The Ashes of the Red Heifer

A recent article begins with the words, "Last Tuesday, the Temple Institute's Red Heifer program was blessed with results; an entirely red female calf was born, paving the way for re-establishing the Temple service and marking the final stage of redemption".[1] This event has been picked up by newspapers world-wide with such lurid headlines as, "First 'red heifer' born in Israel for 2000 years triggers Armageddon fears"[2] and "End of the World fears: First red heifer 'born in Israel in 2,000 years fulfils prophecy'."[3] Secular Jews have gone on record as wishing the young cow would just disappear; some have even suggested that it be destroyed to avoid a potential war. This may seem an over-reaction but Rabbi Moshe ben Maimon (Maimonides), the most renowned medieval Jewish scholar known by the acronym Rambam, wrote in his explanation of the *mitzvah* that "the tenth red heifer will be accomplished by the king, the Messiah; may he be revealed speedily, Amen, May it be God's will."

The "red heifer" that has recently been born and certified "unblemished" is the tenth one, and the first red heifer since the destruction of the temple in AD 70. This is a powerful sign for "third temple fanatics" as rebuilding the third temple is closely linked with the appearance of the Messiah and the third temple cannot be built unless there is a way to cleanse the priesthood. That is why they require the Red Heifer.

Although no ashes have been available over the last 2,000 years the Jews read the passage of the Red heifer (Num 19 – called "Parah" or "heifer") on one of the four specially designated Sabbath's, one of which falls a week before the Passover feast.[4] The entire tractate Parah is devoted to the Laws of the red heifer. The portion of Parah constitutes the

---

[1] Harbinger to Messiah: Red Heifer Is Born by Adam Eliyahu Berkowitz September 5, 2018, 12:17 pm https://www.breakingisraelnews.com/113476/temple-institute-certifies-red-heifer/

[2] News Corp Australia NetworkSeptember 11, 201811:45am https://www.news.com.au/lifestyle/real-life/wtf/first-red-heifer-born-in-israel-for-2000-years-triggers-armageddon-fears/news-story/f02da2eaf05159137d281a2dc5cd39d1

[3] By Nicole Stinson PUBLISHED: 00:14, Tue, Sep 11, 2018 | UPDATED: 10:44, Tue, Sep 11, 2018 https://www.express.co.uk/news/weird/1015577/end-of-the-world-red-heifer-prophecy-israel-temple-institute-armageddon

[4] See, D. Thomas Lancaster, The Sabbath of the Cow (First Fruits of Zion)@ https://ffoz.org/discover/passover/shabbat-parah-sabbath-of-the-cow.html

reading of the third of the four special Sabbaths, and one of the reasons given is that an unclean person could not celebrate the paschal sacrifices without first being purified by the consecrated water of the red heifer. As it took seven days to purify the unclean person, the reading is done seven days before Passover. Of course, no cleansing is done (because they had no ashes) it simply became a tradition in order to prepare spiritually and mentally for the Passover. It seems that in the time of Jesus ashes were available because we read; “Now the Passover of the Jews was at hand, and many went up from the country to Jerusalem before the Passover to purify themselves”. (John 11.55) Whatever the case might be, the traditional association with the preparation for Passover is a distraction. Evidence will be provided that demonstrates the correct setting and meaning of the Red heifer ritual.

Holy cow, what does it all mean?

The Jews have apparently no idea what the ritual means (which I find hard to believe) and academics and theologians have little to say about the historical context. Jewish tradition teaches that only Moses knew the full meaning of this *chukkat*, or Law, which must be obeyed even though not understood. Even the wise and venerable King Solomon purportedly said, ''All these I have comprehended," speaking of ordinances, "but as regards the section dealing with the Red Heifer, I have investigated and inquired and examined: 'I said: I will get wisdom; but it was far from me' "(see *Jacob* 4:14).[5]

There are however, obvious connections between the Day of Atonement (DOA) and the ritual of the red heifer (RH). If both texts are placed next to each other the similarities become clear:

[5] Midrash Rabbah, Numbers Vol. II (London: Soncino Press, 1983), 754

Atonement (Leviticus 16)	**Red Heifer** (Numbers 19)
26 And he that let go the goat for the scapegoat shall wash his clothes, and bathe his flesh in water, and afterward come into the camp.	3 And ye shall give her unto Eleazar the priest, that he may bring her forth without the camp, and one shall slay her before his face:
27 And the bullock for the sin offering, and the goat for the sin offering, whose blood was brought in to make atonement in the holy place, shall one carry forth without the camp; and they shall burn in the fire their skins, and their flesh, and their dung.	4 And Eleazar the priest shall take of her blood with his finger, and sprinkle of her blood directly before the tabernacle of the congregation seven times: 5 And one shall burn the heifer in his sight; her skin, and her flesh, and her blood, with her dung, shall he burn: 6 And the priest shall take cedar wood, and hyssop, and scarlet, and cast it into the midst of the burning of the heifer.
28 And he that burneth them shall wash his clothes, and bathe his flesh in water, and afterward he shall come into the camp.	7 Then the priest shall wash his clothes, and he shall bathe his flesh in water, and afterward he shall come into the camp, and the priest shall be unclean until the even. 8 And he that burneth her shall wash his clothes in water, and bathe his flesh in water, and shall be unclean until the even.

Abbreviations: **DOA**= Day of Atonement **RH**= Red Heifer

The similarities are as follows:

1. Sprinkling seven times with hyssop and blood; **DOA** the mercy seat- **RH** towards tabernacle
2. **DOA** bullock for Aaron called a sin offering - **RH** classed as a sin offering
3. **DOA** Part of the ritual performed outside the camp - **RH** ritual performed outside the camp
4. **DOA** performer becomes unclean - **RH** performer becomes unclean
5. **DOA** Bullock completely destroyed outside camp - **RH** completely destroyed outside camp
6. **DOA** clothes washed and flesh bathed **– RH** clothes washed and flesh bathed

Of course, there are also significant differences. Whereas the DOA rite was concerned with the release of the scapegoat (the goat was not sacrificed in the wilderness), the RH was slaughtered "outside the camp". Despite being classified as a "sin offering" the RH was actually a rite of purification intended to reverse defilement (ritual impurity) caused by death. Other commentators have also noted the parallels between the DOA and RH;

"The sacrifice of the red heifer should be compared with that of the scapegoat, similarly sacrificed outside the camp by one who must purify himself before returning to it. The bullock as the sin-offering of the high priest and the goat as the sin-offering of the people were likewise burned

outside the camp—hide, flesh, and dung (Lev. xvi. 26-27). The red heifer sacrifice is similar to the heifer sacrifice offered for the purpose of purifying the land from the defilement attending an untraced murder, a heifer "which hath not been wrought with, and which hath not drawn in the yoke" (Deut. xxi. 3). In both cases the heifer was chosen as being a more suggestive offering in a rite associated with death. This view is supported by Bähr, Kurtz, Keil, Edersheim, and others. The Jewish exegetes point, in addition, to the uncultivated "rough valley" and the wilderness as suggestive of the check to human multiplication caused by natural death and by manslaughter".[6]

All rituals have a historical context and an origin. They may develop more fully over time but they all have a genesis. For example, Passover celebrated deliverance from Egypt and Purim deliverance of the Persian Jews etc. The ritual of the Red heifer did not suddenly appear out of nowhere. Perhaps the biggest clue to unravelling the origins of the ritual of the Red heifer is the similarities with the Day of Atonement (DOA). **The suggestion is that both rituals owe their origins to the same historical incident namely defilement of the tabernacle.**

The DOA has been examined separately in a series of articles[7] - the theory offered there is that the fast was necessitated by the priestly defilement wrought by Nadab and Abihu (described in Lev 10) as that incident forms the introduction to the DOA chapter; "And the LORD spake unto Moses after the death of the two sons of Aaron, when they offered before the LORD, and died" (Lev 16.1). The family of Aaron was not allowed to mourn or come into contact with the dead bodies – **instead the whole nation mourned and fasted which is characteristic of the Day of Atonement.** The tabernacle required cleansing (particularly the altar of incense), the bodies needed to be removed and all those who had come into contact with the dead required purification. They had become ritually impure. The Living God (whose glory dwelt between the living creatures [cherubim] on the mercy seat) could not dwell in the presence of death. After all, the Ark of the Covenant contained the tokens of new life (resurrection life) hidden inside – and the Ark was covered with divine glory and mercy. Life was hidden and preserved with God (guarded by the cherubim like it was in Eden) and it was an affront to introduce the curse of death into the purity of his immortal

[6] Joseph Jacobs, Judah David Eisenstein, Red Heifer, Jewish Encyclopaedia (1906) http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/12621-red-heifer

[7] Day of Atonement articles originally published in CEJBI by P. Wyns http://www.biblaridion.info/resources/scapegoat.pdf

presence. The problem was that the nation was in a state of sin because their representatives (the priests) had defiled the tabernacle. Access to God was therefore impossible unless a way could be devised to cleanse the nation. The Israelites fasted and mourned and the sins of the nation were exorcised by sending them into the wilderness borne by the scapegoat (this indicates that it was not just the priests that sinned –the whole nation was reprobate). The scapegoat represented ***the nation*** which was always sent away (exiled) <u>when it had defiled the sanctuary</u>. The "goat for Yahweh" represented the messiah whose blood made atonement for sin. Aaron offered a "bullock" to make atonement **for his own house** (Lev 16.6). This was for the sin that his house (his two sons) had perpetrated in a similar fashion a red heifer is sacrificed to purify from the curse of death introduced into the sanctuary (by the priests).

Leviticus 10:4-7 [4] And Moses called Mishael and Elzaphan, the sons of Uzziel the uncle of Aaron, and said unto them, Come near, carry your brethren from before the <u>sanctuary out of the camp.</u> [5] So they went near, and carried them in their coats out of the camp; as Moses had said. [6] And Moses said unto Aaron, and unto Eleazar and unto Ithamar, his sons, Uncover not your heads, neither rend your clothes; lest ye die, and lest wrath come upon all the people: but let your brethren, the whole house of Israel, bewail the burning which the LORD hath kindled. [7] And ye shall not go out from the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, lest ye die: for the anointing oil of the LORD *is* upon you. And they did according to the word of Moses.

The suggestion is that the ritual of the red heifer originated <u>at the same time</u> as the Day of Atonement in order to cleanse the priests (who removed the dead bodies) and also to cleanse the tabernacle (tent);

Numbers 19: 13-15 [13] Whosoever toucheth the dead body of any man that is dead, and purifieth not himself, defileth the tabernacle of the LORD; and that soul shall be cut off from Israel: because the water of separation was not sprinkled upon him, he shall be unclean; his uncleanness *is* yet upon him. [14] **<u>This *is* the Law, when a man dieth in a tent</u>**: all that come into the tent, and all that *is* in the tent, shall be unclean seven days. [15] And every open vessel, which hath no covering bound upon it, *is* unclean.

The original setting of the ritual of the red heifer was then extended to cover other incidents of defilement caused by coming into contact with death.

Alfred Edersheim also connects the DOA scapegoat, which was to remove the national guilt of the Israelites (Lev 16), with the red heifer, which was to take away the defilement of death that stood between man and Elohim, with the "living bird," dipped in "the water and the blood," and then "let loose in the field" at the purification from leprosy (Lev 14:1–7), which symbolized the living death of personal sinfulness, were all, either wholly offered, or in their essentials completely outside the sanctuary. He then observes that the Old Testament sanctuary had no real provision for spiritual wants to which they symbolically pointed; their removal lay outside its sanctuary and beyond its symbols.[8] The cleansing from leprosy that Edersheim noted is pertinent because it seems to combine elements **from both rites**;

Leviticus 14:3-7 3 And the priest shall go forth out of the camp; and the priest shall look, and, behold, if the plague of leprosy be healed in the leper; 4 Then shall the priest command to take for him that is to be cleansed two birds alive and clean, and cedar wood, and scarlet, and hyssop: 5 And the priest shall command that one of the birds be killed in an earthen vessel over running water: 6 As for the living bird, he shall take it, and the cedar wood, and the scarlet, and the hyssop, and shall dip them and the living bird in the blood of the bird that was killed over the running water: 7 And he shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy seven times, and shall pronounce him clean, and shall let the living bird loose into the open field.

Breaking it down – **DOA;** one released one killed **–RH;** cedar wood, scarlet, and hyssop and running (living) water **DOA and RH**; outside the camp **DOA and RH;** sprinkling.

Leprosy was considered a "living death" and the disease is used by the prophet Isaiah as a metaphor for the state of the nation (Isa 1.6). The leprosy rite combines both elements,

[8] Alfred Edersheim ,*The Temple and Its Ministry*, (Originally published: 1874), 280–281.

namely it cleanses from the impurity of death (the leper is cleansed because the disease is no longer contagious) and it releases the "scape-bird" but this time the bird is "clean" – unlike the scapegoat it does not bear the "iniquities of the nation" because it was cleansed by the blood of the other bird. All this is done "outside the camp*". The Law could not save from the impurity of death.*[9] The "scape-bird" is completely free and "clean" it does not go into exile (into "dry places" like the scapegoat). It has been released and cleansed by the blood of the slaughtered bird that "purified from death". Not only does this rite combine elements of the DOA and RH, it brings the DOA *to a natural conclusion*. The scapegoat is no longer wondering around laden with sin waiting to be recalled from exile (the greatest exile being death). It has been cleansed and purified from death – it is truly free. The nation has had many "death" experiences; indeed the prophet Ezekiel saw them as a valley of dry bones. They require God's spirit and his cleansing from death to make them truly free.

This analysis teaches us four things (1) the DOA and RH rites are related (2) The RH rite is a *purification rite* exercised to expunge defilement (separation from God) caused by death, it is only *classified* as a sin offering (Num 19.9) because sin and death *are inextricably linked*. (3) The origin of both rites was due to priestly rebellion under the Law. The sanctuary had been defiled by rebellion (sin) which resulted in death. (4) The Law had no provision for restoring fellowship with God or "resetting" the relationship defiled by death – it had to be done outside the Law (camp).

The ritual paradox

There is an apparent paradox as to how the red heifer **purifies the defiled and defiles the pure.** The Law of the red heifer addressed to Moses and Aaron (Num. 19.1) prescribes that the slaughtering and burning of the animal be carried out by Eleazar (19.4), Aaron's heir

[9] While it is true that the remains of other sacrifices were burned outside the camp, the organs, fat etc were offered on the altar of burnt offering and the blood was poured out at the base. For this, see the bull used in the induction of Aaron and his sons (Ex. 29.14; Lev. 8.17), the bull for the sin offering of the anointed priest (Lev. 4.11), and the goat and the bull for the sin offering of the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16.27). In contrast the red heifer was completely burned outside the camp along with its flesh and dung and blood. Outside the camp was the place where "impurity" dwelt –where the Israelites did their toilet and burned their waste. It represented all that was unholy (i.e. death).

apparent (after the death of his two older brothers; Lev. 10.1–3, 12). Some modern commentators suggest that Eleazar was given the role so as not to defile Aaron the high priest. The ashes were gathered by a ritually clean man (Num. 19.9) and placed outside the camp in a ritually pure place (cf. Lev. 6.4). The gatherer of the ashes could evidently be a layman as could also the slaughterer of a freewill offering (Lev. 1.5). Both the priest and the gatherer became unclean until evening. The ashes of the red heifer were combined with spring water (Heb. *mayim ḥayyim*) in a vessel (Num. 19.17) to produce a mixture called "water of lustration" (Heb. *me niddah*). The mixture was applied by dipping into it and sprinkling (19:18) on the third and seventh days after defilement (19.19). This defilement was acquired by touching a corpse, a grave, or a human bone, or by being under the same roof with any of these. The priest, the gatherer of the ashes, the sprinkler (19:21), and the one who touched the water of lustration (19:22) became unclean until evening. Eleazar, the gatherer of the ashes, the lustrator, and the one who touched the water of lustration were only unclean until the evening. In contrast, the one who had contact with the dead was unclean for seven days (19.14). Many theories have been proposed to explain the anomaly. The passage that throws light on this is found in Haggai;

Haggai 2:12-14 12 "If one carries holy meat in the fold of his garment, and with the edge he touches bread or stew, wine or oil, or any food, will it become holy?" ' "Then the priests answered and said, "No." 13 And Haggai said, "If one who is unclean because of a dead body touches any of these, will it be unclean?" So the priests answered and said, "It shall be unclean." 14 Then Haggai answered and said, " 'So is this people, and so is this nation before Me,' says the LORD, 'and so is every work of their hands; and what they offer there is unclean.

Under the Law a sanctified (holy) sacrifice does not make the things it touches "ritually clean" but the reverse is true - a person defiled by death makes everything contacted unclean. The problem here is that the “lustration” from the Red heifer did make defiled objects “ritually clean” but the performers and preparers of the rite became “unclean” – but only for a shorter period and to a lesser extent. This paradoxical dilemma will be examined once we have determined the deeper meaning of the ritual of the Red heifer.

Defiling the Sanctuary

The parallels with the first sanctuary (Eden) are striking. Through his rebellion Adam (the priestly gardener) **introduces the curse of death into the sanctuary.** Cain is **sent away** from the sanctuary (into exile like the scapegoat) because he caused the death of **Abel who is slaughtered at the entrance of the sanctuary** (like the goat for Yahweh). In the meantime the "tree of life" is guarded by cherubim and a promise is given to the "mother of the living" concerning the Messiah. The contrast between life and death is stark. God will not allow his presence to be defiled by death **as it is contrary to everything that the Living God represents.**

The Red Heifer ritual

Many commentaries link the red heifer with sin (because of the colour). A typical comment would be; "The colour of the heifer, as well as the scarlet thrown upon the fire, represents sin (comp. "your sins be as scarlet"; Isa. 1.18)". The early Jewish conception was that the sacrifice of the red heifer was an expiatory rite to atone for the sin of the golden calf. None of these explanations are satisfactory as the RH is so obviously connected with the impurity caused by death.

Now that we perceive the spiritual intent of the rite can we throw more light on the constituent elements? In order to do this it is necessary to delve into typology and allegory leaving one open to the charge of tendentiousness. Therefore this section begins with an apologetic argument which is necessitated because semantics are so often abused to support literary devices such as allegory. Particularly pertinent is the warning about semantic transference issued by Barr; "….it is doubtful whether any other sphere of life than the theological has common people without special training so continually attempting a semantic transference across such [cultural and linguistic] gaps".[10] Semantic transference[11] is the *bete noir* of exegetes and this explanation is attempting something similar!

[10] Barr, James, The Semantics of Biblical Language, (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1961), 4

[11] **Semantic** transference; In diachronic (or historical) linguistics, **semantic** change is a change in one of the meanings of a word. Every word has a variety of senses and connotations, which can be added, removed, or altered over time, often to the extent that cognates across space and time have very different meanings.

One commentator remarks; “It is still news to many that the fundamental semantic unit is not the “word” but the sentence, and that “words” (lexical entities) acquire a specific meaning when deployed in sentences”. In other words (and this has always been my guiding mantra) *context is everything*. This is doubly important in the Hebrew language as the actual words are context driven because they are **unpointed** (no vowels present). For example, my name paul would be spelt pl. If the text says “fetch pl” does it mean “fetch paul” or “fetch [a] pail”? If the wider sentence structure states; “water-fetch-red-pl” it means “fetch water in a red pail (bucket) rather than “red paul fetch water”. So, word meaning (individual lexical units) is determined by context. An unpointed word without context can have *many meanings*. The Masorites added the vowel pointing about a thousand years ago; this was done as a reading aid so that the words would be correctly interpreted and pronounced (in their context) thus avoiding confusion.

The pointed Hebrew phrase “red heifer” פָּרָה אֲדֻמָּה is transliterated by the SBL as *pārâ ʾădummâ* or by SBL Latin transliteration is *pharah adummah.* The Masorites have added the **correct** vowel pointing because the words obviously *make sense in context* – it is concerned with a sacrificial animal and a cleansing rite. Our next step will be to take the phrase “Red Heifer” out of its immediate context which is (admittedly) exactly what should not be done but is justifiable by the wider theological context also bearing in mind the Hebrew love of **paronomasia**.[12] Of course, we could stand accused of transference of meaning and producing “semantic soup” (such as Barr rightly criticizes) however this is not an exercise in

[12]Paronomasia is a rhetorical device, especially in the OT, using two words similar in sound or appearance. However, Noegel observes that, “Scholars of the Hebrew Bible, however, have long understood paronomasia more loosely and have applied it to the repetition of same or similar consonants a) regardless of where they appear in the relevant words, and b) irrespective of whether the words are etymologically related. This is in step with the view of early rabbis who referred to the device as ‘language falling upon language’ (see Bereshit Rabba 18:6; 31:8; the Bible provides no native term). The term paronomasia also has been applied to words that sound alike, but have different derivations, e.g., when two words occur in tandem or one of the words suggests the other. However, if two etymologies are suggested by a single word and both can be legitimately understood in the context, it is more properly classified as polysemy”. Noegel identifies twelve different subcategories of Paronomasia (see there). Scott B. Noegel, Paronomasia in the Encyclopaedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics [Vol.3 P–Z],
(ed, Geoffrey Khan, Leiden: Boston, Brill, 2013),24
http://faculty.washington.edu/snoegel/PDFs/articles/noegel%2062-paronomasia-EHLL-2013.pdf

etymology but rather of paronomasiac association such as the Hebrew mind loved,[13] "What is at issue is the varied meanings and kinds of meaning which belong both to words and to sentences as they occur within a context that is both linguistic and extra-linguistic". [14] It is this extra-linguistic (theological) context that will be examined for hidden meaning.

Immediately we note that the word for "red" (*adummah*) bears a resemblance with **Adam.** The unpointed word is **a-d-m-h** very close to **a-d-m**. This is not coincidental; Hamilton notes that,

"Genesis itself connects *'ādām* with *ʿadāmâ*, (or *adummah*) ground, earth (→ #141), and this suggests a connection between man's reddish brown skin and the **reddish brown soil [Emphasis mine]** of the earth (→*'dm*, be red, #131). *'ādām* was created from the *ʿadāmâ* (2:7). *'ādām* must work the land *ʿadāmâ* (3:23). One day *'ādām* will return to the *ʿadāmâ* (3:19)".[15]

Adam is thus closely associated with the cursed ground (soil); "And unto Adam (*ʾādām*) he said…. cursed *is* the ground (*hāʾădāmâ*) for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat *of* it all the days of thy life". (Gen 3.17) Moreover, Adam is also closely associated with the colour red

Alden defines "red" as follows; "[*'dm* **be red** (3). The word *'ādōm* – with the wide-colour range of brown-red-pink-appears 8x in six OT books and modifies a variety of words; stew (Gen 25:30), **heifer (Num 19:2), [Emphasis mine]** water (2Kgs 3:22), lover (S of Songs 5.10), garments (Isa 63:2), and horses (Zech 1:8 and 6:2)]". [16]

---

[13] Paronomasia is not just restricted to poetry. Noegel writes; "More recent work has uncovered many examples in prose (Segert 1984; Kalimi 1995; Noegel 2000; 2013). Within the poetic corpus, paronomasia has no generic restrictions. It is found in prophetic texts (Boadt 1983; Doron 1979–1980; Noegel 2007a; 2010b), psalms (Hugger 1972), and wisdom texts (Böstrom 1928; McCreesh 1991; Noegel 2005; 2006; 2007b). The writers of the Aramaic portions of the Bible also employed it (Arnold 2000)" *Ibid*, pg. 25

[14] This observation is valid for both the Old and New Testaments. C. Thiselton, Semantics and New Testament Interpretation in *New Testament Interpretation,* (ed. I. Howard Marshall (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1977), 75-104,75 https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/pdf/nt-interpretation/nti_04.pdf

[15] New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis, [*NIDOTTE*](ed. Willem A. Van Gemeren, PaterNoster, 1999), See V.P. Hamilton, *NIDOTTE* Vol 1., #132, pg. 264

[16] R. L. Alden*, NIDOTTE* Vol 1., #131, pg. 262

Alden enumerates Gen 25.30 where the word *ʾādōm* (red) is used as a modifier; "And Esau said to Jacob: 'Let me swallow, I pray thee, some of this red, red (הָאָדֹם הָאָדֹם *hāʾādōm hāʾādōm*) pottage; for I am faint.' Therefore was his name called Edom (אֱדוֹם *ʾĕdôm*)." We note the paronomasia on "Edom", from which the meaning of Edom is derived as "red". Moreover the word Edom is (obviously) closely related to Adam. A case is not being made for etymological convergence, or for semantic transference, but rather for an expanded philological approach that suggests associations based on paronomasia and on a wider inter-textual and theological setting. In other words, the Hebrew mind would naturally associate the root word *ʾādōm* (cf. *ʾădummâ*, red) with both Adam and the red ground (soil) from which he was made.

Similarly, the word for "heifer" (*pārâ*) when unpointed and devoid of context can mean "fruitful" (**p-r-h**) as in the first time it is used; "And God blessed them, saying, Be fruitful, (פְּרוּ) and multiply" (Gen 1.22). The SBL transliterates this as *pĕrû* which is the *qal imperative masculine plural verb form* of פרה (p-r-h) or with pointing *pharah* (fruitful). In other words, in a different context this word could imply fruitfulness (but here it obviously does not).

A fruitful Adam

The first Adam was meant to be fruitful and fill the earth with an image reflective of divine glory. Instead Adam wrought death and filled the earth with cursing and befouled the sanctuary like the sons of Aaron after him. The ritual of the "red heifer" points forwards to the Messiah who did what the Law could not do (outside the camp) which the writer to the Hebrews recognizes (Heb 13.10-13). The heifer was a very rare female sacrifice alluding to the messianic promise of fruitfulness made to the "mother of the living" (cf. John 19.27 Behold thy mother! The one who fulfilled the promise to Eve[17]) "Second Adam" (1 Cor 15.37) was offered outside the camp. His old nature was completely destroyed because the

[17] It was customary to mix the ashes of the Red heifer with water from the pool of Siloam (cf. John 9.7 which is by interpretation, Sent): In the Jewish Mishna (*Parah* 3:2) it states that children were sent to the pool of Siloam to collect water for the red heifer ceremony. They travelled to and from the pool, on the back of bulls, so that they could remain unpolluted by not touching the ground. The pool of Siloam is fed by the virgin spring. The Gihon Spring (Hebrew: מעיין הגיחון) or Fountain of the Virgin in the Kidron Valley was the main source of water for the Pool of Siloam in the City of David. Wikipedia contributors. (2018, August 12).
Gihon Spring. In *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. Retrieved 02:08, September 14, 2018, from https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Gihon_Spring&oldid=854587935

zeal for his Father's house had eaten him up (John 2.17). However, he strove not to cleanse a house of cedar (2 Sam 7.7) but rather to purify a temple of living stones (1 Pet 2.5). He never served the Law through "dead works" (cf. Heb 9.14, self-justification and ambition; grasping at the fruit like Adam)[18] neither did he serve sin; rather he fulfilled the Law and destroyed his old nature (the red stuff cf. John 19.2, the robe at the crucifixion). Therefore he never bore the conventional "yoke" of his compatriots (the red heifer must never have worn a yoke). His sacrifice was astringent (cf. John 19.29, like hyssop cf. hyssop at the crucifixion)[19] and he provided "running water and blood" (John 19.34) when his side was pierced. Moreover, he was slaughtered like the "goat for Yahweh" while the scapegoat (Barabbas) was released (John 18.39-40). The gospels depict the crucifixion as a combination of aspects of *Atonement* (national reconciliation) *and Passover* (national deliverance). Therefore Jesus made atonement for the nation *and purified new access* to the heavenly sanctuary – free from the curse of death that Adam had introduced. He opened a new way to the tree of life and removed the ritual impurity of death for *his priests*.

Therefore the Red heifer ritual stands for "death" (impurity and alienation from God, which is the result of death) – the ritual can and does pollute those involved in preparing and ministering the ritual because death affects all of mankind without exception (even Jesus). However, once the results of the ritual "the waters of lustration" are prepared they can reverse the tyranny of death because they represent a new way forward as they foreshadow the "cleansing" death of the messiah (a fruitful Adam) that is able to remove the curse of death. This explains the paradox – death is the reason for separation but is also

[18] He fulfilled the Law he did not serve it. The Law was never his master (nor was sin). The Law (of sin and death) did not become a vehicle of death for him as he fulfilled it perfectly out of love. The only man (adam) for whom death was both unwarranted and inappropriate thereby demonstrating the one time the Law was shown to be flawed.. **Colossians 2:14-15** Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; [15] *And* having spoiled principalities and powers, (angels who administered the Law) he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it.

[19] The various components (cedar, hyssop, scarlet stuff [dye?]) were burnt with the whole sacrifice (including the blood). These components would produce an aromatic smoke or aroma. Afterwards the ashes were finely ground and diluted with spring water with the added ingredients perhaps acting as a preservative. Possibly more of the same ingredients (cedar, hyssop, scarlet stuff) were added to the water. It is likely then that the water of purification contained "cedar" oil that came from a kind of juniper tree that grew in both Israel and in the Sinai, probably a piece of fragrant wood of *Juniperus Phœnicea* or *Juniperus Oxycedrus* (Löw, "Aramäische Pflanzennamen," p. 57). This cedar oil would irritate the skin, encouraging the person to vigorously rub the solution into their hands. Most importantly, the hyssop tree associated with mint, possibly marjoram, would produce hyssop oil. This hyssop oil is actually a very effective antiseptic and antibacterial agent. Hyssop oil contains 50 percent carvacrol which is an anti fungal and antibacterial agent still used in medicine, according to the book *None Of These Diseases.*

employed as the means for reconciliation. Death makes "impure" but also "pure" (but only through Messiah). Perhaps the ones who prepared the "lustration" represented the Law. **The Law could only bring death on those priests who administered the Law and those who lived by the Law** [20] the apostle Paul rightly calls the Law the "ministration of death" (2 Cor3.7) or the "ministration of condemnation" (2 Cor3.9). Those who prepared the Red Heifer and sprinkled the waters ***were still under the Law of death***. Those ***who received*** the waters of purification were not under the Law. They became clean through the Messiah. The Red heifer typified *two different ways* of approaching Yahweh – through the Law or through the Messiah. Of the smoke of this sacrifice it might be said; "To the one *we are* the aroma of death *leading* to death, and to the other the aroma of life *leading* to life". (2 Cor 2.16)

Matthew 22:32 I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.

Red Heifer Redux

The sacrifice of another Red heifer and plans to build a third temple are an abomination to God. Be warned. God will not be mocked. He has already provided his sacrifice and his new temple (still under construction) will shortly be revealed.

1 Cor 16:22 If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maranatha.

[20] **Romans 7:10** And the commandment, which *was* to *bring* life, I found to *bring death*.