

5-1-1952

A Study of the Mosaic Sacrifices to Discover Their Primary Meaning and Typical Significance

Donald Bletscher

Recommended Citation

Bletscher, Donald, "A Study of the Mosaic Sacrifices to Discover Their Primary Meaning and Typical Significance" (1952). *Western Evangelical Seminary Theses*. 279.
https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/wes_theses/279

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Western Evangelical Seminary at Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Western Evangelical Seminary Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact arolfe@georgefox.edu.

APPROVAL SHEET

This thesis has been approved by the following
faculty committee:

First reader: Kenneth P. Wesch Approved 5/15/52

Second reader: Edna L. Johnson Approved 5/15/52

A STUDY OF THE MOSAIC SACRIFICES TO DISCOVER
THEIR PRIMARY MEANING AND TYPICAL SIGNIFICANCE

A Thesis
Presented To
the Faculty of the
Western Evangelical Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Bachelor of Divinity

by
Donald Bletscher

May 1952

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of purpose	3
Definition of terms	3
Sacrifice	3
Offering	4
Mosaic sacrifices	4
Type	4
Origin of sacrifice	4
Classification and limitation	7
II. THE BURNT-OFFERING	10
The materials	11
Kinds and occasions of burnt-offerings	12
Ritual and significance of the burnt-offering	14
The presentation of the victim	14
The laying on of the hand	15
The killing of the victim	16
The sprinkling of the blood	17
The sacrificial burning	17
The typical significance	18
The presentation of the victim	19
The laying on of the hand	21
The killing of the victim	22

CHAPTER

PAGE

	The sprinkling of the blood	23
	The sacrificial burning	23
III.	THE MEAL-OFFERING	26
	The materials	26
	The purpose	27
	The typical significance	28
	Materials composing it	29
	Form in which it was presented	36
	The persons who partook of it	39
IV.	THE PEACE-OFFERING	41
	Kinds of peace-offerings	41
	The materials	43
	The ritual	43
	The distribution	45
	The significance of the feast	46
	The typical significance	47
	God's invitation	49
	Progression of Christian's relationship	
	to God	50
	Peace follows forgiveness	50
	Restoration follows peace	51
	Gratitude follows restoration	51
	Devotion follows gratitude	52
	Reconciliation	54

CHAPTER	PAGE
V. THE SIN-OFFERING	57
Kinds of sin-offerings	59
Regular	59
Special	59
The materials	60
The ritual	60
The presentation, and laying on of hands, and slaying	60
The sprinkling of blood	61
The burning on the altar	63
The eating and burning without the camp	63
The actual significance	64
The typical significance	66
A victim without blemish	67
Laying on of hands	68
The sprinkling of the blood	68
Burning without the camp	72
VI. THE TRESPASS-OFFERING	74
Kinds of trespass-offerings	77
The materials	78
The ritual	79
The actual significance	80
The typical significance	81

CHAPTER	PAGE
VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	84
Summary	84
The burnt-offering	84
The meal-offering	85
The peace-offering	86
The sin-offering	86
The trespass-offering	88
Relationship of the offerings	88
Conclusions	90
BIBLIOGRAPHY	92

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

When the writer of this thesis was about ten years of age, he heard a statement which caused him a great deal of concern. The statement was made by a woman who was held as practically "the ideal" in Christian womanhood. She was a Sunday School teacher, which position alone gave her considerable esteem and authority in the boy's mind. The statement was only a passing remark in the course of a conversation with the writer's mother, but it struck a chord in the heart of that ten year old boy which made him doubt the truth of the statement. Her remark, in essence, was as follows:

"The Old Testament has a lot of interesting stories, but I don't believe it is much good to Christians today. I think the New Testament is the part of the Bible for us today."

That early impression caused the writer of this paper to constantly ask the question, "What is the value of the Old Testament to the Christian." With the light of years of Christian training and the illumination of personal Christian experience, the writer has come to realize that the Old Testament is of divine origin and is absolutely necessary in the Divine Revelation. The redemptive work of Jesus Christ was revealed in the Old Testament as well as in the New Testament. The Old Testament revelation of Jesus Christ was

veiled in symbolism. This view is verified in the words of Jesus Himself as He said, "And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself."¹ Theologians of modern times have also considered the Old Testament essential to the revelation of God in Christ.

The Scriptures contain and are this perfect disclosure and finished revelation. Of their Divine origin we need not think as yet; though it is anticipated in the fact that the Saviour has given His authenticating testimony to the whole body of them in their integrity. That sanction, first, makes the Old Testament the revelation of Christ. As it testified of Him so He testifies of it. He took it into His hands, and blessed it, and hallowed it for ever as His own. As revelation is Christ, and Christ is the subject of the Old Testament, the Old Testament is of necessity the revelation of God. Knowing better than any human critic can know all its internal obscurities and difficulties, He sealed it nevertheless for the reverence of His people. The canon of the ancient oracles, precisely as we hold them now, no more no less, He sanctified and gave to His Church as the early preparatory records of His own Gospel and kingdom.²

Some would even go as far as to say that "Christ is to be found upon every page of the Old Testament."³ Such a statement suggests that Christ was spoken of in passages other than the Messianic passages. It presupposes types of Christ which may be found in Old Testament Scripture. There

¹ Luke 24:27.

² William Burt Pope, A Compendium of Christian Theology (second edition; New York: Hunt and Eaton, [n.d.]), Vol. I, pp. 39-40.

³ Henderson Snell Fox, "The Foreshadowed Christ in Leviticus," (unpublished Master of Theology thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, Dallas, [n.d.]), p. 2.

are various opinions regarding the types of the Old Testament. Some would limit them to those that are specifically mentioned by the New Testament writers as being types. Others go to the other extreme of declaring everything a type that has any outward resemblance of something in the New Testament.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The author of this treatise has tried to avoid both of these extremes. It was his purpose to make an objective study of the Mosaic sacrifices to discover (1) their actual meaning to the Hebrew people who offered them; (2) their apparent typical meanings; and (3) what they mean to the Christian living in the light of the New Testament

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Sacrifice. This is a complex and comprehensive term. There are several Hebrew words which may be translated "sacrifice," but each has reference to a different type of sacrifice. These various types will be discussed in the following chapters. But in its general use, it may be defined as a

gift to God. It is a presentation to Deity of some material object, the possession of the offerer, as an act of worship. It may be to attain, restore, maintain, or to celebrate friendly relations with the Deity.⁴

Offering. "Offering" and "sacrifice" are synonymous terms. The capitalization of these words (for example, Offering, Sacrifice), excluding grammatical requirements, indicates a reference to Christ, the Antitype.

Mosaic sacrifices. This refers to the sacrifices which were recorded by Moses in the book of Leviticus. They were instituted while Moses was the leader of the Israelites.

Type. In a theological sense, a "type" is a sign or example prepared and designed by God to prefigure some future person or thing. It must represent this future object with more or less clearness, either by something which it has in common with the antitype, or in being the symbol of some property which it possesses.⁵

ORIGIN OF SACRIFICE

The Bible does not give a clear and definite explanation of the character of sacrificial worship before the time

⁴ J. J. Reeve, "Sacrifice in the Old Testament," The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, IV, 2639.

⁵ Samuel Wakefield, A Complete System of Christian Theology (Cincinnati: Walden and Stowe, 1869), p. 352.

of Moses. However, it is clear that there were at least two forms of sacrifice--the burnt-offering and the peace-offering. Probably these two offerings varied only slightly. But the specific mention that there were these two distinct offerings is found in the words, "And he sent young men of the children of Israel, who offered burnt-offerings, and sacrificed peace-offering of oxen unto Jehovah."⁶ The line of demarcation between the two offerings probably limited itself to the participation or nonparticipation on the part of the offerers.⁷

Scholars have written a great deal about the origin of sacrifice and have proposed many theories of a human origin of sacrifice. The names of some of these theories are: the gift theory; the magic theory; the table-bond theory; the sacramental communion theory; the homage theory; the placular theory; and the religious instinct theory (a combination of human origin and Divine Revelation). These theories, which are the product of the thinking of higher critics, have no particular value to this study, so they are merely mentioned.

The writer of this paper takes the position that the sacrifice was initiated by God Himself at the beginning of

⁶ Exod. 24:5.

⁷ Patrick Fairbairn, The Typology of Scripture (Philadelphia: Daniels and Smith, 1852), Vol. II, p. 261.

human history. H. Orton Wiley says, "This is evidenced by the nature of sacrifice itself, and also from the fact that previous to the deluge, animals were classified as clean and unclean."⁸ But Wiley goes on to point out that the strongest argument is found in the historical record of particular sacrifices.

The first is that of Cain and Abel. 'Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord. And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock and the fat thereof. And the Lord had respect unto Abel and his offering' (Gen. 4:3, 4). This scripture taken in connection with Hebrews 11:4, reveals two facts: one, that the sacrifice was offered in faith; the other, that it was divinely approved. The second is the sacrifice of Noah, which he offered immediately upon leaving the ark. 'And Noah builded an altar unto the Lord; and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the altar. And the Lord smelled a sweet savour; and the Lord said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake' (Gen. 8:20, 21). Here it is asserted that the sacrifice was marked by divine approbation. The third patriarchal sacrifice is that of Abraham, as recorded in an interesting account found in Genesis 15:9-21. Here it is expressly stated that Abraham offered up animal sacrifices in obedience to the command of God. The acceptance of the offering is indicated by the 'burning lamp' which passed between the pieces and hallowed them.⁹

The position of the divine origin of sacrifices necessitates the stating of a basic assumption. It is assumed in this thesis that the Holy Bible is divinely inspired. The author accepts the definition of S. J. Gamertsfelder:

⁸ H. Orton Wiley, Christian Theology (Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1947), Vol. II, p. 218.

⁹ Ibid., pp. 218-9.

Inspiration is that Divine help given through the operation of the Holy Spirit, to men chosen of God to be organs of revelation, which is necessary to speak or write the truth that God purposed to give to the world as His Word for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness.¹⁰

CLASSIFICATION AND LIMITATION

Many different classifications of the sacrifices could be suggested. Maimonides was among the first to classify them. He divided them into two kinds: (1) those on behalf of the whole congregation; and (2) those on behalf of the individual.¹¹ Dr. Oehler also suggested two classes: (1) those which assume that the covenant relation is on the whole undisturbed; and (2) those that are meant to remove a disturbance which has entered into this relation, and to restore the right relation to God.¹² Others suggest a classification as to the thing offered. Professor Paterson divided them into three: (1) animal sacrifices; (2) vegetable sacrifices; and (3) liquid and incense offerings.¹³ There are those who have made two simple classifications, namely, bloody and non-bloody.

¹⁰ S. J. Gamertsfelder, Systematic Theology (Harrisburg: Evangelical Publishing House, 1921), p. 115.

¹¹ Reeve, op. cit., p. 2641.

¹² Gustav Friedrich Oehler, Theology of the Old Testament (eighth edition; New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1883), p. 284.

¹³ Reeve, loc. cit.

In the first seven chapters of the book of Leviticus, there is a very distinct classification. In this portion of Scripture, which deals specifically and entirely with the Mosaic sacrifices, five offerings are explained. They are: (1) burnt-offerings; (2) meal-offerings; (3) peace-offerings; (4) sin-offerings; (5) trespass-offerings. While there is a logical division between the sweet savour offerings¹⁴ (burnt-offerings, meal-offerings, and peace-offerings) and the non-sweet savour offerings (sin-offerings and trespass-offerings), the author of this thesis has followed the classification of the five offerings. The study was limited to these five offerings because the author believes that every important aspect of the Mosaic sacrificial system was included in one of these offerings. Each of these offerings has been considered in the following chapters of the thesis. The method of procedure has been to consider the details of the sacrifice, the significance of the sacrifice in the Jewish religion, and the typical significance of the sacrifice in the New Testament religion.

The primary source for material in this study was the Bible. Reference has also been made to Bible commentaries and other books dealing definitely with Biblical content. The typology of the sacrifices is not a new study, for practically all the commentaries deal with this phase to some

¹⁴ Lev. 1:9; 2:2; 3:5.

extent. Some books deal exclusively with the typology, but they often tend toward the extreme of finding a type in every detailed part of the sacrifice. Therefore, the author of this thesis has been selective and has indicated only those types which seem reasonable and apparent.

CHAPTER II

THE BURNT-OFFERING

The law of the burnt-offering was the first in the law of the offerings. In the order of the ritual it was not first, but second, following the sin offering. However, it is natural that it should be mentioned first because it was the most ancient. Noah and Abraham offered burnt-offerings. It was also the most common because no day could pass in the tabernacle without the offering of burnt-offerings. Except for the great day of atonement for the nation in which the sin offering was the central act, the burnt-offering was the most important sacrifice on all the great feast days.¹

"Burnt-offering", in the modern versions of the Bible, is the ordinary translation of the Hebrew word 'olah'. This word does not mean literally "burnt-offering", but rather "what is brought up". It came to mean literally then "what is presented to the Deity". The name is a translation of the Septuagint rendering, which is based upon the description of the ritual as found in Leviticus, "an offering made by fire of a sweet savor unto Jehovah."² Thus it may be seen that the name for this offering is derived more from its

¹ S. H. Kellogg, An Exposition of the Bible (Hartford: The S. S. Scranton Company, 1903), I, p. 245.

² Lev. 1:9.

unique characteristic than from the actual Hebrew word which was applied to it.³

THE MATERIALS

The burnt-offering was always either animal or fowl. The offerings acceptable were: (1) the bullock⁴; (2) the sheep⁵; (3) the goat⁶; (4) the turtledove⁷; (5) the pigeon⁸. Among these animals, only the clean beasts could be offered. Nothing could be offered as "the food of God" which could not be eaten by the offerer. And even among clean animals, only domestic animals were permitted. For example, an animal that was taken in hunting could not be offered, even though it may have been considered "clean".⁹

The animals to be sacrificed had to be free from all disease or blemish. They were to be brought to the door of the tabernacle and the offerer was to kill them on the north side of the altar, except in the public sacrifices. In such cases, the priest put the victims to death, being assisted on

³ Frederic McCurdy, "Burnt Offering", The Jewish Encyclopedia, New Edition, III, 439-40.

⁴ Lev. 1:5.

⁵ Lev. 1:10.

⁶ Loc. cit.

⁷ Lev. 1:14.

⁸ Loc. cit.

⁹ Kellogg, loc. cit.

occasion by the Levites.¹⁰ The blood was then sprinkled around the altar. If the victim was a large animal, it was flayed and divided, the pieces being placed above the wood on the altar. If the offering was a bird, a similar operation was performed, except that the victim was not entirely divided. The fire which consumed the offerings was never allowed to go out. Several kinds of sacrifice furnished constant material for the flames.¹¹

KINDS AND OCCASIONS OF BURNT-OFFERINGS

In the classification of the burnt-offerings as to kind and occasion, the Jewish Encyclopedia¹² lists three general classes: the stated offerings; the occasional offerings; and the voluntary offerings.

There were three stated offerings. (1) The daily burnt-offering was presented at the time of the morning and the evening prayer (the third and ninth hours). The victim was a lamb or a kid a year old. This was always accompanied by a vegetable offering (minhah) and a libation of wine.¹³ (2) The Sabbath burnt-offering was offered on the Sabbath and included double the amount of all the elements of the ordinary

¹⁰ II Chron. 29:34.

¹¹ McCurdy, op. cit., p. 440.

¹² Loc. cit.

¹³ Exod. 29:38-42; Num. 28:3-8.

daily sacrifice.¹⁴ (3) The festal burnt-offering was observed at the time of the new moon, the Passover, Pentecost, the Feast of Trumpets, the Day of Atonement, and the Feast of Tabernacles. On these occasions, especially the last named, the number of victims was increased.¹⁵

The occasional offerings were those burnt-offerings which were observed only when certain events took place. These events or occasions were as follows: (1) when a priest was consecrated;¹⁶ (2) at the purification of women;¹⁷ (3) at the cleansing of lepers;¹⁸ (4) at the purgation of ceremonial defilement;¹⁹ (5) in connection with the vow of a Nazarite.²⁰

In addition to the sacrifices of burnt-offerings which were prescribed and obligatory, voluntary burnt-offerings were also made. As recorded, some of them involved the immolation of a large number of victims.²¹

Having classified the kinds and occasions of burnt-offerings, the study includes the ritual and significance also.

¹⁴ Num. 28:9, 10.

¹⁵ Num. 28:11-29:39.

¹⁶ Exod. 29:15-18; Lev. 8:18-21; 9:12-14.

¹⁷ Lev. 12:6-8.

¹⁸ Lev. 9:19, 20.

¹⁹ Lev. 15:13-15, 25-30.

²⁰ Num. 6:9-11, 13-16.

²¹ Num. 7; I Kings 8:64.

RITUAL AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE BURNT-OFFERING

Regarding the significance of the offering there were two important aspects, the expiation and the burning. As an expiation for sin, the purpose of the burnt-offering was largely the same as in other bloody sacrifices. Consequently, the discussion of that aspect has not been completed in this chapter, but has been carried on in the following chapters. But the offering does present some features of its own regarding expiation, and these distinctive features have been indicated. The significance of the burning was peculiar to the burnt-offering. There were five stages in the process: (1) The presentation of the victim; (2) The laying on of the hand; (3) The killing of the victim; (4) The sprinkling of blood; (5) The sacrificial burning.

In the following discussion of the meaning of the various steps of the burnt-offering ritual, the writer of this thesis has summarized the interpretations given by Alexander Maclaren.

The presentation of the victim. "He shall offer it at the door of the tent of meeting, that he may be accepted before Jehovah."²² The offerer himself had to bring the animal to the door of the Tabernacle in order to show that he was

²² Lev. 1:3.

willing to surrender a valuable thing. As he stood there, his thoughts passed into the inner part of the Tabernacle where God dwelt. The offerer felt that God already dwelt in the midst of the people, but he could enter into the enjoyment of God's presence only by offering a sacrifice. The offering was to be a "male without blemish"²³ because bodily defect symbolized moral flaw. Therefore, an animal with a defect could not be tolerated in the offerings to a holy God who required purity. God would not be put off with less than man's best, whether it was ox or pigeon. The Israelite thereby learned the important lesson that God claims the best that one has.²⁴

The laying on of the hand. "And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the burnt-offering; and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him."²⁵ There was a certain significance about the laying of the offerer's hand upon the head of the victim. In all other instances where hands were laid on, some transference or communication of gifts or qualities was implied. One might suppose then that the same meaning attached to this act, with such modifications as the

²³ Lev. 1:3.

²⁴ Alexander Maclaren, "The Book of Leviticus," Expositions of Holy Scripture (New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1907), I, p. 236.

²⁵ Lev. 1:4.

case required. It was done in other bloody sacrifices, accompanied with confession. Nothing is said of confession in relation to the burnt-offering, though that element was undoubtedly present to some extent because atonement was made for the offerer through the sacrifice. The fact of the atonement has been indicated in the chapter on the sin-offering, in the discussion of the sprinkling of the victim's blood. The possibility of the victim's blood atoning for the offerer depended upon his having laid his hands on the victim's head. In that act there was an identification of the offerer with the offering. This identification permitted the animal to become a substitute for the offerer. The animal died, though the offerer deserved to die.²⁶

The killing of the victim. "And he shall kill the bullock before Jehovah."²⁷ The animal was killed by the offerer himself unless the offering was being made as a national or public sacrifice, in which case the victim was slain by the priest. The death of the animal was distinctly a vicarious death. When the offerer killed the victim, he thereby acknowledged that its death was the wages of his own sin. He realized the animal was innocent, but the animal's life was taken as his substitute.²⁸

²⁶ Maclaren, loc. cit.

²⁷ Lev. 1:5.

²⁸ Maclaren, op. cit., p. 237.

The sprinkling of blood. When the act of expiation was to be symbolically represented, another person appeared. The priest came forward as mediator between God and man, and applied the blood to the altar. "And Aaron's sons, the priests, shall present the blood, and sprinkle the blood round about upon the altar that is at the door of the tent of meeting."²⁹ In other sacrifices which had expiation as their principal object, some of the blood was sprinkled on the horns of the altar, and as a more solemn act, some was carried into the holiest place, and sprinkled on the mercy seat. But in the burnt-offering, the blood was only sprinkled upon the altar. This would suggest that the essential character of the burnt-offering was not expiatory. The word rendered in the translation "to make atonement"³⁰ means "to cover". The idea conveyed is that the blood, which was the life of the sacrifice, covered the sins of the offerer so that the sins were powerless to keep back the love of God or to bring on the wrath of God.³¹

The sacrificial burning. The final act of the ritual was peculiar to the burnt-offering. In it alone the whole of the sacrifice was consumed on the altar, with the exception

²⁹ Lev. 1:5.

³⁰ Lev. 1:4.

³¹ Maclaren, loc. cit.

of the skin and the contents of the intestines. The skin was given to the priest. Because of this unique characteristic, the offering was sometimes called "a whole burnt-offering". The provision for the completeness of the offering is found in the word rendered "burn" in Leviticus 1:9. As was indicated in the introduction to this chapter, that word does not merely mean "destruction by fire", but it is a peculiar word reserved for sacrificial burnings and meaning "to cause to ascend in smoke or vapour". The gross flesh was refined into vapour and odour, and sent up to God as a sweet savour. It expressed, therefore, the transformation of the sinful human nature of the offerer into something more ethereal and kindred with the heaven to which it rose.³²

THE TYPICAL SIGNIFICANCE

By way of typical significance of the burnt-offering, a great deal could be said about the victim which was offered. The sacrifice had to be a domesticated animal, and because of the personal care and provision by its owner, it had become more or less obedient. This revealed a characteristic of the Antitype in that He should be obedient to the One who offered the sacrifice. Jesus Christ was not an unwilling captive, but rather He gave Himself freely and unresistingly. In very clear terms Jesus proclaimed that His death on the cross was

³² Maclaren, op. cit., p. 239.

not by the hand of man, but by His own will in surrender to the will of the Father.³³ Jesus said:

Therefore doth the Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I may take it again. No one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment received I from my Father.³⁴

Thus it may be seen that Jesus gave Himself at the command of His Father; yet it was voluntary because of His perfect obedience to the will of His Father.

Biblical scholars have given various interpretations to the significance of the burnt-offering. For example, Dr. C. I. Scofield has suggested that each of the animals sets forth a different aspect of the work of Christ in the justification of the sinner.³⁵ But the writer of this thesis has concluded that the most significant teaching of the burnt-offering in reference to its typical meaning, was found in the various steps of the ritual. Therefore, the same outline has been followed in this section as was followed in the section entitled "Ritual and Significance of the Burnt-Offering".

The presentation of the victim. Just as the offerer himself had to bring the victim, so also he who would have

³³ I. M. Haldeman, The Tabernacle Priesthood and Offerings (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1925), p. 340.

³⁴ John 10:17, 18.

³⁵ C. I. Scofield, Reference Bible (New York: Oxford University Press, 1917), p. 126.

the saving benefit of Christ's sacrifice must himself by faith bring this Christ before God. As the Israelite signified his acceptance of God's arrangements concerning sacrifice, so does one express one's acceptance of God's arrangement in one's behalf by bringing Christ in an act of faith before God. In this act of faith one is showing one's readiness and sincere desire to make use of Christ, the Sacrifice appointed for man. This no man can do for another.

The burnt-offering was presented for a certain purpose; namely, "that he may be accepted before Jehovah".³⁶ He was accepted not because of the present he brought, but through an atoning sacrifice. In like manner, anyone who is to be accepted of God is not accepted because of the gift he may bring even though the gift may be that of service. He can gain that acceptance only through the blood of the Holy Victim.

The place of presentation is also significant. The burnt-offering was made "at the door of the tent of meeting".³⁷ S. H. Kellogg says that the reason for this was that the Israelites were so prone to worship idols. The purpose of this order was to separate the worship of God from the worship of false gods. One cannot say there is a law concerning the place where one may present the great Sacrifice before God.

³⁶ Lev. 1:3.

³⁷ Loc. Cit.

Yet the principle which underlies this ordinance of place applies today. The one who is offering Christ, the Sacrifice, can make no terms or conditions as to the mode or condition of the presentation, other than what God appoints. Also, the command was a command of publicity. As the Israelite was commanded to confess publicly the presentation of his sacrifice, so is man today required to make his confession of Christ a public thing.³⁸ "Every one therefore who shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father who is in heaven."³⁹

The laying on of the hand. This part of the ceremony was full of typical meaning. It set forth the way in which man was to make use of the Lamb of God who was slain. By faith, the one seeking salvation lays his hand upon Christ's head. In this act one does frankly and penitently own the sins for which Christ was offered. One accepts the judgment of God against oneself and realizes that one deserves to be cast out from Him eternally. But at the same time, the one laying on the hand identifies himself with this Christ as "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world."⁴⁰ It may be concluded, therefore, that Christ the Lamb becomes

³⁸ Kellogg, op. cit., p. 246.

³⁹ Matt. 10:32.

⁴⁰ John 1:29.

the offering after the penitent offerer identifies himself with Christ.⁴¹

The killing of the victim. In the light of what has been said, the typical significance of the killing of the victim will be quite clear. With the very first sin,⁴² and again and again thereafter, God pronounced death as the penalty for sin. But in the burnt-offering, in accord with a Divine command, the offerer brought before God a sacrificial victim upon whose head he laid his hand and identified himself with the innocent creature. Then the animal suffered death in behalf of the offerer. In the burnt-offering (and this truth has been pointed out in the peace-offering and sin-offering as well) one finds a type of the One Holy Victim. Christ tasted death for every man.

But we behold him who hath been made a little lower than the angels, even Jesus, because of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honor, that by the grace of God he should taste of death for every man.⁴³

Another passage of Scripture states, "Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God."⁴⁴ It was a previously-declared purpose of Christ that He should suffer this death as a condi-

⁴¹ Kellogg, op. cit., p. 247.

⁴² Gen. 2:17.

⁴³ Heb. 2:9.

⁴⁴ I Pet. 3:18.

tional substitute for penalty, for it is recorded that "the Son of man came . . . to give his life a ransom for many."⁴⁵

The sprinkling of the blood. After the animal was slain, the work of the offerer was done and the work of the priest began. In dealing with the antitype of the sprinkling of the blood, certainly the use of the blood of Christ for the remission of sin is a reasonable application. This use of the blood Godward for the remission of sin is the work alone of the Heavenly Priest. The one who has received the sacrifice of Christ, by faith, must also accept the work of the sprinkling of the blood by faith as well.⁴⁶ A fuller discussion on the meaning of the sprinkling of the blood has been given in the chapter on the sin-offering, where it is the central act of the ritual.

The sacrificial burning. There has been a great deal of speculation as to the typical significance of the burning of sacrifices. Some have said it symbolized the consuming wrath of Jehovah, utterly destroying the victim which represented the sinful person of the offerer. Others have suggested the burning typified the eternal fire of hell because the fire which consumed the sacrifice was not allowed to go out. Still others have said the burnt-offering typified those

⁴⁵ Matt. 20:28.

⁴⁶ Kellogg, op. cit., p. 248.

fiery sufferings which the Lord Jesus Christ endured previous to His agonizing death.⁴⁷

There is another view, represented by S. H. Kellogg, which says that the burnt-offering chiefly typified Christ representing His people in perfect consecration and entire self-devotion unto God. Christ gave Himself in perfect obedience. The first recorded saying of Christ is the question He asked His mother, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business."⁴⁸ His constant testimony concerning Himself to which His whole life bore witness was in such words as, "For I am come down from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me."⁴⁹ But it seems the outstanding example of His perfect consecration is expressed in His words spoken in the agony of Gethsemane, "My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass away from me: nevertheless, not as I will but as thou wilt."⁵⁰ Here He offered Himself, body, soul, and spirit, as a whole burnt-offering unto God.⁵¹

A summary of the typical significance of the burnt-offering is found in the following quote from S. H. Kellogg. The verse references are from the first chapter of Leviticus.

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 249.

⁴⁸ Luke 2:49. (A.V.)

⁴⁹ John 6:38.

⁵⁰ Matt. 26:39.

⁵¹ Kellogg, op. cit., p. 250.

And so the burnt-offering teaches us to remember that Christ has not only died for our sins, but has also consecrated Himself for us to God in full self-surrender in our behalf. We are therefore to plead not only His atoning death, but also the transcendent merit of His life of full consecration to the Father's will. To this, the words, three times repeated concerning the burnt-offering (vv. 9, 13, 17), in this chapter, blessedly apply: it is "an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour," a fragrant odour, "unto the Lord." That is, this full self-surrender of the holy Son unto the Father is exceedingly delightful and acceptable unto God. And for this reason it is for us an ever-prevailing argument for our own acceptance, and for the gracious bestowment for Christ's sake of all that there is in Him for us.⁵²

⁵² Ibid., pp. 250-51.

CHAPTER III

THE MEAL-OFFERING

In the Old Testament, the Hebrew word minhāh, "meal-offering," is derived from a word meaning "a gift," or "a present." At first it was applied to both bloody and unbloody offerings, but in Moses' time it was confined to sacrifices from the vegetable world. These offerings were cereals which were the produce of man's labor with the soil.¹

THE MATERIALS

Regarding the materials of the meal-offering, the law ordained that it must consist of fine flour, oil, frankincense,² and salt.³ An exception was made regarding the materials when it was the case of the jealousy offering. In this offering, barley meal was offered and the oil and frankincense were omitted.⁵ This particular offering was for the purpose of bringing iniquity to remembrance so that it did not fall in the general class of meal-offering.

¹ J. J. Reeve, "Sacrifice in the Old Testament," The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, IV, 2638.

² Lev. 2:1.

³ Lev. 2:13.

⁴ Lev. 2:11.

⁵ Num. 5:15.

There were various forms in which the meal-offering could be presented. Firstly, the fine flour could be presented with oil poured upon it. Frankincense was included also. When the offering was in this form, the priest took only a handful of the fine flour with the oil and all the frankincense, and burned it upon the altar.⁶ Secondly, the meal-offering might be made up of different kinds of cakes.⁷ And thirdly, the first-fruits of the field were offered in the shape of roasted ears or ground grains of fresh corn.⁸

THE PURPOSE

The general purpose of the meal-offering was a supplement to an animal offering. It was usually in connection with the burnt-offering and the peace-offering.⁹ It was not offered alone, but in addition to a bloody sacrifice. S. H. Kellogg has suggested that the fundamental idea of the offering was "a gift brought by the worshipper to God, in token of his recognition of His supreme authority, and as an expression of desire for His favour and blessing."¹⁰

⁶ Lev. 2:1-3; 6:15.

⁷ Lev. 2:4-7.

⁸ Lev. 2:14.

⁹ Num. 15:1-13.

¹⁰ S. H. Kellogg, "The Book of Leviticus," An Exposition of the Bible (Hartford: The S. S. Scranton Co., 1903), I, 252.

After the small portion of the sacrifice was burnt upon the altar, the rest became the property of Aaron and his sons. "And that which is left of the meal-offering shall be Aaron's and his sons': it is a thing most holy of the offerings of Jehovah made by fire."¹¹

THE TYPICAL SIGNIFICANCE

The author has discovered in the study of the sin-offering that symbolical representation of the atonement had to involve blood-shedding. Since there was no shedding of blood in the meal-offering, the typology must deal with some aspect other than the death of Christ. Various suggestions have been made by scholars. The discussion which follows is largely a presentation of the views of C. H. Mackintosh and does not necessarily represent the conclusions of other writers in the field.

In its typical significance, Mackintosh says, the meal-offering presented "the Man Christ Jesus." As the burnt-offering typified Christ in death, the meal-offering typified Him in life. In this offering there was no question of bloodshedding. In it is simply found a beautiful type of Christ as He lived and walked and served on earth.¹²

¹¹ Lev. 2:10.

¹² C. H. Mackintosh, Notes on the Book of Leviticus (Chicago: F. H. Revell, 1878), p. 48.

The examination of the meal-offering and its typical significance has been considered in the following order:

(1) the materials of which it was composed; (2) the various forms in which it was presented; and (3) the persons who partook of it.

Materials composing it. It was seen in the first part of this chapter that the materials of the meal-offering were fine flour, oil, frankincense, and salt.

I. M. Haldeman suggests that the "fine flour" may be regarded as the basis of the offering. It was flour that had been thoroughly ground so that there were no lumps in it. There was no unevenness in it.¹³ Mackintosh interprets this to mean that in the fine flour was found a type of Christ's humanity, wherein every perfection met. Jesus was never ruffled by any circumstance or set of circumstances. He never had to retrace a step, or recall a word. No matter what pressure came from without, He always met it in that perfect evenness which is so strikingly typified by the "fine flour." In Scripture, the Person of Christ is set forth in His perfection by contrasting Him with Adam.¹⁴ "The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is of heaven."¹⁵

¹³ I. M. Haldeman, The Tabernacle Priesthood and Offerings (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1925), p. 324.

¹⁴ Mackintosh, op. cit., pp. 53-5.

¹⁵ I Cor. 15:47.

The "oil" in the meal-offering is a type of the Holy Spirit. But since the oil was applied in two different ways, Mackintosh suggests that there was a typification of the Holy Spirit presented in two ways. The fine flour was "mingled" with oil; and there was oil "poured" upon it. Such was the type, and in the Antitype one may see Jesus, first, "conceived," and then "anointed," by the Holy Spirit.

When the angel Gabriel had announced to Mary the honor which was about to be conferred upon her, in connection with the work of the incarnation, she inquired, "How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?"¹⁶ This was not a spirit of skepticism on the part of Mary, for she was honest in thinking this Person should appear according to the ordinary generation.

And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee; wherefore also the holy thing which is begotten shall be called the Son of God.¹⁷

It was the "mingling" of the Holy Spirit with the human Mary, resulting in the virgin birth of Christ, that fulfilled the message "fine flour mingled with oil."

In the Levitical ordinance, "He shall pour oil upon it,"¹⁸ one finds a type of the anointing of the Lord Jesus

¹⁶ Luke 1:34.

¹⁷ Luke 1:35.

¹⁸ Lev. 2:1.

Christ by the Holy Spirit. The body of Jesus was not merely formed by the Holy Spirit, but that pure and holy vessel was also anointed for service by the same power.

Now it came to pass, when all the people were baptized, that Jesus also having been baptized, and praying, the heaven was opened, and the Holy Spirit descended in a bodily form, as a dove, upon him, and a voice came out of heaven, Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased.¹⁹

This anointing previous to His entrance upon His public ministry is of great practical importance to everyone who really desires to be a true and effectual servant of God. C. H. Mackintosh says:

Though conceived, as to His manhood, by the Holy Ghost; though, in His own proper Person, "God manifest in the flesh"; though embodying, in Himself, all the fulness of the Godhead; yet be it well observed, when coming forth, as man, to do the will of God, on the earth, whatever that will might be, whether preaching the gospel, teaching in the synagogues, healing the sick, cleansing the leper, casting out devils, feeding the hungry, or raising the dead, He did all by the Holy Ghost. That holy and heavenly vessel in which God the Son was pleased to appear in this world was formed, filled, anointed, and led by the Holy Ghost.^{20 21}

The next ingredient to be considered in the meal-offering is "the frankincense." As has been remarked, the "fine flour" was the basis of the offering. The "oil" and "frankincense" were the two leading supplements. Mackintosh feels that the connection between these two was instructive.

¹⁹ Luke 3:21-22.

²⁰ Mackintosh, op. cit., p. 65.

²¹ Ibid., pp. 53-66.

The "oil" typified the power of Christ's ministry; the "frankincense" typified the object of His ministry. The former taught that He did everything by the Spirit of God; the latter that He did everything to the glory of God. The frankincense presented that in the life of Christ which was exclusively for God. This was evident by the emphasis upon "all the frankincense" in the following verse which referred to the meal-offering:

And he shall bring it to Aaron's sons the priests; and he shall take thereof his handful of the fine flour thereof, and of the oil thereof, with all the frankincense thereof; and the priest shall burn it as the memorial thereof upon the altar, an offering made by fire, of a sweet savor unto Jehovah.²²

This was an expression of a truth regarding the true Meal-offering--the Man Christ Jesus. There was that in His blessed life which was exclusively for God. Every thought, word, look, and act of His emitted a fragrance which went up immediately to God. And, as in the type, it was the "fire of the altar" that drew forth the sweet odor of the frankincense; so in the Antitype, the more He was tried, the more fully was it manifested that, in His manhood, there was nothing that could not ascend, as an odor of a sweet smell, to the throne of God.²³

The other necessary ingredient of the meal-offering was "salt." Salt is pungent and a barrier against corruption.

²² Lev. 2:2.

²³ Mackintosh, op. cit., pp. 66-8.

It was used in Scripture in connection with speech. "Let your speech be always with grace, seasoned with salt."²⁴ The whole conversation of the Perfect Man exhibited the power of this principle. His words were not merely words of grace, but words of pungent power. They were divinely adapted to preserve from all corrupting influence.²⁵ I. M. Haldeman states:

After two thousand years not a word He spoke needs to be forgiven, forgotten, modified, corrected, or erased; after two thousand years they remain the very essence of spirit, the very pulse of life, the very concrete of cleanness, impassable barriers against corruption, against sin in thought as well as deed.²⁶

Having considered the ingredients which composed the meal-offering, attention shall now be given to those which were excluded from it.

The first of these was "leaven". "No meal-offering, which ye shall offer unto Jehovah, shall be made with leaven."²⁷ Leaven or yeast is a substance in a state of putrefaction, the atoms of which are in a continual motion. It has a permeating effect upon that material with which it is mingled. Some references in Scripture²⁸ use leaven to

²⁴ Col. 4:6.

²⁵ Mackintosh, op. cit., p. 68.

²⁶ Haldeman, op. cit., p. 330.

²⁷ Lev. 2:11.

²⁸ Matt. 16:6; Luke 12:1; I Cor. 5:6-8.

illustrate the effect of evil and moral corruption.²⁹ There was to be nothing sour, nothing that would puff up, nothing that would express evil in that which typified "the Man Christ Jesus." In Him there was nothing savoring of sourness or inflation. Everything about His Person was pure, solid, and genuine. Mackintosh states:

No exercise can be more truly edifying and refreshing for the renewed mind than to dwell upon the unleavened perfectness of Christ's humanity--to contemplate the life and ministry of One who was, absolutely and essentially, unleavened. In all His springs of thought, affection, desire, and imagination, there was not so much as a particle of leaven. He was the sinless, spotless, perfect man.³⁰

The other ingredient which was forbidden in the meal-offering was "honey." "For ye shall burn no leaven, nor any honey, as an offering made by fire unto Jehovah."³¹ Honey is nature's sweetness. It is the symbol of that which is attractive and appealing in nature. Its palatability makes it desirable. There is a diversity of opinion among scholars as to the typical significance of "honey." Fairbairn suggests it meant that the things most pleasing to the flesh are not pleasing to God, and must, therefore, be renounced by his faithful servants.³² Haldeman suggests it was a

²⁹ Patrick Fairbairn, The Typology of Scripture (Philadelphia: Daniels and Smith, 1852), Vol. II, p. 281.

³⁰ Mackintosh, op. cit., p. 70.

³¹ Lev. 2:11.

³² Fairbairn, loc. cit.

reference to the pleasure of sin, especially the sin of self-pity. He indicates the exclusion of honey from the meal-offering typified Christ's refusal to accept flattery and the applause of the world.³³

Unlike leaven, honey was not usually referred to as corruption. Sometimes it was prescribed and sometimes it was prohibited. In one of Isaiah's prophetic utterances regarding Immanuel, it says, "Butter and honey shall he eat, when he knoweth to refuse the evil, and choose the good."³⁴ It would seem then that there are times when honey had its proper place, but other times when it was forbidden. Mackintosh says that "honey" refers to those human relationships which have their proper place. Jesus knew when "honey" was good and when it should be refused. He could say to His mother, "Knew ye not that I must be in my Father's house?"³⁵ Then again He could say to the beloved disciple, "Behold, thy mother!"³⁶ In other words, nature's claims were never allowed to interfere with the presentation to God of all the energies of Christ's perfect manhood. Reference may also be made to the incident in which the mother and brethren of Jesus

³³ Haldeman, op. cit., p. 332-4.

³⁴ Isa. 7:15.

³⁵ Luke 2:49.

³⁶ John 19:27.

sent unto Him, calling Him.³⁷ The true Meat-offering did not abandon His work in order to respond to nature's call. Had He done so, it would have been to mingle "honey" with the meat-offering, which could not be. The "honey" was faithfully excluded on this as on every occasion when God's claims were to be attended to.³⁸ For Jesus answered this human request by saying, "Who is my mother and my brethren? And looking round on them that sat round about him, he saith, Behold, my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother."³⁹

Form in which it was presented. The second main point in the theme of this chapter is the mode in which the meal-offering was prepared. It was "baken in the oven,"⁴⁰ or "of the baking-pan,"⁴¹ or "of the frying-pan."⁴² Mackintosh suggests that the exposure to the heat or the process of baking gave the idea of suffering. But since the meal-offering was called "a sweet savor," it is evident that there was no

³⁷ Mark 3:31.

³⁸ Mackintosh, op. cit., pp. 71-2.

³⁹ Mark 3:33-35.

⁴⁰ Lev. 2:4.

⁴¹ Lev. 2:5.

⁴² Lev. 2:7.

thought of suffering for sin. However, in viewing the earthly life of Jesus, one may notice three distinct kinds of suffering: (1) suffering for righteousness; (2) suffering by the power of sympathy; and (3) suffering in anticipation.

Jesus suffered for righteousness during His life. He suffered for sin in His death. During His life, man and Satan did their utmost to dissuade Him from righteousness. Jesus certainly epitomized a portion of His own experience when He said:

Blessed are they that have been persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are ye when men shall reproach you, and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake.⁴³

But Jesus also suffered by the power of sympathy. This character of suffering unfolded the deep secrets of His tender heart. Human sorrow and human misery always caused Him sorrow. Inasmuch as His humanity was perfect, He felt the sorrow more keenly than those who were the direct subject of it.

His feelings--His affections--His sensibilities--His whole moral and mental constitution were perfect; and hence, none can tell what such an One must have suffered, in passing through such a world as this. He beheld the human family struggling beneath the ponderous weight of guilt and wretchedness; He beheld the whole creation groaning under the yoke; the cry of the prisoner fell upon His ear; the tear of the widow met His view; bereavement and poverty touched His sensitive heart; sickness and death made Him "groan in the spirit;" His

⁴³ Matt. 5:10-11.

sympathetic sufferings were beyond all human conception.⁴⁴

A Scriptural reference to this character of suffering is found in the following quote:

And when even was come, they brought unto him many possessed with demons; and he cast out the spirits with a word, and healed all that were sick: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken through Isaiah the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our diseases.⁴⁵

Finally, one may consider Christ's sufferings by anticipation. The outstanding illustration of this type of suffering is the suffering which Christ endured just previous to the cross. This is distinct from His suffering for righteousness and His suffering by sympathy as well as from the actual suffering on the cross. One of the Scriptural passages indicating this type of suffering is quoted:

And he took with him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, and began to be sorrowful and sore troubled. Then saith he unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death: abide ye here and watch with me. And he went forward a little, and fell on his face, and prayed, saying, My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass away from me: nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt.⁴⁶

It is evident there was something in prospect which Jesus had never encountered before. There was a "cup" being filled of which He had not yet drunk. In Gethsemane He anticipated

⁴⁴ Mackintosh, op. cit., p. 78.

⁴⁵ Matt. 8:16-17.

⁴⁶ Matt. 26:37-39.

the coming cross. He foresaw His bearing of sin, though it was not yet laid upon Him. In this sorrow, He still had direct communion with the Father, but He anticipated that moment when He would be forsaken by the Father. Undoubtedly this was the severest testing endured by the true Meal-offering, the Man Christ Jesus.⁴⁷

The persons who partook of it. Those who ate the meal-offering, except for the small portion which was burnt upon the altar, were the head and members of the priestly house. "And that which is left of the meal-offering shall be Aaron's and his sons': it is a thing most holy of the offerings of Jehovah made by fire."⁴⁸ Mackintosh maintains that the sons of Aaron were types of all true believers, not as convicted sinners, but as worshipping priests. In the meal-offering, the sons of Aaron fed upon the remnant of that which had been laid on the table of Jehovah. This was a high and holy privilege. No one but the priests could enjoy it. This fact is set forth in the following Scripture:

And this is the law of the meal-offering: the sons of Aaron shall offer it before Jehovah, before the altar. And he shall take up therefrom his handful, of the fine flour of the meal-offering, and of the oil thereof, and all the frankincense which is upon the meal-offering, and shall burn it upon the altar for a sweet savor, as the memorial thereof, unto Jehovah. And that which is left thereof shall Aaron and his sons eat: it shall be

⁴⁷ Mackintosh, op. cit., pp. 74-82.

⁴⁸ Lev. 2:10.

eaten without leaven in a holy place; in the court of the tent of meeting they shall eat it. It shall not be baked with leaven. I have given it as their portion of my offerings made by fire; it is most holy, as the sin-offering, and as the trespass-offering. Every male among the children of Aaron shall eat of it, as his portion for ever throughout your generations from the offerings of Jehovah made by fire: whosoever toucheth them shall be holy.⁴⁹

Mackintosh suggests this was a figure of the Church, feeding "in the holy place," in the power of practical holiness, upon the perfections of "the Man Christ Jesus." This is the portion of the believer through the grace of God. But it must be remembered that it was to be eaten with unleavened bread. One cannot feed upon Christ if one is indulging in anything evil. "Whosoever toucheth them shall be holy."⁵⁰ One's position, practice, person, associations, must all be holy, else one is not eligible to feed upon the Meal-Offering.⁵¹ Certainly the same emphasis given in type in the Old Testament is expressed in the New Testament in the words, "Ye shall be holy; for I am holy."⁵²

⁴⁹ Lev. 6:14-18.

⁵⁰ Lev. 6:18.

⁵¹ Mackintosh, op. cit., pp. 83-4.

⁵² I Pet. 1:16.

CHAPTER IV

THE PEACE OFFERING

The third general class of offerings set forth in the book of Leviticus was known as the "peace-offering." The general name for this species was shelamim. This Hebrew word came from a root which signified "to make up," "to supply what was wanting or deficient," or "to pay or recompense." It came to express a state in which all misunderstandings or disturbances having been removed, there was room for friendship, harmony and peace.¹ In the application of shelamim to this particular offering, it came to mean sacrifices of friendship expressing or promoting peaceful relations with the Deity. This sacrifice was an occasion of great joy and was invariably accompanied by a meal or feast.²

KINDS OF PEACE-OFFERINGS

There were three different kinds of offerings which were included under the title "peace-offering." These were: (1) the thank-offerings; (2) the votive offerings (offerings with a vow); and (3) free-will offerings. These seemed to have an order of importance as indicated by various traits.

¹ Patrick Fairbairn, The Typology of Scripture (Philadelphia: Daniels and Smith, 1852), Vol. II, p. 276.

² J. J. Reeve, "Sacrifice in the Old Testament," The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, IV, 2638.

The thank-offering and the votive-offering required an animal without blemish.³ But an exception was made in the free-will offering in that it was acceptable to offer an animal with something lacking or superfluous in its parts.⁴ This would indicate a difference in the free-will offering. Then again, it seemed that the thank-offering was of more importance than the other two because in the laws of the peace-offering, it had a section for itself.⁵ The other two, votive and free-will offerings, came under the same general laws.⁶ This difference was also indicated in the toleration of eating the flesh of the two on the second day while the flesh of the thank-offering could be eaten on the first day only.⁷

The relation of the three kinds to each other, with their respective gradations, is suggested by Fairbairn as follows:

The thank or praise-offering was the expression of the worshipper's feelings of adoring gratitude on account of having received some spontaneous tokens of the Lord's goodness--this was the highest form, as here the grace of God alone shone forth. The vow-sacrifice was the expression of like feelings for benefits received from the divine beneficence, but which were partly conferred

³ Lev. 22:21.

⁴ Lev. 22:23.

⁵ Lev. 7:11-15.

⁶ Lev. 7:16-21

⁷ Lev. 7:15, 16.

in consideration of a vow made by the worshipper--this was of a lower grade, having something of man connected with it. And the free-will offering which was presented without any constraint of necessity, and either without respect to any special acts of mercy experienced, or with a view to the obtaining of such, occupied a still lower ground, as the worshipper here took the initiative, and appeared in the attitude of one seeking after God.⁸

THE MATERIALS

As to the materials, the law allowed great latitude. The animals which could be offered were the same as in the burnt-offering--cattle, sheep and goats--but not pigeons. Unlike the burnt-offering, however, the female was allowed as well as the more valuable male.⁹ The animals were to be without blemish with an exception made for the free-will offering as already noted. In the offering of the thank-offering, it was required that a meal-offering should accompany it.¹⁰

THE RITUAL

The ritual of the peace-offering corresponded in its first stages with that of the burnt-offering. The laying on of hands, the killing of the victim, and the sprinkling of blood upon the altar were the same in both offerings. In the

⁸ Fairbairn, op. cit., p. 277.

⁹ Lev. 3:1, 6.

¹⁰ Lev. 7:12, 13.

peace-offering, the whole animal was not placed upon the altar as in the burnt-offering. At the cutting up of the animal, the fat was removed and afterward burned as a "sweet savor unto Jehovah."¹¹ This fat consisted of four parts in the case of oxen and goats and of five parts in the case of sheep.¹² Gustav Oehler suggests that the reason for burning these fatty portions on the altar was that they were regarded as the choice parts of the animal.¹³

S. H. Kellogg gives an interesting sidelight in regard to "the fat tail entire"¹⁴ which was required when the victim was a sheep. The reference was to a special breed of sheep which is still found in Palestine, Arabia, and North Africa. With these the tail grows to an immense size, sometimes weighing fifteen pounds or more, and consists almost entirely of a rich substance in character between fat and marrow. The Orientals still esteem this as the most valuable part of the animal for food.¹⁵

¹¹ Lev. 3:5, 13.

¹² Lev. 3:3-5, 9-11, 14-16.

¹³ Gustav Friedrich Oehler, Theology of the Old Testament (eighth edition; New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1883), pp. 289-90.

¹⁴ Lev. 3:9.

¹⁵ S. H. Kellogg, "The Book of Leviticus," An Exposition of the Bible (Hartford: The S. S. Scranton Co., 1903), I, 258.

So the burning of the fat upon the altar was the visible Divine appropriation of that which was the best of the offering. This symbolism is supported by the frequent Scriptural references to "fat" and "fatness" as the symbol of that which is richest and best. In the peace-offering, God was served first and with the best of the offering.¹⁶

THE DISTRIBUTION

Attention was given in the preceding section to the portion of the peace-offering which was given to God by burning it upon the altar. The priests also received a portion which consisted of the breast and the right shoulder.¹⁷ The parts assigned to the priests were handled in a peculiar way. On account of this handling they were described as the "breast of the wave-offering" and the "thigh of the heave-offering."¹⁸ W. P. Paterson has suggested an explanation of the wave and heave offerings. He said the ceremony of the "wave-offering" consisted in moving the portion backwards and forwards in the line of the altar. The swinging in a forward direction was an action declaring that it properly belonged to God; while the movement back again denoted that God returned the gift and assigned it as His own present to

¹⁶ Loc. cit.

¹⁷ Lev. 7:31, 32.

¹⁸ Exod. 29:27.

the priest. The handling of the "heave-offering" was similar, only it was in a vertical motion instead of a horizontal one. This rite is interpreted similarly to the wave-offering in that the offering was presented to God by being lifted upward.¹⁹ Practically nothing is said in Scripture in relation to the ceremony and significance on the priest's portion.

After the fat was removed to be offered on the altar, and the priest's portion was taken out, the remainder of the animal was given to the offerer himself. The participation by the offerer and his friends may be regarded as the most distinctive characteristic of the peace-offering. Among those he was instructed to invite, besides his own family and friends, were "the Levite that is within the gates, and the sojourner, and the fatherless, and the widow, that are in the midst of thee."²⁰ These offerings were not to be eaten at the offerer's home, but before Jehovah at the central sanctuary.²¹

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE FEAST

The peace-offering meal denoted that the offerer was admitted to a state of close fellowship and enjoyment with

¹⁹ W. P. Paterson, "Sacrifice," Dictionary of the Bible, IV, 338.

²⁰ Lev. 16:11.

²¹ Lev. 12:18.

God. It was a symbol of established friendship with God and near communion with Him in the blessings of His kingdom. It was associated in the midst of the worshippers with feelings of peculiar joy and gladness. But on the other hand, these feasts were always of a sacred character because they were still to be "before Jehovah" and in the place where He put His name. The feasts were also to be eaten in the company with those who were ceremonially pure.²² So the primary purpose of the peace-offering was a symbolic expression of peace and fellowship with God.

In a secondary sense, it may well have been as S. H. Kellogg explains, an expression of fellowship and friendship between men. The one who gave the feast showed the guests his friendship toward them, in inviting them to partake of the food. And if, in any case, there had been an interruption or breach of friendship, such an invitation to a feast was an indication on his part that the breach was healed and that peace had replaced the enmity.²³

THE TYPICAL SIGNIFICANCE

The peace-offering was one type of offering which is definitely spoken of in the New Testament so that there is no doubt as to its typical significance. One of the out-

²² Fairbairn, op. cit., p. 279.

²³ Kellogg, op. cit., p. 258.

standing Scriptural references is as follows:

But now in Christ Jesus ye that once were far off are made nigh in the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who made both one, and brake down the middle wall of partition, having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; that he might create in himself of the two one new man, so making peace; and might reconcile them both in one body unto God through the cross, having slain the enmity thereby; and he came and preached peace to you that were far off, and peace to them that were nigh: for through him we both have our access in one Spirit unto the Father.²⁴

In this passage alone, and many more could be cited, it may be seen that Jesus Christ "is our peace," is "making peace," and "preached peace." The peace-offering was the picture of reconciliation between God and man. The peace of the offering was on the basis of a mutually accepted sacrifice. Just so, the peace of the Christian with God is on the basis of a mutually accepted sacrifice, even Jesus Christ.

A great deal could be said in a general sense in regard to the fact of Christ's being man's peace-offering. But attention will now be given to the typical significance of some of the particulars of the peace-offering, while the more general discussion has been reserved for the close of the chapter.

There is one question which should be given some discussion before an adequate understanding can be had of the peace-offering. That question is whether the feast of the

²⁴ Eph. 2:13-18.

offering was a feast offered and presented by the Israelite to God, or a feast given by God to the Israelite. In other words, in this feast who was the host and who was the guest? It must be remembered that when the offerer brought the sacrifice, he brought it in much the same manner as he brought the burnt-offering. He committed the offering completely to God. From that time the victim was no longer his own property, but God's. God, having received the offering, then directed what use should be made of it. A part was to be burned upon the altar. Another part He gave to the priests, His servants. And the remaining part He gave as a feast to the worshipper.

The eating of the peace-offering symbolically taught that if one has presented the Lamb of God as his peace, by faith, God invites the believer to sit down at His own table in joyful fellowship with Himself. Fellowship with God through reconciliation by the blood of the slain Lamb was the first thing shadowed forth in this part of the ritual of the peace-offering.²⁵

F. W. Brown has made some illuminating observations regarding the typical significance of the peace-offering. He emphasized the fact that gladness and joy were connected with the offering.

Persons grateful for deliverances wrought and mercies received, desirous of paying vows previously made, or

²⁵ Kellogg, op. cit., p. 260.

pledging themselves voluntarily to some new obligation, were to offer before the Lord their sacrifice of thanksgiving and praise.²⁶

Brown indicated several observations regarding the work of Christ as they were revealed in the law of the peace-offering. He pointed out the progression of the Christian's relationship with God. These observations, which will now receive some attention, were as follows: (1) peace follows forgiveness; (2) restoration follows peace; (3) gratitude follows restoration; and (4) devotion follows gratitude.²⁷

Peace follows forgiveness. The peace-offering admitted the reconciled man into the presence of God. The offerer came not as a culprit seeking pardon, but as a forgiven child drawing near to a loving Father. Pardon was necessary before one could enter into peace. The New Testament supports that in saying, "Being therefore justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ."²⁸ Brown says, "Peace is the Divine legacy Christ has left to all who come to Him for rest from the burden of the ceremonial law, and guilt of sin."²⁹

²⁶ W. Harvey Jellie, Frederick W. Brown, The Preacher's Commentary on the Book of Leviticus (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1892), p. 93.

²⁷ Ibid., p. 94.

²⁸ Rom. 5:1.

²⁹ Jellie, Brown, loc. cit.

Restoration follows peace. In the presentation of the peace-offering and in the feast, the worshippers felt they were admitted into the family of God. The priests and people joined with the Lord in the divinely appointed Eucharistic feast. This privilege was taught by Jesus in the parable of the Prodigal Son.³⁰ It would not have been enough for him to be pardoned for his rebellion and sin; he needed restoration to his father's house and favour. Symbolized by the peace-offering, Christ is the peace which brings about the restoration. "For he is our peace, who made both one, and brake down the middle wall of partition."³¹

Gratitude follows restoration. The restored worshipper was constrained to give to the Lord the glory due to His name. When the offering was "waved" to and fro, and "heaved" toward heaven, it denoted the offerer's gratitude to Jehovah. It recognized Him as the Proprietor of all things, and as worthy of the warmest and strongest love.

The gratitude was:

(a) Prompt. The offering was to be made at once, none of the things provided were to be kept until the third day, all to be partaken of while memory of the blessings acknowledged was fresh.

(b) Large hearted. The priests and people were to invite their families to join them in the feast, and to eat unsparingly.

(c) Perpetual. The statute was never to be repealed while the economy continued. The people were under

³⁰ Luke 15:11-32.

³¹ Eph. 2:14.

obligation to be thankful, and they knew how their thankfulness might be acceptably expressed.³²

The injunction which the Israelite obeyed is also given in the New Testament in the words, "In everything give thanks: for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus to you-ward."³³

Devotion follows gratitude. The "waving" of the breast and the "heaving" of the shoulder symbolized consecration of strength and affection to the Lord. Also, everything offered was to be clean which obviously taught the necessity of moral purity in character of those who presented the offerings.

Specific instructions were given regarding the purity of the flesh of the peace-offering as well as the purity of the participants of the feast.

And the flesh that toucheth any unclean thing shall not be eaten; it shall be burnt with fire. And as for the flesh, every one that is clean shall eat thereof: but the soul that eateth of the flesh of the sacrifice of peace-offerings, that pertain unto Jehovah, having his uncleanness upon him, that soul shall be cut off from his people. And when any one shall touch any unclean thing, the uncleanness of man, or an unclean beast, or any unclean abomination and eat of the flesh of the sacrifice of peace-offerings, which pertain unto Jehovah, that soul shall be cut off from his people.³⁴

The flesh could touch no unclean thing. If it did, it could not be eaten but had to be burned. The peace-offering was required to be without pollution or corruption. This was,

³² Jellie, Brown, loc. cit.

³³ I Thess. 5:18.

³⁴ Lev. 7:19-21.

no doubt, the emphasis also in the requirement that the flesh could not be kept longer than two days in the case of the votive and free-will offerings, and one day in the case of the thank-offering.

The law of the peace-offering also insisted that the peace-offering could not be eaten by any unclean person. When a person was upon any account ceremonially unclean, it was at his peril if he presumed to eat of the flesh of the peace-offering. Holy things were only for holy people. The holiness of the food was ceremonial, so if any person was ceremonially unclean and partook of the feast, he was "cut off from his people." It seems to teach that the believer today must be preserved from the pollutions of sin if he is to have the benefit and comfort of Christ's sacrifice.³⁵

Putting away therefore all wickedness, and all guile, and hypocrisies, and envies, and all evil speakings, as new-born babes, long for the spiritual milk which is without guile, that ye may grow thereby unto salvation.³⁶

As foreshadowed by the offering, if any dared to partake of the Lord under the pollution of sin unrepented of, and so profaned sacred things, they ate and drank judgment to themselves. "For he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself, if he discern not the body."³⁷

³⁵ Matthew Henry, Matthew Henry's Commentary on the Whole Bible (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, [n.d.]), I, Lev. 7:11-34, footnote II-3.

³⁶ I Pet. 2:1, 2.

³⁷ I Cor. 11:29.

It may be clearly seen then that the peace-offering gave recognition or expression to the peace relation between the offerer and God. The peace was symbolized by the offering of the sacrifice. So the Antitype was shadowed forth as the Sacrifice which was given in order to reconcile man with God.

For it was the good pleasure of the Father that in him should all the fulness dwell; and through him to reconcile all things unto himself, having made peace through the blood of his cross; through him, I say, whether things upon the earth, or things in the heavens. And you, being in time past alienated and enemies in your mind in your evil works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and without blemish and unreprieveable before him.³⁸

The "peace" which Christ brought was peace between the sinner and God. This is the meaning of the oft-repeated and much misunderstood announcement of the angels to the shepherds, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men."³⁹ It has been interpreted to mean that this was the announcement that the Lord had come into the world to make peace between warring nations. Whether or not He came to do that is not taught in this particular Scripture. The announcement of the angels was a proclamation in the ears of the shepherds that lambs were no longer needed for temple service. God Himself had provided a Lamb. He was to offer a Sacrifice by which peace would be made, not between warring

³⁸ Col. 1:19-22.

³⁹ Luke 2:14 (A.V.).

nations, but between the individual sinner and God. The "peace" was to be "among men in whom he is well pleased." Jesus declared Himself to be that "peace and good will" about whom the angels spoke.⁴⁰ "For this is the will of my Father, that every one that beholdeth the Son, and believeth on him, should have eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day."⁴¹

From the preceding discussion, it may be concluded that the peace-offering typified the believers in Christ as well as Christ Himself. Though it has been clearly seen that Christ is the means of man's peace with God, yet in the feast of the sacrifice, the feeding at the Lord's own table, and the provisions for the offerer, one can see the blessed state of honor and dignity to which the child of God is raised. One can also see one's nearness to the Father and the privilege of access to the best things in His Kingdom. But one must always keep in mind the requirements of purification. The worshipper can attain a fitness to enjoy these privileges only through the life-blood of Atonement. The privileges come only through faith in the crucified Christ.⁴²

By him has the provision been made, and the door opened, and the invitation issued to go in and partake; such only as have been covered upon by his precious blood

⁴⁰ I. M. Haldeman, The Tabernacle Priesthood and Offerings (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1925), pp. 356-8.

⁴¹ John 6:40.

⁴² Fairbairn, op. cit., pp. 277-80.

can be admitted to taste, or be prepared to relish the feast of fat things he sets before them; for through him as the grand medium of reconciliation and acceptance, must their persons be brought nigh, and their devotions be presented, and their souls be prepared for communion and fellowship with God. The unsanctified by the blood of Christ must of necessity be aliens from God's household, and strangers at his table.⁴³

⁴³ Ibid., p. 280.

CHAPTER V

THE SIN-OFFERING

The next offering to be considered is the "sin-offering." From the very name it may be seen that it had to do with sin in a peculiar way. The name for this offering is translated from the Hebrew word hatta'th. This was applied to both "sin" and "sin-offering," so it indicated that this offering had specially to do with sin. All the sacrifices were necessitated by the fact and consciousness of sin and were, therefore, reminders of sin. But this particular sacrifice dealt most specifically and prominently with the expiation for sin. It was perhaps the most complicated and detailed of all the sacrifices.

Before one can discuss the details of the sin-offering, one must indicate the Biblical references to the subject. The three preceding offerings were dealt with in the first three chapters of Leviticus, successively. It would be convenient indeed if the sin and trespass-offerings to be discussed would be confined to chapters four and five respectively. But this does not seem to be the case. Edward Young suggests in his listing that the sin-offering is dealt with in Leviticus, chapter four, and the first thirteen verses of chapter five.¹ All other sources which the author

¹ Edward Young, An Introduction to the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1949), p. 80.

has used in this thesis concur with this opinion, with the exception of Haldeman.² The many similarities of the sin-offering and the trespass-offering give rise to the problem of determining which portions of Scripture deal with each offering. But in defense of the position taken by most scholars, Fairbairn states the following:

The whole of this portion treats of the sin-offerings, and only at v. 14 does the law of the trespass-offering begin. The division of the chapters here is particularly unhappy. That the word 'trespass' is sometimes used in the first part of the fifth chapter, arises from these two kinds of offering having much in common, and in particular from the circumstance that every sin for which a sin-offering was to be presented, might be called a trespass, in the sense meant by the original. But of this afterwards, under the trespass-offering.³

The point of difficulty occurs in the fifth chapter of Leviticus where the term "trespass-offering" appears.⁴ It is suggested in the margin that in the two instances referred to, these verses may read "for his guilt" instead of "his trespass-offering." If the marginal reading is accepted, it is easily understood that the first thirteen verses of the fifth chapter of Leviticus deal with the sin-offering.⁵

² I. M. Haldeman, The Tabernacle Priesthood and Offerings (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1925), p. 364.

³ Patrick Fairbairn, The Typology of Scripture (Philadelphia: Daniels and Smith, 1852), Vol. II, p. 262.

⁴ Lev. 5:6, 7.

⁵ S. H. Kellogg, "The Book of Leviticus," An Exposition of the Bible (Hartford: The S. S. Scranton Co., 1903), I, 270.

KINDS OF SIN-OFFERINGS

For the sake of information, a list of the various kinds of sin-offerings is given here. These different kinds do not have a great deal of bearing on the typology of the sin-offering, but they give a better understanding of the scope and importance of the offering. A concise list of these sin-offerings is quoted:

Regular

1. For the whole people, at the New Moon, Passover, Pentecost, Feast of Trumpets, and Feast of Tabernacles (Num. 28:15-29:38); besides the solemn offering of the two goats on the Great Day of Atonement (Lev. 16).
2. For priests and Levites at their consecration (Exod. 29:1-14, 36); besides the yearly sin-offering (a bullock) for the high-priest on the Great Day of Atonement (Lev. 16).

Special

1. For any sin of "ignorance" against the commandment of the Lord, on the part of priest, people, ruler, or private man (Lev. 4).
2. For refusal to bear witness under adjuration (Lev. 5:1).
3. For ceremonial defilement not wilfully contracted (Lev. 5:2, 3), under which may be classed the offerings at the purification of women (Lev. 12:6-8), at the cleansing of leprosy (Lev. 14:19, 31), or the uncleanness of men or women (Lev. 15:15, 30), on the defilement of a Nazarite (Num. 6:6-11), or the expiration of his vow (Num. 6:16).
4. For the breach of a rash oath, the keeping of which would involve sin (Lev. 5:4).⁶

Having indicated the various kinds of sin-offerings, attention is now given to the materials generally used.

⁶ John M'Clintock, James Strong, editors, "Sin-offering," Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature, IX, 778.

THE MATERIALS

The sin-offering proper was a sacrifice consisting of either a beast or fowl offered on the altar to atone for a sin committed unwittingly. If the anointed priest or the whole congregation committed the sin through ignorance, the sin-offering was a young bullock without blemish.⁷ Should the ruler sin, his offering was a male goat without blemish.⁸ But when a private individual sinned, his offering had to be either a female goat or a female lamb without blemish.⁹ In the event he was too poor to provide one of these, two turtle-doves or two pigeons were acceptable.¹⁰ In summary then, the subjects which could be offered in the sin-offering were: a bullock, a goat, turtle-doves or pigeons.¹¹

THE RITUAL

The presentation, laying on of hands, and slaying.

In many respects the ritual of the sin-offering was the same as the burnt-offering and peace-offering. The victim was

⁷ Lev. 4:3, 14.

⁸ Lev. 4:23.

⁹ Lev. 4:28, 32.

¹⁰ Lev. 5:7.

¹¹ George A. Barton, "Sin-offering," The Jewish Encyclopedia, XI, 380.

brought by the guilty person to be offered to God by the priest. As in the case of other bloody offerings, the offerer laid his hand on the head of the victim. A particular which was not mentioned in the other offering was that he confessed his sin in connection with the laying on of his hand.¹² Of this significant act, Oehler says:

The animal is said to be, by the laying on of the hand, laden with sin, and thus to have become 'incarnate sin,' the impurity of the sinner being transferred to the victim, and, as it were, imbibed by it.¹³

After the laying on of the hand, the offerer entrusted the victim to the priest, that he might apply its blood for him in atonement before God. The priest then slayed the victim.¹⁴

The sprinkling of the blood. The chief and most distinctive peculiarity in the ritual of the sin-offering was the action with the blood. The various ways in which it was used always gave emphasis to the ideas of sin and atonement. When the offering was made for a single individual, a ruler, or a private member of the congregation, the blood was not simply poured round about the altar, but some of it was also sprinkled upon the horns of the altar. This gave the blood

¹² Lev. 5:5; 16:21.

¹³ Gustav Friedrich Oehler, Theology of the Old Testament (eighth edition; New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1883), p. 308.

¹⁴ Kellogg, op. cit.

a particularly conspicuous place in the offering. If the offering was for the sin of the high-priest or of the congregation at large, a portion of the blood was carried into the sanctuary in addition to action in the outer court. There the priest sprinkled the blood with his finger seven times before the inner vail, and again upon the horns of the altar of incense. It was done in the Holy Place before the vail, because that was the symbolical dwelling-place of the high-priest or of the congregation as represented by him. It was sprinkled upon the altar of incense because that was the most important article of furniture in the holy place.¹⁵

The highest expression possibly given through the blood was presented when the high-priest on the day of atonement went with the blood of his own and the people's sin-offering into the most holy place, and sprinkled the mercy seat, the very place of Jehovah's throne. Patrick Fairbairn says:

In this action the sin appeared on the one hand, rising to its most dreadful form of a condemning witness in the presence-chamber of God, and, on the other, the atonement assumed the appearance of so perfect and complete a satisfaction that the sinner could come nigh to the seat of God, and return again, not only unscathed, but with a commission from him to banish the entire mass of guilt into the gulf of utter oblivion.¹⁶

The intensely atoning power of the blood in the sin-offering gave rise to other rather strict prescriptions in

¹⁵ Fairbairn, op. cit., p. 266.

¹⁶ Loc. cit.

the ritual. The blood was so sacred that if any portion of it was spilled accidentally upon the garments of the persons officiating, the garment had to be washed in the holy place. It was so holy that an earthen vessel which contained it was to be broken and a brazen one, scoured.¹⁷

The burning on the altar. Only the fat was burned upon the altar. But as was seen in the discussion of the peace-offering, the fat was considered to be the choicest part. There was a variation when the offering was composed of two turtle-doves or two pigeons.¹⁸ The very nature of the victims indicates the reason for this variation. In the case of a small creature like a bird, the fat would be so insignificant in quantity, and so difficult to separate from the flesh, that the ordinance was varied and a second bird taken for the burning as a substitute for the separated fat of larger animals.¹⁹

The eating and the burning without the camp. The eating of the flesh of the sin-offering was done in a different manner; it had also a considerably different meaning than the peace-offering. The offerer himself did not eat any of the flesh of the sacrificed victim--only the priests could

¹⁷ Lev. 6:27, 28.

¹⁸ Lev. 5:7.

¹⁹ Kellogg, op. cit., p. 273.

eat it. But there were even restrictions in the priest's eating. For when he was himself the one for whom the offering was made, whether as an individual, or as included in the congregation, he could not eat of it. In other words, the one for whom the victim was offered, could not eat of its flesh. Since the blood which was brought into the holy place was from a sacrifice made for the sins of either the priest or the whole congregation, it is evident that no one was eligible to eat the flesh of that offering. Therefore, the general law was laid down: "And no sin-offering, whereof any of the blood is brought into the tent of meeting to make atonement in the holy place, shall be eaten: it shall be burnt with fire."²⁰

The order was given that those offerings which could not be eaten by the priests be taken outside the camp to a clean place and burned on a fire of wood.²¹ This meant that even the skin was to be burned, for nothing was to remain of the sin-offering.

THE ACTUAL SIGNIFICANCE

The atonement was made specifically by the sin-offering. Though all the offerings reminded the Israelite of sin, this offering definitely purposed to heal the breach (caused

²⁰ Lev. 6:30.

²¹ Lev. 4:11, 12, 21.

by sin) between God and the offerer. Nothing which man could do in himself could remove the sin and guilt from his soul, so God in His mercy and love instituted this atoning sacrifice.

Since God alone can remove sin, the question may be asked, "What benefit came from the sin-offering or the atoning sacrifice?" S. J. Gammertsfelder has suggested three benefits of which the Israelite was the benefactor:

In the first place, the benefit of the atoning sacrifice is due to the fact that it is by Divine appointment. When God appoints an atoning sacrifice for the forgiveness of sin, He Himself accompanies that service with power to forgive. . . . So when God connects atonement, or propitiation, or expiation, or forgiveness with any external rite, such connection means power to accomplish the Divine purpose of redemption. We reply, in the second place, that an atoning sacrifice furnishes the worshiper who seeks God's favor a concrete object of faith. In our finiteness we need just such aid to our faith as some tangible object can furnish. And, in the third place, we answer, that an atoning sacrifice furnishes occasion and opportunity to confess sin, to express penitence and a purpose of righteousness. By these activities the worshiper, guided by the Holy Spirit, gains that attitude of heart and mind which is always required in order to receive Divine forgiveness. Thus we may see that the atoning sacrifice for forgiveness of sin and the removal of guilt provided in the Old Testament was not an arbitrary arrangement, but one made by Divine wisdom and in perfect accord with the constitution and nature of things; that is, it is in perfect accord with God's eternal purpose.²²

So when man made use of the Divinely appointed means for making atonement, God furnished a covering for his sin. God actually took away the sin and removed the guilt. When

²² S. J. Gamertsfelder, Systematic Theology (Harrisburg: Evangelical Publishing House, 1921), pp. 280-1.

man believed Him, his faith was accounted to him for righteousness. But the sin-offering was a covering for sin only in a limited sense. The whole human race needed atonement, even from the fall of Adam. So the sin-offering was a type of the great Sin-offering which God purposed from the very beginning.²³

THE TYPICAL SIGNIFICANCE

There are many evidences in New Testament Scripture that Christ was and is the Antitype of the sin-offering. The apostle John gave the testimony of John the Baptist concerning Jesus with the words, "Behold, the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world!"²⁴ The use of the term "Lamb" certainly inferred directly that Jesus was and is the Atoning Sacrifice for the sin of the world. In another passage one reads, "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins."²⁵ In this verse, the term "propitiation" refers to the service of the high priest on the day of atonement when he took the blood of the sacrifice, carried it into the holy of holies and sprinkled it upon and before the mercy seat.²⁶

²³ Ibid., pp. 278-84.

²⁴ John 1:29.

²⁵ I John 4:10.

²⁶ Gamertsfelder, op. cit., p. 286.

The apostle Paul, perhaps more than any other New Testament writer, emphasized the fact that the death of Christ was the true and final Sin-offering.

Who was delivered up for our trespasses, and was raised for our justification.²⁷

But God commendeth his own love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, shall we be saved from the wrath of God through Him.²⁸

In whom we have our redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses, according to the riches of his grace.²⁹

Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf; that we might become the righteousness of God in Him.³⁰

Attention will now be given to the various aspects of the sin-offering and the typical significance of those details.

A victim without blemish. It was seen in the discussion of the materials of the sin-offering that a variety of animals was allowed. But in each instance, it was stipulated that the animal was to be without blemish. This requirement was enforced in the other offerings as well, but that is only a verification of the fact that all the types point to one and the same great Antitype.

²⁷ Rom. 4:25.

²⁸ Rom. 5:8, 9.

²⁹ Eph. 1:7.

³⁰ II Cor. 5:21.

Scripture states that Christ is the fulfillment of the demand for a victim without blemish in the sin-offering.

Knowing that we were redeemed, not with corruptible things, with silver or gold, from your vain manner of life handed down from your fathers; but with precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, even the blood of Christ.³¹

Laying on of hands. This ceremony was discussed in the chapter on the burnt-offering,³² but since that rite had a different significance in the sin-offering, it must be considered here. In the case of the burnt-offering, the laying on of hands was an identification of the offerer with the offering. In the sin-offering, there was a confession of sin in connection with it.³³ This symbolized the identification of the sin of the offerer with the offering. So in the great Antitype, one finds the One who knew no sin "made to be sin on our behalf; that we might become the righteousness of God in Him."³⁴

The sprinkling of the blood. In the discussion of the ritual, it was discovered that the most distinctive part of the sin-offering was the action with the blood. An

³¹ I Pet. 1:18, 19.

³² Supra, p. 21.

³³ C. H. Mackintosh, Notes on the Book of Leviticus (Chicago: F. H. Revell, 1878), p. 125.

³⁴ II Cor. 5:21.

explanation of the emphasis to the blood has been given in the New Testament in the words, "Apart from shedding of blood there is no remission."³⁵ Many truths regarding the atonement of Christ were foreshadowed in the handling of the blood in the sin-offering.

The most sacred act regarding the sin-offering was that ceremony which took place on the annual day of atonement. The central offering of the annual day of atonement was the sin-offering. On this day the high priest took the blood of the bullock and went within the veil and sprinkled the blood upon and before the mercy-seat.³⁶ The "mercy-seat" was literally the cover or lid of the ark. In order to discover the typical or symbolical meaning of the term, it is necessary to consider its original meaning. In the Hebrew Bible, it is the word kapporeth, from the word kaphar. This, in its strict or primary sense, means "to atone" for sin, "to expiate," or "forgive" sin. In its secondary sense, it means "to cover" sin. The same word used in the Septuagint, and in the Greek version of the New Testament is hilasterion.³⁷ When this Greek word is used as a noun, it is translated "propitiation" or "expiation." This word is used

³⁵ Heb. 9:22.

³⁶ Lev. 16:15.

³⁷ Richard Newton, The Jewish Tabernacle and its Furniture (New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1868), pp. 362-6.

in the passage as follows:

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.³⁸

From this discussion it can be seen that the atonement of Christ was directly typified by the sprinkling of the blood in the great day of atonement. It should be remembered that the mercy seat was located in the holy of holies, the place where God manifested Himself. So at least two observations may be made: (1) the atonement or propitiation was made in the presence of God; and (2) the sprinkling of the blood made possible the exhibition of mercy, and a drawing near to God.³⁹ Christ, therefore, is the True Propitiation. The sacrifice was His own blood. And just as the sprinkling of the blood on the mercy seat was for "all the people," so also is the "sprinkled blood" of Christ for all mankind.

And if any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world.⁴⁰

It has been noticed that it was always the priest who sprinkled the blood of the sin-offering. The high priest

³⁸ Rom. 3:24, 25.

³⁹ H. Orton Wiley, Christian Theology (Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1941), II, p. 287.

⁴⁰ I John 2:1, 2.

made atonement or expiation for the sins of the people. By this means the people were restored to favor with God and became the recipients of the blessings of the covenant. Regarding the Antitype, it is written, "So Christ also, having been once offered to bear the sins of many, shall appear a second time, apart from sin, to them that wait for him, unto salvation."⁴¹ This is a reference to the priestly phase of Christ's work. He is regarded as the Offerer as well as the Offering, and Priest as well as the Sacrifice. It is through the Mediator, Jesus Christ, that man is able to draw near to God.⁴²

Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holy place by the blood of Jesus, by the way which he dedicated for us, a new and living way, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; and having a great priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in fulness of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience: and having our body washed with pure water.⁴³

In order to give as complete a discussion as possible of the merits of the blood of the true Sin-offering, one more phase must be considered.

Sacrifices and offerings and whole burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein (the which are offered according to the law), then hath he said, Lo, I am come to do thy will. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By which will we have been sanctified through

⁴¹ Heb. 9:28.

⁴² Wiley, op. cit., p. 288.

⁴³ Heb. 10:19-22.

the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.⁴⁴

In this Christ was regarded not as Priest, but as the Sacrifice. Just as sin-offerings were made to purify individuals of defilement in the Mosaic economy, so also the blood of Christ is adequate to cleanse the defilement of sin. The cleansing referred to in the above passage is the cleansing from the defilement of original sin or depravity.⁴⁵ Certainly the Sin-offering, the sacrifice of Christ, provided for "all sin." "For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified. And the Holy Spirit also beareth witness to us."⁴⁶

Burning without the camp. It was pointed out earlier in the chapter that the fat of the sacrifice was burned upon the altar in about the same manner as the peace-offering ritual. When the sin-offering had been offered for the anointed priest, or for the congregation (which included him), the remains were to be taken without the camp and burned on wood with fire.⁴⁷ This detail had its antitype in the circumstance that Jesus suffered outside the camp of legal Judaism. He suffered for the "whole congregation" of

⁴⁴ Heb. 10:8-10.

⁴⁵ Wiley, op. cit., pp. 289-90.

⁴⁶ Heb. 10:14, 15.

⁴⁷ Lev. 4:11, 12, 21.

Israel. The Biblical record says further, "They took Jesus therefore: and he went out, bearing the cross for himself."⁴⁸ He went not merely outside the gate of Jerusalem to suffer, but outside the congregation of Israel as well. In other words, His consecration of Himself to God found supreme expression in that He voluntarily submitted to being cast out from Israel, despised and rejected of men, even of the Israel of God.⁴⁹

This part of the type of sin-offering was formally accomplished when the high priest declared Jesus to be guilty of blasphemy.⁵⁰ The Old Testament law stated that anyone guilty of this offense should be taken "without the camp" to suffer for his sin.⁵¹ Jesus fulfilled the prophecy of the sin-offering for of Him it was written, "Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people through his own blood, suffered without the gate."⁵²

⁴⁸ John 19:17.

⁴⁹ Kellogg, op. cit., p. 274.

⁵⁰ Matt. 26:65.

⁵¹ Lev. 24:14.

⁵² Heb. 13:12.

CHAPTER VI

THE TRESPASS OFFERING

The "trespass-offering" stood in very close relation to the "sin-offering," and to a great extent was identified with it in nature. This fact may be drawn from the particular statement which follows: "As is the sin-offering, so is the trespass-offering; there is one law for them: the priest maketh atonement therewith, he shall have it."¹ This statement, of course, refers primarily to the priest's portion of the offering, but there were also other reasons why these two offerings were identified.

The Hebrew word which has been translated "trespass-offering" is asham. The offerings which were distinctively called by the name of asham were offerings for sins in which some debt was incurred. It always admitted some sort of estimation and recompense for the sin. In addition to the atonement required for the iniquity, there was also a requirement for restitution.²

The word asham always had reference to an invasion of the rights of others, especially in respect of property or service. For instance, it was used to name the sin of Achan

¹ Lev. 7:7.

² Patrick Fairbairn, The Typology of Scripture (Philadelphia: Daniels and Smith, 1852), Vol. II, pp. 269-70.

who took part of the spoils from Jericho, which God had commanded to be set apart for Himself.³ The neglect of God's service, and especially the worship of idols, was often described with this same word.⁴ The reason was that idolatry involved a withholding from God of those tithes and other offerings which He claimed. Actually, idolatry was an invasion of the Divine rights of property. The word was also applied to the sin of adultery.⁵ This was so because the woman was regarded as belonging to her husband who had in her certain sacred rights. Adultery was an invasion of these rights. So the sins for which the trespass-offering was prescribed were in every case sins which trespassed the rights of God or man in respect of ownership. This gives the fundamental thought which distinguished the trespass-offering, that for any invasion of the rights of another in regard to property not only expiation was required, but also satisfaction, and so far as possible, plenary reparation of the wrong.⁶

The real importance of the asham, "trespass-offering," as distinguished from the hatta'th, "sin-offering," is

³ Josh. 7:1.

⁴ II Chron. 28:22; 29:6.

⁵ Num. 5:12, 27.

⁶ S. H. Kellogg, "The Book of Leviticus," An Exposition of the Bible (Hartford: The S. S. Scranton Co., 1903), I, 276.

clearly stated in the following Scripture:

When a man or woman shall commit any sin that men commit, so as to trespass against Jehovah, and that soul shall be guilty; then he shall confess his sin which he hath done; and he shall make restitution for his guilt in full, and add unto it the fifth part thereof, and give it unto him in respect of whom he hath been guilty. But if the man have no kinsman to whom restitution may be made for the guilt, the restitution for guilt which is made unto Jehovah shall be the priest's; besides the ram of the atonement, whereby atonement shall be made for him.⁷

The difficulty of making distinction between the "sin-offering" and the "trespass-offering" has been largely due to the chapter divisions in the book of Leviticus. As was discussed in the previous chapter of this thesis, the discussion of the trespass-offering begins with the fourteenth verse of the fifth chapter of Leviticus.⁸ In addition to the consideration in the previous chapter, it should be observed here that this section of Scripture is introduced by the words, "And Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying."⁹ These introductory words are significantly found in three other places. The first time¹⁰ they introduce the sweet-savour offerings, namely, the burnt-offering, the meal-offering, and the peace-offering. The second time¹¹ they introduce the

⁷ Num. 5:6-8.

⁸ Supra, pp. 57-8.

⁹ Lev. 5:14.

¹⁰ Lev. 1:1.

¹¹ Lev. 4:1.

first of the non-sweet-savour offerings, the sin-offering. Then finally, beside the introduction of the trespass-offering, the words appear at the beginning of the second part of the law of the trespass-offering.¹² It is apparent that these are significant words of transition. This adds to the argument that the discussion of the trespass-offering begins not at the beginning of Leviticus 5, but at Leviticus 5:14.

KINDS OF TRESPASS-OFFERINGS

The trespass-offering always had reference to the sin of the individual, never to the congregation. There were no "regular" offerings because they were offered only after a trespass had been made or committed. So they were always "special." In general, they may be classified as two kinds: offerings for trespass against God, and offerings for trespass against one's fellowman. One writer has classified the trespass-offerings as follows:

- 1 For sacrilege 'in ignorance,' with compensation for the harm done, and the gift of a fifth part of the value, besides, to the priest (Lev. 5:15, 16).
- 2 For ignorant transgression against some definite prohibition of the law (Lev. 5:17-19).
- 3 For fraud, suppression of the truth, or perjury against a man, with compensation, and with the addition of a fifth part of the value of the property in question to the person wronged (Lev. 6:1-6).
- 4 For rape of a betrothed slave (Lev. 19:20, 21).
- 5 At the purification of the leper (Lev. 14:12), and the polluted Nazarite (Num. 6:12), offered with the

¹² Lev. 6:1.

sin-offering.¹³

MATERIAL OF THE OFFERING

In this offering, the offerer had no choice as to his offering. It was always a "ram without blemish out of the flock."¹⁴ It is interesting to note that the ram was never offered in the sin-offering. S. H. Kellogg suggests that it was a ram because as contrasted with the ewe or the lamb, or the dove and the pigeon, it was a valuable offering. But on the other hand, it was not as valuable as the bullock, an offering which would have been out of reach of many a poor man.¹⁵ Oehler suggests that the offering was a ram because it was a general practice in ancient times to use rams and other male animals for fines.¹⁶

In this offering alone is there mention of money. Unlike all victims for other offerings, the ram of the trespass-offering was definitely appraised by the priest. The instruction was that it must be "according to thy estimation

¹³ John M'Clintock, James Strong, editors, "Sin Offering," Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature, IX, 778.

¹⁴ Lev. 5:15, 18; 6:6.

¹⁵ Kellogg, op. cit., p. 277.

¹⁶ Gustav Friedrich Oehler, Theology of the Old Testament (eighth edition; New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1883), p. 304.

in silver by shekels, after the shekel of the sanctuary."¹⁷
The evaluation of the animal was not made by the offerer,
but by the priest, God's representative in the transaction.¹⁸

THE RITUAL

The ritual of the trespass-offering was very similar to that of the sin-offering. The guilty person brought and presented the ram, then confessed his sin. And the ram was slain by the priest. But unlike the sin-offering, the blood was not applied to the horns of the altar, nor was it taken into the holy place. Rather, the blood was sprinkled "upon the altar round about."¹⁹ The reason for this difference in the application of the blood lies in the fact that, as in the burnt-offering, the idea of expiation took a secondary place. This offering symbolized satisfaction for the trespass rather than expiation.

There were additional obligations when a trespass against the property rights of men were involved. In such a case the guilty person had to confess the wrong which he had done, then make restitution of all which he defrauded his neighbor, together with one-fifth additional. After he had

¹⁷ Lev. 5:15.

¹⁸ Kellogg, loc. cit.

¹⁹ Lev. 7:2.

thus been set right with his fellowman, he brought the ram to be offered to God.²⁰

The same portions of fat as in the peace-offering and sin-offering were burned upon the altar. These parts were: "The fat tail, and the fat that covereth the inwards, and the two kidneys, and the fat that is on them, which is by the loins, and the caul upon the liver, with the kidneys."²¹ The rest of the flesh was treated as in the sin-offerings of the lower grade. It was consumed by the priests in the holy place.²² "Every male among the priests shall eat thereof; it shall be eaten in a holy place: it is most holy."²³

THE ACTUAL SIGNIFICANCE

While in a general way, the trespass-offering was intended to signify the removal of sin from the conscience and thus be regarded as a variety of the sin-offering, yet the trespass-offering apparently took a distinctly different place. In the light of the way the blood was handled, S. H. Kellogg says that it did not signify an atonement as an expiation for guilt. Instead, it merely represented atonement under the aspect of reparation for the wrong committed.²⁴

²⁰ Kellogg, op. cit., pp. 277-8.

²¹ Lev. 7:3, 4.

²² Oehler, op. cit., p. 305.

²³ Lev. 7:6.

²⁴ Kellogg, op. cit., p. 276.

THE TYPICAL SIGNIFICANCE

As the other offerings pointed to Christ, so also did the trespass-offering. Though the New Testament Scripture does not definitely refer to Christ as the "Trespass-offering," Patrick Fairbairn thinks that the offering foreshadowed the satisfaction and plenary reparation provided by the death of Christ. There is frequent mention made of sin as a debt incurred toward God, rendering the sinner liable to the exaction of a suitable recompense to God's offended justice. This satisfaction is possible only in the Person of the sinner's substitute, the Lamb of God, whose blood is so precious and amply sufficient to cancel in behalf of every believer the guilt of numberless transgressions.²⁵

There are some aspects of the trespass-offering which point to man's obligation in the removal of guilt. Certainly the element of repentance was necessary for Divine forgiveness. To present a ram as a sacrifice for specific trespass and to make restitution, plus a fifth, certainly demanded a real sorrow for sin and a spirit of repentance. The message which the offering preached to the Israelite was the same as that preached by John the Baptist to the Pharisees and Sadducees when he said: "Bring forth therefore fruit worthy of repentance: and think not to say within yourselves, We have

²⁵ Fairbairn, op. cit., p. 272.

Abraham to our father."²⁶

Another important teaching of the trespass-offering was in regard to the trespass against another man. There was no pardon from God for anyone who was not willing to make full restitution for his trespass. A parallel teaching was proclaimed by Jesus when He said:

If therefore thou art offering thy gift at the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift.²⁷

It must be remembered, however, that after the man made restitution with the brother, he had to go back and offer the sacrifice. Mere restitution did not, and does not, avail. Restitution might have satisfied the injured man, but it could not restore communion with God. The offering of the sacrifice was necessary for "apart from shedding of blood there is no remission."²⁸

Furthermore, in the estimation of the value of the trespass-offering, the standard was not the shekel of the people, often of light weight, but the full weight "shekel of the sanctuary."²⁹ This stipulation prevented the easing of the conscience by one's own easy standard. The truth was

²⁶ Matt. 3:8, 9.

²⁷ Matt. 5:23, 24.

²⁸ Heb. 9:22.

²⁹ Lev. 5:15.

taught that if the trespass was to be forgiven, the reparation and restitution were measured by the standard of God, not by the standard of men. God's absolute righteousness as the standard of forgiveness was foreshadowed in this phase of the offering.³⁰

³⁰ Kellogg, op. cit., p. 279.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Mosaic sacrifices foreshadowed a large area of the plan of redemption as later revealed in Jesus Christ. In the Old Testament age, there were many details necessary to carry out the requirements of the God-ordained sacrifices. No one of the sacrifices included the entire scope of worship; nor did it satisfy the entire spiritual need of the sinner. But as all the offerings had a part in the worship, there was complete provision, in a symbolical way, for the need of man. Each particular offering foreshadowed a peculiar part of what was to be accomplished by the one great Sacrifice, the Antitype of all the offerings.

The burnt-offering. The burnt-offering was not primarily an offering for the expiation of sin, though it did bring sin to remembrance in a sense. The offerer brought the offering in order that he might enter into the enjoyment of God's presence. He felt that God already dwelt in the midst of the people, but by identifying himself with the animal "without blemish," he was able to offer himself to God through the substitute. All of the flesh of the animal was consumed upon the altar and ascended to God in vapour and smoke as a sweet savour.

It has been seen that the burnt-offering typified the perfect consecration and self-surrender of Christ unto God. His entire life and death was one of perfect submission to the will of the Father. This self-surrender was made in behalf of the offerer or those who identified themselves with the perfect Sacrifice. Through this identification, the offerer was permitted to enter into God's presence through the Substitute. As has been said, this offering was fulfilled by Christ as stated in the words of the Scripture:

Sacrifices and offerings and whole burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou wouldst not, neither hadst pleasure therein (the which are offered according to the law), then hath he said, Lo, I am come to do thy will. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By which will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.¹

The meal-offering. It has been observed that the meal-offering supplemented other offerings. There was no question of blood-shedding, but it was an offering from the vegetable world. The fundamental idea was the presentation of the gift to God in recognition of His supreme authority and as an expression of desire for His favour and blessing.

Though the Scriptures do not indicate specifically the antitype of the offering, certain scholars say that the offering symbolically represented the humanity of Christ. The various elements or materials of the offering revealed the characteristics of the life of the Lord. Some of these

¹ Heb. 10:10

characteristics were: His miraculous birth; His anointing by the Holy Spirit; His obedience to the Father; His moral perfection; His victory over temptation.

The peace-offering. The distinctive characteristic of the peace-offering was the participation by the offerer. It denoted that the offerer was admitted to a state of close fellowship and enjoyment with God. It was associated with feeling of peculiar joy and gladness because it was a symbolic expression of peace and fellowship with God. It was a reconciliation of God and man. This reconciliation of peace was made possible on the basis of the mutually-accepted sacrifice.

This offering foreshadowed the peace of the Christian with God, made possible on the basis of the mutually-accepted Sacrifice, even Jesus Christ. It gave a picture of the close fellowship which is possible through Christ. This reconciliation or peace is the basis of real joy and gladness in the Christian life. That Jesus is the true Peace-offering is clearly stated in the words:

For he is our peace, who made both one, and brake down the middle wall of partition, having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances.²

The sin-offering. As the name suggests, this offering was definitely for the purpose of bearing away sin.

² Eph. 2:14, 15.

There was an awareness of sin in the very nature of man. Due to this sin, there was a breach between the offerer and God. The offerer realized he was worthy of death. But he brought the victim, one without blemish, and laid his hands upon it. By this act, the sin was symbolically borne by the animal which was slain by the priest as a substitute for the sinner. The blood was then sprinkled on the horns of the altar, or in the holy place, or in the holy of holies, depending upon the kind of offering. Thereby God furnished a covering for man's sin. When man exercised faith in God, objectified by this offering, God took away the sin and removed the guilt.

It has been seen that nothing is more clearly stated in Scripture than the fact of Christ's being the true Sin-offering. The sacrifice of Christ and the shedding of His blood made full provision for all sin. Not only was the blood of Jesus adequate to cleanse from actual sins, but it was adequate to cleanse from the defilement of original sin. This cleansing is appropriated by those who, like as in Old Testament times, accept it by faith.

For the bodies of those beasts whose blood is brought into the holy place by the high priest as an offering for sin, are burned without the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people through his own blood, suffered without the gate. Let us therefore go forth unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach.³

³ Heb. 13:11, 12.

The trespass-offering. Though the trespass-offering was similar to the sin-offering in many ways, it was distinct in that it was always for special sins in which restitution was involved. It was also distinctive in that a different animal was required. The purpose of the offering was a satisfaction and reparation for the wrong committed.

Christ was typified in the offering in the sense of the removal of the debt caused by sin. His death provided a satisfaction for God's justice. This satisfaction is possible only in the Person of the sinners' substitute, the Lamb of God.

Relationship of the offerings. As one views all the offerings as a whole and in relation to one another, there are certain symbolical meanings which are not apparent when they are studied individually.

At the close of the section in Leviticus which deals with the offerings, there is a summary statement listing the various offerings.

This is the law of the burnt-offering, of the meal-offering, and of the sin-offering, and of the trespass-offering, and of the consecration, and of the sacrifice of peace-offerings; which Jehovah commanded Moses in mount Sinai, in the day that he commanded the children of Israel to offer their oblations unto Jehovah, in the wilderness of Sinai.⁴

It is interesting to observe that "the law" of the offerings⁵

⁴ Lev. 7:37, 38.

⁵ Lev. 6:8-7:36.

presented the five offerings in a different order than they were presented originally in Leviticus. The difference is that the peace-offering came last of all instead of third in order. In the light of the total sacrificial system, one can see that this order of listing had its significance. In the burnt-offering, Christ was typified as offering Himself to God. In the meal-offering, Christ's perfect humanity was portrayed. In the sin-offering, one found a type of Christ's complete provision or atonement for sin. In the trespass-offering, there was a picture of the full answer for the actual sins in the life. But in the peace-offering, the communion of the worshipper with God was unfolded. The peace or reconciliation came not merely after the presentation of Christ in His perfect consecration and His perfect humanity, but after the sin-problem was dealt with adequately.

Thus, as one considers the entire picture of the Mosaic sacrifices, one can get a glimpse of the provision of the life and death of Jesus Christ. An omission of any one of the offerings would be a neglect of an important area of the work of Christ. One scholar has summarized thus:

It is clear that the idea of sacrifice is a complex idea, involving the propitiatory, and the dedicatory and the eucharistic elements. Any one of them taken by itself, would lead to error and superstition. The propitiatory alone would tend to the idea of atonement by sacrifice for sin, or being effectual without any condition or repentance and faith; the self-dedicatory, taken alone, ignores the barrier of sin between man and God, and undermines the whole idea of atonement; the eucharistic alone leads to the notion that mere gifts can

satisfy God's service, and is easily perverted into the heathenish attempt to 'bribe' God by vows and offerings.⁶

CONCLUSIONS

In the light of the study which has been made, the author has come to the following conclusions:

1. The Mosaic sacrifices taught God's demand for righteousness. God hated sin and iniquity and it was that which separated men from God. The sacrifices made men aware that their sins had to be removed before they could be reconciled to God.

2. The sacrifices made men realize that they had no power within themselves to be reconciled to God. They could bring the sacrifice and confess their sins, but the sacrifice was always offered before God by the priest, or a mediator.

3. The sacrifices in themselves were not the covering for the sins of the offerers, but they provided an object for the faith of the offerer. They also provided an exercise of obedience to God. God rewarded such faith and obedience with the forgiveness of their sins, thus making possible fellowship with Him.

4. The redemptive work of Jesus Christ was revealed

⁶ James W. Lee, The Self-Interpreting Bible (New York and St. Louis: N. D. Thompson Publishing Company, 1896), I, p. 129.

in the Mosaic sacrifices. They did not give a complete revelation of the work of Christ, but that which was revealed embodied the essential elements of redemption as seen in the light of the New Testament. Jesus Christ was the Mediator between man and God, as well as the Sacrifice.

5. The final note of the message of the sacrifices was not to excuse man from holiness, but it was the method by which man was made holy. To fulfill all the requirements of the external ritual and yet continue in sin would have been to commit the most heinous sin of all. As shown forth by the sin-offering, provision was made for the cleansing of the very nature of sin. Through the blood of Christ which was sprinkled in the holy place, and the righteousness which is imparted by Christ, man is able to fulfill the Scripture, "Ye shall be holy; for I am holy."⁷

⁷ I Pet. 1:16.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Fairbairn, Patrick, The Typology of Scripture. Philadelphia: Daniels and Smith, 1852. Vol. II. 324 pp.
- Gamertsfelder, S. J., Systematic Theology. Harrisburg: Evangelical Publishing House, 1921. 619 pp.
- Haldeman, I. M., The Tabernacle Priesthood and Offerings. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1925. 408 pp.
- Morgan, G. Campbell, Living Messages of the Books of the Bible. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1912. 349 pp.
- Newton, Richard, The Jewish Tabernacle and Its Furniture. New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1868. 393 pp.
- Oehler, Gustav Friedrich, Theology of the Old Testament. Eighth edition; New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1883. 593 pp.
- Pope, William Burt, A Compendium of Christian Theology. Second edition; New York: Hunt and Eaton, [n. d.] Vol. I. 456 pp.
- The Holy Bible, (Revised Version, 1881), New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1901.
- The Holy Bible, (Authorized Version, 1611), Oxford: The University Press, [n. d.]
- Wakefield, Samuel, A Complete System of Christian Theology. Cincinnati: Walden and Stowe, 1869. 663 pp.
- Wiley, H. Orton, Christian Theology. Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1949. Vol. I. 487 pp.
- _____, Christian Theology. Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1947. Vol. II. 517 pp.
- Young, Edward J., An Introduction to the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1949. 414 pp.

B. COMMENTARIES AND EXPOSITIONS

Henry, Matthew, Matthew Henry's Commentary on the Whole Bible. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, [n. d.] I.

Jellie, W. Harvey, and Frederick W. Brown, The Preacher's Commentary on the Book of Leviticus. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1892. 332 pp.

Kellogg, S. H., "The Book of Leviticus," An Exposition of the Bible. Hartford: The S. S. Scranton Co., 1903, I, 235-379.

Lee, James W., The Self-Interpreting Bible. New York: N. D. Thompson Publishing Company, 1896, I. 577 pp.

Mackintosh, C. H., Notes on the Book of Leviticus. Chicago: F. H. Revell, 1878. 371 pp.

Maclaren, Alexander, "The Book of Leviticus," Expositions of Holy Scripture. New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1907, I, 233-97.

Scofield, C. I., Reference Bible. New York: Oxford University Press, 1917. 1362 pp.

C. ENCYCLOPEDIA ARTICLES

Barton, George A., "Sin-offering," The Jewish Encyclopedia, XI, 379-81

M^r Clintock, John, and James Strong, editors, "Sin-offering," Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature, IX, 765-6.

McCurdy, Frederic, "Burnt Offering," The Jewish Encyclopedia, new edition, III, 439-40.

Paterson, W. P., "Sacrifice," Dictionary of the Bible, IV, 329-49.

Reeve, J. J., "Sacrifice in the Old Testament," The International Standard Biblical Encyclopedia, IV, 2638-51.

D. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Fox, Henderson Snell, "The Foreshadowed Christ in Leviticus." Unpublished Master of Theology thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, Dallas, [n. d.] 49 pp.

Schmidt, Otto P., "The Offerings of the Old Testament." Unpublished Master of Sacred Theology treatise, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1924. 102 pp.