the priests. "For his house" in verses 6, 11 and 17 is defined by comparison with verse 33 "for the priests".<sup>(2)</sup> Compare also Psalm 135, 19. Next the high-priest was to take the two he-goats of the people, and "present them" (not "offer";- so we understand that they are merely to be brought up, without a confession of sins). This is to be done "before the Lord at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation", so at the same place where the bullock was offered. The purpose of this "presenting" is to decide by lot which of the two is to be killed and its blood used as a sin-offering and which "to be presented alive, etc." (v. 10). Two lots are to be used, "one lot for the Lord, and the other for the scapegoat",  $\pi\iota\eta\zeta$   $\xi\zeta\zeta\zeta\zeta\zeta$ . The lot having shown the Lord's choice between the goats, the high priest next is to "offer" (not bring, as

---

Note (2): This differs from the interpretation of the Jewish Rabbis as represented by the prayers they record (Edersheim, The Temple, p. 310, 313. Delitzsch, Hebrews, vol. II, p. 477). There the priest first makes one confession for himself "and my house"; then after the casting of lots a second for "I and my house, and the sons of Aaron". Their second confession is no doubt based on the fact that verse 11 repeats the identical words of verse 6. Yet, Maimuni states there are to be only three confessions: for himself, for the priests, for the whole of Israel (Delitzsch, *ibid.* p. 470).

the A. V. gives it) the goat on which the lot fell "for Jehovah" (v. 9), and offer ("make ready") him for a sin-offering. In other words, he is now to make the confession of sins for the people with his hand on this goat's head, just as he had confessed for himself and the priesthood on his bullock previously. The goat "for Azazel" meanwhile was to be "set, placed" alive before the Lord, in other words, kept in readiness for the rite to follow in which he would be used "to make an atonement with him to let him go la-Azazel into the wilderness" (which, consonant to our presentation below, we would translate: "To make an atonement with him by sending him for removing away into the wilderness"). Thus all this is seen to be preliminary, designating the use for each of these three animals, and arranging them to expedite the actual sacrificial slaughtering later. These verses were also understood as preliminary by the Jewish experts in ritual, as Eidersheim's description in "The Temple" shows.

THE TERM  
"AZAZEL"

We do not presume to be an authority, but in our opinion the term Azazel can well be explained in this manner. (1) It is admittedly a hapax legomenon, occurring only in this chapter; Hence, whatever can be determined of its meaning must be based on etymology and its use here. (2) In verse 10 the instruction reads  $\text{וְשַׁחֵט אֶת־הַזֵּבֵן אֲשֶׁר־לָךְ} \text{ .}$  Now the lexicon states on the verb  $\text{שַׁחַט}$  "to send a person or thing, with  $\text{לְ} \text{ or } \text{לְ} \text{ of the person to whom; with } \text{לְ} \text{ and$

inf., to send to do anything". Since here the hapax legomenon follows this verb with a Lamedh, the possibility exists that it can be an infinitive form. (3) We find Keil and others contending that "the word is a more intense form of removit, dimovit, and comes from לִּי לְיָ by absorbing the liquid, like Babel from balbel (Gen. 16, 9) and Golgotha from gulgalta (Ewald 156 c) (Keil, Pentateuch, II, p. 396). This again makes possible the infinitive idea, and gives us the possible meaning "removing, completely taking away, carrying away". (The use of one of the other suggested root etymologies seems to arrive at the same general idea.) (4) We find that the term is not used in the verse which details the exact use of this goat and explains the meaning of that use. However, there both use and explanation agree with the idea of "removing, taking away, carrying away". (5) Except for the phrase quoted from verse 10, we find the term only in verse 8 and 10a), that is in this section of preliminary appointment. It is, then, merely a brief label to designate and distinguish the two he-goats as to their use: the one "la-Jehovah" the other "la-Azazel". Now, in spite of Keil's contention (loc. cit. p. 396) "The words, one lot for Jehovah and one for Azazel require unconditionally that Azazel should be regarded as a personal being, in opposition to Jehovah"--we must admit that this is not so "unconditionally required" as soon as we examine the use here. The term "la-Jehovah" is after all indefinite, obtaining its meaning from the following context; and therefore "la-Azazel" can be equally in-

definite and also takes its meaning from the following context. And as Fred Gardiner observes (Lange-Scheff, Commentary on Leviticus, p. 125) "It would be perfectly consonant with the usage of language that one goat should be for the Lord, and the other for anything, or place, or "abstraction", for the knife, for the wilderness, for the bearing away of sin". The two expressions are worded in such parallel fashion simply to keep intact the twofold idea (1) that the two goats are to be treated differently, yet (2) the rite of one is of equal importance with the other (therefore also two lots used).

In this view, we would translate the two labels "the one goat for Jehovah, the other goat for taking away" or "for removing completely". We would define the form as an infinitive as above indicated. We would regard its intention simply as a label, preliminary to exact explanation. Thus we avoid all ideas of the devil, a demon, a mountain, etc., and can concentrate attention on the clear statements of verse 20 about the purpose of the goat. For this reason we also prefer this explanation to that of Mueller in Theol. Quarterly, vol. 24, p. 17ff., who explains both Jehovah and Azazel as referring to God, the first to God revealed as the Reconciler in Christ, the other to God revealed as the Appeared Judge, the Justifier for Christ's sake.

THE ATONEMENT IN  
THE HOLY OF HOLIES

The actual sacrifice of the atoning  
blood is detailed in verses 11-20.

The first step was the killing of the bullock and catching of his blood, verse 11. The next step was for the high

priest to take a censer ("coal-pan") and fill it with live coal from the altar of burnt-offering, and to take two (3) handfuls of the special incense of the tabernacle (Cf. Ex. 30, 34). Thus provided, the high priest passed through the holy place, folded back the "vail which is before the mercy seat, which is upon the ark", and entered the Holiest. Then, "alone and separated from all the people in the awful gloom of the Holiest of All, only lit up by the red glow of the coals in the censer" (Edersheim), he "put the incense upon the fire before the Lord, that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy seat that is upon the testimony, that he die not" verse 13. Of necessity retracing his steps, since the coal and incense had been all he could carry at first, the high priest now entered the Holy of Holies a second time. This time he brought some of the blood of the slain bullock (kept from coagulating meanwhile by the stirring of an attendant?) and sprinkled with his finger, once, "upon the mercy seat eastward; and before the mercy seat..... seven times" on the ground (v. 14). Hereupon he had to return to the court again, slay the he-goat for the sin-offering of the nation, "and bring his blood of the bullock, and sprinkle it upon the mercy seat and before the mercy seat". Thus atonement was made for the sins of high priest, priesthood, and people, and the Holy of Holies cleansed.

---

Note (3): Why Luther translates "die Hand", and other commentators speak in the singular, I cannot explain in the face of  $\begin{matrix} 1'1 & 57 & 576 \\ \hline 1 & 1 & 1 \end{matrix}$  (dual).

THE ATONEMENT IN  
THE HOLY PLACE

The text now continues in verse 16b with "and so" ]<sup>ע</sup>1. "And so shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation that remaineth among them in the midst of their uncleanness". Thus it is demanded that the acts performed in the Holiest Place be repeated. This time, however, they are to be performed in "the tabernacle of the congregation". This <sup>וַיִּבֶן</sup> לְקֹדֶשׁ, since the term <sup>וַיִּבֶן</sup> is used for the Holiest Place, must refer to the Holy Place, the large portion of the tabernacle in which were found the golden candelabra, the golden table of shew bread, and the golden altar of incense. Here, according to verse 16b, the high priest was to repeat the rites performed in the Holy of Holies--sprinkle first with the blood of the bullock, then with the blood of the goat, both once and seven times. But what was to take the place of the ark and mercy-seat "upon which" to sprinkle? The answer to this is found in Ex. 30, 6 and 10. There, speaking of the altar of incense, God says (v. 6) "thou shalt put it before the veil that is by the ark of the testimony, before the mercy seat that is over the testimony, where I will meet with thee". Thus this altar of incense is placed in definite relation to the ark and the mercy seat. Then in verse 10 we read: "And Aaron shall make an atonement upon the horns of it once a year with the blood of the sin offering of atonements: once in the year shall he make atonement upon it throughout your generations: it is most holy unto the Lord". It is the altar of incense which is to take the place of the

Lev.  
46  
+  
Ex 30:  
6-10

ark and mercy-seat in the atonement ceremony for the Holy Place<sup>(4)</sup>--not the other objects. Expiation here was to be performed by sprinkling blood first on the horns of the golden altar, to expiate the sins of priest and people, then seven times on the ground before it, to affect purification of the Holy Place.

During all this time, so verse 17 informs us, the high priest was to be the only person going in and out of the tabernacle proper. "And there shall be no man in the tabernacle of the congregation when he goeth in to make an atonement in the holy place, until he come out and have made an atonement for himself, and for his household, and for all the congregation of Israel."

#### ATONEMENT AT THE ALTAR IN THE COURT

Expiation had now been made for the Holiest and for the Holy Place. Verse 18 and 19 continue, "And he shall go out unto the altar that is before the Lord, and make an atonement for it; and shall take of the blood of the bullock and of the blood of the

---

Note (4): We must also remember its use in the sin-offering, Lev. 4. "Like the great altar of burnt offering, it was in the category of "most holy" things (Ex. 30, 10); a distinction which gave it a right to a place in the inner room of the cella or holy of holies. Hence, in 1 Kings 6, 22, it is said to "belong to the oracle", and in Hebr. 9, 4, that chamber is said to have the "altar of incense". It did not, however, actually stand there, but in the outer chamber, "before the veil" (Ex. 40, 26). The reason for this departure from the strict rule of temple ritual was that sweet incense was to be burnt daily upon it.....To have burnt this incense within the veil would have required repeated entries into the holy of holies, which entries were forbidden (Lev. 16, 2). W. Shaw Caldecott, International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, Vol. I, p. 111.



goat and put it upon the horns of the altar round about. And he shall sprinkle of the blood upon it with his fingers seven times, and cleanse it, and hallow it from uncleanness of the children Israel". Leaving the tabernacle proper, the high priest is then to proceed to the great brazen altar of sacrifice, and is to put the blood of both sacrificed animals on the horns of the altar, and then he is to sprinkle the blood seven times, but this time not on the ground before the altar, but on the altar itself. Again the application of blood to the altar horns, was for expiation of the sins of priest and populace. The sevenfold sprinkling was for purification of the place of sacrifice.

In this view of verse 18 and 19 we differ from the interpretation of the Rabbins and many commentators. These hold that verse 18 and 19 refer to the altar of incense in the Holy Place. In support they cite Ex. 30, 10, quoted above in another connection. Accordingly we find in the Ritual of the Atonement as quoted by Delitzsch (Commentary on Hebrews, Vol. II, p. 464-481) from Maimuni's "Hajad hachazaka", and in Eidersheim's summary of this and other Rabbinical writings, that the performance of this rite in the Temple of Herod followed this order in this section: "Taking up the bowl with bullock's blood, he (the high priest) next sprinkled once upwards and seven times downwards towards the vail, outside the Most Holy Place, and then did the same with the blood of the goat. Finally, pouring the blood of the bullock into the bowl which contained that of

the goat, and again the mixture of the two into that which had held the blood of the bullock, so as thoroughly to commingle the two, he sprinkled each of the horns of the altar of incense, and then, making a clear place on the altar, seven times the top of the altar of incense. Thus he had sprinkled forty-three times with the expiatory blood, taking care that his own dress should never be spotted with the sin-laden blood. What was left of the blood the high priest poured out on the west side of the base of the altar of burnt offering" (The Temple, p. 315, 316).

We have decided against this view, and with Keil (Brief and Hebr. p. 258) and others refer this to the altar in the court. (1) As Keil points out, Ex. 30, 10, does not state in which part of the ritual, but only that an atonement for the altar is to be included in the ceremonies of the day of atonement. This is therefore fully covered by verse 16b. (2) The designation for the altar in verse 18 "that is before the Lord" is used for the one altar as well as for the other. "The expression 'before Jehovah' is applied to the presence of God, both in the dwelling (viz. in the holy place and the holy of holies, e. g., Lev. 4, 6.7.; 16, 13) and also in the court (e. g., Lev. 1, 5 etc.)" (Keil). When Nadab and Abihu died "before Jehovah" (ch. 10) they died "before the sanctuary of the dwelling", i. e. in the court of the tabernacle. (3) The expression "he shall go out" unto the altar, does not follow on verse 16a which spoke of the Holiest, but after 16b which spoke of the Holy Place, and

immediately after verse 17 which forbade the presence of anyone even in the holy place "until he come out, and have made an atonement for himself, and for his household, and for all the congregation of Israel", which is evidently a summary of both 16a and 16b, of all the acts pertaining to the Holiest and to the Holy Place. Therefore, the first and most natural interpretation is that now the priest "goes out" from the tabernacle proper into the court. (4) In the summary of the atonement ritual, verse 33, there is a division into three parts "for the holy sanctuary, and for the tabernacle of the congregation, and for the altar". Here again the most natural interpretation is of the outer altar. (5) Ex. 29, 42-44 the outer altar is designated as the place where Jehovah will "meet with the children of Israel". Thus we would expect to find also it included in the rites of this day. Perhaps some considerations like those given under (4) and (5) cause some to assume that, after the Holiest, atonement was to be made at the altar in the court and then finally at the altar of incense. (Cp. Lange in Lange-Schaff Commentary on Leviticus, p. 126).

THE RITE OF THE  
LIVING GOAT  
"THE SCAPEGOAT"

Thus all the rites requiring the blood of atonement had been completed. The three great divisions of the tabernacle had been cleansed. Atonement had been affected for the high priest, the priesthood, and the people. Now followed a rite whose detailed interpretation has puzzled interpreters through the centuries, verses 20-22. "He shall bring the live goat". The second

he-goat, on which the lot had fallen "la-Azazel", was now brought up before the altar of burnt-offerings, to the place where all offerings were offered. "And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat". The goat was then sent away by some man standing ready (appointed, prepared, and present) to be taken into the desert. "And the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited, אֶרֶץ אֲזָזִים, "a land cut off". There the animal was to be turned loose. Of pushing the goat off a cliff to its death, as done by the later Jews, our text knows nothing. Thus, symbolically the sins of the people were carried away, cut off from return to accuse them as effectively and completely as the goat from return to the camp.

CONCLUDING RITES  
FOR THE DAY

This concluded the special expiatory ritual of the day. There remained the disposal of the carcasses of the sacrifices made and the offering of the other prescribed offerings of the day. Verses 23-28 make prescription for this. In token that the sacrifices peculiar to the day had been completed, the high priest was to re-enter the Holy Place to take off and lay down (put away) the special white garments. Then he was to bathe again. (Probably because the act of laying the sins on the goat rendered him unclean", Keil thinks. More probably, "Because it was a most holy rite that he had performed", Stoeckhardt (Biblische Geschichte, des Alt. Test., p. 119).

After this bath the high priest was to put on "his clothes", i. e., the colored state-dress of his office to offer the other sacrifices of the day and to burn the fat-portions of the sin-offerings upon the altar. His day ended with the evening sacrifice, the burning of incense and the ordering of the lamps in the holy place for the night. Meanwhile the attendants that had burnt the carcasses of the two sin-offerings outside the camp (a procedure appointed for all sin-offerings for the high priest and the people as a whole, Lev. 4, 11. 21) and the one that had taken the goat "for Azazel" into the wilderness were defiled by contact with these sin-laden animals. Therefore they were to bathe their flesh and to remain as unclean outside the camp until the evening.

#### THE SIGNIFICANCE

This was the ritual of the Day of Atonement, as it appears from the Scriptural record. What was the significance? In answering this question we shall discuss the various features in order, and then summarize.

#### ONLY THE HIGH PRIEST OFFICIATES

The ordinance of the day specifies repeatedly that the high priest alone is to officiate,— he only who has duly succeeded to the office, and has received the investiture to this office in prescribed manner by anointing and "filling his hands" (consecration). So then, while the law permitted sacrifice by a number of "priests", yet after all, this is merely because

of the physical impossibility of having all the service performed by one person, and in reality there is but one priest, --the one usually called "the priest" (ha cohen), i. e., the high priest. After all God recognizes but one mediator who is to mediate between the people and their God. Without the true mediator there can be no atonement.

**THE HOLY OF  
HOLIES ENTERED**

Nearly all sacrifices had their blood put only upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offerings. Only in the case of a sin-offering for the priest or for the whole congregation does Leviticus 4 prescribe a different procedure--there the blood is brought into the Holy Place and some sprinkled upon the horns of the altar of incense. On the great Day of Atonement, however, the blood must be brought into the very Holy of Holies and sprinkled directly upon the throne of God for both priest and people. Atonement must be made in that place where God says: "I will appear in the cloud above the mercy-seat" (Lev. 16, 2). Of the altar of burnt-offering God indeed promises: "I will meet there with the children of Israel" (Ex. 29, 42-44); but of the mercy seat He says: "I will appear there". In other words, this is the supreme and most direct manifestation of the majesty of the all-holy God; this is the nearest approach to the very Person of God made possible in the ordinances of Old Testament services. And this is that Presence from which consuming fire flashes forth upon him that approaches unbidden or approaches without the requirements God has demanded (Lev. 16, 2-2; cp. ch. 10).

What holiness and stern justice in the insistence upon such an approach! What mercy and grace and love toward the sinful, erring creature in providing and opening up a possibility of approach! Atonement is to provide for the sinner a way of approach to God. But such atonement is made possible only through God's mercy and such atonement must be acceptable to His unbending holiness.

**THE BATH** The high priest was required to bathe before entering upon the service of the Day of Atonement. Otherwise washing the hands and feet were required; but on this day a full bath. Only one entirely cleansed, undefiled as to his person, is in position to approach the all-holy Presence. Only such an one can act as mediator.

**THE LINEN GARMENTS** The all-white garments speak a like language. Of these we are told most emphatically "these are holy garments". Keil-Delitzsch (Pentateuch, vol. II, p. 397) is undoubtedly correct in stating, "Although in Ex. 28, 2.4. etc., the official dress not only of Aaron, but of his sons also, that is to say, the priestly costume generally, is described as "holy garments", yet in the present chapter the word kodesh, "holy", is frequently used in an emphatic sense (for example, in verses 2, 3, 14 of the most holy place of the dwelling), and by this predicate the dress is characterized as most holy. Moreover, it was in "baddim) (linen) that the angel of Jehovah was clothed (Ezek. 9, 2.3. 11; 10, 2.6.7.; and Dan. 10, 5; 12, 6.7.), whose whole

appearance, as described in Dan. 10, 6, resembled the appearance of the glory of Jehovah, which Ezekiel saw in the vision of the four cherubim (chap. 1), and was almost exactly like the glory of Jesus Christ, which John saw in the Revelation (chapter 1, 13-15)". These white garments speak of holiness without spot or stain or shadow as essential to that person who would approach God and act as mediator for sinners.

**THE INCENSE** The first entrance into the Holiest had to be made with incense, a full measure of incense ("filling of the hands") sprinkled on the sacrificial embers. But burning incense was a symbol of prayer (Cp. Ps. 141, 2; Rev. 5, 8; 8, 3.4.). It had also to be of the "holy" incense. Thus the approach was heralded as that of a suppliant, approaching by permission granted by God Himself. The supplication was announced as one to be offered by a holy person and by virtue of an atoning sacrifice. Quoting Keil-Delitzsch again (ibid. p. 399), "As burning incense was a symbol of prayer, this covering of the capporeth with the cloud of incense was a symbolical covering of the glory of the Most Holy One with prayer to God, in order that He might not see the sin, nor suffer His holy wrath to break forth upon the sinner, but might graciously accept, in the blood of the sin-offering, the souls for which it was presented".

**"FIRST FOR HIS OWN PERSON"** On the Day of Atonement the high priest first had to offer the bullock of sin-offering for his own person. Before mediating for others he



must first find atonement for his own sins. Though consecrated for the very purpose of being the mediator of the people, proclaimed the mediator by the very robes of his office, yet he must first sacrifice for himself. In more exalted fashion than otherwise he was to mediate for the people, yet he was no less in his own person a sinner than at other times. The more, therefore, on this day the holiness of the Lord was emphasized and the need for a corresponding purity and holiness on the part of the one approaching Him; the more must by contrast the insufficiency of the high priest's person in this respect appear. After all, "the holiness communicated to the priest did not conceal the sin of his nature, but only covered it over for the performance of his official duties" (Keil-Delitzsch). And for this day it needed special covering as he approached the very Presence beyond the veil.

How absolute, then, the demand for spotless purity in the mediator for the people! But if the mediating high priest himself needs atonement, is not then after all his mediation incomplete? If beside the various cleansings and purifications of his official consecration, if beyond the special sin-offerings in the case of his sinning, yet this special atonement is needed before the high priest can enter the Holy of Holies, is there not something insufficient about all the sacrifices? We wonder if such questions did not suggest themselves to the faithful of the Old Testament!

THE BLOOD      The high priest was required to bring blood into the Holy of Holies, and use it for atonement. For his own person the blood of the bullock, for the people the blood of a he-goat had to be offered. The significance of the blood we learn from Lev. 17, 11: "The life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it you upon the altar to make an atonement <sup>a cover</sup> for the soul". This passage indicates that "God appointed the blood for the altar, as containing the soul of the animal, to be the medium of expiation for the souls of men". The blood "as the vehicle of the soul" (Keil-Delitzsch) "possessed expiatory virtue, because the animal soul was offered to God upon the altar as a substitute for the human soul". Again we read, Lev. 19, 22, "and the priest shall make an atonement for him with the ram of the trespass offering before the Lord for his sin which he hath done: and the sin which he hath done shall be forgiven him". According to these passages, the offering of the blood was to affect forgiveness of sin with God, and this could be affected only by giving into death a substitute that God would accept in the stead of the man's life. The idea of substitution is brought out clearly by the ordinance (Lev. 1, 4; 3, 2, etc.) that the offerer was to lay his hand upon the head of the animal, "and it shall be accepted for him"; "whereby (by the imposition of the hand) "he set apart the animal as a sacrifice, representing his own person in one particular aspect" (Keil-Delitzsch, Pentateuch, vol.II, p. 283).

The purpose of the blood is "to make atonement" 753

(from  $\text{כָּפַר}$  to cover, construed with  $\text{לְ}$  objecti). Ch. 17, 11 states that the blood was to "cover over" the soul of the sinner; ch. 1, 4 says the blood is to "cover him", the offerer; ch. 4, 26, 35, etc., "to cover" him who had sinned as concerning his sins. From what was the blood "to cover" the sinner? Gen. 32, 20, Jacob explains the reason for sending his rich presents ahead to Esau by saying, "I will appease him with the present"  $\text{וְכִפַּרְתִּי אֶת־עֵשָׂאֵן$ . He wished to modify the wrath of his brother. Again, when God's wrath was roused by the calf-worship of the people and He threatened to destroy them, then Moses said (Ex. 32, 30) "Ye, have sinned a great sin: and now I will go up unto the Lord; peradventure I shall make an atonement for your sins"  $\text{וְכִפַּרְתִּי אֶת־עֵשָׂאֵן$ . The sinners are to be covered over from the wrath of God. Because of his sin the sinner's life had been forfeit. But now the life of the substitute has been given for him, and he is covered over from that avenging wrath of God. Thus the sin is forgiven and the grace of God is brought to bear on the atoned sinner. Because this is the significance of the blood, it is not for the sinner to decide what blood he will bring, but God must prescribe to the sinner what blood He will accept for "covering". If that blood is brought near to God which is acceptable, then the sinner is covered over from wrath, he is atoned. His sin is forgiven him. God's grace and favor is assured him.

THE TWO-FOLD FORM  
OF SPRINKLING

The blood of the bullock for the high priest, and of the he-goat for the people, was to be sprinkled first once against the mercy seat, then seven times on the ground; first once upon the altar of incense, then seven times upon the ground; first once upon the horns of the brazen altar, then seven times upon its grate. The significance of this appears by comparing verses 11 and 9, which state that the blood was to be for a sin-offering for the priest and the people, and verse 16 which says that thereby the tabernacle was to be purified from defilement. Keil-Delitzsch writes: "The first sprinkling, which was performed once only, was for the expiation of the sins, first of the high priest and his house, and then of the congregation of Israel (chap. 4, 7 and 16); the second, which was repeated seven times, was for the expiation of the sanctuary from the sins of the people" (Pentateuch, vol. II, p. 399). By the first, single, sprinkling atonement and forgiveness was assured for the persons. By the second, sevenfold, sprinkling the tabernacle and its sacrificial appointments were cleansed from the defilement attached to it "because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins" (v. 16). The tabernacle and its sacrificial appointments are considered as instruments and media used by the mediator, the high priest, in mediating atonement. Yet, as long as they are touched by men of transgression, sin, uncleanness, how can they be truly used for atonement of sin? Again, they are viewed as the channels and vessels by which God's grace, favor, and salvation are

to be brought to the people. Also in this view they needed cleansing from defilement to be suited to their holy purpose. That there was a seven-fold sprinkling of blood for this purpose, served to emphasize the act as related to Him who rested on the seventh day and sanctified it and as truly efficient for the intended purpose. How utterly unclean sin appears by this rite! How complete is the forgiveness of that sin as affected by the atoning blood!

**THE DISPOSAL OF  
THE CARCASSES**

The carcasses of the sin-offerings were treated according to the rule laid down in chapter four for those sin-offering which were brought into the tabernacle proper. "And the skin of the bullock, and all his flesh, with his head, and with his legs, and his inwards, and his dung, even the whole bullock shall he carry forth without the camp to a clean place where the ashes are poured out, and burn him on the wood with fire; where the ashes are poured out shall he be burnt" (vs. 11, 12, 21). The body of the sin-offering is considered the bearer of the sin which had been imputed to it. Therefore it must be "given up to the effect of sin, viz., to death or destruction by fire, and that outside the camp, in other words, outside the kingdom of God, from which everything dead was removed" (Keil-Delitzsch). At the same time "it was sacrificial flesh, and most holy by virtue of its destination" (loc. cit.) Cp. Lev. 6, 25; 10, 17. Therefore it was not to be treated as carrion, but disposed of and burnt in a clean place. This ordinance served to emphasize the fact that in God's sight the

animal had truly been made a bearer of sin. It had been substituted for the man to bear his sin in its body. This bearing of the sin "in its body", "imputed to its body", is emphasized still more on the Day of Atonement by the ordinance (v. 26) "he that burneth them (the sin-offerings) shall wash his clothes, and bathe his flesh in water, and afterward he shall come into the camp". The exceeding sinfulness of sin was emphasized in fullest possible measure. Likewise was emphasized the typical completeness of the removal of that sin.

THE RITE OF THE  
SCAPE-GOAT

The rite of the scape-goat has caused perplexity to commentators since ancient days. Accordingly they are divided into opposing camps, each contending for some preferred etymology of the word "azazel" and governing their interpretation accordingly, or else fixing on some other feature as the point of departure for their interpretation. We cannot hope, of course, to offer anything new. Yet, the text gives the interpretation to which all in the end must return. Let us bear in mind the following points. We are expressly told (1) that this goat was to be "presented before the Lord to make an atonement with him  $\text{לְפָנֵי יְהוָה}$  . (On this Keil remarks: " $\text{לְפָנֵי}$  with  $\text{לְפָנֵי}$  always applies to the object of expiation; properly, to expiate with, i. e., to make it the object of expiation, or make expiation with it") (2). This goat was as much God's chosen agent to make atonement as the goat that was slain; for two lots were used, and the choice made before

Jehovah; he was "made to stand before Jehovah" to make atonement with him; he was also to be "offered", (  $\text{בְּרִיבָה}$  ), even as the other goat. (3) This goat was to be sent away, alive, but "into the wilderness", yes,  $\text{בְּרִיבָה לְאֶרֶץ חֲדָשׁוֹת}$ , "into a land of cutting off, of separation", from which there would be no return. (4) Placing both his hands (to make the act the more solemn, impressive and emphatic) on the head of the goat, the high priest had to "confess upon him all the misdeeds (  $\text{בְּיָדָיו}$  ) of the children of Israel, and all their rebellions (  $\text{בְּיָדָיו}$  ) with respect to all their sins" (  $\text{בְּיָדָיו לְכָל עֲוֹנוֹתָם}$  ) "and give (  $\text{בְּיָדָיו}$  ) then upon the head of the goat". (5) The purpose is definitely stated in these words: "The goat shall take away (  $\text{בְּיָדָיו}$  ) upon him all their misdeeds to a land of separation". (6) We are told at the outset, verse 5, that both goats together are to constitute one single sin-offering (  $\text{בְּיָדָיו}$  "for a sin-offering") which means that the sacrifice of the one goat and the offering of its blood is not to be considered apart from, or as detached from, the sending away of the other, nor vice versa. Two goats are used because it was impossible to symbolize everything with just one animal. (Cp. the use of two birds in the sin-offering of the poor and in the cleansing of leprosy (Lev. 5, 7-10; 14, 4ff), or because the one animal was to portray in a heightened and more impressive manner what would have been done in another manner at other occasions. Thus, in the offerings for sin brought for princes and individuals the priests were to eat the flesh in the holy place "to bear and take away (  $\text{בְּיָדָיו}$  ) the

iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them" (Lev. 10, 17) i.e., the priest, by eating, as it were incorporated the victim laden with sin and thus actually took away the sin by virtue of the holiness and sanctifying power belonging to his office (So Keil-Delitzsch, Pentateuch, vol. II, p. 355). Something similar is done here. The slain goat had been accepted by Jehovah as a substitute to suffer the consequences of sin for the people. The live goat was to show that God in view of that atoning sacrifice had cast the guilt of the sin from His presence to a land of no return, into complete forgetfulness. The memory of man's guilt has been banished from God's heart by the atoning blood of the sacrifice whom God appointed.

As Wilhelm Höller puts it (International St. Bible Enc., vol. I, p. 343, 344) "Both goats, so to say, represent two sides of the same thing. The second is necessary to make clear what the first one, which has been slain, can no longer represent, namely, the removal of the sin, and accordingly has quite often aptly been called the 'hircus redivivus'. But what is to be represented finds its expression in the ceremony described in vs. 20ff. Whatever may be the significance of the laying on of hands in other connections, whether the emphasis is placed more on the disposal or on the appropriation of the property, at this place it is certainly only a symbol of the transfer of guilt, which is confessed over the goat and is then carried into the wilderness by the goat upon which it has been laid; In order to make this



transfer all the more impressive, both the hands are here brought into action, while e.g., Lev. 1, 4 only one hand is used. The fact that the goat is accompanied by somebody and that it is to be taken to an uninhabited place is to indicate the absolute impossibility of its return, i.e., the guilt has been absolutely forgiven and erased, a deep thought made objectively evident in a transparent manner and independently of the explanation of Azazel, which is even yet not altogether certain".

#### THE BURNT OFFERINGS

After the rite of the scape goat burnt offerings were to be brought, a ram each for the priest and for the people. Both were to accept gratefully the declaration of God of forgiveness and cleansing, to give Him praise for it, and in gratitude to offer Him their hearts and lives to be transformed and purified by the fire of God's Spirit into newness of life and consecrated service.

#### THE FAST AND SABBATH REST

In keeping with the significance of every act on this day and its importance to the individual and to the nation as God's covenant people as well, the people were to rest "from all work" thus devoting their entire, undivided attention to this work of God in their midst. They were to afflict their souls, so that as individuals and as the congregation they might come before God with true sorrow and contrition because of the misdeeds and rebellions in all their sins which they were to confess, and with genuine desire to receive the forgiveness and grace

which God was preparing and offering them, and with sincere resolve to continue to live in accordance with the ordinances of God, as His purified covenant people.

Such is the significance of the various parts of the expiatory rites of the Day of Atonement. Gathering together these separate items, we are ready to summarize the impression of the whole. In one apt phrase we can give that impression no better than did Delitzsch, who called this "The Good Friday of the Old Testament". That phrase points both to the greatness and to the limitations of the day.

A MIRROR  
OF SIN

*Significance of the rite*  
It is the Good Friday of the Old Testament in  
that it was the greatest single mirror of sin 22

set before the people. How forcibly it portrayed sin as a most horrible impurity and defilement! The cumulative significance of the bath required of the high priest, the sacrifice required first for the officiating priest himself, the repeated confession, the cleansing demanded even for the tabernacle and its appointments from the uncleanness with which the sin of the individual and the congregation had contaminated it, the manner of disposal for the carcasses of the sin-offerings, the full bath for levitical cleansing of all who had come into contact with the sin-bearing animals, the demand for a strict fast and affliction of souls,--all must combine to set forth sin as a most horrible defilement. How sternly these rites condemned sin as a most damnable thing! Even the consecrated priest subject to the consuming fire of the Lord's vengeance because of it, unless he

approaches with the incense of prayer--the blood of the sacrifice required in atonement--the terms used in confessing the sin--how they drove home the fact that the sinner has forfeited everything and become subject to the full fury of wrath. How impressively these rites set forth the inability of man to extricate himself from the uncleanness and the dread wages of sin! Every bit of instruction for this atonement shows the sinner approaching only by virtue of the Lord's grace. Everything shows atonement affected by means established by the Lord for man. Whoever does not approach as a suppliant to this grace (the entrance with incense) nor by these God-appointed means has only death to expect. Surely, in view of it all there was reason for a call to afflict the soul in contrition! It is because the day was such a mirror of sin that some have called the Day of Atonement "the national day of humiliation and prayer" of the Old Testament.

A MIRROR  
OF GRACE

But dark as the Day of Atonement pictures sin, so brightly it mirrors the Lord's grace. God provides a mediator whom He will accept for the people. God provides a way in which that mediator can approach even to the Holiest Place. God provides an atonement acceptable in the sight of His holiness and justice. God cleanses from sin in that atoning blood, yes, sends the guilt away for good. He accepts, again by that atonement the people as His holy nation and accepts their gifts and deeds of service as acceptable and pleasing in His sight. What a call it was to rejoice in the Lord, the Lord God merciful and gracious, and long-

suffering, and abundant in mercy and truth, who forgiveth iniquity and transgression and sin! What a call to sincere gratitude and earnest resolution to hallow His name! All this, no doubt, did not stand out so clearly in the mind of the Old Testament believer as to us who approach and view this Day of Atonement in the light of fulfilment. Yet this gospel of the Atoning Blood and the Great Mediator for sin was there, and God's Spirit by it worked and sustained the saving faith, a faith which could rise to such heights of assurance as we find expressed in the psalms of David. Because in its heaping of all the sin of all the people on the Substitute, and the complete removal of it from them all that this day centered, it is the Old Testament's greatest mirror of grace, the Good Friday of the Old Covenant.

#### A PICTURE OF LIMITATION

But after all, it was still the Old Testament. And it mirrors the limitations of that covenant. This Day of Atonements was added and demanded in addition to the many ceremonies of purification and to the many sacrifices for sin. Were they, then, not pictured as of limited efficacy? The mediator consecrated according to God's institution on this day appears as one in need of atonement himself. Is, then, his mediation placed under the shadow of question--is it after all full and final mediation? The atonement of this day must be repeated year by year. Every year there is need of a new Day of Atonement. Is then also this atonement after all but a limited, incomplete, insufficient atonement? On this day, indeed,

the veil before the Holy of Holies was lifted. Yet, not the people dared enter, and after the rites were complete it was not lifted again for another year. Was this, then, after all but a beginning of restoration?

**A PROMISE OF GREATER  
THINGS TO COME**

Although admitting itself, by its very requirements, insufficient, incomplete, and limited, yet the Day of Atonement was a day ordained by God Himself, and its expiation is accepted by Him for the people. And so this singular day was one great promise, a promise of full atonement and of a perfect Mediator and of a full and free entrance to the throne of God. "This day with its all-embracing expiation, foreshadowed typically and prefigured prophetically the ultimate and highest aim of the Old Testament economy, viz., perfect reconciliation" (Keil-Delitzsch, Pentateuch, Vol. II, p. 263. Cp. also p. 259, 260).

It is to the features of the Day of Atonement pointed out in these last two paragraphs that attention is drawn by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is to his evaluation of the Day of Atonement that we wish further to direct our attention.

ITS EVALUATION IN THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS**THE EPISTLE REFERS TO  
THE DAY OF ATONEMENT**

That the author of the epistle to the Hebrews (which we shall quote hereafter simply as "Hebrews") refers to the Day of Atonement of the Old Testament is apparent to every Bible student. Although the day is never referred to by name, yet the distinctive ritual is definitely referred to Hebrews chapter 7, 27; 9, 7; 12, 25; 10, 3, 19, 20. These passages, in turn, stand organically connected with the sections in which they occur, and logically connected with other references in the epistle. In them we find the evaluation which the author of Hebrews, and through him the Holy Spirit, places upon the Old Testament Day of Atonement.

**A HIGH ESTIMATE** It is a high estimate that the author of Hebrews thus gives to this day. The purpose of the epistle is to establish the faith of Jewish converts who stood in danger of being offended by the reproach and persecution the Christian faith had to meet, while being taken in by the seeming splendor of the old Jewish ritual, its temple appointments, and the privileges it seemed to enjoy in the Roman world. The epistle therefore chooses the most significant and outstanding marks of the Jewish religion and by comparison shows how infinitely above them all stands Christ and the salvation in His name. By including in such a discussion the Day of Atonement what high rank and significance the author of the epistle assigns to it!

INSUFFICIENT  
BECAUSE OF THE NATURE  
OF THE HIGH PRIEST

High as the holy writer ranks the Old Testament Day of Atonement, he yet views it as subject to a number of limitations. More, he points to items in the very ritual of the day as proving it inadequate. For instance, he shows the high priest to be declared by the atonement ritual as insufficient for the true fulfilment of this mediatorial office. Chapter 5, verses 1-3, and ch. 7, 22ff, two points of insufficiency in the nature of the Old Testament high priest are pointed out.

The former passage first directs attention to the purpose of the highpriestly office. "Every high priest taken from men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins". The high priest is ordained *ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων*, in behalf of men, and that *καὶ πρὸς τὸν θεόν*, "in ihren Beziehungen zu Gott, vgl. 2, 17" (Keil). This is further explained by the statement, "that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins, *ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν*". All this declares the highpriestly office an office of mediation for men's guilt, mediation with God. Now by that fact the principle applies: "Let an innocent person come and make expiation for the guilty, and not a guilty person come and make expiation for the guiltless" (Schaff-Lange, Hebrews, p. 102). But what does the ritual of the Day of Atonement reveal of the high priest? (For, as Keil, "Brief and Hebr." p. 125ff quoting Hofman points out, "the author has in mind the rite of the Day of Atonement") It shows that the high priest *περίκειται ἀθώστειαν*.

He is encompassed (as one might be by light, or as by the skin) with moral weakness "so that he can in no condition of earthly life be conceived as separate from it" in a condition entirely independent of human will (Schaff-Lange, *ibid.*). And so, δι' αὐτήν (since without this infirmity it would be otherwise), he is under obligation, ὀφείλει, to observe the regulation of Lev. 4, 3-12, and particularly of the Day of Atonement, Lev. 16, "as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins" (περὶ = on account of). Thus the author of Hebrews points to this requirement of the atonement ritual as declaring the very high priest without whom observance of the Day is impossible to be insufficient to act as a true mediator, ".....da es sich um sündende Vertretung vor Gott handelt, zu welcher kein Mensch, der selber der Sündung bedarf befähigt ist. Es gäbe eben solche Vertretung gar nicht, wenn nicht Gott sie ordnete, der allein diesen Mangel dadurch ersetzt, dasz er sie ordnet" (Hofman, quoted by Keil, "Brief an d. Hebr." p. 124).

In Hebr. 7, 23ff this same "infirmity" of all the priests is pointed out, and a correlate insufficiency added: "They are prevented by death from abiding" (διὰ τὸ θανάτῳ κωλύεσθαι παραμένειν, viz., in their priesthood; not "in life", as that would result in an insufferable platitude and not fit the succeeding context). This insufficiency appears in the fact "they are become priests as many", οἱ μὲν πλείους γίνονται ἱερεῖς, as also the ordinances of the Day of Atonement show in providing for successors in office to Aaron. Whether



the *πλείους* is taken to refer to simultaneous plurality, referring to the fact that Aaron (Ex. 28 f) was not installed alone but his sons with him, or the entire priestly family in them, as Keil (Brief an d. Hebr., p. 194) and others contend; or whether it is taken to refer to successive plurality, the establishment of a succession to office, as many contend; the argument of the verse remains the same. The thought is this: The sinners have need continually to have a mediator acting in their behalf (compare the *πάντοτε* in v. 25, and the *καθ' ἡμέραν* in v. 27), since they sin daily. But in the nature of the Old Testament priesthood there was ever and again a break in that mediation, as one high priest stepped into the place of another whom death had removed from office. Always it was necessary to look forward to another to come, for something more. Never was the question finally, completely put aside: Is the whole of what is necessary to full reconciliation with God now forever attained? (Compare the *εἰς τὸ παντοῦς* in the comparison).

Both points evident in the ordinances of the Yoma-- that of sinfulness, and that of a plurality of priests because of death--are pointed out as something imperfect and unsatisfactory, v. 26ff. "For such an high priest became us" (*ἐπεσπιν*), was appropriate. "That is complete in every respect, fully fitting for his task", Lenski, Interp. of Hebr., p. 242), the author states, and then goes on to picture a high priest in whom the very opposite of these unsatisfactory characteristics are found. In five items,

(objectively presented although the writer has only Jesus in mind), each item forming an apposition to the *ῥηδῶτος*, the high priest is characterized who is truly appropriate to the purpose of his office. First, unlike the high priest of the Old Testament, he must be *ἅγιος*, without a single speck of pollution (a term used in LXX for the Hebrew *chasiḏ*, e.g., Ps. 16, 10 and quoted Acts 2, 27; 13, 35). Secondly, he must be *ἄκακος*, "with not a thing that is bad, base, or even morally inferior attaching to him", --"we have no exact English equivalent" (Lenski). Thirdly, he must be *ἀκίαντος*, "without a stain". These three adjectives emphasize the thought of absolute sinlessness and perfection. Fourthly, he must be in a state (perfect participle) of having been separated from sinners, "withdrawn from sinners", so that he cannot on any count be classed with them.<sup>(5)</sup> And then, fifthly, he needs to be "become higher than the heaven", so that he is ever in position to deal directly with God and that in the

---

Note (5): This participial phrase has caused much comment; even as there is disagreement among commentators on the exact shade of meaning to be assigned to the three preceding adjectives. Some interpret the "kechoorismenos" of Jesus' separation, by virtue of His ascension, from contact with sinners, or from the sufferings occasioned by His work for sinners (Keil, loc. cit. p. 198). This would be local separation. Others take it in the moral sense of "absolute immunity from contagion or stain" while outwardly dwelling in contact with sinners. To us it seems that the force of the work and the context are satisfied with the idea: Though outwardly a man, so at first glance in the same class with sinners, yet Jesus was not on any account to be classed with sinners. Even when "made to be sin for us", He was still in a class by Himself. One's decision in the matter will depend on whether "kechoorismenos" is referred to the time following the "heauton anenengkas", v. 27, or (as we do) prior to it.

fullest measure needful for those whose case and cause he would mediate. (The author, of course, expects his readers to see at once that no one but Jesus could actually offer all this in his person.) Then the writer of Hebrews adds a relative clause, which "does not add to the predicates given a new one" (Keil, Brief an d. Hebr. p. 198: "fügt ze den genannten Prädicaten nicht ein neues hinzu"), but rather shows what the foregoing characterization means for the perfect high priest's work. It means that, unlike the actual high priests of the Old Covenant, he would not day by day bear the necessity of having his own sins provided for and then first offer for the sins of the people, nor would he day by day bear the necessity of performing ever new sacrifices for the people. The former necessity would be out of the question because he had no sins of his own; the latter, because (as Jesus actually did by self-sacrifice) he would satisfy all requirements forever with a single sacrifice. This paraphrase of verse 27 offers our solution of the "crux interpretum" raised by the statement: "Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice first for his own sins, etc.", since the high priest (both according to the Old Testament presentation and the statements of Hebrews, 9, 7; 10, 1) actually did not daily offer sacrifice for his own sins. We are of the opinion that the position assigned the words in  $\delta\varsigma$  οὐκ ἔχει καθ' ἡμέραν ἀνάγκην, clearly indicates that the writer was fully aware of the fact that in actual performance the high priests did not day by day repeat the

sacrifice for their own sins. But the  $\epsilon\chi\theta\varsigma$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$  remains true, and that  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$   $\epsilon\chi\theta\varsigma$  was day by day---whether acknowledged only on occasion by the observance of Lev. 4 by the high priest, or presupposed by the special ceremonies of inauguration and consecration, or viewed as sufficiently satisfied by God's provisions of those consecratory rites and of the annual rite of the Yoma Kippurim, so that "on the strength of this blood-accomplished expiation, the priests could, throughout the year, present in the sanctuary the daily and weekly offerings" (Lange). The writer stresses that he does not have reference to the daily performance of such sacrifice but to the daily need of having this prerequisite satisfactorily settled in the sight of God. Furthermore it seems to us that the position assigned the words allows for the double reference of the  $\epsilon\chi\theta\varsigma$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$  indicated above, looking both to the facts just stated and to the other fact that the high priest actually did offer many, a great many sacrifices for the people, and that day by day the need for them existed because of the "infirmity" attaching to the high priest and because of the insufficiency of the offering sacrificed. Both these latter considerations are included in the statement made of Jesus " $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$   $\gamma\alpha\rho$   $\epsilon\pi\acute{\omicron}\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\nu$   $\epsilon\theta\acute{\omicron}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$   $\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\nu$   $\lambda$ ". The  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$  here is to be taken in the sense "the latter", as it evidently is meant to refer only to the immediately preceding  $\epsilon\theta\acute{\omicron}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$   $\tau\omicron\nu\upsilon$   $\tau\omicron\upsilon$   $\lambda$ . (Cp. also the line of argument presented by Lenski, Interp. of Hebr. p.245ff). This presentation with its direct reference to Jesus' fulfilment of the requirement leads to a statement regarding the other "infirmity", v.28, "For the law ordains men high

priests possessing infirmities, but the word of the oath-swearing, (that occurred) after the law, (ordains) a son perfected to eternity". That statement includes, though it is of course not the primary thought, that the plurality of high priests and their ever-recurring removal from office by death was something falling short of the requisites of complete mediation. Thus in the very character of its high-priestly officiant the Old Testament Day of Atonement is shown to bear the marks of limitation and incompleteness.

INSUFFICIENT BECAUSE Hebrews also points to the very sacrifice which the Old Testament rite of atonement offered as indicating imperfection . We found this stated in the passage we have just reviewed when that passage spoke of the need, the daily need, of repeated sacrifice for the sins of the people. This is treated rather extensively in chapters 9 and 10.

thus we read ch.9, v.6.7., "The priests went always into the first tabernacle (the fore-tent, i.e. the holy place), accomplishing the service of God. But in the second (the inner, i.e. the holy of holies) went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people." This is a distinct reference to the Day of Atonement, and so the offerings of that day are definitely included in the statement of v.9f, "there.. "were offered both gifts and sacrifices that could not make him that did the service perfect as pertaining to the conscience; which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances". As Heubner

states (Prakt. Erkl. d. N.T., vol. 4, p. 492), "The tranquillizing of the conscience is the end of all sacrifices, deliverance from the dreadful guilt that condemns us and from the fear of the avenging God. The more the conscience was aroused, the less could sacrifices appease and satisfy it. Ps. 51, 18". The sacrifices could not bring the complete assurance of heart that all sins have been forgiven by God Himself. In that sense they cannot τελειῶν, bring to the desired goal. In fact, the holy writer goes so far as to say of them, "μόνον ἐπὶ βρώμασιν καὶ πόμασιν καὶ διαφόροις βαπτισμοῖς, δικαιώματα σαρκός..." "only, in addition to (epi) foods and drinks and various baptisms, ordinances about flesh". The sacrifices were only "ordinances about flesh" (objective genitive), that is, regulating the worshipper's "flesh", the outward body. That applies to the sacrifices of the Day of Atonement, too, since they were just mentioned. This thought is again repeated v. 13, "the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh". The author of Hebrews here indeed ascribes a certain power to the sacrifices (also to those of the Day of Atonement), yet what a limited, circumscribed power! We quote Keil:

"Das Blut von Böcken und Stieren brachten der Hohepriester des Gesetzes zur Sühnung der Volksgemeinde alljährlich in das Heiligtum, um es wegen der unreinigkeiten der Söhne Israels in allen ihren Sünden zu sühnen, Lev. 16, 16. Damit verbindet der Verf. das aus der Asche der roten Kuh bereite Sprengwasser, welches dazu diente, die durch Berührung von Toten, Menschenleichen und Totengebeinen Unreingewordenen zu heiligen; vgl. Num. 19 und das Nähere über diesen Ritus in m. bibl. Archäol. par. 58. Diese beiden Sühnmittel des Gesetzes heiligten πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθάρτητα.

Das Opferblut reinigte die Gemeinde von der Unreinheit der Sünde, das aus der Asche bereitete Sprengwasser reinigte von der Unreinheit, die der Tod als Gold der Sünde wirkte. Durch die beiden Sühnmittel wurde aber nur das äusserliche Verhältnis der Bundesgemeinschaft der Gemeinde im ganzen oder in einzelnen Gliedern, wenn es durch Sünde und Tod getrübt oder gestört war, wieder hergestellt. Diese Wiederherstellung wird τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότης genannt, im Unterschied von καθαίρειν τὴν συνείδησιν v.14 vgl. mit v. 9. Die συνείδησις, das Gewissen, ist das auf sein persönliches Wechselverhältnis zu Gott bezügliche Wissen des Menschen um sich selbst. Hiernach ist die der συνείδησις entgegengesetzte αἵμα nicht die leibliche Natur des Menschen, die durch Berührung von Toten verunreinigt worden wäre (Bl. deW.) ebenso wenig wie die Sühnung der Sünde die Reinigung des Leibes ist. Σαφές ist das äusserliche, von der sündigen Natur der Menschen beeinflusste Verhältnis der Volksgemeinde zu Gott, welches durch Sühnung der Sünde und durch Besprengung der mit Todesunreinheit Behafteten mit Wasser von der Kuhasche gereinigt wurde. Der Ausdruck: σποδὸς βουβάλου ἐαντίφουσα, Asche der Kuh sprengend, d.h. welche sprengt, statt: welche gesprengt wird auf die Verunreinigten, erklärt sich daraus, dass es hier nur darauf ankam, die Bestimmung, zu welcher die Asche da ist, geltend zu machen, so dass von ihr das prädicirt werden konnte, was mit dem aus Kuhasche bereiteten Sprengwasser erzielt wurde. Das Verb. ἐαντίφουσα ist hergenommen von der Benennung des zur Tilgung der Todesunreinheit aus Kuhasche bereiteten Sprengwassers: ἕλαιον ἐαντίσμου wie π 77 '8 in der LXX übersetzt ist. Προς nicht des Zweck, sondern den Erfolg angehend. Προς τὴν... καθαρότητα in Bezug auf die Reinheit" (Br. an d. Hebr. p.243).

In short, "Defilement and cleansing were alike symbolic. It was within a well-defined ceremonial limit these sacrifices and washings availed" (Dodds, Exp.Gr. Test. v 1, p.334). "The Israelite who offeres a legal sacrifice maintains thereby his corporate membership in the Old Testament covenant; and if he offers with a right disposition of mind, he experiences an answering operation of grace, but still the holy of holies remains closed for him. The sacrifice which he offers cannot perfect him κατὰ συνείδησιν, cannot give him an inward consciousness of perfect reconciliation with God, perfectly satisfied desires after salvation, or a perfected and inward peace. The material offerings of the law are but parables intended to last only till the time when the reality shall

be made manifest. Regarded in themselves, they are incapable of any operation on the inward part of man" (Delitzsch, Com. on Hebr. ii, p 71).

This insufficiency of the sacrifices is further set forth in the 10th chapter. Vs.1 we read, "The law...year b year with the same sacrifices which they are offering in perpetuity is never able to bring to completion those who draw near". This is an evident reference to the sacrifices of the Day of Atonement, whose rites prescribed sacrifices once every year and identical sacrifices each year. The writer of Hebrews point to this "ceaseless repetition, prescribed by the law itself as the plainest sort of evidence for the fact that the goal is thereby never reached", (Lenski, Interp. of Hebr. p. 328). Those sacrifices cannot work *τελειωσει*. In proof of this the author asks a question, "Else, would they not have ceased being offered because the worshippers, once having been cleansed, have no more conscience in regard to sin?" Certainly, if, finally, in some year these sacrifices had achieved their goal, they would have ceased. For then, cleansed with enduring permanence, all of the sins cleansed away, no more sins would disturb and harrass conscience. If any person should sin and be disturbed in conscience, all he would need to do would be to return in repentance to that final sacrifice already offered (Lenski). But the sacrifices of the Day of Atonement are endlessly repeated, always the same. One gets no farther than the others. "Completeness and finality is not in them, cannot be" (Lenski). On the contrary ( *ελλα* ),



"in connection with them a remembrance of sin year by year; for it is impossible for blood of bulls and goats to be taking away sins". As Lenski puts it (op.cit. p.329), "The whole institution of this sacrifice is a grand reminder of sins, in the most serious way bringing them to the conscience, and that always in the same way, 'year by year'". Point-blank the author of Hebrews declares it an impossibility (*ἀδύνατον γὰρ*) for animal blood, such as offered on the Day of Atonement, ever to take away (*ἀφαιρῆναι*) sins from the sinner, "freeing him from their hold of guilt and punishment, the sacrifice with its blood picking them up and utterly taking them away" (Lenski). "There is no relation between the physical blood of animals and man's moral offence" (Dodds). "The blood of animal sacrifices offered on the altar was indeed, under the Old Testament, a divinely appointed means of making atonement for human souls ( Lev. xvii,11, "I have given it" ), but a means manifestly inadequate to accomplish its end.....The animal sacrifice was but a shadow, and yet, as ordained by God, a true indicator and prophecy of another sacrifice in which the divine will would be fully accomplished" (Delitzsch, *Bf. and Hebr.* p.149.

To these passages one might well add the argumentation of ch. 9, 22-26; 10, 5-12. However, the ones cited clearly refer to the Day of Atonement, and in these the author of Hebrews evaluates that Day as short of ability to achieve fully and finally the high goal of satisfying conscience and freeing men from the burden of their guilt, because the kind of sacrifice prescribed in its rites was in its

own strength and merits insufficient.

INSUFFICIENT BECAUSE  
OF THE PLACE WHERE  
THE RITE WAS PERFORMED

Interlocked with the two  
preceding considerations,

we find another insufficiency alluded to. The place where the high priest performed the functions of his office, and where he brought the sacrifice, also reveals the insufficiency of the Yoma.

Chapter 8, v.5, we read: ("On earth....there are priests that offer gifts according to the law:) Who serve unto the example and shadow of eheavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God, when he was about to make the tabernacle: for, See, saith He, that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount". The author asserts in clearest language that the Levitical priests, and that includes the high priest in the rites of the Day of Atonement, "serve", *λατρεύουσιν* -- "used especially in classics, LXX, and N.T. of service of God, with dative of the person served" (Dodds),-- but they serve *ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιά τῶν ἑπουρανίων*. Keil correctly brings the reminder that this is not intended to be "etwas Herabsetzendes"; for the tabernacle is expressly stated to be a sanctuary erected by divine command and according to a divinely given pattern. "Aber bei alledem is die Stiftshütte als *ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκιά τῶν ἑπουρανίων* nicht das vollkommene Heiligtum, in welchem Gott bei seinem Volke wirklich wohnt und die Gemeinde Israels mit ihrem Gott wahrhaft vereinigt ist. Und in dieser Hinsicht ist der Gottesdienst, der in dem irdischen Heiligtum gepflegt wird, unvollkommen, etc." (Keil, Br. an

d. Hebr. p. 207). Thus also the rites of the Day of Atonement are insufficient, as they are rites performed in the service of the tabernacle of shadow and picture.

ὑπόδειγμα "bezeichnet das veranschaulichende Bild, sei es Vorbild oder Abbild (hier u. 9,23)"(Keil); "a sign suggestive of anything", "a delineation", "outline", perhaps "suggestion" would satisfy the present passage (Dodds). A quotation from Ex. 25, 40 is adduced to show that the tabernacle is described by God Himself as not the true thing, but only a copy. Like a shadow it had no independent existence, no substance in itself; but only gave assurance that the reality did exist.

These thoughts occur again in the 9th chapter, which begins with the statement: "Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a wordly sanctuary". With τὸ τὸ ἕγιον κοσμητικόν the author merely reminds that he is speaking of the earthly tabernacle, but prepares the mind for what is coming. Then in verses 2 - 5 he describes the arrangement of this tabernacle. He brings out the glories of that tabernacle by repeating the descriptive adjective "golden" again and again in enumerating the articles that belonged to the Holy of Holies<sup>(6)</sup> After this description he says in the 9th verse: "...which was a

-----  
 Note (6). On the statement of v. 3 that the holy of holies ἕγιον κοσμητικόν, has the golden altar of incense, compare note 4, p.12.13, above. On the statement of v.4 that the golden pot of manna and Aaron's rod were in the Ark of the testament, cp. Ex. 16,33; Num.17,10; 1 Kgs.8.9 ( 2 Chron. 5,10). The express statement that in Solomon's time the Ark contained nothing save the two tables of stone implies that originally more had been in it, viz. the manna and rod, as our writer says. What had become of them, we are not told, hence do not know.

a figure for the time then present". *ἥτις παραβολὴ εἰς τὸν καιρὸν.*  
 If, however, that tabernacle with all its exact arrangements fixed by God Himself, with all its golden vessels and equipment, with its glorious holy of holies, yet is only a *παραβολή*, then it could not be the reality itself. And so even when "into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself and for the errors of the people" (v.7) this service of the Day of Atonement also could not be the final reality, but a *παραβολή* or figure, and that *εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐπισημαστικόν* --- which, no matter which of the possible explanations of "present time" suggested by interpreters we might accept, always implies that the Old Testament tabernacle was but a temporary arrangement, not the great abiding, permanent reality itself. This point is alluded to once more in the same chapter, v. 21f. "Moreover he (Moses) sprinkled with blood both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry..... It was therefore necessary that the patterns (*ὑποδείγματα*) of things in the heavens should be purified with these, etc." Here the tabernacle and its equipment are once more declared merely *ὑποδείγματα* patterns, copies, suggestions. They are not the reality. When therefore on the Day of Atonement the vessels of this "copy" were sprinkled with the blood, this was on the face of things not the final, genuine "purging" or purification. In v. 24 the sanctuary is called *ἀντίτυπον τῶν ἀληθινῶν*, which Delitzsch translates "a mere counterfeit of the true". And because they are performed in the *κοσμικὸν ἔργον* which

was only *ὑπόδειγμα* , *σκιά* , *παραβολή* , or, *ἀντίτυπα* of heavenly reality, the entire rites of the Day of Atonement are marked as lacking reality, as insufficient in themselves.

INSUFFICIENT BECAUSE  
PART OF A COVENANT  
OF SHADOWS

The author of Hebrews also places the evaluation of inadequacy on the Day of Atonement by proving the covenant of which it was an integral part a covenant of shadows. In chapter 8 we find him saying, v. 7ff, "For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them, He saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah..." Then, after quoting the remainder of Jer, 31, 31 - 34, the author concludes, "In that He saith, A new covenant, He hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away." These words declare and prove the Old Testament covenant, including its *Hom Hakippurim*, a temporary arrangement. What concerns our subject still more, the statement of v. 7, *εἰ γὰρ ἡ πρώτη ἰκεῖνη ἦ ἀμεμπτος κτλ.*, declares the Old Testament covenant subject to censure, defective in some respect. It was not *ἀμεμπτος*. Even though the author in the succeeding 8th verse says, *μυθόμενος αὐτοῖς* , placing the true reason for the fault in the faultiness of the people living under that covenant; yet this does not change the truth that the Old Covenant proved unsatisfactory and was actually for that reason set aside by a

a new covenant. But in what did the fault of the old covenant consist? The author had already given one answer to this question in the preceding chapter.

Ch. 7, 18f he wrote, "There is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof. For the law made nothing perfect".

*ἀσθενὲς καὶ ἀνωφέλιος* he called the Old Testament covenant, because *οὐδὲν ἀτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος*. Nothing was brought to perfection, to the true goal for which the entire law and covenant were given. But this statement \ \ the author had prepared for and substantiated in v. 11f by pointing to the priesthood in conjunction with which the law and covenant had been given, *ὁ λαὸς γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῆς* (viz. *ἐπὶ τῇ Λευϊτικῇ ἱερωσύνῃ*) *νενομοθέτητο* he had written. The Levitical priesthood was an essential part, a foundation pier of the Old Testament covenant arrangements. "It is the soul of the entire legislation. All the arrangements of the law, the entire administration of the people, involves the priesthood. If there is a failure in the priestly service, the whole system breaks down" (Dodds). The Day of Atonement, however, was most intimately connected with all this, for it was the annual re-instatement of the Levitical priesthood, and its seven-fold sprinkling of the reconciling blood had the purpose of renewing the covenant arrangements. But now God speaks in Ps. 110 of a priest "ordained after the order of Melchizedec" and not after the order of Aaron, thus appointing a change of priesthood. What change, however, would be uncalled for if the Old Testament

priesthood actually had been fulfilling the intended purpose "to bring men near to God" (v.19). Thus the inadequacy of the Old Covenant, that in which was faulty, defective, was this that its great goal that by it men might *ἐγγίζοντο τῷ Θεῷ* was never truly accomplished. By being a part, though ever so prominent and glorious, of such a covenant, the Day of atonement also is necessarily inadequate. This is emphatically repeated chapter 10, *σκιὰν γὰρ ἔχων ὁ νόμος τῶν κειμένων ἔργων. Σκία* is in the emphatic place, as that characteristic of the law which determines its inadequacy" (Dodds). That was characteristic of the entire Old Covenant, It was shadowy, indefinite, and unsubstantial. It could not by its very nature, nor by the intimations of God's statements, deal with *τελείωσις*. Of such a covenant the Day of Atonement was a part, a supporting pillar. So it, too, must partake of the insufficiency and inadequacy of the covenant with which it stands and falls.

THIS INSUFFICIENCY  
NOT WITHOUT DESIGN  
ON GOD'S PART

Was then this inadequacy of the Day of Atonement, of its priest, its sacrifice, its place of ministry, and of the covenant of which it was a part, --- was all this mere chance and accident? How shall we understand this insufficiency in the light of the fact that God Himself had so ordered this Day of Atonement in all its parts? Also for this question the author of Hebrews gives us answer. God designed all this with a purpose.

The clearest statement on this we find in chapter 9

with its indubitable reference to the Day of Atonement. Verse 6ff we read, "Now when these things were so ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God. But into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people: The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing". Pointing out the **three** particulars which bring out the impossibility of free access to the Presence between the wings of the cherubim over the Ark -- 1) not at any time, but only once a year; 2) not by any and all priests promiscuously, but by the high priest only; 3) not freely, but only with the prescribed blood was access possible -- the author of Hebrews adds *τοῦτο δεικνύσας τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, καὶ* "this the Holy Spirit signifying, that the way into the Holy of Holies had not yet been made manifest while the foretent has still a place", Dodds' translation). "Access to the Holy of Holies being thus barred was an intimation that the true access to God had not yet been furnished ... The very object of the division of the Tabernacle into two rooms, and outer and an inner, was to impress men with the fact that the way of access had not actually been disclosed" (Dodds, Exp. Cr. Test., Vol. iv, p. 330). Ever and again, when the high priest had lifted the veil to enter the Holiest, that veil dropped back into its place; always it was a case of hope deferred. *Ἡ τῶν ἁγίων ὁδὸς*



ist nicht der Weg in das Allerheiligste des alttest. Gotteshauses; denn dass dieser noch nicht jedem offen stand war eine geschichtliche Tatsache, die nicht von dem häll. Geiste geoffenbart zu werden brauchte. Gemeinst ist der durch Christi Eingang in den Himmel geöffnete neue Weg oder Eingang in das Heiligtum, wo Gott ist, wie bei εἶσδος τῶν ἁγίων 10,19f." (Keil, Br. a d.Hebr., p. 231). Hereupon verse 9 adds the statement: ἵτις παραβολῇ κτλ. κέρει κρεοῦ διαβώσεως ἐπι κείμενα. Keil remarks, "Diese Verse geben an, inwiefern durch das Bestehen des vorderen Zeltes angedeutet ist, dass der Weg zum wahrhaften Heiligtum Gottes noch nicht offenbar geworden". As Dodds translates v.9.10, "For this is a parable for the time (then) present, in accordance with which (parable) are offered both gifts and sacrifices that cannot perfect him that doth the service as regards conscience, being only ordinances of the flesh resting upon meats and drinks and divers washings, imposed until the time or rectification". Like the outhertent, so the entire dispensation. The Levitical ordinances were to show in every part that everything done was but a temporary arrangement, was only something pointing forward to a time of διόρθωσις, a time of "putting things right, bringing matters into a satisfactory state". And all this was δηλοῦντος τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου. The Holy Ghost who speaks to men not only in the prophets but in the entire γραφή θεόπνευστος (cp. 2 Tim. 3, 16 and Heb. 1, 1), had all these arrangements of the Old Testament ritual (also those particular ordinances of the Day of Atonement so graphically recalled to the minds of the readers

of Hebrews here), fixed and recorded so minutely with the design that by all these signs of insufficiency and marks of temporary intention men might be led to look forward to a day of "satisfactory state", look forward to the true priest, the true sacrifice, the true putting aside of the veil, the true opening of access to the Presence of God with all this *παρὰ βολή* was promising.

Another bit of God's design in all this is indicated in chapter 5, v. 1 - 3. "Every high priest taken from among men is ordained from men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins: Who can have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way, for that he himself also is compassed with infirmity. And by reason hereof he ought as for the people, so also for himself to offer for sin". Here it is stated that one of God's purposes in ordaining high priests who both by reason of the divine ordinance (e.g. on the Day of Atonement) and by their own moral need had to offer first for their own sins, and then for the people, was this:

*μετριοπαθεῖν δυνάμεις τῆς ἀγνοῦσιν καὶ πλανωμένοις -*

Keil says, "Ἀγνοεῖν (vgl. ἀγνοήματα 9,7) bezeichnet ein in der versuchlichen Schwäche der menschlichen Natur begründetes Sündigen, welches infolge getrübbten sittlichen Bewusstseins den göttlichen Willen verkennt" (Br. an d. Hebr. p, 127). And for the sake of those who under the Old Covenant fell into such sins of weakness, in which they were overcome in the struggle of the Spirit against the flesh, God wanted a high priest *μετριοπαθεῖν δυνάμεις τῆς ἀγνοῦσιν,*

one who could keep the proper balance between stoical apathy and passionate excitement, and show himself mild and moderate with those who have erred. The sincere believers of the Old Covenant must have felt very keenly their failures to live up to the stringent demands of the Mosaic ordinances and their transgressions. To re-assure these true-hearted ones God wanted them to have before their eyes in the person of an high priest who had first to sacrifice for his own sins a symbol of God's grace which can and does have compassion on sinners. They were not to despair of finding an understanding heart with the high priest who ministered before the unapproachable holiness in the unapproachable Sanctuary, but take heart to come to him for his intercession and mediation with God in their behalf. They were to infer that since God had provided them with such an high priest, he would also look to their humble and contrite spirit and His promised Savior in whom they were trusting and would again accept them into His covenant. At the same time the requirement that the high priest first sacrifice for his own sins would tend to keep him meek and humble even in his exalted office.

Thus the very particulars which the author of Hebrews points out as marks of insufficiency in the Day of Atonement, he also declares to have been designed by God for a twofold purpose. On the one hand they were designed to fit the spiritual needs of a people living in a period of waiting and expectation. On the other hand they were designed to keep constantly before the minds of all who seriously

considered them the fact that these appointments had no true value in themselves, but were a parable and shadow and promise of a time to come when all things were to find their *διόρθωσις* and be brought to a truly satisfactory state.

ITS VIRTUE DERIVED  
ONLY FROM THE WORK  
OF CHRIST

Thus all this fits marvelously into the thesis of Hebrews that the coming of Jesus and His work has brought *διόρθωσις*, and that all virtue and value of the Old Testament ordinances derived only from Him. To present this fully would require a commentary on the entire letter. We shall confine ourselves to an outline of the main points.

In Jesus we have a High Priest perfectly fitted to our needs and inspiring our complete confidence. Chapter 2 pictures Him, who had been described previously as the exalted Son of God, incarnate "not ashamed to call us brothers" (v.11f), He and we being "from one" (v.11), and He sharing our "blood and flesh" (v.14), as One who undertook to help the seed of Abraham and therefore needed to be made like unto His brethren in all things (v.16.17) "That He might be a merciful and faithful highpriest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that He Himself suffered being tempted, He is able to succour them that are tempted".(v.17, 18). "We have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, etc" Ch.4, 15. A similar thought underlies ch.5, 7.8. Surely, we can approach this our High Priest with full confidence that He will understand our plight, feel pity, be ready to provide all the help that is

at His command! At the same time He is such an High Priest who is perfectly fitted to the task of mediating with God. For He is God-appointed (ch.3,1.2; 5,5.6). He is also faultless, great, and eternal, and can even remain "within the veil", made a priest "not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life" (ch.7, 16.17), in "an unchangeable priesthood" (v.24) "ever living to make intercession" (v.25) "holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens" (v.26) "a son consecrated for evermore" (v.28) He is made complete to be the Author of eternal salvation, designated by God a High Priest according to the order of Melchizedec (ch. 5, 9.10). He is "an high priest over the house of God" (ch. 10, 21), a "great high priest" (ch.4,14).

In Jesus we have the true sacrifice of atonement and reconciliation. Our High Priest "needeth not daily to offer up sacrifice ... for this He did once, when He offered up Himself" (ch.7, 27). "For Christ is not entered into the holy places .... that He should offer Himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with the blood of others; For then must He often have suffered since the foundation of the world: But now once in the end of the world hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself" (ch. 9, 24 - 28). "We are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all" (ch.10, 5 - 14). "By His own blood He entered in once into the holy place having obtained eternal redemption for us" (ch. 9, 12-14; 13, 12). And "when He had by Himself purged our sins,

sat down on the right hand of the majesty on high" (ch.1m3) Jesus has brought the perfect and final sacrifice, eternally powerful and availing.

In Jesus, furthermore, we have a mediation performed in the very presence of God in heaven itself. "We have a great High Priest that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God" (ch.4, 14; 1,3; 7, 27). We have such an High Priest who is set on the right hand of the throne of Majesty in the heavens, a minister of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not man (ch.8, 1. 2; 9, 11).

"For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands which are the figures of the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us" (ch.9, 24), "sat down at the right hand of God" (ch.10, 12). There "He ever liveth to make intercession for them whom come unto God by Him" (ch. 7, 25).

Finally, in and by Jesus our atonement is part of a better covenant, -- a perfect covenant of full remission of sins and of heavenly inheritance. "For the law made nothing perfect but the bringing in of a better hope did; by the which we draw nigh unto God, And inasmuch as not without an oath He was made priest,... By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament" (ch. 7, 19-23). "He is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises. For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for a second", -- but Jer. 31, 31 - 34 promises a new covenant in which sins and iniquities will be remembered

no more and hearts will be renewed. (ch. 8, 6 - 13; 10, 14ff).

"And for this cause He is the mediator of the new testament that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance" (ch. 9, 15; 12, 24; 13, 20).

Thus does Jesus provide finally, fully, forever that which the Old Testament Yom Hakippurim could only foreshadow. But because it constantly pointed forward to His coming, His mediation, His atonement, those Old Testament faithful who accepted that promise already, like Abraham, by faith saw the day of Christ, were counted righteous, and received eternal inheritance.

CHAPTER 13, 10 - 12            There remains consideration of one passage without which this essay could not be called complete, Hebrews 13, 10f, since it contains an evident reference to the rites of the Day of Atonement. At first glance the passage would seem to indicate that the burning of the carcasses of the sacrificial animals outside the camp on the Yoma was intended as a type of Jesus in His suffering outside the gate. However, that is scarcely the intention of the verses. The author's intention, rather, is to put before his readers point blank, once more, the necessity of making a determined choice. Either his readers must break with the Tabernacle and serving it, i.e. break their allegiance completely with the Jewish religion and wholeheartedly follow Christ so that they might "eat of the altar we have", become partakers of Christ's salvation; or,

they must break with Christ. It is absolutely, either---or. For to every one who truly "serves the Tabernacle", to every orthodox Jew, if he thinks at all, Christ must appear as an abomination. For Christ suffered "without the gate", as an outcast, condemned as a blasphemer, executed as a criminal, ---as unclean according to the Law as those carcasses burnt outside the camp. This line of thought best fits the "therefore" of v 13f. Since Christ's work is done, there can be no neutral ground. We must accept Him at all costs. We must choose reproach, and worse, with Him rather than lose Him. Only so do we share that benefit which the Old Testament Day of Atonement was to confer by pointing forward to His work, and which now in Jesus is forever completely effected by virtue of His sacrifice on Good Friday, the Perfect Day of Atonement, and which is forever made available to every one that believes by His session at the right hand of Majesty as our Perfect Mediator, as our Eternal High Priest, yes, as our Forerunner within the veil.

Such is the evaluation of the Old Testament Day of Atonement by its own author, the Holy Spirit, set down for us in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Thus the Day of Atonement stands before us in the Scripture as a monument of that wisdom of God which always finds means exactly fitted to supply the needs of men under the conditions and times in which they live, and still more as a monument to that loving kindness of the Lord which is ever stooping to the sinners to rescue their souls from death and to "restore unto them the joy of His



salvation". Also from a contemplation of this unique institution of the Old Covenant we today can derive comfort in our daily struggles and trials. We are thereby led to renewed trust in the wisdom of God to shape all His providence also to the requirements of our daily needs. We are led to appreciate all the better the marvelous fulness of spiritual blessings which are ours as members of the New Covenant. As he who has already scaled the foothills appreciates all the more the grand heights to which the rugged peak still towers high above; so he who has climbed this Old Testament mount of grace, who has seen the significance of the rites of the Day of Atonement, must appreciate all the more those towering heights of divine mercy exhibited by the perfect atonement of Calvary. With redoubled emphasis the plea of Hebrews must strike home into his heart: "Having therefore, Brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of JESUS, by a new and living way which He hath consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say His flesh; and having an High Priest over the house of God; Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water. Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering, (for He is faithful that promised;) And let us consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works" (Hebr. 10, 19ff)

\*\*\*\*\*

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

## COMMENTARIES

- Keil- Delitzsch, Commentary on the Pentateuch, 3 vols.  
Edition of T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 1864
- Franz Delitzsch, Commentary on the Hebrews, 2 vols.  
Edition of T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 1878
- J.C.Friedr. Keil, Commentar über d Brief an d Hebräer,  
Leipzig, 1885
- The Expositor's Greek Testament, Vol. 4, Marcus Dodds, D.D.  
on the Letter to the Hebrews.
- P.E.Kretzmann, Popular Commentary, Old Testament, vol. 1
- P.E.Kretzmann, Popular Commentary, New Testament, vol. 2
- Lange's Bible Commentary, edited by Ph.Schaff, on Leviticus
- G. Stoeckhardt, Bibl. Geschichte des Alten Testaments
- R.C.H.Lenski, Interpretation of Hebrews
- Lange's Bible Commentary, edited by Ph.Schaff, on Hebrews
- Heinr. Leonhard Heubner, Praktische Erklärung d. N. T.  
vol. 4, (Potsdam, 1859)
- Christoph Starke, Synopsis etc., on Hebrews
- Jamieson, Faussett, and Brown, One-Volume Commentary on the Bible.

## SPECIAL VOLUMES

- Edersheim, A., D.D., The Temple, Its Ministry and Services  
at the Time of Christ, Geo.Doran Co, 1908

## MAGAZINES and PAMPHLETS

- Wm. Moenkemoeller, "The Festivals and Sacrifices of Israel".
- James M. Gray, D.D., "Christ in the Sacrificial Offerings".
- Carl Manthey-Zorn, "Die Epistel and die Hebräer".
- Theological Quarterly, vol. 13 (1909), No. 4, p. 219ff
- Theological Quarterly, vol. 24 (1920), No. 1, p. 17ff

REFERENCE WORKS

Kirchliches Handlexikon, Meusel et al. (Leipzig, 1902)

The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, James Orr, D.D.  
General Editor (Chicago, 1925)

John D. Davis, A dictionary of the Bible, 4th Edition