



Vayikria- He called - Leviticus 1:1-5:26

Haftorah – Isa. 43:21-44:23

B’rit Hadashah - Hebrews 10:1-18

Rabbin Deborah Eliana Brandt

Yeshua In The Sacrificial System

Parshah Overview: ¹

G-d **calls** to **Moses** from the **Tent of Meeting**, and communicates to him the laws of the *korbanot*, the **animal** and meal offerings brought in the Sanctuary. These include:

- The “ascending offering” (*olah*) that is wholly raised to G-d by the **fire** atop the altar;
- Five varieties of “meal offering” (*minchah*) prepared with fine flour, olive oil and frankincense;
- The “**peace offering**” (*shelamim*), whose meat was eaten by the one bringing the offering, after parts are burned on the altar and parts are given to the *kohanim* (priests);
- The different types of “sin offering” (*chatat*) brought to atone for **transgressions** committed erroneously by the high priest, the entire community, the king or the ordinary Jew;
- The “**guilt offering**” (*asham*) brought by one who has misappropriated property of the Sanctuary, who is in **doubt** as to whether he transgressed a divine prohibition, or who has committed a “betrayal against G-d” by swearing falsely to defraud a **fellow man**.

¹ © Copyright, all rights reserved. If you enjoyed this article, we encourage you to distribute it further, provided that you comply with Chabad.org's [copyright policy](#).

Laws for Burnt Offerings

Lev 1:1 Now Adonai called to Moses and spoke to him out of the Tent of Meeting, saying:

Lev 1:2 “Speak to Bnei-Yisrael, and tell them: When anyone of you brings an offering to Adonai, you may present your offering of livestock, from the herd or from the flock.

Lev 1:3 “If his sacrifice is a burnt offering from the herd, he is to present a male without blemish. He is to offer it at the entrance of the Tent of Meeting, so that he may be accepted before Adonai.

Lev 1:4 He is to lay his hand on the head of the burnt offering, so that it will be accepted for him to make atonement on his behalf.

A STUDY IN THE 5 OFFERINGS IN THIS PASSAGE - Dr. Arnold Fruchtenbaum

THE BURNT OFFERING—LEVITICUS 1:3–17

The first Levitical offering is the **Burnt Offering, olah** in the Hebrew, literally meaning “to go up.” It means that the whole offering “went up in smoke.” This is the oldest of the offerings, found as early as the Book of Genesis. This was a voluntary offering, with the worshipper voluntarily devoting his whole offering to God through the fire. As Moses deals with the specific animals allowed, the progression always goes from the most expensive to the least expensive. This study will not go through all of the various details, but it is important to get the gist of their meanings.

A. The Typology

As far as its typology is concerned, the basic meaning of the Burnt Offering is that the Messiah offered Himself to God without spot and without blemish; the Messiah offered Himself as His own consecration offering to the Lord.

B. Observations and Ramifications

There are seven things to mention by way of observations and ramifications concerning the Burnt Offering.

1. Divisions of Labor

The first observation or ramification is that there was a division of labor between the worshipper and the priest.

The labor for the worshipper involved five things: first, he had to bring the animal; secondly, he had to kill the animal; thirdly, he had to skin it; fourthly, he had to gut it; and fifth, the worshipper had to cut up the animal.

Meanwhile, the priest had to do three things: first, he had to prepare wood for the fire; secondly, he had to sprinkle blood on the Altar; and thirdly, he had to place the dismembered animal’s body on the fire.

2. General Aspects

The second observation is that there are nine general aspects concerning the Burnt Offering.

The first aspect to note is that it is known in Hebrew as the *olah*, because the whole thing literally “went up” to God in smoke; nothing was returned to the offerer.

The second general aspect is that the total burning made the Burnt Offering distinct from other offerings. Of course, parts of the other sacrifices were also burned on the Altar, but the Burnt Offering was totally consumed on the fire except for the hide of the animal and the crop of the bird. Otherwise, everything was totally burned.

A third general aspect is that there are other names found in the Scriptures for this offering. It is sometimes referred to merely as “an offering made by fire.” In Deuteronomy 33:10, it is called in Hebrew *kalil*, the whole burnt offering.

The fourth general aspect is that this is the oldest of known offerings, mentioned for the first time in Genesis 8:20.

The fifth general aspect to note is that, in actual practice, it was often preceded by a Sin Offering or a Trespass Offering (Lev. 6:8–7:38).

The sixth general aspect is that the kinds of animals for the Burnt Offering and the details as to how they were offered closely parallel the Peace Offering. There will be more on this point in the study of the Peace Offering.

The seventh general aspect is that the underlying purpose was to secure atonement for sins, to propitiate God’s wrath.

The eighth general aspect is that the immediate purpose was to express total dedication to God; it was a consecration. So while the underlying purpose was to secure atonement for sins, the immediate purpose was to express total dedication to God.

The ninth and final general aspect is that the offering was voluntary as far as private practice, but it was mandatory for specific public occasions. It was mandatory as a daily sacrifice every morning and evening; it was mandatory as a weekly sacrifice on the Sabbath; it was mandatory as a monthly sacrifice for the first day of the month or the New Moon Offering; it was mandatory seasonally for the seven Holy Seasons of Israel; it was mandatory annually for special annual offerings. So, while on the individual level it was voluntary, it was mandatory for public situations.

3. General Characteristics of the Sacrificial Animal

The third observation or ramification is to note the four general characteristics of the animal. First, the animal had to be ceremonially clean. Secondly, it had to be utilitarian, meaning “usable for food.” Thirdly, it had to be an animal that was domesticated; although some wild game animals were permissible for food, no game animal was permissible for sacrifice. And fourthly, the animal had to be costly; the selection of the animal was based upon the economic status of the individual Jewish member of the commonwealth. If the individual were wealthy, he had to offer an expensive sacrifice; if he were poor, he could offer a less expensive sacrifice, nevertheless, it would have to be costly relative to his economic status.

4. Individual Characteristics of the Sacrificial Animal

The fourth ramification is the individual characteristics of the animal, and there were three of these. First, it had to be perfect: without spot, without blemish, without disease, without deformity. Secondly, as to gender: the animal had to be male. Thirdly, as to age: generally, the animal had to be one year old. There were exceptions; sometimes it could be as young as a week old or as old as three years, but the general principle was a one year old animal.

5. The Sequence of the Ritual

The fifth ramification is the sequential steps of the ritual. In the first step, the worshipper brought the animal to the entrance of the Tabernacle and stood near the Altar (v. 3). In the second step, the worshipper would lay his hands on the head of the animal; this was done if the animal came from a herd, but not true if the animal came from a flock of birds (v. 4). In the third step, the priest would declare the animal acceptable (v. 4). In the fourth step, the worshipper would kill the animal, except for the bird which was killed by the priest (v. 5). In the fifth step, the priest would sprinkle the blood against the Altar, round about on all four sides (v. 5). In the sixth step, the worshipper would skin and divide the animal (v. 6). In the seventh step, the priest would burn the animal on the Altar. And in the eighth step, the priest would then get to keep the hide.

6. The Burnt Offering in the Old Testament

The sixth ramification involves the Burnt Offering in the Old Testament, where there were two primary ideas. The first idea is that of atonement; the Burnt Offering provided some kind of atonement for sin (Gen. 8:20–21; Job 1:5; 42:7–9); this was already true under the Adamic and Noahic Covenants. The second idea was that of dedication: this was the means of dedicating oneself to God (Ex. 18:11–12; Num. 15:3). This was especially its meaning under the Mosaic Covenant.

7. The Burnt Offering in the New Testament

The seventh and last ramification concerns the Burnt Offering in the New Testament. Explicitly, it is mentioned in Mark 12:33 and Hebrews 10:6–8. But implicitly, it is found in Luke 2:23–24, which mentions that a Burnt Offering was required after childbearing. It is also implicit in Luke 17:14, when the healing of a leper apparently required a Burnt Offering.

II. THE MEAL OFFERING: LEVITICUS 2:1–16

The second Levitical offering is called a **Meal Offering**, and it is the only one that was not a blood offering. The Meal Offering is referred to in the Hebrew text as *korban minchah*, and literally means “to give a present.” Therefore, the basic concept is that of a gift (Gen. 32:13, 18). It was often used in the context of giving a gift to gain the favor of a superior. It was a tribute of a faithful worshipper to a divine overlord.

A. The Basic Content

The basic content of the Meal Offering was usually either wheat or barley. Often, the Meal Offering is mentioned in conjunction with the Burnt Offering, as it is very closely associated with the Burnt Offering (Josh. 22:23, 29; Judg. 13:19, 23; 1 Kg. 8:64; 2 Kg. 16:13).

B. Accompanied by Blood

As mentioned, this is the only offering which was a bloodless offering. However, it was never offered apart from blood, but was normally accompanied by blood (Lev. 23:9–14; Num. 15:1–16; Ezra 7:17). Before the Meal Offering was placed upon the Altar, the Burnt Offering was given first. The Meal Offering was then placed upon the Burnt Offering, so that the Meal Offering always came in contact with blood.

C. The Presentation

The Meal Offering was offered to God in thanksgiving, and then given to the priest for the purpose of ministry. It may have been offered either cooked or uncooked. If it were offered in cooked form, there were four options: first, it might be baked in an oven; secondly, it could be baked on a flat pan; thirdly, it could be fried; and fourthly, in harvest times, it could be roasted.

D. The Typology

As far as its typology is concerned, the Meal Offering typifies the perfect humanity of the Messiah.

E. Observations and Ramifications

Here again, this study will not give all of the various details about the Meal Offering, but as an overall picture, there are five observations and ramifications. First, there were two types of Meal Offerings, either cooked or uncooked. Secondly, there were four types of cooked Meal Offerings: baked in an oven, baked in a flat pan, fried, and, in the case of the Feast of First-fruits, roasted. Thirdly, if it were offered in an uncooked form, it would be offered as fine flour mixed with two items: oil and frankincense. Fourthly, there were two prohibitions or elements, which were never to be added to the Meal Offering: leaven and honey. And fifth, the ritual of the Meal Offering involved four basic steps. In the first step, the worshipper would bring his Meal Offering to the Tabernacle. In the second step, the worshipper would then take a handful of the Meal Offering. In the third step, the priest would take the handful of fine flour from the worshipper and burn it on the Altar. And in the fourth step, the rest of the Meal Offering would be given to the priest as a means of sustenance.

III. THE PEACE OFFERING: LEVITICUS 3:1–17

The third Levitical offering is **the Peace Offering**. The Hebrew name for the Peace Offering is *zebach shlamim*; literally, it means “sacrifices of peaces.” The second word, *shlamim*, comes from the well known Hebrew word *shalom*, which means “peace” or “to make peace.” This was a voluntary thanksgiving offering. It emphasized complete well being and harmony, not merely the absence of war. The uniqueness of this offering is that certain parts were burned on the Altar, but

the rest was given back to the petitioner. The one who offered it got most of it back. This was the believer's way of participating in the blessings of the fellowship with God.

A. The Typology

As far as its typology is concerned, it typifies the value of Messiah's death in terms of its communion. It typifies the Messiah's procuring peace with God for the sinner (Rom. 5:1). And it typifies the fellowship of believers with God, once again, the concept of communion.

B. Observations and Ramifications

There are six basic observations and ramifications concerning the Peace Offering.

1. Motivations

The first observation is that there were three motivations for the Peace Offering. The first motivation was as a thanksgiving offering in Leviticus 7:12–14; and 22:29, and it is almost synonymous with the fellowship offerings of 2 Chronicles 29:31; 33:16; and Jeremiah 17:26. It was brought as an acknowledgment of God's deliverance or blessing bestowed as an answer to prayer (Ps. 56:12–13; 107:22; 116:17–19; Jer. 33:11).

The second motivation was as a votive offering, meaning making a vow in Leviticus 7:16. It was a ritual expression of a vow in Leviticus 27:9–10. Indeed, when a Nazirite fulfilled his vow, this is the sacrifice he would need to offer according to Numbers 6:17–20.

The third motivation was as a freewill offering to express devotion and thanksgiving to God for some unexpected blessing in Leviticus 7:16 and 22:17–20.

2. The Ritual

The second observation is the description of the ritual itself, which was performed in eight steps. In the first step, the worshipper brought the animal to the entrance of the tent of meeting. In the second step, the worshipper pressed his hands on the animal's head. In third step, the worshipper killed the animal. In the fourth step, the priest would splash the blood of the animal over the Altar. In the fifth step, the worshipper would cut up the animal. In the sixth step, parts of the animal were burned on the Altar by the priest. This included the kidneys, which were the symbol of one's emotions (Job 19:27), and the fat, which symbolized the best of the offering; the best was given to God according to Genesis 45:18. In the seventh step, the priest was entitled to keep certain parts of the animal: the skin, the right thigh or shoulder, and the breast. The right thigh or shoulder could typify the power and strength of the Messiah, though this may be a bit far fetched. And in the eighth step, the worshipper and others ate the remainder of the sacrifice as a festive meal. If it were a thanksgiving or confessional offering, it was eaten the same day. If it were offered for other reasons, it was eaten the following day. All who ate of it had to be ceremonially clean, and all leftovers had to be completely burned.

3. The Occasions

The third observation is that the Peace Offering could be either for private or public occasions. If it were a private occasion, it was voluntary in two forms: either as a thanksgiving and confessional offering or as a spontaneous freewill offering. While it was voluntary as a normal principle, it was a required offering for the individual as a fulfillment of a vow (Lev. 7:12, 16). It was regularly preceded by a Burnt Offering (Lev. 3:5). If the occasion were public, then the Peace Offering was mandatory. For example, it was mandatory during the Feast of Weeks (Lev. 23:19), and it was mandatory during the ordination of a priest (Lev. 9:4).

4. The Animals

The fourth observation is that birds were not allowed for a Peace Offering, because a bird would not provide sufficient meat for a full, festive meal. Therefore, animals from flocks such as sheep and goats and herds of cattle were used, but not birds.

5. The Peace Offering in the Old Testament

The fifth observation concerns the Peace Offering in the Old Testament. It is mentioned as a freewill offering (Ps. 54:6), and as a votive offering (Ps. 56:12–13).

6. The Peace Offering in the New Testament

The sixth observation is in regard to the Peace Offering in the New Testament. Explicitly, it is not mentioned at all in the New Testament. Implicitly, it is found in Acts 21:23–26. That passage deals with offerings at the conclusion of a vow and, of course, the Peace Offering in its votive form would be used for that purpose.

IV. THE SIN OFFERING—LEVITICUS 4:4–5:13

The fourth Levitical offering is **the Sin Offering**. The basic purpose of the Sin Offering was to deal with the issue of mandatory offerings for sins done unwittingly. In Leviticus 4:1, we have God's second utterance. The first three offerings, which were based upon God's first utterance, were largely voluntary offerings, but the last two offerings are based upon the second utterance and concern mandatory sacrifices. These last two, then, are mandatory and expiatory. While the first three offerings were already known from previous revelation, these last two are totally new and revealed for the first time by the Mosaic Law.

A. The Nature of the Sin

Stating the nature of the sin, God says in Leviticus 4:2: *Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, If any one shall sin unwittingly.*

That is the issue-unwitting sin. Literally, the Hebrew means unwittingly in the sense of "unintentionally." It is a sin that was committed through ignorance, error, or oversight.

The Hebrew word has for its root meaning "to wander," "to go wrong," "to make a mistake," "to commit error." It is a sin which arises from human infirmity or from the weakness of the flesh; it

is a sin of weakness of flesh and blood; it is a sin of waywardness. This is unintentional sin, sin of ignorance or inadvertent sin, such as the sin of manslaughter (Num. 35:11–23). It is a sin that was committed without premeditation (Num. 15:22–29). In other words, it is not a sin done in a spirit of rebellion; it is not a sin of presumption. This is in contrast with a sin committed with a high hand, a calculated sin of defiance against God, for which there is no sacrifice. The penalty for those kinds of sins was merely to be cut off or executed (Num. 15:30–31).

The Hebrew word for *sin* here is *chata*, which literally means “to miss the mark.” When you miss the mark, of course, you also hit the wrong mark. Thus, this passage deals with sins that were not premeditated, but sins done out of ignorance, sins that a person just happened to fall into. Verse 2 goes on to say: *in any of the things which Jehovah has commanded not to be done.*

In other words, we are dealing with sins, which were committed against a negative commandment, a violation of a negative commandment.

The Hebrew word for *Sin Offering* is *chataat*. Literally, a Sin Offering is a purification offering. It is not the only one to deal with sin, as the fifth offering will also deal with sin, but the emphasis of the Sin Offering is on the purification from sin. It emphasizes the principle of sin and expiation for the guilt of sin.

B. The Unique Features

This particular offering has four unique features. First, the scriptural discussion on the Sin Offering is twice as long as on all previous offerings. Secondly, the first time that the Sin Offering is mentioned is in this passage. Thirdly, at this point it becomes the most important of the five offerings. It was not mentioned heretofore and it was not practiced heretofore. But with this commandment of Moses, it becomes the most important sacrifice, needing to be offered up even during the festivals. And fourthly, it was killed and offered in the same place as the Burnt Offering.

C. The Result

The key result of the offering is forgiveness; one was forgiven because of this offering.

D. The Animals

Various types of Burnt Offerings were allowed, based upon the economic status of the offerer. In the case of the Sin Offering, the different types of Sin Offerings mentioned in this passage in decreasing order were based upon the social status of the sinner. The higher a person stood on the social ladder, the more expensive an offering he had to make.

E. Observations and Ramifications

There are four specific observations and ramifications concerning the Sin Offering: its purpose, ritual, the manipulations of the blood, and its typology.

1. The Purpose

The first observation is the distinctive purpose of the Sin Offering: to atone for sin and provide forgiveness for specific unintentional or non defiant sins, where no restitution was required. God accepted the blood of the animal as a ransom payment for the particular sin which occasioned it and, by so doing, diverted His wrath from the sinner and, ultimately, to the Messiah on the cross.

2. The Ritual

The second observation is that the ritual involved eight specific steps. The first step was the presentation of the sacrifice at the door of the Tabernacle by the Altar (Lev. 4:4, 15, 23, 28). The second step was an identification of the sinner with the offering. This was when the sinner laid his hands upon the head of the offering; the laying on of hands upon the head of the animal was a means of identification with the sinner (Lev. 4:4, 15, 24, 29). The third step was the confession of the sin that occasioned the sacrifice (Lev. 5:5). The fourth step was the killing of the sacrifice, which was done by the petitioner himself (Lev. 4:4, 15, 24, 29). The fifth step was the sprinkling of the blood. This procedure differed according to the social status of the petitioner. If the petitioner were the high priest, and the offering was for the high priest himself and the congregation of Israel as mentioned in Leviticus 4:6–7, and 17–18, the priest took the blood into the Holy Place and sprinkled the blood seven times toward the veil and then applied the blood on the horns of the Altar of Incense. But if the offering was for a tribal ruler or a common person, the blood was merely applied to the horns of the Altar of Sacrifice (Lev. 4:25, 30). In the sixth step, the remainder of the blood was poured out at the base of the Altar of Sacrifice (Lev. 4:7, 18, 25, 30). In the seventh step, the fat and the kidneys were burned on the Altar (Lev. 4:8–10, 19, 26, 31). And in the eighth step, the body of the bullock was burned outside the camp (Lev. 4:11, 12, 21).

3. The Manipulations of the Blood

The third observation or ramification concerns the four distinctive manipulations of the blood of the Sin Offering. First, if it were a poor man's offering, the blood was sprinkled around the Altar. Secondly, if the offering were that of a tribal ruler or a common person, the blood was applied upon the horns of the Altar of Sacrifice. Thirdly, if the offering were for the high priest and the congregation of Israel, the blood was applied to the horns of the Altar of Incense. And fourthly, on the Day of Atonement, on this one and only occasion, the blood was sprinkled upon the Mercy Seat. This sprinkling of the blood upon the Mercy Seat would provide the blood for the very poor, who, when they offered a Sin Offering, were allowed to bring a bloodless offering. Nevertheless, the poor man's sins were covered by blood, because his Meal Offering that was used as a Sin Offering was placed upon the Burnt Offering, thereby coming in contact with blood. But on the Day of Atonement, one goat was offered up for the whole nation, with the animal's blood sprinkled upon the Mercy Seat; on that occasion, then, the sins of the very, very poor were taken care of as well.

4. The Typology

The fourth ramification had to do with its typology. The key typological meaning is the death of the Messiah as a satisfactory, substitutionary sacrifice to provide forgiveness of sins. The basic

typological meaning is: the Messiah as our sin bearer. It typifies redemption for the sinner; it typifies the Messiah as our expiation; and it typifies forgiveness of sin through His blood.²

V. THE TRESPASS OFFERING—LEVITICUS 5:14–6:7

The fifth and last Levitical offering is called **the Trespass Offering**. Two basic Hebrew words are used for this offering: first, the word *asham*, which carries the concept of guilt; thus, this offering is referred to as a Trespass Offering, a reparation offering or guilt offering. Secondly, the Hebrew word is *maal*, which basically means “a violation.” It has to do with an act of misappropriation or denial of that which is rightfully due to another, with the word “another” being God or man.

A. The Emphasis

The emphasis of this offering is on the practice of sin rather than the sin itself. The Sin Offering focused on the sin itself, but the Trespass Offering focused attention on the practice of sin. The emphasis here was on the harmful effects of sin. It emphasized the harm done by transgressing the Law of Moses. Therefore, this offering requires confession, compensation, and restitution for the wrong done. It was an expiation of trespass claims of both God and man. Therefore, when the Book of Leviticus discussed this offering, it discussed it in two parts: first, sins or trespasses against God (Lev. 5:14–19); and secondly, trespasses against man (Lev. 6:1–7).

B. The Typology

As to its basic typological meaning, it typifies the Messiah’s payment for the penalty of sin. It typifies redemption from sin. It typifies the atonement from the harmful effects of sin. It typifies the death of the Messiah in terms of victory over sin. In fact, it states in the famous messianic prophecy of Isaiah 53:10, speaking about the death of the Messiah, that God will make Him an offering for sin. The word for *sin* is *asham*, which has to do with the Trespass Offering. It means that Jesus removed the harmful effects of sin.

C. Observations and Ramifications

There are eight specific observations and ramifications concerning the Trespass Offering.

1. Required with Acts of Misappropriation

The first observation is that this offering was required when one committed a violation, a *maal*. This was an act of misappropriation, a denial to either God or man of his rightful due. It was an offense that caused damage or loss. It may have been either unintentional or deliberate.

² Fruchtenbaum, A. G. (1983). *Vol. 180: The Messianic Bible Study Collection (8–16)*. Tustin, CA: Ariel Ministries.

2. Distinctive Features

The second observation concerns the three distinctive features of the Trespass Offering, which would not necessarily be true of the other offerings.

The first distinctive feature is that it required restitution; the payment of a fine to the wronged party. The Trespass Offering required restitution, but the Sin Offering did not. If the sin could be assessed for a monetary compensation, if a value could be put on the sin, the guilty party had to bring a ram for the guilt offering, as well as pay compensation in property or in silver of the actual value plus a twenty percent fine. The ram itself was not part of the restitution, but it was for the expiation for the sin before God.

The second distinctive feature is that it may have been for unintentional sins committed against man, but offenses that were not defiant sins against God.

Furthermore, there may have even been intentional sins against man. In other words, the sinner may have premeditated the sin against man, but he did not intend to act defiantly against God (Num. 15:30). So, in summarizing this distinctive, the offering was for unintentional sins; that is, they may have been intentional against man, but they were unintentionally defiant sins against God.

3. The Main Idea

The third observation is that the main idea of the Sin Offering was expiation for sin, but the main idea of the Trespass Offering was satisfaction for restoration of rights that had been violated.

4. The Lessons

The fourth observation is that there are four specific lessons of the Trespass Offering. The first lesson is that, in cases of sin that caused harm to others, amends must be made first; restitution had to be made before making the offering. This same principle is taught in Matthew 5:23–24; 6:12. The second lesson is that the sinner must give complete satisfaction. The third lesson is that sin defiles, and this defilement has both spiritual and social dimensions. And the fourth lesson is that the concept of satisfaction and compensation was included here; both satisfaction and compensation were essential.

5. The Ritual

The fifth observation is the six basic steps of the ritual. In the first step, the offerer had to present the sacrifice and, in this presentation, had to estimate the proper value of the crime, while also estimating the value of the ram (Lev. 5:15; 6:2–6). In the second step, he would then need to make restitution, which had to be made before the actual atonement (Lev. 5:16; 6:5). As part of this restitution, he had to pay full value of the deed plus a twenty percent fine. If the sin were against God, the twenty percent fine was paid to the priest; if it were against another man, it was paid to the victim. In the third step, he would then carry out the atonement itself, in which the ram was offered up; the blood of the ram was shed (Lev. 5:15, 18). In the fourth step, the blood was sprinkled on the sides of the Altar of Sacrifice (Lev. 7:2). In the fifth step, the fat was burned (Lev. 7:5). And in the sixth step, the remainder of the sacrifice was eaten by the priest (Lev. 7:6).

6. The Occasions

The sixth observation concerns the five occasions of the Trespass Offering. First, if any of the sins listed in Leviticus 5:14–6:7 were trespass sins, then the Trespass Offering was required. Secondly, it was part of the cleansing of a Jewish leper as he was healed of his leprosy (Lev. 14:10–14). Thirdly, this offering was required when fornication was committed with a female slave, who was betrothed to another (Lev. 19:20–22). Fourthly, it was required for any of the basic trespass sins mentioned in Numbers 5:5–10. And fifth, it was needed for the cleansing of a Nazirite who was defiled by touching a dead body during his vow (Num. 6:9–12).

7. An Apparent Contradiction

The seventh observation deals with a seeming contradiction; the Leviticus passage required a twenty percent restitution, but Exodus 22:4–14 required a one hundred percent restitution. So is there a contradiction between Leviticus and Exodus? The answer is “no,” and the solution is in examining the context. In the Book of Exodus, the offender is convicted by the evidence, and if so, then the restitution must be one hundred percent. But in the Leviticus passage, the offender voluntarily surrenders and confesses his sin, so the restitution is only twenty percent.

8. The Trespass Offering in the New Testament

The eighth observation concerns the Trespass Offering in the New Testament. Explicitly, there is no mention of the Trespass Offering in the New Testament, but it is found implicitly. Again, Isaiah 53:10 states that the Messiah was to be a Trespass Offering, and this chapter is quoted in the New Testament: Isaiah 53:1 is quoted in John 12:38 and Romans 10:16; Isaiah 53:4 is quoted in Matthew 8:17; Isaiah 53:5–6 is quoted in 1 Peter 2:24 and 25; Isaiah 53:9 is quoted in 1 Peter 2:23; and Isaiah 53:12 is quoted in Luke 22:37. So implicitly, it is to be found in the death of the Messiah.³

Messiah Yeshua’s Sacrifice For Sin To All Who Put Faith In Him

Heb 10:1 The Torah has a shadow of the good things to come—not the form itself of the realities. For this reason it can never, by means of the same sacrifices they offer constantly year after year, make perfect those who draw near.

Heb 10:2 Otherwise, would they not have ceased to be offered, since the worshipers—cleansed once and for all—would no longer have consciousness of sins?

Heb 10:3 But in these sacrifices is a reminder of sins year after year— TLV

“If the keynote of the last chapter was the efficacy of blood offered in sacrifice, the main theme of this chapter is the once-for-all character of [the Messiah’s] saving death” (Hugh Montefiore, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 163).

³ Fruchtenbaum, A. G. (1983). *Vol. 180: The Messianic Bible Study Collection* (16–19). Tustin, CA: Ariel Ministries.

Shadow ... originals. The notion of earthly copies and heavenly originals is Hebraic and grounded in the *Tanakh* (see 8:2–6a&N; 9:1–5&N, 23–24), but here it is expressed in Hellenistic imagery drawn from Plato’s *Republic*.

The Torah has in it a shadow of the good things to come, but not the actual manifestation (or “image”) **of the originals.** The author does not belittle the *Torah* (compare Co 2:16–23&NN) but gives it its place in the unfolding of God’s work in history. In respect to the sacrificial system, the Messiah’s death and entry into the heavenly Holiest Place brings to humanity an **actual manifestation** here and now of what the *Torah* previewed, namely, the **good things still to come** when Yeshua returns.

But the argument does not extend to other components of the *Torah*. First of all, just as Sha’ul at Ga 3:17–25&NN uses the term “*Torah*” to refer to only its legal aspects, the author of this book frequently uses “*Torah*” in reference only to its “food and drink and various ceremonial washings” (9:10), not its moral elements. Secondly, nothing is said one way or another about Jewish rituals unconnected with the sacrificial system, such as *kashrut* or Jewish festivals. See 8:13.

1–3 In Judaism the daily synagogue services are thought of as having replaced the daily Temple sacrifices. This connection is made clear in the *Siddur* itself, where the first part of the *shacharit* (“morning”) service includes portions recalling the sacrifices (Hertz edition, pp. 34–41). Other portions of the liturgy are directly concerned with sin and forgiveness (the 5th and 6th blessings of the *Amidah* and the *Tachanunim* (“supplications”). Thus, with the Temple no longer in existence, it is the daily synagogue service which serves as **a reminder of sins, year after year**. In fact, it makes sense for the Conservative and Reform Jewish movements to apply the term “Temple” to synagogues if synagogue prayers are equivalent to Temple sacrifices. But see 9:22&N on why they are not.

Yochanan Ben-Zakkai, who led the Synod of Yavneh (90 C.E.) in reorienting non-Messianic Judaism toward *halakhah* (“law”) and away from the sacrificial system after the Temple had been destroyed, apparently continued to have **sins on his conscience**, even on his deathbed (see Talmudic source quoted in 1 Th 4:13N).

Heb 10:4 for it is impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sins. TLV

4 Compare Psalm 50:7-17

Psa 50:7 “Hear, My people, and I will speak, O Israel, and I will testify against you: I am God, your God.

Psa 50:8 I do not rebuke you for your sacrifices, for your burnt offerings are continually before Me.

Psa 50:9 I have no need of a bull from your house nor goats from your pens.

Psa 50:10 For every beast of the forest is Mine, and the cattle on a thousand hills.

Psa 50:11 I know every bird of the mountains. Everything moving in the field is Mine.

Psa 50:12 If I were hungry, I would not tell you—for the world is Mine and all it contains!

Psa 50:13 Do I eat the flesh of bulls or drink the blood of goats?

Psa 50:14 Offer God a sacrifice of thank offerings, then fulfill your vows to Elyon.

Psa 50:15 Call upon Me in the day of trouble. When I rescue you, you will honor Me.”

Psa 50:16 But to the wicked, God says: “What are you doing, reciting My laws and taking My covenant in your mouth?

Psa 50:17 For you hate discipline, and you cast My words behind you.

Heb 10:5 So when Messiah comes into the world, He says, “Sacrifice and offering You did not desire, but a body You prepared for Me.

Heb 10:6 In whole burnt offerings and sin offerings You did not delight.

Heb 10:7 Then I said, ‘Behold, I come to do Your will, O God (in the scroll of the book it is written of Me).’” TLV

5–7 It is sometimes claimed by opponents of the New Testament that in this passage the author distorts the *Tanakh* (see 2C 4:1–2&N) in order to prove that Yeshua is the Son of God. More specifically, they hold, first, that Psalm 40 does not refer to the Messiah at all, and second, that several of its lines are intentionally misquoted.

Following, for comparative purposes, is the Jewish Publication Society’s rendering of Psalm 40:7–9(6–8):

“Sacrifice and meal-offering Thou hast no delight in;
Mine ears hast Thou opened;
Burnt-offering and sin-offering hast Thou not required.
Then said I: ‘Lo, I am come
With the roll of a book which is prescribed for me;
I delight to do Thy will, O my God.’ ”

The answer to the first objection is that although the Psalm itself expresses its writer’s gratitude at deliverance from trouble or sickness, our author, aware that the Messiah could have expressed his own conception of his task on earth with these words, uses the passage midrashically for this purpose. This procedure, legitimate if all understand that the text is being used in this elastic fashion, was common among Jewish writers of the time.

The answer to the second objection is that the author accurately quotes the Septuagint, the Greek version of the *Tanakh* prepared by Jewish translators more than two centuries before Yeshua was born; but it is necessary to examine three phrases more thoroughly.

You have prepared for me a body. The line differs significantly from the second line of the Hebrew text translated above, which is, literally, “You have dug my ears,” and is usually understood to mean that God has opened this person’s ears so that he will be able to hear the *Torah* better and thus be better able to carry out its commands. The sense of the Septuagint is essentially the same as that of the Hebrew, for the point in both is that the person is entirely ready to do God’s **will** and obey his *Torah*. It is not known whether the Septuagint translators worked from a different Hebrew text or merely clarified the sense of the existing text, a common practice among the Targum translators.

In the scroll of the book it is written about me. The Hebrew of the corresponding line in Psalm 40 is: *Bim.gillat-sefer katuv .alai*. The New Testament and my translation give a more obvious and defensible rendering of the Hebrew than the Jewish Publication Society version quoted above.

I have come to do your will. The Hebrew of Psalm 40:9(8) means, in full:

“I delight to do your will;
your *Torah* is in my inmost parts.”

The objection is that the Psalmist equates delighting to do God’s will with obeying the *Torah*, not with Yeshua’s dying sacrificially, and that the author intentionally deletes the second line in order to avoid that conclusion. But, as I often point out, rabbinic citation of a *Tanakh* text always implies the context (see, for example, Mt 2:15N, Ro 10:6–8N). **Therefore, we learn from this passage that Yeshua’s relationship to the *Torah* is so intimate that he could speak of it as being “in my inmost parts.”** This accords with his own proclamation, at Mt 5:17–20, that he had not come to do away with the *Torah* or the Prophets, but to bring out their full meaning. We also learn that as “the firstborn among many brothers” (Ro 8:29), the Messiah himself was the first to receive God’s New Covenant promise, as expressed by Jeremiah, “I will put my *Torah* in their minds and write it on their hearts” (v. 16b below). We who are Yeshua’s followers, by being immersed into Yeshua (Ro 6:2), and to the degree that we are thus fully identified with him (Yn 15:1–10, 17:20–26), too have God’s *Torah* in our own inmost parts and delight to **do his will**. The essence of *Torah*, then, is doing God’s **will**; but it is a delight only if it arises out of fully trusting him (Ro 1:5, 17; Ep 2:8–10; Pp 2:12–13).

This extensive defense of the author’s use of Psalm 40 has been necessary because of the word-by-word analysis which he makes in vv. 8–10. For example, God’s **will** is mentioned in all three of those verses.

Heb 10:8 After saying above, “Sacrifices and offerings and whole burnt offerings and sin offerings You did not desire, nor did You delight in them” (those which are offered according to *Torah*),

Heb 10:9 then He said, “Behold, I come to do Your will.” He takes away the first to establish the second.

Heb 10:10 By His will we have been made holy through the offering of the body of Messiah Yeshua once for all. TLV

8–10 Notice that God does not take away the *Torah*; rather, **he takes away the first system of sacrifices and priesthood in order to set up the second within the framework of the one eternal *Torah*.**

Moreover, it is not necessary to suppose that this “taking away” prohibits all animal sacrifices by the Levitical priesthood. **The author’s point relates to only the sin offering: “an offering for sins is no longer needed”** (vv. 15–18&N) because the second sin offering system is effectual in a way that the first never was (v. 10, 9:11–15&N). **The other animal sacrifices and the Levitical priesthood could be continued without eclipsing the preeminent role of Yeshua’s once-for-all sacrifice and eternal high-**

priesthood. Even the sin-offering ritual could theoretically be continued, but only if it were regarded as a memorial and not as effective in itself. Just as it was never more than “a shadow” (v. 1&N), so now, if it should be resumed (which would presuppose the rebuilding of the Temple at some future time; see 2 Th 2:4N), it could not be more than a reminder of the great deliverance provided in Yeshua’s death as our final and permanently effective sin offering and his resurrection as our *cohen gadol*.⁴

Heb 10:11 Indeed, every kohen stands day by day serving and offering the same sacrifices again and again, which can never take away sins.

Heb 10:12 But on the other hand, when this One offered for all time a single sacrifice for sins, He sat down at the right hand of God—

Heb 10:13 waiting from then on, until His enemies are made a footstool for His feet.

Heb 10:14 For by one offering He has perfected forever those being made holy.

Heb 10:15 The Ruach ha-Kodesh also testifies to us—for after saying,

Heb 10:16 “This is the covenant that I will cut with them: ‘After those days,’ says Adonai, ‘I will put My Torah upon their hearts, and upon their minds I will write it,’” then He says,

Heb 10:17 I will remember their sins and their lawless deeds no more.”

Heb 10:18 Now where there is removal of these, there is no longer an offering for sin.

The point is the **once-and-for-all**-ness, the eternal effectiveness of Yeshua’s sacrifice, as opposed to the repeated but only temporarily effective sacrifices of the first system (compare vv. 1–4, in cleansing consciences and making believers truly **holy**; also see 9:11–15&N). This is reinforced by the re quoting of Psalm 110:1: Yeshua, after performing his ritual service, did what no Levitical *cohen gadol* ever did, he **sat down at the right hand of God**.

11 Every day ... over and over. See Exodus 29:38.

14 Brought to the goal of being permanently forgiven. See 7:11.

15–18 Having God’s *Torah* written in one’s heart and mind necessarily implies that God has forgiven one’s sins, so that **an offering for sins is no longer needed**. Therefore the readers of this sermon should free themselves from their compulsion to offer animal sacrifices as sin offerings and instead be fully assured of the sufficiency of Yeshua’s sacrifice of himself on their behalf. We moderns have no such compulsion, but we too should be convinced of the necessity of blood sacrifice for sin while having assurance that Yeshua’s blood sacrifice fulfills that requirement. With this, the author’s major argument is completed.

But the author is very specific in limiting what he says. **An offering for sins is no longer needed** and is ruled out. But the other sacrificial offerings remain part of God’s order even after Yeshua’s death, as proved by Sha’ul’s activity in the Temple at Ac 21:26 and his own offering of sacrifices which he himself speaks of at Ac 24:17. With the

⁴ Stern, D. H. (1996). *Jewish New Testament Commentary : A companion volume to the Jewish New Testament* (electronic ed.) (Heb 10:1–8). Clarksville: Jewish New Testament Publications.

destruction of the Temple, sacrificial offerings became impossible; but if the Temple is rebuilt, thank offerings, meal offerings, and praise offerings may be offered once again. **The author of this letter does not proclaim the end of the sacrificial system in its entirety, only the end of animal sacrifices for sins.** ⁵

⁵ Stern, D. H. (1996). *Jewish New Testament Commentary : A companion volume to the Jewish New Testament* (electronic ed.) (Heb 10:11–15). Clarksville: Jewish New Testament Publications.