

**The Development Of The Idea Of Sacrifice
And Atonement In The Old Testament.**

**The Development Of The Idea Of
Sacrifice And Atonement In The Old Testament**

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty

of the

Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

in

partial fulfillment

of the

Requirements for the degree

of

Doctor in Theology

by

Dwight H. Willett

1923

To

My Father And Mother

Preface.

The Old Testament does not contain a more vital subject than "The Development of the Idea of Sacrifice and Atonement." In recent years, this subject has become more vital because of an effort on the part of certain rationalists to reject altogether the idea of a substitutionary atonement for sin.

It has been our aim in this inquiry to put aside, as far as possible, all bias and preconceived ideas and find out exactly what the Old Testament teaches regarding the idea of atonement in the sacrifices. The study of this subject has been a source of pleasure and profit to the writer. It has enabled him to get a clearer conception of the teachings of both the Old and the New Testaments. Especially has it magnified the importance of the Old Testament as a preparation for the New. The writer only claims originality for the arrangement of the material and the expression of the thought contained in this thesis. In a work of this character, the author is supposed to search out the opinions of the leading scholars on the subject at hand and from these draw his own conclusions.

While the writer realizes his inability to adequately solve all of the problems contained within the scope of this inquiry, he presents this volume with the hope that others will be inspired to labor on the same problems with more satisfactory results.

Louisville, Ky.

Feb. 21, 1923.

Dwight H. Willett.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Introduction - - - - -	I.
Chapter I. The Patriarchal Period. - - - - -	6.
Chapter II. The Mosaic Period. - - - - -	23.
Chapter III. The Prophetic Period. - - - - -	73.
Chapter IV. Conclusion. - - - - -	108.
Appendix. - - - - -	113.
Bibliography.	

Introduction.

Introduction.

In developing the idea of sacrifice and atonement in the Old Testament, the Bible will be considered the source or test of all opinions legitimate to our inquiry. The subsequent discussion will be conducted on the assumption of the historic value and accuracy of the books of Scripture. We do not make this statement because we are unaware of the assertions of modern "criticism." ^I While it is evident that criticism, especially the rationalistic sort, has been the source of serious evils, at the same time, under the providence of God, it has been productive of many benefits. In every case, it has tended to strengthen the Bible rather than to weaken it. The "Higher Critic" applies the same tests to the Bible which he is accustomed to apply to all other kinds of literature. His first problem is to decide what place he will give the religion of Israel among the other historical religions. Is Israel's religion "nothing less, but also nothing more" than other religions? Many of these "critics" deny the supernatural in history and prophecy and recognize only the principle of "natural development."

I. Orr. The Problem of the Old Testament.

His second problem, which is dependent somewhat on the first, is to determine the literary value of the Scriptures. For example, such questions as the following are asked: Is the Pentateuch, in its present form, the work of Moses or is it composed of three or more documents, correlated at a later date? When was the Levitical law finally codified? How many authors has the Book of Isaiah? Were the Psalms written in pre-exilic or post-exilic times? The date and authorship of every book in the Bible are thus questioned. It is significant that the "critics" do not agree among themselves on any of these questions. Therefore, in such a brief discussion as we undertake in this volume, it would not be well to enter the field of criticism. We will content ourselves with the study of the Scriptures in their present form. Occasions may arise, however, which will make it necessary to refer to certain critical views. Our task, as we view it, is not to ask, Are the scriptural statements upon sacrifice and atonement credible? but, What do the Scriptures really teach upon the subject?

Our method of approach to this subject is inductive. We will trace the development of the idea of sacrifice and atonement through the outstanding periods

of Old Testament history, laying emphasis in each period upon the consciousness of sin, the ritual of the offering and the relation of sacrifice to the forgiveness of sin. The history of the Old Testament naturally divides itself into three divisions. For convenience, we will arrange our chapters so that they will correspond with these divisions. Chapter one, or "The Patriarchal Period," will deal with the idea of sacrifice and atonement preceding the Mosaic legislation, chapter two, or "The Mosaic Period," will contain a study of the atonement as taught by Moses, and chapter three, or "The Prophetic Period," will relate itself to this doctrine as conceived and expanded by the prophets.

In chapter one, we will endeavor to show the beginning of sacrifice, the distinguishing features of Abel's sacrifice, the points of advancement in the sacrifices of Noah, Abraham and Jacob and then point out the relation of these sacrifices to the forgiveness of sin.

Chapter two will contain the Mosaic injunctions and their interpretation. We first show the moral necessity for an atonement for sin. As a foundation for future discussion, we then briefly state the

Mosaic injunctions in their natural order. After making clear the place of each offering in the system as a whole, we determine as far as possible the relation of these sacrifices to the forgiveness of sin.

The third chapter is taken up with the prophetic conception of atonement. One after another, the prophets are made to give their ideas of sin, their conceptions of the Mosaic sacrifices and finally their prophecy concerning a perfect atonement for sin. A brief conclusion follows.

In the appendix, an effort has been made to gather from external sources the most important arguments favoring the idea of substitution in the atoning sacrifices of the Old Testament.

Chapter I.

The Patriarchal Period.

Chapter I.

The Patriarchal Period.

It is with peculiar difficulty that we approach the problem of the substitutionary atonement in the Patriarchal Period. The history of this age is veiled with antiquity. Besides this, we have to deal with a people whose habits and customs are remote from our present day experience. The Scripture records are practically our only source of information and they are so extremely sketchy and reticent that every single word and phrase possesses an importance which is difficult to overestimate.

In searching this period of Bible history, we may not expect to discover much truth of permanent value but we enter it with the hope that its contents will throw some light upon the periods that are to follow. In order to come directly to the subject, we will ask some questions and, in searching for their answers, endeavor to discover the facts pertinent to our inquiry. As our study naturally relates itself to the examples of sacrifice in this period, we should first ask the question, How did the institution of sacrifice originate? Was it of divine or of human origin? Ancient

and modern scholars are divided on this question. Davison and others hold that Abel offered up a sacrifice in obedience to an express, divine command,¹ while Hagee and his followers contend that his offering was the response to a tentative impulse wholly within himself.²

The first view encounters serious objections because, first of all, the Old Testament Scriptures do not sustain it. Also, we find that the universal prevalence of sacrifice among the heathen nations points to the contrary.³ On the other hand, to say that the offering of Abel was in every respect spontaneous, would perhaps be as much overdrawn as the other theory. A study of the details of the narrative points rather to a position midway between the two theories. The opening chapters of Genesis imply that sacrifice was synchronous with the creation of man. The entire life of our first parents, before the Fall, was one continuous self surrender. As Augustine says, "For then, pure and untainted by any spot or blemish of sin, they gave their very selves

-
1. Davison, *Inquiry into Origin and Extent of Sacrifice*, pp. 19, 20. (Quoted by Cave).
 2. Hagee, *On Atonement and Sacrifice*, Vol. I, pp. 334-345.
 3. Davidson, *The Theology of the Old Testament*, pp. 311, 312.

to God as the cleanliest offerings." ^I The sacrifices offered in Paradise were without doubt spontaneous acts of devotion. Because to know God and at the same time not to have a knowledge of sin, was to surrender oneself without reserve to holy service. The case, however, would be different with respect to the offerings of fallen man. It appears that Cave is more nearly correct when he says, "The precedent which Abel constituted into a precedent for animal sacrifice was undoubtedly of divine appointment; just as certainly the stretch of faith, the spiritual vision, so conspicuous in Abel, was human. The vague leadings, the data for decision, were of God; the reachings forth of faith, the deliberate act, were of man."²

Going still farther into the narrative of the sacrifice of Cain and Abel, we are confronted with such questions as: "What was the nature of Abel's sacrifice?" "Why was his offering acceptable to the Lord and that of Cain rejected?" "Was a gift of lambs superior to a gift of fruits?" "Was it that Abel's sacrifice was a thank-offering and Cain's a thankless presentation?" "Had the effusion of blood which must have taken place before Abel could present the fat of his victims, anything to do with the acceptability of the offering?"

1. Augustine, The City of God, Book 20, Chapter 26.
2. Cave, The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice, Second edition, p. 42.

"Was the death of the animal any recognition on Abel's part of his moral depravity and the sin of Cain an insufficient contrition for his faults?" All of these questions have been answered in the affirmative by various commentators. We cannot take the space to reply to all of them in detail. The best way to decide this matter is to analyze minutely the acts of Abel as the circumstances in the case permit. At the outset, we would denounce as unbiblical the hypothesis of Kalisch that "the idea of sacrifices offered up to immortal beings who govern the world presupposes a degree of culture and experience hardly acquired in the course of centuries."^I However, we realize that in the study of these primitive times, we are not to overstep the limits of what is written and go off into fanciful imagination. Did Abel have certain motives in presenting his sacrifice? If so, what were they? Was he at all conscious of the divine estrangement? Abel had no knowledge of the Divine Being except that which had previously been revealed in Creation, Paradise and the Fall; yet these revelations were sufficient to inform him of certain fundamental principles of religion. The experience of his parents in being driven from the Garden of Eden, clothed in the bloody skins of animals, was sufficient to awaken in him a consciousness of an

I. Kalisch, Commentary on Leviticus, Vol. I, p. 8.

estrangement from the Divine and Holy Creator. Having thus a consciousness of a divine estrangement and being a creature constituted for fellowship with God,^I the next motive that would naturally impel him would be to approach the Deity and renew this fellowship. But was it possible to approach God? Would not approach be intrusion and intrusion be punished by the fulfillment of that promise described as "death"? Again, was not his desire to approach God an assurance that God desired to have communion with him? It is safe to say that there must have been a conflict of emotions in Abel's mind before he finally decided to approach the Divine Majesty. Therefore, conscious of the penal clauses of the divine proclamation sufficient to severely condition approach, yet with a trust in the divine mercy toward sinful man enough to countenance such an advance, Abel determined to make trial of the divine attitude toward himself, so, selecting the firstlings of his flock, he slew them and presented them and their fat before the Lord.

If these inferences are true, Cain's sin consisted in the fact that, although he, from force of habit, possessed a momentary desire to offer a sacrifice to Deity, he did not recognize the means which had been ordained of God to remove the sense of guilt, nor did he

as his offering indicates, manifest any consciousness of a divine estrangement such as was characteristic of his brother. "It is significant," says Kerwill, "that Cain offered only that kind of sacrifice which was a recognition of God's providence; he did not offer that which would have been a confession of his own life-forfeiting sin." ^I From a mental standpoint, Cain's offering showed neither a sense of sin and its results nor sufficient gratitude; from the standpoint of material, his offering was characterized by a presumption hitherto unprecedented by fallen man.

We would not go as far as some who say that Abel fully realized the penalty of sin and therefore, with a knowledge of the merit of blood to atone, he offered up his firstlings as a propitiatory blood sacrifice to the Lord. We agree with Davidson that this conception is too far advanced for the ethical ideas of this period. ² With still less plausibility, would we consider the theory, originated by Professors Robertson Smith and Wellhausen, that the primitive sacrifice was a sacrificial meal - "the communion of deity and man in a common sacramental food." ³ The difficulties presented by this theory are: How can we reconcile the

-
1. Kerwill, The Old Testament Doctrine of Salvation, p. 59.
 2. Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament, p. 312.
 3. Quoted from Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament, p. 313.

sacrificial meal idea with the whole burnt offering and also with the prevailing idea in the Hebrew word MINCHAH which signifies a gift to God. According to Brown, Driver and Briggs, the word MINCHAH conveys only the idea of presentation.

To sum up the idea of Abel's sacrifice, we will use the words of Cave, when he said: "A gift of the choicest and best was not enough, nor was the feeling of worship enough which such a gift might express; a slaughtered animal was not enough, nor was the trustful following of the divine precedent which such a slaughtering conveyed: acceptable sacrifice must display all these in harmonious union."

Having considered the essential elements in the sacrifice of Abel, let us take up briefly the remaining sacrifices of the Patriarchal Period with a view to ascertaining the points of advancement. Taking, first, the offerings presented by Noah, we find a great many points of similarity to the offering of Abel. The fact of approach to God is emphasized and upon every such approach, animal blood was spilt. We note also that the divine approval remained. There was, at the same time, elements of advancement in the offerings of Noah. A greater variety of blood-offerings

are presented and also the occasions for sacrifice are increased. Noah's worship contained all of the emotions which in after years found expression in the burnt offering and the peace offering, in the sin-offering and the trespass-offering, and in the offering of incense and tithes. Abel offered only lambs while Noah expressed his gratitude by an offering of every clean beast and bird (Gen. 8:20). The ritual of Abel's sacrifice was of the most simple type - mere slaughter and presentation. Noah, in addition to this, consumed his offering with fire. Exactly what idea the smoke of the burning sacrifice at first conveyed, we are unable to state. It is reasonable, however, to assert that to cause the smoke of the sacrifice to ascend toward heaven would symbolize a more complete presentation.

If the sacrifice of Abel obtained for him and succeeding generations an assurance of restoration to the divine favor, is it any more than natural to suppose that men, eager for divine approval, would come to offer up human sacrifices since they would be considered more potent than the sacrifices of an animal? History records this as a common occurrence from the days of Achilles, when "a dozen noble sons of haughty Troy" were thrown upon the funeral pyre of Patroclus,

to the time of the celebration of the memory of the deceased kings of Dahoney. Moses warned the people against such practice (Deut. 18:10). During the reign of Hosea, king of Israel, the people went off after foreign gods and caused their children to be passed through the fire to Moloch (2 Kings 17:17). In the trial of the faith of Abram, we find a new revelation regarding the material of the offering. Having been commanded of the Lord to offer up his son, Isaac, who was the fruit of his old age and the pledge of his posterity, as a holocaust on Mount Moriah, Abram proceeded to obey. When the human victim was bound and the knife drawn to slay him, the hand was stayed and the effusion of blood was completed by the substitution of a ram (Gen. 22:13). Three significant facts are pointed out in this incident. In the first place, animal sacrifice received a renewed sanction as a method of approach to God. Secondly, sacrifice carried with it the renewed declaration of penitence and voluntary surrender - a surrender so complete that even an only son, born under privileged conditions and with a privileged destiny, should not be withheld. And again, the motives which prompted human sacrifice received a distinct approval while the act of human sacrifice itself received a distinct disapproval. The

subsequent history of Israel testifies to the profound influence this incident and its lessons had upon Abraham's descendants.

The only remaining sacrifices of importance in this period are those of Jacob. In a sacrifice made by him, we find that the entire carcass of the offering was not consumed. After a certain portion was presented to God, the remaining parts were consumed in the form of a sacrificial meal (Gen. 31:54). This variety of sacrifice is designated as TSEVACH. According to the greatest scholars, TSEVACH, in this usage, does not refer to a peace-offering - the technical name of which is SHELAMIM - but to a festal-offering. The festal-offering is the genus of which the peace-offerings are species. An element of advancement is thus noted.

The fact that Jacob erected altars in places where the Deity had manifested Himself (Gen. 12:7; 35:14) might be considered as pointing toward the later idea of special places of worship. There are also indications of the gradual rise of a separate order of sacrificial ministrants chosen either for reasons of religious piety or for social distinction. The act of sacrifice was at first performed for the entire family by the father of the household (Gen. 8:20; 12:7;

13:18; 26:25; 33:20; 35:3) but later by the princes of the larger families or petty patriarchal kingdoms (Gen. 14:18; Exodus 2:16; 3:1).

Having indicated the outstanding features of the sacrifices of the Patriarchal Period, only one other question of importance remains for our consideration. That question is: What relation did the patriarchal sacrifices sustain to the forgiveness of sin? To maintain that there was any such relation is to go contrary to a commonly expressed opinion in theological circles. If by opposing this idea, one means to say that in primitive times, no account is given of an offering which by its intrinsic merit, without reference either to a present accommodation or future achievement, brought about the forgiveness of sins, it would be true. Would it not, however, be impossible to designate an Old Testament sacrifice as expiatory in such a sense? Again, if it be understood that in patriarchal times there were no sacrifices expressing the one idea of an offering for sin without the interblending of other ideas, this is likewise true. This is due to the fact that, before the Mosaic institutions, there were no sacrifices which were exclusively thank-offerings, or peace-offerings, or trespass-offerings. If, on the other hand, it be meant that during the Patriarchal Period there were no sacrifices which had even

a partial reference to human sin, we are forced to take issue.

From the standpoint of divine arrangement, the initiation of any movement is always characterized by an intellectual clearness of vision and spiritual emotions seldom experienced afterwards. But, laying aside such general considerations, let us find out what the Scriptures have to say on the subject. The question largely hinges upon the meaning of the Hebrew word CHATTATH as used in Genesis 4:7. The American Standard Version translates the word "sin" as follows: "If thou doest well, shall it not be lifted up? and if thou doest not well, SIN coucheth at the door." If this translation is accepted, it is evident that some relationship exists between the sin of Cain and the offering which he presented. The chief difficulty, however, attending the above translation, is the apparent lack of clear connection between the contents of this sentence and the thought which immediately precedes it. To say the least, this translation renders the passage very difficult of interpretation. Magee translates the word CHATTATH "a sin-offering." He supports this translation by some splendid arguments. This position is first confirmed because of

the force of the word ROBETS which is connected with CHATTATH and which strictly implies couching or lying down as a beast. The rendering is thus simplified to mean "a sin-offering lieth at the door." Another point made by Magee is that CHATTATH, which is feminine, is here connected with ROBETS, a word of the masculine gender. He says that this connection is perfectly consistent on the ground that CHATTATH is made to denote a sin-offering. "According to a construction common in Hebrew, which refers the adjective not to the word but to the thing understood by it, the masculine ROBETS is here combined with the animal, which was to be the sin-offering." According to this principle, it will be found that CHATTATH, where it is used in scriptural connections for a "sin-offering," is, though itself feminine, connected with a masculine adjunct (Ex. 29:14; Lev. 4:21, 24; 5:9), while in other places (Gen 18:20; 20:9; Ex. 32:21, 30), where the word is found to signify "sin," it has constantly the adjective connected in the feminine. If his translation be accepted, the passage would be rendered as follows:

"And the Lord said unto Cain, wherefore art thou wroth? And why is thy countenance fallen? Is there not, if thou doest well, exaltation: and, if thou doest not

well, a sin-offering lying at the door? And thus he may become subject to thee, and thou mayest have the dominion over him." Whether Magee's translation is preferred or not, the very fact that there was a distinction between the sacrifices of Abel and his brother - the animal sacrifice of Abel accepted and the vegetable sacrifice of Cain rejected - would lead to the reasonable conclusion that animal sacrifice and the forgiveness of sins are in some way related as cause and effect.

But granting this much as a fact, what was there in the sacrifices of the Patriarchal Period which could palliate the divine wrath or counteract the divine alienation? It would be a wonderful satisfaction if we could ascertain with certainty this important element. While it is impossible to arrive at a definite conclusion from a study of the prehistoric period, some elements in the attainment of forgiveness are evident. It is safe to say that the people of this period knew that death had been decreed upon their race because of transgression. They saw that it was by the permission, suggestion, and command of God that sheep and oxen became their substitutes and died in their stead. What did they regard as the

reason for this singular substitution? Perhaps they never asked such questions but merely relied upon the religious discovery of Abel. Whatever may have been their conception, we are perfectly justified in asserting that they saw in animal sacrifice not only a sensuous representation of their personal feelings but in the representative material itself an element of prophecy which constituted it a type of things to come. According to their experience, redemption was to come through two distinct channels, these developing alongside of each other. One was that redemption was in some way being obtained, by animal sacrifice and the other that, in some mysterious manner, redemption was to be obtained by that seed of the woman which should bruise the serpent's head (Gen. 3:15), by that seed of Abraham in which all nations of the earth should be blessed (Gen. 22:18), and by that Shiloh unto whom should be the gathering of the people (Gen. 49:10). It may be observed that this promise was handed down from generation to generation during this period. The general promise of ultimate victory over Satan made to the offspring of Eve became to Noah a promise of redemption through Isaac, and to Jacob a promise of the universal rule of a Prince who should come from the loins of Judah. If they realized, as their religious

spirit would naturally feel, that the blood of their animal sacrifices could not remove sin, although through this medium they had repeatedly received restoration to divine favor, is it beyond possibility that they connected the two revelations of redemption by sacrifice and redemption by a promised Redeemer? We know that there was at least a sufficient consciousness to produce a spirit of expectancy, stimulating the most devout to continue their habitual methods of approach to God and at the same time to eagerly expect from every mother's son the promised Redeemer.

Chapter II.

The Mosaic Period.

Chapter II.

The Mosaic Period.

Upon entering the period of Moses, we find that the fundamental elements of religion as practiced by the patriarchs have now become authoritative and that the simple worship of former times has been supplanted by a ritual more elaborate, centralized and expressive. The difficulties encountered in the study of this period are similar to those of the previous age. The one advantage which this period has over the former is that it is not so remote. We cannot hope to receive much assistance from writings or traditions outside of the Old Testament Scriptures. One would naturally think that much light could be thrown upon the difficult elements in the Pentateuch by a study of the writings of Josephus, Philo and the authors and commentators of the Talmud but these works are found to be of little or no value on the subject. Modern Jewish traditions also might be expected to aid in this study. Unfortunately, however, the law of Moses was perverted by the Rabbis to such an extent that even as early as the teachings of our Lord, we are warned to beware of the "traditions of the elders" (Matt. 15:6).

The customs among the Jews of today are more at variance with the Mosaic legislation than they were at that time. The most of our authoritative information, therefore, will come from the books of the Pentateuch with an occasional ray of light from some of the later canonical books. In this study, it is not necessary to present a history of the successive amendments which the Law underwent from its first beginnings to the time of the entry of Israel into the Promised Land. We will only be concerned with the Law in its completed form.

We will pursue the study of this period under the following divisions: first, the Mosaic conception of sin; second, the Mosaic sacrifices; and, third, the relation of the Mosaic sacrifices to the forgiveness of sin.

I. THE MOSAIC CONCEPTION OF SIN.

The conception of sin among the children of Israel grew as their ideas of God advanced. Since God was conceived as holy (Lev. 19:2; 20:7; 21:8), sin was the occasion of divine punishment, and calamities were generally interpreted as chastisements for sin (Ex. 21:12-17; 22:18-20). Anyone who committed a sin against Jehovah was, in almost every case, worthy of death (Deut.

24:16; Lev. 5:1, 17; Num. 18:1, 22; Ex. 28:43). The account of the Fall and the Deluge show that this condition prevailed in the Patriarchal Period. In the Levitical code, sin and punishment are almost automatically connected. Throughout this period, sin is generally conceived as national. The sin of the individual reflects upon the nation.¹ The nation was considered as a unit. The sin of one member brought calamity upon the whole body, even though, as individuals, they were innocent (Num. 16:22). For example, because Achan partook of "the devoted thing," all Israel was brought to defeat (Joshua 7:11). In the same way, David's census subjected the entire nation to the ravages of a pestilence (II Sam. 24:15).

The only guarantee of escape from the divine wrath was righteousness. Righteousness, however, was not considered as due to individual or national sinlessness but to Israel's relation to a covenant made with Jehovah.² The Israelite had no hope of salvation through his own piety for we find such teaching as: "If thou Jehovah shouldst mark iniquities, O Lord, who could stand" (Psa. 130:3); "In thy sight no man living is righteous" (Psa. 143:2); also, "for there is no man that

1. Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament, p. 215.
2. " " " " " " " " pp. 271-

sinneth not" (I Kg. 8:46). Righteousness, therefore, was only to be found within the covenant relation. This covenant, made between Jehovah and Israel, provided for an atonement for sin. An elaborate system of worship was instituted. Specific instructions were given concerning the Tabernacle or place of sacrifice, the Priests or sacrificial ministrants, Purifications or legal preparations for sacrifice, and the various offerings together with their Times and Seasons. Should this ritual fail in any particular, excision or death was the inevitable result (Deut. 27:26, 28).

II. THE MOSAIC SACRIFICES.

Before proceeding to an examination of these specific instructions, it will be well to mention briefly two religious ceremonies which were very similar to those of the Patriarchal Period, yet, at the same time, sufficiently differentiated to render them transitional in character. They are usually known as the Passover and the Sacrifice of the Covenant.

One of the most memorable occasions in the history of Israel was the night of the Exodus. It was memorable not only for its deliverance but also for the memory of its sacrifice. While a cry was heard in every

Egyptian household because of the death of their first-born, an entirely different scene was taking place among the Hebrews. Unharmd by the destroying angel, the members of every Hebrew family were standing ready for their departure and partaking, in haste, of a sacrificial meal. What is the explanation? A people who had been in bondage were, by divine command, celebrating their first Passover (Ex. 12:43). A male lamb or kid, without spot or blemish, had been carefully selected and slain in every household. The blood of the victim, according to command, had been sprinkled upon the doorposts and the carcass, roasted whole, was being hastily eaten with bitter herbs and unleavened bread. But what was the religious import of this rite? It is clearly seen that this sacrifice was an atonement sufficient in its efficacy to stay the arm of the angel of death. It may also be said that, in addition to the merciful sparing of life, the sacrifice provided a religious ceremony which in after years became a sustenance in the time of trial.

When the children of Israel had come, in their wilderness journey, to the foot of Mount Sinai, another Sacrifice of memorable significance took place. After Moses had descended for the first time from the summit of the sacred mountain and had proclaimed to the twelve tribes assembled the decalogue with its civil and religious rites (Ex. 20:1-23:33), the covenant between

Jehovah and His people was solemnly concluded by the effusion of blood and a holy feast. Victims were slain and placed upon an altar and burnt-offerings and festal-offerings were presented before Jehovah. On this occasion, the blood of the slaughtered animals was effused by Moses, one half being slung upon the altar and the other half upon the people. It is not our purpose to answer all of the various opinions held concerning the origin and nature of this sacrifice. The most reasonable interpretation is that of Cave who says, "This rite of the covenant is seen in fact to be a patriarchal festal-offering such as was offered by Jacob at his covenant with Laban, with the peculiar ritual of the blood-manipulation of the Passover super-added." ^I Every individual Israelite could not help but be conscious of the fact that while the offering was being made, he was personally making a solemn vow before God to keep the covenant which had just been recited by Moses. The drops of blood which fell upon his head and garments from the hand of Moses would remind him that the death angel had passed by him once again. As he partook of the roasted flesh of the offering and drank of the accompanying drink-offering, he would be assured that, so long as the covenant remained unbroken, Jehovah would provide for his physical necessities.

I. Cave, The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice, Second edition, p. 62.

It is evident that these two inaugural sacrifices were only a preparation for a more elaborate system and a more minute revelation. Because of the limits of this volume, it will be necessary for us to omit a description of the Tabernacle with its various gradations and furnishings, the Priesthood, and the Levitical Purifications and come directly to a consideration of the Mosaic sacrifices. In order to properly comprehend these sacrifices, they should be considered from two points of view, - namely, the material of the sacrifices and the persons who offered them. As to material, sacrifices may be generally classed as Blood-offerings and Bloodless-offerings. The bloodless-sacrifices are called "sacrifices of atonement." We will consider first the blood-sacrifices. These sacrifices are usually designated as burnt-offerings, peace-offerings, sin-offerings and trespass-offerings.

The Ritual Of The Burnt Offering.

The law of the burnt-offering is found in the first chapter of Leviticus. These offerings could be either individual or national. If the individual was financially able, he was required to present a spotless ox, ram or he-goat. If he was not able to afford this, he could present a turtle-dove or a pigeon. In case a bird was presented, the ritual was very simple. The

priest brought it to the altar, wrung off its head and burnt it on the altar. He then took out the crop and faeces and threw them into the ash pit. After keeping an incision at the wings, he burned the entire body upon the altar. This was not true, however, of any other kind of burnt-offerings. The offerer brought his victim to the altar, forcibly placed his hand upon the head of the animal and slaughtered it on the north side. The priest, having caught the blood, sprinkled it against the four sides of the altar. After flaying the animal, the offerer divided it and washed the intestines and lower parts of the legs in water. The priest then placed the several parts together with the skin, head and fat upon the altar, previously arranged with wood, as a burnt-offering - "an offering made by fire, of a sweet savor unto Jehovah." After the entry into Canaan, Jehovah commanded that a meal-offering should immediately follow the burnt-offering (Num. 15: 1-12). A point of peculiar interest is here noted. A foreigner, who was rigidly forbidden to offer other Levitical sacrifices, was permitted to present burnt-offerings (Lev. 17:8; 22:18, 25).

The Ritual Of The Peace-offering.

The laws concerning the peace-offerings are

recorded in the third and seventh chapters of Leviticus. The peace-offerings were of a social character rather than individual or national. While presented by individuals, the entire family or group partook of the holy festival in its consummation. The ritual of the peace-offering was dissimilar in several respects to that of the burnt-offering. While either sex of cattle could be offered, the male was preferable. As in the burnt-offering, the offerer, having led his victim to the altar, placed his hand upon its head, killed, flayed, divided and cleansed it. There was no designation, however, that it should be slain on the north side. The priest caught the blood and sprinkled it upon the altar. Instead of burning the entire carcass of the animal, as in the burnt-offering, only the fatty portions were burned upon the altar. The breast was "waved" and given to the Aaronites and the right leg was "heaved" off as a gift to the ministering priest. That which remained was taken by the offerer, who, having made a feast, partook of it with his entire household within the sacred enclosure of the Tabernacle. Accompanying this form of sacrifice were meal and drink offerings. One of the cakes of the meal-offering fell to the officiating priest (Lev. 7:12-14).

According to Cave, "the thank-offerings, votive-offerings and voluntary offerings were varieties of

the peace-offerings." I

The Ritual Of The Sin-offering.

The sin-offering is of unusual interest from the point of view of our inquiry. The laws of the sin-offering are found in the fourth chapter of Leviticus. They were similar to the burnt-offerings in that they were offered both on behalf of the individual and the nation. The national sin-offerings were only presented on feast-days and, therefore, will be more appropriately discussed under that head. The status of the individual determined largely the variety of the ceremony of the offering. In the case of the high priest, an ox without blemish was to be offered. After the usual presentation, the laying on of hands and the accustomed slaughter, he took some of the blood into the Tabernacle and sprinkled it seven times "before the veil of the sanctuary." Then he smeared some of the blood upon the horns of the altar of incense and poured the remainder at the base of the altar of burnt-offering. As in the peace-offerings, the fatty portions were removed and burned upon the altar of burnt-offering. The remainder of the carcass was taken by the high priest to a clean place before the camp and burned. In case the entire congregation became

conscious of sin committed unwittingly, the elders of the congregation presented a young ox in the same manner as required of the high priest. / When, through ignorance, a ruler or one of the common Israelites sinned, he was ordered to present a goat without blemish, - the ruler, a he-goat and the common Israelite, a she-goat. In the case of both, the customary laying on of hands and the slaughter were required, after which the priest, having caught the blood, smeared some of it upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offering, poured the remainder at its base, and burned the fat upon the altar of burnt-offering. The carcass became the priest's portion. / The sin-offerings and the burnt-offerings were slain at the same place. In offering burnt-offerings, any number of victims might be slain but in the sin-offering, only one animal could be offered.

The Ritual Of The Trespass-offering.

We now come to the important blood-sacrifices called the trespass-offerings. The laws regarding these offerings are given in the fifth and sixth chapters of Leviticus. According to the simple record, there were three groups of transgressions which required a trespass-offering: in the first place, any

unwitting sin regarding gifts due Jehovah; such as sacrifices, tithes or first-fruits (Lev. 5:15); secondly, any unintentional violation of a divine command (Lev. 5:17); and, thirdly, any fraudulent practice in matters related to property even though it be a voluntary act (Lev. 6:2, 3). In every case, the offering consisted of a ram without blemish. After the presentation, laying on of hands, and slaughter, as in the burnt-offering, the blood, instead of being smeared on the horns of the altar, or taken into the Holy Place as in the sin-offering, was simply dashed against the side of the altar. Accompanying this sacrifice was a remuneration for wrong done both to God and to man. God was recompensed by the priest placing a value upon the victim offered equivalent to the wrong committed. The offended party was recompensed by the offender paying him in money the entire value of the damage plus a fifth part.

Under certain conditions, the nazirite and the restored leper offered trespass offerings.

The Bloodless Sacrifices.

We are now ready to consider the bloodless sacrifices. Of these, the meal-offerings were the most prominent. They consisted of the vegetable sacrifices and were offered both on behalf of the individual

and the nation. This offering was prepared by mixing some fine wheaten flour with oil, according to the culinary arts of the Jews, and either baked in an oven or fried in a skillet. Sometimes, the offering consisted simply of roasted ears of corn. Oil and salt were always added to the meal-offerings and, in case flour or grain was used, incense was also added. Any fruit such as dates, figs or almonds, upon which continuous labor was not expended, were strictly forbidden as was also any mixture of honey or vinegar. The offerer having presented the offering at the altar, the priest simply took a handful of the meal and oil together with some incense and burned them upon the altar. The remainder was retained by the priest as his own portion since it was "a thing most precious." On certain exceptional days such as Sabbaths and feast-days, the entire offering was consumed upon the altar. Sometimes, there was added a drink-offering of wine or strong drink called shechar. With only two exceptions, the meal-offering was preceded by some blood sacrifice - namely, the daily offering of the high priest and, in case of the poor, where a certain offering was substituted for the blood sacrifice (Lev. 5:II).

Other important bloodless sacrifices were those where shew-bread, incense and oil were offered in behalf of the Holy Place. According to the Levitical law (Lev. 24:5-9), twelve loaves of this bread were to be prepared on every Sabbath day. Each loaf represented one of the twelve tribes of Israel. These loaves were removed periodically on each Sabbath, after they had remained on the table for seven days, and were assigned to the priests who ate them in a holy place. The offering of oil (Ex. 27:20, 21; Lev. 24:2) consisted of the purest olive oil. Each day it was the duty of the high priest to take a portion of this oil and replenish the golden candlestick. The offering of incense was burned both morning and evening upon its appropriate altar.

Still other bloodless sacrifices may be briefly summarized as follows: redemption money consisting of five shekels for each Israelite except the Levites (Num. 3:47-51); freewill offerings for the construction and maintenance of the Tabernacle and the vestments of its ministrants (Ex. 35:20-29); wood-offerings (Neh. 10:34; 13:31); tithes (Lev. 27:30-33; Num. 18:21-22); the firstlings of fruit, cattle and men (Ex. 24:19; Lev. 2:14; Num. 18:8-11); the offerings of booty taken in battle (Num. 31:48-54); and certain vows such as those concerning self, house, cattle or

land which were solemnly and willingly made to Jehovah (Lev. 27). There is practically no end to these bloodless sacrifices. These will serve all of the purposes necessary to our inquiry.

From the point of view of the persons offering them, sacrifices may be divided into national, official and individual ceremonies. In the national sacrifices, the entire nation as a unit was conceived as being in the act of humiliation, confession, atonement and self-surrender. They consisted of serial-offerings which were presented daily, weekly and monthly; of festal-offerings on holy days; of various offerings for the service of the Holy Places; and of offerings on such extraordinary occasions as thanksgiving or humiliation:^I

The official sacrifices were offered primarily for the benefit of the ecclesiastical and political heads of the nation. The priestly offerings were as follows: the sin-offering occasioned by inadvertant sin (Lev. 4:3); the meal-offering offered daily in the Holy Place (Lev. 6:20); the solemn and elaborate offerings of the great Day of Atonement; and the offerings at the consecration of a priest or Levite to his office.

The offerings to be made by political officials may be summed up as follows: those at the dedication of the Tabernacle (Num. 7:10-89) and a certain sin-offering

I. Cave, The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice, Second edition, p. 83.

(Lev. 4:22-26) to be offered by either a judge or a king.

Concerning the individual sacrifices, little space need be given here. Suffice it to say that particular attention is given in the Levitical law to the religious needs of the individual Israelite. These individual sacrifices consisted of all the varieties of blood and bloodless offerings which were to be offered in their respective seasons. These have already been sufficiently discussed in this chapter.

The Offerings On The Holy Days.

It is not necessary to discuss these offerings at any great length. The details may be found in the twenty-third chapter of Leviticus. Our present inquiry only concerns itself with the special and appropriate sacrifices that were offered on these extraordinary occasions. On every day during the year, both morning and evening, a lamb was offered as a burnt-offering followed by a meal-offering of meal and oil and a drink-offering of wine. A daily sacrifice of incense and meal was also offered by the high priest. At the morning and evening oblations on the Sabbath days, the burnt-offerings were doubled. Besides the daily and monthly oblations, sacrifices of two young bullocks, one ram, and seven lambs as a burnt-offering, with

proportional meal-offerings and drink-offerings and of a goat as a sin-offering, were offered on New-moons, on the days of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, on the Feast of Harvest, on the Feast of Trumpets and on the Day of Atonement. The only additional ritual on the day of the Passover was that of the paschal lamb. Having been selected for four days, it was slain in the accustomed manner at the altar of burnt-offering, roasted without a bone being broken and then eaten with unleavened bread and bitter herbs. The peculiarities of the ritual of the Feast of Tabernacles were as follows: instead of the burnt-offering consisting of one and seven rams, the number was doubled to two and fourteen; while ordinarily only two bullocks were slain, during this feast, the number was increased to seventy. These bullocks were so distributed that thirteen were offered the first day, twelve the second day, eleven the third, and so forth, until on the last day of the feast only seven were offered. The ritual of the Day of Atonement is all that remains of importance to describe in this connection. Briefly stated, the ritual is as follows: first of all, a sin-offering of a bullock and a burnt-offering of a ram were presented on behalf of the priesthood by the high priest; and, on behalf of the congregation, a sin-offering of two he-goats and a burnt-offering of a ram

were offered. The priest, after bathing his entire body, was clothed in a robe of pure white linen. Having cast lots upon the two he-goats, thus choosing one for Jehovah and one for Azazel, the two animals were presented as living sacrifices before the altar. Then began the ceremony of expiation in behalf of the priesthood and the Holy Places. After the bullock had been slaughtered as a sin-offering for himself and his house, the high priest took a censer full of coals from off the altar and some incense and placed them within the veil. A portion of the bullock's blood was then sprinkled upon the mercy-seat and seven times upon the ground before the mercy-seat. The high priest now made atonement for the people. After slaying the he-goat, its blood was taken into the Holy of Holies and sprinkled in the same manner as that of the bullock. Then, some of the blood was sprinkled in the Holy Place, some on the altar of incense and the remainder on the altar of burnt-offering. When atonement had been made for the priesthood, the Tabernacle, and the people, the high priest placed his hands upon the head of the live goat and, having confessed over it all of the sins of the people, sent it away into the wilderness by a Levite who was standing ready for that purpose. The high priest then went into the Tabernacle, removed his white garments, bathed himself in a

holy place, dressed again in his official garments and offered the burnt-offerings in behalf of himself and the people. This completes the lengthy injunctions of Moses concerning the sacrifices.

Definition Of Terms.

In order to arrive at an intelligent conclusion concerning the sacramental meaning of the sacrifices, we must first ascertain their literal significance. We will first study the meaning of the general term "sacrifice" and then try to apprehend the meaning of the various sacrifices in their regular order. In attempting to define the term "sacrifice," we are immediately confronted with a host of difficulties. The statement which Fairbairn made concerning the use of the term "priesthood" could as well be applied to the term "sacrifice." He states that "there is no term more vaguely used, or more frequently used to denote, if not contradictory, yet different and even incompatible conceptions."¹ The definition one gives of sacrifice must depend upon the idea he has of religion. This accounts for the multitude of definitions offered by the various scholars. As we desire to investigate the scriptural teaching of the term, we must confine ourselves largely to its use by Moses.

1. Sanday, Priesthood and Sacrifice, Report of a Conference, p. 16.

in the Pentateuch. According to Driver, "The usual Hebrew word for 'To sacrifice' is ZABAH, 'To slaughter,' hence ZEBAH, 'a slaughtering,' or, by usage, 'A sacred slaughtering,' or 'Sacrifice.'" ^I As used in its generic sense, "sacrifice" could be defined as a gift to God or the presentation to God of that which was of some cost to the offerer. Davison agrees with this definition when he states that "sacrifice in religion in general is an offering to God in worship of that which implies self-denial in the offerer." ² This definition is sufficient, no doubt, to cover its usage in the Patriarchal Period but is not specific enough for all of its applications in the Pentateuch. After a careful examination of a number of definitions, the most comprehensive statement, according to our opinion, is that of Cave when he states that "at the root of the essential significance of the Mosaic sacrifices two ideas lie, - viz. the Mosaic idea of presentation and that of atonement." ³

The idea of presentation, or a gift to God, is the fundamental idea of all sacrifice. This idea has been

1. Sandy, Priesthood and Sacrifice, The Report of a Conference, p. 12.

2. Ibid., p. 11.

3. Cave, The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice, Second edition, p. 101.

emphasized in our discussion of the Patriarchal sacrifices and needs little additional emphasis here. Worship in the Mosaic Period was similar to that of the former period in the sense that approach to God was conditioned upon the presentation of a gift of some kind. The offerer could not worship deity empty handed. In the Mosaic Period, gifts which were the fruit of labor were reckoned as a means of grace. In return for gifts from man, God gave gifts to man.

The idea of atonement, however, was altogether different from that of presentation. While the idea of presentation was contained in every sacrifice, the idea of atonement was limited, with but few exceptions, to the blood sacrifices. This idea of the atonement, so prominent in the Mosaic Period, is, while everywhere latent, never expressly alluded to in the period of the patriarchs. Some writers have analyzed the word "atonement" by the simple division "at-one-ment" as if the Old Testament was written in the English language. In order to arrive at the correct meaning, we must go back to the original root word in the Hebrew. The term "atonement" comes from the Hebrew word KIPPER and is usually translated: "to make atonement," "purge," "purge away," "reconcile," "make reconciliation," "pacify," "pardon," "be merciful," and "put off." As this word is often mistranslated and since so much of our

inquiry depends upon a correct understanding of it, it will be well to make a thorough study of its various forms, grammatical constructions, etymology and usage. The forms under which the root KAPHAR appears are not numerous. Most scholars deny that it is found in the Kal. ¹ Cave claims that it is found once in the Kal. ² While it is found once in the Nithpael and Hithpael, the usual verbal forms are the Piel and Pual. As to the etymology of the root, the cognate dialects give unanimous testimony that it signifies "to cover." The various grammatical constructions of the Piel form of KIPPER are interesting. At times, it is followed by a simple objective case, signifying the covering "of iniquity" (Ps. 73:38; Dan. 9:24), "of the face of an enemy" (Gen. 32:21), of the land of promise (Deut. 32:43), etc. The more usual construction, however, is where the thing or person covered is expressed by the preposition AL and its consequent case as: to throw a covering "over her" (Lev. 4:20), "over him" (Lev. 4:35), "over them" (Lev. 4:20), "over sins" (Ps. 79:9), "over souls" (Ex. 30:16), etc. Often the preposition BAADH is used as in the phrases: to throw a covering round one's "sin," "house," "congregation."

-
1. Brown, Driver and Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament; Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament, p. 327.
 2. Cave, The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice, Second edition, Appendix I.

Sometimes the prepositions *Be* and *MIN* are used, for example; to cover anything or anybody over "by blood" (Ex. 30:10), "by a sin-offering" (Lev. 4:26). The preposition *Be* was used also to designate the place of the covering as in the phrase *BAQODESH* - in the holy place. The person from whom covering was made was expressed by the preposition *Le* - to cover up "from the face of the Lord" (Lev. 5:26). An examination of the grammatical structure together with the usage shows that the covering of a person means the covering of his sin (Lev. 4:35; 5:13). The full construction of *KIPPER*; therefore, would be "to throw a covering over a man, that is to say, over his sin, from the face of God by means of a sacrifice presented in a holy place." The common usage of the word clearly shows that the covering was not so much "to render invisible," or "to protect from danger" as a "concealing" or "neutralizing" of sin, a covering of such a kind as "to render the divine anger inoperative"² (Ps. 78:38; Deut. 21:8; Prov. 16:14; Job 36:18; Gen. 32:21). This conception of neutralizing and rendering inoperative the punitive wrath of God underlies all scriptural use of *KIPPER* with the exception of a single passage - "Your covenant

-
1. Cave, The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice, Second edition, Appendix.
 2. Brown, Driver and Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament; Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament, p. 327.

with death shall be covered" (Isa. 28:18) - where a secondary idea seems to be conveyed. Instead of stating that the divine anger has been rendered inoperative and therefore abolished, the secondary idea "to abolish" is used. The effect ascribed to KIPPER is summed up in either the expression, "forgiveness of sins" (Lev. 4:28, 31, 35; 5:10, 13, 16, 18, 26; Num. 15:28) or "removal of uncleanness" (Lev. 12:7, 8) whether contracted deliberately or unintentionally.

In all of the offerings where there was no effusion of blood, the idea of presentation was paramount. The animal sacrifices contained this idea, and in addition, the idea of atonement. One important passage in Leviticus (Lev. 17:11) brings this out distinctly: "For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life." According to this passage, the blood of every animal sacrifice was appointed by God as a means of atonement for a human life, because the blood itself is the actual life of the animal sacrificed. Four points are emphasized in this passage: first, that souls are covered by animal sacrifice; second, that the covering was conditioned upon the shedding of blood; third, that the effusion of blood was efficacious because it was the pouring out of

life; and, fourth, that such an acceptance of life was according to the will of God. As soon as animal blood is shed, atonement is effected. Davidson states that the blood is given to make atonement but that "atonement is here represented as made not for sins, but for souls or persons." This interpretation of atonement is contrary to the general teaching of atonement in Leviticus. In our definition of KILPER, we have clearly shown that, according to both grammatical structure and usage, the covering of a person means the covering of his sins. The following passage from Leviticus is so direct and positive that further argument is unnecessary: (literally rendered) "And the priest shall throw a covering over him, over the sin which he hath sinned in any of these things, and he shall be forgiven" (Lev. 5:13).

Having the two ideas of presentation and atonement in mind, we will examine the various animal sacrifices and classify them according to both their general and their distinguishing characteristics.

We will first define the term for "burnt-offering." This term is derived from the Hebrew word OLAH (the root being ALAH) meaning "to go up," - the offering that rises to God in smoke.² Olah is exclusively used with

1. Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament, p. 325.
 2. Brown, Driver and Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament.

reference to animal sacrifices which were completely burned when presented at the altar. Its synonym in the Hebrew is **KABIL** or whole-offering. The word "holocaust" is also used as a synonym. While the burnt-offering had in it an element of atonement, this was only a subordinate feature. It atoned in order that it might be called an offering. Its existence, as a species, was due to the perfectness of presentation to which it gave expression. Of all the offerings, the burnt-offering was superior in its measure of presentation. Having in it an element of atonement and, at the same time, the most vivid form of presentation, the burnt-offering was preeminently the sacrifice of worship.

The Hebrew word from which the term "peace-offering" is derived is **SHELAMIM**. Scholars differ as to the root meaning of the word. Their interpretations may be placed in two general classes. According to the one, the word is derived from **SHALEM**, the same word as **SALEM**, which means primarily "to be whole," and thus "to be at peace," "to have friendship" with any one: the **SHELAMIM** would consequently be sacrifices made in assurance of peace with God. The other class holds that the term is derived from the Piel

I. See Tholuck, Kahnis, Delitsch, Oehler, Hengstenberg.

form of the same root, which signifies "to make whole," and as a result, the secondary meaning would be "to heal a breach by making some recompense;" this rendering would make the SHELAMIM sacrifices of restitution.^I

From the standpoint of etymology, it is difficult to decide between the two hypotheses. According to usage, the first interpretation appears to be the correct one. The peace-offering was very similar to the burnt-offering in that the atonement occupied in it a relatively insignificant place. The difference in the two, however, was that the burnt-offering provided for individual worship while the peace-offering provided for the worship of an entire household or group. They were primarily sacrifices of friendship and were presented by those who lived and rejoiced in a sense of the divine favor. Just as the burnt-offering emphasized the offerer's union with God, the peace-offering laid stress upon communion with God. That which distinguished the peace-offering as a special class of sacrifices was that it culminated in a holy festival. It could appropriately be called the Lord's Supper of the Old Testament./

We will now define the sin and trespass offerings. They are of a different genus from those previously

I. See Baehr, Baumgarten, Ebard, Neumann.

mentioned. It is the fact of atonement that is chiefly emphasized in these offerings. They were presentations for the purpose of making atonement.

The sin-offerings, as their name indicates, were sacrifices made to atone for sin. The name is derived from the Hebrew word CHATTATH which originally meant "to miss the mark," as an archer, or "to make a false step." As a secondary meaning, it is used to signify that variety of sacrifice called the "sin-offering." In order to understand their relative importance in the Mosaic economy, it will be necessary to ascertain the exact character of sins for which they would atone. In general, it can be said that the sin-offerings were divided into three different classes: those presented to effect purification; those which were offered for precise sins; and, those which were offered for the expiation of sins in general. The sin-offerings presented in the case of uncleanness are of only minor importance to our inquiry. These may be reduced to four classes: first, those concerning contact with the dead; second, those related to the action of the generative functions; third, those respecting leprosy; and fourth, those concerning certain outstanding sin-offerings. Authorities differ as to the ultimate significance of the purificatory offerings. The rationalists find in them merely sanitary regulations. Other

scholars have introduced various theories but the view which seems the most probable is that of the conservative school which holds that they were presented in atonement for original sin or its effects.^I The singular offerings were restricted to certain specific limitations. They could not be presented for promiscuous sins but only in well defined cases which the Law divides into two categories: sins of ignorance and other like sins. For example, such offerings were offered in the following instances: the high priest who, through ignorance, sinned in the performance of his official duty; the nation when, through ignorance, it had broken any of the divine commands; the ruler who had ignorantly neglected his official duty; and the common Israelite who had, through ignorance, trespassed upon the Mosaic injunctions. In other words, any one who, through ignorance, had violated any of the commands of God had to offer a sin-offering. Sins of a similar nature, where sin-offerings were required, were as follows: in case a man withheld evidence in a criminal case; where a man had been unintentionally defiled by contact with a corpse; and in the case of the breaking of rash vows. / In reality, all of these various instances of sin-offerings could be summed up under the head of sins "through ignorance." Sins of ignorance

I. Cave, The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice, Second edition, p. 100.

embraced those violations of the law where the offender became conscious of the offense after the deed had been committed, whether revealed by personal reflection or otherwise. Cave says that the phrase often refers to "sins committed rashly, unawares, without deliberate intent." In other words, sins which were the result of physical or moral weakness; as for example, the distinction in our modern courts between murder and manslaughter. Or as Davidson puts it, "The distinction was thus primarily a distinction in regard to the state of mind of the transgressor." Sins committed "through ignorance" were further set over against sins committed with "a high hand" (Num. 15:30) for which no sacrifice could be offered. High handed sins are described by Magee as "sins of presumption; that is to such as proceed, not from human frailty, but from a deliberate and audacious defiance of the divine authority." Some modern writers try to render of non-effect the sin-offerings by interpreting sins "through ignorance" in a strictly literal sense when they say, "Such matters as these do not constitute sin in the Christian sense of the word at all, yet the necessity for atonement is

-
1. Cave, The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice, Second edition, p. 107.
 2. Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament, p. 315.
 3. Magee, On Atonement and Sacrifice, Vol. I, p. 243.
 4. Burton, Smith and Smith, Atonement, pp. 45, 46.

"imperative." Such an interpretation indicts the divine wisdom and minimizes the law of God. Magee answers well this rationalistic view when he says, "The ignorance intended cannot have been of a nature absolute and invincible, but such as the clear promulgation of their law, and their strict obligation to study it day and night, rendered them accountable for, and which was consequently in a certain degree culpable." ^I / The real significance, then, of the singular offerings was that, while they constituted gifts and atonements, their chief purpose was to atone for sins of ignorance, error or weakness, all of which are the results of the frequent lapses of depraved human nature. The general sin-offerings, as a rule, were offered only on special occasions, such as feast-days. Whenever presented, they atoned for the sins of the nation as a whole. Special sins were not the occasion of their presentation as they were only offered for sins in general. For fear that some of the sins of the people had been omitted in the former offerings, these sin-offerings were offered as supplementary offerings. / Sin-offerings, therefore, may be defined as animal sacrifices offered in atonement for sins of ignorance which, according to the law, included all sins except those deliberately

property (Lev. 5: 15, 16), if he had failed to tithe or to give the priest his portion of the offering (Lev. 22:14-16), if he had defrauded or robbed his fellow-man (Lev. 5:21-26), if a leper had been restored to health (Lev. 12:20), and, if a nazirite had defiled himself unawares (Num. 6:12), compensation could be made by a trespass-offering and, in certain cases, by the additional payment of an indemnity. Both the sin and the trespass-offerings were sin-offerings. In the sin-offering, however, atonement was the prominent feature - an animal life being offered as a substitute for a human life - while, in the trespass-offering, the outstanding characteristic was that of satisfaction - the expiation of sin by the payment of a ransom.

Sufficient explanation has already been made concerning the bloodless sacrifices. The fact that they were gifts pure and simple, without any element of atonement, might well be emphasized.

III. THE RELATION OF THE MOSAIC SACRIFICES TO THE FORGIVENESS OF SIN.

Thus far, in our study of the Mosaic Period, we have found that there was a moral necessity for an

I. See Delitzsch, Fairbairn, Kalisch, Mueller and Oehler.

atonement for sin because of God's moral righteousness and of man's universal sinfulness. In providing for an atonement for sin, God gave to Moses specific instructions concerning various offerings and their respective rituals. / An effort has been made to define these offerings according to their scriptural usage. We are now in a position to investigate the real significance and import of the atonement so frequently mentioned in the Law. / In other words, our purpose is to ascertain the exact relation of the Mosaic sacrifices to the forgiveness of sin. Was this atonement, wrought by the sacrifices, substitutionary? and if so, what was the nature of the substitution? / Since there is a difference of opinion among scholars on this question, we will first state the leading views and then draw our own conclusions from the plain teaching of the Scripture.

In the main, there are just two schools of opinion on this question - the conservatives on the one hand and the liberals on the other. Hodge clearly states the conservative view when he says, "The death of the bleeding sacrifice was a poena vicaria, a vicarious punishment, the life of the victim being substituted in the stead of the life of the offerer."^I The liberal view,

I. Hodge, Atonement, p. 127.

generally known as the Old Scoonian View, was first enunciated by Sykes and Taylor and afterward restated by Baehr. According to Baehr, the death of the victim had no vicarious import whatever but was simply an incidental means of obtaining the blood. He made the sprinkling of the blood the essence of the entire sacrificial service since the the effusion of the blood symbolized the giving away of the offerer's life to God or, to quote his own words, the merit of the transaction rested in "his (the offerer's) returning back to God, by repentance and faith and self-dedication, after being separated from him by sin." ^I Maurice agrees with Baehr in making the sacrifices mere objective symbols of the subjective state of the offerer. Bushnell belongs to the same school and believes that the only effect of the sacrifices was lustral. His statement is as follows: "Here, then, is the grand terminal of all sacrifice; it purges, washes, sprinkles, purifies, sanctifies, carries away pollution, in that sense absolves the guilty." ² Still other more recent writers have restated the liberal view but the above statements are sufficient for our present inquiry.

1. Quoted from Hodge, Atonement, p. 128.

2. Bushnell, Vicarious Sacrifice, Vol. I, p. 469.

atonement for sin because of God's moral righteousness and of man's universal sinfulness. In providing for an atonement for sin, God gave to Moses specific instructions concerning various offerings and their respective rituals. / An effort has been made to define these offerings according to their scriptural usage. We are now in a position to investigate the real significance and import of the atonement so frequently mentioned in the Law. / In other words, our purpose is to ascertain the exact relation of the Messianic sacrifices to the forgiveness of sin. Was this atonement, wrought by the sacrifices, substitutionary? and if so, what was the nature of the substitution? / Since there is a difference of opinion among scholars on this question, we will first state the leading views and then draw our own conclusions from the plain teaching of the Scripture.

In the main, there are just two schools of opinion on this question - the conservatives on the one hand and the liberals on the other. Hodge clearly states the conservative view when he says, "The death of the bleeding sacrifice was a poenā vicaria, a vicarious punishment, the life of the victim being substituted in the stead of the life of the offerer."^I The liberal view,

I. Hodge, Atonement, p. 127.

generally known as the Old Socinian View, was first enunciated by Sykes and Taylor and afterward restated by Baehr. According to Baehr, the death of the victim had no vicarious import whatever but was simply an incidental means of obtaining the blood. He made the sprinkling of the blood the essence of the entire sacrificial service since the the effusion of the blood symbolized the giving away of the offerer's life to God or, to quote his own words, the merit of the transaction rested in "his (the offerer's) returning back to God, by repentance and faith and self-dedication, after being separated from him by sin." ^I Maurice agrees with Baehr in making the sacrifices mere objective symbols of the subjective state of the offerer. Bushnell belongs to the same school and believes that the only effect of the sacrifices was lustral. His statement is as follows: "Here, then, is the grand terminal of all sacrifice; it purges, washes, sprinkles, purifies, sanctifies, carries away pollution, in that sense absolves the guilty." ² Still other more recent writers have restated the liberal view but the above statements are sufficient for our present inquiry.

1. Quoted from Hodge, Atonement, p. 128.

2. Bushnell, Vicarious Sacrifice, Vol. I, p. 469.

In our investigation of this problem, we will study the nature, the method, the extent and the efficacy of the atonement. We have shown, in our definition of the word "atone" that the original meaning was "to cover," not in the sense of rendering invisible to God, but to neutralize sin, or to render inoperative the punitive wrath of God toward sin. In other words, to deprive sin of its power to come between the offerer and God.

The next problem is to ascertain the exact method by which atonement was wrought. Was the death of the victim a vicarious punishment for the death of the offerer? Was the sprinkling of the blood the only essential part of the sacrifice? Did the objective element in the sacrifices merely symbolize the subjective state of the offerer? In other words, how did the Mosaic sacrifices atone for sin? No attempt will be made to follow any one of these arguments in every detail. From our study of the meaning and usage of the terms "sacrifice" and "atonement," we have proven beyond doubt that expiation was effected for human sin by means of the effusion of animal blood. If the ritual of these blood-offerings had any symbolical significance whatever, it was that they testified to the fact that the life of the animal victim vicariously bore the punishment of death due to the offerer. For

the Law clearly states that "the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls" (Lev. 17:11). In other words, life was atoned by life, blood by blood. The moment the blood or the sacrifice touched the altar, the sins of the offerer were forgiven.

While it is true that the blood is recognized by the Law as the instrument of atonement, it would be false to state that the death of the victim was merely incidental and possessed no significance in the transaction. Kalisch says, "It is, moreover, obviously erroneous to deny all significance to the killing of the animal, and to look upon it simply as an act of transition and a means of obtaining the blood; if so, it would not have been so regularly recorded in the text, nor would the mode have been so characteristically varied in different sacrifices." ^I The ceremony of the slaying was entrusted to the offerer rather than to the priest as the offerer was, in some manner, required to testify to his submission, gratitude and death-deserving guilt. It is significant also, that in order for the effusion of the blood to be lawful it had to be obtained by the killing of the animal. If the blood was procured from a fresh wound or even from

I. Kalisch, Commentary on Leviticus, Vol. I, p. 193-194.

a vital organ of a living animal, its use was illegal. Oehler makes the proper distinction between the death of the victim and its blood, as used to effect atonement, when he states that while "the whole act of sacrifice aims at atonement, the manipulation of the blood takes place in a higher degree."¹

The question is asked by the rationalists whether or not other objective means of atonement were recognized by the Law besides the effusion of animal blood.² While it is true that certain exceptions may be found, the fact remains that the only stipulated means of atonement in the law is the offering of a blood-sacrifice upon the altar. We will examine a few of these instances. Take, for example, the instance where, in cases of extreme poverty, a meal-offering could be substituted for a blood-offering to make atonement for sin (Lev. 5:11-13). The offering of flour was accepted only on the condition that the offerer was so poor that, unless this exception be granted, he would be deprived of worship altogether. It is clear that this exception is made only in cases of absolute necessity and then merely as a substitute for the blood. As the poor man stood and watched his offering of flour burn upon the

1. Oehler, Old Testament Theology, p. 280.

2. Burton, Smith and Smith, Atonement, p. 53.

altar, he would be compelled to consider it as a substitute for the regularly prescribed means of atonement which was animal blood. / Other examples follow. When a census was taken of the tribes, each Israelite was required to pay a half-shekel - "the rich shall not give more and the poor shall not give less" - to make atonement for their souls (Ex. 30:11-16). Upon numbering their forces after returning from the slaughter of the Midianites, the warriors gave of their bracelets, earrings, and golden chains to make atonement for their souls (Num. 31:48-54). In these two cases, the record shows that atonement was effected by the payment of money equal to the value placed upon the life. After the death of Korah and his band, Aaron was instructed by Moses to avert the oncoming plague by an offering of incense. Moses said, "Take thy censor - - - make atonement for them - - - for there is wrath gone out from Jehovah" (Num. 16:46). In the case of Korah's rebellion, we find that atonement was made by priestly intercession. While the instances cited prove an exception to the rule, they do not invalidate the assertion that, under the Law, the appointed objective means of atonement was that of animal sacrifice. Moses, because he was a prophet and the giver of the law, could, at certain crises, interpose other objective means of atonement but the only stipulated means by which sin

could be atoned was the effusion of animal blood. Had a priest endeavored to effect atonement by the payment of money or the burning of incense alone, he would have gone contrary to what he himself believed to be the direct command of God. Cave, on this point says, "It is indisputable, that although in certain cases which it itself dictated, the Law recognized other means of atonement, and by its perpetual approbation of the deeds of Moses regarded it as possible that one endowed with the prophetic office should himself be above the law, never-the-less, the only method to which recourse could be had at any time for purification and absolution was the legal offering of animal life."

The next question which arises concerning the method of atonement is: Is there a subjective element in the atonement? and if so, just what relation does this element sustain to the forgiveness of sins? We know that the Law recognized a subjective element in atonement for, in certain cases, the offerer was required to confess his sins before the victim was offered (Lev. 5:5; Num. 5:7). One would grossly misrepresent Mosaic worship if he described the sacrificial offerings as simple mechanical and perfunctory obedience to a divine law without making any demands

whatever upon the spiritual nature. It can be clearly shown from the Pentateuch that the mental and spiritual attitude of the worshipper had much to do with the efficacy of his sacrifice. For example, the priests were forbidden to enter upon their sacred duties if their minds were affected in the least by strong drink (Lev. 10:9). Since many of the sacrifices offered by individuals were voluntary, the will of the offerer undoubtedly played some part in the offering (Lev. 7:16). As sin-offerings were only commanded to be offered when the individual became conscious of his sin, it would be reasonable to conclude that certain feelings and spiritual emotions prompted his obedience to the law (Lev. 4:14, 23, 28). The Law specifically states that, on the Day of Atonement, all of the people should manifest an attitude of humility toward God by outwardly fasting and inwardly bowing in repentance. Should the individual fail to do this, he was under a heavy penalty for the Law states that "whatsoever soul it be that shall not be afflicted (bowed) in that same day, he shall be cut off from among his people" (Lev. 23:29). With this thought in mind, it is not difficult to understand why there was no atonement provided under the law for sins committed with a high hand since they were in open rebellion against God and in wilful rejection of the divine authority (Num. 15:30). / The rite of the

imposition of hands vividly portrays the subjective element in the method of atonement. It is true that some authorities¹ assert that this rite was only a devotion of the victim to the purpose of sacrifice, while others find in it an occasion for the confession of sins. Outram quotes from the Jewish Rabbis to the effect that "where there is no confession of sins, there is no imposition of hands" and that, in such cases, the audible confession was "O God, I have sinned, I have done perversely, I have trespassed before thee, and done so and so. Lo! now I repent and am truly sorry for my misdeeds. Let this victim be my expiation."² Whether we give any credence to the statements of the Jewish Rabbis or not, the Law clearly testifies that certain placular sacrifices were accompanied by the confession of sins (Lev. 5:5; Num. 5:7). The Law is very clear, however, regarding this rite in the ritual of the sacrifices on the Day of Atonement. The subjective element is plainly mentioned for the Law states that "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, even all their sins" (Lev. 16:21). Some

1. Cave, The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice, Second edition, p. 129.

2. Quoted from Magee, On Atonement and Sacrifice, Vol. I, p. 257.

writers eliminate the subjective element altogether while others contend that the subjective element is the essence of the entire sacrificial service. From the evidence produced, it is clear that, in the giving of the law, Moses recognized both an objective and a subjective element in the method of atonement.

We will now take up the problem of the effect of the Mosaic sacrifices. To what extent did they atone? what degree of validity did they possess in the divine economy? We find two extreme views on this point. The conservatives hold that both the moral and the ceremonial effects of sin were neutralized by the atonement effected by the expiatory sacrifices, providing these sacrifices were offered in faith. They furthermore assert that the absolution of sin thus wrought was just as efficacious as that accomplished by the atonement of Christ in the New Testament economy. On the contrary, the liberals contend that the Mosaic ritual had no power to remove the pollution of moral but merely of ceremonial transgressions and possibly, for special reasons, a few cases bordering on moral transgression. To carry either one of these views to an extreme would result in gross error. It is possible to harmonize these opposing views into one statement which would be in perfect accord with the teaching of the Pentateuch. The conservative view makes the atonement, wrought by

the legal sin-offerings, valid in the eternal council of God, while, according to the liberals, this atonement is only valid in God's temporary, earthly government. The atonement, according to the first view, reinstated the offerer into his former position as a child of God; while, according to the second view, it placed the offerer back into his former position as a citizen. In the Mosaic economy, to reinstate an individual into the earthly theocracy was to reinstate him into the theocracy of heaven. The two ideas were identical in the mind of Moses. The Law makes no distinction between the ceremonial and the moral law. "In the Mosaic law, what we are accustomed to regard as ceremonial acts are considered as in the truest and deepest sense moral acts, and the temporary government of God as a necessary section of His eternal government." ¹ Oehler confirms this idea when he says, "The traditional division of the law of Moses into moral, ceremonial, and juristic laws may serve to facilitate a general view of theocratic ordinances; but it is incorrect if it seeks to express a distinction within the law, and to claim a difference of dignity for the various parts." ² The penalty for the breaking of a

1. Cave, The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice, Second edition, p. 150.

2. Oehler, Old Testament Theology, Art. 84, p. 182.

ceremonial law was just as severe as that of a moral law. An unconscious transgression of such a law rendered the subject unfit for worship and, if a suitable sacrifice was not offered when the transgressor became conscious of his error, he was visited by excision and death. The Scriptures affirm that the effect of the sacrifices, which were offered either for sin or for inherited, original sin, called uncleanness, was to forgive sins and to remove uncleanness (Lev. 5:10; 12:8). We find no indication from the Scriptures that the design of the sacrifices was to produce merely a moral influence upon the offender, to place him in a position where it was possible to be forgiven, or simply to exhibit a determination on the part of God to punish sin but to actually cover sin in such a way that God could neglect it. The unclean person realized that the guilt, which was operating in his body as disease and death, was removed and the moral offender was conscious that he had obtained forgiveness for his transgression. The reality of this forgiveness may be seen by mentioning some of the sins which were actually forgiven. The sin-offerings atoned for all sins of human frailty and inadvertency whether committed consciously or unconsciously (Lev. 4:1-5:13). The trespass-offerings atoned for such sins as lying, theft, fraud, perjury, and debauchery (Lev. 6:1-7). Then on the great Day

of Atonement, the children of Israel received forgiveness for all their sins (Lev. 16:16, 30, 34). The only sins for which no atonement was provided were those committed with a high hand, in which cases, emphasis was placed upon the necessity of obedience as well as sacrifice. Our conclusion, therefore, would not be in favor of either of the views proposed since the scriptural usage of the word "atone" teaches that wherever an offering for sin was legally made, it mattered not what the character of the sin was, "a covering" was effected. Not that the sin became invisible but that it was covered in such a way that the divine anger was rendered inoperative.

It further remains to investigate the means of the atonement. What did the Mosaic law regard as the actual instrument by which forgiveness of sins was obtained? In what way was the blood able to cover sin? Was its power inherent or was it efficacious in that it foreshadowed or pointed to some perfect sacrifice? We find no direct teaching in the law on this question. There are suggestions here and there that the difficulty might be solved in the far distant future. These suggestions, however, could only have been grasped by individuals with deep insight and spiritual vision. The time had not yet come for the full light of the Gospel to be shed upon the shadowy precepts of the law. The point of interest to

us is how the Israelite, living under the Law, could believe that animal blood atoned for sin. We would probably be safe in saying that the majority of those who sought atonement simply obeyed the Law without asking any questions. If there were those among the throng of unthinking worshippers who desired to penetrate into the deep mysteries of the atonement, they would not have sought altogether in vain. They should have had no difficulty in ascertaining the subjective conditions of sacrifice for it would have appeared to be according to the natural order for repentance and faith to precede the removal of the consequences of guilt. The question of the objective condition of sacrifice would have been their problem. As they witnessed the burning of their offerings upon the altar, they could have enquired how it was that their atonement depended upon the blood of an innocent animal which was incapable either of sin or of moral emotion. The statement in the law that "the blood maketh atonement by reason of the life" (Lev. 17:11) would not have been a sufficient explanation. Some of them might have thought that the sacrifice of their own lives could have atoned for sins but they could scarcely have conceived of a valid substitute in the offering of dumb animals. The only direct reply they could have made to such a question would have been that

"God had so ordained." They could have seen that repentance alone was insufficient to effect atonement and that the effusion of animal blood was required in addition to make the transaction legal but there was no reason for it given in the law except "I have given it (the blood) to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls" (Lev. 17:11). If they had been inclined to criticise the declarations of God, as some of our modern writers are in the habit of doing, they would no doubt have renounced God altogether. On the other hand, if they should have desired to go still farther into the plans and purposes of God in redemption, they might have associated the idea of atonement through sacrifice with the story of a Deliverer so often repeated to them as a promise made to their fathers. No doubt, they were familiar with the prophecy of Balaam, one of their contemporaries, who declared:

"There shall come forth a star out of Jacob

And a scepter shall rise out of Israel" (Num. 24:17).

and also the prophecy of Moses, "Jehovah thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me: unto him ye shall hearken" (Deut. 18:15). It appears reasonable that the very nature of their institutions would have led them to see that the law was only a shadow of the good things to come (Heb. 10:1). For as Hodge says, "The sacrifice of a

dumb animal was fully sufficient, when divinely appointed, to satisfy for the infringement of the law, when considered simply in its character as a ceremonial; while the law, viewed as an expression of absolute righteousness, can evidently be satisfied with nothing else than either the full execution of the penalty in the person of the sinner, or a full equivalent therefor in the person of an adequate substitute." ^I The fact of the lack of proportion between the Mosaic sacrificial symbols and the things symbolized should have convinced those discerning Israelites that the blood of bulls and goats could not take away their sins (Heb. 10:4) but that this sacrificial system together with the promises made to the chosen people were intended to arouse an expectancy of the time when types would give place to antitypes and shadows to living realities. For, says Cave, "Those symbols, from their very insufficiency, had an element of prophecy which pointed to a future time, when, the day of figurative representation having passed, those same truths should be painted upon the eye of man by forms ² adequate and expressions proportionate."

1. Hodge, Atonement, p. 139.

2. Cave, The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice, Second edition, p. 139.

Chapter III.

The Prophetic Period.

Chapter III.

The Prophetic Period.

Having traced the biblical conception of atonement through the Patriarchal and Mosaic Periods, we now come to study its further development in the period of the prophets. In the Patriarchal Period, we found only the beginnings of the institution of sacrifice. Its full meaning could not be ascertained because of the primitive condition of man and the extreme remoteness of the period. While a study of the succeeding period showed that the law, as revealed by Moses, was the source of all of the genuine, spiritual life of the people, yet, there was nothing contained in the code which definitely pointed the Israelite to a complete deliverance through an antitypical sacrifice. It remained the task of prophecy to conduct the Mosaic doctrine of sacrifice through this new phase of development.

The books of the prophets contain the greatest mental achievements of man prior to the Christian era. The Hebrew prophet of the Old Testament is an object of wonder and admiration. His realm was the supernatural yet he never went beyond the limitations of

human genius. He spoke for God and, being a divine interpreter, expressed his heavenly messages in words of eloquence and rich poetry. Ewald defines a prophet as "a loud, clear speaker, yet always one who declares the mind and words of one who does not himself speak; just as a dumb or a retired person must have a speaker to speak for him and declare his thoughts, so must God, who is dumb with respect to the mass of men, have his messenger or speaker; and hence the word in its sacred sense denotes him who speaks not of himself, but as commanded of his God." ¹ "The prophet, as regarded in the light of Scripture, was simply the recipient and bearer of a message from God; and such a message of course was a prophecy, whatever might be its more specific character - whether the disclosure of some important truth, the inculcation of an imperative duty, or a prospective delineation of coming events." ² "The prophet then was the representative of God under the theocratic government, the vizier, or deputy, whose business it was to speak in God's name." ³ In answer to the question, how the prophet became conscious of the position which he occupied,

1. Ewald, The Prophets of the Old Testament, Vol. I, p. 8.
 2. Fairbairn, On Prophecy, p. 5.
 3. Payne Smith, Prophecy & Preparation for Christ, Second edition, p. 65.

Oehler says, "The prophet, as such, knows himself to be the organ of divine revelation, in virtue both of a Divine vocation, capable of being known by him as such, and which came to him with irresistible power and also of his endowment with the enlightening, sanctifying, and strengthening spirit of God." ^I The privilege of receiving and proclaiming divine revelations was not limited to any particular family or tribe, as was the case with the office of the priesthood, but God chose whomsoever He would to be His confidant and spokesman. The above conception of the nature of prophecy is in perfect harmony with the teaching of the Scripture and thus prevents what some writers have pointed out as discrepancies in the Old Testament teaching concerning sacrifice and atonement. According to the Mosaic injunctions, sacrifices were, under capital penalties, never to be offered in any place except at the Tabernacle and then only by the Levitical priesthood but the record shows that certain prophets, without priestly assistance, offered sacrifices in places far distant from the court. Take, for example, the instance where Elijah offered his sacrifice on Mount Carmel. That his sacrifice was

accepted is evident from the presence of fire from heaven which consumed his offering. According to the biblical conception of a prophet, such cases can easily be explained. The prophet Moses was the giver of the Law and every prophet that came after him was a law unto himself. // The very fact of his divine calling made it necessary for the prophet to obey the voice of God as revealed within while the priest must obey God's law as revealed without. // In other words, because of his direct communion with God, the conscience of the prophet was just as authoritative as were the commands of God to Moses on Mount Sinai. // In support of this statement, we call attention to the fact that every change that was subsequently made in the Mosaic law was inaugurated only by the prophetic office. Certain changes in the Levitical arrangement were made by Samuel (I Chron. 9:22). Other changes, related to the Temple of Solomon, were made by the prophet David (I Chron. 28:19). Still others, respecting the second Temple, were made by the prophets Haggai and Ezekiel (Ezek. 40-46; Haggai I:7-14).

From the time of Adam, the first prophet, to the days of Samuel, the only prophetic utterances were those of Jacob, Balaam and Moses. Beginning with the time of Samuel, however, the gift of prophecy was more

or less abundant up until the close of the Old Testament canon. No doubt, the statement is true that the utterances of such prophets as Samuel, Elijah, and Elisha are incomplete as we now have them but, beginning about the time of the fall of Samaria, the records preserved to us are much more extended. It is from the prophecies of Obadiah and Joel; from the utterances of Jonah, Amos and Hosea; from the majestic prophecies of Isaiah; from the prophecies of Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah and Jeremiah; from the exilic prophecies of Haggai, Ezekiel and Daniel; and from the final productions of Zechariah and Malachi that the most important instructions concerning our inquiry may be found.

One cannot study the prophetic writings without being impressed with the fact that the prophets were concerned with the preservation of that which was productive of genuine spiritual life in the teaching of the Law as well as the prediction of and preparation for the golden age of the future. For as Davison asserts, "If we take up the Prophetic Volume, we find it readily distinguishes itself into two parts, which may be called the Moral or Doctrinal, and the Predictive."¹ "Predict the prophets did that they

1. Davison, On Prophecy, Sixth edition, p. 28.

might teach, and predict they did concerning sacrifice: but their teaching was not confined to prediction: prophecy was also concerned in emphatically reiterating the doctrine of Sacrifice previously given." ^I Without this conception, one cannot properly interpret the message of the prophets.

Our inquiry into the teaching of the prophets will be directed along three lines: first, the prophetic conception of sin; second, the prophetic conception of the Mosaic sacrifices; and, third, the prophetic conception of the relation of the Mosaic sacrifices to the forgiveness of sin.

I. THE PROPHETIC CONCEPTION OF SIN.

The prophets are very practical in their dealing with sin. They do not speculate as to the origin of sin but simply point it out as it manifests itself in the lives of the people. With them, sin is universal. A certain development, however, is noted in their ideas of sin. At first, sin is conceived as national and more or less external but later, about the time of the

I. Cave, The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice, Second edition, p. 208.

exile, sin is conceived as individual and emphasis is placed upon the state of mind which the external act of sin implies. The fact is pointed out that the people failed to attain that righteousness necessary before God to realize the purpose of their election and the conviction is overwhelming that if this righteousness is ever attained it will be through a new dispensation of grace, or, in other words, God must, of His mercy, blot out their transgression. Space will permit only a limited number of scriptural quotations. Concerning the sin of the nation, Micah, speaking for Israel, says, "I will bear the indignation of Jehovah, because I have sinned against him" (Micah 7:9); while Isaiah declares, "Yea, thou heardest not; yea, thou knewest not; yea, from of old thine ear was not opened; for I knew that thou didst deal very treacherously and wast called a transgressor from the womb" (Isaiah 48:8); again, "Thy first father sinned, and thy teachers have transgressed against me" (Isaiah 43:27). Still further, he says, "For we are all become as one that is unclean, and all our righteousnesses are as a polluted garment: and we all do fade as a leaf: and our iniquities, like the wind, take us away" (Isaiah 64:6). Sin is now conceived as individual, for Isaiah cries out, "Woe is me; for I am

undone: because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips" (Isaiah 6:5). The doctrine of the individual is clearly stated in Jeremiah and Ezekiel: "In those days they shall say no more, The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge. But every one shall die for his own iniquity" (Jer. 31:29, 30); "The soul that sinneth, it shall die" (Ezek. 18:20). Sin is further conceived as an inward state of the mind, for Jeremiah says, "The heart is deceitful above all things, and it is exceedingly corrupt; who can know it? I Jehovah, search the mind, I try the heart, even to give every man according to his way, according to the fruit of his doings" (Jer. 17:9, 10). The same prophet also points out the only cure for sin: "And I will give them a heart to know me" (Jer. 24:7); "Behold, the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the days that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt: which my covenant they brake, although I was a husband unto them, saith Jehovah. But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith Jehovah: I will put my law in their inward

parts, and in their heart will I write it; and I will be their God and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know Jehovah: for they shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest of them, saith Jehovah: for I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin will I remember no more" (Jer. 31:31-34). The people are no longer to look for righteousness in the rigid objectivity of the law but in the spiritual attitude of the heart, for Ezekiel says, "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh; and I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep mine ordinances and do them" (Ezek. 36:26, 27).

II. THE PROPHETIC CONCEPTION OF THE MOSAIC SACRIFICES.

The prophets recognized both the objective and the subjective elements in the Mosaic sacrifices. They often reiterated the importance of the sacrificial rites as a means of spiritual worship. Nahum exclaims, "Keep thy feasts, O Judah, perform thy vows; for the wicked one shall no more pass through thee" (Nahum I:15). Likewise, Zechariah adds, "Thus saith Jehovah of hosts: the

fast of the fourth month and the fast of the fifth, and the fast of the seventh, and the fast of the tenth, shall be to the house of Judah joy and gladness, and cheerful feasts: therefore love truth and peace" (Zech. 8:19). Perhaps the prophet, who placed the greatest emphasis upon the sacrificial system of Moses, was Ezekiel, who described his vision of the new Temple which was to be erected upon the ruins of the old (Ezek. 40-48).

The prophets were strong in their denunciation of iniquitous sacrificial observance. Amos cries out, "Hear this, O ye that would swallow up the needy, and cause the poor of the land to fall, saying, When will the new moon be gone, that we may sell grain - - - making the ephah small, and the shekel great - - - Jehovah hath sworn by the excellency of Jacob, Surely I will never forget any of their works" (Amos 8:4-7). Hosea writes, "My people ask counsel at their stock, and their staff declareth unto them; - - - They sacrifice upon the tops of the mountains, and burn incense upon the hills, under the oaks and poplars and terebinths, - - - Ephraim is joined to idols; let him alone" (Hosea 4:12-17).

The subjective side of sacrifice is stressed with unusual vigor by the prophets. Take, for instance,

the exhortation of Joel, "Gird yourselves with sackcloth, and lament, ye priests; wail, ye ministers of the altar; come, lie all night in sackcloth, ye ministers of my God" (Joel I:13). Or, as Micah asks, "Wherewith shall I come before Jehovah, and bow myself before the high God? shall I come before him with burnt-offerings, with calves a year old? will Jehovah be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body, for the sin of my soul? He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth Jehovah require of thee, but to do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God?" (Micah 6:6-8).

III. THE PROPHEPIC CONCEPTION OF THE RELATION OF THE MOSAIC SACRIFICES TO THE FORGIVENESS OF SIN.

It is with regard to the relation of the Mosaic sacrifices to the forgiveness of sin that the Old Testament prophets render their greatest contribution. They took as one of their chief tasks the unification of the sacrificial teachings of Mosaism with the teachings concerning the Messiah. While these two teachings had developed side by side since the days

Abel, no successful effort had as yet been made to show their connection or to establish the fact that future deliverance would be accomplished through an antitypical sacrifice. Although the psalms had much to say about the kingly and priestly qualities of the Divine Deliverer, no definite assurance can be found in them to warrant the reader in looking for a Redeemer who would offer Himself as an adequate as well as an eternal sacrifice for sin. Prophecy, however, succeeded in welding these two doctrines into one great chain of divine revelation.

As a preparation for this final teaching, the prophets were impressed with the fact that the Mosaic sacrifices, instead of being permanent institutions, were only transitional in character. Zephaniah, as Jehovah's mouthpiece, says, "Therefore as I live, saith Jehovah of hosts, the God of Israel, Surely Moab shall be as Sodom, and the children of Ammon as Gomorrah. - - Jehovah will be terrible unto them; for he will smite all the gods of the earth; and men shall worship him, every one from his place, even all the isles of the nations" (Zeph. 2:9-11). Joel represents Jehovah as promising a satisfaction not realized in Mosaic worship. For, he says, - "Judah shall abide forever, and Jerusalem from generation to generation. And I will cleanse

their blood that I have not cleansed: for Jehovah dwelleth in Zion" (Joel 3:20, 21). A sacrifice is spoken of by Zephaniah which Jehovah will offer when He shall manifest His grace;: "Hold thy peace at the presense of the Lord Jehovah; for the day of Jehovah is at hand: for Jehovah hath prepared a sacrifice, he hath consecrated his guests" (Zeph. I:7).

The work of each succeeding prophet brought into higher relief the image of a Redeemer which had been but dimly sketched by former revelation. Anticipating this chapter somewhat in our former discussions, we have called attention to the Messianic element in the earlier prophecies. In the Patriarchal Period, we saw that the promise was limited to the descendants of Shem, Abraham, Jacob and Judah. Coming on into the next period, we heard Balaam describe a King, under whose leadership the kingdom of Judah would realize complete victory and even Moses, in his meekness, was heard to tell of a prophet greater than himself. The Psalms were spoken of as containing many forecasts of a Messiah with kingly and priestly qualities. The Messianic ideas contained in the Pentateuch and the Psalms are greatly enlarged and clarified by the later prophets, who, according to their gift of revealing the future, made known their expectation of a Messiah who was to be a descendent of the royal

line of David and a blessing to all mankind.

We will first call attention to some Messianic prophecies which helped to prepare the way for the nobler Isaiah. According to Hosea, "the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without sacrifices, and without pillar, and without ephod or teraphim: afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek Jehovah their God, and David their king, and shall come with fear unto Jehovah and to his goodness in the latter days" (Hosea 3:4,5). Joel exultantly announces to backsliding Israel, "Be glad, then, ye children of Zion, and rejoice in Jehovah your God; for he giveth you the former rain in just measure, and he causeth to come down for you the rain, the former rain and the latter rain in the first month. - - - And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh" (Joel 2:23, 28). Amos, speaking for Jehovah, declares, "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up its ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old; that they may possess the remnant of Edom, and all the nations that are called by my name, saith Jehovah that doeth this" (Amos 9:11, 12). And, after pronouncing certain woes upon Samaria and

Judah, Micah gives utterance to the glorious prophecy, "And thou, Bethlehem, Ephrathah, which art little to be among the thousands of Judah, out of thee shall one come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth are from of old, from everlasting" (Micah 5:2).

The task of uniting the Old Testament teachings concerning sacrifice and the Messiah into one central theme was left for the calm, majestic, Isaiah. He did the task well. According to his prophecy, the two doctrines, as taught in the past, were only different phases of the same truth. As might be expected, an element of progress is noted in the series of prophecies contained in the book of Isaiah. At first, Isaiah seems to follow the same trend as former prophets but gradually he ascends in his vision of a Deliverer until he towers above all of his predecessors and contemporaries. At an hour of spiritual gloom, he points to a time when Jerusalem shall be cleansed of her iniquity and when her inhabitants shall be led by One, whose life originates with God, called the Branch: "In that day shall the branch of Jehovah be beautiful and glorious, and the fruit of the land shall be excellent and comely for them that are escaped of Israel. And it shall come to pass, that he that is left in Zion, and he that remaineth in Jerusalem, shall be called holy, even every one that is written among the living in Jerusalem

when the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion, and shall have purged the blood of Jerusalem from the midst thereof, by the spirit of justice, and by the spirit of burning. And Jehovah will create over the whole habitation of Mount Zion and over her assemblies, a cloud and smoke by day, and the shining of a flaming fire by night: for over all the glory shall be spread a covering. And there shall be a pavilion for a shade in the day-time from the heat, and for a refuge and for a covert from storm and from rain"

(Isa. 4:2-6). This same Branch of the Lord is later spoken of as the Son of a virgin whose presence shall unite the two kingdoms: "behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel" (Isa. 7:14). Soon after this announcement was made, there came the message that in this child would be combined the divine element of the kingly Messiahship and the human element of descent from the seed of David: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and of peace there shall be no end, upon his kingdom, to establish it, and to uphold it with justice and with righteousness from henceforth

even forever" (Isa. 9:6-8). The features of the Messiah, above mentioned, are reiterated and expanded in other of Isaiah's prophecies (Isa. II:12; 16:5; 18:7; 25:6-8; 26:1; 27:13; 28:16; 29:18, 19; 32:1-3, 17-20; 35; 42:1-9). Up to this time, prophecy has set forth only the kingly qualities of the Messiah but from now on an additional characteristic is noted. Isaiah predicts that the Messiah, whose kingly rule shall be universal, will suffer vicariously for the sins of His subjects. It will be through His sufferings that He will insure the recognition of His claims. While He is pictured as One Whom kings and princes shall worship, at the same time, He is portrayed as One Whom "man despiseth," "Whom the nation abhorreth," "a servant of rulers" (Isa. 49:7), and who without resistance gave His back to the smiters, His cheeks to the pluckers, and hid not His face from shame and spitting (Isa. 50:6). Isaiah's brilliant prophecy on the priestly qualities of the Messiah now follows: "Behold, my servant shall deal wisely, he shall be exalted and lifted up, and shall be very high. Like as many were astonished at thee (his visage was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men), so shall he sprinkle many nations; kings shall shut their mouths at him; for that which had not been told them

shall they see; and that which they had not heard shall they understand. Who hath believed our message? and to whom hath the arm of Jehovah been revealed? For he grew up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground: he hath no form nor comeliness; and when we see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him. He was despised, and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and as one from whom men hide their face he was despised: and we esteemed him not. Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows; yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him: and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and Jehovah hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. He was oppressed, yet when he was afflicted he opened not his mouth: as a lamb that is led to the slaughter, and as a sheep that before its shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth. By oppression and judgment he was taken away; and as for his generation, who among them considered that he was cut off out of the land of the living for the transgression of my people to whom the stroke was due? And they made his grave with the

kicked, and with a rich man in his death; although he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth. Yet it pleased Jehovah to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of Jehovah shall prosper in his hand. He shall see the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by the knowledge of himself shall my righteous servant justify many; and he shall bear their iniquities. Therefore, will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he poured out his soul unto death, and was numbered with the transgressors: yet he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors" (Isa. 52:13-53:12).

This prophecy of Isaiah demands more than a passing consideration. While it contains many features of intense interest, we shall deal only with those which bear directly upon the question of sacrifice and atonement. The first thing that should attract our attention is the fact that, after years of silence, the dumb sacrificial types have suddenly burst forth into speech. The work wrought by the servant of Jehovah is described by the prophet in sacrificial language.

In order to study this prophecy intelligently, it

will be necessary to ascertain who it is that is addressed as the "Servant of Jehovah." Does this term refer to the Messiah, to some other individual or to a collective body of individuals? This subject has been the cause of endless debate among modern scholars. Jewish and rationalistic scholars, in general, prefer one or the other of the latter interpretations, while most conservative scholars hold that this term refers to the Messiah. In many respects, the experiences of the Servant of Jehovah are similar to those of Israel when she passed through the sufferings and vicissitudes of the Exile and emerged, as it were, from the tomb at the restoration from captivity in order to become the instrument for the redemption of the world. Attempts have been made to explain the passage on the ground that the prophet drew his details from the actual experiences of a particular righteous sufferer, such as was Jeremiah. There are certain passages, however, that attribute characteristics to the Servant which could be realized only in an individual of superhuman origin. The Messianic interpretation, therefore, is the only one which fills all of the requirements. Delitzsch says, "In relation to Jehovah, Israel has often been called 'my servant' and 'his servant': here, however, there has preceded the representation of Israel as a female: Moreover, in 51:1-16 though

the national idea of the Servant of Jehovah has reached its definite expression, yet there has been no mention of the name borne by the individual whom, in 50:4-9, it is impossible to mistake. It is this individual who is further spoken of here." ^I Among other convincing arguments, Hengstenberg shows that the Messianic interpretation is the only one that can be harmonized with the Old Testament Scriptures: "The first condition of the vicarious satisfaction which, according to our prophecy, is to be performed by the Servant of God, is, according to verse nine (Because He had done no violence, neither was any deceit in His mouth), but more especially still, according to verse eleven (He, the righteous one, my Servant, shall justify the many) the absolute righteousness of the suffering subject. He who is himself sinful cannot undergo punishment for the sins of others. - - - Thus, nowhere in the Old Testament, is even the slightest trace found of a satisfaction to be accomplished by man for man; nor can it be found there, because, from its very commencement, Scripture most emphatically declares: 'that they are all under sin'" ² (Rom. 3:9). From the above arguments, the Messianic

1. Delitzsch, Commentary on Isaiah, pp. 278, 279.

2. Hengstenberg, The Christology of the Old Testament, Vol. II, pp. 354-356.

interpretation appears to be the most reasonable.

We will now endeavor to show that the Messiah, who is the subject of this prophecy, is declared by Isaiah to be both the Priest or Offerer and the Victim or Object of the one sufficient sacrifice for the sins of his subjects. The priesthood of the Messiah is first mentioned in Isaiah 52:15: "So shall he sprinkle many nations." The Hebrew word translated "sprinkle" is YAZZEH. YAZZEH is the Hiphil, future, third person, singular, masculine of NAZAH. In order to avoid the sacrificial reference, commentators have adopted various interpretations. Instead of taking the common usage of the word in the Old Testament, recourse has been had to etymology, and the Kal formation has been supposed to possess a parallel in an Arabic verb, which means "to leap." Thus YAZZEH has been translated "to cause to leap"; "to cause to tremble"; to start with wonder.^I This translation, while in many respects plausible, is, at the same time, questionable, for, as Cave says, "The analogy of the cognate dialects, ever requiring caution in application, can have no place where the usage is invariable; and the 'hiphil' form of NAZAH is invariably used in the Old Testament to signify the priestly act of

1. Brown, Driver and Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament; Delitzsch, Commentary on Isaiah, p. 262.

sprinkling."¹ The same word is used to express the idea of the sprinkling of the water at the consecration of the Levites, of the sprinkling of the oil in the consecration of the Tabernacle, and of the sprinkling of the blood and oil at the consecration of the priesthood (Ex. 29:21; Lev. 8:1; Num. 8:7). It is also used with reference to the sprinkling of the blood of the sin offering, of the water in the ceremony of the cleansing of the leper, and of the aspersion connected with the ceremonies of the slaughter of the red heifer and the ritual of the Day of Atonement (Lev. 4:6, 17; 5:9; 14:7, 16, 27, 51; 16:14, 15, 19; Num. 19:4, 18, 19, 21). The passage in question is the only case on record where any other meaning is attributed to it except the priestly act of sprinkling either in the process of purification or atonement. Hengstenberg confirms this interpretation and further adds: "Hence, here also, the sprinkling has the signification of cleansing from sin. The expression indicates that Christ is the true High Priest, to whom the ordinary priesthood with its sprinklings typically pointed. The expression is a summary of that which in the following chapter, we are told regarding the expiation through the suffering and death of the Servant of God."² Should,

1. Cave, The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice, Second edition, p. 218.
 2. Hengstenberg, The Christology of the Old Testament, Vol. II, p. 268.

however, the translation of Delitzsch be proven the correct one, the teaching of Isaiah on the priesthood of the Messiah would not be materially affected, for in the tenth verse of chapter fifty-three, he asserts, "thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin;" in verse eleven, "He shall justify many;" and, in verse twelve, it is specifically stated that He "made intercession for the transgressors." Other Scriptures corroborate this testimony. The prediction is made in the Psalms that the Messiah, on account of His priestly qualities, shall be "a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek" (Ps. 110:4). Likewise, after the time of Isaiah, Zechariah adds: "And he shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne" (Zech. 6:13).

According to Isaiah, the Servant of Jehovah is not only to be the Priest but also the Victim or the Object of the perfect sacrifice for sin. Although innocent, He voluntarily offers Himself as the substitute for the sins of mankind. "He suffers with his people, for his people, instead of his people: because he has not, like the mass of the people, brought on the suffering through sin, but as the guiltless and righteous one, voluntarily takes on himself the guilt and the sin, in order to take it completely away by his sacrifice of himself."^I

I. Delitzsch, Commentary on Isaiah, p. 279.

Looking at the prophecy more in detail, we find the statement plainly made that the sins of Israel are laid upon the Suffering Servant of Jehovah. This is taught in the passage: "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and Jehovah hath laid on him the iniquity of us all" (Isa. 53:6). The words "All we" refer to redeemed Israel but not in a sense to exclude other nations, since they, through the Suffering Servant, will become a part of the new Israel. This interpretation is in perfect harmony with the general Messianic teaching of the Old Testament. According to Hengstenberg, "All we" refers, "in the first instance," to "members of the covenant people, - not, however, as contrasted with the rest of mankind, but as partaking in the general human destiny." I

The first part of the passage refers to the moral condition of Israel. In the midst of their ruined condition brought about by sin, and, in a position before God worthy of death, Israel is like a scattered flock of sheep without a shepherd. They had erred from the ways of Jehovah (53:17) and, in their selfishness and greed, had turned from God, every one in the direction of his own particular way of sinning. Jehovah did not permit them to endure the just result of their own iniquity but "caused it to hit upon" the Suffering Serv-

Servant. Delitzsch says, "Jehovah caused the punishment of their guilt to fall on his Servant, that he might make atonement for them by his sufferings." ^I That which falls upon Him is not punishment, such as the sinner should justly receive but only in the sense that He voluntarily identifies Himself as a substitute for sinners.

Another fact contained in this prophecy is that the Suffering Servant bore the sins which were laid upon Him. This point is clearly brought out in the passage: "But 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" (Isa. 53:5). The word "wound" indicates one who is not only severely wounded but one who has been pierced unto death. It was our transgression and offences, which he had voluntarily taken on Himself as our substitute, that caused Him to suffer such a cruel and painful death. Through the vicarious sacrifice of the Servant, the justice of God has been satisfied and thus an avenue is opened through which He can bestow peace and salvation. In sprinkling many nations (52:15), in bearing their iniquities (53:11), and in making intercession for them

1. Delitzsch, Commentary on Isaiah, p. 295.

(53:12). He pours out His soul unto death, (53:12). The term "soul" is used here to represent His life's blood (Gen. 9:4, 5). In verse ten, the soul of the Servant is called a trespass-offering. This expression indicates that the sacrifice of the Suffering Servant is an antitype of the sacrifices of Moses. To sin is to rob God of the reverence and authority due Him and, as a result, the sinner incurs a debt to God which implies the necessity of a recompense. According to the Mosaic economy, all sin-offerings were debt-offerings. Both the sin and the trespass-offerings were sacrifices for sin. The sacrifice of the Suffering Servant was to fulfill all of the anticipations of the Mosaic sacrifices. In other words, it was to be a perfect sacrifice, for, it is said, "He shall see the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied" (53:11). As Hengstenberg says, "This antitypical sacrifice will be offered up by the true High Priest. For the sins of the human race, which, without compensation, cannot be forgiven, He furnishes the restitution, which could not be paid by the sinners, and thereby works out the justification of the sinner before God." The vicarious sacrifice of the Servant is further brought

I. Hengstenberg, The Christology of the Old Testament, Vol. II, p. 301.

out by the frequent expressions "bearing our sins," "bearing our iniquities," "bearing our sorrows," "bearing our diseases." The idea of "bearing," in these expressions, is conveyed by the two Hebrew words, SABMAL and NASA. The former means "to bear as a burden" and the latter "to bear as a punishment." Of the two words, NASA is the more common. SABMAL occurs only nine times and five of these are found in Isaiah. From these parallel expressions found in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, the two verbs appear to be used synonymously. When referring to sins or iniquities, NASA always means the bearing of their punishment, whatever the penalty may be (Lev. 5:1, 17; 24:15; Num. 9:13; 30:16). Thus, the vicarious "bearing" of sins, mentioned in this chapter, must either be the bearing of the merited punishment of those sins or the offering of an adequate sin-offering for them. Delitzsch supports this interpretation, when he says, "Because of our sins we are sick unto death; then he, the sinless One, took on himself a suffering unto death, which was, as it were, the quintessence and substance of the woe we had incurred; and this voluntary suffering, this self-submission to the justice of the Holy One, in accordance with the counsel of love, became our healing." ^I

A third fact of significance, noted in this prophecy, is that the suffering and death of the Servant of Jehovah, in effecting a vicarious atonement for sin, became the ground of His exaltation. The twelfth verse sets this thought forth: "Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he poured out his soul unto death, and was numbered with the transgressors: yet he bare the sins of many, and made intercession for the transgressors." By His suffering and death, the Servant of Jehovah shall succeed in winning for Himself the same success that other great ones have won by means of the sword. Behind the apparent equality of the Servant with worldly conquerors lies a contrast concealed. The superiority of the Servant over worldly rulers is shown first by a contrast in their method of conquest. Worldly triumphs are acquired by means of force and bloodshed while the triumph here spoken of is accomplished by love which finds expression in the vicarious sacrifice of the Conqueror Himself. Again, the Servant's superiority is shown by the more excellent benefits which accrue to His subjects. Worldly rulers, as a general thing, tyrannize and oppress their subjects but the Servant of Jehovah grants to His suppliants mercy and salvation from their sins.

Still a third contrast is evident from the context. While worldly rulers can only build temporary kingdoms, the Kingdom which the Servant of Jehovah will construct will be spiritual and eternal (Isa. 9:6-8). Isaiah tells how that even the Gentile nations will reverence Him and become a part of His Kingdom because He will sprinkle them with His blood (52:15); because He will justify them and bear their sins (53:11); because He will make intercession for them (53:12). The reason, therefore, of His exaltation to a position of such everlasting power and glory is that "He poured out his soul unto death" and by this act effected a sufficient and an eternal sacrifice for sin.

In the description of the suffering Servant, prophecy reaches its goal of achievement. Oehler beautifully expresses it, when he says, "In these discourses, the contemplation of the prophet ascends by stages as it were from the foundation walls of a cathedral, enclosing a large space, to the gladd height of a towering summit upon which the cross has been planted; and the nearer it approaches the summit, the clearer appears the outline of the cross fixed there: arrived at the top, it rests in peace, for it has reached what was desired when it began to ascend

the first step of the temple tower." I It is true at this point in the prophecy of Isaiah, the Old Testament makes its noblest utterances on the subject of an atonement for sin. The remainder of Isaiah's prophecies are largely consumed with the glories of the new Kingdom which shall be founded on the conquering power of love unto death.

The prophecies of Jeremiah and Ezekiel make little if any contribution to the sacrificial teaching of Isaiah. However, certain passages indicate that they were acquainted with his teaching. Jeremiah has occasion to refer to the Branch (Jer. 23:5-8; 33:15, 16); to a kingly priest who will offer eternal sacrifices (Jer. 33:17, 18); and to a new covenant when sin will be abolished and the divine law will be written upon the heart (Jer. 31:30-34). Ezekiel describes a new covenant which shall last forever, founded upon perpetual forgiveness (Ezek. 16:60-63); a cedar of Judah which will shelter fowls of every wing (Ezek. 17:22-24); a sprinkling of water which will effect an eternal sin-offering (Ezek. 36:23-25); and an everlasting sanctuary to be built when "David my servant shall be their prince for ever" (Ezek. 37:24-27).

I. Quoted from Delitzsch, Commentary on Isaiah, p. 312.

Daniel, in his prophecy, makes a real contribution to the teachings of the Old Testament on the question of sacrifice and atonement. Just as it was the privilege of Moses, by virtue of his prophetic office, to announce the sacrificial cult; and the privilege of Isaiah to combine the two great streams of prophecy, and give utterance to one comprehensive truth concerning a Messiah whose universal Kingdom should be inaugurated by an act of sacrifice: so it was the privilege of Daniel to predict the exact time when the Mosaic sacrifices would be abrogated and when this sacrifice of eternal significance would be offered. After narrating other visions, Daniel records the remarkable prophecy concerning the seventy weeks: "Seventy weeks are decreed upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most holy. Know therefore and discern, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the anointed one, the prince, shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: it shall be built again, with street and moat, even in troublous times. And after the threescore and two weeks shall the

anointed one be cut off, and shall have nothing: and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and even unto the end shall be war; desolations are determined. And he shall make a firm covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease; and upon the wing of abominations shall come one that maketh desolate; and even unto the full end, and that determined, shall wrath be poured out upon the desolate." (Dan. 9:24-27).

In the prophecy of Zechariah, the Messiah appears as an atoning priest (Zech. 6:13). The prophet further declares that future reconciliation will be made by an attitude of repentance and supplication because of the sight of the "Pierced One:" "I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplication: and they shall look unto me whom they have pierced: and they shall mourn for him" (Zech. 12:10). "This much is clear in this much-misused passage, that the piercing of one, in whose person the Lord is as it were Himself-pierced, is spoken of." We read also of "a fountain

that shall be opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for uncleanness" (Ezek. 43:1), the streams of which shall be more effective, in their expiation, than the water which contained the ashes of the red heifer.

The prophecy of Malachi casts a ray of light upon the subject of the atonement. A righteous offering is mentioned which will supercede the offerings made by the faulty adherents of Mosaism: "For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered in my name, and a pure offering" (Malachi 1:11; 3:3).

With Malachi, Old Testament prophecy closes. While many difficulties still remain and many problems are left unsolved, our study of the development of the idea of sacrifice and atonement, which was found to reach its climax in the prophecy of Isaiah, is sufficiently convincing to justify one in confirming the statement of Delitzsch when he said: "The banner of the cross is here set up. That faith which penetrates into the inner sense of prophecy abides in patient hope not merely for the Lion of the tribe of Judah but also for the Lamb of God that beareth the sin of the world."

Chapter IV.

Conclusion.

Chapter IV.

Conclusion.

The purpose of this inquiry has been to ascertain from the Scriptures the development of the idea of sacrifice and atonement in the Old Testament. Having traced this idea through the three great periods of Old Testament history, we are now ready to present a brief summary of the results obtained.

When the blissful state of our first parents (who were able, because of their innocence, to present to God their every thought, act and feeling) was marred by the Fall, man found that fellowship with God could be restored only by the act of sacrifice. The blood offering which Abel was inspired to present before Jehovah was graciously accepted and afterward became the model of sacrificial worship during the Patriarchal Period. The ritual of this offering was augmented and its use somewhat extended. While the sacrifices of this early period contained all of the elements, which in after years became prominent, the idea of presentation was clearly visible from the beginning. It is evident from later revelation that these patriarchal sacrifices were symbolical, typical and sacramental. They expressed the

worshipper's self-surrender and pointed to the atonement to be revealed in the fullness of time. They symbolized the elementary truths of revealed religion. The unexplained portions most assuredly aroused, on the part of the worshippers, the attitude of suspense and expectancy concerning the future revelation of God.

Sacrificial worship in the Mosaic Period retained the same general features which were conspicuous in the preceding age. The same intellectual difficulties remained with but slightly more adequate means of solution. The Mosaic injunctions, however, were given in much more detail and with more satisfying explanation. In addition to the idea of presentation in the sacrifices, the idea of atonement was developed to a pronounced degree. Still further development over the former period was noted in the fact that the Mosaic injunctions provided a greater opportunity for the assimilation and development of worship by giving specific instructions concerning places, persons, rights and seasons. As in the Patriarchal Period, these sacrifices had a symbolical, sacramental and typical significance. They symbolized the religious truths which God had thus far revealed. As a ceremony, they were found to be a vicarious atonement for sin and thus satisfied the immediate spiritual demands of the worshippers. If the typical nature of

these animal sacrifices, yet unexplained, was not discerned by the more pious worshippers, the unexplained elements were understood to foreshadow revelations yet to come. While no specific teaching can be found in the Law on this point, the very nature of the Mosaic institutions should have convinced the most discerning Israelites that these sacrifices were only shadows of future realities yet to be revealed.

In the period of the prophets, we find the most comprehensive conception of the idea of sacrifice and atonement. The two mediums of hope, which up to this time had been kept separate and distinct, are united in the prophecy of Isaiah. The conquering King becomes the atoning High Priest and thus the dumb sacrifices speak forth their secret meaning. Through his prophecy, the Mosaic sacrifices are made to typify the atoning sacrifice of Christ upon the cross. Isaiah prophesied that the Suffering Servant would offer Himself as a vicarious sacrifice for the sins of mankind. Three facts are emphasized in this wonderful prophecy: first, that our sins were laid upon Him; second, that he bore our sins; and, third, that the substitutionary atonement, thus wrought became the ground of His exaltation.

We realize that the entire teaching of the Old Testament on the subject of sacrifice and atonement is but

introductory to the complete revelation of the Gospel in the New Testament. Even if there was no further revelation, one could not complete such a study without receiving sufficient faith and hope in a loving Redeemer to sing with William Cowper, the beautiful lines:

"There is a fountain filled with blood,
Drawn from Immanuel's veins:
And sinners, plunged beneath that flood,
Lose all their guilty stains."

Appendix.

**A Summary Of External Arguments Favoring The Idea Of
The Substitutionary Atonement In The Old Testament.**

Appendix.

A Summary Of External Arguments Favoring The Idea Of The Substitutionary Atonement In The Old Testament.

In the preceding chapters, the subject of Sacrifice and Atonement has been discussed, almost exclusively, from the point of view of the Old Testament Scriptures. By the use of the inductive method of study, the Old Testament has been found to strongly imply, if not to positively teach, the idea of a substitutionary atonement in the Mosaic sacrifices. In the necessary research connected with the preparation of this thesis, the writer has observed several arguments favoring the same idea from sources outside of the Old Testament canon of Scripture. In this appendix, we make a summary of these external arguments with the desire that they will aid in a further study of the subject. Because of the limits of this volume, only a brief statement of these arguments will be given. Wherever quotations are made, they are considered of unusual importance.

I. Argument From Heathen Worship.

It is a significant fact that, in their worship, some form of blood sacrifice was observed among all of

the ancient heathen nations. The point is made by Outram, in his book entitled, "De Sacrificiis," that the heathen, in their sacrificial rites and ceremonies, held the idea of a substitutionary expiation of sin.¹ This idea seems to be conveyed in their ancient writings concerning sacrifice. Instances are cited from the Greeks, Romans, Egyptians, Assyrians, Chinese and others.

II. Arguments From Ancient Jewish Writers.

It is interesting to note the opinion of ancient Jewish theologians on this subject. Their ancient theological literature is practically a unit in setting forth the Mosaic sacrifices as vicarious and placular. Thus, Outram quotes Rabbi Levi Ben Gerson as saying, "The imposition of hands was a tacit declaration on the part of every offerer that he removed his sins from himself and transferred them to that animal."² In like manner, Rabbi Moses Ben Nachman is reported to have said: "It was just that his blood be shed and that his body should be burned. But the Creator, of His mercy, accepted this victim from him as his substitute and ransom, that the blood of the animal might be shed instead

1. See also Magee, On Atonement and Sacrifice, Vol. I, pp. 88-109, 189-211; Kallisch, Commentary on Leviticus, Vol. I, pp. 202-232.

2. Quoted from Hodge, Atonement, p. 141.

of his blood; that is, that the life of the animal might be given for his life." Again, referring to Lev. 17:11, Rabbi Solomon Jarchi is credited with the statement: "The life of every living creature is in the blood: wherefore I have given it to make an atonement for your souls: life shall come and atone for life." Referring to the same passage, Rabbi Aben Ezra says: "The blood makes atonement for the soul; the meaning is life instead of life."

III. The Testimony Of Christ And His Apostles.

It is from this source that our most authoritative external arguments, favoring the idea of a substitutionary atonement in the Mosaic sacrifices, may be found. This argument presupposes the substitutionary atonement of Christ. Therefore, the sacrificial terms used to describe His atonement would imply a substitutionary element in the Levitical sacrifices.

We will first investigate the testimony of Christ Himself. In speaking of His mission in the world, Jesus said to His disciples, "For the Son of man also came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many" (Mk. 10:45). The

I. Quoted from Hodge, Atonement, p. 142.

term "ransom" is used here in identically the same sense as used by Moses in the Levitical law to express the idea of the remuneration paid by the offerer of the trespass-offering. In His discourse concerning the Good Shepherd, Jesus, no doubt, had Isaiah's prophecy in mind when He said, "I lay down my life for the sheep" (Jno. 10:15). On the night before His death, when He instituted the Lord's Supper with His disciples in the upper room, Jesus said, "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many" (Mk. 14:24). There is no doubt but that this expression reminded the disciples of the sealing of the covenant at Sinai when Moses said to the children of Israel: "Behold the blood of the covenant" (Ex. 24:8). After the resurrection of Jesus had been announced by certain women, two of Christ's followers were going from Jerusalem to Emmaus. As they journeyed, they were wondering if the report of the women could be true. Before they recognized who He was, Jesus entered into their conversation and said: "O foolish men, and slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken! Behooved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into His glory? And beginning from Moses and from all of the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself" (Lu. 24:25-27). That same night, when the apostles and others were gathered

together in the upper room, Jesus appeared in their midst and, after saluting them and convincing them that He had truly risen from the dead, said: "These are my words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must needs be fulfilled, which are spoken in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the Psalms, concerning me." And when their minds were opened that they might understand the Scriptures, He further said: "Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem" (Lu. 24:44-47).

The Apostle Peter makes much use of the sacrificial language of the Old Testament to describe the atoning work of Christ. In his first Epistle, he refers to the figure of the Passover lamb in his effort to impress upon Christ's followers their unparalleled obligations. He exhorts them to "call to mind" that they were not redeemed from death, as was the case in the Law, "by corruptible things, with silver or gold," but, like the first-born, who were spared by the destroying angel of Egypt, "with precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, even the blood of Christ (1 Pet. 1:18, 19). Further, in the same Epistle, Peter advances Christ's example as worthy of imitation because

"when he was reviled," He "reviled not again" but as Isaiah prophesied, He patiently "bore our sins" like the sacrificial victims of the past, and that too as on an altar, for He suffered "in his own body upon the tree" (I Pet. 2:23, 24). Again, speaking of the sufferings of Christ as a sin-offering, Peter refers to Christ as the One who "suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God" (I Pet. 3:18).

In the Epistles of Paul, we find a pronounced contrast between Judaism and Christianity. Never-the-less, in these contrasts, the idea of the substitutionary atonement in the Old Testament is portrayed. This is seen, first of all, in his Epistle to the Romans. After his opening salutation, he confesses that his glory is in the Gospel of Christ, for, besides showing God's power to save the believer, "Therein is the righteousness of God revealed" (Rom. 1:17). He then shows, from the standpoint of experience, that no such righteousness was ever visible in either the heathen, who possessed the Law written in the conscience (Rom. 1:18-32), or in the Jew, who possessed the objective Law (Rom. 2:1-3:20). He then proceeds to show, by appealing to facts and also to the Old Testament Scriptures, that the quality of righteousness which God demanded had not been visible

before the appearance of Christ but that "now apart from the law a righteousness of God hath been manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets: even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ unto all them that believe; for there is no distinction; for all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, in his blood, to show his righteousness because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God" (Rom. 3:21-25). The point of emphasis in this passage is that the righteousness which the Mosaic law required but never accomplished is effected by faith in that divine manifestation of grace which is seen in the ransom paid by Christ. We are not concerned, in this inquiry, about Paul's idea of righteousness, grace or faith but only of his idea of redemption. What does he mean by the word *APOLUTROSIS*? From its general usage in Paul's writings, we are safe in saying that it is connected in some way with the Old Testament sacrifices. Paul thinks of Christ as a Redeemer because His blood is "an atoning sacrifice." The word translated in the American Standard Version, "propitiation," is used in the Septuagint to convey the

distinguishing feature of the mercy-seat. It can, therefore, be clearly seen that the blood of Christ possesses the same atoning characteristic in the New Testament as the mercy-seat possessed in the Old Testament. This conception is substantiated by the other Epistles of the Apostle Paul. He speaks of Christ as a High Priest (Rom. 1:8). The fact that "the blood of Christ" brings justification clearly suggests the atoning rites of the old covenant (Rom. 5:9). He describes the Lord as "Christ our Passover" (I Cor. 5:7) and makes mention of the believer's "communion in the blood of Christ" (I Cor. 10:16). In the Epistle to the Ephesians, Christ is said to have offered Himself for us as "an offering and a sacrifice to God for an odor of a sweet smell (Eph. 5:2). In writing to Timothy, Paul speaks of "one God, one mediator also between God and man, himself man, Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all" (I Tim. 2:5, 6). In his Epistle to Titus, Paul uses the combined figure of purification and redemption. He speaks concerning Him "who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a people for his own possession, zealous of good works" (Titus 2:14). This is exactly what the Old Testament rites promised but never accomplished.

Valuable argument, in favor of the proposition at hand, is found in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The aim of this Epistle is to discover the analogies between the old and the new covenants. There are so many passages, our difficulty will be in selecting the most important. All through the Epistle, the words "blood" (Heb. 9:11-14; 10:5-10; 12:24; 13:10) and "high priest" (Heb. 2:17; 3:1; 4:14; 6:20; 7:16, 24-27) occur. Jesus is characterized throughout the Epistle as the antitypical High Priest, who obtained eternal redemption not by the blood of bulls and goats, or by any sacramental rite of Mossaism but by the gift of His own life offered once for all: "But Christ having come a high priest of the good things to come, through the greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this creation, nor yet through the blood of goats and calves, but through his own blood, entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption. For if the blood of goats and bulls, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling them that have been defiled, sanctify unto the cleanness of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish unto God, cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God" (Heb. 9:11-14)? It is clearly shown in the above quotation, that, while

the sacrifice of Christ was superior to that of the Levitical sacrifices, both are conceived as substitutionary in their application.

No less convincing argument, favoring the substitutionary theory of the atonement in the Old Testament, may be found in the writings of the apostle John than in those already mentioned. In his first Epistle, John asserts, "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin" (I Jno. 1:7). There is no doubt but that this allusion is to the purifications spoken of in the Levitical law. For example, in the case of the healed leper, the taint of original sin was removed by a sacrifice of blood. In like manner, the Christian convalescent is daily cleansed from all his former spots and diseases by the blood of Jesus Christ. In another passage in this Epistle, John describes the work of Christ as similar to that of the Old Testament sacrifices, for he says that He is "the atonement for our sins" (I Jno. 2:2) and that God "sent his Son to be the atonement for our sins" (II Jno. 4:10). In the book of Revelation, it is significant that the sacrificial Lamb occupies a very prominent place. At the first glimpse of the heavenly throne, the Lamb is seen standing in the midst of the mysterious assembly and the song of creation, "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God

sin-offerings; but upon others the offerers themselves laid their hands. This was a symbol of the substitution of the victim in the room of the offerer for whom it was slain." ¹ "An attentive observer may learn this very thing, also from the law respecting sacrifices, which enjoins every one who offers a sacrifice to lay his hands on the head of the victim, and holding it by the head, to bring it to the priest, as offering the animal instead of his own head. Therefore its language respecting every victim is, Let the offerer present it before the Lord, and lay his hands upon the head of his offering; - - - whence it is concluded that the lives of the victims were given instead of the lives of the offerers." ²

V. Argument From The Nature Of God.

From the nature of God, the Old Testament, as far as it goes, should be a unit with the New Testament in its teaching regarding the substitutionary atonement. The Scriptures plainly teach that God is a unit in all of His plans and purposes. He is not a God of confusion (1 Cor. 14:33) but a God of law and order. If

1. Theodoret, *Quest.* 61, ad Exod.

2. Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea, *Demonstra., Evang.*
L. 1., c. 10.

this be true, His law of redemption is a unit through all of the ages. There is no doubt but that Paul had this same general principle in mind when he said,

"There is one body and one Spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all and in all" (Eph. 4:4-6). If God is one (Gal. 3:20), then His plan of redemption must have been one from all eternity. Paul used an argument akin to this to support his doctrine of predestination. The argument, from the nature of God, is this: Since God is a God of consistency, His principle of atonement must be the same throughout all of the ages; He revealed that the antitypical sacrifice of Christ was substitutionary; therefore, the typical sacrifices of Moses were intended to have a substitutionary import from the very beginning.

With this thought in mind, it is not difficult to understand how all of the ancient heathen nations as well as Israel could conceive the idea of substitution in their sacrificial rites, for God, in His wisdom, revealed it to them from their earliest existence. The heathen nations, because of their ignorance and sin, would naturally wander farther and farther away from God's eternal plan for them. It was different,

however, with Abraham and his descendents. They not only retained the divine instructions of early times concerning sacrifice but became the repository for future revelations concerning the development of the eternal plan of God through the ages. According to this argument, the process of development would continue until the perfect sacrifice appeared in the person of the Son of God who gave His life a ransom for many. Just how much knowledge the Israelites had at any certain stage of their long development, is difficult to estimate but we may be certain that if the antitypical sacrifice of Christ was substitutionary, the nature of God would demand that the typical sacrifices of the Old Testament were likewise substitutionary in their significance. This same thought is beautifully expressed in the familiar lines of Tennyson:

"Yet I doubt not through the ages one increasing
purpose runs,
And the thoughts of men are widened with the process
of the suns."

From Tennyson's *Lockley Hall*.

Bibliography.

Bibliography.

Holy Bible, AMERICAN STANDARD VERSION.

Augustine, Saint (Bishop of Hippo), THE CITY OF GOD.

Armour, J. M., ATONEMENT AND THE LAW.

Barnes, Albert, ATONEMENT IN ITS RELATION TO LAW AND
MORAL GOVERNMENT.

Bond, E. P., ATONEMENT.

Bushnell, Horace, THE VICARIOUS SACRIFICE, 2 Vols.

Burney, C. F., THE OLD TESTAMENT CONCEPTION OF ATONE-
MENT FULFILLED BY CHRIST. (A pamphlet).

Burton, E. D., Smith, J. M., and Smith, G. B., BIBLICAL
IDEAS OF ATONEMENT.

Campbell, J. M., THE NATURE OF THE ATONEMENT.

Carson, Alex., THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT AND OTHER
TREATISES.

Cave, Alfred, THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF SACRIFICE AND
ATONEMENT, Second edition.

Cheyne, T. K., THE PROPHECIES OF ISAAH, 2 Vols.

Cornill, C. H., THE PROPHETS OF ISRAEL.

Dale, R. W., ATONEMENT.

Davidson, A. B., THE THEOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Davidson, A. B., OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECY.

Davidson, A. B., THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

- Davidson, John, INQUIRY INTO ORIGIN AND EXTENT OF SACRIFICE.
- Davidson, John, ON PROPHECY.
- Denny, James, THE DEATH OF CHRIST.
- Denny, James, ATONEMENT AND THE MODERN MIND.
- Edwards, Lewis, THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT.
- Ewald, G. H. A. von, THE PROPHETS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, 2 Vols.
- Fairbairn, Patrick, TYPOLOGY OF SCRIPTURE.
- Fairbairn, Patrick, ON PROPHECY.
- Forsyth, R. T., THE CRUCIALITY OF THE CROSS.
- Gilbert, Joseph, THE CHRISTIAN ATONEMENT.
- Hall, C. C., THE GOSPEL OF THE DIVINE SACRIFICE.
- Hengstenberg, E. W., THE CHRISTOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, Vol. II.
- Hodge, Chas., REVIEW OF BERNAN ON THE ATONEMENT.
- Hodge, A. A., THE ATONEMENT.
- Jenkyn, Thos. W., THE EXTENT OF THE ATONEMENT.
- Kirkpatrick, A. F., THE DOCTRINE OF THE PROPHETS.
- Kerwill, W. D., THE OLD TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF SALVATION.
- Lynd, S. W., SACRIFICE AND ATONEMENT.
- Mable, H. C., HOW THE DEATH OF JESUS SAVES US.
- Magee, Wm., DISCOURSES AND DISSERTATIONS ON THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINES OF ATONEMENT AND SACRIFICE, 2 Vols.
- Mackintosh, Robt., HISTORICAL THEORIES OF THE ATONEMENT.
- Malcom, Howard, EXTENT AND EFFICACY OF THE ATONEMENT.
- Martin, Hugh, THE ATONEMENT IN ITS RELATION TO THE

COVENANT? PRIESTHOOD AND ETC.

Moberly, R. C., ATONEMENT AND PERSONALITY.

Moxley, J. K., THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT.

Mullins, E. Y., THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION IN ITS DOCTRINAL
EXPRESSION.

Oehler, G. F., OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY.

Orelli, C. V., THE PROPHECIES OF ISAIAH, 2 Vols.

Orr, James, THE PROBLEM OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Outram, DE SACRIFICIIS.

Oxenham, H. N., CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT.

Park, E. A., THE ATONEMENT.

Pendleton, J. M., THE ATONEMENT AND CHRIST.

Reuss, Edward, HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION IN THE
APOSTOLIC AGE.

Ritschl, Albrecht, DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION AND ATONE-
MENT.

Russell, C. T., AT-ONE-MENT BETWEEN GOD AND MAN.

Sanday, W., DIFFERENT CONCEPTIONS OF PRIESTHOOD AND SAC-
RIFICE.

Sampson, G. W., THE ATONEMENT.

Smeaton, George, THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT AS TAUGHT
BY CHRIST.

Smeaton, George, THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT AS TAUGHT
BY THE APOSTLES.

Smith, Payne, PROPHECY A PREPARATION FOR CHRIST, Second
edition.

Stanton, V. H., THE JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN MESSIAH.

Shultz, H., OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY.

Symington, Wm., ATONEMENT AND INTERCESSION.

Wace, Henry, CREATIVE CHRISTIANITY.

Commentaries referred to in the preparation of this thesis:

Alexander, J. A., COMMENTARY ON ISAIAH, 2 Vols.

Delitzsch, Franz, COMMENTARY ON ISAIAH.

Frazer, Alex., COMMENTARY ON THE PROPHECY OF ISAIAH.

Kalisch, M. W., COMMENTARY ON LEVITICUS, 2 Vols.

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY.

Encyclopedias containing helpful articles on important topics:

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL ENCYCLOPEDIA.

THE JEWISH ENCYCLOPEDIA.

THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA.

THE NEW SCHAFF-HERZOG ENCYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE.

THE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPEDIA.

THE ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA.

THE HASTINGS DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE.

Magna cum laude

E. Y. M.

H. C. W.

F. M. P.