

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-30-1924

The Offerings of the Old Testament

Otto P. Schmidt

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

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



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Schmidt, Otto P., "The Offerings of the Old Testament" (1924). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 573.
<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/573>

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 Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

THE OFFERINGS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

A treatise

submitted to

The Faculty of the

Graduate School of Concordia Seminary

in partial fulfilment of the

requirements for the Degree of

Master of Sacred

Theology

by

Otto P. Schmidt

May 30, 1924

Introduction

The idea of offering is a universal one. It is embodied in every religion under the sun. Almost every religion is built up around the idea of offering. But as the religions vary, so also the nature and purpose of the offering. And as men were led farther and farther away from the truth, they were also led farther and farther away from the true idea and purpose of offering.

As the truth can be found only in the Word of God, so also the true nature and purpose of offering can be found there alone. That is the big distinction between true offerings and false, that they who bring false offerings believe that their offerings are effective *ex opere operato*, while they who bring true offerings bring them only by faith in that one great offering which no man was able to bring, the sacrifice of Christ on the cross. It was to this one great offering that the sacrifices of the Old Covenant pointed; it is from this that all the offerings of the New Covenant proceed and derive their significance and effectiveness.

The offerings were the center of Old Testament worship. They were a service to God which He demanded, and which, if brought according to His command and prescription, were pleasing to Him. But they had no effectiveness 'per se'. Their power was derived solely from the promise of a universal redemption through the one perfect sacrifice of the Messiah who was to come.

At the moment that the suffering Redeemer closed His weary eyes in death, all necessity for further atonement ceased. When Christ

called triumphantly from the cross: It is finished! he meant what He said. But an opposing voice says: It is not finished! We must repeat the offering until the last day. Who wants to be saved, pay, and we shall offer Christ for him in an unbloody way! It is the voice of Antichrist and his henchman. With that blasphemous, abominable invention of the father of lies, the mass, they seek to deprive poor souls of the one hope that is held out to them. And that they declare to be the greatest, noblest, most glorious work of the Church of Jesus Christ! And its one purpose is to remove Christ's atoning sacrifice from the Church of Jesus Christ.

The mass is the heart of the Roman system. With it the Roman Church stands and falls. The mass has a fourfold purpose: 1) To honor and praise God; 2) To thank God for his blessings; 3) To reconcile God's justice or righteousness and to obtain remission of sins; 4) To pray for further blessings. Thus in the Kat. Oestr., p. 152: "Die heilige Messe ist die Sonne aller geistlichen Uebungen, der Mittelpunkt der christlichen Religion, die Seele der Froemigkeit, das unausprechliche Geheimnis, welches der Abgrund der goettlichen Liebe in sich begreift," and p. 148: "Das Kreuzesopfer Jesu Christi wird durch die heilige Messe fortwaehrend erneuert. Zwischen dem Mezopfer und dem Kreuzesopfer ist dem Wesen nach kein Unterschied." What a blasphemy of Christ who said: It is finished!

The origin of their error lies in the false interpretation of Hebr. 5, 1: "Every high priest taken from among men is ordained for

men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins." Rome concludes therefrom that, since in the New Testament there are high priests and priests, it follows that there is also a sacrifice for sins. "This passage particularly makes an impression on the unlearned, especially when the pomp of the priesthood and the sacrifices of the Old Testament are spread before their eyes. This resemblance deceives the ignorant, so that they judge that, according to the same manner, a ceremonial sacrifice ought to exist among us, which should be applied on behalf of the sins of others, just as in the Old Testament. Neither is the service of the masses and the rest of the polity of the Pope anything else than false zeal in behalf of the misunderstood Levitical polity." Trigl. 403.

But in accordance with the Word of God "we teach that the sacrifice of Christ dying on the cross has been sufficient for the sins of the whole world, and that there is no need, besides of other sacrifices, as though this were not sufficient for our sins." Trigl. 311. And this is clearly taught by

The Offerings of the Old Testament

We have divided this treatise into three parts:

- I. The Origin and Fundamental Idea of Offerings in General.
- II. The Mosaic Offerings and their Symbolical Significance.
- III. The Mosaic Offerings and their Typological Significance.

The Origin and Fundamental Idea of Offerings in General.

The origin of offerings is not recorded in the Scripture. The account in Gen. 4, 3ff is the earliest reference we have to them. We can assume with reasonable certainty, however, that the offerings of Cain and Abel are not the first of their kind, but that offerings were known also to their parents, from whom the two sons probably learned their nature and meaning. Thus the ceremony dates back practically to the beginning of the human race.

The practice was universal. The Vedas have their elaborate rituals. The Semitic peoples, the Greeks, Romans, Africans, and Indians all knew of them. In fact, offerings constitute the chief part of practically every religion under the sun. For this practically universal habit of the race several solutions have been offered.

All theories regarding the origin of sacrifices may be divided into two classes:

- 1) Those that attribute to them a human origin.
- 2) Those that attribute to them a divine origin.

We shall review briefly the theories which derive the offerings from a human source.

a) The Gift Theory. This theory holds that offerings were originally presents to the Deity which the offerer took for granted would be received with pleasure and even gratitude. The purpose was

to establish good relations with and secure favors from the Deity. While this was undoubtedly the conception and motive of many heathen peoples,¹ it cannot be said to explain the origin of sacrifices in general. Such offerings are based upon a very low conception of the deity. The gods to whom these offerings were brought must have been nature-spirits, or fetishes, or ancestral ghosts, who were in need of such offerings, and were thus placed under obligations. Of such a nature were some of the offerings in the East, where the god was a ruler, king, or chief. Such a theory certainly cannot account for the offerings brought to Jehovah.

b) The Magic Theory. This theory has been set up in two slightly variant forms. One is that of R. C. Thompson.¹ He holds that the victim served as a substitute to appease the wrath of a demon who had become troublesome in a person; the aim of the offering was to entice or drive the evil spirit out of the person into the animal, and that then by killing the animal the spirit could be destroyed. The other is that of Marillier, who holds that sacrifice in its origin is essentially a magic rite. The shedding of the blood liberated a magical force which caused the god to accede to the will of the man. This theory also may account for some forms of heathen sacrifice, but they certainly fall far short of supplying the origin of the Biblical offerings.

c) The table-bond theory. This theory held that offerings were meals at which the offerers and the god partook together and thus

1. "Semitic Magic, Its Origins and Developments," 175-218.

established a firmer bond of fellowship. But this theory accounts in no way for the burnt offerings, which were among the earliest, most solemn, and most important of offerings.

d) The sacramental communion theory which is in its essence merely a modification of the table bond theory. At the basis of it lies the totemistic idea that the animal partook of divine nature. Thus, when an animal sacrificed for a feast was eaten, it was really the god who was eaten, and who was thus incorporated physically, intellectually, and morally, into them who partook of the flesh of the animal. In some cases also the life of the god was imbibed by the drinking of the blood of the animal. Sometimes, as in the case of the sacred camel, the quivering flesh was devoured before the animal was really dead. But totemism was far removed from the religion of the Hebrews and, while it may apply to some of the savage feasts of the Arabs, it certainly does not apply to the practises of the people of the Bible.

e) The Homage Theory. According to this theory offerings were originally an expression of dependence and homage. The motive, for man to seek God was not a sense of guilt but a sense of dependence and a desire to show homage and obedience. While this was indeed one of the elements of a true offering, it does not account for the origin of all sacrifices in general.

f) The Piacular Theory. This theory holds that sacrifices are fundamentally atoning, and that the death of the animal is a vicarious expiation of the sins of the offerer. But this theory accounts only for some of the offerings, not for all of them.

Against all these theories attributing the origin of offerings to a human agency, we hold that man cannot have been the originator. It is true that man, Adam and Eve, performed the first ceremony of offering; but it is just as true that they did not do this thru their own devotion, that they did not introduce this form of divine service as a product of their own brain. Scripture testifies that self-elected service is an abomination to God,¹ Deut. 12, 1ff; 16, 21.22. This is clearly seen from the history of Jeroboam, 1 K. 12, 28, who set up two calves for worship, and is severely arraigned for the fact that he 'made Israel to sin.' Christ says of the Pharisees: 'In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men,' Matth. 15, 9. Scripture also testifies that God has received offerings with favor, as the offering of Abel, Gen. 4, 4, and of Noah, Gen. 8, 21. God is pleased only with such acts as are in accord with His Word. Hence, though Scripture does not state when and how God instituted the offerings, yet it is certain that He did institute them.

But even among them who hold that God is the originator of the sacrifices, there is a difference of opinion, namely, how God instituted them. Some hold that the necessity of bringing offerings was written in man's heart by God, even as the law. The reason given is that the heathen, too, bring offerings; and although their offerings differ, yet the mere fact that they bring them shows that they felt

1. Luther: "Das heisst eigentlich Abgoetterei anrichten, ohne gottes Gehiess, aus eigener Andacht einen Gottesdienst vornehmen." XIV, 37.

a necessity for them, and hence this necessity must have been written in their hearts.

Others, again, modify this view to the extent of saying that not since the beginning of the world, but since the beginning of sin, man has the inherent feeling, that he owes something to the deity, that he must do something to regain that favor which has lost through his sin, that he must bring an offering, so that God may know that he is earnestly endeavoring to be God's friend. Because the heathen did not know what to offer, they naturally hit upon the most varied objects for that purpose.

A few lonesome kernels of truth are contained in these views; the most of it is manifest error. It was written in the hearts of the first parents before the fall that all that they had was a gracious gift of God, and that it was their duty to live entirely to him, that their life was to be a continual eucharistic offering to their Lord and Maker, and that this offering was pleasing to Him. But we cannot say that God wrote into their hearts at creation that He required of them certain definite acts of offering. Scripture gives us no basis for such a view. It is also true that when the heathen bring offerings to their gods, they do it with the mistaken notion that they thereby regain the favor of their supposed deities. But that does not prove that this was written in their hearts after the fall into sin; if that were the case, children would need no instruction to bring offerings, for they would know that of themselves.

All attempts at establishing the manner in which gave the ordinance for offering are and must remain conjecture. Scripture is quiet on that point. And the same holds true of the question: "When did God institute offerings," The most common conjecture is that it took place on the occasion when God slew animals to make a covering of skins for the two fallen parents.

All that we can therefore say with certainty is that the origin of offerings lies with God.

The basis of offerings we find in Ex. 23, 15: "None shall appear before me empty," $\text{H } \Phi \text{ ? } \sim \text{J } \Phi \text{ } \text{JH } \Gamma \sim \text{H } \Phi \text{ ?} = \text{'and not shall my face be viewed emptily'}$. And this prohibition is repeated Deut. 16, 17 where it is added: "Every man shall give as he is able - $\text{J } \Gamma \sim \text{H } \Phi \text{ ?}$ according to the gift of his hand--according to the blessing of the Lord thy God which He hath given thee." The wicked says: "What is the almighty that we should serve him? What profit should we have, if we pray unto him?" Job 21, 15. The pious, on the contrary, is driven by an irresistible impulse to seek his origin, and knows that as certainly as he is created in the image of God, as certainly he dare not appear before his Creator empty, but must return to him. what he has received; he knows that if he does not bring offerings, he abnegates his human dignity and lowers himself to the level of the irrational creature, which consumes the gifts of God with serene indifference; which only takes, but never gives. The prophets describe 'conamone', how the beasts ravage the once proud metropolis of the world. As a righteous retribution, they took the place of the gener-

ations of men which had become brutalized, and refused any longer to sacrifice. The duty and impulse to make offerings becomes stronger in proportion as God's prevenient gifts are greater. -- Hengstenberg, Ev. K. Z. 113.

The fundamental idea of sacrifices in general is also apparent from the most general term for offerings, זָבַח = 'oblation,' 'offering,' a generic term for all kinds of offerings, animal, vegetable, or even gold and silver. It is derived from זָבַח 'to approach', Hiph. זָבַח = 'to cause to approach', 'to bring near.'" Mark. 7, 11: $\text{Κορβάν ὁ ἐστὶ δῶρον}$. In Ex. 28, 38 and others also זָבַח occurs, from זָבַח = 'to give'. It corresponds to our English: 'offering' and the German 'Opfer', from the Latin: 'offere'. Hence an offering is something that is brought as a gift. In a narrow sense it signifies those gifts, which are brought to God or the idol in worship, consisting of grain, animals, human beings, and other valuables. In a general sense it signifies any possession, which is dedicated to another with self denial, whether it be energies of body and soul, time, comfort, honor, etc. Thus it also refers to things not brought to God. So it is used for the sacred treasure, which consisted of the free-will offerings of Israel, Num. 7, 3ff.

The fundamental idea of offerings in general may also be seen by considering the idea underlying the offerings recorded in the Bible before the Mosaic law-giving. The first offering is that of Cain and Abel, recorded Gen. 4, 3-5. Cain brought of the fruit of

the ground an offering unto the Lord, and Abel brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. Both of these offerings are designated by the same term הָהִנְיָה , from the Ar. manaha donavit (Koenig). This term has various usages. It describes a gift or token of friendship, Is. 39, 1: "At that time Merodach-baladan, the son of Baladan, king of Babylon, sent letters and a present (הָהִנְיָה) to Hezekiah." It furthermore signifies an act of homage, 1 S. 10, 27: "And they despised him and brought him no presents" (הָהִנְיָה). 1 K. 10, 25: "And they brought every man his present (הָהִנְיָה)." It signified tribute. Judg. 3, 15: "By him (Ehud) the children of Israel sent a present (הָהִנְיָה) unto Eglon, king of Moab." It is used also of propitiation for friend wronged, Gen. 32, 13: "He took of that which came to his hand a present (הָהִנְיָה) for Esau his brother," and v. 19: "I will appease him with the present that goeth before me." Finally it signifies also a gift to procure favor or assistance, Gen. 43, 11ff; Hos. 10, 6. Here in Gen. 4, 3-4 it means simply a gift of presentation to God, applied to both bloody and bloodless offerings.

Abel's offering was pleasing to God;¹ Cain's offering was displeasing. Many reasons have been given for this difference between

1. Luther: "Das Wort הָהִנְיָה ist ein weitlaeufig Wort. Es gebraucht dieses Wortes Jesiaas, 17, 7: 'Zu der Zeit wird sich der Mensch halten zu dem, der ihn gemacht hat,' Item 66, 12: 'Auf den Knieen wird man euch freundlich halten.' Denn das meint er, dass wenn eine Mutter ihr Kind auf dem Schoss haelt, erzeigt sie ihm eine froehlich und liebliche Geberde. Ein solch Erzeigen wird durch dieses Wort angezeigt, darum greift es viel weiter um sich, denn das Wort 'sehen'. Denn wenn eine Mutter ein Kind ansieht, erzeigt sie ihm zugleich sine lachende und fœundliche Geberde, als die das Kind lieb habe. Man hat aber in der Deutschen Spraceh kein Wort, damit man dies eigentlich und vollkoemlich geben koennte, so weiss ich in der lateinischen Sprache auch keins." I, 308.

the two offerings. Some try to find it in the fact that Abel's was a bloody sacrifice,¹ Cain's a bloodless one and conclude therefrom that Abel had believed that the blood of the animal signified the blood 'of the son of man,' while Cain did not think of that. In other words, Abel's offering was propitiatory, Cain's was not. But there is no indication in the text that the difference was of that nature, in fact, the common term *הִזְבֵּחַ* argues against this view. Others say that it is written of Abel that he picked out the firstlings of his flock, the best, while Cain brought merely of the fruit of the ground, the self-righteous Jews saying that it was chaff and not grain. They who hold this view judge the two offerings according to their value. These views are not tenable. Abel did, of course, believe in the future shedding of blood by the promised Messiah, but there is no indication in the text that the shedding of blood in Abel's offering was the prime and deciding factor. Thus the difference between the two offerings lies not in their material or value, but in the disposition of the heart in which they were brought.

This is clearly brought out by the author of Hebrews, who says: "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts." Thus it is clear that the position which God took over against these offerings was not actuated by the offerings themselves, their comparative value, but by the disposition of the heart. God looked at the motives with which the offerings were brought. This is

1. Entirely unfounded is the view that Abel's offering was also a bloodless one and consisted only in the wool and the milk of the animals.

also indicated by the position of the words in Gen. 4, 4.5: "The Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering: But unto Cain and to his offering he had not respect." God first looked at the person and then at the offering. In so doing God saw that Abel had faith, and that faith was the motive for his offering. On the contrary he found that Cain had no faith, but this offering came from a different motive, and hence Cain's offering displeased Him. This is also shown by the Lord's reply to Cain: "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted?" Gen. 4, 7. And this difference in the disposition of the heart is indicated by the difference in the choice of gifts. Cain merely brought of the fruit of the ground. Abel, however, made a careful selection of his best specimens. He chose the 'firstlings', 'the firstborn of the flock,' and the fattest ones, ? being explicative, Ges. #155, 1a, not the first ones he happened to find. Abel's offering was a self-offering; in the offering Abel brought to the Lord his heart full of faith and love and gratitude. Cain's offering on the contrary was a kind of commutation, based on a calculation of profit and loss, a selfish investment. His heart he kept back for himself and for sin; but he believed that he would make use of the Lord in his tilling of the soil, he considered it dangerous to be on bad terms with his God, and therefore, in the interest of his selfishness, the father of all soulless worship so far overcame his selfishness, as to offer to his Creator a small portion of the fruits of the earth by way of compensation. -- Hengstenberg, Ev. K. Z. p. 114.

From the name and the nature of these two offerings we conclude that Cain and Abel felt the impulse to offer unto God a portion of the produce of their daily occupation as a fruit of the blessing which God had bestowed upon the work of their hands. Hence the fundamental idea underlying these sacrifices is thanksgiving and prayer, and not propitiation.^{1.}

After Noah had left the ark and once more set foot on dry land, he "built an altar unto the Lord; and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the altar." Ge. 8, 20. The purpose of this offering certainly was to thank God for his gracious preservation. - Also here nothing is said of propitiation, and Noah, already before the Flood, was declared to be a just man, Gen. 6, 9: "Noah was a just man and perfect in his generations, and Noah walked with God." So also the fundamental idea of this offering is thanksgiving and prayer.

Furthermore all of the patriarchs repeatedly brought offerings unto the Lord. Abraham came from a land and an age when sacrifices and religion were practically identical.. No mention is made of his offerings at Ur and Haran, but upon his arrival at Shechem he erected an altar in consequence of an appearance of Jehovah. The altar is always connected with the idea of offering. This is clearly seen

1. "Es ist nicht der Wunsch nach Vergebung der Sünde, welcher Adams Soehne zum Opfern trieb; denn von Sühne ist bei diesen Opfern gar nicht die Rede, und die Ansicht, dass Abel durch Tödtung des Tieres ein Bekenntnis der Todeswürdigkeit seiner Sünde zu erkennen gegeben, ist von dem mos. Sühnopfern willkürlich in unsere Stelle hineingetragen." Keil, Comm. ueber Buecher Mosis, I, 84.

from the Hebrew word for 'altar', מִזְבֵּחַ , from חָטַט , 'to slaughter'. Hence: 'the place for that which is slaughtered.' Thus we read of the erection of an altar, that necessarily includes the carrying out of the purpose for which the altar was erected, namely the offering of that which is slaughtered. Here the offering was clearly brought as a result of the glorious promise of the Lord: "Unto thy seed will I give this land." Hence the purpose of the offering was to express thanksgiving and adoration. The same thing occurred at Bethel, Gen. 12, 8, where we are told that Abraham again erected an altar to the Lord, and informed that he "called upon the name of the Lord," or as Luther gives the sense of the passage: "Und predigte von dem Namen des Herrn." In fact, throughout the history of the Patriarchs we find that the erection of an altar is usually the consequence of an appearance of Jehovah, and the altar marks the spot as a place of true Jehovah worship and adoration.¹ Upon his return from Egypt, Abraham again worshipped at the altar at Bethel and again it is stated that he "called on the name of the Lord," Gen. 13, 14-18. The attempted sacrifice of Isaac is an extraordinary offering, being made in obedience to the command of God. The purpose was to ascertain the extent of Abraham's fear of and devotion to God, Gen. 22, 12. It taught the right spirit of offering, namely whole hearted devotion to God which is prepared for any amount of self denial,

1. "Abraham und die Patriarchen ueberhaupt hatten ohne Zweifel auch die Bedeutung einer lebendigen Busspredigt fuer die Kanaaniter, wie Noah eine solche war fuer seine Zeit." Lange, Comm. zur. Gen., p.203.

and it taught also that God does not desire human sacrifice. Of propitiation as the fundamental idea nothing is mentioned.

At this place we may also include the offerings of Job who is represented as living in the patriarchal age. He, too, offered sacrifices, Job 1, 5: "And it was so, when the days of their feasting were gone about, that Job sent and sanctified them, and rose up early in the morning, and offered burnt offerings according to the number of them all: for Job said, It may be that my sons have sinned, and cursed God in their hearts." His purpose, according to this, was to atone for possible sin. Thus these sacrifices of Job had the fundamental idea of expiation. The same may be said of the sacrifices of his friends, Job. 42, 7-9.

Isaac seems to have had a permanent altar at Beersheba and to have regularly offered sacrifices there. Again the phrase occurs: "He called upon the name of the Lord," Gen. 26, 25.

The first recorded offering of Jacob was the pouring of oil on the stone at Bethel, Gen. 28, 18. The purpose was not to make of the stone an object of worship, but a memorial of the grace of God which he had experienced. Thanksgiving and adoration were his motives. Again after his covenant with Laban (Gen. 31, 54) he offered sacrifices, הֲזָרָה , 'a slaughtered animal', after which both parties partook of a sacrificial meal. The purpose here was to signify the establishing of the covenant. Again Jacob erected an altar at Shechem, Gen. 33, 20. This, too, was purely an act of devotion and worship as is apparent from the name which Jacob applied to it,

אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל = 'God the God of Israel'. He also worshipped
 at Bethel, Gen. 35, 7. Here the reason is expressly stated: 'because
 there God appeared unto him, when he fled from the face of his brother.'
 It was an act of thanksgiving for his deliverance, and a commemora-
 tion of the Lord's revelation. Likewise at Beersheba Jacob "offered
 sacrifices unto the God of his father Isaac," Gen. 46, 1. This was
 also an act of worship and devotion, being performed at a place desig-
 nated for that purpose.

The offering of Jethro in the desert, Ex. 18, 12 was likewise
 an act of homage and devotion to the true God of Israel, not an act of
 propitiation.

Thus the fundamental idea underlying the offerings in the pre-
 Mosaic age is apparent. The sacrifices of the Patriarchs are chiefly
 connected with prayer. When we read of the erection of an altar, we
 hear of the "calling on the name of the Lord." In all the great
 occasions of their lives, after every manifestation of divine preser-
 vation and blessing the patriarchs held a special service with offering
 and prayer, e.g. Abraham after his arrival in Canaan, Gen. 12, 7, and
 the first revelation from God in the new land, and again after his
 return from Egypt, Gen. 13, 4. This close connection between sacri-
 fice and prayer is further evident from such passages as Hos. 14, 2:
 "Take away all iniquity, and receive us graciously, so will we render
 the calves of our lips." Also Heb. 13, 15: "By him therefore let us
 offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit
 of our lips, giving thanks (confessing) to his name." "In accordance

with the tendency to symbolism characteristic of ancient times, with the need so deeply felt by men in an age when fancy and the perceptions of sense were all prevailing, to see in an outward shape that which inwardly stirred their souls, prayer took to itself a body in sacrifice. This, however, does not exhaust its significance. Men desired, it is true, to see their inward feelings outwardly embodied and represented, but, at the same time, another impulse also was at work, namely, the wish to give a pledge for the reality and earnestness of what was inwardly experienced, and thus to secure themselves against self-deception. Samuel's parents, for example, wished to devote their son to the Lord. That was an inward act, but the prayer in which they presented him to the Lord did not fully satisfy the impulse of their heart. They felt compelled to give a proof of their sincerity by the presentation of a burnt-offering of three bullocks. Such a disposition to furnish a tangible pledge of sincerity dwells in us as well as in the men of Old Testament days, only the mode of expression is different. For example, when some great mercy had been vouchsafed unto us, the mere offering of thanks to God in prayer does not content us. We feel impelled to prove the sincerity of our thankfulness by devoting to the Lord a portion of our substance. Such is the origin of very many charitable foundations." Hengstenberg, Ev. K. Z. 113.

Thus the offerings in the pre-mosaic age were essentially self-sacrifices expressing gratitude and devotion. This offering of oneself to the Lord in a spiritual way is done through prayer; in a

physical way it is done through the act of bringing offerings.

Hence the fundamental idea underlying sacrifices in general is not propitiation, but heartfelt and whole-souled devotion and thanksgiving.^{1.}

But did the element of propitiation play no part in these offerings?^{2.} The original idea of sacrifice seems to have been that of a gift to the Deity, a conception that does not necessarily presuppose sin. Hence also Adam and Eve before the fall could and probably did bring offerings. But this idea was substantially altered when, in consequence of the sin of man, man could no longer appear before his Maker with that whole hearted confidence and sincere trust that was a characteristic of his holy state in Paradise. In consequence of sin man could no longer come to God, but had to hide at his approach, Gen. 3, 8. He could no longer bring offerings to Him.^{2.} Before this could again happen, the sinner's guilt and stain had to be removed from before the eyes of the Lord. This man was unable to do. But God in his grace had already ordained a means whereby propitiation could be made. And this he announced to the fallen parents in a wonderful word of promise, Gen. 3, 15. Not being bound by space

1. "So war bei allen vormosaischen Opfern der Schrift nicht das Gefuehl der von Gott trennenden Suende, sondern der Drang der Liebe und Dankbarkeit fuer empfangene Gnade und Segensspenden Motiv zur Darbringung und sie beseelender Grundgedanke." Keil, R.-G. Zeitschr. 1857, p. 55.

2. "Gott gefallen die Opfer nicht, wenn sie nicht von einer solchen Person dargebracht werden, die vorher gerecht und Ihm wohlgefaellig ist." Luther 6, 836.

and time, God viewed this propitiation as already effected. All that the sinful men needed was to accept the fruits of this propitiation with the hand of faith, Faith was all that was required to restore the sinner to grace of God. Hence God did not ordain sacrifices as a means of propitiation, but merely faith in the word of promise. Having that faith, they could again appear before God with their offerings of praise and devotion and thanksgiving. Adam and Eve gladly embraced this hope held out to them and diligently taught their children the word of the Lord.¹ Thus it is that the offerings of Abel and Noah and the Patriarchs proved acceptable to God, namely, because they had faith in the promise. Hence the idea of propitiation lay not in the offerings, but in that which necessarily had to precede the offerings, faith in the promise. Hence the view that propitiation is the fundamental idea of offerings in general is false and misleading.

And here lies the difference between the offerings of God's people and those of the heathen. God's people had the proper means of propitiation, namely faith in the Word of promise. On the basis of that faith they can bring true God-pleasing offerings. The heathen

L. "Weil Adam und Eva des Heiligen Geistes voll und erleuchtet sind mit der Erkenntnis des zukuenftigen Heilandes Christi, predigen sie von solcher Hoffnung zukuenftiger Erloesung ihren Kindern, und vermahnem sie, dass sie so einem guetigen und gnaedigen Gott Dankbarkeit erzeigen. Denn dass sie auf keine andere Meinung ihre Opfer angerichtet und gehalten haben, ist gewiss." Luther I, 302f.

also feel the need or religious worship, but not having the true means of propitiation, they think up means of their own, with varied results.^{1.}

1. Luther: "Die menschliche Natur is so, dass sie nicht ohne Gottesdienst sein kann. Wenn sie daher das Wort nicht hat, so erdenkt sie solche Dinge, wie sie die Exempel sowohl der Heiden als auch des Pabstes zeigen." V, 552.

"Die ganze Welt sucht mit Gott ausgesoehnt zu sein; daher hat immer einer andere Arten der Versoehnung, als der andere ausgedacht." IX, 1026 (Walch).

The Mosaic Offerings and their Symbolical Significance.

During the sojourn of the children of Israel in Egypt, offerings practically ceased, because such offerings were an abomination to the Egyptians, Ex. 8, 25.26: "And Pharaoh called for Moses and Aaron, and said, Go ye, sacrifice to your God in the land. And Moses said, It is not meet so to do; for we shall sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians to the Lord our God; lo, shall we sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians before their eyes, and will they not stone us?"

But when the Exodus had taken place and Israel was on its way to take possession of the promised land, the time had come for Israel to be taken up into the covenant with the Lord. Israel was now to be the chosen people of God. Their government was to be purely theocratic. God was their king, their lawgiver. As such he required of them obedience to His mandates. All this took place on Mt. Sinai at the giving of the Law. Israel was there placed into a positive relationship with the Lord, which promised them the possession and enjoyment of the gracious blessings which had been promised to the Patriarchs on the condition that they fulfill the commandments of their God. But this promise would have been of little benefit to the chosen people because of its sinful nature, if God in His mercy had not offered them a means, by which they could obtain not only forgiveness for their transgressions and omissions of the covenant duties, but also grace and salvation without their own works. This the offerings which had been customary until that time could not do. 'Tis true, they had satisfied the religious consciousness of the

Patriarchs. But they were not sufficient for the Israelites in his new relationship to God. He was placed under a strict law and knew that the promise of the blessings was dependent upon the fulfillment of the commandments. He also knew his own weakness, and that punishment awaited the transgressor. Hence the offerings as they were could not quiet his conscience, unless they were made by the word and promise of God to be an institution which would serve that purpose. To that end the sacrificial system was so extended and perfected as the purpose and aim of the theocratic covenant required it. To the customary burnt- and thank offerings were added the propitiatory offerings, which did not exist before the Mosaic law went into effect.

All the sacrifices can be divided into two classes: a) propitiatory and b) eucharistic. The propitiatory sacrifices make satisfaction for guilt and punishment, i.e. they reconcile God or appease God's wrath, or merit remission of sin for others. The eucharistic sacrifices do not merit remission of sins or reconciliation, but are rendered by those who have been reconciled, in order that they may give thanks, or return gratitude for the remission of sins that has been received.^{1.} In this twofold division the older theologians agree.^{2.}

-
1. "In the law certain sacrifices were named propitiatory on account of their significance or similitude; not because they merited the remission of sins before God, but because they merited the remission of sins according to the righteousness of the Law, in order that those for whom they were made might not be excluded from the people of Israel. Therefore they were called sin-offerings or burnt-offerings for a trespass. Whereas the eucharistic sacrifices were the oblation, the drink-offering, thank offerings, first fruits, tithes." Trigl. 389, 19.20.
 2. J. Gerhard: Vulgariter dividitur sacrificium in ἱλαστικόν et εὐχαριστικόν. In illo typus proponebatur unci sacrificii propitiatorii, in ara crucis a Christo offerendi, in hoc vero populus Israeliticus suam obedientiam ac gratitudinem Deo probabat." Loci, VI, p. 9--ed. Cotta.

We find that those who have treated the ritual and significance of offerings draw a sharp line of distinction between propitiatory offerings and eucharistic offerings, and attribute to the latter no expiatory significance whatever.

According to the Mosaic system the bloody offerings comprise the sin offerings, trespass offerings, burnt offerings, and peace offerings. Under the bloodless sacrifices belong the meat and drink offerings.

Having a false conception of the basic idea of offerings, some theologians find in the Mosaic system only bloody sacrifices, and deprive the bloodless offerings of their independent character. They view the meat and drink offerings as mere adjuncts of the bloody offerings. Thus Baehr¹ and Kurtz². They base their assumption on Num. 15, 1-12 (28, 1f; 29, 1f). Here it is commanded that when Israel offers a sacrifice, be it burnt offering, or because of a vow, or a free will offering, or at a special feast, then also a meat offering should be brought, whereupon the quantity of this meat offering is regulated according to the nature of various animals brought in

-
1. "Die unblitigen Opfer stehen zu den blutigen in einemvoellig untergeordneten Verhaeltnisse, fehlen bei zwei Gattungen, der Suend- und Schuldopfern, wahrscheinlich ganz, und erscheinen bei den andern beiden als blosse Zugabe, wie aus der Hauptstelle Num. 15, 1-12, (28, 1f; 29, 1f) erhellt." Baehr, Symbolic II, S. 199.
 2. "Das Mosaische Gesetz unterscheidet mehre Arten von Opfern. Am angefaelligsten ist der Unterschied der blutigen und unblutigen Opfer. Jedoch bilden die letzteren keine besondern, selbstaendigen Opfer, sondern erscheinen stets, wie dies spaeter zu erwaissen sein wird, als integrirende Zugabe zu einzelnen blutigen Opferarten." Kurtz, Mos. Opfer, S. 5.

sacrifice. The same regulation is found in regard to the feast offerings of the whole year, Num. 28 and 29. But nowhere is it indicated that these meat offerings are mere adjuncts to the animal offerings. They are certainly designated as independent offerings. Only the quantity of the material is regulated according to the animal offerings. If we would want to follow through the rule that meat offerings are only additions to the animal offerings, we would have to conclude from the passages which prescribe that a burnt offering accompany the sin offering, that the burnt offerings are merely an adjunct of the sin offerings.

That the meat- and drink offerings were of an independent character is shown by the fact that they are frequently designated by

הַחֵלֶב וְהַיַּיִן וְהַזֶּהֱבֵן. Thus in Josh. 22, 23 and Jer. 33, 18 הַזֶּהֱבֵן, הַחֵלֶב and הַיַּיִן are coordinated. Furthermore their independent character is shown by the sacrificial system according to Lev. 1-7, where sin-, trespass-, burnt-, peace-, and meat offerings are treated as absolutely coordinate. And finally the independent character of the meat offerings is apparent from the fact that it sometimes stands alone, without animal sacrifices. Such an instance is the offering of jealousy, Num. 5, 15, which Kurtz includes under the meat offerings, but designates as an exception to the rule.¹ Also in Lev. 6, 12ff. 19ff a meat

1. Gegen die Auffassung des Eiferopfers als eines Speisopfers kann nur der Umstand geltend gemacht werden, dass sonst das Speisopfer nie als ein selbstaendiges erscheint, sondern immer als Zugabe zu einem Brand- oder Dankopfer. Indess Umstaende koennen die Sache aendern, und die Regel zur Ausnahme gestalten. Es zeigt sich bald, dass hier ein vorangehendes blutiges Opfer durchaus unpassend war. Es handelte sich hier garnicht um Siehne, weder um specielle, die durch ein Suend- oder Schuldopfer, noch um allgemeine, die durch ein Dank- oder Brandopfer zu seuhnen gewesen waere." Kurtz, Mos. Opfer, p. 329, Note.

offering is prescribed for the priests, to be brought as $\text{קָדְשׁוֹן} \text{קָדְשׁוֹן}$ (Heb. v. 13), 'a gift of extension or duration', i.e. every morning and every evening during the seven days of their consecration, entirely independent of the sin-, burnt-, and peace offerings prescribed for the consecration itself, Ex. 29 and Lev. 8.

With the establishment of the meat- and drink offerings as having an independent character, it will be seen that the view that all sacrifices in the Mosaic system have expiatory significance¹ is entirely false.

These Mosaic offerings were given by God, hence must have had a purpose. This purpose may be summed up as follows: The offerings of the Old Testament preached to every Israelite that he was a transgressor of the commandments of God; that as unclean he could not approach God; that he had offended God and contracted a debt which had to be paid; that God hates a sinner and will not suffer him in His presence; that God is righteous and punishes sin by death; but also that God is gracious and will accept the sinner in spite of his sin; that God, however, will not do this at the expense of his holiness and righteousness; that wrath and curse must take its course; that something must be applied to appease God's wrath; that death must be endured either by the sinner or a substitute; that God Himself had

1. Baehr draws the conclusion from Lev. 17, 11: "dass dem mosaischen Opfer ueberhaupt und im allgemeinen jedenfalls die Idee der Suedne zu Grunde liegt, und davon nicht getrennt werden darf." Symbolik II, p. 202.

provided such a substitute; that this substitute was represented by the sacrificial animal and was none other than the promised Messiah; that the death of Christ was the only real atoning sacrifice; that Christ would give Himself as sacrifice for all transgressions; that God would make Christ to be the sacrifice, and punish all sins in Him; that all atoning sacrifices of the Old Testament receive their power from the sacrifice of Christ, of which they are the shadow.^{1.}
 Trigl. 390f.

In answer to the question: Why did God ordain so many and varied offerings in the service of the Old Testament? Stock has the following:

1) That Israel might be held in check. For if there had been but one kind of offering, which had always been repeated in the same manner and with the same ceremonies, Israel would soon have become negligent and careless.

2) That Israel might realize the imperfection and insufficiency of these offerings for atonement from the fact that they were to be brought in large numbers and at frequent intervals. They showed that they could not 'per se' remove sin and work reconciliation.

3) That Israel might be led to the one perfect sacrifice of the

1. "Der Opferkultus war fuer das Volk eine vortreffliche Schule, in welcher es die hoechsten Realitaeten kennen lernen sollte. Aufs Eindringlichste mussten ihm diese nicht leicht zu leistenden Opfer seine Abhaengigkeit von Gott, die Heiligkeit des Herrn, die eigene Suendhaftigkeit, die verhaengnisvillen Wirkungen der Suende und die Notwendigkeit einer Suehnung derselben, ebenso aber auch die Freundlichkeit, Gnade und Barmherzigkeit Gottes einpraegen. In diesen Zeremonien shaltete sich schon das selige Geheimniss der durch Christus vollbrachten Erloesung ab." v. Orelli in Zellers Bibl. Handwoerterbuch, unter 'Opfer'.

Messiah, which was to atone for the sins of the entire world, also for their sins.

4) To typify and foreshadow the many blessings which Christ was to bring about by his perfect sacrifice. Reallexikon, 861.

According to the purpose for which the offerings were brought we can divide them into a) offerings which were to effect the restoration of the theocratic communion of Israel with its God, which had been disrupted by transgression, or the readmittance into the state of grace, and b) offerings brought by such who were in the state of grace and were to bring about vivification and strengthening of the communion of Israel with Jehovah and the blessed enjoyment of divine grace. Under a) belong the sin- and trespass offerings, under b) the burnt-, peace-, meat-, and drink offerings.¹

With the lawgiving on Sinai the offerings became the center of the divine worship and from that time on the eyes of Israel were focused upon them.

1. So Berkhof: "The law speaks of two kinds of sacrifices that presuppose a disturbed relationship of man to his God, and the aim at restoring the right relationship, viz. the sin-offering and the trespass-offering." p. 145.

"Then there were four kinds of sacrifices that presupposed a right relation between man and his God, offerings that spoke of consecration and communion. Two of these, viz. the burnt offering and the peace offering were bloody, while the other two, viz. the meat-offering and the drink-offering were unbloody. The idea of expiation was indeed subordinate but not altogether absent from these bloody sacrifices; it was entirely foreign to the bloodless ones, however." p. 147.

Before proceeding to the consideration of the various kinds of Mosaic offerings, we shall treat of certain features common to them all.

The Location of the Offerings.

In accordance with Ex. 23, 15: 'None shall appear before me empty,' or literally, 'my face shall not be viewed emptily,' the place where the offerings were to be brought was 'before the face of Jehovah,' that place where Israel could see his face. God had designated a certain place where He was to be sought, Deut. 12, 5-7: "But unto the place whith the Lord your God shall choose out of all your tribes to put His name there, even unto His habitation shall ye seek, and thither thou shalt come; and thither ye shall bring your burnt offerings, and your sacrifices, and your tithes, and heave offerings of your hand, and your vows, and your free will offerings, and the firstlings of your herds and of your flocks; and there shall ye eat before the Lord your God, and ye shall rejoice in all that ye put your hand unto, ye and your households, wherein the Lord thy God hath blessed thee." Thus we find God's people offering at various places where God had manifested his presence. The story in Genesis proceeds on the theory that wherever opportunity was presented for sacrifice, there it was offered, 8, 20; 31, 54; Ex. 24, 4. No one fixed place seems to have been selected, Ex. 20, 24: "In all places where I record my name I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee." This freedom to offer sacrifices at any place recurs in the eschatological visions of the later prophets, Is. 19, 19ff: "In that day there shall be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to the Lord---and the Lord shall

be known to Egypt, and the Egyptians shall know the Lord in that day, and shall do sacrifice and oblation." Zeph. 2, 11: "Men shall worship him, every one from his place, even all the isles of the heathen." Mal. 1, 11: "In every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering."

In the pre-mosaic we find offerings brought at a great number of places. So Cain and Abel, Noah, the Patriarchs, Israel in Egypt, Jethro, and Moses, in the passages quoted above. These offerings, as we have seen, were usually brought upon an altar, which was erected at a place where God had previously manifested His presence. In fact, the altar was necessary for the offerings, Ex. 20, 24: "An altar of earth¹ thou shalt make unto me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt offerings, and thy peace offerings, thy sheep, and thine oxen."

1. The altar was in a sense God's table, at and around which the Holy One of heaven and the guilty children of dust might come together, and transact respecting life and blessing. But as such it must be a table peculiarly of blood, the place for things killed and slaughtered (hence called חֲזֵק from חָטַק = to kill or slaughter), for the way to fellowship with God, for guilty beings, could only be found thru an avenue of death. And since this table must thus perpetually bear on it the blood-stained memorials and fruits of sin, what so suitable for the material of which it was to be principally formed, as the naked dust of earth, or earth's unhews, unpolished stones, taken just as God and nature had provided them? For thus the worshippers might most easily discern the appointed place of meeting to be of God's providing, and His in such a sense, that no art or device of their could be of any avail to fit it for the highest end it was intended to serve, nay, that their workmanship, being that of sinful creatures, had rather a contrary tendency a polluting effect. Materials directly fashioned by the hand of God were alone suitable here, and these not of the more rare and costly description, but the simple earth, made originally for man's support and nourishment, but now the witness of his sin, the drinker in of the blood of his forfeited life, the theatre and home of death." Fairbairn, 255.

With the giving of the Law, regulations were also given for the erection of the tabernacle. At the door^{1.} of the tabernacle was placed the altar of burnt offerings or the brazen altar, Ex. 20, 24. 25; 38, 1-7. This tabernacle now became the place where God recorded his name, where His face was to be viewed, and the altar at the door of the tabernacle, the place where the offerings were to be brought,^{2.} Lev. 1, 3; 4, 4; 12, 6; 15, 14.29; 16, 7; 17, 2-6; 19, 21. It was henceforth to be the only legitimate place for offerings, and severe punishment was inflicted on any one who failed to heed this command, Lev. 17, 2-6: "What man soever there be of the house of Israel, that killeth an ox or lamb, or goat, in the camp, or that killeth it out of the camp, and bringeth it not unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, to offer an offering unto the Lord before the tabernacle of the Lord; blood shall be imputed unto that man; he hath shed blood; and that man shall be cut off from among his people." An example of God's wrath in this respect is the fate of Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, who offered strange incense to the Lord, in direct opposition to the prohibition, Ex. 20, 9: "Ye shall offer no strange incense," and were consumed by fire from the Lord, Lev. 10, 1.2.

-
1. "This altar (brazen altar) of sacrifice was to be the grand point of meeting between God and men as sinful, and only by first meeting there, and entering into a state of reconciliation and peace, could they afterwards be admitted into His house, as those who had the privilege of communion and fellowship with Him. " Fairbairn, p.255.
 2. Ex. 29, 42: "This shall be a continual burnt offering throughout your generations at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the Lord; where I will meet you, to speak there unto thee."

After the conquest Shiloh became the central sanctuary, where at certain seasons festivals were celebrated and Israel assembled to bring offerings, Judg. 21, 19; 1 S. 1, 3, 321; 2, 19.

But while the Law required that sacrifices should be offered only at the sanctuary and only by priests, the sons of Aaron, repeated mention is made of offerings being brought to the Lord, and that with acceptance, at a place elsewhere than at the sanctuary, and by a person who was not a descendant of Aaron. Thus the children of Israel offered at Bochim, Judg. 2, 5, in a penitential spirit¹ when rebuked by the angel of the Lord for their disobedience. Gideon built two altars in Ophrah and offered a bullock to the Lord, Judg. 6, 24-27. Manoah offered a kid upon a rock to the Lord, Judg. 13, 19.

These offerings at Bochim, and those of Gideon and Manoah, are readily accounted for by the extraordinary circumstances that called them forth. On all ordinary occasions the sanctuary was the place for sacrificial worship and this was to be offered only by the priests, who were especially charged with this service. But when God manifested Himself in an extraordinary manner in any place remote from the tabernacle, that place became for the time a sanctuary, and the person to whom He thus manifested Himself, a priest. The special prerogative of the priest is that he is authorized to 'come near' unto God, Num. 3, 10; 16, 5. 40; Ezek. 44, 15. 16; he, to whom

1. Bochim, בְּבֹחִים = Part. Qal. Act. of בָּכָה = 'to weep', hence: 'they who weep'.

God visibly appears and thus brings him near to Himself, is accordingly invested temporarily with a sacerdotal character. God must be worshipped wherever he appeared, and by whomsoever He honored by such special manifestation. Accordingly, whenever throughout the Book of Judges the Lord or the Angel of the Lord appeared to men, they offered sacrifices on the spot; and no sacrifices were offered elsewhere than at the sanctuary or by any other than a priest, except upon the occasion of such a special manifestation of the divine presence." Green, Higher Cr. of the Pentateuch, p. 151f.

Furthermore offerings could be brought anywhere in the presence of the ark of the covenant. The ark was the symbol of the Lord's presence. It was the ark in the tabernacle which made the latter a holy place. And when the ark was taken from the tabernacle, it was still the throne of God. Wherever the ark was, there was the symbol of God's presence, and hence when the ark was at Bethel, Judg. 20, 26.27, or when it came back from the Philistines to Beth-shemesh, 1 S. 6, 14, offerings were brought to the Lord. And so when David was transporting the ark to Zion, oxen and fatlings were sacrificed before it (2 S. 6, 13).

But we find Samuel bringing offerings, 1 S. 7, 9.17; 11, 15, away from the ark and the tabernacle, and without any special divine manifestation having been made. "This was again because of the peculiar circumstances of the case. In consequence of the sins of Eli's sons, and in general the wickedness of both priests and people, God suffered the sacred ark to be taken captive by the Philistines.

The removal of the symbol of His presence was significant of God's forsaking Shiloh and forsaking His people, Ps. 78, 59-61. 67. 68; Jer. 7, 12; 26, 6.9. The Philistines were compelled by the heavy plagues sent upon them to return the ark. But the ark was not taken back to Shiloh, which the Lord had so signally rejected as His abode. It was hid away in the seclusion of a private house until the favor of the Lord should again return to His people. God had abandoned the sanctuary, and there was thenceforth no legitimate sanctuary in Israel until the ark was taken to Zion, and the Lord chose that for his abode. During this period, when Israel was without a divinely sanctioned sanctuary, Samuel, as God's prophet and representative, by divine authority, assumed the functions of the degenerate priesthood, and sacrifices were offered on high places." Green, Higher Cr. of the Pent., p. 152f.

In addition to this we find many private sacrifices; Jesse's household, 1 S. 20, 6, a yearly 'feast'. 2 S. 15, 12; 2 K. 5, 17.19; Naaman takes earth with him from Palestine to his native land, to offer to the Lord thereon.

With removal of the ark to Jerusalem, Zion became the central sanctuary. With the building of Solomon's temple, the ark was removed from the tabernacle and housed in that magnificent edifice of antiquity. This now became the place which God had chosen to record His name there, 1 K. 8, 29, and henceforth was the only lawful place for offerings. We do indeed read of many offerings made on high places

after that, but they were plainly instances of disregard of the law and were not divinely sanctioned but severely punished, 1 K. 12, 28ff: Jeroboam set up two calves at Bethel and Dan, which were to take the place of the temple at Jerusalem. For this act Jeroboam is repeatedly arraigned in Scripture as the man 'who sinned and made Israel to sin.' Also 2 K. 17, 16: The worship of Baal and other deities, which was severely censured and led to the final complete destruction of the Northern Kingdom. These offerings were illegal and regarded as such, and pious princes endeavored to suppress them with varying success, until at last Hezekiah, and more effectually still, Josiah, succeeded in abolishing them.

From the repeated violation of the law critics argue its non-existence. It is claimed that history shows that the laws of the Pentateuch were not in fact obeyed; whence it is inferred that no such laws existed. It is admitted, of course, that there were numerous departures from God and repeated open violations or continued neglect of His laws. History records such instances and brands them in every case as wilful transgressions against God and his known law. It does not follow from the perpetration of murder and theft that the 5th and 7th commandments did not exist. Thus it is apparent that sacrifices were in repeated instances offered elsewhere than at the sanctuary; but whether these were justified by extraordinary circumstances, or whether they were irregular and condemned as such, they cannot disprove the existence of the law restricting sacrifice to one common altar in all ordinary cases. -- Green, Higher Cr. of Pent., p. 150.153.

That the law was in existence is shown by the repeated severe arraignment of Jeroboam: "Who made Israel to sin." Sin is a transgression of the law. His sin was that he ordered worship at a place other than that which God had ordained. Hence if the sin was there, the transgression was there, and if there was transgression, there also must have been a law which could be transgressed.

Thus the lawful place for offerings was the brazen altar at the door of the sanctuary of God, and in extraordinary cases any place where God manifested His presence and recorded His name.

The Material for the Offerings.

In accordance with the division of offerings into body and bloodless, the material was restricted to the products of cattle breeding and agriculture. The material for the offerings in the pre-Mosaic age was taken from these two classes. Cain brought his offering from the fruit of the ground, while Abel brought of the firstlings of his flock. Already in this first recorded offering the two classes are represented. Noah "took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl and offered burnt offerings on the altar," Gen. 8, 20. The same constituted the offerings of the Patriarchs, as the passages cited above will indicate. From these instances we see that animals and the fruits of the field as the result of labor constituted the material for offerings. And this is also the material for the Mosaic offerings.

The foundation is laid in Ex. 23, 15 and Deut. 16, 16f: 'No man shall appear before me empty.' When a person came before Jehovah, he was to appear not with empty hands, but with a gift, corresponding to the blessing which God had placed upon the labor of his hands. The $\frac{1}{7} \frac{9}{7} \frac{7}{7}$ was to be taken from the fruit of his labor. This fruit was the produce either of cattle breeding or of agriculture. According to this the material for offerings consisted in cattle, bullocks, sheep, and goats, and in grain, wine, and oil. From the fact that these three classes of animals and of vegetable matter constituted the most important products of Palestine we cannot draw the conclusion that they represented the total of the nation's property and wealth and this make the viewpoint of national property the principle in establishing the material for sacrifice.^{1.} The falsity of this conclusion is apparent when we consider the great limitation set upon the products of cattle breeding and agriculture as material for offerings. Not all of the products were permitted to be used. Only oxen, sheep, goats, and pigeons, corn, wine, and oil were acceptable material. They were the products of the regular occupation of the Israelites and also constituted their principal food. Property is much too general to be taken as the measure according to which the material was selected. In this conception of 'property'

1. "Nichts laesst sich aber weniger leugnen, als dass Korn oder Brot und Wein immer und allenthalben als vorzueglichste Nahrungsmittel und daher als Repraesentanten und Zuintessenz der Nahrung erscheinen, z.B., Gen. 27, 28, 37; Richt. 19, 19; Luc. 7, 33; u.v.a. St. Es heisse demnach willkuerlich verfahren, wenn man ihnen hier eine andere Bedeutung vindiciren wollte." Kurtz, S. 96.

one must also include fields and meadows, buildings, implements, which form the material basis of a nation's wealth. Also some of the products of labor were excluded, as e.g. the ass. And among the most important and noblest products of the agriculture of Palestine were the figs and pomegranates, as is apparent from Deut. 8, 8. If in determining the material for offerings the products of occupation as representing national possession and wealth had been the prevailing factor, the ass, figs and pomegranates could not have been excluded. This leads us to the idea of sustenance as the rule for determining the material. This is true of the material for the bloodless offerings.¹ And if this is true of the one class of offerings, it is also true of the other. The Mosaic system emphasizes this point also by repeatedly designating the offerings as $\text{לֶחֶם} \text{ וְיַיִן} \text{ וְחֵמֶר}$, Lev. 21, 6.8.17; 22, 25, or as $\text{לֶחֶם} \text{ וְיַיִן} \text{ וְחֵמֶר}$, Num. 28, 2.

This gift brought for an offering must be fit to represent the personality of the offerer.² Not all means of sustenance were suited for this purpose, but only those which were the product of his occupation, the fruit of the labor of his hands, in the work which God had assigned to him. As Keil points out, p. 62, God has assigned man

1. See note (1), page 37.

2. "Die Opfergabe soll nicht bloss das Leben als Substanz des Menschen abschalten, so dass es genuegte, den 'victus' als 'symbolum vitae' zu fassen, sondern bezweckt, das persoenliche Verhaeltniss 'des Menschen zu Gott zu betaetigen. Soll aber die Opfergabe diesem Zweck entsprechen, so muss sie auch geeignet sein, die Persoenlichkeit des Opfernden darzustellen." Keil, Die. O. des A. B., S. 61.

to work and labor not only to sustain this temporal life, but to support and strengthen this body and soul for eternal life. John 6, 27: "Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life."

If therefore the Israelite was to bring his offering from the result of his labor as cattle breeder or as husbandman, all wild animals and all uneatable tame animals were excluded. Doves were allowed only in spacial cases, and then only for the poor.¹ So also of the vegetable products the fruit of trees which is brought forth with little or no human care was excluded, while the fruit of vine and olive trees requires human attention before it becomes wine and oil.

Thus when the people of the covenant wished to bring an offering to their Lord in order to receive renewed strength, and to enjoy the blessings of their communion with Him, what could be a more fitting symbol for the consecration of their lives than just the offering of those materials whereby their life was sustained and which represented all his endeavor?

L. "In cases of extreme poverty, when the worshipper could not afford a proper sacrifice, the law permitted him to bring pigeons or turtle doves. ...That these rather than poultry are specified, the domestic fowls of modern times, arose from the manners prevalent among the ancient Israelites. These doves were, in fact, with them the tame, domesticated fowls, and in the feathered tribe corresponded to sheep and oxen among animals. No mention whatever is made of homebred fowls or chickens in Old Testament Scripture." Fairbarin, Typology, p. 262.

Human sacrifices were not permitted, as is apparent from the story of the attempted offering of Isaac, Gen. 22, because none such could be found free from guilt, and so they were utterly unfit for being presented as a substitute for sinful man. "But to make the gap between offerer and victim as small as possible--to secure that at least the animal natures of the two should stand in the nearest relation, the offerer was obliged to select his representative from the domestic animals of his own property, and of his own rearing--so far homogeneous that the flesh of the one was fit nutriment for the flesh of the other," Fairbairn, Typ., p. 261.

Representing therefore both the fruit and the substance of man's life, these prescribed materials chosen from the flock and from the field could best symbolize the surrender of human life to God.

"The reasons given for the choice of the victims being confined to flock and herd, such as that they were the more valuable, were more accessible, ever at hand, horned (emblematical of power and dignity) and such like, fall away of themselves, when the subject is viewed in its proper connection and bearings. It is, of course, quite easy to find many analogies in such respects between the victims and Christ, but they are rather beside the purpose and tend to lead away the mind from the main idea." Fairbairn, Typ. p. 261.

So also the notion which represents the materials of ancient offerings as property gifts, of which view discussed above, that they represent the total wealth of the nation, is an ingenious modification,

must be discarded as false. Its defection lies in the fact that it omits all reference to sin, punishment, substitution.

The material, of course, had to be the lawful property of the offerer, 2 S. 24, 24; stolen goods were not allowed, but to buy the material for the offering was permitted, and frequently occurred; Ezra 7, 17.22. David bought the threshing floor and the oxen from Araunah, 2 S. 24, 24. Even materials which foreign kings distributed were used by Israel in later times for its offerings, Ezra 6, 9.10.

Very strict regulations were set regarding the quality of this material. The animal brought for an offering had to be perfect in its kind, both as to age and character. It had to be free from physical faults, Lev. 22, 20-24, at least eight days old, Lev. 22, 27; Ex. 22, 30, and as a rule not more than three years of age. Blind, broken, maimed, ulcerous, scurried, scabbed, bruised, crushed, and castrated animals were excluded. In fact, the offering of a blemished animal was a sacrilege. Deut. 17, 1: "That is an abomination unto the Lord." Mal. 1, 6ff. The mother and her young might not be slaughtered on the same day, Lev. 22, 28. The first-born males were to be dilled within the first year, Deut. 15, 19ff. The animal for the burnt-offering, sin- and thankoffering had to be more than one year old, as also the pascal lamb, #x. 12, 5; 29, 38; Lev. 9, 3; 12, 6; 14, 10; 23, 12.19; Num. 6, 12.14; 7, 17.23; 15, 27; 28, 2.9.11.19.27. For doves and pigeons no age was set. Sometimes also the offering called for an animal that had neither done work

nor borne any yoke, as the Red Heifer in the preparation of the water of purification, Num. 19, 1-10; Deut. 21, 3.4.

Of the vegetable offerings the corn had to be of the earlier and better sort, Lev. 2, 14. The flour had to be of the choicest cereal, wheat, and of the finest quality. The oil had to be pure white olive oil from pure unripe berries. The frankincense also was to be white and pure. The wine for the drink offerings is not described or qualified. The שֶׁזַיִן ¹ mentioned in Num. 28, 7 was a beverage prepared from fruit or honey, according to Is. 5, 22 also mixed, or spiced. "Mit synekdochischer Verallgemeinerung auch vom Wein gesagt," Koenig, Woerterb.

Leaven and honey were excluded, Lev. 2, 11. Leaven² and honey³ are substances which indeed make human food more palatable, but also cause fermentation. They were therefore excluded, because

1. " שֶׁזַיִן bedeutet hier nicht: berauschendes Getraenk (s. zu Lev. 10, 9) sondern nur: kraeftiges Getraenk im Gegensatz zum Wasser als dem einfachen Getaenke. Denn das Trankopfer bestand nur in Wein, s. zu 15, 5ff, daher Ankelos שֶׁזַיִן 'vini veteris' umschreibt." Keil, Kommentar, S. 359.

2. 'Leaven' is often used as a picture of moral corruption. Luke 12, 1: $\text{ζύμη τῶν φαρισαίων, ἣτις ἐστὶν ὑπόκρισις}$. Gal. 5, 9: $\text{μικρὰ ζύμη ὄλον τὸ ψῆμα ὑμῶν}$, where the context clearly indicates the reference of the picture to spiritual and moral corruption.

3. Honey also has the characteristic that it makes sour, and this fact was known to the Hebrews, as the rabbinical שֶׁזַיִן from שֶׁזַיִן 'honey' means 'dulcedinemiadmiltere,' but then also 'corrumpere', 'fermentescere'.

the ferment of corruption dare not inhere in the spiritual food which man offers, i.e. the sanctification of his life. Instead of this, the vegetable offering was to be spiced with oil, incense, and salt. Especially the latter was never to be lacking Lev. 2, 13: "Neither shalt thou suffer the salt of the covenant of thy God to be lacking from thy meat offering; with all thine offerings thou shalt offer salt." The oil, which by its fatty constituents strengthens the organism of the body, is a symbol of the spirit of God, as is apparent from the ritual of anointing in the Old Testament, 1 S. 10, 1f; 16, 13f. Is. 61, 1 etc. Through the Spirit alone comes strength for sanctification. The incense represents in a sensible form prayer, which cannot be absent from a God-pleasing life. That incense symbolizes prayer is clearly indicated in Ps. 141, 2: "Let my prayer be set forth before thee as incense," Apoc. 5, 8: "golden vials full of odours (lit. incense *ὄνια μύρων*), which are the prayers of saints." The salt, which makes food palatable, and preserves it from putrefaction and decay, symbolizes the element which gives strength and prevents all impurity and hypocrisy in the life wholly consecrated to God.¹

This perfection of the material in every way was required not merely because it served to express the strength and purity of the

1. "The explanation of those solemn words 'all thy meat-offerings shalt thou season with salt, neither shalt thou suffer the salt of the covenant of thy God to be lacking from thy meat offering' (Lev. 2, 13), is given by Paul in Col. 4, 6: 'Let your speech be alway with grace, and seasoned with salt that ye may know how ye ought to answer every man.' According to this, salt designates grace, in contrast to the saltlessness of the natural state of man." Hengstenberg, Ev. K. Z., S. 141.

offerer's consecration, but especially because, in the case of the animal, its vigor and perfection was symbolical of the sinlessness that made it fit for the altar of God. Cf. 1 Pet. 1, 18. 19: "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." In the region of the animal life it was to be a fitting representative of what man should be-- what his real and proper representative must be, in the region of the moral and spiritual life. Any palpable defect or blemish, rendering it an imperfect specimen of the natural species it belonged to, would have visibly marred the image it was intended to present of the holy beauty which was sought by God first in man, and now in man's substitute." -- Fairbairn, Typology, p. 262.^{1.}

When the material for the offerings was fit by reason of its quality to be a substitute for the person of the offerer, two things were necessary before it could obtain this vicarious significance.

1. "Diese Vorschrift, deren natuerlicher Grund darin zu suchen, dass einerseits in der Gabe sich die Liebe auspraegen muss, welche das Schoenste und Beste spendet, andererseits aber auch nur eine fehlerlose und untadeliche Gabe eine fuer Gott den Heiligen und Vollkommenen geeignete Darbringung sein kann, schliesst die ethische Forderung in sich, dass, sofern in den Leibesfehlern sich ethische Gebrechen abspiegeln, der Mensch nur als tadellos (אֲדָמָה) und von ethischen Fehlern frei (אֲדָמָה) sich Gott dem Heiligen weihen und in die Gemeinschaft seines goettlichen Lebens eintreten kann. Auch kann diese Weihe und Hingabe nur dann rechter Art sein, wenn sie in der Energie des selbstaendigen und vollen Lebens geschieht, daher das Opfertier weder durch zu grosse Jugend als noch nicht vollkommen reif zum Leben, noch durch zu grosses Alter schon in seiner Lebenskraft gebrochen erscheinen sollte." Keil, Opfer des Alten Bundes, S. 64.

One was that God demanded such offerings from his people when they appeared before Him, and the other, that He instituted these offerings as vehicles of His grace; the offerings, according to the purpose for which they were brought, obtained for the offerer forgiveness of sins, and strength for a new and sanctified life, and enjoyment of peace and other blessings. If, however, the offerings were to attain this end, they could no longer be left to the individual, to be brought according to his own judgment, but had to be strictly regulated by God Himself. Thus God ordained not only that sacrifices be brought by every member of the covenant people, but also minutely prescribed every detail of the act, investing each one with its own particular significance.

The Method of Procedure.

We shall here consider only the method of procedure with regard to animal sacrifices; the disposition of the material for the bloodless offerings will be treated in the ritual for the meat- and drink offerings.

Five separate and significant acts constitute the process of sacrifice. 1) Leading the gift to the altar; 2) The imposition of hands; 3) The slaughtering of the animal; 4) The manipulation of the blood; 5) the disposal of the flesh.

1) The victim was led to the altar by the offerer himself. The offerer thereby signified that he was bringing it to the Lord as a gift, in order to become a partaker of the Lord's grace. There followed

2) The imposition of hands. This took place in the case of every animal offering, and only there. Only when pigeons constituted the material, this part of the ceremony was omitted. Thus we find this prescription essentially connected with the great idea of sacrifice, and given as a general direction before each of the several kinds of bloody offerings, except the trespass-offering (Lev. 1, 4; 3, 2; 4, 4. 15; 16, 21. Also 2 Chron. 29, 23). The fact that it is omitted in regard to the trespass offerings is no doubt explained by the fact that this class of offerings was so much of the same nature with the sin offerings, so that the regulations given for the one would naturally be understood to be applicable to both. The Jewish writers held the necessity of the imposition of hands in all the animal offerings except the Passover. "Maimonidas, Hile, Korbanoth 3: Omnibus victimis, quae a quopiam privato offerebantur, sive ex praecepto, sive ex arbitrio offerentur, oportebat ipsum imponere manus dum vivebant adhuc, exceptis tantum primitiis, decimis, et agno paschali."
-- Fairbairn, Typology, p. 263, Note.

The action 'laying on of hands' is a common one in Scripture. It is used of blessing, of the consecration to office and giving of the Holy Spirit in general, of the healings performed by Christ and his apostles, and of the confirmation of newly converted, Acts 8, 17;

19, 6. In each case the action implies the transfer of something from one person to another, Gen. 48, 13.14; Num. 27, 18; Deut. 34, 9; Num. 8, 10. It does not always point to a real, but often to an ideal transfer. Kurtz states the significance of the action thus: "Der Zweck desselben ist bei allen: Mittheilung dessen, was der Eine hat und dessen der Andere ermangelt, oder das er bekommen soll," Mosaische Opfer, S. 67. Keil, against this view: "In allen diesen Faellen ist sie das aeussere Zeichen, wodurch der Handelnde dem Andern ein geistiges Gut, eine uebersinnliche Kraft oder Gabe zuwendet oder auf ihn uebertraegt." Opfer des A. B., S. 66.¹ So also in the case of the offering the imposition of hands implies a transfer. It is not merely a declaration on the part of the offerer that the animal is his property and that he is prepared to give it into death for the Lord.

The answer to the question: What is transferred? is found in Lev. 16, 21: "Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat." This is part of the ritual for the Day of Atonement, on which the greatest of all offerings was brought,

1. "Nicht den eigenen Frieden gibt der Segnende, nicht die eigne Gesundheit gibt der Heilende, nicht das eigene Amt der Weihende an den Andern hinueber, sondern er macht Gebrauch von seiner Priesterschaft, seinem Heilsvermoegen, seiner Gemeindestellung, um an dem Andern das zu tun, waa ihm vermoege dieser seiner Machtvollkommenheit zu tun zusteht." Hofmann, Schriftbeweis, II, 1. 155.

a sin-offering for the entire people. Thus in the sin-offerings the transfer was the symbolical transfer of the sin of the offerer to the animal, namely sin in a forensic sense, as liability to punishment. Guilt was the fundamental distinction between the offerer and the victim. "The imposition of hands indicated that the offerer willingly made over to the victim as innocent the burden of guilt with which he felt himself to be charged." Fairbairn, *Typology*, p. 263. But besides this he might also symbolically transfer other things to the sacrifice, according to the special design and object of the offering; as his substitute it might be made to embody and express whatever feelings toward God animated his soul. In the case of the propitiatory offerings, as we have seen, this was always the feeling of sin and guilt and the desire for forgiveness. In the case of the thank- or peace offerings, however, it was a feeling of gratitude for benefits received and desire for strength to lead a God-pleasing life. Thus in this class of offerings it was this gratefulness which he transferred to the hostage. The imposition of hands in the case of peace offerings signified that the offerer thereby dedicated the offering to the Lord, to receive thereby strength from the Lord for a sanctified life. No imputation of guilt was signified, in accordance with the nature and purpose of the peace offerings.

According to Lev. 16, 21 the imposition of hands was accompanied by a confession of sins. Outtam (1, 15, 18) has this formula: "I beseech thee; O Lord, I have sinned, I have done perversely, I have rebelled, I have done (mentioning the particular transgression), but

now I repent, and let this victim be my expiation." He also states that in Jewish minds the two were so closely associated that they had the maxim: "Where there is no confession of sins, there is no imposition of hands," and held it as certain that the design of the imposition "was to remove the sins from the individual and transfer them to the animal" (1, 22, 15).

3) The third step in the process of offering bloody sacrifices was the slaying of the animal. The victim was slain by the offerer himself, Lev. 1, 5; 4, 4; 22 etc. The purpose of this act was not merely to get at the flesh and the blood of the victim, but it had independent significance. This may be inferred from the fact that the altar derived its name from it (הַמִּזְבֵּחַ = lit. 'place of killing'); that the place where the killing had to be done was strictly regulated by law; and that it was essential that the killing should be done on holy ground. In connection with the imposition of hands in the propitiatory offerings the slaying of the animal signified a vicarious punishment for sin. This is apparent from Deut. 21, 1-9, where expiation is made without the sprinkling of blood. Death is the punishment for sin. Rom. 6, 23: "The wages of sin is death." $\tau\delta\ \acute{o}\psi\acute{\omega}\nu\iota\delta$ --'wages', that which sin pays its servants. It is the natural complement of sin. The Lord said: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." God's righteousness and holiness demands that for every sin punishment be meted out. No reconciliation and restoration to grace can take place unless this punishment has been endured. Thus the animal, as substitute for the offerer, endures the punishment of sin by being slain, and makes expiation thereby for the guilt

of the offerer. By shedding its blood in death, it pays the debt contracted by the offerer through his sin, of course, only in a symbolical sense. Thus the suffering and death of the victim is to be regarded as a "satisfactio vicaria". This view is most conformable to the antitype of the New Testament, Christ, the lamb of God, who through his innocent suffering and death, laden with the sins of the world, atoned for the guilt of the world, endured the punishment of sin, paid off the debt which man had contracted by his sin, and thus satisfied the demands of God's righteousness and holiness. We can, therefore, not agree with Keil in this point, who denies that the shedding of the blood, the death, of the animal is a 'satisfactio', and places the expiation not in the shedding, but into the sprinkling of the blood. However, as we have seen, death was absolutely necessary to atone for sin,¹ and with this death accomplished, atonement was made.

As the element of propitiation is not contained in the peace offerings, the slaying of the animal there had no expiatory significance. However the idea of substitution must not be excluded. Its significance will be discussed when we treat of the peace-offerings.

4) Upon the slaying of the animal followed the manipulation of the blood. This is distinctively characteristic of the Mosaic offer-

1. This is clearly taught Hebr. 9, 22: "Without shedding of blood is no remission." And V. 15: "For this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance."

ings, and is a peculiarity unknown to heathenism. It is the most sacred part of the Mosaic service.¹ Lundius, 'die alt. Jued. Heiligtuemer,' calls it: das allerfuehrnehmste in allen Opfern," p. 582. So also Outram (De Sacr. I, 16, 4): "This sprinkling of the blood was by much the most sacred part of the entire service, since it was that by which the life and soul of the victim were considered to be given to God as the supreme Lord of life and death; for what was placed upon the altar of God was supposed, according to the religion of the Old Testament, to be rendered unto Him."

The manipulation of blood played an important part in Scripture. According to Ex. 24 the Old Covenant was established with blood, Hebr. 9, 18: 'Whereupon neither the first testament was dedicated without blood.' Moses commanded that sacrifice be made. Half of the blood he sprinkled on the altar, the other half on the people. This signified that the sacrificial blood should bind together God and Israel. Therefore it is called the blood of the Covenant. The New Covenant was also not established without blood. The blood of the sacrifices under the Old Covenant typified the blood of the New Covenant, and thereby had power to atone. Through the blood of Christ a perfect atonement was made, and a permanent covenant of peace established between God and sinners.

1. Carpzov, Appar. Crit., p. 713, of sprinkling of blood: "ritus omnium sanctissimus erat."

Blood served to atone and was the means designated by God for this purpose, Lev. 17, 11: "the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls, for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul,"

קָפַח = lit. 'to cover'. Literally the verse reads: For the soul (נַפְשׁוֹ) of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to cover over your souls (וְעָפַחְתָּ אֹתָם), for (כִּי) the blood in or through the soul it covers (וְהָיָה דַם הַנֶּפֶשׁ כֹּפֵר),

קָפַח - 'to cover' is used only in Peil and Pual, and signifies covering for the purpose of atonement or reconciliation. This is brought out also by the Greek word ἐλάττωσις to cause to become propitious, from εἰλατός = 'kind, gentle,' used by LXX for קָפַח. It is usually constructed with עָלָה, 'to cover over' or 'upon', in the sense: 'to atone for', Lev. 1, 4: וַעֲלֶה עָלָיו = 'to make a covering for him', 'to make atonement for him.' The word קָפַח is found in the Old Testament only in this meaning. It does not refer to covering as of a debt. That metaphor is foreign to Hebrew usage. קָפַח indeed is λύτρον, the price by which redemption from a debt is obtained, but while in our usage it designates the required sum, in Hebrew usage it designates the debtor, whom the payment of the debt covers. קָפַח is never used of the offerings, hence the idea of covering in offerings cannot be associated with the idea of the payment of a debt. According to this passage, Lev. 17, 11, blood is the means which God has given to effect an atonement, a covering. The reason why he has given the blood for this purpose is that the soul, the life-principle is in the blood. The

וְדָם at the end of the verse refers back to the וְדָם at the beginning and expresses the seat of life, not in him who is to be atoned for, but in the creature by which the atonement is made for him. It is not the matter of the blood that atones, but the soul or life which resides in it, so that the soul of the offered victim atones for the soul of the man who offers it. דָּם is to be taken instrumental, 'by' or 'through' the soul. Why should blood have been appointed for the purpose of making atonement, Because the soul or life is in the blood, and hence is most suitably taken for the soul or life of man forfeited by sin. This is the only sense of the passage that can be grammatically justified, for דָּם after וְדָם always denotes that by which atonement is made, while עַל denotes the person or object for which atonement is made. Abenezra: *Languis anima, quae sibi inest, expiat.* This blood served as an atonement, because in with the blood the life of the animal was poured out, and thus the punishment was expiated. The life of the victim had been given into death for that of the offerer; now the application of the blood to the altar covered the sinful man and his sin, so that God no longer saw the sin. In His eyes the man had no sin. No argument can be adduced from this passage for the view that all bloody offerings had atoning significance. God does not make a general statement. He says only that the reason why he has given the blood as the means of atonement is that the life is in the blood. The blood atones only because of the life that resides in it. It certainly would be false to conclude therefrom that all blood atones when it is shed. All we can conclude therefrom as a general statement is

that whenever the blood of a victim is shed, its life is poured out, or given into death. And wherever God has given it to be the means of atonement, he has done it only for the reason that the life of the victim is in its blood.

By shedding of the blood of the victim, its life has been given into death as a substitute. Therewith, in the case of the propitiatory offerings, the punishment has been endured. But thereby the sin has not been removed or wiped out. If death were at the same time a wiping out of sin, it would follow that all men will be saved, as surely as they die. Sin must first be forgiven. The endurance of death as punishment for sin does not restore the sinner to his former state of integrity, but the sinner remains in the perdition into which his sin has cast him; temporal death, which he has suffered, will turn into eternal death, unless he is restored by the grace of God to his former blessed state, if the disorder caused by sin in body and soul is removed. Expiation had to be preceded by satisfaction. And this satisfaction was wrought by the perfect sacrifice of Christ. By virtue of his death God gave to the blood in the Old Testament offerings a significance which it can never have 'per se'.... Because of the power which He placed in this promise, God considered the offerer, for whom the life-blood of the victim has been shed, as free alike from sin and from its guilt, and again restored him to His favor and fellowship. And it was to testify of this that the sprinkling with blood took place.

The objection has been raised that the blood and life of the victim was really a polluted thing, since, as a result of the im-

position of hands, it was charged with the guilt of the offerer, and could therefore not with propriety be regarded as holy when sprinkled upon the altar, that it sanctified whatever it touched. In answer to this objection Fairbairn presents the following: "By the offerer's bringing his victim, and with the imposition of hands confessing over it his sins, it became symbolically a personation of sin, and hence must forthwith bear the penalty of sin--death. When this was done, the offerer was himself free alike from sin and from its penalty. But was the transaction by which this was effected owned by God? And was the offerer again restored, as one possessed of pure and blessed life, to the favor and fellowship of God? It was to testify of these things--the most important in the whole transaction--that the sprinkling of the blood upon the altar took place.¹ Having with his own hands executed the deserved penalty on the victim, the offerer gave the blood to the priest, as God's representative. But that blood had already paid in death, the penalty of sin, and was no longer laden with guilt and pollution. The justice of God was (symbolically) satisfied concerning it; and by the hands of His own representative, He could with perfect consistence receive it, as a pure and spotless thing, the very image of His own holiness, upon His table or altar. It being received there, however, it still rep-

1. "Das Blutsprengen ist mithin nicht die 'causa efficiens' der Sühne, sondern nur die Bedingung derselben insofern, als Gott demjenigen die Sünde vergibt, der durch das von ihm geordnete Mittel des Opferblutes seine Seele in den Wirkungskreis seiner Seele bringen laesst." Keil, Opfer des A. B., S. 72.

resented the blood or soul of the offerer, who thus saw himself, through the action with the blood of his victim, reestablished in communion with God, and solemnly recognized as possessing life, holy and blessed, as it is in God Himself. His soul had come again into peaceful and approved contact with God, and was thence admitted to participate of a divine nature."¹ Typology, p. 266. Kurtz, Mos. Opfer, p. 79-85, has this explanation, but spoils its simplicity and truthfulness by considering the altar in a sense the representative of the offerer, rather than of God.

The blood of the offerings was manipulated in various ways. In the great majority of cases it was partly applied to the horns of the brazen altar or sprinkled on its sides, and partly poured out at its base. The blood of more important sin offerings, however, was also carried into the Holy Place and applied to the horns of the golden altar. The significance of applying the blood not to the altar itself but to the horns lies in the meaning of the horns of the altar. They are not only points, so that spot is highest and hence the blood brought closest to God. The horns have a symbolical meaning. The horn is a symbol of power and strength, which in the horned animal, concentrates in the horn. The horns of the altar are therefore sym-

1. "Suehnende Bedeutung schreibt die Schrift nur dem Opferblute zu, sofern es an den Altar gesprengt wird, indem mittelst des Blutes die Seele des Suenders in das Gnadenreich Gottes gesetzt wird, der aus reiner Barmherzigkeit die Sünde zudeckt und auch tilgt, indem er den Suender, der sich im Glauben an die goettliche Verheissung des im Opfer gebotenen Mittels der Gnade bedient, nicht nur rechtfertigt sondern auch heiligt, und dadurch den Tod, diese bittere Frucht, welche die Sünde ihm getragen, in die susses und köestliche Frucht heiligen und seligen Lebens in der Gemeinschaft Gottes verwandelt." Keil, Opfer des A. B., S. 221.

bois of the power and strength of this place of divine revelation of grace, in which the whole power and strength of grace and salvation of this holy place is concentrated. By the sprinkling of the blood against the altar the soul was received into the communion of grace; by applying the blood to the horns of the altar, it was received into the whole power and strength of the divine grace, necessary to cleanse from sin and sanctify. This is the reason why in those offerings which primarily effected expiation, the blood was applied to the horns of the altar,¹ while in all others it was applied merely to the altar in general.

In all sin-offerings, where only a small quantity of blood was used for sprinkling, the remainder was poured out at the base of the altar, and thus all of the blood was brought to the place of God's presence, signifying that the soul in its entirety was received into fellowship with God.

In the more important sin offerings the blood was brought into the Holy Place, and a double application made. In every offering made for the anointed priest or for the entire congregation the blood had to be sprinkled seven times before Jehovah against the curtain separating this place from the Holy of Holies, and then it was also applied to the horns of the altar of incense. This sprinkling against the

1. Dilmann, Commentary on Lev., p. 374, claims that according to Ex. 30, 10 there was a time when the atonement upon the horns of the altar was restricted to the Great day of atonement. -- But does Ex. 30, 10 teach that?

curtain signified the restoration of the covenant relationship which had been broken by the transgressions on the part of the one party. This is indicated also by the number seven, which is the sign of the covenant. After the covenant relationship had thus been re-established, the real restoration to fellowship with God could again be effected by the application of the blood to the horns of the altar.

The sprinkling of blood on the day of atonement will be considered when we treat of that special great offering.

5) The final step in the process of offering was the disposal of the flesh. In the burnt offerings, or whole offerings the entire flesh was consumed by fire upon the altar. In all others only a part of the flesh was burned. The element employed in the burning was the flaming fire. Fire in Scripture is a symbol of punishment but also of purification. For that which contains the seed of incorruptibility, fire serves to purify, by burning away all the dross. Thus fire is the element whereby the puregold is separated from the adhering dross. For that which is entirely corrupt, fire serves to annihilate, to utterly destroy, 1 Cor. 3, 11f.¹. Therefore fire appears in Scripture not only as picture and vehicle of the Holy Ghost, but God himself is called a fire, a consuming fire, Deut. 4,

1. "Das Feuer ist das edelste, feinste, shaerfste und reinste der Elemente, ja ich moechte sagen, das goettlichste, denn wie Gott selbst kein (ethisch-) Unreines sich nahen darf, ohne in seiner fluchwuerdigen Unreinheit Qual und Verdammis zu empfinden, aber der Reine in seiner Naehel selig ist, so kann auch alles (physisch-) Unreine dem Feuer nicht nahen, ohne von seiner Glut verzehrt zu werden, waehrend das Reine dadurch nur Erhoehung seiner Lebenskraft erhaelt." Kurtz, Mos. Opfer, S. 90.

24; Heb. 12, 29, who reveals himself by fire, Ex. 3, 2; 19, 18; Ps. 18, 8ff; 29, 7 etc. Thus in all nature religions fire is looked upon as the symbol and even incarnation of the deity itself.

The fire which consumed the offering upon the altar was not lighted up by human hand, but according to Lev. 9, 24 the fire was sent down directly from heaven at the institution of the tabernacle service, and consumed the burnt offering of Aaron. According to Lev. 6, 12 it was the duty of the priesthood to keep this fire perpetually burning,¹ so that the same fire from heaven, which at first consumed, might, by being constantly preserved, never cease to consume the people's offerings. This fire sent down from God must not be taken as a symbol of the divine nature, but as fire is a power or an energy that purifies or consumes, so it is a fitting symbol of the power and energy of God's holiness. Thus Vitringa, as quoted by Fairbairn, p. 256: "The fire upon the altar signified anything in God, and indeed what is holy in God--either the holy will of God, as righteous, loving excellence, delighting in every good work, and vindicating His own glory; or the Holy Spirit of God, which is in God, and from God, Himself holy, and the administrator of the dispensation of holiness."

1. "The keeping of the fire perpetually alive was, no doubt, also a sign of the unceasing presentation of offerings, that ought to be ever proceeding on the altar." Fairbairn, Typology, p. 256.

The transaction of the burning of the flesh is not to be looked upon as an intensification of the punishment symbolically inflicted on the animal. Neither can it be considered to have as its purpose that the offering be completely annihilated, nor that it designate the goal toward which it tends; the burning of the flesh symbolizes the offerer's entire consecration to God, his whole body with its members, energies, and impulses. The offerer's body is thereby symbolically delivered up to the perpetual purifying fire of the Holy Spirit, to be cleansed of all its impurities, and sanctified unto a new life pleasing to the Lord.¹

In the sin offerings only certain parts were burned. The fat pieces were removed, namely the fat covering the internal organs, and the two kidneys, and the caul above the liver, and consumed by fire upon the altar, Lev. 4, 8-10. 20. Now if the flesh of the offering represents the body of the offerer as organ of the soul, these select parts of the animal must represent the better part of the man, the *σῶμα ψυχικόν*, while the remainder represented the *σῶμα χοϊκόν*, analogous to the distinction made by Paul, Rom. 7, 22.23 between the *ἔσω ἀνθρώπου* and *τὰ μέλη*. Therefore the burning of the best parts of the animal symbolizes the surrender of the better part of the human nature to the purifying fire

1. "Wenn mittelst der Blutsprengung die Seele, in den Bereich der goettlichen Gnade aufgenommen, Vergebung der Suende und Rechtfertigung empfaengt, so wird durch das Verfahren mit dem Fleische des Suendopfers das andere Moment der Expiation, die Tilgung der Suende und Heiligung dargestellt." Keil, Opfer des A. B., S. 226.

of divine holiness, and, being purified, rises in its glorified essence to heaven "for a sweet savour unto the Lord," Lev. 4, 31. The outer man, the *σῶμα χοϊκόν*, cannot in glorified essence rise to God, because thru sin it is doomed to die, and therefore these outer parts of the animal, the skin, flesh, head, legs, inwards, and dung, could not be burned upon the altar. Since death only puts an end to sin, but does not remove it, so also the flesh and remaining parts of the offering, even after death, are still burdened with the imputed sin.

This remainder of the flesh is disposed of in two ways. In the common sin offerings, where the blood remained in the outer court, the remaining flesh was officially eaten by the priests; in the special offerings, where the blood was brought into the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies, the entire flesh, with head, skin, legs, inwards, and dung, was carried outside of the camp, and burned at a clean place, there where the altar ashes were poured out, Lev. 4, 11, 12.21.

The purpose of the eating of the flesh by the priest is given Lev. 10, 17: "Wherefore have ye not eaten the sin offering in the Holy place, seeing it is most holy, and God hath given it to you to bear the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord?" *לִי-חַיִּי חַיִּי-וְעַ* does not mean 'to bear the transgression with its attendant results,' as Lev. 5, 1 etc., but as Ex. 28, 38: 'to take the transgression upon oneself in order to destroy it.' Thus the eating of the flesh on the part of the priest was to destroy and completely expiate sin. Deyling, Ots.

Sacr. I, 45 #2: "hoc pacto cum ederent, incorporabant quasi peccatum polulique reatum in se recipiebant." It did not assume the character of an ordinary meal; neither the offerer nor his family, not even the relatives of the priest, took part in it. Only the priest himself, by virtue of his office, could perform this rite. It is therefore an act of divine service, by which the flesh with its imputed sin is consumed by the priest and through the power of holiness dwelling in him by virtue of his office, the sin is utterly destroyed and annihilated.

From this fact it is clear that in those sin offerings which were brought for the priest and for the whole congregation including the priest, the flesh could not be eaten by him but had to be burned outside the camp. Only he who is holy, who is not in need of atonement can take another's sins upon him and destroy them. In these cases the priests were themselves in need of atonement, hence could not at the same time be holy and act in their official capacity. Therefore God prescribed that the remaining flesh of these offerings be burned outside the camp, in a clean place, where the ashes of the altar was poured out. Being made unclean by the imputed sin, the flesh could not be burned, at a holy place, but had to be removed to some place outside the camp, however, to a clean place, because it was the flesh of offering, which having been consecrated for holy use was not to become an abomination by being thrown away in some place where carcasses and other refuse was usually cast, Lev. 14, 40. 45. Such a clean place was that place where the ashes, the remnants of the offerings consumed by the holy fire of God were poured out, Lev. 6, 11.

To this method of procedure we might also add the sacrificial meal, but this will be treated in connection with the peace offerings, to which it is peculiar.

The Mosaic offerings as we have seen, are divided into two classes: a) Propitiatory; b) Eucharistic. The first class comprises the sin offerings and trespass offerings, the second class the burnt- peace-, meat-, and drink offerings.

The Propitiatory Offerings.

The names given to these two kinds of offerings are חַטָּאת and זֶבַח עֲוֹנוֹת . חַטָּאת really is 'sin', and here stands for the offering, not only in that sense, that according to a metonymy it stands for $\text{חַטָּאת} \text{ עֲוֹנוֹת}$ (περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, LXX), but because the offering is really made to be sin, 2 Cor. 5, 21: 'He hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin.' So also זֶבַח עֲוֹנוֹת , 'guilt', from זֶבַח עֲוֹנוֹת = 'to contract guilt', 'sich veruntreuen', (Koenig), is used of the offering, Cf. Is. 53, 10, where the 'Servant of the Lord' is called an זֶבַח עֲוֹנוֹת , a trespass offering.

Both sin- and trespass offering did not exist before the giving of the law, but were then first introduced. Thus the arrangement of offerings in Leviticus brings first the burnt-offerings, Chap. 1, then the meat offerings, Chap. 2, and the peace offerings, Chap. 3, and finally Chap. 4 & 5 the sin- and trespass offerings as a new addition, the first three being based on offerings already known.

Both sin- and trespass offerings were brought for sins committed $\int \underset{\tau}{\lambda} \underset{\tau}{\lambda} \psi \underset{\tau}{\zeta}$ 'thru aberration,' 'through ignorance', Lev. 4, 1 (of sin-offerings) and 5, 15.18 (of trespass offerings). Such sins are all sins of weakness, not only those committed precipitately and thoughtlessly, but also those committed intentionally and with premeditated design, but through weakness of the spirit. This did not include sins committed $\int \underset{\tau}{\zeta} \underset{\tau}{\zeta} \tau \underset{\tau}{\zeta}$ 'with raised hand,' 'highhandedly', namely sins of revolt against God. For such there was no offering ordained, but only punishment, Num. 15, 30: "The soul that doeth ought presumptuously ($\int \underset{\tau}{\zeta} \underset{\tau}{\zeta} \tau \underset{\tau}{\zeta}$ with a high hand), whether he be born in the land, or a stranger, the same reproacheth the Lord; and that soul shall be cut off from among his people."

To ascertain clearly the significance of the propitiatory sacrifices, a distinction must be made between sin- and trespass offerings. This distinction is set up in the Law and clearly stated there. To find the basic odea of the trespass offerings we shall consider three cases where trespass offerings are prescribed. In Lev. 5, 15 the offering is prescribed for a trespass committed against the $\int \underset{\tau}{\lambda} \underset{\tau}{\lambda} \sim \underset{\tau}{\zeta} \underset{\tau}{\zeta}$, the holy things of Jehovah, that is, the things made holy by being consecrated to Jehovah, as the firstling, tithes, etc. In Lev. 6, 2ff and Num. 5, 6f it is prescribed for a trespass committed against the Lord by abnegation of that which was entrusted to him, or 'in fellowship', or by taking something from the neighbor by violence, or by defrauding him, or by falsely denying the finding of something belonging to the neighbor. In each of these cases we find the formula

שׁוֹטֵט שׁוֹטֵט . שׁוֹטֵט = 'to cover', then 'to act covertly, faith-
 lessly', usually against Jehovah, but also against the husband, Num.
 5, 12, 27, of the adulterous wife. The formula denotes the viola-
 tion of the rights of another, which this one has toward another by
 some covenant or agreement. Jehovah has a covenant with Israel.
 Every apostasy from Jehovah, all idolatry, every violation of the
 rights of this covenant, is depriving the Lord of that which is con-
 secrated to him, is designated by שׁוֹטֵט , Lev. 5, 15, 21; 26, 40;
 Num. 21, 16; Josh. 7, 1; Ezech. 20, 27; 1 Chron. 10, 13 etc.
 Likewise the embezzlement or theft of a neighbor's property is a vio-
 lation of these covenant rights, the שׁוֹטֵט , which Je-
 hovah gave his people when the covenant was concluded. Every such em-
 bezzlement or theft required material restitution to the amount of
 1 1/5 of that which was stolen, Lev. 5, 16; 6, 5. If the person
 affected is dead, and no kinsman שׁוֹטֵט was at hand, the restitu-
 tion was to be made to the priest. But in order to expiate the sin
 which was thereby committed against the Lord, a trespass offering
 was also necessary, a ram, of which a valuation was made by the priest
 as the equivalent of the fault. In Lev. 5, 17-19 the same prescription
 is made as for the foregoing. It is also a trespass offering, being
 introduced by the same formula. However, no mention is made of a
 material restitution, hence we must assume that it was a violation
 of rights for which restitution was not feasible. Such a violation
 also occurs in Lev. 19, 20-22. If any man has lain carnally with
 the bondmaid of another, scourging, not death--for the maid is not
 free--should be the punishment, and the perpetrator of the deed shall
 bring a ram for a trespass offering. No restitution is prescribed.

No material restitution is possible in this case. However, the scourging served as a satisfaction for the owner of the bondmaid.

A trespass offering was also prescribed for the leper, after having been cleansed of his disease, Lev. 14, 1ff. Though he had to omit the public ceremonies during the period of his uncleanness through no fault of his own, in most cases, yet, like an excommunicated person, he was excluded from the possession and exercise of the covenant rights and privileges, and required levitical cleansing to reobtain them. For this purpose he had to bring a trespass offering, by which he was again taken up into the communion of God's people.

So also the Nazarite, Num. 6, who had during the time of his vow been defiled unawares by a death in his vicinity, had contracted no guilt, but had only interrupted the time of his vow, which time was not to be broken. This he had to make good by beginning anew the days of his vow, and in addition bring a lamb as a trespass-offering, as compensation for his restoration into the former state of consecration. In both of these cases no material restitution could be thought of and also no valuation of the guilt, hence neither of them are prescribed.

From these instances we see that there are two kinds of cases which require a trespass offering: a) where the violation of a privilege is to be expiated, and b) where the offering serves to recover privileges which had been forfeited. These violations relate either to Jehovah who has been deprived of something which was His due, or

to the neighbor, who has been deprived of property. In both cases there is a twofold guilt, against Jehovah and against the neighbor. The trespass offering did not expiate that guilt, for the material guilt had to be materially restored both to Jehovah and to the neighbor. Where such restitution was not feasible nor possible, it was made symbolically by the valuation of the offering, if the restitution was due God, and by penal expiation, (Lev. 19, 20--scourging), when it was due the neighbor. The offering itself served only to atone for the ethical guilt, while the valuation symbolized atonement for the material debt. The offerings of the second class, where no restitution was to be thought of, were also considered an act whereby full theocratic rights were recovered, and served as a satisfaction for them.

From all this it is apparent that satisfaction formed the basic idea of the trespass offerings, whereby they are clearly distinguished from the sin-offerings.

The sin offerings were ordained also to atone not only for sin, but also for guilt, Lev. 4, 3: $\text{לֹא־בְּחַטָּאתֵי־בְּרִי־וְיָוֶהֱוָה}$, v. 13, $\text{וְלֹא־בְּחַטָּאתֵי־בְּרִי־וְיָוֶהֱוָה}$. Every sin involves guilt, yet there is a difference in this, whether sin or guilt is the chief feature. Some sins include violation of civil and theocratic rights, for which satisfaction must be made. For such trespass offerings were required. Others required no satisfaction, but with their being forgiven the guilt is 'eo ipso' abolished. For such a sin offering was prescribed. Sin offerings, as the name implies, $\text{לֹא־בְּחַטָּאתֵי־בְּרִי־וְיָוֶהֱוָה}$, have to deal with sins as such, not only for

individual sins, but also for those which during a certain period had been committed but remained unrecognized and unatoned. For such the great festival offerings were prescribed. They are required for all transgressions of the moral and ceremonial laws, both for sins of commission and omission, Lev. 4, 2.13.22.27; 5, 1. Of course, they had to be sins of weakness or of ignorance. $\overset{\cdot}{\text{H}} \overset{\cdot}{\text{Z}} \overset{\cdot}{\text{Z}} \overset{\cdot}{\text{P}} \overset{\cdot}{\text{L}}$, Lev. 4,2. The sin offerings were to be brought to atone for these sins, hence the fundamental idea underlying this class of offerings is expiation.

Thus the sin offering was brought for sins of which the effect terminated primarily on the sinner himself. The trespass offering was brought for sins of which the effect terminated primarily on another. For the former only the offering was required, for the latter offering and restitution.

This distinction is also brought out by the ritual of two kinds of offering. The material for the sin offering varied according to the parties for whom it was made, Lev. 4. For the sin of the whole congregation, and for that of the high priest, who represented the whole people, it was a bullock; for the king, a male goat; for one of the common people, a female goat or female lamb. In cases of poverty a pair of turtle-doves or young pigeons could be brought. By the laying on of hands the sin of the offerer was imputed to the victim. Then followed the slaying of the animal, which thereby suffered the punishment for the offerer's sin, by giving its life for him. The manipulation of the blood was the center of the ritual of this offering. If it was brought for one of the common people or for the ruler,

the blood was partly applied to the horns of the brazen altar and partly poured out at the base of the altar; but when it was made for the high priest, or for the whole congregation, the blood was sprinkled seven times before the inner veil and applied to the horns of the golden altar of incense, while the remainder was poured out at the base of the altar of burnt offering. On the great day of atonement the blood was even carried into the Holy of Holies and sprinkled on the mercy-seat.

Then followed the disposal of the flesh. Only the fat adhering to the inwards, the kidneys, and the caul of the liver were consumed upon the altar. The remaining parts were burned outside of the camp, or city, if expiation was to be made for the whole congregation or for the high priest; it was eaten by the priest if the offering was brought for some private individual.

For the trespass offering the material was a ram of definite value, except in the case of lepers and Nazarites, when it consisted of a lamb. No females were allowed, nor could any substitute be brought in cases of poverty. The ritual in most cases corresponded to that of the sin offerings. The ram was valued by the priest and thus raised to the equivalent of the guilt, which was imputed to the ram by the imposition of hands, so that the ram from then on was the substitute of the guilty person. Then followed the slaying and the manipulation of the blood, which was sprinkled round about the altar of burnt offering. Then the select parts were burned. Finally

the guilt was wholly atoned for by the eating of the flesh by the priests at a holy place. Thus satisfaction was made for the righteousness of God. The material restitution consisted in the payment of 1 1/5 the value of the embezzled or stolen property, or, when no restitution could be made, by the enduring of civil punishment. Thereby satisfaction was made for the neighbor. Thus the guilt was atoned for both materially and ethically.

The Eucharistic Offerings.

This class is composed of the burnt-, peace-, meat and drink offerings.

1) The Burnt Offerings.

The Hebrew name for burnt offerings is $\text{אֲשֶׁר יָאָ} \text{ from } \text{אֲשֶׁר יָאָ} =$ 'to go up', 'to ascend'. Two views are prevalent as to the significance of this name: a) that which goes upon or up to the altar (Knobel, Wellhausen, Nowack) and b) that which goes up from the altar in smoke to the sky (Baehr, Delitzsch, Dillmann, Keil¹). The term is sometimes used synonymously with $\text{אֲשֶׁר יָאָ} =$ 'whole burnt offering', Deut. 33, 10; Ps. 51, 21; 1 S. 7, 9. This would favor the second view.

1. "Das Brandopfer fuehrt seinen Namen אֲשֶׁר יָאָ ascensio davon, dass die ganze Hostie (אֲשֶׁר יָאָ , Lev. 1, 9) im Feuer des Altars zu Gott emporstieg, im Unterschiede von den Opfern, welche nur teilweise auf dem Altare verbrannt wurden." Keil, Opfer des A.B., p.232.

The burning of the whole offering signifies complete dedication to the Lord, to be sanctified unto a new, holy life by His Spirit. It reminded the Israelite that as a member of God's congregation, after his sins had been atoned for, he had to give himself wholly to God and his service.

To designate this consecration as full of power and energy, the animal had to be a male, Lev. 1, 3.10, which in relation to the female sex is the stronger. It could be either a ram, bull, or sheep. It had to be without blemish, perfect in its kind, because the consecration of the Lord dare not be burdened with deficiencies and frailties. The body when consecrated must be holy, Rom. 12, 1. In cases of poverty turtle-doves or young pigeons were permitted.

The burnt offering could be brought only by such who stood in covenant relationship with the Lord, because only he could consecrate his life to God. And they who stood in such relationship to God were to be animated by such religious feeling at all times, hence the prominence of the burnt offering in the cultus of the Old Testament, and the frequency of the same. Burnt offerings were brought every morning and evening, while special offerings were made on Sabbaths, new moons, and many other occasions, burnt offerings constituting the majority of the festival offerings. If this offering accompanied another, it followed the sin-, but preceded the peace offering.

The offerer laid his hand on the victim, thereby imputing his sin to the animal. This reminded him of the fact that even in the

state of grace sin still clung to him, and death would necessarily follow. Then he slaughtered the animal, the innocent life being given for the guilty. The blood of the animal was placed in a vessel and the priest sprinkled it round about the altar, before the Lord. Then after skin, sinew of thigh, stomach, and entrails, and in case of birds also feathers and wings, were removed, the sacrifice was cut in sections, salted, and wholly burned. The idea of expiation was present indeed, but that of a whole-hearted devotion predominated.

2) The Peace Offerings.

The name is derived from their Hebrew designation: $\text{II } \xi \psi$ or $\text{II } \sim \gamma \xi \psi$. The singular occurs only Am. 5, 22. $\text{II } \xi \psi$ signifies the condition of the $\text{II } \xi \psi$, the 'integritas completa, pacifica beata', LXX: $\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\iota\sigma\upsilon$. The plural signifies the whole complex of gifts which form the state of integrity in a man's relationship with God. They were sacrifices of friendship expressing and promoting peaceful relations with God. In times of prosperity the offerer will think of these blessings which he has received, with gratitude and praise in his heart, and these emotions will take outward form in a peace offering. This offering will then be a thank offering. In times of need and tribulation he will bring this offering, in order to ask and pray for help and grace. This will then be an offering of prayer. The $\text{II } \sim \gamma \xi \psi$ therefore embrace offerings of thanks and offerings of prayer.

There are three species of peace offerings 1) offerings of praise; 2) votive offerings; 3) free-will offerings.

As to the material the law allowed great latitude; it might be an animal of the flock or herd, either male or female, but had to be without blemish, Lev. 3. By placing his hand upon the animal, the offerer thereby did not impute his sin to the animal, for he could not bring a peace offering, unless he was already in the state of grace, but declared thereby that he consecrated it to the Lord as his own, and that as it served for the support of his life, he thereby offered the substance of his life to the Lord, that his life might through it be strengthened and blessed. The idea of propitiation was entirely foreign to the peace offerings, and the idea of substitution was limited to them only to that part which was actually offered upon the altar. The killing of the animal signified that the life of the offerer was thereby given to God through the life of the victim. The idea of punishment does not all come into consideration. The sprinkling signified complete consecration. Only the fat adhering to the inwards was burned upon the altar, together with the kidneys, and the caul above the liver. Then followed a ceremony peculiar to the peace offerings. The right shoulder and the breast of the animal were separated from the remainder and given to the functioning priest as his part. These parts, the heave shoulder and the wave breast the priests were to cook and prepare and then eat at a clean place, Lev. 10, 12f. According to Lev. 7, 30 the breast was to be 'waved for a wave offering before the Lord.' This rite had the symbolical significance of surrender to the Lord, and was probably performed by waving the breast toward the altar and back. Thus Jarchi explains the $\text{הַשְׁבֵּעַ וְהַשְׁבִּיב}$ in Lev. 7, 34 with: 'ducebat et reducebat.'

The heave shoulder was not accompanied by a special ceremony. The idea which lay at the basis of the waving, namely, that of delivering to the Lord was also connected with heave shoulder.

The remaining parts of the offering belonged to the offerer, constituting a sacrificial meal for him and his friends. The persons who partook of this meal had to be levitically clean. This meal is not to be considered as being given by Jehovah, who is host to them who partake of it. It is a meal of worship where God's people partake of the fruits of their labor, won by divine blessing, and at which God condescends to be a guest, taking a part of the meal and permitting it to be consumed by his representatives, the priests, and permits his people to partake of the meal in the Holy Place, before His countenance, in His very presence. This meal symbolizes the most intimate fellowship of the people with Jehovah, which is designated as a rejoicing before the Lord, Deut. 12, 1.8.

This meal had to be eaten on the day on which the offering was brought, and in the case of the praise offerings, nothing was to be kept for the following day, Lev. 7, 15; 22, 30. In the case of the votive offerings and also the free-will offerings the remainder could still be eaten on the following day, and whatever was not consumed on that day had to be burned with fire, because meat on the third day is an abomination to the Lord, Lev. 7, 16-18.

3) The Meat and Drink Offerings.

The chief material for these offerings was grain, brought in some prepared form, either as flour mixed with oil and incense, or as unleavened bread or cake, also prepared with oil. Oil and incense are therefore not really material, but adjuncts to the grain, Lev.

2. The drink offering consisted in wine, for the disposal of which no regulations are given. It was probably poured upon or against the altar, as it was not suitable for being consumed by fire.

Since bread and wine in Scripture always appear as the chief means of sustenance, the meat and drink offerings can only signify the nourishment, which Israel brings to God. The oil symbolized the Holy Spirit, the incense signified prayer, and the salt was the covenant salt of God. The meat and drink offerings were presented to Jehovah as food and drink and aimed at maintaining symbolically the covenant relation.

The meat offering was first presented before the Lord; then a handful of it was burnt on the altar as a memorial, Lev. 2, 2, and the remainder was eaten by the priests, except when the offering was brought for the priests themselves, Lev. 6, 23, when it was wholly burnt. These offerings were sometimes brought independently, but more generally in connection with burnt and peace offerings, never with a sin- or trespass offering, thus completing the expression of man's consecration to God. In such cases the quantity of the material was determined by the animal brought in sacrifice. So an ox demanded $\frac{3}{10}$ ephah of flour, $\frac{1}{2}$ hin of oil, and $\frac{1}{2}$ hin of wine. A ram re-

quired 2/10 ephah of flour, 1/3 hin each of oil and wine, and a lamb 1/10 ephah of flour and 1/4 hin each of oil and wine. When brought in connection with the burnt offerings on the Sabbath or other feasts the meat offering was entirely consumed. Whether now it was entirely or only partly burned upon the altar it belonged wholly to the Lord. When brought in conjunction with peace offerings, however, only a part was to be given to the priest, Lev. 7, 14, and we may assume that the remainder was eaten by the offerer.

The Offering on the Day of Atonement.

The entire sacrificial service of the Old Testament culminated in the offering on the great Day of Atonement. This fell on the tenth day of the seventh month, toward the middle or end of our October, about the close of the busier occupations of the year, before the beginning of winter.

The Day of Atonement was a day of national humiliation, a day that made an annual remembrance of sin and restored the people ceremonially to that harmonious relation with God without which peace of conscience and heartfelt gratitude and joy were impossible. In contradistinction to the large number of Israel's joyous feasts it stood all by itself as the only day of fasting prescribed by the law,¹ Lev. 16, 29: "Ye shall afflict your souls." It was a day of sabbatic

1. It was familiarly named 'the fast', Acts 27, 9: 'the fast was now already past.'

rest, "a Sabbath of rest", Lev. 16, 31, yet not like other Sabbaths, a day of repose and satisfaction, but a day on which 'they should afflict their souls'. It was literally the day of atonements,

כִּי יִשְׁכַּח אֶת-עֲוֹנוֹתָיִם , Lev. 23, 27, a day not so much for one act of atonement, as for atonement in general, for the whole work of propitiation. "The main part of the Mosaic worship consisted in the presentation of offerings, and on this day the idea of atonement by sacrifice rose to its highest expression, and became concentrated in one grand comprehensive series of actions. In accordance with this design, the sense of guilt was to be deepened to its utmost intensity in the national mind, and exhibited in appropriate forms of penitential grief. It was a day of humiliation and repentance. It was the day of nearest approach to the Holy God, and hence for the people a day of remembrance of their sins against this holiness." Fairbairn, Typology, p. 276.

But it was also a day of blessed rest and consolation. For atonement was made on that day for all sins. It was implied that the acts of expiation which took place during the year, but imperfectly satisfied for the iniquities of the people, for the people were kept at a distance from the dwelling place of God, and could not even enter through their consecrated head. On this day admission was granted to God's presence, and the whole mass of sin had to be blotted out by a more perfect atonement. Also the dwelling of God, and its instruments had continually been defiled by "remaining among men in the midst of their uncleanness," Lev. 16, 16, and required purification. Thus atonement was made on that day for the high

priest, and the entire priesthood, for the tabernacle and its fixtures, and for the people.

A singular importance is attached to every act of that momentous occasion. On this day only the high priest could officiate, whilst the other priests acted as his assistants, Ex. 30, 10; Lev. 16; 23, 26-32; Num. 29, 7-11. After the usual morning oblations, at which he had to strip himself of the rich and beautiful garments of his office, as unsuitable for the work of that day, and after having washed himself, the high priest put on the plain garments. These were of linen, and white, and were called 'garments of holiness', Lev. 16, 4. This denoted purity and signified that no unclean person can appear before God. Thus prepared, he took a bullock for a sin-offering for himself and the whole priesthood. He laid his hands upon it, confessing his sins and the sins of the house of Aaron, slaughtered the bullock and entered with its blood into the Holy of Holies. He took with him also a censer full of burning coals of fire from the altar and to this he applied handfuls of incense, that a cloud of fragrant odor might arise as he entered the Most Holy. This was the emblem of prayer. The meaning was that he had to come to God as a humble supplicant, who had no right to demand admittance, but humbly implored it from God. The cloud protected him from the wrathful look of God. Having entered, he sprinkled the blood upon the mercy-seat, and again before it seven times, the number of the covenant. This was a double act of atonement, one having respect to the persons interested, the other to the sanctuary and its furniture, as defiled by the uncleanness of the people around them.

When this personal act of expiation was completed, that for the sins of the people commenced. Two goats were presented at the door of the tabernacle. These two are expressly named one offering, Lev. 16, 5: 'two kinds of the goats for a sin offering.' The one goat was designed to exhibit the means, the other the effect of the atonement. The fact that the two goats were presented as one offering by the high priest before the Lord at the door of the tabernacle stamped the offering as the Lord's. Then the high priest cast lots upon the two goats. This was done only with what belonged to God and for ascertaining what was His mind in a matter. The point to be determined here was not which of the two God would claim for Himself and which might belong to another, but simply to what particular destination He appointed the two parts of one offering which was wholly and exclusively His own.

The goat on which the lot fell was then slain for a sin-offering for the sins of the people and with its blood the high priest again entered the Holy of Holies and sprinkled, as before, the mercy seat first, and then before it seven times; making atonement for the guilt of the congregation, and purifying the furniture. Then he came out of the Most Holy into the Holy Place and sprinkled with the blood of the bullock and of the goat upon the altar of incense, applying it first to the horns of the altar as in every sin-offering, and then seven times against the altar, to purify the altar "and hallow it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel," Lev. 16, 19.

The climax of the entire ceremony was the sprinkling of blood against the mercy seat. The mercy seat, as it is called in the English Version, was a piece of solid gold, as long and as broad as the ark, and ordered to be placed on top of it. The Hebrew name is $\text{כַּסֵּפֶה} =$ 'covering', but not in the sense of being a mere lid or covering for the ark of the covenant. For it is never mentioned as precisely the lid of the ark, or as designed simply to cover and conceal what lay within. It rather appears as occupying a place of its own; though connected with the ark, it was by no means a mere appendage; and thus, when the holy things in the tabernacle are enumerated, the כַּסֵּפֶה is mentioned separately, Ex. 25, 17; 26, 34; 35, 12; 39, 35; 40, 20. It sometimes appears to stand out more prominently than the ark itself, and to have been peculiarly that for which the Most Holy Place was set apart, Lev. 16, 2 where the Holy Place is described as being 'within the veil before the mercy seat', and 1 Chr. 28, 11, where it is simply called 'the place of the mercy seat.'

The כַּסֵּפֶה served for a covering indeed, but only in the sense of atonement. See above on כַּפֵּר . The word is never used for covering in the ordinary sense; wherever it occurs, it is always the name of this one object, a name which it derived from being peculiarly and pre-eminently the place where covering or atonement was made for the sins of the people. The name, therefore, indicates the meaning of the symbol, as the kind of covering expressed by it is covering only in the spiritual sense,--atonement. Hence the LXX renders it with ἐξαστῆριον . The words with this ending de-

note something concrete, which determines the action of the verb from which it is formed. *Ἰλαστήριον* is formed from *ἰλάσκεσθαι*, which means 'to make propitious' from *ἴλαος* = 'kind, gentle'. In connection with a relation between God and men it signifies, as Hofmann says, 'to cause sin to cease to be the cause of God's wrath against him.' Thus *ἰλαστήριον* had something to do with propitiation. In the Old Testament *ἰλαστήριον* is the Greek translation from *כַּפֶּרֶת*, and is sometimes complemented by *ἐπίθεμα*. Hence the meaning of *ἰλαστήριον* is evidently 'propitiatory covering.' So Heb. 9, 5; Rom. 3, 25.

While this is the real meaning of *כַּפֶּרֶת*, yet the name was not given without some respect also to the external position of the article, which was immediately above and upon, not the ark merely, but also the two tables of testimony within, Ex. 26, 34; 30, 6; Lev. 16, 13. These tables contained God's testimony for holiness as opposed to transgressions. Before the accusations it was constantly raising in the presence of God in the Most Holy, the people could not stand. A covering was needed, an atonement-covering, between the testimony and God. A mere external covering would not do; for nothing outward can conceal from the all-searching eye of God; and the law from which the covering was needed, was itself something spiritual. That the *כַּפֶּרֶת* served as an outward covering, shutting out from bodily view the tables of testimony, was a kind of shadow of the provision required and suggested only what was really

required, viz. an atonement covering on which the Holy God might ever see the sign of reconciliation, the blood, and the Most Holy could therefore fitly be called the 'house of the propitiatory', or the 'atonement house', -- Fairbairn, Typology, p. 270.

The blood sprinkled upon the קֹדֶשׁ הַקֹּדֶשׁ came between the wrathful God and the accusing law and covered up the transgressions before the eyes of God, so that He no longer saw them, no longer imputed them. Thus they were made clean from all their sins before the Lord, Lev. 16, 30.

After this ceremony had been concluded, the highpriest again came out from the Holy of Holies, took the live goat, laid both his hands upon its head, 'confessed over him all the iniquities of the Children of Israel', Lev. 16, 21, and sent him away, laden with his awful burden, by a fit person, into a wilderness, a land of separation, where no man dwelt. It is stated v. 22 that this goat bore away all the iniquities; but these iniquities had already been atoned for by the shedding of the blood of the first goat. Thus the action with the first goat signified that without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins, the action with the second goat, that where there is shedding of blood in accordance with the law, there is also remission of sins. Hence the action with the second goat was not a separate one, but the continuation and complement of the action with the first. The goat, according to Lev. 16, 10, was sent to Azazel, אֲזָזֵל .

This is the evil spirit which dwelt in the desert.¹ ™ denotes purpose or aim: 'to the evil spirit,' not 'for a scapegoat' (Engl. Vers.). It was a visible sign to the people that their sins had been atoned for.² It was a most striking image of the everlasting oblivion into which the sins of God's people are thrown, when once they are covered with the blood of an acceptable atonement.

Thereafter the high priest put off the white linen garments, and laid them up in the sanctuary until the next day of atonement should come.. Then he washed himself with water, put on his usual garments, came forth and offered a burnt offering for himself and another for the people, to make an atonement again for sin, implying that sin mingled itself even in these holiest services. As in the case of the sin-offering generally, the fat was burned upon the altar, while the remainder was burned at a clean place outside the camp. Finally the person burning them and he who had led the goat into the wilderness were required to wash themselves on their return. The ceremonies of the Great Day of Atonement closed with the regular evening sacrifice.

-
1. "Er wurde, wie es v. 9.10 nach dem Urten und heisst, dem Asasel zugesandt, das heisst, dem boesen Geist, der in der Wueste hauste. Die Suende wurde durch diesen sinnbildlichen Vorgang dem Zurueckgegeben, der sie in die Welt gebracht, dem Teufel. Der hatte jetzt, nachdem die Suende gesuehnt war, an dem Volk Gottes nichts mehr zu suchen." Stoeckh. A. T., 119.
 2. "The part he has to do in the transaction is simply to bear them off and bury them out of sight, as things concerning which the justice of God had been satisfied, which were no more to be taken into account, fit tenants of a land of separation and forgetfulness." Fairbairn, Typology, p. 280.

The Mosaic Offerings and their Typological Significance

Taken by themselves, the blood offerings of the Old Testament presented a sorrowful spectacle. For the sake of the sins of man many innocent and irrational beings had to suffer and die, though they were not an object of wrath. In addition to this, the shedding of their blood had no power to remove sin, but served only as a reminder of sin. This is clearly taught in Hebr. 10, 4: "It is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins." This is furthermore shown by the fact that there were so many different classes of offerings and that they had to be brought at such frequent intervals. This is also shown by the sacrifice of Christ, which was brought "for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament," Hebr. 9, 15. If the offerings of the Old Testament had already brought this redemption, the one perfect sacrifice of Christ would have been unnecessary.

The offerings of the Old Testament were therefore ineffective 'ex opere operato,'^{1.} and it is a great error to place any idea

1. "The Jews did not understand their ceremonies aright, and imagined that they were righteous before God when they had wrought works 'ex opere operato', against this the prophets contend with the greatest earnestness. Accordingly, the prophets also in the Old Testament condemn the opinion of the people concerning the 'opus operatum', and teach the righteousness and sacrifices of the Spirit, Jer. 7, 22.23. -- Jeremiah condemns the opinion concerning sacrifices which God had not delivered, namely, that these services should please him 'ex opere operato' Ps. 50, 13.15 also condemns the opinion concerning the 'opus operatum'. Likewise Ps. 40, 6; 51, 16.17; 4, 5: "Offer the sacrifices of righteousness, and put your trust (hope, V) in the Lord." He bids us hope, and says that this is a righteous sacrifice, signifying that other sacrifices are not true and righteous sacrifices. And Ps. 116, 17." Trigl. 393.

of effectiveness into them 'per se'.¹

Their very nature shows it. No animal could atone for the sins of man. There is between man and the animal an essential difference, which makes the latter altogether inadequate and unable to really be man's substitute. The offering purposes the restoration or preservation of a relationship with God. The animal, being on an altogether different plane than man, cannot take the place of man to reestablish this broken relationship. This must be done by a being with free personality, which no animal possesses. But neither can a sinful man setp in for his sinful brother, and atone for his sins by offering himself, Ps. 49, 7f: "None of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him: for the redemption of their soul is precious, and it ceaseth forever." Not even a sinless, righteous man, if there were such an one among the children of Eve, could reconcile God unto his brother, because in relation to God each man can only answer for one soul, not also for that of another.

And yet the promise of God, "I have given it (the blood) to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls," Lev. 17, 11, promised a true atonement which was actually given by means of the offerings. Here, then, is an apparent contradiction. The offerings

1. "They altogether err who imagine that Levitical sacrifices merited the remission of sins before God, and, by this example in addition to the death of Christ, require in the New Testament sacrifices that are to be applied on behalf of others." Trigl. 405.

could not atone for sin, Hebr. 10, 3, yet God gave them as means for atonement, Lev. 17, 11. To explain this, a mediation must be found between the inadequacy of the offerings to atone and the Word of the Lord which has placed such atonement into them. And this mediation is the sacrifice of Christ, the blood of the Son which cleanseth us from all sin, 1 John 1, 7, which makes perfect atonement. And the apparent contradiction is done away with by the typical relation which the Old Testament offerings bear to the offering of Christ. The offerings of the Old Testament were types of the offering of Christ. Hebr. 10, 1: "The law having a shadow of good things to come."

And it is only in this respect that the offerings of the Old Testament were effective. Rom. 3, 25: "Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past." The believers in the Old Testament found consolation in their offerings only by looking forward to the offering of the coming Messiah. That the blood of lambs and oxen could not cleanse their consciences of sin, the Israelites felt full well. But the offering of the animals stood in the beginning in relation to the promise given by God to Adam and Eve and often repeated. Whenever the children of Israel brought the prescribed offerings, they involuntarily thought of the promise which was kept fresh in their minds by the law, the priests, and the prophets. And therefore Hebrews says of Abel's offering: "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain," 11, 4.

Of course, Christ could not bring his offering until the appointed time had come, but since redemption through His sacrifice had already been concluded in the eternal councils of God, and only its fulfillment on earth was bound by the earthly laws of succession of time, and since with the eternal God, who is not limited by time and space, the counsel is the deed, the effect of its offering was already at hand with God at that time it was decided upon, and so the benefits and blessings derived from it were already placed by God into the offerings brought during the time of preparation for the coming of the Messiah.

Thus it was the offering of Christ which gave to the offerings their power. Only when the offerings of the Mosaic ordinance had a real inner connection with the offering of Christ--and it was that wherein their typical character consisted--were they true pledges of reconciliation, whereby the offerer obtained remission of sins, life and salvation, if the offering was brought in the acceptable manner, according to the Law. Since the antitype was not yet come, the offerer had to rest his hope for benefit and blessing on faith in the promise which God had given.

Thus the offerings of the Old Testament had a symbolical-typical character. This is indicated in the prophetic books of the Old Testament. So the Holy Spirit speaks through the mouth of the prophet Isaiah of the servant of the Lord, who as priest will give his soul as an offering for sin, he shall bear the iniquities of all and thereby justify many, Is. 53, 10.11. "Isaiah interprets the law, in

order that we may know that the death of Christ is truly a satisfaction for our sins, or expiation, and that the ceremonies of the Law are not; wherefore he says, 53, 10: "When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, He will see his seed," etc. For the word employed here, זָחַת , signifies a victim for transgression; which signified in the Law that a certain Victim was to come to make satisfaction for our sin and reconcile God, in order that men might know that God wishes to be reconciled to us, not on account of our own righteousness, but on account of the merits of another, namely, of Christ. Paul interprets the same word זָחַת as 'sin', Rom. 8, 3: 'For sin (God) condemned sin', i.e., He punished sin for sin, i.e., by a Victim for sin. The significance of the word can be the more easily understood from the customs of the heathen, which, we see, have been received from the misunderstood expressions of the Fathers. The Latins called a victim that which in great calamities, where God seemed to be especially enraged, was offered to appease God's wrath, a 'piaculum'; and they sometimes sacrificed human victims, perhaps because they had heard that a human victim would appease God for the entire human race. The Greeks sometimes called them καθάρματα and sometimes πρὶς ψῆμα Isaiah and Paul, therefore, mean that Christ became a victim, i.e. an expiation, that by His merits, and not by our own, God might be reconciled." Trigl. 391.

The fundamental idea underlying the whole sacrificial system was substitution. And that is the great idea in Is. 53, namely sub-

stitution. "He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows." "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and by His stripes we are healed," "the Lord laid on him the iniquity of us all," v. 4-6.

And this substitutionary suffering Isaiah designates an $\text{II} \psi \mu$. Here the suffering of the Messiah is declared to be a trespass offering, the fulfilment of that which was pictured by the trespass offerings in the sacrificial system. This $\lambda \psi \mu$ is the antitype of which all other $\text{II} \psi \mu$'s were types. And in the New Testament Christ is declared to be 'the lamb of God,' which takes away the sins of the world. He is compared to a lamb which is led to the slaughter. Also 1 Pet. 1, 18.19: "You were redeemed...with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." The reference in these passages is clearly to the lamb as it was used in the offerings of the Mosaic system; and the lamb, because that is the picture of humility and patience. Thus if Isaiah declares that the Messiah will give his soul for an $\text{II} \psi \mu$ and John and Peter declare that Christ was a lamb which was offered for sin, then the typical character of the Old Testament offerings is justified.

And the offering of Christ was indeed a true sacrifice. That is taught throughout the whole New Testament. Christ himself designates his death as vicarious atonement, Matt. 20, 28; Mark 10, 45: "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many," $\delta\omicron\upsilon\tilde{\nu}\alpha\iota \tau\eta\tilde{\nu} \psi\upsilon\chi\eta\tilde{\nu}$ $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\tilde{\nu} \lambda\upsilon\tilde{\tau}\rho\omicron\upsilon\tilde{\nu} \acute{\iota}\nu\tau\acute{\iota} \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\omega\tilde{\nu}$. $\lambda\upsilon\tilde{\tau}\rho\omicron\upsilon\tilde{\nu}$ is the word the

LXX uses for the Hebrew קָדַשׁ , Ex. 21,30: "If there be laid on him a קָדַשׁ , then he shall give for the ransom of his life whatsoever is laid upon him." Num. 35, 31: "Ye shall take no קָדַשׁ for the life of a murderer, which is guilty of death," The sense of the passage is therefore: Christ gave his life as a ransom--Loesegeld--in the place of many, ἀντὶ πολλῶν .¹ The λύτρον denotes the idea of atonement, for a ransom is paid in order to cover a debt, or to liberate the debtor from a penalty. In this case we were the debtors. The penalty was death. Christ paid the penalty. And the price he paid for it was his life.

This does not stamp Christ's death directly as a propitiatory sacrifice, but if that is taught by Christ, namely in the words of institution of the Holy Supper, Matt. 26; Mark 14; Luke 22. Here Christ clearly represents his death as an offering. The Passover meal had just been eaten, and in conjunction with it Christ introduces the meal or feast of the New Covenant by giving his disciples bread and wine, which are his body and blood, the 'blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins,' Matt. 26, 28. To obtain remission of sins, atonement must first be made. Since the shedding of the blood obtains remission of sins, it must work atonement. Hence it is the blood of propitiation, and Christ's death is therefore a propitiatory offering.

1. Meyer, Commentary to Matt. 20, 28: $\text{λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν}$ - 'als Loesegeld anstatt Vieler', d.h. damit durch meinen Tod viele (meine wahren Bekenner) vom (ewigen) Tode (als Strafe der Suende) befreit wuerden (in so fern sie naemlich kraft der durch meinen Tode erlangten Suendenvergebung nicht in diesen Strafzustand kommen)."

This is also clearly and repeatedly brought out in the apostolic epistles. So Paul says 1 Cor. 5, 7: "Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ, our passover is sacrificed for us." 2 Cor. 5, 15: "he died for all." 2 Cor. 5, 21: "he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." $\dot{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu\ \pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\tau\epsilon\iota\nu$ means to consider a person as a sinner, treat him as such, and inflict the punishment of sin on him. Thus in the sin offerings the offering is directly called $\text{חַטָּאת} = \text{'sin'}$. Christ was without sin, guiltless, even as the offering. But sin was placed on him, he was made to be sin. As a result we are declared righteous, for he was made to be sin for us, $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho\ \eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$. But before satisfaction can be made for God's righteousness, death, the punishment for sin, must be endured. This was endured by Christ. Christ is here, therefore, declared to have been a sin-offering.

Very clearly Paul brings out this point Rom. 3, 24-26, where he even uses terms used in the ritual for sin offerings, as $\acute{\iota}\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ the Greek word for חַטָּאת . Even as Israel on the great day of atonement viewed the חַטָּאת sprinkled with the blood of the sin offering, as the symbol and pledge of atonement and reconciliation,

so God has set forth, *προέδειτο*,¹ for public view, Christ as a spiritual *ἡγίασμα*, sprinkled with the atoning blood, so that from it anyone might receive righteousness *διὰ πίστεως*.

In Col. 2, 13ff the death of Christ on the cross is viewed as a removal of guilt; so v. 14: "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." The *χειρογράφων* = certificate of debt--was the Law which accused us, and held our guilt before the eyes of God. This certificate God destroyed, blotted out our guilt, by nailing it to the cross. Now the Law was not nailed to the cross, but the body of Christ. This can mean only that by Christ's crucifixion the demands of the law for the payment of penalty for guilt was completely removed, done away with. Christ paid the penalty on the cross, and we are free from this guilt. It has been paid for us. Christ was a true trespass offering.

Also the apostle Peter emphasizes the same thing when he declares that Christ 'his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree,

1. " *προετίθει* kann heissen: sich vorsetzen, beschliessen, und es waere dann zu uebersetzen: 'den Gott voraus bestimmt hat.' Die Grammatik erforderte dann wohl nicht notwendig *εἶναι ἰσχυρότερον*, denn man sagt *προορίζειν*, *ἐκλέγειν*, also wohl auch *προετίθει* *τινὰ* *τι* im Sinne von: 'Jemanden zu etwas vorausbestimmen, erwählen,' vgl. Roem. 8, 29; Jak. 2, 5. Doch weiset der Zusammenhang nicht sowohl auf einen ewigen Ratschluss Gottes, als vielmehr auf ein in der Zeit realisiertes Faktum hin, wofuer auch das Folgende *εἰς ἐνδειξιν κατὰ πρόσθεν ἐν τῷ νῦν κειμῆ* spricht. Passend ist demnach an unserer Stelle nur die Erklaerung: den Gott dargestellt hat." Philippi, Römerbrief, S. 105.

that we, being dead to sin, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed,' 1 Pet. 2, 24. Christ was the offering. Laden with our sins, as our substitute, he went into death. This death atoned for our sins. We are now righteous before God. Christ was one atoning sacrifice.

Finally we may include the story related Acts 8, 31ff, where the eunuch was reading the passage in Isaiah of the lamb which was offered. Philip, upon being asked to explain the passage, points out Christ as the lamb.

In Hebrews 2, 9 it is said that Christ 'tasted death for every man,' ὑπὲρ πάντων, and thereby took the power away from the ruler of death, and 'delivered them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage," v. 14.15. 'To taste death' for some one in order to free him from the fear and power of death, does not mean only to die for his benefit, but also 'in his stead.' That is the force of the ὑπὲρ.

From these passages it is evident that Christ, both according to the Old and New Testaments, is the true, perfect sacrifice, whereby satisfaction has been made for the righteousness of God, and reconciliation effected. 'Tis true, the death of Christ is not always designated as an offering with those very words, still the ideas on which these passages are based refer back to the ideas of the Old

Testament offerings.¹ There has been only one propitiatory in the world, the death of Christ, Hebr. 10, 10: "We are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all."

In Christ's offering not only offerings in general, but also the essential elements of the various classes of offerings found their antitype.

Typical significance is ascribed to the Mosaic propitiatory offerings by the New Testament in all those places where Christ is designated as ἱλασμός περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, 1 John 2, 2; 4, 10, and ἱλαστήριον, Rom. 3, 25; where his death is called a λύτρον and its effect ἀπολύτρωσις τῶν πλημμελειῶν, Hebr. 9, 15; Col. 1, 14; Eph. 1, 7; Rom. 3, 24; 1 Cor. 1, 30.

Typical significance is, therefore, also ascribed to the greatest of the Old Testament propitiatory offerings, that on the Great Day of Atonement. The service of the Day of Atonement is the part of the Mosaic ritual which of all others has received the most explicit application from the pen of inspiration. It is to this that the author of Hebrews most especially and frequently refers when pointing to Christ for the great realities of the shadows of the Old

1. "Wenn nun auch die angeführten Stellen nicht 'expressis verbis' bezeugen, dass durch Christi Opfertod dem Zorne Gottes Genugtuung geleistet worden; so lehren sie doch ausdruecklich, dass Gott dadurch oder darin seine Gerechtigkeit erwiesen habe, und zwar seine Gerechtigkeit in Bezug auf die vorher begangenen Sunden oder Uebertretung." Keil, Opfer des A. B., 460.

Testament. He tells us that Christ as the true highpriest has by his one offering, 10, 12, namely the offering of his flesh, 10, 10; 9, 26, provided a new and living way into the Holy of Holies, as thru a veil, no longer concealing or excluding from the presence of God, but open to receive every penitent sinner, of which the literal rending of the veil at Christ's death, Matt. 27, 51, was a matter-of-fact announcement--that through the blood of Christ we can enter into not only with safety but also with boldness into God's presence, 10, 19.20, that this arises from Christ Himself having entered with His own blood into the heavens, presenting Himself as the true Redeemer, 9, 11.12.24, who had borne the curse of sin for sinners and forever satisfied the justice of God, 9, 12, and that this sacrifice is attended by none of the imperfections belonging to the Old Testament service, 9, 11.12.24.25; 10, 3.11.12. -- Fairbairn, Typology, p. 282. Christ was moreover *ἀμωμος*, spotless, 9, 14; 1 Pet. 1, 19: 'a lamb without blemish and without spot.' Also the imposition of hands typified that Christ took on him the sins of all, Hebr. 9, 28. The entering of the priest into the Holy of Holies typified Christ's entering into 'heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us,' Hebr. 9, 24. The slaying of the animal was a type of Christ, in so far as He gave his life into death, 9, 14. Also the burning of the flesh outside of the camp was a type of Christ, Hebr. 13, 11: "For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate." Of the *ὅτι*, 'wherefore', Estius says: 'ut ille typus V. T. impleretur

illa figura quae est de carnibus extra castra comburendis'--as quoted by Keil, Opfer des A. B., p. 463. Because the flesh of the sin-offering, whose blood was brought into the sanctuary, had to be burned outside the campe, so also Christ had to suffer and die outside of the city of Jerusalem.

No countenance is given to merely outward and superficial resemblances, which have often been arbitrarily and incorrectly drawn; as that, in the high priest putting on and laying aside the white garments was typified Christ's assuming and then, when his work was finished, renouncing the likeness of sinful flesh; in the goats his twofold nature; in the slain goat a dying, in the live goat a risen Savior; or, in the former Christ; in the latter Barabbas; or even, the Jews sent into the desert of the world with God's curse upon them. Prof. Bush in his notes on Leviticus gravely states that the live goat made an atonement simply by being let go into the desert, and that the Jewish people made propitiation for their sins by being judicially subjected to the wrath of heaven! All such deductions, if not palpably incorrect, at least have no foundation in Scripture. By fixing our view on the real and essential elements in the respective cases do we find all that is required to satisfy the just conditions of type and antitype. -- Fairbairn, Typology, p. 283. As in all cases, Scripture must decide.

Christ's offering was also the antitype of the trespass-offering. This was already indicated above when mention was made of Is. 53, 10 and John 1, 29. Christ paid and made satisfaction for our guilt on

the cross. We have contracted guilt by repeated violations of the rights of God and the rights of our neighbor. We have withheld from God the service and obedience we owe Him, and from our neighbor the debt of love. We have violated the rights of our neighbor, and especially the divine right. We have contracted a debt towards God, and God's righteousness demands payment of this debt. We have by our sins done damage which we can never restore. But another stepped in for us. By his 'obedientia passiva' he atoned for our guilt, that atonement typified by the imputation of sin to the offering, and its subsequent slaughter; by His 'obedientia activa' he restored the guilt or debt, which is in the trespass offerings typified by the material restitution. Gal. 4, 4; Phil. 2, 8. Thus Christ's offering was also the antitype of the trespass offerings.

Thus the propitiatory offerings of the Old Testament have found their fulfilment in the offering of Christ. It follows therefrom that propitiatory sacrifices have with that one perfect offering been completed, and are now no longer necessary. That is the great error of the Roman Catholic Church with its satanic invention the Mass. According to this, propitiation is still necessary and must continue to be made until the end. The Roman priest says: O yes, Christ's sacrifice has been of much use, but the chief thing is that we sacrifice Him daily. He thereby virtually says to Christ: Your bit of suffering on Golgatha is not the thing; you must now yet be offered in many thousand places. Hence the Romans call the mass a 'sacrificium propitiarium'. The priest thus makes himself a savior of the people, who is able to bring atoning sacrifices for them, who is able

to make the sacrifice of Christ effective. Of them the words of the 'Apology' hold good: "They altogether err who imagine that Levitical sacrifices merited the remission of sins before God, and, by this example in addition to the death of Christ, require in the New Testament sacrifices that are to be applied on behalf of the other. This imagination absolutely destroys the merit of Christ's passion and the righteousness of faith, and corrupts the doctrine of the Old and New Testaments, and instead of Christ makes for us other mediators and propitiators out of the priests and sacrificers, who daily sell their work in the churches." Trigl. 405.

But also the eucharistic offerings in the Old Testament had typical significance. This is clear from the internal relation existing between the various classes of offerings, which were all various expressions of the one sacrificial idea, and only when combined did they constitute a whole.

That the burnt offerings typified the offering of Christ is clearly taught Eph. 5, 2: "Walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour." The terms here employed point to the burnt offering. Sin offerings are always called *θυσία περὶ ἁμαρτίας* or *ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν*, Hebr. 10, 12.26, or *προσφορά περὶ ἁμαρτίας*, Hebr. 10, 18, and always in the Leviticus, LXX *προσφορά*, *θυσία*, corresponding to the Hebrew *הַזֶּבַח הַדָּם* , denote bloody and bloodless offerings in general, as *δῶρα καὶ θυσίας*, Hebr. 9, 9. Even the pecuniary support which the congregation at

Philippi had forwarded to him, Paul calls ὁσμὴν εὐωδίας, θυσιῶν δεκτὴν, εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ Phil. 4, 18. Hence προσφορά and θυσιὰ cannot refer only to sin offerings unless the special idea περὶ or ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτίας is added or indicated by the context. In this passage, Eph. 5, 2, both are lacking, hence προσφορά καὶ θυσιὰ must refer to a bloody offering, which is accompanied by a meat offering, hence either a burnt- or a peace offering. The παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν denotes nothing more than the surrender of life into sacrificial death, but this surrender is viewed as an action of love, not of suffering, but as an act of offering. This would indicate the burnt-offering. This παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν refers not only to the death of Christ, but to his whole activity on earth, as an unbroken, uninterrupted act of sacrificing love which culminated in death. This becomes a burnt offering by being made τῷ θεῷ εἰς ὁσμὴν εὐωδίας. Christ's entire life on earth was a surrender to the will of the father, John 17, 4, for the glorification of the Father's name. That which the burnt offering of the Old Testament symbolized, namely consecration of the whole man with all his energies, that Christ has fulfilled by his perfect obedience and holy life unto death on the cross, thus being the antitype of the burnt offering of the Old Testament.

The typical significance of the peace offerings lies in the institution of the Lord's Supper, by which Christ gives us to eat and to drink of his body and blood given and shed for us in a sacrificial

death. This meal is the antitype of that feature in which the peace offerings culminated, the sacrificial meal.

The meat and drink offerings of the Old Testament find their antitype in the fruits of sanctification, the *ἔργα*, the deeds of holiness which characterized Christ's life, and which are now emulated by the people of God in the New Covenant, who derive the strength for them from the life and death of their King. Such offerings are faith, prayer, thanksgiving, confession, and the preaching of the Gospel, afflictions of the saints, and the like, Trigl. 395. All believers are priests of God, and their entire life should be a perpetual self-sacrifice to their Lord, Rom. 12, 1. And if their offerings are brought out of love toward the Savior, and out of gratitude to him, they are pleasing and acceptable to God.

Thus the shadows have departed; the realities have come. The Mosaic ritual is no more; instead there are the spiritual offerings of the saints which will continue until He return who is the one true and perfect offering of all.

Bibliography

- Berkhof--Biblical Archaeology.
- Uarpzov--Apparat. Critic.
- Concordia Triglotta.
- Delitzsch--Hebräerbrief.
- Delitzsch--Jesaias.
- Dillmann--Exodus and Leviticus.
- Eckhardt, Reallexikon
- English Bible.
- Fairbairn, The Typology of Scripture.
- Gerhard, Loci Theologici, VI.
- German Bible.
- Gesenius-Kautsch--Hebrew Grammar, 28th Ed.
- Greek Testament.
- Green, Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch.
- Green, The Hebrew Feasts.
- Hebrew Testament.
- Heim--Genesis.
- Hengstenberg
- Jamieson--Leviticus.
- Keil--Commentar ueber die Buecher Mosis.
- Keil--Commentar ueber den Brief an die Hebräer.
- Keil--Die Opfer des Alten Bundes--in "Zeitschrift
von Rudelbach und Guericke, XVII, XVIII.

International Standard Bible Encyclopedia.

Jacobus--Notes on Genesis.

Kurtz--Das Mosaische Opfer.

Lange--Genesis.

Lehre und Wehre, 37. 48. 56.

Luther, St. Louis Ed. I, V, VI, XII, XVIII,
XIX, XIV.

Lutheraner, 51, 63.

Magazin, Homil. 11. 22. 23. 27.

Meyer--Matthew.

Meyer--Romans.

Philippi--Roemerbrief.

Stock--Realexicon.

Stoeckhardt--Biblische Geschichte des A. T.

Stoeckhardt--Roemerbrief.

Strack--Leviticus.

Synodical Reports.

California 1897
Canada 1897.1898.1900
Central 1888.1909.
Eastern 1903.
Illinois 1875.1898.
Iowa 1898

Kansas 1903.
Michigan 1900.1903.
1906.1910.
S. Dakota 1907.
Southern 1897.
Western 1874.

Tholuck--Hebräerbrief.

Walther--Epistel-Postille.

Young, Analytical Concordance.

Zeller, Biblisches Handwoerterbuch.