"Someone has said somewhere": A 'Transtextual' Analysis of the Tabernacle Theme in the Letter to the Hebrews

Mayjee Philip

A Thesis

in

The Department

of

Religion

Presented in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy at
Concordia University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

June 2007

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-31130-1
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-31130-1

ABSTRACT

"Someone has said somewhere": A 'Transtextual' Analysis
of the Tabernacle Theme in the Letter to the Hebrews

Mayjee Philip, Ph.D.
Concordia University, 2007

Although the Letter to the Hebrews has merited immense amounts of scholarly attention regarding its use of Hebrew Scriptures, Hebrews scholarship is lacking a critical accounting of the dependence of Hebrews on the Hebrew Scriptures, especially Leviticus, to construct a meaningful text. My dissertation, which addresses this lacuna, is interested in how the author of Hebrews uses the textual levitical Tabernacle theme to construct the central motif of the heavenly Tabernacle in Hebrews. In analysing the ways in which Hebrews relates to Hebrew Scriptures, I make use of literary theorist Gérard Genette's model of "transtextuality," which classifies different kinds of textual relations between antecedent and successor texts. This model sets in relief the variegated relationships Hebrews has with Hebrew Scriptures in general and Leviticus in particular. Using Genette's model, I identify various types of transtextual relationships that exist between Hebrews and Hebrew Scriptures. Based on the results of this mapping, I argue that the author's selective use of symbolism associated with the levitical Tabernacle and priesthood gives the author the scope to present Jesus as the High Priest at the heavenly Tabernacle.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My journey from East to West in completing my doctoral dissertation has been long and eventful. It would have been a wandering in the academic wilderness if it were not for the many people who helped and encouraged me; to all of them I am deeply indebted.

I thank my advisor, Professor Jack Lightstone, for supporting me over the years, training me through my graduate work in the art of reading and analysing unfamiliar texts, and teaching me to look beyond the usual in familiar texts. I cannot thank you enough for your unending patience, particularly during the time of writing my dissertation at its various stages. I have benefited much from your scholarship and guidance and am forever grateful. Thank you, Professor Philip Harland, for your continued help and support. I am grateful for your many scholarly recommendations and for your meticulous comments on my chapters that have added to my work. My thanks and appreciation to Professor Norma Joseph. I am thankful for your insights and feedback on my chapters, for motivating me throughout the writing of my dissertation, and for your wise counsel at important junctures throughout my time at Concordia. Thank you, Professor Leslie Orr, for your support and encouragement. I thank Professor Frederick Bird for advising me to apply to the Department of Religion and to work with Professor Lightstone. I am indebted to Dr. Maria Mamfredis for guiding me in the initial stages of my dissertation. Tina Montandon and Munit Merid, thank you for always being there for me; your caring ways and your friendship made me feel at home in the Department. Without your constant support this journey would have been arduous and monotonous. I

also owe my sincerest gratitude to the Department of Religion for supporting me financially through many Teaching Assistantships and Research Assistantships and for also giving me the opportunity to teach. I am also grateful to the Fonds québécois de la recherche sur la société et la culture (FQRSC) for their financial support.

To my friends who are and were at Grace Montreal Church, especially Alberto, Alex, Andy, Anna, Anne, Catherine, Chris, Ena, Harry, Iman, James, Janey, Janice, Joe, John, Julie, Jung, Kamin, Kevin, Linda, MyoungHee, Phillip, Ronald, Sheila, Sue, Vadim, you added many shades of meaning to my life here. Thank you for taking care of me, standing by me, and cheering me on; your encouragement and love gave me the courage to press on even in difficult times. Jen-I, your giftedness for perfection has blessed my work and I am truly indebted. Winnie, your unwavering diligence and exceptional kindness have graced my work and touched my life deeply – I am richer for our friendship. Thank you.

To C. B. Samuel and L.T. Jeyachandran, I am grateful to you for reading my chapters and giving me invaluable advice on various subjects that have greatly enriched my work. Selina, Nina, Joy, Gangatharan, Gayatri, Nawin, Sona, Rebekah, Priya, Vinu, Manu, Nasreen, Anil, Bonnie and Prasad – thank you for your many generous and kind ways, by them you have made me understand the meaning of true friendship.

To my family, especially Sunnypapan and Omanamamma, thank you for your loving support. To Pa, Ma, Tommy, Cinu, and Jayden, your unconditional love, patience, and prayers carried and sustained me thus far – this is for you.

"[F]rom Him and through Him and to Him are all things. To Him be the glory forever!"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1. INTRODUCTION

1. Introduction

The Letter to the Hebrews stands out among New Testament texts because of its many distinctive features. Though it has traditionally been thought to be authored by Paul, contemporary scholarly consensus does not place it among the genuine Pauline epistles[1]. The unknown author of this text has a particular and seemingly peculiar manner of quoting Hebrew Scriptures in comparison to other New Testament authors. "[T]he writer of Hebrews usually introduces the words of the OT as the direct speaking of God. . . . [T]his manner of presenting the OT text is without parallel elsewhere in the NT" (Lane cxvii). With the exception of a few instances in which the author cites David and Moses as his sources (4:7; 7:14; 9:19-20), he uses texts from the Pentateuch, the Prophets, and the Writings without specifying their origins. The author of the Letter to the Hebrews is also thematically selective: of the many themes, such as creation, covenants, Israel, and the Temple, he is keenly interested in aspects of sacrifice and worship in conjunction with the desert Tabernacle and its ministrations, and the priestly office as set forth in the text of Leviticus. Thus, the author's interaction with Hebrew Scriptures and his selective use of the themes of sacrifice, worship, and the priestly office, particularly from Leviticus, differ from other New Testament texts and make the Letter to the Hebrews a curious phenomenon in biblical literature.

---

[1] "In antiquity, the names of Paul, Barnabas, Luke, and Clement of Rome were mentioned in certain church centers as the author of Hebrews. In current scholarship, Apollos, Silvanus, the deacon Philip, Priscilla and Aquila, Jude, Aristion, and others have found their proponents. . . . This divergence underscores the impossibility of establishing the author's identity" (Lane 1991, xlix).

2. Current Scholarship

For the purposes of this review, the numerous scholarly works on the Letter to the Hebrews are divided into three sub-sets. Several commentaries, including the works of F.F. Bruce (1964, 1990), H.W. Montefiore (1964), J. H. Davies (1967), Philip E. Hughes (1977), Leon Morris (1981), Donald Guthrie (1983), Harold W. Attridge (1989), William L. Lane (1991), Paul Ellingworth (1993), and Craig R. Koester (2001) fall into the first subcategory of theological studies interested in exegetical and hermeneutical questions. Historical criticism and text-linguistic analysis have been the preferred methodologies. The second sub-set includes studies that address theological questions, particularly regarding the author's purpose in writing the Letter to the Hebrews. W. Manson (1951, 1966), Jean Héring (1970), and T.H. Robinson (1933, 1964) use literary and historical criticism as their principle methodologies. Other studies that raise questions of theological and methodological significance include George H. Guthrie's *The Structure of Hebrews: A Text-Linguistic Analysis* (1994), which argues that Hebrews "was meant to have an impact on listeners" (146). Even so, Guthrie's text-linguistic approach makes the case that it is difficult[2] to categorize Hebrews "according to one speech form of ancient Greek rhetoric" (32).

Graham Hughes' *Hebrews and Hermeneutics* (1979) raises and discusses the following theological and methodological issue:

> Is it even conceivable that a satisfactory theory of biblical hermeneutics might be formulated . . . which attempts to take altogether seriously the priority

[2] Guthrie agrees with Burton Mack's assertion that "'[e]arly Christian rhetoric was a distinctively mixed bag in which every form of rhetorical issue and strategy was frequently brought to bear simultaneously . . .' (*Rhetoric and the New Testament*, 35)" (32).

> attributed by the texts themselves to the activity of God in the interpretative and communicative process? . . .
>
> Whereas . . . the priority of importance to the historical method in our age has dictated that hermeneutical procedures have moved away from criticism of the texts to an attempted faith-understanding of them, we shall suggest that the natural and useful order is to move from an analysis of faith-understanding to criticism. (113-114)

Hughes' conclusion, based on his suggested methodology, is that the Letter to the Hebrews "is a message for tired *Christians*," with no particular agenda for evangelism (135).

In *The Rhetorical Composition and Function of Hebrews 11 in Light of Example Lists in Antiquity* (1988), Michael R. Cosby claims that:

> The structure of the examples of famous people in Hebrews 11 varies considerably within the overall tightly knit and well-defined purpose of the list. The diversity of composition prevents a public reading of the passage from becoming monotonous, while the unity of all the examples in presenting the central theme of the chapter prevents the audience from missing the impact of the presentation. (24)

This work is unique in its effort of pointing to the "list-like" structure of Hebrews 11, which has striking resemblance to forms of ancient rhetoric and yet is distinct in its organization and function. Cosby's claim about the author's ingenuity in presenting Hebrews 11 as a list also points to the ambiguous nature of Hebrews, which combines aspects of a letter and a sermon.

In the first part of *The Role of the Septuagint in Hebrews: An Investigation of Its Influence with Special Consideration to the Use of Hab 2:3-4 in Heb 10:37-38* (2003), Radu Gheorghita reviews the state of research on the use of Hebrew Scriptures in Hebrews and categorizes the research in the field as primarily pertaining to textual, exegetical-hermeneutical, and rhetorical approaches. Further, he compares and contrasts selections of Masoretic and Septuagint texts as sources of quotations from the Hebrew Scriptures in the Letter to the Hebrews. In the second part, he analyses the author's use of LXX Hab. 2:3-4 in Heb. 10:37-38. Gheorghita's analysis highlights the intertextual and lexical semantic relations between Hebrews and its antecedent texts. While Gheorghita's work shows that the author of Hebrews used the LXX and was preeminently influenced by it, he also points out that "not all disagreements between the Author and the Hebrew OT account can be resolved by appealing to the Greek Scriptures" (91). His conclusion, despite some idiosyncrasies that remain unaccounted for with regards to quotations from Hebrew Scriptures in the Letter to the Hebrews, is that "the Greek text better supports the influence drawn by the Author than any existent Hebrew text could have done, clearly indicating the Septuagint's role as a formative influence on the epistle's use of allusions" (99). Gheorghita's work contributes to scholarly understanding of the relation between the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Hebrew Scriptures, particularly the role and influence of the ancient Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures in terms of eschatology, messianism, and theology.

A third sub-set of studies focuses on exposition of the text based on central themes and the use of Hebrew Scriptures in Hebrews, as is evident from the following examples: Helmut Koester's "'Outside the Camp': Hebrews 13:9-14" (1962), Mary Rose

D'Angelo's *Moses in the Letter to the Hebrews* (1979), R.N. Longenecker's "The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews" (1978), David Peterson's *Hebrews and Perfection: An Examination of the Concept of Perfection in the 'Epistle to the Hebrews'* (1982), L. D. Hurst's *The Epistle to the Hebrews: Its Background and Thought* (1990), Susanne Lehne's *The New Covenant in Hebrews* (1990), John M. Scholer's *Proleptic Priests: Priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (1991), Marie E. Isaacs' *Sacred Space: An Approach to the Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (1992), Richard W. Johnson's *Going Outside the Camp: The Sociological Function of the Levitical Critique in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (2001), and Ernst Käsemann's *The Wandering People of God* (1984). Käsemann suggests that the author of Hebrews was influenced by Gnosticism; further, his work is an exploration of the "wandering people of God" motif in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Of particular interest with respect to influences is Hurst's study, which deals with a wide spectrum of non-Christian and Christian influences on the author of Hebrews. The sources Hurst analyses include Philo, Platonism, the Samaritans, the Qumran texts, pre-Christian Gnosticism, Luke (particularly Stephen's speech - Acts 7), and Pauline theology, among others. Hurst's conclusion is that,

> After his conversion to Christianity, *Auctor*[3] , a 'bookish' Christian, studiously searched the LXX for its proper meaning in light of the recent climactic events of Christ's life, death and resurrection. In particular, he was drawn to the psalms, with their emphasis on the will and disposition of the worshiper over the necessity of literal sacrifice (Ps. 40) and the dangers of treating lightly the laws which operate in the sphere of God's dealings with humankind (Ps. 95). The Christian coupling of Pss. 8 and 110 led him to further reflect upon the nature and destiny

[3] Hurst's term for the writer/author of Hebrews, p. 4.

> of humankind in relation to Christ. At some point he came under the influence of certain uses of the same OT traditions which also appear in Acts 7. . . .
>
> Affecting his thinking at several points, particularly in the area of the necessity of advance in the light of the spiritual nature of God and his demands, this in turn pushed him further to delineate those lines of thought which he found corroborated in his OT and in the form of Christian teaching which has been entrusted to him. An additional factor entered the picture via the teaching which also surfaces in Paul. This crystallized his thinking regarding the relation of the two covenants and the meaning of Christ for the OT. These three factors – the impact of certain sections of the LXX, the same use of OT as preserved in Acts 7, and an exposure to a 'Paul-like' theology – were mingled with a fourth, an exposure to strands of Jewish apocalyptic similar to that which also appears in 4 Ezra and 1 Enoch 90. These four influences could cautiously be isolated as those which produced the distinctive and potent brew which we call the Epistle to the Hebrews. (132-133)

Hurst's analysis convincingly shows that the influences on the author's work were largely Jewish/Christian and, though his intellectual milieu could have been punctuated with other systems of thought, he chose not to represent them in his letter of "encouragement."

In Lehne's *The New Covenant in Hebrews* (1990), the author presents a comprehensive study of the notion of covenant, tracing its development in the Letter to the Hebrews and in Judaism, particularly in the Second Temple period and the Qumran Scrolls. Lehne also looks at the development of the covenant concept in other New Testament texts and concludes with the "function" of the concept of the new covenant in

the Letter to the Hebrews, which, she says, is the basis and the "heart of the author's concern to relate the old (cultic) order to the new" (117).

Steve Moyise's *The Old Testament in the New* (2001) is not only an examination of the "Old Testament" texts in the four Gospels, Acts, Paul's epistles, Hebrews, Peter, Jude, and Revelation, but also a summary statement on various Jewish exegetical techniques in these texts, such as the use of "typology, allegory, catch-word links, quoting from variant texts, altering the quoted texts, reading the text in an unorthodox manner, drawing on *haggada* legends and using homiletic forms of argumentation" (19, 128). In his brief chapter titled "The Old Testament in Hebrews," Moyise's analysis focuses on the author's use of quotations from the Hebrew Scriptures. His primary conclusion is that, while there are similarities between Hebrews and other New Testament writings regarding the "continuity and discontinuity" with the Hebrew Scriptures, this issue is "starkest in Hebrews" (107).

In "The Interpretation of Psalm 95 in Hebrews 3.1-4.13" (1997), Peter Enns' primary purpose is to analyse the "theological concerns" behind the author's interpretation of Ps. 95, which, according to Enns, exhibits similarities with "*pesher* exegesis in which a particular passage is given an eschatological interpretation" (352). Enns concludes that the author's nuanced use of the LXX text is primarily undergirded by the author's eschatology, which "is further seen in his presentation of God's creation-rest as the church's final destination. . . . [T]herefore proper meaning [of the text] concerns the church's participation in God's blessing, both now amid certain trouble . . . and later in the world to come" (363). Enns' argument that the meaning of Hebrews is based on a

theological interpretation bound by the author's eschatological understanding of his times, in my opinion, is true for other New Testament writings.

Helmut Koester's "'Outside the Camp': Hebrews 13:9-14" (1962) deals with the author's use and interpretation of Leviticus 16:28. Koester argues that the author is not making an anti-Jewish statement; instead, according to Koester,

> what is attacked here . . . is the Christian – but heretical – doctrine of direct communion with the divine in the sacrament or in any other regulations and rituals. This teaching failed to acknowledge the paradoxical character of the divine presence in the salvation focused in the cross of Calvary "outside the camp," and did not see the involvement of the Christian existence in the non-sacred character of life as a necessary consequence from the "unholy sacrifice" of Jesus, upon which Christian faith rests. (315)

Koester's reading of this text sheds light on the author's use of Leviticus not as a polemic against the levitical system, but as a source to further elucidate the basis of the sacrifice of Jesus and as a challenge to contemporaneous heresies.

In a brief section in *The Dwelling of God: The Tabernacle in the Old Testament, Intertestamental Jewish Literature, and the New Testament* (1989), Craig R. Koester analyses the Tabernacle theme in Hebrews. Koester argues that Hebrews is the only New Testament text in which the connection between sacrifice and the Tabernacle is "prominent" (186). His most important contribution to Hebrews scholarship is his analysis of the evolution of the Tabernacle motif and theme across significant periods of textual development – the Hebrew Scriptures, the intertestamental period, and the New Testament.

In "The Different Functions of a Similar Melchizedek Tradition in *2 Enoch* and the Epistle to the Hebrews" (1997), Charles A. Geischen argues that, while there are many similarities between *2 Enoch* and Hebrews regarding the Melchizedek tradition, the differences are primarily ideological, based on the privileging of Jesus' role as mediator, as saviour who fulfilled the old covenant and therefore "initiates the new history . . . long before the end of time" (397), and as redeemer, "emphasizing the self-sacrifice of the priest as the atonement for all sins of all time" (397).

Using sociologist Mary Douglas' group/grid analysis in his *Going Outside the Camp: The Sociological Function of the Levitical Critique in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (2001), Richard W. Johnson demonstrates that the author's critique of the levitical system is an aspect of a well-formulated cosmology which is "compatible with life in an implied weak group, weak grid society . . . [whose] members . . . are ideally suited for carrying out the world missions of the Church . . ." (151). Johnson's conclusion, using this sociological approach, reaffirms Manson's proposal that the author's main purpose was to foster a sense of world missions (24, 160).

In contrast to Johnson's claims about the purpose of Hebrews, Scott D. Mackie argues in "Confession of the Son of God in Hebrews" (2007) that, in response to "waning commitment," the author attempts to encourage the community by "dramatiz[ing] the Son's exultation, emphasizing the presentation of the Father's declaration of Jesus' sonship, the Son's reciprocal confession of the Fatherhood of God, and the Son's conferral of family membership upon the recipients" (114). According to Mackie, this dramatizing includes the community in the "'sacred action', as they are offered a 'speaking part' in the unfolding drama" (128). Mackie's creative reading of Hebrews is

the most recent response to the ongoing quest to identify, among other things, the purpose of Hebrews.

In *Covenant and Sacrifice in the Letter to the Hebrews* (1992), John Dunnill analyses the symbolism of the concepts of covenant and sacrifice in Hebrews. He successfully demonstrates, "that ways into an understanding of [the Letter to the Hebrews] with all its strangeness may be provided by the social sciences, especially structuralist methods as they have been developed in linguistics, literary theory and, most particularly, anthropology" (1). Dunnill's multi-disciplinary approach has distinctively shown the usefulness in reading Hebrews "through the social and cosmological functions of religious symbolism" (262). Moving beyond historical and form criticism, his work brings together a generative theoretical model that is unique among studies about the Letter to the Hebrews. These studies cover a wide range of themes and topics that include some trend-setting works, such as Dunnill's multi-disciplinary approach, Cosby's rhetorical analysis of Hebrews 11, Hurst's study on the background of and possible influences on the author's work, and Gheorghita's analysis of the role of the Septuagint in Hebrews.

In addition to the aforementioned studies, Hebrews has often been considered as a text that sheds light on the parting of ways between Judaism and Christianity by offering evidence of a missing link of a Christian community that bridges the gulf between late Second Temple Judaism and a Hellenistic Christianity. Further, the preoccupation with the Platonic aspect of Hebrews is also part of this effort of trying to bridge the gap between late Second Temple Judaism and a Hellenized Christianity as being represented by the community of Hebrews, since it has been linked to the hypothesis that a middle

Platonic Hellenistic mystery conception of Judaism (in Alexandria) has been proffered as the origins of the Hebrews' Christian community. The following set of studies use Hebrews to shed light on the relationship between Judaism and Christianity at the turn of the second century; these include the works of S.G. Wilson (1995), Jack T. Sanders (1993), James D. G. Dunn (1991), and William Klassen (1986), among others. Using sociological, historical-critical, anthropological, and comparative textual methodologies, these studies focus on the emerging picture of Jewish-Christian relations as evident from the Letter to the Hebrews, in addition to other early Christian documents in the formative years of Christianity's break from Judaism. In my opinion, this was not a sudden break-away by any means; instead, it was a slow, but definitive process. However, Dunn's conclusion regarding the separation between Christianity and Judaism is that:

> The crisis of 70 C.E. did not settle the matter. . . . *The period between the two Jewish revolts (66-70, 132-135) was decisive for the parting of ways.* After the first revolt it could be said that all was still to play for. But after the second revolt the separation of the main bodies of Christianity and Judaism was clear-cut and final. . . . [although] there continued to be [interaction] at the margins. . . .
>
> *With the emergence of Rabbinic Judaism we have the beginnings of the first real or really effective form of orthodox or normative Judaism.* In these circumstances it became increasingly difficult for Christian Jews to sustain any claim to be one of a number of legitimate forms of Judaism. From being heterodox, Christianity became heretical. (238-239)

Even though Dunn concludes that the break in Jewish-Christian relations was definitive rather than gradual and long drawn, Wilson's observation about the demographics of the

fledgling Christian community is important to appreciate the context of the conflicts that primarily centered on Christian interpretations of the Hebrew Scriptures, the Temple, the covenant, and the like.

According to Wilson, "Christianity was a small and insignificant movement during the first hundred years of its existence and even some seventy years later, ca. 200 C.E., it had advanced numerically in only a modest way" (1995, 25). In light of this often-ignored fact, Klassen points out that the idiosyncratic interpretations about the Temple, similar to those of the author of the Letter to the Hebrews, were not uncommon,

> It is doubtful, however, that Jews of the first century, even Jews devoutly attached to the Temple, would have had any great difficulty with the epistle of Hebrews. There were many people who criticized the Temple and its administration and many people who looked to ways in which the presence of God could be more fully assured. It is highly unlikely that Jews of the first century before 70 C.E. would have found the epistle offensive. (15)

Sanders, offering a counter perspective, has a valid point when he reasons that:

> The temple in Jerusalem was the Jewish cultural symbol *par excellence*. . . . The Torah defined Jewishness. To attack the validity of those institutions was to attack Jewish identity at its core, and it is not surprising in the least that Jewish authorities punished and sought to silence what they must have seen as an extreme subversiveness. (99)

These studies testify to the fact that early Christianity could only define itself in reference to Judaism, not apart from it. At the turn of the second century, Christianity and Judaism had not yet gone their separate ways; they were, at this point, on the road to separation.

Regarding Philonic and Platonic influences in Hebrews, Sidney G. Sowers argues in *The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews: A Comparison of the Interpretation of the Old Testament in Philo Judaeus and the Epistle to the Hebrews* (1965) that the author of Hebrews "has come from the same school of Alexandrian Judaism as Philo, and that Philo's writings still offer us the best single body of *religionsgeschichtlich* material we have for [Hebrews]" (66). Sowers consolidates his argument by focusing particularly on the following aspects of Hebrews: the Philonic doctrine of the logos as applied to the Son and the Word, the activities of the High Priest, and the divine oath. According to Sowers, the link between Philo and the Letter to the Hebrews lies in their use of middle-Platonic Alexandrian Jewish exegesis. Lala Kalyan Kumar Dey's *The Intermediary World and Patterns of Perfection in Philo and Hebrews* (1975) focuses on the similarities between mediators in the intermediary world between God and man in Hebrews and the larger context of Hellenistic Judaism.

In contrast to Sowers' and Dey's works on Hebrews, Ronald Williamson argues in *Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews* (1970) that, though Hebrews does have superficial similarities with Philo, they are fundamentally different. He convincingly proves his point[4] by critically comparing Hebrews and Philo at three levels: firstly, at the linguistic level, secondly, regarding themes and ideas, and, lastly, with regards to the use of Scripture in these writings. Williamson concludes that, at the linguistic level, the

[4] Williamson ruminates that "it is possible . . . that the Writer of Hebrews had once been a Philonist but had broken on his conversion to Christianity, with the past. . . . It is possible that the Writer of Hebrews steeled himself not to interpret the new ideas and convictions he had embraced in the language of his former philosophy or to employ only some of its terms but none of its fundamental ideas. . . . It is possible that he once believed that allegory was the key to the meaning of the O.T., but that on becoming a Christian he had rejected it entirely. . . . *Or* it is possible that the Writer of Hebrews had never been a Philonist, had never read Philo's works, had never come under the influence of Philo directly or indirectly" (579). Williamson proves this last point convincingly through his analysis.

author of Hebrews is not influenced by "Philo's lexicographical thesaurus;" regarding Philo's and the author's use of Hebrew Scriptures, he argues that there are fundamental differences in their exegetical methods. This leads Williamson to conclude that Philo and the author of Hebrews belonged to "different schools of O.T. exegesis. . . . There is in the Epistle of Hebrews no attempt to extract philosophical truths from the pages of the O.T., only a sustained endeavour to demonstrate that the O.T. in its entirety pointed forward prophetically to Christ" (576). With reference to themes and ideas, Williamson finds that Philo and the author of Hebrews are "poles apart" and this is primarily because of their particular understandings of "time, history, eschatology, [and the] nature of the physical world" (577). Williamson clearly demonstrates that Hebrews is not based on Philonic-like middle-Platonic Alexandrian exegesis.

James W. Thompson's *The Beginnings of Christian Philosophy: The Epistle to the Hebrews* (1982), while recognizing Williamson's contribution to the question of Hebrews and Platonic influence, argues that "the Middle Platonism view of the structure of the world was widely accepted in antiquity. . . . It is more likely that both writers have accepted a common set of assumptions from the environment. Hebrews thus represents a preliminary stage in the church's adoption of a Platonic metaphysics" (158). Clearly, for Thompson, Hebrews is the harbinger of Platonic philosophy in Christianity and the missing link between a Hellenized Judaism and Christianity. Hurst's (1990) detailed discussion on the question of the background of Hebrews offers a counter perspective and challenges Thompson's conclusions.

The works summarized above are clearly different in their range and scope from the first set of studies, which are primarily exegetical and hermeneutical. These studies

shed light on Hebrews by taking into account its socio-cultural and religious milieu. The conclusion of many of these studies is that texts such as Hebrews reflect the complex nature of Jewish-Christian relations and a certain degree of Platonism that was common at the turn of the second century. The aim of my dissertation is to escape this focus and to add a new dimension to Hebrews scholarship by introducing a study that addresses the use of Hebrew Scriptures in Hebrews to produce a meaningful text.

3. Principal Problem

From the literature review it is clear that Hebrews has merited a considerable amount of scholarly attention. However, despite the wide range of topics, a comprehensive analysis of the relationship of Hebrews to Hebrew Scriptures in general and the author's particular preference for selective themes is lacking. This is a crucial lacuna in scholarship because the author of the Letter to the Hebrews is critically dependent on Hebrew Scriptures in developing his arguments and in creating a meaningful text. In an effort to address this lack in existing scholarship on Hebrews, the principal problem that this dissertation addresses pertains to the Tabernacle theme that the author of the Letter to the Hebrews borrows from Hebrew Scriptures, particularly Leviticus. More specifically, this study focuses on the appropriation of the Tabernacle theme and the construction of new meaning in relation to it. This dynamic of dependence, appropriation, and meaning-construction in the Letter to the Hebrews is a crucial part of this dissertation. Though the Tabernacle is significant to both Leviticus and the Letter to the Hebrews thematically, these texts belong to multiple variegated contexts and literary genres. Leviticus, in terms of its literary genre, is defined by legal language, whereas

Hebrews is a hortatory text in the form of a letter[5]. Nonetheless, the author uses a theme from Leviticus to "exhort" his readers. With respect to studying the relatedness of these texts, there is a need for an approach that can appropriately bridge the gap between thematic unity (Tabernacle) and contextual (socio-cultural, historical, literary, theological) diversity between them.

Semioticians and literary theorists have termed this aspect of the relatedness of texts as "intertextuality." Essentially, a theory of intertextuality establishes "the way in which a given text relates to its contexts as systems of meaning already in place . . . the significance of the text itself will be some kind of reflection on the relationship between . . . contexts" (Mack 1987, 15). Regarding Leviticus and Hebrews, while thematic unity brings them together, each text is significant apart from the other within the communities and traditions from which they emerged. However, an analysis of their relationship – particularly how and why Hebrews relates to Leviticus and their varied socio-cultural, historical, literary, and theological contexts – requires a theory that accounts for textual relatedness.

In comparison to historical criticism, form criticism, and socio-rhetorical analysis, among other methodological frameworks that have proven useful in biblical studies, intertextuality as a methodological framework is less frequently used in biblical scholarship, particularly because of the various forms it has taken as a theoretical paradigm in the analysis of biblical texts. In "Intertextuality and the Study of the Old Testament in the New Testament" (2000), Moyise points out that intertextuality in

[5] Lacking the typical introductory features of letters, Hebrews reads like a sermon but ends like a letter (13:22). Its literary character is defined for us by the author himself: it is a "word of exhortation," as he puts it in 13:22. A "word of exhortation" is a form of sermon or homily . . ." (Bruce 1990, 25).

biblical scholarship is best used as an "umbrella term," to understand the relationship between texts. He further elaborates that intertextuality has often been used in divergent and idiosyncratic ways by biblical scholars. To clarify the various forms of intertextuality in biblical scholarship, Moyise introduces three subcategories within the broad framework of intertextuality; firstly, "intertextual echo," which "aims to show that a particular allusion or echo can sometimes be more important than its 'volume' might suggest" (17). Secondly, "dialogical intertextuality" pertains to the "interaction between text and subtext [and] operate[s] in both directions" (17). Thirdly, Moyise lists Julia Kristeva's "postmodern intertextuality," which essentially "aims to show that 'meaning' is always bought at a price and explores what that price is" (18). According to Moyise, the primary difference between these three categories relates to the question of meaning; while the first two aim to "secure meaning by defining . . . how a text interacts with a subtext . . . postmodern intertextuality turns this on its head and shows how the process is inherently unstable" (18).

Intertextuality in Biblical Writings (1989), edited by Sipke Draisma, and Richard Hays' *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (1989) were among the early works that brought intertextuality to the attention of biblical scholars. Hays' work, however, has come under a lot of criticism for its unqualified use of intertextuality[6]. Other significant works include *Reading between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible* (1992), edited by Danna N. Fewell, *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel* (1993) and *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigation and Proposals* (1997), edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, Knut M. Heim's "The Perfect King of Psalm 72: An 'Intertextual' Analysis" (1995),' "Intertextuality and the Bible" (1995), edited by

[6] See Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders (1993) and Porter (1997).

George Aichele and Gary A. Phillips, and *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders* (1997) edited by Craig A. Evans and S. Talmon.

Seán Freyne's "Reading Hebrews and Revelation Intertextually" (1989) is a harbinger to intertextual analysis of Hebrews. Although the Letter to the Hebrews is not the sole concern of this essay, Freyne's analysis focuses on Hebrews' and Revelation's "indebtedness to the Jewish world of the first century, in particular their exploitation of Jewish religious symbols in developing their respective narratives" (89). According to Freyne, the "liturgical tone" of these texts is a clue to understanding the centrality of the Temple symbolism in these texts and therefore "reading either text with the other in mind becomes an exercise 'of intertextual assignment of meaning' by giving us a greater awareness of the pre-texts (in this case Ex 19 and Lev 16) that both works employ in their different ways" (91).

In "Heroes and History in Hebrews 11" (1997), Pamela Eisenbaum points out that the criteria behind the author's choice of heroes in Hebrews 11 are different from "Sirach 44-50, 1 Macc. 2.51-60, Wisdom 10, and Covenant of Damascus 2-3" (380). According to Eisenbaum, what sets the text "against" these other texts are four qualities that seem to govern the author's choice of heroes, though not all of them necessarily have all four "traits." These include, "death or near-death experience" (382) "ability to see into the future" (384), "alteration of status" (386) and "marginalization" (391). In her investigation of how these criteria are peculiar to the author of Hebrews, she uses Gérard Genette's concept of "transvaluation," by which she means that "the heroes . . . were transformed by the values of the author. . . . The author's understanding of Christology

and the new covenant as well as his experience of being a Christian cause him to value the heroes of the Jewish Bible for reasons different from those that had traditionally been employed" (394). Eisenbaum's essay is an exception in Hebrews scholarship, particularly in her use of Genette. Further, her work is also an example of how theoretical frameworks such as Genette's can further our understanding of the distinctiveness of Hebrews in comparison to other texts with similar characteristics, such as the list of heroes in chapter 11 and the "denationalization" of biblical history.

Apart from these works and Gheorghita's chapter on "Septuagintal Allusions in Hebrews" in *The Role of the Septuagint in Hebrews* (2003), the marked absence of any substantial analysis of the interrelatedness of Hebrews and Hebrew Scriptures is noteworthy. By attempting such an analysis, I believe my dissertation bridges the lacuna in terms of textual relatedness in the Letter to the Hebrews. My analysis further enriches existing understanding of Hebrews in relation to its dependence on Hebrew Scriptures, the author's thematic selectivity, and the inextricability of these themes in the construction of meaning in Hebrews.

4. Methodological and Theoretical Framework

Intertextuality as a theoretical framework takes two forms. The first is the traditional "author-centered" understanding of the term, which deals essentially with identifying influences/sources in the form of quotations, allusions, and the like, in a text. "Intertextuality construed in this way is essentially a study of the formative and informative influences exerted by precursor texts on successor texts, bearing witness to an interconnectedness between texts. . . " (Gheorghita 2003, 74). The second form of

intertextuality, based on a "reader-centered" perspective, is what poststructuralist semiotician Julia Kristeva has developed, based on M. M. Bakhtin's concept of "dialogism," which essentially stemmed from "a dynamic understanding of the literary text that considered every utterance as a result of the intersection within it as a number of voices" (Guberman 189). According to Kristeva, within the framework of narrative semiotics, texts consist of "signifying systems" that yield multiple layers of meaning. In the process of accessing the meaning of narratives, intertextuality as Kristeva defines it is more than a prosaic identification of sources or layers within texts. For Kristeva, intertextuality

> [D]enotes . . . transposition of one (or several) sign system(s) into another; . . . [it] specifies that the passage from one signifying system to another demands a new articulation . . . of enunciative and denotative positionality. If one grants that every signifying practice is a field of transpositions of various signifying systems (an inter-textuality), one then understands that its 'place' of enunciation and its denoted 'object' are never single, complete, and identical to themselves. . . . In this way polysemy can also be seen as the result of a semiotic polyvalence–an adherence to different sign systems. (1984, 59-60)

Kristeva's complex conception of intertextuality entails not merely an identifying of sources and their use, or a consideration of how and why they are relevant to the author and his readers. She is primarily interested in examining the text not as a self-contained, meaningful system, but as multiple signifying systems; from this stems her preference for the term "transposition" instead of sources. This system of significance, according to Kristeva, is unique and never similar to the old system. Kristeva identifies relational

dynamics within texts at two levels – the horizontal and vertical level. The former connects the author and the reader of the text, and the latter highlights the interconnectedness between texts. "Uniting these two axes are shared codes: every text and every reading depends on prior codes. Kristeva declared that 'every text is from the outset under the jurisdiction of other discourses which impose a universe on it' . . ." (Chandler 195). Kristeva's own work on intertextuality primarily concentrates on psychoanalytical readings of texts, where the notion of authorship at these dual levels is the focal point of her analysis.

Thomas Hatina correctly notes that Kristeva's form of intertextuality is not particularly complementary with biblical scholarship for the following reasons: i. the ideological context wherein the term was coined, ii. the inherently related concept of text, and iii. the distinction between influence and intertextuality (29). Hatina is of the opinion that biblical scholars who use the Kristevan notion of intertextuality overlook the very basis on which this theory was founded and is operational. Identifying the ideological underpinnings[7] of this theory, Hatina points out that the conceptual framework of poststructuralist intertextuality completely changes the premises upon which literature has been conceptualized, as the basic tenets of this theory reveal:

> (1) [L]anguage is not a medium of thought or a tool for communication; it is nebulous, arbitrary and leads to infinite interpretations; (2) all texts–having no

[7] "Though Kristeva's main emphasis was on language theory, the concept of intertextuality was inseparably connected with political idealism. The agenda was nothing less than the subversion of the bourgeois establishment through the empowerment of the reader/critic to resist and combat the literary and social tradition at large.

Kristeva originally envisioned a new kind of hermeneutics. Traditionally hermeneutics operated and still does, from a work (and author) oriented perspective. There continues to be a search for a unified message and an 'actual' meaning, despite the awareness that a single message is never to be fixed due to the continued historical process of appropriating meaning. Kristeva believed that meaning does not exist apart from meaning producers (i.e. readers or recipients). Her aim was to gain control over texts" (30).

> closure, resolution and self-sufficiency–refer endlessly to other texts; (3) the author is never in control over the meaning of the text; (4) meaning is supplanted by the idea of signification, whereby the signifier remains without a corresponding signified; (5) criticism is part of the text and contributes to the creation of meaning; (6) disciplinary boundaries are discarded, leaving all disciplines as part of the discursive environment and ultimately inseparable from literature; and (7) the rules of reason and identity are replaced by the notion of 'contradiction' which refers to the fallacy of identity–that the concept does not exhaust the thing conceived. (32)

Hatina's seven point summary sheds light on the fact that the very fundamentals of language in general, and literature, such as biblical texts, in particular have been supplanted by Kristevan intertextuality. These "include . . . the potential of language to create stable meaning," the formal limits such as morphological, syntactic, and semantic parameters within which meaning exists, the author's control/role in creating meaning and by extension the text, the definite closure and limitedness of a text, and the reader/critic as distinct and separate from the author/creator of the text (Hatina 32).

Two other implications that are related to undoing the notion of text that stem from the poststructuralist conception are, firstly, that texts are unbounded and open-ended, which undermines the concept of a text as a fixed entity with meaning. This unboundedness gives rise to the theory that all texts are summarily "intertexts" (Frow 46), having no fixed meaning, and therefore being open to meanings assigned by readers. This is at cross purposes with identifying and locating antecedent texts that aid the construction of meaning in a text. The second problematic is the relationship between

"influence and intertextuality," which are unrelated for poststructuralists (Hatina 37). Influence would be characterized as the banal "study of sources" (Kristeva 1984, 60). Though it is superficially related to intertextuality, influence is defined as:

> [T]he relationship between an anterior text and a posterior text–the connections may be literary, social, or psychological. When a critic can demonstrate that text Y has borrowed certain features such as theme(s), structure(s) or sign(s) from text X, then it can be posited that text X has influenced text Y. One becomes the source of the other. (Hatina 37-38)

Clearly, Kristevan intertextuality is at odds with the purposes and endeavours in biblical studies to isolate and identify antecedent texts in later texts. In locating influence (rather than Kristevan intertextuality) within texts, biblical scholars can isolate antecedent texts that have been appropriated to create meaning in the subsequent texts without compromising the key notions of text and meaning. In *Is There a Meaning in This Text?* (1998), Kevin Vanhoozer argues that "the [biblical] canon encourages a play of meaning as it were, but only within carefully prescribed boundaries" (134). In this canonical sense, biblical texts "confirm" intertextuality and affirm that the construction of meaning in texts such as Hebrews is dependent on earlier texts, such as Leviticus, among others. The present study is interested in intertextuality in this canonical, author-centered sense, using it "more as a technique than an ideology" (Green 1993, 63) and as a means to establish "the formative and informative influences exerted by precursor texts on successor texts, bearing witness to an interconnectedness between texts" (Gheorghita 2003, 74).

In contrast to Kristeva's notion of intertextuality, literary critic Gérard Genette's methodological paradigm embraces the basic notions of influence/source theory. It also

provides a framework to isolate and categorize the interconnectedness between texts, which he defines as the "relation of co-presence of one text within another" (Morgan 29). In examining the multifaceted relationships between texts from a structuralist perspective, Genette "asserts that *intertextuality* is an inadequate term and proposes in its place *transtextuality* (or textual transcendence), by which he means everything, be it explicit or latent, that links one text to the others" (Worton 22).

Transtextuality includes in its rubric the following five "sub-types"[8]: firstly, "*intertextuality*," which is "perceived as covering allusion as well as quotation and plagiarism;" secondly, "*paratextuality*, which [Genette] radically redefines as the relation between the body of the text and its titles, epigraphs, illustrations, notes, first drafts, etc.;" thirdly, "*metatextuality*," which is "the relationship between a commentary and its objects;" fourthly, "*architextuality* . . . defined as a tacit, perhaps even unconscious, gesture or genre-demarcations" and finally, "*hypertextuality* . . . which includes and informs all literary genres [as] the hypertext necessarily gains in some way or another from the reader's awareness of its signifying and determining relationship with its hypotext(s)" (Worton 23 emphasis mine). Hypertextuality is closely related to metatextuality; these two categories are sometimes not clearly distinguishable (Chandler 204). While metatextuality deals with a text's relation to critical commentaries, both implicit and explicit, hypertextuality is the kind of textual transcendence that relates a text to the text(s) from which it borrows or is based on and transforms them to create a new text.

[8] Chandler David, *Semiotics: The Basics*. London: Routledge, 2002. 203-205.

I use this five-fold classificatory system, based on Genette's *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree* (1997)[9], as a framework to map the multi-layered relationships between Hebrews and Hebrew Scriptures. It is an effective paradigm that helps to see a reflection of transtextual relationships in these texts and to determine further why and how they are related. In addition to analysing Hebrews through Genette's system of categorization, the other important aim of this dissertation is to do a comparative analysis of the ways in which meaning is constructed in Leviticus and Hebrews. In the former text, this is primarily done via its laws pertaining to the Tabernacle. In the latter, pertinent material is significantly transformed to suit the author's homiletical purposes.

My analysis of the transformation of texts from the Hebrew Scriptures in the Letter to the Hebrews involves investigating the process of "metaphorization," which, according to Paul Ricoeur, is "a process at work between the encompassing narrative and the embedded narrative" (1995, 150). In "The Bible and Genre: The Polyphony of Biblical Discourses,"[10] Ricoeur points to the usefulness of the semiotic method to analyse and arrive at the meaning of biblical narratives:

> To understand [a] work of meaning, we must first have taken into account the structures of the narrative following the semiotic method. . . .To understand a narrative dynamically is to understand it as the operation of transforming an initial situation into a terminal situation. . . .
>
> [A] semiotic approach [is] completely distinct from the historical-critical method. It takes the text at its last state, just as it has been read by believing and

[9] Originally published in French as *Palimpsestes: la littérature au second degré* (Paris: Seuil, 1982).
[10] *Figuring the Sacred Religion, Narrative, and Imagination.* Minneapolis: Fortress P, 1995.

> nonbelieving readers, and it attempts to reconstruct the codes that govern the transformations at work in the narrative. (1995, 150-151)

The suggested semiotic approach helps identify and isolate structures of meaning that are in place in each text separately. Among others, this study focuses on chapters 5 and 7-10 of Hebrews and chapters 1-7, 16, and 23 of Leviticus. The analysis of these texts provides evidence of "systems of meaning" in each text separately. It identifies how meaning is worked out in Leviticus through the list of instructions central to the Tabernacle, while also indicating how a selective reworking of Tabernacle symbolism is at work in constructing meaning in Hebrews. It also clarifies the significance of such authoritative texts in the context of shared symbolism, where these texts are not only reflections of shared symbols, but are also representations of transformed symbols that are identity constituting/defining symbols. Further, this study not only bridges the existing lacuna regarding an appropriate methodology to analyse the relationship between Hebrews and Leviticus, but it also attempts to pose some fundamental questions that remain unanswered and continue to engage scholarly attention about the author of Hebrews and his community – who authored this text, who its recipients were, and possibly why they shared such inimitable knowledge of Hebrew Scriptures.

5. Summary of Chapters

As stated above, the central objectives of my project are, firstly, to examine the transtextual relation between Hebrews and Hebrew Scriptures in general and Leviticus in particular and, secondly, to study how a creative and selective appropriation of Tabernacle symbolism constitutes meaning in Hebrews. I achieve this by doing a

comparative analysis of meaning constructed in relation to the Tabernacle theme. Thirdly, based on the results of this study, my objective is to propose a new dimension to existing theoretical and methodological frameworks that helps analyse complex relationships between texts that share themes, symbols, and the like.

Chapter two is divided into two sections. The first section focuses on the idiosyncratic features of the construction of meaning in Leviticus and Hebrews. Meaning in Leviticus is constructed through its legislations regarding sacred space, time, and mediation in relation to sacrifices and offerings made at the Tabernacle. Hebrews, on the other hand, constructs meaning by borrowing from the Pentateuch, the Prophets, and the Writings. This exercise of identifying the construction of meaning helps isolate contextual diversity and thematic unity and continuity in Hebrews. The second section of this chapter deals with the dependence of Hebrews on Leviticus in terms of thematic unity with regards to the Tabernacle, its ministrations, contextual discontinuity, diversity, and the change in meaning that is effected in Hebrews by the author's interpretative Christological hermeneutic at work in the text.

Chapter three concentrates on identifying and analysing the various types of transtextuality operating in Hebrews. The focus is to apply Genette's theoretical framework to Hebrews and to isolate and highlight the transformations that are at work in this text. What Ricoeur terms "metaphorization" is brought to the fore by categorizing and cataloguing the various kinds of transformations. The emerging results validate the use of this theory to achieve what other methodological endeavours have failed to establish, or have only partially achieved. The analysis and results of this chapter examine Genette's theory of transtextuality and its usefulness in analysing biblical and

other texts that are related. The fourth chapter elaborates on the use of Hebrew Scriptures in Hebrews, while also comparing it to the way Hebrew Scriptures are used in the larger New Testament corpus. Furthermore, this chapter analyses the idiosyncratic use of Hebrew Scriptures in Hebrews and the social significance of this use and thereby seeks to address questions of the identity of the author and the community.

The concluding chapter highlights this study's contribution in terms of a new direction/departure in relation to existing conceptual and theoretical frameworks. It helps establish how texts are related historically and culturally, particularly through Scripture, and how they appropriate, use, and transform existing meanings and symbols to suit their respective contexts and purposes within and across traditions. Based on new types of evidence that are compellingly illustrative, this effort permits scholars to respond to similar questions of interrelatedness and transformations in other texts of the Hebrew Scriptures, the New Testament, and extra and non-biblical texts.

Chapter 2. THE TABERNACLE THEME IN LEVITICUS AND THE LETTER TO THE HEBREWS

1. Construction of Meaning in Leviticus and Hebrews

The goal of this chapter is to provide a substantial summary of the Tabernacle theme in Leviticus and Hebrews. Attempting to highlight its significance in each text separately, I deal with other aspects of the individual texts in conjunction with the Tabernacle theme. In Leviticus, this includes concepts such as holiness, covenant, sacrifices, and priesthood. In Hebrews, similar concepts are important in understanding the significance of the Tabernacle in the text. Jesus Christ in relation to Hebrew Scriptures is also crucial to the unfolding of the meaning of the text.

The primary differences between Leviticus and Hebrews are their genres and in their contexts. Leviticus is a legal text that deals with stipulations pertaining to the levitical cult, while Hebrews is a homiletical letter. The literary context of Leviticus is governed by the larger Sinai covenant framework to which it belongs; the context of Hebrews, on the other hand, is primarily circumscribed by the author's hermeneutics of presenting Jesus as the Christ/Messiah who is also the eternal High Priest and the fulfilment of the Hebrew Scriptures. The similarities between Leviticus and Hebrews stem from their thematic unity in matters pertaining to the levitical system in general and the Tabernacle specifically. Hebrews depends heavily on the Hebrew Scriptures and Leviticus for its conception of the Tabernacle and cultic activities related to it, which are my focus here.

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section focuses on the construction of meaning in Leviticus and Hebrews and the idiosyncratic ways in which meaning is constructed in these texts. The second section is a comparison between Leviticus and Hebrews in relation to the Tabernacle; this section also includes an appraisal of the dependence of Hebrews on the Hebrew Scriptures. The thematic focus of Hebrews and Leviticus on the Tabernacle and its ministrations guides the analysis in this section.

2. Leviticus

Leviticus is largely characterized by God communicating to Moses on the one hand, and Moses in turn communicating God's commands to the people on the other hand. The Tabernacle represents God's "dwelling" among the Israelites and is alternatively called the Tent of Meeting, the place where God meets with Moses and Aaron. Considerable amount of narrative space in Exodus (25-31, 35-40) is spent on the description of its design and construction. It is a richly bedecked, portable, tent-like structure that is central to ancient Israel's religious life. The Tabernacle has an outer court which contains a bronze altar for burnt offerings and a water basin. A curtain divides the outer court from the next section, the inner court, which is further divided into the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies, the Most Holy Place. In the Holy Place are placed a lampstand, a bread table, and an incense altar. The Holy of Holies contains the Ark, which encases the covenant, and is therefore called the Ark of the Covenant. This is the

most ornamented piece of furnishing[11] in the entire Tabernacle and it is from there that God communicates with Moses. The Exodus narrative concludes with the construction of the Tabernacle and God's presence taking up residence among the people. Leviticus continues the discourse about the Tabernacle, primarily articulating what it means to have God take up residence among a people He calls "my people" (Exod. 3: 7).

Leviticus begins with God addressing Moses, "The LORD summoned Moses and spoke to him from the Tent of Meeting, saying: Speak to the Israelites and say to them . . . " (1:1-2a). From this point on, Moses announces to the Israelites the various demands God makes on them as a community and as a people set apart for Him. "This double formulation of an introductory formula plus a commission-to-speak formula means that not only had Moses received a word from Yahweh, but he had also been commissioned to deliver it. . . . Leviticus . . . preserve[s] divine sermons for the instruction of the congregation in cultic and ethical matters" (Hartley 1992, xxxii). From a thematic perspective, the entire text of Leviticus can be summarized by the following dictum: "be holy, for I am holy" (Lev. 11:44, 45; 19:2; 20:7). The central concerns of the text elaborate upon this key concept of holiness in the lives of the ancient Hebrews, in their

[11] "They shall make an ark of acacia wood; it shall be two and a half cubits long, a cubit and a half wide, and a cubit and a half high. You shall overlay it with pure gold, inside and outside you shall overlay it, and you shall make a moulding of gold upon it all around. You shall cast four rings of gold for it and put them on its four feet, two rings on one side of it, and two rings on the other side. You shall make poles of acacia wood, and overlay them with gold. And you shall put the poles into the rings on the sides of the ark, by which to carry the ark. The poles shall remain in the rings of the ark; they shall not be taken from it. You shall put into the ark the covenant that I shall give you.

Then you shall make a mercy-seat of pure gold; two cubits and a half shall be its length, and a cubit and a half its width. You shall make two cherubim of gold; you shall make them of hammered work, at the two ends of the mercy-seat. Make one cherub at the one end, and one cherub at the other; of one piece with the mercy-seat you shall make the cherubim at its two ends. The cherubim shall spread out their wings above, overshadowing the mercy-seat with their wings. They shall face each other; the faces of the cherubim shall be turned towards the mercy-seat. You shall put the mercy-seat on the top of the ark; and in the ark you shall put the covenant that I shall give you. There I will meet you, and from above the mercy-seat, from between the two cherubim that are on the ark of the covenant, I will deliver to you all my commands for the Israelites" (Exod. 25:10-22).

being a distinct people, and a community marked by holiness in every aspect of its existence. For the purposes of this chapter, the text is broadly analysed in terms of three themes that are interrelated and intertwined to constitute the semantic and textual world of Leviticus: covenant, sacrifice, and priesthood. These three themes, expressed in conjunction with the concept of holiness, are the clue to the meaning of Leviticus.

2.1 Holiness

Holiness is the chief attribute of God in the Hebrew Scriptures. He is wholly other and exclusively separate from the human realm of things. Generally, holiness is best understood as a theological concept that signifies a certain otherworldliness and remoteness. In Leviticus, however, holiness is tangible and real; it transcends its otherworldliness and is translated into being a part of the here and now. Lev. 10:10 states, "You are to distinguish between the holy and the common, and between the unclean and the clean;" the complexity of juxtaposing these antithetical concepts is what creates the world of Leviticus, where holiness is physically symbolized by the pure/clean, while the profane is represented by the impure/unclean. To maintain holiness – the most desired state – is the chief purpose of the text. Leviticus constructs meaning by sanctifying the profane.

The *Theological Word Book of the Old Testament* defines holiness in the following terms: "*qādôsh* connotes the concept of 'holiness,' i.e. the essential nature of that which belongs to the sphere of the sacred and which is thus distinct from the common and profane. This distinction is evident in Lev. 10:10 and Ezek. 22:26, where

qādôsh occurs as the antithesis of *ḥôl* ('profane,' 'common')" (787)[12]. In Leviticus, holiness is mirrored by the concepts of covenant (sacred space – Tabernacle), sacrifice (sacred ritual, time), and priesthood (sacred personnel). The world of Leviticus is a graded one, with holiness, or the lack thereof, characterizing meaning in every aspect of life. To understand this fully, it is important to look at the structure of the Tabernacle, as the framework within which time, personnel, and rituals are also measured on the holiness gradient (Jenson 37):

i. The Tabernacle precincts are graded from very holy to very unclean: the Holy of Holies, the Holy Place, the court, the camp, and outside the camp.

ii. People measured against the gradient are classified along similar lines: High Priest, priests, Levites, clean Israelites, people with minor impurities, and finally dead people (corpses).

iii. Rituals are classified as: sacrifices which are completely given over to God, sacrifices which are eaten by priests, sacrifices which are eaten by common people, purification rituals lasting one day, and purification rituals lasting seven days.

iv. Lastly, time on this gradient is divided into the Day of Atonement marking the holiest of days, festivals and Sabbaths following as holy, and common days as clean days. P.P. Jenson's *Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World* schematically represents the holiness continuum (37):

[12] For the complete definition, see Appendix I: i.

Table I: HOLINESS SPECTRUM

	I	II	III	IV	V
	Very Holy קדש קדשים	***Holy*** קדש	***Clean*** טהור	***Unclean*** טמא	***Very unclean*** טמא
Spatial	holy of holies	holy place	court	camp	outside
Personal	high priest	priest	Levites, clean Israelites	clean, minor impurities	major impurities, the dead
	(sacrificial animals)	(sacrificial animals)	(clean animals)	(unclean animals)	(carcasses)
Ritual	sacrificial (not eaten)	sacrificial (priests eat)	sacrificial (non-priests eat)	purification (1 day)	purification (7 days)
Temporal	Day of Atonement	festivals, Sabbath	common days		

As represented above, holiness pertains to every conceivable area of Israelite life and it is worked into the community's life through a covenant. However, in its requirement for holiness, the levitical system makes provision for lapses that could otherwise disfigure the perfection represented by holiness. The covenant accounts for such inadvertent circumstances through sacrifices and offerings.

2.2 Covenant

Leviticus is part of the larger narrative corpus of the Sinai covenant that is textually inaugurated in Exod. 25 and completed in Num. 10. In the Hebrew Scriptures, a covenant is a pact that marks a "binding agreement" made between a holy God and

individuals, or between two or more individuals (McCarthy 34). However, it is more than a theological construct:

> Covenant is not merely a religious idea or idiom of a liturgy. It was an institution serving social, political, and economic ends, and even the religious dimension, highly significant in ancient Israel, is not to be viewed in static terms, but as an expression of historic experience and collective aspiration. . . . The covenant (or covenants) merely served as the charter, or commission under the terms of which the cult, as well as the other establishments within Israelite society operated. (Levine 1974, 40, 41)

There are three main types of covenants represented in the Bible: the royal grant, the parity treaty, and the suzerain-vassal treaty (Levenson 26). In the Ancient Near East, the royal grant was a free gift of land or other kinds of favours given by a king or rich land owner to a close ally with no obligations in return. In the biblical narratives, God makes covenants and gives free gifts to His people. This is evident in the covenants between God and Noah and his sons (Gen. 9:8-17), God and Abraham (Gen. 15:9-21), and God and Phinehas (Num. 25:10-13). The Davidic covenant (2 Sam. 7:5-16) and the new covenant (Jer. 31:31-34) fall into the rubric of a royal grant covenant, where nothing is expected in return from the recipient(s). The parity treaty is an agreement between equals, where participants are called "brothers" (Levenson 28). In the Hebrew Bible, examples of this type of covenant are evident in Gen. 21:27, 26:31, 31:44-54; 1 Kings 5:12, 15:19, 20:32-34; and Amos 1:9. God is never a participant in a covenant of this type.

The most elaborate form of the covenant types is the suzerain-vassal covenant. It involves a "great king . . . the *suzerain* and the petty monarch . . . the *vassal*" (Levenson 26). Biblical examples of this covenant type, which include the Abrahamic covenant (Gen. 17), the Sinai covenant (Exod. 19 – Num. 10), the covenant between the Israelites and the Gibeonites (Josh. 9:3-27), and that between God and Judah (Ezek. 17:13-21), are often characterized by their idiosyncratic contexts, and therefore are not entirely in line with the standard suzerain-vassal treaties of the ancient Near East.

Drawing upon parallels from non-biblical traditions of the Ancient Near East, scholars have designated the classic formulation of the suzerain-vassal treaty to be made up of a "*covenant formulary* [which includes] a sequence of six steps, although not always in the same order" (Levenson 26). These steps are the preamble or titulary, the historical prologue or antecedent history, the stipulations, the deposition, the list of witnesses, and the curses and blessings[13]. Mendenhall's *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East* includes the following steps in addition to the ones mentioned by Levenson: the "formal oath," a "solemn ceremony which accompanied the oath, or perhaps was a symbolical oath," and there probably also existed "some sort of form . . . for initiating procedure against a rebellious vassal" (Mendenhall 34-35).

To analyse Leviticus in terms of the covenant formulary of the suzerain-vassal order, its larger textual context in the Pentateuch, more specifically Exodus and Numbers, is taken into account. In the Exodus narrative, God initiates what is known as the Sinai covenant:

> On the third new moon after the Israelites had gone out of the land of Egypt, on that very day, they came into the wilderness of Sinai. . . . Then Moses went up to

[13] For a detailed definition of a covenant formulary, see Appendix I: ii.

> God; the LORD called to him from the mountain, saying, "Thus you shall say to the house of Jacob, and tell the Israelites: You have seen what I did to the Egyptians, and how I bore you on eagles' wings and brought you to myself. Now therefore, if you obey my voice and keep my *covenant*, you shall be my treasured possession out of all the peoples. Indeed, the whole earth is mine, but you shall be for me a *priestly kingdom* and a *holy nation*. These are the words that you shall speak to the Israelites." (Exod. 19:1, 3-6, emphasis mine)

The Sinai covenant, initiated by God, is spelled out in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers.

Though many aspects of the Sinai covenant fit into the classic formulation of the suzerain-vassal treaty, it is distinct in many respects as well, particularly when Leviticus is considered in isolation, apart from Exodus and Numbers. The similarities and differences are discussed below:

i. The one who initiates the covenant is God, who can be thought of as a suzerain. In contrast to most Near Eastern treaties of this type, God is not a witness in the Sinai covenant; He is the initiator and an active participant, and therefore there are no other witnesses beyond God and Israel[14]. In many respects, this is a reflection of Israel's monotheistic world view as opposed to the polytheistic world views of surrounding nations.

ii. The historical prologue of the suzerain-vassal covenant, like that of other non-biblical treaties, is set forth in the Sinai covenant, which also states God's relationship with Israel "I am the LORD who brought you up from the land of Egypt, to be your God" (Lev. 11:45; also stated elaborately in Exod. 19:4-6).

---

[14] However, in covenant renewal ceremonies such as in Deut. 30:19 and Josh. 24:27, heaven and earth on the one hand, and a stone on the other, serve as witnesses.

iii. God uses a mediator, Moses, both to speak to and to communicate with the community. "The LORD summoned Moses and spoke to him from the tent of meeting, saying: Speak to the people of Israel and say to them . . ." (Lev. 1:1-2a). This is a unique feature of the Sinai covenant.

iv. The covenant designates the people as a "priestly kingdom and a holy nation" (Exod. 19:6) and in light of this, the stipulations deal with matters of worship and holy living, encompassing concepts of sacred space, time, and mediation, which are spelt out in Leviticus. In contrast to other Near Eastern suzerain-vassal treaties, God gives His vassal a *new identity*. "For I am the LORD your God; sanctify yourselves therefore, and be holy, for I am holy. You shall not defile yourselves . . . you shall be holy, for I am holy" (Lev. 11:44-45).

v. God, as the object of the community's worship, sets up residence among the people with whom He makes a covenant: "I will dwell among the Israelites, and I will be their God. And they shall know that I am the LORD their God, who brought them out of the land of Egypt that I might dwell among them; I am the LORD their God" (Exod. 29:45-46). "So Moses finished the work. Then the cloud covered the tent of meeting, and the glory of the LORD filled the tabernacle. Moses was not able to enter the tent of meeting because the cloud settled upon it, and the glory of the LORD filled the tabernacle" (Exod. 40:33b-35). This sanctification of the profane in terms of space, time, and personnel is uniquely engineered through the Sinai covenant.

vi. The setup and organization of the life of the community around the Tabernacle, which is the portable emblem of God's residence among the people, are governed by the stipulations, such as the *pattern* in its construction and rules regarding sacrifices and

offerings in the Sinai covenant. "[H]ave them make me a sanctuary, so that I may dwell among them. In accordance with all that I show you concerning the pattern of the tabernacle and of all its furniture, so you shall make it" (Exod. 25:8-9). Unlike other Near Eastern covenants, the Sinai covenant establishes a new order of things: sacred and profane. God's holiness transcends the profane and sanctifies it through the covenant. Space becomes sacred as a result of the covenant, which mandates the setting up of the Tabernacle.

vii. Mendenhall's "formal oath" declaring obedience and a "symbolical oath" that accompanied this formal oath are evident in Israel's agreement to God's covenant offer: "The people all answered as one: Everything that the LORD has spoken we will do. Moses reported the words of the people to the LORD" (Exod. 19:8).

viii. Finally, there are several instances when God punishes Israel for her rebellious ways corporately and as individuals: Exod. 32:33-34; Lev. 10:1-5; 24:10 -16, 23; Num. 15:21-37, among others.

Though the Sinai covenant has characteristics that help classify it as a suzerain-vassal treaty, it seems unconventional and atypical in its details. Given its complexity and intricate ceremonial and liturgical detail, it both transcends and translates the typical Near Eastern suzerain-vassal treaty for its own purposes. Mary Douglas makes a similar observation in *Leviticus as Literature*:

> Leviticus is not normally associated with the covenant. . . . It is not the treaty form (though chapter 26 has the blessings and curses that go with the treaty form) so much as the general principle of a feudal relation. . . . The thought of Sinai is ever present in Leviticus. The feudal relation of a lord and his vassals accounts for

> the requirement of human obedience. . . . The people are God's dependants because he rescued them from Egypt. If they break their side of the covenant by failing to deliver loyalty and obedience, he will be released from his side: his violence and anger against them will be unrestrained. The underlying relation is reciprocity modified by relative rank. Reciprocity does not mean symmetry. The higher the lord's rank, the more heinous any offence against the lord, and the higher the rank, the greater the generosity from the lord. Furthermore the reciprocity principle is softened by God's compassion and mercy. (1999, 87-88)

Without making definite claims as to whether Leviticus does or does not fit into the paradigm of the covenant model, it can be added that, for Leviticus, the Sinai covenant is a vehicle that transforms Israel into a holy nation and a sacred people.

The construction of the Tabernacle and community life based on the centrality of the Tabernacle is a key aspect of Israel's fulfilment of covenant obligations. Leviticus does not deal with the building or setting up of the Tabernacle per se; it deals with the life of the community in light of the Tabernacle as the vehicle of God's presence among them. Even so, Leviticus is textually meaningless apart from the covenant stipulating the construction of the Tabernacle. In that sense, covenant and Tabernacle are complementary and coextensive conceptions (Dunnill 105). Leviticus sets forth what it means for Israel to live as a "holy nation" on a daily basis. While the stipulations of the covenant unite the community as a whole, they also divide the community into leaders, priests, and lay people and to each stratum the stipulations, particularly those regarding sacrifices and offerings, are variously set forth (Lev. 4:1-35). This is evident in the various spheres of the Tabernacle as well. In its restricted access to its various zones, the

Tabernacle also reflects/reinforces the division within the community – High Priest, priests, and laity. The covenant motif, undergirded by holiness, is one of the constituting elements of meaning in the text. Holiness and covenant/Tabernacle relate to two other elements that further spell out the stipulations found in Leviticus: sacrifice and priesthood.

2.3 Sacrifices and Offerings

Sacrifices[15] and offerings form a substantial part of the text of Leviticus and are the hallmark of the life of the community with the Tabernacle at its centre. The sacrifices and offerings stipulate what is to be sacrificed or offered, by whom, for what purpose, and on what occasion. With the covenant as the framework in which these sacrifices and offerings are stipulated, they function as the primary safeguard of the relationship between God and the Israelites. According to Levine, however,

> [N]o particular type of sacrifice, in and of itself, served as the special means for dramatizing the covenant (or covenants) operative between Yahweh and Israel. In a certain sense, the entire cult presupposed the existence of the covenant relationship, but the same can be said concerning duties and activities of a non-cultic character prescribed in the code of the Pentateuch, and in other biblical sources. As far as enactment of covenants is concerned, the use of sacrifice, where attended represented only one of several means available for the celebration or sanctioning of a covenant. (1974, 37)

[15] For the purposes of this analysis, the following definition by Hubert and Mauss will be used, "Sacrifice is a religious act which, through the consecration of a victim, modifies the condition of the moral person who accomplishes it or that of certain objects with which he is concerned" (13).

Levine's claim that sacrifices do not define the covenant, but are to some extent also a means of celebrating and reaffirming the covenant, is most appropriate with respect to the Tabernacle, which in and of itself is a physical representation of the covenant between God and Israel; in essence, the Tabernacle is a *perpetual* emblem of the covenant as opposed to the occasional re-presentation of the covenant in the enactments of the sacrifices and offerings. The sacrifices and offering are in actuality an outworking of the very presence of the Tabernacle. With the Tabernacle serving as a constant reminder of the covenant, the sacrifices and offerings do not in themselves ratify or sanction the covenant – they are part and parcel of the covenant.

The following is a list of the various kinds of sacrifices/offerings made at the Tabernacle. The burnt offering (1; 6:8-13; 8:18-21; 16:24), the cereal/grain offering (2; 6:14-23), the well-being/fellowship offering (3; 7:11-34), the sin/purification offering (4:1-5:13; 6:24-30; 8:14-17; 16:3-22), and the guilt offering (5:14-6:7; 7:1-6). These offerings can be further divided into two types based on whether they are volitional or required. The burnt offering, the grain offering, and the fellowship offering are voluntary, while the sin and guilt offerings are required. These sacrifices and offerings form a complex and yet systematic expression of the "networking" between God and Israel. They are a marker of the covenant and an overt expression of Israel meeting God on His terms of holiness. According to Jacob Milgrom, "No single theory embraces the entire complex of sacrifices. . . . [T]he sacrifices cover a gamut of the psychological, emotional, and religious needs of the people" (2004, 20). The following description of the sacrifices and offerings focuses on what is offered, by whom, and for what purpose. All offerings are made at the Tabernacle.

2.3.1 The Burnt Offering

The burnt offering[16] can be offered by anyone in order to be accepted by God. "Peace with God was the goal of the sacrifice" (Wenham 1979, 55). The following stipulations circumscribe what is acceptable: all animal offerings have to be from either the flock or herd, most often male, and always without defect. The animals that can be offered are bulls, rams, sheep, goats, and birds, namely doves and pigeons. This offering takes economic disparity into account and makes provision for the various sections of society: the poor offer birds, while the rich offer animals. This offering is given over fully to be burnt and consumed by the flames. Both the one making the offering and the priest are involved with the sacrifice.

> The separate roles of priest and offerer are carefully defined in the laws dealing with cattle and sheep. The worshipper prepared the animal for sacrifice, by killing it, skinning it, washing the dirty parts, and chopping it up. The priest on the other hand had to catch the blood and sprinkle it over the altar and then put the pieces of meat on the altar fire. Such a distribution of duties was hardly feasible when a small bird was offered. This time the priest did nearly everything. . . . The law is concerned that the clean and holy priest be kept from pollution. Therefore the worshipper must undertake the messier tasks associated with sacrifice. (Wenham 1979, 54)

Neither the one who makes the offering, nor the priests who officiate at the altar by splashing the blood on it and burning the flesh of the animal, consume any part of the offering. However, the priests are allowed to keep the skin of the animal (7:8). Unlike in

[16] "*'ōlâ* literally means 'that which ascends,' which implies that the offering is entirely turned into smoke" (Milgrom 1991, 172).

other pagan traditions (Milgrom 2004, 21), the God of Israel does not consume the offering; to Him "an offering by fire [is] of pleasing odour" (1:17).

2.3.2 The Grain Offering

The grain offering[17] is made up of grain or fine flour, oil, salt[18], (if uncooked, incense has to be offered as well); yeast and honey are forbidden. If the offering is cooked, it can be baked, toasted, or fried. In the case of first fruits, the offering is to be "coarse new grain from fresh ears" (2:14). A portion ("a handful" 2:2) of the offering is burnt; this is the holiest part of the offering and belongs to God, the rest belongs to the priests. But if priests are to make a grain offering, then no portion is set aside, it is to be burnt entirely (6:23). This offering again is distinguishable from pagan offerings in that it is not entirely burnt (Milgrom 1991, 25). The grain offering, like the burnt offering, is meant to be "an offering by fire of pleasing odour to the LORD" (2:2).

2.3.3 The Fellowship Offering

The fellowship or well-being[19] offering is a celebratory, thanksgiving offering. It includes any male or female animal from the flock or herd, as well as bread. The fat and the organs are to be burnt on the altar, as they exclusively belong to God, and the blood is to be sprinkled on the altar. "It shall be a perpetual statute throughout your generations, in all your settlements: you must not eat any fat or any blood" (3:17). Milgrom suggests that

> The 'well-being offering' falls into three categories: 'freewill,' 'vow' and 'thanksgiving'. The common denominator for all three is joy. 'You shall sacrifice

[17] "*minḥâ* means gift, tribute" (Milgrom 1991, 197).
[18] "its preservative qualities made it the ideal symbol of the perdurability of the covenant" (Ibid, 27).
[19] "*šĕlāmîm* refers to the specific motivation that prompts the sacrifice, a feeling of "well-being" (Milgrom 1991, 204).

the well-being, and eat them, *rejoicing* before the LORD your God.' (Deut 27:7). The freewill offering is the spontaneous byproduct of one's happiness, whatsoever its cause: 'with a whole heart they made freewill offerings to YHWH' (1 Chr 29:9). . . . If the emotion is lacking, the offering brought is a sterile gift at best.

The votive offering is brought following the successful fulfillment of a vow. . . . Finally, there is the thanksgiving offering. . . . The main function of all the well-being offerings is to provide meat for the table. Except for kings and aristocrats, meat was eaten only on rare occasions, usually surrounding celebrations. Because a whole animal was probably too much for a nuclear family, it has to be a household or a clan celebration. All joyous celebrations would have been marked by a well-being offering, the joyous sacrifice par excellence. . . .

Thus the free-will sacrifice makes a link between individual/communal joy and thanksgiving. . . . (Milgrom 2004, 28-29)

Celebration and thanksgiving, coupled with a communal meal, are the purposes of the well-being offering.

2.3.4 The Sin Offering

The sin offering or purification offering[20] is primarily an expiation offering for offences committed against God by, "doing *unintentionally* any one of all the things that by commandments of the LORD . . . ought not to be done" (4:22, emphasis mine).

---

[20] "The term for the 'purification offering' comes (חטאת) from the root חטא 'fail, sin.'. . . It describes behavior that violates the community's standards. Because God set these standards, חטא is primarily a religious judgment on deviant behavior. . . .

Milgrom's proposal to translate חטאת, 'a purification offering,' is a much better rendering for the term in Eng, which unfortunately does not have a word that is closer to its literal meaning 'de-sin'" (Hartley 55).

Therefore, making atonement is mandatory. It also serves as a purification ritual, for "recovery from child birth (chap. 12), the completion of the Nazirite vow (Num 6) and the dedication of the newly constructed altar (8:15; see Exod 29:36-37)" (Milgrom 1991, 253). "The sins of the priest or the cultic community defiled the inner sanctuary, while those of the prince or the individual defiled the main altar. Everyone, from the High Priest to the ordinary person, had to present a purification offering for any inadvertent sin or sin committed and forgotten before the defilement had been removed" (Hartley 70). The status of the offender in the community designates the kind of sacrifice to be offered. If the offender is the High Priest or the whole community/elders, the animal is a young bull without defect; for a leader a male goat; for a common person a female goat or lamb; birds – a dove or a pigeon for the poor and "one-tenth of an ephah[21] of choice flour" (5:11) for the very poor. No section of society is left out; just as the command for Israel to be a holy nation is a corporate command, so also the requirement for atonement as stipulated by the sin offerings includes all Israel.

The blood and fat of the sacrificed animal belong to God and therefore are offered at the altar, while the rest of the offering is burnt at a designated place "outside the camp" (4:12, 21). No part of this sacrifice is eaten by either the priest (if the offender is the priest), or by those making the offering. However, if the offering is made by the leader or an individual, the officiating priests eat the meat, after blood and fat portions are offered at the altar. Through the sacrifices, the defilement caused by the offence/sin is removed, and holiness is restored to both the offender(s) and their environs. Milgrom is of the opinion that what is purged is essentially the sacred space – the sanctuary, which has

[21] "An Egyptian measure, *ʾipt*, estimated as equivalent to 22.8 liters. . . . One tenth of an *ephah*, the most common amount of semolina for a cereal offering (6:13; 14:21; Num5:15; 28:5, 9, 13, 21, 29; etc.), would amount to 2.3 liters, which would suffice for a day's bread for one person . . ." (Milgrom 1991, 305-306).

been polluted as a result of human sin. Milgrom arrives at this conclusion based on four principles that, in his opinion, are attached to this purification sacrifice:

> [T]he first principle: Blood is the ritual cleanser that purges the altar of the impurities inflicted on it by the offerer.
>
> If the individual has accidentally violated a prohibition, the priest purges the outer (sacrificial) altar with the blood of the offerer's purification offering (4:27-35). If the entire community has accidentally violated a prohibition, the priest purges the inner (incense) altar and the shrine, the outer room of the tent, with the blood of the purification offering brought by the community's representative (4:13-21). If, however, individuals have brazenly violated prohibitions, then, once a year, on Yom Kippur, the High Priest purges the entire sanctuary, beginning with the inner and the holiest area containing the Ark. In this case, the purification offering is not brought by the culprits–deliberate sinners are barred from the sanctuary–but by the High Priest himself.
>
> This graded impurity of the sanctuary and its purgation leads to the second principle: A sin committed anywhere will generate impurity that, becoming airborne, penetrates the sanctuary in proportion to its magnitude. . . . Israel . . . in the wake of its monotheistic revolution, abolished the world of demonic divinities. Only a single being capable of demonic acts remained – the human being. The humans were even more powerful than their pagan counterparts: they could drive God out of God's sanctuary.
>
> Thus the third principle: God will not abide in a polluted sanctuary. To be sure, the Merciful One would tolerate a modicum of pollution. But there is a point of no

return. If the pollution levels continue to rise, the end is inexorable. God abandons the sanctuary and leaves the people to their doom. . . .

[T]he fourth and final principle: the priestly doctrine of collective responsibility. Sinners may go about apparently unmarred by their evil, but the sanctuary bears the wounds, and with its destruction, all the sinners will meet their doom. . . . (2004, 31-32)[22]

In its function of purging sin, the sin offering serves to sanctify the sanctuary, and by the restoration of its state of holiness, the offerer is freed from his sin.

The sin offering, unlike the grain and the well-being offerings, presents a graded scale for sin, while also taking care of economic disparity within the community. Common people who sin unintentionally are required to bring either a lamb, or doves, or pigeons, depending on their economic status, and their sin is atoned for. The High Priest, priests, and leaders, however, are responsible for higher degrees of moral integrity and physical purity. "The power of defilement corresponded to the prominence of the sinner" (Hartley 70). Therefore, in their violation of the commandments, even if the violation is inadvertent, they are dealt with severely. The inviolability of the Tabernacle, patterned (Exod. 25:9) on the model shown to Moses on Mount Sinai, has to be maintained at a great cost, particularly to those who represent God to the people and vice versa, because in both relationships their proximity to God demands a higher level of sanctity and purity.

[22] Also discussed in Milgrom 1991, 257-258.

2.3.5 The Guilt Offering

The guilt or reparation offering[23] is another atonement sacrifice (5:16; 6:7). Sins that are inadvertently or deliberately committed against holy things and holy people (fellow Israelites), such as theft, cheating, exhortation, and false accusation, are expiated by this offering combined with a restitution and payment for damages; the additional restitution charges highlight the seriousness of the offence and the significance of living as a holy people. Guilt offerings include a ram, the value of which is set by the priest depending on the value of the damage caused; the value of the ram can also be converted in silver shekels according to the sanctuary weight[24] and the appropriate amount paid to the priest. The guilt offering accounts for offences on two levels: if the offence is against holy things relating to God/the sanctuary, the ram, or an equivalent of its value in shekels makes atonement and if the offence is a conflict between fellow Israelites, restitution has to be made.

> The reparation offering draws attention to the fact that sin has both a social and a spiritual dimension. . . . [It] demonstrates that there is another aspect of sin not covered by the other sacrifices. It is that of satisfaction or compensation. If the burnt offering brings reconciliation between God and man, the purification or sin

---

[23] "*'ašam* describes the syndrome of sin, guilt, and punishment. It has a psychological dimension. Wrongdoing creates guilt and fear of punishment, and conversely suffering reinforces the feeling of guilt. Thus we find one word bridging all expiatory offering: *'ašam*.

For involuntary sin *'ašam*, 'remorse' is sufficient. For deliberate sin, the remorse must be verbalized, the sin articulated, and responsibility assumed. Before transgressors may approach God for expiation, they must first make restitution to the people they wronged. In civil justice matters people take priority over God.

The repentance of sinners, through remorse (*'ašam*) and confession, reduces intentional sin to an in advertence, which is then eligible for sacrificial expiation. Confession is then the legal device . . . to transform deliberate sins into inadvertencies, thereby qualifying them for sacrificial expiation" (Milgrom 2004, 46).

[24] "[T]he shekel of the sanctuary [w]as an ancient shekel of 224 grains; fifteen of these silver shekels equaled a gold shekel weighing 253 grains. This shekel is a 'heavy' shekel. When merchants adopted a lighter shekel, the Temple continued to accept only the heavy shekel . . ." (Hartley 81).

> offering brings purification, while the reparation offering brings satisfaction through paying for the sin. (Wenham 1979, 111)

Thus, the consequences of the requirements of restitution are not purely material, since the wronged individual is also emotionally compensated. The sacrificial and offering system of Leviticus, summarized above, details what holiness demands and how it is to be preserved. Holiness is restored at the expense of the offender; however, the levitical system is also a system based on economic, social, and moral considerations. The poor are not exempt from bringing an appropriate offering and neither are the High Priest's offences ever overlooked – he pays a heavier price for his access and proximity to the sanctuary.

The conception of how holiness translates into everyday life and the way in which it is maintained with the offering of blood, which functions as a synonym for life[25], suggest that holiness is meant to be co-extensive with life, and blood is the agent that has the power to maintain it. Conversely, defilement/sin is synonymous with death and coterminous with the unholy and profane. Holiness and defilement cannot coexist without one or the other incurring the cost. The key to unlocking meaning in Leviticus, then, is embodied in what can be termed as the *covenant of holiness* – in its dramatic expression of sacrifices, its exactitude, its perfection, its concern, and its provision. The quintessence of Leviticus' "be holy, for I am holy" (11:44, 45; 19:2; 20:7), then, is a clarion call to *all* Israel, not only her priests, for Israel was to be a "priestly kingdom and a holy nation" (Exod. 19:6).

---

[25] "For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you for making atonement for your lives on the altar; for, as life, it is the blood that makes atonement" (Lev. 17:11).

2.4 The Priesthood

Although all of Israel is called to be part of the covenant of holiness, the sections of Leviticus following the discourse on sacrifice deal specifically with priests and their part in being mediators on behalf of God and Israel: the consecration of the priesthood (8), the service of Aaron and his sons at the Tabernacle (9), the death of Aaron's sons Nadab and Abihu (10), the yearly Day of Atonement (16) and the importance of making offerings and sacrifices at the Tabernacle only (17), and more instructions for priests (21-22).

The election of a special group of people to be priests before God is stated in the Sinai covenant in Exodus. At the Tabernacle, which is consecrated in itself, Aaron and his sons are to be set apart for the exclusive service to the Lord.

> I will meet the Israelites [at the Tabernacle], and it shall be sanctified by my glory; I will consecrate the tent of meeting and the altar; Aaron also and his sons I will consecrate, to serve me as priests. I will dwell among the Israelites, and I will be their God. And they shall know that I am the LORD their God, who brought them out of the land of Egypt that I might dwell among them; I am the LORD their God. (Exod. 29: 43-46)

In Leviticus, Moses complies with all the instructions set out in Exod. 29 regarding the consecration of the Tabernacle and of Aaron and his sons. In addition to the instructions about sacrifices and offerings (1-7), Leviticus is concerned with the consecration of the priesthood and the Tabernacle. Moses is the one consecrating and giving Aaron and his sons instructions on how to minister at the Tabernacle. The minutiae that are specified regarding the consecration of sacred space and sacred personnel reflect the exacting

nature of that which is to be deemed sacrosanct. Holiness then continues to be the key to understanding the function and the role of the priesthood and to unravelling the meaning of their significance in Leviticus: "Through those who are near me I will show myself holy, and before all the people I will be glorified" (10:3).

2.4.1 Consecration

The elaborate process of consecration involves sacrifices and offerings, special garments for Aaron and his sons, special anointing oil, and additional appurtenances. Aaron and his sons are willing participants, while the rest of the community is present as observers[26]. Significantly, in this consecration ceremony, Moses, the unconsecrated one, is the officiating priest:

> [I]n the sacrifices [Moses] undertakes all the priestly duties specified in chs. 1-7. He manipulates the blood (8:15, 19, 23), burns the fat pieces (vv. 16, 20, 28), and receives the priestly portion of the breast (v. 29). Aaron and his sons, on the other hand, undertake some of the jobs usually assigned to the laity, such as laying their hands on the animals and killing them (vv. 14-15, 18-19). Until the ordination ceremony was complete, Moses had to act as priest. (Wenham 1979, 134)

The ceremony includes a cleansing ritual where Aaron and his sons are bathed by Moses. They are then clothed, Aaron receiving a more elaborate set of vestments than his sons. A

[26] "The LORD spoke to Moses, saying: Take Aaron and his sons with him, the vestments, the anointing-oil, the bull of sin-offering, the two rams, and the basket of unleavened bread; and assemble the whole congregation at the entrance of the tent of meeting. And Moses did as the LORD commanded him. When the congregation was assembled at the entrance of the tent of meeting, Moses said to the congregation, 'This is what the LORD has commanded to be done'" (Lev. 8:1-5).

closer look at Aaron's attire reveals the details: the tunic, the sash, the robe, the ephod,[27] the decorated band of the ephod around him, the breastpiece including the Urim and the Thummim,[28] and the turban ornamented with the gold crown on which are inscribed the words "Holy to the LORD" (Exod. 28:36). All elements of Aaron's attire point to the regality associated with the office of the High Priest, to which Aaron is ordained[29]. In contrast, the priests do not wear the ephod, the breastpiece, the robe, or the gold crown.

After the priests are attired, the Tabernacle and all its furnishing are anointed with the special anointing oil[30] meant for the exclusive use of anointing. Aaron and his sons are also anointed with this oil. The high point of the text is the discussion of the sacrifices offered at this investiture ceremony[31]. The elaborate and detailed consecration ceremony ends with Moses sprinkling anointing oil once again, to end the ceremony. After the ceremony, the priests cook their meat portions and eat them at the entrance of the Tent of Meeting. They remain at the Tabernacle for the next seven days, as a final step in this consecration process that marks their entry into a *covenant of holiness* with God, as well as their new status that allows them to be in an exclusive relationship with God at the Tabernacle. They begin their service to Israel and to God as priests on the eighth day and offer up burnt offerings, sin offerings, and fellowship offerings. The community worships

---

[27] "[L]iterally 'that which fits closely,' refers in the OT to various types of garments. In the case of the High Priest, it was a type of trousers with a bib. The ephod was made of gold, of rich violet, purple, and scarlet wool, and a fine linen (Exod. 28:6)" (Hartley 111).

[28] "The Urim and Thummim were a form of oracle placed inside a pocket of the breastpiece, worn by the High Priest on his chest. . . . [T]hey were used exclusively by the High Priest inside the Tabernacle. Their shape and operation are unknown" (Milgrom 2004, 83).

[29] "[The] majesty [of Aaron's garments] enhanced the splendor of the service at the Tent of Meeting. It corresponded with the awesome glory that attended the holy God's appearing in the cloud cover over the Tabernacle. There was also a royal quality to these garments, indicating that the High Priest ministered at the altar for a people who were God's kingdom on earth" (Hartley 115).

[30] "You shall say to the Israelites, 'This shall be *my holy anointing-oil* throughout your generations. *It shall not be used in any ordinary anointing of the body, and you shall make no other like it in composition; it is holy, and it shall be holy to you*" (Exod. 30:31-32, emphasis mine).

[31] For a detailed description of the ceremony, see Appendix I: iii.

as a result of their ministrations being accepted: "Fire came out from the LORD and consumed the burnt-offering and the fat on the altar; and when all the people saw it, they shouted and fell on their faces" (9:24). This textual high point is almost immediately off-set by the death of Aaron's sons Nadab and Abihu, who are consumed by holy fire from God for offering unholy fire at the Tabernacle. The stark reminder, "[t]hrough those who are near me I will show myself holy, and before all the people I will be glorified" (10:3) is followed (11-15) by a detailed list of impurities which can pollute the sanctuary.

2.4.2 Day of Atonement

The narrative continues with a reminder, many warnings, and several commands from God to Aaron, communicated by Moses:

> The LORD spoke to Moses after the death of the two sons of Aaron, when they drew near before the LORD and died. The LORD said to Moses: Tell your brother Aaron not to come just at any time into the sanctuary inside the curtain before the mercy-seat that is upon the ark, or he will die; for I appear in the cloud upon the mercy-seat. Thus shall Aaron come into the holy place: with a young bull for a sin-offering and a ram for a burnt-offering. He shall put on the holy linen tunic, and shall have the linen undergarments next to his body, fasten the linen sash, and wear the linen turban; these are the holy vestments. He shall bathe his body in water, and then put them on. (16:1-4)

This admonitory preface is followed by a detailed description of what ensues on the holiest of days, in the holiest of places, between the holiest of people and the most holy God, to rid the sanctuary of defilement, which is inevitable given the fragile nature of the fault lines between holiness and a profane world (11-15): "These laws drive home the

truth that God is just as holy and demands just as much reverence when he dwells permanently with Israel as on the first occasion when he appeared on Sinai (Exod. 19)" (Wenham 1979, 229).

On the Day of Atonement, the day when atonement for all unatoned and deliberate sins is made, the High Priest has to follow a far more stringent set of commands than those of the regular sacrifices. Aaron's preparations to enter the Most Holy Place include ritual cleansing and the wearing of a special set of garments that are simple and plain linen garments in comparison to the regality of his regular high priestly attire, which he has to leave in the Holy Place.

> On the day of atonement he looked more like a slave. His outfit consisted of four simple garments in white linen, even plainer than the vestments of the ordinary priest (Exod. 39:27-29). The symbolic significance of these special vestments is no where clearly explained. Undoubtedly they draw attention to the unique character of the occasion. On this day the High Priest enters the 'other world,' into the very presence of God. He must therefore dress as befits the occasion. Among his fellow men his dignity as the great mediator between man and God is unsurpassed, and his splendid clothes draw attention to the glory of his office. But in the presence of God even the High Priest is stripped of all honor: he becomes simply the servant of the King of kings, whose true status is portrayed in the simplicity of this dress. . . . (Wenham 1979, 230)

The High Priest has to offer a bull and a ram, the former as a purification offering and the latter as a burnt offering for himself and his household. Additionally, he also has to offer two goats and another ram to make atonement for the rest of the community. Unlike other

purification offerings where the blood is sprinkled on the curtain, on this day, the blood of the bull has to be taken into the Most Holy Place and the blood has to be sprinkled on the mercy seat[32]. The Most Holy Place is also the most dangerous place for the High Priest to be in – even a hint of a lack of holiness means the High Priest's death. To protect himself, he has to carry a censer filled with incense to create a hazy and dense atmosphere to shield him when he actually sprinkles the mercy seat with the purification blood. Having done this, he turns his attention to the two goats. After deciding by lot which one is to be sacrificed, the blood of the sacrificed goat is taken into the Holy of Holies and the mercy seat is sprinkled, this time on behalf of the community which is required to perform penitent acts such as fasting and possibly other forms of self-deprecation (16:29; 23:27-32). He then takes the blood of the bull and the goat and applies it to the horns of the altar in the outer court and also sprinkles the rest of the blood seven times on the altar:

> Thus he shall make atonement for the sanctuary, because of the uncleannesses of the people of Israel, and because of their transgressions, all their sins; and so he shall do for the tent of meeting, which remains with them in the midst of their uncleannesses. He shall sprinkle some of the blood on it with his finger seven times, and cleanse it and hallow it from the uncleannesses of the people of Israel. When he has finished atoning for the holy place and the tent of meeting and the altar, he shall present the live goat. (16:16, 19-20)

Aaron lays his hands on the second goat, which is not sacrificed, and confesses the sins of the community, symbolically transferring onto the goat all the sins that need to be atoned for. Though this is already done in the earlier sacrifices because the Most Holy Place is

[32] For a brief discussion of the etymology of the term "mercy seat," see Appendix I: iv.

being purged, the duplication guarantees that no sin that can pollute the sanctuary was left unatoned. Instead of being sacrificed, this goat is then lead away by an assigned person into the wilderness, where it is set free for Azazel[33]. After this is done, Aaron removes his special clothes and dons his high priestly robes and offers up the rams as burnt offerings. Expiation is accomplished. This ends the ritual aspects of the most holy day of the levitical calendar. Following the description of this elaborate ritual, Leviticus reinforces the centrality of the Tabernacle (17) by reminding the community that all sacrifices and offerings have to be made in the designated ways and only at the Tabernacle. Thus, the centrality of the Tabernacle in the community's worship is reiterated.

Through the Day of Atonement ritual, holiness is restored to Aaron, the priesthood, the Tabernacle, and the people. This ritual also highlights Aaron's singular significance as the one mediator who can restore the covenant of holiness between God and Israel. Even so, the details, particularly the atonement made separately for Aaron first and then for the community as a whole, make it clear that sin exists at all levels and has to be dealt with for God's presence to continue to remain among the people. This ceremony brings to the fore the importance of corporate holiness and the importance of banishing sin and defilement completely – symbolized in the sending of the second goat "to Azazel," away from the Israelite camp and into the wilderness. While several aspects of the Day of Atonement ceremony are distinctive, e.g., the sprinkling of blood on the mercy seat, the High Priest's attire, and his confessing of sins committed by the community to make atonement for them, this culminating moment of the ritual is even more unique, in that while it is a sacrifice and an offering, it is also a visual

[33] For an exegetical discussion of the term "Azazel," see Appendix I: v.

representation of the fact that the holy can never coexist with the profane. In this one act, the invisible boundary lines are now made visible through the text of the ritual. With the acceptance of the final burnt offerings of the two rams, holiness is restored to Aaron/the priesthood, the Tabernacle, and the people.

The foregoing discussion of Leviticus shows clearly that meaning in this text is scripted in its mandate for holiness. The primacy of holiness in the Sinai covenant further compounds the meaning of Leviticus, particularly through the centrality of the Tabernacle, the priesthood, the covenant, and the sacrifices and offerings. Every conceivable kind of pollutant/agent of sin, moral and material, is taken into account and provided for by way of specific atonements. Through its stringent stipulations, Leviticus accounts for the inevitability of sin and therefore addresses the resultant lack of holiness within the Israelite community. Leviticus is not idealistic in its demands about holiness; instead, it is categorical about the impediments to its preservation and maintenance. To this end, Leviticus is a legal repository that prescribes ways to preserve holiness and to maintain it at an individual and at a communal level in an otherwise profane world.

3. The Letter to the Hebrews

This section is a summary of the Letter to the Hebrews and its key concerns of priesthood, covenant, and sacrifice in relation to the Tabernacle. As mentioned in the previous chapter of this dissertation, the author of Hebrews has a rather peculiar way of quoting Hebrew Scriptures. The author's hermeneutic involves extensive appropriation and interpretation of Hebrew Scriptures, which he believes are the Word of God. He uses Scripture with the goal of instructing his readers in matters of doctrine and faith, and for

the purpose of communicating the relation between Hebrew Scriptures and Jesus Christ to individuals, who, according to the author of Hebrews, should be "teachers," but instead have to be taught themselves (5:12-14). To this end, his primary motifs are priesthood, covenant, and sacrifice. The author of Hebrews claims a common ancestry with his audience: "Long ago God spoke to our ancestors in many and various ways by the prophets" (1:1), but at the particular point in their corporate history they also need to be encouraged to, "pay greater attention to what we have heard, so that we do not drift away from it" (2:1). This pattern of reminding/warning, together with comparing and reinterpreting Hebrew Scriptures in light of Jesus' suffering, death, and resurrection can be traced in the entire text.

In his opening remarks, the author of Hebrews makes eight claims about God's Son: i. God has spoken "to us" through His Son (1:2), ii. God appointed Him heir of all things (1:2), iii. God made the worlds through Him (1:2), iv. The Son reflects God's glory (1:3), v. He is "the exact imprint of God's very being" (1:3), vi. He sustains all things by His powerful Word (1:3), vii. He is seated at the right hand of the Majesty in heaven (1:3), and viii. He is superior to the angels and has inherited a name greater than those of the angels (1:4). The author uses Hebrew Scriptures to back up these claims, particularly the final claim that the Son is superior to angels. He then introduces the Son as Lord (2:3) and Jesus (2:9), who was made "like his brothers" (2:11), and for a time even made lower than angels, but, as a result of His suffering and substitutionary death, He is now second to none and yet can sympathize with those who suffer. He intercedes for them and is their "faithful High Priest" (2:17), because of His own suffering. After

having consolidated and clarified these characteristics of Jesus, the author now turns his attention to equating Moses and Jesus.

The author presents Moses as Jesus' forerunner. He gives Moses a unique place of honour and measures Jesus' faithfulness against Moses': "[Jesus] was faithful to the one who appointed him, just as Moses also was faithful in all God's house. . . . Now Moses was faithful in all God's house as a servant, to testify to the things that would be spoken later" (3:2, 5). According to the author, in terms of faithfulness to God, Moses and Jesus are equals; however, in their roles as servant and Son they differ[34].

> The figure of Moses, as the mediator of Israel's covenant and cult, is of central importance in Hebrews. The writer contrasts the Mosaic era, Mosaic covenant, and the Mosaic cult with the new situation introduced by God through Jesus. . . . This approach is sustained throughout Hebrews. . . . It develops the parallel between Moses as mediator of the old cult and Jesus as the mediator of the new. By creative reference to Moses and the wilderness generation, the writer presents Christ as the mediator of the new covenant. . . . Moses is not simply one figure among several who is compared to Jesus. Instead, Moses and Jesus are joined together throughout the homily. (Lane 73)

Having established the significance of the two mediators, the author warns his readers against unbelief by comparing[35] them to the Exodus generation and he encourages them to believe in Jesus and enter God's rest with faith. "For indeed *the good news came to us*

---

[34] D'Angelo argues that the difference is that the "Christology of Hebrews . . . allow[s] an identification of the glory of Christ with the glory that Moses *saw*" (1979, 162, emphasis mine).

[35] "The use of comparison as a rhetorical strategy is employed throughout Hebrews. The comparative adjective κρείσσων/κρείττων and the comparative adverb κρείτον, in the sense of 'superior', 'better,' are characteristic speech-forms for the writer, occurring twelve times in Hebrews, and are fundamental to his argument" (Lane cxxix).

just as to them; but the message they heard did not benefit them, because they were not united by faith with those who listened" (Hebrews 4:2, emphasis mine). According to the author, the "good news" is not exclusive to his audience. The message to the Exodus generation was also good news (4:2); the invitation still stands now, but remains unprofitable for those who do not receive it with faith[36]. If they choose to accept it, they have

> a great High Priest who has passed through the heavens, Jesus, the Son of God. . . . For we do not have a High Priest who is unable to sympathize with our weaknesses, but we have one who in every respect has been tested as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore approach the throne of grace with boldness, so that we may receive mercy and find grace to help in time of need. (4:14-16)

The author's master stroke, however, is not in the offer of "good news" to the Exodus generation and to his audience, or in the comparison of the two groups, but in his contextualization of Ps. 95:7-8a, through which he makes the invitation to enter God's rest a contemporaneous one. In so doing, the author makes Jesus the eternal contemporary – through His one sacrificial act of offering His own blood, He became the mediator of the new covenant and a High Priest forever. This contemporizing is crucial to understanding priesthood, covenant, and sacrifice in Hebrews.

3.1 Priesthood

Priesthood in Hebrews is based on the high priesthood of Jesus and the mandate of sacrifice set forth in the levitical system. In presenting Jesus' high priesthood, the

[36] The point of the author's comparison between Joshua's offer of rest (entering the Promised Land) to the Israelites and Jesus' offer of rest (salvation from sin) is that both are contingent on the example of God having ceased from all work on the seventh day and rested (Gen. 2:2).

author's elaborate excurses begin by introducing the concept of an "oath"[37] and its centrality and binding nature in God's relationship with Abraham. This, according to the author, is also true of and applicable to the oath about priesthood of the order of Melchizedek (6:20, 7:1-28).

> The basis of [the author's] argument is a reflection on Ps.110:4 and God's oath to establish an eternal priesthood like that of Melchizedek. . . . He uses the incident of Melchizedek meeting with Abraham to show the priority of Melchizedek over the levitical priests. . . . In the Genesis narrative and Ps 110:4, the writer finds the unmistakable implication that the levitical priesthood will be replaced by the eternal priesthood foreshadowed and prefigured in the person of Melchizedek. (Lane 163)

Thus, the author announces a new order of priesthood even while the levitical system is in place.

As Lane points out, the author of Hebrews applies and appropriates Psalm 110:4 as a prophetic Psalm, in conjunction with Gen. 14:18-20, to present Jesus' high priesthood:

> Every High Priest chosen from among mortals is put in charge of things pertaining to God on their behalf, to offer gifts and sacrifices for sins. He is able to deal gently with the ignorant and wayward, since he himself is subject to

---

[37] "What the divine oath demonstrates is the 'immutability; . . . of God's 'will'. . . . That God is unchanging in his designs and that his word is firm and secure are constant affirmations of the biblical traditions. . . . This . . . tradition about God's immutability underlies Hebrews' affirmation. . . .

To demonstrate his inflexible purpose, God 'guaranteed' it with an oath. . . . The use of an oath by God ensures that there are 'two immutable things' on which believers can rest assured. These two things are no doubt God's word and the oath that confirms it. Hebrews does not specify more precisely on what word and oath the addressees may rely. Our author may have in mind the two verses from the Psalms mentioned in 5:5 and 6, namely Ps 2:7 and Ps 110:4, although it is more likely that he refers simply to the word of Ps110:4 which proclaims the High Priest and the oath in the same context which confirms that appointment" (Attridge 182).

> weakness; and because of this he must offer sacrifice for his own sins as well as for those of the people. And one does not presume to take this honour, but takes it only when called by God, just as Aaron was. So also Christ did not glorify himself in becoming a High Priest, but was appointed by the one who said to him, 'You are my Son, today I have begotten you'; As he says also in another place, 'You are a priest forever, according to the order of Melchizedek.' (5:1-6)

The author of Hebrews begins his excursus by comparing Jesus' role as mediator and intercessor to that of Aaron. Jesus, like Aaron, is chosen by God and despite His divinity, Jesus "learned obedience" and is "made perfect" (5:8, 9) through His suffering and death. Thus, He is closer to Aaron's slave-like demeanour on the Day of Atonement than to his everyday regality. Unlike Aaron, Jesus is not a Levite and, in line with the mandates of the Sinai covenant, He can never be a priest or have access to the earthly sanctuary; therefore, He is an appointed priest "of the order of Melchizedek," a permanent order maintained "through the power of an indestructible life" (7:16b). Donald Guthrie suggests that

> *Legal requirement* is set against *power*, and *bodily descent* against *indestructible life*. The first contrast is between external restraint and inward dynamic which at once puts the new order of priesthood on a different footing. The requirement of the law concentrated on heredity rather than on personal quality. . . . The word rendered *bodily descent* (*sarkinēs*) literally means 'pertaining to or made of flesh', used in the New Testament in contrast to 'spiritual' (*pneumatikos*). . . . It is essentially mortal as contrasted with *indestructible* (*akatalytou*, literally incapable of being dissolved). This is . . . a restatement . . . of the superiority of Christ over

> Aaron's priesthood, but with special emphasis on the continuity of the one compared with the constant succession caused by death of the other. . . . (162-163)

According to the author of Hebrews, the order of Melchizedek was a precursor to the levitical order. In offering a tithe to Melchizedek after being blessed by him (Gen. 14: 19-20), Abram, as Levi's ancestor, represents Levi as well as the entire levitical priesthood (7: 1-9). Melchizedek offers only gifts, he does not offer any sacrifices (8:3a).

In addition to introducing an alternative line of priesthood, the author also synthesizes the levitical priesthood and the order of Melchizedek[38]. The centrality of sacrifice from the levitical priesthood is maintained and the eternality of the order of Melchizedek is forged to it, thus creating a new order in Jesus' high priesthood. The primordial Melchizedek and the changing levitical priesthood, which is constrained by the mortality of the priests, are held together in the eternally contemporaneous high priesthood of the new covenant:

> "The Lord has sworn and will not change his mind, 'You are a priest forever'"—accordingly Jesus has also become the guarantee of a better covenant.
>
> Furthermore, the former priests were many in number, because they were prevented by death from continuing in office; but he holds his priesthood permanently, because he continues for ever. Consequently he is able for all time to save those who approach God through him, since he always lives to make intercession for them.

[38] "This seems to have been [the author's] own contribution to the ongoing development of early Christian apologetic . . . Melchizedek became important to him as a prototype of messianic redemption" (Longenecker 1978, 177).

> For it was fitting that we should have such a High Priest, holy, blameless, undefiled, separated from sinners, and exalted above the heavens. Unlike the other High Priests, he has no need to offer sacrifices day after day, first for his own sins, and then for those of the people; this he did once for all when he offered himself. For the law appoints as High Priests those who are subject to weakness, but the word of the oath, which came later than the law, appoints a Son who has been made perfect for ever. (7:21b-28)

The author's conclusions about priesthood rest on his selection of texts from the Hebrew Scriptures that authenticate the meaning of Jesus in relation to the levitical priesthood for him and his community. For the author, the high priesthood of Jesus is based on sacrifice as stipulated in the Sinai covenant and on God's oath, which in turn also becomes the basis of the new covenant prophesied by Jeremiah (31:31-34). Jesus is High Priest of a new covenant, serving forever at the heavenly Tabernacle. Significantly, the notion of the heavenly Tabernacle is the author's innovation, based on the silence of Hebrew Scriptures regarding the "pattern" (Exod. 25:9) shown to Moses and the description of the wilderness Tabernacle set forth in great detail in Exodus and Leviticus.

3.2 Covenant

Covenant in Hebrews is inextricably tied to the high priesthood of Jesus and, by extension, to the heavenly Tabernacle where Jesus ministers. The meaning of the new covenant rests on the author's appropriation and application of Jer. 31 (LXX 38): 31-34. The main aspects of this second covenant summarily stated are: i. it is a new covenant, ii made by God with Israel, iii. a future time awaits its initiation, iv. God will put the laws of the new covenant in the minds and write them upon the hearts of His people, v. God

will be Israel's God and Israel His people, vi. no one will have to be taught about God, vii. all Israel will know God, and viii. God will forgive her wickedness and He will not remember her sin any longer. The author of Hebrews appropriates the idea of the newness of the covenant and applies aspects of Jesus' priesthood, sacrifice, and Tabernacle ministrations to it.

A new covenant requires a new mediator; Jesus is that mediator and His blood ratifies the covenant. The author's point in all this seems to be the accessibility to God that the new covenant initiates. He sees Jesus as having initiated this new kind of accessibility through His blood and His permanent priesthood at the heavenly Tabernacle. With the requirement of sacrifice being fulfilled and therefore the need for the levitical sacrificial system expunged, God is now accessible through the high priestly intercession of Jesus: "we have such a High Priest, one who is seated at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens, a minister in the sanctuary and the true tent that the Lord, and not any mortal, has set up" (8:1-2). The author's preoccupation is that the heavenly Tabernacle, unlike the earthly Tabernacle, was made by God, not by human beings, and therefore needs a better sacrifice than the blood of animals; thus, Christ's blood has to be offered. The author's presentation of Jesus seated and yet ministering at the heavenly Tabernacle points simultaneously to the completed and yet ongoing task of the High Priest of the new covenant. "Hebrews . . . does not conceptualize Christ's ongoing activity as minister in terms of an eternal sacrificial self-offering (*leitourgos*; 8:2, cf. v. 6). That sacrificial offering encompassed a series of acts (self-offering, death, entrance and appearance, removal of sins) done only 'once'" (Nelson 257). The completed task is

Christ's sacrifice, the ongoing task is His intercession for His people which is unrelated and therefore different from the office of the levitical High Priest.

Describing the earthly Tabernacle, the author displays his knowledge of the levitical Tabernacle in terms of its structure and furnishings – the Holy Place with its lampstand, the table and the consecrated bread; the Holy of Holies with "the golden altar[39] of incense and the Ark of the covenant overlaid on all sides with gold, in which there are a golden urn holding the manna, Aaron's rod that budded, and the tablets of the covenant; above it are the cherubim of glory overshadowing the mercy-seat" (9:4). He describes the regular happenings in the outer court and the proceedings of the Day of Atonement in the Most Holy Place. His main argument about the significance of the Tabernacle is that all the ministrations at the earthly Tabernacle had to be carried on until the way to the heavenly Tabernacle was inaugurated through the blood of Jesus.

The heavenly Tabernacle and the requirement of blood are heavily dependent on the levitical system and are an extension of it. However, what is unusual in the author's presentation of the heavenly Tabernacle is that it also has to be purified. Uncharacteristic for New Testament writings, the author's interpretation further enhances his dependence on the levitical system and its reflection of physical and spiritual realities. The author's inference is that, just as the earthly Tabernacle can be polluted by sin, so can the heavenly Tabernacle[40]. The two, then, are not unconnected; in fact, in the author's scheme of

---

[39] "[T]he author appears to locate this altar inside the Most Holy Place, though its real place is 'in front of the curtain' (Exod 30:6). Indeed, it had to be outside the Most Holy Place, for it was in daily use (Exod 30:7-8). Some have thought that this altar was also in the Most Holy Place (2 Baruch 6:7). But it seems more likely that the author has in mind the intimate connection of the incense altar with the Most Holy Place. So it 'belonged to the inner sanctuary' (1 Kings 6:22), as is shown by its situation 'in front of the curtain that is before the ark of the testimony–before the atonement cover [mercy seat] that is over the Testimony' (Exod 30:6)" (Morris 82).

[40] For a fuller excursus on the heavenly Temple see Attridge (222-224).

things, they are parallel yet supplementary systems, with the difference that the heavenly Tabernacle needs a better sacrifice than the blood of animals.

> Even the terms which the author chooses for affirming that this covenant transcends the old, when comparing the sacrifices appropriate to the instruments of the old covenant with Christ's sacrifice, plunge us back into the old. The dangers inherent in the language of expiatory 'blood' re-emerge in full force when Christ's one true sacrifice is described as 'purifying the heavenly things' (9:23). Perhaps the idea of 'purifying' the heavenly and its instruments is a mere analogy, describing the *inauguration* of the new covenant in the same terms as Moses' inauguration of the old. . . . [A]t another level, though, the suggestion that evil has entered the dwelling of God has to be taken seriously. There can be no question of assigning the 'heavenly sanctuary' to some intermediary zone, 'in the heavens', where a mythological defeat of demons can be imagined without strain. That is ruled out by the argument that Christ himself is not to be given an intermediary status, as one of the angels, but identified at once with God as the ['the reflection of God's glory and the exact imprint of God's very being'] (1:3). . . . The idea that God himself has to be defended against the encroaching power of evil – and by the ritual manipulation of blood – was, it was argued, the unthinkable but inescapable message of the Day of Atonement. In Israel's religion, as recast in this disjunctive mould, the sense of evil seems to operate at a deeper level than the conviction of divine mercy (Hag. 2:11-14), and the use of purificatory language appears to introduce the same tension into the 'new' covenant. (Dunnill 232-234)

Jesus thus enters the heavenly Tabernacle that is "not a part of this creation" (9:11), as High Priest of the new covenant. He does so with His own blood, as the sinless, perfect sacrifice[41]. The author compares the two sacrifices and declares that what Jesus does is not only outward atonement, but His blood also atones for "consciences" (9:14), which cannot be accounted for by the blood of animals.

> What is involved in the atoning sacrifice of the heavenly High Priest is not the blood of animals but that of Christ. . . . In fact what Christ offered was "himself". . . . The victim was not something extrinsic to the officiant and the officiant was none other than the eternal Son. Hence, the blood and by metonymy the sacrifice as a whole, is of immense value. . . .
>
> That the victim in Christ's sacrifice is "blameless" . . . is another factor indicating the superlative worth of the act. The term itself is derived from the Old Testament's cultic prescription about the physical perfection of the victims, and it has been applied to Christ in early Christianity. In Hebrews, as in that early Christian tradition, Christ's blamelessness was seen to be moral . . . his offering was not made for his own needs.
>
> The "blood" so offered "will cleanse the conscience". . . . That Christ's death has a cleansing effect, washing away sins and purifying the heart, is also a traditional Christian affirmation[42]. . . .
>
> As a result of the cleansing is the ability to "serve the living God." The language of serving has cultic connotations, and these stand in continuity with the

[41] Physical perfection, which represents moral perfection, is also a requirement for animals offered at the earthly Tabernacle.

[42] "Cf. Acts 15:9; Tit 2:14; 1 John 1:7, 9. Such a traditional affirmation may also be behind the parable of the vine and vinedresser in John 15" (Attridge 252 n. 102).

> purification theme inspired by Numbers[43]. . . . In the metaphorical application of the theme of serving God that develops in Hebrews, "service" is certainly not focused upon a Christian cult. (Attridge 250-252)

While the earthly Tabernacle had to be cleansed on a yearly basis, Jesus' one sacrifice on the cross purified the heavenly Tabernacle for all time. His sacrifice fulfils the blood requirement to purify, for "under the law almost everything is purified with blood, and without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness of sins" (9:22) and the blood of Christ purified the heavenly Tabernacle, and therefore, in the author's scheme of things, fulfilled requirements for the levitical Tabernacle as well.

Unlike that in Leviticus, the description of the Tabernacle in Hebrews is minimalist. The author's concern is not so much the Tabernacle as it is the sacrifice of Jesus. Meaning in Hebrews rests entirely on the author's reinvention of the levitical Tabernacle and in the claim that the heavenly Tabernacle needs a greater sacrifice. Therefore, Jesus' sacrifice takes precedence over any hint of an attempt to describe the heavenly Tabernacle, "it was necessary for the sketches of the heavenly things to be purified with these rites, but the heavenly things themselves need better sacrifices than these. For Christ did not enter a sanctuary made by human hands, a mere copy of the true one, but he entered into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God on our behalf" (9:23-24). Freyne argues that "because [Hebrews] sees the earthly realities as copies of the true heavenly ones through which the blessings of the New Covenant are mediated, [Hebrews] spends very little narrative space in describing the heavenly realities themselves, though it repeatedly points to this antithetic pole of the contrasting typology

[43] "Cf. Num. 19:13, 20. Touching a corpse defiles the sanctuary, makes for ritual uncleanness, and prevents participation with the community in divine service" (Ibid, n. 111).

it is developing in chs. 8-10" (90). Clearly, the author makes no claims of any new revelation about the heavenly Tabernacle, instead, his silence seems to reflect a reversal of sorts – the levitical Tabernacle is now a textual/scriptural pattern for the heavenly Tabernacle.

3.3 Sacrifice

The elaborate details of the various sacrifices and offerings in Leviticus are lacking in Hebrews, but the proceedings of the Day of Atonement ritual are the basis for the author's presentation of sacrifice in Hebrews and, to that end, the fact that blood is a requirement as the chief medium of atonement is highlighted by the author (9:22). The sacrifice and blood of Jesus in Hebrews, as in the rest of the New Testament, are synonymous with Jesus' atoning and substitutionary sacrifice on the cross, "*once* for all" (9:12, emphasis mine), as a result of which He entered the heavenly Tabernacle:

> When on the cross he offered up his life to God as a sacrifice for his people's sin, he accomplished in reality what Aaron and his successors performed in type by the two fold act of slaying the victim and presenting its blood in the holy of holies. . . . And then "through his own blood" –that is, by virtue of the infinitely acceptable oblation of his life–he could appear before God, not on sufferance but by right, as his people's prevailing representative and high priest. The Aaronic high priests had to present themselves before God repeatedly, because such redemption as their ministry procured bore but a token and temporary character; but Christ entered in once for all, to be enthroned there in perpetuity, because the redemption procured by him is perfect in nature and eternal in effect. (Bruce 214)

While pointing to the efficacy of the levitical system in making atonement possible, given its limitations, namely that the ritual is repetitive and that it purifies externalities and does not clear people's consciences of guilt, the author's preoccupation is that the heavenly Tabernacle needs a better sacrifice. To this end, he sees Jesus' sacrifice as an offering that was appropriate (blood/body), pleasing (sinless), and sufficient (final) for the purposes of atonement:

> The blood of Jesus is better than that of the old covenant on being human blood, voluntarily offered, and therefore embracing a moral as well as a ritual dimension; it alone may truly be said to have intrinsic power as the body and blood of the one sent by God, a purifying and hallowing force coming into the defiled system from the outside; as such, it can be claimed to be different in kind, and therefore final and unique, leaving no need of repetition. That provides an answer to the problem of the Old Testament, but leaves the framework untouched. (Dunnill 231)

Through His blood, then, Jesus inaugurates the new covenant, has access to the heavenly Tabernacle, becomes the eternal High Priest, and does away with the shedding of sacrificial blood of animals for the atonement of sin. In yet another example of his use of Hebrew Scriptures, the author interprets Ps. 40:6-8 as Jesus' confession[44] to prove his point about the change initiated by Jesus' sacrifice. The innovation in this confession is that Jesus is both the priest and the sacrifice (victim), though He does not need to make the sacrifice for Himself[45], unlike the Aaronic priests who, on account of their humanity,

---

[44] "Consequently, when Christ came into the world, he said, 'Sacrifices and offerings you have not desired, but a body you have prepared for me; in burnt-offerings and sin-offerings you have taken no pleasure. Then I said, "See, God, I have come to do your will, O God" (in the scroll of the book it is written of me).' When he said above, 'You have neither desired nor taken pleasure in sacrifices and offerings and burnt-offerings and sin-offerings' (these are offered according to the law), then he added, 'See, I have come to do your will.' He abolishes the first in order to establish the second" (Hebrews 10:5-9).

[45] (Nelson 257).

have to offer sacrifices to make atonement for their own sins. Hubert and Mauss' definition[46] of sacrifice does not apply to Christ's sacrifice. Nelson, in his essay "'He Offered Himself': Sacrifice in Hebrews," explains, "[T]he beneficiary donor [is] the *sacrificant*, one who has a sacrifice performed for his or her benefit. The role is distinguished from that of the *sacrificateur*, the one who actually performs the sacrifice. Using these terms, Christ was the *sacrificateur* and victim, but had no need of being the *sacrificant*" (257-258).

The sacrificial system in Hebrews, based entirely on the levitical system is transformed into one that is required, but completed once and for all, both for the present and the future. The author's ingenuity in reinterpreting the levitical sacrificial system without discounting it in disparaging terms is the hallmark of his hermeneutical and exegetical expertise. This is clearly evident in his proposal that the sacrifice of Jesus is the final sacrifice that is required and therefore, in it, all other sacrifices are accounted for. In the levitical system, holiness is the mandate of the covenant and is entrenched in all aspects pertaining to the covenant, priesthood, and sacrifice. In Hebrews, holiness is specifically related to the sacrifice of Christ: "we have been *sanctified* through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all" (10:10, emphasis mine). To consolidate the notion that holiness is still a requirement of the new covenant as well, the author once again refers to the levitical system. He compares Jesus' crucifixion "outside the city" to the sin offering that was burnt outside the Israelite camp. Just as the former imputes holiness on the offerer, so also Jesus, through His death, transfers holiness to those who associate with Him, if they appropriate His sacrifice for themselves (13:11-13).

---

[46] See footnote 15.

The author's final exhortations are, "Through [Jesus], then, let us continually offer *a sacrifice of praise* to God, that is, the fruit of lips that confess his name" (13:15, emphasis mine). While the author never diminishes the significance of sacrifice, he offers a "new" perspective, informed possibly by LXX Ps. 49:12-15[47] and LXX Hos. 14:3[48], on what sacrifice means once blood sacrifices are no longer required (Bruce 383). Sacrifice takes on a new meaning, it is no longer associated with blood; instead, it is now associated with praise and thanksgiving for the one sacrifice that encompassed all others[49].

4. Thematic Unity and Contextual Diversity

Leviticus and Hebrews are not contemporaneous texts, neither are they alike in genre. The question of thematic unity in the two texts, then, is informed by the dependence of Hebrews on Leviticus. The author's primary method of communicating is one of introducing Scriptures, expounding the text, comparing, contrasting, and relating it to Jesus Christ, which accounts for the contextual diversity between the texts. In so doing, his primary aim is never to disparage the Hebrew Scriptures, but to highlight their role in fully understanding Jesus Christ and in presenting Him as coextensive with them. Even so, the author of Hebrews diminishes the significance of the ritual and ceremonial aspects pertaining to the covenant, priesthood, and sacrifice. However, he also makes it

[47] "If I were hungry, I would not tell you, for the world and all that is in it is mine. Do I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats? Offer to God a sacrifice of thanksgiving, and pay your vows to the Most High. Call on me in the day of trouble; I will deliver you, and you shall glorify me."
[48] "Take with you words, and turn to the Lord your God: speak to him, that ye may not receive *the reward of* unrighteousness, but that ye may receive good things: and we will render in return the fruit of our lips."
[49] According to Helmut Koester, "since the refuge of sacred places and cultic performances is abolished for those people who stay 'outside the camp' with Jesus, the sacrifices of God are rather thanksgiving and charity (Hebrews 13, 15-16)" (303).

clear that, apart from the basic framework of covenant, priesthood, and sacrifice, it is impossible to understand any conception of Jesus' relation to priesthood, sacrifice, and covenant. The author's perspective is governed by Hebrew Scriptures and in presenting this point of view in light of Jesus Christ, he maintains a fine balance negotiating between the two perspectives he presents; they are never in collision as much as one leading up to and giving way to the other, which then makes contextual diversity inevitable.

The central themes of Hebrews, though not identical, clearly are similar to those of Leviticus. The centrality of holiness representing God's presence in Israel and its implications in relation to the covenant, the Tabernacle, the sacrifices and offerings, and the priesthood, clearly hold Leviticus together. Holiness is the clue to deciphering the meaning of the rules and regulations surrounding the Tabernacle in Leviticus. In Hebrews, the context and meaning of the text are undergirded by Jesus as the Christ, as well as the fulfilment of the covenant, the priesthood, and the sacrifices in relation to the heavenly Tabernacle. In presenting Christ in connection with the new covenant, the author first presents the first covenant and Moses in relation to it. The author establishes Moses' role as the mediator and the central purpose of the covenant as one that defines God's relationship to Israel. Without this, his argument about the second covenant, for which he depends on Jeremiah, makes no thematic or textual sense. It is vitally clear that the author maintains the integrity of the original concept of covenant, mediation, and relationship intact and, in presenting the second covenant, he merely builds on the first covenant.

Regarding the priesthood and sacrifice, similarly, the author presents the importance of Aaron's mediatory role as High Priest at the earthly Tabernacle and only in

relation to it does he present the high priesthood of Jesus and the relevance of His sacrificial death. In so doing, he disassociates Jesus' sacrifice from the repetitiveness and impermanence of the Aaronic priesthood, but maintains the centrality of the requirement of mediation in a relationship between a holy God and sinful human beings. In his presentation of Jesus' priesthood, he is fully cognizant and conversant with the levitical system, for without it he could never present Jesus as the High Priest of the new covenant[50].

The Tabernacle proves the point of Hebrews' thematic dependence and contextual divergence more than any other textual motif. Section 3.2 in this chapter points out that the author of Hebrews does not describe the heavenly Tabernacle at which Jesus ministers; instead, he describes the earthly Tabernacle, which is based on the pattern shown by God to Moses. Hebrews merely appropriates what Hebrew Scriptures[51] preserve in terms of the earthly Tabernacle and its ministrations. The author's exposition of the levitical sacrificial system and the Day of Atonement rituals are a further example of his integrative approach at presenting Christ as a logical extension of the first covenant.

From the foregoing discussion, it can be deduced that thematically Hebrews and Leviticus are similar in their overarching treatments of covenant, priesthood, Tabernacle, and sacrifice, with the obvious difference that Hebrews introduces Jesus as the fulfilment of the Hebrew Scriptures. Contextually, Hebrews is defined primarily by Jesus Christ. While other aspects common to early Christian writings, such as responses to

---

[50] "The cultus is essentially a system of actions mediating between humanity and God, so 'understanding' it must involve entering into the assumptions and thought patterns intrinsic to that relationship but seldom made explicit in the procedural details down in the text . . . " (Dunnill 47).
[51] Exod. 25:9, 40; 26:30.

persecution, problems within fledgling Christian communities, the delay of the parousia, tensions between Jews and Gentiles, etc., could have informed the context, in Hebrews, Jesus' high priesthood is central.

5. Summary and Conclusion

The goal of this chapter was to provide a summary of Leviticus and Hebrews in relation to their central themes, namely: Tabernacle, covenant, priesthood, and sacrifice, and to highlight how meaning is constructed and constituted in these two texts. I demonstrated that, in Leviticus, the concept of holiness is a graded one, and this gradient is reflected in the ordering of sacred space, time, and personnel. The Tabernacle, the priesthood, and the system of sacrifices and offerings exemplify this holiness gradient, which in effect constitutes the meaning of the text. The importance of the larger Sinai covenant, including the discussion thereof in Exodus and Numbers, was taken into account in the description of the Tabernacle, which in Leviticus is the centre of all covenantal, priestly, and sacrificial activity. The discussion also highlighted the differences between the Sinai covenant and other Near Eastern suzerain-vassal covenants. The various offerings and sacrifices, the consecration of Aaron, his sons, and the Tabernacle, and the proceedings of the Day of Atonement, were presented as central to significance of the Tabernacle and to the meaning of Leviticus.

Hebrews was summarized using the same themes of priesthood, covenant, and sacrifice. The Tabernacle is not as straightforwardly tied to priesthood, covenant, and sacrifice in Hebrews, as much as it is connected to these concepts through the linkages already established in Leviticus. The author is heavily dependent on Leviticus for his

explorations of the heavenly Tabernacle, where Jesus ministers as High Priest of the new covenant. To this end, the author systematically compares, contrasts, abrogates, appropriates, and applies Hebrew Scriptures. However, the more significant conclusions of this chapter are that in both Leviticus and Hebrews the Tabernacle is defined by covenant, sacrifice, and priesthood. In Hebrews, the author is bound by the description of the Tabernacle given in Leviticus. In a reversal of sorts, the textual Tabernacle is now the pattern for the heavenly Tabernacle.

Chapter 3. TRANSTEXTUALITY IN THE LETTER TO THE HEBREWS

1. Intertextuality

> [A]lthough the concept [of intertextuality] has been coined under the auspices of postmodernism, [it] is a phenomenon that is not restricted to postmodernist writing at all. From the earliest traceable origins onwards, literary texts have always referred not only to reality (*imitatio vitae*), but also to previous other texts (*imitatio veterum*), and the various intertextual practices of alluding and quoting, of paraphrasing and translating, of continuation and adaptation, of parody and travesty flourished in periods long before postmodernism. . . . (Pfister 209-210)

As Manfred Pfister points out, the concept of intertextuality is not new; texts have borrowed from, imitated, and influenced each other since time immemorial. However, intertextuality, popularized by literary theorists and semioticians in the twentieth century, has substantially expanded its purview as a theoretical framework with which to analyse the relatedness of texts. In my first chapter, I stated that the interrelatedness of the Letter to the Hebrews and the Hebrew Scriptures is the principal problem that this dissertation seeks to address. Reviewing the implications of intertextuality as a theoretical and methodological framework, I argued that intertextuality as explained by Kristeva is not complementary with biblical scholarship, and instead I proposed Genette's model of transtextuality as a viable framework to analyse texts such as Hebrews. The major difference between Kristeva's and Genette's models of textual relatedness lies in the post-structuralist and structuralist paradigms on which they are modelled respectively.

Pfister notes that "in [the] structuralist version of intertextuality the author retains authority over the text, the unity and autonomy of the text remain intact, and the reader does not get lost in a labyrinthine network of possible references but realizes the author's intentions by decoding the signals and markers into the text" (210). This is particularly significant when considering the author's choice of texts from the Hebrew Scriptures, which sets Hebrews apart from other New Testament texts. To better comprehend and appreciate the dependence of Hebrews on Hebrew Scriptures, chapter two focused on highlighting the complex relationship of Hebrews to Leviticus and how meaning is constructed in the texts. The aim of this chapter is to categorize Hebrews in light of Genette's paradigm in order to isolate his textual categories, such as quotations, allusions, commentaries, and the like, in Hebrews. This, in turn, will help develop a taxonomy that will further existing understanding of Hebrews' appropriation of and dependence on Hebrew Scriptures in general and Leviticus in particular. Further, based on this taxonomy, the present chapter focuses on thematic and metaphoric transformations in Hebrews.

2. Genette's Transtextuality

Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree (henceforth *Palimpsests*) is Genette's seminal work on transtextuality. Using a structuralist framework, Genette defines transtextuality as "all that sets the text in relationship, whether obvious or concealed, with other texts" (1). In *Palimpsests*, Genette further categorizes transtextuality into five different types, namely intertextuality, paratextuality, metatextuality, architextuality, and hypertextuality. According to Genette,

"transformation" is one of the principal methods that authors employ in relating their texts to other texts. This is evidenced in the use of textual categories, such as quotation, allusion, summary, and commentary, which are emblematic of the different types of textual relationships. The following table is an attempt to present Genette's description of the various types of transtextuality in a cohesive format.

Table II: TYPES OF TRANSTEXTUALITY[52]

TYPE OF TRANSTEXTUALITY	DEFINITION	TEXTUAL CATEGORIES
1. Intertextuality	"[A] relationship of copresence between two texts or among several texts: that is to say, eidetically and typically as the actual presence of one text within another" (1-2)	"In its most explicit and literal form, it is the traditional practice of *quoting* (with quotation marks, with or without specific references). . . . [A] less explicit and canonical form . . .[is] *plagiarism* . . . [and in] still less explicit and less literal guise, it is . . . *allusion*" (2)
2. Paratextuality	This "second type is the generally less explicit and more distant relationship that binds the text properly speaking, taken within the totality of the literary work, to what can be called its *paratext*" (3)	"[A] title, a subtitle, intertitles; prefaces, postfaces, notices, forewords, etc.; marginal, infrapaginal, terminal notes; epigraphs; illustrations; blurbs, book covers, dust jackets, and many other kinds of secondary signals, whether allographic or autographic . . . . [T]he "foretext" of the various rough drafts,

[52] All quotations in the table are from Genette's *Palimpsests*.

TYPE OF TRANSTEXTUALITY	DEFINITION	TEXTUAL CATEGORIES
		outlines, and projects of a work can also function as a paratext" (3)
3. Metatextuality	"It unites a given text to another, of which it speaks without necessarily citing it . . . in fact sometimes even without naming it" (4)	". . . is the relationship most often labeled "commentary" (4)
4. Architextuality	". . . the most abstract and most implicit of all. . . . It involves a relationship that is completely silent, articulated at most only by a paratextual mention, which can be titular . . . or most often subtitular . . . [and] is appended to the title . . . but which remains in any case of a purely taxonomic nature. When this relationship is unarticulated, it may be because of a refusal to underscore the obvious or, conversely, an intent to reject or elude any kind of classification" (4)	". . . the entire set of general or transcendent categories– types of discourse, modes of enunciation, literary genres– from which emerges each singular text" (1)
5. Hypertextuality	"[A]ny relationship uniting a text B (which I shall call the *hypertext*) to an earlier text A (I shall . . . call it the *hypotext*), upon which it is grafted in a manner that is not that of a commentary. . . . Hypertext . . . is any text derived from a previous	parody, travesty, pastiche, caricature, forgery, translation, digest, and summary represent hypertextuality

TYPE OF TRANSTEXTUALITY	DEFINITION	TEXTUAL CATEGORIES
	text either through simple transformation, which I shall simply call . . . *transformation* or through indirect transformation, which I shall label *imitation* (5,7)	

Genette's working definition of transtextuality is operational through the various textual categories that represent the five different kinds of transtextuality. However, Genette also states that these five categories do not necessarily exist in isolation; instead,

> their relationships to one another are numerous and often crucial. For example, generic architextuality is, historically, almost always constituted by way of imitation . . . hence by way of hypertextuality. The architextual appurtenance of a given work is frequently announced by way of paratextual clues. These in themselves often initiate a metatext ("this book is a novel"), and the paratext, whether prefatory or other, contains many more forms of commentary. The hypertext, too, often acts as a commentary. . . . The critical metatext can be conceived of, but is hardly ever practiced, without the often considerable use of quotational intertext as support. (7-8)

Genette's work on various types of literatures, spanning diverse genres and historical periods, fully exemplifies his theoretical proposition. In what follows, I propose to analyse Hebrews in light of Genette's framework of transtextuality in a way that sheds new light on the interrelatedness of the entire text of Hebrews and the Hebrew Scriptures

with particular emphasis on Leviticus. Further, this analysis will also be the basis for a closer examination of the various transformations in Hebrews.

2.1 Transtextuality: Hebrews and Hebrew Scriptures

From my analysis of the transtextual relation of Hebrews to Hebrew Scriptures, set out in the transtextuality chart (Appendix II), it is clear that the author's use of Hebrew Scriptures is a reflection of an extraordinary dependence on Hebrew Scriptures that is unparalleled among New Testament writings. I agree with Elke Tönges, who argues that "The author does not just adopt these Jewish traditions, but forms them into an immense intertextual network. . . . The text never refers to non-Jewish traditions, nor does it cite Greek or Roman literature" (89). Based on the evidence drawn from the transtextuality chart, my preliminary conclusion is that the primary way in which Hebrews relates to Hebrew Scriptures is through quotations: Approximately seventy-five quotations punctuate the author's text.

The second-largest textual category in Hebrews is that of allusions, numbering around seventy. In Genette's paradigm, this is clearly symptomatic of what he classifies as intertextuality, which, as stated above, is "a relationship of copresence between two texts or among several texts: that is to say, eidetically and typically as the actual presence of one text within another" (*Palimpsests* 2). Besides quotations and allusions, the author of Hebrews also includes his commentaries to many of these texts from the Hebrew Scriptures. This phenomenon is representative of metatextuality. Hypertextuality is a third type of transtextuality at work in Hebrews; however, it is less frequent in its occurrence than examples of intertextuality and metatextuality. The textual category of summary, together with commentary/allusion, is operational predominantly in relation to

the description of the Tabernacle based on Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers[53] in Heb. 9:2-5:

> For a tent was constructed, the first one, in which were the lampstand, the table, and the bread of the Presence; this is called the Holy Place. Behind the second curtain was a tent called the Holy of Holies. In it stood the golden altar of incense and the ark of the covenant overlaid on all sides with gold, in which there were a golden urn holding the manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tablets of the covenant; above it were the cherubim of glory overshadowing the mercy-seat. Of these things we cannot speak now in detail.

The passage quoted above exemplifies how the various forms of transtextuality function in conjunction with each other, which, according to Genette, is typical (*Palimpsests* 7-8).

The author's use of quotations, allusions, commentaries, and summaries categorizes the three types of transtextual relationships that are at work in Hebrews. From a systemic view of the text, the author uses quotations for many reasons, but his predominant rationale seems to be to prove Jesus' identity. He also uses Hebrew Scriptures to admonish and encourage his readers and to prove to them that they have a rich heritage together with the ancient Hebrews. The texts that are quoted include: Ps. 2:7, 2 Sam. 7:14, 1 Chron. 17:13 in relation to Jesus' Sonship; LXX Deut. 32:43; LXX Ps. 96:7; 103:4; 44:6-8; 101:25-27; 109; 143:3; Job 7:17; Ps. 8; Zech. 12:1; Isa. 34:4, 51:6; to authenticate Jesus' role as creator and His superiority over angels; to prove His relationship to humanity, the author of Hebrews quotes LXX Ps. 21:22; Isa. 8:17-18. The author introduces Jesus' relation to Moses with great care. His choice of Num. 12:7 is

[53] The texts from which Hebrews, the hypertext, borrows, namely, Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers are hypotexts.

indicative of his giving Moses the prime position of having set the standard in terms of "serving" God. In this comparison, Jesus' service is evaluated against that of Moses; the author uses a non-scriptural analogy of a house and its builder – Heb. 3:3-6 to further highlight the equality in Jesus' and Moses' faithful service to God while presenting them as unique in their roles as Son and servant[54]; quotations from LXX Ps. 109 announce Jesus' high priesthood in the line of Melchizedek instead of the levitical line of priesthood; in conjunction with Jesus' high priesthood, the author quotes LXX Jer. 38:31-34 to support his position that Jesus' high priesthood is a fulfillment of Jeremiah's prophecy of the new covenant; Jesus' sacrificial death, resurrection, and reign are authenticated by quotations from LXX Ps. 39 and Ps. 109.

By quoting LXX Ps. 94:8-12, the author of Hebrews contextualizes the offer of entering God's rest as a contemporaneous invitation for his audience, while alluding to Num. 14:2, 20-23, 29 and Deut. 1:34, 35 to highlight the fact that the offer will not be useful to his audience if they do not accept it with faith. The author carries forward his line of argument about the offer of rest and the importance of faith and obedience by quoting LXX Ps. 94:8, 11 once again. The author's motive in using Hebrew Scriptures in relation to his audience, as mentioned above, seems to be to highlight their heritage through Scripture. The author's systematic and calculated use of stories of heroes of the faith is evident in his quotations, allusions, summary statements, and commentaries from the Hebrew Scriptures. The author's list includes Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Sarah, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Rahab, Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthah, David, Samuel[55], and many more whom he mentions by their acts of faith rather than by their names. His

[54] See also section three of chapter two of this dissertation.
[55] The author alludes to the incident of Esau selling his birthright (Gen. 25:25-29) and admonishes his audience with his commentary on the episode not to be like Esau (Heb. 12:16-17).

quotations and allusions span the length and breadth of the Hebrew Scriptures: Genesis, Exodus, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, Daniel, and Chronicles.

From the description of the author's use of Scripture thus far, two features emerge: firstly, for the author, any reference to Hebrew Scriptures is presented as fact or truth. This is particularly evident in his use of quotations, where he cautiously appropriates texts to prove his point about Jesus' identity as the Christ and His relation to Hebrew Scriptures. Secondly, he presents the history and heritage of the Hebrew Scriptures as belonging to his audience as much as they did to the ancients. This is best exemplified in his presenting God and Scripture, which is God's Word, as one, making his point by alluding to Isa. 55:11 and Jer. 23:29, "Indeed, the word of God is living and active, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing until it divides soul from spirit, joints from marrow; it is able to judge the thoughts and intentions of the heart. And before him no creature is hidden, but all are naked and laid bare to the eyes of the one to whom we must render an account" (Heb. 4:12). From the author's systematic use of Scripture, it is clear that Scripture holds a prime place in his idiolect and also informs his theology.

2.2 Transtextuality: Hebrews and Leviticus

In the previous chapter, I dealt with the dependence of Hebrews on Leviticus in terms of the concepts of priesthood, covenant, and sacrifice. I concluded that the Tabernacle theme in Hebrews is inextricably tied to the pattern of the earthly Tabernacle as presented in the Sinai covenant. This section elaborates on the author's transtextual use of Leviticus in relation to the Tabernacle theme. As is evident from the transtextuality chart, the author's use of Leviticus is limited to fourteen references, none of which is a quotation. The presence of Leviticus in Hebrews is characterized by allusions to the

levitical priestly system of sacrifices and offerings made at the Tabernacle and the High Priest's central role on the Day of Atonement on behalf of the community. These allusions are supported by the author's commentaries that reflect his theological purposes in presenting Jesus as the High Priest who ministers at the heavenly Tabernacle.

Alluding to Lev. 1-7, 8, and 16, the author introduces the Aaronic High Priest in relation to his duties, highlighting his humanity and, by extension, his sinfulness. In contrast to the Aaronic High Priest, the author introduces Jesus as human, but different from Aaron:

> Every High Priest chosen from among mortals is put in charge of things pertaining to God on their behalf, to offer gifts and sacrifices for sins. He is able to deal gently with the ignorant and wayward, since he himself is subject to weakness; and because of this he must offer sacrifice for his own sins as well as for those of the people. And one does not presume to take this honour, but takes it only when called by God, just as Aaron was. . . . In the days of his flesh, Jesus offered up prayers and supplications, with loud cries and tears, to the one who was able to save him from death, and he was heard because of his reverent submission. (Heb. 5:1-4, 7)

In what follows, the author's commentary makes a case for Jesus' high priesthood based on levitical priesthood. Jesus is "appointed" by God (v. 5) like every High Priest of the Aaronic line. However, unlike those of the Aaronic priests, His offerings involve intercessory prayers "with loud cries and tears" (v. 7). Jesus is different in two other respects as well; He is the Son who, through His suffering, learnt obedience and "was

made perfect" (v. 8-9) and, as a result, became the "source of eternal salvation" (v. 9), which an Aaronic priest, constrained by his humanity and mortality, could never be.

The next allusion is to Lev. 16:2 in Heb. 6:19-20, "We have this hope, a sure and steadfast anchor of the soul, a hope that enters the inner shrine behind the curtain, where Jesus, a forerunner on our behalf, has entered, having become a High Priest for ever according to the order of Melchizedek." In this text, the author's allusion to the Tabernacle is poignant and deliberate. The author refers to the Tabernacle and juxtaposes the inner sanctuary with Jesus' high priesthood. Clearly, the author is alluding to the proceedings of the Day of Atonement, where the Aaronic High Priest enters the Most Holy Place once a year to make atonement for himself and for the entire community. In contrast to the Aaronic High Priest, Jesus is presented as the "forerunner on our behalf" (v. 20), with an eternal priesthood in the "line of Melchizedek." The author's attention is turned to proving the validity, centrality, and significance of Melchizedek and his priestly line to fortify his case for Jesus' high priesthood as originating in a pre- and non-levitical source. He ends this commentary by alluding to Lev. 1-7, 16 and 23 in Heb. 7:27-28:

> Unlike the other High Priests, he has no need to offer sacrifices day after day, first for his own sins, and then for those of the people; this he did once for all when he offered himself. For the law appoints as High Priests those who are subject to weakness, but the word of the oath, which came later than the law, appoints a Son who has been made perfect forever.

The author's detailed excurses on Melchizedek seemingly marginalize his allusions to Leviticus, in particular references to the Tabernacle, sacrifices, offerings, and to the

Aaronic priesthood. This peripheral status of Leviticus is evidenced again in the author's seemingly casual allusion to Lev. 1-7, 16, and 23 in Heb. 8:3-4.

However, this pattern of using Leviticus is modified by the author's references to various aspects of the Tabernacle when presenting Jesus' high-priestly sacrifice. In Heb. 9:1-2, 7, 12, and 22, he alludes to Lev. 10:3; 8:15; 16:11-19, 34; 17:11; 24:5-8:

> Now even the first covenant had regulations for worship and an earthly sanctuary. For a tent was constructed, the first one, in which were the lampstand, the table, and the bread of the Presence; this is called the Holy Place. . . .
>
> [B]ut only the high priest goes into the second, and he but once a year, and not without taking the blood that he offers for himself and for the sins committed unintentionally by the people. . . .
>
> [H]e entered once for all into the Holy Place, not with the blood of goats and calves, but with his own blood, thus obtaining eternal redemption. . . .
>
> Indeed, under the law almost everything is purified with blood, and without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness of sins.

The pivotal point of the author's argument rests on his allusions to the high-priestly activities of the Day of Atonement. He starts his discourse with a general description of the stipulations for worship at the earthly Tabernacle. He describes the Tabernacle briefly as divided into the outer court, or the Holy Place, which contains the accessories pertaining to worship, such as "the lampstand, the table, and the bread." In his second allusion in this context, he introduces the priestly activity in the second court, or the Most Holy Place. The author's brevity and his succinct description of the activities of the Day

of Atonement are crucial[56], particularly in light of his primary concern, which is to present Jesus' role in His sacrificial death both as the one who is offering the sacrifice i.e., the High Priest and the victim whose blood takes the place of the "blood of goats and calves." The author's discourse on the Day of Atonement ends with his restating the centrality of blood, which is required for the atonement of sin. In his use of allusions from Leviticus, the author fuses the concepts of covenant, priesthood, and sacrifice together with the Tabernacle, as is evident in the texts cited above.

The final set of allusions to Lev. 4:12, 21; 9:11; 16:15, 27 is located in Heb. 13:10-11:[57]

> We have an altar from which those who officiate in the tent have no right to eat. For the bodies of those animals whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the High Priest as a sacrifice for sin are burned outside the camp. Therefore Jesus also suffered outside the city gate in order to sanctify the people by his own blood. Let us then go to him outside the camp and bear the abuse he endured.

This allusion combines two sacrifices of the levitical system, namely the sin offering[58] and the Day of Atonement offering. The author's master stroke in alluding to the two

---

[56] "[The] central argument [of Hebrews] straightforwardly expounds the death and exaltation of Jesus as fulfillment of the Day of Atonement ritual, and in particular (ignoring) the scapegoat rite the entry of the high priest into the Holy of Holies. . . . The once-a-year event is treated as anticipatory of the once-for-all (9:7-12), and, taking seriously the cosmic properties of the [Tabernacle], the entry into the shrine is fused with Jesus' entry into heaven. The symbolic value of this definite movement, 'drawing near' is very fully exploited in the letter, as is the movement's goal, the personal encounter of humanity with God in his holiest place, which is contrasted with the impersonal symbolism more generally employed (9:9f 10:4) as well as with the disjunctive ideology it expresses (9:18-22, 12:18-21).

The complex procedures of the Day are for the purpose of argument reduced to this one entry of the high priest bearing (his own) blood. The atoning sacrifice is therefore a single, completed, past event (9:11, 27f), but 'Today' is still the Day of Atonement, for time has stood still. Whereas the old covenant was marked by multiple and repeated sacrifices (9:6f, 10:11), so that a cycle of time was intrinsic to its operation, the new covenant has one sacrifice already made once for all on this day, and the continuation of chronological time has no interest for the author" (Dunnill 140).

[57] This last set of allusions follows Heb. 10:3, referring to Lev. 16:34, and Heb. 10:19, referring to Lev. 16:2, which rehearse the activities of the Day of Atonement.

[58] For a detailed description of the sin offering see section 2.3.4 of chapter two.

sacrifices related exclusively to sin in the levitical system once again proves the author's central concern with presenting Jesus not only as the ultimate, irreplaceable sacrifice for sin, but also as completely entrenched in the levitical system. His reference to Jesus' crucifixion "outside the city gate," in conjunction with sacrifices that were burnt "outside the camp," connects the crucifixion and the levitical system inextricably. Once again, the author's point seems to be that, apart from the levitical system, the discourse surrounding Jesus' sacrifice makes no sense. The author uses allusions, supported by his commentary, to make and prove these linkages. Further, using this final allusion to Leviticus, the author encourages his community to be deliberate in their confession of Jesus, and thereby also challenges them to make their faith public.

3. Transformations in Hebrews

From the foregoing analysis, it is amply clear that the primary textual categories the author of Hebrews uses in relation to Leviticus are allusions and commentaries; this, in turn, reflects intertextual and metatextual relations between Hebrews and Leviticus. The present section deals with thematic transformations in Hebrews, worked out in its appropriation and use of sacrificial metaphors from Leviticus. The principal concepts that are transformed in relation to the levitical system, particularly the Tabernacle, are the cultic concepts of priesthood, sacrifice, and offerings. The thematic transformations are selective and governed chiefly by the author's Christ-centred theology. As mentioned in chapter one, this process of transformation is known as metaphorization, which is "at work between the encompassing narrative and the embedded narrative" (Ricoeur 1995, 150). Genette's paradigm of transtextuality helps decipher the various textual relations

between Hebrews and the Hebrew Scriptures; however, it does not account for deeper levels of transformation, particularly at the level of metaphoric appropriations, as Genette "decries the progressive reduction of the multiplicity of figures . . . to the single category 'metaphor'" (Groden 430). In the section that follows, I further analyse the various transformations effected by Hebrews on the metaphors of sacrifice borrowed from Leviticus. The texts analysed in section 2.2 of this chapter are the focus.

4. Metaphors of Sacrifice in Hebrews

Firstly, Jesus "offered prayers and supplications" (Heb. 5:7), unlike the Aaronic High Priest, who only presents offerings and sacrifices. The author's transformation of the sacrificial system is subtle yet substantial. Offering prayers and making supplications are not new to the Hebrew Scriptures, as the various examples of personal and corporate prayer indicate, for example Ps. 22, 51, 73, 116, 1 Sam. 1:10-16[59]. However, it is significant that the author transforms the high-priestly role in Hebrews in relation to Leviticus because of Jesus. He also alters the high-priestly activity of making offerings and sacrifices to include intercession. Leviticus is silent about the High Priest's role as intercessor; the author of Hebrews keeps the levitical system intact, but introduces the new element of verbal intercession, presents Jesus as the one exemplar of such mediation, and introduces intercession as an "offering." This transformation, effected by the author, could very well be based on accounts of Jesus' suffering in relation to His crucifixion; however, it is significant that the author integrates it into the levitical system. As Christian Eberhart points out, "[i]t does not matter if [Heb. 5:7] is understood as an

[59] See also Eberhart 55.

allusion to the struggle in Gethsemane, or as referring to general mortality as a feature of human existence already implied in the first words in Heb. 5:7, 'in the days of his flesh.' Either way, in subtle fashion Hebrews associates sacrificial terminology with the death of Christ" (56). The effect of this transformation is both semantic and thematic; keeping the primary framework of the levitical system intact, the author presents the new element of intercession, which is an introduction to the author's subsequent argument about access to the heavenly Tabernacle through Jesus' sacrifice.

Secondly, Jesus, "a forerunner[60] on our behalf, has entered [the Most Holy Place], having become a High Priest for ever . . ." (Heb. 6:20). Jesus, while likened to the High Priest because He has access to the Most Holy Place, is introduced as a pioneer. The author's suggestion that the Most Holy Place is accessible after Jesus' entry into it is yet another nuanced and innovative interpretation of the high-priestly office associated with Jesus. Through Jesus, the Most Holy Place in the heavenly Tabernacle becomes accessible with none of the constraints or restrictions that limited the levitical High Priest's entry into the earthly Tabernacle to the annual Day of Atonement to make atonement for himself and for the community. Building on the first transformation of intercession as part of Jesus' high-priestly activity, the author transforms the high-priestly office once again by adding another element of Jesus' eternal priesthood, namely His being a representative on behalf of the believing community.

Thirdly, Jesus, "has no need to offer sacrifices day after day, first for his own sins, and then for those of the people; this he did once for all when he offered himself. . . . [H]e entered once for all into the Holy Place, not with the blood of goats and calves, but with

[60] "The epithet of Jesus who entered into the true inner sanctuary, 'forerunner' (*πρόδρομος*), appears only here in the New Testament. . . . Whether as a military or athletic metaphor, the title suggests the basic soteriological pattern of Hebrews" (Attridge 185).

his own blood, thus obtaining eternal redemption" (Heb. 7:27; 9:12). The author essentially changes the principal events of the Day of Atonement; firstly, Jesus, as the sinless High Priest, does not have to offer blood to atone for His own sin, but instead offers Himself as the sacrifice. Secondly, His blood replaces the "blood of goats and calves" and, being the perfect, sinless sacrifice, He brings about eternal redemption from sin. The high point of the author's transformation is the presentation of the crucifixion as pertaining to the sacrificial language and system of Leviticus. In analysing the author's use of sacrificial metaphors, Eberhart argues that

> The focus of the whole argumentation in Heb 9 has been that Christ's sacrifice offered once for all is better than the repeated sacrifices offered in the levitical cult. It may be pointed out that throughout this argumentation, the general validity of the cult has remained unquestioned. The soteriological concept of Christ's sacrifice and the purification it effects are developed in analogy to the levitical sacrifice, which means that the latter is taken for granted so that the validity of the earlier can be derived from it. (59)

This transformation of the levitical system is not subtle; instead, it is deliberate and undeniable. Even so, the sacrificial system of Leviticus is embedded in the presentation of Jesus' sacrifice in Hebrews. It is reinterpreted by the various aspects of both Jesus' role as High Priest and His self-sacrifice. Jesus is essentially the all-encompassing, sinless High Priest, who sacrifices Himself and who also brings about "eternal salvation," clearing guilty consciences. By being the "forerunner"[61] who has entered the heavenly

[61] According to Lindars, "Entry beyond the veil symbolises direct access to God which belongs to the eschatological age. It is available already through Jesus, because in his priestly act of sacrifice he passed beyond the veil as our 'forerunner' (*prodromos* = the advance party in a military campaign), which is another way of referring to him as a 'pioneer' (2.10). Direct access to God requires the removal of the

Tabernacle, He paves the way for others to follow. This potential access is only hinted at, through the use of the term "forerunner," and is not really developed; however, in my opinion this is a new and non-levitical element in Hebrews. The restricted access to the Most Holy Place is the most distinctive feature of the functioning of the Tabernacle, to the point that even the High Priest's life is at risk during his annual entrance into it. The author of Hebrews works with these very modalities and ushers in a future of accessibility into the heavenly Tabernacle, of which the earthly Tabernacle is a pattern.

Fourthly, in Heb. 13:10-12, the author fuses metaphors pertaining to the sin offering and the Day of Atonement, and transposes them in relation to Jesus: "We have an altar from which those who officiate in the tent have no right to eat. For the bodies of those animals whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the High Priest as a sacrifice for sin are burned outside the camp. Therefore Jesus also suffered outside the city gate in order to sanctify the people by his own blood." As pointed out earlier, in this final allusion to Leviticus, the author once again brings together the key elements of the sin offering and the Day of Atonement: the Tabernacle, the priesthood, and the sacrifice. The meat of the sacrificed animals, that of a sin offering made on behalf of a priest, and that of the animals slaughtered on the Day of Atonement are not eaten; instead, the bodies of the sacrificed animals are to be burnt outside the camp. Building on this common element, the author fuses Jesus and the levitical system at three levels.

Firstly, the author refers to the carcasses of the animals that are burnt outside the camp on the Day of Atonement. The author transforms this aspect of the levitical system; he presents Jesus' crucifixion as equivalent to the animal carcasses being burnt outside

---

barrier of sin. Jesus has done this because he is 'a high priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek' (6:20)" (1991, 71).

the camp. As mentioned above, the burning of animal carcasses is specific to the Day of Atonement and the sin offering. Through this allusion, the author refers to the one common element in the regular sin offering and the Day of Atonement sacrifices, which is that the bodies of the slaughtered animals are burnt outside the camp (Lev. 4:21; 9:10-11; 16:15, 27; Exod. 29:14). In equating Jesus' sacrifice with that of the animal carcasses that were burnt outside the camp, the author presents the crucifixion in a way that is unfamiliar to New Testament writings. His interpretation of the crucifixion of Jesus in this way captures the central rationale of the Tabernacle – to make atonement for sin, as Jesus is the sin offering "burnt" *outside the city*. While many commentators point out that this is a reference to the Day of Atonement ritual[62], I argue that, by combining the most significant elements of the two sacrifices specifically relating to the atonement of sin, the author makes room for a fusion of the two offerings as well, thereby covering all aspects related to sin. This interpretation fits the author's claim that Jesus' sacrifice has accounted for Sin, and by His death, Jesus has "destroy[ed] the one who has the power of death, that is, the devil" (Heb. 2:14). Thus, the author's "overall Christological program set out in Heb. 2:14 that salvation is accomplished through Christ's death" (Eberhart 57) finds fulfilment in Heb. 13:11, which leads the author to introduce another form of sacrifice, "Through him, then, let us continually offer a *sacrifice of praise* to God, that is, the fruit of lips that confess his name" (Heb. 13:15, emphasis mine).

Secondly, unlike his other allusions to Jesus' sacrifice, in this instance, the author's focus is the associated aspect of the carcasses of the animals that are burnt

[62] Attridge, 397; Bruce, 378-380; Lane, 539-540. Morris states that this text possibly refers to both the sin offering and Day of Atonement; however, he argues that the latter is preferable because "there have been references to the Day of Atonement earlier in the epistle, which also seems to fit the present passage better than the other sin offerings" (150).

"outside the camp."[63] This element of the sacrifice is transformed by the author to refer to Jesus' crucifixion "outside the city." The levitical "outside the camp" becomes the "outside the city" of Hebrews. Thirdly, I venture to propose that the city can be seen as the Tabernacle;[64] the Tabernacle is metaphorically extended to include and signify the city as well. By leaving the city unnamed, the author makes his location coterminous with Jerusalem, for Jesus was crucified at Golgotha, which is located outside of Jerusalem.

In this allusion, more than any other, the author ties the levitical community and his own community together through the appropriation of a common heritage based on Hebrew Scriptures. He speaks of the two communities as one, but highlights Jesus' sacrifice while maintaining the levitical system and its heritage intact. This suggestion contradicts earlier interpretations that this pericope, particularly the "altar," refers to the Lord's Table and its associated Christian implications. I agree with Dunnill, who claims that "it is more plausible to argue that the eucharist plays no part at all in the author's thinking, or that it is consciously excluded, than to find in the cultic imagery grounds for detecting here a fully institutionalized practice" (259).

In sum, the author's use of sacrificial metaphors from Leviticus is in line with his agenda of presenting Jesus as the hermeneutical key, and the centre piece of the thematic transformations that are operational in Hebrews. It is noteworthy that the author exercises extreme care in maintaining the sacrificial metaphors related to the levitical system as the

---

[63] "For Hebrews, 'outside the camp' is identical with the worldliness of the world itself and the place where men are exposed to the experience of this world rather than secluded and protected from it" (Koester, 1962, 302).

[64] My suggestion of reading the city as equivalent to the Tabernacle, though not explicit in Hebrews, is clearly in line with the eschatological ideals of early Christian writings, such as Revelation, where Jerusalem is presented as the heavenly city: "And I saw the holy city, the new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God. . . . And in the spirit he carried me away to a great, high mountain and showed me the holy city Jerusalem coming down out of heaven from God" (Rev. 21:2, 10). See also Freyne (1989, 83-93).

primary signifiers that point to the new signified[65], which is the sacrifice of Jesus on the cross. The intricate linkages that the author establishes between Jesus and particularly the Day of Atonement further signify that, apart from the sacrificial system of Leviticus, the cross is inscrutable. Further, I propose that the author's use of allusions and commentaries instead of quotations seems to be a deliberate choice to suit his hermeneutical purposes. This usage leads to the conclusion that allusions allow the author the latitude to transfer the sacrificial metaphors of Leviticus onto Jesus' sacrifice, while maintaining their significance and centrality.

5. Summary and Conclusion

This chapter set out to analyse the interrelatedness of Hebrews and Hebrew Scriptures. I used Genette's model of transtextuality as the theoretical framework to identify the various ways in which Hebrews depends on Hebrew Scriptures. Using the transtextuality chart as a tool to map the relation of Hebrews to Hebrew Scriptures, I was able to demonstrate that it is based on quotations, allusions, commentaries, and summaries. Within Genette's paradigm, this meant that there are three kinds of transtextual relations, namely intertextuality, metatextuality, and hypertextuality. As Genette points out, these concepts are not mutually exclusive; this is evident in Hebrews, which makes use of quotations, allusions, commentaries, and summaries in conjunction with each other.

---

[65] "Saussure divides the sign into two parts: the *signifier* and the *signified.* The signifier is the material 'sound pattern', a written word, whilst the signified is the concept associated with that particular signifier. For Saussure signs do not refer directly to things in the real world but have their meaning in terms of the relation between signifiers and signifieds, depending upon the synchronic system of language and its rules and codes of association, combination, definition and distinction" (Allen 218).

This chapter also dealt extensively with the use of quotations from the Hebrew Scriptures in Hebrews; the author uses quotations primarily to authenticate Jesus' humanity, Sonship, and high priesthood in relation to His sacrifice, and to also prove and reinforce the community's heritage via the Hebrew Scriptures. In contrast to this, the chapter also drew attention to the fact that the author's dependence on Leviticus is marked by allusions to the levitical system. Through the analysis of the author's use of allusions, I argued that the author presents Jesus' sacrifice as intricately and inextricably tied to the levitical system. The author's use of allusions in relation to Leviticus also seems to allow the author the room to present the Tabernacle as transcendent (heavenly) and immanent (Hebrew Scriptures) simultaneously. In analysing the transformations that are at work in Hebrews, my analysis focused on metaphors of sacrifice that are central to Leviticus, which the author transforms for his purpose of presenting Jesus as the ultimate sacrifice for Sin. Beginning with the introduction of verbal intercession as distinguishing Jesus' high priesthood to the high point of equating Jesus' sacrifice with the carcasses of the animals burnt outside the city/camp, the transformations the author introduces are substantial and consequential. They all point to the centrality of Jesus' sacrifice as the culmination of the levitical system. To this end, the centrality of the Tabernacle as the meeting ground between a holy and awesome God and sinful human beings is maintained as the primary signifier and the new signified of Jesus' "once for all" (9:12) sacrifice primarily transforms the repetitive aspect while maintaining the eternality of the Tabernacle through Jesus as the High Priest ministering at the heavenly Tabernacle.

In the foregoing analysis of Hebrews, I have shown that the conceptual framework of transtextuality is central to understanding the interrelatedness between

Hebrews and Hebrew Scriptures. The plethora of texts that are an integral part of the author's repertoire are representative of more than a casual acquaintance with the Hebrew Scriptures. I have argued that the Hebrew Scriptures and, more importantly, Leviticus, are foundational in the way the author constructs meaning in Hebrews; these texts are the author's framework to establish his Jesus-centred, soteriological hermeneutic. In sum, transtextuality is extremely helpful in analysing the relation of Hebrew Scriptures to Hebrews.

Chapter 4. THE USE OF HEBREW SCRIPTURES IN THE LETTER TO THE HEBREWS

1. Hebrew Scriptures and the New Testament

Within the larger Greco-Roman context, the use of Hebrew Scriptures in the first century was simultaneously widespread and idiosyncratic. Along with the early Christian communities, the Qumran community and the Rabbis of the first century, besides other groups, were dependent on the Hebrew Scriptures. Each of these groups produced their own texts and theologies by appropriating, interpreting, and applying the Hebrew Scriptures to their particular contexts. So also the New Testament authors depended on the Hebrew Scriptures as their primary source from which they developed their theology. The uniqueness of the New Testament authors' appropriation and application of the Hebrew Scriptures lies in their hermeneutics based on the revelation of Jesus as the Messiah. New Testament authors formulated and developed their Christology engaging in textual negotiations with Jesus as the hermeneutical key in their exegesis of the Hebrew Scriptures.

This complex issue of the use of Hebrew Scriptures in the New Testament in general and in Hebrews in particular is the focus of this chapter. My goal is to further analyse data of the transtextual analysis to ascertain the significance of Hebrew Scriptures to the author of Hebrews as well as to the community. The first section of this chapter highlights similarities and differences with regard to the appropriation and adaptation of Hebrew Scriptures in the New Testament in general and Hebrews in particular. Secondly, this chapter focuses on idiosyncrasies evidenced in Hebrews in light

of the larger New Testament corpus. The third section deals with the social significance of the use of Hebrew Scriptures in Hebrews. Lastly, I draw upon the conclusions of the first three sections to arrive at an attempt to describe the author's and the community's identities. However, at the outset of this chapter, it must be noted that Genette's methodology, which I have applied in the previous chapter, does not account for the social significance or social relevance of the transtextual relationships in Hebrews; neither does it accommodate questions pertaining to the author's or the community's identity. Despite these methodological constraints, the aim of this chapter is to further scrutinize and interpret the data emerging from the analysis of the textual dependence of Hebrews on the Hebrew Scriptures and to highlight in what ways this textual dependence is significant to Hebrews.

2. Hebrew Scriptures in Hebrews versus the Rest of the New Testament: Similarities and Differences

From his analysis of the history of the use of Hebrew Scriptures in the New Testament, Harry Y. Gamble states that:

> It appears that there was never a time when the kerygma of the church was not accompanied by an appeal to Jewish scripture. The most primitive confessional and homiletical material incorporated allusions to and quotations from it. In the earliest Christian documents preserved, the apostle Paul frequently resorts to Jewish scripture in writing to Gentile congregations. Paul's heritage is Jewish but he clearly expects that his Gentile Christian readers will also be familiar with Jewish scripture and that scripture will carry the weight of authority with them. The same expectations are evident in most of the rest of the literature of early

> Christianity. Notable examples are found in the Gospel of Matthew, the Gospel of John, and the epistle to the Hebrews. . . . (24)

A survey of New Testament writings with regard to the presence and use of Hebrew Scriptures authenticates Gamble's observations and leads to the inevitable conclusion that, apart from the quotations from and allusions to Hebrew Scriptures, along with christianized interpretations, commentaries, and summaries, not much would remain of early Christian texts.

From the transtextual analysis undertaken in the previous chapter, it is clear that Hebrews as a text, for all practical purposes, is inscrutable apart from the Hebrew Scriptures, primarily because its meaning and significance are dependent on its appropriation and adaptation of Hebrew Scriptures. Even so, in making use of Hebrew Scriptures, the author of Hebrews is merely following the norm among early Christian authors, with the significant difference being his *thematic* selectivity, which is elaborately woven into the author's argument. Gamble rightly points out that "[a]part from the evidence of the quotations themselves, the many allusions in the earliest Christian writings to the study and comprehension of scripture suggest that it was among the major occupations of the primitive church" (28).

Each of the New Testament authors uses Hebrew Scriptures idiosyncratically. For instance, as pointed out by Gamble, Paul uses Hebrew Scriptures as a source of authority even when writing to his Gentile audiences. The gospel writers for their part are interested in genealogical records and messianic prophecies. Unlike that of other New Testament authors, the author of Hebrews' use of Hebrew Scriptures is marked by his synchronous application of many texts of Hebrew Scriptures, privileging one over the

other by altering chronological and historical details. Some prime examples where the author engages in these kinds of exegetical exercises can be witnessed in the author's presentation of the Melchizedekian order of priesthood (Gen. 14:18-20) as the new order and the "pattern" (Exod. 25:9) as the reality of the nonexistent earthly Tabernacle.

The significance of these choices seems to lie in the author's use of key motifs that were vibrant textual symbols and perhaps not quite social realities, given the historical context of the Second Temple. This is particularly the case with the choice of the symbol of the wilderness Tabernacle and its priesthood. The Tabernacle, the priesthood, and the regalia associated with them are pentateuchal symbols that were superseded in the subsequent divisions of the Hebrew Scriptures, namely the Prophets and the Writings, by the Jerusalem Temple and its associated priesthood. However, in the author's discourse on the priesthood, he specifically privileges the earthly and heavenly Tabernacle over the Temple. By resurrecting the symbols of the Tabernacle and its priesthood, the author transcends the immanence of the Jerusalem Temple and its associations. This exercise, undertaken by the author, seems to be a deliberate effort, substantially different from those of other New Testament writers. The author's exegetical mechanics and his choice of older textual motifs, which he then makes central to his discourse, are recognizably unique in comparison to the larger New Testament corpus.

3. Idiosyncrasies of the Use of Hebrew Scriptures in Hebrews in Light of the Larger New Testament Corpus

As mentioned above, while most New Testament authors make use of Hebrew Scriptures as an integral part of their writings, these authors do so idiosyncratically, as

occasioned by the contexts of their communities, which is particularly evident in Paul's writings and Luke-Acts, for instance. Hebrews is an exception in this regard: the context is fairly well-disguised and therefore not as easily detectable as in other New Testament writings. However, similarities with regard to the gospel are evident in Hebrews: the author maintains that the fundamental teachings include, "the basic teaching about Christ, . . . repentance from dead works and faith towards God, instruction about baptisms, laying on of hands, resurrection of the dead, and eternal judgement" (6:1b-2). There is no need for further instruction regarding these basic concerns, but instead, the author expects his community to "go on toward [maturity], leaving behind the basic teaching" (6:1a). With regards to the fundamentals of Christian teachings, the author's instruction falls within the larger New Testament paradigm. Nonetheless, the author's teaching about the relationship between his community and the ancients of the Hebrew Scriptures, Sabbath rest, and the Tabernacle are distinct. Furthermore, in terms of Christ's perfection and high priesthood, the author's discourse is unlike other New Testament writings.

3.1 The Ancients, Sabbath Rest, and Hebrews

The ancients, according to the author's descriptions in Heb.1:1-2, 4:2, 11:1-32, are his community's "ancestors." They were privileged to have had God speak to them "in various ways" (1:1), to have heard the gospel first (4:2), and they continue to be a "great cloud of witnesses" (12:1) through their faith and martyrdom. The author encourages his community to learn principles of faith and perseverance from them. His discourse integrates the two communities as one, with the Hebrew Scriptures being the bridge that unites his community to the various communities of the ancients. This idea of the unity, familial relations, and the offer of the *gospel* in and through the Hebrew

Scriptures, presents a Scripture-based world view that is quite distinctive[66] in the New Testament. Like other early Christian writers, the author also uses the relationship he has established between his community and the ancients as a platform to teach, to warn, and to encourage his community.

In his teaching about Sabbath rest (3:7-4:11), the author's discourse brings together various texts from Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Joshua, and Psalms, as is clear from the transtextuality chart in chapter three of this dissertation; the author uses the experience of communities of the ancients as a negative example of "disobedience" to warn his community. By using these texts, the author presents a Sabbath-day theology to his community "So then, a sabbath rest still remains for the people of God; for those who enter God's rest also cease from their labours as God did from his. Let us therefore make every effort to enter that rest, so that no one may fall through such disobedience as theirs" (4:9-11). Though the author's primary reference is to the incident (Exod. 17:1-7; Num. 20:1-13) of the wilderness account, the eschatological conclusions are his own.

3.2 The Tabernacle

The author's preoccupation with the Tabernacle, his distinctive use of this motif, and his development of this theme, based on the Leviticus narrative and other narratives, set the author apart from other New Testament writers. Through his discourse, the author introduces the heavenly Tabernacle while using the earthly Tabernacle as the pattern – a reversal which I have dealt with at length in chapter two of this dissertation. While the author's deliberations about the Tabernacle are coextensive with the priesthood into

[66] Apart from similarities with Stephen's speech (Acts 7:1-53), there seems to be no other New Testament text that makes such linkages with the Hebrew Scriptures.

which he incorporates Jesus as the eternal, heavenly High Priest, his silence about the Temple is intriguing. His references to the priesthood and the Tabernacle seem to unfold in the shadow of the Temple. In light of the fact that the gospel writers, the apostle Paul, and other New Testament authors, make references to the Temple in their writings (Matt. 12, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27; Mark 11, 12, 13, 14, 15; Luke 1, 2, 4, 11, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24; John 2, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 18; Acts 2, 3, 4, 5, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26; 1 Cor. 3, 6, 8, 9; 2 Cor. 6; Eph. 2; 2 Thess. 2; Rev. 3, 7, 11, 14, 15, 16, 21), the author's silence regarding this subject is noteworthy.

With the Tabernacle theme, the author creates a "possible world" (Ricoeur 1981, 177) for his community, a world firmly rooted in the textual world of the Hebrew Scriptures, while he also "asserts that it is continuous with the real world" (Dunnill 265). In addition to appropriating and reintroducing textual patterns of the earthly Tabernacle as representing the heavenly Tabernacle, the author recreates the significance of that world of sacrifices and offerings for his community. He then reinforces for them that all these sacrifices have been fulfilled in Jesus both as High Priest and victim. Therefore they need to be understood differently from the sacrifices of the levitical system.

The author's preoccupation with dualities, such as earthly-heavenly and pattern-real, together with his method of argumentation, have led earlier biblical scholars[67] to conclude that the author was influenced by Platonic and Philonic modes of argumentation and interpretation. As pointed out in chapter one, this was particularly the case with scholarly efforts that sought to offer evidence of a missing link of a Christian community that bridges the gulf between late Second Temple Judaism and a very Hellenistic Christianity as we know it by the turn or middle of the second century. However, though

[67] See also section two of chapter one of this dissertation.

there is sufficient reason to arrive at the conclusion that Hebrews is a Christian-Platonic text, within the normal, expected background level of Platonism which was common to early Christian writings, evidence in this dissertation has shown that the author's use and emphasis of the earthly and heavenly Tabernacle[68], besides other such dualities, are clearly influenced by Hebrew Scriptures; apart from them his discourse is incoherent and therefore meaningless. Bruce (1990) and Dunnill (1992) argue likewise:

> The presence of God, the heavenly sanctuary, where Christ now ministers as his people's high priest, is naturally superior to any holy place on earth, and the priesthood which is exercised in the former is naturally superior to any priesthood which is exercised in one of the latter sanctuaries. The earthly sanctuary, where the Aaronic priests ministered, is but a material copy of 'the true tent, pitched by the Lord, not by any human hand' (8:2). Here it is natural to recognize the influence of Platonic idealism in our author's thought and language, mediated through Philo and Alexandrian culture in general; and such influences need not be ruled out. For Plato and his followers material and sensible objects are not the ultimate realities; they are but copies of archetypes or 'ideas' laid up in heaven, which can be discerned only by the intellect. But the idea of the earthly sanctuary as a copy of the heavenly dwelling-place of God goes back far beyond Plato's day. . . . [O]ur author finds Old Testament authority for his view of the earthly sanctuary as a copy of the heavenly in the direction given to Moses to construct

[68] See also Ellingworth (1993, 406 – 408), for a concise statement on parallels of the earthly - heavenly Tabernacle in Judaism. Based on Williamson's analysis of Philo and Hebrews (1970, 142-159, 557-570), Ellingworth argues that, since such dualities were common, "it is unnecessary to read . . . any general Platonic and Philonic doctrine of archetypal ideas: the comparison is limited to the earthly and heavenly σχηναί, and these are not spiritualized as in Philo" (408).

> the tabernacle in all respects according to the model shown him by God on Mount Sinai. (Bruce 33)

Bruce argues that, for the author of Hebrews, the material, earthly Tabernacle and the "true tabernacle" are not merely "ideas" as they are for the Platonist, they are spiritual reality. Along the same lines, Dunnill makes the following observations, but also points out that the scholars who recognized Platonic influences in Hebrews were essentially influenced by their own "classical backgrounds":

> Though Hebrews exhibits Alexandrian terminology and a dualistic thought-pattern of earthly and heavenly, copy and real, many and one, in every case the substance of thought is Jewish: these are really comparisons of the sinful and the holy, the provisional and the permanent. As well as having an historical aspect it is essentially concrete, concerned with human persons, not souls; Jesus Christ, not a redeeming spirit; a new covenant between humanity and God, not escape from the material. The Hellenistic element overlays a mind thinking in the categories of the Old Testament cultus, with its contrasts between the near and the unapproachable, the manifest and the hidden, the sinful and the holy, and with its stress on the sacred time and place, on wrath, on the purifying power of blood and the sacred functions of priest and victim. In short, it depends for its presuppositions, not on a fashionable form of philosophical idealism, but on those portions of the Old Testament which are in appearance most 'primitive' and uncongenial, not only to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries but to the educated Jew and Greek of the first century too. (46-47)

Bruce and Dunnill affirm and acknowledge that, though evidence of Platonism can be seen in Hebrews, unlike a true Neo-Platonist like Philo, the author of Hebrews uses Hebrew Scripture as the foundation of his discourse. In my view, Platonic and Philonic influences would be true of Hebrews only if they were also true of the texts from the Hebrew Scriptures that the author uses. I have also demonstrated that the author's description of the heavenly Tabernacle is entirely dependent on the earthly Tabernacle of the Hebrew Scriptures; this textual reversal cannot be accounted for or accommodated by Platonism. The dichotomies the author presents clearly have their origins in the Hebrew Scriptures, which talk of the earthly Tabernacle based on the pattern shown to Moses, the old and the new covenant, and the levitical priesthood and the order of Melchizedek, all of which point to dualities that the author uses to develop his Christology.

3.3 Priesthood and Perfection

Intricately tied to the author's discourse on the Tabernacle is the priesthood associated with it, particularly the role of the High Priest. The author of Hebrews has the distinction of being the only author in the New Testament who presents Jesus Christ as "apostle and High Priest" (3:1); while the former motif is not developed, the author presents his apologetic regarding the priestly line of Melchizedek. The combination of these titles for Christ is present only in Hebrews, and though the use of Ps. 110 is not exclusive to Hebrews[69], the presentation of Jesus as the High Priest of the pre-levitical order of Melchizedek is entirely the author's innovation. Fred L. Horton argues that:

> [T]he author of Hebrews sees no succession in Melchizedek's priesthood. Melchizedek, as the first priest, comes to be priest without benefit of the

[69] Matt. 22:43-45; Mark 12:36-37; Luke 20:42-44; Acts 2:34-36; 1 Cor. 15:25; Eph. 1:20

> hereditary process by which the levitical priesthood was carried on. His is a priesthood superior to that of the Levites since through Abraham Levi himself paid tithes to Melchizedek. Exploiting the silence of scripture, the author shows that the priesthood of Melchizedek had no beginning and no end and that Melchizedek remains a priest perpetually. . . . [E]very significant feature of Melchizedek's priesthood is recapitulated in Christ's priesthood. Christ is not Melchizedek's successor, for Melchizedek, possessing a perpetual priesthood, has no successor. Rather Christ's priesthood is of another order, a heavenly order. (163-164)

Horton points out that the author's choice is careful, deliberate, and purposeful. The most distinct feature of this appropriation is the author's presentation of Jesus, who has access to the Holy of Holies, while also being the victim Himself. This makes the author's use of the Melchizedek motif different from that of the Qumran Scrolls (11Q13), where Melchizedek is a priestly, messianic, divine figure. By using the order of Melchizedek to justify Jesus' high priesthood, the author is also able to present Jesus as the officiant and the offering/victim.

Another feature[70] that the author ties to the high priesthood of Jesus is His Sonship and His attaining perfection through His suffering, "[a]lthough he was a Son, he learned obedience through what he suffered; and having been made perfect, he became the source of eternal salvation for all who obey him, having been designated by God a High Priest according to the order of Melchizedek" (5:8-10). Jesus' suffering and His obedience perfected Him to be saviour for all peoples. The author's selection of these particular motifs, such as the ancients and their relationship to his community via the

[70] Jesus as "forerunner" (6:20) has been dealt with in section 2.2 of chapter three.

Hebrew Scriptures, Sabbath rest, the Tabernacle, and Christ's perfection and high priesthood, makes the author's discourse unlike other New Testament writings.

4. Social Significance of the Use of Hebrew Scriptures in Hebrews

The opening statement of Hebrews, "Long ago God spoke to *our ancestors* in many and various ways by the prophets, but in these last days he has spoken to us by a Son. . . ." (1:1-2a, emphasis mine), makes claims to the ancestry of the community without explicitly identifying it. Again, in speaking of the heroes of faith from the Hebrew Scriptures, the author says, "Yet all these, though they were commended for their faith, did not receive what was promised, since God had provided something better so that *they would not, without us*, be made perfect" (11:39-40, emphasis mine). This not only sets Hebrews apart from all other New Testament writings, but also reflects the author's idiosyncratic way of using Hebrew Scriptures as the link between the ancient Hebrews and his community, while calculatedly and cautiously bypassing any specific reference to the community's immediate social context. In the same vein, the author introduces Jesus as an addition to the link that already exists through Scripture. In all, his effort seems to be to restate that his community's heritage is inextricably related to the Hebrew Scriptures at various levels, and he achieves this through his systematic use and interpretation of Hebrew Scriptures.

The author also uses Scripture as a pedagogical tool to teach and to warn his audience. He issues these instructions in conjunction with his teachings regarding the law, obeying God's voice, the priesthood, God's justice, Christ's sacrifice in relation to

the new covenant, holy living, and grace, which are interspersed throughout the text of Hebrews:

> [W]e must pay greater attention to what we have heard, so that we do not drift away from it (2:1)
>
> Take care, brothers and sisters, that none of you may have an evil, unbelieving heart that turns away from the living God. (3:12)
>
> [W]e want each one of you to show the same diligence, so as to realize the full assurance of hope to the very end, so that you may not become sluggish, but imitators of those who through faith and patience inherit the promises. (6:11-12)
>
> Let us hold fast to the confession of our hope without wavering, for he who has promised is faithful. And let us consider how to provoke one another to love and good deeds. . . .
>
> But we are not among those who shrink back and so are lost, but among those who have faith and so are saved. (10:23-24, 39)
>
> Therefore, since we are receiving a kingdom that cannot be shaken, let us give thanks, by which we offer to God an acceptable worship with reverence and awe; for indeed our God is a consuming fire. (12:28-29)

These instructions are perhaps reflective of the author's use of Hebrew Scriptures to authenticate his teaching and possibly his community's acceptance of it as authoritative and therefore binding. This aspect of Hebrew Scriptures being the basis of authority, as noted earlier, is common practice among New Testament authors.

Furthermore, the author also uses Hebrew Scriptures to encourage his community with regards to keeping their faith in the face of trying circumstances (10:32-39).

Positioned between his definition of faith, "faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen" (11:1), and the encouragement from the faithful of the Hebrew Scriptures, whom he christens "a [great] cloud of witnesses" (12:1), is the author's list of formidable heroes of faith from the Hebrew Scriptures. The author presents these heroes as having great faith even in the face of disappointment, and therefore as worthy of being emulated:

> All of these died in faith *without having received the promises*, but from a distance they saw and greeted them. They confessed that they were strangers and foreigners on the earth, for people who speak in this way make it clear that they are seeking a homeland. If they had been thinking of the land that they had left behind, they would have had opportunity to return. But as it is, they desire a better country, that is, a heavenly one. *Therefore God is not ashamed to be called their God*; indeed, he has prepared a city for them. (11: 13-16, emphasis mine)

By the author's use of Hebrew Scriptures, these heroes are resurrected and presented as contemporaries who are role models for his community to emulate. The author's comprehensive list of faithful heroes, whose stories are told by a mere mention of their names, again betrays a kind of familiarity with the Hebrew Scriptures that is unparalleled in other New Testament writings. Eisenbaum's essay on Hebrews 11 (1997) further confirms this. Using Genette's concept of "transvaluation," Eisenbaum proves that the author imputes his Christian values on the heroes in his list and thereby engages in "re-writing . . . biblical history" (394).

The author's many claims about Jesus, His superiority over angels, His faithfulness and uniqueness as Son, His humanity and divinity, His sacrifice, suffering,

and salvation are all anchored by the author in his exegesis of Hebrew Scriptures. Through his many and various references to the Hebrew Scriptures as pointing to Jesus, the author's goal seems to be to present Jesus as coextensive with Hebrew Scriptures and a continuation of them, rather than a genesis. To the community, this is either a revelation or a form of reinforcement. I suggest that the latter is true, in light of the fact that the author's use of Hebrew Scriptures is representative of a kind of learning that perhaps took place in his community.

It is significant that the author does not circumvent Hebrew Scriptures in presenting Jesus; this is evident in the sections dealing with the levitical sacrificial system and Jesus' relation to it. In fact, he depends on the Hebrew Scriptures to present the earthly Tabernacle as the pattern for the heavenly Tabernacle. The reversal of the heavenly Tabernacle being represented by the earthly Tabernacle is possible only because of the author's dependence on the Hebrew Scriptures. By using the Hebrew Scriptures thus, the author grounds the heavenly Tabernacle firmly in the earthly Tabernacle of the Hebrew Scriptures. The author's inability and unwillingness to dismiss the earthly Tabernacle are evident in the way he preserves its primary function as the point of contact between God and Israel; he merely transposes it to the heavenly realm, for which he is again dependent on the Hebrew Scriptures (Exod. 25:9). Through his use of Hebrew Scriptures, the author makes the Tabernacle socially relevant and significant for his community. Further, in making the Tabernacle an undeniable and intricate part of the community's experience, he equates the camp of ancient Israel to the city and, by extension, makes the crucifixion meaningful through the Tabernacle's sacrificial content and context. The author seems to be unable to dismiss or ignore the levitical Tabernacle;

therefore he appropriates it and makes it syntagmatic with the sacrifice of Jesus. Though the use of the Tabernacle motif is specific to Hebrews, this kind of transposition is symptomatic of what the author, his community, and other early Christian communities needed to grapple with, namely how to appropriate Hebrew Scriptures to accommodate their yet unformulated Christ-theology.

The author's textual world is distinct from other Christian communities because of his manipulations of the specific symbols, such as the Tabernacle, the priesthood, and the covenant, among others, which he introduces through his allusions, quotations, commentaries, and summaries drawn from the Hebrew Scriptures. The emergent picture is dependent on resurrecting older symbols that the author transforms into new ones through his presentation of Jesus as the Christ and as the hermeneutical key to the Hebrew Scriptures. This is best exemplified in his final exhortations to his community:

> For the bodies of those animals whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest as a sacrifice for sin are burned outside the camp. Therefore Jesus also suffered outside the city gate in order to sanctify the people by his own blood. Let us then go to him outside the camp and bear the abuse he endured. For here we have no lasting city, but we are looking for the city that is to come. (13:11-14)

The mixing of metaphors and the ease with which the author introduces Christ's sacrifice in conjunction with the levitical sacrifices are evident in this text. The author's presentation of Christ holds in tension the world of the Hebrew Scriptures, the present situation of the Hebrews' community, and their future hope. The author's world is one of the past, coalesced with the here and now, but also with the not yet and yet to come. Like "the city that is to come," the Tabernacle in Hebrews is not localized as it was among the

Israelites in the wilderness; instead, it is the permanent heavenly Tabernacle with no earthly bindings of place or people. Further, this also renders inconsequential who the author and his community are and what they do, in light of their association and profession of Jesus, the eternal High Priest, who is also the saviour who suffered, "outside the city gate." To the author, this recognition and confession of Jesus and His death (Heb. 13:12) and resurrection (Heb. 13:20) as historical facts are pivotal and every other concern fades in light of this.

Clearly, the social significance of the use of Hebrew Scriptures in Hebrews points to the former being a platform of unity for both the author and his community together with the ancients. The Hebrew Scriptures were also a source of authority for the author and his community, as in other early Christian communities; they were a source of encouragement and a peg on which the un-institutionalized Christ-theology was hitched. Lastly, the author's particular use of Hebrew Scriptures, in my view, creates what we would in today's parlance call a virtual family, consisting of the ancients and Hebrews' community, which is not attested in this way in other New Testament writings. In sum, through his uncharacteristic sermon-letter, the author affirms the authority of the Hebrew Scriptures by his use of them while simultaneously exhorting, educating, and encouraging his community.

4.1 The Author, the Community, and Contributions to Christology

The idiosyncrasies of the use of Hebrew Scriptures in Hebrews and the suggested social significance of such usage beg the question as to the authorship and the audience of Hebrews. As mentioned previously in this chapter, the author's silence regarding the Temple in light of his preoccupation with the Tabernacle has led some scholars to

conclude that the Hebrews' community was a community of priests. In his monograph *Proleptic Priests: Priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, John M. Scholer makes a case for the priestly identity of the Hebrews' community based on the cultic language, and Hebrews' apologetic on priesthood:

> The present priestly character of the readership is expressed both through the applied cultic terminology in Heb. and through its sacerdotal contexts. Both serve to identify the readers as priests already during their earthly existence. The reason for this priestly status is not found in their performance of any sort of atoning ritual service, but solely in their uninhibited access to God, made possible by the past and present priestly service rendered by Christ himself. In Heb. it is precisely this access to God, extended to earthly believers, which characterizes all Christians as 'proleptic priests'. Their priesthood is 'proleptic' and 'penultimate', because their entry into God's very presence is achieved only in the Holy Spirit. Only when the End comes will a priesthood characterized by the believers' absolute and unending access to God be revealed. (207)

While Scholer's conclusion about the community being a priestly community is a tenable option[71], two aspects remain unclear. Firstly, why would this form of rhetoric/ argumentation be exclusive to priests in particular, especially in light of the fact that the author asserts that the Hebrews' community is lacking in maturity and therefore, "need[s] someone to teach [them] again the basic elements of the oracles of God" (5:12)? Clearly,

[71] "The word of God continued to spread; the number of the disciples increased greatly in Jerusalem, and a great many of the *priests* became obedient to the faith" (Acts 6:7, emphasis mine). The priests of Acts do not seem to be a fitting description of the Hebrews' community as the author indicates that the gospel message "was attested to us by those who heard [the Lord]" (Heb. 2:3).

as can be observed in the transtextuality chart in chapter three of this dissertation, the author's concerns are not restricted to the Tabernacle and its priesthood.

Secondly, and more intriguingly, if Christ's service designates all believers as priests, what then is unique about the Hebrews' community having been a community of priests before the "End"? Scholer's conclusions on the heavenly high priesthood of Christ and the priestly identity of the Hebrews' community as the precursor to the priesthood of all believers seem just as "implicit" as he finds that "the priesthood [in Hebrews] remains an *implicit* assertion. . . . [He] believe[s] the application of cultic language . . . is convincing evidence that betrays the intention of the author regarding his readers" (10, emphasis mine). Along similar lines as Scholer, Marie E. Isaacs argues that the author of Hebrews is Jewish. For Isaacs, this is clear from the author's use of Hebrew Scriptures:

> Nothing is more evident of the author of Hebrews' Jewish background than his citations and use of what the church subsequently called 'the Old Testament'. Clearly it is this corpus of writings which constitutes his sacred Scriptures, to be appealed to and explicated– albeit in terms of his overtly Christian stance. Its inspiration is accepted as axiomatic. (68)

Isaacs' position on the author's Jewish background seems to be an oversimplification of the complexity that surrounds the author's identity. The early church's preoccupation with Hebrew Scriptures, as pointed out by Gamble, challenges Isaacs' conclusion.

W. S. Green's caution about the limitedness of rabbinic texts reflecting their social context is valid in understanding and interpreting the social context of Hebrews as well:

> The very attempt to draw a social description out of a document necessarily entails the assumption that literature, especially anonymous literature, is the product of a community and reflects its life. But the presence of the document in a particular group does not attest the role of the group in its production nor does it reveal how members of the community regarded the status or content of the text. The relations between literature and society are complex and frequently obscure; to assume that the former always reflects the latter is naïve, facile, and unwarranted. In addition, our capacity to construct a social context from a literary document is limited by the character, quality, and quantity of the information it provides. A text, a document no matter how unpolished, simply does not constitute the sort of raw materials out if which . . . a society and its idiosyncrasies can be composed. (1983, 195)

In light of Green's caution, Scholer's over-analysis and Isaacs' oversimplification of the data of Hebrews as reflective of the social context of the text and its community are problematic. Through the analysis of how meaning is constructed in Leviticus and Hebrews in chapter two of this dissertation, I argued that the author's attention is focused on Jesus and His high priesthood at the heavenly Tabernacle. The author is dependent on Leviticus to establish linkages between the Tabernacle and the priesthood and, as a result, it seems that the author deliberately ignores the actual identity of his community while concealing his own identity. The emergent picture is one of theological sophistication rather than of identification.

From the transtextual analysis of Hebrews, it is amply clear that the author's efforts to exhibit the range and scope of his knowledge of the Hebrew Scriptures, which

converges on the entire corpus of Hebrew Scriptures, are deliberate. The author's knowledge of Hebrew Scriptures could cautiously be assumed to reflect the community's knowledge of Hebrew Scriptures as well. This seems to be a probable conclusion, because if the community does not have the kind of familiarity with Hebrew Scriptures as that author's discourse suggests, then the author's addressing them in this manner is entirely futile. Even so, it could also be argued that the author's expectations far exceed the community's proclivity for the kind of hermeneutical and exegetical skills he expects of them. This comes through eloquently, even if only as a rhetorical appendage, in the author's disappointment with the community's inability to progress in their faith and in their lack of understanding of how Christ challenges their knowledge of Hebrew Scriptures:

> Although [Jesus] was a Son, he learned obedience through what he suffered; and having been made perfect, he became the source of eternal salvation for all who obey him, having been designated by God a High Priest according to the order of Melchizedek. *About [him] we have much to say that is hard to explain*, since you have *become* dull in understanding. For though by this time *you ought to be teachers*, you need someone to teach you again the basic elements of the oracles of God. You need milk, not solid food; for everyone who lives on milk, being still an infant, is unskilled in the word of righteousness. But solid food is for the mature, for those whose faculties have been trained by practice to distinguish good from evil. (5:8-14, emphasis mine)

The author's expectation that the community should already be teachers paves the way to consider the option of the author, himself being a well trained teacher, modeling for this

community how to be teachers through his discourse; even so, the question of the community's identity remains inscrutable.

Within the larger context of the New Testament corpus, while there are numerous references to teachers and the gift of teaching being primarily linked to pastors and the pastoral office[72], there seems to be no evidence even to suggest a predominant or exclusive community of teachers. In light of a lack of corroborative external evidence, and with internal ambiguity characterizing the text, Barnabas Lindars' explanation about the community seems reasonable:

> Hebrews belongs to a creative phase in the early history of Christianity. It is a time when the church is moving into new places and different cultural situations. The simple gospel . . . raises questions not previously posed, and answers have to be found for them. The people addressed in Hebrews cannot be identified with any of the main groups known to us in the New Testament. . . . In Hebrews we have a glimpse into a segment of earliest Christianity unknown from other sources. (1991, 2)

Lindars' point is well made, particularly in light of the fact that the limited information about the early church does not account for a group of people such as the Hebrews' community[73]. Even so, the overwhelming presence of Hebrew Scriptures in Hebrews is

---

[72] "The term occurs fifty–eight times in the NT, forty–eight times in the Gospels, forty–one refer to Jesus (twenty – nine in direct address).There are *didáskaloi* in the churches (Acts 13:1; 1 Cor. 12:28, 29; Eph. 4:11). Paul calls himself a teacher (I Tim. 2:7; 2 Tim. 1:11)" (Zodhiates 449-450).

[73] Frederik Wisse's observations on the use of early Christian writings among heterodox Christians, particularly Gnostics, are insightful as well: "If indeed most Christian literature before 200 C.E., was written in a heterodox milieu, this has major consequences for the historian. It means that the beliefs and practices advocated in these writings, in so far as they vary from other Christian texts, cannot be attributed to a distinct community or sect. Rather, these writings were more likely idiosyncratic in terms of their environment. The 'teaching' they contain was not meant to replace other teaching but to supplement. They did not defend the beliefs of a community but rather tried to develop and explore Christian truth in different directions. In this heterodox milieu there were few limits to such private speculation. There was room for

worthy of further attention and investigation, even if it means moving beyond the purview of methodological limitations stated at the beginning of this chapter.

In *The Rise of Christianity: A Sociologist Reconsiders History*, Rodney Stark analyses Christianity as a new religious movement, describing its development in the context of Hellenized Judaism, and examining why Christianity would have been attractive to Jews in the Diaspora. In the chapter, "The Mission to the Jews: Why It Probably Succeeded," Stark lists three "sociological propositions" (54) relating to multi-religious, ethnic, and cultural contexts such as the Hellenistic Diaspora: marginality, accommodation, and cultural continuity. Jews in the Diaspora encountered marginality in relation to their Jewish identity vis-à-vis their Greek context. Stark defines marginality as experienced when, "membership in two groups poses a contradiction or cross pressure such that [the] status [of individuals] in each group is lowered by their membership in the other" (52). According to Stark, in such situations people "will attempt to escape or resolve a marginal position" (52).

Secondly, "*New religious movements mainly draw their converts from the ranks of the religiously inactive and discontented, and those affiliated with the most accommodated (worldly) religious communities*" (54). Thirdly and significantly, "*People are more willing to adopt a new religion to the extent that it retains cultural continuity with conventional religion(s) with which they already are familiar*" (55). Using Philo as his prime example of a Hellenized Jew, Stark argues that, in the face of marginality,

---

the prophet and the visionary. One heterodox writing would inspire the creation of another. . . . These writings reflect only the visions and speculations of individuals and the literature they used and imitated. One expects to find such individuals among itinerant preachers, sages, magicians, ascetics, visionaries, philosophers, and holy men" (188).

"secularization"/accommodation, and the desire for cultural continuity, Jews perhaps found a safe haven in Christianity. He concludes that:

> Christianity offered twice as much cultural continuity to the Hellenized Jews as to Gentiles. If we examine the marginality of Hellenized Jews, torn between two cultures, we may note how Christianity offered to retain much of the religious content of *both* cultures and to resolve the contradictions between them. . . .
>
> Little needs to be said of the extent to which Christianity maintained cultural continuity with Judaism. Indeed, much of the New Testament is developed to displaying how Christianity extends and fulfills the Old. . . . [I]f we look at these 'two cultural faces' of early Christianity, it seems clear that its greatest appeal would have been for those to whom *each* face mattered: Jews in the diaspora. (59)

On a superficial level, Stark's propositions can help further our understanding about Hebrews; however, in light of the author's conspicuous silence on the immediate cultural, ethnic, and geographical contexts of the community, these propositions need to be applied rather cautiously to the case of Hebrews. From the centrality of the Hebrew Scriptures and their associated Christian hermeneutics, it can be concluded that the author is making a case for cultural and, more precisely, textual continuity between the Hebrew Scriptures and the revelation of Jesus as Son, saviour, High Priest at the heavenly Tabernacle, the sacrificed Christ, and the one with whom the Hebrews community was to associate "outside the camp." In light of this preoccupation with Hebrew Scriptures and their application to Jesus, it seems to emerge that this community's vocation was perhaps related to the study and interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures. From the author's perspective, however, the community is yet to master the ropes of what was possibly a

new profession, in which case the author's entire discourse is an effort at giving the community a first-hand experience of how to transform Hebrew Scriptures and all their associated symbolism in light of its identity that was perhaps in transition or yet to be defined.

The many descriptions of early Christians include Jewish-Christians, Christian-Jews, Alexandrians, Italians, Gentiles, God-Fearers, Synagogue-Christians, Israelite-Christians, among others. The Hebrews' community could have been an exclusively Jewish-Christian community based on the overwhelming presence of Hebrew Scriptures and the kind of relationship the author tries to forge between the ancients and the Hebrews' community. The title "To the Hebrews" is often taken to support this proposition, but, as Craig R. Koester suggests, the title, "reflects the view, common in the late second and early third centuries, that Hebrews was written by Paul in the Hebrew language for Jewish Christians. . . . The title appears to be an inference made by later generations based on the book's contents, and it can best be treated as an early 'commentary' on the book" (172-173). Koester's caution further highlights the limitations of using the title of this text as a clue to further our understanding about the community. Koester's conclusion that the title "To the Hebrews" functions as a commentary is also supported by Genette's description of "paratexts;" paratexts include textual categories such as titles which "provide the text with a (variable) setting and sometimes a commentary" (*Palimpsests* 3). Though not a definitive conclusion, this seems to be a highly plausible proposition as far as the title of Hebrews is concerned.

Based on the similar premise of the presence of Hebrew Scriptures, the community could have been a Christian-Jewish community that was "drift[ing] away"

(2:1) to its parent Jewish faith. With regards to its geographical provenance, the Hebrews' community could have been located in Alexandria: the superficial Platonic and Philonic elements readily support this conclusion; the mention of "those from Italy" (13:24) could be a clue and a possible reference to the group's ethnic/geographical identity. The fact that Gentiles and God-Fearers were a part of the early Christian groups is evident from the larger New Testament corpus and this could have been true of the Hebrews' community; similarly, from the writings of Paul and other New Testament writers, the synagogue was the primary location for the early Christian message and it seems reasonable to assume that this community could have been one such early synagogue group[74]. From the Qumran and Rabbinic documents, it is clear that there were communities that specialized in the study of Hebrew Scriptures and their interpretation, particularly in Israel; the Hebrews' community could have been one such community whose identity was intentionally obscured by the author[75]. The author's silence and the eclectic nature of the subjects discussed in Hebrews make any of these exclusive descriptions or a combination such as Jewish-Christian/Gentile appropriate for the Hebrews' community.

Yet another perspective on the formative years of the self-definition of Christian communities, given the heterogeneous contexts from which they emerged, is similar to

---

[74] Gabriella Gelardini argues that Hebrews is a synagogue homily in her "Hebrews, an Ancient Synagogue Homily for *Tisha Be-Av*: Its Function, its Basis, its Theological Interpretation."

[75] Elke Tönges refers to Hebrews as a "Jesus-Midrash." The characteristics she isolates in her analysis include: the use of quotations from the various parts of the Hebrew Scriptures; the emphasis on the Torah, but without the use of stock phrases "'Law of (Moses) and Prophets', or Torah of Moses, Prophets, Psalms" (94); the establishing of links with the prophetic traditions of the Hebrew Scriptures evident in Heb. 1:1 and in the extensive use of Jer. 31 etc; the small number of quotations from the third division of the Hebrew Scriptures, with the exception of the Psalms, which are a favourite with the author. Based on these characteristics, Tönges states that, "Hebrews . . . seems part of the Jewish discussion: it respects Jewish boundaries and thus enables the community it addresses to develop their ideas and understanding of the world and of God's plan in the context of and in discussion with Jewish positions and traditions" (95). See also Dunn (2006, 87-111) for an analysis of the use of Jewish exegetical methods in the New Testament.

what Jacob Neusner identifies as characteristic of "Formative Judaism." Neusner argues that the reinterpretation of Jewish symbols, such as Torah and Temple, among others, characterized Formative Judaism:

> Priest, sage, soldier–all of these figures stand for Israel, or part of the nation. When all would meld into one, that one would stand for some fresh and unprecedented Judaism. Jesus represented as perfect priest, rabbi, messiah, was one such protean figure. The Talmudic rabbi as Torah incarnate, priest manqué, and a model of the son of David, was another. In both cases we find a fresh reading of an old symbol, and, more important an unprecedented reading of established symbols in fresh and striking ways. The history of piety in Israel is the story of successive arrangements and revisions of available symbols. . . . [N]o category would ever be left intact for long. When Jesus asked people what they thought he was, the enigmatic answer proves less interesting than the question. For the task he set before them was to reframe everything they knew in the encounter with the one they did not know. . . . When, along these same lines, the rabbis of the later centuries of late antiquity rewrote in their own image and likeness the entire Scripture and history of Israel, dropping whole eras as though they had never been, ignoring vast bodies of old Jewish writing, inventing whole new books for the canon of Judaism, they did the same. They reworked the received light of what they proposed to give. No mode of piety could be left untouched, for all proved promising. (1983, 65-66)

That each emergent Christian community negotiated and transformed Hebrew Scriptures in light of its context is amply evident from the New Testament. The author of Hebrews,

then, can be seen as one such figure who, having engaged in this kind of an exercise, expects the community he addresses to "reframe everything they knew in the[ir] encounter with" Jesus. The Hebrews' community does not seem to be an atypical group as much as a variant among the many emergent Christian communities.

In light of freedoms exercised with regard to the use of Hebrew Scriptures in the contexts of both Formative Judaism (Neusner) and heterodox Christianity (Wisse) the author of Hebrews seems to be an exemplar of an inherited legacy of textual appropriation, interpretation, and application, rather than an innovator of any recognizable distinction. His desire for the community to follow his example seems evident. The idiosyncrasies listed above essentially are a reflection of the author's creative use of Hebrew Scriptures to formulate and forge a Christology through Hebrew Scriptures, which was perhaps the trademark of most early Christian communities; the author of Hebrews' distinction lies in his choice of symbols and metaphors, some of which happen not to be employed by other New Testament authors. Given the larger context of textual appropriation and manipulation, which seems to have been characteristic of both Formative Judaism and early Christian communities, Hebrews is similar to other early Christian texts that made use of the inspiration of the Hebrew Scriptures and used them to their own ends.

The author's unique contribution then lies in his Christology that rests largely on the author's appropriation of Hebrew Scriptures. As pointed out earlier, this Christology includes presenting Christ as the eternal High Priest of the order of Melchizedek who entered the heavenly Tabernacle with His own blood and as the one who was made perfect through His suffering. The author's characterization of Jesus as the eternal High

Priest is not attested anywhere else in the New Testament and, as I pointed out earlier, this distinctive characterization rests on his choice of symbols and metaphors relating to the levitical priesthood, which has been interpreted as reflecting the identity of the community in that they are either priests or scribes or teachers. Whether this is actually the case or not is difficult to ascertain. W.S. Green's caution about the limitations of texts reflecting their social contexts is pertinent in the case of Hebrews. Even so, Hebrews represents a phase of early Christianity that reflects an apologetic of the gospel of Jesus Christ, using metaphors and symbols such as the Tabernacle and the high priesthood that were distinct among early Christian writers. In sum, the distinction of Hebrews lies in the author's innovativeness in establishing new and unconventional links between the Hebrew Scriptures and New Testament Christology.

5. Summary and Conclusion

This chapter dealt with the use of Hebrew Scriptures in Hebrews and the New Testament. Essentially, there were both similarities and differences that characterize the presence of Hebrew Scriptures in the New Testament in general and Hebrews in particular. The distinction of Hebrews lies in its seemingly unique exegetical exercise of privileging certain parts of Hebrew Scriptures, such as the Pentateuch, while correspondingly conflating texts to prove the author's exegetical and hermeneutical task of presenting Jesus as an extension and fulfillment of Hebrew Scriptures.

Secondly, the idiosyncratic use of Hebrew Scriptures in Hebrews, in many respects, such as the heavenly high priesthood of Christ and the eternal Melchizedekian order, distinct from the Melchizedek of the Qumran Scrolls, is again reflective of a

certain uniqueness that would make the Hebrews' community distinct from other early Christian communities and other communities/individuals who appropriated Hebrew Scriptures. The preoccupation with the Tabernacle and its priesthood has been the focus of this dissertation, as demonstrated in earlier chapters; apart from the particularities of the levitical Tabernacle and its priesthood, Hebrews is meaningless. In this section of the chapter, I also argued that the author's use of Hebrew Scriptures does not primarily reflect Platonic influences, but instead, the author is reinterpreting Hebrew Scriptures to establish his case that Christology is a development and fulfillment of Hebrew Scriptures.

Thirdly, the social significance of the use of Hebrews Scriptures in Hebrews pertains to the author's purpose of using Hebrew Scriptures as a bridge between the ancients and his own community and to create what I called a virtual family. In doing this, the author's purpose seems to be to teach the community to model their lives after the ancients and to persevere in their faith like the heroes of the Hebrew Scriptures, while also learning from their experiences in encountering the God of Israel, for "God is not ashamed to be called their God" (11:16b). Lastly, this chapter dealt with the question of the identities of the author and the community of Hebrews and the text's contribution to Christology. I raised the question of whether the author and his community were priests or teachers, arriving at no definitive answer in either case. Given the nature of ancient documents and their scope in reflecting socio-historical realties, as pointed out by Green and as is clear from this study, such endeavours are riddled with problems. With regard to the second proposition of the community being teachers, limited internal evidence and a lack of corroborative external evidence made this an unsustainable proposition. While the first three sections of this chapter depended to a large extent on the transtextual analysis

of the third chapter, I also made use of Stark's sociological analysis of the rise of early Christianity and Neusner's conclusions about the characteristics of Formative Judaism to arrive at the conclusion that Hebrews is essentially alike other early Christian texts, which also made use of Hebrew Scriptures, and that its true distinction lies in its Christology, which is unparalleled in the New Testament.

Chapter 5. CONCLUSION

This dissertation set out to explore transtextuality in Hebrews in relation to the Tabernacle theme in the Hebrew Scriptures, particularly focusing on Leviticus. My first chapter identified the existing lacuna in the study of Hebrews and addressed the need for an appropriate methodology that helps examine the dependence of Hebrews on Hebrew Scriptures. Tracing the literary origins of the concept of intertextuality to the thought of Kristeva and further analysing the ideological underpinnings of Kristeva's concept of intertextuality, I argued that Kristevan intertextuality is inadequate as a methodological framework to undertake an analysis of the interrelatedness of Hebrews and Hebrew Scriptures. This was further supported by Hatina's critique of Kristeva's model of intertextuality, which is based primarily on assumptions about the nature and scope of language in general and of literature in particular. Hatina's appropriate critique of Kristeva's ideological assumptions about language and texts include the following seven points. According to Hatina, for Kristeva:

> (1) [L]anguage is not a medium of thought or a tool for communication; it is nebulous, arbitrary and leads to infinite interpretations; (2) all texts–having no closure, resolution and self-sufficiency–refer endlessly to other texts; (3) the author is never in control over the meaning of the text; (4) meaning is supplanted by the idea of signification, whereby the signifier remains without a corresponding signified; (5) criticism is part of the text and contributes to the creation of meaning; (6) disciplinary boundaries are discarded, leaving all disciplines as part of the discursive environment and ultimately inseparable from literature; and (7) the rules of reason and identity are replaced by the notion of

'contradiction' which refers to the fallacy of identity–that the concept does not exhaust the thing conceived. (Hatina 32)

Further, my review of Kristevan poststructuralist intertextuality demonstrated that it is at odds with the notions of self-contained, meaningful texts and the idea of a closed canon, which are foundational to biblical literature. Instead of the Kristevan conception of intertextuality, I used Genette's structuralist paradigm of transtextuality as the theoretical and methodological paradigm to analyse the interconnectedness between Hebrews and Hebrew Scriptures. I also examined the construction of meaning in Hebrews based on its multi-faceted appropriation from the Hebrew Scriptures. Genette classifies transtextuality as intertextuality, paratextuality, metatextuality, architextuality, and hypertextuality. In this study, I used these concepts to analyse the variegated dependence of Hebrews on Hebrew Scriptures.

The second chapter of this dissertation undertook a substantial summary of the Tabernacle theme in Leviticus and Hebrews and examined how meaning is constituted in these texts respectively. Meaning in Leviticus is based on legislations pertaining to holiness, particularly in relation to covenant, sacrifice, and priesthood. Holiness governs all aspects of life in Leviticus through the modalities of the covenant of which the Tabernacle is a tangible expression; gradients of holiness are mirrored in terms of space, time, and people. The meaning and significance of Leviticus are exemplified in Israel's life and activities in the ordering and the organization of the Tabernacle, which are an integral part of the Sinai covenant.

In contrast to the clearly laid-out instructions of Leviticus pertaining to holiness in relation to the Tabernacle, meaning in Hebrews is based on the linkages already

established in Leviticus, primarily via the Tabernacle and the covenant, priesthood, and associated sacrifices. The uniqueness of Hebrews lies in the author's appropriation and application of Leviticus to his presentation of Jesus as the High Priest at the heavenly Tabernacle. The description of the levitical Tabernacle in Hebrews is minimalist, as I demonstrated in chapter two. The core concern that occupies the author's attention is the sacrifice of Jesus in relation to the levitical system of sacrificial requirements, which the author transfers to the heavenly pattern of the earthly Tabernacle. This is the author's unique contribution to the New Testament. Though texts such as Acts and Revelation mention the heavenly Tabernacle/Temple, no other New Testament author presents such a textual paradigm of the heavenly Tabernacle as the author of Hebrews does, which is essentially the author's way of exploring and exploiting the silence of Exod. 25:9 regarding the pattern shown to Moses on Mount Sinai. As I pointed out earlier in this dissertation, the author's ingenuity rests on his modeling the heavenly Tabernacle on the earthly Tabernacle. This is also a significant departure from the rest of the New Testament in terms of presenting the Tabernacle and priestly motifs of the Hebrew Bible as constituting a heavenly reality that is realized in the sacrifice, death, and resurrection of Jesus.

In light of this summary, the third chapter used Genette's concept of transtextuality, which he defines as "all that sets the text in relationship . . . with other texts" (*Palimpsests* 1), to examine the dependence of Hebrews on Hebrew Scriptures. As the central determining facet of transtextual relation, Genette's paradigm proved to be an ideal technique to isolate the variegated relationships between Hebrews and Hebrew Scriptures in general and Leviticus in particular. The three primary kinds of

transtextuality that emerged from using Genette's model in analysing Hebrews are, firstly, intertextuality, characterized chiefly by textual categories such as quotations and allusions. Secondly, metatextuality is marked by commentaries on texts that Hebrews makes use of without any direct reference to the Hebrew Scriptures, and thirdly, hypertextuality, includes the category of summary. Further, in chapter four, I also pointed out that the title "To the Hebrews" best describes what Genette classifies as paratext, since it functions as a commentary on the text rather than an identity marker of the author or his community. From the analysis, it is clear that the author of Hebrews makes use of various textual categories, namely quotations, allusions, commentaries, and summaries, in conjunction with each other. This proved Genette's claim that these textual categories are not mutually exclusive; it also pointed to the complexity of the transtextual relations of a text such as Hebrews.

Significantly, the transtextual analysis helped foreground Hebrews' relationship to Leviticus. The author's dependence on Leviticus is marked by allusions and commentaries. This use of allusions to and commentaries on Leviticus, I argued, gives the author the scope to present Jesus' sacrifice and His high priesthood as an extension and a new expression of the levitical sacrificial system in light of the new covenant. Thus, the strength of Genette's methodology was proven in its circumscribing textual categories to particular types of transtextualites, which allowed for the mapping of various textual relationships that are evidenced in Hebrews. However, this dissertation also discovered that Genette's methodology does not account for questions such as the social significance of the use of Hebrew Scriptures in Hebrews, nor does it address issues of identity. Apart from these limitations, Genette's methodology has proven useful in

adding a new dimension to the study of the interrelatedness of biblical texts without compromising notions of meaning and canonicity that are central to the Bible.

Based on the transtextual relations identified in the third chapter, the fourth chapter further analysed the use of Hebrew Scriptures in the New Testament and in Hebrews. Additionally, this chapter highlighted the possible social significance of the use of Hebrew Scriptures in Hebrews and also addressed the complex issue of the identities of the community and the author of Hebrews and the text's Christology. In analysing similarities and differences regarding the centrality of Hebrew Scriptures to the New Testament and Hebrews, the unity and uniformity among New Testament authors lay in their presentation of Jesus as the fulfillment of the Hebrew Scriptures. Here Hebrews has the distinction of presenting Jesus simultaneously as Son, High Priest, and Messiah. The author achieves this by his exegetical exercise of privileging and conflating texts from Hebrew Scriptures that aid his task of presenting Jesus as an extension and fulfillment of Hebrew Scriptures.

In analysing the use of Hebrew Scriptures in Hebrews, I concluded that the author's teaching about Christ's high priesthood, based on the levitical and Melchizedekian order, stands out among New Testament writings. The presentation of Jesus the Son being qualified as saviour through His suffering which made Him perfect is also distinct in the New Testament. The notion of the heavenly Tabernacle is the author's addition to the Christian understanding of the pattern on which the earthly Tabernacle was based. Even so, what occupies the author's attention and governs the meaning of Hebrews to a large extent are the levitical Tabernacle and its priesthood. In this chapter, I also argued that the dichotomies in Hebrews are in line with general tendencies of

Platonism in early Christianity; even so, the overwhelming evidence that emerged from this dissertation is that these dichotomies are a reflection of the author's dependence on Hebrew Scriptures, where these dualities have their origin. Further, though I did not pursue the question of Jewish-Christian relations in this dissertation, from the analysis of the dependence of Hebrews on Hebrew Scriptures, it is clear that Hebrews does not give more or less evidence about Jewish-Christian relations or the parting of ways between them than other New Testament documents. Early Christianity, particularly the phase represented in Hebrews, could only define itself in reference to Judaism, not apart from it.

The social significance of the presence of Hebrew Scriptures in Hebrews primarily rests on the author's goals in asserting and creating a familial bond between his community and the ancients of the Hebrew Scriptures, "[of whom] God is not ashamed." In doing this, the author seems to reaffirm that his community's heritage is tied to Hebrew Scriptures. The author also uses Hebrew Scriptures, not only as a pedagogical tool, to instruct, to warn, to correct, and to encourage, but also to demonstrate through his hermeneutics how Jesus needs to be viewed through the lens of Hebrew Scriptures and that Jesus fulfils the Hebrew Scriptures. What he believes, affirms, and confesses is clear through his use of Hebrew Scriptures in conjunction with Jesus and this he expects his community also to believe, affirm, and confess. To this end, the author's deliberations with the Tabernacle and the priesthood and his efforts to teach and instruct his community about Jesus via these specific symbols of Hebrew Scriptures can be linked to his preoccupation to balance the hope of the future with the heritage of the past. For the author, it seems that the present is meaningful and significant because it is inextricably

tied to the glory of the past and the expectation of the future and therefore the two can never be separated.

Of the many possible identities that the author and community of Hebrews could be associated with, chapter four dealt substantially with two particular descriptions of the community, namely that they were probably priests and that the author expected them to be teachers. I concluded that limited internal evidence, especially in the case of the latter, and a lack of corroborative external evidence in the case of the former, made these options untenable. Besides these, I also analysed possible descriptions of the Hebrews' community, such as Jewish-Christians, Christian-Jews, Alexandrians, Italians, Gentiles, God-Fearers, Synagogue-Christians, and Israelite-Christians, among others that were common descriptions of early Christian groups. However, these descriptions privileged certain aspects of the text while ignoring others. Further, I also argued that the author's use of the Hebrew Scriptures is similar to that of other early Christian authors. His specific choice of symbols and metaphors from the Hebrew Scriptures is distinctive and need not necessarily be a reflection of the identity of the community. The author's use of Hebrew Scriptures in his presentation of Jesus, drawing upon symbols such as the Tabernacle, high priesthood, and Melchizedek, is significantly different in comparison with other New Testament writers. Such a preoccupation with priestly symbols is unique; this has often been seen as the clue to the author's and his community's identities. However, as I have argued in this dissertation, since there is no conclusive statement on the author's and the community's identities, the question remains an enigma. The more significant aspect of this text is the world that the author brings together in Hebrews by creative appropriation and hermeneutical application. It is a world that coalesces the

Hebrew Scriptures and Jesus in a way that brings to the fore the necessity of understanding Jesus in light of Hebrew Scriptures. While the presentation of Jesus as Messiah is germane to the New Testament, Jesus as the High Priest of the Melchizedekian order at the heavenly Tabernacle is idiosyncratically the author's innovation.

As I have repeatedly pointed out in this dissertation, the symbolism associated with Jesus as the eternal High Priest who is also the victim cannot be understood apart from the levitical system of sacrifices and offerings centered on the earthly Tabernacle that was an integral part of the Sinai covenant. Herein lies the author's unique contribution to the larger New Testament corpus and the distinction of his use of Hebrew Scriptures. Through the transtextual analysis of this dissertation, I have shown that the author's use of Hebrew Scriptures is reflective of his innovative way of presenting Christ. The Christology of Hebrews is distinct and therefore indispensable to the fuller description of Jesus – the eternal High Priest at the heavenly Tabernacle.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aichele, George. *The Control of Biblical Meaning: Canon as Semiotic Mechanism.* Harrisburg: Trinity P, 2001.

Aichele, George, and G.A. Phillips, eds. "Intertextuality and the Bible." *Semeia* 69/70 (1995).

Allen, Graham. *Intertextuality: The New Critical Idiom.* London: Routledge, 2000.

Attridge, Harold W. *Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary.* Ed. Helmut Koester. Philadelphia: Fortress P, 1989.

Baker, David W. "Division Markers and the Structure of Leviticus 1-7." *Studia Biblica.* 1978. Ed. E. A. Livingstone. Sheffield: JSOT P, 1979. 9-15.

---. "Leviticus 1-7 and the Punic Tariffs: A Form Critical Comparison." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 99.2 (1987): 188-197.

Barton, John. "Intertextuality and the 'Final Form' of the Text." *Congress Volume: Oslo 1998.* Ed. André Lemaire and Magne Sæbø. Leiden: Brill, 2000. 33-37.

Berger, Peter L. *The Social Reality of Religion.* London: Faber & Faber, 1969.

Berger, Peter L., and Thomas Luckmann. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge.* NY: Doubleday, 1966.

Biran, Avraham, ed. *Temples and High Places in Biblical Times.* Proceedings of the Colloquium in Honor of the Centennial of Hebrew Union College – Jewish Institute of Religion: Jerusalem, 14-16 March 1977. Jerusalem: Nelson Glueck School of Biblical Archaeology of Hebrew Union College – Jewish Institute of Religion, 1981.

Boer, Roland C. "Banality and Sacrifice." *Strange Fire.* NY: NY UP, 2000. 146-160.

Bouissac, Paul, ed. *Encyclopedia of Semiotics*. NY: Oxford UP, 1998.

Bourdillon, M.F.C., and Meyer Fortes, eds. *Sacrifice*. NY: Academic P, 1980.

Brenton, Lancelot C. L., trans. *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English*. 1851. London: Hendrickson, 2001.

Britt, Brian, and Patrick Creehan. "Chiasmus in Leviticus 16: 29-17: 11." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 112.3 (2000): 398-400.

Brogan, T.V.F., ed. *New Princeton Handbook of Poetic Terms*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994.

Brown, William P., and J.T. Carroll. "Atonement in Scripture." *Interpretation* 52.1 (1998): 5-69.

---. "Holiness and Purity." *Interpretation* 53.4 (1999): 340-408.

Bruce, F.F. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. 1964. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.

Büchler, A. *Studies in Sin and Atonement in the Rabbinic Literature of the First Century*. Library of Biblical Studies. Ed. Harry M. Orlinsky. NY: KTAV, 1967.

Campbell, Edward F., and D. N. Freedman, eds. *The Biblical Archaeologist Reader*. Vol. 3. Garden City: Doubleday, 1970.

Carmichael, Calum M. *Law and Narrative in the Bible*. NY: Cornell UP, 1985.

---. "The Origin of the Scapegoat Ritual." *Vetus Testamentum* 50.2 (2000): 167-182.

---. "A Strange Sequence of Rules: Leviticus 19: 20-26." *Reading Leviticus*. Ed. J. Sawyer. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic P, 1996. 182-206.

Chandler, Daniel. *Semiotics: The Basics*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Chia, Philip P. "Intersubjectivity, Intertextuality and Interconnectivity: On Biblical Hermeneutics and Hegemony." *Jian Dao* 5 (1996): 1-21.

Clayton, Jay, and Eric Rothstein, eds. *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History.* Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1991.

Cohen, Philip. *Texts and Textuality: Textual Instability, Theory, and Interpretation.* NY: Garland, 1997.

Cohn, R.L. *The Shape of Sacred Space: Four Biblical Studies.* Chico: Scholars P, 1981.

Coleson, Joseph E., and Victor H. Matthews, eds. *"Go to the Land I Will Show You": Studies in Honor of Dwight W. Young.* Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1996.

Coogan, Michael D., ed. *The New Oxford Annotated Bible: New Revised Standard Version with the Apocrypha.* 3rd ed. NY: Oxford UP, 2001.

Cosby, M.R. *The Rhetorical Composition and Function of Hebrews 11 in Light of Example Lists in Antiquity.* Macon: Mercer UP, 1988.

Culler, J. *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction.* Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1981.

D'Angelo, Mary Rose. *Moses in the Letter to the Hebrews.* Ed. Howard Clark Kee. Missoula: Scholars P, 1979.

Damrosch, David. *The Narrative Covenant: Transformation of Genre in the Growth of Biblical Literature.* San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1987.

Davies, J. H. *A Letter to the Hebrews.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1967.

deSilva, David Arthur. *Despising Shame: Honor Discourse and Community Maintenance in the Epistle to the Hebrews.* Atlanta: Scholars P, 1995.

Dey, Lala Kaylan Kumar. *The Intermediary World and Patterns of Perfection in Philo and Hebrews*. Missoula: Scholars P, 1975.

Douglas, Mary. "Atonement in Leviticus." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 1/2 (1993): 109-130.

---. "The Go-Away Goat." *The Book of Leviticus*. Ed. R. Rendtorff and R. A. Kugler, Leiden: Brill, 2003. 121-141.

---. *In the Wilderness: The Doctrine of Defilement in the Book of Numbers*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic P, 1993.

---. *Jacob's Tears: The Priestly Work of Reconciliation*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004.

---. "Justice as the Cornerstone: An Interpretation of Leviticus 18-20." *Interpretation* 53.4 (1999): 341-350.

---. *Leviticus as Literature*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999.

Draisma, Sipke, ed. *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersel*. Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1989. 83-93.

Driver, S. R. *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. NY: Meridian Books, 1956.

Dunn, James D. G., ed. *Jews and Christians: The Parting of Ways AD 70 to 135*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992.

---. *The Parting of Ways between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity*. London: SCM P; Philadelphia: Trinity P, 1991.

---. *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity*. 3rd ed. London: SCM P, 2006.

Dunnill, John. *Covenant and Sacrifice in the Letter to the Hebrews*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.

Eberhart, Christian A. "Characteristics of Sacrificial Metaphors in Hebrews." *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods – New Insights*. Ed. Gabriella Gelardini. Leiden: Brill, 2005. 37-64.

Eco, Umberto. *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1984.

Eisenbaum, Pamela. "Heroes and History in Hebrews 11." *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scripture of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic P., 1997. 380-396.

Ellingworth, Paul. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.

Enns, Peter. "The Interpretation of Psalm 95 in Hebrews 3.1-4.13." *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scripture of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic P, 1997. 352-363.

Evans Craig. A. and James A. Sanders, eds. *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scripture of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic P, 1997.

---. *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic P, 1993.

Evans, Craig. A. and S. Talmon, eds. *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Fewell, Danna Nolan, ed. *Reading between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible.* Louisville: Westminster/John Knox P, 1992.

Finkelpearl, Ellen. "Pagan Traditions of Intertextuality in the Roman World." *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity*. Ed. D. R. MacDonald. Harrisburg: Trinity P International, 2001. 78-90.

Fredriksen, Paula. *From Jesus to Christ: The Origins of the New Testament Images of Jesus*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1988.

Freedman, H., and Maurice Simon, eds. *Midrash Rabbah: Leviticus*. London: Soncino P, 1939.

Freyne, Seán "Reading Hebrews and Revelation Intertextually." *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersel*. Ed. Sipke Draisma. Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1989. 83-93.

Frow, John. "Intertextuality and Ontology." *Intertextuality Theories and Practice*. Ed. Michael Worton and Judith Still. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1990. 45-55.

Gager, John G. *Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1975.

Gamble, Harry Y. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History Of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1995.

Gelardini, Gabriella. "Hebrews, an Ancient Synagogue Homily for *Tisha Be-Av*: Its Function, its Basis, its Theological Interpretation." *Hebrews Contemporary Methods – New Insights*. Ed. Gabriella Gelardini. Leiden: Brill, 2005. 107-127.

---, ed. *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods – New Insights*. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Geller, S. *Sacred Enigmas: Literary Religion in the Hebrew Bible*. NY: Routledge, 1996.

Genette, Gérard. *The Architext: An Introduction*. Trans. Jane E. Lewin. Berkeley: U of California P, 1992.

---. *Figures of Literary Discourse*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. NY: Columbia UP, 1982.

---. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Trans. Jane E. Lewin. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1972.

---. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Trans. Chana Newman and Claude Doubinsky. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1997.

---. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretations*. Trans. Jane E. Lewin. Berkeley: U of California P, 1997.

---. "Structuralism and Literary Criticism." *Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader*. Ed. David Lodge. London: Longman, 1988. 62-78.

Gheorghita, Radu. *The Role of the Septuagint in Hebrews: An Investigation of Its Influence with Special Consideration to the Use of Hab 2:3-4 in Heb 10:37-38*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

Gieschen, Charles A. "The Different Functions of a Similar Melchizedek Tradition in *2 Enoch* and the Epistle to the Hebrews." *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scripture of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic P, 1997. 364-379.

Giglioli, Pier Paolo, ed. *Language and Social Context: Selected Readings*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972.

Gilders, William K. *Blood Ritual in the Hebrew Bible: Meaning and Power*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2004.

Girard, René. *The Scapegoat*. Trans. Yvonne Freccero. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1986.

Goody, J. R. *The Interface between Written and Oral*. NY: Cambridge UP, 1987.

---. *Literacy in Traditional Societies*. London: Cambridge UP, 1968.

---. *The Logic of Writing and the Organization of Society*. NY: Cambridge UP, 1986.

---. *The Power of the Written Tradition*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution P, 2000.

Grabbe, Lester L. "The Scapegoat Tradition: A Study in Early Jewish Interpretation." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 18.2 (1987): 152-167.

Green, W.S. "Doing the Text's Work for It: Richard Hays on Paul's Use of Scripture." *Paul and the Scripture of Israel*. Ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic P, 1993. 58-63.

---. "Introduction: Law as Literature." *Semeia* 27 (1983): 1-4.

---. "Reading the Writing of Rabbinism: Toward an Interpretation of Rabbinic Literature." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 51 (1983): 191-206.

Groden, Michael, et al., eds. "Genette Gérard." *The Johns Hopkins Guide to Literary Theory and Criticism*. 2nd ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2005. 430-433.

Guberman, R. M., ed. *Julia Kristeva Interviews*. NY: Columbia UP, 1996.

Guthrie, Donald. *The Letter to the Hebrews: An Introduction and Commentary*. The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Leicester: InterVarsity P; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.

Guthrie, George H. *The Structure of Hebrews: A Text-Linguistic Analysis*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Gutmann, Joseph. "The Strange History of the Kapporet Ritual." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 112.4 (2000): 624-626.

Haran, Menham. *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into the Character of Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School.* 1978. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1979.

Harrington, H. K. "Interpreting Leviticus in the Second Temple Period: Struggling with Ambiguity." *Reading Leviticus.* Ed. J. Sawyer. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic P, 1996. 214-229.

Harris, Laird R., et al., eds. *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament.* Vol. 2. Chicago: Moody P, 1980.

Harrison, R. K. *Leviticus: An Introduction and Commentary.* Downers Grove: InterVarsity P, 1980.

Hartley, John E. *Leviticus.* Word Biblical Commentary. Vol. 4. Dallas: Word, 1992.

Hartman, L. "Some Unorthodox Thoughts on the 'Household-Code Form.'" *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism.* Ed. J. Neusner et al. Philadelphia: Fortress P, 1988. 219-34.

Hatina, Thomas R. "Intertextuality and Historical Criticism in New Testament Studies: Is There a Relationship?" *Biblical Interpretation* 7.1 (1999): 28-43.

Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul.* New Haven: Yale UP, 1989.

Heen, Eric M., and P. D. W. Krey, eds. *Hebrews.* Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: New Testament X. Downers Grove: InterVarsity P, 2005.

Heim, Knut M. "The Perfect King of Psalm 72: An 'Intertextual' Analysis." *The Lord's Anointed: Interpretation of Old Testament Messianic Texts.* Ed. Philip E. Satterthwaite, Richard S. Hees, and Gordon J. Wenham. Carlisle: Paternoster P; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995. 223-248.

Héring, Jean. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Trans. A.W. Heathcote and P.J. Allcock. London: Epworth P, 1970.

Hicks, F.C.N. *The Fullness of Sacrifice*. 3rd ed. London: SPCK, 1953.

Hillers, Delbert R. *Covenant: The History of a Biblical Idea*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins P, 1969.

---. *Treaty-Curses and the Old Testament Prophets*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1964.

Hodge, Robert, and Gunter Kress. *Social Semiotics*. Ithaca: Cornell P, 1988.

Hoffmann, Ronald, and Shira Leibowitz-Schmidt. "Pure and Impure." *New England Review* 16.1 (1994): 41-64.

Hoppin, Ruth. *Pricilla's Letter: Finding the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. San Francisco: Christian UP, 1997.

Horton, Fred L. *The Melchizedek Tradition: A Critical Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Century A.D. and in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1976.

Houston, Walter. *Purity and Monotheism: Clean and Unclean Animals in Biblical Law*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic P, 1993.

Hubert, Henri, and Marcel Mauss. *Sacrifice: Its Nature and Function*. Trans. W. D. Halls. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1964.

Hughes, Graham. *Hebrews and Hermeneutics: The Epistle to the Hebrews as a New Testament Example of Biblical Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1979.

Hughes, Philip E. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.

Hurst, L. D. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: Its Background of Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.

Isaacs, Marie E. *Sacred Space: An Approach to the Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic P, 1992.

Izard, Michel, and Pierre Smith, eds. *Between Belief and Transgression: Structuralist Essays in Religion, History, and Myth*. Trans. John Leavitt. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1982.

Jaworski, Adam, and Nikolas Coupland, eds. *The Discourse Reader*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Jenson, Philip Peter. *Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic P, 1992.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. "The Scriptural World of Hebrews." *Interpretation* 57.3 (2003): 237-250.

Johnson, Richard W. *Going Outside the Camp: The Sociological Function of the Levitical Critique in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic P, 2001.

Judge, Edwin A. "The Early Christians as Scholastic Community." *Journal of Religious History* 1 (1960): 4-15, 125-37.

---. "The Social Identity of the First Christians: A Question of Method in Religious History." *Journal of Religious History* 11 (1980): 201-217.

---. *The Social Pattern of Christian Groups in the First Century*. London: Tyndale, 1960.

Judisch, Douglas MacCallum Lindsay. "Propitiation in the Language and Typology of the Old Testament." *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 48 (1984): 221-243.

Juel, Donald. *Messianic Exegesis: Christological Interpretation of the Old Testament in Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress P, 1988.

Kadushin, Max. *Value Concepts in Jewish Thought*. A Conceptual Commentary on Midrash Leviticus Rabbah 126. Atlanta: Scholars P, 1987.

Käsemann, Ernst. *The Wandering People of God: An Investigation of the Letter of Hebrews*. Trans. Roy A. Harrisville and Irving L. Sandberg. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984.

Kearney, Richard, ed. *Paul Ricoeur: The Hermeneutics of Action.* London: Sage, 1996.

Klassen, William. "To the Hebrews or Against the Hebrews? Anti-Judaism and the Epistle to the Hebrews." *Separation and Polemic: Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity*. Vol. 2. Ed. S.G. Wilson. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier UP, 1986. 1-16.

Kleinig, John W. "The Blood for Sprinkling: Atoning Blood in Leviticus and Hebrews." *Lutheran Theological Journal* 33.3 (1999): 124-135.

Kleinig, Vernon. "Providence and Worship - the Aaronic Blessing: Numbers 6:22-27." *Lutheran Theological Journal* 19 (1985): 120-124.

Knierim, R. P. *Text and Concept in Leviticus 1:1-9. A Case in Exegetical Method.* Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1992.

Knohl, Israel. *The Sanctuary of Silence*. Philadelphia: Fortress P, 1995.

---. "The Priestly Torah versus the Holiness School: Sabbath and the Festivals." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 58 (1987): 65-117.

Kochan, Lionel. *Beyond the Graven Image: A Jewish View*. NY: NY UP, 1997.

Koester, Craig R. *The Dwelling of God: The Tabernacle in the Old Testament, Intertestamental Jewish Literature, and the New Testament*. Washington: Catholic

Biblical Association of America, 1989.

---. *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible. NY: Doubleday, 2001.

Koester, Helmut "'Outside the Camp': Hebrews 13.9-14." *The Harvard Theological Review*. 55.4 (1962): 299-315.

Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Worship in Israel: A Cultic History of the Old Testament*. Trans. Geoffrey Buswell. Richmond: John Knox P, 1966.

Kristeva, Julia. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez. NY: Columbia UP, 1980.

---. *Revolution in Poetic Language*. Trans. Margaret Waller. NY: Columbia UP, 1984.

Kristeva, Julia, J. Rey-Debove, and D. J. Umiker. *Essays in Semiotics*. The Hague: Mouton, 1971.

LaCocque A., and P. Ricoeur. *Thinking Biblically: Exegetical and Hermeneutical Studies*. Tans. David Pellauer. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1998.

Lakoff, G., and M. Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980.

Lane, William L. *Hebrews 1-8*. Word Biblical Commentary 47A. Dallas: Word, 1991.

---. *Hebrews 9-13*. Word Biblical Commentary 47B. Dallas: Word, 1991.

---. "Hebrews: A Sermon in Search of a Setting." *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 28.1 (1985): 13-18.

Lang, Bernhard, ed. *Anthropological Approaches to the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress P; London: SPCK, 1985.

Lechte, John, and Mary Zournazi, eds. *The Kristeva Critical Reader*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2003.

Lee, Clarence L. "Social Unrest and Primitive Christianity." *The Catacombs and the Colosseum: The Roman Empire as the Setting of Primitive Christianity*. Ed. Stephan Benko and John J. O'Rourke. Valley Forge: Judson, 1971. 121-138.

Lehne, Susanne. *The New Covenant in Hebrews*. Sheffield: JSOT P, 1990.

Levenson, Jon D. *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible*. Minneapolis: Winston P, 1985.

Levine, Baruch A. "A Further Look at the Mo'adim of the Temple Scroll." *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Sheffield: JSOT P, 1990. 53-66.

---. *In the Presence of the Lord: A Study of Cult and Some Cultic Terms in Ancient Israel*. Leiden: Brill, 1974.

---. *Leviticus*. The JPS Commentary. Philadelphia: JPS, 1989.

Lewis, Joe O. "The Ark and the Tent." *Review and Expositor* 74.04 (1977): 537-548.

Lightstone, Jack N. *The Commerce of the Sacred: Mediation of the Divine Among Jews in the Graeco-Roman Diaspora*. Chico: Scholars P, 1984.

Lindars, Barnabas. *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of Old Testament Quotations*. London: SCM P, 1961.

---. *The Theology of the Letter to the Hebrews*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991.

Longenecker, Richard N. *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity*. London: SCM P, 1970.

---. "The Melchizedek Argument of Hebrews." *Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology*. Ed. R. Guelich. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978. 161-185.

Lyonnet, S., and L. Sabourin. *Sin, Redemption, and Sacrifice: A Biblical and Patristic Study*. AnBib 48. Rome: Bible Institute, 1970. 299-332.

Maccoby, Hyam. *Ritual and Morality: The Ritual Purity System and Its Place in Judaism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999.

Mack, Burton L. *Rhetoric and the New Testament*. Minneapolis: Fortress P, 1990.

---. "Wisdom makes a Difference: Alternatives to 'Messianic' Configurations." *Judaism and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. Ed. Jacob Neusner, William S. Green, and Ernest Frerichs. NY: Cambridge UP, 1987. 15-48.

Mackie, Scott D. "Confession of the Son of God in Hebrews." *New Testament Studies* 53 (2007): 114-129.

MacRae, George W. "Heavenly Temple and Eschatology in the Letter to the Hebrews." *Semeia* 12 (1978): 179-199.

Madsen, Truman G. *The Temple in Antiquity: Ancient Records and Modern Perspectives*. Provo: Religious Studies Center: Brigham Young U, 1984.

Malherbe, Abraham J. *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*. Rockwell Lectures of 1975. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1977.

Manson, William. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: An Historical and Theological Reconsideration*. The Baird Lecture, 1949. 1951. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1966.

Marx, Alfred. "The Theology of the Sacrifice According to Leviticus 1-7." Trans. Cheryl Cloyd. *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*. Ed. R. Rendtorff and R.A. Kugler. Leiden: Brill, 2003. 103-120.

McCarthy, Dennis J. *Old Testament Covenant: A Survey of Current Opinions*. Richmond: John Knox P, 1972.

McComiskey, Thomas Edward. *The Covenants of Promise: A Theology of the Old Testament Covenants*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985.

McKenzie, Steven. *Covenant*. St. Louis: Chalice P, 2000.

Meeks, Wayne A. *The First Urban Christians – The Social World of the Apostle Paul.* New Haven: Yale UP, 1983.

---. *The Moral World of the First Christians*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.

Mendenhall, George E. *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East.* Pittsburgh: The Biblical Colloquium, 1955.

Milgrom, Jacob. "The Biblical Diet Laws as an Ethical System." *Interpretation* 17 (1963): 288-301.

---. "The Changing Concept of Holiness." *Reading Leviticus*. Ed. J. Sawyer. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic P, 1996. 65-75.

---. *Cult and Conscience: The* Asham *and the Priestly Doctrine of Repentance*. Leiden: Brill, 1976.

---. "The First Fruits Festivals of Grain and the Composition of Leviticus 23:9-21." *Tehillah le-Moshe*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1997. 81-89.

---. *Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Vol. 3. NY: Doubleday, 1991.

---. *Leviticus 17-22: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Vol. 3A. NY: Doubleday, 2000.

---. *Leviticus 23-27: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Vol. 3B. NY: Doubleday, 2001.

---. *Leviticus: A Book of Ritual and Ethics: A Continental Commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress P, 2004.

---. *Numbers*. The JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia: JPS, 1990.

---. "Rationale for Cultic Law: The Case of Impurity." *Semeia* 45 (1989): 103-109.

---. "Sin-Offering or Purification-Offering?" *VT* 21 (1971): 237-239.

---. *Studies in Cultic Theology and Terminology*. Ed. Jacob Neusner. Leiden: Brill, 1983.

---. *Studies in Levitical Terminology, I. The Encroacher and the Levite: The Term 'Aboda*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1970.

---. "Two Biblical Hebrew Priestly Terms: Seqes and Tame." *MAARAV* 8 (1992): 107-116.

Moi, Toril, ed. *The Kristeva Reader*. NY: Columbia UP, 1986.

Montefiore, H.W. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1964.

Morgan, T. E. "Is There an Intertext in this Text?: Literary and Interdisciplinary Approaches to Intertextuality." *American Journal of Semiotics* 3.4 (1985): 1-40.

Morris, Leon. "Hebrews." *Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Ed. F.E. Gæbelein. Vol. 12. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981. 3-158.

Moyise, Steve. *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction*. London: T&T Clark, 2001.

---. *The Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J.L. North*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic P, 2000.

Nairne, A. *The Epistle of Priesthood*. Edinburgh: T&T Clarke, 1915.

Nelson, Richard D. "'He Offered Himself': Sacrifice in Hebrews." *Interpretation* 57.3 (2003): 251-265.

Neusner, Jacob. *Formative Judaism: Religious Historical and Literary Studies: Second Series*. Chico: Scholars P, 1983.

---. *Sifra: An Analytical Translation*. 3 vols. Atlanta: Scholars P, 1988.

---, ed. *Studies in Cultic Theology and Terminology in Judaism in Late Antiquity*. Leiden: Brill, 1983.

Nicholson, Ernest W. *God and His People: Covenant and Theology in the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1986.

Niditch, Susan. *Ancient Israelite Religion*. NY: Oxford UP, 1997.

Noth, Martin. *Leviticus: A Commentary*. Philadelphia: Westminster P, 1965.

Oliver, Kelly, ed. *The Portable Kristeva*. NY: Columbia UP, 1997.

Omanson, Roger L. "A Superior Covenant: Hebrews 8:1-10:18." *Review & Expositor* 82 (1985): 361-373.

Orr, Mary. *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts*. Cambridge: Polity P, 2003.

Paton, L. B. "The Original Form of Leviticus xxiii, xxv." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 18 (1999): 35-60.

Peterson, David. *Hebrews and Perfection: An Examination of the Concept of Perfection in the "Epistle to the Hebrew."* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982.

Pfister, Manfred. "How Postmodern Is Intertextuality?" *Intertextuality*. Ed. Heinrich F. Plett. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1991, 207-224.

Plett, Heinrich F., ed. *Intertextuality*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1991.

Poorthuis, M. J. H. M., and J. Schwartz, eds. *Purity and Holiness: The Heritage of Leviticus*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Porter, J.R. *Leviticus*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1976.

Porter, Stanley E. "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology." *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scripture of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic P, 1997. 79-96.

Queen-Sutherland, Kandy. "Cultic Calendars in the Old Testament." *Faith and Mission* 8.2 (1991): 76-87.

Rabe, Virgil W. "The Identity of the Priestly Tabernacle." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 25.2 (1966): 132-134.

Rendtorff, Rolf, and Robert A. Kugler, eds. *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Richard, E. *Jesus: One and Many. The Christological Concept of the New Testament Authors*. Wilmington: M. Glazier, 1988.

Ricoeur, P. *The Conflict of Interpretations: Essays in Hermeneutics*. Ed. Don Ihde. Evanston: Northwestern UP, 1974.

---. *Figuring the Sacred Religion, Narrative, and Imagination*. Trans. David Pellauer and Mark I. Wallace. Minneapolis: Fortress P, 1995.

---. *From Text to Action: Essays in Hermeneutics II*. Trans. Kathleen Blamey and John B. Thompson. Evanston: Northwestern UP, 1991.

---. *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences: Essays on Language, Action and Interpretation*. Ed. and trans. John B. Thompson. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1981.

---. *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning*. Fort Worth: Texas Christian UP, 1976.

---. *The Rule of Metaphor: Multi-Disciplinary Studies of the Creation of Meaning in Language*. Trans. Robert Czerny, Kathleen McLaughlin, and John Cosetella. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1975.

Robbins, Vernon K. *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse: Rhetoric, Society and Ideology*. London: Routledge, 1996.

---. *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation*. Valley Forge: Trinity P International, 1996.

Robertson, O. Palmer. *The Christ of the Covenants*. Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1980.

Robinson, T.H. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1964.

Rodriguez, Angel M. "Leviticus 16: Its Literary Structure." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 34 (1996): 269-286.

Roo, Jacqueline C. R. De. "Was the Goat for Azazel Destined for the Wrath of God?" *Biblica* 81.2 (2000): 233-242.

Rowley, H. H. *Worship in Ancient Israel: Its Forms and Meaning*. Philadelphia, Fortress P, 1967.

Sanders, Jack T. *Schismatics, Sectarians, Dissidents, Deviants: The First 100 Years of Jewish-Christian Relations*. London: SCM P, 1993.

Sawyer, J.F.A., ed. *Reading Leviticus: A Conversation with Mary Douglas*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic P, 1997.

---. *Sacred Languages and Sacred Texts*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Schiffirin, D., D. Tannen, and H. E. Hamilton. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.

Scholer, John M. *Proleptic Priests: Priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic P, 1991.

Scholes, Robert. *Semiotics and Interpretation*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1982.

Scroggs, R. "The Earliest Christian Communities as a Sectarian Movement." *Christianity, Judaism, and Other Greco-Roman Cults*. Part 2. Ed. J. Neusner. Leiden: Brill, 1975. 1-23.

Seung, T. K. *Semiotics and Thematics in Hermeneutics*. NY: Columbia UP, 1982.

---. *Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. NY: Columbia UP, 1982.

Skarsaune, Oskar. *In the Shadow of the Temple: Jewish Influences on Early Christianity*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity P, 2002.

Smith, C.R. "The Literary Structure of Leviticus." *JSOT* 70 (1996): 17-32.

Sommer, Benjamin D. "Conflicting Construction of Divine Presence in the Priestly Tabernacle." *Biblical Interpretations* 9.1 (2001): 41-63.

Sowers, Sidney G. *The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews: A Comparison of the Interpretation of the Old Testament in Philo Judaeus and the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Richmond: John Knox P, 1965.

Sweeney, A. M., and E. Ben Zvi, eds. *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

Stark, Rodney. *The Rise Of Christianity: A Sociologist Reconsiders History*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1996.

Stern, David H. *Jewish New Testament: A Translation of the New Testament that Expresses Its Jewishness*. Clarksville: Jewish New Testament Publications, 1989.

Talmon, S. "The Desert Motif in the Bible and in the Qumran Literature." *Literary Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Form and Content: Collected Studies*. Jerusalem: Magnes P, 1993. 216-254.

Theissen, Gerd. *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*. Ed. and trans. John H. Schütz. Philadelphia: Fortress P, 1982.

Thompson, J. B. *Critical Hermeneutics: A Study in the Thought of Paul Ricoeur and Jürgen Habermas*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1981.

Thompson, James W. *The Beginnings of Christian Philosophy: The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Washington: Catholic Association of America, 1982.

Thompson, R. J. *Penitence and Sacrifice in Early Israel Outside the Levitical Law: An Examination of the Fellowship Theory of Early Israelite Sacrifice*. Leiden: Brill, 1963.

Tönges, Elke. "The Epistle to the Hebrews as a 'Jesus-Midrash.'" *Hebrews Contemporary Methods – New Insights*. Ed. Gabriella Gelardini. Leiden: Brill, 2005. 89-105.

Vaage, Leif E., ed. *Religious Rivalries in Early Roman Empire and the Rise of Christianity*. [Waterloo]: Wilfrid Laurier UP, 2006.

Vanhoozer, Kevin J. *Is There a Meaning in This Text? The Bible, the Reader, and the Morality of Literary Knowledge*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998.

---. *Biblical Narrative in the Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur: A Study in Hermeneutics and Theology*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.

Vaux, Roland de. *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Trans. Damian McHugh. NY: Double Day, 1971.

Vermes, Geza. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. London: Penguin P, 1997.

Vriezen, Th. C. *An Outline of Old Testament Theology*. 2nd ed. Newton: Charles T. Branford, 1970.

Warning, W. *Literary Artistry in Leviticus*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Wenham, Gordon J. *The Book of Leviticus*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1979.

---. *Numbers*. Old Testament Guides. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic P, 1997.

Williamson, Ronald. *Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

Wilson, S. G., ed. *Separation and Polemic*. Vol. 2 of *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity*. Ed. Peter Richardson and David Granskou. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier UP, 1986.

---. *Related Strangers: Jews and Christians 70-170 C.E.* Minneapolis: Fortress P, 1995.

Wisse, Frederik. "The Use of Early Christian Literature as Evidence for Inner Diversity and Conflict." *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity: Fourteen Leading Scholars Discuss the Current Issues in Gnostic Studies*. Eds. Charles W. Hedrick and Robert Hodgson Jr. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1986. 177-190.

Witherington, Ben, III. *The Many Faces of the Christ: The Christologies of the New Testament and Beyond*. NY: Crossroad, 1998.

Worton, Michael, and Judith Still, eds. *Intertextuality Theories and Practice*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1990.

Wright, David P., et al, eds. *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995.

Zodhiates, Spiros. *The Complete Word Study Dictionary: New Testament*. Chattanooga: AMG, 1992.

APPENDIX I

Theological and Sociological Terminology

i. Holiness:

The *Theological Word Book of the Old Testament* gives an elaborate and lengthy definition of holiness in the following terms:

> . . . *qādôsh* connotes the concept of "holiness," i.e. the essential nature of that which belongs to the sphere of the sacred and which is thus distinct from the common and profane. This distinction is evident in Lev.10:10 and Ezk 22:26 where *qādôsh* occurs as the antithesis of *ḥôl* ("profane," "common").
>
> There is some truth in the idea of R. Otto . . . that the word "holy" refers to *mysterium tremendum*. It speaks of God with a measure of awe.... "His holy name" is the name of God. The inner room of God's dwelling is called the Holy of Holies – the most holy place.
>
> . . . [T]he Biblical viewpoint would refer the holiness of God not only to the mystery of his power, but also to his character as totally good and entirely without evil. Holy objects therefore are those with no cultic pollution which is symbolic of the moral pollution. They are not merely dedicated, but dedicated to what is good and kept from evil. The separation of men from what defiles ceremonially is but typical of holiness that is spiritual and ethical. . . .
>
> A basic element of Israelite religion was the maintenance of an invisible distinction between the spheres of the sacred and the common or profane (Num 18:32). That which was inherently holy or designated so by divine decree or cultic

rite was not to be treated as common. The sabbath was holy, and the restrictions connected with that day served to maintain its distinctive nature and to guard against its being treated as common (Ex 16:23-26; Is 58:13, 14). Special restrictions were placed on the priests to guard against profanation of its holy status (Lev. 21:6ff.). Sexual intercourse was not considered immoral in the OT but it did effect a state of levitical defilement (Lev 15:18) which prohibited contact with that which was holy (1 Sam 21:4). The same principle applied to the peace offering (Lev 19:5-8), the holy oil (Ex 30:32-33), and holy incense (Ex 30:37)

That which was dedicated to God was conceived of as entering the sphere of the "holy." This included various elements of levitical worship called "holy things" in Lev 5:15-16, the produce of the land (Lev 19:24), personal property (Lev 27:28), and spoils obtained in military action (Josh 6:19). The sacrifices that were made to be eaten only by the priests were denominated "holy" by virtue of their absolute dedication to the sphere of the sacred as represented by the priesthood (Lev 19:18).

While the realm of the holy was conceptually distinct from the world with its imperfections, it could nevertheless operate within the world as long as the integrity was strictly maintained. The maintenance of the integrity of the "holy" was a function of the Israelite cultus. . . . The cultus also effected the holiness of those who participated in it. (787-788)

ii. Covenant Formulary:

In *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible*, Levenson describes covenant formulary as follows:

> In the first step, the *preamble* or *titulary*, the suzerain identifies himself. The second step is the *historical prologue* or *antecedent history*. . . . [I]t is a statement of the past relationship of the parties. Sometimes the suzerain stresses his benefactions towards the vassal. . . .
>
> The historical prologue leads . . . into . . . the third step, the *stipulations*, the terms of the treaty. The purpose of the stipulations is to secure the fidelity of the vassal, to insure that the centerpiece of his foreign policy is faithful to his liege lord. The stipulations are in the nature of direct address; they are in the second person. . . . The ancient Near Eastern covenant was not an impersonal code, but an instrument of diplomacy founded upon the personal relationship of the heads of state. The essence of the covenant lies in the fact that the latter pledge to be faithful to one another. . . . [T]he king was thought to look after his subjects solicitously. In a ubiquitous metaphor, he was their shepherd they were his flock. They loved him and feared him. . . . [I]n some suzerainty treaties, the greater king is the "father" of the lesser king, not in a biological sense, of course, but in a powerful metaphorical way. Thus, we find that the vassals are sometimes commanded to even love their suzerain.
>
> The purpose of the covenant would be defeated if the vassal were allowed to enter into such a relationship with another suzerain as well, for that would undermine the great king's control over the area ruled by his partner. Therefore,

although a suzerain may have many vassals, a given vassal must recognize only one suzerain. . . . [The] demand for exclusive loyalty is central to the stipulations. From it the others follow naturally. Without it they make no sense.

The fourth step in the covenant formulary is the *deposition* of the text. . . . In a society in which gods served as guarantors of the treaty, it was often deemed appropriate to put a public document in their temples, where they would be continually reminded of its provisions, lest a perfidious ally go unpunished. . . . Furthermore, some treaties required that the text be periodically read to the vassal in a kind of liturgical reaffirmation of the pact. . . . [The] recitation has as its goal knowledge of the terms of the covenant. One must know the treaty in order to fulfill it.

The fifth item is the *list of witnesses*. These are gods before whom the sacred oath is sworn. To violate the treaty, solemnly entered into, is to risk the wrath of the deities. The list is often quite lengthy, since the treaties tend to invoke the pantheon of each of the two parties. In addition, certain natural phenomena, such as mountains, rivers, heaven and earth, stand in witness. In a culture in which words were believed to have effects and in which one therefore did not utter the names of the deities lightly, the list of divine or cosmic witnesses served as a potent inducement to observance of stipulations.

The sixth and last element in the covenant formulary is called *curses and blessings*. Violation of the stipulations, perfidy and betrayal, will surely result in a cursed life. Conversely, compliance with the stipulations, loyalty and faithfulness to the suzerain, result in a state of beatitude. The curses include such things as

annihilation, epidemic, sterility, drought, famine, dethronement, and exile. It is clear that the covenant contains within it a moral mechanism based on the principle of retribution, reward for faithfulness, punishment for the faithless. The moral principle was thought to be implemented not so much by the workings of the human political order, as by a transcendent element, the trustworthiness of the gods to respond to an oath sworn in their holy names. (27-30)

To this list of six steps, three more steps can be added, as suggested by Mendenhall in *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. "The formal oath by which the vassal pledged his obedience. . . . [S]ome solemn ceremony which accompanied the oath, or perhaps was a symbolical oath. . . . [I]t is quite likely that some sort of form existed for initiating procedure against a rebellious vassal" (34-35).

iii. Consecration of the Tabernacle and the Priests:

The following is Hartley's exposition of the detailed procedures pertaining to the consecration of the Tabernacle and the priests:

> Aaron and his sons lay their hands on [the young bull's] head. The sacrificial animal is the young bull, called here פר החטאת, "the bull of the purification offering." This is the same kind of animal prescribed as the offering for the anointed priest who has sinned inadvertently (4:3-12). Aaron slaughters the bull, possibly with the help of his sons. Acting as high priest, Moses takes some of the blood and smears it on the horns of the altar. This action purifies (חטא) the altar (מזבח), by removing any sin or uncleanness that has attached itself to the altar. . . . This blood rite is not mentioned in 4:3-12; thus it must be a special rite for the ordination ceremony. It is further stated that this act of כפר, "making expiation,"

for the altar sanctifies (קדשׁ) it. . . . [T]his ritual removes any uncleanness that is present from either the altar or the priests before they are consecrated as holy . . . indicating that this purification offering has a slightly different function than the purification offering prescribed in Lev. 4:1-5:13. *This rite, along with the fact that both the priests and the Tabernacle and its furniture are anointed, underscores the close bond between the sanctuary and the priests. Both must be consecrated, anointed, and cleansed for the sacrificial system to function effectively.*

Moses disposes of the remains of the bull outside the camp as with the greater reparation offering (4:11, 12, 21). The entire animal must be consumed. The priests may not eat from it since it is offered on their behalf. Moses must have taken these parts outside the camp himself since no other priests has yet been ordained.

איל המלאים, "the ram of ordination," is sacrificed next. Aaron and his sons lay their hands on the ram's head, indicating that this is their sacrifice. The word מלאים, "ordination," is a technical term. It is derived from the idiom מלא יד, "to fill the hand.". . . Behind the word is the act of placing in the priest's hands portions from the sacrifices which he presents as תנופה, "an elevation offering" (cf. 7:28-34). The ritual of this sacrifice and the meal from the portions of the ram indicate that this offering was presented according to the basic ritual presented for an offering of well-being (chap. 3).

Moses slaughters the ram and takes some of the blood and puts it on Aaron's right earlobe . . . on his right thumb . . . and on the big toe of his right foot. A similar action takes place in the cleansing of the leper (14:14, 17, 25, 28). By

covering Aaron's extremities with blood, Moses consecrates him totally to Yahweh. . . . Later Moses sprinkled Aaron and his sons and their garments with a mixture of oil and blood from the altar as a further act of consecration. . . .

Moses takes the fat tail and various other fat parts, and the right thigh (שׁוק הימין) and adds to them three types of bread–חלת מצה, "unleavened bread,"חלת לחם שׁמן, "bread mixed with oil," and רקיק, "a wafer" – the portions that are explicitly given to the priests for their service. He puts all of these elements in the hands of the Aaron and his sons in order that they may raise them (הניף) as an elevated offering (תנופה). The connection between "filling Aaron's hands" and the technical term for ordination, מלאים, lit. "the filling" is quite visible. By this rite of elevation Aaron and his sons offer to God those portions of the sacrifices that God has assigned to them (cf. 7:30-31). Then Moses takes these parts from their hands and burns (חקטיר) them on the altar on top of the whole offering (העלה). This rite diverges from an offering of well-being, in which the right thigh is considered to be תרומה, "a special gift," belonging to the officiating priest (7: 32-34). In the ordination offering, however, it receives special sanctification by being elevated and then burnt on the altar. . . . Since it is offered by the priests for their own ordination, they may not eat from it. This ordination offering is fully acceptable, for it is described as . . . . "a soothing aroma, it is a gift to Yahweh" (cf. 1:9). Then Moses, as the officiating priest, presents the breast as an elevated offering (cf. 7:30, 34), and it becomes his portion."[76] (113, 114, 116, emphasis mine)

[76] "In the standard peace offering the priests also received the right thigh. On this occasion the *right thigh* was included in God's portion burned on the altar (v.25) Perhaps this distribution of the priestly prerequisite represents the idea that the ordination of Aaron was carried out jointly by God and Moses" (Wenham 142).

iv. Mercy Seat:

Scholars disagree in regard to the etymology of the term "mercy seat":

> The most appropriate way to translate this term is disputed. Probably it is connected with *kipper*, "to make atonement," as is suggested by the Greek translation *hilastērion* (propitiation) and the other ancient versions. The English rendering *mercy* seat reflects the idea that this part of the ark was used for atonement. The notion of it being a "seat" comes from remarks such as Ps. 99:1, "the Lord reigns. . . . He sits enthroned upon the cherubim." These cherubim flanked the mercy seat (Exod. 25:17-22), making it look like a throne.
>
> Many scholars, however, have associated *kappōreṯ* with Arab. *kafara*, "to cover," and translate it "lid, cover." The plausibility of this etymology depends on *kipper* meaning "to cover sin". If this is rejected . . . it seems unlikely that *kappōreṯ* means merely "lid". It was a sort of lid for the ark, but much more. It was the place where God's glory appeared and where atonement was made once a year. The etymology of *kappōreṯ* does not concern the biblical writers: what is stressed . . . is that it is the place where "I will meet with you . . . and speak with you." (Wenham 1979, 229 n. 2)

Milgrom categorically states that:

> The term *kapporet* is untranslatable, so far. It refers to the solid gold slab (3.75 feet by 2.25 feet) atop the ark, at the edge of which rest two cherubim, of one piece with it and made of hammered gold, kneeling and facing each other with bowed heads and outstretched wings so as to touch in the middle. It can hardly be rendered "mercy seat/throne" or "cover" (2004, 167).

v. Azazel:

Hartley presents the following scholarly positions on Azazel:

> The term עזאזל, "Azazel," occurs only four times in the OT, all in this chapter [Lev. 16] (vv 8, 10 [2x], 26). Its meaning has been disputed from ancient times. There are four major explanations. The first takes the descriptive term for the goat itself. LXX and Vg understand it to be a composite of two words עז, "goat," and אזל, "go away," i.e., "the goat which departs". . . . A major difficulty with this widely held view is that the goat is "for Azazel" and is to be sent "to Azazel" (vv 8, 10, 26). . . . A second possibility . . . takes Azazel to be an abstract term meaning "entire removal"; the phrase לעזאזל then means "for removal." An argument against this position is that there are few abstract terms in Leviticus; in fact the entire ritual of the Day of Atonement, including the release of this goat, is a symbolic enactment of spiritual realities. Neither does this meaning establish a good parallel with ליהוה, "for Yahweh". A third view, which comes from the rabbinic tradition, takes this word as the place to which the goat departs. Rashi identifies the word as a "rocky precipice". . . . *B. Yoma* 63b renders it "hardest of the mountains" as though it were written עזז אל. R. Saadia renders it Mount Azaz. . . . G.R. Driver . . . takes it as a place name from the root עזז, which is a cognate of Arab *'azâzu*, "rough ground". . . . There are two difficulties [with this position]. (1) לעזאזל, "for Azazel," is the parallel to ליהוה, "for Yahweh" (vv 8-10), suggesting that Azazel is some type of being rather than place. (2) If לעזאזל meant "to a rocky precipice" why is this place to which the goat goes called ארץ גזרה, "a separate land," v 22? A fourth position holds that עזאזל is the name of a demon or

the devil himself. . . . Many object to this identification, however, for they cannot conceive that the Scriptures would prescribe a sacrifice or a gift to a demon (cf. Harrison 170-71). . . . Nevertheless there are no indications at all that this goat was offered as a sacrifice. It was not ritually slaughtered; nor were there any rites for manipulating its blood. In fact, because it carries the people's sins, this goat was unclean, thus disqualifying it for sacrifice. While the OT is very careful not to personify evil in a figure such as Satan, it does recognize that there are cosmic forces hostile to Yahweh. These forces are represented as either sea monsters, such as Leviathan (e.g., Isa 27:1), or satyrs that inhabit the desert (e.g., Isa 13:21). The fact that these satyrs were thought to be goatlike favours the possibility that Azazel stands for one of those demons, especially given the fact that part of the name Azazel in Heb. means "goat". . . . If Azazel was a demon, this rite means that the sins were carried by the goat were returned to this demon for the purpose of removing them from the community and leaving them at their source in order that their power or effect in the community might be completely broken. The difference between the third and the fourth options is not that great, for a society frequently names a place after an identity and vice versa. (237-238)

APPENDIX II

Table III: TRANSTEXTUALITY IN HEBREWS

Chapter 1

HEBREWS	PENTATEUCH	PROPHETS	WRITINGS
[1] Long ago God spoke to our ancestors in many and various ways by the prophets, [2] but in these last days he has spoken to us by a Son, whom he appointed heir of all things, through whom he also created the worlds [3] He is the reflection of God's glory and the exact imprint of God's very being, and he sustains all things by his powerful word. When he had made purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high, [4] having become as much superior to angels as the name he has inherited is more excellent than theirs. [5] For to which of the angels did God			

ever say, 'You are my Son; today I have begotten you'? Or again, 'I will be his Father, and he will be my Son'?		2 Sam. 7:14 (quotation)	Ps. 2:7 (quotation) 1 Chron. 17:13 (quotation)
6 And again, when he brings the firstborn into the world, he says, 'Let all God's angels worship him.'	LXX Deut. 32:43 (quotation)		Ps. 97:7 LXX Ps. 96:7 (quotation)
7 Of the angels he says, 'He makes his angels winds, and his servants flames of fire.'			Ps. 104:4 LXX Ps. 103:4 (quotation)
8 But of the Son he says, 'Your throne, O God, is for ever and ever, and the righteous sceptre is the sceptre of your kingdom.			Ps. 45:6 LXX Ps. 44:6 (quotation)
9 You have loved righteousness and hated wickedness; therefore God, your God, has anointed you with the oil of gladness beyond your companions.'			Ps. 45:7-8 LXX Ps. 44:7-8 (quotation)
10 And, 'In the beginning, Lord, you founded the earth, and the heavens are the work of your hands;		Zech. 12:1 (quotation)	Ps.102:25 LXX Ps. 101:25 Ps. 8:6 (quotations)
11 they will perish, but you remain;		Isa. 34:4; 51:6 (quotation)	

they will all wear out like clothing; [12] like a cloak you will roll them up, and like clothing they will be changed. But you are the same, and your years will never end.' [13] But to which of the angels has he ever said, 'Sit at my right hand until I make your enemies a footstool for your feet'? [14] Are not all angels spirits in the divine service, sent to serve for the sake of those who are to inherit salvation?			Ps.102:26-27 LXX Ps.101:26-27 (quotation) Ps.110:1 LXX Ps. 109:1 (quotation) Ps. 91:11 LXX Ps. 90:11 (allusion)

Chapter 2

HEBREWS	PENTATEUCH	PROPHETS	WRITINGS
[1] Therefore we must pay greater attention to what we have heard, so that we do not drift away from it. [2] For if the message declared through angels was valid, and every transgression or disobedience	Deut. 33:2 (allusion)		

received a just penalty,			
[3] how can we escape if we neglect so great a salvation? It was declared at first through the Lord, and it was attested to us by those who heard him,			
[4] while God added his testimony by signs and wonders and various miracles, and by gifts of the Holy Spirit, distributed according to his will.			
[5] Now God did not subject the coming world, about which we are speaking, to angels.			
[6] But someone has testified somewhere, 'What are human beings that you are mindful of them, or mortals, that you care for them?			Job 7:17 Ps. 144:3 LXX Ps.143:3 Ps. 8: 4 (quotation)
[7] You have made them for a little while lower than the angels; you have crowned them with glory and honour,			Ps. 8:5 (quotation)
[8] subjecting all things under their			Ps. 8:6 (quotation)

feet.' Now in subjecting all things to them, God left nothing outside their control. As it is, we do not yet see everything in subjection to them, 9 but we do see Jesus, who for a little while was made lower than the angels, now crowned with glory and honour because of the suffering of death, so that by the grace of God he might taste death for everyone. 10 It was fitting that God, for whom and through whom all things exist, in bringing many children to glory, should make the pioneer of their salvation perfect through sufferings. 11 For the one who sanctifies and those who are sanctified all have one Father. For this reason Jesus is not ashamed to call them brothers and sisters, 12 saying, 'I will proclaim your name			Ps. 22:22 LXX Ps. 21:22

to my brothers and sisters, in the midst of the congregation I will praise you.'			(quotation)
13 And again, 'I will put my trust in him.' And again, 'Here am I and the children whom God has given me.'		Isa. 8:17 (quotation) Isa. 8:18 (quotation)	
14 Since, therefore, the children share flesh and blood, he himself likewise shared the same things, so that through death he might destroy the one who has the power of death, that is, the devil,			
15 and free those who all their lives were held in slavery by the fear of death.			
16 For it is clear that he did not come to help angels, but the descendants of Abraham.			
17 Therefore he had to become like his brothers and sisters in every respect, so that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in the service of God, to make a sacrifice of			

atonement for the sins of the people. [18] Because he himself was tested by what he suffered, he is able to help those who are being tested.			

Chapter 3

HEBREWS	PENTATEUCH	PROPHETS	WRITINGS
[1] Therefore, brothers and sisters, holy partners in a heavenly calling, consider that Jesus, the apostle and high priest of our confession, [2] was faithful to the one who appointed him, just as Moses also 'was faithful in all God's house.' [3] Yet Jesus is worthy of more glory than Moses, just as the builder of a house has more honour than the house itself. [4] (For every house is built by someone, but the builder of all things is God.) [5] Now Moses was faithful in all God's house as a servant,	Num. 12:7 (quotation) Num. 12:7 (quotation)		

to testify to the things that would be spoken later. [6] Christ, however, was faithful over God's house as a son, and we are his house if we hold firm the confidence and the pride that belong to hope. [7] Therefore, as the Holy Spirit says, 'Today, if you hear his voice, [8] do not harden your hearts as in the rebellion, as on the day of testing in the wilderness, [9] where your ancestors put me to the test, though they had seen my works [10] for forty years. Therefore I was angry with that generation, and I said, "They always go astray in their hearts, and they have not known my ways." [11] As in my anger I swore, "They will not enter my rest."' [12] Take care, brothers and sisters, that none of you			Ps. 95:7 LXX Ps. 94:8 (quotation) Ps. 95:8 LXX Ps. 94:9 (quotation) Ps. 95:9 LXX Ps. 94:10 (quotation) Ps. 95:10 LXX Ps. 94:11 (quotation) Ps. 95:11 LXX Ps. 94:12 (quotation)

may have an evil, unbelieving heart that turns away from the living God.			
[13] But exhort one another every day, as long as it is called 'today', so that none of you may be hardened by the deceitfulness of sin.			
[14] For we have become partners of Christ, if only we hold our first confidence firm to the end.			
[15] As it is said, 'Today, if you hear his voice, do not harden your hearts as in the rebellion.'			Ps. 95:7-8 LXX Ps. 94:8 (quotation)
[16] Now who were they who heard and yet were rebellious? Was it not all those who left Egypt under the leadership of Moses?	Num. 14:2 (allusion)		
[17] But with whom was he angry for forty years? Was it not those who sinned, whose bodies fell in the wilderness?	Num. 14:29 (allusion)		Ps. 106:26 LXX Ps. 105:26 (allusion)
[18] And to whom did he swear that they would not enter his	Num. 14:20-23; Deut. 1:34, 35 (allusion)		

rest, if not to those who were disobedient? [19] So we see that they were unable to enter because of unbelief.			Ps. 78:22; 106:24 LXX Ps. 77:22; Ps. 105:24 (allusion)

Chapter 4

HEBREWS	PENTATEUCH	PROPHETS	WRITINGS
[1] Therefore, while the promise of entering his rest is still open, let us take care that none of you should seem to have failed to reach it. [2] For indeed the good news came to us just as to them; but the message they heard did not benefit them, because they were not united by faith with those who listened. [3] For we who have believed enter that rest, just as God has said, 'As in my anger I swore, "They shall not enter my rest"', though his works were finished at the foundation of the world.			Ps. 95:11 LXX Ps. 94:11 (quotation)

[4] For in one place it speaks about the seventh day as follows: 'And God rested on the seventh day from all his works.'	Gen. 2:2, 3 (quotation)		
[5] And again in this place it says, 'They shall not enter my rest.'			Ps. 95:11 LXX Ps. 94:11 (quotation)
[6] Since therefore it remains open for some to enter it, and those who formerly received the good news failed to enter because of disobedience,			
[7] again he sets a certain day—'today'—saying through David much later, in the words already quoted, 'Today, if you hear his voice, do not harden your hearts.'			Ps. 95:7, 8 LXX Ps. 94:8 (quotation)
[8] For if Joshua had given them rest, God would not speak later about another day.		Josh. 22:4 (allusion)	
[9] So then, a sabbath rest still remains for the people of God;			
[10] for those who enter God's rest also cease from their labours as God	Gen. 2:2-3; Exod. 20: 8-9 (allusion)		

did from his. [11] Let us therefore make every effort to enter that rest, so that no one may fall through such disobedience as theirs. [12] Indeed, the word of God is living and active, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing until it divides soul from spirit, joints from marrow; it is able to judge the thoughts and intentions of the heart. [13] And before him no creature is hidden, but all are naked and laid bare to the eyes of the one to whom we must render an account. [14] Since, then, we have a great high priest who has passed through the heavens, Jesus, the Son of God, let us hold fast to our confession. [15] For we do not have a high priest who is unable to sympathize with our weaknesses, but we		Isa. 55:11 Jer. 23:29 (commentary) Jer. 16:17 (allusion / commentary)	Ps. 33:13-15 LXX Ps. 32: 1-15 Prov. 5:21, Dan. 2:22 (allusion / commentary)

have one who in every respect has been tested as we are, yet without sin. 16 Let us therefore approach the throne of grace with boldness, so that we may receive mercy and find grace to help in time of need.			

Chapter 5

HEBREWS	PENTATEUCH	PROPHETS	WRITINGS
1 Every high priest chosen from among mortals is put in charge of things pertaining to God on their behalf, to offer gifts and sacrifices for sins.	Lev. 1-7 (allusion)		
2 He is able to deal gently with the ignorant and wayward, since he himself is subject to weakness;	Lev. 16 (allusion)		
3 and because of this he must offer sacrifice for his own sins as well as for those of the people.	Exod. 28 Lev. 8 Num. 3 (allusion)		
4 And one does not presume to take this honour, but takes it only when called by God, just as Aaron			

was. [5] So also Christ did not glorify himself in becoming a high priest, but was appointed by the one who said to him, 'You are my Son, today I have begotten you'; [6] as he says also in another place, 'You are a priest for ever, according to the order of Melchizedek.' [7] In the days of his flesh, Jesus offered up prayers and supplications, with loud cries and tears, to the one who was able to save him from death, and he was heard because of his reverent submission. [8] Although he was a Son, he learned obedience through what he suffered; [9] and having been made perfect, he became the source of eternal salvation for all who obey him, [10] having been designated by God a high priest according to the			Ps. 2:7 (quotation) Ps. 110:4 LXX Ps. 109:4 (quotation) Ps. 22:24 LXX Ps. 21:24 (allusion) Ps. 110:4 LXX Ps. 109:4 (quotation)

order of Melchizedek. [11] About this we have much to say that is hard to explain, since you have become dull in understanding. [12] For though by this time you ought to be teachers, you need someone to teach you again the basic elements of the oracles of God. You need milk, not solid food; [13] for everyone who lives on milk, being still an infant, is unskilled in the word of righteousness. [14] But solid food is for the mature, for those whose faculties have been trained by practice to distinguish good from evil.			

Chapter 6

HEBREWS	PENTATEUCH	PROPHETS	WRITINGS
[1] Therefore let us go on towards perfection, leaving behind the basic teaching about Christ, and not			

laying again the foundation: repentance from dead works and faith towards God, [2] instruction about baptisms, laying on of hands, resurrection of the dead, and eternal judgement. [3] And we will do this, if God permits. [4] For it is impossible to restore again to repentance those who have once been enlightened, and have tasted the heavenly gift, and have shared in the Holy Spirit, [5] and have tasted the goodness of the word of God and the powers of the age to come, [6] and then have fallen away, since on their own they are crucifying the Son of God and are holding him up to contempt. [7] Ground that drinks up the rain falling on it repeatedly, and that produces a crop useful to those for			

whom it is cultivated, receives a blessing from God.

[8] But if it produces thorns and thistles, it is worthless and on the verge of being cursed; its end is to be burned over.

[9] Even though we speak in this way, beloved, we are confident of better things in your case, things that belong to salvation.

[10] For God is not unjust; he will not overlook your work and the love that you showed for his sake in serving the saints, as you still do.

[11] And we want each one of you to show the same diligence, so as to realize the full assurance of hope to the very end,

[12] so that you may not become sluggish, but imitators of those who through faith and patience inherit the promises.

[13] When God made

a promise to Abraham, because he had no one greater by whom to swear, he swore by himself,	Gen. 22:16 -17 (allusion)		
[14] saying, 'I will surely bless you and multiply you.'	Gen. 22:17 (quotation)		
[15] And thus Abraham, having patiently endured, obtained the promise.	Gen. 21:5 (allusion / commentary)		
[16] Human beings, of course, swear by someone greater than themselves, and an oath given as confirmation puts an end to all dispute.	Exod. 22:11 (allusion)		
[17] In the same way, when God desired to show even more clearly to the heirs of the promise the unchangeable character of his purpose, he guaranteed it by an oath,			Ps. 110:4 LXX Ps. 109:4 (allusion)
[18] so that through two unchangeable things, in which it is impossible that God would prove false, we who have taken refuge might be strongly encouraged to seize the hope set	Gen. 22:16 -17 (commentary)		

before us. [19] We have this hope, a sure and steadfast anchor of the soul, a hope that enters the inner shrine behind the curtain, [20] where Jesus, a forerunner on our behalf, has entered, having become a high priest for ever according to the order of Melchizedek.	Lev. 16:2 (allusion)		Ps. 110:4 LXX Ps. 190:4 (quotation)

Chapter 7

HEBREWS	PENTATEUCH	PROPHETS	WRITINGS
[1] This 'King Melchizedek of Salem, priest of the Most High God, met Abraham as he was returning from defeating the kings and blessed him';	Gen. 14:18-20 (quotation)		
[2] and to him Abraham apportioned 'one-tenth of everything'. His name, in the first place, means 'king of righteousness'; next he is also king of Salem, that is, 'king of peace'.	Gen. 14:18-20 (commentary)		
[3] Without father,	Gen. 14:18-20		

without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but resembling the Son of God, he remains a priest for ever.	(commentary)		
[4] See how great he is! Even Abraham the patriarch gave him a tenth of the spoils.	Gen. 14:20 (commentary)		
[5] And those descendants of Levi who receive the priestly office have a commandment in the law to collect tithes from the people, that is, from their kindred, though these also are descended from Abraham.	Num. 18:21 (allusion / commentary)		
[6] But this man, who does not belong to their ancestry, collected tithes from Abraham and blessed him who had received the promises.	Gen. 14:19 (commentary)		
[7] It is beyond dispute that the inferior is blessed by the superior.			
[8] In the one case, tithes are received by those who are mortal; in the other,			

by one of whom it is testified that he lives. [9] One might even say that Levi himself, who receives tithes, paid tithes through Abraham, [10] for he was still in the loins of his ancestor when Melchizedek met him. [11] Now if perfection had been attainable through the levitical priesthood—for the people received the law under this priesthood—what further need would there have been to speak of another priest arising according to the order of Melchizedek, rather than one according to the order of Aaron? [12] For when there is a change in the priesthood, there is necessarily a change in the law as well. [13] Now the one of whom these things are spoken belonged to another tribe, from which no one	Num. 18:21; Gen. 14:20 (commentary)		Ps. 110:4 LXX Ps. 109:4 (quotation)

has ever served at the altar. [14] For it is evident that our Lord was descended from Judah, and in connection with that tribe Moses said nothing about priests. [15] It is even more obvious when another priest arises, resembling Melchizedek, [16] one who has become a priest, not through a legal requirement concerning physical descent, but through the power of an indestructible life. [17] For it is attested of him, 'You are a priest for ever, according to the order of Melchizedek.' [18] There is, on the one hand, the abrogation of an earlier commandment because it was weak and ineffectual [19] (for the law made nothing perfect); there is, on the other hand, the introduction of a	Exod. 32:28; Num. 3:45 (allusion)	Mic. 5:2 (allusion)	Ps. 110:4 LXX Ps. 109:4 (quotation)

better hope, through which we approach God. [20] This was confirmed with an oath; for others who became priests took their office without an oath, [21] but this one became a priest with an oath, because of the one who said to him, 'The Lord has sworn and will not change his mind, "You are a priest for ever"'— [22] accordingly Jesus has also become the guarantee of a better covenant. [23] Furthermore, the former priests were many in number, because they were prevented by death from continuing in office; [24] but he holds his priesthood permanently, because he continues for ever. [25] Consequently he is able for all time to save those who approach God through him, since he always lives to make intercession			Ps. 110: 4 LXX Ps. 109:4 (quotation)

for them. [26] For it is fitting that we should have such a high priest, holy, blameless, undefiled, separated from sinners, and exalted above the heavens. [27] Unlike the other high priests, he has no need to offer sacrifices day after day, first for his own sins, and then for those of the people; this he did once for all when he offered himself. [28] For the law appoints as high priests those who are subject to weakness, but the word of the oath, which came later than the law, appoints a Son who has been made perfect for ever.	Lev: 1-7, 16, 23 (allusion / commentary)		

Chapter 8

HEBREWS	PENTATEUCH	PROPHETS	WRITINGS
[1] Now the main point in what we are saying is this: we have such a high priest, one who is seated at the right hand of the throne			

of the Majesty in the heavens, [2] a minister in the sanctuary and the true tent that the Lord, and not any mortal, has set up. [3] For every high priest is appointed to offer gifts and sacrifices; hence it is necessary for this priest also to have something to offer. [4] Now if he were on earth, he would not be a priest at all, since there are priests who offer gifts according to the law. [5] They offer worship in a sanctuary that is a sketch and shadow of the heavenly one; for Moses, when he was about to erect the tent, was warned, 'See that you make everything according to the pattern that was shown you on the mountain.' [6] But Jesus has now obtained a more excellent ministry, and to that degree he is the mediator	Lev: 1-7, 16, 23 (allusion) Lev: 1-7 (allusion) Exod. 25:40 (quotation)		

of a better covenant, which has been enacted through better promises.			
[7] For if that first covenant had been faultless, there would have been no need to look for a second one.			
[8] God finds fault with them when he says: 'The days are surely coming, says the Lord, when I will establish a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah;		Jer. 31:31 [LXX 38:31] (quotation)	
[9] not like the covenant that I made with their ancestors, on the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; for they did not continue in my covenant, and so I had no concern for them, says the Lord.		Jer. 31:32 [LXX 38:32] (quotation)	
[10] This is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the Lord: I will put my laws in their minds, and write them on their hearts, and I		Jer. 31:33 [LXX 38:33] (quotation)	

will be their God, and they shall be my people. [11] And they shall not teach one another or say to each other, "Know the Lord", for they shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest. [12] For I will be merciful towards their iniquities, and I will remember their sins no more.' [13] In speaking of 'a new covenant', he has made the first one obsolete. And what is obsolete and growing old will soon disappear.		Jer. 31:34 [LXX 38:34] (quotation) Jer. 31:34 [LXX 38:34] (quotation) Jer. 31:31 [LXX 38:31] (quotation)	

Chapter 9

HEBREWS	PENTATEUCH	PROPHETS	WRITINGS
[1] Now even the first covenant had regulations for worship and an earthly sanctuary. [2] For a tent was constructed, the first one, in which were the lampstand, the table, and the bread of the Presence; this is called the Holy Place.	Exod. 25-31; 35-40; Lev 10:3 (allusion) Exod. 25:23-39 ; 26: 33,34; 39:32-43 ; 40: 1-33 ; Lev. 24:5-8 (summary / commentary)		

[3] Behind the second curtain was a tent called the Holy of Holies.	Exod. 26:31-33 (summary / commentary)		
[4] In it stood the golden altar of incense and the ark of the covenant overlaid on all sides with gold, in which there were a golden urn holding the manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tablets of the covenant;	Exod. 30:1-5; 25:10-22; 16:32,33; 31:18; 32:15; Num. 17:10 (summary / commentary)		
[5] above it were the cherubim of glory overshadowing the mercy-seat. Of these things we cannot speak now in detail.	Exod. 25:17-22; 26: 34 (summary / commentary)		
[6] Such preparations having been made, the priests go continually into the first tent to carry out their ritual duties;			
[7] but only the high priest goes into the second, and he but once a year, and not without taking the blood that he offers for himself and for the sins committed unintentionally by the people.	Lev. 16:11-19, 34 (summary / commentary)		
[8] By this the Holy Spirit indicates that the way into the			

sanctuary has not yet been disclosed as long as the first tent is still standing. 9 This is a symbol of the present time, during which gifts and sacrifices are offered that cannot perfect the conscience of the worshipper, 10 but deal only with food and drink and various baptisms, regulations for the body imposed until the time comes to set things right. 11 But when Christ came as a high priest of the good things that have come, then through the greater and perfect tent (not made with hands, that is, not of this creation), 12 he entered once for all into the Holy Place, not with the blood of goats and calves, but with his own blood, thus obtaining eternal redemption. 13 For if the blood of goats and bulls, with the sprinkling of the ashes of a heifer,	Num. 19:1-22 (allusion) Lev. 16:6,15 (allusion) Num. 19:1-22 (allusion)		

sanctifies those who have been defiled so that their flesh is purified, 14 how much more will the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish to God, purify our conscience from dead works to worship the living God! 15 For this reason he is the mediator of a new covenant, so that those who are called may receive the promised eternal inheritance, because a death has occurred that redeems them from the transgressions under the first covenant. 16 Where a will is involved, the death of the one who made it must be established. 17 For a will takes effect only at death, since it is not in force as long as the one who made it is alive. 18 Hence not even the first covenant was inaugurated	Exod. 24:6-8 (allusion)		

without blood. [19] For when every commandment had been told to all the people by Moses in accordance with the law, he took the blood of calves and goats, with water and scarlet wool and hyssop, and sprinkled both the scroll itself and all the people, [20] saying, 'This is the blood of the covenant that God has ordained for you.' [21] And in the same way he sprinkled with the blood both the tent and all the vessels used in worship. [22] Indeed, under the law almost everything is purified with blood, and without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness of sins. [23] Thus it was necessary for the sketches of the heavenly things to be purified with these rites, but the heavenly things themselves need	Exod. 24:6-8 (commentary) Exod. 24:8 (quotation) Exod. 24:6 (allusion) Exod. 29:21; Lev. 8:15; 17:11 (allusion)		

better sacrifices than these. [24] For Christ did not enter a sanctuary made by human hands, a mere copy of the true one, but he entered into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God on our behalf. [25] Nor was it to offer himself again and again, as the high priest enters the Holy Place year after year with blood that is not his own; [26] for then he would have had to suffer again and again since the foundation of the world. But as it is, he has appeared once for all at the end of the age to remove sin by the sacrifice of himself. [27] And just as it is appointed for mortals to die once, and after that the judgement, [28] so Christ, having been offered once to bear the sins of many, will appear a second time, not to	Exod. 25:40 (allusion) Gen. 3:19 (allusion)		

deal with sin, but to save those who are eagerly waiting for him.			

Chapter 10

HEBREWS	PENTATEUCH	PROPHETS	WRITINGS
[1] Since the law has only a shadow of the good things to come and not the true form of these realities, it can never, by the same sacrifices that are continually offered year after year, make perfect those who approach. [2] Otherwise, would they not have ceased being offered, since the worshippers, cleansed once for all, would no longer have any consciousness of sin? [3] But in these sacrifices there is a reminder of sin year after year. [4] For it is impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sins. [5] Consequently,	Lev. 16:34 (allusion)		

when Christ came into the world, he said, 'Sacrifices and offerings you have not desired, but a body you have prepared for me;			Ps. 40:6 LXX Ps. 39:6 (quotation)
6 in burnt-offerings and sin-offerings you have taken no pleasure.			Ps. 40:7 LXX Ps. 39:6 (quotation)
7 Then I said, "See, God, I have come to do your will, O God" (in the scroll of the book it is written of me).'			Ps. 40:8 LXX Ps. 39:7 (quotation)
8 When he said above, 'You have neither desired nor taken pleasure in sacrifices and offerings and burnt-offerings and sin-offerings' (these are offered according to the law),			Ps. 40:6-7 LXX Ps. 39:6 (quotation)
9 then he added, 'See, I have come to do your will.' He abolishes the first in order to establish the second.			Ps. 40:8 LXX Ps. 39:7 (quotation)
10 And it is by God's will that we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.			
11 And every priest stands day after day			

at his service, offering again and again the same sacrifices that can never take away sins.			
[12] But when Christ had offered for all time a single sacrifice for sins, 'he sat down at the right hand of God',			Ps. 110:1 LXX Ps. 109:1 (quotation)
[13] and since then has been waiting 'until his enemies would be made a footstool for his feet.'			Ps. 110:2 LXX Ps.109:2 (quotation)
[14] For by a single offering he has perfected for all time those who are sanctified.			
[15] And the Holy Spirit also testifies to us, for after saying,			
[16] 'This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, says the Lord: I will put my laws in their hearts, and I will write them on their minds',		Jer. 31:33 [LXX 38:33] (quotation)	
[17] he also adds, 'I will remember their sins and their lawless deeds no more.'		Jer. 31:34 [LXX 38:34] (quotation)	

[18] Where there is forgiveness of these, there is no longer any offering for sin. [19] Therefore, my friends, since we have confidence to enter the sanctuary by the blood of Jesus, [20] by the new and living way that he opened for us through the curtain (that is, through his flesh), [21] and since we have a great high priest over the house of God, [22] let us approach with a true heart in full assurance of faith, with our hearts sprinkled clean from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water. [23] Let us hold fast to the confession of our hope without wavering, for he who has promised is faithful. [24] And let us consider how provoke one another to love and good deeds,	Lev. 16:2 (allusion)	Ezek. 36:25-29a (allusion)	

[25] not neglecting to meet together, as is the habit of some, but encouraging one another, and all the more as you see the Day approaching.			
[26] For if we wilfully persist in sin after having received the knowledge of the truth, there no longer remains a sacrifice for sins,	Num. 15:30 (allusion)		
[27] but a fearful prospect of judgement, and a fury of fire that will consume the adversaries.		Isa. 26:11 (allusion)	
[28] Anyone who has violated the law of Moses dies without mercy 'on the testimony of two or three witnesses.'	Deut. 17:6 (quotation)		
[29] How much worse punishment do you think will be deserved by those who have spurned the Son of God, profaned the blood of the covenant by which they were sanctified, and outraged the Spirit of grace?			
[30] For we know the one who said, 'Vengeance is mine,	Deut. 32:35, 36 (quotation)		

I will repay.' And again, 'The Lord will judge his people.'

31 It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.

32 But recall those earlier days when, after you had been enlightened, you endured a hard struggle with sufferings,

33 sometimes being publicly exposed to abuse and persecution, and sometimes being partners with those so treated.

34 For you had compassion for those who were in prison, and you cheerfully accepted the plundering of your possessions, knowing that you yourselves possessed something better and more lasting.

35 Do not, therefore, abandon that confidence of yours; it brings a great reward.

36 For you need endurance, so that

when you have done the will of God, you may receive what was promised. [37] For yet 'in a very little while, the one who is coming will come and will not delay; [38] but my righteous one will live by faith. My soul takes no pleasure in anyone who shrinks back.' [39] But we are not among those who shrink back and so are lost, but among those who have faith and so are saved.		Isa. 26:20 (allusion) Hab. 2:4 (quotation)	

Chapter 11

HEBREWS	PENTATEUCH	PROPHETS	WRITINGS
[1] Now faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen. [2] Indeed, by faith our ancestors received approval. [3] By faith we understand that the worlds were prepared by the word of God, so that	Gen. 1, 2 (commentary)		

what is seen was made from things that are not visible.			
[4] By faith Abel offered to God a more acceptable sacrifice than Cain's. Through this he received approval as righteous, God himself giving approval to his gifts; he died, but through his faith he still speaks.	Gen. 4:3-5 (commentary)		
[5] By faith Enoch was taken so that he did not experience death; and 'he was not found, because God had taken him.' For it was attested before he was taken away that 'he had pleased God.'	Gen. 5:21-24 (quotation, commentary)		
[6] And without faith it is impossible to please God, for whoever would approach him must believe that he exists and that he rewards those who seek him.			
[7] By faith Noah, warned by God about events as yet unseen, respected the warning and built an ark to save his household; by	Gen. 6:13-22, 9 (commentary)		

this he condemned the world and became an heir to the righteousness that is in accordance with faith.			
[8] By faith Abraham obeyed when he was called to set out for a place that he was to receive as an inheritance; and he set out, not knowing where he was going.	Gen. 12:1-4, 7 (commentary)		
[9] By faith he stayed for a time in the land he had been promised, as in a foreign land, living in tents, as did Isaac and Jacob, who were heirs with him of the same promise.	Gen. 12:8; 18:1 (commentary)		
[10] For he looked forward to the city that has foundations, whose architect and builder is God.			
[11] By faith he received power of procreation, even though he was too old—and Sarah herself was barren—because he considered him faithful who had promised.	Gen. 17:17-19; 18:11-14; 21:2 (commentary)		
[12] Therefore from	Gen. 22:17		

one person, and this one as good as dead, descendants were born, 'as many as the stars of heaven and as the innumerable grains of sand by the seashore.' 13 All of these died in faith without having received the promises, but from a distance they saw and greeted them. They confessed that they were strangers and foreigners on the earth, 14 for people who speak in this way make it clear that they are seeking a homeland. 15 If they had been thinking of the land that they had left behind, they would have had opportunity to return. 16 But as it is, they desire a better country, that is, a heavenly one. Therefore God is not ashamed to be called their God; indeed, he has prepared a city for them.	(quotation, commentary)		

[17] By faith Abraham, when put to the test, offered up Isaac. He who had received the promises was ready to offer up his only son,	Gen. 22:1-10 (commentary)		
[18] of whom he had been told, 'It is through Isaac that descendants shall be named after you.'	Gen. 21:12 (quotation)		
[19] He considered the fact that God is able even to raise someone from the dead—and figuratively speaking, he did receive him back.			
[20] By faith Isaac invoked blessings for the future on Jacob and Esau.	Gen. 27:27- 40 (allusion, commentary)		
[21] By faith Jacob, when dying, blessed each of the sons of Joseph, 'bowing in worship over the top of his staff.'	Gen. 47:29-31; 48:8-22 (commentary, quotation)		
[22] By faith Joseph, at the end of his life, made mention of the exodus of the Israelites and gave instructions about his burial.	Gen. 50:24-25 (allusion)	Josh. 24:32 (allusion)	
[23] By faith Moses was hidden by his	Exod. 1:16, 22, 2:2 (commentary)		

parents for three months after his birth, because they saw that the child was beautiful; and they were not afraid of the king's edict.			
[24] By faith Moses, when he was grown up, refused to be called a son of Pharaoh's daughter,	Exod. 2:10, 11 (commentary)		
[25] choosing rather to share ill-treatment with the people of God than to enjoy the fleeting pleasures of sin.			
[26] He considered abuse suffered for the Christ to be greater wealth than the treasures of Egypt, for he was looking ahead to the reward.			
[27] By faith he left Egypt, unafraid of the king's anger; for he persevered as though he saw him who is invisible.	Exod. 12:50-51 (commentary)		
[28] By faith he kept the Passover and the sprinkling of blood, so that the destroyer of the firstborn would not touch the firstborn of Israel.	Exod. 12:21-23 (commentary)		
[29] By faith the people passed	Exod. 14:21-31 (commentary)		

through the Red Sea as if it were dry land, but when the Egyptians attempted to do so they were drowned.			
[30] By faith the walls of Jericho fell after they had been encircled for seven days.		Josh. 6:2-20 (commentary)	
[31] By faith Rahab the prostitute did not perish with those who were disobedient, because she had received the spies in peace.		Josh. 2:1, 9-14; 6:22-25 (commentary)	
[32] And what more should I say? For time would fail me to tell of Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthah, of David and Samuel and the prophets—		Judg. 6-8; 4-5; 13-16; 11-12; 1Sam. 16:1-13; 1:20 (allusion)	
[33] who through faith conquered kingdoms, administered justice, obtained promises, shut the mouths of lions,		2 Sam. 8:1-3 (allusion)	Dan. 6:22 (allusion)
[34] quenched raging fire, escaped the edge of the sword, won strength out of weakness, became mighty in war, put foreign armies to	Exod. 18: 4 (allusion)	Judg. 15:8 (allusion)	Dan. 3:19-27 (allusion)

flight. [35] Women received their dead by resurrection. Others were tortured, refusing to accept release, in order to obtain a better resurrection.		1 Kings 17:22, 23; 2 Kings 4:36-37 (allusion)	
[36] Others suffered mocking and flogging, and even chains and imprisonment.	Gen. 39:20 (allusion)	Jer. 20:2; 37:15 (allusion)	
[37] They were stoned to death, they were sawn in two, they were killed by the sword; they went about in skins of sheep and goats, destitute, persecuted, tormented—		1 Kings 19:10; Jer. 26:23 (allusion)	2 Chron. 24:21 (allusion)
[38] of whom the world was not worthy. They wandered in deserts and mountains, and in caves and holes in the ground.		1 Kings 18:4; 19:9 (allusion)	
[39] Yet all these, though they were commended for their faith, did not receive what was promised,			
[40] since God had provided something better so that they would not, without			

us, be made perfect.			

Chapter 12

HEBREWS	PENTATEUCH	PROPHETS	WRITINGS
[1] Therefore, since we are surrounded by so great a cloud of witnesses, let us also lay aside every weight and the sin that clings so closely, and let us run with perseverance the race that is set before us, [2] looking to Jesus the pioneer and perfecter of our faith, who for the sake of the joy that was set before him endured the cross, disregarding its shame, and has taken his seat at the right hand of the throne of God. [3] Consider him who endured such hostility against himself from sinners, so that you may not grow weary or lose heart. [4] In your struggle against sin you have not yet resisted to the point of shedding your		Isa. 53:10-12 (allusion)	Ps. 110:1 LXX Ps. 109:1 (quotation)

blood. [5] And you have forgotten the exhortation that addresses you as children— 'My child, do not regard lightly the discipline of the Lord, or lose heart when you are punished by him; [6] for the Lord disciplines those whom he loves, and chastises every child whom he accepts.' [7] Endure trials for the sake of discipline. God is treating you as children; for what child is there whom a parent does not discipline? [8] If you do not have that discipline in which all children share, then you are illegitimate and not his children. [9] Moreover, we had human parents to discipline us, and we respected them. Should we not be even more willing to be subject to the Father of spirits and live?			Prov. 3:11-12 (quotation) Ps. 94:12 LXX Ps. 93:12 (allusion)

[10] For they disciplined us for a short time as seemed best to them, but he disciplines us for our good, in order that we may share his holiness. [11] Now, discipline always seems painful rather than pleasant at the time, but later it yields the peaceful fruit of righteousness to those who have been trained by it. [12] Therefore lift your drooping hands and strengthen your weak knees, [13] and make straight paths for your feet, so that what is lame may not be put out of joint, but rather be healed. [14] Pursue peace with everyone, and the holiness without which no one will see the Lord. [15] See to it that no one fails to obtain the grace of God; that no root of bitterness springs up and causes trouble, and	Deut. 29:18 (allusion)	Isa. 35:3 (quotation)	Prov. 4:26 (quotation)

through it many become defiled.			
[16] See to it that no one becomes like Esau, an immoral and godless person, who sold his birthright for a single meal.	Gen. 25:29-34 (allusion, commentary)		
[17] You know that later, when he wanted to inherit the blessing, he was rejected, for he found no chance to repent, even though he sought the blessing with tears.	Gen. 27:30-40 (commentary)		
[18] You have not come to something that can be touched, a blazing fire, and darkness, and gloom, and a tempest,	Exod. 19:12-22; 20:18; Deut. 4:11 (allusion, commentary)		
[19] and the sound of a trumpet, and a voice whose words made the hearers beg that not another word be spoken to them.	Exod. 20:18, 19; Deut. 4:12; 5:5, 25; 18:16 (allusion, commentary)		
[20] (For they could not endure the order that was given, 'If even an animal touches the mountain, it shall be stoned to death.'	Exod. 19:12, 13 (quotation)		
[21] Indeed, so terrifying was the	Deut. 9:19 (quotation)		

sight that Moses said, 'I tremble with fear.')			
[22] But you have come to Mount Zion and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to innumerable angels in festal gathering,		Isa. 24:23; 26:1; 60:14 (allusion)	Ps 48; 87:3 (allusion)
[23] and to the assembly of the firstborn who are enrolled in heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of the righteous made perfect,	Gen. 18:25 (quotation)		Ps. 94:2 LXX Ps. 93:2 (allusion)
[24] and to Jesus, the mediator of a new covenant, and to the sprinkled blood that speaks a better word than the blood of Abel.	Gen. 4:10 (allusion)	Jer. 31:31 LXX 38:31 (allusion)	
[25] See that you do not refuse the one who is speaking; for if they did not escape when they refused the one who warned them on earth, how much less will we escape if we reject the one who warns from heaven!	Deut. 18:19 (allusion)		
[26] At that time his voice shook the		Hag. 2:6	

earth; but now he has promised, 'Yet once more I will shake not only the earth but also the heaven.'	Exod. 19:18 (allusion)	(quotation)	
[27] This phrase 'Yet once more' indicates the removal of what is shaken—that is, created things—so that what cannot be shaken may remain.		Hag. 2:6 (quotation), Isa. 34:4; 54:10 (allusion)	
[28] Therefore, since we are receiving a kingdom that cannot be shaken, let us give thanks, by which we offer to God an acceptable worship with reverence and awe;		Mal. 2:5; 4:2 (allusion)	Dan. 2:44 (allusion)
[29] for indeed our God is a consuming fire.	Exod. 24:17; Deut. 4:24; 9:3 (allusion)		

Chapter 13

HEBREWS	PENTATEUCH	PROPHETS	WRITINGS
[1] Let mutual love continue.			
[2] Do not neglect to show hospitality to strangers, for by doing that some have entertained angels without	Gen 18:1-8; 19:1 (allusion)		

knowing it. [3] Remember those who are in prison, as though you were in prison with them; those who are being tortured, as though you yourselves were being tortured. [4] Let marriage be held in honour by all, and let the marriage bed be kept undefiled; for God will judge fornicators and adulterers. [5] Keep your lives free from the love of money, and be content with what you have; for he has said, 'I will never leave you or forsake you.' [6] So we can say with confidence, 'The Lord is my helper; I will not be afraid. What can anyone do to me?' [7] Remember your leaders, those who spoke the word of God to you; consider the outcome of their way of life, and imitate their faith. [8] Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and		Josh.1:5 (quotation)	Ps. 118:6-7 LXX Ps. 117:6-7 (quotation)

today and for ever. [9] Do not be carried away by all kinds of strange teachings; for it is well for the heart to be strengthened by grace, not by regulations about food, which have not benefited those who observe them. [10] We have an altar from which those who officiate in the tent have no right to eat. [11] For the bodies of those animals whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest as a sacrifice for sin are burned outside the camp. [12] Therefore Jesus also suffered outside the city gate in order to sanctify the people by his own blood. [13] Let us then go to him outside the camp and bear the abuse he endured. [14] For here we have no lasting city, but we are looking for the city that is to come.	Lev. 4:21; 9:10-11; 16:15, 27 Exod. 29:14 (commentary)		

[15] Through him, then, let us continually offer a sacrifice of praise to God, that is, the fruit of lips that confess his name. [16] Do not neglect to do good and to share what you have, for such sacrifices are pleasing to God. [17] Obey your leaders and submit to them, for they are keeping watch over your souls and will give an account. Let them do this with joy and not with sighing—for that would be harmful to you. [18] Pray for us; we are sure that we have a clear conscience, desiring to act honourably in all things. [19] I urge you all the more to do this, so that I may be restored to you very soon. [20] Now may the God of peace, who brought back from the dead our Lord Jesus, the great shepherd of the		Hos. 14:2 LXX Hos. 14:3 (allusion)	

sheep, by the blood of the eternal covenant, [21] make you complete in everything good so that you may do his will, working among us that which is pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ, to whom be the glory for ever and ever. Amen. [22] I appeal to you, brothers and sisters, bear with my word of exhortation, for I have written to you briefly. [23] I want you to know that our brother Timothy has been set free; and if he comes in time, he will be with me when I see you. [24] Greet all your leaders and all the saints. Those from Italy send you greetings. [25] Grace be with all of you.			