

# The Blood Sacrifices of the Old Testament

*E. Reim*

The following study is the outgrowth of an assignment by the Program Committee of the Misericordias Conference (Mixed) of Milwaukee and vicinity. The purpose of the committee was to bring about a comparison of the several types of blood sacrifices prescribed in Leviticus, to note the points in which they agree as well as those in which they differ from each other, and finally to try, to ascertain the significance of the common features on the one hand, and of the variants on the other, with particular attention to any New Testament references which might be noted. This material was presented to the 1945 Conference in lecture form. The present article follows the same line of thought, but may occasionally vary somewhat in its presentation.

In view of the prescribed limitations there will be no attempt to treat either the origin or the development of sacrifice as a rite of worship. Nor is there any occasion for comparing the sacrifices of Israel with the many forms of offerings practiced by heathen nations. It will be enough to study the material presented in the first five chapters of Leviticus (excepting only chapter 2, which deals with the bloodless Meal Offering), with the additional information supplied by chapters 6, 7, 16; and 17, plus a few references in the Book of Numbers.

These are - the divinely sanctioned sacrifices of the Old Testament, constituting an integral part of the Covenant of Sinai, and setting apart the Chosen People from all other nations. These are the forms under which God would be worshipped by them. They reflect the Messianic promise for the sake of which this Covenant was established, and served to keep it ever before the people in a rich variety of types. This justifies our speaking of their New Testament significance, noting the New Testament fulfillments, allusions, parallels, and applications, which constitute the chief reason for this study.

For the sake of facilitating the necessary comparisons this material has been condensed into a convenient table to which we shall refer from time to time during the course of this study. It will, of course, be understood that such a condensation cannot do full justice to the original material, and therefore should not be permitted to supplant it. After all, there is no adequate substitute for the original text.

## **A. The Significance of the Common Features**

It will be seen from our table that the Blood Offerings of the Old Testament were four in number: the Burnt Offering, the Peace Offering, the Sin Offering, the Trespass Offering. These several names in themselves constitute variant features, the significance of which shall be discussed later. For our present purpose it will be enough to note that they cover the different phases of worship and prayer, of confession and absolution. Something of each of these elements is included in every one of these different types of sacrifices. The different types, in turn, serve to give particular emphasis or expression to one or the other of these elements of worship. Together with the one bloodless offering they are a complete expression of the relation of a Covenant People to their God.

There is little uniformity in that part of these codes which deals with the nature of the sacrificial victim, unless it were the requirement that there be a victim, and that this be without blemish. The approved list runs from the powerful bullock down to a shrinking pair of turtle doves. A further bit of consideration for the poor was shown when they were permitted to bring as little as a tenth of an Ephah of meal (Lv. 5:11). After this, however, there follow a number of steps in which a striking similarity runs through each of the several types of sacrifices under discussion. They are a) the Presentation, b) the Laying on of Hands, c) the Slaughtering, d) the Use of the Blood, and (after flaying and dissection) e) the Consuming of the Flesh. In the case of d) and e) certain variations occur within the action which we shall note later. But in each case the action itself is the same.

The formal act of the presentation of the offering took place at the door of the Tabernacle (Lv. 1:3). It involved an examination of the animal to determine whether it met with the ceremonial requirements. The presence of these animals in the Court of the Temple (John 2) would seem to indicate that they had been previously examined, and were now offered for sale to the worshipers as "certified stock." Koenig holds that because of this examination the act of presentation can not be considered a part of the sacrificial action proper,

since it would always be possible that the intended victim might have to be rejected. But this reasoning is hardly cogent since such a rejection need constitute only a temporary interruption, and not an annulling of the sacrifice. Presumably the offerer would soon appear with another offering to carry out his original intention. In all other respects this part of the ceremony is certainly filled with sacrificial implications. The offering is called by the solemn liturgical name of QORBAN (QARAB - to approach in reverence and worship). The injunction, "He shall offer it of his own voluntary will" points to the quality of conscious, active surrender to God, which is an essential element of any offering which should be pleasing to Him. But in one respect this voluntary quality, essential though it was, could not possibly express the true situation existing between the offerer and his God. It could not give adequate expression to the fact that because of man's sin his life was forfeit. For this purpose the silent victim had to serve, by dying as the substitute, that the offerer might live. But the death of this victim was incomplete in turn, could not be otherwise, in fact. For in this passive role the voluntary element is necessarily missing. These two essential features were to be combined once only, thus to create the perfect sacrifice: "Christ .. hath loved us, and hath given Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweetsmelling savor" (Eph. 5, 2). This alone was the perfect Presentation, an offering without blemish.

The next part of the ceremonial of sacrifice was the peculiarly impressive laying on of hands. It is carefully prescribed in connection with every offering but the so-called Trespass Offering. According to Keil no conclusions are to be drawn from this omission, since the procedure had been quite firmly established by the preceding ordinances. We are not ready to share the positiveness of this assertion, but feel that this does not detract from either the solemnity or the significance of the action. The usual form was that the offerer would lay his hands upon the head of the victim. The ceremony was made doubly impressive when on the Day of Atonement (YOM KIPPUR) the High Priest placed both hands upon the head of the Scapegoat and confessed over him all the sins of the Children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat (Lv. 16:21). This leaves no doubt as to the significance of this action in connection with the Sin Offering. In other cases the thought may well have been of a more general nature, and in keeping with the character and purpose of the particular type of sacrifice in question. By this action the offerer would then be dedicating his sacrifice to God, and making it the vehicle, as it were, of the particular thought that was uppermost in his heart and which constituted the specific purpose of his offering, be it worship, prayer, thanksgiving, or perhaps a particular confession of sin. It is this last thought which is used in a most appropriate manner by Isaac Watts:

My faith would lay her hand  
Oh that dear head of Thine  
While like a penitent I stand  
And there confess my sin.  
(*TLH* 156, 3)

The prophet likewise clearly has this same particular feature of the Atonement Day ceremonial in mind when he says of the great Servant of the Lord, "The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all" (Is. 53:6).

The ceremonial slaughtering of the sacrificial victim is designated by the word SHACHAT, rather than the Piel or Hifil MUTH which would suggest the bare act of putting to death. As in the case of the previous actions (presentation, laying on of hands), so this function was as a rule performed by the offerer himself. Exceptions occurred when this was done by the Highpriest in behalf of the people at large (Day of Atonement) or when the priests brought the standing offerings of worship and prayer which were repeated each day. It is sometimes said (e.g. by Oehler) that the SHACHAT was a purely functional act, needed to secure the blood for the subsequent rite, and that it had no significance of its own, perhaps as picturing the punishment by which satisfaction is made for sin. But if we note that the blood is accepted as an atonement "because the life of the flesh is in the blood" (Lv. 17:11), then surely one can not escape the conviction that a broader significance is to be attached to the death of the victim which has already been designated as the accepted substitute for the one who is bringing the offering. It is a drastic preachment, made doubly impressive by the fact that the offerer

must with his own hand carry out the fatal sentence, to the uniform effect that "the wages of sin is death" (Rom. 6:23).

The next step in the solemn sacrificial rite was the use of the blood. The manner of doing this was by no means uniform, but was most carefully prescribed for each particular occasion. Sometimes the blood was to be poured out from a vessel against the four sides of the Great Altar, and this with considerable vigor (ZARAQ - dashed). Sometimes it was sprinkled with the fingers (HIZZAH). On certain occasions it was applied (NATHAN) to the horns of the altar, on others poured out in great quantity (YISHPOK) at the foot of the altar. Another variant was the manner in which the blood of the doves was caused to spurt against the sides of the altar (Lv. 1:15). But regardless of how much difference there was in these matters of detail, the constant factor remains that the blood was always to be used. The only exception was the Meal Offering (which the A.V. somewhat misleadingly calls Meat Offering), in which God's people by their token gifts of grain, flour, or cakes acknowledged Him as the sole Giver of their Daily Bread, and which therefore lay on a somewhat different plane. But otherwise, whenever these people came before their God, whether in solemn worship, in joyful praise, or in mournful confession, there was always enacted before their eyes the shedding of that blood which God had given them upon the altar for an atonement for their souls.

Not only was this the obvious climax of the sacrificial rite, but it was also clearly an indispensable part of it. In noting its significance we come to the very heart of the entire institution of blood sacrifices. Concerning this use of the blood God Himself had told His people (Lv. 17:11) : "I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls" (literally: for a covering unto your souls - L'KAPPER AL-NAPHSHOTHEIKEM). Like a protecting shield this blood was to come between these lives that because of sin were subject to death, and the just vengeance of their God. Its mute appeal was to be a constant plea for pardon, and its price, namely the life which had been yielded in the shedding of this blood, was to render full satisfaction for the enormous debt which had been incurred. This was the way of the Atonement, of reconciliation, without which no true Israelite who was conscious of the holiness of God could venture to come into His presence.

Obviously, this could not rest on terms other than those designated by God Himself. He was the One to whom satisfaction had to be made. Neither work nor offering designed by man could be of any value here. It was therefore a powerful support to the faith of true children of the Covenant that they could look to the express words in which their Lord had said to them: "*I have given it to you upon the altar.*" Now let reason come upon the discovery that there is no inherent value in the blood of bulls and goats. The blessing of the Atonement was still secure to them. It rested on God's solemn promise. Any means chosen and designated by Him must needs be effective, be they ever so far beyond the power of reason to understand. We may well apply to this blood rite of the Old Testament what Augustine said concerning the divinely instituted ceremonies of the New : "*Accedit verbum ad eleinentum, et fit sacramentum.*"

In another respect, however, the majesty of the "*I,*" which could well inspire boundless terror in the heart of a member of the Covenant, is tempered by the sheer grace of the next word, NATHATTI, *I have given*. It was simply God's royal, gracious gift, tendered in mercy to a people who had nothing adequate of their own which they could bring. It placed a readily available means for atonement at their disposal, even as once before in an hour of desperate need God had provided an Abraham with a substitute for the sacrifice.

If in magnifying the grace of this gift it has been brought out that these blood offerings had no inherent value of their own, at least not for the purpose for which they were to serve, and that no particular merit could therefore be attributed to the bringing of such an offering, this still does not imply that this use of blood as the means for bringing about an atonement constitutes an arbitrary choice of an irrelevant, token on the part of God. The contrary is rather implied by the words which state the reason for this choice. For it seems certain that the prepositional Beth in BANNEPHESH is instrumental, stating that the blood makes an atonement *through* the life. We would perhaps say, through the fact that it is the vehicle of the life. Better than any other instrument that could have been chosen it brought out the fact that the issue was indeed one of life and death, and that the offering had to be one that was in kind.

True, this might, and probably did, suggest another problem to the mind of many believers of old,

concerning the grave discrepancy between the blood and life of a sacrificial animal and the high purpose which it was to serve. So little was being offered where so much was being sought. But if the need of a greater sacrifice was thereby indicated, that was well and good, for a Greater Sacrifice was indeed to come. It was supplied when "Christ, being come an high priest of good things to come, -by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." Heb. 9:11f. To point to Him was the sole purpose of these Blood Sacrifices. Because of this all important function these countless offerings are completely justified. Everything which these elaborate ceremonies had foretold in their picturesque type found its complete fulfillment in the perfect antitype, Jesus Christ.

The solemn rites of sacrifice which we have traced so far end with the consuming of the flesh. Again there are several methods which were employed, but it is the same function which in each case was thereby carried out. Once an offering had been consecrated to the Lord, no part of it was ever to revert to profane use. It was to be given to God in its entirety. In the case of these offerings this was sometimes done by a slow burning upon the altar (HIQTIR), sometimes by a bright blazing fire beyond the borders of the camp (SARAPH, the same root which appears in the word SERAPHIM). Sometimes it was to be eaten by the priests, sometimes even by the offerer and his guests. Compare the Table. When certain parts of the offering were consumed by the priests, the thought was that God was receiving His tribute through them. When the offerer and his guests shared in the sacrificial meal (at the Peace Offering), the thought was still that the offering was already the Lord's, and that He was permitting men to share in His bounty, to rejoice in His gifts and blessings. As His guests they were consuming this offering for Him. For even under these circumstances the offering was to be a complete one.

If we may assign some New Testament significance to this feature, it is perhaps best to abide by the simple fact that the offering of our great High Priest was to be a complete one. He yielded Himself without reservation, giving His body, shedding His blood, surrendering His will to that of His heavenly Father, rendering perfect obedience, even unto death, paying to His Father the tribute of perfect trust, and at last commending His soul into the Father's hands. It was a perfect offering when Christ gave Himself for us.

## **B. The Significance of the Variant Features**

In our previous discussion we noted that the common features of the blood sacrifices are found chiefly in the general ceremonial which was prescribed. An almost equal measure of agreement appears in connection with the substance of the offering, the use of the blood, and the consuming of the flesh. It only remains, therefore, to note the significance of the slight variants that occur under these latter headings and then to observe the bearing of the differences which appear in the other categories of our table, and which have not yet been mentioned, viz., the names, occasion, and purpose of the four types of offerings. We refer once more to the comparative table which appears on pages 274-5 of our last issue.

### **1. The Burnt Offering**

The first offering to be described in Leviticus is the OLAH. The word itself means nothing more than a going up, and describes the manner in which the offering, through being consumed by fire, was caused to rise into the presence of God "for a sweet smelling savor." The various translations of this term (burnt offering, Brandopfer, Ganzopfer; also the "holocaustum" of the Vulgate and LXX) go well beyond the inherent meaning of the word and incorporate something of the subsequent description of the details of this offering, namely that all except the ceremonially unclean parts of the offering were carefully to be laid upon the altar where they were then to be totally consumed in the slow, smoldering manner of the sacrificial burning. The application of the blood in the case of the OLAH was according to what one might call the normal use, even as this entire offering might be considered the standard type. Significant deviations from this norm will therefore show up only when we study the other types.

The normal nature of this offering appears also from the occasions when it was employed and the purpose for which it was designed. It was used as a daily rite in the Tabernacle and subsequently the Temple. It was the morning and the evening sacrifice—the solemn opening and close of daily worship. Together with other ceremonies (see Ps 141:2) it was employed in connection with the daily offerings of prayer and praise, as well as with special acts of worship on extraordinary occasions, e.g. Solomon's offering at the dedication of the Temple, 2 Kings 8:64. It was a means by which the entire congregation could render homage to its God, but could also serve as an expression of personal devotion on the part of an individual in some memorable hour. On all such special occasions it served as a voluntary expression of love and reverence of a Covenant People for their God.

The principal features of this offering arise out of the nature of these occasions and purposes. The use of the blood was, of course, basic. These offerings were, above all, blood sacrifices. For there could be no approach to God, whether in prayer or any other manner, except upon the basis of this atonement for their sins which God had given His people upon the altar. In addition to this it was required that the victim be without blemish. This requirement is fully accounted for by the fact that no imperfect gift would be adequate as tribute and in worship of the perfect God. The offering must also be a total one in order to express the complete dependence of man upon his Maker, also that nothing may be withheld from the God who is Lord of all.

In looking for New Testament counterparts for this Old Testament offering we must consider the entire range of congregational as well as personal worship, including the personal consecration which marks the new life of the believer. The truths embodied in these God-given ordinances of the Old Testament will necessarily, emerge and stand forth clearly, now that the hour has come when "true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship Him. God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." (John 4:23f.) This must apply particularly to that central thought which was expressed by the blood ceremonial of the ancient rites.

It is therefore most fitting and proper that the form of worship which is commonly followed by our congregations should have as one of its first liturgical elements the traditional Confiteor, including not only a confession of sins, but also the absolution. Thus not only room but prominence is given to the thought that our entire service, our very right to come before God, all rest upon the atoning work of the Savior. The same thought appears in all true Christian prayer. For when we make our requests in the name of Jesus, this is more than a mere phrase. It is a clear confession that because of our sins we are worthy of none of the things for which we ask. At the same time it is an expression of confidence in which we rest our case upon the forgiveness earned for us by the precious blood of Christ. This same thought is also reflected in true Christian songs of praise. For these are hymns called forth by the undeserved mercies of God. They are simply the song of those who are redeemed by the Blood of the Lamb. Nor should we in this connection overlook the role of the true Christian sermon. For it is essentially a showing forth of the praises of Him who hath called us out of darkness into His marvellous light. Insofar as the sermon remains true to the great central theme of all Gospel preaching it is a tribute of praise to the grace and love of God as manifested in the vicarious atonement of Christ.

All this is equally true of the prayer, praise, and personal devotion of the individual Christian. But here another opportunity for God pleasing sacrifice and worship appears. Paul calls attention to it: "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service" (*latreia* - Rom. 12:1). "Ye are bought with a price : therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are God's" (1 Cor. 6:20). Here the mercies of God and the price with which we have been bought not only provide the motive of gratefulness which elicits this tribute of a "new obedience" and of the Christian works which result therefrom, but they also supply the reason which makes it clear why the imperfect works of man can yet be a "service" which is acceptable to God. For not only the last sentence, but the entire quotation must be considered carefully when we read the wellknown passage from Hebrews: "*By Him* therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to His name. But to do good and to communicate forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." (Hebr. 13: 15f.)

## 2. The Peace Offering

The second chapter of Leviticus deals with the Meat (Meal) Offering, which does not come under the scope of our discussion. The next sacrifice in which the use of the blood plays an essential part is the so-called Peace Offering. The Hebrew term is ZEBACH SHELAMIM. The word ZEBACH signifies a slaughtering, either for sacrificial purposes (cf. MIZBEACH-altar) or for food. Then it may also designate the flesh of the slaughtered animal, likewise a repast, banquet. In our case this latter use of the word is obviously combined with the sacrificial meaning. The word SHELEM is, of course, related to the word for peace. Specifically it is derived either from the Piel SHILLAM, in which case it would mean to restore, repay, thank, or it stems from the Qal SHALAM or SHALEM, and would then convey the thought of living in peace and plenty. That is why the LXX translated it with *thysia eirenike* or *thysia soteriou*. The English "Peace Offering" comes closer than "Thank Offering," and the German "Heilsopfer" is preferable to "Dankopfer." However, the thought of thanksgiving is certainly not to be excluded, from the thought which the term is to convey.

As we consider the occasions on which this offering was employed and the purpose for which it was designed, it appears immediately that this ceremony was of a decidedly festive character. There were many occasions in the life of a devout Israelite or of the nation as a whole which would justify and call for these special sacrifices of thanksgiving and praise. The blessings which had been granted by a merciful God, the help experienced in fulfilling a vow or in completing some major undertaking would naturally call for some expression of gratefulness and rejoicing. Thus the major part of the offerings brought by Solomon and the people at the dedication of the Temple were such SHELAMIM. See 1 Kings 8:63. At other times the purpose might be that of entreaty, which need not necessarily be inconsistent with the festive and joyous character of these offerings since it could and should express the confident assurance of aid to come, as well as a joyful awareness of Israel's great privilege of being able in every need to turn to the Covenant God for His promised help.

All this was expressed in a peculiarly vivid manner by the provisions for the consuming of the sacrifice. The entire offering was consecrated to God, and was His in every sense of the word. Yet only certain specified parts were to be consumed by the fire upon the altar. This was all that God claimed. The remainder was to be eaten, in part by the priests (as also in some of the other offerings where the thought was that they were thereby acting as God's representatives, receiving the gift for Him), in part by the offerer, together with his family and possibly some guests. Since the entire offering had been consecrated to God, and thus formally belonged to God, this meant that the people were now the privileged guests of a Divine Host, enjoying His bountiful blessings in His gracious presence. The SHELAMIM thus become a ceremonious communal meal, expressing the believers' conscious, undisturbed, confident enjoyment of God's favor and many blessings, including specifically the right to entreat Him for further mercies. When Moses and the Seventy Elders ate and drank in the presence of God on Mount Sinai (Ex. 24:9-11), this expressed the same gracious relationship: "Upon the nobles he laid not his hand: also they saw God, and did eat and drink." When devout Israelites of later generations gathered at the altar for their SHELAMIM, eating and drinking of the sacrifice and with their priests sharing also their spiritual blessings in the presence of their God, this was essentially a repetition of the scene on Sinai, albeit under much less dramatic circumstances. .

A brief comparison will show that this offering involved no departure from the normal sacrificial use of the blood. There was no occasion for any deviation. The same significance which is expressed by the presence of the blood upon the altar in the previous type of offering is in evidence here also. If the SHELAMIM expressed the conscious, undisturbed, confident enjoyment of God's favor and blessings, the presence of the blood served as a constant reminder that this blessed communion with God could be attained only after an atonement had been made for sin, which otherwise must always separate man from his God. The atonement by blood was the divinely established premise upon which their privilege rested. Even as this blood admitted the Covenant People to this blessed communion with their God, so it also set them apart from all other nations, making them truly "a peculiar people," separated unto their Lord. What this meant to them, and what blessings it conveyed to them, appears from a word of Paul to the Corinthians (I Cor. 10:18): "Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they

which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?" He is saying that by eating of the sacrifice, by taking advantage of this gracious opportunity provided by their God, these Old Testament believers shared in everything for which the altar stood and which that altar intended to communicate to them. And that, as we have seen before, is nothing less than the great salvation which was effected by the perfect sacrifice which was prefigured by this Blood Atonement of the Old Covenant.

This leads us directly to the first and foremost point of New Testament significance of which we may speak in connection with this ancient ceremony. For St. Paul is citing the foregoing passage in order to illustrate what he has been teaching in the two previous verses : "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we, being many, are one bread and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread." In this sacrament of eating and drinking we become actual partakers of the body and blood that were given and shed for the remission of our sins. We find ourselves in full possession of every blessing secured for us by this great sacrifice. But in sharing this blessing with other believers we find ourselves drawn into a most intimate fellowship with each other, a fellowship which sets God's people far apart from the world in which they live. In this respect note a repetition of the effect which followed out of the sharing of God's blessings in the SUELAMIM. But if this Old Testament ceremony goes no farther than to indicate a fellowship in which a believer is united with his God on the basis of His Covenant, and thereby separated from the world, this does not preclude the necessity of subsequent additional New Testament warnings which call for steadfast rejection of error and for studious avoidance of all such as promote, defend, and perpetuate such departures from the truth of the Word. For in such error we must recognize a force which will not only vitiate the truth, but must make of any fellowship which one might base upon such a treacherous foundation a hollow sham which can not stand before the searching eye of God. It may be that this involves a decision which runs counter to our natural inclinations. It is not an easy matter to take the uncompromising stand for which this calls. But there is no legitimate way of getting around these warnings of God.

But while we recognize the stern necessity of these warnings, that need and should not in any way lessen the joy of sharing this fellowship with others where the proper basis for it is present. The very concern with which God guards it by means of such earnest warnings against errors and errorists will make it all the more precious in our eyes, and at the same time make us more concerned about retaining its purity.

It will readily be understood that our New Testament counterpart of this Old Testament ceremony is not restricted to the Sacrament alone. The blessings which we receive are spiritual, and they come not only by the sacramental eating and drinking but by the hearing of God's Word as well. There we are in a most direct way partaking of what is truly the Bread of Life. As we experience its blessings our joy is heightened by the knowledge that others share them with us. Our faith is strengthened by mutual contact. A fellowship of hearing develops, and we become aware that a special blessing lies in exercising this privilege together, even as a particular danger results from neglecting this opportunity. That is the reason for the apostolic admonition "not to forsake the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is."

We know that these assemblies of believers also provided for a joint exercise of the privilege of entreating the Lord in common prayer. But we may also be sure that where there were conditions which called for the avoidance of errors and errorists, these warnings were needed with reference to prayer as well as to the other demonstrations of the fellowship of believers. There is no word of Scripture to indicate that the warnings which apply in other cases were not intended for this fellowship of prayer as well.

In conclusion we note that the enjoyment of these incomparably rich blessings of God certainly also calls for a sincere returning of thanks to the Giver. Thereby we are reminded once more of the significance of the unfailling use of the blood in the ancient sacrifices. This blood will call to mind that our foremost reason for gratitude is certainly the wondrous salvation which has been purchased for us by the Blood of the Cross. But it will also lead us to recognize another important truth, namely that all other gifts of our Lord, and they are without number, become true blessings for us only through the Atonement which was made when "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them."

The substance of these two first types of offerings, the Burnt Offering and the Peace Offering, may

therefore be summed up by stating that they serve to express the Covenant Relationship. In the former, man is worshipping his God; God is receiving a tribute which is due Him. In the latter, God is blessing man; man is freely receiving and enjoying blessings which he never could merit by himself.

### 3. The Sin Offering

The first two types of offerings which have so far been considered in this study, the Burnt Offering and the Peace Offering, served to express the Covenant relationship of Israel with its God. The other two which are still before us, the Sin Offering and the Trespass Offering, were to restore that same relationship in those countless instances where it had been disturbed by the failure of the people to abide by the terms of the covenant which their God had established with them.

The first of these is the Sin Offering, CHATTATH. The first meaning of the Hebrew word is simply sin, in the sense of erring from the appointed way. The same word then becomes the name of the Offering which shall be brought for this sin. The LXX uses *hamartia* for both concepts.

There can be no mistaking the purpose of this offering. The Law which had just been given in connection with the Covenant of Sinai could not fail to create among these people a painful awareness of their many transgressions. It had been designed by God for several functions, but particularly to lead to a true knowledge of sin. Unless men hardened their hearts, it did this with telling effect. If under such conditions God's true children were not to despair, they would require a source of strong comfort. This needed to go beyond what was proclaimed by the use of the blood in other types of offerings. In these other instances this blood provided the assurance that men might worship and draw near to their God because provisions had been made for the covering of their sins. Here this truth is to be set forth in a way that would be fundamental for the entire time of the Old Testament. A great and solemn institution, YOM KIPPUR, the Day of Atonement, was to unfold what these other sacrifices implied only in passing.

It is, therefore, most striking that the ordinance concerning this all-important offering should begin with the words, "If a soul shall sin through ignorance" (Lv. 4:2). This certainly constitutes a definite limitation as to the cases to which these provisions were meant to apply. It presents a thought which is taken up in Hb. 9: 7 where the High Priest is described as offering blood upon the mercy seat "for the-errors (*agnoemata*, sins of ignorance) of the people." Num. 15:27-31 puts it even more drastically, especially when it adds, "but the soul that doeth ought presumptuously (lit.: with up-raised hand), that soul shall be cut off from among his people." Many explanations are offered for this apparent withholding of forgiveness from all sins save those done in ignorance. The simplest solution is perhaps the one which notes that these statements refer only to the sacrificial ceremonial, to the public action by which God's people were assured that those sins were forgiven which did not grow out of a despising of the Word of the Lord. (v. 31), which did not involve the element of wilful and impenitent defiance of their God. So far this general rite could go, and only so far.

But this did not mean that there could and would not also be a very specific and personal assurance of forgiveness where a sinner who had previously defied his God in a most flagrant manner now contritely confessed his evil deeds. The absolution which Nathan pronounced to a penitent David is a case in point. Isaiah 1:18 holds forth a similar promise of pardon: "Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow ; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool." In fact, the Old Testament abounds in passages and instances that make it plain that the penitent sinner shall receive the free forgiveness of God even though his sin might lie beyond the range of the "errors" for which this particular offering was designed.

The occasions for the use of the CHATTATH were many, ranging from an individual's desire to confess his sin to a similar provision for the entire people. It also covered a number of special occasions which called for a cleansing from previous sins, such as the consecration of priests (Ex. 29:9-14) and the festival which marked the beginning of each new month (Num. 28: 15). It culminated in the Day of the Great Atonement (Lv. 16). On this last occasion the offerings were very elaborate, in keeping with the solemnity of the occasion. But this elaborateness was not an essential feature of all Sin Offerings. For the sake of the individual who was seeking the comfort of forgiveness the offering could also be a most simple one. Even the most modest meal

offering was acceptable: one-tenth of an ephah of fine flour (Lv. 6:11), lest an Israelite be deprived of this precious comfort of forgiveness by reason of his poverty. The allimportant thing was that this provision for conveying the pardoning grace of God be kept constantly before the people and made available to every member.

It is in connection with the detailed description which Lv. 16 gives of the Day of Atonement that we have the best opportunity to note the full significance and purpose of the various parts of the ceremonial of the Sin Offering. This also makes it plain that the CHATTATH rather than the Trespass Offering, the ASHAM, is that offering into which God has placed the greatest measure of Messianic significance and Gospel content. This is the sacrifice which demonstrates most clearly the expiation of sin before God and which shows how God is propitiated. Very properly Delitzsch calls this Day of Atonement the "Good Friday of the Old Testament."

Reference to the comparative table that was published with the first installment of this study will show that the ceremonial of the blood played a much more prominent role in the CHATTATH than in any other offering. The use of blood was an essential requirement in the other sacrifices also, but there it was enough that it was dashed against the sides of the altar as a general reminder of the promise which God had attached to this most important part of the entire ceremonial, Lv. 17:11. In the case of the CHATTATH, however, the directives given in Lv. 4 and 5 are very specific. If it was an individual member or even a ruler of the people who was bringing the offering, the Priest was carefully to apply some of the blood to the horns of the Great Altar. Thus he was, so to speak, bringing before the very eyes of God this mute plea for forgiveness. If, on the other hand, the offering was for a High Priest who in his official capacity had erred in some part of his ministrations and thus had brought a certain measure of responsibility and guilt upon the people whose official representative he was,<sup>1</sup> the blood was to be applied also to the Altar of Incense and to be sprinkled seven times before the Lord, before the Veil of the sanctuary. For these were the holy places where he officiated and upon which he had brought the reproach of his error. The same was to be done if the sin was one of the whole people. This last application was in substance the pattern for the use of the blood on the Day of Atonement, except that there it was carried out to a far higher degree. For it was for the sins of the people that the atonement was being made, the many accumulated sins. Here no possibility was to be overlooked. No place was to remain where the abomination of sin could offend against the holiness of God. The atonement proper was to be made upon the Mercy Seat, in the very presence of God. But the sanctuary itself, the Altar of Incense, the Great Altar of Burnt Offerings, also must be cleansed from the taint of the many sins which had been brought before God in this holy place. This was the great climax in the use of the blood upon the altars of Israel, in fact, of the entire sacrificial system. Nor can there be any doubt but that the blood ceremonial is to be considered the essential element in these sacred rites.

After this, only a secondary role may be ascribed to that part of the ceremonial which describes the use of the flesh in the Sin Offering. The sacrificial burning (HIQTIR) remains as a constant factor in the rite. The ceremonial eating of certain parts by the priests is also practiced, at least when the offering is brought by an individual, be he king or commoner. But a significant change appears when the CHATTATH was offered for the priest or for the nation. In these instances there is no mention of any eating of the sacrifice, only the specific command to take the entire offering to a place outside of the camp where it was to be cleanly consumed with a bright and blazing fire (SARAPH). This meant that no part of it was to be converted to any common use. Beyond that, however, this act had no special meaning. It added nothing to the sacrifice. The full significance of the Sin Offering lay in the blood that had been shed. This act gains added significance when we note that the two kinds of CHATTATH where this departure from the normal use appears, the sacrifice for the priest and that for the people, are the same that were prescribed for the Day of Atonement. On that day above all others there was to be nothing that would detract in the least from the full significance of the atoning blood. To note this will help one to understand the reference which the letter to the Hebrews makes when it says : "We, have an altar,

---

<sup>1</sup> This is the sense of Lv. 4: 3: "If the priest . . . do sin according to the sin of the people," L'ASHMATH HACAM - to be inculcating of the people. This verse is also interesting because the High Priest is here called HAKKOHEN HAMMASHIACH, the Messiah priest, a designation which occurs only in connection with this particular prophetic type offering, the fulfillment of which we have in Jesus, the true Messiah Priest.

whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle. For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp." (Hb. 13:10f) For when the blood of Christ was shed in death upon the cross, no further act was needed. "The life of the flesh is in the blood." The atonement was complete. The *tetelestai* could now be spoken.

An interesting variant appears when we note the description of the ceremony by which the priest on the Day of Atonement made ready the second of the two goats for the peculiar part which he was to play in the ceremonies of the day. We have observed that the laying on of hands was one of the factors which were common to the several types of offerings. It is mentioned in Lv. 1:4; 3:2; 4:4 but always in the singular: the offerer shall lay his hand upon the head of the victim. The plural does appear in chapter 4:15, but only because a group of offerers is mentioned: "The elders of the congregation shall lay their hands," etc. But in Lv. 16:21 the picture changes: "Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness." The intention is clear and the sign language very drastic. The meaning which this gesture had in the other cases is here to be intensified. The symbolism of this act is further supplemented by the spoken word. The oral confession of sins, solemnly pronounced before the assembled people by their highest ranking mediator, must have made a profound impression on the assembled multitude. But if this was true of the confession, it was equally true of the absolution which was implied when the live goat was now led away into the wilderness, "bearing upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited. Thus their damning sins are now rendered harmless, are returned to AZAZEL, to their author. For this rendering of the L'AZAZEL of verse 8 is better than the translation of the A. V. and others who render this as "for the scapegoat." For the parallel of the phrases ("one lot for the Lord, and the other lot L'AZAZEL") compels us to take this hapax legomenon as a proper noun even as JAHWEH. We take this as another designation for Satan rather than for some demon of the wilderness. For this is simply in keeping with the entire teaching of Scripture on this subject, which traces the origin of all sin to the Great Adversary of God. It should be, noted, of course, that the text says nothing to indicate that this second goat was in any way meant to be a sacrifice to AZAZEL. To him God's people owe no tribute. For an extensive and thorough discussion of this entire subject, see Keil's Commentary on the text.

When we ask for the New Testament significance of this offering and its distinctive features, there can be no uncertainty as to the answer: In connection with what was said, on the general use of the blood we have already stated that it is pointed at a greater sacrifice that was to come. But in the same degree in which the use of the blood in the CHATTATH is more detailed and impressive, and therefore of greater significance than the use of the blood in the other offerings, so the prophetic function is more specific and its legitimate application richer in its amazing variety. For here we have a clear picture of the Great Atonement in its many different aspects.

The Epistle to the Hebrews brings the great unfolding of this theme, particularly in Chapters 7, 9 and 10. It is significant that in so doing it describes the atonement of Christ chiefly in terms of the CHATTATH, the Sin Offering, and that it makes extensive use of the dramatic features of that great day which called for the most vivid and solemn observance of this particular type of offering.

In tracing the manner in which this thought is developed, we must, of course, keep in mind that the writer of this Epistle is tracing a two-fold likeness between the type and its fulfillment. To him Christ is the great, the perfect High Priest, with an unchangeable priesthood, who is able to save to the uttermost. "For such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's; for this he did once, when he offered-up himself" (Heb. 7: 26f). As such he entered in once into the holy place, having attained eternal redemption for us (9: 12). As such he has entered into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us (9: 24). As such, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, he sat down on the right hand of God . . . till his enemies be made his footstool (10: 12f.). As such He, therefore, will rule with God until unto them that look for Him He shall appear the second time without sin unto salvation (9: 28).

But another phase of the Savior's mission remains. He was not only to bring the offering in the manner of the ancient priests. He was to be the offering: "Himself the Victim and Himself the Priest." In this He was again the perfect fulfillment of the Old Testament types. His offering was indeed "not without blood." "Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God" (Heb. 9: 12-14). But in this respect the type was not merely equaled. It was exceeded by far. The "how much more" of verse 14 is characteristic of this Epistle which everywhere shows the better, the greater, the more excellent priesthood of Christ. To this end the pouring out of His blood was indispensable, for "without shedding of blood is no remission" v. 22.

The writer of this epistle attaches a similar significance to the death of Christ as the sacrificial victim, attributing to it a distinct redemptive value of its own. Verse 15 reads (in Moffatt's translation) : "He mediates a new covenant for this reason, that those who have been called may obtain the eternal inheritance they have been promised, now that a death has occurred which redeems them from transgressions involved in the first covenant." This death is the final factor which validates the testament which so far has been but a promise. "For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth" (9: 17). Indeed, so perfect is the sacrifice, so complete, so entirely without any flaw, that it stands in no need of constant repetition. It exceeds the type in this respect also that it is of eternal value. "Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment: so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many" (Heb.9:25-28a).

These observations should make it clear that the various features of the ancient Sin Offering were meant to foreshadow our great redemption, and did actually provide a true picture of it, thereby presenting even to the faithful of the Old Testament, the Gospel in its most concentrated form. But when we note the mass application of this offering, by which it was employed for an entire nation at the same time, we should not forget that it also had a highly individual and personal use. It was so designed that it was available even to the poorest Israelite as a strictly private ministrations. If the wider use of this offering may be compared with the general public preaching of the Gospel even to all the world, then the personal and individual use finds its most fitting equivalent in that institution of the church which, we fear, is falling into ever greater disuse and neglect among us—the practice of private confession and absolution. This Old Testament rite should certainly move us to greater zeal in cultivating this private, personal assurance of the forgiving grace of our Lord in our congregations and among our people, and in seeking it for our own spiritual comfort.

#### 4. The Trespass Offering

The last of the blood offerings is the Trespass Offering, *Schuldopfer*. As in the case of the CHATTATH, so the original name for this offering is likewise simply a word which in its first sense means sin, and then it also applied to the offering which is to be brought for it. But in this instance the Hebrew word ASHAM emphasizes the thought of guilt, and the responsibility which has been incurred by trespassing upon the rights or property of another. The LXX has *plēmmeleia* (sometimes also *plēmmelēsis*), derived from *plēn*, beyond, and *melos*, song, and meaning therefore a mistake in music, a false note, discord, and then metaphorically a fault, offense, error. The more active *plēmmelēsis* would then imply failing, sinning.

In order to explain the difference between the Sin Offering and the ASHAM, the Trespass Offering, it has been suggested that the former pertains to sins of commission, the latter to those of omission. In view of Lv. 5:17 this theory is untenable. It is far more in keeping with the original meaning of ASHAM to take this as referring to offenses which were of such a nature that the loss which they caused would be estimated and so covered by compensation (Robinson-Brown). A careful reading of the passage in Leviticus and Numbers which

refer to this offering will show that the element of restitution recurs constantly. In this sense one may say that the thought of satisfaction prevails in this offering. Our civil courts would call them compensatory rather than punitive awards.

How this can be done toward one's neighbor is easily understood. Lv. 6:1-7 describes in detail the manner in which an offender who has defrauded his neighbor shall make amends by restoring to him the principal, and adding the fifth part more thereto. And then he shall bring his ASHAM unto the Lord, a ram without blemish. But it is not so evident how this can be done with reference to God who, after all, is not made richer by the gifts of man. The difficulty becomes even more pronounced when the ASHAM is called for in the ceremony of the cleansing of lepers (Lv. 14:12f), and in certain offerings by Nazarites. But the difficulties disappear when we consider that in the case of an Israelite who found himself in default with regard to some of his obligations toward his God ("in the matter of sacred gifts to the Lord." Goodspeed-Smith: American Translation. Lv. 5 : 15), this requirement was not prescribed for the sake of compensating God, but rather constituted a measure which was wholesome and beneficial for the delinquent, as a matter of training and discipline. This training included even the adding of the fifth part to the amends.

That a leper could not keep up with his religious obligations was inevitable. Certainly no reproach was to come upon him on that score. But it was good and wholesome for him to be reminded that in the day of his rejoicing over his recovery he would not only remember to give thanks to God, but also go as far as his means permitted in bringing a token offering as compensation for his accumulated arrears in his duties toward his Lord. Note that the "amends" are not called for in this instance. The Nazarite was to bring an ASHAM only if during the days of his vow he had become ceremonially defiled, and therefore temporarily disqualified for the special service to God which was specified by his vow. It was an acknowledgement that some days had been lost which belonged to God (Num. 6:12). God did not profit thereby. But the Nazarite himself was further trained and exercised in the conscientious fulfilling of his solemn pledge. "Offer unto God thanksgiving and pay thy vows unto the most High" (Ps. 50:14).

A somewhat different use of the word occurs in 1 Sam. 6:3 where the tribute of gold which the Philistines sent along when they returned the captured Ark of the Covenant is also called an ASHAM. Though this lies entirely outside of the range of the prescribed ceremonial offerings of Israel, yet a certain relation appears in the intended meaning of this act. The Philistines had become painfully aware that they had violated the honor of the God of Israel by taking the Ark into the temple of their idol, Dagon. They understood that the calamities which had befallen them were active demonstrations of YAHWEH's power to avenge Himself. By the return of the Ark they meant to rid themselves of the object of their guilt. By this added tribute of gold they intended to satisfy the honor of an offended God. Thus in its purpose this intuitive action of these foes of Israel comes close to the principle which God's people were to be taught by this particular type of offering. – Oehler (Theologie des A. T., p. 471) sums up the difference between the Sin Offering and the Trespass Offering by quoting Delitzsch: "The basic idea of the Sin Offering is the *expiatio*, and of the Trespass Offering, the *satisfactio*; in the former case the evangelical character prevails, in the latter the disciplinary."

It will be noted that in addition to all the special provisions for the restitution of what had been withheld from God or taken from the neighbor, the offering of a sacrificial victim still remained, and that the normal use of the blood was observed. This clearly demonstrated that material restitution and compensation, even in excess of the offense, did not remove the moral wrong, the offense against the holy will of God. An atonement was still needed for that, and could be supplied only by the means which God's grace had established for that purpose: the sacrificial blood.

In the case of the Trespass Offering it was normal procedure that part of the flesh was eaten by the priests. "Every male among the priests shall eat thereof" (Lv. 7, 6). By this ordinance God was acknowledging the Levitical priesthood as truly representing Him, so that He received these offerings through them as well as directly by means of the ceremonial burning. This representative status of the priests was further emphasized when the amends which accompanied the offering of the victim were assigned to the priests in those cases where the guilt had consisted in withholding something which was due to God (Lv. 5:16), a principle which was also applied under quite unusual circumstances in Num. 5: 8-10 ("let the trespass be recompensed unto the

Lord, even to the priest").

The New Testament significance of this Trespass Offering is revealed when Isaiah (53:10) speaks of the Servant of the Lord as bringing his life as an ASHAM. The A.V. does not make the reference to this particular type of offering quite clear, mainly because it speaks of an "offering for sin." Goodspeed-Smith translates : "When He makes Himself (NAPHSO) a guilt-offering." Luther : "Wenn er sein Leben zum Schuldopfer gegeben hat." The implications of this terminology are carried out in the following quotation which we offer in a rather free translation: "ASHAM in the sense of guilt is that type of offense by which man does injury to God or to the property of his neighbor and by which he is obligated to make some restitution. ASHAM in the sense of sacrifice is, therefore, that offering by which such restitution is made. Satisfaction is made for sin, but not by means of punishment (that is the function of the Sin Offering), but by redressing the injury by means of compensation over and above the harm that has been done. It is especially to be noted that this Trespass Offering is really based on personal awareness of guilt and free acknowledgement of the offense. As our suffering substitute the Servant of the Lord had taken our sin upon his own conscience as an offense against God, considered the guilt His own, and offered His life to God in voluntary satisfaction therefor." (Pieper, *Jesaias II*, p. 414.)

In addition to the special light which this passage thus sheds on the redemptive work of Christ the observations which we have made on this last type of offering lend themselves to some very practical applications to the congregational life of our day, specifically to the purpose and the exercise of Christian discipline. The aim of such discipline in our day is also not to be a punitive one, but rather remedial and constructive, a purposeful training of the New Man. If there has been any violation of the rights or property of a neighbor, proper restitution will certainly be in order wherever possible. This is definitely a matter of Christian sanctification, a bringing forth of fruits of repentance. The fact that God graciously forgives the sin itself should be ample motivation for such a deed. To guide our Christians in such a direction will be a most evangelical exercise of brotherly admonition and discipline.

The same principle holds good when the occasion for such discipline is a matter of someone's neglecting the obligations which all Christians have toward their church and its Lord. The entire vexatious question of the arrears of members in their support of their congregation and its work crops up at this point. If it is really a matter of neglect, and not of inability to do more, if it is really a case where the reluctant flesh seems to be getting the better of a Christian, then again brotherly admonition along the above lines in that same spirit will certainly be in order. And this may well include an urgent appeal to such a brother that as far as possible he make amends for his past neglect—not for the sake of enriching the coffers of the church, but rather for the sake of his own training and development. There is need among us for cultivating the attitude that our support of our church and its work constitutes an obligation of love and gratitude to our Lord and should, therefore, be held sacred. The fact that this has as a rule been attempted only in a mechanical and legalistic manner, with the unsatisfactory results which must necessarily follow upon such methods, does not mean that it cannot be done in a right and evangelical way, and should so be done.

In reviewing the entire subject matter which has been covered in this essay we cannot forgo one final observation. One cannot but be deeply impressed by noting how great were the sacrifices which God required from His people when they stood under the dispensation of the Law, how sternly He dealt with them when there was any breach of the Law, yet how graciously He made arrangements, albeit provisional ones, for the covering of their sins. How much more should not we to whom so much has been given, we who stand in the glorious era of fulfillment of the many things which were merely implied in Old Testament prophecy, we who have the wondrous Gospel of reconciliation and atonement, of justification by grace through faith, how much more should not we excel in our joyful tribute, in our offerings of thanksgiving to the God of our salvation.

	<b>THE BLOOD-SACRIFICES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT</b>			
	<b>OLAH</b>	<b>ZEBACH SHELAMIM</b>	<b>CHATTATH</b>	<b>ASHAM</b>
	Burnt Offering	Peace, Thank Offering	Sin Offering	Trespass Offering
	<i>Brand-, Ganzopfer</i>	<i>Dank-, Heilsopfer</i>	<i>Suendopfer</i>	<i>Schuldopfer</i>
	Leviticus 1	Leviticus 3	Leviticus 4:1-5, 13	Leviticus 5:14 – 6:7
<b>VICTIM HOSTIA</b>	Cattle, sheep, goats, or doves. Perfect male.	"One of the flock," perfect, male or female.	Bullock, goat, sheep, doves, or meal offering ( <i>without</i> oil or incense).	Ram, plus amends. – Lamb for lepers and Nazarites.
<b>CEREMONIAL (general)</b>	Solemn Presentation; Laying on of Hands; Slaughtering (on north side of Altar, except in SHELAMIM); Use of Blood; Consuming of Flesh.			
<b>CEREMONIAL of BLOOD</b>	Dashed against sides of Great Altar.	The Same	1) To Horns of the Great Altar 2) To Altar of Incense, against Veil. 3) Into Holiest, upon KAPPORETH.	Against sides of Great Altar.
<b>CEREMONIAL of FLESH</b>	Sacrificial burning (HIQTIR) of entire victim (Holocaust) except hide and offal.	Sacrificial burning of select fat and flesh. Part for priests, remainder for offerer, guests. Leavings burnt.	Sacrificial burning of select parts. Remainder consumed by priests or burnt outside of camp (SARAPH).	Sacrificial burning of select parts. Remainder consumed by priests.
<b>OCCASION</b>	Morning and Evening Sacrifice. Also personal devotion.	For blessings received (public or private). On entering or completing a vow. Voluntary offering.	For sins, of High Priest (ch. 4:3-12), Congregation (12-21), Rulers (22-26), Commoners (27-35).	For specific trespass; not part of festival ceremonies.
<b>PURPOSE</b>	Worship, Prayer, Reverence: -- " <i>Sacrificium latreuticum.</i> "	Thanksgiving, Praise, Entreaty. Communion of blessings: -- " <i>Sacrificia eucharistica vel impetratoria.</i> "	Propitiation, Expiation of sin before God. Cf. Lev. 16.	Satisfaction for violation of rights of others. Restoration of obligations.
<b>N. T. SIGNIFICANCE</b>	Prayer, Worship: in word, (Heb 13:15) in "service" (Rom 12:1).	Thanksgiving, Supplication, Intercession. Participation in Christian privileges. Fellowship, sacramental and personal.	The Great Atonement (Heb 9-10). Confession, Absolution.	Fruits of repentance (apology, amends, restitution).
	<b>EXPRESSING</b> the Covenant Relationship		<b>RESTORING</b> the Covenant Relationship	