

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

6-1-1956

The Peace-Offering of the Old Testament

John Dede

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_dedej@csl.edu

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



Part of the [History of Christianity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Dede, John, "The Peace-Offering of the Old Testament" (1956). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 503.
<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/503>

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

THE PEACE-OFFERING OF THE
OLD TESTAMENT

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Old Testament Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Divinity

by

John Dedo

June 1956

Approved by: Alfred van Roon Jans
Advisor

A. J. A. Bouman
Reader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE PEACE-OFFERING IN OLD TESTAMENT AND IN NEW TESTAMENT THOUGHT	1
II. THE RITUAL AND REGULATIONS OF THE PEACE- OFFERING	5
III. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PEACE-OFFERING	11
The Peace-offering as a Gift	11
The Peace-offering as Fellowship	15
The Peace-offering as Thanksgiving	22
The Peace-offering as a Symbol	27
The Peace-offering as a Type	30
The Peace-offering as a Sacrament	37
IV. A CHRISTIAN'S VIEW OF THE PEACE-OFFERING	44
BIBLIOGRAPHY	47

CHAPTER I

THE PEACE-OFFERING IN OLD TESTAMENT AND IN NEW TESTAMENT THOUGHT

The subject with which we are here concerned is the Old Testament peace-offering. To the New Testament Christian, who no longer relies for his salvation upon ritual sacrifices, but rather trusts in the atoning work of Christ, that subject may seem of little value. But to a Christian who realizes that his faith is founded in the Word of God in the Scriptures, both Old and New Testaments, any inquiry into the subject matter of that Book becomes important. As the apostle says, "These things were written for our learning."

Secondly, since Judaism was the true worship of God in the Old Testament as Christianity is in the New, it becomes an important matter to ascertain what continuity there may be between the two. Sacrifice was probably one of the most important aspects of Old Testament worship; and the peace-offering was an important sacrifice. What does that mean to the Christian today?

Thirdly, it will become evident in the discussion that is to follow that Christ's atoning work can be understood more clearly if the Scriptural idea of sacrifice is also understood. New Testament language, religious conceptions, teaching, and worship are all based upon the Old Testament. Accordingly the Old Testament doctrine of sacrifice must

form the basis for a thoroughly Scriptural understanding of the Atonement. The peace-offering forms one part of the sacrificial system.

Our subject is the peace-offering. To understand this offering, it will be necessary first to discover what was the ritual--what were the regulations which governed the presentation of this offering. From there we will be able to proceed to discuss the various meanings that might be given to the ritual and regulations. And finally we shall attempt to discover how much these regulations has meaning to the Christian.

The final authority for all conclusions is to be the Bible. There is this difficulty, however, that little is stated regarding the peace-offering. The two major references are Leviticus 3 and Leviticus 7:11-34. In approaching the Bible, it is the assumption that the books as they stand are authoritative and historically accurate. Accordingly it is sufficient to find the origin of the peace-offering in the regulations laid down by Moses in the book of Leviticus. Any offerings made before that time are a matter of little concern, since the data at our disposal is always very slim. We shall consider all hypotheses regarding the rearrangement and re-dating of the various parts of the Pentateuch to be nothing more than just that--hypotheses.

In speaking of the peace-offering the following distinctions are to be taken into consideration. There is, first of

all, a two-fold distinction with regard to the various sacrifices called peace-offerings: (1) Some of the peace-offerings were obligatory, e.g., the lambs on the Feast of Weeks and the ram given by the Nazarite at the end of his term; (2) Others, and this includes the vast majority of the peace-offerings, were voluntary. For those offerings that were required by Moses' law, there are some additional requirements not found in the case of the freewill-offerings.¹ This distinction is made on the basis of the regulations for the peace-offering.

In the second place, there is also a three-fold distinction on which must be noted. First, there was the $\overline{\text{ש}} \overline{\text{ל}} \overline{\text{ל}} \overline{\text{ל}}$ $\overline{\text{א}} \overline{\text{ל}} \overline{\text{ש}}$, exactly translated freewill-offering. This was a peace-offering in which for some reason the voluntary quality of the sacrifice is stressed (Lev. 7:16). Secondly, the $\overline{\text{ז}} \overline{\text{ל}} \overline{\text{ל}} \overline{\text{ל}}$ $\overline{\text{א}} \overline{\text{ל}} \overline{\text{ש}}$, votive-offering, was an offering given after a prayer had been answered and when a vow was involved (Lev. 7:16, 22:21). Finally, there was the $\overline{\text{ז}} \overline{\text{ל}} \overline{\text{ל}} \overline{\text{ל}}$ $\overline{\text{א}} \overline{\text{ל}} \overline{\text{ש}}$. These were thank-offerings, given for some benefit already received, or for some one yet to come (Lev. 7:12).² This three-fold distinction is made on the basis of the names for the offerings found in the Old Testament.

¹See chapter II of this thesis.

²Alfred Cave, The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice and Atonement (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1890), p. 507. Also, S. C. Gayford, Sacrifice and Priesthood, Jewish and Christian (London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1953), p. 37.

With these distinctions in mind we shall proceed to discuss what was probably the most joyous of all Israelite sacrifices. It was the peace-offering which was reserved for festive occasions, when all were especially conscious of divine favor.

The preparation of the animal to be sacrificed was the same as in the case of the burnt-offering. (1) The killing of the animal; (2) the washing of the entrails; (3) the removal of the lungs; (4) the sprinkling of the blood; (5) the burning of the lungs and portions upon the altar; (6) the skin and hoofs were to be burnt; (7) the sacrificial meal.

The preparation of a peace-offering was naturally preceded by suitable preparations in washing with such a great quantity of water and incense were required as in the case of the animal which was brought. Thus, for the offering to be acceptable, the removal and removal of every leather which was substituted was required. Washing, washing or changes of clothing, and were essential observances were required. Regulations for preparation of participants in this offering are prescribed in Leviticus 12-14 and are given also in practice in 1 Samuel 16:7. All who prepared the offering in the peace-offering had to be

clean, both from ceremonial uncleanness, and from contact

Leviticus 12-14, 16-17, 19-20, 22-24, 26-27, 29-31, 33-34, 36-37, 39-40, 42-43, 45-46, 48-49, 51-52, 54-55, 57-58, 60-61, 63-64, 66-67, 69-70, 72-73, 75-76, 78-79, 81-82, 84-85, 87-88, 90-91, 93-94, 96-97, 99-100, 102-103, 105-106, 108-109, 111-112, 114-115, 117-118, 120-121, 123-124, 126-127, 129-130, 132-133, 135-136, 138-139, 141-142, 144-145, 147-148, 150-151, 153-154, 156-157, 159-160, 162-163, 165-166, 168-169, 171-172, 174-175, 177-178, 180-181, 183-184, 186-187, 189-190, 192-193, 195-196, 198-199, 201-202, 204-205, 207-208, 210-211, 213-214, 216-217, 219-220, 222-223, 225-226, 228-229, 231-232, 234-235, 237-238, 240-241, 243-244, 246-247, 249-250, 252-253, 255-256, 258-259, 261-262, 264-265, 267-268, 270-271, 273-274, 276-277, 279-280, 282-283, 285-286, 288-289, 291-292, 294-295, 297-298, 300-301, 303-304, 306-307, 309-310, 312-313, 315-316, 318-319, 321-322, 324-325, 327-328, 330-331, 333-334, 336-337, 339-340, 342-343, 345-346, 348-349, 351-352, 354-355, 357-358, 360-361, 363-364, 366-367, 369-370, 372-373, 375-376, 378-379, 381-382, 384-385, 387-388, 390-391, 393-394, 396-397, 399-400, 402-403, 405-406, 408-409, 411-412, 414-415, 417-418, 420-421, 423-424, 426-427, 429-430, 432-433, 435-436, 438-439, 441-442, 444-445, 447-448, 450-451, 453-454, 456-457, 459-460, 462-463, 465-466, 468-469, 471-472, 474-475, 477-478, 480-481, 483-484, 486-487, 489-490, 492-493, 495-496, 498-499, 501-502, 504-505, 507-508, 510-511, 513-514, 516-517, 519-520, 522-523, 525-526, 528-529, 531-532, 534-535, 537-538, 540-541, 543-544, 546-547, 549-550, 552-553, 555-556, 558-559, 561-562, 564-565, 567-568, 570-571, 573-574, 576-577, 579-580, 582-583, 585-586, 588-589, 591-592, 594-595, 597-598, 600-601, 603-604, 606-607, 609-610, 612-613, 615-616, 618-619, 621-622, 624-625, 627-628, 630-631, 633-634, 636-637, 639-640, 642-643, 645-646, 648-649, 651-652, 654-655, 657-658, 660-661, 663-664, 666-667, 669-670, 672-673, 675-676, 678-679, 681-682, 684-685, 687-688, 690-691, 693-694, 696-697, 699-700, 702-703, 705-706, 708-709, 711-712, 714-715, 717-718, 720-721, 723-724, 726-727, 729-730, 732-733, 735-736, 738-739, 741-742, 744-745, 747-748, 750-751, 753-754, 756-757, 759-760, 762-763, 765-766, 768-769, 771-772, 774-775, 777-778, 780-781, 783-784, 786-787, 789-790, 792-793, 795-796, 798-799, 801-802, 804-805, 807-808, 810-811, 813-814, 816-817, 819-820, 822-823, 825-826, 828-829, 831-832, 834-835, 837-838, 840-841, 843-844, 846-847, 849-850, 852-853, 855-856, 858-859, 861-862, 864-865, 867-868, 870-871, 873-874, 876-877, 879-880, 882-883, 885-886, 888-889, 891-892, 894-895, 897-898, 900-901, 903-904, 906-907, 909-910, 912-913, 915-916, 918-919, 921-922, 924-925, 927-928, 930-931, 933-934, 936-937, 939-940, 942-943, 945-946, 948-949, 951-952, 954-955, 957-958, 960-961, 963-964, 966-967, 969-970, 972-973, 975-976, 978-979, 981-982, 984-985, 987-988, 990-991, 993-994, 996-997, 999-1000.

Leviticus 12-14, 16-17, 19-20, 22-24, 26-27, 29-31, 33-34, 36-37, 39-40, 42-43, 45-46, 48-49, 51-52, 54-55, 57-58, 60-61, 63-64, 66-67, 69-70, 72-73, 75-76, 78-79, 81-82, 84-85, 87-88, 90-91, 93-94, 96-97, 99-100, 102-103, 105-106, 108-109, 111-112, 114-115, 117-118, 120-121, 123-124, 126-127, 129-130, 132-133, 135-136, 138-139, 141-142, 144-145, 147-148, 150-151, 153-154, 156-157, 159-160, 162-163, 165-166, 168-169, 171-172, 174-175, 177-178, 180-181, 183-184, 186-187, 189-190, 192-193, 195-196, 198-199, 201-202, 204-205, 207-208, 210-211, 213-214, 216-217, 219-220, 222-223, 225-226, 228-229, 231-232, 234-235, 237-238, 240-241, 243-244, 246-247, 249-250, 252-253, 255-256, 258-259, 261-262, 264-265, 267-268, 270-271, 273-274, 276-277, 279-280, 282-283, 285-286, 288-289, 291-292, 294-295, 297-298, 299-300, 302-303, 305-306, 308-309, 311-312, 314-315, 317-318, 320-321, 323-324, 326-327, 329-330, 332-333, 335-336, 338-339, 341-342, 344-345, 347-348, 350-351, 353-354, 356-357, 359-360, 362-363, 365-366, 368-369, 371-372, 374-375, 377-378, 380-381, 383-384, 386-387, 389-390, 392-393, 395-396, 398-399, 401-402, 404-405, 407-408, 410-411, 413-414, 416-417, 419-420, 422-423, 425-426, 428-429, 431-432, 434-435, 437-438, 440-441, 443-444, 446-447, 449-450, 452-453, 455-456, 458-459, 461-462, 464-465, 467-468, 470-471, 473-474, 476-477, 479-480, 482-483, 485-486, 488-489, 491-492, 494-495, 497-498, 500-501, 503-504, 506-507, 509-510, 512-513, 515-516, 518-519, 521-522, 524-525, 527-528, 530-531, 533-534, 536-537, 539-540, 542-543, 545-546, 548-549, 551-552, 554-555, 557-558, 560-561, 563-564, 566-567, 569-570, 572-573, 575-576, 578-579, 581-582, 584-585, 587-588, 590-591, 593-594, 596-597, 599-600, 602-603, 605-606, 608-609, 611-612, 614-615, 617-618, 620-621, 623-624, 626-627, 629-630, 632-633, 635-636, 638-639, 641-642, 644-645, 647-648, 650-651, 653-654, 656-657, 659-660, 662-663, 665-666, 668-669, 671-672, 674-675, 677-678, 680-681, 683-684, 686-687, 689-690, 692-693, 695-696, 698-699, 701-702, 704-705, 707-708, 710-711, 713-714, 716-717, 719-720, 722-723, 725-726, 728-729, 731-732, 734-735, 737-738, 740-741, 743-744, 746-747, 749-750, 752-753, 755-756, 758-759, 761-762, 764-765, 767-768, 770-771, 773-774, 776-777, 779-780, 782-783, 785-786, 788-789, 791-792, 794-795, 797-798, 800-801, 803-804, 806-807, 809-810, 812-813, 815-816, 818-819, 821-822, 824-825, 827-828, 830-831, 833-834, 836-837, 839-840, 842-843, 845-846, 848-849, 851-852, 854-855, 857-858, 860-861, 863-864, 866-867, 869-870, 872-873, 875-876, 878-879, 881-882, 884-885, 887-888, 890-891, 893-894, 896-897, 899-900, 902-903, 905-906, 908-909, 911-912, 914-915, 917-918, 920-921, 923-924, 926-927, 929-930, 932-933, 935-936, 938-939, 941-942, 944-945, 947-948, 950-951, 953-954, 956-957, 959-960, 962-963, 965-966, 968-969, 971-972, 974-975, 977-978, 980-981, 983-984, 986-987, 989-990, 992-993, 995-996, 998-999, 1000.

CHAPTER II

THE RITUAL AND REGULATIONS REGARDING THE PEACE-OFFERING

The regulations of the peace-offering involved in general: (1) The presentation of the animal to be sacrificed before the altar; (2) The laying on of hands; (3) The killing; (4) The sprinkling of the blood; (5) The burning of the Lord's portions upon the altar; (6) The wave and heave offerings; (7) The sacrificial meal.¹

The presentation of a peace-offering was naturally preceded by suitable preparations in keeping with such a sacred ceremony. Outward and inward purity were required on the part of the man who brought the offering. Thus, for the sacrifice to be acceptable, the removal and renunciation of every heathen emblem and superstition was required. Bathing, washing or changes of clothing, and even conjugal abstinence were required.² Directions for preparation of participants in this offering are prescribed in Leviticus 7:19-21 and required also in practice in 1 Samuel 16:5. All who proposed to take part in the peace-offering had to be

clean, both from transmitted taboo, and from contact

¹Gustave Friedrich Oehler, Theology of the Old Testament, translated from the German by George E. Day (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.), pp. 274 & 290. Cf. Lev. 3 and 7:11-34.

²M. M. Kalisch, A Historical and Critical Commentary of the Old Testament, Leviticus (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1867), p. 120.

with an "unclean thing" or with flesh which had touched a tainted thing. One who dared to participate in worship after touching an "unclean thing" was to be cut off from the people.³

The victim of the peace-offering was a sheep, or a goat, or a bullock, or an ox. The animal might be either male or female. There was not the same rigid restriction regarding sex as in the case of the burnt-offering. This animal had to be physically sound, without blemish. Naturally this soundness included the idea that the animal had no ceremonial uncleanness. Furthermore, as these offerings were presented with joy from love to God, in gladness, and from the abundance of a man's property, they never consisted of cereals alone, or of birds, such as pigeons and doves. These would never have been enough for the altar, the priests, and the meals of those sacrificing. There was no legal command on this subject. It was in the very nature of the sacrifice that a larger animal was required.⁴

Now the thank-offerings, originally forming one great class, were by the Levitical code divided into two separate kinds--those that were obligatory and prescribed by the law, as the two lambs offered on the Feast of Weeks, and the ram presented by the Nazarite at the end of his term of seclusion, and those that were presented in consequence of a vow or as a voluntary gift. In the former case, they received in the Levitical legislation the distinctive name of praise-offering. They were naturally regarded as more solemn,

³Royden Keith Yorkes, Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religions and Early Judaism (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952), p. 154.

⁴Kalisch, op. cit., p. 164.

and therefore surrounded with more stringent regulations. . . . The praise-offering was accompanied by an extraordinary bloodless oblation not demanded with the voluntary or vowed sacrifice. Besides, there was this gradation fixed between a thank-offering as a vow and as a free-will gift that, in the former case, the animal was required to be absolutely perfect; while, in the latter, it was accepted even if its members were either abnormally long or short (Lev. 22:23).⁵

The bloodless offering required with certain peace-offerings is referred to in Leviticus 7:12,13. Unleavened cakes mingled with oil, unleavened wafers anointed with oil, fried cakes mingled with oil, and then some leavened bread were required. Just what was done with these cakes is uncertain.

When the offering had been brought within the Sanctuary, and a priest had examined it and declared it to be pure and acceptable for a sacrifice, then the sacrificial rite actually began. Since the peace-offering always involved a large animal rather than cereal or a bird, the offerer, first of all, laid his hand upon the head of the victim. Jewish tradition contends that the hand was laid with the full weight of the body upon the victim. The Hebrew $\int \text{כֹּד}$ supports this opinion. As a rule, it seems that only one hand was laid on the victim. In connection with the scape-goat alone, on the Day of Atonement, the High priest laid both his hands upon the head of the victim. It is also probable that at this time the offerer spoke a prayer of praise to God.⁶

⁵Ibid., pp. 164f.

⁶Ibid., p. 125.

Then, that the offering might be clearly marked as his own and that of the people connected with him, the worshipper himself, not the priest, immediately killed the animal. With regard to the peace-offering, the slaying of the animal was not restricted to the north side of the altar.⁷ No rite seems to have been prescribed for the killing. But the Talmud indicates that it must be done without violence if possible.⁸ Furthermore all the blood should completely stream out of the body. None of it should be lost, for it was forbidden to eat the blood. Moreover the blood was necessary for the ritual at the altar.⁹

According to Leviticus 1:5, it was the right and privilege of the priests, "the sons of Aaron," to sprinkle the blood of the sacrificial victim upon the altar. This sprinkling was considered the most important part of the offering, without which the sacrifice could not be considered complete. It was rigorously and carefully performed in all animal sacrifices. In the case of the peace-offering, the blood was sprinkled round about upon the brazen altar, the main altar in the Temple (Lev. 3:2). In some of the other offerings, such as the sin-offering, the blood might be sprinkled on the side of the altar or poured on the ground at the base of the

⁷Oehler, op. cit., p. 290.

⁸Cf. Kalisch, op. cit., p. 131.

⁹Ibid.

altar.¹⁰ Such action never seems to have been taken in connection with the peace-offering.

Now, because the major part of the animal was to be eaten at the peace-offering, the parts to be specially dedicated to God and burned at the altar were carefully separated from the rest of the animal.

Four parts were especially to be burned for Yahweh: the rump, the fat, the kidneys, and the upper lobe of the liver called the yothereth halskevedh, and translated usually as "the caul above the liver."¹¹

In the case of sheep there was an additional fatty portion, the tail. The fat naturally interspersed in the flesh was not sacrificed specially to the Lord. The prohibition of fat as food related only to the four or five separate parts mentioned above (Lev. 7:23-25).¹²

After the removal of the fat, the offerer of a private peace-offering was to bring with his own hand not only this, but also the wave-breast, and the right ^{DiU} armus . . . therefore a fore leg . . . the right thigh) to the priest as a heave-offering (Lev. 7:29-34). According to Jewish tradition, which coincides with intimations given in Ex. 29:24, Lev. 8:27, etc., the wave action consisted in the priest's laying the matter to be waved upon the hands of the offerer, placing his hands under those of the latter, and moving them in a horizontal direction--backward and forward, . . . and also toward the right and left, that is, toward the four quarters of the heavens. . . . [The heaving was] a moving upward and downward of portions of the sacrifice

¹⁰Lev. 1:15, 4:25.

¹¹Yerkes, op. cit., p. 155.

¹²Oehler, op. cit., p. 290.

with reference to the God who rules in heaven and on earth.¹³

After the ceremonies of the wave and heave-offerings had been completed, the worshipper, his family, and any guests that he might invite, sat down with a priest for a banquet. The flesh of the animal was boiled, probably by the priests, and eaten at the place of worship. The meat of the thank-offering, the $\overline{\text{ס}}\overline{\text{ך}}\overline{\text{י}}\overline{\text{ך}}$, had to be eaten the same day that the Lord's portion had been offered. But the meat of other peace-offerings might be eaten also on the next day. If any remained to the third day, it had to be burned.¹⁴ This prescription prevented selfishness. In order not to waste any of the abundance of the meat, the needy, friends, relatives, and others were invited to these joyful banquets in the Lord's House.¹⁵

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Yorkes, op. cit., p. 157.

¹⁵Oehler, op. cit., p. 291.

meal."¹ The other word $\overline{\text{נ}} \overline{\text{ז}} \overline{\text{ש}}$ or $\overline{\text{נ}} \cdot \overline{\text{ז}} \overline{\text{ש}}$ used as a synonym for $\overline{\text{נ}} \overline{\text{ז}} \overline{\text{ש}}$ has been given various etymologies. One would find the basic meaning to be "payments." This derives the word from the piel of $\overline{\text{נ}} \overline{\text{ז}} \overline{\text{ש}}$. It would of course connect this offering closely with the idea of a gift offered to God. Following another etymology, the Septuagint translates $\overline{\text{נ}} \overline{\text{ז}} \overline{\text{ש}}$ $\overline{\text{נ}} \overline{\text{ז}} \overline{\text{ש}}$ Our English translations have generally followed this lead and have translated "peace-offering."

In adopting this name, however, we must beware of a misconception. This sacrifice is not the sacrifice to make peace with an offended God. If the name were used in this sense, the peace-offering would be beyond all others the atoning sacrifice. The peace to which it refers is a peace already existing when the offering is made.²

Both these ideas may be behind the word $\overline{\text{נ}} \overline{\text{ז}} \overline{\text{ש}}$ for peace-offerings. If so, they emphasize the two significances of gift and peace. Again, the term $\overline{\text{נ}} \overline{\text{ז}} \overline{\text{ש}}$, what is spontaneous or voluntary, another synonym for $\overline{\text{נ}} \overline{\text{ז}} \overline{\text{ש}}$, obviously expresses the sense of gift. But the variety of terms used is so wide that the significance for the peace-offering to be taken from its name seems somewhat obscured.

Nevertheless the idea of the peace-offering as a gift is contained in the terminology, even if somewhat vaguely. And the Israelite must indeed have thought of his offering as a

¹George Buchanan Gray, Sacrifice in the Old Testament, Its Theory and Practice (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1925), p. 6.

²S. C. Gayford, Sacrifice and Priesthood, Jewish and Christian (London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1953), p. 35.

gift to his God. This fact lies in the very nature of the offering, and of the ritual connected with it. In fact,

the Mosaic system of worship, like the patriarchal, was based upon the fact that man might approach God so long as his hands were not empty. As Adam worshipped in Eden by the surrender of time and strength in obedient performance of the divine will, and possibly by the presentation of some of the fruits of his labor, as Abel brought of the firstlings of his flock, the acceptance of his gift opening a way to God which the patriarchs were not slow to follow; so, in the law given upon Sinai, the Jew was bidden to come near his Maker and Preserver, gifts in hand. Offerings of toil became means of grace; things eloquent of cost were channels for what was priceless; pledges of human sincerity in appeal were transmuted into pledges of divine earnestness in reply; gifts from men to God brought gifts from God to man.³

If, for example, the peace-offering was a so-called freewill-offering ($s) \frac{1}{r} \frac{1}{r} \frac{1}{r}$), then it was brought to show by a gift to God the thankful heart of the offerer. The freewill-offering was a kind of thanks ahead of time for the thing prayed for.

If it was a peace-offering in connection with a vow, then it was thought of as thanks after the vow had been fulfilled. This sort of peace-offering was given after the worshipper had been answered, and the blessings had been received.

Ordinarily of course the peace-offering was given simply as thanksgiving for the general goodness of God without any

³ Alfred Cave, The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice and Atonement (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1890), p. 101. "Offerings of toil became means of grace," cf. pp. 42-43 of this thesis.

vow connected with it.⁴ Thus for example (1 Kings 19:21),

Elisha in thanksgiving for having been called to the prophetic office, "took the yoke of oxen, and slew them, and roasted their flesh with the instruments of the oxen, and gave unto the people, and they did eat"; that was clearly a thank-offering, though the term for sacrifice is not used.⁵

Such thank-offerings must have been thought of as gifts to God, else the thanks idea would be obscured. When therefore the ritual required that certain fatty portions be set aside for the Lord, these were regarded as gifts to the Lord. And the parts set aside for the priests were regarded as gifts to the Lord in a sense, since the priests were God's representatives.

And, finally, when all were eating at the festive meal, again the Israelite must have conceived of the meal as a kind of gift-offering to the Lord. For the significance of the meal was that the Lord, in grace and mercy, condescended to be the guest of the worshipper, not that the worshipper was the guest of God. God therefore received the choice portions and the priest's portions as His share of the meal, a gift to Him as the honored guest.⁶

Whether therefore the peace-offering was brought in gratitude for God's blessings, or out of longing for a more

⁴Gayford, op. cit., p. 37.

⁵W. O. E. Oesterley, Sacrifices in Ancient Israel, their Origin, Purposes and Development (New York: The Macmillan Company, n.d.), p. 133.

⁶Oehler, op. cit., p. 291.

complete sense of fellowship with God, or as the fulfillment of a vow, it always was given as a kind of gift to God. It lay in the very free and uncommanded nature of the peace-offering that it was a gift. And God accepted that gift as a "sweet savor." He took pleasure in such right worship.⁷

The Peace-offering as Fellowship

The feature which distinguished the peace-offering from all the other sacrifices of the Old Testament was the festive meal connected with the ritual. The most important single idea connected with this offering therefore involved fellowship, fellowship with God and man.

Perhaps it is necessary, however, to insert some information regarding totemism, since some critics see a remnant of such savage practices in the Old Testament peace-offering.⁸ Totemism involves the belief that there is a bond of relationship between a given family or tribe of people and an animal-god as a kind of ancestor to humanity. Every real animal, moreover, was regarded as a holy representative of that ancestor-animal-god. There was then a sense of kinship between that real animal and the given family. Thus the animal-god, the family, and the real animals of the same kind

⁷The phrase, "sweet savor," is discussed further on p. 26 of this thesis.

⁸Oesterley, op. cit., p. 157.

as the totem-god were all thought of as related by ancestry.⁹

Now, on certain solemn occasions one of the sacred animals was sacrificed and eaten. The strength of the god was thereby once again communicated to his descendants and the unity of the tribe or family was strengthened. It was a holy meal in which the animal-god and the members of the human family united, actually united, since the blood of the animal was thus scattered throughout all the members of the family.¹⁰ And life and strength was in the blood of the holy animal, the representative of the god.

But to speak of the eating of a totem-animal as lying behind the idea of the fellowship-sacrifice with the Holy Jehovah would seem to be almost blasphemy.

Nevertheless, it is true that the act of eating together at the same table and from the same food was an act which cemented friendships and even created a bond something like kinship. This custom among Semitic people is well-known even today. The laws of hospitality are strictly followed in the East and certain Bedouin tribes still regard a common meal as a binding symbol of lasting friendly relations.¹¹

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰G. A. Hadjiantoniou, "Sacrifice: Its Origin and Purpose," The Evangelical Quarterly, XVII (1945), 46f.

¹¹Samuel Ives Curtiss, "The Semitic Sacrifice of Reconciliation," The Expositor, series 6, VI (1902). This article describes a modern Bedouin meal similar to the peace-offering. It was a meal for reconciliation of two tribes at enmity with one another.

Just so the peace-offering was an offering designed to remind the pious Israelite of his fellowship with God and man. The regulations of the ritual already demonstrate this fact. It would seem that it was for this reason that the laws of purification were carefully followed with regard to the peace-offering. That offering involved fellowship, and fellowship with God demanded true preparation.

According to the Mosaic law, there were certain physical conditions which made it impossible for an Israelite to eat of those things which were "holy to the Lord" (Lev. 7:20, 21). Certain physical conditions made the worshipper unclean. And when an Israelite was unclean, he was unable to have fellowship with his God.

Now, an examination of the Mosaic regulations regarding uncleanness would indicate that the Israelite was to learn an important lesson from the prohibitions. For example, a husband and wife were made incapable of attending the worship of Jehovah by intercourse (Lev. 15:18). They remained unclean until the evening when they were ordered to bathe. Again, involuntary seminal emission placed a man among the unclean until evening, when he was to take a bath and wash his garments (Lev. 15:16,17). During menstruation the woman was unclean for seven days (Lev. 15:19-24). And yet the Israelite home was one which gloried in children as the gift of God. Sex was one of God's blessings.

Furthermore, a dead human body made everyone in the immediate neighborhood unclean. "To be in a tent at the time

of the death of an inmate, to enter a tent where a dead body lay, to touch a corpse, a grave, or a bone, was to contract uncleanness for seven days."¹²

These and similar regulations regarding uncleanness taught the Israelite that by nature he was sinful and unclean in the sight of his God. But the rites of purification preceding the peace-offering cleansed him to a certain extent. They cleansed him so that he could without sin approach the Lord. Thus "although thank-offerings could only be brought by such as were in the state of grace, still the consciousness of sin was represented in them."¹³

For further preparation of the worshipper for fellowship with God the Mosaic ritual gave directions regarding the killing of the animal. This ritual clearly indicated that atonement for sin was necessary before a man could have fellowship with God. Thus the Israelite bringing a peace-offering first laid his hand on the head of the victim. He did this to show that he was transferring to the animal the ability or right to do something for him. "The laying on of hands in sacrifice signifies the sacrificer's bestowing upon the victim the power to represent himself" (Num. 8:10,

¹²Cave, op. cit., p. 74.

¹³E. W. Hengstenberg, Commentary on Ecclesiastes, with Other Treatises, translated from the German by D. W. Simon (Philadelphia: Smith, English, & Co., 1860), p. 402.

16,18).¹⁴ It is therefore noteworthy that the significance of laying the hand on the head of the victim was a substitutionary act. It was not an act of identification by which the victim and the sacrificer became united, but an act in which the victim did something for the Israelite.¹⁵ The pious Israelite in fact thought of the victim as gaining forgiveness for him also in the case of the peace-offering (1 Sam. 3:14).¹⁶ When therefore the peace-offering victim was slaughtered and its blood was sprinkled upon the altar, what remained of the uncleanness and sinfulness of the sacrificer was removed from the sight of Jehovah.¹⁷ For the laying on of hands meant that the blood-atonement would be applied by substitution to the worshipper (Lev. 1:4).

The peace-offering, then, taught the Israelite that sacrifice was potent before God, but only when accompanied by repentance, obedience, and submission. On the other hand, he could also see that penitence and submission were

¹⁴Gayford, op. cit., p. 163. The Bible passage indicates that the laying on of hands meant substitution. The Levites represented the whole nation.

¹⁵G. J. C. Marchandt, "Sacrifice in the Epistle to the Hebrews," The Evangelical Quarterly, XX (1948), p. 205.

¹⁶Adolph Wendel, Das Opfer in der Altisraelitischen Religion (Leipzig: Verlag von Eduard Pfeiffer, 1927), p. 100.

¹⁷That these ideas regarding atonement are, however, secondary with regard to the peace-offering is evident from the manner in which the blood was applied to the altar. It was sprinkled in a general manner upon the top of the main altar, rather than carefully applied to any one part of the altar. Cf. Hengstenberg, op. cit., p. 402.

not enough without some sort of prescribed substitutionary atonement. A man could not approach God, save himself from sin, and enjoy fellowship with God by means of repentance alone or by sacrifice alone. Rather it was obvious that divine power reached down to a man when he offered his sacrifice. A mere animal could do nothing. But when a man sacrificed it in obedience to God's commands and promises, then the "sacrifice was the organ of his approach in humble surrender and obedience to God; then it became the organ of God's approach in power to bless him."¹⁸

But all this atonement ritual was only preliminary to the main point of the peace-offering. That main point was the sacrificial feast. Thus, although there is a necessary element of atonement in the peace-offering, "the peace-offerings atoned that they might be offerings; they were not offerings that they might atone."¹⁹ They concentrated attention upon the act of union and communion with God, upon that special sacrificial meal in which all joined.

This meal was, first of all, a pledge of the blessed fellowship into which God would enter with His people. The peace-offering was a sacrifice in which all could enjoy the friendship of their God. The Israelite, according to Moses'

¹⁸Harold H. Rowley, The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament (Manchester: The Manchester University Press, 1950), p. 95.

¹⁹Cave, op. cit., p. 105.

Law, could make a feast and invite God Himself to share with him and his family the food of the offering.²⁰

The sacrificial feasts were the times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord; times when men could say with their whole heart, "The Lord is my Shepherd."²¹

To picture God as the host at these meals is to set the sacrifice in a false light. It is true that certain parts of the offering were given to the Lord and His priests, but peace-offerings were not whole offerings and the remaining parts of the animal belonged to the sacrificer. He then invited his friends to enjoy this meal with him. And God was one of these friends, a highly honored friend, but one who received His portion from His host, the Israelite (Lev. 7:34). Although the world is the Almighty's, yet He is pleased to be so worshipped.²²

In the second place, the peace-offering meal was also a kind of love feast. The ritual regulations demonstrate this. Moses' law set limits as to the time allowed for eating the meat of the offering. Now, these regulations may have been given simply because meat decays. But that meat decays would not explain the reason for the difference in time allowed for consuming the meat of the thank-offering and the time for the freewill-offering. Rather it would seem that the limitation

²⁰Ibid.

²¹Hengstenberg, op. cit., p. 403.

²²The peace-offering was a "sweet-savor" to God. He was pleased to accept it. Cf. p. 26 of this thesis.

of time was set so that Israel's peace-offerings would require a large number of people to consume the meat in time. God limited the time so that the Israelite could not be selfish, but must invite his friends, or simply waste the meat after the second day. A peace-offering shared with a large number of friends and relatives (such as would be necessary to consume a large amount of meat) precluded any gluttonous, selfish worship and demonstrated rather the joy, prosperity, unity, fellowship, and peace of God's people. God limited the time for eating; Israelites were forced by the limitations to invite many of their friends; hence the offering expressed peace, "not in its minimum sense, but in its maximum: fellowship with God, fellowship in His service, and fellowship with one another."²³

The Peace-offering as Thanksgiving

Since it is true that the peace-offering was, in general, an offering of a gift to God and that the food given and the ritual followed was thought of as a kind of tangible gift,²⁴ it should be noted that the peace-offering taught the Israelite to keep a thankful attitude toward the Almighty. This is especially evident in that kind of peace-offering called the $\int \int \int$. The $\int \int \int$ expressed a spiritual

²³F. D. Kidner, Sacrifice in the Old Testament (London: The Tyndale Press, 1952), pp. 18f.

²⁴See chapter II of this thesis.

attitude rather than merely a physical gift. שָׁלוֹם means "thanksgiving." It signified an act of worship, an attitude of the heart addressed to God, marked by gladness and song. It was this particular peace-offering that was to be eaten on the same day that it was offered to God.²⁵ And this regulation was no doubt given to assure the right attitude for this sacrifice especially.

The peace-offering, and especially the שָׁלוֹם , therefore was an attempt to put into outward form and ritual something which stirred the soul. Inward feelings were outwardly demonstrated. When an Israelite prayed and gave thanks to God, if he wished to assure himself, his friends, and his God of his sincerity in prayer, he would offer a peace-offering as a pledge of the reality and earnestness of what he spoke in prayer. Thus in the peace-offering there was a particularly close relationship between prayer and sacrifice (Ps. 116:17).²⁶

In this connection it will be well to consider the theory of some that blood-sacrifice was offered as a means of liberating life. According to this idea the food and drink offerings were thought of as "giving sustenance to Yahweh."²⁷ And the offering of the blood of the slaughtered

²⁵Royden Keith Yerkes, Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religions and Early Judaism (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952), p. 151.

²⁶Hengstenberg, op. cit., p. 371.

²⁷Oesterley, op. cit., p. 185.

victim imparted life to God.

In other words, by the sacrifice of the victim its life was liberated, and the liberated life inherent in the blood was absorbed by Yahweh, whose own life was strengthened and replenished thereby.²⁸

The meal at the conclusion of the peace-offering with its special portions set aside for God was an offering to God supposedly to strengthen Him. According to this idea the pious Israelite was to have thought that since God had helped him, he might return the favor and help God. So by mutual aid the relationship was maintained, and maintained favorable for men. God, exhausted by the answering of a request from men, was to be strengthened with new life and made ready for the next request.²⁹

But such a view detracts too much from the ideas of power and might that were associated with the great Jehovah. The thank-offering was an offering which, if anything, magnified God's power and strength. Far from making Jehovah seem dependent upon men, the thank-offering emphasized man's dependence upon God.

When, for example, Achan was caught in his sin (Jos. 7: 19), Joshua insisted that Achan should "give glory and $\overline{\text{st}} \overline{\text{t}} \overline{\text{t}} \overline{\text{t}}$ to Jehovah." Achan was to recognize God's supremacy. He was to recognize that to disobey His commandments was folly.³⁰

²⁸Ibid., p. 186.

²⁹Ibid., pp. 177-190.

³⁰Kerkes, op. cit., pp. 235f., (footnote 164).

There is no idea of giving strength to God, but rather of recognizing the glory and dominion that is already His.³¹

We know, in this connection, that thank-offerings were frequently brought on occasions of sorrow. Then they could only be thanks for blessings hoped for. David the king brought thank-offerings even while the people were being punished for his pride in numbering them (2 Sam. 24:25). Or the children of Israel brought thank-offerings after a serious defeat (Jud. 20:26) and after the tribe of Benjamin was almost wiped out (Jud. 21:14). This practice demonstrates a high regard for the power of God. To give thanks for grace already given is a humble way of asking for more. (It is certainly not pride strengthening a weak God.) Furthermore, when the Israelite offered his thank-offering, he did not pray and sacrifice by experiment, but based the prayer and the sacrifice upon the word and promises of God (Ps. 40).³² He knew and was sure that although God had no need for the offering, He would accept it when that offering was given in sincerity.

The Israelite could know this because God had said that the thank-offering was a sacrifice received with pleasure by Him. In Leviticus 3:5 and elsewhere God had said that the

³¹Ps. 50:13, Jer. 7:21-23, etc., give further evidence that the regulations were not laid down with the idea of strengthening God.

³²Hengstenberg, op. cit., p. 400.

peace-offerings produce a $\overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta} \overline{\Delta}$, "a sweet savor."

This phrase has often been taken to indicate that God is reconciled by means of the sacrifice. But that would hardly seem to be the case, since this phrase occurs only once in connection with the sin-offering and never with the guilt-offering.³³ These were the specific atonement-sacrifices. But the phrase is found frequently with regard to the peace-offerings and other offerings where the idea of atonement is somewhat secondary. In fact,

the expression is used when an ox is offered, so it is also when a head of small cattle or a bird is offered, in order to teach the lesson that he who offers much and he who offers little is alike before God, for God neither eats nor drinks (i.e., is not placated by receiving more rather than less).³⁴

The Targum therefore paraphrases correctly, "an offering which is received with pleasure before God."³⁵ The sweet smell of the peace-offering was not regarded as something placating the just anger of God, but as an indication of His pleasure in the right worship and sacrifice of the Israelite, in the attitude of thanksgiving and humble dependence demonstrated by the gift.

We conclude, then, that no pious Israelite would have dared to think that he might offer strength and life to the

³³Gray, op. cit., p. 79.

³⁴Simon b. Azzai (A.D. 100-130) as quoted in Gray, op. cit., p. 81.

³⁵cf. Ibid., p. 80.

Almighty. For God possesses all things and needs nothing. Yet He had promised to be pleased with the humble thanks which the Israelite sought to make evident and tangible in the thank-offering. It was in this spirit that the thank-offering was brought, a spirit of humble dependence marked by the certain assurance that such sacrifice was God-pleasing.

The Peace-offering as a Symbol

It has become evident that the peace-offering was a sacrifice designed to set forth spiritual ideas under tangible forms. The supersensuous was taught by means of the senses. This is true of the whole sacrificial system. It was a minutely symbolical system, symbolizing things then present and things to come. But for convenience we will use the term symbol in the following with reference to the facts that were already revealed to the Israelites and the term type with reference to the truths yet to be revealed, but foreshadowed in the peace-offering.

Now, if we follow this distinction, it becomes obvious that

the one canon for the accurate and precise study of the symbolic significance of the Mosaic injunctions in that narrower sense is that the spheres of the symbolical and essential significance are co-extensive.³⁶

This statement has been demonstrated to be true in the fore-

³⁶Cave, op. cit., p. 116.

going chapters. The ritual of the peace-offering is largely a series of symbolic actions. Thus it is only through symbolism that the Israelite could understand that his own physical cleanliness meant spiritual purity. Only symbolism could give any meaning to the rite of laying the hand on the head of a sacrificial victim. Pouring blood on the altar would have been meaningless ritual without symbolism. And while the peace-offering meal was obviously fellowship of one man with another; only symbolism could indicate that God was in fellowship there, too. But the majority of these actions have been discussed. Two points, however, remain. These are the wave-breast and the heave-thigh.

These portions of the peace-offering were the parts that belonged to the priests (Lev. 7:30). The ritual connected with these parts signified that they, just like the parts that were consumed at the altar, were presented and devoted to the Lord. Thus, in Numbers 8:11 in the appointment of the Levites the wave-offering ritual was used as a symbol of consecration.³⁷ The Levites were "offered to the Lord and returned by Him 'as a gift to Aaron and his sons' to assist them in the Tabernacle ministry."³⁸ The parts, then, of the wave-offering and the heave-offering were parts of the offering given to God for the priests. But regarding the ritual action connected with these parts, little definite can be

³⁷Hengstenberg, op. cit., p. 403.

³⁸Gayford, op. cit., p. 37.

known beyond what may be determined from the words wave and heave themselves. The heaving, since it was an up-and-down movement, probably pointed to God as enthroned in the heavens, and as the ruler of the earth. The waving to the four corners of the earth taught that God watches over His people. As Psalms 139:3 says: "Thou compassest my path and my lying down."³⁹ This matter, however, is not at all clear.

In conclusion we may say that the peace-offering could not have meant the same thing to every worshipper. A symbol may mean more to one person than it does to another. Not all people have the same imaginative understanding. To some the ritual of the peace-offering may have been a somewhat meaningless pageant. But to those who meditated day and night upon the ritual, it was a rich storehouse of doctrinal treasure.⁴⁰

It was a storehouse because God employed the ritual as a symbol to teach important truths. The symbols were a method of teaching by illustration. Now, it is true the symbols were to a certain extent inadequate to show the truth behind them, but just because of their inadequacy, they showed that in God's plan there was a day coming when symbolism would no longer be necessary. Like the prophets, the symbolism of the ritual pointed to a day when the reality

³⁹Hengstenberg, op. cit., p. 403.

⁴⁰Gave, op. cit., p. 118.

must replace the symbol.⁴¹

The Peace-offering as a Type

When the pious Jew brought his peace-offering, it no doubt gave much satisfaction to his heart to ponder upon the significance of the ritual as we have outlined it. But it would seem that the careful thinkers among the Israelites must have wondered why it was that meat and bread, a careful observance of certain prescriptions--why these things should be accounted worthy of many blessings by the Almighty. There was, of course, the express promise and will of God in the matter, but that still did not answer why God would have the offerings as they were. What solution could such a thinker have found for his question?

As indicated above,⁴² he must have come to realize the transitory nature of the ritual of the peace-offering and of all sacrifice in general. He must have realized that the offering was a type or model of something greater to come. He must have realized, in fact, that the sacrifices were so designed by God that they would resemble that greater thing which was to come.⁴³

⁴¹Ibid., p. 169.

⁴²Cf. the conclusion of the previous subheading.

⁴³Our definition of a type is the following: "it adumbrates something, it adumbrates some future thing, and it is especially designed by God to adumbrate that future thing." (Cave, op. cit., p. 163.)

The prophets in fact did realize this relationship. They realized that there was a relationship between the sacrifices and the work of the coming Messiah.⁴⁴ They tried to bring this fact home to the minds of the Israelites. In Isaiah's description of the Suffering Servant there is, for example, a deliberate "description of the work wrought by the Servant under sacrificial language."⁴⁵ Furthermore the prophets saw very plainly that

all the animal sacrifices failed to meet man's need, since the sins that most needed cleansing were beyond the range of their power. A sacrifice greater than any the Law provided, and more far-reaching in its power, was therefore envisaged in the Old Testament, and its deepest word on sacrifice speaks of one never offered on the altar of the Temple or provided in the ritual of the Pentateuch, but one to which it looked forward beyond the Old Testament itself.⁴⁶

For example, Zechariah 13:1 speaks of a "fountain that shall be opened for sin and uncleanness to the house of David, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem." This fountain shall be so potent that it will replace the blood in the holy containers in the Temple, that Temple which is built by the Branch.⁴⁷

We may conclude, then that

⁴⁴It is a common view that the pre-exilic prophets condemned all sacrifice. Rowley's remark is pertinent. "It is improbable that their words should be so interpreted, and far more probable that they opposed the sacrifices of their day because they were hollow and unrelated to the spirit of the offerer." (Rowley, op. cit., p. 88.)

⁴⁵Cave, op. cit., p. 217 (Is. 52, 53).

⁴⁶Rowley, op. cit., p. 110.

⁴⁷Cave, op. cit., p. 224.

no one with a spiritual conception of things could for a moment imagine that the blood of lambs and bullocks did in reality atone for sins. The very fact that all the sacrifices had to be repeated day after day and that they culminated annually in the sacrifices of the Great Day of Atonement was indication enough that they were not real substitutes, but that they could be only symbolic types, which prefigured and foreshadowed the work of Him whom prophecy foretold as the seed of woman, whose heel would be bruised in His conflict with the Serpent.⁴⁸

But the question remains whether the work of Christ is the antitype of which the sacrificial system was but a type. And more specifically we have the task of relating Christ's work to the peace-offering.

In this connection the Septuagint rendering of the Hebrew $\Pi \zeta \psi$ becomes an extremely significant matter. Sixty-four times throughout the Greek Old Testament the word $\epsilon\omega\tau\eta\rho\iota\upsilon\upsilon$, either in combination with other words or alone, translates the Hebrew $\Pi \zeta \psi$. Twelve times it is translated by $\epsilon\iota\rho\eta\nu\iota\kappa\acute{o}\upsilon$ and twice by the plural of $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\upsilon\upsilon$, Greek for "sumptuous banquet."⁴⁹ One of the very common words for peace-offering was therefore $\epsilon\omega\tau\eta\rho\iota\upsilon\upsilon$.

With this information in mind it becomes obvious that God intended the work of Christ to be the true antitype of the peace-offering, and that many pious Israelites so understood the ritual of the offering. We know that when Simeon took Christ in his arms in the Temple, he said: "Lord, now

⁴⁸William Moenkemoeller, The Festivals and Sacrifices of Israel (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1932), p. 39.

⁴⁹Yerkes, op. cit., p. 151.

lettest thou thy servant depart in peace . . . for mine eyes have seen thy επιήρπιον (peace-offering, not merely salvation), which thou hast prepared before the face of all people."⁵⁰

Moreover, the various details of the peace-offering ritual demonstrate that the work of Christ is the fulfillment of the symbolism of that sacrifice. Before the coming of Christ many of these details could not be understood fully, but after He had come, they all took on new depths of meaning.

Before Christ had come, the special regulation that the animal had to be perfect, immaculate, without blemish--that regulation had little significance. But after Christ's death all became clear. The perfect victim symbolized the holiness of Christ. In the case of the animal this was only a physical perfection. In Christ's death a victim was sacrificed who knew no sin, who was in fact the Son of God.⁵¹

In the peace-offering, as we have shown, there was an element of atonement in the sprinkling ritual. But the question always remained, why animal blood should be so potent. But after Christ came and died for men, it became clear that the redemption was "through his blood" (Col. 1:14). God was looking forward in His omniscience to that great sacrifice, "for if the blood of bulls and of goats and the ashes of a

⁵⁰Gave, op. cit., p. 425.

⁵¹Ibid., p. 432.

heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ. . . ." (Heb. 9:13). What is more, when the Apostle looks forward into the unseen world, even there "the Lamb as it had been slain" (Rev. 5:6) comes into prominence.

The ritual of the laying on of hands, given by God in the Old Testament to indicate substitution in the peace-offering, was only a picture of that greater substitutionary work of Christ.

Again, in the peace-offering we have three participants--the victim, the priest, and the worshipper. Christ fulfills all these pictures. He is the victim offered to God for the sins of mankind. He is the priest who Himself brings the offering, His own body. And He is the man, for He is "the Archetype of man both as created and redeemed" (Rom. 8:29).⁵²

In the Old Testament peace-offering the fellowship-meal was the most important aspect of the ritual. Christ has fulfilled this picture also. As the peace-offering was a sacrifice designed to bring about fellowship with Jehovah, so with regard to Christ, "the peace-offering speaks of His continual communion with the Father through all the circumstances of His earthly life."⁵³ Furthermore, through the Ascension the Son of God took His manhood to sit at the right

⁵²Ibid., p. 306.

⁵³J. Russell Howden, "The Levitical Offerings," The Biblical Review (1932), p. 195.

hand of the Father.

As the glorified Son returns to the Fellowship with the Father, which He had before the world was, He brings with Him His Manhood, uniting it into the same Fellowship with God.⁵⁴

What is more, in the Old Testament the fellowship of the peace-offering was limited to the Israelites. In Christ all men may approach God and join in fellowship with God. And finally, when Christ was about to die He left as His last testament the Lord's Supper. In this meal Christians have fellowship with one another and with Christ who is God.⁵⁵

It thus becomes evident that the peace-offering was intended to set forth the work of Christ. In fact, every part of the whole Levitical system finds its fulfillment in the one historical fact of Christ on Calvary. And the offerings set forth Christ's death as a power to justify and to sanctify.⁵⁶

But the ritual of the peace-offering is also fulfilled in the sacrifices of the Christian life. In the solemn presentation of the victim at God's altar in the peace-offering, the Israelite expressed the wish to approach the Almighty. So in the worship of the Christian church today the wish to approach the Lord is expressed whenever the believer sets his faith firmly upon the work of Christ and what

⁵⁴Gayford, op. cit., p. 133.

⁵⁵This matter is discussed further under the next sub-heading.

⁵⁶Howden, op. cit., p. 194.

it means to him for eternity as well as for time. Through Christ he can assure himself that God is with him and that there is a mansion for him in heaven.⁵⁷ Furthermore, in the church, whenever the Gospel of Christ is spoken, that is the fulfillment of the ritual of the sprinkling. "By the preaching of the Gospel, believers are sprinkled with the blood of that Lamb, i.e., sanctified, as Peter says, 1Ep. 1:2."⁵⁸

Again Paul calls the freewill-offerings of the church at Philippi "a sacrifice⁵⁹ acceptable, well-pleasing to God" (Phil. 4:18). He writes to the Romans that they should present their bodies (instead of an animal) "a living sacrifice,⁵⁹ holy, acceptable to God" (Rom. 12:1). As to the praise-offering--a kind of peace-offering--"by him therefore let us offer the sacrifice⁵⁹ of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to his name" (Heb. 13:15).

And, finally, just as the Old Testament Israelite invited many of his friends and neighbors to partake of his

⁵⁷Cave, op. cit., p. 455.

⁵⁸Triglot Concordia: The Symbolical Books of the Ev. Lutheran Church (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921), p. 397; Apology XLIV, 36.

⁵⁹The Greek is . This "word was limited to those sacrifices in which part of a victim was burnt on an altar for a deity and the remainder either eaten by the worshippers who presented the animal or by the priests." $\pi \lambda \nu \sigma$ and $\theta \upsilon \sigma \iota \alpha$ are therefore closely related words. (Verkes, op. cit., p. 146). And so it is probable that the sacrifice in the mind of the apostle in these references was the peace-offering.

sacrifice, so in the New Testament sacrifice--"to do good and communicate, forget not, for with such sacrifices (*δουλιὰ*) God is well pleased" (Heb. 13:16).⁶⁰

The ritual of the peace-offering therefore had the relation to the Gospel of Christ of

a shadow or silhouette that indicated the presence of a solid reality, to come into view in its due time. Such an outline, therefore, may be valued as illustrating and adumbrating the now observed reality; the details may be compared, both to illuminate the significance of the new reality . . . and also the more strongly to teach that as we now have the reality, the use of the shadow outline is finished, except to illustrate afresh and renew understanding of the reality.⁶¹

The Peace-offering as a Sacrament

The Apology of the Augsburg Confession defines a Sacrament as follows: "A Sacrament is a ceremony or work in which God presents to us that which the promise annexed to the ceremony offers." This definition is given in distinction to the definition of a sacrifice: "A sacrifice, on the contrary, is a ceremony or work which we render God in order to afford Him honor."⁶² Following this distinction we must conclude that the peace-offering is both a sacrament and a sacrifice. In the peace-offering God promised to remember

⁶⁰Hengstenberg, op. cit., p. 404.

⁶¹Marchand, op. cit., p. 196.

⁶²Triglöt, p. 389; Apology XLV, 18. The general Lutheran view of a sacrament today requires that the act be instituted by Christ. In the following discussion we follow the broader definition of the Apology.

His mercy and His offer of atonement to the sinner. He promised to have fellowship with him who offered the peace-offering.⁶³ It was therefore a sacrament. But the peace-offering was also a gift to God expressing thanksgiving.⁶⁴ It was therefore a sacrifice.

In considering the peace-offering as a sacrament it will be well to define somewhat the Old Testament ideas of atonement.

The idea expressed by the Hebrew original of the word translated atone was cover and covering, not in the sense of rendering invisible to Jehovah, but in the sense of engrossing His sight with something else, of neutralising sin, so to speak, of disarming it, of rendering it inert to arouse the righteous anger of God.⁶⁵

The covering of sin, then, in the peace-offering was accomplished (1) by the rite of purification and washing with water, (2) by the blood sprinkling ritual, and (3) by the faith which trusted the promise of God who said, "I have given [the blood] to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls" (Lev. 17:11).⁶⁶

In view of this atonement, in the peace-offering God condescended to have fellowship with the sacrificer. Thus in this respect also the offering was a sacrament, since God

⁶³cf. pp. 15f. of this thesis.

⁶⁴cf. pp. 11f. and 22f. of this thesis.

⁶⁵Cave, op. cit., p. 144.

⁶⁶Ibid., p. 152.

gave to men what He had promised, His presence.

But these matters have been already discussed. What is of importance to us at this point is the question whether or not the Lord's Supper can be thought of as a fulfillment of the typology of the peace-offering.

It is a fact that the Lord's Supper has a distinct sacrificial character. First of all, it was instituted in connection with the Passover. Whether the meal that Christ and His disciples ate at which the Lord's Supper was instituted was actually the official Passover meal, is a question of little importance in this connection. The fact is that the meal was very similar to the Passover. It was the Passover season. Therefore the association in the disciples' minds of the Lord's Supper with the Passover would seem almost inevitable. And the Passover was a sacrifice in the nature of a peace-offering.⁶⁷ Furthermore the Lord took bread and wine and spoke of them as body and blood. Body and blood were the objects of offering in the animal sacrifices. When Christ

⁶⁷The ritual of the Passover would connect it self-evidently with the peace-offering, since there is the communion meal. But the prominence of atonement as a purpose behind the Passover would seem to militate against this obvious view, since the peace-offering is not primarily an atonement sacrifice. The following points are worthy of note. (1) The Hebrew זָבַח is used in connection with the Passover (Ex. 12:27, 28:16). This is the characteristic name for the peace-offerings. (2) It is true that the Passover emphasizes strongly the idea of atonement. At the institution of the Passover the thought uppermost in the minds of the Israelites must have been deliverance from death at the hands of the angel of death. But it is atonement for a purpose. There was also "the reception by God of those He had delivered into a new life of fellowship with Himself.

spoke of the blood of His new covenant, it was therefore a "direct reference to the Sacrifices by which the Old Covenant was established."⁶⁸ And finally, a meal together before God is part of the Old Testament sacrificial system, as is evident especially in the peace-offering.

It therefore seems reasonable to conclude that the Lord's Supper is a fulfillment of the typology of the peace-offering. Some of the following points of contact in the

The first Passover was the commencement of the special privileges of the chosen nation; every subsequent Passover became a pledge of the continuance of those privileges" (Cave, op. cit., p. 111). Therefore just as the peace-offering worked atonement that there might be fellowship, so the blood ritual of the Passover worked atonement that God might fellowship in the meal that was to follow. (3) Christ made use of bread and wine in the institution of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. But it was possible to present bread and wine only "in company with burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, and never with sacrifices for sin and trespass; bread and wine it had only been possible to present to God . . . after atonement had been made by the effusion of blood" (Cave, op. cit., p. 468). Now the Passover certainly was not a burnt-offering. The rituals are not at all similar. Yet bread and wine were necessary to the usual celebration of the Passover. (4) The meal of the Passover is just as significant as the blood ritual. No sharp line of distinction should be drawn between the various actions, but all must be viewed as a unit (Gayford, op. cit., p. 161). (5) There seems to be a further similarity in the fact that the Passover was a meal reserved for those who were circumcised, i.e., already in God's covenant, while the peace-offering was a meal reserved for those who were in a state of grace.

From all this it would seem logical to conclude--"both in origin and in later times, the Passover was a communion sacrifice" (Oosterley, op. cit., p. 106). And this close connection of peace-offering and Passover is almost inevitably evident unless all ideas of atonement be denied the peace-offering.

⁶⁸Gayford, op. cit., p. 162. Ex. 24:5-11.

symbolism are especially worthy of note. The peace-offering was a sacrifice reserved for those who were already in a state of grace. No pious Israelite would dare to hope for fellowship with his God unless he were free from all uncleanness. Just so the Lord's Supper is for believers only.

The peace-offering first gave assurance of forgiveness of sins and of atonement in God's eyes to the worshipper and then it permitted him to have fellowship with Jehovah. So the Lord's Supper assures us of the forgiveness of our sins, while at the same time it unites us in fellowship with Christ, our Lord (1 Cor. 10:16). The Lord's Supper is a meal in which the believer, "in all his sins and in all his temptations, rests in faith upon the one Sacrifice, and eats the flesh and drinks the blood of the Son of man."⁶⁹

The peace-offering was so designed that it strengthened the faith which an Israelite had in the promises of his God. He simply had to believe that God was there in fellowship with him. There was no other visible assurance granted him than the promise of God symbolized in the banquet. Similarly the Lord's Supper strengthens our faith in God's promises. We can only know by faith that we are in communion with Christ.

We know also that the peace-offering was often given as a demonstration of the thankful heart. So in the Lord's

⁶⁹Hengstenberg, op. cit., p. 424.

Supper,

after conscience encouraged by faith has perceived from what terrors it is freed, then indeed it fervently gives thanks for the benefit and passion of Christ, and uses the ceremony itself to the praise of God, in order by this obedience to show its gratitude; and testifies that it holds in high esteem the gifts of God. Thus the ceremony becomes a sacrifice of praise.⁷⁰

In the peace-offering, the worshipper, his God, and those who ate the meal with him, were all united in fellowship. And in the Lord's Supper, because of the fellowship which each Christian has with Christ, all are likewise united in fellowship, communion with one another. The peace-offering meal involved many people, friends, relatives, and acquaintances in fellowship. So with the Lord's Supper.

We may therefore conclude that the relationship of the peace-offering to the Sacrament of the Altar is that of the type to the fulfillment. There is this difference, however. The peace-offering was distinctly a sacrifice, but a sacrifice with sacramental significance in addition. On the other hand, the Lord's Supper is a sacrament with certain sacrificial elements added. In the peace-offering it was a matter of the worshipper bringing something to his God and then receiving the blessings of God's forgiveness and of assurance of fellowship with God. In the Sacrament of the Altar, it is God who brings us the forgiveness of sins in Christ; it is He who invites us to fellowship and communion. And after

⁷⁰Triglot, pp. 410f.

we have received these gifts, then we proceed to offer honor to our God.⁷¹

⁷¹To speak of the Lord's Supper as a "life-giving sacrifice" (Gayford, op. cit., p. 164) is to ignore this distinction. Such terminology introduces work-righteous, ex opere operato ideas into the Lord's Supper. Only if we properly emphasize that the Lord's Supper is a sacrament will we properly emphasize the atoning work of Christ.

CHAPTER IV

A CHRISTIAN'S VIEW OF THE PEACE-OFFERING

Our view of the peace-offering has now been set before us. The basis of this offering was the love of God. In it He taught men to rest secure in His mercy. Through it He pointed men to the time when He would bring about for them some great deliverance. And through it He today brings men to a better appreciation of His mercy and of His work of salvation.

When in the Old Testament the believer prepared himself to bring a peace-offering, the cleansing ritual he performed made it clear to him that he was a sinner in the eyes of Jehovah. Yet just because there was a cleansing ritual for him, he knew that God was a God of mercy who was ready to help him even though he was a sinner. Then, relying on that assurance of help, he brought the peace-offering animal and presented it at God's altar. Next, by laying his hands on the head of that victim he delegated it to be his substitute before God. Now, this animal was a perfect specimen. When he then killed it the Old Testament believer was shown that innocent perfection was being sacrificed, given to destruction, because of the sin and imperfection in himself. Next, by the applying of the blood to the altar, the ritual made evident to the worshipper that by death God was making forgiveness of sins available to all men. God was accepting

the offering, and so recognizing that atonement was made between Him and the Old Testament believer. After this atonement had been completed, the peace-offering ritual proceeded to a joyful conclusion. God was given a part of the offering. The priests received their share. And then in the concluding meal, all shared in the bounties which God had given. All enjoyed a fellowship among themselves and with God. All were assured completely of God's forgiveness, His love, and His constant tender care and concern for them as individuals. For there at the offering, in that meal, God was there with them.

Now, because the Israelite's God was not some tangible, visible idol, the peace-offering must have pointed already in the Old Testament to some greater fulfillment. It was too crude and unspiritual a thought to believe that a mere animal could somehow placate the great Jehovah. It was too crude to think that He could take pleasure in the eating of a meal. But as the prophets made clear, something greater was to come.

And from the New Testament we have a vantage point which permits us to see what it was that the peace-offering was pointing to. The peace-offering was pointing to Christ and to the Christian era. Christ came as a man before God, presented as His sacrificial victim His own self, and was killed upon the cross. By His life and through His death He has opened for all men a way of fellowship with God which is more

sure than all the peace-offerings of the Old Testament. And now, sitting at the right hand of the Father, His humanity has gone before us, assuring us of a more perfect fellowship with the Lord.

Therefore, when the Christian comes in worship and prayer before the Lord, trusting His mercy, knowing that Christ is his substitute, the sacrificial victim for him, he can know and enjoy fellowship with God Himself. This fact the Lord has made more sure for us through the Sacrament of the Altar. There we can taste and feel and know that the Lord is with us.

So the Christian views the peace-offering. He sees in it a picture, symbol, or type of the central facts of his faith. He sees it as a picture of the manner in which the Lord strengthens and keeps His people in the faith. The Christian sees the peace-offering as part of the first step in God's plan of salvation, as part of an Old Covenant. He finds himself living in a New Covenant which is not new, but a glorification of the Old. And as he can see that God kept the promise set forth in the Old Testament peace-offering when He sent Christ to the world, so the Christian may certainly know that God will keep the promise set forth in the offering of Christ when He receives His people to fellowship with Him in heaven.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bissell, Edwin Cone. Biblical Antiquities: A Handbook. Philadelphia: The American Sunday-School Union, 1892.
- Cave, Alfred. The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice and Atonement. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1890.
- Curtiss, Samuel Ives. "The Semitic Sacrifice of Reconciliation," The Expositor, Series 6, VI (August, 1902).
- Gayford, S. C. Sacrifice and Priesthood. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1924 (Reprint 1953).
- Gray, George Buchanan. "Interpretations of Jewish Sacrifice," The Expositor. Series VIII, IX (May, 1915).
- Sacrifice in the Old Testament. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1925.
- Hadjiantoniou, G. A. "Sacrifice: Its Origin and Purpose," The Evangelical Quarterly, XVII (January, 1945).
- Hongstenberg, H. W. Commentary on Ecclesiastes, with Other Treatises. Translated from the German by D. W. Simon. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co., 1860.
- Howden, J. Russell. "The Levitical Offerings," The Biblical Review (April, 1932).
- Jukes, Andrew. The Law of the Offerings. London: James Nisbet & Co., 1847.
- Kalisch, M. M. A Historical and Critical Commentary on the Old Testament, Leviticus. I. London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1867.
- Kidner, F. D. Sacrifice in the Old Testament. London: The Tyndale Press, 1952.
- Leighton, John. The Jewish Altar. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1886.
- Marchandt, G. J. C. "Sacrifice in the Epistle to the Hebrews," The Evangelical Quarterly, XX (July, 1948).
- Moonkemoeller, William. The Festivals and Sacrifices of Israel. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1932.

- Oehler, Gustavo Friedrich. Theology of the Old Testament.
Translated from the German by George E. Day. Grand
Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.
- Oesterley, W. O. E. Sacrifice in Ancient Israel. New York:
The MacMillan Co., n.d. [1937].
- Rowley, Harold H. The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old
Testament. Manchester: The Manchester University Press,
1950.
- Schmidt, Otto P. "The Offerings of the Old Testament."
Unpublished Master of Sacred Theology Thesis, Concordia
Seminary, St. Louis, n.d.
- Triglot Concordia: The Symbolical Books of the Ev. Lutheran
Church. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921.
- Wendel, Adolf. Das Opfer in der Alterisraelitischen Reli-
gion. Leipzig: Verlag von Eduard Pfeiffer, 1927.
- Yorkes, Royden Keith. Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Reli-
gions and Early Judaism. New York: Charles Scribner's
Sons, 1952.