

INAUGURATION OR DAY OF ATONEMENT?  
A RESPONSE TO NORMAN YOUNG'S  
"OLD TESTAMENT BACKGROUND  
TO HEBREWS 6:19-20 REVISITED"

RICHARD M. DAVIDSON  
Andrews University

I appreciate the opportunity to continue the dialogue with my friend and colleague Norman Young over important matters in the book of Hebrews raised by Roy Gane's article and our two responses in recent issues of *AUSS*.<sup>1</sup> First of all, I wish to soften the language of the editor in his introduction of our two articles in the last issue of *AUSS*. The editor writes that I offer "a contrasting view to both Gane and Young."<sup>2</sup> Awkward wording in an earlier draft of my article may have given the editor that impression, but the final (published) draft is, as far as I can determine, in complete harmony with the study by Gane. I agree with Gane that reference by the author of Hebrews to the veil in Heb 6:19-20, following LXX usage, most probably has in view the "second" veil, i.e., the veil before the Most Holy Place. This was also the major conclusion of Norman Young's article, and thus I find myself in agreement with both Gane and Young in regard to their main point (i.e., the identification of the veil of Heb 6:19) and their basic methodology (recognizing the

<sup>1</sup>Roy Gane, "Re-Opening *Katapetasma* ('Veil') in Hebrews," *AUSS* 38 (2000):5-8; the response by Norman H. Young, "Where Jesus Has Gone as a Forerunner on Our Behalf (Hebrews 6:20)," *AUSS* 39 (2001):165-173; and my response, "Christ's Entry 'Within the Veil' in Hebrews 6:19-20: The Old Testament Background," *AUSS* 39 (2001):175-190.

<sup>2</sup>Jerry Moon, "More on *Katapetasma*," *AUSS* 39 (2001):163. Perhaps here is an appropriate place to make a minor (but important) correction of an error in my article that crept in during the editorial process. In seeking to improve my style (for which I am grateful!), an editor inadvertently introduced a contradiction to an earlier statement in my article. P. 183, para. 1, sent. 1, reads in part: "the LXX always uses *ta bagia* for the entire sanctuary as a whole, but never for the Most Holy Place in particular." My earlier draft read: "*ta bagia* is a term in the LXX for the entire sanctuary as a whole, and never the Most Holy Place in particular." In the published version, the word "always" (added inadvertently by the editor) should be replaced with "regularly" or "almost always," since, as we pointed out on p. 180, n. 18, out of 109 occurrences of *ta bagia* in the LXX referring to the sanctuary, in 106 occurrences—i.e., almost always—the term refers to the sanctuary as a whole, but in three verses it seems to refer to the Holy Place. The conclusion of this published sentence still stands, however, that in the LXX *ta bagia* is used "never for the Most Holy Place in particular." (I take ultimate responsibility for this error, since I was supplied with the edited copy to make a final check, and failed to note this inadvertent editorial mistake.) One additional minor typographical error should also be noted: p. 179, n. 12, should read "For Pentateuchal usage, see n. 13"—not n. 12.

consistency of the author of Hebrews with LXX usage).

My article actually addressed a further, deeper issue, building upon the previous one: what is the OT background of Heb 6:19-20? I applaud Young for acknowledging in his reply to my article that "this indeed is the real issue."<sup>3</sup> On this issue of background Young and I do come to different conclusions. I see the OT background of Heb 6:19-20 and parallel "entering" passages in Hebrews as inauguration, while Young sees the background as the Day of Atonement.

Young rightly points out that the inauguration background to Heb 6:19-20 was suggested almost a century ago by E. E. Andross, in his book *A More Excellent Ministry*. However, Andross based his arguments largely on thematic typological parallels to the OT inauguration services and allusions to these elsewhere in the NT, and did not ground his conclusions in an examination of the intertextual use of key LXX terms by the author of Hebrews.

Furthermore, Andross argued that Christ, following his inauguration of the heavenly sanctuary, left its Most Holy Place and sat down at the right hand of the Father on a throne in the *Holy Place*. Young assumes that "the logic" of my position leads to the same conclusion, but in fact I do not concur with Andross on this point. I agree instead with Young, that in Hebrews the "throne of the Majesty in the heavens" (Heb 8:1), the "throne of God" (Heb 12:2), where Christ sat down, most probably should be located in the heavenly equivalent to the Most Holy Place, just as in the earthly sanctuary YHWH was enthroned in the Most Holy Place, above the ark between the cherubim (Exod 25:22; Num 7:89; 1 Sam 4:4; 2 Sam 6:2; 2 Kgs 19:15).

But I find attractive the further suggestion of my colleague Roy Gane, who argues that Christ is by no means *confined* to his position on the throne with the Father in the heavenly equivalent to the Holy of Holies.<sup>4</sup> In fact, Ps 110, the root passage cited by the author of Hebrews to indicate that Jesus "sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on High" (Heb 1:3; cf. 1:13; 8:1; 10:12; 12:2), makes clear that "sitting at the right hand of" does not primarily refer to *location* but to *status*. In Ps 110:1, YHWH says to David's "Lord" (i.e., the Messiah), "Sit at My right hand"; but v. 5, also addressed to the Messiah, states that "Yahweh is at your right hand." Who is at whose right hand? The two verses are contradictory if taken literally as referring to location. Furthermore, in Ps 110:1 YHWH states that the Messiah will sit at his right hand "till I make your enemies your footstool," yet in vv. 5 to 7, while apparently still sitting at YHWH's right hand, he is at the same time engaged in battle against his enemies!

<sup>3</sup>Norman H. Young, "The Day of Dedication or the Day of Atonement? The Old Testament Background to Hebrews 6:19-20 Revisited," 61.

<sup>4</sup>Roy Gane, *Altar Call* (Berrien Springs: Diadem, 1999), 174-182.

Obviously the reference to "sitting at the right hand" is not dealing primarily with location, but with kingly status. This is also the way the phrase is often used elsewhere throughout the OT: the king, while described as "sitting on the throne of the kingdom"—i.e., in his status as king, is simultaneously involved in activities that clearly indicate he is not literally seated upon a throne.<sup>5</sup>

The author of Hebrews, faithful to the predictive language regarding the Messiah's kingship in Ps 110, describes Christ's kingly status in terms of "sitting on the throne of God," while at the same time acknowledging the priestly work of Jesus that also is predicted in Ps 110 (v. 4). As priest forever "after the order of Melchizedek," i.e., both priest and king, Christ can at one and the same time be presented as "seated at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens" (kingly status) and yet not be confined to a certain location in carrying out his high priestly role as "Minister of the sanctuary and of the true tabernacle which the Lord erected, and not man" (Heb 8:1-2).

By using the plural term *ta bagia*, "holy places," which in the LXX regularly refers to the whole (bipartite) sanctuary, the author of Hebrews certainly leaves open the possibility that part or even all of Christ's heavenly ministry as high priest could take place in the heavenly counterpart to the Holy Place. The present ongoing work of Christ as high priest in the heavenly sanctuary, from the first-century perspective of the author of Hebrews, is that of intercession, i.e., the "continual" or *tamid* ministry which in the OT type took place in the earthly Holy Place of the sanctuary (Heb 7:25-27). But the author of Hebrews is not concerned to spell out the details of precisely where in the heavenly sanctuary Christ's high priestly ministry is conducted.

I will now respond as briefly as possible to the various points raised by Young in objection to my conclusion that the OT sanctuary inauguration rituals provide the background to Heb 6:19-20 and the parallel "entering" passages in the epistle. Since he raises a number of new points not referred to in either of our earlier articles, more space is needed in this reply to address these points than I at first envisioned.

First, Young rightly points out that in the OT material dealing with the inauguration/dedication of the sanctuary, Moses is never referred to

<sup>5</sup>See, e.g., the numerous references to Solomon "sitting on his throne" (for instance, 1 Kgs 1:13, 17, 20, 27, 30, 35, 46, 48; 2:12, 24; 3:6; 5:5; 10:9; 1 Chron 28:5) in the sense of having kingly status, and not confinement to a precise location on a literal throne. At the Temple dedication Solomon said, "I sit on the throne of Israel" even as he "turned around and blessed the whole congregation" (1 Kgs 8:14-15, 20; cf. 2 Chron 6:3, 10). Again, Jeremiah speaks of kings and princes "sitting on the throne of David" even as they are riding on horses or chariots into the city of Jerusalem (Jer 17:25; 22:4).

as a high priest, whereas in Hebrews the One who enters the heavenly sanctuary is repeatedly called High Priest. But that is just my point: Hebrews is modifying the high-priestly typology of the Pentateuch in light of the prediction of Ps 110 that the Messiah will be *both* priest and king in the same person. In Hebrews, as I indicated in my article, the roles of *both* Aaron and Moses (the equivalent of priest and king) are combined in the work of Jesus Christ, the High Priest "after the order of Melchizedek" and not the order of Aaron.<sup>6</sup> Hebrews also clearly recognizes what is implicit in the Torah, that Moses engages in high-priestly work, especially in performing the complex of rituals connected with the inauguration of the sanctuary before Aaron was anointed (Heb 9:19-21). As has been demonstrated in my article, this complex of inauguration rituals is precisely the context of each of the three "entering" passages in Hebrews that parallel Heb 6:19-20.<sup>7</sup>

Young's second objection is that the Pentateuchal chapters dealing with inauguration contain no language of entering "within the veil." Young wishes to exclude from consideration the reference in Exod 26:33 to "within the veil," but I still maintain that this verse is very relevant to the discussion. At the very least, this verse shows that the phrase "within the veil" is not technical language limited to a Day of Atonement context; it pinpoints a certain location—the Most Holy Place—and not a particular event. But more than this, Exod 26:33 must clearly be seen within the larger integrally bound-up complex of inauguration/consecration events connected with the commencement of the Hebrew cultus.<sup>8</sup> Although the actual anointing of the sanctuary is not explicitly mentioned in Exod 26:33, this verse refers to the time when the sanctuary would be erected and the ark taken "within the veil," and Exod 40:1-9 shows that the actualization of this verse was indeed on the day when the sanctuary, including the ark within the second veil, was anointed by Moses, in his high-priestly role (before Aaron's anointing). Thus

<sup>6</sup>Davidson, "Christ's Entry," 176-177. It is widely recognized that in the Hebrew Torah Moses is presented in the triple role of prophet, priest, and king, even though neither the term "priest" nor "king" is explicitly employed to refer to him, and even the term "prophet" is only implicitly applied to him (Deut 18:15; 34:10). Moses' function as earthly leader of Israel specifically places him in the equivalent position of king within the Israelite theocracy, alongside Aaron, the designated priest. It is instructive to note the parallel with the First Temple inauguration, at which time both the king and the priests played active roles in the dedicatory services (see 1 Kgs 8).

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., 181, 185, 186-187.

<sup>8</sup>The Pentateuchal materials portraying this single complex of events include prescriptive texts for the setting up of the sanctuary (such as Exod 26), narrative texts describing the fulfillment of these prescriptions by Moses (such as Exod 40), and further descriptive/narrative details involved in the consecration/inauguration of the sanctuary and the priesthood (such as found in Lev 8-9 and Num 7).

it is very difficult for me to understand how Exod 26:33 may be regarded as unrelated to the inauguration of the sanctuary and irrelevant for the discussion of the background event of Heb 6:19-20.

Third, Young feels I make too much of the differences in wording and syntax between the LXX and Hebrews in the expression for "within the veil." I did record the differences in a footnote, suggesting that these must be kept in mind, but I agree with Young that in comparing the usage of the expression "within the veil" in Hebrews to that of the LXX, "the differences do not outweigh the similarities."<sup>9</sup> Hence I have acknowledged, and even built upon, the cogency of his and Gane's arguments for the basic conclusion in their articles, i.e., that this expression most probably refers to the second veil and not the first. Thanks, Norman and Roy, for nudging me to a decision on this issue!

Young's fourth objection is that the inauguration services of the earthly sanctuary occurred only once, and as such they cannot be the background to the emphasis in Hebrews upon the *repetitious* nature of the old covenant sacrifices and the *annual* entrance of the high priest on the Day of Atonement, *contrasted* with the once-for-all sacrifice and once-for-all entrance of Jesus into the heavenly sanctuary.

This objection goes to the heart of what I see as the major underlying difference of perspective on Hebrews between Young and myself: we have a very different view of the nature of typology in the epistle. Young posits a basic *discontinuity* between the OT type and the NT antitype in Hebrews; he claims that "manipulating the type to fit the antitype" or "forcing of the shadow to fit the substance is the common manner of the writer."<sup>10</sup> The implication of this position is that one therefore cannot legitimately argue from the OT type to the NT antitype, but only the other way around; one must interpret the types in light of their inspired reinterpretation in Hebrews.<sup>11</sup>

By contrast, I view the nature of typology in Hebrews to be one of basic *continuity* and not discontinuity.<sup>12</sup> To be sure, this continuity entails

<sup>9</sup>Young, "Day of Dedication or Day of Atonement?" 63. I would simply add to Young's remarks that the language for this expression is not only to its usage in Lev 16, but also similar to its usage in Exod 26:33; and thus while it is most probably referring to the second veil, it is not necessarily referring to the event of Day of Atonement.

<sup>10</sup>Norman Young, "The Gospel According to Hebrews 9," *NTS* 27 (1981):205, 209.

<sup>11</sup>*Ibid.*, 209, n. 77.

<sup>12</sup>This continuity is demonstrated in Hebrews, e.g., by the author's use of terminology that highlights correspondence (and intensification) of basic contours: *hypodeigma* "copy," *skia* "shadow," *typos* "type," *antitypos* "anti [=corresponding to the] type," *anagkē* "necessity," and *alēthinos* "true." The continuity is also illustrated by the way the author of Hebrews argues from type to antitype: several times he explicitly insists that as it happened in the OT type, so

*intensification* from type to antitype, as in all biblical typology,<sup>13</sup> but not manipulation or distortion of the OT type. There are a couple of crucial instances in the book of Hebrews where the NT antitype does in fact move beyond intensification to involve actual modification of the OT type, but these instances of discontinuity occur *not* because the author of Hebrews feels free to manipulate the OT types, but because *already in the OT* there was a prophetic indication of such change in the typology.

One major area of discontinuity is with regard to the priesthood: the author of Hebrews does point to a modification from the (1) mortal, (2) sinful, (3) Levitical priest to the antitypical priest, who is immortal, sinless, and after the order of Melchizedek, not Levi. But, as we noted above, this modification is based upon his exegesis of the OT passage in Ps 110 (note the repeated citation of this passage in Hebrews, and in particular the treatment in Heb 7). The other major area of discontinuity is with regard to the sacrifices: the author of Hebrews indeed sees a typological shift from the (1) many (2) ineffectual (3) animal sacrifices to the once-for-all, effectual sacrifice of the man Jesus. But these modifications again are grounded in the OT messianic passage of Ps 40:6-8 (see the exegesis in Heb 10:1-14).

Thus I concur with Young that with regard to the *sacrifices*, the author of Hebrews does contrast the *many* sacrifices offered daily and yearly (including the Day of Atonement) with the *once-for-all* sacrifice of Christ, thereby modifying the type (Heb 7:27; 10:11). But this is based upon an OT control, i.e., Ps 40:6-8, which predicts the coalescing of the many animal sacrifices into the one sacrifice of the Messiah.

With regard to Christ's *entry into the heavenly sanctuary*, however, I do not find any OT control justifying a modification of basic OT sanctuary typology, making Christ's entry into the heavenly sanctuary to commence its services the antitype of the annual entry on the Day of Atonement. Neither do I find the author of Hebrews making such modification. Instead, he uses inauguration language to describe this entering. The inauguration of the

---

it is *necessary* (*anagkē*) for it to happen that way in the antitype (see, e.g., Heb 8:3; 9:16, 23; 13:11-12). Throughout the epistle, including the sanctuary discussion, the author also often uses Rabbi Hillel's principle of *Qal wahomer*, "light to heavy" (we today term this the *a fortiori* or "what is more" argument), which posits a basic continuity between the items compared (e.g., Heb 9:13-14; 12:25). For further discussion, see Richard M. Davidson, "Typology in the Book of Hebrews," in *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, vol. 4 (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 1989), 174-178.

<sup>13</sup>See Richard M. Davidson, *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical Types Structures*, Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, vol. 2 (Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 1981), 276-277, 303-304, 326-327, 346-347, 353, 365, 398, 405-408, 416-422.

antitypical heavenly sanctuary at the commencement of its services is presented in basic continuity with the inauguration of the typical earthly sanctuary at the commencement of its services. The Day of Atonement language is reserved by the author for portraying Christ's once-for-all sacrifice (as we have seen above, modified typology in harmony with Ps 40:6-8 where all sacrifices coalesce into one), and for portraying the work of judgment that is still future in his time, also in harmony with the OT type that places the Day of Atonement at the end of the yearly round of sanctuary services (Heb 10:25-31; cf. 9:27<sup>14</sup>).

The passages adduced by Young to support a contrast between the many yearly Day of Atonement enterings (Heb 9:7, 25; 10:1, 3) and the once-for-all entrance of Christ (9:12) do not appear to me to be describing such contrast. In these passages a contrast of *sacrifices*, not *enterings*, is in view. Even in Heb 9:12, where Christ is said to enter "once-for-all," the explicitly stated contrast is between the blood of the dedication animals ("not with the blood of goats and calves") and the better blood of Christ's sacrifice ("but with his own blood").

As I point out in my article,<sup>15</sup> Young and I differ on the contextual emphasis of the verses preceding Heb 9:12. I concur with a number of recent studies which maintain that the overarching context of Heb 9:1-12 is a comparison/contrast *between the old and new covenants, each with their respective sanctuaries*.<sup>16</sup> Hebrews 9:12 thus presents the transition between the old and new covenant, the transition between the earthly sanctuary and the heavenly sanctuary, concentrated in the inauguration of the heavenly sanctuary. On the other hand, Young sees the context primarily as a contrast *between the two apartments* of the earthly sanctuary—the first apartment

<sup>14</sup>In the conclusion of his critique of my article, Young questions whether Heb 9:27 points to a Day of Atonement future judgment ("Day of Dedication or Day of Atonement?" 67-68). I agree with him that the *stress* of the parallel in this passage is not on future judgment, but I do not believe the concept is totally absent from the verse.

<sup>15</sup>Davidson, "Christ's Entry," 185, n. 29.

<sup>16</sup>For bibliography and further discussion, see *ibid.* Cf. the consensus statement of the Daniel and Revelation Committee, "Daniel and Revelation Committee Report," in *Issues in the Book of Hebrews*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, vol. 4 (Silver Spring, MD: Biblical Research Institute, 1989), 4-5, and Davidson, "Typology in the Book of Hebrews," 176-185. In the latter reference, I discuss how the basic comparison/contrast between old and new covenant sanctuaries (not apartments) is highlighted in Heb 9:8. This verse indicates (contrary to Young's interpretation) that the way into *ta hagia* (the heavenly sanctuary, not just the Most Holy Place) is not made manifest as long as the first (i.e., earthly) sanctuary (not first apartment) still has a standing. (See NEB for essentially this translation.) Verses 9-10 point out that this whole earthly sanctuary is a *parabolē*, standing for the earthly OT age of which it was a part. Verses 11-12 make clear that this same earthly sanctuary in its entirety is also a type of the heavenly sanctuary (cf. Heb 8:5; 9:23-24).

representing the OT age and the second apartment the NT age and heaven itself. Hebrews 9:12 is thus placed in parallel/contrast with the earthly entering of the second apartment on the Day of Atonement. I believe Young's focus upon a contrast between apartments and not covenants, in which the continuity between type and antitype totally breaks down, further illustrates his fundamental presupposition of radical discontinuity between OT type and NT antitype (and the author's freedom to modify the OT type), and may go a long way to explain our different interpretations of the background event in Heb 9:12 and other parallel "entering" passages in Hebrews.

If one recognizes that the context of Heb 9:1-12 presents a comparison between the whole earthly sanctuary (vv. 1-10) and the whole heavenly sanctuary (vv. 11-12), and not a contrast between apartments, then a closer look makes further apparent that the author of Hebrews does not contrast Heb 9:12 (Christ entering into the heavenly sanctuary once-for-all) with Heb 9:7 (the high priest's annual going into the Most Holy Place).<sup>17</sup> Instead, in Heb 9:12 the "once-for-all" inauguration of the antitypical heavenly sanctuary at the commencement of its services is presented by the author of Hebrews in basic continuity with the initial (one-time) inauguration of the typical earthly sanctuary at the commencement of its services, of course intensified as the

<sup>17</sup>This is contrary to what Young seeks to demonstrate in his parallel chart derived from his 1981 article (Young, "Day of Dedication or Day of Atonement?" 64; cf. idem, "The Gospel According to Hebrews 9," 199). Heb 9:7 contrasts with v. 6, not with v. 12. The contrast is between the earthly priests' "continual/regular" or *tamid* (LXX *dia pantos*) ministry in the first apartment (v. 6) and the earthly high priest's once-a-year (*hapax tou eneiantou*) service—going into the second apartment on the Day of Atonement with blood which he had offered for himself and the people (v. 7). Surface similarities between Heb 9:7 and 9:12 diminish upon closer inspection. A different Greek verb for "go in" (*eiseimi*) is used in Heb 9:7 (actually the verb does not even appear in v. 7 but is implied from the previous verse) than for "enter" (*eiserchomai*) in 9:12 and the other "entering" passages of Hebrews that refer to Christ's entering into the heavenly sanctuary (as examined in my article). Again, Heb 9:7 refers to the high priest going specifically into the "second" apartment, whereas Heb 9:12 speaks of Christ entering *ta hagia*, "the sanctuary," which, as we noted in the article, may include the Most Holy Place, but in LXX usage is *never* the term used to denote specifically the second apartment by itself. Instead of positing that the author of Hebrews departs from LXX usage in Heb 9:12, as Young claims, I find that he is remaining consistent with LXX usage, and referring to Christ's entering of the entire heavenly sanctuary at the time of its inauguration, including, but not limited to, the heavenly Holy of Holies. If the author had wished to contrast the many yearly (Day of Atonement) enterings with the once-for-all entering of Christ in these two passages, he would undoubtedly have used the phrase "every year" (*kat' eneiantou*) in contrast with "once-for-all" (*ephapax*), as he does in Heb 9:25 and 10:3, instead of "once in the year" (*hapax tou eneiantou*). It is unlikely that the author would radically contrast the two words *hapax* "once" (9:7) with *ephapax* "once, once for all" (9:12), when the latter term is used synonymously with the former elsewhere in the epistle (see, e.g., 10:2, where *hapax* clearly means "once for all"). Finally, the use of the word *tragos* in Heb 9:12, which is intertextually linked to inauguration (Num 7) and not Day of Atonement, makes highly problematic any linkage to the Day of Atonement in Heb 9:7.

earthly inauguration used the blood of “goats and calves” while the heavenly inauguration involved the blood of Christ.

As a fifth objection, Young finds “quite arbitrary” my suggestion that Heb 10:19-20 provides the key to interpreting Heb 6:19-20, and suggests that the reverse is more likely to be the case. However, it is not unusual within the Hebrew mind-set to portray a scene in more general terms first and then in later references to that scene provide crucial interpretive details. For example, in Ezek 1 the prophet Ezekiel describes the four living creatures, but not until chapter 10, when he sees them again, does he give the “key” to their identity by pointing out that they are in fact “cherubim” (Ezek 10:3-5, 15, 20).

This pattern of moving from the general introduction to clarifying details is found within the book of Hebrews. For example, the author briefly introduces the general concept of the high priesthood of Jesus already in Heb 2:17, but it is not until Heb 5, and especially Heb 7, that we learn the specific nature of this high priesthood, that it is after the order of Melchizedek (Heb 5), and the radical implications of this shift in priesthood typology (Heb 7). Similarly, I find the author of Hebrews introducing the theme of Christ’s entry into the heavenly sanctuary in 6:19-20, and then in 9:12 and especially 10:19-20 providing crucial details to identify the occasion as the inauguration. This is consonant with other language of entry in these passages that moves from the general (in 6:19-20) to the specific and more explanatory (in 10:19-20).<sup>18</sup>

As part of this fifth objection, Young claims that the presence of the verb *enkainizō* in Heb 10:20 does not point unambiguously to the complex of inauguration/dedication rituals for the sanctuary, since the term may refer to other kinds of renewal than inauguration of the sanctuary. But Young’s references to other occurrences of *enkainizō* outside the Pentateuch miss the point. Young himself acknowledges that “Hebrews’s concern is, of course, with the Mosaic Tabernacle not the Solomonic Temple or the Second Temple.”<sup>19</sup> Hence, it is the usage of the *enkainzō* word group (verb or nominal derivatives) describing the Mosaic cultus in the LXX Pentateuch that is significant as background for Hebrews.<sup>20</sup> And the evidence is clear from the LXX Pentateuch: in material dealing with the sanctuary and cultus the *enkainizō* word group appears *only* in Num 7, and the context of this chapter

<sup>18</sup>See Davidson, “Christ’s Entry,” 181-182.

<sup>19</sup>Young, “Day of Dedication or Day of Atonement?” 67.

<sup>20</sup>Such is to be presumed unless Hebrews actually cites (or clearly alludes to) other OT passages that describe the OT cultic practices in general, as we see below with the conjoining of “bulls” and “goats.” In the remainder of this article I use *enkainizō* to encompass the whole word group which includes both the verb and its nominal derivatives, unless I specifically refer to it as a verb. Note that verb *enkainizō* does appear twice in a noncultic setting in the LXX Pentateuch (Deut 20:5 [2 times]), and here the meaning is also clearly “to dedicate.”

is the complex of rituals performed to dedicate/inaugurate the sanctuary. In fact, the inauguration of the sanctuary altar, described in Num 7, comes as the climactic, culminating stage in this complex of inauguration/dedication rituals for the sanctuary (see Num 7:1).

If the evidence is clear from the LXX Pentateuch that *enkainizō* in a cultic context refers to "inauguration" and not "renewal" in general, it is even clearer from the context of Hebrews itself. As noted already in my article, the verb *enkainizō* is employed by the author not only in Heb 10:20, but also in Heb 9:18. This latter passage uses *enkainizō* with reference to putting the first covenant into effect and anointing the sanctuary (see vs. 21), and here it unambiguously means "inaugurate." This use of *enkainizō* is the closest context for interpreting Heb 10:20, even closer than LXX usage, and confirms that "inaugurate" is the meaning intended by the author of Hebrews in this "entering" passage.

Young also argues that according to Heb 10:20, it is "a new and living way" that has been consecrated, not the sanctuary. But again, as pointed out in my article, "the new and living way [*hodos*]" of Heb 10:20 is "through the veil" which is further defined in Heb 9:8 as "the way [*hodos*] into the sanctuary [*ta hagia*]." Furthermore, the context of both 10:20 and 9:8 is the official starting up of the heavenly sanctuary services.<sup>21</sup> It is difficult to escape the conclusion that Heb 10:20 speaks of the inauguration of the heavenly sanctuary.

A sixth objection raised by Young is that my argument "deals with a word but neglects the sentence." He uses a vivid illustration from the imagery associated with Christmas: "Just as . . . steam pudding, holly, stocking, presents, conifer tree and snow *when all found together* point to a northern Christmas, so . . . the grouping of high priest, blood of goats and calves, entered, sanctuary, and once-for-all (not annually) pointed to the entrance of the high priest into the sanctuary on the Day of Atonement."<sup>22</sup> May I suggest a parallel illustration? What do the following connote—December, the 25th day of the month, snow, exchange of presents and cards, lights decorating the house, family celebration and games, and special holiday culinary delicacies? Sounds indeed like Christmas. But then add two more items: *hanukkiyyot* (nine-branched candelabra) and dreidel, and it is clear that the holiday is not Christmas, but Hanukkah, which begins on the 25th day of the Jewish month Kislev. Likewise in Hebrews, the collocation of high priest, blood of goats and calves, entered, sanctuary, and once-for-all may together sound like Day of Atonement, but add the two LXX terms *enkainizō* and *tragos*, and it is

<sup>21</sup>Davidson, "Christ's Entry," 181, 185.

<sup>22</sup>Young, "Day of Dedication or Day of Atonement?" 64.

clear that inauguration, rather than the Day of Atonement is in view. (The Hebrew term for "inauguration" is *hanukkah*, so the illustration is particularly appropriate here!) The point is that one must take *all* the words of the sentence into account, not just some of them.

I agree with Young that Heb 9:7 and 9:25 refer to Day of Atonement, because of the clear reference to "once a year" and "every year" respectively.<sup>23</sup> But in Heb 9:12 and 10:19-20 the lack of reference to "once a year" or "every year," the reference to *enkainizō* and *tragos* ("inaugurate" and "he-goat") used in LXX cultic language of the Torah only for the inauguration, and the larger context of these passages—all clearly point to inauguration as the background. Furthermore, Heb 13:11 does not refer exclusively to Lev 16:27 and the Day of Atonement, but summarizes the general principle (set forth foundationally in Lev 4:5, 12, 21; and 6:30) that all sin offerings (both daily and yearly) whose blood is taken into the sanctuary must be burned outside the camp.<sup>24</sup> One cannot arbitrarily lump together all of these passages because of some similar language: the full scope of terminology and immediate context for any given passage must be given due weight in deciding which background is in view.

A seventh objection of Young is that the two terms *tragos* "goat" and *moschos* "calf" are never conjoined in Num 7 as sin offerings. But that is just my point! The *tragoi* "goats" and *moschoi* "calves" of Heb 9:12 do not refer to the OT Day of Atonement sin offerings, as Young assumes, but to inauguration offerings. This is made apparent within the immediate context of Hebrews itself. It is no accident that just a few verses later in this same chapter, Heb 9:19, the blood of these same two animals is mentioned again,<sup>25</sup> and this time the context clarifies beyond any doubt that the OT background is inauguration (see the term *enkainizō* in v. 18). The author of Hebrews unmistakably links the conjoining of these two animals with the background of inauguration, not the Day of Atonement. Hebrews 9:19 refers to the inauguration of the covenant, and according to Exod 24:5, the sacrifices for

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., 64-65, 67. However, I disagree that *ta hagia* in 9:25 refers exclusively to the Most Holy Place. In light of LXX usage where *ta hagia* never refers to the Most Holy Place alone, I find it more probable that Heb 9:25 is remaining consistent with the LXX and referring to the entire sanctuary. After all, on the Day of Atonement, the high priest went into the entire sanctuary to make atonement for both apartments with the blood of the Lord's goat.

<sup>24</sup>Heb 13:11 is paraphrasing both Lev 16:27 and the foundational statements of this principle in Lev 4:5, 12, and 6:23 (v. 30 in Heb. and Eng.). A comparison of the Greek of Heb 13:11 with LXX usage reveals that every parallel Greek expression found in Lev 16:27 is also found in the basic statement of the principle in Lev 4:5, 12, and 6:23 (v. 30 in Heb. and Eng.).

<sup>25</sup>I am assuming the presence of both these words in the Greek original, in harmony with the decision of the latest edition of the UBS Greek Bible, and as generally represented in the most recent English translations. Young concurs ("The Gospel According to Hebrews 9," 205, n. 53).

this inauguration were not sin offerings, but burnt offerings and peace offerings. In Num 7, in the context of the inauguration of the sanctuary, these same two kinds of offerings are conjoined—thirteen times, along with explicit use of the term for inauguration/dedication (LXX *enkainizō*). Hebrews 9:12 refers to these same two kinds of offerings. The animal chosen by the author to represent the burnt offering is the first one mentioned in the lists of Num 7, the *moschos*; and the animal he chooses to represent the peace offerings of Num 7 is the one distinctive animal that is not mentioned with regard to any other sanctuary ritual, i.e., the *tragos*, thus pinpointing the inauguration context.

Young continues his critique by pointing out that the blood of the *tragos* and *moschos* in Num 7 is not brought into the sanctuary. It is true that Num 7 does not mention the blood of these animals being brought into the sanctuary. However, *according to the author of Hebrews*, the blood of these two animals is indeed brought into the sanctuary in the context of the inauguration! Hebrews 9:19 specifically states that Moses “took the blood of calves [*moschoi*] and goats [*tragoi*] . . . and sprinkled both the book itself and all the people.” Then v. 21 indicates that “likewise [*omoiōs*] he sprinkled with the blood [*tō haimata*] both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry.” The use of the Greek word translated “likewise, in the same way” and the presence of the article “the” with the word “blood” in Greek unambiguously refers back to the previous inauguration rites of v. 19 and to the same kind of blood (i.e., of the calves and goats).<sup>26</sup>

Young refers to the use of the phrase “bulls and goats” (Heb 9:13, and the reverse order in Heb 10:4), where the word *tauros* “bull” is linked with *tragos* “goat,” and suggests that the author of Hebrews “is choosing his terms for the sacrificial animals with less than a precise match with the

<sup>26</sup>Is the author of Hebrews here manipulating or misrepresenting the OT type? To the contrary, I believe the author of Hebrews may well have recognized the underlying linguistic connection in the LXX Torah between the inauguration of the covenant and the inauguration of the sanctuary and altar, and that he draws the logical implications. Exod 24:5 indicates that for the inauguration of the covenant the blood sprinkled on the people was from burnt offerings and peace offerings, but only one animal is mentioned for these sacrifices: the *moscharion* (diminutive of *moschos*). In Num 7, this *moschos* (same Hebrew word *par* as in Exod 24:5) is connected to the burnt offering. The author of Hebrews mentions this word, representing the burnt offering, and then selects the uniquely characteristic inauguration animal of Num 7 for the peace offering, i.e., the *tragos*. Based upon Num 7, where the altar is anointed (v. 1) as well as inaugurated with blood (vv. 10-88), the author of Hebrews apparently assumes (not without some textual justification, and perhaps oral tradition—note that Josephus, *AJ* iii.206, describes the use of both blood and oil in the dedication service) that the rest of the sanctuary was inaugurated with blood like the altar, employing the same animals as in Num 7. Thus, it seems that the author of Hebrews finds Num 7 to be the key passage that links the inauguration of the covenant with the inauguration of the altar and the sanctuary.

LXX.<sup>27</sup> But as I have argued in my article,<sup>28</sup> this linkage of terms is very precise. In Heb 9:13 and 10:4 the author is alluding to Isa 1:11 and Ps 49:13 [50:13 in Hebrew and English], and deliberately broadening the reference from the inauguration context of Heb 9:12, 19 to the whole complex of sacrifices in the OT, as the more general contexts in Heb 9:13 and 10:4 make clear. Thus in Heb 9:12 and 19 the author precisely pairs *tragos* and *moschos*—terms that are uniquely conjoined in the context of inauguration in Num 7—when he wishes to point to inauguration. And in Heb 9:13 and 10:4 he pairs *tauros* and *tragos*—terms that are conjoined to describe sacrifices in general in Isa 1:11 and Ps 49:13—when he wishes to speak of the whole sacrificial system. This is another of the many examples in Hebrews where it is apparent that the author was intimately acquainted with the intricacies of the Hebrew cultus and did not use descriptive terminology imprecisely.<sup>29</sup>

I agree with Young that the central concern of the epistle with regard to sacrifices is for the sin offering. Particularly emphasized are the sin offerings offered up “daily” or “continually” throughout the year as they became necessary (Heb 7:27; 10:1). But this does not rule out reference to inauguration in other contexts where the author draws the specific parallel between the old covenant with its (earthly) sanctuary and the new covenant with its (heavenly) sanctuary. In presenting the transition between the two covenants, and the commencement of the heavenly sanctuary ministry (especially Heb 9:12 and 10:20), the author uses specific language that pinpoints the inauguration sacrifice (*tragos*) and event (*enkainizō*).

It is rather surprising to me to see that when the evidence of LXX usage points to inauguration rather than the Day of Atonement, Young so easily abandons the methodology that he so strongly promoted in his article with regard to interpreting the phrase “within the veil” in Heb 6:19-20. He shifts away from a terminological control in the LXX to suggest that the author of Hebrews may have been following the imprecise usage of terms in Philo. The prodigious research of Ronald Williamson has shown that the book of

<sup>27</sup>Young, “Day of Dedication or Day of Atonement?” 65.

<sup>28</sup>Davidson, “Christ’s Entry,” 184, n. 27.

<sup>29</sup>Another classic example is the alleged “blunder” on the part of the writer of Hebrews when he states that the Most Holy Place “had” the altar of incense (Heb 9:4); Harold S. Camacho, “The Altar of Incense in Heb 9:3-4,” *AUSS* 24 (1986): 5-12, shows that, far from being a case of ignorance or carelessness, this passage reveals the author’s mastery of the subtle OT theology of the sanctuary in which the altar of incense, although located in the Holy Place, actually had a Most Holy Place function (1 Kgs 6:22; cf. Exod 30:10.) Note also the statement of the author of Hebrews in 9:22 that according to the Torah “almost all things are purged with blood”; he had a clear grasp of that one minor exception to the expiation by blood found in Lev 5:11-13.

Hebrews contains no trace of the fundamental attitudes or convictions of Philo's philosophical thought-forms,<sup>30</sup> and those who have claimed close conceptual affinities of Hebrews with Philo have not taken Williamson's evidence seriously. But regardless of any possible terminological affinities between Hebrews and Philo, fortunately the author of Hebrews does not leave us in doubt as to whether he is following the usage of Philo or of the LXX with regard to conjoining *tragos* and *moschos*. As we have seen above, the context of the epistle itself in Heb 9:18-19 indisputably shows that when the author of Hebrews conjoins the terms *tragos* and *moschos*, he has reference to inauguration. Young acknowledges the inauguration background of Heb 9:18-19 and I am hard pressed to understand why he does not allow the author of Hebrews's own terminological usage in these verses to inform the same usage a few verses earlier in the same chapter. This closest context of usage for these terms surely must take exegetical precedence over any speculation regarding employment of Philonic terminology.

Young's eighth objection is to my suggestion that the aorist participle *genomenos* may hint at inauguration in Heb 6:19, 20. I agree that this is at best only a hint, and not conclusive. But as Young notes, the aorist participle generally refers to action completed with or before the main verb. I simply suggest that the other occurrences of this aorist participle in Hebrews cited by Young seem to connect the action of the main verb and the participle rather closely together in time (Heb 1:3, 4; 5:9, 10; 7:26, 27; 9:11-12, 28; 10:12), and this may well be the case with Jesus' officially becoming high priest and inaugurating the heavenly sanctuary. In the OT type these two events are part of one inauguration complex, and I suggest that the author of Hebrews is remaining consistent with the OT sanctuary typology, rather than modifying/manipulating the type to bring together the high priest's inauguration with the Day of Atonement, events never associated together in time in the OT sanctuary services.

Young's final query leaves me wondering why he wishes to shift the discussion to the exegesis of Dan 8, a totally different topic from the interpretation of Hebrews's "entering" passages. This is not the place to discuss in detail the interpretation of Dan 8. I would simply point out that I do not interpret Dan 8:11-13 as referring to the Day of Atonement, as Young seems to imply. I find these verses describing a counterfeit religious power that attempts to usurp the "continual" (*tamid*) ministry of the Prince of the host. Regarding Dan 8:14, where I do see connections with the Day of Atonement, the query of Young applies equally well to his

<sup>30</sup>Ronald Williamson, *Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Leiden: Brill, 1970); for a summary of his conclusions, see Davidson, "Typology in the Book of Hebrews," 137-140.

own apparent interpretation of (re)dedication<sup>31</sup> in Dan 8:14 as to mine. I have pointed out above that the terms such as high priest, blood, calves and goats, entering, sin offering, cleanse, and inner veil,<sup>32</sup> apply equally well to the inauguration/dedication rituals as to the Day of Atonement. Therefore, Young must also face the fact that none of these terms normally describing sanctuary dedication are present in the text. In other words, the absence of these terms helps neither the Day of Atonement nor the (re)dedication interpretations.

In the case of Dan 8, I have not seen any exclusive terminology linking decisively to either inauguration or the Day of Atonement; and thus in order to ascertain which background, if either, is in view, a broader, text-based linguistic study of the passage in question must be undertaken in addition to broader intertextual study that includes contexts and concepts as well as terminology.<sup>33</sup> By contrast, in the case of the "entry passages" in the book of Hebrews, as I have pointed out in my article, there are two such exclusive terms (*enkainizō* and *tragos*) which occur in the cultic sections of the Torah LXX *only* in a context of inauguration, and in fact conjoin only in a single chapter of the Pentateuch (Num 7), thus providing powerful intertextual indicators of the inauguration background of these passages. One of these terms (*enkainizō*) actually means "to inaugurate," and thus represents not only an intertextual linkage to the general inauguration background, but actually provides a semantic control that points unmistakably to inauguration and not to the Day of Atonement. This term does not appear only incidentally in Heb 10:20, to show some "dedicatory ideas" in the passage apart from the main point, but constitutes the operative

<sup>31</sup>In a previous draft of his response to my article, Young argued more explicitly for a dedication ritual as the more probable interpretation of Dan 8:14, and I presume he refers to the (re)dedication of the sanctuary after its desecration by Antiochus Epiphanes, in line with the interpretation of many modern Daniel commentators.

<sup>32</sup>I do not include from Young's list the burning of the carcasses outside the camp since, as we have seen above, this applies to the general rule for a sin offering whose blood is brought inside the sanctuary, and not uniquely to the Day of Atonement. Obviously also if the final cosmic Day of Atonement is alluded to in Daniel 8:14, it will not be termed "annual."

<sup>33</sup>Some study has already been done in significant articles, revealing a strong linkage between Dan 8 and the Day of Atonement, and not inauguration. See especially Angel M. Rodriguez, "Significance of the Cultic Language in Daniel 8:9-14," in *Symposium on Daniel*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, vol. 2 (Washington, DC: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), 527-549; and Jacques B. Doukhan, *Daniel: The Vision of the End* (Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 1987), 23-31. An exhaustive text-based linguistic and intertextual study of Dan 8:9-14 is currently being undertaken by Martin Pröbstle in an Andrews University Ph.D. dissertation. This work will probably exceed 650 pages when completed.

verb (parallel to and explanatory of the verb “enter” in Heb 6:20<sup>34</sup>) clarifying the purpose of Christ’s entry—to inaugurate the heavenly sanctuary.

In summary of the above responses to Young’s arguments, the following points may be emphasized.

1. The term *enkainizō* in Heb 10:19-20 clearly focuses upon the OT background of inauguration and not the Day of Atonement. The *enkainizō* word group repeatedly, and exclusively, appears in the context of the complex of dedication rituals of the Mosaic sanctuary (four times, to be exact, in Num 7). Young wishes to dismiss these occurrences as not being a part of the dedication rituals for the sanctuary and its precincts, but as I have shown above, they actually appear as the climax and culmination of these rituals. That *enkainizō* is referring to “inauguration” and is not just a general term for “opening” or “renewal” is not only indicated by LXX usage, but is confirmed within the epistle to the Hebrews, where the same verb *enkainizō* is used in Heb 9:18 with reference to the ratification of the covenant and indisputably means “inauguration.” Christ’s inauguration of “a new and living way. . . through the veil” in Heb 10:19-20, seen in light of the parallel language in Heb 9:8 (“the way into the [heavenly] sanctuary [*ta hagia*]”), clearly refers to his inauguration of the heavenly sanctuary, corresponding antitypically to the inauguration of the earthly Mosaic sanctuary.

2. The term *tragos* “goat” in Heb 9:12, likewise clearly alludes to the inauguration rituals of the Mosaic sanctuary. This word appears in the cultic parts of the LXX Torah only in Num 7 (and here thirteen times!), in a context of sanctuary inauguration. In fact, the terms “goat” (*tragos*) and “calf” (*moschos*), along with *enkainizō* (in its nominal forms), conjoin only here in Num 7 in the entire LXX OT. Such exclusive intertextual convergence of crucial cultic terms employed by the author of Hebrews in a single OT LXX chapter in a context of inauguration certainly points to inauguration as the OT background of these “entering” passages in the book of Hebrews. Any lingering doubt as to whether the author of Hebrews is remaining faithful to LXX usage or possibly following the ambiguous usage of Philo (which could allow for either inauguration or the Day of Atonement backgrounds), is dismissed by the author of Hebrews himself. Within the same chapter as Heb 9:12, and just a few verses later (v. 18) he refers to the blood of the same two animals, “calves” [*moschoi*] and “goats” [*tragoi*], and here the conjoining of these two animals indisputably refers to the inauguration rituals (of both covenant and sanctuary, see v. 21), not the Day of Atonement. As with *enkainizō*

<sup>34</sup>See Davidson, “Christ’s Entry,” 181-182.

in Heb 10:20, so with the reference to *tragos* and *moschos* in Heb 9:12: we find both an intertextual terminological control from LXX usage and an inner terminological control within the book of Hebrews itself, and both point clearly to inauguration and not the Day of Atonement as the background event of these passages.

3. Contextual clues within the epistle provide further evidence for the OT background intended by the author of Hebrews. The context of each of the "entering" passages of Hebrews paralleling Heb 6:19-20 is the transition between the two covenants with their respective sanctuaries and the official starting up of the heavenly sanctuary ministry. Just as the starting up of the earthly sanctuary in the OT was the occasion for inauguration, so in the antitype it is natural that Christ be presented by the author of Hebrews as inaugurating the heavenly sanctuary when he officially started up its services. In the OT cultus the Day of Atonement never coincided with the inauguration of the sanctuary, and thus it is contextually consistent that the Day of Atonement is not the antitypical event alluded to in the Hebrews's "entering" passages. Furthermore, in none of these passages does the context call for translating *ta bagia* with reference only to the Most Holy Place, but rather to the entire heavenly sanctuary, in harmony with LXX usage in which *ta bagia* never refers solely to the Most Holy Place, and in harmony with the OT inauguration rituals in which the entire sanctuary and not just the Most Holy Place was inaugurated.

4. Hebrews 6:19-20 is in clear and close parallel with the other three "entering" passages of Hebrews, and it seems most probable that the same inauguration background behind Heb 9:12, 24; and 10:19-20 is the background for Heb 6:19-20. This is fully consistent with the work of the high priest "after the order of Melchizedek" (Ps 110), which according to Hebrews includes the high-priestly work performed by both Moses and Aaron.

5. Fundamental to our divergent conclusions is the fact that Young and I approach Hebrews very differently. I see in Hebrews a basic continuity between OT type and NT antitype, except in those instances where the OT itself has announced a discontinuity (i.e., Ps 40:6-8 and 110:4). I find the author of Hebrews supporting this fundamental continuity of basic contours both by precept (use of terminology for continuity such as *typos* "type" and *antitypos* "corresponding to the type") and example (himself arguing from type to antitype and insisting on the "necessity" *anagkē* that as it happened in the type, so it must also occur in the antitype, 8:3; 9:16-18, 23). Young, on the other hand, believes that the "common manner of the writer" of Hebrews consists of "manipulating the type to fit the antitype" and "forcing of the shadow to

fit the substance."<sup>35</sup> By suggesting such radical discontinuity between type and antitype, and thereby disallowing the legitimacy of arguing from type to antitype, it appears to me that Young has followed critical scholarship in general in nullifying the predictive nature of typology and robbing typology of its intended gospel-teaching function within the OT whereby OT believers could understand in advance the essential contours of the Messiah's redemptive work.

Young and I also disagree over how literally to take the author of Hebrews' language regarding the heavenly sanctuary. Young thinks that I treat Hebrews as a "literalistic commentary on the OT types,"<sup>36</sup> whereas it seems to me that Young has virtually collapsed sanctuary typology in Hebrews into a metaphor of the achievement of Jesus' death. Young's reference to the many affinities between Hebrews and Philo of Alexandria, along with his allusion in an earlier article to the author of Hebrews being "Alexandrian,"<sup>37</sup> leads me to wonder if Young sees the Epistle to the Hebrews steeped in (or at least tinged with) Philonic/Platonic dualism, as do many critical Hebrews scholars. In the thought world of Philo, there is no room for a real, spatio-temporal heavenly sanctuary. In contrast to this view, I believe that Williamson's monograph (referred to above) has shown that the epistle to the Hebrews contains none of the fundamental dualistic attitudes or convictions of Philonism, but rather upholds the same robust biblical realism as throughout the rest of Scripture. In Hebrews, the author not only affirms a real deity, real humanity, and real priesthood of Christ, but also "a real ministry in a real sanctuary" (original emphasis).<sup>38</sup>

Contrary to Young's appraisal of my approach, I do not regard Hebrews as a "literalistic commentary on the OT types." That the author of Hebrews remains faithful to the basic contours of sanctuary typology, and that he affirms the existence of Christ's ongoing priestly ministry in a real, spatiotemporal heavenly sanctuary, is not "literalism" but biblical realism.<sup>39</sup> The author of Hebrews does not literalistically apply all of the minute details of the Mosaic tabernacle to the heavenly sanctuary, but

<sup>35</sup>Young, "The Gospel According to Hebrews 9," 205, 209.

<sup>36</sup>Young, "Day of Dedication or Day of Atonement?" 68.

<sup>37</sup>Young, "The Gospel According to Hebrews 9," 201.

<sup>38</sup>William G. Johnsson, *In Absolute Confidence: The Book of Hebrews Speaks to Our Day* (Nashville: Southern, 1979), 91.

<sup>39</sup>See Fernando Canale, "Philosophical Foundations and the Biblical Sanctuary," *AUSS* 36 (1998):183-206, for a helpful discussion of various philosophical deconstructions of the literal biblical language of the sanctuary, including Philo and leading Christian theologians, and a call to return to the biblical foundations regarding the interpretation of sanctuary texts.

recognizes, in harmony with the nature of biblical typology throughout Scripture, the fundamental continuity between the *basic contours* of type and antitype.<sup>40</sup>

The author of Hebrews does not attempt a full-blown typological commentary on the Levitical cultus. At the same time the antitypical fulfillments to which he does point remain faithful to the OT types or the modifications of those types already predicted in the OT. With regard to the Israelite cultus, the author of Hebrews shows that the basic contours of the OT sanctuary typology are fulfilled in Christ: (1) his sacrifice, coalescing the many daily and yearly sacrifices into his once-for-all death in light of Ps 40:6-8 (Heb 7:27; 9:7, 25; 10:1, 3); (2) his inauguration of the heavenly sanctuary to officially start up its services and provide access into the presence of God (Heb 6:19-20; 9:12, 21-24; 10:19-20); (3) his ongoing high priestly mediatorial ministry in the heavenly sanctuary (Heb 4:14-16; 7:25); and (4) his future (from the author's perspective) Day of Atonement work of investigative and executive judgment for the professed people of God (Heb 9:27; 10:25-31). The book of Hebrews does not collapse sanctuary typology into a mere hortatory metaphor of the crucified and glorified Christ, but calls upon Jewish Christians tempted to return to Judaism not to forsake Jesus, in whom is found the fulfillment of the wide range of OT types that pointed to him.

To conclude, I wish once again to commend my esteemed colleague Norman Young for his contribution to the exegetical methodology of Hebrews interpretation by taking seriously the LXX terminology utilized by the author of the epistle. He has shown how this methodology provides a crucial control for the identification of the veil in Heb 6:19 and 10:20. I merely suggest that this methodology be extended to other key LXX terminology used by the author of Hebrews, including *enkainizō*, *tragos*, *moschos*, and *ta bagia*, and that the implications of this usage be taken seriously in identifying the OT background behind the "entry passages" in Hebrews. Young acknowledges allusions to dedicatory ideas in Heb 9:18-23 and even perhaps in 10:19-20, but goes on to state that "by itself it [inauguration/dedication] is insufficient background for all the sanctuary language found in Hebrews, especially Heb 6:19-20."<sup>41</sup> I heartily agree that inauguration is insufficient background for all the sanctuary language in Hebrews. As I mentioned in the conclusion to my article, I find the inauguration motif to be only one—and

<sup>40</sup>These basic contours are already apparent in the OT as one examines the features of the sanctuary precincts and services that remain *constant* as one moves from the Mosaic tent tabernacle to the permanent structures of the Solomonite temple, the Second temple, and the descriptions of the eschatological temple in Ezek 40-48. It is these same basic contours that are summarized by the author of Hebrews in 9:1-7.

<sup>41</sup>Young, "The Day of Dedication of the Day of Atonement?" 67.

not the major one—among many sanctuary motifs in Hebrews, including the Day of Atonement. But, based upon LXX usage and contextual evidence within the epistle, I do find inauguration, and not the Day of Atonement, to be the most probable background to Heb 6:19-20 and parallel “entering” passages.