

**THE DOCTRINE OF SUBSTITUTION**

**IN THE OLD TESTAMENT**

By  
Hobart E. Freeman

## PREFACE

Within the entire realm of historical Biblical theology there is no doctrine of greater importance than the concept of the substitutionary sacrifice of Jesus Christ as the Lamb of God on behalf of sinners. The subject of the vicarious atonement is especially pertinent today, when in the midst of the vicissitudes of theological thought and speculation this great truth is either being denied outright as an outmoded theological concept or deliberately weakened in its meaning and significance. Increasingly the general point of view, as the result of theological rationalism, is that the death of Jesus Christ does not imply *penal substitution*, such a concept being foreign to the Old Testament meaning of sacrifice. In view of this, it will be the purpose of this dissertation to demonstrate that the concept of substitution was central in the religious thought of Israel, and was the basis and ground of the Old Testament Mosaic system of sacrifice. Quite obviously, therefore, while the main thrust of this effort will be to establish this truth on Old Testament grounds, the scope and latitude of the concept of substitution will require an examination of related doctrines, such as sin, salvation, atonement, propitiation, and the like.

The writer's interest in this important subject was first aroused during undergraduate studies upon reading an article in a theological journal in which the penal substitutionary nature of Christ's sacrifice was subtly set aside and the Neo-orthodox interpretation of the atonement presented. Inasmuch as the author of the article was at that time a professor of Christian Ethics in an institution which had historically affirmed the Biblical view of the vicarious atonement of Christ, the incongruity of the situation was disturbing. The rejection of the penal and substitutionary nature of Christ's death is becoming increasingly more prevalent among contemporary theologians and in institutions which once fought to preserve the truths they now deny. No doctrinal pursuit

should be more relevant to contemporary theology, in view of the situation, than an inquiry into the place and significance of the idea of substitution in the Old Testament.

Perhaps it should be noted also that the writer observed, while engaged in research for this dissertation, that although the doctrine of the atonement has received comprehensive treatment by numerous authors, yet the significance of the concept of substitution in the Old Testament was a virgin field for study and research. In one theological library used by the writer, which contained in excess of: 135,000 volumes, there was not a single work devoted to this vital question. With this in view it is the sincere desire of: the writer that the work which follows may contribute some small share to the field of Old Testament theology from a Biblical and conservative viewpoint in a neglected but vitally important area; but more, that this effort might magnify the vicarious work of Him of whom the prophet Isaiah spoke when he declared:

But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; The chastisement of our peace was upon him; And with his stripes we are healed.<sup>1</sup>

The writer wishes to express acknowledgment of his indebtedness to the host of Biblically stable authors and theologians of the Christian faith whose writings have helped to establish him firmly in Biblical theology and historical Christianity in an era characterized by theological extremes, "new" orthodoxies, and doctrinal compromises. It is under the influence of such stalwarts of the faith that the present work is undertaken, and without which it would have been impossible. The particular area of this dissertation, the concept of substitution, was suggested to the author from a lecture on the Doctrine of Salvation by Dr. Alva J. McClain, Professor of Theology and President of Grace Theological Seminary.

Especially to his graduate committee, Dr. John C. Whitcomb, Professor Herbert Bess, and Dr. Herman A. Hoyt, the writer gratefully acknowledges the many helpful suggestions and insights with respect to the final preparation of the manuscript. Finally, he owes special grati-

---

<sup>1</sup> Isaiah 53:5

tude to his wife for her able assistance in editing and for the typing of the manuscript.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE DOCTRINE OF SUBSTITUTION.....	1
IN THE OLD TESTAMENT .....	1
PREFACE .....	2
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	5
INTRODUCTION.....	11
CHAPTER I.....	15
THE BIBLICAL VIEW OF REVELATION .....	15
Revelation in the Old Testament.....	15
The Evolutionary Theory of Religion.....	16
Relevance of the Biblical View of Revelation for Old Testament Theology and the Doctrine of Substitution .....	19
CHAPTER II.....	21
THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT IN THE OLD TESTAMENT .....	21
The Necessity for a Re-examination of the Doctrine of Substitutionary Atonement .....	21
Historical Theories of the Atonement.....	26
The Patristic Period.....	27
The Recapitulation Theory .....	27
The Ransom Theory.....	28
The Medieval Period .....	29
The Satisfaction Theory .....	29
The Moral Influence Theory .....	30
The Merit Theory .....	31
The Reformation Period.....	31
The Socinian or Example Theory.....	32
The Governmental Theory .....	32
The Penal Substitutionary Theory.....	33
The Modern Period .....	34
The Mystical Theory .....	34
The Vicarious Penitence Theory .....	35
The Vicarious Sacrificial or Bushnellian Theory.....	35
The Nature of Atonement and its Relation to the Idea of Substitution....	36
The Theological Meaning of the Word Atonement.....	36
The Subject and Object of Atonement .....	37
The Relation of Atonement to the Idea of Substitution .....	39
The Old Testament Doctrine of Man's Need for Atonement.....	41
The Idea and Nature of Man in the Old Testament.....	41
The Psychology of the Hebrews .....	41
Man in the Image of God.....	46
Man as a Sinner .....	47

The Nature of Sin and Guilt in the Old Testament .....	49
The Hebrew Concept of Sin .....	50
The Hebrew Concept of Guilt .....	51
The Moral Necessity of Substitutionary Atonement .....	55
Salvation in the Old Testament .....	56
The Hebrew Idea of Salvation .....	56
The Idea of Covenant .....	57
The Relation between the Old and New Testament Doctrines of Atonement .....	61
Old Testament Language .....	62
The Essential Nature of the Relationship between the Old and New Testament Doctrines of the Atonement .....	63
CHAPTER III .....	69
THE DOCTRINE OF SACRIFICE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT .....	69
The Origin of Sacrifice .....	70
Theories of Origin .....	71
The Essential Idea in Sacrifice .....	77
The Antiquity and Meaning of $\pi \lambda \iota \tau \eta$ .....	80
The Definition of Sacrifice .....	82
The Moral and Ethical Nature of the Levitical Sacrifices .....	86
The Ceremonial View of Old Testament Sacrifice .....	86
The Moral and Ethical Conception of Old Testament Sacrifice .....	88
The Unwarranted Distinction between the Levitical or Ceremonial and the Prophetic or Moral Conceptions in the Old Testament .....	88
The Religious Purpose in the Levitical Sacrifices .....	91
Spiritual Purification an Important Element in Hebrew Thought .....	92
Objective Evidence as to the Moral and Ethical Nature of Old Testament Sacrifice .....	93
The Ground for the Moral and Ethical Nature of Levitical Sacrifices .....	95
CHAPTER IV .....	102
THE DOCTRINE OF SUBSTITUTION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT .....	102
The Nature of Substitution .....	102
Definition of Vicarious or Substitutionary Sacrifice .....	102
The Relation of the Doctrine of Substitution to Law and Grace .....	103
The Distinction between Representation and Substitution .....	105
The Essential Conditions of Suretyship .....	106
The Concept of Substitution in Other Religions .....	109
The Concept of Substitution in the Mesopotamian Religion .....	110
The Concept of Substitution in the Egyptian Religion .....	111
The Concept of Substitution in the Religions of India .....	112
The Concept of Substitution in the Religions of Asia and China .....	113
The Concept of Substitution in the Mohammedan Religion .....	114

The Concept of Substitution in the Religion of Rome .....	115
The Concept of Substitution in the Religion of Greece .....	115
The Concept of Substitution in the Religion of the Gauls, Britons, Canaanites, Phoenicians, and Others.....	117
Basic Objections to the Doctrine of Substitution .....	119
The Innocent Cannot Suffer for the Guilty .....	119
True Satisfaction Cannot Be Rendered by a Substitute .....	121
Substitution Is Merely An Equivalent and Not the Exact Thing Owed .....	122
Atoning Sacrifice Is Absent in Several Important Instances .....	123
Actual Substitution Is a Misnomer.....	124
Penal Substitution Prohibited by Scripture Itself .....	124
The Hermeneutical Basis of the Old Testament Idea of Substitution ...	128
Typological Interpretation—Its Justification .....	129
Objections to the Typical Nature of Old Testament Sacrifices .....	132
Evidence of the Symbolic and Typical Nature of the Old Testament ...	133
The Distinction between Symbol and Type.....	134
Arguments for the Symbolic and Typical Nature of the Old Testament .....	135
The Symbolic and Typical Significance of the Mosaic Institutions....	139
The Symbolism of the Tabernacle .....	141
The Symbolism of the Priesthood .....	142
The Symbolism of the Rites of Purification .....	143
The Symbolism of the Sacred Times and Seasons .....	144
The Symbolism of the Sacrifices .....	146
The Linguistic Basis for the Doctrine of Substitution.....	147
Greek Terminology.....	147
The Greek Preposition ὑπέρ.....	147
The Greek Preposition ἀντί.....	148
The Greek Preposition περί.....	149
Hebrew Terminology .....	150
The Hebrew Preposition על.....	150
The Hebrew Preposition כעד.....	152
The Hebrew Preposition תחת.....	153
The Doctrinal Bases for the Idea of Substitution in the Old Testament	154
The Divine Provision for Substitution by the Law.....	154
The Three-Fold Nature of Man's Inability.....	155
The Law's Provision for Substitution .....	156
The Substitutionary Significance of the Imposition of Hands.....	161
The Doctrine of Imputation.....	164
The Nature of Imputation .....	164
The Old Testament Terms for Imputation .....	167

The Results of Imputation .....	170
The Wrath of God .....	172
The Doctrine of Propitiation.....	177
The Linguistic Basis of Propitiation .....	178
The Old Testament Concept of Propitiation in the Vicarious Sacrifice of Christ .....	179
The Emendation of the Term Propitiation to Expiation by Critical Interpreters .....	182
The Biblical Ground for the Doctrine .....	187
The Expression of Substitution in Old Testament Thought .....	189
Substitution in the Pentateuch .....	190
Substitution in the Book of Genesis. ....	190
Substitution. in the Book of Exodus .....	191
Substitution in the Book of Leviticus. ....	193
Substitution in the Book of Numbers.....	194
Substitution in the Book of Deuteronomy .....	195
Substitution in the Historical Books.....	196
Substitution in the Psalms .....	198
Substitution in the Prophets .....	199
Special Aspects of Substitution in the Old Testament .....	202
Intercession .....	202
Commutation .....	206
Tithes.....	207
Substitutionary Sacrifices for the Purification of a Community from the Suspicion of Blood-guiltiness .....	208
Substitutionary Sacrifices for the Ratification of a Covenant .....	208
Metaphorical Expressions of Substitution .....	210
The Typical and Substitutionary Nature of the Old Testament Sacrifices .....	213
The Divine Purpose in the Institution of Blood Sacrifice .....	214
The Sin-Offering and the Doctrine of Substitution .....	215
The Declared Effects of the Sin-Offering .....	232
The Problem of the Efficacy of Old Testament Sacrifices .....	233
The Basic Problem .....	233
Views as to the Efficacy of Old Testament Sacrifices.....	235
The Nature of the Efficacy of Old Testament Sacrifice .....	238
The Relationship between the Typical Nature of Old Testament Sacrifice and the Vicarious Sacrifice of Christ .....	248
The Significance of Isaiah 53 in the Doctrine of Substitutionary Atonement .....	273
CONCLUSION .....	289
APPENDIX I .....	296
HEBREW SACRIFICIAL TERMINOLOGY.....	296

The Generic Terms .....	296
מִנְחָה (minchah)--gift, present, offering .....	296
זֶבַח (zevach)--sacrifice .....	296
אִשְׁשֵׁה ( 'ishsheh) --an offering made by fire.....	297
קֹרְבָן (qorban) --offering, oblation .....	297
The Specific Terms .....	298
עֹלָה ( 'olah) --whole burnt-offering.....	298
זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים (zevach shelamin ) --sacrifice of the peace-offerings .....	299
חַטָּאת (chattath)--sin; sin-offering.....	299
אֲשָׁם ('asham) --offense, guilt, trespass, trespass-offering.....	300
מִנְחָה (minchah) --meal-offering.....	300
נֶסֶק (nesek) --drink-offering .....	301
שֶׁמֶן (shemen)--oil.....	301
Libation of Water .....	301
The Prominent Old Testament Sacrificial Term .....	302
APPENDIX II .....	305
THE CLASSIFICATION OF THE LEVITICAL SACRIFICES .....	305
The National Sacrifices .....	305
The Serial Offerings .....	305
Everyday .....	305
Every Sabbath.....	305
Every Month .....	305
The Festal Offerings.....	306
The Passover Cycle .....	306
The Cycle of the Seventh Month.....	306
The Offerings for the Service of the Holy Place .....	307
The Extraordinary Offerings .....	307
The Official Sacrifices .....	307
The Priestly Offerings.....	307
The Offerings for Rulers.....	308
The Personal Sacrifices .....	308
The Blood Sacrifices .....	308
The Bloodless Sacrifices or Vegetable Offerings.....	308
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	309
A.. BOOKS .....	309
B. COMMENTARIES.....	316
C. GRAMMARS, LEXICONS, TEXTS.....	317
D. DICTIONARIES, ENCYCLOPEDIAS CONCORDANCES .....	318
E. ARTICLES AND PERIODICALS .....	320
F. DOCUMENTS .....	320
G. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS .....	320

APPENDIX (Not Part Of Original Manuscript) ..... 322  
Index of Greek and Hebrew Terms ..... 322

# INTRODUCTION

When the children of Israel had by divine guidance made their way to Sinai, a revelation was given to them on the summit of the Mount which was concluded with a solemn covenant.

Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be mine own possession from among all peoples: for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation.<sup>2</sup>

After a three days' national fast the revelation was given which consisted in the first place of the decalogue, and afterwards in greater detail the system of civil, social, ceremonial, moral, and religious aspects of the Mosaic dispensation. After the sealing and ratification of the covenant by a national sacrifice, the details of one sanctuary, the Aaronic priesthood, the laws of sacrifice, and substitutionary atonement were promulgated.<sup>3</sup> It was in the ratification of the covenant that the blood of the slain victim first came into full significance, as Moses sprinkled it first upon the altar and then upon the people (Exodus 24). The covenant was to subsist on offerings and sacrifices in which the blood of the victim was always prominent. In the midst of the new nation the holy God was now to dwell. The nation was to be a kingdom of priests and a holy nation; but the people were sinful and had need of cleansing in order to have access to God, and in order that He might dwell among them. In view of this the sacrificial system was instituted. Through the sacrificial death of an animal victim, and through the ritual of the manipulation of the blood by the consecrated priest, an atonement for sin was effected on behalf of the covenant individual; and in this way the covenant relationship, between God and the people, was maintained and perpetuated.

In contrast to the Biblical account and as a result of the critical analysis of the Biblical text by the negative critical school, the religious institutions of Israel are said to be the two-fold product of a borrowing

---

<sup>2</sup> Exodus 19:5-6.

<sup>3</sup> Alfred Cave, *The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice and Atonement* (Rev. ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1890), pp. 173-74.

of the concepts and practices of pagan religions on the one hand and of evolutionary development on the other. The difference between the historical interpretation of the Old Testament and the attitude of negative criticism is perhaps nowhere more clearly delineated than at the point of the institution and meaning of sacrifice. The elaborate system of Mosaic sacrifice is, according to critical scholarship, a product of the priestly cultus during the Exile. Pre-exilic sacrifice on the other hand was an evolution from primitive animism. The priestly legislation was unknown in pre-exilic time and was therefore a late development introduced by Ezra. The Graf-Wellhausen development hypothesis of the gradual growth of the Pentateuch from individual documents JEDP assigns the sacrificial and priestly legislation, the so-called "P" document, to the period of the Exile, largely as the work of Ezra. To P the bulk of the laws of the Pentateuch is assigned; Exodus 25-40 (except 32-34), the whole of Leviticus, Numbers 1-10, 15-20, 25-34. Graf and Kayser, because of Ezekiel's obvious acquaintance with the Pentateuch, postulate the hypothesis that Ezekiel, as a priest, wrote the law of holiness—Leviticus 17-26.<sup>4</sup>

Critical scholarship, rejecting the historic Biblical view of revelation and the divine institution of Mosaic worship, postulates the view that the institutions of Israelite worship were drawn largely from the practices of Canaan. Wellhausen, Influenced by Hegelian philosophy, applied his system to Old Testament study. Hegel's philosophy involved a thesis, an antithesis, and a final synthesis. The synthesis lays the foundation for a new basic proposition and the process is repeated. Little by little growth and evolution occur and a higher understanding develops. Wellhausen, applying the Hegelian concept to religion, held that (1) Israel's religion was at first that of the pagan religions around her—animism (thesis); (2) over against this was the later spiritual religion of the prophets (antithesis); and (3) these were synthesized in the ritualistic religion of the Law. Thesis and antithesis were brought together at the time of Ezra by the priests. The priests, during the exile and after, represented the ritual ideas as going back to the Mosaic period and wrote the priestly documents to validate their ideas. Thus religion in general, and the Mosaic institutions in particular, become some-

---

<sup>4</sup>H. D. M. Spence and J. S. Exell (eds.), *The Pulpit Commentary*, Vol. XII: *Ezekiel* (Michigan: Wm. B. Erdmans Publishing Co., 1950), p. xxvi.

thing which man postulates by reason, rather than their being products of divine revelation. Israel's religion in this concept did not surpass the contemporary systems of her neighbors; but on the contrary, as H. Wheeler Robinson speculates in *The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament*,

the institutions of Israelite worship, its religious festivals, and sacrificial customs, appear to have been drawn largely from the practices of Canaan. The holy places of the land, each with its sacred stone and wooden post, passed over to the victorious invaders, and became the sanctuaries of Yahweh. The same relation holds of the three great festivals of the Jewish year. The Feast of Unleavened Bread, the Feast of Weeks, and the Feast of Booths are all shown by the details of their observance to be agricultural in character—i.e. they could not have belonged to a period prior to settlement in Canaan, and were most probably adopted from the Canaanites. Even the prophets themselves... are genetically related to an older non-moral type Nebi'im, who are, perhaps, like the holy places and festivals, and the general details of sacrifice, a contribution of Canaan to Israel's development.<sup>5</sup>

That this view is at variance with the historic Jewish and Christian concept of the Old Testament is quite apparent, and that it results from a faulty concept of *revelation* is just as obvious. The antithesis between the two schools comes to a focus at the point of revelation. Inasmuch as the study in this dissertation will be based upon the presupposition that God has revealed Himself in history as set forth in the Mosaic record, and that trustworthy conclusions can be drawn from this revelation, then it would seem essential as preparatory to the study to examine to some degree the idea of revelation as it is related to Old Testament study. The motivation for this introductory study is two-fold: first, there is a growing need today for a reexamination and restatement of the theological tenets of the Old Testament from the conservative view of revelation in refutation of the unbiblical and philosophical presuppositions of the modern school of negative criticism; second, there is a need for proper perspective in the treatment of Old Testament theology today. With the rise of modern criticism there is a strik-

---

<sup>5</sup>H. Wheeler Robinson, *The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament* (2nd. ed. rev.; London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1956), pp. 17-18.

ing and profound absence of perspective in their results and conclusions. This is seen in their inability to view the facts of Biblical history in their proper relations. The Old Testament, according to its own representation, is an historical religion. "It is grounded upon that which God Himself did in history. Remove this historical foundation from it and there is no longer any true biblical religion."<sup>6</sup> Edward J. Young in his book, *The Study of Old Testament Theology Today*, stresses the necessity of grounding Old Testament theology in the fact of an historical revelation. He writes,

It is at this particular point that a truly Scriptural Old Testament theology will part company with those approaches which do not receive the Scriptures as the authoritative revelation of God. If our study is to be truly biblical, it must come to grips with the fact that God... did in fact reveal Himself to Moses at the burning bush. The revelation took place in history. It took place on a certain day of our calendar and at a very definite spot in the Sinai wilderness.... Unless the historical facts are presupposed, we shall waste our time if we try to study the significance and meaning of what is narrated.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>Edward J. Young, *The Study of Old Testament Theology Today* (Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1959), P. 15.

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 30.

# CHAPTER I

## THE BIBLICAL VIEW OF REVELATION

### *Revelation in the Old Testament*

Unless the truth of an historical revelation of facts is presupposed, it is futile and unavailing to attempt to establish the concept of substitutionary atonement on the basis of the Old Testament text. But it is a patent fact that the Old Testament testifies to the supposition that all history is the story of something that God is doing. Furthermore, there is seen to be an exclusive history within history—God working in a particular people, in a particular place, at a particular time, for His purpose.<sup>8</sup> The Scriptures are fundamentally a revelation through historical events—God speaking to people through history. The interpreters of these historical events were mainly prophets of God beginning with Moses. The result is a concurrence of historical act and interpretive word.

The Old Testament, as well as the New Testament, views revelation as divine communication of truth through inspired men of God. Revelation is a revelation of *facts*; facts dealing with God, creation, sin, election, redemption, a nation of slaves transformed into a kingdom of priests, the institution of a system of worship, deliverance from oppressors, exile, restoration, and many circumstances concerning the relation of God to the world in general and Israel in particular. The facts of history stand on the one side, as it were, and the recorded testimony to these facts, the divine Word, stands on the other. That is, on the one side is God's act in history and on the other is the prophetic consciousness illuminated by God; the result—a creative divine event. The waters of the Red Sea were parted by a wind and to the uninformed ob-

---

<sup>8</sup>In direct contradiction to this stands the view of Liberalism. One writer cautions: "Let us not be among the number so dwarfed, so limited, so bigoted as to think that the Infinite God has revealed Himself to one little handful of His children, in one little quarter of the globe, and at one particular time.... The great fundamental principles of all religions are the same. They differ only in minor details. . . . There is only one religion." He concludes by asserting, ". . . your error is—and you show you absurdly laughable limitations by it—your inability to see that other Scriptures are also inspired." Ralph Waldo Trine, *In Tune with the Infinite* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 1897), pp. 206-209.

server this is all that the historical event signified. But the presence of Moses to interpret the act as an act of God makes this incident a divine event in history. The destruction of Sennacherib's army would ordinarily have been seen simply as a mysterious catastrophe of fate. But there was an Isaiah to interpret it for the observer as the judgment of God. The Exile would not have been seen as the judgment of God apart from revelation through the writings of Jeremiah, Daniel, and Ezekiel. The fact of the Exodus may have had no particular significance in history simply as an event, since the migration of peoples was not an uncommon occurrence of history; but the fact taken together with the divine revelation of the meaning of this event to the inspired writer gives the event spiritual and supernatural significance. Now a mutual correspondence exists between the two—the historical act and the divine testimony to it. The result is infallible revelation. Amos confirmed this when he declared, "Surely the Lord Jehovah will do nothing, except he reveal his secret unto his servants the prophets."<sup>9</sup> This declaration points to the close connection that exists between the facts and words of revelation.

### *The Evolutionary Theory of Religion*

Critical scholarship, on the other hand, which treats revelation as an *evolution* of the human reason acting upon the facts of history, sees within the framework of the Bible a record of man's quest for truth as he *progressively* speculates upon matters of the past in his attempt to build an acceptable theology or faith. Revelation, at best, in this system is chiefly the influence of God upon *human* reason and knowledge. Hence, the Scriptures are not to be regarded as perfectly trustworthy either as to their historical references or spiritual concepts. Such a rationalistic concept of revelation is apparent in such statements as that by R. H. Charles when he writes: "In these statements Ezekiel has enunciated a great spiritual truth, but has hampered its acceptance and development by associating it with positions which are demonstrably false."<sup>10</sup> Or, "... this Old Testament doctrine of the time of the resurrection of the faithful is manifestly based on the faulty conceptions of that

---

<sup>9</sup>Amos 3:7

<sup>10</sup>R. H. Charles, *A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1913), P. 63.

age...."<sup>11</sup> Again he writes, "The ideas that prevailed in pre-Mosaic times regarding the future life, and... in some degree down to the second century B.C.,... were not the outcome of revelation, but were mere survivals of Semitic heathenism."<sup>12</sup> "As in nature, so in religion, God reveals Himself in the course of slow evolution."<sup>13</sup> "The eschatology of the individual in early Israel is not only wholly independent of Yahwism, but it actually stands in implicit antagonism to it...."<sup>14</sup>

Some hold that in the whole history of the religious life of mankind one may perceive growth, evolution, and imperfection striving toward perfection. Religion, in this view, is a desire for life, a belief in higher powers, and an evolution from the animism of the primitive peoples, fetishism, magic, and tribal religions, to a reverence for common gods and national religions as in Babylon, Egypt, and Greece, with their polytheisms culminating in the later prophetic stage. This stage is a high point in the evolutionary process and is represented by Zarathustra, Buddha, Confucius, Socrates, Plato, and the prophets of Israel.<sup>15</sup>

James Orr, in criticism of this evolutionary theory, points out that it can be argued that proof is lacking of any such progression and development without contact with higher civilization. It cannot, for example, be shown that the higher elements in Babylonian, Egyptian, and Greek religions have developed out of fetishism, totemism, animism, and ghost-worship.<sup>16</sup> Still less, that polytheistic religions became purer and more monotheistic in the course of their development, rather than continually more idolatrous, superstitious, and corrupt as is historically the case. Instead of spiritual monotheism being the natural development of religion, there are but three monotheistic religions in the world: Judaism, Christianity, and Mohammedanism; and all three are derived from one source—the Bible<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 136.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 18.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. vii.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 18.

<sup>15</sup> James Orr, *Revelation and Inspiration* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1952), pp. 29-33.

<sup>16</sup> Conversely, it can be shown now, better than ever, that Near Eastern religions remained in a fixed pattern from beginning to end.

<sup>17</sup> Orr, *op. cit.*, pp. 33-39.

In this regard Heinrich Ewald writes,

Thus heathenism and true religion flowed at first from the same source, and resemble, so far, two streams which, taking their rise from one spring, flow together undivided a longer or shorter distance, but subsequently parting at this or that rock, one diverges into side streams which, following different courses, run on a longer or shorter time, some of them with much grandeur and magnificence, but all at last alike losing themselves in the sand, while the other goes pouring on in its straight direct course, is never again completely broken or divided, and grows mightier and mightier as it flows.<sup>18</sup>

The idea that all religions contain an element of revelation and that no religion has a right to claim a monopoly on revelation is denied even by Brunner in his work, *Revelation and Reason*. The Biblical view holds that in the Christian faith there are many distinctives and that whatever it might have in common with other religions is nonessential.<sup>19</sup>

Thus the evolutionary theory of religion must be rejected as insufficient in the light of religious history which shows the various religions of mankind to be more devolutionary than evolutionary—a retrogradation of religion instead of inevitable development. Religious evolution is based upon a fallacy that there are inexorable laws of progress in religion and morality which must work themselves out in every civilization and culture.

That the Bible is the record of progressive revelation, as the writer of Hebrews declares in the first verse of his epistle, few would deny. Jesus came to fulfill a revelation that was incomplete. The Apostle declares that Christ came in the fullness of time (Galatians 4:4). A revelation grounded in the historical growth of man could hardly be otherwise. The early Scriptures emphasized the power of God; while His moral qualities, though not ignored, received greater emphasis in the later Psalms and Prophets, all of which is climaxed in the New Tes-

---

<sup>18</sup>Heinrich Ewald, *Revelation - Its Nature and Record*, trans. Thomas Goadby (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1884).

<sup>19</sup>Emil Brunner, *Revelation and Reason*, trans. Olive Wyon (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946), pp. 219-220.

tament. Revelation was conditioned morally and spiritually on man's capacity to receive it. This is not to teach naturalistic evolution, but it is a recognition that man's receptivity is also God's creation.<sup>20</sup>

### *Relevance of the Biblical View of Revelation for Old Testament Theology and the Doctrine of Substitution*

The Biblical view of revelation discloses the inadequacy of the presuppositions of negative theology. The Old Testament shows that revelation means that something hidden has been made known. "... I have shown thee new things from this time, even hidden things, which thou hast not known. They are created now, and not from old; and before this day thou heardest them not; lest thou shouldest say, Behold, I knew them."<sup>21</sup> Biblical revelation is the manifestation and unveiling of something that had been a mystery and absolutely concealed. Revelation is essentially a means of acquiring knowledge completely opposite to the usual human method by means of observation, research, and the thought process. Revelation in the Biblical sense means a supernatural kind of knowledge given in a supernatural way regarding something man himself could neither know nor discern. It is apparent that this concept is diametrically opposed to the negative critical view that the Old Testament is a record of the evolution of human reason in its quest for God.<sup>22</sup> On the contrary, the Old Testament testifies that revelation issues from a region beyond man's rational and natural faculties to discover. The sum total of all that man can discern is limited to the world and is worldly, and the fact that he cannot know beyond his own sphere shows there is something altogether above and beyond him and his world or cosmos. The Bible declares that there is no revelation other than that which comes to us from outside this sphere, and that there is no other true knowledge of God except in His revelation of Himself to His creatures. The central message of the Bible—God's redemption of sinful creation—is the product of this supernatural revelation. The Scriptures are God's permanent and final record of how God made Himself known in redeeming love—they are His self-revelation.

---

<sup>20</sup>Walter T. Conner, *Revelation and God* (Nashville: The Broadman Press, 1936), pp. 88-89.

<sup>21</sup> Isaiah 48:6-7

<sup>22</sup> Corinthians 2:9-10

The relevance of this view of revelation to the idea of atonement and substitution in the Old Testament is simply this—revelation in the Old Testament is synonymous with redemption; God does not reveal Himself apart from a redemptive purpose. God speaks to the world through crises—not through the evolution of ideas; and the supreme crisis is man's sin and his need of redemption. Hence, Israel's religion is living and personal, because it is God's personal encounter with man in his crisis and need. Since it is personal it involves divine initiative in self-revelation on the one hand, and man's apprehension and response on the other. Israel's religion was not a quest for but a response to divine revelation. Zophar admits this when he asks, "Canst thou by searching find out God?"<sup>23</sup> Religion, in this connotation, as one writer has correctly observed, is not the thrill which comes from discovery, but the awareness of being assaulted—not so much man finding God, but God finding man, and his response to His grace.<sup>24</sup>

Revelation results in the mediation of God's grace, and because it is grace it is redemptive. In the Old Testament God's revelation of Himself to Moses was not simply a communication of knowledge about Himself, but the communication of life itself to be interpreted within the covenant community with its religious and spiritual institutions. As one surveys the Levitical system of sacrifice and Mosaic institutions of worship, he finds there a divine purpose whereby the most profound spiritual truths were presented to the Hebrew mind; a system of religious education in which the deepest truths which the human heard could receive were revealed.

---

<sup>23</sup>Job 1:7.

<sup>24</sup>David Elton Trueblood, *The Logic of Belief* (New York: Harper & Bros. Publishers, 1942), pp. 202-203.

## CHAPTER II

### THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

#### *The Necessity for a Re-examination of the Doctrine of Substitutionary Atonement*

Representative of the influence of Neo-orthodox thought, which has permeated contemporary theology, is its impact upon the central affirmation of the historic Christian faith—the doctrine of substitutionary atonement. The dominant influence of Neo-orthodox theology is illustrated in an article by Guy H. Ranson in the *Review and Expositor*, entitled "The Primary Emphasis in Christology." Following the familiar Neo-orthodox method of minimizing the vicarious death of Christ and emphasizing the Incarnation as the means by which God redeems man through the identification of Himself with humanity, the author writes: "In Protestant Fundamentalism Christ has become the supernatural payment of an infinite debt to assure some men of eternal happiness."<sup>25</sup> Rejecting this as Fundamentalist orthodoxy which fails to emphasize man's personal relation to Christ, he adds, "Thus the atonement does not placate the Father but fulfills his will by restoring man to fellowship with him...."<sup>26</sup> He clearly enunciates the Neo-orthodox position when he quotes approvingly from F. D. Maurice: "In the incarnation, Maurice says, the pre-existent Christ was united with human nature and by His obedience and dependence upon God while in this human nature all men are restored to union with God."<sup>27</sup>

This is the Neo-orthodox concept of the atonement which places redemption in the Incarnation rather than the Cross. Chester E. Tulga quoting Berkhof says, "We are told repeatedly by Barth and Brunner that the revelation *is* the reconciliation, and sometimes it seems as

---

<sup>25</sup>Guy H. Ranson, "The Primary Emphasis in Christology," *Review and Expositor*, LII, No. 3, (July, 1955), p. 290.

<sup>26</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 291.

<sup>27</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 297

if they regard the incarnation as in itself already the reconciliation."<sup>28</sup> Alan Richardson supports this interpretation when he writes, "According to the New Testament teaching Christ redeemed human nature by assuming it..."<sup>29</sup>

Professor Ranson in his article uses Biblical terminology such as ransom, atonement, sin, death, etc., but typical of Neo-orthodox theology he does not mean by it what is meant by orthodox theologians. He reveals this when he rejects the Biblical and substitutionary nature of Christ's death as a ransom for man's deliverance. Commenting on Mark 10:45 where Jesus said that "the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many," Ranson writes,

Here is a ransomed deliverance which men could not purchase for themselves, but it is not necessarily a *substitutionary* idea. By his *life* Christ provides a way of deliverance for men. From other sayings it is clear that this is not an external and mechanical transaction, but it must be appropriated by men by their participation with Christ.<sup>30</sup>

While it is true that in a real sense the believer is identified with Christ in His death, yet this identification is not of such a nature that it denies the idea of the substitution of Christ in the sinner's place; but rather it is solely because Christ has so identified Himself with humanity that such a substitution is made possible (Hebrews 2:14-17). Ranson finds the doctrine of substitution unpalatable wherever it is enunciated, and rejects Luther's and Calvin's interpretation of Mark 15:34 where Jesus cried, "... My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" as the abandonment of Jesus by the Father, in order that He might endure the pains of the lost as a substitute and thus bear all the pain and grief of sins. Ranson writes:

The saying does express a feeling of desolation, abandonment, defeat [sic!], and despair, but it does not imply that God forsook him that he might be substituted for others. The suffering is not

---

<sup>28</sup>Chester E. Tulga, *The Case Against Neo-Orthodoxy* (Chicago: Published by Conservative Baptist Fellowship, 1951), p. 38.

<sup>29</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 39.

<sup>30</sup>Ranson, *op. cit.*, p. 305. Italics mine.

pain directly inflicted by God, but it is entering into the condition of man who is apart from God in order that man might be reconciled to God. As man Jesus suffers the alienation of God because of man's sin, He tastes the meaning of sin and death, and by perfect obedience and perfect trust in the Father he redeems man.<sup>31</sup>

In this view, quite obviously, all thought of substitution, vicarious suffering, the just for the unjust, propitiation, and death *for* sinners is ruled out; and a *new* orthodoxy is substituted for the doctrine of substitution. Christ redeemed man by His identification of Himself with sinful humanity, and He is simply required to "*taste the meaning*" of sin and death, and by emerging triumphant He redeems man! He does not die *for* sinners, but simply identifies Himself with them and "tastes" of their sin and death.

Neo-orthodox theologians emphasize the representative character of Christ's ministry and life and reject the representative or substitutionary nature of His death. This is a one-sided emphasis upon the incarnation to the exclusion of His atonement for sinners. "Christ, they are wont to say, is not to be regarded as standing apart from men, and doing vicariously for them a work which they ought themselves to do, but cannot accomplish...."<sup>32</sup> Christ is rather to be seen as He who identified Himself with humanity in the incarnation, assuming their sinful Adamic nature, entering into their trials and sufferings, and giving Himself unselfishly to the service of humanity and the will of God; so that by all He did and suffered He brought humanity into a closer relation to God, reconciling them to Him, not *through* Himself as their Substitute, but rather *in* Himself as the "last Adam," the source and Head of redeemed humanity.<sup>33</sup>

Lest there be any doubt about Professor Ranson's attitude toward the Biblical doctrine of substitution, he adds:

Another tendency is that of treating Paul as the theologian of Christ who satisfies the judgment of God upon sinners and provides an atonement in order that some might escape punishment.... It is ob-

---

<sup>31</sup>Ibid.

<sup>32</sup>Thomas J. Crawford, *The Doctrine of the Holy Scripture Respecting the Atonement* (4th ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1954), p. 93.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid.

vious that *Paul believes not in a substitutionary idea of atonement* but in a participation with Christ. He emphasizes the necessity of being crucified with Christ and of presenting one's body as a sacrifice.<sup>34</sup>

Only as we are personally related to God in the living person Jesus Christ are we in the Faith. We are always tempted to allow a doctrine of a substitutionary and external atonement take the place of a personal relationship.<sup>35</sup>

One is almost overwhelmed by such a statement that "it is obvious that Paul believes not in a substitutionary idea of atonement...." in the face of the abundance of New Testament evidence to the contrary by the hand of the Apostle himself. If there was ever an assumption at variance with the facts this is certainly an excellent example. Such an obvious misstatement gives no evidence of scholarship; nor can the author be expected to be taken seriously. Although his conclusions would be manifestly erroneous had he said simply that he himself did not believe in the doctrine of substitution from his study of the Scriptures, yet this would have been his prerogative. But it is quite another thing entirely to say that the Apostle Paul did not believe in the substitutionary atonement. Since the author can appeal to no evidence outside the writings of the Apostle himself, his statement is completely fallacious in light of the assertions of the Apostle to the contrary. Since it would be superfluous and redundant to quote the overwhelming catalogue of Pauline passages teaching the doctrine of substitutionary atonement, only some of the most familiar will be set forth. All are from the Epistles of Paul.<sup>36</sup>

Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.<sup>37</sup>

Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith,

---

<sup>34</sup>Ranson, *op. cit.*, p. 308. Italics mine.

<sup>35</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 309.

<sup>36</sup>See also: Romans 5:19; Ephesians 1:7; Titus 2:14; Galatians 1:4; 4:4-5, et. al.

<sup>37</sup>Galatians 3:13.

in his blood, to show his righteousness because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God.<sup>38</sup>

Be ye therefore imitators of God, as beloved children; and walk in love, even as Christ also loved you, and gave himself up for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for an odor of a sweet smell.<sup>39</sup>

For there is one God, one mediator also between God and men, himself man, Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all; the testimony to be borne in its own times.<sup>40</sup>

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.<sup>41</sup>

Else must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once at the end of the ages hath he been manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And inasmuch as it is appointed unto men once to die, and after this cometh judgment; 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.<sup>42</sup>

By which will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. And every priest indeed standeth day by day ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, the which can never take away sins: but he, when he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God; henceforth expecting till his enemies be made the footstool of his feet. For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.<sup>43</sup>

To wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses, and having committed unto us the word of reconciliation.

---

<sup>38</sup>Romans 3:24-25.

<sup>39</sup>Ephesians 5:1-2.

<sup>40</sup>I Timothy 2:5-6.

<sup>41</sup>Romans 5:8-9.

<sup>42</sup>Hebrews 9:26-28.

<sup>43</sup>Hebrews 10:10-14.

Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf; that we might become the righteousness of God in him.<sup>44</sup>

In conclusion, it may be pointed out that critical scholarship, while it may deny the substitutionary nature of Christ's death, nevertheless would be very hesitant in asserting that the Apostle Paul did not teach the doctrine of substitution. No less a critical scholar than H. Wheeler Robinson in commenting on Paul's statement in Galatians 3:13 said that this was "one of the clearest indications that St. Paul conceived the death of Christ as both substitutionary and penal."<sup>45</sup>

### *Historical Theories of the Atonement*

In the religion of Israel one of the fundamental presuppositions was the forbidding and inescapable fact that man was a sinner. Since communion with God was the chief end of man's existence, the doctrine of redemption is the expression of the divine institution of the conditions whereby reconciliation is effected. The means and nature of this reconciliation are called, in the language of theology, the atonement. The true meaning of the atonement is summed up in the Apostle's words "... that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures."<sup>46</sup> Traditional theology, as well as heretical and liberal theology, has advocated widely divergent theories as to the nature of the atonement. Some theologians have based their views on the Apostle's statement, others on philosophic and unscriptural presuppositions. The importance of a proper understanding of the Biblical idea of the atonement cannot be overemphasized, in view of the fact that it is the sole means by which men are removed from under the condemnation of God and reconciliation is effected. Those theories which reject the sacrificial and substitutionary nature of the atonement are characterized by serious deviations from the Biblical conceptions of sin and the holiness of God. Therefore, it is not an exaggeration to say that the Biblical trustworthiness of one's entire theological position rests upon, and is determined by, one's view of the atonement. The historical theories of the atonement may be examined under four periods: the Patristic Peri-

---

<sup>44</sup>I Corinthians 5:19, 21.

<sup>45</sup>Leon Morris, *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1955) , p. 55.

<sup>46</sup>I Corinthians 15:3.

od, the Medieval Period, the Reformation Period, and the Modern Period.<sup>47</sup>

## The Patristic Period

The views enunciated during this period are those of the Church Fathers encompassing approximately the first four centuries.

### *The Recapitulation Theory*

This is the view of Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons, who lived during the second century A.D. His theory of the atonement was essentially an emphasis on the incarnation. Christ is the new man, the renewer of humanity, the second Adam. What man lost in the first Adam is restored in Christ. According to his conception Christ recapitulated all the states of man's life, emerging triumphant. Irenaeus writes,

He came to save all through himself; all, that is, who through him are born into God, infants, children, boys, young men and old. Therefore he passed through every stage of life: he was made an infant for infants, sanctifying infancy; a child among children, sanctifying those of this age...; a young man amongst young men, an example to them, and sanctifying them to the Lord. So also amongst the older men... And then he came even unto death that he might be "the firstborn from the dead"....<sup>48</sup>

In all this Irenaeus held that Christ became what man is so that man might become what He is. Irenaeus wrote that,

... when he was incarnate and made man, he recapitulated [or summed up] in himself the long line of the human race, procuring for us salvation thus summarily, so that what we had lost in Adam, that is, the being in the image and likeness of God, that we should regain in Christ Jesus.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup>It is not within the scope of this work to attempt an exhaustive study of the theories of the atonement, but simply to set forth the more significant ideas that have been advocated.

<sup>48</sup>Henry Bettenson, *Documents of the Christian Church* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1954), p. 43.

<sup>49</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 42.

Athanasius (295-373 A.D.), bishop of Alexandria, advocated a view similar to that of Irenaeus, that salvation was by *restoration*. God's goodness could not acquiesce in the ruin and loss of His handiwork; thus Athanasius writes, "He... was made man that we might be made divine."<sup>50</sup> "And thus, taking a body like ours, because all men are liable to the corruption of death he surrendered it to death instead of all... that he might turn back to incorruption men who had reverted to corruption...."<sup>51</sup>

Nevertheless Athanasius goes beyond the concept of Irenaeus and sets forth one of the clearest and earliest statements of the *sacrificial* and *penal substitutionary* nature of Christ's death. He writes,

The Word takes on a body capable of death, in order that, by partaking in the Word that is above all, it might be worthy to die instead of all... Hence he did away with death for all who are like him by the offering of a substitute.... For it was reasonable that the Word, who is above all, in offering his own temple and bodily instrument as a substitute—life for all, fulfilled the liability in his death....<sup>52</sup>

### *The Ransom Theory*

Origen, born about 182 A.D., was successor to Clement in the headship of the Alexandrian catechetical school; and more than any theologian since Paul, he emphasized the sacrificial character of Christ's death, but he interpreted it in many ways. Christ suffered as a representative; and again, as an example; He was a propitiatory sacrifice to God; He conquered the demons by His death; and His death was a ransom paid to Satan.<sup>53</sup> This old patristic theory, first propounded by Justin Martyr, held that God and Satan were in an eternal conflict over the possession of man. Satan had captured man, and as a captor had a right to his spoils, so too Satan could only be bought off by ransom. The ransom was Christ, who in the guise of sinful humani-

---

<sup>50</sup>Williston Walker, *A History of the Christian Church* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954), p. 118.

<sup>51</sup>Bettenson, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

<sup>52</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 47-48.

<sup>53</sup>Walker, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

ty, deceived Satan who believed Him only another man, and overcame him through His resurrection.

A modification or elaboration of the Ransom theory was employed by Gregory of Nyssa, Rufinus, Augustine, and others, and was known as the "mousetrap" or "fish hook" theory. Rufinus writes,

The purpose of the Incarnation... was that the divine virtue of the Son of God might be as it were a hook hidden beneath the form of human flesh... to lure on the prince of this age to a contest; that the Son might offer him his flesh as bait and that then the divinity which lay beneath might catch him and hold him fast with its hook.... Then, as a fish which seizes a baited hook not only fails to drag off the bait but is itself dragged out of the water to serve as food for others; so he that had the power of death seized the body of Jesus in death, unaware of the hook of divinity concealed therein. Having swallowed it, he was caught straightway; the bars of hell were burst, and he was, as it were, drawn up from the pit, to become food for others....<sup>54</sup>

## The Medieval Period

From the fifth century A.D. until the time of the Reformation numerous views were expressed by theologians which have had significant influence on both the conservative and liberal views of contemporary theology.

### *The Satisfaction Theory*<sup>55</sup>

This view has been called the Anselmic, or Commercial theory of Atonement, and was advocated by the father of the Schoolmen, Anselm (1033-1109 A.D.). Anselm's most influential contribution to theology was his classic work on the atonement, *Cur Deus-Homo*, "Why the God-Man?" Anselm rejected the patristic idea of the atonement signifying a ransom paid to Satan, which had prevailed from the time of

---

<sup>54</sup>Bettenson, op. cit., p. 49.

<sup>55</sup>The Satisfaction Theory of Anselm is an adequate expression of the penal substitutionary view, except that it appears too legalistic and places an extreme emphasis upon the "honor" of God which must be satisfied (which is true) rather than upon His "holiness." Sin is essentially moral in its effects, and it is God's holiness that constitutes a moral demand for justice and satisfaction.

Gregory the Great until Anselm. Man by his sin had dishonored God and his debt was to Him alone. God's honor demands satisfaction. Man owes a perfect obedience to God's laws at all times, but he has nothing wherewith to make good his past disobedience. The justice of God requires Him to exact punishment, while the love of God seeks to spare man, His creation. Satisfaction can be rendered to God's honor and the difficulty reconciled by the voluntary sacrifice of the God-Man, who, as God, assumes human nature. This answers the question, Cur Deus-Homo? Anselm writes,

The problem is how could God forgive man's sin?... To sin is to fail to render to God His due. What is due God? Righteousness, or rectitude of will.... It is necessary, therefore, that either the honor taken away should be repaid, or punishment should be inflicted.... The satisfaction ought to be in proportion to the sin....<sup>56</sup>

It is necessary that God should fulfill His purpose respecting human nature. And this cannot be except there be a complete satisfaction made for sin: and this no sinner can make. Satisfaction cannot be made unless there be some One able to pay to God for man's sin something greater than all that is beside God.... Now nothing is greater than all that is not God, except God Himself. None therefore can make satisfaction except God.... If, then, it be necessary that the kingdom of heaven be completed by man's admission, and if man cannot be admitted unless the aforesaid satisfaction for sin be first made, and if God only can,... then necessarily one must make it who is both God and man.<sup>57</sup>

### *The Moral Influence Theory*

Abelard (1079-1142) was decidedly modern in his view of the atonement. "Like Anselm, he rejected all ransom to the devil; but he repudiated Anselm's doctrine of satisfaction no less energetically. In Abelard's view the incarnation and death of Christ are the highest expression of God's love to men, the effect of which is to awaken love in us."<sup>58</sup> This will be recognized as the origin of the contemporary liberal conception of the atonement. In the cross the sinner beholds a revela-

---

<sup>56</sup>Bettenson, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

<sup>57</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 198.

<sup>58</sup>Walker, *op. cit.*, p. 265.

tion of divine love which is designed to awaken a responsive love in the heart of men. The cross has a moral influence upon men. As they see in the crucifixion of Christ the terrible nature of their sinfulness, they are influenced to reject their sins and respond to God's love. In Abelard's conception the cross is not a punishment of sin; but rather it is God in Christ revealing His love for sinners.

### *The Merit Theory*

The Merit Theory is that conception of the atonement advocated by the Roman Catholic theologian Thomas Aquinas (1225?-1274). Aquinas developed and combined the views of Anselm and Abelard. The work of Christ involved satisfaction for man's sin, and, as Anselm taught, deserves a reward. It also moves men to responsive love. "Christ's satisfaction superabounds man's sin, and the reward which Christ cannot personally receive, since as God he needs nothing, comes to the advantage of his human brethren."<sup>59</sup> Aquinas writes in his *Summa Theologica*,

... grace was given to Christ not only as to an individual but in so much as he is the head of the Church, that is, in order that it might from him rebound to the members....

And therefore the passion of Christ was not only sufficient but a superabundant satisfaction for the sins of the human race (I John ii. 2)....<sup>60</sup>

Aquinas proposed a view of the atonement whereby Christ's superabundant merit is placed in a treasury to be dispensed by the church. Man, once redeemed, can by his own good works performed over and above the precepts and commandments add to this treasury of merit. He can do works of supererogation, the chief of which is the faithful fulfillment of the monastic life.

## The Reformation Period

The views set forth during this period were in many respects not only a synthesis of what had preceded, but more important they were

---

<sup>59</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 272.

<sup>60</sup>Bettenson, *op. cit.*, pp. 207-208.

also an expression of the views, both Biblical and liberal, which have prevailed until the present time. Whatever theory that has been advocated since that time is for the most part either a modification or affirmation of the views of the Reformers and their contemporaries.

### *The Socinian or Example Theory*

This theory was elaborated by Laelius and Faustus Socinus of Poland in the sixteenth century. "The only method of reconciliation is to better man's moral condition. This can be effected by man's own will, through repentance and reformation. The death of Christ is but the death of a noble martyr."<sup>61</sup> Walker in his book, *A History of the Christian Church*, describes the Socinian polemic. They held that "it is absolute injustice that the sins of the guilty be punished on the person of the innocent. Christ's death is a great example of the obedience which every Christian should, if necessary, manifest; but that obedience was no greater than He owed for Himself, and He could not transfer its value to others."<sup>62</sup> This is essentially the later Unitarian position on the atonement.

### *The Governmental Theory*

The Governmental Theory was set forth by the Dutch jurist, Hugo Grotius (1583-1645), who saw the death of Christ a defense of God's moral law and government. "God is a great moral ruler. Sin is an offense against His law.... Hence Christ's death was not a payment for man's sin—that is freely given—but a tribute to the sanctity of divine government.... He vindicates the majesty of His divine government."<sup>63</sup> Like an earthly monarch God may pardon all who will receive it on His terms, namely, repentance and faith. The basic objection to this theory is not that it does not contain some truth, but rather because it substitutes one subordinate aspect of the meaning of Christ's death as the chief aim and purpose; for as one writer has well noted with respect to the Governmental theory, "... the message of the Gospel is that in some true sense Christ died, not for general justice, but for me."<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup>Augustus Hopkins Strong, *Systematic Theology* (Philadelphia: The Judson Press, 1907), p. 728.

<sup>62</sup>Walker, *op. cit.*, p. 453.

<sup>63</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 456.

<sup>64</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 457.

## *The Penal Substitutionary Theory*<sup>65</sup>

The Penal Substitutionary view of the atonement, also called the Ethical View, was that conception of the atonement set forth by the Reformers, and is grounded in the Biblical view of man and God. This view as set forth by the Apostle Paul, and expressed to some degree by Athanasius and Anselm, and later by Luther and Calvin, holds that the necessity of the atonement is grounded in the fact that God is holy, and man, His creature, is unholy. "There is an ethical principle in the divine nature, which demands that sin shall be punished."<sup>66</sup> Strong writes,

Punishment is the constitutional reaction of God's being against moral evil—the self-assertion of infinite holiness against its antagonist and would-be destroyer. In God this demand is devoid of all passion, and is consistent with infinite benevolence. It is a demand that cannot be evaded, since the holiness from which it springs is unchanging. The atonement is therefore a satisfaction of the ethical demand of the divine nature, by the substitution of Christ's penal sufferings for the punishment of the guilty.<sup>67</sup>

Calvin held that Christ paid the penalty due for the sins of those on whose behalf He died and that this is the meaning of the atonement. He says, "the meaning therefore is, that God, to whom we were hateful through sin, was appeased by the death of his Son, and made propitious to us."<sup>68</sup> The penal substitutionary character of Christ's death is set forth, Calvin held, by Isaiah 53. He writes: "There is no ambiguity in Isaiah's testimony, 'He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities...'"<sup>69</sup> For had not Christ made satisfaction for man's sins, He could not be said to have appeased God by taking upon Himself the penalty which man had incurred.<sup>70</sup> The ethical nature of the

---

<sup>65</sup>The penal substitutionary view holds that the punishment due the sinner fell upon Christ as his substitute who thus suffered vicariously.

<sup>66</sup>Strong, *op. cit.*, p. 751.

<sup>67</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 752.

<sup>68</sup>John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. Henry Beveridge (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1953), I, p. 455.

<sup>69</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 456.

<sup>70</sup>*Ibid.*

penal substitutionary atonement, grounded in the holiness and righteousness of God, is stated by Calvin thus:

For God, who is perfect righteousness, cannot love the iniquity which he sees in all. All of us, therefore, have that within which deserves the hatred of God.... But if there is a perpetual and irreconcilable repugnance between righteousness and iniquity, so long as we remain sinners we cannot be completely received. Therefore, in order that all ground of offence may be removed, and he may completely reconcile us to himself, he, by means of the expiation set forth in the death of Christ, abolishes all the evil that is in us, so that we, formerly impure and unclean, now appear in his sight just and holy.<sup>71</sup>

## The Modern Period

The theories of the atonement postulated during the modern period reflect the influence of liberal theology. They are all an emphasis on the subjective element, concerned more in what happens in the individual, rather than the objective atonement of Christ and its effect upon God.

### *The Mystical Theory*

Schleiermacher, who is called "the father of modern theology," advocated a "Mystical Theory" of the atonement and rejected the penal satisfaction of Christ. He emphasized, as do the Neo-orthodox theologians, the incarnation as the means by which God achieved an atonement. The essence of religion is man's sense of God's presence within, or God-consciousness, which permeates and overcomes the worldly or lower consciousness in man. Left to himself man could not overcome this lower self; and, therefore, it is at this point that Jesus comes to his assistance. Christ is the ideal Man in whom this God-consciousness is complete; He has the power, in a mystical way, to awaken this God-consciousness in other men, and the result is transformation and salvation.

---

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 435-36.

## *The Vicarious Penitence Theory*

The theory of J. M. Campbell, the Scottish theologian, did not categorically reject penal substitution, but regarded it as deficient in that it was too legal and did not sufficiently reflect the love of God. Repentance is as necessary and adequate to satisfy justice as punishment of sin. Christ did not take man's punishment, but repented perfectly for him. Following Edwards' idea of *perfect repentance* he made this the central element in the atonement. Man was incapable of perfect repentance, which could have been accepted by God as an atonement. Christ, therefore, offered to God, in behalf of humanity, the required repentance and thus fulfilled the condition of forgiveness; it was a vicarious repentance for sins on man's behalf. This leads to the question of how the sufferings and death of Christ were related to this vicarious confession of sins. Campbell answers that Christ by His sufferings and death entered sympathetically into the Father's condemnation of sin. This concurrence constituted a perfect confession and was accepted by the Father as a perfect repentance for man.<sup>72</sup> Campbell's theory nevertheless fails to answer satisfactorily the questions, How could Christ repent for others? How could His repentance change the heart of the sinner who must indicate such a change by repentance? How, finally, could Christ, who is without sin, repent unless He could repent of sin?

## *The Vicarious Sacrificial or Bushnellian Theory*

The theory advocated by Horace Busnell in his book, *The Vicarious Sacrifice*, is simply a restatement of Abelard, Schleiermacher, Ritschl, et al, and is seen to be the old Moral Influence Theory in a new dress. Bushnell rejected the penal substitutionary atonement as "immoral." He held with the Socinians that there is no element in the divine nature which was propitiated by Christ's death; but that His death was a manifestation of God's love. Christ's death was the natural consequence of His taking human nature upon Himself. The atonement was not to satisfy divine justice, but to reveal divine love and lead sinners to repentance. Strong writes, "... Christ's sufferings," according to Bushnell, "were necessary, not in order to remove an obstacle to the pardon

---

<sup>72</sup>Louis Berkhof, *Vicarious Atonement Through Christ* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1936), pp. 30-31.

of sinners which exists in the mind of God, but in order to convince sinners that there exists no such obstacle."<sup>73</sup> Bushnell means by vicarious sacrifice, not that Christ suffered on behalf of men their penalty for sin, but simply that this death manifests God's love by His suffering in and with the sins of His creatures; it is His acceptance of the trials, griefs, and consequences which are involved in humanity. To say the least, the title of Bushnell's work, *The Vicarious Sacrifice*, is a misnomer.

### *The Nature of Atonement and its Relation to the Idea of Substitution*

The cardinal doctrine in both Old Testament and New Testament theology concerns the means and conditions of the reconciliation of sinful men unto God. The doctrine of the atonement assumes that through man's wilful transgression the natural and spiritual relation between God and man has been broken, and that the former communion can be restored only by the complete removal of sin. The means of restoration in the Old Testament was effected typically through the ritualistic system of Mosaic sacrifice. The New Testament directly relates the sufferings and sacrificial death of Jesus Christ on the cross to the Old Testament sacrificial offering for sin.

#### The Theological Meaning of the Word Atonement<sup>74</sup>

The English word "Atonement," translating the Hebrew word כִּפָּר, which means "to cover" by making propitiation, was popularized by the English versions. The older term, which was used to translate the Hebrew and Greek, was "Satisfaction," in use since the days of Anselm and always used by the Reformers in their creeds and classical theological writings. The word "atonement," which does not correspond etymologically to, nor convey the exact meaning of, the Hebrew word, is used many times in the Old Testament versions to translate the Hebrew כִּפָּר, "to cover," but it appears but once in the English New Testament (Romans 5:11), where it is equivalent to the Greek word καταλλαγή, "reconciliation."<sup>75</sup> Thus the English word intends to reflect

---

<sup>73</sup>Strong, *op. cit.*, p. 733.

<sup>74</sup>Cf. p. 300ff. for further discussion of the Hebrew term in its meaning and usage.

<sup>75</sup>The English word "atonement" is said to be derived from the phrase "at one," and signifies theologically the restoration of the broken relationship that had existed between God and the sinner. He is now "at one" or "reconciled" with God.

the two-fold connotation of that sin-covering work by which reconciliation was effected. As Dr. A. A. Hodge notes,

When we say that we have "received the atonement," we mean that we have been reconciled to God. But when it is said that Christ, after the analogy of the ancient sacrifices, has "made atonement for us," it means that he has done that which secures our reconciliation....<sup>76</sup>

In the Old Testament, therefore, the fundamental Hebrew word for atonement means "to cover"; sin is thus removed or atoned for by covering it from the sight of God, and reconciliation is thereby effected. In theology the word atonement is commonly used to denote the sacrificial work of Christ foreshadowed by the Old Testament Levitical types. It is that satisfaction to the law and justice of God for the sins of men, which, as the one great High Priest, He made by His own obedience unto death, and on the ground of which men are saved.<sup>77</sup> Atonement, therefore, is the ground and means of redemption; that is to say, redemption or reconciliation is the purpose and result of atonement. Redemption consists of two aspects; the one legal, the other moral. It is legal in that the vicarious sufferings and death of Christ were to meet the demands of justice against sinners; it is moral in its application in which the regenerating work of the Holy Spirit renews the nature and transforms it into the divine image.<sup>78</sup>

### The Subject and Object of Atonement

The Hebrew word, כִּפָּר, rendered atone, meaning properly "to cover," has a two-fold reference. *The object* of atonement in its Old Testament usage is the *sin*. "... thine iniquity is taken away, and thy sin is covered [תִּכַּפֶּר]."<sup>79</sup> The psalmist writes, "But he, being merciful, covered [יִכַּפֵּר] their iniquity, and destroyed them not...."<sup>80</sup> Thus the immediate effect of the covering or atonement is upon the sin itself; the sin is

---

<sup>76</sup>A. A. Hodge, *The Atonement* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1867), p. 33.

<sup>77</sup>R. A. Torrey, *The New Topical Text Book* (Rev. ed.; New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1935), p. 309.

<sup>78</sup>Ibid.

<sup>79</sup>Isaiah 6:7.

<sup>80</sup>Psalm 78:38.

covered and withdrawn from the sight of God. Similar ideas are expressed by such statements as that in Micah 7:19, "... and thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of the sea," and in Isaiah 38:17, "... for thou hast cast all my sins behind thy back."

In other passages the object of the atonement, while ultimately still the sins of the offender, is said to be the *nephesh* or life of the person. The most familiar passage which designates the *nephesh* as the object covered by the blood of sacrifice is Leviticus 17:11, "For the life of the flesh is in the blood; I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement [לְכַפֵּר] for your souls...."

The *subject* of atonement is usually God Himself—it is He who covers the sin.<sup>81</sup> The psalmist writes, "... as for our transgressions, thou wilt forgive [תְּכַפֵּר] them."<sup>82</sup> Micah declares, "Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity...?"<sup>83</sup> The most significant passage which sets forth the general idea that the atoning or covering of sin must proceed from the Lord Himself is that of Isaiah 6, where the sin and iniquity of the Prophet is removed by a messenger sent from the Divine Presence.

Then flew one of the seraphim unto me, having a live coal in his hand, which he had taken with tongs from off the altar: and he touched my mouth with it, and said, Lo, this hath touched thy lips; and thine iniquity is taken away, and thy sin forgiven.<sup>84</sup>

But God is also the *object* of the atonement. Not only does He render the atonement possible, but it is He who must also be propitiated. It is not simply man's sin which needs to be covered, and is, therefore, the object of the atoning blood; but the judicial wrath of God against sin must also be satisfied. The effect of the sacrifice is to remove the guilt of sin and to propitiate the judicial disfavor of God. God as both subject and object of the atonement is clearly expressed by the

---

<sup>81</sup>The subject of atonement is, in the ultimate sense, always God; but apart from the divine institution of Levitical sacrifice, there are to be noted those instances of human intercession by Moses, the prophets, etc., which intercession provided an atonement on Israel's behalf.

<sup>82</sup>Psalms 65:3 (65:4 in the Hebrew).

<sup>83</sup>Micah 7:18.

<sup>84</sup>Isaiah 6:6-7.

Apostle who writes, "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God sent forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood...."<sup>85</sup>

## The Relation of Atonement to the Idea of Substitution

While it has become popular in liberal circles to speak of the significance of the death of Christ as "constraining love" in which God demonstrates at the Cross "a perfect, complete, and sinless love which reveals the enormity of man's sin and demonstrates how far God is willing to go to win estranged sons back into communion with Himself,"<sup>86</sup> yet such a limited view of the atonement in no sense reveals either the *enormity* of man's sin or the divine problem of the removal of that sin. Any view of the atonement that fails to take into consideration the penal substitutionary nature of His death emasculates itself, and ignores the inseparable gulf that stands between a holy God and unrighteous man.

The divine problem of the justification of the sinner is a moral and ethical problem with three aspects: (1) the sinful character of all men (Romans 3:10); (2) the unrelenting nature of the moral law (Romans 2:12-13); (3) and the holy and righteous character of God (Habakkuk 1:13). The divine solution to this problem of how God could justify the ungodly, as the Scriptures show, could not be based upon man's character (Psalm 130:3); his observance of the law (Romans 3:20); any religious rites or ceremonies performed (Romans 4:9-11); nor on the basis of God's love for man, because love that winks at sin is not true love; but it was based upon the blood of the penal substitutionary atonement of Jesus Christ, His Son (Romans 5:8-9).<sup>87</sup> Just a cursory reading of Romans 5:1-12 will reveal these three truths: (1) that man is under the penalty of death because of sin; (2) the *wrath* of God abides upon the sinner who is viewed as an enemy by God; and (3) that reconciliation has been effected on behalf of sinners by the substitutionary atonement of Christ (ὐπὲρ - "on behalf of"). The Scriptures always view sinful man as estranged from God and under His wrath and condemna-

---

<sup>85</sup>Romans 3:25.

<sup>86</sup>Madeleine S. Miller and J. Lane Miller, *Harper's Bible Dictionary* (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1952), p. 52.

<sup>87</sup>Alva J. McClain, "The Doctrine of Salvation" (mimeographed notes, Christian Theology, Grace Theological Seminary, Winona Lake, Ind., 1960), pp. 43-4.

tion (contrary to the popular view), and reconciliation effected through vicarious or substitutionary sacrifice. Dr. Alva J. McClain in his treatment of the doctrine of Justification states that,

God justifies the believing sinner on the basis of that satisfaction rendered fully to the Divine moral law by God's own Son when He died for our sins in our stead upon the cross.<sup>88</sup>

A sacrifice, whether it be the animal type of Old Testament Levitical law, or the Antitype, the Lamb of God, which disregards the vicarious or substitutionary conception, disregards also, as a logical necessity, the reality of man's sinfulness and his estrangement from God. Conversely, to admit man's sinful and fallen condition, and the impossibility of his personal satisfaction of the demands of the law of God, is to concede that if these demands are met, it will of necessity be at the hands of some qualified person *on his behalf* and *in his stead*. This is the meaning of the substitutionary atonement. Anything less than penal substitution dishonors the righteous Law of God and renders *meaningless the entire Old Testament system of sacrifice*. For, in fact, the very basis of the Mosaic sacrificial offerings was rooted and grounded in the concept of substitution and vicarious atonement. In the very first chapter of Leviticus God commands, concerning the burnt-offering, that the man who offers the victim

... shall lay his hand upon the head of the burnt offering; and *it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him.*<sup>89</sup>

Hence, to deny the clear implication of substitution in such a passage is to reduce the language of the Scriptures to meaningless neologisms. That the conception of substitution and atonement is basically inherent in all the Mosaic sacrifices is to be seen from the fact that the preceding statement, "and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him," is made by God with reference to the burnt-offering which was neither a sin-offering nor a compulsory sacrifice, but on the contrary was a voluntary offering signifying one's complete devotion and consecration to God. The implication is two-fold: first, that *atone-*

---

<sup>88</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 44.

<sup>89</sup>Leviticus 1:4. All italics which appear in the Scripture quotations throughout this dissertation are mine.

*ment for sin* must be realized (seen in the sprinkling of the victim's blood upon the altar) before one could approach God with any kind of gift or offering; second, the sacrifice, always an unblemished, innocent victim, impressed upon the offerer's consciousness the need of substitution.

### *The Old Testament Doctrine of Man's Need for Atonement*

For a proper understanding of the idea of substitution in Old Testament thought the question of man's need for atonement must be examined. Such an inquiry involves such aspects as the nature of man, sin, and the moral and ethical nature of God.

### The Idea and Nature of Man in the Old Testament

The religion of Israel was theocentric rather than anthropocentric. As revelation the Old Testament is a revelation of God and His relationship to His creation. But since it is a revelation of Himself in His relationship to man, it places a particular emphasis upon man himself and gives to him a special place of spiritual value and dignity—he is created in the image and likeness of God. Nevertheless, the Old Testament portrays man with a vivid realism. His first moral testing resulted in failure; in jealous rage Cain slew his brother; man's wickedness compelled his destruction by a flood; the deep-seated rebelliousness of his nature broke forth anew at Babel; disbelief and rebellion characterized the attitude of the newly created nation toward their God in the wilderness; multiplied sin, transgression, apostasy and idolatry finally culminated in exile for Israel and judgment upon the surrounding nations.

### *The Psychology of the Hebrews*

Old Testament anthropology saw man as consisting of three elements—body, *nephesh* (soul), and spirit, though more popularly conceived as body and *nephesh*.

### The Nature of the *Nephesh*, נֶפֶשׁ

The *nephesh* is identified with the blood in some Old Testament passages. As the shedding of blood caused death, hence the life was in the blood; and the *nephesh* in a symbolic sense was identified with

it. "For the life [*nephesh*] of the flesh is in the blood...."<sup>90</sup> "But the flesh with its life [*nephesh*] which is the blood, ye shall not eat."<sup>91</sup> Likewise blood unjustly spilt on the earth cried unto heaven for vengeance (Genesis 4:10).<sup>92</sup>

The *nephesh* is conceived of as the seat of feeling, emotion, desire, and intelligence, and is identified with the *personality*. Not only are purely physical functions attributed to the *nephesh*, such as hunger (Proverbs 10:30), thirst (Proverbs 25:25), sexual desire (Jeremiah 2:24), but also physical affections, such as love (Isaiah 42:1), joy (Psalm 86:4), fear (Isaiah 15:5), trust (Psalm 57:1), hate (Isaiah 1:14), and contempt (Ezekiel 36:5). Wish and desire were also ascribed to man's *nephesh* (Genesis 23:8; II Kings 9:15; I Chronicles 28:9); and very rarely, memory (Lamentations 3:20; Deuteronomy 4:9) and knowledge (Psalm 139:14). As the seat of these factors, the *nephesh* becomes a synonym for the *individual conscious life*. Thus "my *nephesh*," בְּנַפְשִׁי is the synonym for "I," "thy *nephesh*" for "thou" (Lamentations 3:24; Isaiah 51:23; Psalm 25:13; 124:7). Sixteen *nepheshim* mean sixteen persons in Genesis 46:18, etc. "My spirit" רוּחִי was never so used in Hebrew thought.<sup>93</sup> The *nephesh* is the man, "... man became a living being [נַפְשׁ חַיָּה]"<sup>94</sup>

### The Nephesh at Death

The *nephesh* leaves the body at death, "And it came to pass, as her soul was in departing (for she died) that she called his name Benoni, but his father called him Benjamin."<sup>95</sup> In a certain sense, in some cases after outward death, the *nephesh* was regarded as still in or near the body, for a dead person is called a "*nephesh*." "And there were certain men, who were defiled by the dead body [נִפְשׁוֹ] of a man...."<sup>96</sup> This would have been better translated: "defiled by the dead man." At other

---

<sup>90</sup>Leviticus 17:11.

<sup>91</sup>Genesis 9:4.

<sup>92</sup>Charles, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

<sup>93</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 37-8.

<sup>94</sup>Genesis 2:7.

<sup>95</sup>Genesis 35:18; cf. I Kings 17:21; II Samuel 1:9; Jonah 4:3.

<sup>96</sup>Numbers 9:6; cf. Leviticus 19:28; 21:1; 22:4; Numbers 9:7,10, Haggai 2:13.

times the dead person is referred to as [נְפֹשׁ מֵת] (Numbers 6:6; Leviticus 21:11).<sup>97</sup>

### The State of the *Nephesh* after Death

In Sheol the departed possess a certain degree of knowledge and power with reference to the living and their affairs. There is self-consciousness and speech (Isaiah 14); they possess knowledge, hence their name "the knowing ones" (familiar spirits), הַיִּדְעָנִים (Leviticus 19:31; 20:6; Isaiah 19:3). Poetically, there is acquaintance with and concern about the affairs and fortunes of their living descendants; thus Rachel mourns from her grave for her captive children (Jeremiah 31:15). The deceased prophets could still forecast the future for Israel (I Samuel 27:13-20).<sup>98</sup> However, consulting the dead, making cuttings in the flesh, and cutting the hair and beard with respect to the dead were strictly forbidden by God as heathen customs.

In some sense the distinctive characteristics of this life are carried over into Sheol. The prophet was distinguished by his mantle (I Samuel 28:14); kings by their crowns and thrones (Isaiah 14); the Gentiles because they were still uncircumcised (Ezekiel 32). Each nation preserved its individuality (Ezekiel 32); those slain by the sword bore the tokens of such a violent death in Sheol (Ezekiel 32:25); as also those who died from grief (Genesis 42:38).<sup>99</sup>

### The Concept of the Spirit, רוּחַ

The account of creation in Genesis 2:7 indicates that the material body when animated by the spirit became a "living being," נְפֹשׁ חַיָּה. This was accomplished by the divine spiritual inbreathing, the "breath of life," נְשַׁמַּת חַיִּים. The "breath of life" described here is called, however, the "spirit of life," רוּחַ חַיִּים, in Genesis 6:17, 7:15. Thus the "spirit of life" is found in both man and animal creation in these passages, and termed "the breath of the spirit of life" נְשַׁמַּת רוּחַ חַיִּים, in Genesis 7:22. However, this is the spirit of life as conceived in an impersonal sense. It is not to be equated with the personal spiritual nature of man who was

---

<sup>97</sup>Charles, *op. cit.*, pp. 38-9.

<sup>98</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 40.

<sup>99</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 40-41.

created in the image and likeness of God as a result of the divine in-breathing (Genesis 1:27; 2:7).

According to R. H. Charles the *nephesh* is the result of the indwelling of the spirit in the material body; and thus in early Hebrew thought so long as the spirit is present the *nephesh* is a living *nephesh*, but when the spirit is withdrawn, the vitality of the *nephesh* is destroyed and it becomes the *nephesh* of a dead man. According to this view the annihilation of the *nephesh* ensues inevitably at death, that is, when the spirit is withdrawn. However, he bases this "early" view on "late" passages, such as Ecclesiastes 12:7 and Proverbs 15:11, where the synonym for Sheol is Abaddon, or destruction.<sup>100</sup> The view that the *nephesh* is the result of the indwelling of the spirit in the material body does not imply or necessitate the conclusion that at the death of the body the *nephesh* has no independent existence of its own. For in death the same God who animated the body by giving it spiritual life can sustain that same life beyond the grave. If man's *nephesh* is spiritual there is no logical necessity which requires a separation of the *nephesh* and its spiritual life simply because they have separated from the material and perishable body at death. Charles seems to overlook the fact that both *nephesh* and spirit are from God and can be sustained by God even after death, when he writes that the spirit

... is the impersonal basis of life coming from God, returning on death to God. [The *nephesh*], which is the personal factor in man, is simply the supreme function of the quickened body, and perishes on the withdrawal of the spirit.<sup>101</sup>

Charles holds that the primitive Hebrew equated the spirit with the *nephesh* and believed man was a dichotomy rather than the later view that he was a trichotomy. The *nephesh* and spirit were the same and were synonymous in their primitive signification as "breath," or "wind," רֵיחַ. The conception was derived by way of observation. When the breath (*nephesh* or *ruach*) left the body, death was the result. Thus the life principle was identified with the breath, or *nephesh*, or spirit. But here Charles misunderstands the Hebrew psychology. The Hebrew was graphic in his thought patterns, and he liked to describe what he

---

<sup>100</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 42.

<sup>101</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 44.

saw *by the language of appearance*, personification, metaphor, and the like. Thus it was customary to speak of a locust's plague as an invasion of horsemen because of their similarity of appearance and flight (cf. Joel 2); Egypt is called a crocodile (Ezekiel 29); God thundered on Mount Sinai when He spoke; the heavens are stretched out like a curtain (Psalm 104); the sun rises and sets; the sea roars (Psalm 98); the heavens rejoice, the fields and the trees are joyful (Psalm 96); the bowels were the seat of emotion and compassion; the prophets were shepherds, the people sheep; the righteous man is like a tree planted by the rivers of water; the heart was the center of intellectual activity; the blood was the life; Canaan was a land of milk and honey; the horn of the beast was synonymous with strength; the heathen were simply the uncircumcised; a man who touched a dead body was unclean; to depend on the "arm of the flesh" was a sign of faithlessness; the entire sacrificial system was a language of types, etc. One could multiply these examples of how the Hebrew spoke by the language of appearance, type, metaphor, simile, allegory, poetry, personification, description, and the like.

Hence, the careful student of the Old Testament would hesitate to assert dogmatically that the Hebrew, because he made certain graphic statements, or used the language of appearance in describing what he observed, was necessarily to be taken literally always, or that he was expressing his theological conclusions! Even the modern-day theologian would not allow this of his own writings and speech. Therefore, there is no basis of fact for asserting that the early Hebrew conceived of the *nephesh* or spirit simply as the "breath," and that when this left the body it ceased to have any further existence, or went back to God who gave it. The Hebrew often described what he saw in the language of appearance, but this cannot be used to reconstruct his theological beliefs; and with regard to this particular concept, it does not even have the support of Biblical usage.

The function and nature of the spirit in the Old Testament is variously portrayed. Thus anger is an expression of the *ruach* in Judges 8:3, "their anger [*ruach*] was abated." So long as man was in control of his physical powers, he still possessed his *ruach*; but when lost in amazement, as the queen of Sheba (I Kings 10:5), or in despair (Joshua 2:11), or in a faint (I Samuel 30:12), his spirit, or *ruach*, left him, and on reviving it returned (Genesis 45:27; Judges 15:19). In this concep-

tion of man's spirit, it is said to be the subject of trouble (Genesis 41:80); anguish (Job, 7:11) grief (Genesis 26:35; Isaiah 54:6); contrition (Psalm 51:17; Isaiah 66:2); and heaviness (Isaiah 61:3). There is the haughty spirit (Proverbs 16:18), the lowly spirit (Proverbs 29:23), and the impatient spirit (Proverbs 14:29). The *ruach*, often very abstract in function, is the seat of the highest spiritual functions in man.<sup>102</sup> This concept of the *nephesh* and spirit lays the foundation for the most unique metaphysical concept in Hebrew thought—man in the Image of God, **צֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים**

### *Man in the Image of God*

Creation in the in the image of God, **צֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים**, is ascribed to no other creature, and only man has a nature that resembles the nature of God. Man was given this nature because it was called for by the divine purpose for him. Since this purpose included fellowship with his Creator, they must bear some resemblance to each other. Sin is an interruption of this fellowship and a marring of the image, so that man stands in need of restoration to his former state of fellowship. The nature of man in the Old Testament is seen to be personal, moral, ethical, spiritual, and rational. Since he is created in the image of God and for fellowship with God, man is also a religious person. "Without doubt the Old Testament's description of man as a religious person is its most conspicuous testimony about man."<sup>103</sup> It means that man is capable of entering into a spiritual relationship with God. Further, "man as a religious being is dependent upon God, from whom he received his life, and through whom he has hope of salvation."<sup>104</sup> "As the hart panteth after the water brooks, So panteth my soul after thee, O God. My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God..."<sup>105</sup>

As noted previously, the spirit, **רוּחַ**, is that element in human nature which is most closely related to the nature of God. "This term suggests more than any other the content and meaning of the phrase 'in the image of God' (Genesis 1:27)."<sup>106</sup> The *ruach* in man, or the **צֶלֶם**

---

<sup>102</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 45-6.

<sup>103</sup>Otto J. Baab, *The Theology of the Old Testament* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1949), p. 78.

<sup>104</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>105</sup>Psalm 42:1-2.

<sup>106</sup>Baab, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

אֱלֹהִים, is his capacity for communion and fellowship with God. The image of God connotes a special sacredness of personality affirmed by the psalmist who declares,

What is man, that thou art mindful of him?  
And the son of man, that thou visitest him?  
For thou hast made him but little lower than God,  
And crownest him with glory and honor.  
Thou makest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands;  
Thou hast put all things under his feet.<sup>107</sup>

### *Man as a Sinner*

The Old Testament portrays man as having a great dignity conferred upon him—he was created in the image of God; but there is another side to man's nature vividly and realistically portrayed in the Old Testament also—man is a sinner, and as such, is in need of salvation. It is generally admitted by scholars of every persuasion that the basis, according to Mosaic revelation, for the institution of the Levitical sacrificial system was the presence of sin in the world resulting in a separation between God and man His creature. To be sure, the harmony of agreement terminates here, for there is no unanimity of belief as to the origin of man, sacrifice, or sin; and Mosaic revelation itself is variously affirmed and denied. But with respect to the Old Testament account itself, it bears an unequivocal witness, as conservative scholarship contends, to the view that sacrificial and vicarious atonement finds its *meaning and origin in man's need as a sinner*.

Old Testament theology uses various terms to describe that aspect of man's being which distinguishes him from all other creatures; but it delineates him basically as the only creature in the world-order who is not only moral and spiritual, but because of this also free and responsible within the limits of his creatureliness. "Man *is* what God has made him; but Man has also *become* what he has made himself: Man is God's creature—but, in refusing to accept this, Man has re-

---

<sup>107</sup>Psalm 8:4-6.

belled against his Maker and now finds himself estranged from the Source of his own life—Man has become a Sinner!"<sup>108</sup>

Louis Berkhof, writing with reference to the origin, universality, nature, and consequences of sin, observes that sin has a voluntary origin in the human race on the one hand, and on the other, is not merely to be regarded as an imperfection of human nature, but sin is held to be a positive transgression of the *Law*.<sup>109</sup> Man is what God has made him, moral and free; but Man is also what he has become by a wilful departure from God. "Leibnitz views sin as something that is unavoidable, since it is the inevitable result of the limitation of finite beings. Hegel looks upon it as something... marking a necessary step in man's transition from a state of innocence to a state of virtue."<sup>110</sup> Such reasoning is in harmony with the theory of moral and physical evolution, which views sin as "a stumble upwards" in man's development. It is patent, therefore, that any theory of sin which views it as a *necessary* aspect of Man's moral development is not only a *deceptio visus* in the realm of liberal theology, but also nullifies the Biblical doctrine of atonement and renders it unnecessary.

Sin in the Old Testament, however, is not merely something negative, as an imperfection of humanity, but a positive transgression of God's law which renders man liable to the penal consequences. "In opposition to modern theology it should be maintained that sin is guilt in the specific sense of the word, as *liability to legal punishment*. It can be removed only by bearing the penalty which the law has affixed to sin."<sup>111</sup> This is not to minimize the fact that sin is also pollution affecting the whole man; but as it respects his relationship to God it involves guilt and liability to punishment—it is in a word, a transgression of God's commands for obedience. In spite of modern attempts to divest sin of all forensic or legal significance, nevertheless it places the offender under the judicial sentence of absolute condemnation. Sin, in liberal theology, is not so serious. Nels Ferré, as a representative example of "skimmed-milk theology," asserts that total evil is impossible

---

<sup>108</sup>W. E. Ward, "The Doctrine of Man" (mimeographed notes, Christian Theology, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, 1958), p. 4.

<sup>109</sup>Berkhof, *op. cit.*, pp. 36, 38.

<sup>110</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 36-7.

<sup>111</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 38, 40.

for any creature. "Man is perverted, partially depraved, or, in truer perspective, an immature child, dominantly selfish, yet deep down bored with his self-seeking and yearning for fellowship."<sup>112</sup> Ferré subtly argues that since finite man cannot sin infinitely, then penal punishment in an eternal Hell is quite out of the question, and is inconsistent with God's love and justice. Man is inherently good; and while he is free, yet he does not have the freedom to remain eternally alienated from his Creator. In a word, universal salvation is a logical necessity in Ferré's theological system. Hell is simply heaven temporarily rejected. "Heaven cannot be heaven until it has emptied hell. In the Ferré rigorism, no saint can enter heaven until all sinners are redeemed. To say the least, this postpones things a bit."<sup>113</sup> Liberalism discloses its effeminacy and amounts to little more than religious prudence in its surrender of belief in the tragedy of sin and expectation of judgment.

There can be no doubt, however, that according to the clear teachings of Scripture sin is serious and brings man under an eternal sentence of condemnation, makes him an object of the judicial wrath of God and liable to divine punishment. The relationship between man and God which sin has effected is one of categorical alienation; for men are, declares the Apostle, "... by nature children of wrath,..."<sup>114</sup> And God solemnly declares, "... I will not justify the wicked,"<sup>115</sup> nor "... will by no means clear the guilty...."<sup>116</sup>

## The Nature of Sin and Guilt in the Old Testament

The fundamental idea of sin in the Old Testament is that of rebellion against God, and in the language of the prophets this is disobedience to the moral requirements of God. Isaiah cries:

Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth; for Jehovah hath spoken:  
I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled  
against me.

---

<sup>112</sup>David Wesley Soper, *Major Voices in American Theology* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953), p. 94.

<sup>113</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 92.

<sup>114</sup>Ephesians 2:3.

<sup>115</sup>Exodus 23:7.

<sup>116</sup>Exodus 34:7.

How is the faithful city become a harlot! she that was full of justice!  
righteousness lodged in her, but now murderers.<sup>117</sup>

### *The Hebrew Concept of Sin*

The concept of sin in Hebrew thought falls into four classes according to the principle words and their usage. The four classes are expressed primarily by the Hebrew words: חָטָא, "to miss, to sin"; רָשָׁע, "to be wicked"; אָשָׁם, "to be guilty"; and פָּשַׁע, "to rebel." The term חָטָא<sup>118</sup> is the common word for sin in the Old Testament and its literal meaning is "to miss the mark or goal," and answers to the Greek ἀμαρτάνω. It signifies *the failure or falling short of the goal or standard intended by God*, and includes wrong done toward either God, man, or oneself.<sup>119</sup> The term רָשָׁע, "to be wicked," emphasizes *the inner character of the sinner*. The רָשָׁע, wicked, are often contrasted with the צַדִּיק, the righteous.<sup>120</sup> The term usually denotes one who is guilty of crime or disobedience and deserving punishment; the cause of his sin being his wicked character or nature.<sup>121</sup> The wicked persistently pervert justice and are condemned before the law.<sup>122</sup> The term used to denote *the status of the sinner before the law* is אָשָׁם, "to be guilty." The term signifies guilt and liability to punishment through transgression of the law. The word is legal in character and designates the forensic status or condition of the transgressor before the Mosaic law.

The fourth term פָּשַׁע, "to rebel," denotes sin in its *dynamic essence or inward nature*. It signifies revolt against and rejection of all authority and is generally translated "transgression." In secular usage the word is employed to describe the wilful breaking of a peaceful relationship or covenant, as when Israel rebelled against the house of David because of Rehoboam's despotic attitude (I Kings 12:19). In religious and theological usage it describes the most significant concept of sin in the Old Testament. Since Hebrew thought considered the Law of

---

<sup>117</sup>Isaiah 1:2, 21.

<sup>118</sup>The word חָטָא is used in its original meaning "to miss" in Judges 20:16.

<sup>119</sup>Isaiah 42:24; I Samuel 26:21; Proverbs 8:36.

<sup>120</sup>Deuteronomy 25:1.

<sup>121</sup>Included in this concept עָוֹן, "to commit iniquity." The noun, "iniquity, guilt," is עָוֹן more frequent. Etymologically the root meaning is seen in the verb, "to bend, curve, twist," and signifies the perverseness and internal depravation of the sinner.

<sup>122</sup>Deuteronomy 25:2; Isaiah 48:22.

God to be the revelation of His entire will for man, sin was not simply a matter of error of judgment or missing the mark. It was an unfilial act of defiance to a loving, gracious Father; in short, it was rebellion against the revealed will of God.<sup>123</sup> Therefore,  $\text{מִשְׁפָּח}$  is *rebellion against God* rather than simply transgression of the law. It signifies open defiance and self-assertion against the will of God. It is sin in its most tragic and apostate sense. It is personal, self-willed, conscious defiance of the divine will and authority. It is the cardinal term used by the prophets to describe the attitude of Israel toward God: "Thy first father sinned, and thy teachers have rebelled against me";<sup>124</sup> "... I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me";<sup>125</sup> "wherefore will ye contend with me? ye all have rebelled against me, saith Jehovah."<sup>126</sup>

Sin, then, in the Old Testament is (1) a deviation from the right way; (2) it describes the inner character of man and is seen as an intrinsic evil; (3) it is an act which constitutes the sinner as guilty before the law; and (4) it is personal, wilful rebellion against divine will and authority—it is, in a word, that which alienates man from God and brings down upon him judgment, and issues in eternal separation and punishment.

### *The Hebrew Concept of Guilt*

Guilt in the Old Testament is a reality and is expressed by the verb  $\text{חָשַׁח}$ , "to be guilty, offend, trespass," and by the noun  $\text{חַטָּאת}$ , "guilt or offense," and the adjective  $\text{חַשְׁשָׁן}$ , "guilty." "The Hebrews have no other word to signify guilt or guilty but  $\text{חָשַׁח}$ ; and this they use both for *sin*, the *guilt* of it, and the *punishment* due unto it, and a *sacrifice* for it."<sup>127</sup>

According to Girdlestone, "an examination of all the passages in which the word occurs leads to the conclusion that Asham is used where sin, moral or ceremonial, has been committed through error,

---

<sup>123</sup>Morton Scott Enslin, *Christian Beginnings* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1938), p. 103.

<sup>124</sup>Isaiah 43:27.

<sup>125</sup>Isaiah 1:2.

<sup>126</sup>Jeremiah 2:29.

<sup>127</sup>John Owen, *Justification by Faith* (Evansville: Sovereign Grace Publishers, 1959), p. 197.

negligence, or ignorance."<sup>128</sup> But this assertion cannot stand in view of the fact that חַטָּאת not only had respect to sins of ignorance, but also to cases of actual defrauding, breaches of trust, finding a lost object and denying it to its rightful owner, robbery, oppression, etc., as set forth in Leviticus 6. Hence, the nature of the guilt could be either conscious or unconscious. While the term refers generally, however, to unintentional or unpremeditated trespasses, yet it cannot be limited to mere inadvertence; it extends to sins of infirmity and rashness, although not to sins בְּיָד רַפְּיָה, "with a high hand." Since חַטָּאת is likewise the Hebrew word for the "trespass-offering," then, when the offending Israelite saw his guilt, he was to acknowledge himself חַטָּאת and offer an חַטָּאת, trespass (guilt) offering for his infraction.

The verb חָטָא, "to miss, or sin," which is the general Old Testament word for sin, is to be distinguished from חַטָּאת, "to be guilty, or to trespass." Interpreters have based the distinction between sin and trespass on various concepts. It has been advocated that חָטָא denotes sins of commission, whereas חַטָּאת denotes sins of omission; but this view is obviously at variance with the usage of these terms. Others hold that the sin-offering served to avert punishment, and the trespass-offering to appease the conscience, or that חָטָא refers to those sins which had come to the knowledge of others, whereas the trespasses to which חַטָּאת had reference were such as the transgressor himself was conscious of. But the solution to the problem of the distinction between the two terms, sin and trespass, is quite readily resolved by noting the distinction made in the Levitical law between the חַטָּאת sin-offering and the sins it covered, and the חַטָּאת trespass-offering and the offenses covered by it.

An examination of the passages will indicate that the sin-offering חַטָּאת covers sin in general, of all degrees, whereas the trespass-offering always refers to certain concrete cases, and always involves trespasses on the rights of God or man in respect to ownership that could be estimated and covered by compensation. The sin-offering would, therefore, cover sins in general, and could atone for a variety of sins committed over a period, as is implied in the sin-offering for an entire year made on the Day of Atonement, and by the sin-offerings made

---

<sup>128</sup>Robert Baker Girdlestone, *Synonyms of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., [n.d.], a reproduction of 1897 edition) , p. 84.

on festive occasions. The trespass-offering, on the other hand, never applied to sins of a general nature, but the trespasses for which this sacrifice was made are quite specifically enumerated in the Levitical law; and as further evidence the trespass-offering was never made on festive occasions, nor on the Day of Atonement.<sup>129</sup>

The relation of guilt to sin is seen in God's declaration in Numbers 14:18 that "... He will by no means clear the guilty, visiting the iniquity of fathers upon children...."<sup>130</sup> Guilt is the condition before God of that individual or community which comes as a result of sin—of some violation of His laws and commandments. This truth is illustrated in various passages in the Old Testament. In Deuteronomy 5:11 Moses declared: "... Jehovah will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain." The law of the sin-offering had respect to guilt: "And if any one of the common people sin in doing any of the things which Jehovah hath commanded not to be done, and be guilty;... then he shall bring his oblation...."<sup>131</sup> Again the law states: "And it shall be, when he shall be guilty in one of these things, that he shall confess that wherein he hath sinned."<sup>132</sup> There was no sacrifice to atone for the guilt of murder: "Moreover ye shall take no ransom for the life of a murderer, that is guilty of death; but he shall surely be put to death."<sup>133</sup> And the psalmist writes: "... they that hate the righteous shall be held guilty."<sup>134</sup>

The Old Testament emphasizes both individual and collective guilt. The fall of Adam emphasized the guilt of the individual, seen in the curses pronounced upon the three individuals involved (Genesis 3); but the Flood and the tower of Babel incident, which were the later consequences, gave evidence of the reality of collective guilt. The Apostle Paul recognizes the existence of collective or racial guilt in Romans 5, where Adam is seen as the race representative, whose posterity in him at the moment of his disobedience and fall were made sinful by nature, and guilty in consequence of their natural state.<sup>135</sup> The

---

<sup>129</sup>Benjamin Hamilton, "The Place of the Trespass Offering in God's Plan of Redemption" (unpublished Master's Thesis, Grace Theological Seminary, 1952), p. 50.

<sup>130</sup>Cf. also Exodus 34:7; Nahum 1:3.

<sup>131</sup>Leviticus 4:27-28.

<sup>132</sup>Leviticus 5:6.

<sup>133</sup>Numbers 35:31.

<sup>134</sup>Psalm 34:21.

<sup>135</sup>Romans 5:12, 15, 17, 19.

history of sacrifice and priesthood is evidence of this universal sense of guilt. The teaching of the prophets that the Exile represented national punishment for national sin gives evidence that the guilt was collective, since it does not except the children.<sup>136</sup>

When the Lord declared, therefore, that He "... will by no means clear the guilty...," He set forth the terrible nature of sin and disobedience illustrated by the statement which follows this, "... visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, upon the third and fourth generation."<sup>137</sup> Yet, there is another aspect of God's relationship toward men, for it is said that "Jehovah is slow to anger, and abundant in loving-kindness, forgiving iniquity and transgression...."<sup>138</sup> These two views of His attitude toward man imply that although God is ready to forgive iniquity, He by no means ignores or disregards it. The sinner is regarded as אשׁלם, guilty, before God until the revealed means of removing guilt is appealed to. The various forms of guilt are to be expiated, when in humble repentance they are symbolically laid upon the head of an innocent substitute, who by the vicarious shedding of blood makes atonement for the sins. Guilt in the Old Testament always signifies the relation of the sin with respect to its punishment; i.e., there is no guilt of sin, but in relation to punishment. Therefore Christ became אשׁלם, legally guilty, and a debtor on behalf of sinners with respect to their punishment.<sup>139</sup> It is not without significance, therefore, that the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53, whose office it was to take upon Himself the legal guilt and the punishment for the iniquities of others, is said to have offered His soul as an אשׁלם, a guilt or trespass-offering.

Finally then, with respect to the relation between guilt and the idea of substitution it is seen that the term guilty is commonly employed both in the sense of *blameworthiness* and *legal answerableness*.<sup>140</sup> It is used in both senses when applied with respect to the *actual transgressor*, but only in the latter sense, and by no means the former, when used with respect to the *representative* or *substitute* who bears the guilt of the sinner.

---

<sup>136</sup>Jeremiah 9:1-22; Ezekiel 21, etc.

<sup>137</sup>Numbers 14:18.

<sup>138</sup>Numbers 14:18.

<sup>139</sup>Owen, *op. cit.*, p. 199.

<sup>140</sup>John Pye Smith, *Four Discourses on the Sacrifice and Priesthood of Jesus Christ* (Edinburgh: William Oliphant and Co., 1859), p. 260.

## The Moral Necessity of Substitutionary Atonement

There are but four Divine attitudes possible toward sin—ignorance, indifference, consent or condemnation. It is evident that by moral necessity the latter represents God's attitude toward sin. But how was condemnation to be expressed? In two ways it was possible—through precept and through penalty. When the first fails, the second alone remains. In the Old Testament, God condemned sin by precept *universally* in the conscience, and specifically through the command to Adam, and through the Mosaic legislation. When man challenged the precept of God, then condemnation of sin by penalty became a moral necessity in the righteous nature of God. Therefore, to suggest forgiveness without penal sacrifice, as critical theology insists upon doing, is to suggest a knowledge of sin on God's part unaccompanied by His positive condemnation of it.<sup>141</sup>

"The sin and ruin of man gave occasion for the gracious interposition of God,"<sup>142</sup> seen in His merciful provision for man's redemption. The need for vicarious atonement is to be seen in the recurrent declaration of Scripture that man is sinful and there is no ground for self-redemption. The fall of man wrought a change in both his nature and legal standing. "To be redeemed he must be placed where he was before, both as to character and as to state. His purity must be restored; his condemnation must be removed."<sup>143</sup> Man cannot make atonement for himself for two reasons: (1) the moral difficulty is insuperable (John 3:6). No sinner can regain by self-effort the purity of nature which he has lost, and there can be no redemption without it (Hebrews 12:14); (2) the legal difficulty is also insuperable.<sup>144</sup> The divine law requires perfect obedience or payment of the penalty for disobedience; man has not done the former, he cannot do the latter. There is, therefore, a moral necessity for *substitutionary* atonement in order for God to effect man's redemption—a necessity which is grounded not only in man's inability with respect to his nature, but a necessity that is grounded in the nature of God Himself.

---

<sup>141</sup>Charles Cuthbert Hall, *The Gospel of the Divine Sacrifice* (New York: Hodder & Staughton, 1896), pp. 78-9.

<sup>142</sup>Torrey, *op. cit.*, p. 307.

<sup>143</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>144</sup>*Ibid.*

## *Salvation in the Old Testament*

Old Testament history is the tragic story of man's sinful rebellion and failure to meet the moral and spiritual obligations resting upon him; but there is another side—it is also *Heilsgeschichte*, "salvation history." Against the background of man's rebellion and God's righteous indignation and judgment is portrayed salvation and grace—the redemption of God's creature, man.

Salvation for Israel is portrayed in the Old Testament in a series of divine acts and is grounded in her election and covenant. Salvation is the activity of God resulting in the deliverance of the nation throughout its history; it is seen as release from personal afflictions, such as human enemies, fear, calamities, disease, and anxiety, and in its highest expression, the prophetic hope of spiritual deliverance and life in the future glorious Messianic Kingdom.

### The Hebrew Idea of Salvation

The doctrine of salvation in the Old Testament is bound up with several other important concepts and ideas, such as sin, redemption, covenant, election, grace, mercy, forgiveness, sacrifice, etc., of which only the most significant can be noted at this juncture. The Hebrew term for salvation is *יִשְׁע*, or *יְשׁוּעָה* from the verb root *יָשַׁע*, "to deliver, to save, which generally answers to the Greek *σώζω*. The term *יִשְׁע* is used of Israel's deliverance from the Egyptians (Exodus 14:30; Isaiah 43:3), and hence signifies, in this usage, to have victory over one's enemies, or to have victory in war, as in Numbers 10:9. Yahweh also saves His people from natural enemies as well, from drought, disease, pestilence, famine; thus salvation can mean freedom, material blessings, prosperity, and happiness.

More and more, through the psalms and the prophets, the inner meaning and divine purpose in these saving acts were made clearer. In Psalm 24:5 it is said of the man with a pure heart that "he shall receive... righteousness from the God of his salvation." The spiritual import of salvation is again seen in Psalm 79:9 where the Israelite prays: "Help us, O God of our salvation, for the glory of thy name; and deliver us, and forgive our sins, for thy name's sake." The prophets echo this spiritual deliverance. Isaiah declares: "Behold, Jehovah's hand is not shortened, that it cannot save; neither his ear heavy, that it cannot

hear: but your iniquities have separated between you and your God, and your sins have hid his face from you.... And a Redeemer will come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith Jehovah."<sup>145</sup> Zechariah promises that "... Jehovah their God will save them in that day as the flock of his people...."<sup>146</sup> Ezekiel's commission was to warn the wicked "... from his wicked way, to save his life,"<sup>147</sup> and God promises "... I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the earth."<sup>148</sup>

## The Idea of Covenant

Salvation for Israel was fundamentally bound up with the covenant. Israel's salvation derived its significance from the covenant relationship as the basis and continuance of her redemption. The importance of the covenant idea in Israel's salvation is not to be minimized since it is a new covenant—the moral and spiritual essence of the old—that was to become the basis of God's salvation of the future as Jeremiah and Ezekiel declare. Within the covenant Israel was to express her loyalty and devotion to God, live her life, and find salvation. The uniqueness of Israel's religion is to be found in the idea of the covenant. Other religions sought to *relate themselves* to the deities, but Israel's God was a *self-revealing* God and a covenant God. From Abraham to Moses He entered into covenants with individuals: Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. With Moses in Exodus 19 He instituted a covenant with the nation, and at that time entered into a unique relationship with Israel.

In the Old Testament the term used in the Hebrew for expressing the covenant relationship is בְּרִית. The etymology of this word has been suggested as coming from the Akkadian *beritu*, which means "fetter" or "bond," hence בְּרִית signifying something binding. The origin of the covenant concept is with Abraham in Genesis 17, or may be placed even earlier in Genesis 9:9ff, where there is found a preliminary covenant with Noah—the covenant sign being the rainbow. The giving of a sign to seal a covenant was a customary practice. It could be con-

---

<sup>145</sup>Isaiah 59:1-2, 20.

<sup>146</sup>Zechariah 9:16.

<sup>147</sup>Ezekiel 3:18.

<sup>148</sup>Isaiah 49:6.

firmed by the shake of hands or by a kiss (II Kings 10:15; I Samuel 10:1). It may be confirmed by a gift as in the case of David and Jonathan (I Samuel 18:3-4), or by sharing a common meal as with Jacob and Laban (Genesis 37:48-54). The sign of the Abrahamic covenant was circumcision, and with this covenant the promise was given that Abraham's seed would become a great nation and inherit the land that God had promised. The Abrahamic covenant was renewed with Isaac (Genesis 26:1-5), and again with Jacob (Genesis 28:12-16).

The nature of Israel's covenant was unique. The study of international treaties in the ancient world has distinguished two types of covenants: parity and suzerainty. "A parity covenant is reciprocal—that is, both parties bind themselves to each other by bilateral obligations. The suzerainty covenant, on the other hand, is more unilateral, for it is made between a king and his vassal."<sup>149</sup> To his servant the king "gives" a covenant, and within this covenant the vassal finds protection and security. As the inferior party the vassal is under obligation to obey the commands of the author of the covenant. To make such a covenant in no way infringes upon the sovereignty of the king, and yet the covenant is not the mere assertion of authority and power over the subject nor an enforcement of obedience. "The most striking aspect of the suzerainty is the great attention given to the king's deeds of benevolence on behalf of the vassal. The vassal's motive for obligation is that of gratitude for what has been done for him."<sup>150</sup>

Hence, the covenant at Sinai was in no sense a parity contract in which both parties were equal and mutually dependent.<sup>151</sup> It was, on the other hand, a relationship between unequals—between God and man. "The covenant was *given* by God; the relationship was conferred upon the people by their sovereign. Yahweh was not legally bound to Israel, for his sovereignty was not limited by the covenant."<sup>152</sup> He had freely initiated the relationship, and the Exodus story (Exodus 1-14)

---

<sup>149</sup>Bernard W. Anderson, *Understanding the Old Testament*, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958), p. 56.

<sup>150</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 57.

<sup>151</sup>"The endurance of the covenant depended on God's faithfulness alone. . . . The distinctive thing about the Hebrew covenant, therefore, was God's transcendence over it, not democratic ratification or constitutional contracting." Paul Ramsey, *Basic Christian Ethics* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954), p. 376.

<sup>152</sup>Anderson, *loc. cit.*

puts the emphasis on what Yahweh had done on Israel's behalf, upon His "mighty acts" of deliverance. Therefore, Israel's pledge of obedience was grounded in their gratitude for Yahweh's blessings and on their realization that their whole existence was dependent upon His grace. It is significant that the unconditional obligations of the Ten Commandments are prefaced with a brief historical prologue: "I am Yahweh your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage."<sup>153</sup>

Köhler, in his book *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, expresses this truth. He writes,

The Old Testament knows nothing of the בְּרִית between Yahweh and Israel resting upon the free resolution of both partners. He from whom this stipulation proceeds is God alone. Therefore it always means that God concludes the covenant with someone, but never that God and someone conclude the covenant.<sup>154</sup>

Unlike covenants between men, the covenant between God and man is not a contract between two parties on an equal footing. It is not a bargain. The initiative is entirely God's, and Israel simply has the choice of whether or not she will accept God's terms. Israel does not have the right or privilege of modifying the covenant stipulations. God establishes the covenant relationship; Israel accepts or rejects it. The covenant is not bi-lateral. It lays no obligations upon God. The obligations that are upon God do not stem *from the covenant*, but were freely taken upon Himself in the call of Israel. In choosing Israel He chose to bind Himself to them, but this was purely an act of grace and not necessity. The covenant itself was unconditional. Neither party could forsake it. God could not, because of His faithfulness (דִּקְדֻקָּה); Israel could not withdraw from the covenant except she break it, dishonor it, and repudiate it. When she did, judgment fell because of her rebellion.

The fundamental aim of this covenant is expressed in the words "... ye shall be holy; for I Jehovah your God am holy,"<sup>155</sup> and the covenant communion was to express itself through the ritual of sacrifice. It

---

<sup>153</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>154</sup>Ludwig Köhler, *Theologie des Alten Testaments* (Qubingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1953), p. 45.

<sup>155</sup>Leviticus 19:2.

was through the medium of sacrifice that divine forgiveness was to be effected and the covenant relationship sustained. The relation of sacrifice to salvation was not such that the mere performance of an outward rite obtained the removal of guilt and restoration to covenant standing; for the covenant Law, as well as the later prophets, was not content with merely a formal act. But "where sacrifice was offered for sin, the Law demanded the confession of sin and humble penitence of spirit, and where the sin was against another man and restitution could be made, it demanded restitution."<sup>156</sup> God promised, on the basis of the covenant, to forgive guilt and sin; but it was ethically conditioned on the inward motivation of the worshipper. At the same time, it was clearly taught that sacrifice properly offered had a propitiatory effect upon God; that the blood of the substitute victim, dying in the sinner's stead, would be accepted as an atonement for his sin.

Wilhelm Vischer stresses this important relation between sacrifice and the covenant in his book, *Das Christuszeugnis des Alten Testaments*. He writes:

It is the covenant which renders possible and preserves life. There is peace, a wholesome, safe life in the covenant community. Sin is a breach of the covenant, a violation of the peace; he who does sin has destroyed and forfeited his life, "sein Blut kommt auf sein Haupt" his blood comes upon his head, i.e. his blood must be shed in expiation, he must relinquish his life. "Without shedding blood no forgiveness can come" (Hebrews 9:22). So then, if the covenant and the community life between the Lord and his people is violated, through a conscious or unconscious sin of the priest, or of the commoner or layman against God, or against another fellow countryman, it is formed again through the sin offering or through the guilt-offering.<sup>157</sup>

It has been suggested that the blood was brought within the Tabernacle on the Day of Atonement in order to bring it into closer proximity to God, but the true purpose lies deeper than this. The mercy seat derived its significance chiefly from its location upon the Ark of the Covenant. The blood sprinkled upon the mercy seat of the Ark, which

---

<sup>156</sup>H. H. Rowley, *The Faith of Israel* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956), p. 95.

<sup>157</sup>Wilhelm Vischer, *Das Christuszeugnis des Alten Testaments* (Zurich: Evangelischer Verlag A. G. Zollikon, 1946), p. 262.

contained the tables of the covenant, was brought into a special relationship with the covenant. "It signified that the atonement sought was in view of the people's covenant relationship with God; that its object was to reinstate the people in full covenant privilege, and that the atonement was sure, because based upon covenant promise."<sup>158</sup>

This then is the significance of the earlier statement to the effect that against the background of man's sin and rebellion is portrayed another aspect—salvation and grace expressed in the benevolent provision of the Mosaic sacrificial system. Through this divine institution the righteousness of the holy God of Israel was honored, and His mercy and grace could be extended in forgiveness to the penitent sinner. The sinner by faith in the atoning blood of the propitiatory sacrifice had the assurance of an atonement, or covering for his sins, and the continuance in communion and fellowship with the covenant community. The great gulf that stood between man's alienation because of sin and divine forgiveness and salvation was bridged through the gracious provision of substitutionary sacrifice, which typified and anticipated the future atoning Sacrifice to be made by the Lamb of God once for all. In the Old Testament, therefore, these three ideas are inseparably bound together; the idea of Covenant, Sacrifice, and Salvation.

### The Relation between the Old and New Testament Doctrines of Atonement

That there exists a vital and recognizable relation between the Old Testament institutions, especially the Levitical sacrifices, and the New Testament atonement of Christ is one of the major ideas that this dissertation shall endeavor to confirm. If there does exist such a relationship, then it logically follows that the concept of substitutionary atonement did not originate in a vacuum, but one should expect to find the idea of substitution in the Old Testament revelation. This evidence will be quite amply set forth in the division of this work entitled: "The Doctrine of Substitution in the Old Testament"; but as a preliminary to this it would be well, at this juncture, to show the vital relationship between the Old and New Testament doctrines of atonement.

---

<sup>158</sup>U. Z. Rule, *Old Testament Institutions* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1910), p. 242.

## Old Testament Language

The sacrificial ritual of the Old Testament afforded figurative language for the expression of the principles of Christianity, for the whole system of Hebrew rites, complicated and grand, enabled the New Testament writers to find figures of speech with little effort.

The *Tabernacle* and its succeeding Temple were to the Hebrew visible embodiments of God who had condescended to dwell among them. How natural and easily, then, for the apostles to find in them a type of Christ.<sup>159</sup> So John readily sees and asserts the analogy, "And the Word became flesh and dwelt [Greek: tabernacled] among us...."<sup>160</sup> Christ Himself said of His own body, "Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up."<sup>161</sup> His work on the cross is regarded as a sacrifice which He as the Lamb of God makes, "For our passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ."<sup>162</sup> He thus becomes the minister of a new covenant and with His own blood enters within the veil into the Holy of Holies to obtain eternal redemption for His people.<sup>163</sup>

Further, the sacrificial and intercessory work of Christ was expressed by the apostles with language drawn from the Old Testament typical *priesthood*. The priests, chosen by God, were the intercessory ministers at the altar of the atoning sacrifices, which mediation was concentrated in the office of the high priest on the Day of Atonement. Christ is depicted as bestowing in His own person the atoning substitutive sacrifice and the discharging of priestly duties; and it is said of Him that He was "... a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God to make propitiation for the sins of the people."<sup>164</sup>

The rites of *purification* presented terminology adopted by the New Testament to describe the cleansing work of Christ, "who being the effulgence of his glory... when he had made purification of sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high."<sup>165</sup> Jesus Christ, writes the Apostle to Titus, "... gave himself for us, that he might redeem us

---

<sup>159</sup>Cave, op. cit., p. 420.

<sup>160</sup>John 1:14.

<sup>161</sup>John 2:19.

<sup>162</sup>Corinthians 5:7.

<sup>163</sup>Hebrews 9.

<sup>164</sup>Hebrews 2:17.

<sup>165</sup>Hebrews 1:3.

from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a people for his own possession...."<sup>166</sup> His blood is said to "... cleanse your conscience... ",<sup>167</sup> and it "... cleanseth from all sin," and will "... cleanse us from all unrighteousness."<sup>168</sup>

Every variety of the Old Testament *Levitical sacrifices* illustrates by its language certain aspects of the work of Christ. Christ was the true Sin-offering, "... but now once at the end of the ages hath he been manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself."<sup>169</sup> He is also the Trespass-offering, "Yet it pleased Jehovah to bruise him; he hath put him to grief; when thou shalt make his soul a trespass-offering for sin...."<sup>170</sup> Having trespassed against God and become alienated from Him, the sinner while yet an enemy has, by the death of Christ, been reconciled.<sup>171</sup> He was a true Burnt-offering who "... gave himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for an odor of a sweet smell."<sup>172</sup> The Peace-offering was but a type of the effect of Christ's death, "Being therefore justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." "... being now justified by his blood, shall we be saved from the wrath of God through him."<sup>173</sup> He is further described as the Passover Lamb and the Lamb of God, and is in every sense described as the great Antitype of the Old Testament Levitical sacrifices. There is, then, a clear relationship between the language of the Old Testament sacrificial system and the atoning work of Christ as described in the New Testament. But is there a closer relation between the Old Testament sacrificial symbols and the New Testament atonement?

### *The Essential Nature of the Relationship between the Old and New Testament Doctrines of the Atonement*

An important question to be decided, then, is what is the relationship between the sacrificial doctrines of the atonement in the Old and New Testaments? Or, stated differently, since the sacrificial ritual

---

<sup>166</sup>Titus 2:14.

<sup>167</sup>Hebrews 9:14.

<sup>168</sup>John 1:7-9.

<sup>169</sup>Hebrews 9:26.

<sup>170</sup>Isaiah 53:10. Literal Translation.

<sup>171</sup>Romans 5:8-11.

<sup>172</sup>Ephesians 5:2.

<sup>173</sup>Romans 5:1, 9.

of the Old Testament afforded figurative language for the expression of the principles of Christ's atoning work, does then the language of the New Testament merely contain figurative allusions to the Jewish sacrifices, or does it ascribe a real and immediate efficacy to Christ's death corresponding to the atonement produced by the Levitical sin-offerings? The Old Testament sacrifices and institutions were both symbolical of then present truths, and typical of future revelations to be made—the Old a type preparing the way for the New, its antitype. "Type and antitype do not mean different things under the same form, but the *same thing* under different forms. Type and antitype are so related to each other by a pre-established harmony, that the type teaches by figure what the antitype teaches by fact."<sup>174</sup> This, then, means that the description of Christ's work and death under sacrificial language was intended to be more than figurative; it was, in fact, not a fleeting and intangible resemblance to the Mosaic system, but as a true antitype it was the final complete work for which the old system had been preparing the way for centuries. Alfred Cave establishes this premise when he writes,

If the sacrificial doctrine of the New Testament is that more perfect form for which the doctrine of Mosaism paved the way, then the former should show itself upon analysis to be that related form to which the latter pointed. In short, if these several forms of doctrine are indeed related as type and antitype, comparison should disclose this relation.<sup>175</sup>

The New Testament substantiates the truth that the vicarious atonement of Christ was sacrificial. It has, in fact, been shown that the same language and symbols are applicable to the atoning work of Christ as to the Levitical sacrifices under the Mosaic dispensation. The sacrifices were declared in the Epistles and Gospels to be but shadows of better things to come. The atonement of Christ was the actual realization of that Old Testament reconciling work by which the Levitical sacrifices covered sin, making it possible for God to forgive transgressions and restore alienated humanity. The peculiar aspect of sacrifice has been completely absorbed in the death-offering of Christ. Sacrifice

---

<sup>174</sup>Cave, *op. cit.*, p. 427.

<sup>175</sup>*Ibid.*

was needed to express man's disability and his need of atonement. If the atonement ever became perfect and complete then the need and function of the institution of the priesthood and sacrifice is done away. The fundamental testimony of the New Testament is that they were abolished in the offering and death of Christ.<sup>176</sup>

Cave suggests several forms in which the Old and New Testament doctrines of the atonement are related, in which the atonement of Christ teaches by fact what the Mosaic atonement proclaimed by prefigurative symbol. In the first place, as regards the nature of the atonement, Christ over and over is depicted as a sacrifice whose shed blood effects a propitiation for the Judicial anger of God and results in reconciliation between Him and the alienated offender. The analogy with the nature and declared effect of the Levitical sacrifices is evident and the two modes of atonement are clearly related to each other as type and antitype.

In the second place, the Mosaic Law itself did not profess to be a final revelation, but distinctly pointed to the future. The announcements of the prophets emphasized the transitional nature of Mosaism and its method of atonement.<sup>177</sup> "Behold, the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah, not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers...."<sup>178</sup> Moses himself spoke to Israel in the plains of Moab of a Prophet to come who, although like unto Moses, would, nevertheless, give new commandments that the people would then hearken to.<sup>179</sup> As early as the time of Samuel it is implied that Levitical sacrifices were not intended by God to be an end in themselves. "Hath Jehovah as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of Jehovah? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams."<sup>180</sup> The transitional nature of the Mosaic system intimates the relation between the Old Testament type and the New Testament antitype.<sup>181</sup>

---

<sup>176</sup>W. Sanday (ed.), *Different Conceptions of Priesthood and Sacrifice* (New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1900), pp. 76-7.

<sup>177</sup>Cave, *op. cit.*, p. 428.

<sup>178</sup>Jeremiah 31:31-32.

<sup>179</sup>Deuteronomy 18:15-19.

<sup>180</sup>1 Samuel 15:22; cf. Psalm 40:6-8; 51:16-17; Isaiah 1:11-15; Micah 6:6-8.

<sup>181</sup>Cave, *loc. cit.*

Thirdly, the prophets made certain announcements concerning the coming kingdom of God, many of which received a literal fulfillment in the sacrificial death of Christ. This refers of course to the many Messianic prophecies, where the Messiah is depicted as a sacrifice; a trespass-offering; a smitten Shepherd; and where in Daniel He would "... make reconciliation for iniquity...."<sup>182</sup> The literal fulfillment of Messianic prophecy indicates the close and vital relationship between the Old and New Testament atonements.<sup>183</sup>

Fourthly, in this connection, the New Testament represents itself as a literal fulfillment of the preceding Mosaic dispensation.<sup>184</sup> Jesus spoke of Himself, not as an antagonist of Moses, but as a fulfillment of the Old Testament concerning Himself. "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy, but to fulfill."<sup>185</sup> "Ye search the scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life; and these are they which bear witness of me."<sup>186</sup> Old Testament worship and the Mosaic institutions are everywhere considered in the New Testament as a means to an end; that end was seen to be in the revelation of Jesus Christ: "For the law was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ."<sup>187</sup>

Again, on the supposition that the Christian atonement was the antitype of the Mosaic, the unexplained elements of the Mosaic ritual become clear.<sup>188</sup> In spite of whatever light the pious Israelite might have had as to the meaning and typical significance of Mosaism, yet there still remained, as the Apostle Peter contends, many things perplexing and enigmatic,

concerning which salvation the prophets sought and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: searching what time or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ

---

<sup>182</sup>Daniel 9:24.

<sup>183</sup>Cave, *op. cit.*, p. 429.

<sup>184</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>185</sup>Matthew 5:17.

<sup>186</sup>John 5:39.

<sup>187</sup>John 1:17.

<sup>188</sup>Cave *op. cit.*, p. 431.

which was in them did point unto, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glories that should follow them.<sup>189</sup>

Before the atonement of Christ the selection of victims, which must be from among the domesticated animals and without blemish, was in part unintelligible; but after the sacrificial death of the sinless Christ, the enigmatic became clear and patent. The idea of substitution, so prominent in the Old Testament thought in general and in the Levitical sacrifices in particular, becomes a reality in the penal vicarious surrender of the Lamb of God. Only upon the premise that the New Testament atonement was the antitype of Mosaic atonement do the shadows become realities, the figures obtain actuality, and the obscure and often incomprehensible details of the intricate Old Testament rituals lend themselves to a satisfactory solution.

Lastly, but most significant, in showing the necessary and real relationship between the typical of the Old and the antitypical of the New Testament atonement, is the fact that the Mosaic and Christian methods of atonement are in a certain but very real sense antithetical, or as Cave writes, they are "... so universal as to be mutually exclusive."<sup>190</sup> That is, if one, the type, is trusted to, the other, the antitype, cannot be. Under the Mosaic dispensation forgiveness was promised and atonement of sins effected through obedience to the prescribed *sacrificial ritual*. The atonement of Christ promised precisely the same thing to be effected through *faith*.<sup>191</sup> At different times in history divine revelations were made of the methods of atonement for exactly the same sins and for the same purposes, yet they were essentially different in their inherent nature. "Does it not seem to follow that, if both methods of forgiveness were of divine origin, they must have been related as shadow and substance, symbol and thing symbolized, type and antitype?"<sup>192</sup>

---

<sup>189</sup> Peter 1:10-11.

<sup>190</sup> Cave, *op. cit.*, p. 430.

<sup>191</sup> This is not to overlook the necessity of faith which was, to be sure, involved in the Mosaic sacrifices, but is intended to contrast objective and continuous ritual, on the one hand, with the appropriation of salvation by faith alone in the final sacrifice of Christ on the other.

<sup>192</sup> Cave, *op. cit.*, pp. 430-31.

In conclusion, therefore, there may be said to be three lines of preparation in the Old Testament for the New Testament doctrine of the atonement. "The most general, but indispensable, preparation in the Old Testament lies in doctrines of the *holiness, righteousness, and grace of God*; also of the *sin and guilt of man*."<sup>193</sup> As holy, God abhors sin, and in His righteousness expresses His wrath against it. His grace, on the other hand, is shown in providing a means of forgiveness in a way that His holiness is not compromised but is still upheld and honored. Hence, the second important line of Old Testament preparation—the *doctrine of substitutionary sacrifice*. It provided a means by which people, notwithstanding their sin, maintained their fellowship and communion with the holy God who dwelt among them. It rests in all its parts on the basic ideas of the holiness of God and the sinfulness of man; and even in sacrifice the people could not approach God directly, but only through the consecrated priesthood. The design of these sacrifices was to remove the guilt of the offerer by covering his sin; the animal in yielding up its life in substitution for the sinner propitiated the wrath of God against sin and acknowledged His judgment upon it. There is yet a third line of preparation for the doctrine of the atonement, namely, *the prophetic*. The prophets, contrary to earlier Old Testament criticism, are not opposed to worship by sacrificial ritual, but their polemic is always to be regarded as directed against its abuse, not its use.<sup>194</sup> In many ways they recognize its legitimacy, and even include it in their predictions of the restored theocracy (cf. Isaiah 56,6,7; 60:7; 66:23; Jeremiah 17:24-27; 33:17-18; Ezekiel 40-47, etc.). Their preparation lay along the line of the unique predictions of the Messiah, who as the Suffering Servant bears vicariously the sins of His people. Here, at length, the lines of sacrificial law and those of prophecy coincide in such predictions as those of the Psalmist, Isaiah, Zechariah, and Daniel (cf. Psalm 22; Isaiah 53; Zechariah 3:9; 12:10; 13:1; Daniel 9:24-26).<sup>195</sup>

---

<sup>193</sup>James Hastings (ed.), *Dictionary of the Bible* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909), p. 71.

<sup>194</sup>Most present day criticism, however, instead of making the prophet an antagonist of the cultus, has moved to the opposite extreme and holds that the prophets were functionaries in the ritual.

<sup>195</sup>Hastings, *op. cit.*, pp. 71-2.

## CHAPTER III

### THE DOCTRINE OF SACRIFICE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Inasmuch as the institution of Old Testament sacrifice presupposes some divine purpose, and that in some real sense Christ's death was also a sacrifice; the principal aim in this dissertation will be to ascertain the true nature of the Levitical sacrifices as to their origin, objects, efficacy, meaning, and relationship to the work of Christ. The divine origin of Mosaic worship has never been satisfactorily disputed. In the institution of the Levitical Law the precepts, with regard to sacrifice, are indisputably divine. In the study of the history of sacrifice it is seen that the heathen universally attributed to sacrifice a certain efficacy; nor was the primitive idea of atonement, buried under idolatrous corruptions and superstitions, completely lost. Nevertheless, it is only in the Levitical system of sacrifice that there is found a real representation of spiritual truth, meaning, and purpose.

To inquire into the divine meaning and purpose of Old Testament sacrifice will disclose that at the heart of all sacrifice lay the fundamental concept of *substitution*. John Pye Smith writes, "... the idea of substitution, or vicarious suffering, was essential to the theory of sacrifices, as understood and practiced by profane and sacred antiquity...."<sup>196</sup> While the atoning work of Christ is described under many figures, yet the prevailing language is that of sacrifice. A correct view of the substitutionary atonement must therefore be grounded in a proper interpretation of sacrifice, especially as found in the Mosaic system.<sup>197</sup>

As an aid to the substantiation of the Biblical doctrine of substitutionary sacrifice, and to lessen the difficulties which have arisen from the ambiguity in the various translations of the Hebrew sacrificial terms, it is important to designate the various Hebrew sacrificial terms in the Old Testament, and the classification of the Levitical sacrifices used in this dissertation. Reference may be made, therefore, to Appendixes I and II of this dissertation as needed.

---

<sup>196</sup>Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

<sup>197</sup>Strong, *op. cit.*, p. 721.

## *The Origin of Sacrifice*

It has been alleged by some that the Levitical sacrifices were appointed simply in accommodation to the Hebrews who had acquired the heathenistic practice during their sojourn in Egypt and from their Canaanite neighbors. In support of this view reference is made to the fact that the sacrificial precepts in the Book of Leviticus have reference not to the institution of a new rite but to the regulation of an already existing one, seen in the command in Leviticus 1:2: "Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When any of you offereth an oblation unto Jehovah... , you shall offer it in such and such a manner.

This mode of expression may be satisfactorily explained from several considerations. First, it is evident that sacrifices were observed as an acceptable method of worship by the Patriarchs from whom the Israelite nation was descended. Sacrifice was not introduced by the Mosaic law, but is found at least as early as Genesis 4. Offerings of atonement in the technical Levitical sense are not mentioned, of course in the Old Testament before their institution by Moses. However, it is to be noted that Genesis 8:20 records the pre-Mosaic use of the burnt-offering by Noah which had an appeasing and propitiatory effect upon God.<sup>198</sup> The Book of Job, reflecting the customs of the patriarchal age, represents the presentation of burnt-offerings for sin,<sup>199</sup> but it is significant that the writer uses the term *שָׁדַד*, to set apart, consecrate, sanctify,<sup>200</sup> rather than the later Levitical term *כָּפַר*, to cover, to atone,<sup>201</sup> which is not introduced until Moses.<sup>202</sup> Besides the burnt-offering in the pre-Mosaic period, the term sacrifice, *זָבַח*, with the sacrificial meal, is also found in patriarchal times in Genesis 31:54, where it serves to ratify the covenant between Jacob and Laban.

It is patent, therefore, from these considerations that the Levitical precepts do presuppose a knowledge of blood sacrifice on the part

---

<sup>198</sup>Note Genesis 8:21-22.

<sup>199</sup>Job 1:5; 42:8.

<sup>200</sup>Job 1:5.

<sup>201</sup>Leviticus 1:4.

<sup>202</sup>This does not imply that from God's side the sacrifice, *זָבַח*, and burnt-offering, *עֹלָה*, which were pre-Mosaic, had no propitiatory purpose, or from the offer's point of view there was no understanding of its atoning nature, since the signal purpose by Job in offering the burnt-offering was to remove sin and effect propitiation.

of the Israelites, but this knowledge was handed down from the Patriarchs themselves and was not an assimilation of heathen practices from Egypt and Canaan. In fact within the Levitical code itself there was a positive prohibition against adopting the observances of any heathen nation, with specific reference to the Egyptians and Canaanites.

Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, I am Jehovah your God. After the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein ye dwell, shall ye not do: and after the doings of the land of Canaan, whither I bring you, shall ye not do; neither shall ye walk in their statutes.<sup>203</sup>

### Theories of Origin

It is characteristic of critical scholarship in general that there is seldom any precise agreement on theological questions; there is no exception to this with respect to the various theories as to the origin of sacrifice among men in general and Israel in particular. The following quotations bear witness to this fact.

The origin of animal or blood sacrifice in Israel according to Ewald in his work, *The Antiquities of Israel*, resulted from the cooperation of two causes. In the first place the more powerful, warlike and excited an ancient nation became, the more it learned to like and use blood sacrifices. In Israel too, Ewald contends, everything goes to show that it was during the time of its early wars and victories that animal sacrifices became predominant in it. The second factor contributing to the institution of sacrifice would be the mysterious and sacred nature of the blood which seemed to contain the very soul or life of the creature, and was, therefore, of special efficacy when shed upon the altar.<sup>204</sup>

Other critical expositors speculate as follows:

The origin of sacrifice... is to be found in the custom of leaving food and drink at the graves of the dead, and as the ancestral spir-

---

<sup>203</sup>Leviticus 18:2-3.

<sup>204</sup>Heinrich Ewald, *The Antiquities of Israel*, trans. Henry Shaen Solly (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1876), pp. 37-8.

its rose to divine rank the refreshments placed for the dead developed into sacrifices.<sup>205</sup>

The "expiatory" character of *all* sacrifice is a comparatively late development, due to the deepened sense of sin occasioned by the Babylonian exile.<sup>206</sup>

The religion of Israel necessarily shared to a very large extent the general heritage of eastern cult religion. A glance at its ritual will reveal to the practised eye that the same primitive concepts underlie its theory of sacrifice, of holiness, of clean and unclean as are at the bottom of the religions of its primitive neighbors.<sup>207</sup>

S. A. Cook in *The Journal of Theological Studies* contends that sacrifices proper began with the origin of the cult of the dead.<sup>208</sup> The dead were to be feared and avoided, or they were to be besought and their aid invoked. The more prominent dead received the greater attention and the belief of the mutual interdependence of the dead and living gave rise to the belief in the efficacy of the dead on behalf of the living.<sup>209</sup> The sacrifices of purification and expiation have a magical origin. There is in primitive sacrifice an amalgamation of magic, religion, and morality; "and the magical and magico-religious rites, where the sacrificial victim... delivers men from the demons that torment them, are the ancestor of the idea that the death of Christ was a ransom and substitute."<sup>210</sup>

That the sprinkling of blood upon the door posts and lintel by the Israelites to secure them against the judgment of death upon the

---

<sup>205</sup>James Hastings (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920), XI, p. 1.

<sup>206</sup>Alan Richardson (ed.), *A Theological Word Book of the Bible* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1951), p. 206.

<sup>207</sup>E. G. Kraeling, "The Real Religion of Ancient Israel," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XLVII (1928), p. 147.

<sup>208</sup>Fisher notes the fallacy of this view when he writes: The doctrine that religion begins in a worship of ancestors . . . does not correspond with the facts of history; since divinities in human shape were not the earliest objects of heathen worship." George P. Fisher, *The Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1885), p. 20.

<sup>209</sup>S. A. Cook, "The Theory of Sacrifice," *The Journal of Theological Studies*, XXII (July, 1921), p. 337.

<sup>210</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 340.

first-born is, according to the critical expositor Gray, "... naive mythology, and not a history, scarcely requires elaborate proof. The ritual may, indeed, have been performed on the night of the Exodus, but not then for the first time, nor for the precise reason assigned to it in the story."<sup>211</sup> According to Pedersen, "The Israelite sacrifice does not differ much from that in common use among other Canaanite peoples, but to a certain extent it has acquired a special Israelitish character."<sup>212</sup>

A. B. Davidson, in *The Theology of the Old Testament*, argues rather unconvincingly that sacrifice was not ordained directly by God, because on the one hand the Old Testament does not say so, and on the other, the universal prevalence of sacrifice among the heathen nations implies that sacrifice was simply the natural expression of man's sense of his relation to God.<sup>213</sup> The first assertion remains to be proven; and the second, that of the universal prevalence of sacrifice, rather than disproving its divine institution, on the contrary, confirms this view.

The German theologian Ludwig Köhler in his work, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, repudiates the divine origin of sacrifice. He writes,

The Old Testament knows nothing whatever of sacrifice or any other constituent part of the cultus having been instituted by God. It knows only the regulation of the existing sacrifices through divine instruction.... The cult is a bit of ethnic life. Israel [follows] the heathen. Cain offered sacrifice without God having commanded it of him. Abel did also (Genesis 4:3-4). People offering sacrifice to God is the course of the world.<sup>214</sup>

Keil and Delitzsch likewise contend against the divine origin of sacrifice and hold that

---

<sup>211</sup>George Buchanan Gray, *Sacrifice in the Old Testament* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1925), p. 356.

<sup>212</sup>Johs Pedersen, *Israel, Its Life and Culture* (London: Oxford University Press, 1947), II, p. 289.

<sup>213</sup>A. B. Davidson, *The Theology of the Old Testament* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904), p. 312.

<sup>214</sup>Köhler, *op. cit.*, p. 171.

... although sacrifice in general reaches up to the earliest times in man's history, and is met with in every nation, it was not enjoined upon the human race by any positive command of God, but sprang out of a religious necessity for fellowship with God....<sup>215</sup>

This is closely akin to the view of Wellhausen that sacrifice is the result of the natural prompting of human reason.<sup>216</sup> H. Wheeler Robinson argues for the Canaanite origin of Hebrew sacrifice: "The institutions of Israelite worship, its religions, festivals, and sacrificial customs, appear to have been drawn largely from the practices of Canaan."<sup>217</sup>

The one common area of agreement among the adversaries of the doctrine of piacular sacrifice is that it was originally a heathen rite associated with the gross superstitions of polytheism without divine sanction or institution, and that under a modified form it was adopted into the Mosaic sacrificial system in order to conform to the habits of sacrificial worship which the Israelites had acquired in common with the surrounding nations.<sup>218</sup> The significance of establishing the divine origin of blood sacrifice from the dawn of human deflection is, therefore, no unimportant argument in confirmation of the doctrine of the substitutionary atonement.

It is not a new discovery that the Israelites were not the only people who offered sacrifice, had a ritual, temple, priesthood, and a form of worship. The Old Testament itself has much to say about the heathen practices of Israel's neighbors, but their existence in no way weakens the Israelite claim that her system and form of worship alone had divine sanction. Indeed, even a superficial comparison of the worship and practices of the other cults—with their cruelties, licentiousness, ideas of magic, and bribery—with the purity of Israel's worship, quite convincingly gives evidence of its divine origin and authority.<sup>219</sup> The Hebrew sacrifices, even in their primitive aspects, were free from the contamination of human sacrifices. The case of Isaac and Jeph-

---

<sup>215</sup>C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *The Pentateuch, Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament*, trans. James Martin (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1909), II, p. 266.

<sup>216</sup>W. L. Baxter, *Sanctuary and Sacrifice: A Reply to Wellhausen* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1896), p. 88.

<sup>217</sup>Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

<sup>218</sup>Crawford, *op. cit.*, p. 283.

<sup>219</sup>F. D. Kidner, *Sacrifice in the Old Testament* (London: The Tyndale Press, 1952), p. 5.

thah's daughter, often cited by the critics as proof to the contrary to support the alleged commonness of the Hebrew and heathen sacrifices, are explicable by an honest consideration of their context. On the contrary, the Mosaic legislation strictly prohibited human sacrifice as adverse to the will of God, and an abomination of the heathen.<sup>220</sup>

There are rational arguments in favor of attributing the origin of sacrifices to divine authority. It is a patent truth that whatever practice obtains universally in the world from antiquity must exist from (1) some dictate of *reason*; (2) some demand of *nature*; (3) some principle of *interest*; (4) or some injunction by *divine authority* and *revelation*. That sacrifice has obtained universally from antiquity will not be denied by any student of history. That the practice did not originate in man's reason is evident from the obvious consideration that unprejudiced reason could never dictate that acceptable worship would be in the form of the violent death of an innocent victim. Nor is there any demand in man's nature whereby he must satisfy a natural appetite by destroying the best of his fruits and useful creatures by spilling blood and burning an inoffensive beast upon an altar. That it did not prevail from some principle of interest is seen in that the early sacrifices of expiation were the holocaust, or whole burnt-offering, in which no part was eaten by the offerer, but all was consumed upon the altar. Neither was there any selfish interest of priestcraft, since sacrifice existed for ages before its institution. How the practice of sacrifice could universally prevail is impossible to account for apart from divine appointment.

Jonathan Edwards, in *The History of Redemption*, confirms this when he says,

... from this institution of sacrifices that was after the fall, all nations derived the custom of sacrificing. For this custom of offering up sacrifices to the gods, to atone for sins, was common to all nations.... This is a great evidence of the truth of the Christian religion; for no nation, but only the Jews, could tell how they came by this custom, or to what purpose it was to offer sacrifices to their deities. The light of nature did not teach them any such thing.... They

---

<sup>220</sup>Samuel Fallows (ed.), *The Popular and Critical Bible Encyclopedia and Scriptural Dictionary* (Chicago: The Howard-Severance Co., 1909), III, p. 1504.

derived it from Noah, who had it from his ancestors, on whom God had enjoined it as a type of the great sacrifice of Christ.<sup>221</sup>

The origin and nature of sacrifice may, therefore, be classified under two general heads: theories of the human origin of sacrifice, and the divine revelation view. The former aspect is set forth in various ways by its advocates as follows: (1) The Gift-Theory: by this it is held that sacrifices were originally presents to the deity to establish good relations and obtain favors and blessings; (2) The Magic-Theory: through the shedding of the substitute victim's blood the disease, evil, or sin clinging to the people was magically transferred to the animal; (3) The Table-Bond Theory: this view advocated by Wellhausen and W. R. Smith holds that sacrifices were meals in which the worshippers and the god shared, establishing a bond of fellowship between them; (4) The Sacramental Communion Theory: this is a modification of the former theory. Here the animal represented the god and thus through eating the totem the worshippers incorporated into themselves the power and life of the deity; (5) The Homage-Theory: in this view sacrifices originated as an expression of homage and dependence upon his god; (6) The Religious-Instinct Theory: the idea of sacrifice arose out of the religious instincts of the human heart, which had a consciousness of alienation between itself and God, and the primitive offered something of his own which might be accepted in his stead.

The Divine Revelation view, on the other hand, holds that God Himself initiated the rite at the time of man's fall and need of redemption. Abel offered an acceptable sacrifice by faith, which implies that it was based upon a positive enactment by God in the past, or else he himself would have been the author of the action, based not upon faith, but superstition. This concept based upon divine revelation has also been termed the Piacular view. This view holds that on the basis of divine authority sacrifices were fundamentally atoning, and that the death of the animal was a vicarious atonement for the sins of the offerer.<sup>222</sup>

---

<sup>221</sup>Jonathan Edwards, *The History of Redemption* (Evansville: Sovereign Grace Publishers, 1959), pp. 35-36.

<sup>222</sup>James Orr (ed.), *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* (Chicago: The Howard-Severance Co., 1915), IV, pp. 2638-40.

## The Essential Idea in Sacrifice<sup>223</sup>

To ascertain the essential idea in sacrifice will at the same time help to determine its origin. Robertson Smith and Wellhausen postulate the theory that the essential idea of sacrifice, with respect to its origin, is the sacrificial meal—the communion of the gods and man in a common meal. The god and the tribe were one, and as the common partaking of food in human relations united in a bond of friendship or covenant, the idea was transferred to the sphere of divine and human relations. The common sacrificial meal, as it cemented the union between men, also confirmed the relationship of the deity and men.<sup>224</sup> It is difficult, however, to maintain this theory in view of several considerations. This view cannot satisfactorily account for the diversity of sacrifices found among the Hebrews; and even more significant, if the sacrifices consisted only of a common sacramental meal between men and their god, how can one account for such a sacrifice as the *זֶלֶה* or *כָּלִיל*, the whole burnt-offering, in which all was consumed in the fire of the altar, and of which men did not partake at all?<sup>225</sup>

Others contend that the essential idea in sacrifice is that of self-surrender. But "to make any sacrifice denote *self-surrender* is to confound the feeling of the offerer with the meaning of the offering. The former is not self-surrender, but faith. The latter is the self-surrender, not of the offerer, but of the victim."<sup>226</sup> Some have believed that the virtue of the sacrifice consisted in a certain material possession being given up in return for a blessing. Others consider the sacrifices in the nature of a fine, by the payment of which the offender is set right again with his judge; and still others consider the blood propitiatory because it

---

<sup>223</sup>Five motives for sacrifice have been suggested by Bouquet: adoration, thanksgiving, bargaining, propitiation, and expiation. A. C. Bouquet, *Comparative Religion* (London: Pelican Books, 1954), p. 49.

<sup>224</sup>Covenants of a more serious import were often sealed by a common meal. Cf. the covenant between Jacob and Laban (Genesis 31:48-54); between Abimelech and Isaac (Genesis 26:27-31); between David and Abner (II Samuel 3:17-21).

<sup>225</sup>Davidson, *op. cit.*, p. 313.

<sup>226</sup>James G. Murphy, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary, on the Book of Leviticus* (Andover: Warren F. Draper, Publisher, 1872), p. 20.

being pure and innocent represented the acknowledgment that the sinner himself should be so.<sup>227</sup>

A. B. Davidson takes the view that sacrifices express merely the idea of a gift to deity with the hope of pleasing him. He writes, "Whatever the historical evolution of the idea of sacrifice, or whatever its primary idea, it seems certain that this idea of a gift or offering to God is the prevailing idea in the Hebrew religion from the earliest."<sup>228</sup> Davidson bases this view on the fact that the sacrifices of Cain and Abel are called a *מִנְחָה*, "a present." But this is not a valid basis, since the *מִנְחָה* did not simply signify a gift, or present, but was a Hebrew generic term designating offerings made to God of any kind, whether vegetable, animal, or mineral, and the offering of Abel could very well have been a whole burnt-offering as the text would seem to suggest. The sacrifices in the Book of Genesis are described in general terms, since they are not yet developed into a system. Hence, the first recorded sacrifice, that of Cain and Abel, avoids the use of technical terms and uses the general term *minchah* for both the animal and vegetable offering.<sup>229</sup> The term is used later to signify the meal-offering in Leviticus.

With respect to the difference in the offerings of Cain and Abel, the former being rejected, the latter accepted, some have attempted an explanation based upon the intrinsic value of the two gifts, but this is unlikely since both brought of the offerings from their respective occupations. Equally unsatisfactory is the explanation that Abel's offering was acceptable because it, unlike Cain's, was made by faith. Faith was, to be sure, the motivating principle in the offering, but the writer to the Hebrews states that because of faith Abel offered up an *acceptable* kind of offering—a blood sacrifice. "By faith Abel offered unto God a *more excellent sacrifice* than Cain, through which he had witness borne to him that he was righteous, God bearing witness *in respect of his gifts*...."<sup>230</sup> Hence, one is to look for something in Abel's sacrifice which indicated his faith, rather than simply looking at the faith itself. In the

---

<sup>227</sup>*The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch*, trans. J. W.

Etheridge (London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green, 1865), p. 47.

<sup>228</sup>Davidson, *op. cit.*, pp. 313-15.

<sup>229</sup>Kidner, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

<sup>230</sup>Hebrews 11:4 with Genesis 4:1-7.

cases of Noah, Abraham, Moses, and the other patriarchs, their actions with regard to sacrifice and worship cannot be accounted for, except by their faith in the truths revealed unto them. The analogy of other instances of sacrifice requires the conclusion that there was something about Abel's sacrifice that distinguished it from Cain's offering as an act of faith. While there is no real distinction between the two offerings with respect to value, seen in that the meal-offering under later Levitical legislation is called "most holy,"<sup>231</sup> there is, however, a great distinction between the two in that one was simply an inanimate object, whereas the other was a living creature.<sup>232</sup> One was a gift merely presented, the other was a life taken away. That Abel's offering of a blood sacrifice was made by faith, in conformity to some prior revelation which required atonement by blood sacrifice, seems apparent from the record in Genesis 4 and Hebrews 11. The very acceptance with which Abel's sacrifice met is tacit evidence of its divine institution.

It is by no means presumptive argument that may be drawn in favor of the divine institution of sacrifice from the universal prevalence of atoning sacrifices among the heathen. The heathen sacrifices did not arise, as others contend, as mere thank-offerings returned in gratitude for the blessings of Providence, nor did they arise out of the superstitious notion that the gods were invested with human passions and appetites, so that they might be conciliated by bribes, or gratified with the flesh of the slain victims. This notion is rebuked by the Apostle Paul in the first chapter of his Roman Epistle where he shows that the grosser forms of idolatry were the result of a gradual process of *deterioration*.<sup>233</sup>

Heathen sacrifices were, for the most part, piacular in nature; these sacrifices being vicarious in the strict sense of the expression, the victim, animal or human, being understood to bear the guilt and to

---

<sup>231</sup>Leviticus 6:17.

<sup>232</sup>According to Leviticus 5:11-13, the poverty stricken Israelite, too poor to bring an animal, or two turtledoves or pigeons for a sin-offering, could substitute the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour. This concession to poverty did not invalidate the principle that without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins, since such exceptions would be covered in the great annual sin-offering on the Day of Atonement. Without this temporary concession to poverty, there would have been one class in Israel not covered by the most important of all sacrifices, the sin-offering.

<sup>233</sup>Crawford, *op. cit.*, p. 266.

suffer the due punishment of the one whom he represents. *This is the essential idea in sacrifice.* This receives added confirmation in the fact that those rationalistic writers who are the most keenly opposed to the doctrine of the atonement, speaking disparagingly of vicarious sacrifice, do so on the ground that it is a *heathen concept* adopted from their practices. Therefore, the universal prevalence of the practice of vicarious and piacular sacrifice, in which there is an actual substitution made of an innocent victim in the place of the worshipper, cannot be reasonably explained apart from the idea that it was derived from a common and authoritative source.<sup>234</sup>

### The Antiquity and Meaning of זָבַח

The Hebrew word for sacrifice is זָבַח, meaning "to slaughter," either for a sacrifice or for eating. While it generally denotes the slaying of an animal for sacrifice, yet it is used in the Old Testament where the animal is slaughtered for the purpose of food. Thus the woman of Endor who prepared a meal for Saul is said to have "sacrificed" or "killed" the calf. "And the woman had a fatted calf in the house; and she hastened, and killed it [וַתִּזְבַּח־הוּ] "and she sacrificed it"...."<sup>235</sup> Animal flesh for food could be slaughtered by the Israelites, and the slaying of the animal is referred to by the sacrificial term זָבַח in Deuteronomy 12:15: "Notwithstanding, thou mayest kill [וַתִּזְבַּח] and eat flesh within all thy gates, after all the desire of thy soul...."<sup>236</sup> The reason for the close association of the ideas of slaughtering an animal for food and slaughtering for sacrifice, which is seen in the use of the same term זָבַח for both, is that in a real sense all slaughtering of animal life had a sacrificial import among the Hebrews. This is implied in the Genesis account of God providing coats of skins for Adam and Eve; it is seen in the sacrifice made by Jacob to ratify the covenant between Laban and himself, which consisted of a meal eaten together;<sup>237</sup> it is further indicated in the meal prepared for Saul;<sup>238</sup> and the sheep and oxen killed by Ahab for Jehoshaphat.<sup>239</sup> The passage noted in Deuteronomy 12:15 illustrates

<sup>234</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 266-68.

<sup>235</sup> | Samuel 28:24.

<sup>236</sup> Cf. also Deuteronomy 12:21; Ezekiel 34:3.

<sup>237</sup> Genesis 31:54.

<sup>238</sup> | Samuel 28:24.

<sup>239</sup> | I Chronicles 18:2.

the close connection between slaughtering for food and the concept of sacrifice in a definite way. Here it is said by God, after the permission to allow animals to be slaughtered (זָבַח) for food, that "thou shalt kill [זָבַח] of thy herd and of thy flock... and thou mayest eat within thy gates... only be sure that thou eat not the blood: for the blood is the life... thou shalt pour it out upon the earth as water"<sup>240</sup> (Cf. Leviticus 17:10-14).

The histories of Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob furnish evidence that the rite of sacrifice was familiar to the patriarchs before the time of Moses and the Israelite bondage in Egypt, from where the Hebrew idea of sacrifice originated. It is recorded that wherever the patriarchs pitched their tents they built an altar, מִזְבֵּחַ, and called upon the name of the Lord.<sup>241</sup> In the command given to Abraham to offer up Isaac, the boy expressed surprise when he learned his father was going to worship God without taking the customary sacrificial victim along; he inquired, "... Behold, the fire and the wood: but where is the lamb for a burnt-offering?"<sup>242</sup> This gives unmistakable proof that the rite of animal sacrifice was a familiar and acceptable method of religious worship by the ancient patriarchs.<sup>243</sup>

Earlier in the account of Noah, there is antediluvian confirmation of the practice of blood sacrifice, as well as an understanding of the essential idea in sacrifice, which may be seen in his selection from among the clean beasts of burnt-offerings for the altar. That the sacrifice was intended as propitiation is noted from the circumstances. All mankind had just been destroyed as God's judgment upon sin. Noah's first action after disembarking from the ark was to offer up burnt-offerings which the Lord accepted as a "sweet savour" (or as the Syriac version renders it "an odour of placability"), implying the offended Deity had now been appeased. This was indicated in the reply received by Noah, "... I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake...."<sup>244</sup> As Crawford surmises, "we may reason back, from the reception which the sacrifice met with, to what must have been the inten-

---

<sup>240</sup>Deuteronomy 12:21-24.

<sup>241</sup>Genesis 12:8; 13:4, 18; 26:25; 33:20; 25:1, 7.

<sup>242</sup>Genesis 22:7.

<sup>243</sup>Crawford, *op. cit.*, p. 270.

<sup>244</sup>Genesis 8:21.

tion of the sacrifice—namely, to propitiate the anger of a justly-offended God."<sup>245</sup>

In addition, God's command shortly after the Deluge to Noah and his descendants was that, while they were to use the animals for food, yet they were strictly forbidden to use the blood.<sup>246</sup> There can be no reasonable doubt but that it was the same reason God gave under the Mosaic legislation, "... I will set my face against that soul that eateth blood... for the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls...."<sup>247</sup> Another significant fact to be remembered is that since animals were not permitted to be slain for food until after the Deluge (Genesis 9:3), then the slaughtering of animals prior to this, as in the case of God's provision of coats of skins for Adam and Eve, and the animal offering of Abel, could only have been for the express purpose of blood sacrifices. The logical conclusion is that the shedding of sacrificial blood was the recognized and acceptable method of seeking remission of sin centuries before it was instituted at Sinai.<sup>248</sup>

### *The Definition of Sacrifice*

Fairbairn correctly observes that an accurate definition of sacrifice is impossible without prior definition of the ideas on which it rests. He says:

The idea of Sacrifice depends throughout on the idea of religion.... In other words, we must ascertain (a) the terms on which the religion conceives that God is willing to enter into communion with man, and to save him; (b) how far man's actual condition renders him capable or incapable of fulfilling these terms ; and (c) if he be unable, by what means or agency he may be enabled to do so.<sup>249</sup>

In view of the fact that there is no precise agreement as to the origin and nature of sacrifice among expositors of the Old Testament, it follows, therefore, that an examination of the definition of sacrifice will

---

<sup>245</sup>Crawford, *op. cit.*, p. 272.

<sup>246</sup>Genesis 9:3-4.

<sup>247</sup>Leviticus 17:10-11.

<sup>248</sup>Crawford, *loc. cit.*

<sup>249</sup>Sanday, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

reveal a similar diversity of opinion. The following definitions confirm this. Dr. Forsyth defines sacrifice as follows:

Sacrifice in Old Testament was first something shared by man with God as a meal, next something surrendered by man to God, and lastly this gift as symbolic of the surrender of the self in righteousness. It was in nature collective more than individual, and replaced the individual in the community of grace, when by his sin he had fallen from it.<sup>250</sup>

The definition of sacrifice, according to Dr. Driver, is difficult. He writes,

I doubt if the Hebrews had any term exactly co-extensive with our "sacrifice." Applying our idea of "sacrifice" to the regular and recognized sacrificial system of the Hebrews... I should say it was something offered to the deity, of which the whole (substantially) or a part was consumed on the altar.<sup>251</sup>

John Pye Smith, commenting on the origin and nature of sacrifice, defines it thus:

A sacrifice...is the solemn infliction of death on a living creature, generally by effusion of its blood, in a way of religious worship; and the presenting of this act to the Deity, as a supplication for the pardon of sin....<sup>252</sup>

According to C. F. Burney,

Sacrifice is a material oblation offered on the altar by which the nation as a whole, or an individual member of it, is brought into personal relationship with the Deity.<sup>253</sup>

Oehler held that in the widest sense the idea of sacrifice included the observance of sacred abstinence such as the Nazarite vow, fasting, and the Levitical rites of purification. In the narrower sense it

---

<sup>250</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 12

<sup>251</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 14.

<sup>252</sup> John Pye Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

<sup>253</sup> C. F. Burney, *Outlines of Old Testament Theology* (London: Rivingtons, 1920), p. 55.

refers to the presentation of a gift to God.<sup>254</sup> Canon Gore of Westminster said that sacrifice was "the presenting of anything before a god with a view to communion with him."<sup>255</sup> Baab in *The Theology of the Old Testament* writes that "... sacrifices were the tangible acts conceived as providing the sacrificer access to God and an assurance of his help to men."<sup>256</sup> H. Wheeler Robinson writes that sacrifice is to be regarded "... as a communion feast, strengthening the bond between the deity and his worshippers."<sup>257</sup>

Dr. Sanday outlines a three-fold definition of sacrifice:

There are three root-ideas in sacrifice which appear to be constant throughout: - (i) the idea of gift, tribute, propitiatory offering; (ii) the idea of communion through the sacrificial meal; and (iii) in either case, solemn presentation to God.<sup>258</sup>

Funk and Wagnalls' dictionary defines sacrifice as "the act of making an offering to God or a deity, as a tribute, a gift, or an expression of thanksgiving, especially for propitiation or atonement for sin"; "to surrender or devote with loss or suffering."<sup>259</sup> Cave adds to this definition the idea that the sacrifice was "... a gift to God,—a surrender to Jehovah of what has cost the offerer something. Negatively, it may be said that a sacrifice can never be costless, nor is that gift a sacrifice which is made to man."<sup>260</sup> Alexander Cruden defines sacrifice as "... an offering made to God upon his altars by the hand of a lawful minister, to acknowledge his power, to own entire dependence on him, or to conciliate his favour." A sacrifice differs from an oblation in that in a sacrifice there must be a change or destruction of the thing offered; whereas an oblation is but a simple offering of a gift.<sup>261</sup>

---

<sup>254</sup>Gustave Friedrich Oehler, *Theology of the Old Testament*, trans. George E. Day (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, [n.d.], pp. 261-62.

<sup>255</sup>Sanday, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

<sup>256</sup>Baab, *op. cit.*, p. 154.

<sup>257</sup>H. W. Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 143.

<sup>258</sup>Sanday, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

<sup>259</sup>Isaac K. Funk et al (eds.), *A Standard Dictionary of the English Language* (New York and London: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1905), p. 1560.

<sup>260</sup>Cave, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

<sup>261</sup>Alexander Cruden, *Cruden's Unabridged Concordance* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1954), p. 409.

Some of these definitions reflecting the views of liberal theology are to be rejected; others, while expressing some measure of truth, are inadequate expressions of the Old Testament idea of sacrifice. The idea of sacrifice in the Old Testament is no insignificant concept, but on the contrary it is one of the most comprehensive ideas in the religious thought of the Hebrews. An accurate and satisfactory definition of sacrifice is difficult to determine, if for no other reason than the fact that there is such a great variety of offerings and meanings in the Old Testament record. An acceptable definition of sacrifice must of necessity take into consideration the meaning and usage of the Hebrew terms, the purpose of sacrifice, as well as its declared effect.

The fundamental difficulty arises from the fact that the Hebrew term for sacrifice (זָבַח) is subject to much ambiguity in the English translations. The English word "sacrifice" is derived from the Latin word *sacrificium*, which signified the slaughter of an animal as an offering to deity. But it must be carefully noted, however, that in Hebrew usage the term sacrifice, זָבַח, can be properly applied only to those animal sacrifices which culminated in a sacrificial meal of fellowship and communion, such as the Passover, the covenant sacrifices, and the varieties of the peace-offering; namely, the thank-offering, the vow-offering, and the free-will offering. The translators of the English versions have confused the meaning of זָבַח, sacrifice, by sometimes using it to translate the מִנְחָה, gift or offering, the קָרְבָּן, an offering, the אֶשֶׁה, an offering made by fire, the סֵדָה, feast, the תּוֹדָה, thank-offering, etc., rather than translating the Hebrew meaning of the various types of offerings. Furthermore, in popular usage outside the Scripture text, the English word "sacrifice" has come to signify, in general, *all* offerings made to God, whether vegetable, animal, or mineral; and specifically used to refer to the animal blood offerings made upon the altar. This also appears to be the accepted usage by the New Testament writers who translate (as does the LXX) the Hebrew word זָבַח by θυσία, which means "a sacrifice" and by the Greek verb θύω meaning "to offer sacrifice" (Cf. I Corinthians 5:7; Hebrews 9:26, etc.). Hence, it is in this derived usage of a sacrifice referring to the blood substitutionary offerings of all kinds upon the altar, rather than its technical Old Testament meaning of a sacrifice which culminates in a feast, that the following definition is suggested as an adequate expression of the Levitical concept of sacrifice.

*Sacrifice is to be defined as a substitutionary blood offering made to God by His duly appointed ministers upon His altar with the object of covering sin and propitiating His just indignation, restoring those, upon whose behalf it is offered, to fellowship and communion with God, and expressing, with respect to the purpose for which it was offered, either penitence, homage, gratitude, thanksgiving, dedication and consecration, communion, or entreaty of divine blessing.*

### *The Moral and Ethical Nature of the Levitical Sacrifices*

The question under consideration here is significant, since it bears directly on the doctrine of substitution in the Old Testament. Did the Levitical sacrifices have only a ceremonial reference and cleanse merely ceremonial sins, or were they moral and ethical in their design and affected moral transgressions of the Law? In the solution of this problem is to be found the very basis for the doctrine of substitution in the Old Testament.

#### The Ceremonial View of Old Testament Sacrifice

"Speaking generally," writes Dale, "neither sin-offering nor trespass-offering could, when offered by an individual, assure forgiveness to the guilty for any sins committed either against God or man. They removed ceremonial defilement...."<sup>262</sup> The rather categorical statement that no sacrifices could secure forgiveness for specific moral offenses, but were applicable only to ceremonial defilement unavoidably incurred, is the view held by a number of Old Testament scholars such as Dale, Cave, Crawford, Hodge, et al. This is surprising in view of the fact that to deny the moral and ethical nature of the Levitical sacrifices is tantamount to a denial of the doctrine of substitution itself, which doctrine the above named scholars stoutly defended with respect to Old Testament sacrifices. But their failure to see their incongruity at this place lies, as strange as it may seem, in their zeal to defend the doctrine of the vicarious atonement of Christ. Falling prey to the common mistake of reading New Testament theology into Old Testament thought, they place an unwarranted emphasis on the typical and shadowy nature of Old Testament sacrifice. That is to say, it is one thing to

---

<sup>262</sup>R. W. Dale, *The Atonement* (London: Congregational Union of England and Wales, 1985), p. 469.

contend that the Old Testament sacrifices were typical of the good things to come, but it is quite another to state categorically that they had reference only to ceremonial defilement. Such an assertion falls so far short of the divinely intended meaning and purpose of sacrificial worship, that it is, to say the least, a careless statement.

The significance of the question at hand lies, as stated above, in just this: a denial of the moral, spiritual, and ethical nature of the Old Testament Levitical sacrifices is equivalent to a denial of their substitutionary character. Why this is so can be stated quite simply: if the Levitical sacrifices could not atone for moral, ethical, and spiritual sins and transgressions, as well as ceremonial defilement, then why would there be any need of the concept of substitution at all? Ceremonial defilement was incurred by such external transgressions of the law as touching a dead body, childbirth, leprosy, breaking a Nazarite vow by drinking wine or touching a corpse, etc. This defilement, obviously external, transgressed mere arbitrary precepts to insure symbolic cleanliness and holiness, and such transgression could as well have been atoned for by a bloodless offering if God had so desired. But on the other hand, moral, and ethical sins had to do with spiritual iniquity and could only be atoned for by the shedding of the blood of an innocent victim, who bore the guilt and punishment by its death for the actual transgressor. Even admitting the need for blood sacrifice to cleanse mere outward ceremonial defilement, how much more then would blood sacrifice be required to remove actual moral guilt? The very ritual of the sacrifice, the laying of the hands upon the head of the victim and the confession of sins, the slaying of the innocent victim in the place of the sinner, and the sprinkling of the blood as an atonement upon the altar, all graphically bespeak of moral guilt. If nothing else, the view that the Levitical sacrifices removed only ceremonial defilement makes the *sin* and *trespass-offerings* quite superfluous. Only the admission that the Old Testament Levitical sacrifice had a moral and ethical reference, as well as ceremonial, conceives of these sacrifices as worthy of the greatest concept of the Scriptures—the doctrine of the Substitutionary Atonement. The importance of this premise will be examined more at length under the Doctrine of Substitution.<sup>263</sup> The purpose at this point is

---

<sup>263</sup>See p. 2541ff "The nature of the Efficacy of Old Testament Sacrifice."

to show that the Levitical sacrifices did not have reference only to ceremonial transgressions, but to moral and ethical guilt as well.

### The Moral and Ethical Conception of Old Testament Sacrifice

Rather than Old Testament sacrifice being non-moral, or purely ceremonial, as some have contended, and a ritualistic system at variance with the prophetic conception of morality, it is quite the contrary. The characteristic idea of Old Testament sacrifice is the categorical insistence upon moral righteousness in man's relation both to God and his neighbor. The fundamental conception was the awareness of the divine presence, the consciousness of sin, the offering of a substitutionary sacrifice in humble faith and repentance, the abandonment of the sinful will, and the willing acceptance of the divine penalty. This ethical conception of sacrifice was not the product of prophetic preaching, but rather the motive. They sought to restore the divine intention of the Sinaitic Covenant; they were not in essential opposition to one another.

### *The Unwarranted Distinction between the Levitical or Ceremonial and the Prophetic or Moral Conceptions in the Old Testament*

It was at one time rather popular among critical scholars to emphasize a strong distinction between the Levitical and prophetic elements in the Old Testament, and either condemning outright the former, or minimizing its spiritual importance. Historically the Levitical element was as essential to the religious life and development of Israel as the prophetic. It formed the framework, as it were, without which the continuity of the religious life of the Jewish nation would have been impossible. Some would go so far as to eliminate the Levitical element from the New Testament idea of sacrifice, which of course is impossible.<sup>264</sup> The statement that Christ "... our passover also hath been sacrificed...." in I Corinthians 5:7 is most certainly Levitical in its import, to say nothing of the entire Epistle to the Hebrews.

No valid distinction can be made between the early and later portions of the Old Testament, nor between the Levitical (or ceremonial) and prophetic (or moral) elements of the Old Testament, since each was divinely instituted to serve its proper purpose. Such a separation is

---

<sup>264</sup>Sanday, *op. cit.*, pp. 90-91.

unbiblical and foreign to Old Testament thought. Throughout Israel's history the moral was taught *through* the ceremonial, the ceremonial being the necessary vehicle for the expression of the moral. The Jewish sacrifices were, by divine intention, to reflect the moral truths of obedience, self-sacrifice, self-dedication, love for and devotion to God, recognition of sin, repentance, and many other spiritual conceptions. Throughout the Old Testament the moral interprets the ritual and the ceremonial gives meaning to the ethical. It is indeed a narrow view of Old Testament sacrifice to fail to see in its institution moral, ethical, and spiritual elements. There was pervading the idea of sacrifice a principle of righteousness. Sacrifice was the divinely appointed means of securing a right standing before God in the Mosaic dispensation, and it is faulty hermeneutics to interpret Old Testament sacrificial concepts in terms of New Testament theology. It cannot be overemphasized that the interpreter of Old Testament thought, practices, and theological concepts must constantly remind himself that the Old Testament Hebrew did not have at his disposal the Epistle to the Romans and its revelation of righteousness *without the law* "even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ...,"<sup>265</sup> nor did he have the Hebrews' Epistle and its testimony to the nature of Old Testament sacrifice as being typical and a shadow of the good things to come.<sup>266</sup>

The interpreter of Old Testament sacrifice should be aware of two things often overlooked. First, to follow to its logical conclusion the idea that the Old Testament Levitical sacrifices were merely typical or efficacious only with respect to ceremonial sins, and had no real importance, results in the denial of the importance of a great portion of the Pentateuch itself, especially Leviticus in its entirety, and a great part of Exodus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. Such a view can give no satisfactory reason for the institution of sacrifice at all. The second factor often overlooked in Old Testament sacrifice is that sacrifice was not to the Hebrew some crude, temporary, and merely typical institution, nor a substitute for that dispensation until better things were provided by revelation, but, as will be shown, *sacrifice was then the only sufficient means of remaining in harmonious relation to God. It was ade-*

---

<sup>265</sup>70Romans 3:21-22.

<sup>266</sup>This of course is not to deny the necessity of faith on the part of the Israelite, but to emphasize the proper importance and place of divinely instituted sacrifice and Mosaic worship in its dispensation.

*quate for the period in which God intended it should serve.* This is not the same as saying Levitical sacrifice was on an equal with the sacrifice of Christ, nor that the blood of bulls and goats could, from God's side, take away sins; but it is recognizing the reality of the divine institution of Mosaic worship, and looking, as too often Old Testament interpreters fail to do, at sacrifice from the viewpoint of the Hebrew in the Old Testament dispensation. Sacrifice, to the pious Hebrew, was not something unimportant, or simply a perfunctory ritual, but it was an important element in his *moral obedience to the revealed will of God.* Sacrifice was by its very nature intensely personal, ethical, moral, and spiritual, because it was intended to reflect the attitude of the heart and will towards God.

It is just at this point that the prophetic assaults upon the sacrificial system can find explanation. The Israelites had come to believe that punctilious attention to sacrificial ritual and ceremony could atone for their sins however great. But this notion was a misconception of the very principle of the ceremonial system which was based upon moral and ethical conduct within the Covenant. The prophets insisted that the people unite moral conduct with their religious observances. This polemic against mere ceremonialism appears in many Old Testament passages.<sup>267</sup> The two sides to this problem are clearly seen in the words of the Psalmist. He writes in Psalm 51:16-17:

For thou delightest not in sacrifice; else would I give it:  
Thou hast no pleasure in burnt-offering.  
The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit:  
A broken and contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise.

To the superficial observer this would appear as a rejection of sacrifice as a result of the later higher moral concept of religion by the Hebrews. But verse 19 which follows repudiates this view; for after the heart of the worshipper is turned in penitence toward God,

Then wilt thou delight in right sacrifices,  
In burnt-offering and whole burnt-offering:  
Then will they offer bullocks upon thine altar.<sup>268</sup>

---

<sup>267</sup>Cf. Psalms 50:23; 40:6-10; 69:30; Isaiah 1:11-15; Micah 6:6-8.

<sup>268</sup>Psalm 51:19 RSV.

## *The Religious Purpose in the Levitical Sacrifices*

The Scriptural doctrine of Sacrifice is of inestimable value in understanding the cardinal tenet of Christianity, the doctrine of the Substitutionary Atonement. "There is no book," writes Andrew Bonar, "in the whole compass of that inspired Volume which the Holy Ghost has given us, that contains more of the very words of God than *Leviticus*. It is God that is the direct speaker in almost every page...."<sup>269</sup> The rites contained in the Book were typical and intended by God to bear resemblance to some higher spiritual truth. "The likeness between type and antitype is never accidental."<sup>270</sup> The Levitical sacrifices, in view of the work of the cross, are ample testimony to the cogency of this truth.

Few elements in the Mosaic dispensation are more significant than the system of Levitical sacrifices for numerous reasons. Basically, however, the reason for its importance to the Christian dispensation is that the Levitical system of offerings served a religious purpose not only for the past, but also the present and future. God, who purposed from eternity to make a special intervention in the affairs of men, not only intimated His purpose in shadowy outline to His chosen nation, but also prefigured the course He would adopt in an extraordinary and graphic manner. The Levitical system of sacrifices sketched in shadowy outline, by providing forgiveness for sin through substitutionary atonement, the unique work that divine grace was to accomplish in the fullness of time.<sup>271</sup>

Mosaic worship was designed to provide ample resources for the spiritual needs of the Israelite. Whatever the religious feeling needed to be expressed, with respect to God, it could find adequate expression through the complexities of the Mosaic ritual. The rite of sacrifice was a symbolic act, adapted and intended to convey important instruction. The nature and circumstances of the sacrifices indicate that they were intended as a species of symbolical language. The Levitical ritual of the special selection, presentation, slaying and sprinkling of the blood of the victim, together with the solemn ceremonies and confes-

---

<sup>269</sup>Andrew A. Bonar, *A Commentary on the Book of Leviticus* (Evansville: The Sovereign Grace Publishers, 1959), p. vii.

<sup>270</sup>*Ibid.*, p. viii.

<sup>271</sup>Girdlestone, *op. cit.*, p. 185.

sions of the worshipper, must have graphically impressed upon the consciousness the ideas of sin and guilt, the desert of punishment, the substitution of the innocent, and the covering of sin.

Fundamentally, therefore, it was the design of the Mosaic Law to remind the Israelites that they were guilty of sin and liable to death. Every sacrifice was a memorial of this solemn truth, hence the Apostle writes, "But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance made of sins year by year."<sup>272</sup> It was impossible for the devout mind to avoid recognition of deep spiritual truths—that sin is transgression against a Holy God and that His righteousness demands punishment; that death is the inevitable punishment, and that the sinner is unable to escape its consequences; yet that God by His grace condescends to pardon the guilty through the substitution of a piacular victim.<sup>273</sup>

### *Spiritual Purification an Important Element in Hebrew Thought*

"The process whereby moral impurity was to be done away was typified or shadowed forth by the purifications of the Levitical ritual;<sup>274</sup> and the word which is in general use in the Old Testament to express the process is טָהַר, "to be clean, or pure." External purification from early times was taken as a symbol of internal cleansing. Thus Jacob says to his household '... Put away the foreign gods that are among you, and purify yourselves, and change your garments."<sup>275</sup> "The cleansing and the change of dress were evidently intended to set forth the resolution to put away those false gods by which their lives had been contaminated."<sup>276</sup> Hence, טָהַר can signify both ceremonial and moral or spiritual cleansing. Ceremonial cleansing is probably most clearly illustrated in the cleansing from leprosy by ceremonial ritual to be enacted upon cure.<sup>277</sup> Ceremonial cleansing was also made in preparation for sacred duties of priests and of people.<sup>278</sup> The verb טָהַר is used in the moral and spiritual sense in numerous passages: "Purify me with hyssop, and I shall be clean: Wash me, and I shall be whiter

---

<sup>272</sup>Hebrews 10:3.

<sup>273</sup>John Pye Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

<sup>274</sup>Girdlestone, *op. cit.*, p. 143.

<sup>275</sup>Genesis 35:2.

<sup>276</sup>Girdlestone, *loc. cit.*

<sup>277</sup>Leviticus 14.

<sup>278</sup>Numbers 8:7; II Chronicles 30:18; Ezra 6:20; Nehemiah 13:22.

than snow."<sup>279</sup> "... O Jerusalem! thou wilt not be made clean...."<sup>280</sup> "Is the iniquity of Peor too little for us, from which we have not cleansed ourselves unto this day...?"<sup>281</sup> In the familiar prophecy of Ezekiel קְהָר is used both in its verbal form and as the adjective טָהוֹר to denote spiritual cleansing, "and I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and you shall be clean; from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you."<sup>282</sup>

Therefore, the Levitical sacrifices and ceremonial ritual, which symbolized cleansing from spiritual impurity, were appointed by God as the central expression of Israel's worship. And that blood sacrifice had particular reference to moral and ethical transgressions of the Law is to be seen from the Scriptures themselves with respect to the nature of the transgressions atoned for by Levitical sacrifices.

### *Objective Evidence as to the Moral and Ethical Nature of Old Testament Sacrifice*

The sin and trespass-offerings atoned for the following catalogue of sins and trespasses, which will reveal quite clearly that they were designed to cover, in the majority of cases, moral and ethical sins, rather than merely ceremonial defilement.

Sin-offerings were presented for the following sins:

1. When the high priest had committed an offense and brought guilt upon the nation.
2. When the whole nation had transgressed through ignorance and repented.
3. The Day of Atonement - when the sins of the entire nation were atoned for.
4. When the magistrate had committed an offense through error. Leviticus 4:22-26.
5. Individual sin through ignorance.

---

<sup>279</sup>Psalm 51:7 (51:9-Hebrew).

<sup>280</sup>Jeremiah 13:27.

<sup>281</sup>Joshua 22:17.

<sup>282</sup>Ezekiel 36:25.

6. Purification after an issue of blood; childbirth. Leviticus 15:2-15, 25-30; 12:6-8.

7. When a Nazarite had touched a corpse; and when the time of his vow was completed. Numbers 6:10-14.

8. On the consecration of a priest or Levite. Leviticus 9:23; Numbers 8:8,12.

9. On purification of a leper. Leviticus 14:19-31.

10. All sins moral, civil, and ceremonial not covered by the trespass-offering. The sin-offering covered *all* sins of a moral and ethical nature, including errors due to frailty and rashness. Often overlooked is the fact that the reason sin-offerings are not limited purely to moral and ethical sins, but were combined with lustrations for uncleanness, is found in the fact that sexual conditions, leprosy, and death were quite naturally regarded in their connection with the natural sinfulness of man.<sup>283</sup>

Trespass-offerings were presented in the following cases:

1. When a person did not inform of a crime committed by another, he being morally and legally required to give information.

2. When a person had ceremonially defiled himself by touching an unclean object, and discovered it too late to bring the sacrifice of purification.

3. When an individual had rashly sworn that he would do a certain thing, and then, through forgetfulness neglected to perform it, he was under moral obligation to present a trespass-offering.

4. When a person had by mistake applied to common use that which had been consecrated to a holy use.

5. When an individual refused to give up what had been committed to his trust, or violated an engagement, or denied stolen property which had come into his possession, or concealed any lost property he had found.

---

<sup>283</sup>Oehler, *op. cit.*, p. 302.

6. When any person had, through ignorance, done something forbidden and afterwards learned of it.

7. When a man had sexual relations with a female slave.

8. A Nazarite who had contracted defilement by touching a dead body and a leper who had been cured were to bring trespass-offerings.

All except two and eight obviously are concerned with moral and ethical sins, rather than ceremonial, and thus this evidence renders completely groundless the assertion that the Levitical sacrifices atoned for only ceremonial defilement.

### *The Ground for the Moral and Ethical Nature of Levitical Sacrifices*

The Pentateuch clearly demonstrates that the efficacious nature of Mosaic worship in no slight degree depended upon the mental attitude of the worshipper. The priests were forbidden to perform their sacred functions under the influence of strong drink. "And Jehovah spake unto Aaron saying, Drink no wine nor strong drink, thou, nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the tent of meeting, that ye die not...."<sup>284</sup> With respect to the individual sacrifices many were voluntary, as the burnt-offerings, and free-will offering, and would therefore reflect the subjective or spiritual element. It was required that the sin-offerings were to be made when the knowledge of transgressions became known to the offender; hence, penitence and unfeigned faith is implied whenever an offering was given. In fact, every sin and trespass-offering was a public confession of sin and of the need of cleansing. On the Day of Atonement the spiritual injunction was that all are to "... afflict your souls...,"<sup>285</sup> by a fast and inward humble repentance.

It is a strong testimony to the spiritual nature of Mosaic sacrifices that they were not designed to cover wilful and premeditated sins, and therefore did not provide mechanical or automatic atonement without regard to the spiritual condition or intention of the worshipper. The ritual of the imposition of hands and the confession of sins is clearly a spiritual exercise. Further, the Pentateuch is filled with the necessity of

---

<sup>284</sup>Leviticus 10:8-9.

<sup>285</sup>Leviticus 16:29-31.

moral as well as ceremonial obedience.<sup>286</sup> Scores of precepts are as clearly moral and spiritual as any in the New Testament revelation itself. Exodus 22:21-22 states: "And a sojourner shalt thou not wrong, neither shalt thou oppress him.... Ye shall not afflict any widow, or fatherless child." Again, "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil...."<sup>287</sup> "... ye shall be holy...."<sup>288</sup> "Thou shalt not take vengeance, nor bear any grudge... but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."<sup>289</sup>

It has been objected that the Old Testament sacrificial system was a mistaken concept of worship, not divinely instituted, and ignored the essentially personal relation between man and God, and substituted an impersonal ceremonial transaction for personal devotion. But this objection assumes that the use of materials in worship necessarily implies that personal relations cannot be expressed. But what could be more personal than Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac? Why could not the Israelite's offering of a sacrifice, at personal cost to himself, express the conviction that he was not able to offer himself, and that this substitute signified the penalty due him as he offered it in personal devotion and humble penitence?<sup>290</sup> "Every sacrifice was assumed to have a vital connection with the spirit of the worshipper. The offering, unless accompanied with the heart of the offerer, was rejected by God (Psalm xl. 6; 1. 8-15; Prov. xxi. 3; Isaiah i. 11-15; Jer. vii. 21-23; Hosea vi. 6; Micah vi. 7-8; 1 Sam. xv. 22; Matt. v. 23-24)."<sup>291</sup> The legal order of the sacrifices was first the sin-offering, then the burnt-offering, followed by the peace-offering. The spiritual order corresponds to this: the sin of the worshipper must first be removed by an atonement; then he must consecrate himself to God; and finally, he can then offer up acceptable sacrifice of love and fellowship.<sup>292</sup>

---

<sup>286</sup>Cave, *op. cit.*, pp. 146-48.

<sup>287</sup>Leviticus 23:2.

<sup>288</sup>Leviticus 19:2.

<sup>289</sup>Leviticus 19:18.

<sup>290</sup>Leonard Hodgson, *The Doctrine of the Atonement* (London: Nesbet & Co., Ltd., 1951), p. 29.

<sup>291</sup>Cushing Biggs Hassell, *History of the Church of God, from the Creation to A.D. 1885* (Rev & completed by Sylvester Hassell, New York: Gilbert Beebe's Sons, Publishers, 1948), p. 90.

<sup>292</sup>*Ibid.*

The Hebrew Soncino commentary on Leviticus states that the burnt-offering "... also atoned for the contemplation of a sinful act although not committed."<sup>293</sup> In fact "all sacrifices had to be accompanied by a sincere confession of guilt, indicative of true repentance and a change of heart."<sup>294</sup> According to the Mishnah forgiveness was not effected automatically through sacrifice without regard to the attitude of the worshipper. "If a man said 'I will sin and repent, and sin again and repent,' he will be given no chance to repent. [If he said,] 'I will sin and the Day of Atonement will effect atonement,' then the Day of Atonement effects no atonement."<sup>295</sup>

A great moral and religious idea lay at the root of the Old Testament sacrifices. That idea was one of the formative influences in the ethical education of Israel.... Ceremonial cleanliness was not to remain a negative and fruitless idea, a mere religious dress for a holy nation.<sup>296</sup>

The dwelling of God in the midst of Israel did not remove the great gulf that divided the holy God from sinful men. Fellowship and communion with Him could be maintained only through sacrifice and priestly intercession. One could not approach the Most High God who was not first cleansed by acts of sacrifice.<sup>297</sup> The ritual of sacrifice was intended to deepen the conviction of uncleanness, not just ceremonial impurity, but to remind Israel that they, as God's people, must be free from all impurity and defilement of life and soul.

The Old Testament foundation is an *ethical* one—the moral nature of man, the recognition of the holiness of God, the consciousness of the sinfulness of man, and the divine institution of a system of worship by which reconciliation and redemption can be effected. It is both naive and unrealistic to speak of ancient Mosaic worship and sacrifice as purely ceremonial and non-ethical. The God of Israel presented Himself as both an ethical God and the standard or norm for Israel. On

---

<sup>293</sup>A. Cohen (ed.), *The Soncino Chumash* (Hindhead, Surrey: The Soncino Press, 1947), p. 606.

<sup>294</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 605.

<sup>295</sup>*The Mishnah*, trans. Herbert Lanby (London: Oxford University Press, 1949), p. 172.

<sup>296</sup>W. S. Bruce, *The Ethics of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895), p. 210.

<sup>297</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 208.

their conformity to this model and standard, the Old Testament revealed to them that all their prosperity and blessedness, both temporal and future, were dependent. "Ye shall be holy; for I Jehovah your God am holy" (Leviticus 19:2; 21:8; I Samuel 2:2; Psalm 22:3; 145:17; Isaiah 6:3; 52:10; Job 6:10, et al.). Israel was reminded perpetually that this true holiness was her only standard.<sup>298</sup> The very basis of God demanding exclusive worship was His moral holiness: "Exalt ye Jehovah our God, and worship at his footstool: Holy is he."<sup>299</sup> The reason given for Israel's judgment was her rejection of this moral and ethical holiness which had caused a separation.<sup>300</sup>

M. Lazarus, a German-Hebrew scholar, in his work *The Ethics of Judaism*, confirms the Hebrew concept of ceremony and Law as moral and not just a formal system of ritual and legalistic codes. He writes, "Lawfulness, the disposition to fulfill the law as such, may be considered the real aim of law...." The idea is that an act becomes moral through obedience to the law that produces it. "All other purposes disappear, or rather are subdued... and the moral purpose is left supreme and alone authoritative."<sup>301</sup> The significance of this Jewish interpretation of Mosaic law is that the aim of the law, from the Old Testament viewpoint, was to produce the fruits of obedience, which response in itself is a moral act. Hence, there is no such thing, as liberalism affirms, as mere ceremonial and ritualistic intention in the law and sacrifices. The very act itself of presenting a sin-offering, in obedience to the Law, constituted a moral action, to say nothing of the moral incentives which promoted the offering on the part of the sinner.

Man as flesh, in contrast to the holy God, is weak, creaturely, and on his moral side, sinful and impure; for according to the Hebrew view, the two are inseparable, and thus in his natural condition man is never fit to draw near to God. Accordingly, when he wished to express his devotion and loyalty or to obtain forgiveness, he was required to

---

<sup>298</sup>The Hebrew term used in the Old Testament for God's holiness is which , קדוש קדוש implies the denial of evil, separated from any communion with it. Hence, man's fellowship with His holiness makes him holy (Leviticus 21:8, 15, 23; 22:9, 32).

<sup>299</sup>Psalm 99:5.

<sup>300</sup>W. A. Jarrel, *Old Testament Ethics Vindicated* (Greenville, Texas: W. A. Jarrel Publisher, 1882), pp. 47-48.

<sup>301</sup>M. Lazarus, *The Ethics of Judaism*, trans. Henrietta Szold (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1901), Part II, p. 51.

come to Him through the medium of blood sacrifice which provided a covering for his sin and his creatureliness.<sup>302</sup> The necessity for this covering arises from God's holiness, on the one hand, and His wrath against sin, on the other; hence, no valid Biblical distinction can be made between the Old Testament conception of the moral and ceremonial elements of Mosaic worship, nor even less between the holiness of God and the righteousness of God as one writer contends.<sup>303</sup>

According to the view of A. B. Davidson "there were in Israel two streams of conception regarding God, running side by side." In the one view, God is a King, who as a righteous Ruler and Judge, punishes sin judicially, or freely forgives it of His mercy, requiring not sacrifice, but only repentance. In the other view, God is a holy Person, dwelling among His people, who, in their approach to worship Him, must remove all their uncleanness by ceremonial lustrations and sacrificial ritual.<sup>304</sup> But such an hypothesis makes an unwarranted distinction, on the one hand, between the divine righteousness and divine holiness, and between moral holiness and ceremonial holiness, on the other. In fact, there can be no valid separation made between the moral and ceremonial as critical scholarship contends, because one was the necessary Old Testament vehicle for the expression of the other.

The Old Testament recognizes the moral righteousness of God which manifests itself as wrath against sin, and it at the same time recognizes this sin as moral impurity affecting man's being and disturbing his relationship with the holy God. In the Mosaic economy this impurity and unholiness was to be covered by substitutionary blood sacrifice, which propitiated the holy Lord who dwelt among them.

Holiness in the Old Testament embraces all that Yahweh is.<sup>305</sup> His other attributes such as love, mercy, righteousness, etc., are all

---

<sup>302</sup>Hermann Schultz, *Old Testament Theology*, trans. J. A. Paterson (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1898), pp. 399-400.

<sup>303</sup>This is not to confuse these two divine attributes, since God's holiness is an attribute distinct from His righteousness; but they are not, as Old Testament critical scholarship contends, two streams of conception regarding God to be seen in contrast to one another and later coming together in the prophets.

<sup>304</sup>Davidson, *op. cit.*, p. 318.

<sup>305</sup>"Holiness," according to Wellhausen, means almost the same as "exclusive." The ideal of holiness governed the whole life of the Israelite by means of ceremonies and

embraced by His fundamental attribute of holiness. Hence, all sins in the Old Testament whether moral or the so-called ceremonial sins are looked upon as uncleanness and defilement—defilement of the land, defilement of the sanctuary, and defilement of the people. The land was made unholy and defiled by sin: "Ye shall keep my statutes and ordinances... for all these abominations have the men of the land done, that were before you, and the land is defiled."<sup>306</sup> The sanctuary itself must be yearly cleansed from the defilement which it incurs from being in the midst of the sinful people:

And he shall make atonement for the holy place, because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions, even all their sins: and so shall he do for the tent of meeting, that dwelleth with them in the midst of their uncleannesses.<sup>307</sup>

The moral nature of Levitical defilement is clearly indicated in this passage where Israel's uncleanness is identified as transgressions and sins, and not mere ceremonial impurity. That this defilement is moral and not simply ceremonial is put beyond any question of doubt in Leviticus 18-19, where holiness and defilement are directly related to the entire catalogue of moral and ethical precepts: incest, adultery, idolatry, theft, cursing, gossip, hate love for one's neighbor, harlotry, spiritism, righteousness in business transactions, et al. In connection with these moral and ethical precepts it is commanded, "Defile not yourselves in any of these things."<sup>308</sup> "... Ye shall be holy: for I Jehovah your God am holy."<sup>309</sup>

Equally unknown in the Old Testament is the idea that the Levitical purifications and ritual offerings were only symbolical, that is, operations performed merely to suggest the *ideas* of moral purity. On the contrary, Levitical defilements, as just noted, were identified with moral iniquities, and thus were real, and as such were offenses to the divine nature and holiness, and required the blood of the sin and trespass-

---

observances which separated the Hebrew from the heathen. J. Wellhausen, *Sketch of the History of Israel and Judah* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1891), p. 207.

<sup>306</sup>Leviticus 18:26-7.

<sup>307</sup>Leviticus 16:16.

<sup>308</sup>Leviticus 18:24.

<sup>309</sup>Leviticus 19:2.

offerings to atone for them. The Old Testament knows nothing of the subtle distinction made by modern scholarship between purely ceremonial and purely moral defilement. This does not necessarily mean that some defilements were not of a more legalistic or ceremonial character than others, such as may be seen in the uncleanness arising from touching the dead, as contrasted with the crime of murder for example. But what it does mean is that (1) the Old Testament considers all disobedience to a revealed precept as sin, and (2) that there is some moral conception underlying every Levitical ordinance. This is clearly seen in the case of the cleansed leper, the touching of the dead, the woman who had given birth, and those who had been cured of a sexual issue; they were unclean and were required to bring a trespass-offering. If some moral conception did not underlie these defilements, then a mere burnt-offering, peace-offering, or meal-offering could have sufficed. But the requirement was a guilt or trespass-offering; for by their impurity they had sinned or trespassed against God's holiness.<sup>310</sup> As noted previously, man as flesh is mortal and creaturely, and on his moral side sinful and impure; and thus all manner of disease, sexual impurity, death. etc., only tended to emphasize this truth.

An instructive instance of the close relation between the so-called ceremonial defilement and moral transgression or sin is seen in that Nazarite defilement, incurred by touching the dead, is called *sin* and must be atoned for by a sin-offering.

And if any man die very suddenly beside him and he defile the head of his separation.... he shall bring two turtle-doves... and the priest shall offer one for a *sin-offering*... and make *atonement* for him, for that *he sinned* by reason of the dead....<sup>311</sup>

Therefore, the ground or the meaning of this conception of sin in the Old Testament is that *all disobedience, or infraction of the holiness of the Levitical precepts, was disobedience to the revealed will of God, and was therefore, constituted as sin, thus implying a moral character underlying every Mosaic ordinance.*

---

<sup>310</sup>The fact that such impurity was inadvertently acquired does not alter the fact that God designated it as trespassing His holiness; that He recognized its involuntary nature is seen in His provision for cleansing. Sin does not cease to be sin simply because it is involuntary.

<sup>311</sup>Numbers 6:9-12.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE DOCTRINE OF SUBSTITUTION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

#### *The Nature of Substitution*

It has been shown that the principal doctrine of the Scriptures concerns the means and conditions for the reconciliation of sinful humanity unto God; thus the doctrine of Atonement is the cardinal doctrine of the Old and New Testaments. Old Testament history is the history of salvation, and is, therefore, a revelation of the activity of God, who by His grace purposed the redemption of man. Anselm, in his monumental work *Cur Deus-Homo?* ("Why the God-Man?"), brings into focus the important truth that if the central doctrine of the Scriptures is the Atonement, then the principal idea in the doctrine of the atonement is its nature—the doctrine of Substitution. The only sufficient answer to "Cur Deus Homo?" is man's extremity and his imperative need of divine forgiveness based upon the satisfaction brought to divine justice by the expiatory and vicarious death of the divinely appointed *Substitute*—the *Deus-Homo*.

#### Definition of Vicarious or Substitutionary Sacrifice

The substitutionary or vicarious nature of sacrifice is to be understood from the precise meaning of the term itself. The English word substitution is from the Latin *vicarius* which means substitute.<sup>312</sup> It is the same word in the root as the word *vice* in viceregent, viceroy, vicar, vice-president, and the like. It is a word that always denotes substitution, indicating that one person stands in the place of another. Thus a vice-president acts for the president in certain contingencies; a viceroy for a king. Any person acts vicariously, in this view, just as far as he comes in place of another. The commercial agent, the trustee, the attorney are likewise examples of vicarious action at common law. Then in respect to sacrifice any person acts in the way of vicarious sacrifice

---

<sup>312</sup>C. T. Onions (ed.), *The Oxford Universal Dictionary*, prepared William Little, H. W. Fowler, & J. Coulson (3rd. ed. rev.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1955), p. 2353.

when he yields up, at his own loss and hurt, his life in another's place.<sup>313</sup>

The English word substitution, following its Latin root, means simply the replacement of one person or thing for another. A substitute is an alternate, deputy, proxy, or representative for another. Theologically substitution has reference to that work or act by which one person or being suffers in the place of, or on behalf of, another. The doctrine of substitution has respect to that divine system of moral administration under which the penalties of the transgressed laws of God are properly satisfied in such a way that God's judicial *holiness* and *righteousness* are honored, on the one hand, and His *grace* and *mercy* glorified on the other. This principle is expressed through the divine institution of substitutionary sacrifice, the constitution of which provides a moral and spiritual atonement on behalf of sinners, and operates propitiately with respect to divine wrath against sin.

### The Relation of the Doctrine of Substitution to Law and Grace

The doctrine of the penal substitutionary atonement proceeds on the assumption that sin is in its very nature a transgression of God's law and thus renders the offender guilty. When the Scriptures represent sin as a transgression of the law, this does not necessarily mean that sin is an infraction of some positive precept of God. But the law to which it refers is rooted and grounded in the nature and being of God Himself. It is the law of righteousness and holiness, not just the objective Mosaic legislation, although this code, like the law "written upon the heart" of the Gentiles, reflects these divine attributes. It is, therefore, an immutable law; and if the law is regarded as an expression of the holiness and moral character of God, and therefore as a revelation of the will of God for the guidance of His moral creatures, "it becomes utterly impossible to assume that the Judge of all the earth might have pardoned sin without any adequate atonement."<sup>314</sup>

Law, if it is to be truly called such, whether civil, ceremonial, or moral, carries with it a penal sanction. True law commands perfect obedience, and in the event of its transgression provides for the inflict-

---

<sup>313</sup>Horace Bushnell, *The Vicarious Sacrifice* (London: Alexander Strahan, 1866), p. 5.

<sup>314</sup>Berkhof, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

tion of a penalty. The justice of God, therefore, necessarily inflicts due punishment on transgressors. The principle of law requires that transgression be punished without modification or abrogation.<sup>315</sup>

"Grace," says Chafer, "is not exercised in the just payment of a debt."<sup>316</sup> Grace is no longer grace if it is complicated by obligation. "An act in order to be gracious must stand disassociated and alone."<sup>317</sup> The importance of this is seen in the relation between the obligations of the law and the doctrine of substitution. "Of the various divine undertakings in the salvation of a sinner, some are acts of divine justice, and some are acts of the immediate, super-abounding grace of God."<sup>318</sup> Those activities of God which deal with *human sin and guilt* are acts of justice. "These include forgiveness, justification, death to the law, freedom from the law, and the whole new creation."<sup>319</sup> On the other hand, those aspects of salvation wherein God is revealed as *providing the means of and undertaking the work of salvation* are said to be acts of grace.

While the law makes provision for the admission of a substitute to discharge the debt of sinners, yet there is never any relaxation of the categorical demands of the law in doing so. The release obtained by the substitute is granted on the condition that he render fully the obligations incurred by those whom he represents. Hence, release is neither obtained nor bestowed by a work of grace; nor is satisfaction rendered by grace. The satisfaction undertaken by the substitute is a *legal work* or action with respect to the violations of the law—thus it is not grace. The bestowal of justification and reinstatement obtained through this satisfaction upon those for whom it was wrought is not grace but *an act of divine justice*. The substitute always stands in a *legal* relationship to the law. Justice demands that penalty be exacted for violations of the precepts of the law, and when the substitute fulfills the obligations of the law, he has fulfilled the law and paid the penalty exacted. Justice has been satisfied and results in a just release of those who were under obligation.

---

<sup>315</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 61-62.

<sup>316</sup>Lewis Sperry Chafer, *Grace* (8th. ed.; Wheaton, Illinois: Von Kampen Press, 1947), p. 8.

<sup>317</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 11.

<sup>318</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 15.

<sup>319</sup>*Ibid.*

Wherein lies grace in this transaction? Grace is to be seen in *the merciful provision of a substitute*. To fulfill the obligations of others is a matter of legal justice. But *to agree* to assume these obligations on behalf of others is grace. "That the whole transaction may be one of pure and mere grace, it is necessary that the fulfillment of the legal obligations be pure, mere and exact justice."<sup>320</sup> "Grace is the limitless, unrestrained love of God for the lost, acting in full compliance with the exact and unchangeable demands of His own righteousness through the sacrificial death of Christ."<sup>321</sup>

## The Distinction between Representation and Substitution

Representation in many cases implies substitution, but the two ideas are not necessarily identical. A representative is one who, or that which, represents another person or thing. Specifically it is that which stands as a type, or acts in the capacity of an agent, deputy, delegate, or ambassador. When, for example, the Apostle Paul declares, "We are ambassadors therefore on behalf of [ὑπέρ] Christ, as though God were entreating by us: we beseech you on behalf of [ὑπέρ] Christ, be ye reconciled to God,"<sup>322</sup> he clearly speaks of himself as a *representative* of Christ. On the other hand, when the Apostle says in the very next verse that, "Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf [ὑπέρ]...",<sup>323</sup> he has definitely in mind the idea of *substitution*.

But with respect to the idea of atoning sacrifice, too much cannot be maintained in this distinction between representation and substitution; and even in the case of Paul, who acted as an ambassador for Christ, it may be said that in representing Christ he in a true sense takes His place.<sup>324</sup> For all practical purposes, therefore, the representative may be spoken of as a substitute, and with respect to Old Testament sacrifice, as well as the sacrifice of Christ, the terms may be con-

---

<sup>320</sup>John M. Armour, *Atonement and Law* (Philadelphia: Christian Statesman Publishing Co., 1885), p. 173.

<sup>321</sup>Chafer, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

<sup>322</sup>II Corinthians 5:20.

<sup>323</sup>II Corinthians 5:21.

<sup>324</sup>Again, when the Apostle writes to Philemon concerning Onesimus, "whom I would fain have kept with me, that in thy behalf [ὑπέρ] he might minister unto me. . .," Onesimus is regarded as representing Philemon, and this involves the substitution of service, as with Paul in II Corinthians 5:20 that of witness.

sidered as synonymous. In the case of the Levitical sacrifices the ritual clearly implied, especially the ceremony of the laying on of hands, that the victim was to *represent* the sinner. But, on the other hand, the requirement that the sacrifice be selected from among the clean beasts and that the animal be without blemish, or ceremonially pure, together with its death and the sprinkling of its blood, is expressly described as *substitutionary*; for it is again and again said of the animal victim that *it* would be accepted as an atonement *for* the sins of the actual offender.

In the sacrifice of Christ representation is likewise equivalent to substitution. When the Apostle writes "... that one died for all, therefore all died..."<sup>325</sup> representation is manifestly equivalent to substitution. The two-fold idea in this passage is that of a union of the believer with Christ (representation), and that Christ died in the believer's stead, His death taking the place of theirs (substitution). In His Incarnation and humanity He identified Himself with His people, and in so doing was their Representative; and in dying He put Himself in the sinner's place, and their punishment fell upon Him as their true Substitute.

### The Essential Conditions of Suretyship

... also hath Jesus become the *surety*<sup>326</sup> of a better covenant.... For such a high priest became us, holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; who needeth not daily, like those high priests, to offer up sacrifices, first for his own sins, and then for the sins of the people: for this he did once for all, when he offered up himself.<sup>327</sup>

The doctrine of substitution is essentially the principle of suretyship in operation. A surety is a person who undertakes some specific responsibility on behalf of another, and who makes himself liable for the default of the other,<sup>328</sup> as seen in the case of the co-signer of a note

---

<sup>325</sup>|| Corinthians 5:14.

<sup>326</sup>Greek: ἕγγυος, "a surety." In the legal sense a surety was a formal pledge, bond, guarantee, or security given for the fulfillment of an undertaking. Figuratively applied to Christ as The Guarantor of the New Covenant. The Hebrew term was quite common in the Old Testament: Cf. Genesis to take or give in pledge, to go surety for. קָרַב 44:32; Proverbs 6:1; Job 17:3.

<sup>327</sup>Hebrews 7:22, 26-27.

<sup>328</sup>Onions, *op. cit.*, p. 2090.

who agrees to make payment of the obligation and debt on behalf of another's default. With respect to the substitutionary atonement suretyship involves more than simply a security against probable loss, but is the actual exercise of the principle on behalf of those who have already defaulted in their obligation of obedience to God. Therefore, the writer of Hebrews says that Christ became the *Surety* when He offered up Himself as a vicarious sacrifice once for all.

There are, therefore, certain essential conditions to be met in order for one to be an acceptable surety on behalf of others, with respect to the assumption and payment of their liability to the violated law of God. The essential conditions of true suretyship or substitution are set forth in several propositions by John M. Armour in his work *Atonement and Law*, and are noted here for benefit of their added clarification of the nature of substitution with respect to Christ.

1. The Surety or Substitute must be of the same nature and must become identified with those in whose behalf he acts,<sup>329</sup> hence "... the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us...."<sup>330</sup>

2. A surety must be one who is free from the obligations of the law, insofar as penalty and guilt are concerned. That is, a surety would not be allowed to present himself as a substitute for others, if he himself owed penal obligations to the law for having transgressed its commands. "For such a high priest became us, holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners...."<sup>331</sup>

3. A surety or substitute is one who is free, voluntary, and sovereign in assuming the obligations of another. Substitution by its nature is voluntary, since no law requires anyone to assume the legal obliga-

---

<sup>329</sup>In the animal type this is seen in the imposition of hands, as the animal then came to represent its offerer.

<sup>330</sup>John 1:14.

<sup>331</sup>Hebrews 7:26.

tions of another.<sup>332</sup> "... I lay down my life for the sheep.... No one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself."<sup>333</sup>

4. While a person who is surety is free, yet he must in the exercise of his freedom consent to come under law. Thus Christ was "... born under the law, that he might redeem them that were under the law...."<sup>334</sup> Christ did not merely come under the law, in the sense that its demands came upon Him as upon others, but He assumed, as surety, the debt of the law which rested upon others and came under the penalty of the law bearing upon others.

5. A surety or substitute must discharge the legal obligations he assumes in exact obedience to the law. The substitute comes under certain definite demands of the law and must discharge them faithfully and fully. "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us...."<sup>335</sup>

6. A true surety, as a valid substitute, having rendered to the law full satisfaction, secures the reinstatement of all those in whose behalf satisfaction has been made. Any offering rendered by a substitute, which does not necessitate reinstatement as a matter of simple justice, cannot properly be called a satisfaction. The substitute has legally imputed to him the entire obligation, so that having fully discharged the debt, the release, or legal righteousness, is imputed to the debtor in whose behalf he acted. That is to say, true suretyship involves the assumption of a common obligation by the substitute on behalf of definitely named parties and insures their full remission of obligation and reinstatement. "Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf; that we might become the righteousness of God in him."<sup>336</sup>

7. Suretyship or substitution is constituted by a covenant engagement in which the surety is made *one* with those for whom he

---

<sup>332</sup>The involuntary nature of Old Testament sacrifice of the non-consenting dumb animals does not contradict this principle, since the Levitical sacrifice was intended as a type, and its voluntary aspect is to be seen in that even here it is God who gives the sacrificial system as a means of atonement, as He gives the true Lamb later as the antitype.

<sup>333</sup>John 10:15, 18.

<sup>334</sup>Galatians 4:4-5.

<sup>335</sup>Galatians 3:13.

<sup>336</sup>I Corinthians 5:21.

acts. The Apostle Paul affirmed this proposition when he stated that "... we thus judge that one died for all, therefore all died."<sup>337</sup> The meaning of this is significant for the doctrine of substitution. The names of either three or three hundred persons affixed to a legal bond or note causes them all under law to become *legally one*, and can actually be dealt with as one person in the eyes of the law. Not only this but *each individual* of this one legal unit is bound in justice to suffer for the unit if necessary. This means that if all but one are found to be unable to meet the legal obligation, the entire obligation justly falls upon the one solvent individual. This is not simply a theological dogma, but is affirmed in every transaction involving suretyship. But conversely, while the whole of the obligation may fall upon one individual of the legal unit, yet the credit for making payment applies to all the group, and in the sight of the law "all" have paid. Hence, the analogy with respect to the substitutionary atonement of Christ, who bound Himself to humanity by nature and freely engaged to assume the obligations resting upon the sinner, is apparent. His people, being unable to satisfy their obligations to the law, but being bound to Him, their Surety, satisfied the legal demands of the law *in Him*; and the merits of His vicarious atonement are credited to their behalf, since in that "... one died for all, therefore all died."<sup>338</sup>

### *The Concept of Substitution in Other Religions*

While a comparison of the religions of mankind reveals some to be more ethically advanced than others, some cruel and superstitious, others passive and benevolent, some quite primitive and simple, and others more advanced and elaborate in ritual; yet they all seem to possess three basic ideas in common. First there is to be found a belief in some idea of salvation or a future life, ranging all the way from the cheerless prospect in Mesopotamian religion of a kind of shadowy existence in the realm of the dead, or salvation consisting of simply annihilation as in Buddhism, to the idea of the personal salvation of the individual in Hebrew and Christian thought. Second there is found in every religion some idea and practice of propitiatory sacrifice; and third, usually alongside this, there is seen some perverted form of the con-

---

<sup>337</sup>I Corinthians 5:14.

<sup>338</sup> Armour, *op. cit.*, pp. 187-202.

cept of substitution. While the heathen concept of salvation, sacrifice, and substitution falls far below the Biblical concept, both morally and spiritually, yet its significance for this study is that it does reveal, to the obvious embarrassment of the negative critics, that the concept of substitution cannot be denied to Hebrew thought and admitted to be everywhere else quite prevalent.

## The Concept of Substitution in the Mesopotamian Religion

The Mesopotamian concept of substitution is seen in the following quotation by Jacob from an old Accadian text. "The lamb is the substitute for man; for his life, he shall deliver the lamb: the lamb's head shall he deliver for the neck of the man, the breast of the lamb for the breast of the man shall he deliver."<sup>339</sup>

In the Babylonian ritual of atonement (*kuppuru*) bread, grain, plants, and animal sacrifices were used. The priests sought to remove the evil or uncleanness by uttering a curse over the substituted object which magically absorbed the curse and the uncleanness, which were then taken away.<sup>340</sup> According to Kraeling in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, in ancient Babylon during the New Year's festivities, substitutionary atonement was performed in which two wooden images adorned with gold, precious stones, and garments were decapitated.<sup>341</sup>

On the sixth day of the Babylonian New Year festival a condemned criminal, who was regarded as a scapegoat, was paraded through the streets and scourged. In another ceremony evil was expelled by preparing a model of a boat which was set adrift with accompanying incantations.<sup>342</sup> Among some of the Semites of Western Asia the king in time of national danger sometimes substituted the life of his own son as a vicarious sacrifice for the people. This was illustrated when the king of Moab, besieged by Israelites, sacrificed his eldest son as a burnt-offering. The custom was gradually modified to substitute condemned criminals for innocent victims; such a substitution is known

---

<sup>339</sup>Edmon Jacob, *Theology of the Old Testament*, trans. Arthur W. Heathcote and Philip J. Allcock (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1958), p. 294.

<sup>340</sup>Gray, *op. cit.*, pp. 72-73.

<sup>341</sup>Kraeling, *op. cit.*, p. 145.

<sup>342</sup>James George Frazer, *The New Golden Bough* (New York: Criterion Books, 1959), p. 555.

to have taken place annually in the human sacrifices offered in Rhodes to Baa1.<sup>343</sup>

It is believed that the criminal who died on the cross or gallows at Babylon died as a substitute for the king, in whose royal robes he had been allowed to masquerade for a few days. According to the historian Berosus, there was celebrated annually in Babylon a festival called Sacaea in which for five days masters and servants changed places. A prisoner condemned to death was dressed in the kings robes, seated upon his throne, and was permitted to enjoy the privileges of kingship for this period in the place of the king, after which he was put to death. The need for such a substitutionary death apparently stemmed from the ancient custom of putting the aging king to death. The idea behind this seems to be that since the king personified the nation; its strength, power, and vitality were to be preserved by removing the aged monarch and substituting a younger successor. Hence, this was a modification of this stern rule, and the king willingly abdicated for a few days, while his substitute reigned and died in his stead.<sup>344</sup>

### The Concept of Substitution in the Egyptian Religion

Herodotus wrote that the Egyptians believed that calamities which were impending were averted by being laid upon the head of a sacrificed victim.<sup>345</sup> The Egyptians marked the substitute victim with a seal bearing the image of a man bound and kneeling with a sword at his throat, thus indicating the penal, expiatory, and vicarious nature of the sacrifice.<sup>346</sup> Another practice of the Egyptians that Herodotus notes is that after they had cut off the head of the substitute victim, they uttered a long list of execrations upon it and then threw it into the river, transferring their calamities to it, and thereby ridding themselves of them.<sup>347</sup>

The idea that man could transfer his guilt and sufferings to some other being, who would bear them away for him, was quite famil-

---

<sup>343</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 245-46.

<sup>344</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 235-36.

<sup>345</sup>John Pye Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 215.

<sup>346</sup>W. R. Smith and Edwin Hatch, "Sacrifice," *The Encyclopaedia Britannica* (Chicago: The Werner Co., 1894), XXI, p. 136.

<sup>347</sup>John Pye Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 233.

lar to the primitive mind. It arises from an obvious confusion between the material and immaterial. Because it is possible to shift a load of wood from one's own back to the back of another, the heathen imagined it was equally possible to shift the burden of pains and sorrows to another who would suffer them in his stead.<sup>348</sup>

The concept of atonement and propitiation was conspicuous in Egyptian religion. In alluding to the four gods of the dead, Bonwick quotes Sharpe as follows:

These gods befriended the deceased on his trial before the judges; they sometimes present offerings to the judge, as *mediators* on his behalf; and they are sometimes *sacrificed for him*, he places them on the altar as his atoning sacrifice.... They... offer themselves as an atoning sacrifice on behalf of the sinner.<sup>349</sup>

According to Mercer in his book, *The Religion of Ancient Egypt*, sacrifices in Egypt sometimes took the form of a burnt-offering, in which an animal was ritually burned. Sometimes it consisted of a libation, in which water, milk, or the blood of the sacrificed animal was poured out to propitiate the deity. He quotes Ovid as saying that the custom of sacrificing strangers arose during a famine as a result of the Nile remaining low for a period of nine years.<sup>350</sup> Petrie also notes evidence of human sacrifice in Egypt.<sup>351</sup>

### The Concept of Substitution in the Religions of India

In India horses were the most valuable animals and constituted the highest of substitutionary sacrifices in early Hinduism.

The Asvamedha or Horse Sacrifice, for example, took over a year to complete, and involved in its beginning the gathering and proffering, if not the actual sacrifice, of 609 animals! But the priests as-

---

<sup>348</sup>H. M. Hugnes, *What is the Atonement?* (London: James Clarke & Co., Ltd., [n.d.], p. 40.

<sup>349</sup>James Bonwick, *Egyptian Belief and Modern Thought* (Indian Hills, Colo.: The Falcon's Wing Press, 1956), p. 408.

<sup>350</sup>Samuel A. B. Mercer, *The Religion of Ancient Egypt* (London: Luzac & Co. Ltd., 1949), p. 356.

<sup>351</sup>Sir Flinders Petrie, *Religious Life in Ancient Egypt* (New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1924), pp. 34-38.

sured the rajahs who alone could afford to perform it: "This is the atonement for everything. He who performs the Asvemedha redeems all sin."<sup>352</sup>

The idea of the scapegoat is seen from the practice in India when cholera rages. A goat or buffalo is taken, and after some grain, cloves, and red lead are tied on its back, it is driven out carrying the plague with it.<sup>353</sup> In another substitutionary ritual the Hindu Brahmans symbolically transfer the sins of the people into one or more sacred cows, which are then carried away, thus removing the sins from the people.<sup>354</sup>

### The Concept of Substitution in the Religions of Asia and China

The Buddhists of Tibet observe a substitutionary ritual yearly in which one man acts as a scapegoat by going about daily in the marketplace and shaking a black yak's tail over the people, who thus transfer their sins to him. Then as a result of a ceremony between a representative of the Grand Lama and this victim, he is driven out of the city where he must remain an outcast for several months.<sup>355</sup> The Bhotiyas, in the Western Himalayas, once a year drive a dog over a cliff into the sea believing it is laden with all the sicknesses of the people.<sup>356</sup>

As in the ancient Roman religion in which models of wax or some other substance were substituted for the animal to be sacrificed, the Chinese substituted straw dogs in their sacrifices for the real victim. In another ritual in China a man with great strength is selected to act the part of the scapegoat. Having painted his face he then performs many antics with the view of enticing all the evils and ills to attach themselves to him. He is then driven out by the villagers.<sup>357</sup>

---

<sup>352</sup>John B. Noss, *Man's Religions* (Rev. ed.; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1956), p. 127.

<sup>353</sup>Frazer, *op. cit.*, p. 532.

<sup>354</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 536.

<sup>355</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 537-539.

<sup>356</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 533.

<sup>357</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 532.

## The Concept of Substitution in the Mohammedan Religion

While sacrifice plays an extensive role in Mohammedanism, yet the victims are always slain to be eaten.<sup>358</sup> The whole burnt-offering does not appear in Islam. The ritual of sacrifice, however, is observed on every occasion among the modern Arabs.

Sacrifices are offered on the birth of a son, a circumcision, marriage, the coming of a guest, for the recovery of the sick, or for the health of flocks and herds, on the conclusion of a covenant, the return from a successful expedition, on the anniversary of a kinsman's death, and the like.<sup>359</sup>

Of neither Mohammed himself, nor his teachings, is there any suggestion of vicarious suffering or substitution. Noss writes,

But though his authority is supreme, he is not a divine being appearing in the flesh: he is human like the rest of men; nor did he pretend to supernatural powers: he performed no miracles; instituted no mystical, deifying, sacraments; ordained no holy priesthood....<sup>360</sup>

The idea of substitutionary sacrifice does not appear in Islam, which stands as an exception among the world's religions, as the *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* shows:

As there are, properly speaking, no temples and no priesthood in Islam, so there is no sacrifice in the ordinary acceptance of the term. The sense of sin and the need for an atonement... are not brought in connexion with the shedding of blood.... Thus in the Qur'an the atonement... for the sin of deliberate perjury is not a sacrifice, but the feeding or clothing of ten poor folk, or the freeing of a Muslim slave, or, if these are beyond the culprit's means, then

---

<sup>358</sup>There are but few religious precepts in Islam with respect to sacrifice. The Koran gives the following restrictions: "O ye who believe! Eat of the good things wherewith we have provided you, and render thanks to Allah. . . . He hath forbidden you only carrion, and blood, and swineflesh, and that which hath been immolated to (the name of) any other than Allah." *The Meaning of the Glorious Koran*, an explanatory translation by Mohammed Marmaduke Pickthall (New York: Mentor Books, 1955), p. 48.

<sup>359</sup>T. K. Cheyne and J. Sutherland Black (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1903), IV, p. 4185.

<sup>360</sup>Noss, *op. cit.*, p. 700.

a fast of three days.... The fact that the worst sinner in order to be saved has merely to declare himself a Muslim cuts the ground from under the feet of any theory of an atoning sacrifice.<sup>361</sup>

## The Concept of Substitution in the Religion of Rome

The idea of substitution was widespread in the early Roman religions. The Romans substituted models in wax or dough for victims that could not be procured according to the ritual requirements. Sometimes they feigned that a sheep was a stag, puppets were substituted for human sacrifices, and dolls were cast into the Tiber at the yearly atoning sacrifice on the Sublician Bridge.<sup>362</sup> The name of the month of February is derived from an old Roman term, "Februa," which was a general term for sacrifices and ceremonies to expiate all sins at the close of the year.<sup>363</sup>

In Rome the farmer and his family solemnly sacrificed pigs, sheep, and oxen to propitiate the gods. As the sacrifices were offered they prayed thus:

Father Mars, I pray and beseech thee that thou mayest be propitious and of good will to me.... by the sacrifice of this offering of suckling pig, lamb, and calf.<sup>364</sup>

In Rome when the elder Decius devoted himself to death for the supposed salvation of his country, he was regarded as having been sent by heaven to be a substitutionary propitiation for the wrath of the gods. His son, in another public danger, substituted himself by following his example, and exclaimed that it was granted to their family to be expiations to remove the perils of state on behalf of the people.<sup>365</sup>

## The Concept of Substitution in the Religion of Greece

With respect to the idea of substitution it was the common belief among the Greeks and Phoenicians that the life of an animal was ac-

---

<sup>361</sup>Hastings (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, XI, p. 29.

<sup>362</sup>Smith and Hatch, *loc. cit.*

<sup>363</sup>John Pye Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 216.

<sup>364</sup>Noss, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

<sup>365</sup>John Pye Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 216.

cepted by the god in place of a human life, and piacular sacrifice was commonly practiced.<sup>366</sup> In piacular or substitutionary sacrifices among the Greeks only the life of the victim was demanded and there was no sacrificial meal. Thus the carcass of the victim was buried or cast into the sea.

Homer and the Greek Tragedians, reflecting the religious views of Greece, considered substitutionary sacrifices to be efficacious in placating the gods and procuring their pardon.<sup>367</sup> Therefore, in Greece when a city was visited by a plague, a man of the poorer classes offered himself as a scapegoat. He was fed choice food at public expense for one year, then led throughout the city while prayers were uttered that all the evils of the people would fall upon him. He was then cast out of the city or stoned to death by the people. The Athenians regularly maintained degraded and so-called useless individuals at public expense; and when any calamity, such as a plague, drought, or famine befell the city, they sacrificed two of these outcasts as scapegoats, or substitutionary sacrifices. The city of Abdera in Thrace was publically purified once per year by stoning to death some individual as a vicarious sacrifice in order that he might bear all the sins of the people.<sup>368</sup>

Greek mythology reflected the idea of substitution. Homer's Iliad describes an expiatory offering made to Phoebus Apollo, which turned away his wrath and caused the plagues that had beset the Greeks to cease. The Greek poet Aeschylus, writing of the banishment of Prometheus for giving fire to men, has Hermes say to him, "Hope not for an end to such oppression until a god appears as thy substitute in torment, ready to descend for thee unto the unilluminated realm of Hades and the dark abyss of Tartarus."<sup>369</sup>

---

<sup>366</sup>Smith and Hatch, *loc. cit.*

<sup>367</sup>John Pye Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 215.

<sup>368</sup>Frazer, *op. cit.*, p. 541.

<sup>369</sup>Strong, *op. cit.*, p. 723.

## The Concept of Substitution in the Religion of the Gauls, Britons, Canaanites, Phoenicians, and Others

The ancient Gauls and Britons believed in the propitiatory effect of their numerous human sacrificial victims.<sup>370</sup> They believed when dangers, diseases, and calamities threatened that the gods could be propitiated only by substituting the life of man for the life of man.<sup>371</sup>

Sacrifices among the Canaanites were of two kinds; gift sacrifices given for various purposes, and communion sacrifices between the worshipper and the deity. The former classification included human sacrifice, and more commonly a bull, ram, or goat. In the worship of Baal human victims were sacrificed to him in order to appease his anger in the time of plague or other calamity, the victim usually being the first-born of the worshipper and burned alive.<sup>372</sup> In the Old Testament this is referred to as "passing the victim through the fire" (II Kings 16:3; 21:6). The concept of vicarious and propitiatory sacrifice was quite prevalent among the Canaanites, as well as the surrounding nations of Moab, Ammon, and others.

In Phoenician mythology there is a story that Kronos (one of the Titans in Greek mythology and Saturn in Latin),<sup>373</sup> whom the Phoenicians called "Ep, had an only son by a nymph, who, when war beset the land, was sacrificed by his father to propitiate the gods. This story resembles the sacrifice of the eldest son of the king of Moab when surrounded by Israel. It was the custom, according to Sanchuniathon, in ancient times during great calamities to sacrifice to the avenging spirits the most beloved child of the rulers as a λύτρον, ransom.<sup>374</sup>

Frazer in his book *The Golden Bough* records numerous practices of the idea of substitution in the religions of the world. He remarks, "the principle of vicarious suffering is commonly understood and practiced by races who stand on a low level of social and intellectual

---

<sup>370</sup>John Pye Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 216.

<sup>371</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 233.

<sup>372</sup>Orr (ed.), *op. cit.*, II, p. 345.

<sup>373</sup>Edith Hamilton, *Mythology* (New York: The New American Library of World Literature, Inc., 1955), p. 24.

<sup>374</sup>Gray, *op. cit.*, pp. 91-92.

culture."<sup>375</sup> While one must reject his interpretation, which would apply to neither Israel nor Greece for example, yet he does give evidence that the idea that man could be saved in no other way than by substitutionary atonement has as universal as the idea of God. In addition to the instances already cited throughout this division, one or two others from Frazer might also be noted in conclusion, which depict the practice of substitution in other religions.

Among the Korwas of Mirzapur, when cholera has broken out, the priest offers a black cock, or if the disease is very malignant, a black goat, at the shrine of the local deity, and then drives the animal away...."<sup>376</sup>

At a Badaga funeral... the buffalo calf was led thrice round the bier, and the dead man's hand was laid on its head. "By this act, the calf was supposed to receive all the sins of the deceased. It was then driven away to a great distance...."<sup>377</sup>

Amongst the Caffres of South Africa, when other remedies have failed, natives sometimes adopt the custom of taking a goat into the presence of a sick man, and confess the sins of the kraal over the animal... which is turned out into an uninhabited part of the veldt. The sickness is supposed to be transferred to the animal, and to become lost in the desert.<sup>378</sup>

Sacrifice and some form of substitution are to be found in all religions, but in the heathen cultures it falls far below the moral and ethical concept of Biblical revelation. This is seen in the pagan view of sacrifice. Since man wishes to gain something for himself from the gods, whether in the form of blessings or freedom from divine anger, he offers a sacrifice. But because man cannot give himself, he compromises and offers a substitute in his place. The idea of substitution is then enlarged to embrace other realms with respect to sin, disease, and calamity. A quasi-magical efficacy is assigned to the substitutionary idea, and animal substitutes are used to bear the sins, diseases, and evils of the community away by transferring them through a prescribed ritual to the substitute victim. Impending calamities could be

---

<sup>375</sup>James George Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1935), IX, p. 1.

<sup>376</sup>*Ibid.*, IX, p. 192.

<sup>377</sup>*Ibid.*, IX, pp. 36.37.

<sup>378</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 31.

averted, pestilences removed, military victories obtained, disease and death averted, and the angry gods placated, through the ritual of substitutionary sacrifice.

In conclusion, therefore, two things should be noted. On the one hand, heathen sacrificial and substitutionary concepts, unlike the Biblical revelation, are simply a means to an end—a selfish end. They are always mingled with the desire to gain something for oneself, rather than an expression of faith, devotion, and worship. But on the other hand, with the universal prevalence of the idea of substitution in the concepts of salvation in the religions of mankind, it would then be incongruous indeed to deny its existence in the religion of Israel as negative criticism seeks to do. Since the Old Testament critic alleges that all Israel's religious beliefs and practices have been adopted from heathen sources, Babylonia, Assyria, Egypt, Canaan, etc., and since the ideas of substitution and propitiatory sacrifice have existed in all religions, then the ideas of substitution and vicarious sacrifice cannot very logically be denied to the religion of Israel, while admitted to be present in the religious thought of the rest of the world.

### *Basic Objections to the Doctrine of Substitution*

True substitution renders full satisfaction to the Law, but this has been disputed by some writers on various grounds. It has been objected that the innocent cannot suffer for the guilty; true satisfaction cannot be rendered by a substitute; substitution is merely an equivalent and not the very thing that is owed; and that penal substitution is prohibited by the Scriptures, etc.

### **The Innocent Cannot Suffer for the Guilty**

In reply to the first objection it is seen to stem from an erroneous principle; namely, that the law does not make provision for the innocent suffering in behalf of the guilty. But suffering by the innocent in meeting the penalty of the law in the human realm is permitted among men. The person who surrenders what is his suffers with respect to the loss of his property. All penalty involves suffering by the innocent when the payment of a fine or ransom is made by another party who is not under obligation; thus the law freely permits substitutes to suffer in the

loss of their property.<sup>379</sup> Likewise the Mosaic system made such provision for the innocent to suffer loss on behalf of the guilty, which is clearly seen with respect to the concept of the *go'el* (גֹּאֵל), or redeemer-kinsman, who suffered the loss of his property in buying back a blood relation who had sold himself into slavery. In the institution of sacrifice itself, it was always a tacit implication, through the death of a ceremonially pure substitute victim, that it was a case of the innocent suffering for the guilty.

Life itself involves the principle of the innocent suffering for the guilty, for this is not a world in which such a principle is abhorrent or unvirtuous. "Innocence is the essential qualification for this the highest form of virtue."<sup>380</sup> Obvious illustrations are those in which one person gives himself for another; the mother on behalf of the child, the hostages who are slain on behalf of the whole city, the friend who suffers injury or loss of life on behalf of another, and the millions of innocent who have suffered loss of life and property through the ravages of warfare. Not irrelevant to the question are the countless thousands, who through the suffering occasioned by the natural evil of disease, such as cancer and polio, have suffered in behalf of mankind generally, for it is through their affliction that science is able to develop cures that redeem the rest of society from the same experiences. Hence the objectors to this principle might well reflect upon the manifest truth that not only does human law permit the innocent to suffer for the guilty, but also that ours is a universe of turmoil and struggle, in which this principle reflects the highest expression of virtue, and makes possible, through sorrow, tragedy, need, and affliction, a richness of human experience otherwise impossible.<sup>381</sup>

The solution to the problem of substitution under the law is not resolved by denying the ability of the innocent to stand in the place of the guilty, since it is *only the innocent*, and they alone, who can properly be said to suffer for the guilty. Even the substitute for a human debt is innocent. The only difference between satisfaction being made to human law and satisfaction made for the transgressions of divine law is

---

<sup>379</sup> Armour, *op. cit.*, p. 165.

<sup>380</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 170.

<sup>381</sup> It is not to be forgotten, however, that this is a world perverted by sin (Romans 8:21f.), and that such conditions are not necessarily essential to the attainment of virtue.

that the *kind* of suffering which man makes in behalf of another is only that which he is able and competent to assume. If a case arises where no substitute can be accepted, it is not because the law does not allow an innocent substitute to suffer in the place of the guilty; but it is because there is no *adequate* substitute, or the transgression is of such a nature that no qualified substitute exists. In the case of the substitutionary atonement of Christ the cause for any such limitation is removed by the infinite value and nature of the One who suffered as an innocent victim on behalf of the guilty.

### True Satisfaction Cannot Be Rendered by a Substitute

The second objection that satisfaction rendered to the law necessarily falls short of meeting the rigid claims of the law, because it is rendered by a substitute, is equally fallacious. The fallacy here is in failing to apprehend the fact that substitution is provided for in the law itself, so that an adequate substitute is fully as acceptable to the law as satisfaction rendered by the debtor himself. As will be shown later, the law itself provides for substitution, since the sinner in his own person cannot render acceptable satisfaction due to his lack of righteousness, which has resulted from his transgression of the law he would seek to satisfy. If substitution were not a normal provision of the law, then the only solution to the dilemma would be either a relaxation of the demands of the law or the just eternal condemnation of all men. It should be patent that the former dishonors God's holy law, and that the latter is not the case is the main thrust of Biblical revelation. The law is concerned primarily, not with whether or not the satisfaction is made by the guilty or by a qualified substitute, but that justice be served, and that full and exact satisfaction be made. In the natural realm even an anonymous benefactor can discharge the debt of another, and the law is in no sense violated or relaxed in so permitting.

To fulfill the obligations to justice and satisfy the claims of the law it is necessary, then, only that there be a willing and adequate substitute so that the law in its most rigid and absolute enforcement can offer no objection. The substitute, therefore, must render to the law all that it demands so that satisfaction is complete. That there was no relaxation of the law in admitting Christ as the substitute is found in the

statement of the Apostle that He was "... born under the law that he might redeem them that were under the law...."<sup>382</sup> And in Christ's own words, He said: "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy but fulfil."<sup>383</sup> And that the full penalty of the law was borne by Him, by which He satisfied completely the demands of justice, is declared in God's promise to forgive all sins through faith in His substitutionary work, which enabled God to "... be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus."<sup>384</sup>

### Substitution Is Merely An Equivalent and Not the Exact Thing Owed

The third objection that substitution cannot possibly satisfy the obligation, since it would merely be an equivalent and not the very thing owed, is not a valid argument from two considerations. First, it should be remembered that under the Mosaic economy the essential feature of the Levitical sacrificial system was the idea of substitution. Satisfaction could be met by a substitute in a two-fold way: (1) the person who brought the offering was represented by the sacrifice offered in his stead; or (2) when something was substituted for the object which was supposed to be the substitute, as in the case of first-born sons being redeemed by money, or the first-born of an ass being redeemed with a lamb. Hence, under the Old Testament dispensation substitution was never *in kind*, and in some cases something was substituted for the substitute. Therefore, substitution by an exact equivalent is not necessarily an *inherent* requirement of the law in rendering exact satisfaction.

Nevertheless, since "... it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins,"<sup>385</sup> the problem of this third objection is overcome, in the second place, by the nature of the Person who rendered the final vicarious atonement. "Since then the children are sharers in flesh and blood, he also himself in like manner partook of the same.... to make propitiation for the sins of the people."<sup>386</sup> Christ, in

---

<sup>382</sup>Galatians 4:4-5.

<sup>383</sup>Matthew 5:17.

<sup>384</sup>Romans 3:26.

<sup>385</sup>Hebrews 10:4.

<sup>386</sup>Hebrews 2:14, 17.

human nature, could thus satisfy the requirement for an equivalent sacrifice as pertaining to "kind," since nothing can be a surety, in the full and absolute sense, unless it comes into the very place where the full weight of the obligation lies. But in order to fully answer the objection that Christ could never be considered a proper substitute, since at the most His sufferings could only represent an equivalent satisfaction and not a payment of the actual debt owed; it can be shown that He not only identified Himself perfectly with humanity, but identified Himself fully with His people at the greatest point of their need—their sin, when He assumed their legal guilt and punishment due. To this fact the Scriptures everywhere testify.

All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and Jehovah hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.<sup>387</sup>

Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf; that we might become the righteousness of God in him.<sup>388</sup>

### Atoning Sacrifice Is Absent in Several Important Instances

Another objection often urged to the doctrine of substitution is that under the Jewish dispensation atoning sacrifice is not resorted to in several remarkable instances of gross transgression, where it should have been expected if sacrifice possessed atoning and propitiatory virtues. Such incidents are cited as the apostasy of Israel in the worship of the golden calf at Sinai, the rebellion of Korah, the sin of David, and the like.<sup>389</sup> Mozley asks, "... if in the animal's death there is involved a doctrine of substitution, how comes it that there is no sacrifice permitted in cases of sins whose penalty is death?"<sup>390</sup> But the objectors have overlooked a basic tenet of the Mosaic legislation, that wilful and presumptuous sins were "sins with a high hand." Such sins as wilful apostasy, idolatry, adultery, and murder were excluded from the benefits of Mosaic sacrifice, since there were no legal provisions which provided a sacrifice for such sins (Numbers 15:30-31), and it would therefore necessarily be absent in these instances.

---

<sup>387</sup>Isaiah 53:6.

<sup>388</sup>I Corinthians 5:21.

<sup>389</sup>Crawford, *op. cit.*, p. 228.

<sup>390</sup>J. K. Mozley, *The Doctrine of the Atonement* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916), p. 20.

## Actual Substitution Is a Misnomer

The objection is also raised that the Levitical victims could not be vicarious sin-bearers, because in this case they would have become unclean, and on the contrary they appear in the Scriptures as holy, inasmuch as they were wholly dedicated to God in some instances as in the burnt-offering, and in the case of the sin and trespass-offerings they were eaten by the priests. Further, anything that came into contact with the blood of the sacrifice became holy.<sup>391</sup>

It is correct that the Levitical sacrifices and especially the sin-offering, instead of being unclean, were most holy. Of the sin and trespass-offerings it was said: "Whatsoever shall touch the flesh thereof shall be holy.... Every male among the priests shall eat thereof: it is most holy."<sup>392</sup> While it is seen that the flesh of the sin-offerings (תאֲדָרָה) was not unclean, but on the contrary most holy, yet this does not imply they were not substitutionary sin-bearers. It does not necessarily follow that the victim itself must become unclean in order to be a true substitute and receive the penalty for sin. On the contrary, the essential requirement of the substitute is that it must be perfectly pure—ceremonially holy in the case of the animal type—actually holy in the case of the great Antitype, the Lamb of God. The imposition of hands upon the victim's head symbolically laid the transgressor's sins upon him. But this imputation of sins had respect only to the *guilt* of sin and its liability to punishment, and not to *moral* impurity; and the blood and flesh of that which, as an innocent substitute, purchased the redemption of the sinner, became most holy to the Lord.<sup>393</sup>

## Penal Substitution Prohibited by Scripture Itself

The alleged unrighteousness of penal substitution is shown, as critics of the doctrine assert, by the fact that God expressly prohibited its use by human magistrates in Deuteronomy 24:16, "The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers: every man shall be put to death for his own sin."

---

<sup>391</sup>Crawford, *op. cit.*, p. 231.

<sup>392</sup>Leviticus 6:27, 29.

<sup>393</sup>Crawford, *op. cit.*, p. 232.

Ezekiel 18:4 is also cited in denial of penal substitution, "... the soul that sinneth, it shall die."

It would be a sufficient reply to say that the critical objection to penal substitution is based upon the false assumption that simply because a certain moral prerogative is improper for men, it must therefore be improper for God. "The principles of righteousness for the two rulers, God and a human magistrate, are the same; the details of prerogative for the two may differ greatly, while directed by the same holy principles."<sup>394</sup> Because of the infinite sovereignty, wisdom, and holiness of God, His moral rights may be conditioned and used in a manner far different from what is proper for men. "The prerogative of retribution is God's alone; magistrates only possess a small fraction of it by delegation from him."<sup>395</sup> Therefore they are bound by such restrictions as He chooses to impose upon their judicial functions. Furthermore, God Himself specifically states that He will, in spite of the claims of the critics to the contrary, do precisely what He forbids the fallible human magistrate to do. "... for I Jehovah thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, upon the third and upon the fourth generation of them that hate me."<sup>396</sup> And that this is not simply an ancient barbaric conception of God, superseded by the ethics of the New Testament dispensation, is to be seen in the words of Christ Himself to the unbelieving Jews: He declared

... that the blood of all the prophets, which was shed from the foundation of the world, may be required of *this generation* from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zechariah, who perished between the altar and the sanctuary: yea, I say unto you, it shall be required of *this generation*.<sup>397</sup>

Individual responsibility, as taught in Deuteronomy 24:15 and Ezekiel 18:4, is not denied by the declarations of God in Exodus and by Christ in the Gospel of Luke. The inferences are clear enough to the unbiased reader. Men were not to assume the prerogatives of an all wise, holy God and exact retribution or the penal consequences of sin

---

<sup>394</sup>Robert L. Dabney, *Christ Our Penal Substitute* (Richmond, Va.: The Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 1898). pp. 20-21.

<sup>395</sup>*Ibid.*, p.21.

<sup>396</sup>Exodus 20:5; 34:7.

<sup>397</sup>Luke 11:50-51; cf. also Leviticus 16:39-40; Numbers 14:18; Deuteronomy 5:9.

and iniquity upon the descendants of the guilty, who may be guiltless with respect to those particular vices. So too in the passage from Ezekiel. The prophet's purpose here is to correct a mistaken interpretation of the Jews with respect to the Exile. Jeremiah, as did Ezekiel, declared that "In those days they shall say no more, The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge."<sup>398</sup> The Jews in Exile had overlooked their personal responsibility, and with this proverb had complained that their father's iniquities had been visited upon them. Ezekiel and Jeremiah correct this misinterpretation by advising, "But every one shall die for his own iniquity: every man that eateth the sour grapes, his teeth shall be set on edge."<sup>399</sup>

This principle of individual and personal responsibility, however, does not destroy another divine principle of penal substitution. It is a sophism to reason from the necessary limitations placed upon men, as in Deuteronomy 24:16, that such finite limitations are equally applicable upon an omniscient God. Men are bound by such limitations for two reasons: on the one hand they lack both the wisdom and moral judgment, and on the other, man cannot find suitable subjects for acceptable penal substitution. However, to deny penal substitution to God's providence is not only to do so in the face of express statements to the contrary, but to overlook the basic meaning of the Levitical sacrificial system; for it is constantly reiterated in the Mosaic law that the shedding of the blood of an innocent victim was for the specific purpose of providing an atonement for *their* sins. It is as futile and groundless to speak of Levitical sacrifice as an atonement for the sins of another, and at the same time deny the validity of penal substitution, as it is to speak of Christ as Saviour, but to reject the penal substitutionary nature of His death.<sup>400</sup>

---

<sup>398</sup>Jeremiah 31:29.

<sup>399</sup>Jeremiah 31:30; Ezekiel 18:4.

<sup>400</sup>Robert L. Dabney confirms the substitutionary nature of Old Testament sacrifice when he writes that "this awful rite, the death and burning of an innocent and living creature, could typify but one truth, substitution. Compared with the milder ritual of the new dispensation, bloody sacrifice was more expensive and inconvenient, yet God regularly required it. It is manifest that his object was to keep this great truth, penal substitution, prominent before the minds of sinful men, because, like our opponents, they are so prone to forget it." *Ibid.*, p. 53.

Another objection to the idea that the death of the animal signified penal punishment is raised on the ground that the slaying is done by the offerer himself and not by the priest as God's representative, hence the death signified little more than self-surrender. But Kurtz has given adequate reply to such an objection pointing out that it was proper and significant that the sinner himself, through the act of slaying his representative and substitute, accused himself, pronounced his own judgment, and symbolically executed it upon himself. It was otherwise, however, with the act of sprinkling the blood, which completed the work of atonement, for this had respect to the *acceptance* of the substituted life for that of the sinner and could only be accomplished by the consecrated priesthood, who were the divinely appointed mediators of the ministry of redemption.<sup>401</sup>

In conclusion then, on the basis of the teachings of Scripture, the opponents of substitution place themselves in a fatal dilemma. Since they unrelentingly contend that there cannot be, without violating moral principles, any substitutionary punishment of guilt, and that vicarious suffering and death is immoral and barbarous, then they place themselves in a position of wilful condemnation. The Scriptures declare that all men are sinners (Romans 3:23), and that sin is unpardonable apart from penal satisfaction (Galatians 3:10-13). The curse of the law can never be pardoned apart from satisfaction. For transgressions of God's law, satisfaction must be made by *someone*; if not through an acceptable substitute, then there is but one alternative—satisfaction must be made by *the sinner himself*. If the Lamb of God cannot bear their griefs and carry their sorrows; if the righteous Servant was not wounded for their transgressions; if He was not bruised for their iniquities; if the Lord had not laid upon Him their iniquities; if, in short, substitution is absurd and immoral, then the conclusion is obvious—these must bear their own guilt and its punishment in their own persons.<sup>402</sup>

---

<sup>401</sup>Patrick Fairbairn, *The Typology of Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, [n.d.], p. 467.

<sup>402</sup>Berkhof concurs strongly in this, and observes that "if the opponents of a substitutionary atonement succeed in proving to their own satisfaction that Christ did not vicariously atone for sin by His supreme self-sacrifice, they have also with the same cogency established the fact that they and all other men will have to suffer eternal perdition." Berkhof, *Vicarious Atonement Through Christ*, p. 116.

The Apostle Paul, however, settles the question for all time for all who are willing to embrace the truth of penal satisfaction, when he declares,

For I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures.<sup>403</sup>

God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing unto them their trespasses.<sup>404</sup>

### *The Hermeneutical Basis of the Old Testament Idea of Substitution*

The justification for the endeavor to establish the validity of the doctrine of Substitution in the Old Testament is based primarily upon the New Testament assumption of the existence of this idea in the Old Testament revelation. This is seen from such statements of Christ and His Apostles as the following: "Behold, the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world!"<sup>405</sup> "... O foolish men, and slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken! Behooved it not the Christ to suffer these things... ?"<sup>406</sup> "... Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures."<sup>407</sup> "For our passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ."<sup>408</sup> "... we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all."<sup>409</sup> "For the law having a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image of the things, can never with the same sacrifices year by year, which they offer continually make perfect them that draw nigh."<sup>410</sup> "... but now once at the end of the ages hath he been manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself."<sup>411</sup>

---

<sup>403</sup>1 Corinthians 15:3.

<sup>404</sup>11 Corinthians 5:19.

<sup>405</sup>John 1:29.

<sup>406</sup>Luke 24:25-26.

<sup>407</sup>1 Corinthians 15:3.

<sup>408</sup>1 Corinthians 5:7.

<sup>409</sup>Hebrews 10:10.

<sup>410</sup>Hebrews 10:1.

<sup>411</sup>Hebrews 9:26.

From such assertions it is evident that the New Testament writers, as well as the Lord Himself, believed that the sacrificial death of Christ was an antitypical fulfillment of the Old Testament prophecies, types, and typical sacrificial institutions, and that corroborative testimony of the substitutional nature of His work was to be found within the symbolic and typical framework of the Old Testament itself. Hence, at the threshold of the inquiry into the significance of the doctrine of substitution, and before endeavoring to investigate the profound symbolism and typical allusions to this concept in the Old Testament, it will first be necessary to establish the fact of the symbolic and typical nature of much of the Old Testament itself.

### Typological Interpretation—Its Justification

The justification for the typological interpretation of the Old Testament as noted by Bernard Ramm is three-fold: (1) the general relationship which the Old Testament sustains to the New; (2) Christ's own use of the Old Testament and His invitation to find Him predicted and typified therein; (3) and the vocabulary of the New Testament with reference to the Old.<sup>412</sup>

The strong prophetic element in the Old Testament establishes "... the principle that the New is latent in the Old, and that the Old is patent in the New. The form of prophecy may be either verbally predictive or typically predictive."<sup>413</sup> The former are those prophecies which *foretell* the age to come (Psalm 22, Isaiah 53); the latter are those typical persons, things, and events which *picture* the age to come. Hence, a type is in reality a species of prophecy and therefore justifies typological interpretation of the Old Testament. The further verification of this is seen in the fact that just as the Christian does not wait for the fulfillment of prophecy to accept a passage as prophecy, neither does he need to have the New Testament declare everything a type that is a type. The very implication in the Book of Hebrews itself is that only a small fraction of the great typical parallels between the Old and New

---

<sup>412</sup>Bernard Ramm, *Protestant Biblical Interpretation* (Rev. ed.; Boston: W. A. Wilde Co., 1956), pp. 196-98.

<sup>413</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 197.

Covenants is considered, and that it is left to Christian understanding of the Old Testament to draw other obvious parallels.<sup>414</sup>

It is necessary to make a distinction between allegorical and typological interpretation, since some have attempted to identify them as one method of interpretation, mistakenly called by two different terms, when in reality they represent two entirely different methods of interpretation. It should also be noted that a distinction must be made between an allegory and an allegorical interpretation, and that there is nothing inherently wrong in the use of either, since both are employed in the Scriptures. The allegory is a symbolical narrative in which every detail has a figurative meaning, as in John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, or the allegory of the "Foundling Child" in Ezekiel 16:1-43. On the other hand, it is a common error for Christians to attempt to *allegorize* or give an allegorical interpretation to the parables of Jesus by looking for a hidden meaning in every detail. "The word allegory is derived from the Greek, ἀλληγορία, a description of one thing under the image of another.... Allegory is a figurative representation in which the signs, words, or forms signify something other than their literal or direct meaning."<sup>415</sup> Ezekiel's style of prophetic utterance is characterized by the use of allegory. Ezekiel portrays nations under the personification of animals, plants, and specific kinds of people. Jerusalem and Samaria are prostitutes (23:4); the house of David is a lion's den (19:1); or a vine (19:10; 17:6); or a cedar (17:3); Egypt is a cedar (31:3); or a crocodile (32:1); the Chaldeans are pictured as an eagle (17:3); and Israel in Exile is depicted as a valley of dry bones (37:1).<sup>416</sup>

Allegorical interpretation, on the other hand, is another thing and can be either a valid or invalid method of interpretation of the Old Testament. It is invalid "... when Philo or Origen find Platonic philosophy in the Old Testament...."<sup>417</sup> It can be a valid and cogent method when the interpreter makes perfectly clear that he is using this method purposely to gain a deeper spiritual meaning from the text. Paul in Galatians, for example, gives an *allegorical interpretation* to the *historical*

---

<sup>414</sup>*Ibid.*, ppl 196-202.

<sup>415</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 4.

<sup>416</sup>S. M. Jackson (ed.), *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1909), IV, p. 254.

<sup>417</sup>Ramm, *op. cit.*, p. 204.

narrative concerning Sarah and Hagar. He does not mean, when he says of the account, "which things contain an allegory: for these women are two covenants,"<sup>418</sup> that this narrative is an allegory, but draws from it a deeper spiritual meaning than is evident on the surface. He does this by making an allegory out of an historical event, and thus he only speaks of it as allegorically applied.<sup>419</sup>

Most allegorical interpretation has been an improper use of hermeneutics and must, therefore, be carefully distinguished from the typological method. Dana writes

Allegorical interpretation is assigning to scripture an assumed meaning different from its plain literal meaning, derived deductively from some abstract moral or philosophical conception. It takes the events and ideas of scripture as symbols, beneath which are concealed profound or "hidden" meanings.<sup>420</sup>

Typological interpretation, on the other hand, "... is specifically the interpretation of the Old Testament based on the fundamental theological unity of the two Testaments whereby something in the Old shadows, prefigures, adumbrates something in the New."<sup>421</sup> Therefore, that which is interpreted as typical in the Old Testament is not something foreign and superimposed upon the text, but arises from the *unity* of the two Testaments and is the result of divine purpose. Typological interpretation is held in disrepute by many because of its misuse by some Christians of the second century, who believed that all the ideas and institutions of the Christian religion were foreshadowed in the Old Testament. Since some aspects of the Old Testament did point very vividly, in a typical way, toward the great truths of Christ and redemption, it was too easily assumed that all redemptive truth was typified in the whole of the Old Testament. Hence, the Garden of Eden became a type of the church; the number of Abraham's servants was seen to contain the numerical equivalent of the first two Greek letters for Jesus (IH), and the Greek letter tau (T) which is in the form of the cross.

---

<sup>418</sup>Galatians 4:24.

<sup>419</sup>John McClintock and James Strong, *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1891), I, p. 162.

<sup>420</sup>H. E. Dana, *Searching the Scriptures* (Kansas City: Central Seminary Press, 1946), p. 67.

<sup>421</sup>Ramm, *loc. cit.*

Hence, this was a typical representation of Jesus and His cross. The six days of creation typified the fact that the world would last but six thousand years,<sup>422</sup> "every piece of wood is discovered to be a reference to the cross, and every pool of water speaks of baptismal regeneration!"<sup>423</sup>

Nevertheless, the Old Testament language of religion has a definite symbolic function. The language of the Old Testament is not a language about religion, but the language of religion itself. Religious language as one writer observes "... is clearly different, both in its forms and in its functions, from the literal language found in the statements of science. It is used to convey a sense of what men *feel* about their experience, and to awaken in others the same attitudes and emotions."<sup>424</sup> The Old Testament, as will be shown, in communicating its message of redemption, employs metaphors and symbols to express its religious ideas. "Religious *language* provides a set of *symbols* in terms of which men can express and share the experiences they feel deeply, and relate them to the 'things which are not seen.'"<sup>425</sup>

Justification for a proper use of typological interpretation, as noted previously, is apparent from the fundamental harmony which lies between the two Testaments. The New Testament itself clearly specifies that the Tabernacle, the priesthood, the Levitical sacrifices, and the wilderness wanderings are basic areas of typological truth. This does not mean, however, that every detail of these matters has typological significance; "what is typical must be judged from New Testament considerations and the general hermeneutical skill of the interpreter."<sup>426</sup>

### Objections to the Typical Nature of Old Testament Sacrifices

The question has been raised that if the sacrifices of Moses were actually symbolical of the substitutionary death of Christ, then why is it that no trace of this symbolism appears in the Pentateuch itself? That is, why was not their symbolic and typical character an-

---

<sup>422</sup>Dana, *op. cit.*, pp. 63-66.

<sup>423</sup>Ramm, *loc. cit.*

<sup>424</sup>William Ernest Hocking *et al*, *Preface to Philosophy* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1947), p. 323.

<sup>425</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>426</sup>Ramm, *op. cit.*, p. 211.

nounced as prophetic of Christ? In reply it should be noted that "... the Mosaic ordinances, in so far as they were of a pre-figurative nature, were not intended to unfold their full import until the event should come to which they had an ultimate reference."<sup>427</sup> This would obviously be inconsistent with their nature. "A type, with its prophetic import clearly disclosed, would really amount to a full exposition, instead of a mere foreshadowing of its antitype."<sup>428</sup>

It is further objected that God would not appoint rites to teach men long afterwards in a figurative manner what was then taught by Christ plainly and without a figure. But the Mosaic rites were by no means merely instituted as symbols and types with a view to the light they were to shed fifteen hundred years afterwards on the nature of Christ's work. Thomas J. Crawford answers that the Mosaic institutions "were edifying and useful symbolical acts of worship, and symbolical methods of religious teaching, apart from the pre-figurative character which we assign to them...."<sup>429</sup> The language of symbolism, somewhat foreign to contemporary thought (although by no means absent), was in the most familiar use in ancient times and appears throughout the Old Testament, particularly in the prophecies of Jeremiah, Daniel, Ezekiel, and Zechariah. Likewise the Mosaic ordinances had a great religious advantage to those who observed them, apart from their typical or prophetic reference. They served to constantly remind the Israelites of the holiness of God and the sinfulness of man; of sin's penalty incurred and the need for and provision of pardon; "and of the devout consecration which they ought to make of all their powers and faculties to His service."<sup>430</sup>

### *Evidence of the Symbolic and Typical Nature of the Old Testament*

"God revealed himself not only in words, but also in facts,"<sup>431</sup> writes Berkhof. These facts may have symbolic or typical significance.

---

<sup>427</sup>Crawford, *op. cit.*, p. 255.

<sup>428</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 255.

<sup>429</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 256.

<sup>430</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>431</sup>L. Berkhof, *Principles of Biblical Interpretation* Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1950), p. 142.

The Old Testament interpreter is not to be content merely with the understanding of the Scripture narrative as such, but he must discover, if any, the underlying meaning of such facts as the call of Abraham, the sacrifice of Isaac, the wrestling of Jacob with the Angel, Israel's deliverance from Egypt, etc., in order to do full justice to the obvious symbolical and typical character of Israel's history.<sup>432</sup> G. Ernest Wright confirms this when he says that "the significance of an Old Testament event is to be seen at two levels, its historical meaning, and its typological meaning in foreshadowing later events."<sup>433</sup>

### The Distinction between Symbol and Type

The religion of Sinai was both symbolical and typical. Outram, quoted by Cave, distinguishes between symbol and type. He writes, "The term *symbol* is equally applicable to that which represents a thing past, present, or future; whereas the object represented by a *type* is invariably future."<sup>434</sup> The Mosaic system was adopted, in the first place, to disclose a knowledge of certain great religious truths for the development of a spiritual life within the covenant—thus the ritual was symbolical; at the same time, however, it prepared the way for a future revelation, in which the same truths would be conveyed in a full, clear, and direct manner—hence, the ritual was at once a symbolism proper and a typology. The rites signified to the Jews religious truths and virtues to be practiced for the present, but at the same time were divinely appointed to represent things future, and thus the Mosaic institutions were, at once, symbolical and typological. A type is neither a prophecy nor a symbol, but has relations to both. "A prophecy is a prediction in words, a type a prediction in things. A symbol is a sensuous representation of a thing, a type is such a representation having a distinctly predictive aspect."<sup>435</sup>

An excellent example of the distinction, and at the same time relationship between symbol and type in the Old Testament, is found in the Jewish Passover, which had for its aim not simply to convey certain religious truths at the time, but also prepared the way for that Passover

---

<sup>432</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 142-43.

<sup>433</sup>G. Ernest Wright, *God Who Acts* (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1952), p. 65.

<sup>434</sup>Cave, *op. cit.*, p. 159.

<sup>435</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 163.

of which the Apostle wrote to the Corinthians.<sup>436</sup> During the Mosaic dispensation, and before the coming of its Antitype, the Jewish Passover in its *symbolical* aspect was an important part of the divine revelation as a perpetual memorial or symbol looking backward to God's providential deliverance and salvation from Egyptian bondage. But at the same time there was a prophetic element involved which pointed to the future, and in so doing was a *type* of the preordained Passover who was to come as the great Antitype, and thereby work a true and final deliverance and salvation from bondage for God's people.

The symbolic nature of Israel's history as distinguished from the typical is seen again in Jacob's wrestling with the Angel, by which there was symbolized the need of man's determined persistence with God in order to obtain His blessing. Perseverance in prayer, a form of spiritual wrestling, is not the least of things symbolized in Jacob's experience. The facts of Israel's history also have typical significance as seen in the narratives of Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac; David, as king, clearly a type of his great Son; and the serpent lifted up in the wilderness foretold typically the lifting up of Christ on the cross.<sup>437</sup>

#### Arguments for the Symbolic and Typical Nature of the Old Testament

It may be observed, first of all, that the Mosaic rites bear the marks, not of a final and complete system of religion, but of an incomplete and preparatory dispensation, intending to prepare the way for better things to come. Let their typical reference to the Gospel be admitted and the difficulties are readily resolved, since their pre-figurative character is then consistent with "... those pure and lofty views of spiritual truth and moral duty with which we find them so singularly associated."<sup>438</sup> The cumbersome, burdensome, technical, and ritualistic character of the sacrificial observances then receives its full significance and completion in the great and final atonement at calvary.<sup>439</sup> Thus "the Old Testament embodies not only a code of outward observances, but

---

<sup>436</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 164.

<sup>437</sup>Berkhof, Principles of Biblical Interpretation, p. 144.

<sup>438</sup>Crawford, op. cit., p. 257.

<sup>439</sup>*Ibid.*

points beyond their letter to a deeper spiritual meaning in the present, and to a higher spiritual fulfillment in the future."<sup>440</sup>

Further, the clear correspondence that may be detected between the Levitical ordinances and the sacrifice of Christ is strong corroborative evidence that the former was intended by God to prefigure the latter. With regard to the Mosaic sacrifices in general there are many correspondences—such as the requirements that the victim be ceremonially pure, without blemish and the best of the flock, its substitution in the place of the sinner, its penal suffering and death, the shedding and application of the blood upon the altar Godward, and the exemption from guilt and theocratic Penalties procured by this atonement and propitiation of God—all of which are in extraordinary accordance with the perfect purity and vicarious sufferings and death of the incarnate Son of God. Even more remarkable are the points of correspondence which exist between His death and the institutions of the Passover and the Day of Atonement.<sup>441</sup>

Also the prophets intimate that the Mosaic ritual is to give place to a more perfect system. Jeremiah speaks of a time when the Ark of the Covenant will no longer be needed, "... in those days, saith Jehovah, they shall say no more, The ark of the covenant of Jehovah; neither shall it come to mind; neither shall they remember it; neither shall they miss it; neither shall it be made any more."<sup>442</sup> It will be a time, said the Lord, when "... my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering...."<sup>443</sup> It is a time when God said that from among the Gentiles "... also will I take for priests and for Levites...."<sup>444</sup> Then God also "... will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers...."<sup>445</sup> It will be a time of inward obedience to the laws and statutes declares Ezekiel, "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you... and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye

---

<sup>440</sup>Alfred Edersheim, *Prophecy and History in Relation to the Messiah* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1955), pp. 166-67.

<sup>441</sup>Crawford, *op. cit.*, p. 258.

<sup>442</sup>Jeremiah 3:16.

<sup>443</sup>Malachi 1:11.

<sup>444</sup>Isaiah 66:21.

<sup>445</sup>Jeremiah 31:31-32.

shall keep mine ordinances, and do them."<sup>446</sup> Sacrifices and offerings, especially the burnt-offering and sin-offering, will no longer be required.<sup>447</sup> The reason given by the prophets for the cessation of the Levitical ordinances is that the Messiah would in His own Person sustain an office and perform functions that would supply their place. David predicted His priestly office when he said of Him, "... Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek."<sup>448</sup> Isaiah predicts His sacrificial work for the Messiah shall "... make his soul an offering for sin...."<sup>449</sup> The prophet Daniel represents Him as coming "... to finish transgression and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness...."<sup>450</sup> Hence, the prophets allude to the higher, more spiritual arrangement that will one day supplant the Old Testament Mosaic ritual and ordinances.<sup>451</sup>

When one comes to the New Testament there is found abundant evidence and confirmation of the typical reference of the Jewish ordinances to the sacrificial work of Christ. It is a patent fact to all students of the Scriptures that Christ Himself immediately after His sufferings and death related these events directly to the whole of the Old Testament record. Luke reports that "... beginning at Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself,"<sup>452</sup> and "... that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day."<sup>453</sup> These things Christ said "... must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms, concerning me."<sup>454</sup>

That the Old Testament did contain such typical references to Christ is affirmed by the Apostle Paul who said, "... I... say nothing but what the prophets and Moses did say should come; how that the Christ must suffer...."<sup>455</sup> It cannot, with profit, be gainsaid that the only place in

---

<sup>446</sup>Ezekiel 36:26-27.

<sup>447</sup>Psalms 40:6.

<sup>448</sup>Psalms 110:4.

<sup>449</sup>Isaiah 54:10.

<sup>450</sup>Daniel 9:24.

<sup>451</sup>Crawford, *op. cit.*, p. 259.

<sup>452</sup>Luke 24:27.

<sup>453</sup>Luke 24:46.

<sup>454</sup>Luke 24:44.

<sup>455</sup>Acts 26:22-23.

the entire scope of the Pentateuch that Moses, or the law of Moses, bears witness to the sufferings and death of Christ, is in the Levitical sacrifices themselves, especially depicted in the Sin and Trespass-offerings, the Day of Atonement, and the Passover. There are, to be sure, numerous prophecies concerning the coming of the Messiah, which are contained in the Pentateuch, such as the prediction that "There shall come forth a star out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel...,"<sup>456</sup> and that "Jehovah thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet...,"<sup>457</sup> yet in none of them is there given any indication that the Messiah would suffer and die. This is typified in the Mosaic sacrifices themselves.<sup>458</sup> The Lord Himself when instituting the bread and cup indicated that His death stood in the same relation to the Gospel as that in which the sacrifices stood in relation to the first covenant at Sinai. For He said, "... This cup is the new covenant in my blood...."<sup>459</sup> John, in like manner, referring to the fact that the soldiers did not break the legs of Jesus as was done of the malefactors, relates this to the Mosaic directions concerning the paschal lamb at the Passover, that "... neither shall ye break a bone thereof."<sup>460</sup> The Apostle Paul confirms this typical reference from the Pentateuch when he speaks of Jesus as "... our passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ."<sup>461</sup> The Levitical reference is obvious when He is called "the Lamb of God";<sup>462</sup> "... a Lamb standing, as though it had been slain,..."<sup>463</sup> "... ye were redeemed... with precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, even the blood of Christ."<sup>464</sup>

These analogies and resemblances between the two testaments are hardly accidental, but imply that the correspondence between them was designed. That this was the case is attested to by the Apostle who declared in the Colossian Epistle that the ceremonies of the Mosaic Law were "... a shadow of the things to come..."<sup>465</sup> a fact

---

<sup>456</sup>Numbers 24:17.

<sup>457</sup>Deuteronomy 18:15.

<sup>458</sup>Crawford, *op. cit.*, pp. 260-61.

<sup>459</sup>1 Corinthians 11:25.

<sup>460</sup>John 19:36; Ezekiel 12:46.

<sup>461</sup>1 Corinthians 5:7.

<sup>462</sup>John 1:29.

<sup>463</sup>Revelation 5:9.

<sup>464</sup>1 Peter 1:19.

<sup>465</sup>Colossians 2:17.

which the entire Hebrew Epistle confirms, "For the law having a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image of the things...",<sup>466</sup> is fulfilled in Christ.<sup>467</sup> In addition, the inauguration of the first Covenant at Sinai with the sprinkling of blood; the ceremony of the red heifer whose ashes mixed with holy water removed defilement; the ritual of the Day of Atonement in which the holy of holies was entered alone by the high priest with the blood of bulls and goats whereby the sins of Israel were atoned for, are held forth as representing the one pre-eminent and final atonement at the cross.<sup>468</sup>

## The Symbolic and Typical Significance of the Mosaic Institutions

It is a fact often overlooked that Christ came not only in fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies, but His coming also fulfilled the *sacrificial* and *priestly* elements of the Old Testament. It is noteworthy that He testified to this very thing when He said, "Think not that I came to destroy, but to fulfil."<sup>469</sup> The Epistle to the Hebrews pronounces the Levitical sacrifices to be antiquated and passed away on one basis only—because every detail of the sacrificial system has been fulfilled in Christ, of whom John the Baptist cried: "... Behold, the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world!"<sup>470</sup>

Biblical symbolism, as the divine method of impressing religious and spiritual truths upon the consciousness of the worshipper, was employed in the Levitical ritual and Mosaic institutions. Spiritual ideas were clothed, as it were, with concrete reality, and the import of the various symbols was purposely designed to represent truths which would condition and direct the mind and life of the pious Israelite toward a deeper realization of man as a sinner, and of his relationships and responsibilities to a holy God, and at the same time prepare the

---

<sup>466</sup>Hebrews 10:1.

<sup>467</sup>Edersheim writes of the tenth chapter of Hebrews: "However the exegesis of this passage may be disputed, we believe that it presents this three-fold view of sacrifices: their symbolical and transitional character; the moral element in them; and the great Sacrifice of inherent value by the self-surrender of the Righteous One. . . ." Edersheim, *op. cit.*, p. 171.

<sup>468</sup>Crawford, *op. cit.*, pp. 262-63.

<sup>469</sup>Matthew 5:17.

<sup>470</sup>John 1:29.

way for future revelation. Alfred Cave writes that religious truths were conveyed under symbolical and typical forms.

If the Jew is to learn the divine accessibility, a visible sanctuary where the Omnipresent condescends to limit His attributes is placed before the eyes; if he is bidden bethink himself of the holiness of the elect priesthood, white vestments become aids to thought; if he is urged to approach the Lord God merciful and Gracious in humble confession of sins or heartfelt gratitude, sin-offerings and burnt-offerings are placed in his hands. This sacrificial system was, in fact, minutely symbolical,—symbolical of things to come, and symbolical of things then present.<sup>471</sup>

If the doctrine of substitutionary atonement is to be firmly substantiated in Old Testament Levitical sacrifices, as typical of the death of Christ, then the importance and relevance of establishing the symbolic and typical nature of the Mosaic institutions per se becomes at once apparent. Biblical symbolism permeates the entire body of revelation in both the Old and New Testaments. Terry in *Biblical Hermeneutics* classifies them under three categories: *miraculous symbolism*, such as the pillars of cloud and fire which were with Israel in the Exodus; *visional symbolism*, such as Amos' vision of the summer fruit; and *material symbolism*, such as the blood of the vicarious sacrifices, the priesthood, the Tabernacle and its furnishings, and most important, the sacrifices themselves.<sup>472</sup> For the purpose of this study only the material symbolism pertaining to Mosaic worship will be noted. The complex ritual and intricate details connected with the priesthood, sacrifices, and sanctuary imply symbolic and typical significance.

---

<sup>471</sup>Cave, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

<sup>472</sup>Milton S. Terry, *Biblical Hermeneutics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, [n.d.]), pp. 347-48.

## *The Symbolism of the Tabernacle*

The symbolical and typical nature of the Mosaic tabernacle, and its significance to the doctrine of substitution in the Old Testament is confirmed in Hebrews, the ninth chapter, where it is seen that the specific objects such as the lamp stand, the showbread, and the ark, as well as the priesthood and the sacrifices, all had a symbolical meaning as shadows of things to come.

The symbolic reference of the tabernacle is to be seen, first of all, in its three divisions: (1) the outer court, in which only the covenant people could enter; (2) the holy place, in which only the consecrated priests could serve; and (3) the holy of holies, to which only the high priest was permitted access once each year, when he entered with the blood of atonement for the sins of Israel. The sanctuary was called the "tent of meeting" (אֶהֱל מוֹעֵד) where God met with His people. Here God dwelt in the midst of Israel. Nevertheless, the people were made conscious that although He condescended to dwell among them, yet because of their sinfulness this communion cannot be realized directly, but was to be accomplished through divinely appointed substitutes or mediators, the consecrated priesthood. The people, therefore, were limited to the court of the sanctuary and even the priests were separated by a veil from the divine presence. These three divisions of the sanctuary emphatically symbolized the separation that existed between the holy God and the sinful people and the need of an intercessor for communion.

The meaning of the various sacred objects in the tabernacle symbolized important spiritual truths. In the Holy of Holies the *Ark of the Covenant* symbolized the revelation and presence of the Lord among His people. The cover of the ark, which constituted His throne, was called the *Kapporeth* (כַּפֹּרֶת) in Hebrew meaning "propitiatory," i.e. "the place of propitiation" ("mercy-seat" in the AV). God had said unto Israel: "And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat...."<sup>473</sup> It was here that the atoning blood was sprinkled on the Day of Atonement. In the Holy Place stood the *altar of incense* symbolizing the prayers of the people and intercession of the priest rising perpetually before God. There was also the *table of shew-*

---

<sup>473</sup>Exodus 25:22.

*bread* with the twelve loaves representing the twelve tribes of Israel which was a symbolic testimony that Israel owed to the grace of God the maintenance of life, and that the twelve tribes of Israel were continually presented as a living sacrifice before God (Leviticus 24:5-9). The *golden lampstand* with its seven lamps symbolized the presence of the Perfect Light which shined in the covenant community, a symbol of the divine saving grace in their midst. Then there was the *veil* solemnly symbolizing the eternal separation existing between God and man except through a mediator. In the outer court the *laver* in which the priest must symbolically purify himself signified that he who was to substitute for the sinner and carry out the ministry of reconciliation must himself be pure and undefiled. There was situated in the center of the court the *altar of burnt-offering*, the most important object outside the Ark of the Covenant itself. The altar of burnt-offering, upon which the blood of atonement of the substitute victim was shed, stood, as it were, between the people and God, and it was only *through* this altar that communion, fellowship, and forgiveness were to be realized.

The essential significance of the Mosaic sanctuary and all its features lay in the fact that it being the visible dwelling place of God among His people testified in both a symbolic and typical way to the possibility of the sinner's approach into the presence of God, if the conditions for such communion were adequately met, namely, through substitutionary sacrifice. Hence, the great altar continually proclaimed that without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins.

### *The Symbolism of the Priesthood*

The most minute symbolism was designed, with respect to the priesthood, to convey to the mind the ceremonial purity and consecration required of those who substituted for men and ministered before the Lord in the ministry of reconciliation and worship. Their characteristic holiness was graphically represented by their faultless physical constitution, their mature age, their stern and secluded habit of life, and their life of consecration and devotion. They served barefoot emphasizing the solemnity of their approach to God; pure white linen as their official attire spoke of outward holiness; their access to the Holy Place indicated their divine selection for the ministry; and when the newly-installed priest offered his three-fold sacrifice, the sin-offering was a sign of the forgiveness of his sins, the burnt-offering was a sign of his com-

plete consecration, and the peace-offering signified his oneness with the Lord whom he served. The same attributes were visible to the worshipper in the person of the high priest in an intensified form. "His was a stricter cleanliness, his was a more solemn consecration, his was a more elaborate investiture."<sup>474</sup>

Not only were holiness and purity symbolized in the person of the priest, but in addition in his consecrated role he acted as a substitute for the Israelite before God. A priest, in the Old Testament sense of the word, was one who had been divinely chosen and consecrated to draw near unto God, that he might offer vicarious sacrifices unto Him, and transact with Him on behalf of the people, and in turn convey from Him certain gifts unto the people, such as cleansing, forgiveness, and blessing. The symbolism of the priesthood is permeated with the idea of substitution and the work of Christ on behalf of sinners.<sup>475</sup>

### *The Symbolism of the Rites of Purification*

The whole of the ceremonial of purification was also profoundly symbolic, impressing deeply upon the mind of the Israelite the defiling nature of sin and the essential need of cleansing in order to approach God. Two types of defilement are discerned in Levitical purification, ceremonial and moral defilement.

Ceremonial defilement came through contact with a corpse or anything connected with it, the house, vessels, etc., or touching the carcass of unclean animals, or even clean animals not dying by proper

---

<sup>474</sup>Cave, *op. cit.*, pp. 124-25.

<sup>475</sup>The Nazarite symbolized in a unique way the idea of separation and holiness which characterized the Levitical priesthood. Fundamentally, the Nazarite vow signified a consecration of the whole life unto God. One view holds that the abstinence from wine, cutting the hair, and defilement from contact with the dead, denoted separation from profane civilization. But this fails to account for the symbolism connected with the vow. As Oehler contends the Nazarite restrictions point unmistakably to the relation between the Nazarite vow and the restrictions imposed upon the priesthood. The priest was also denied wine during his time of service (Leviticus 10:9); the high priest was commanded that he should not defile himself by a corpse (Leviticus 21:11); the growth of hair on the Nazarite was called "the *קִנְוָה* (from *קָנָה*) of God upon his head," and bore the same name as the high priest's *diadem* (Exodus 29:6). Thus the *priestly mode of life*, consecrated and holy and dedicated for service to God, was duplicated by the Nazarite during the period of his separation unto God. Oehler, *op. cit.*, pp. 294-96.

slaughtering. In this type of defilement a "water of sprinkling" was applied, and is specifically called a sin-offering in Numbers 19:9. The purifying water was prepared by slaying a red heifer without blemish and burning by fire. The ashes were then mixed with water and sprinkled, as needed, upon persons and vessels defiled by the dead. Other instances of ceremonial defilement for which purification was required were childbirth, cure of leprosy, issues from male or female organs, and Nazarite defilement.

Moral defilement for which purification rites were prescribed had to do with suspicion of adultery and of murder. Numbers 5 sets forth the "trial of jealousy" to which a husband was to submit his wife if he suspected her of adultery. Deuteronomy 21:1-9 outlines the purification procedure for a community to observe for removal of guilt for an unknown murderer's crime. As the priestly ablutions at the laver denoted cleansing, so the rites of purification symbolized the essential need of cleansing from sin and defilement before one might stand in the presence of God.

### *The Symbolism of the Sacred Times and Seasons*

The sacred seasons were designed by God to symbolically depict religious and spiritual truths. These holy days were the enactments of the covenant God who purposed on the one hand to preserve by these seasons a remembrance of His election and deliverance, and on the other hand they were to be constant reminder of their dependence upon Him for all their material blessings of prosperity and spiritual blessings of forgiveness and salvation.

The sanctification of time in general, since all time belonged to the Lord, was effected by the morning and evening sacrifice called the צֹולֶת תָּמִיד. Besides this, special times were designated as holy seasons. These sacred seasons were called מוֹעֲדֵי יְהוָה, where the expression appears in Leviticus 23:2 and is translated "the set feasts of Yahweh," or "appointed seasons," and designates all holy days including the Sabbath.<sup>476</sup> The sacred seasons were as follows: (1) the Sabbath of the seventh day; (2) the New Moons: (a) the first day of each month; (b) the New Moon of the seventh month, a festival day called the Feast of

---

<sup>476</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 323-24.

Trumpets and was the Jewish New Year (Tisri); (3) three festival pilgrimages: (a) Passover; (b) Pentecost; (c) the Feast of Tabernacles; (4) the Day of Atonement; (5) the Sabbatical Year; and (6) the Year of Jubilee.<sup>477</sup>

Besides the regular sacrifices, special public sacrifices were required on the Holy days. On the seven annual feast days<sup>478</sup> rest from labor was commanded as well as on the weekly Sabbath as they were considered sabbaths of rest. There was one difference: on the weekly Sabbath and Day of Atonement all labor was forbidden;<sup>479</sup> on the other sabbaths rest only was required and did not exclude the preparation of food.<sup>480</sup> The celebration of the weekly Sabbath and sabbatical feast days are called "holy convocations," מִקְרָא קֹדֶשׁ. This signified a holy calling together of the people to worship at the sanctuary. The universal command to appear at the sanctuary was in connection with the three pilgrimage festivals, when all males were to appear with a gift.<sup>481</sup>

The sacrifices and ceremonies on these special days were adapted to symbolize important religious truths. For example, the symbolic significance in connection with the several sabbatical seasons was the recognition of God as the Creator of the heavens and earth; the thought expressed by the several more precisely festal times was the recognition of the covenant God of Israel as Deliverer and Provider; while the great Day of Atonement was the distinct recognition of God as Saviour and Sanctifier.<sup>482</sup> In all these seasons the idea of substitutionary sacrifice and vicarious suffering is not only never lost sight of, but is central in the sacrificial ritual. The sacred seasons were designed to symbolize and preserve the great religious and spiritual truths of Israel's history.

---

<sup>477</sup>The laws containing the sacred seasons are found in Exodus 23:10-17; Leviticus 23-25; Numbers 28-29; Deuteronomy 16.

<sup>478</sup>The first and seventh days of unleavened bread; Day of Pentecost; New Moon sabbath; Day of Atonement; and first and last days of Feast of Tabernacles.

<sup>479</sup>Leviticus 23:3; Numbers 29:7.

<sup>480</sup>Exodus 12:16.

<sup>481</sup>Oehler, *op. cit.*, pp. 326-27.

<sup>482</sup>Cave, *op. cit.*, p.140.

## *The Symbolism of the Sacrifices*

Inasmuch as the symbolic and typical nature of sacrifice constitutes a major division of this dissertation and as such is treated at length elsewhere, it will only be mentioned at this point because of its relevance to the concept of typological interpretation as a whole. Alfred Cave in his work *The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice* outlines the symbolic nature of the sacrificial ritual when he writes:

Thus, in every animal sacrifice that he offered, the Jew, who by the light of the express teaching of the Law entered into the meaning of his combined act of atonement and worship, would see in the presentation at the Tabernacle a material expression of his desire to approach the Almighty, Who there revealed himself; in the laying on of the hand, the deliberate dedication of the victim to the purpose of the sacrifice;<sup>483</sup> in the aspersion of its blood; the "covering" of his sin before the face of God; in the burning upon the hearth of earth, the acceptance by Jehovah of the presentation made; and, when a meal of any kind succeeded, he would see God his Saviour adding to His merciful reconciliation the privilege of fellowship with Himself.<sup>484</sup>

In conclusion, therefore, it has been seen that in the theological sense the word "type" refers in the Old Testament to a person, institution, office, action, or event by means of which some truth of the Gospel was divinely foreshadowed.<sup>485</sup> The justification for a typical interpretation of a significant portion of the Old Testament lies in the preordained relationship that the Old Testament and its institutions and history sustain to the New. The significance of establishing this truth, with respect to the doctrine of substitution, lies in the fact that if the doctrine of the substitutionary atonement is to be substantiated on Old Testament grounds, then the symbolic and typical nature of the Mosaic sacrifices is a logical necessity. It becomes increasingly evident, however, in the study of the Old Testament doctrine of substitution, that not only is this truth clearly taught in the Levitical sacrifices themselves, but that the concept of substitution is expressed in a variety of ways throughout

---

<sup>483</sup>The full significance of the imposition of hands cannot be limited to the symbolism of dedication as will be noted later.

<sup>484</sup>Cave, *op. cit.*, pp. 132-35.

<sup>485</sup>Terry, *op. cit.*, p. 336.

the whole of the Old Testament record. The concept of substitution is present in the divine institution of the Mosaic sanctuary, the priesthood, and sacrifice; but it will now be the task of this study to show just how prominent is the idea throughout the framework of the entire Old Testament.

### *The Linguistic Basis for the Doctrine of Substitution*

In numerous passages in both the Old and New Testament, the doctrine of substitution can be clearly demonstrated on the basis of linguistic considerations. Both the Hebrew and Greek prepositions lend themselves particularly to this idea.

### Greek Terminology

Throughout the New Testament there are three Greek prepositions employed to indicate the substitution of Christ in place of, and on behalf of, those for whom He died. These prepositions, denoting substitution, are likewise used throughout the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Old Testament.

#### *The Greek Preposition ὑπέρ.*

The Greek preposition ὑπέρ with the genitive in the New Testament generally carries with it the idea of substitution. Caiaphas said, "... it is expedient for you that one man should die for [ὑπέρ] the people, and that the whole nation perish not."<sup>486</sup> The Apostle Paul said to the Corinthians: "... we beseech you on behalf of Christ [ὑπέρ Χριστοῦ], be ye reconciled to God."<sup>487</sup> When the Apostle wrote to Philemon he advised that he was sending back to him Onesimus "whom I would fain have kept with me, that in thy behalf [ὑπέρ σοῦ] he might minister unto me...."<sup>488</sup>

The same construction is continually used to set forth the nature of Christ's substitution on behalf of sinners. In II Corinthians 5:14 the Apostle declares: "...we thus judge, that one died for all [ὑπέρ πάντων], therefore all died." And again in verse 21: "Him who knew no

---

<sup>486</sup>John 11:50.

<sup>487</sup>II Corinthians 5:20.

<sup>488</sup>Philemon 13.

sin he made to be sin on our behalf [ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν]." The preposition is again used in Galatians 3:13 to indicate the idea of substitution: "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us [ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν]." In Hebrews 2:9 ὑπὲρ teaches substitution: "... that by the grace of God he should taste of death for every man [ὑπὲρ παντός]." The Apostle Peter uses this preposition to indicate the same concept. "Because Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for [ὑπὲρ] the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God...."<sup>489</sup> A. T. Robertson, in his book *A New Short Grammar of the Greek Testament*, confirms the substitutionary usage of ὑπὲρ when he writes, "... in the New Testament as in the papyri and in Euripides... ὑπὲρ is the usual preposition used for the notion of substitution.... Hence one should find no trouble with ὑπὲρ in 2 Corinthians 5:15; Romans 5:6; Hebrews 2:9; Titus 2:14."<sup>490</sup>

### *The Greek Preposition ἀντί*

The Greek preposition ἀντί is employed in this same sense in the New Testament and clearly expresses the exact idea of substitution. Thus it is said in Matthew 2:22, "... Archelaus was reigning over Judea in the room of [ἀντί] his father Herod...." Again, Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount referring to Mosaic Law said in Matthew 5:38: "... an eye for [ἀντί] an eye, and a tooth for [ἀντί] a tooth." When this word is used to express the relation of Christ to those on whose behalf He died, it is often rendered in association with λύτρον, redemption.<sup>491</sup> A. T. Robertson confirms this. He writes, "Hence he was willing to give his life a ransom (λύτρον, word used of price for a slave's freedom) for (ἀντί) many, answering over to many, in exchange for many."<sup>492</sup> "... the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many"<sup>493</sup> (λύτρον ἀντί πολλῶν). The Apostle Paul combines the force of all three terms in I Timothy 2:6, "... Christ Jesus,

---

<sup>489</sup> Peter 3:18.

<sup>490</sup> A. T. Robertson and W. Hersey Davis, *A New Short Grammar of the Greek Testament* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1933), p. 262.

<sup>491</sup> Hodge, *op. cit.*, p. 166.

<sup>492</sup> Robertson, *op. cit.*, p. 253.

<sup>493</sup> Matthew 20:28.

who gave himself a ransom for all...." (ἀντί λύτρον ὑπέρ). That is, He gave Himself in substitution as a ransom for all.<sup>494</sup>

Thus the Greek preposition ἀντί, answering to the English preposition "for," expresses the setting of one thing over against another, and is usually employed to signify the idea of commutation or substitution.<sup>495</sup> It is so used in the Septuagint. In Genesis 4:25 Eve declared upon the birth of Seth: "... God hath appointed me another seed instead of [ἀντί] Abel...." Again in Genesis 44:4, "... wherefore have ye rewarded evil for [ἀντί] good?" The substitutionary concept is clearly set forth in Deuteronomy 10:6 where it is said: "... There Aaron died... and Eleazar his son ministered in the priest's office in his stead [ἀντί]."<sup>496</sup>

### *The Greek Preposition περί*

In other passages denoting substitution the preposition used is περί.. "... God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin [περὶ ἁμαρτίας] condemned sin in the flesh."<sup>497</sup> "... Christ, who gave himself for our sins...."<sup>498</sup> (περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν). "Because Christ also suffered for sins once [περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν] the righteous for the unrighteous...."<sup>499</sup>

All these texts point out the reason or cause for which Christ was delivered up for suffering and death. His sufferings had substantially the same *relation* to the believer's sins as the sufferings of the sinner himself if he had suffered for them. That is, when God inflicts judgment upon men for their own sins, He shows His righteous displeasure against *them* as transgressors. When, therefore, the Scriptures say that Christ died for our sins, or He suffered for sins once, the just for the unjust, it means that His sufferings are a manifestation of the holy displeasure of God, not against Him, but the sinner, whose sin is being punished in Him.<sup>500</sup> This amounts to a substitutionary atone-

---

<sup>494</sup>Hodge, *op. cit.*, pp. 166-67.

<sup>495</sup>Crawford, *op. cit.*, pp. 20-21.

<sup>496</sup>The idea of substitution is certainly implied by the Septuagint translators who rendered the Hebrew of Leviticus 17:11 thus: τὸ γὰρ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἀντὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐξιλάσεται.

<sup>497</sup>Romans 8:3.

<sup>498</sup>Galatians 1:4.

<sup>499</sup>1 Peter 3:18.

<sup>500</sup>Crawford, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

ment as Christ bore the penal consequences of man's sins in his stead and on his behalf.

## Hebrew Terminology

The doctrine of substitution is clearly set forth, therefore, by the usage of the Greek prepositions ἀντί (Matthew 20:28); περί (Romans 8\3); and ὑπέρ (Galatians 3:13), which prepositions indicate the substitutionary idea of "for," "instead of," "in place of," "on behalf of," etc. The doctrine is just as forcibly represented by the Hebrew prepositions in the Old Testament.

### *The Hebrew Preposition על*

The three Hebrew prepositions used in the Old Testament to denote the idea of substitution are על, מֵעַד, and תַּחַת. The preposition על has the meaning of: upon, over, to, on behalf of, on account of.<sup>501</sup> The preposition מֵעַד is translated: away from, about, on behalf of.<sup>502</sup> The third preposition תַּחַת is translated: underneath, below, instead of.<sup>503</sup> Girdlestone in his *Synonyms of the Old Testament* is in error, therefore, when he writes that "the Hebrew preposition rendered by the *for* [עַל]<sup>504</sup> in connection with the doctrine of... atonement does not mean *instead of*, but *over, on, because of, or on account of*."<sup>505</sup> The Hebrew preposition that is used with כַּפֵּר, atonement, is almost always על used in a substitutionary sense, which is likewise at variance with Girdlestone's further assertion that "in one passage only does the strict idea of substitution... appear in the Old Testament in connection with sacrifice, namely, in Genesis 22:13...."<sup>506</sup>

The substitutionary sense of על meaning "on behalf of" is seen even in non-sacrificial usage such as I Kings 2:18 where Bathsheba assures Adonijah that "... I will speak for thee [on thy behalf] unto the

---

<sup>501</sup>Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (2nd. ed., London: Oxford University Press, 1955), p. 752.

<sup>502</sup>ibid., p. 126.

<sup>503</sup>ibid., p. 1065.

<sup>504</sup>The Hebrew preposition על does not have the strict meaning of "for," but is an acceptable translation used in the various versions in connection with . . . and the כַּפֵּר priest shall make atonement for him [], . . ."Leviticus 4:35. עֲלֵיו.

<sup>505</sup>Girdlestone, op. cit., p. 132.

<sup>506</sup>ibid., p. 133.

king." The preposition translated "for," "on thy behalf," is עָלֶיךָ. This idea of intercession on behalf of others is quite clear in the prayer of Nehemiah on behalf of Israel. "... I beseech thee, O Jehovah,... that thou mayest hearken unto the prayer of thy servant... for [עַל - on behalf of] the children of Israel thy servants, while I confess the sins of the children of Israel...."<sup>507</sup> Again, when Mordecai persuades Esther to intercede on behalf of her people the preposition עַל is used.<sup>508</sup> The angel Michael intercedes on behalf of (עַל) Israel in Daniel 12:1.

The preposition עַל, in the sense of "on behalf of," is used in connection with substitutionary sacrifice throughout the Old Testament. In II Chronicles 29:21 when king Hezekiah began to reign after the death of wicked king Ahaz, he commanded that sin-offerings be made on behalf of Israel. "And they brought seven bullocks, and seven rams, and seven lambs, and seven he-goats for a sin-offering for [עַל - on behalf of] the kingdom...." The same is true in Ezra 8:35 where burnt-offerings were made on behalf of (עַל) the returning Exiles. The usage of עַל meaning "on behalf of" is used in a unique sense with the Hebrew word for atonement כִּפָּר Girdlestone states that "the preposition which properly marks *substitution* is never used in connection with the word caphar."<sup>509</sup> He has reference here to the Hebrew prepositions נָצַד and תָּחַת to which he limits the idea of substitution in the Old Testament, and further contends, as previously noted, that in the strict sense of substitution there is only one occurrence where the idea is seen in connection with sacrifice. That this is an untenable assumption has already been shown from the obvious Old Testament uses of עַל in the sense of "on behalf of." Furthermore, to state that the preposition which properly denotes substitution is never used in connection with כִּפָּר is an erroneous conclusion on two grounds. First, it ignores the constant usage of עַל, which plainly teaches substitution, with the verb "to cover, to make atonement." Secondly, it will be shown that the preposition נָצַד is also frequently used with כִּפָּר

The substitutionary sense of עַל when used with כִּפָּר is uniquely portrayed in its Old Testament usage. While עַל when used in a substitutionary sense has the meaning of "for," "on behalf of," when used

---

507Nehemiah 1:5-6.

508Esther 4:9; see also 4:16; Job 42:8; II Chronicles 30:18; Ezra 8:35.

509Girdlestone, op. cit., p. 132.

with other words, yet when used with כָּפַר may either retain this same translation or may graphically be translated as the preposition *over*. The literal meaning of כָּפַר, "to make atonement," is *to cover over the sin*, and therefore the preposition צַל is most properly translated "over." Hence, for example, Leviticus 4:35 which speaks of the law of the sin-offering is translated in the Authorized Version "... and the priest shall make atonement for him [כָּפַר עָלָיו] as touching his sin...." The idea of substitution is clear in the translation to make atonement *for* him (or on his behalf); but more properly the usage of צַל with כָּפַר should be translated as "over." The passage would then be rendered: "And the priest shall make *a covering over him* [by the blood of the sin-offering] concerning his sin which he has sinned and it shall be forgiven him."

Since to make atonement for sin is literally to *cover over* the sin, symbolically portrayed in the application of the blood of the substitute victim upon the altar, then the preposition צַל in the sense of "over" is constantly used with כָּפַר.<sup>510</sup>

### *The Hebrew Preposition בְּעַד*

The preposition בְּעַד, "on behalf of," contrary to Girdlestone's contention, is frequently used in the strict substitutionary sense in the Old Testament. In non-sacrificial usage it appears in many passages in the sense of "for" or "on behalf of." In Genesis 20:7 Abimelech is warned by God to restore Abraham's wife Sarah unto him and that Abraham, being a prophet, would make intercession on his behalf. "Now therefore restore the man's wife; for he is a prophet, and he shall pray for thee [בְּעַדְךָ, on behalf of thee], and thou shalt live...." The preposition appears quite frequently in this sense of "on behalf of," often in connection with the verb פָּלַל, to pray or make intercession, as seen in Numbers 21:7; I Samuel 7:5; and Psalm 72:15.<sup>511</sup> Moses, Samuel, and Jeremiah are frequently spoken of as making intercession on behalf of (בְּעַד) Israel.

---

<sup>510</sup> צַל is also used with other verbs meaning "to cover" as in Habakkuk 2:14 ". . . as the waters cover over the sea" (צַל). כָּסָה.

<sup>511</sup> is used with other verbs of intercession and entreaty. Cf. I Samuel 7:9; Isaiah 8:19; II Kings 22:13; Jeremiah 21:2.

The preposition **בְּעַד** is commonly used also with **כַּפֵּר** to make atonement. In Levitical sacrifices the substitutionary sense of **בְּעַד** finds expression in Leviticus 9:7: "And Moses said unto Aaron, Draw near unto the altar, and offer thy sin-offering, and thy burnt-offering, and make atonement for thyself, and for the people [**וַיְבַעַד הָעַם וְכַפֵּר בְּעַדָּהוּ**]...."<sup>512</sup> Moses offered himself as a substitute and interceded on behalf of Israel to make an atonement: "... Moses said unto the people, Ye have sinned a great sin: and now I will go up unto Jehovah; peradventure I shall make atonement for your sin" (**אֶכַּפְּרֶה בְּעַד חַטְאֵיכֶם**). The prepositions **עַל** and **בְּצַד** are used together in the substitutionary sense in Job 42:8 and II Chronicles 30:18. The passage in Job 42:8 reads: "Now therefore, take unto you seven bullocks and seven rams, and go to my servant Job, and offer up for yourselves [**בְּעַדְכֶם**, on your behalf], burnt-offering; and my servant Job shall pray for you [**עַלְיֶכֶם**] on your behalf]...."

### *The Hebrew Preposition תַּחַת*

The substitutionary significance of the preposition **תַּחַת**, "instead of," "in the place of," is seen in its various Old Testament uses. In Leviticus 16:32 it is used in the sense of "in the place of": "And the priest, who shall be anointed and who shall be consecrated to be priest in his father's stead [**תַּחַת**], shall make the atonement...." The substitutionary force of the preposition is seen in those passages where the sense is "to exchange" as in Exodus 21:24: "But if any harm follow, then thou shalt give life for life [**נֶפֶשׁ תַּחַת נֶפֶשׁ**], in place of, in exchange for], eye for eye, tooth for tooth...." Again, in Leviticus 14:42 clean stones were to be substituted for unclean stones in the cleansing of a house infected with leprosy, "And they shall take other stones, and put them in the place of [**תַּחַת**] those stones...." The spies sent by Joshua to Jericho bargained with Rahab "and the men said unto her, Our life for yours [**נַפְשֵׁנוּ תַּחַתְיֶכֶם**]...."

A most singular use of **תַּחַת** to express the concept of substitution is found in Genesis 22:13, which stands as a monument to the doctrine of substitution in Old Testament literature, where Abraham is said to have offered up a substitute for his son Isaac. "And Abraham lifted up his eyes, and looked, and behold, behind him a ram caught in

<sup>512</sup>Cf. Leviticus 11:6, 11, 17, 24; Ezekiel 45:22.

the thicket by his horns: and Abraham went and took the ram, and offered him up for a burnt-offering *in the stead of* [תַּמַּת] his son." The design of this extraordinary event was to portray, as did the later Levitical sacrifices, the doctrine of substitution by action instead of words.<sup>513</sup>

The idea of substitution is graphically depicted, therefore, in both the Old and New Testament revelations by the Greek and Hebrew prepositions. The linguistic basis for the concept constitutes one of the strongest polemics in support of the idea of substitution. These prepositions are not as some contend to be limited to the vague or general idea of "for," but they express as has been seen the inmost immediate putting of one thing in the place or stead of another. Thus with respect to Christ's death it is not merely that He died *for* others, but also *in their stead* as their substitute.

### *The Doctrinal Bases for the Idea of Substitution in the Old Testament*

From the theological standpoint the concept of substitution is grounded in certain Biblical doctrines of both the Old and New Testaments. In asserting the doctrinal grounds for the idea of substitution in the Old Testament there is to be seen an essential relation between this concept and such doctrines as the Law, imputation, the wrath of God, propitiation, as well as the ritual of the imposition of hands which is closely related to the doctrine of imputation.

### The Divine Provision for Substitution by the Law

In order to ascertain the precise nature of substitution it requires, fundamentally, the satisfactory solution to a problem which may be stated as follows: Since no atonement can be made by a violator of the law. No one has been able to show how man can make full satis-

---

<sup>513</sup>Critical interpreters find in this account a legend as the explanation for animal substitution. "Having regard to the origin of many other Genesis narratives, we must admit the possibility that the one before us is a legend, explaining the substitution of an animal for human sacrifices in some type of ancient worship." John Skinner, "Genesis," *The International Critical Commentary* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1930, I, p. 232.

faction for either his past offenses, or how he can render perfect obedience in the future in his state of unrighteousness.

### *The Three-Fold Nature of Man's Inability*

The Scriptures show that *no violator* of God's law can make acceptable atonement, *in his own person*, for the transgression. A single violation has rendered him unrighteous, "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet stumble in one point, he is become guilty of all."<sup>514</sup> Righteousness before God admits of no degrees. The fall of the entire human race is seen in a single act of disobedience. Before the act man was righteous—after the fall, unrighteous. The law is a unity; the breaking of one precept is a breaking of the law, and a repudiation of the whole. The complete loss before God of righteousness is the penalty annexed to the single act of disobedience. Man, therefore, as a transgressor of the law can render no acceptable atonement for his violations. This is seen in that the law requires *righteousness of character* before it can accept as righteous any proposed acts or works. That is, it requires that one *be* righteous, not merely that he do this or that good deed. Further, the obligations of the law are *continuous*, that is, there is no allowance permitted in the law for an act on the part of the transgressor which would be for the atonement of a past offense. His immediate and continuous obedience is required at every moment of time. Also, the law required of every individual *the utmost* he is able to render. This means simply that no moral being is ever able to exceed at any time the absolute requirements of divine law. The obvious implication is that if Adam before his transgression could not have exceeded the requirements of the divine commands, then how could actual transgressors of the revealed law hope to do so?<sup>515</sup> The law, therefore, requiring absolute continuous obedience and righteousness of character, forbids and disqualifies one who is unrighteous from making satisfaction in his own person for his transgression. He owes to the law a debt which he, being morally insolvent, is unable to pay. Can, therefore, atonement be rendered by a substitute? Does the law itself, in view of this, allow satisfaction to be rendered by a substitute in the place of the

---

<sup>514</sup>James 2:10.

<sup>515</sup>Armour, *op. cit.*, pp. 115-25.

actual transgressor? W. F. Lofthouse in his book *Ethics and Atonement* replies in the negative.

... if we cannot get rid of sin by bearing the punishment, no more can Christ himself, by bearing the punishment for us; if the terms of such a transaction could be carried out at all, it would make no difference whether they were carried out by the principle or by a surety.<sup>516</sup>

That this is not the Biblical view, however, will now be shown.

### *The Law's Provision for Substitution*

In the solution of this important question, however, it may be noted first of all that Law, in its own nature, as a body of rules, precepts, ordinances, and principles, *does* make provision for substitution. For if atonement by the sinner be a manifest impossibility, then any satisfaction of the law on behalf of the sinner is likewise an impossibility, unless substitution is a normal provision of the law. "The satisfaction theory of the Atonement, or the doctrine that 'Christ did make a proper, real and full satisfaction,' can be maintained only on the ground that substitution is provided for in the very nature of law."<sup>517</sup> Not only cannot sinful man make his own satisfaction, but even more, there can be no relaxation of the demands of the law, nor a dispensing with the law, in order to make satisfaction by a substitute. The burden of this is that he who would thoroughly discharge the obligation to divine justice must do so, not by an abrogation of the law or a relaxation of its severity, but through a perfect satisfaction of the law, and this cannot be accomplished unless the law in itself provides for that very substitution.

Law admits a substitute in every case in which an adequate substitute is offered to meet the penalty for violation of law. John M. Armour notes that Law, as administered by man in every age, has provided for and admitted substitution in the following regards at least: public works, military service, crimes, and debt. Work for public benefit, required by the laws of state of able citizens, may be performed by any

---

<sup>516</sup>W. F. Lofthouse, *Ethics and Atonement* (London: Methuen & Co., 1906), p. 138.

<sup>517</sup>Armour, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

substitute who is willing and able. In the past, with respect to military service required for defense of a country, nations have almost universally allowed for a substitute under their laws of one person for another, who is himself free from the same obligation. Even in the case of certain crimes committed, law provides that the penalty may be met by a substitute. Also in the case of debt, which is obligation under law, a substitute is always admitted. "A surety, who is always a true and proper substitute, when he discharges the obligation does 'ipso facto' release the debtor and fully satisfy the law."<sup>518</sup>

There is a distinction to be made in natural or human law between substitution for debt and substitution for crime, that is, there is an essential difference between substitution in the case of surety for debt and substitution for crime; one is pecuniary and the other penal indebtedness. For in a pecuniary debt the payment of the debt owed liberates the debtor, because here the point is not who pays, but *what is paid*. But the case is different with respect to the payment of a penal debt, because here the obligation has reference to the person who satisfies the debt as well as the debt itself. In debt the demand terminates upon the thing due, whereas in crime the legal demand for punishment is upon the person. With respect to human obligation for transgression of the divine law both aspects are brought into view, for not only is divine justice concerned with *what* is paid, but the *person* who pays.

That sin is a "debt" is evident from Christ's words to His disciples, when in guiding them in the principles of prayer, He taught them that they should pray, "And forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors."<sup>519</sup> In the final analysis sin and debt agree in that both withhold from the law what is due, and legal condemnation falls upon them both. From legal condemnation there is but one way for deliverance and that is full satisfaction of the law. Hence, in the case of man's violation of divine law, the full obligation of the sinner's debt must not only be met, but the person by whom the satisfaction is made is *never* the debtor himself, but is in every instance a substitute. The logic of this has already been set forth; the sinner as a transgressor of the law can, in his own person, render no acceptable atonement, in that the law itself requires a righteousness of character, not just right deeds.

---

<sup>518</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 130.

<sup>519</sup>Matthew 6:12.

It presupposes a continuous obedience at every moment of time and contains no provision which would enable the transgressor himself to make atonement for his own sins, since the law requires of every individual the utmost in continuous moral obedience. This absolute demand of the law, which is a unity in which the violation of one precept is tantamount to a transgression of the whole, involves sinful man in an obligation which he can in no way meet. The Aristotelian idea of righteousness as a human virtue, acquired and developed by man's ability, stands condemned in the revelation to Moses, where God at Sinai demanded the absolute in His law, requiring categorical obedience, and condemning anything relative. Moral, social, civil, and ceremonial righteousness were both demanded and expected. Since the voice of conscience might permit a relative obedience, and therefore be partial and imperfect, the voice of the Law would admit no imperfection, but was a categorical imperative spoken to the whole man in the totality of his life. It is obvious in the light of Scripture, the testimony of history, and the witness of conscience, that obedience to the absolute righteousness of the law was not only impossible, but satisfaction of the legal debt for its transgression by the transgressor was just as impossible. Divine justice is, therefore, not only concerned with respect to what is paid, but even more, is concerned with who meets the obligation. The need of a substitute, who can with no guilt of his own to disqualify him, make the proper legal satisfaction, is evident.

Since self-atonement is an admitted impossibility, the need of an acceptable substitute is a moral necessity. Since man has alienated himself from God because of sin, God alone must take the initiative and restore the breach of relationship; if the satisfaction is met God must provide a way. Since, admittedly, the law cannot yield, then God must find a way, not at the expense of justice, but a way that satisfies the righteousness of the law. It is a universally accepted principle that natural or human law permits a substitute to discharge a debt or obligation. So too in the divine economy, the law itself provides for substitution. The Mosaic Law Covenant was rooted and grounded in the Levitical system of substitutionary sacrifice. Sacrifice, as a means of atonement for sin, became the very basis of the Mosaic system, which itself was instituted by a blood atonement—the Covenant sacrifice of Exodus 24.

And Moses wrote all the words of Jehovah, and rose up early in the morning, and builded an altar under the mount, and twelve pillars, according to the twelve tribes of Israel. And he sent young men of the children of Israel, who offered burnt-offerings, and sacrificed peace-offerings of oxen unto Jehovah. And Moses took half of the blood, and put it in basins; and half of the blood he sprinkled on the altar. And he took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people: and they said, All that Jehovah hath spoken will we do, and be obedient. And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant, which Jehovah hath made with you concerning all these words.<sup>520</sup>

The covenant, which was to subsist on the basis of the offerings and sacrifices of atonement made for transgressions of the Law given at Sinai, was a revelation of the grace and mercy of Israel' s God—a God who not only demanded absolute obedience and holiness, but who graciously provided the means as well as the end. This is seen in that the essential feature in the Mosaic Covenant was the system of sacrifice; and unique within this system was the concept of substitution. It was not unique in that the idea of substitution was absent in heathen sacrifice, for the very act of sacrifice is an a prior assumption of the concept of substitution, but unique in that both the language and the ritual of Mosaic blood sacrifice purposely typified and taught the idea. The essential purpose of this dissertation is to support this tenet; and it will suffice at this juncture to indicate the validity of this premise that both the language and ritual of Levitical sacrifice exemplified the idea of substitution, and that the Law, therefore, made provision for substitution. In the offering of a blood sacrifice of all kinds the individual was to bring the victim to the altar,

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.<sup>521</sup>

This is, as clearly as language can state it, divine substitution provided for in the Law itself! As will be discussed later in greater detail under the substitutionary implications of the Sin-offering, the ritual of all

---

<sup>520</sup>Exodus 24:4-8.

<sup>521</sup>Leviticus 1:4.

blood sacrifices required an imposition of the hands of the sinner on the head of the victim who was to stand in his place and suffer the penalty for the transgressions confessed. This having been done, it was said that "... *it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him.*" The clear and plain meaning of the language is that of the acceptance of another *in the place of or for* the one who made the offering. The tacit meaning of the sacrificial ritual, from the imposition of the hands and confession of sin to the application of the atoning blood of the victim to the altar, is that of substitution. The use made of the blood, for example, in every type of sacrifice—burnt, peace, sin or trespass-offering—was a constant affirmation of this truth. For in every type of blood offering the blood was first required to be sprinkled upon the altar as an atonement by means of the *substitute victim* before the offering itself could be made. Symbolically the innocent victim typified the future Lamb of God presented on behalf of the sinner for an atonement for sin through a substitutionary death. The sprinkling of the blood upon the altar signified the presentation of the blood Godward, and its gracious acceptance by Him for the remission of sins. "For the life of the flesh is in the blood; I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls...."<sup>522</sup>

Critical scholarship may reject the idea of substitution on the basis of their unbiblical views of revelation and philosophical arguments, but all are constrained to admit that on the basis of the words of the *text itself* the sacrificial language can imply little else but the idea of substitution. "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," can mean only one thing. That is, if language is to serve any rational function at all, it means that the innocent victim is accepted by God on behalf of the actual transgressor; and because it had died for him and in his stead, that he himself does not have to die. There is no suggestion in all the Old Testament of some vague idea of the dedication of one's property being symbolized by the slaying of the animal at the altar; but on the contrary, there is to be seen in the death of the innocent and ceremonially pure victim the judgment of God upon sin, being exacted by the mercy and grace of God, not upon the actual sinner, but upon his substitute, who suffers vicariously the penal consequences of

---

<sup>522</sup>Leviticus 17:11.

his guilt. Hence, the idea of substitution, rather than being the mere product of theological speculation with respect to the death of Christ as criticism contends, is on the contrary seen to be a divine provision within the Levitical law of the Old Testament itself.

### The Substitutionary Significance of the Imposition of Hands<sup>523</sup>

With respect to the symbolism of the imposition of hands two interpretations have been suggested, with certain modifications of these by others. It was commanded that "... he shall lay his hand upon the head of the burnt-offering; and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him."<sup>524</sup> One view contends that the laying on of the hand is a mere declaration of the offerer's property. "If this were true," rightly observes Kellogg, "we should find the ceremony also in the bloodless offerings; where the cakes of corn were no less the property of the offerer than the bullock or sheep of the burnt-offering. But the ceremony was confined to these bloody offerings."<sup>525</sup>

The second view holds that the imposition of hands was symbolical of the transference of sin and of the guilt and obligation to suffer for sin to the innocent victim. Cave, however, objects to this interpretation on the ground that it opens "... wide the door to frequent contradictions."<sup>526</sup> He argues that if the victim carries the sins of the offerer, then it cannot be also termed as "holy," or the blood sprinkled upon the altar of God. Critical interpreters also argue from this premise. F. C. N. Hicks in his book *The Fullness of Sacrifice* writes:

The offerer laid his hands... on the head of the victim. This was formerly interpreted as an act of substitution—by a reading back into the Old Testament sacrifices of "substitution" theories of

---

<sup>523</sup>In the Old Testament the imposition of hands is found in the following instances: (1) by the offerer on the head of the sacrifice (Leviticus 1:4); (2) by the high priest on the head of the goats on the Day of Atonement (Leviticus 16:21); (3) by witnesses on the head of a blasphemer (Leviticus 24:14; cf. Susanna 5:34); (4) by the people on the heads of the Levites to set them apart for service in the sanctuary (Numbers 8:10); and (5) by Moses on the head of Joshua, when formally instituting him as his successor (Numbers 27:18; Deuteronomy 34:9).

<sup>524</sup>Leviticus 1:4.

<sup>525</sup>S. H. Kellogg, "The Book of Leviticus," *The Expositor's Bible* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1891), p. 41.

<sup>526</sup>Cave, *op. cit.*, p. 129.

atonement; but such an explanation breaks down if only for the reason, among others, that the victim is still holy.<sup>527</sup>

A German critic also in agreement writes:

... the offerer places his hands on the head of the victim, not in order to transfer to it his own sins (this would be only to make it impure and hence unsuitable for sacrifice) but in order to be more effectively identified with it.<sup>528</sup>

In reply to Cave's objection that the sacrifice could not symbolize the ideal transference of sin and guilt because it was called "most holy," it is obvious that he overlooks, first of all, the express fact that in the case of the sin-offering the victim is called *תִּזְבֵּחַ*, Sin, and at the same time is designated by God as "most holy."<sup>529</sup> This is not an anomalous designation, since the imposition of hands designates, not the actual transference of sin which morally belongs to the sinner, but the legal guilt and liability to suffer for his sins. Hence, the ceremonially pure and innocent victim offered in substitute is "most holy," and his blood becomes an acceptable covering for the sins of the penitent offerer.

The ceremony of the laying on of hands symbolized more than mere designation as others contend, but also the transfer or communication of something invisible in vital connection with this visible act. In the New Testament the laying on of hands always denotes the communication of the Holy Spirit. "The laying of the hands of Moses on Joshua, in like manner, signified the transfer to him of the gifts, office, and authority of Moses."<sup>530</sup> Dr. Herman A. Hoyt in his book *All Things Whatsoever I Have Commanded You*, in the chapter on the practice of the laying on of hands, writes that,

... in every instance the two ideas of contact and communication emerge.... In conferring blessing (Genesis 48:18; Matthew 19:13,

---

<sup>527</sup>F. C. N. Hicks, *The Fullness of Sacrifice* (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1930), p. 379.

<sup>528</sup>J. J. Von Allmen (ed.), *Vocabulary of the Bible* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1958), p. 379.

<sup>529</sup>Leviticus 6:29.

<sup>530</sup>Kellogg, *op. cit.*, pp. 41-42.

15), confessing of sins (Exodus 29:10; Hebrews 6:2), ordaining of officers (Numbers 8:10; Acts 6:6), healing the sick (Mark 5:23), and the conversion of sinners (Acts 8:17, 18), the hands always come in contact with the person or animal upon which the rite is being performed. The idea of *communication* also follows as a natural consequence of contact.... By this act it is signified that blessing has been communicated, sins are transferred to the animal, power and authority for service are conveyed, healing power has been transmitted, and new life has been imparted. No better sign or symbol could be used to picture these two ideas to the human mind.<sup>531</sup>

He points out, however, that one is not to "... make the mistake of thinking that some peculiar efficacy lies in the hands, or that the hands become channels through which blessing [or guilt transference] is administered."<sup>532</sup>

"There appears no reasonable objection against the idea," writes William Magee, "that the imposition of hands, in piacular sacrifices, denoted an emblematical transfer of guilt."<sup>533</sup> This idea receives further confirmation from those passages of Scripture in which the ceremony of the imposition of hands was employed without any reference to sacrifice. In Leviticus 24:14-15, the ceremony is found prescribed in the case of the blasphemer before he was put to death. After the imposition of hands upon his head it was then said, "Whosoever curseth his God shall bear his sin," implying, as in the ritual of sacrifice, that the consequences of sin were to fall upon his head. Likewise idolatry was to be punished by death after the imposition of hands upon the guilty by the witnesses against them (Deuteronomy 13:9; 17:7).

Deeply inherent within the rite of the imposition of hands is the idea of the ideal transference of guilt and the liability to suffer its penal consequences. In the Levitical sacrifices the victim was in the most literal sense conceivable substituted for the sinner to bear the penalty due him. If the penal substitutionary nature of sacrifice is once admit-

---

<sup>531</sup>Herman A. Hoyt, *All Things Whatsoever I Have Commanded You* (Winona Lake, Indiana: The Brethren Missionary Herald Co. , 1948), p. 28.

<sup>532</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 31-32.

<sup>533</sup>William Magee, *Discourses and Dissertations on the Scriptural Doctrines of Atonement and Sacrifice* (New York: James Eastburn, 1813), p. 208.

ted, then the ceremony of the imposition of hands upon the animal victim can conceivably imply but one meaning —and that is the signification of the transfer of legal guilt to the substitute who was then given over to death to suffer the penal consequences of his sins.

### The Doctrine of Imputation

In close connection with the ceremony of the imposition of hands, which symbolized the transference of guilt to the substitute victim, is the doctrine of Imputation. That the doctrine of imputation is vitally related to the concept of substitution is evident, not only from the imposition of hands on the head of animal victim in the Levitical sacrifices, but also from those passages of Scripture which assert that *the believer's sins were laid upon Christ*, and made to be His in the legal sense that they were the cause of His suffering the penalty due the believer. "... Jehovah hath laid on him the iniquity of us all."<sup>534</sup> "... he bare the sins of many...."<sup>535</sup> "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us...."<sup>536</sup> "Who his own self bare our sins in his body upon the tree...."<sup>537</sup> "So Christ also, having been once offered to bear the sins of many...."<sup>538</sup> "Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf...."<sup>539</sup> This close relationship between the doctrine of imputation and the doctrine of substitution is illustrated in Philemon 17-18, where Paul is willing to assume the obligations of Onesimus, and asks that any demerit be reckoned (imputed) to his account. "If then thou countest me a partner, receive him as myself. But if he hath wronged thee at all, or oweth thee aught, put that to mine account."

#### *The Nature of Imputation*

The doctrine of imputation technically defined means that which is placed to one's account, reckoned, or attributed vicariously. Theologically imputation refers to the attribution of (1) the sin of Adam to his posterity, (2) of the righteousness of Christ to believers,<sup>540</sup> and (3) of

---

<sup>534</sup>Isaiah 53:6.

<sup>535</sup>Isaiah 53:12.

<sup>536</sup>Galatians 3:13.

<sup>537</sup>1 Peter 2:24.

<sup>538</sup>Hebrews 9:28.

<sup>539</sup>11 Corinthians 5:21.

<sup>540</sup>Funk, *op. cit.*, p.905.

the guilt of sinners to Christ, not implying a transfer of moral qualities, but rather of legal merit or demerit. Imputation means, therefore, according to Andrew Fuller, (1) to charge or place to the account of persons things which properly belong to them. To impute sin in this sense is to charge guilt upon the guilty; or (2) to charge or place to the account of persons things which do not properly belong to them. In this latter sense the term is used with respect to justification and substitutionary atonement.<sup>541</sup> The doctrine of imputation supports the doctrine of substitution as the previously quoted scriptures affirm, and as will be seen from several considerations.

The doctrine of the imputation of the guilt of the sinner does not imply a transfer of moral qualities, but of legal guilt and punishment. This is to be noted in the Apostle Paul's statement that, "Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf; that we might become the righteousness of God in him."<sup>542</sup> Since "righteousness" here cannot mean intrinsic purity, else for Christ to be made sin would mean to be intrinsically unholy, then the Scriptures do not refer to an actual transfer of sin whereby Christ *became sinful*, but to a transfer of the *legal guilt and punishment* of man's sin.

Crawford writing in support of this truth says:

The imputation of our sins to Christ has reference exclusively to *their legal forfeitures and liabilities*. It implies no such thing as a transference to Him of their inherent sinfulness or moral turpitude. Indeed such a transference is impossible in the nature of things. Our sins, as regards their moral qualities are our own, and cannot by imputation become another's. Their legal liabilities may be laid to the account of another party, who undertakes, with the sanction of the supreme Judge, to bear legal liabilities in our stead. And this, by a metonymy of the cause for the effect, may be figuratively spoken of as a transference of the sins themselves. But there can be no *literal* transference of sins, to the effect of making him who has not committed them a sinful person, and of rendering us, who have committed them. pure and sinless.... The imputation of our

---

<sup>541</sup>Andrew Gunton Fuller, *The Complete Works of the Rev. Andrew Fuller* (London: G. and J. Dyer, 1846). p. 309.

<sup>542</sup>I Corinthians 5:21.

sins to Jesus Christ implies only that He was made liable to endure their penalties....<sup>543</sup>

Some, however, in seeking to escape this error have gone to the opposite extreme and denied that the legal guilt and punishment due the sinner were transferred to the substitute victim. Such a misconception is seen in the following quotation:

May it be supposed that the punishment of sin is actually transferred from the human sinner to the sacrificed animal, and is executed upon it?... What a disparity, between the person who has deserved the punishment and the vastly inferior creature which is punished in his stead!<sup>544</sup>

The logic of this objection is faulty. The efficacy of animal sacrifices is nowhere said to lie in the animal victim itself. Also in reply to the question, May it then be supposed that the punishment of sin is actually transferred from the human sinner to the sacrificed animal, and is executed upon it?, the Old Testament Scriptures clearly answer in the affirmative. "And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the sin-offering and *kill the sin-offering*... and the priest shall make atonement for him, and he shall be forgiven."<sup>545</sup> Also the contention that there is too great a disparity between the person who deserved the punishment and his substitute completely overlooks the infinite disparity between the sinner and the sinless Son of God who took upon Himself the legal guilt and punishment of the sinner. If the differences in equality of subjects renders true substitution invalid in the case of Old Testament sacrifice, then the problem becomes insurmountable with respect to the substitution of God Himself in the place of wicked men!

"The transfer of guilt to the Saviour was only legal, not moral; imputation, not pollution; He took the penalty, not the moral consciousness of our guilt, not the stain but the liability to suffer, the obligation to die."<sup>546</sup> As Christ was not made a sinner by the imputation of man's sins to Him, so the sinner is not made holy by the imputation of Christ's

---

<sup>543</sup>Crawford, *op. cit.*, p. 189.

<sup>544</sup>John Pye Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 198.

<sup>545</sup>Leviticus 4:29, 31.

<sup>546</sup>A. R. Fausset, *Bible Cyclopaedia Critical and Expository* (Hartford: The S. S. Scranton Co., [n.d.]), p. 618.

righteousness to him. Imputation is the transfer of legal guilt from the sinner to Christ and the merit of Christ to the sinner (Rom. 4:6-9).<sup>547</sup>

And so in the Levitical sin-offering (חַטָּאת) the guilt and punishment of the sinner fell upon the innocent victim. In Leviticus 1:4; 4:26; 5:1, 16-18; 17:11, the truth is established that the legal guilt is transferred from the sinners upon the innocent substitute in order to satisfy violated justice and cover the guilt.<sup>548</sup> As the Levitical sacrifice was called Sin (חַטָּאת), because the offender's guilt and punishment were now imputed to it, so Christ is called Sin by the Apostle when He was put under the legal guilt and penalty of man's sin by imputation. "The phrase to 'impute sin,' or 'righteousness,' in its scriptural usage signifies simply to set to one's account, to lay to one's charge or credit as a ground of legal process."<sup>549</sup>

The word sin is used in the Scripture to denote moral evil in three aspects: (1) Sin as a transgression of God's law (I John 3:4); (2) Sin as a moral quality inherent in the soul—the state of the soul (Ephesians 2:1; Romans 6:11-13); (3) Sin considered with respect to its legal obligation to punishment, i.e. sin as guilt. In the latter sense it is used in those passages in both testaments which speak of "bearing sin," "laying on iniquities," "imputing sin," "making to be sin," etc. It is in this sense that the Old Testament Levitical sacrifices were designated when the חַטָּאת, sin-offering, and חַטְּאת־פְּשָׁעִים, trespass-offering, were made to suffer vicariously the guilt and penalty due the transgressor. It is in this sense that guilt and punishment were transferred or imputed to Christ, who as the sinner's substitute suffered vicariously as a sin-offering.<sup>550</sup>

### *The Old Testament Terms for Imputation*

There are three terms in Hebrew which indicate by their usage the concepts of imputation and substitution. They are חָשַׁב, to think, account, reckon, impute; נָשָׂא, to bear; and a similar term נָשָׂא, to carry.<sup>551</sup>

---

<sup>547</sup>Torrey, *op. cit.*, p. 314.

<sup>548</sup>Fausset, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

<sup>549</sup>Hodge, *op. cit.*, pp. 170-71.

<sup>550</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 170.

<sup>551</sup>Another Hebrew term which is used very infrequently to indicate imputation in the Old Testament is שָׂם, meaning "to put, place, set." It is so used in I Samuel 22:15: ". . . let not the king impute (שָׂם) anything unto his servant. . . ." Cf. also Job 4:18; Deuteronomy 22:14, 17.

Leviticus 7:18 clearly depicts the idea of imputation and substitution. Levitical law required that all of the peace-offering be eaten the same day if a thank-offering, or by the second day at the latest if a vow or free-will offering. In no case was any of the flesh to remain until the third day. Thus in Leviticus 7:18 it is stated:

And if any of the flesh of the sacrifice of his peace-offerings be eaten on the third day, it shall not be accepted, neither shall it be imputed unto him that offereth it: it shall be an abomination, and the soul that eateth of it shall bear his iniquity.

Both terms are found here in the Hebrew, *הָשִׁיב*, to impute, and *וָנָשָׂא*, to bear. The doctrinal teaching is evident here. The sacrifice had been offered and the blood of atonement sprinkled, but since the correct ritual regulations of Levitical law had not been observed, the expiation of the atonement had not been credited to the offerer, nor had the iniquity of his soul been *imputed* (*הָשִׁיב*) *to the substitute victim*, hence "... the soul... shall bear his iniquity." The language graphically describes the substitutionary nature of all Old Testament sacrifice. The sin of the offerer was imputed to the substitute victim who suffered vicariously, bearing the guilt and penalty due the transgressor. The idea is seen again in the interposition of Phinehas, who slew the transgressing Israelite, and it resulted in righteousness being imputed unto him. "Then stood up Phinehas, and executed judgment; and so the plague was stayed. And it was reckoned [*הָשִׁיב*] unto him for righteousness...."<sup>552</sup> Of Abraham it is said. "And be believed in Jehovah; and he reckoned it [*וַיִּהְיֶה שְׂבָהּ*] to him for righteousness."<sup>553</sup>

This concept also appears in the New Testament usage of the Greek word, *λογίζουαι* to count, reckon (impute), which is used in the LXX to translate *הָשִׁיב*.<sup>554</sup> Christ, speaking with reference to Isaiah 53:12 said: "For I say unto you, that this which is written must be fulfilled in me, And he was reckoned with transgressors...."<sup>555</sup> The Apostle Paul

---

<sup>552</sup>Psalm 106:30-31.

<sup>553</sup>Genesis 15:6

<sup>554</sup>G. Abbott-Smith, *A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1953), p. 270.

<sup>555</sup>Luke 22:37.

writes "Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, And whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not reckon sin."<sup>556</sup> "... God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses...."<sup>557</sup> This usage indicates imputation in the two-fold sense of (1) the imputation of righteousness through faith, and (2) the imputation of the sinner's legal guilt to Christ, which is assumed in II Corinthians 5:21.

The other Hebrew terms indicating imputation of the legal *guilt* of sin to a substitute, טָבַל and נָשָׂא translated "to bear, or carry," are used in the Old Testament in the sense "to bear sin." The word טָבַל has this meaning in Lamentations 5:7, but not here in the sense of bearing away sin or removing, but in the sense of *carrying*. "Our fathers have sinned, and are not; and we have borne [טָבַל] their iniquities." This obviously can only mean to bear the penalty and consequences of their father's sins and not their literal transgressions. So of Christ, "He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by the knowledge of himself shall my righteous servant justify many; and he shall bear their iniquities."<sup>558</sup> Here the Servant of Yahweh bears, in the sense of carrying, the load of guilt. The Hebrew word נָשָׂא, when construed with the idea of sin, always means to bear sin in the sense of being penally responsible for it.<sup>559</sup> For instance, under Mosaic law if a husband caused his wife to break a vow made with his approval, "... he shall bear [נָשָׂא] her iniquity."<sup>560</sup> It is here seen clearly in the penal, judicial sense; that is, he is responsible for the guilt and punishment attached. In Leviticus 5:17-18 the soul that sins is guilty "... and shall bear his iniquity." The consequence of bearing sin is death as the penalty, Numbers 18:22. The goat for Azazel, upon whom the iniquities of Israel were confessed, was said to bear them (נָשָׂא); hence their guilt was imputed unto him. "And the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities...."<sup>561</sup>

When נָשָׂא is used with reference to the Suffering Servant it denotes more than the idea simply of "bearing" the sins of others,

---

<sup>556</sup>Romans 4:7-8.

<sup>557</sup>II Corinthians 5:19.

<sup>558</sup>Isaiah 53:11.

<sup>559</sup>Hodge, *op. cit.*, pp. 170-78.

<sup>560</sup>Numbers 30:15.

<sup>561</sup>Leviticus 16:22.

but bearing them for the express purpose of removing them.<sup>562</sup> In John the Baptist's testimony to Christ, "Behold the Lamb of God which takes away the sin of the world," Dale correctly interprets this to mean Jesus would lift up the burden of sin by expiating it. The verb αἴρω represents the Hebrew term נָשָׂא. Had John followed the usage of the LXX in which נָשָׂא, when it denotes "bearing of sin" or its punishment, is translated by λαμβάνω or θέρω, he would have failed to convey the precise idea. He was not thinking so much of Christ taking the sins of the world upon Himself, as of His taking them away. The testimony was to denote the *result* as well as the *act* of expiation. It is not simply a bearing of man's sin, but the usage of the term denotes a taking up of this burden and carrying it away.<sup>563</sup>

### *The Results of Imputation*

In view of all the foregoing it is concluded that with respect to penal substitution sin or sinfulness is best defined as an *attribute*, whereas the guilt is seen to be a *relation*. It is a personal relation between a sinner and the righteous Sovereign who legislates the penal statute defining and fixing the guilt.<sup>564</sup> Thus when the Scriptures or theology speak of imputation or penal substitution, it is this legal relation only which is spoken of as transferred or imputed from the sinner to his substitute. Only the novice or uninformed would speak of an actual transfer of personal acts and moral character from the wicked to the righteous. In the Scriptures the word "sin" is often used by metonymy where the meaning is that of the guilt for the sin. The prophet Jeremiah cries, "In those days, and in that time, saith Jehovah, the iniquity of Is-

---

<sup>562</sup>Alfred Cave confirms this interpretation and writes, "Much difficulty has been made concerning the significance of αἴρω, some translating it 'take away,' and others 'bear.' The precise translation adopted matters little, so long as the reference to the Levitical law is preserved. αἴρω is the synonym of the Hebrew *nasa*, which, in connection with *avon* or *cheta*, always means the *taking away of by bearing its punishment*." Cave *op. cit.*, p. 277.

<sup>563</sup>Dale, *op. cit.*, p. 459.

<sup>564</sup>Dabney, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

rael shall be sought for, and there shall be none, and the sins of Judah and they shall not be found."<sup>565</sup> The prophet does not contradict his earlier statements that Israel and Judah are guilty of gross sins and iniquities, but intends for the word "iniquity" to connote the idea of guilt.<sup>566</sup> God's act of forgiveness removes the guilt from sinners; it is never said that he has not sinned, but rather he is treated as if he had not sinned. The sinner is released from the penal consequences or guilt and punishment for his sins when the guilt and the punishment of them are imputed to and borne by an acceptable substitute. When anyone pays the debt for another the entire legal obligation is assumed and discharged by him. But there is involved in this transaction another imputation, for true imputation looks in *two directions*.<sup>567</sup> "As debt is imputed to the surety or substitute, the discharge or release is imputed to the debtor,"<sup>568</sup> i.e. the whole of the obligation is imputed to the surety, and a full release from the obligation is imputed to the debtor.<sup>569</sup> This principle prevails in both the moral and the natural realms. The release is complete and perfect righteousness before the law in the matter of the debt. It is imputed to him and is therefore imputed righteousness. The debt or obligation which is assumed by the substitute is an imputed one and is discharged by him as a legal and voluntary obligation.

Therefore, imputation is the legal act of God whereby (1) He makes the guilt and legal responsibilities of the believer's sins really Christ's as his Substitute (Isaiah 53:5, 11; John 1:29; II Corinthians 5:21); and (2) whereby He makes the righteousness of Christ that of

---

<sup>565</sup>Jeremiah 50:20; Cf. 31:34; Isaiah 43:25; Micah 7:9.

<sup>566</sup>Dabney, *op. cit.*, pp. 11-12.

<sup>567</sup>If imputation of the guilt and punishment of men's sins to Christ is absurd, as negative criticism contends, then the imputation of His righteousness is equally so. Dabney confirms this when he writes that imputation looks in two directions. "He who pronounces the imputation of guilt to Christ morally impossible for God, has, of course, rejected the doctrine of original sin; for that contains, as Paul teaches in Romans v., a parallel imputation. Next, the church doctrine of justification must be corrupted, for that is founded upon the counterpart imputation of Christ's righteousness to believers. . . ." *Ibid.*, p. 15.

<sup>568</sup>Armour, *op. cit.*, p. 139.

<sup>569</sup>This concept is stated in another form by John Owen. He writes, ". . . our justification consists in the *non-imputation* of sin, and the *imputation of righteousness*." Owen, *op. cit.*, p. 163.

the believer, that is, it is counted legally as his own (Romans 4:6-9; I Corinthians 1:30; II Corinthians 5:21; Philippians 3:9).<sup>570</sup>

## The Wrath of God

One of the most important problems related to the doctrine of substitution is the question of *the wrath of God and the need of propitiation*. A correct view of the atonement depends directly upon one's conception of the nature of sin and the moral and ethical character of God. Apart from the reality of Divine wrath against sin, Old Testament sacrifice and especially the vicarious death of Christ have no real meaning and purpose. The close relationship between the wrath of God against sin and the doctrine of atonement is seen most clearly in Numbers 16:46<sup>571</sup> after the rebellion of Korah. "And Moses said unto Aaron, Take thy censor, and put fire therein from the altar, and lay incense thereon, and carry it quickly unto the congregation, and *make atonement for them: for there is wrath gone out from Jehovah; the plague is begun.*"

One of the major tenets of liberal theology is an overemphasis on the love of God and a firm denial of the reality of the wrath of God, which when carried to its logical conclusion, makes the doctrine of substitutionary atonement quite superfluous. An excellent summarization of the problem is that of a contemporary writer:

Much of the misunderstanding concerning the wrath of God comes from misinterpretation. With God wrath is not an angry passion. It is not vindictiveness or hatred. The wrath of God is His resistance against sin, His reaction against wrong-doing. The reaction expresses itself in penalty. The judgment of God is the reaction of God to sin and expresses itself positively in the moral order of the universe. The fatal flaw of most of the liberal books that deal with sin is the absence of the evangelical or biblical attitude toward sin. There is lacking in liberalism that fervent hatred of sin which characterizes the biblical writers, consequently few liberals can appreciate the attitude of God toward sin for they do not share it and do not care to. So God's wrath is not angry passion, nor irrational madness, nor a vindictive feeling toward man. The wrath of God is

---

<sup>570</sup>Torrey, *loc. cit.*

<sup>571</sup>17:11 in Hebrew.

the judgment which falls upon sin and sinners in the moral world over which God rules.<sup>572</sup>

While most liberal thinkers would deny outright the existence of the wrath of God as an outmoded anthropomorphism, others, although using the term, divest it of its Biblical meaning and force. Such an inadequate view is taught by C. H. Dodd in his commentary on Romans. Dodd seeks to avoid what he believes to be an anomaly between the wrath of God and the love of God by dissociating the fact of divine retribution from any idea of an angry God visiting His displeasure upon sinful men. Thus the wrath of God, according to Dodd, is *to be forsaken* by God and His grace and left to one's own evil inclinations, where the choice of evil in human society is a natural process of cause and effect. Man has rejected God's revelation of His everlasting power and divinity through His works in creation, refused to worship Him, and made a Creator out of the creature, and has turned to idols. As a natural consequence they are receiving the due recompense of their perversity, and *the wrath of God is the abstention from interference with their free choice and its consequences*. The whole process is a part of the divine government of the universe, and in this sense it is God who brings the wrath upon men, but it is not thought of as the direct expression of God's attitude to men.<sup>573</sup>

Admittedly, there is certainly some truth in Dodd's interpretation that the wrath of God is to be forsaken by God and His grace and left to one's own evil inclinations, for the Apostle writes precisely this in his Roman Epistle: "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men.... wherefore God gave them up in the lusts of their hearts unto uncleanness...."<sup>574</sup> Yet to be forsaken by God is not all that the wrath of God means, for this is simply one of the consequences of sine. But there is an active side to the wrath of God which manifests itself in penal judgment and eternal punishment. It is at this point that Dodd's interpretation of the wrath of God breaks down. Wrath, to Dodd, is at best a sort of passive non-

---

<sup>572</sup>Chester E. Tulga, *The Case for the Atonement of Christ* (Chicago: Conservative Baptist Fellowship, 1951), p. 21.

<sup>573</sup>C. H. Dodd, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, The Moffatt New Testament Commentary* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, [n.d.]), pp. 19-30.

<sup>574</sup>Romans 1:18, 24.

interference with sinners, who are left to themselves in their choice of evil, which brings its own moral retribution. The wrath of God is simply the abstention from interference with the sinner's free choice and its consequences. It is the mechanical operation of the moral law of the universe, but should never be thought of as the direct expression of God's attitude toward the sinner. Thus Dodd uses the Biblical term wrath to postulate an unbiblical view of the wrath of God, which, in effect, is merely an attempt to make the old liberal position more palatable.

Liberal theology notwithstanding, divine judgment and the wrath of God are realities in Biblical thought and are quite pronounced in Old Testament history and theology. Salvation and election are displayed in the Old Testament against a background of divine wrath and judgment against sin. The wrath of God is often dismissed by critical interpreters as an outworn anthropomorphism, or a primitive idea associated with ancient crude and non-moral ideas of holiness, but any serious consideration of Old Testament theology must take note of its reality. The basic Hebrew words which are used in the Old Testament to express the wrath and anger of God are  $\text{אַף}$ , anger, and  $\text{קֶצֶף}$ , wrath, and the verbs  $\text{אַף}$ , to be angry, and  $\text{קֶצֶף}$ , to be wroth. While the terms are used in the Old Testament with reference to both God and man, yet they appear most frequently as an expression of the righteous indignation of God against rebellion and iniquity.

The Pentateuch displays a cognizance of the reality of divine wrath against sin. This was seen, as previously noted, in the plague sent upon the rebellious people as a result of divine wrath (Numbers 16:46). In Deuteronomy 9:18-19 Moses reminds the people of the reality of God's wrath when he fell down before the Lord in prayer on their behalf. "For I was afraid of the anger and hot displeasure, wherewith Jehovah was wroth against you to destroy you...." The Psalmist teaches the existence of divine anger: "Jehovah will swallow them up in his wrath, and the fire shall devour them."<sup>575</sup> "Who knoweth the power of thine anger, and thy wrath according to the fear that is due unto thee?"<sup>576</sup> The prophets constantly asserted the reality of divine wrath against all sinners, and especially against the iniquities of His own

---

<sup>575</sup>Psalm 21:9.

<sup>576</sup>Psalm 90:11.

people. Isaiah declared that God delivered Israel into the hands of Babylon because of His wrath against sin (Isaiah 47:6). Assyria is called "... the rod of mine anger... ," whom God will send "... against the people of my wrath...."<sup>577</sup> Hosea warns that God has said: "I will pour out my wrath upon them like water."<sup>578</sup> His wrath also is directed toward the heathen, and it is called the Day of God's wrath: "Behold the day of Jehovah cometh, cruel, with wrath and fierce anger; to make the land a desolation, and to destroy the sinners thereof out of it."<sup>579</sup> Zephaniah declares: "That day is a day of wrath, a day of trouble and distress...."<sup>580</sup> From these passages and numerous others the concept of divine judgment and wrath against all iniquity is graphically portrayed in Old Testament thought.<sup>581</sup> The thoughts and demands of the wrath of God against sin and sinners are extremely prevalent in Scripture. The latter concept is found in over five hundred and eighty occurrences in the Old Testament alone.<sup>582</sup> "By undercutting God's justice, holiness and utter abhorrence of sin, one undermines and brings into jeopardy the whole moral nature of God."<sup>583</sup>

The effect of sin upon God, whether wrong-doing, disobedience, or idolatry, was to arouse His divine anger or wrath. The divine wrath is not, however, to be considered an attribute like His righteousness or holiness, as liberal theology misrepresents it, and thus uses this as a basis of denying its true existence.<sup>584</sup> But wrath in God is an affection, a disposition which is transient. "Wrath, when it is attributed to God," writes Thomas Boston, "must not be considered in respect to the affection of wrath, but the effects thereof."<sup>585</sup> God is love, to be

---

<sup>577</sup>Isaiah 10:5-6.

<sup>578</sup>Hosea 5:10.

<sup>579</sup>Isaiah 13:9.

<sup>580</sup>Zephaniah 1:15.

<sup>581</sup>Cf. also: Psalm 100:5; Proverbs 11:4; II Chronicles 28:11; Ezra 10:14; Psalm 78:31; Leviticus 10:6; Numbers 1:53; Deuteronomy 9:7; 29:28;; Joshua 9:20; II Kings 23:26, etc.

<sup>582</sup>This does not imply, as the opponents of the doctrine of wrath assert, that God in this view shows no compassion whatever toward the unregenerate. Numerous passages contradict this: Genesis 39:5; Psalm 145:9; 15-16; 36:6; Matthew 5:44-45; Luke 6:35-36; Acts 14:16-17; Romans 2:4; Ezra 18:23, 32; 33:11.

<sup>583</sup>Roger Nicole, "Propitiation," *Christianity Today*, I, No. 14 (April, 1957), p. 3.

<sup>584</sup>Davidson, *op. cit.*, p. 332.

<sup>585</sup>Thomas Boston, *Human Nature in Its Fourfold State* (Evansville: Sovereign Grace Publishers, 1957), p. 96.

sure, but the divine nature is capable of wrath. aroused by disobedience and iniquity and calmed by the punishment of transgression; hence the need of substitutionary atonement. Any interpretation of Biblical theology that fails to see this and to take it into account falls short of the Biblical testimony itself. But as divine wrath is an affection and not an attribute of God's nature, or the fundamental character of the divine mind, then His wrath can be placated and assuaged by propitiation, for He is long-suffering and full of mercy and compassion. His forgiveness of Israel bears witness to this:

For their heart was not right with him, neither were they faithful in his covenant. But he, being merciful, forgave their iniquity, and destroyed them not: yea, many a time turned he his anger away, and did not stir up all his wrath. And he remembered that they were but flesh....<sup>586</sup>

He does this for His name's sake; "For my name's sake will I defer mine anger... for mine own sake, for mine own sake, will I do it...."<sup>587</sup> Although sin arouses the divine anger of God, yet wrath with Him is a passing emotion as the Psalmist declares: "For his anger is but for a moment; his favor is for a life-time...."<sup>588</sup>

But this is not to deny the terrible reality of His righteous indignation. The wrath called forth by sin and rebellion expressed itself in plagues upon the people in the wilderness, constant afflictions at the hands of their enemies, and finally subjugation by the Gentiles, and exile by expulsion from their land. Thus the righteous wrath of God is displayed and God's justice is glorified. So testifies Isaiah: "Therefore my people all gone into captivity... but Jehovah of hosts is exalted in justice, and God the Holy One is sanctified in righteousness."<sup>589</sup> God's just wrath against sin is as real as His love to men (Psalm 7:11; John 3:16).<sup>590</sup> "God has a wrath which is calm, judicial, inevitable—the natural reaction of holiness against unholiness."<sup>591</sup>

---

<sup>586</sup>Psalm 78:37-39.

<sup>587</sup>Isaiah 48:9, 11.

<sup>588</sup>Psalm 30:5.

<sup>589</sup>Isaiah 5:13-16.

<sup>590</sup>Fausset, *op. cit.*, p. 618.

<sup>591</sup>Strong, *op. cit.*, p. 724.

## The Doctrine of Propitiation

Having established the reality of the wrath of God in Old Testament thought, then a necessary corollary which follows upon this is the need of propitiating this divine anger. It is here that the Levitical system of sacrifice comes into prominence. As previously stated, apart from the reality of divine wrath against sin, Old Testament sacrifice has little significance. And as might be anticipated, the same school of interpretation that denies or weakens the Biblical doctrine of the wrath of God consistently rejects the doctrine of propitiation.

A great many Old Testament expositors under the influence of the Graf-Wellhausen school of Biblical criticism deny the penal and substitutionary character of Old Testament sacrifice. Berkhof quotes Stevens as saying: "We must conclude, therefore, that whatever may have been the popular interpretation of Jewish sacrifice, neither its original nor its intended and prevailing meaning was penal or substitutionary."<sup>592</sup> Another writer rejects any judicial significance in sacrifice, saying that it is a "... persistent mistake of supposing that sin-offerings must somehow have been intended to propitiate God by the killing of a victim in the offerer's stead.' The real purpose of animal sacrifice was not propitiation of God's justice...."<sup>593</sup> Liberal scholarship overlooks the fact, however, that there is no satisfactory reply to the question, What is the meaning and purpose of the sin-offerings in the Old Testament if penal substitution has no place in Old Testament sacrifice? Carl F. H. Henry in his book *Christian Personal Ethics* demonstrates the weakness at this point of the child of liberalism, Neo-orthodoxy. He writes:

The dialectical theology of crisis, now so stylish, re-emphasizes the expiatory work of Christ. At the same time it denies any propitiatory and forensic significance to the atonement. This view revives an emphasis on the divine wrath, but it does so only with half-seriousness, and in the final analysis subordinates God's wrath to his love.<sup>594</sup>

---

<sup>592</sup>Berkhof, *Vicarious Atonement Through Christ*, p.86.

<sup>593</sup>Walter Marshall Horton, *Christian Theology* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1955), p. 187.

<sup>594</sup>Carl F. H. Henry, *Christian Personal Ethics* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1957), p. 371.

## *The Linguistic Basis of Propitiation*

Nevertheless, the effects of Old Testament sacrifice and the death of Christ, as it regards God, are designated in the Scriptures as *propitiation*, which effects a reconciliation between God and the sinner. The words used are καταλλάσσειν, καταλλαγή, ἰλάσκεσθαι, ἰλασμός, ἰλαστήριον, in the Septuagint and the New Testament, and כִּפֶּה in the Hebrew. The classical usage of καταλλάσσειν is to change or exchange; to change a person from enmity to friendship or to reconcile. The usage of the derivative noun καταλλαγή is precisely similar. The propitiatory nature of the term is seen in its usage in Romans 5:9-11, where the sinner is said to be reconciled to God through the death of His Son, and being justified by His blood will be saved from God's wrath through Him. In its classical usage ἰλάσκεσθαι means to propitiate an offended deity by means of expiatory sacrifices or penances. This was its universal sense and usage before the Septuagint used it as the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew כִּפֶּה, to cover over or propitiate. It is translated in Hebrews 2:17 as reconciliation in the Authorized Version and propitiation in the American Standard Version. "... to make propitiation for the sins of the people." In I John 2:2 and 4:10 Christ is said to be the ἰλασμός for our sins. In Romans 3:25 He is called a ἰλαστήριον, propitiation through His blood, that is "a propitiation by means of an expiatory sacrifice covering the sins of his people with his blood."<sup>595</sup>

The Hebrew word used to express propitiation is כִּפֶּה, to cover, atone, propitiate, and was used to express the effect designed and accomplished by the Levitical sacrifices. Thus כִּפֶּה expressed in regard to sin a *covering*, but in respect to God a *propitiation*, and hence a means of reconciliation. The entire sacrificial system prescribed in Leviticus was for the purpose of propitiating God to regain His favor and effect reconciliation. He was propitiated or made friendly again by an offering of various kinds; the burnt-offering, peace-offering, sin-offering and trespass-offering. The sacrifice was brought and the blood applied Godward upon the altar, and the graciousness of God was indicated by His acceptance of the substitute. The significance of propitiation is most clearly seen in the annual Day of Atonement when the blood of the sin-offering was brought into the Holy of Holies and sprinkled upon the Kapporeth, כַּפֹּרֶת, the propitiatory, or as translated in the Authorized

---

<sup>595</sup>Hodge, *op. cit.*, pp. 179-81.

Version "the mercy-seat."<sup>596</sup> Since the propitiatory, or mercy-seat covered the broken law in the Ark of the Covenant, God, as it were, saw the blood upon the Kapporeth and His judicial wrath was propitiated. Hence the Kapporeth, or mercy-seat, was the most important part of the tabernacle—the Holy of Holies being designated at times as "... the house of the Kapporeth."<sup>597</sup>

Thus the Hebrew word כָּפַר, basically meaning "to cover," came to be used to express the *effect* of a sacrifice in *covering* the guilt of sin and in *propitiating* the judicial disfavor of God. Atonement (to cover over) expresses the removal of the *guilt* of sin. Propitiation, on the other hand, removes the *judicial displeasure* of God because of sin. Atonement has respect to the sinner, propitiation has respect to God. The fundamental idea in the usage of the word and its derivatives is that God is reconciled to the sinner only on the basis of a *covering* for his iniquities, and that sin is covered only by the *sacrificial* blood of a substitute. In Leviticus 10:17 it is said that the sin-offering is given to take away the iniquity of the congregation and to make atonement, כָּפַר, for them. The atonement was a covering of sin by the blood of the substitute victim. The Septuagint consistently translates כָּפַר (to cover sin by blood sacrifice) by the Greek word ἰλάσκεισθαι, the universal meaning of which was to propitiate by expiation.<sup>598</sup> The apostles following the usage applied the same word to Christ in Romans 3, I John 1 and 4, and in Hebrews 2.

### *The Old Testament Concept of Propitiation in the Vicarious Sacrifice of Christ*

The inherent theological relationship that the New Testament sustains to the Old is clearly perceptible in the Biblical concept of Propitiation, inasmuch as the Old Testament Levitical term כָּפַר, "to propitiate," is expressed in no less than four classic passages in the New Testament revelation. Critical scholarship, confronted with the term in both testaments and finding itself unable to refute the doctrine on linguistic and exegetical grounds, has sought to do so by philosophic arguments, on the one hand, and by a disregard of hermeneutical princi-

---

<sup>596</sup>Rendered in the Greek ἰλαστήριον, and in the Latin, propitiatorium.

<sup>597</sup>1 Chronicles 28:11.

<sup>598</sup>Hodge, *op. cit.*, pp. 181-84.

ples on the other. The Revised Standard Version, which reflects the theological position of the negative critical school, ignores the Septuagint, as well as the accepted classical meaning of the Greek terms for *propitiation*, and translates the terms in every instance as *expiation*. Before examining their arguments, however, it will first be necessary to set forth an accurate translation of the four disputed texts together with their meaning. The following verses are rendered correctly by the American Standard Version: I John 2:2; I John 4:10; Hebrews 2;17; Romans 3:24-25:

... 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.

Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the *propitiation* for our sins.

Wherefore it behooved him in all things to be made like unto his brethren, that he might become a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God to make *propitiation* for the sins of the people.

Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth to be a *propitiation*, through faith in his blood....

In both of the passages in I John the word translated "propitiation" is the Greek term ἰλασμός. The Greek word is used in the Septuagint to translate כַּפָּרִים,<sup>599</sup> atonement; סְלִיחָה, forgiveness;<sup>600</sup> and אָשָׁם, trespass-offering;<sup>601</sup> and הַסֵּאת, sin-offering.<sup>602</sup> To propitiate a person is to avert or remove his wrath and to conciliate his favor. Hence, a propitiation is something done or given to this person by which his displeasure is removed and his favorable disposition toward the other restored.<sup>603</sup> The term ἰλάσκομαι used in the Septuagint to translate כַּפָּר in

---

<sup>599</sup>Numbers 5:8.

<sup>600</sup>Psalms 130:4.

<sup>601</sup>Amos 8:14.

<sup>602</sup>Ezekiel 44:27.

<sup>603</sup>G. Abbott-Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 215.

Genesis 32:20<sup>604</sup> where Jacob seeks to appease the anger of Esau his brother: "For he said I will propitiate him with the present that goeth before me, and afterward I will see his face; peradventure he will accept me." In the parable of the Pharisee and Publican the latter cried, "... God be thou propitiated toward me a sinner"<sup>605</sup> (ἰλασθητί σοί).

Hence, as Crawford observes, when Christ is said in I John to be "a propitiation," it does not mean that He is so because He propitiates *man towards God*, or induces man to be reconciled to God; but He is said to be a propitiation for our sins, which clearly means that the barrier, or obstacle to friendship which His propitiation removes, is God's righteous displeasure with man because of his sin. One cannot ignore, therefore, the obvious sacrificial connotation of the term, taken directly from the Levitical sacrificial system, suggesting an analogy between Christ's work and the Hebrew sin-offerings which were clearly intended to propitiate God.<sup>606</sup>

A third reference in which the Old Testament sacrificial term "propitiation" appears with reference to Christ is Hebrews 2:17 where Christ is said to be "... a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people." The analogy between the Levitical system and Christ's work is evident. The propitiation has respect to the sins of the people which was accomplished by the priestly offerings for sin when the high priest went into the innermost sanctuary annually with the blood of atonement and sprinkled it upon the propitiatory or mercy seat (כַּפֹּרֶת).

A fourth passage in which the term "propitiation" is found with reference to Christ is Romans 3:24-25:

Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, in his blood, to show his righteousness because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God.

---

<sup>604</sup>32:31 in Hebrew.

<sup>605</sup>Luke 18:13.

<sup>606</sup>Crawford, *op. cit.*, pp. 78-79.

Some expositors suggest the Greek term here used, ἰλαστήριον, is a reference to the mercy-seat of the Ark, and Christ as such is a proclaimer of God's mercy. But this view attributes to Him the function of a herald of mercy, rather than the procurer of it. Further, the Apostle is not setting forth a declaration of God's mercy, but of His righteousness. An allusion here to Christ as the mercy-seat is incongruous, inasmuch as He would be represented as being sprinkled with His own blood. It is much more acceptable to see in Christ's death for sin, bearing for man its penalties, the means by which He appeased or propitiated God's judicial displeasure against it.<sup>607</sup> This is not then simply a proclamation of mercy, but a manifestation of God's righteousness through the expiation of human guilt by the propitiation of Christ, which is in perfect accord with Old Testament usage.

### *The Emendation of the Term Propitiation to Expiation by Critical Interpreters*

In spite of the admitted meaning of propitiation expressed in the Hebrew verb כָּפַר by all scholars, and its Greek synonym ἰλάσκεσθαι, C. H. Dodd, the Revised Standard Version of the Bible, et al., insist on emending the text of the New Testament to read "expiation" in order to remove what is, to them at least, the objectionable connotation implied by the word ἰλασμός, propitiation. Having rejected the "wrath of God" as an Old Testament anthropomorphism, they quite presumptuously mistranslate the Greek and Hebrew term for propitiation on the basis of their previous unbiblical presupposition, namely, the denial of the reality of the anger and wrath of God. In fact,

Dodd went so far in this direction as to set forth the thesis that in the biblical language the idea of "pacifying the displeasure of the Deity is absent and that the translations 'expiate,' 'cleanse,' 'forgive,' should be substituted for 'propitiate.'"<sup>608</sup>

The intention is obvious, of course, in emending the text from propitiation, which means to appease the anger of another, or to change the disposition of one from enmity to friendship, to expiation,

---

<sup>607</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 80-82.

<sup>608</sup> Roger Nicole, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

which implies only an act performed to remove defilement.<sup>609</sup> Here the purpose is to emphasize, as liberal theology is dedicated to do, the love of God, rather than propitiating or satisfying the divine wrath and justice against sin and sinners. C. H. Dodd in his commentary on *The Johannine Epistles* believes he has sufficient grounds for an emendation of the Biblical text, at least in its translation. He writes, with reference to I John 2:2:

The word propitiation, however, is a doubtful rendering. The word in the original (*hilasmos*), which occurs also in iv. 10, is derived from a verb which in pagan Greek usage generally means to "placate," "pacify," or "propitiate" an offended person, and in particular an offended deity. The verb, however, has another meaning, *rarer* in pagan writers—namely, to perform an act by which defilement (ritual or moral) is removed; to "expiate."<sup>610</sup>

The weaknesses of Dodd's hypothesis are evident from several considerations. First of all, he admits that such a usage of *ἱλασμός* is quite rare in classical Greek literature; hence he would have difficulty building a convincing argument that the New Testament writers meant to imply by their use of *ἱλασμός* the idea of expiation, admittedly unlikely, instead of the common, universally accepted meaning of propitiation. Roger Nicole in his article on Propitiation correctly observes that,

While certain modifications in the circumstantial connotations of the words may well be assumed, it is very difficult to believe that the essential meaning of appeasement could have been systematically banished in Scripture. If such had been the intention of the Septuagint translators and the New Testament writers one can scarcely see why they would have failed to choose other terms which would have expressed rather than obscured their thought. The view that they could use *hilasmos* and its cognates without meaning propitiation is just as unlikely as the surmise that modern

---

<sup>609</sup>Pfeiffer connects the Hebrew verb *kipper* (כִּפֶּר) with the Assyrian *kuppuru*, to erase, wipe off; hence to cleanse persons or things, or to perform a lustration, rather than with the Arabic *kafara*, to cover up. Robert H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1948), p. 269.

<sup>610</sup>C. H. Dodd, *The Johannine Epistles* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1946), p. 26. Italics mine.

writers would use "propitiation" when they wish to avoid any connotation of appeasement!<sup>611</sup>

Furthermore, Dodd has against him the weight of scholarship from every school of interpretation who admit that ἰλάσους or the verb ἰλάσκεσθαι means in classical usage to propitiate an offended deity. Also Dodd fails to take into account the means of expiation, for the Greek classical usage of ἰλάσκεσθαι indicates, according to A. A. Hodge, the propitiation of an offended deity *by means of expiatory sacrifices* or penances.<sup>612</sup> If the idea of expiation is present in the Greek terms, then it is in this sense and most certainly does not exclude the idea of propitiation. Further, in Hebrew thought it was possible for the subject of the action to be God, hence the meaning would certainly be propitiation of divine anger. Hence, what Dodd, the Revised Standard Version, et al., seem to forget is that not only was propitiation of deity the universal sense of ἰλάσκεσθαι, but even more pertinent to the question at hand, this is the term (with its cognates) used by the Septuagint translators as the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew כָּפַר which unquestionably means "to cover," "to propitiate," as has been shown. Dodd, ignoring the cogency of these facts, dismisses their importance with a stroke of the pen and says:

Biblical usage is not necessarily decisive for a writer who makes so few allusions to the Old Testament as our present author; and in the immediate context it might seem possible that the sense of "propitiation" is in place: if our guilt requires an advocate before God, we might, logically, need to placate His righteous anger. But the wider context denies this interpretation. Our forgiveness rests upon the justice and faithfulness of God, not upon the possibility of averting His anger.<sup>613</sup>

Here "Biblical" usage which teaches propitiation is not decisive, whereas the "rarer" usage by the pagan writers which may sometimes imply expiation is decisive for Dodd. There can be only one reason for such faulty hermeneutics—the Biblical usage does not coincide with Dodd's presuppositions. And furthermore it is difficult to believe that

---

<sup>611</sup>Nicole, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

<sup>612</sup>Hodge, *op. cit.*, p. 179.

<sup>613</sup>Dodd, *The Johannine Epistles*, p. 26.

even Dodd expects to be taken seriously when he says that the forgiveness of sinners rests upon the *justice* of God, since even a superficial understanding of the Biblical teaching of the holiness of God and sinfulness of man would lead one to the opposite conclusion; namely, that what man needs is not justice, but mercy and grace on his behalf. Justice apart from absolute and perfect satisfaction for every sin and rebellion issues in only wrath and judgment. Dodd's problem is that of all liberals; namely, an improper view of the holy character of God and the sinful character of man, which results in a lopsided view of God's nature as love. The Scriptures depict God just as strong in anger against the sinner because of unrighteousness as in His love for man. "If love is to be taken in its full meaning, so is anger. If God is capable of love, he must also be capable of real wrath."<sup>614</sup> To deny the reality of God's wrath, while affirming His love, would seem to make Him an unemotional Being, insofar as anger, indignation, and wrath are concerned, but exceedingly emotional on the sentimental or positive side.<sup>615</sup>

The reality of divine wrath does not mean that God has to be propitiated before He will have mercy upon, or extend love toward, the sinner; but it means rather that God's holy character reacts against sin and that all unrighteousness interposes a barrier that must be removed for reconciliation to be effected. "God is not vindictive, but he does have regard to his own moral consistency."<sup>616</sup>

It is further objected by liberal theology that the punishment of a substitute cannot propitiate the anger of an offended God even if such wrath were a reality, since this anger would be against the actual offender and not against the innocent substitute; hence, the terms are more properly translated as "expiation." The punishment of a substitute, however, may be as truly relevant as the punishment of the actual offender when several factors are considered. The Law is interested primarily in the satisfaction of justice, and when the guilt is duly punished and the penal debt paid, there remains no reason why the purpose of retribution may not be as completely gained from an adequate

---

<sup>614</sup>James Albert Nichols, Jr., *A Critique of the Theory of Vital Atonement* (New York: Vantage Press, Inc., 1955), p. 45.

<sup>615</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>616</sup>W. T. Conner, *Christian Doctrine* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1937), p. 175.

substitute as from a sinner. The reasonableness and righteousness of this plan of vicarious redemption are evidenced by making a simple inquiry. Whom does substitution injure? God the Lawgiver and Judge is not injured, for the plan is His own. And more significant still, He achieves in such a plan a nobler satisfaction to the penal claims of His law, as well as to His own holiness, truth, and justice, than could ever be gained by punishment of the finite and impotent offenders themselves. The Substitute is not injured or dishonored, because it is of His own free consent, and preordained glories follow as the reward of His sufferings. Certainly there is no harm wrought upon ransomed sinners by the work of substitution, for they gain infinite blessedness. The unsaved, who reject a substitute, are not wronged, for in bearing their due punishment in their own person they obtain precisely what the penal demands of the law require. If no one in heaven or upon earth is injured by the divine method of substitution, how then could there be injustice in such a design for the penal satisfaction of the holiness of the law?<sup>617</sup> The answer can only be that there is no injustice to such a glorious procedure, whereby in the eternal counsels of an all-wise, omnipotent, and loving God, He with the free consent of His Son decreed to effect a magnificent and grand work of substitution by which impartial justice and holy law are more gloriously satisfied than by the eternal punishment of the guilty themselves. The result is infinitely more honorable, not only to Justice, but to divine holiness and love. God is thereby revealed fully in righteousness, since sin is punished with an infinite satisfaction of the law, and His incomparable grace and love are magnified in granting justification by faith in His substitutionary work.

But now apart from the law a righteousness of God hath been manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ unto all them that believe; for there is no distinction; for all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, in his blood, to show his righteousness because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God; for the showing, I say, of his righteousness at

---

<sup>617</sup>Dabney, *op. cit.*, pp. 85-86.

this present season: that he might himself be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus.<sup>618</sup>

### *The Biblical Ground for the Doctrine*

The whole problem, therefore, stems from an erroneous view of the meaning and purpose of propitiation. As has been shown, wrath, with God, is not an angry passion, vindictiveness or hatred. The wrath of God is His positive reaction against unrighteousness which expresses itself in righteous and holy judgment. Liberalism has lost the Biblical view of the holiness of God, and to lose the sense of the holiness of God is to lose the Biblical view of the depth of man's sin. God, unlike liberal theologians, takes sin seriously and He becomes actively concerned with man's sin and unrighteousness. Stephen Charnock expresses this truth thus:

Holiness is the glory of Deity.... A love of holiness cannot be without a hatred of everything that is contrary to it.... If he did not hate it, he would hate himself; for since righteousness is his image, and sin would deface his image... he would be an enemy to his own nature.<sup>619</sup>

God's holiness is expressed in his wrath against sin. God's holiness becomes wrath when it is resisted by man's transgression of His righteous demands. Since God takes sin seriously, sin cannot exist in God's world as if it did not matter.

Therefore, satisfaction made by substitutionary atonement is that satisfaction which is made to holiness and divine justice. Such satisfaction is not simply the placation of anger, nor appeasing personal feelings, but "it is... simply a provision which shall, in the view of wisdom... be adequate to maintain that moral order in which holiness delights, and to the maintenance of which, justice is bound."<sup>620</sup> This moral demand in God to punish all unrighteousness is devoid of all passion, and is consistent with His infinite benevolence. "It is a demand which cannot be evaded, since the holiness from which it springs is unchang-

---

<sup>618</sup>Romans 3:21-26.

<sup>619</sup>Stephen Charnock, *The Existence and Attributes of God* ([Evansville: The Sovereign Grace Publishers], 1958), p. 455.

<sup>620</sup>Joseph Gilbert, *The Christian Atonement* (London: William Ball, 1836), p. 235.

ing. The atonement is therefore a satisfaction of the ethical demand of the divine nature, by the substitution of Christ's penal sufferings for the punishment of the guilty."<sup>621</sup> Not only does liberal and critical theology postulate an unbiblical view of the holiness of God and sin, but it lacks an adequate view of the righteousness of God. To say that God is righteous is to say that He is true to Himself, or the norm of His own character. In His dealings with man God is not an irresponsible tyrant. He demands obedience to His law; and since that law is an expression of His innermost Being—His holiness and righteousness, any failure to respond issues in divine displeasure or wrath. This characteristic of God's nature is immutable—it cannot be changed—disobedience results in divine indignation and judgment. But God is also love. Liberalism denies the former in an effort to magnify the latter; this is its mistake. The Biblical view is to hold to both the righteousness of God and the love of God. How could He be true to His righteousness and holiness and still express His love? Critical theology cannot give an adequate solution, because it overlooks the necessity of satisfying divine justice, expressed as wrath. Biblical theology solves the dilemma by the vicarious death of Christ. God demanded perfect obedience, or satisfaction for disobedience. Man has not done the former—he cannot do the latter. Therefore, the righteousness of God was preserved and the love of God was manifested when God gave *Himself* and *met His own demands* in the cross. He is righteous in that He will not set aside His law and its demands for absolute perfection; He is love in that He meets His own demands on behalf of the sinner.

Therefore, in reality Dodd and liberal theology wrestle with a non-existent difficulty with reference to God's nature and the Biblical view of the doctrine of propitiation. Sooner or later the question must arise as to who demands expiation and why?. If the answer be, God does in the exercise of His righteousness, then the liberal is back to the Biblical and historic view, entirely consonant with the carefully avoided term "propitiation."<sup>622</sup> The propitiation effected by Old Testament sacrifice and fulfilled in the vicarious atonement of Christ produces a change in the legal relation between God and man, so that God can display one of the elements of His nature toward sinful man rather than

---

<sup>621</sup>Strong, *op. cit.*, p. 752.

<sup>622</sup>Roger Nicole, *loc. cit.*

the other. Divine love is seen in propitiation, and not simply divine wrath. How can this be? The love of God is expressed, first of all, in His willingness on the one hand to *be* propitiated, since justice could just as properly have issued in judgment without any loss to the honor and glory of God; and love is expressed by propitiation, on the other hand, by God providing the effective means of propitiation—the Old Testament sacrificial system is the type, and the sacrifice of Christ as the Antitype. Thus in reality divine love *precedes* the propitiation and effects it, opening by means of propitiation the channel through which God's love may be expressed toward the sinner instead of His wrath.

This elevates the Biblical idea of propitiation to a higher spiritual plane than the pagan conception. Propitiation in the Scriptures is not just placation of angry deity, but it is seen as God meeting His own demands—it is God satisfying God's righteousness. Propitiation does not, as the critics assert, detract from God's love, but on the contrary it enhances it.<sup>623</sup>

### *The Expression of Substitution in Old Testament Thought*

The doctrine of Substitution in the Old Testament is not limited to atoning sacrifice, but stands as a uniquely prominent idea throughout the entire Old Testament. While an examination of the doctrine in the Old Testament will reveal that the dominant idea is that of substitutionary or vicarious sacrifice, yet the concept is so comprehensive in nature that it is by no means limited to the Mosaic sacrificial system. The idea of substitution is found in various forms and related to several ideas in the Old Testament. The concept is seen in the intercession of the righteous on behalf of a sinful nation; it is found within the Levitical institutions and precepts; the Servant of the Lord suffers vicariously on behalf of others; it is depicted in the lives of the patriarchs; taught by the prophets; and, in a word, the doctrine of substitution is taught so expressly in the Old Testament by types, symbols, allusions, and with such iteration that it cannot be eliminated from Old Testament thought with any more success than from the New by those who find the doctrine offensive to their moral and ethical taste.

---

<sup>623</sup>R. Nicole. "C. H. Dodd and the Doctrine of Propitiation," *The Westminster Theological Journal*, XVII, No. 2 (May, 1955), pp. 117-157.

## Substitution in the Pentateuch

The vicarious concept finds expression throughout the Pentateuch, being anticipated in the early narratives of Genesis, exemplified in the lives of the patriarchs, breaking forth strikingly in the life of Abraham, and later coming into full expression in the Mosaic sacrificial system and the pronouncements of the Psalms and Prophets.

### *Substitution in the Book of Genesis.*

The incipient idea of the doctrine of substitution and the vicarious sufferings of Christ is alluded to in the first prophecy concerning the Redeemer of the fallen race, where it is stated in Genesis 3:15 that "... he shall bruise thy head and *thou shalt bruise his heel.*" It is by no means an unwarranted assumption, in the light of the rest of Scripture, to discern the vicarious sufferings of Christ prophesied in this passage, which resulted from His mediatorial work when He was manifested to "... destroy the works of the devil."<sup>624</sup> However, the clearest and most extraordinary example of the idea of substitution, not only in the Pentateuch but in all the Old Testament, excepting only that of the Suffering Servant in Isaiah 53, is the familiar account of Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac. The tremendous self-devotion of the patriarch is seen in his unquestioning obedience to God's command to offer his son unto Him upon the altar. The circumstances provide a unique illustration and type of the substitutionary work of Christ. In obedience to God's command Abraham made preparations, set out for Moriah, and on the third day arrived at the place of sacrifice. Leaving the servants, the father and son ascended the hill—the one bearing the knife; the other, the wood for the sacrifice. But there was no victim to be seen, and the reply of Abraham to Isaac's question "... where is the lamb for a burnt-offering?"<sup>625</sup> becomes the clearest statement of the doctrine of substitution, or vicarious sacrifice, in the Old Testament. The voice of prophecy speaking through Abraham's reply said, "... God will provide himself the lamb for a burnt-offering...."<sup>626</sup> As Abraham stretched forth his hand to slay his only son, he was arrested by a voice from heaven: "and Abraham lifted up his eyes, and looked and behold behind him a

---

<sup>624</sup> John 3:18.

<sup>625</sup> Genesis 22:7.

<sup>626</sup> Genesis 22:8.

ram caught in the thicket by his horns: and Abraham went and took the ram, and offered him up for a burnt-offering *in the stead of his son* [תַּחַת בְּנֹו]."<sup>627</sup> Here in the earliest narratives of the Old Testament is typified by divine intention the cardinal doctrine of the Scriptures—the idea of vicarious' atonement.

The vicarious idea is seen again in the Book of Genesis in the account of the selling of Joseph into slavery which Joseph himself later interprets in vicarious terms: "And now be not grieved, nor angry with yourselves, that ye sold me hither: for God did send *me* before you *to preserve life*."<sup>628</sup> Joseph's brethren had sent him to be a slave, but God's overruling providence had sent him to be a saviour and deliverer: "and God sent me before you to preserve you a remnant in the earth, and to save you alive by a great deliverance."<sup>629</sup> The idea of substitution is again illustrated by a previous event related also to this where Judah made intercession on behalf of Benjamin, whom Joseph had required to remain behind as a hostage in Egypt, and offered himself as a substitute in his stead. Judah pleaded on Benjamin's behalf and said:

For thy servant became surety for the lad unto my father, saying, If I bring him not unto thee, then shall I bear the blame to my father forever. Now therefore, let thy servant, I pray thee, abide instead of the lad a bondman to my lord; and let the lad go up with his brethren.<sup>630</sup>

The substitutionary or vicarious idea is clearly manifest in these early narratives in the Pentateuch.

### *Substitution. in the Book of Exodus*

The Book of Exodus abundantly portrays the idea of substitution. The first illustration of the idea is found in Exodus 12 and the institution of the Passover. In preparation for their departure from Egypt God had instructed the Israelites to take an unblemished lamb, slay it, and sprinkle the blood of sacrifice upon the doors of their houses in

---

<sup>627</sup>Genesis 22:13.

<sup>628</sup>Genesis 45:5.

<sup>629</sup>Genesis 45:7.

<sup>630</sup>Genesis 44:32-33.

order that their first-born would be preserved from death when the angel of death slew all the first-born of Egypt. The design of the Passover was to indicate to Israel the ground upon which its salvation and deliverance was bestowed—vicarious sacrifice and redemption by blood. The sacrifice taught the Israelites that by nature they too, like the Egyptians, were justly exposed to the wrath of God, as they like all men shared in the sinfulness of the race. But it taught them secondly, that the medium of their salvation—the ground upon which it was to be bestowed—was the blood of atonement.<sup>631</sup> That it was vicarious and substitutionary is seen in the promise that it would be accepted for their life; that it was propitiatory is seen in the use made of the shed blood. The lamb died in the room of the firstborn; the stroke of death fell upon a substitute whom God graciously accepted in their stead.

Another clear example of the vicarious idea in the Book of Exodus is found in the life of Moses. Moses, under God, was the mediator and the "saviour" of Israel. This introduces the vicarious idea in two ways. Moses spoke for God to the people, and he was commissioned to deliver Israel. He received the commission because he himself was an Israelite. It was through this identification, because he was one with his people, that his work could be said to be vicarious. It meant that his life was now given to jeopardy, suffering, and self-sacrifice in Egypt and the wilderness on behalf of Israel. This concept is vividly portrayed in Moses' own words after Israel's great sin of apostasy.<sup>632</sup>

And it came to pass on the morrow, that Moses said unto the people, ye have sinned a great sin: and now I will go up unto Jehovah; *peradventure I shall make atonement for your sin.*

And Moses returned unto Jehovah, and said, Oh, this people have sinned a great sin, and have made gods of gold. Yet now, if thou wilt, forgive their sin—; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written.<sup>633</sup>

---

<sup>631</sup>Spence & Exell (eds.). *op. cit.*, I. p. 287.

<sup>632</sup>C. Ryder Smith, *The Bible Doctrine of Salvation* (Rev. ed.; London: The Epworth Press, 1941), p. 27.

<sup>633</sup>Exodus 32:30-32.

The concept is seen again in the instance of Moses smiting the rock during the threatened rebellion of the people (Numbers 20). The interpretation of this incident affirms the vicarious office of Moses.

Furthermore, *Jehovah was angry with me for your sakes*, and swore that I should not go over the Jordan, and that I should not go in unto that good land, which Jehovah thy God giveth thee for an inheritance.<sup>634</sup>

From what did Moses save Israel? He saved his people from suffering—from the bondage of Egypt and from perishing in the desert. He saved them from their enemies, the Amalekites. He saved them time and again from utter destruction for their sins, although they were to suffer the consequences of their final rebellion; however, he was to save their descendants, bringing them finally to the promised land.<sup>635</sup> He interceded for them, made atonement on their behalf, offered himself to be cursed from the presence of God on their behalf, and at last bore the wrath of God for their sakes, and suffered the penalty of being forbidden to enter the Promised Land.

Other ideas of substitution running through the Book of Exodus are found in the redemption of the first-born, which will be discussed later, and the basis of the Covenant which was instituted by the blood of atonement and rooted and grounded in substitutionary sacrifice. The relation between the Old and New Covenants is to be seen at this place—the old covenant was sealed by, and grounded in, the blood of vicarious sacrifice (Exodus 24); the new covenant likewise is sealed and confirmed by the shed blood of the vicarious atonement of the Lamb of God (Matthew 20:28; Mark 14:24; Luke 22:20; I Corinthians 11).

### *Substitution in the Book of Leviticus.*

The vicarious concept is predominant in the Book of Leviticus. The Levitical rites detailed here were typical and were designed and intended by God to bear resemblance to, and convey some spiritual

---

<sup>634</sup>Deuteronomy 4:21.

<sup>635</sup>C. Ryder Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. 27-28.

truth; they were chosen by God to shadow forth the good things to come (Hebrews 10:1). The substitutionary idea is grounded in the Book of Leviticus, in the sacrifices, the ritual, the great Day of Atonement, and in the various laws and precepts of the Mosaic legislation. Therefore, inasmuch as the Book of Leviticus puts forth the basic principles, concepts, and ideas which constitute the main thrust and purpose of this dissertation, no detailed discussion of its contents will be attempted here. Redemption is seen throughout the book, which was called by the rabbis "The Law of the Priest" and "The Law of Offerings." The main redemptive ideas emphasized in the book are: (1) God is holy and demands holiness from His people; (2) cleansing from sin and removal of guilt is through the shedding of blood; (3) sacrifice is to be the basis, and the priesthood the means of forgiveness and access to God; (4) redemption is by (a) substitution; (b) imputation of the guilt to the substitute; (c) death—the victim is to suffer the penal consequences actually due the sinner.<sup>636</sup>

### *Substitution in the Book of Numbers*

Substitution is depicted in four passages in the Book of Numbers. In Numbers 8 the formal substitution of the Levites in the place of the first-born of Israel is recorded. In this ceremony the Levites were presented before the Lord, sanctified and cleansed, after which the children of Israel laid their hands upon the heads of the Levites, who were thus dedicated for special service unto the Lord. From this time they were regarded and treated as substitutes for Israel by taking upon themselves the obligations required by God in the service of the sanctuary.

The redemption of the first-born recorded in Numbers 18 again demonstrates the concept of substitution by the provision by God for the substitution of silver in the place of the first-born of Israel. In commemoration of the salvation whereby the first-born had been spared when all the Egyptian first-born had been slain, God required the Israelites to do two things: (1) to dedicate unto Him all the first-born of their flocks, herds, and of their sons; and (2) to redeem their first-born sons by the payment of five shekels of silver which God would accept as a

---

<sup>636</sup>J. B. Tidwell, *The Bible Book by Book* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1953), p. 55.

substitute in their stead. The first-born of the animals were slain upon the altar.

By strength of hand Jehovah brought us out from Egypt, from the house of bondage: and it came to pass, when Pharaoh would hardly let us go, that Jehovah slew all that openeth the womb, being males, but all the firstborn of my sons I redeem.<sup>637</sup>

Two additional passages in Numbers represent the idea of substitution: Numbers 19, which describes the slaying of the red heifer, and Numbers 21, which contains the account of the brazen serpent. Chapter 19 contains the procedure for preparing the "water of separation" to purify those who had come in contact with the dead. The slaying of the substitute victim provided a means of cleansing from the sin of defilement, symbolizing by this shadow the cleansing of sinners from the defilement of death through the vicarious atonement of Christ. In the account of the brazen serpent in Chapter 21, God sent fiery serpents among the rebellious Israelites because of their bitter words against God and Moses. The severity of the scourge brought them to a sense of sin and through the intercession of Moses they were miraculously delivered. He was directed to make a figure of a serpent in brass, to be elevated on a pole, to which all who looked in faith found healing. In this instance, God had substituted a brazen serpent for the fiery serpents. As the destruction was through the serpent, so salvation also was by the substitute provided by God, that it might be a type of Him who was lifted up in vicarious death on the cross (John 3:14-15).

### *Substitution in the Book of Deuteronomy*

The Book of Deuteronomy is called in the Septuagint "this second law" (Deuteronomy 17:18), i.e. the repetition of the law, and is an explanation and enforcement of the most essential features of the covenant revelation at Sinai.<sup>638</sup> The introductory words connect the book with what has preceded, and here are to be found several of the substitutionary ideas already set forth in Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, in addition to several new expressions of the concept. There

---

<sup>637</sup>Exodus 13:14-15.

<sup>638</sup>E. J. Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1954), p. 97.

is found in Deuteronomy: (1) the account of Moses bearing the anger of God for Israel's sake (chapter 4); (2) the laws of substitutionary blood sacrifices (chapter 12); (3) the distinction between the clean and the unclean animals to be eaten or sacrificed, nothing unholy being permitted (chapter 14); (4) the substitution of silver for the tithe of animals and food permitted in certain cases (chapter 14); (5) the redemption of the male first-born by the substitution of five shekels is again implied by the repetition of legislation as to the consecration of the first-born unto the Lord (chapter 15); (6) the sacrifice of the Passover is again enjoined with its witness to salvation by vicarious sacrifice and redemption through blood (chapter 18); (7) the substitution of the Levites who had laid upon them the religious obligations and responsibilities of Israel (chapter 18); (8) exemption from military service for special reasons, which implies the substitution of others to fill this breach (chapter 20); (9) the removal of blood guiltiness by the substitutionary death of an animal victim in the case of an unknown murderer's crime (chapter 21); (10) the Levirate law which required the brother of a widow's husband to perform the duties of a husband by substituting himself in his dead brother's place to preserve his inheritance in Israel (chapter 25).

### Substitution in the Historical Books

That the intercession of the righteous on behalf of a sinful nation was effectual and constituted, in effect, a substitutionary atonement is a thought beginning with Abraham, and is specifically stated to be such by Moses, and runs throughout the entire Old Testament. A detailed examination of this idea will be treated later, but the concept is also to be noted in the historical books as seen in Joshua's intercession on behalf of Israel and the sin of Achan (Joshua 7); Samuel's intercession for the people (I Samuel 7:9); David's intercession by propitiatory sacrifice to entreat the Lord with respect to the pestilence upon Israel; and the concept is further illustrated in the lives of Ezra, Nehemiah, the prophets, and the vicarious intercession of Esther on behalf of her people.

The Book of Judges, especially chapters 2-16, has been called "The Book of Saviours" or "Deliverers,"<sup>639</sup> since the character of the men described in this book is better described by these terms. The phrase "to save Israel" actually occurs in the account of Gideon (Judges 6:14). The judges were "saviours," divine representatives, who as divinely appointed mediators between God and the people saved them from disaster. Together with this idea of representation is seen that of substitution (always implicit within representation) and vicarious suffering and distress on behalf of the nation. Neither is the idea absent from the later kingship in which the king as "the Lord's anointed" defended the people, delivered them from enemy oppression, and represented them in suffering and judgment. The king might even offer himself as a propitiation to appease the righteous wrath of God, as with David at Jerusalem when he cried during the great pestilence "... these sheep, what have they done? let thy hand, I pray thee, be against me, and against my father's house."<sup>640</sup>

The idea of substitution is further seen in the surrender of seven of Saul's sons to the Gibeonites as an atonement to avenge the blood guiltiness of Saul's house.<sup>641</sup> David, mourning the death of his rebellious son Absalom, laments that he did not die in his place, on his behalf: "O my son Absalom, my son, my son Absalom! would I had died for thee, O Absalom, my son. my son!"<sup>642</sup> In II Samuel 9, Mephibosheth is treated as a substitute to receive the mercy and kindness from David due his father Jonathan. "And David said, Is there yet any that is left of the house of Saul, that I may show him kindness for Jonathan's sake?" (בְּעִבְיָו, on behalf of, for the sake of).

Finally, the prophets, no less than Moses, the judges, kings, and leaders, were seen as vicarious sufferers on behalf of the people in their struggles against sin and apostasy, as witnessed in the lives of such men as Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Elijah and the rest, which is confirmed by Jesus in the Gospels (Matthew 23:29-36).

---

<sup>639</sup>Clyde T. Francisco, *Introducing the Old Testament* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1953), p. 51.

<sup>640</sup>II Samuel 24:17.

<sup>641</sup>II Samuel 21.

<sup>642</sup>II Samuel 18:33.

## Substitution in the Psalms

The concepts of substitution, vicarious suffering and death, and Messianic references are everywhere expressed throughout the Psalms as foreshadowings of the vicarious work of Christ. In view of this, a representative passage only will be examined to illustrate the idea of substitution in the Psalms. In Psalm 40:6-8 the vicarious nature of Christ's sufferings and death is clearly indicated.

Sacrifice and offering thou hast no delight in;  
Mine ears hast thou opened:<sup>643</sup>  
Burnt-offering and sin-offering has thou not required.  
Then said I, Lo. I am come;  
In the roll of the book it is written of me:  
I delight to do thy will, O my God;  
Yea, thy law is within my heart.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews this passage is expressly applied to the sacrificial and substitutionary work of Christ as is evident from the following quotation:

For it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins.  
Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith,  
Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not,  
But a body didst thou prepare for me;  
In whole burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hadst no pleasure:  
Then said I, Lo, I am come  
(In the roll of the book it is written of me)  
To do thy will, O God.

---

<sup>643</sup> The LXX version, followed here by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews in 10:5, renders the Hebrew "my ears thou hast opened" (i.e. "given me ears to hear and obey") instead as, "a body didst thou prepare for me." Without attempting to set forth all the technical arguments, it will suffice to mention what seems the most satisfactory conclusion; namely, that the Greek translators, avoiding the harshness of a literal rendering of the Hebrew, instead simply generalized the expression giving its sense by a more forceful symbol of obedience. As the ears are organs to hear and obey, the body is the general instrument of accomplishing God's will. Whether or not this deviation from the Hebrew by the LXX was divinely directed does not change the meaning of the passage in Hebrews, since there is no doubt as to the author's meaning and intention from verses 8-10: "then hath he said, Lo, I am come to do thy will. . . . By which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all."

Saying above, 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 the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. And every priest indeed standeth day by day ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, the which can never take away sins: but he, when he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God.<sup>644</sup>

Therefore, it is clear that the Apostle in Hebrews 10 intends to teach the *substitution* of the Messiah's sacrificial atonement in the place of the Levitical sacrifices. That it is such a substitution which he has in view is seen from his statements that the law was only a shadow of the good things to come; that the blood of bulls and goats could never expiate sin; and that "he taketh away the first [the Levitical sacrifices], that he may establish the second."<sup>645</sup> And that he has in mind the idea of a substitutionary atonement is clear from his statement, "... we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all."<sup>646</sup>

### Substitution in the Prophets

Modern critical scholarship is inclined to minimize the predictive element in prophecy and insists on reading prophecy as history written after the event it foretells.<sup>647</sup> Nevertheless the predictive element is present; and the most prominent thought in the entire Old Testament is that of redemption, which, especially in the prophets, is to be accomplished by the Lord's Messiah. The doctrine of substitution with respect to the Messiah finds expression in several of the prophets, the most significant being those of Zachariah, Daniel, and Isaiah.

Without a doubt one of the most remarkable prophecies of the Old Testament concerning the penal and vicarious nature of Christ's death is found in Zechariah 13:7:

---

<sup>644</sup>Hebrews 10:4-12.

<sup>645</sup>Hebrews 10:9.

<sup>646</sup>Hebrews 10:10.

<sup>647</sup>Oswald T. Allis. *The Five Books of Moses* (Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1949), p. 278.

Awake, O sword against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith Jehovah of hosts: smite the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered; and I will turn my hand upon the little ones.

There can be no question as to the vicarious and Messianic nature of this passage, since the Lord applied it specifically in reference to His own sufferings and the events at Gethsemane. "Then saith Jesus unto them, all ye shall be offended in me this night: for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad."<sup>648</sup>

Several things may be noted with respect to this important prophecy which testify to the vicarious nature of Christ's death. First, there is to be seen a unique and peculiar relationship between this Shepherd and Jehovah; He is called גִּבּוֹר עִמִּיתִי, "the man who is my Fellow. "The obvious implication, as Paron notes, of this phrase is "equality with God."<sup>649</sup> It is a direct Old Testament reference to the God-man, who, as the Shepherd of Jehovah, was to be smitten by the Lord on behalf of the sheep, as Christ testified in John 10. Next, the immediate consequence of the smiting of the Shepherd is "... and I will turn my hand upon the little ones," evidently a promise of the gathering and saving of those for whom the Shepherd was smitten. This idea follows in 13:9 where it is said in respect to the refined remnant "... I will say, It is my people; and they shall say, Jehovah is my God."

Here, then, is indicated the vicarious sufferings inflicted by divine appointment upon the divinely commissioned Shepherd who stood in a position of the closest equality and the most intimate relationship to the Lord. "And these sufferings are connected with the intimation of a merciful design for the benefit of those sheep who were the objects of love and care to the great Sufferer."<sup>650</sup> The substitutionary nature of the Shepherd's work is unmistakably evident in the Lord's words, when He, with this prophecy again in mind, said, "I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd layeth down his life *for* the sheep."

---

<sup>648</sup>Matthew 26:31.

<sup>649</sup>David Baron, *The Visions & Prophecies of Zechariah* (London: Hebrew Christian Testimony to Israel, 1951), p. 478.

<sup>650</sup>Crawford, *op. cit.*, p. 215.

Another very significant but often overlooked prophecy in the Old Testament depicting the substitutionary atonement and the sacrificial death of the Messiah is found in the prophecy of the seventy weeks in the ninth chapter of Daniel. The prophecy reads as follows:

Seventy weeks are decreed upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up vision and prophecy. and to anoint the most holy. Know therefore and discern, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the anointed one, the prince, shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: it shall be built again, with street and moat, even in troublous times. And after the threescore and two weeks shall the anointed one be cut off, and shall have nothing: and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and even unto the end shall be war; desolations are determined. And he shall make a firm covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease; and upon the wing of abominations shall come one that maketh desolate; that determined, shall wrath be poured out upon the desolate.<sup>651</sup>

The relevancy of this passage to the Old Testament doctrine of substitutionary atonement is seen at several points. Interpreters of almost all schools have conceded that the details of this prophecy have reference to the ministry of Christ.<sup>652</sup> The prophecy indicates that the death of the Messiah comes at the close of the sixty-ninth week, where it is stated in verse 26 that "... the anointed one [shall] be cut off, and shall have nothing."<sup>653</sup> The Hebrew word יִכָּרֵת, "he shall be cut off," signifies the cutting off of the life of the Messiah by judicial death. That the passage centers around the Person and atoning work of the Messiah is

---

<sup>651</sup>Daniel 9:24-27.

<sup>652</sup>Robert D. Culver, *Daniel and the Latter Days* (Westwood, N. J.: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1954), p. 136.

<sup>653</sup>The idea of substitution is clearly taught by the translation of this verse in the Authorized Version which reads: "And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, *but not for himself*. . . ." However, the Hebrew is וְאֵין לוֹ , "and there is nothing for him," rather than himself," which would be required by the , "and not for לוֹ translation in the Authorized Version.

seen even more clearly in verse 24, in which it is said that, "Seventy weeks are decreed upon the people and upon thy holy city, [1] to finish transgression, [2] and to make an end of sins, [3] and to make reconciliation for iniquity, [4] and to bring in everlasting righteousness...." The phrase "to make reconciliation for iniquity" is literally "to make atonement, or propitiation for iniquity" (לְכַפֵּר עֲוֹן); hence, to offer an atoning and substitutionary sacrifice in which sense it occurs some fifty times in Leviticus. Therefore, the meaning of the prophecy which is said (1) to finish transgression; (2) to make an end of sins; (3) to make an atonement for iniquity; (4) and to bring in everlasting righteousness is explained in verse 26, where the Anointed One (מְשִׁיחַ) is said to be cut off in death, which is quite obviously a vicarious death on behalf of the people.

There remains one other significant Old Testament prophecy which sets forth the doctrine of substitution with such clarity and in such a comprehensive manner that it will require a more exact and detailed treatment. Isaiah 52:13-53:12 stands as a monument in Old Testament thought with respect to the doctrine of substitutionary atonement. The importance of this passage to the fundamental premise of this dissertation is significant, since it not only illuminates the doctrine of substitution in the Old Testament, but it grounds it in the Levitical sacrificial system on the one hand, and relates it specifically to the death of Christ on the other. Because of its importance to the entire study of the doctrine of substitution in the Old Testament, it will of necessity comprise a separate and distinct division.

## Special Aspects of Substitution in the Old Testament

In addition to those various concepts of substitution already examined from the several divisions of the Old Testament, there remain several extraordinary aspects that require a more extensive or particular inquiry before there can be made an examination of the doctrine of substitution in the Levitical sacrificial system itself.

### *Intercession*

That the intercession of the righteous for a sinful nation, and on behalf of others, is effectual, is a thought permeating the entire Old Testament from Genesis 18:23 onward, and has already been suggested. Intercession is to be seen as another aspect of substitution in

the Old Testament, but more spiritual in nature than the sacrificial ritual. All the prophets, for example, not only exercise their divine calling as mediators of divine revelation, but also act in the capacity of intercessors. Just as the prophetic ministry was a gift to a few unique individuals in the Old Testament, so too the extraordinary privilege of intercession on behalf of others was permitted only to a few outstanding figures; for nowhere in the Old Testament is there a general exhortation to intercede for one another.<sup>654</sup> Even in the New Testament dispensation, while intercession is the privilege and duty of every believer, yet its most effectual use is still the prerogative of those of great faith. "The supplication of a righteous man availeth much in its working."<sup>655</sup>

Among the great intercessors, efficacious prayer had nothing magical and automatic about it, but often assumed the aspect of a severe struggle in the course of which the intercessor offered himself to God in substitution for the people until his request was granted, or his own will becomes harmonious with God's. There are so many examples of this concept in the Old Testament that no attempt will be made to examine them all in detail.

The first Old Testament account of intercession on behalf of others was Abraham's effectual intercession on behalf of the sinful cities of Sodom and Gomorrah. To be sure the cities were destroyed, but it was not due to the lack of effective intercession on Abraham's part, for God heard his prayers and agreed to Abraham's request that if there could be found but ten righteous within the city God would spare its judgment. God Himself on another occasion confirms the intercessory effectiveness of Abraham's prayers, when in the case of Abimelech, who had unknowingly taken Abraham's wife for himself, he was warned by God to restore her with the words, "Now therefore restore the man's wife; for he is a prophet, and he shall pray for thee, and thou shalt live...."<sup>656</sup> Again, when Job's friends had sinned against God in their rebuke of Job, God commanded them to offer burnt-offerings for their sin, and then adds "... and my servant Job shall pray for you; for him will I accept, that I deal not with you after your folly; for ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right, as my servant Job

---

<sup>654</sup>Jacob, *op. cit.*, p. 296.

<sup>655</sup>James 5:16.

<sup>656</sup>Genesis 20:7.

hath."<sup>657</sup> Samuel, when the greatly feared Philistine armies gathered against Israel, interceded on behalf of the sinful nation: "... and Samuel cried unto Jehovah for Israel: and Jehovah answered him... and they were smitten down before Israel."<sup>658</sup>

God had commanded the prophets that they should stand in the breaches on behalf of the people (Ezekiel 13:5), and as their representatives they are often seen as vicarious sufferers in their severe struggles against sin and apostasy. Especially is this to be noted in the lives of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel in their relationship to apostate Israel and the downfall of Jerusalem. The vicarious element is nowhere more clearly seen than in the ministry of Jeremiah who has been called "the weeping prophet." Jeremiah, a man of sorrow and grief, in the midst of a people totally perverted, moved among them, pleading, preaching, warning, and interceding on their behalf, but to no avail, until finally God Himself commanded the suffering prophet, "... Do not pray for the welfare of this people.... Though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my heart would not turn toward this people."<sup>659</sup> The reality of the vicarious nature of his ministry is graphically illustrated by the prophet's own words, when he cried out in heartbreak to God, "But I was like a gentle lamb that is led to the slaughter; and I knew not that they had devised devices against me, saying.... let us cut him off from the land of the living, that his name may be remembered no more."<sup>660</sup> "The prophet's messages, necessarily severe and iconoclastic (1:10), met with intense opposition from all classes of a society which had become honeycombed with evil and fanatically attached to pagan idolatry."<sup>661</sup> And "the prophet died as he had lived, in the heartbreak of preaching to an unresponsive people."<sup>662</sup>

The intercession of Daniel on behalf of Israel, in one instance for a period of three weeks (Daniel 10), further illustrates this idea. Amos succeeded in delaying God's wrath on two occasions by his intercession on behalf of the apostate nation (Amos 7:1-9). Such inter-

---

<sup>657</sup>Job 42:8.

<sup>658</sup>1 Samuel 9-10.

<sup>659</sup>Jeremiah 14:11; 15:1.

<sup>660</sup>Jeremiah 11:19.

<sup>661</sup>Merrill F. Unger, *Introductory Guide to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1951), p. 323.

<sup>662</sup>Francisco, *op. cit.*, p. 143.

cession on behalf of Israel is likewise seen in the ministry of Ezra (Ezra 9-10); Nehemiah (Nehemiah 1); Esther (Esther 4); king David (II Samuel 24); king Solomon (I Kings 8); king Hezekiah (II Kings 19; II Chronicles 30:18-20); and others.

The vicarious nature of intercession by the righteous on behalf of the wicked is nowhere more nobly illustrated than the account in the Pentateuch, in which Moses appears in all his greatness as he offers himself as ἀνάθεμα, if God will only forgive the people—"a thought," observes Oehler, "which has been uttered by only one other than Moses, namely Paul, Romans ix. 3."<sup>663</sup> The spiritual aspect of substitution is clearly evident here. The prophet Moses on two extraordinary occasions intercedes effectively on behalf of the idolatrous and rebellious people. During the Exodus and the golden calf incident God said unto Moses,

... I have seen this people, and, behold, it is a stiff-necked people: now therefore let me alone, that my wrath may wax hot against them, and that I may consume them....<sup>664</sup>

And Moses besought Jehovah his God.... Turn from thy fierce wrath.... Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, thy servants, to whom thou swarest by thine own self, and saidest unto them, I will multiply your seed as the stars of heaven.... And Jehovah repented of the evil which he said he would do unto his people.<sup>665</sup>

A second time when the people rebelled upon hearing the report of the twelve spies, God's wrath threatened to destroy them, but Moses interceded on their behalf as the Psalmist writes, "Therefore he said that he would destroy them, had not Moses his chosen stood before him in the breach, to turn away his wrath, lest he should destroy them."<sup>666</sup> Moses had prayed "Pardon, I pray thee, the iniquity of this people, according to the greatness of thy lovingkindness.... And Jehovah said, I have pardoned according to thy word...."<sup>667</sup>

---

<sup>663</sup>Oehler, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

<sup>664</sup>Exodus 32:9-10

<sup>665</sup>Exodus 32:11-13.

<sup>666</sup>Psalms 106:23.

<sup>667</sup>Numbers 14:17, 20.

It is, however, in the golden calf incident, noted previously, that the vicarious and substitutionary aspect of Moses' intercession is most vividly portrayed.

And it came to pass on the morrow, that Moses said unto the people, ye have sinned a great sin: and now I will go up unto Jehovah; peradventure *I shall make atone for your sin*. And Moses returned unto Jehovah, and said, Oh, this people have sinned a great sin, and have made gods of gold. Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin—; *and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of they book which thou hast written.*<sup>668</sup>

Moses so identified himself with his people that he devoutly refused life for himself, unless those, on whose behalf he now stood in the breach, should live also. Here is to be seen the vicarious idea graphically illustrated; he, feeling profoundly the sin of the people, confesses it, which, from the relation he assumes to them as their substitute before the Lord, may be considered their own confession, or atonement, and was accepted as such. This same idea is seen in the prayers of Ezra and Daniel, who, although free from the guilt they pray with respect to, nevertheless stand in the room of the sinners and confess it as their own on Israel's behalf (Ezra 9-10; Daniel 9). They are of the people, hence can represent them; but yet they are different, they are righteous, they are near to God, and He, as it were, has respect with regard to their vicarious or substitutionary intercession on behalf of the sinful people, and thereby accepts their righteous intercession as a substitutionary atonement.

### *Commutation*

Another particular aspect of substitution seen in the Old Testament is the practice of commutation, i.e. the substitution of money for the equivalent value of the gift or sacrifice intended. This idea of substitution found expression in several ways: (1) the first-born of *unclean animals* were to be redeemed by a substitute: "and every firstling of an ass thou shalt redeem with a lamb...."<sup>669</sup> (2) the first-born of *men* were to be redeemed by the substitution of five shekels of silver (Numbers

---

<sup>668</sup>Exodus 32:30-32.

<sup>669</sup>Exodus 13:13.

18:16);<sup>670</sup> (3) the commutation of *vows of persons* is set forth in Leviticus 27:1-8. An Israelite could vow to God for His service whatever he had a right over; that is, himself, his wife, his children, his servants, his flocks and herds, his houses, and his fields. In the case when persons were vowed, the law required that they were to be redeemed at a certain price in silver as a substitute; (4) the *Deuteronomic Tithe* could be commuted to money in substitute. The law required that one-tenth of the grain, wine, and oil was to be brought in kind to the sanctuary and used in feasts of rejoicing (Deuteronomy 14). However, when inconvenient to carry the tithe to Jerusalem for festival meals, it was permitted to commute the tithe to an equivalent in money and then purchase the materials at Jerusalem. "This practice of commutation into money must have been widely resorted to by the loyal Jews of the Diaspora, whose distance from Jerusalem must have made it impossible, except on rarest occasions, to present the sacred gifts in kind."<sup>671</sup>

### *Tithes*

The theocratic taxes also convey the idea of substitution. The fundamental idea on which the theocratic taxes, or tithes, were based was that the people of Israel and all their possessions, including the land itself, belonged to God. The acknowledgment of this divine ownership was to be made by the people through a surrender of a portion of its produce as a consecration of, and in substitution for, the whole. The law required a three-fold application of this Principle of substitution: (1) the male first-born of both man and beast were given to the Lord in substitution for the whole; the male of the men, however, being redeemed by a further substitution of silver, and the firstling of an ass by the substitution of a lamb; (2) one-tenth of the first fruits of all the produce of agriculture; (3) the tax imposing upon Israel for the service of the sanctuary for the support of the priests and Levites who acted as substitutes in religious service for all people.

---

<sup>670</sup>The critical interpretation of this practice of commutation is stated by Jacob as follows: "The profound reason for these substitutionary rites is to be found in early beliefs about the mystery of life," writes Jacob, "the first-born takes upon himself the life of the parents, who, by that fact, are virtually dead; to regain life, they must cause its release by the immolation of the first-born, immolation alone allowing the filling of the life-principle." Jacob, *op. cit.*, p. 295.

<sup>671</sup>Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

## *Substitutionary Sacrifices for the Purification of a Community from the Suspicion of Blood-guiltiness*

Deuteronomy 21:1-9 sets forth the proper procedure for expiation of a community for an unknown murderer's crime. The death of the victim in this ritual clearly sets forth the idea of substitution. When a slain person was discovered in the neighborhood of an Israelite community and the murderer could not be ascertained, the law prescribed that the elders, as representatives of the community, were to take a young heifer to a brook and break its neck. They were then to wash their hands over the innocent victim and say, "... our hands have not shed this blood, neither have our eyes seen it. Forgive Oh Jehovah, thy people Israel... and suffer not the innocent blood to remain in the midst of thy people Israel..."<sup>672</sup> The substitutionary significance of this action is clear. The suspicion of bloodguiltiness was removed from the midst of the people, symbolized by inflicting capital punishment upon an innocent victim, who in this case stood as a substitute for the unknown perpetrator of the crime. The significance of the requirement that the death be executed at a brook of running water and the command for the elders to wash their hands over the slain animal was to signify, no doubt, washing the hands of guilt and having it symbolically carried away by the stream. Those who deny that the death of an animal victim in the Levitical sacrifices is penal and substitutionary have, quite obviously, a difficult time explaining the penal judgment exacted upon an innocent victim in Deuteronomy 21:1-9.

## *Substitutionary Sacrifices for the Ratification of a Covenant*

Here again the sacrifice was a symbol of substitutionary death. Genesis 15 and Jeremiah 34:17-20 record the Hebrew practice of ratifying important covenants. On occasions of great significance when two or more parties joined in a compact, a sacrifice was slain and cut in half. The two halves were laid opposite one another and the parties to the covenant then walked between them. "And I will give the men that have transgressed my covenant, that have not performed the words of the covenant which they made before me, when they cut the calf in twain and passed between the parts thereof; I will even give them into

---

<sup>672</sup>Deuteronomy 21:7-8.

the hand of their enemies...."<sup>673</sup> After the carcass had been divided into two equal parts and laid opposite each other at a short distance, the covenanting parties approached at opposite ends of the passageway thus formed, and meeting in the midst, took the customary oath.<sup>674</sup>

The ceremony appears to be the basis for the Hebrew phrase "cutting a covenant," כָּרַת בְּרִית.<sup>675</sup> The meaning of the ceremony seems to indicate that this was a solemn assurance that he who should transgress the covenant agreement would share the same fate as the victim who had been slain as a substitute for the covenanting parties.<sup>676</sup> The slain substitute victim was the token of the ratification of the covenant, and as long as the covenant was honored the death of the animal could substitute for that of the parties of the covenant. When Israel broke such a covenant agreement with the Lord, she was to suffer, according to Jeremiah, the same fate as that of the sacrificial victim, for she was to be given

... to the sword, to the pestilence, and to the famine... into the hands of their enemies, and into the hand of them that seek their life; and their dead bodies shall be for food unto the birds of the heavens, and to the beasts of the earth.<sup>677</sup>

The two prominent Covenants of the Scriptures were ratified by the shedding of the blood of a substitute victim. The Old Covenant was instituted by the covenant offering in Exodus 24 where Moses sprinkled the altar and the people with the blood of the slain victim. The second Covenant is called New solely in regard to the manner of its institution, being ratified afresh by the blood and substitutionary death of Christ.

---

<sup>673</sup>Jeremiah 34:18, 20.

<sup>674</sup>James Comper Gray and George M. Adams, *Gray and Adams' Bible Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, [n.d.]), I, p. 49.

<sup>675</sup>Cf. Exodus 34:10; Genesis 6:18; 9:17; 15:18; 17:7; Ezra 10:3; Job 31:1; etc.

<sup>676</sup>On the other hand, a less likely interpretation, according to the Jewish Encyclopedia, holds that "the cutting of the sacrificial animal into two parts . . . and walking between these bleeding halves by the sacrificer—this and the other customs show that blood, which was regarded as the seat of life, served for the sacramental uniting of man and the deity." Isaac Landman (ed.). *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia* (New York: The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Inc., [n.d.]). IX, p. 306.

<sup>677</sup>Jeremiah 34:17, 20.

## *Metaphorical Expressions of Substitution*

Numerous examples occur in the Old Testament, referring to the deliverances of Israel from Egypt, Babylon, and from other national oppressions, which are referred to by the Biblical metaphor of "a ransom," or redemption through the payment of "a ransom." Israel's redemption is spoken of in the song of Moses in Exodus 15:13, where he sings of Israel's deliverance from Egypt: "Thou in thy lovingkindness hast led the people that thou hast redeemed...." Moses reminds Israel as they were encamped in the plains of Moab of their redemption: "And thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondman in the land of Egypt, and Jehovah thy God redeemed thee...."<sup>678</sup> The prophet Isaiah, with words of comfort, foretells of the time when Israel will be set free from her Babylonian Exile: "For thus saith Jehovah, Ye were sold for nought; and ye shall be redeemed without money."<sup>679</sup> In the passage which immediately follows this promise of temporal redemption, the prophet breaks forth with the majestic prophecy of the vicarious sufferings and death of the Servant of the Lord, the central passage in the Old Testament on the doctrine of the substitutionary atonement (Isaiah 52:13-53:12).

One unique passage stands out in the Old Testament, however, where the metaphor of "a ransom" is used with respect to Israel's deliverance, and the idea of substitution is clearly indicated. The passage is found in Isaiah 43:1-4:

But now thus saith Jehovah that created thee, O Jacob, and he that formed thee, O Israel: Fear not, for I have *redeemed* thee; I have called thee by thy name, thou art mine. When thou passest through the waters, I will be with thee; and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee: when thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burned, neither shall the flame kindle upon thee. For I am Jehovah thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Saviour; I have *given Egypt as thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba in thy stead*. Since thou hast been precious in my sight, and honorable, and I have loved thee; *therefore will I give men in thy stead, and peoples instead of thy life*.

---

<sup>678</sup>Deuteronomy 15:15.

<sup>679</sup>Isaiah 52:3.

This is a most remarkable passage directly bearing on the Old Testament doctrine of substitution. God is in effect saying here, "In my counsels I have already assigned to the Persians, as compensation for their letting thee go free, the broad countries of Egypt, Ethiopia, and Seba."<sup>680</sup> In this passage Egypt, Ethiopia, and Seba are designated as the ransom, כֶּפֶר, for Israel. As a matter of fact the conquest of Egypt was effected by Cambyses, the son and successor of Cyrus, and Persia was compensated for the emancipation of Israel by the conquest of these rich African nations.<sup>681</sup> The preciousness of Israel in God's sight and His unchanging love for her, constrains Him to sacrifice, as it were, Egypt in substitution for Israel. It seems that "either Egypt or Israel must perish; God chose that Egypt, though so much more mighty, should be destroyed in order that his people might be delivered; thus Egypt stood, *instead* of Israel, as a kind of ransom."<sup>682</sup>

The substitutionary figure is strikingly illustrated by the words of God when He declares, "Since thou hast been precious in my sight, and honorable, and I have loved thee; therefore, will I give men in thy stead, and peoples instead of thy life."<sup>683</sup> The ground for God's sacrifice of mighty heathen nations on behalf of Israel did not lie in her inherent worth or moral superiority, but on the contrary her deliverance was based upon four grounds that lay quite outside Israel herself. They were (1) God's own unchanging love; "... I have loved thee...."<sup>684</sup> (2) His covenant with, and love for, their fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: "And because he loved thy fathers, therefore he chose their seed after them and brought thee... out of Egypt,"<sup>685</sup> "For Jehovah thy God is a merciful God; he will not fail thee, nor destroy thee, nor forget the covenant of thy fathers which he swore unto them";<sup>686</sup> (3) His election of

---

<sup>680</sup>Spence & Exell (eds.), *op. cit.*, X, P. 136.

<sup>681</sup>J. Skinner, *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah, Chapters XL-LXVI, The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges* (Cambridge: University Press, 1954), p. 41.

<sup>682</sup>Robert Jamieson, A. R. Fausset, and David Brown, *A Commentary Critical and Explanatory, on the Old and New Testament* (Glasgow: William Collins, Sons, and Co., 1873), I, p. 491.

<sup>683</sup>Isaiah 43:4.

<sup>684</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>685</sup>Deuteronomy 4:37.

<sup>686</sup>Deuteronomy 4:31.

Israel: "... Jehovah thy God hath chosen thee to be a people for his own possession, above all the peoples that are upon the face on the earth";<sup>687</sup> and :(4) His own glory; "Fear not; for I am with thee: I will bring thy seed from the east, and gather thee from the west... every one that is called by my name, and whom I have created for my glory...."<sup>688</sup>

The same metaphor, כִּפְרִי, ransom, indicating substitution, occurs in other Old Testament passages. In the Book of Proverbs two passages set forth the concept. Proverbs 11:8: "The righteous is delivered out of trouble, and the wicked cometh in his stead," and Proverbs 21:18: "The wicked is a ransom for the righteous; and the treacherous in the stead of the upright." Here the thought is that the evil from which the righteous are delivered falls upon the wicked, or conversely, the evil falls upon the wicked *instead of* the righteous.<sup>689</sup> Hence, "by suffering what they had devised for the righteous, or brought on them, the wicked became their ransom, in the usual sense of substitutes."<sup>690</sup>

Historical instances of this substitution occur throughout the Old Testament. It is first noted in the deliverance of Israel from Egypt, when the death stroke passed over the Israelites and fell upon the Egyptians. The passover lamb provided an atonement or covering כִּפְרִים for the houses of the Israelites, and the destroying angel poured his wrath instead upon the Egyptians. Again in the case of Achan's sin which resulted in Joshua's defeat at Ai, the wrath of God was turned from Israel only when it fell upon Achan, who, in a negative sense, became the substitute or sole object of His displeasure. "... and all Israel stoned him with stones... and Jehovah turned from the fierceness of his anger...."<sup>691</sup> Thus also was Haman hanged on the gallows which he had erected for Mordecai,<sup>692</sup> and Daniel's accusers were cast into the den of lions from which God had delivered him.<sup>693</sup>

---

<sup>687</sup>Deuteronomy 7:7.

<sup>688</sup>Isaiah 43:5, 7.

<sup>689</sup>As Abraham says to the rich man in Luke 16:25, "... but now he [Lazarus] is comforted, and thou art in anguish."

<sup>690</sup>Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown *op. cit.*, p. 406.

<sup>691</sup>Joshua 7:26.

<sup>692</sup>Esther 7:10.

<sup>693</sup>Daniel 6:24.

The close connection between the idea of ransom and the idea of substitution is revealed in Exodus 21:31, where the owner of a vicious bull, who had carelessly neglected to confine the dangerous beast, forfeited his own life if a person was gored to death. However, the Law allowed him to make a substitution by redeeming his life through the payment of a כֶּפֶר, ransom. The idea of substitution and ransom occurs in the same sense in Psalm 49:7: "None of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him."

Thus in these passages the consequences of divine judgment upon sin are averted by the substitution of a ransom—either a slain sacrifice; a price paid; one person or nation for another; or by some other providential interposition.

### The Typical and Substitutionary Nature of the Old Testament Sacrifices

Inasmuch as the Scriptures repeatedly represent Christ as a substitutionary sacrifice, effecting the salvation of His people, it was imperative that the exact nature of the Old Testament Levitical and Jewish sacrifices be determined.<sup>694</sup> That is, since Christ is, in the strict Jewish sense, depicted as a sacrifice in the New Testament, the significance and purpose of Old Testament sacrifices suggest the nature and meaning of the death of Christ Himself. Dr. A. A. Hodge suggests three factors which confirm this truth: (1) from the dawn of sacred history the prevailing mode in which the people of God worshipped Him acceptably was in the use of blood sacrifices. These sacrifices were regarded by those who were offering them as vicarious sufferings, atoning sin and propitiating God; (2) the sacrifices which God ordained under the Mosaic sacrificial system were substitutionary and atoning; (3) the Mosaic sacrifices were typical of the sacrifice of Christ; that is, Christ, in dying, expiated the sins of His own people *on precisely the same principles* that the Jewish sacrifices atoned for the offerer's violation of the law.<sup>695</sup>

---

<sup>694</sup>See "The Doctrine of Sacrifice." p. 61ff.

<sup>695</sup>Hodge, *op. cit.*, p. 122.

## *The Divine Purpose in the Institution of Blood Sacrifice*

With regard to the first mentioned factor, orthodox Old Testament theologians have always held that sacrifices originated in the family of Adam for a definite purpose and... that down to the Christian era they had continued as the inseparable accompaniment of all acceptable worship, and that the practice was diffused among all the people of all lands and religions. As has been shown, it has, nevertheless, been disputed, whether they originated as the result of an immediate divine revelation, imposed by divine authority, or whether their origin lies in the spontaneous expression of man's religious nature. In answer to this, the Scriptures show that not only were the Mosaic sacrifices peculiar and typical of the work of Christ, but that the entire system of primitive sacrifices was ordained by God to be typical of this same work.<sup>696</sup> It is redundant to observe... that this is in conflict with the evolutionary theory of religion which holds that sacrifice is simply one of the primitive forms of magic in which the worshipper attempted to control or placate the hostile spirit powers and unseen mysterious forces of nature.<sup>697</sup>

The divine institution of substitutionary sacrifice appears certain, however, from the fact that it is highly improbable that the propriety and practicality of presenting material gifts to an invisible deity, especially the attempt to propitiate God and atone for sin by blood sacrifices, should ever have occurred to the human mind spontaneously. But, on the other hand, on the supposition that God purposed to save fallen man (noted as early as Genesis 3:15), it is highly probable that He would have given them instruction upon so vital a question as that concerning the means of approaching His sacred presence and conciliating His divine favor. Further, it is clearly stated in Scripture that God, in every dispensation, disapproved of any use by man of unauthorized methods of worship and service.<sup>698</sup> Since the salvation of fallen creatures finds its source in God and His grace, it quite logically follows that

---

<sup>696</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 123.

<sup>697</sup>Noss, *op. cit.*, pp. 22-23.

<sup>698</sup>Thus all manner of self-instituted worship, and teaching for doctrines the commandments of men, are equally forbidden in both Testaments. Cf. Isaiah 29:13; Genesis 4:1-5; Ezekiel 33:31; Numbers 12:15; Exodus 32; Leviticus 10; Matthew 15:9; Mark 7:7; Colossians 2:33.

the worship and religion of the sinner, together with its principles, methods, and the very forms in which it is expressed, must of necessity originate with God.<sup>699</sup>

The blood sacrifices under the Mosaic law were of four kinds: the burnt-offering, the peace-offering, the sin-offering, and the trespass-offering. The manner of presentation of the victim, the laying on of hands, and the slaying of the animal were the same in all. But in the three remaining functions of the ritual—the sprinkling of blood, the burning of the animal upon the altar, and the sacrificial meal—differences are noted depending upon which of the four types of sacrifice was being made. For example, the sprinkling of the blood was central in the sin-offering, whereas in the other offerings it played a less prominent role. In the burnt-offering the complete burning of the whole animal was the characteristic feature. The sacrificial meal was the essential idea in the peace-offering. Therefore, in determining the nature and meaning of Old Testament sacrifice it is evident that in all types there was confession of sin, the death of a substitute victim, and the vicarious penalty. In the case of the sin-offering and trespass-offering, atonement for some special sin is intended in order to restore the offender to the covenant relationship which had been violated by some transgression.

### *The Sin-Offering and the Doctrine of Substitution*

In view of the fact that the sin-offering and the trespass-offering were in a special sense typical of the work of Christ, and since it was in these that the ideas of atonement and substitution were most clearly and forcibly set forth, then an examination of the nature of these two offerings is necessary in support of the basic assumptions of this dissertation.

H. Wheeler Robinson in his book *The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament* denies any penal or substitutionary nature to the Old Testament sin-offering in particular and to sacrifice in general. His views so adequately express the position of the negative school of criticism that he is quoted here at length. He writes,

---

<sup>699</sup>Hodge, *op. cit.*, pp. 123-24.

In regard to the general significance of the sin-offering... there seems no sufficient evidence for the idea of a vicarious *penalty*. Those who appeal to the case of the scapegoat, sent away for Azazel into the wilderness on the Day of Atonement (Leviticus xvi.), overlook the fact that this was not a sacrifice at all; the companion goat that was retained formed the sacrifice.... Nor does the fact that the offerer lays his hand upon the victim prove any transference of guilt, for the same ceremony occurs also in the case of the burnt-offering and the peace-offering.... Finally, nothing can be made out for the idea of a substitutionary atonement from the manipulation of the victim's blood.... The statement that "it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life," is in perfect agreement with the Hebrew idea of blood-soul; but the "atonement" made consists in the restoration of a quasi-physical relationship, rather than in the forensic conceptions of Protestant theology.... In view of these facts [sic], we must dismiss from the mind, in regard to the sin-offering of the Old Testament, the idea that the animal victim receives the penalty which is really due to the offerer of the sacrifice.<sup>700</sup>

That this represents an unbiblical view of the sin-offering and that the sin-offering atoned for sin and propitiated God through *vicarious punishment and substitutionary atonement* can be shown from the subsequent considerations: (1) the occasions; (2) the necessary qualifications and sacrificial designations of the victims; (3) the ritual of the sacrifice; and :(4) their declared effects.<sup>701</sup>

### The Occasion for the Sin-Offering

According to the Levitical law of the sin-offering as recorded in Leviticus 4-6:7, the occasion for the sin offer-ing was usually some specific sin which included moral as well as ceremonial transgressions. The Hebrew word for the sin-offering is חטאת, and as in the case of the trespass-offering, חטאת, the purpose was to abolish the interruption of the covenant relation caused by some transgression either moral or ceremonial. Sins in this respect were divided into two classes—those

---

<sup>700</sup>H. Wheeler Robinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 146-47.

<sup>701</sup>This "order" of treatment follows, in part, that suggested by A. A. Hodge in his work, *The Atonement*, in his chapter on Old Testament sacrifice. In the particular method of treatment and interpretation, the writer follows no one single source, but attempts to reflect his view as the result of the consultation of several authors.

which admitted of atonement and those... which did not. Hence, there was a limitation in this offering for overt acts of sin, for if a man sinned wilfully, presumptuously, or "with a high hand" (בְּיָד רְפָה), there was no legal provision in the law for a sacrifice to restore him to covenant standing, and he was cut off from his people. "A man that hath set at nought Moses' law dieth without compassion on the word of two or three witnesses."<sup>702</sup> Therefore, the sins covered by this sacrifice were sins of ignorance, i.e. unintentional offenses and unpremeditated sin. It included also errors of infirmity and rashness. But no sin-offering was provided in the entire Levitical system for a murderer, blasphemer, adulterer, or for many other wilful crimes. The sinner might truly repent, confess his sin, manifest godly sorrow, but nevertheless, he must die. The Law could exhibit no mercy—this was not its function. "For as many as are of the works of the law are under a curse: for it is written, cursed is every one who continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law, to do them."<sup>703</sup>

The significance of this fact is two-fold: it emphasized, on the one hand, the great wickedness of rebellious sins, and on the other, *the need of a perfect vicarious sacrifice sufficient for all sins*. For David's sin of adultery with Bathsheba, and for the murder of Uriah, no ritual act could atone, and none was prescribed by Mosaic Law. If the requirements of the Law had been carried out, he would have been put to death. Only the special intervening grace of God, a special and unique event in Old Testament history, prevented it (II Samuel 12). But even here it anticipates the future forgiveness of God in Christ, upon repentance, as II Samuel 12:13 and Psalm 32:1-5 indicate. For inadvertent sins, the thing to be noted is that when the priest, an individual, or the congregation became conscious of sin and transgressions committed, they were excluded from the fellowship of the covenant until atonement was effected through vicarious sacrifice.

### The qualifications and Sacrificial Designations of the Victims

In blood sacrifices which were to substitute for and suffer death on behalf of men, the Mosaic law required they be taken only from among those classified as clean animals. Moreover, the animals were

---

<sup>702</sup>Hebrews 10:28; CF. Numbers 15:30-31.

<sup>703</sup>Galatians 3:10.

those most closely associated with man—the domesticated animal. Of the clean animals acceptable for offering were the domesticated cattle, sheep, goats; and in the case of the poor, the offering of doves or pigeons was permitted. In the sin-offering only an animal at least eight days old and without blemish could be offered. "This physical perfection of the animal was symbolical of spiritual perfection... , and indicated that only an innocent and pure life could be accepted as a sacrificial substitute in the stead of a polluted one."<sup>704</sup>

It is significant, in the doctrine of substitution, that this "perfect" victim was designated *חַטָּאת* *Sin* (Leviticus 4:27-29).<sup>705</sup> The victim is called Sin because the vicarious nature of the entire sacrifice is summed up in this designation—the animal is now a *substitute* for the sinner, and its death is the punishment of the sin and guilt formerly resting upon the individual it represents. The purpose in this divinely instituted type was to emphatically depict the concept of substitution and its later fulfillment in the vicarious work of God in Christ.

Him who knew no sin he hath made to be sin on our behalf; that we might become the righteousness of God in him.<sup>706</sup>

The whole concept and every aspect of the sin-offering is pregnant with the impression and thought of substitution. Since the sacrifice itself was looked upon as the embodiment of sin, it therefore depicted the ideal transference of the guilt of sin from the sinner to his substitute. "That there was such a transference, is further confirmed by the fact that the expression, elsewhere so common, 'for the good pleasure of the Lord,' was never employed in connection with the sin-offering."<sup>707</sup>

---

<sup>704</sup>Hodge, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

<sup>705</sup>Calvin writes in his Institutes, "By this application of the term, the Spirit intended to intimate, that they were a kind of καθαρμάτων, (purifications), bearing, by substitution, the curse due to sin." Calvin, *op. cit.*, I, p. 439.

<sup>706</sup>I Corinthians 5:21.

<sup>707</sup>E. W. Hengstenberg, *Commentary on Ecclesiastes*, trans. D. W. Simon (Philadelphia: Smith, English, & Co., 1860), p. 378.

## The Ritual of the Sacrifice

The ritual of blood sacrifices confirms the idea of substitution and consisted of six elements: (1) the presentation of the victim; (2) the laying on of hands; (3) the slaying of the victim (this ritual was the same in all blood offerings) ; (4) the sprinkling of the blood; (5) the burning of the sacrifice; (6) the sacrificial meal<sup>708</sup> (differences of ritual occurred in the various sacrifices with respect to the last three elements, and the sacrificial meal was seen only in the peace-offering).

The ritual of the sin-offering gives further evidence of its atoning and substitutionary nature.

*The Presentation of the Victim.* Three aspects are to be noted in the presentation of the animal having to do with the person, the place, and the purpose. The person: it was required that the offerer himself bring the victim, which was to represent him and be his substitute. The place: the place of presentation was to be at the door of the tabernacle. This discouraged idolatrous sacrifices, on the one hand, and compelled, on the other, the sinning Israelite to confess publically his sin. The purpose: the offering must be presented for a certain purpose that "... it shall be forgiven him,"<sup>709</sup> and that "... it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him."<sup>710</sup>

*The Laying on of Hands.* The laying on of hands signifies three ideas in Scripture: (1) an act of designation as to an office and authority, as seen, for example, in the designation of Joshua to succeed Moses as the leader of Israel (Deuteronomy 34:9):<sup>711</sup> (2) an act to designate a personal substitute or representative, as in the case of the setting apart of the Levites as substitutes for the first-born of all the Israelites (Numbers 8:10, 16);<sup>712</sup> and (3) an act of communication of something invisible, symbolized by the visible act, as seen in the communication of the Spirit from Moses to Joshua, from the Apostles to new

---

<sup>708</sup>Inasmuch as the sacrificial meal did not occur in connection with the sin-offering, it will not be treated in this study.

<sup>709</sup>Leviticus 4:35.

<sup>710</sup>Leviticus 1:4.

<sup>711</sup>CF. also Acts 6:6; I Timothy 4:14.

<sup>712</sup>Cf. also all passages dealing with blood sacrifices.

converts, and in the healing wrought through the imposition of hands (Deuteronomy 34:9; Acts 8; Mark 6:6).<sup>713</sup>

The ritual of the laying on of hands depicts one of the major elements in the idea of substitution and is prescribed in all blood sacrifices.<sup>714</sup> This is a natural and expressive symbol of transfer of something from one person to another object of which it is representative. This is not, as some erroneously maintain, a mere declaration of the person's property, or an indication, as Hengstenberg suggests, of the rapport that existed between the sinner and the victim, else the ceremony would appear also in the bloodless offerings; but it signifies an *ideal transference* of the guilt and penalty to suffer for sin from the sinner to the innocent substitute. The victim now stood as a substitute in the sinner's place. The wrath that should belong to the guilty offender now fell upon the representative victim. The ritual on the Day of Atonement confirms this as the sins of the people were confessed over the head of the victim, which was to remove the people's sins from the presence of God.<sup>715</sup> The sinner, by this act of laying his hands upon the head of the innocent victim, appointed the victim to be for him a medium of atonement, and a substitute to receive the punishment due him for sin. The reality of the signification of an actual transference of guilt has already been noted from the fact that the victim, which stood as a substitute, was designated אֶת־חַטָּאת, Sin. Without this transference of guilt, the doctrine of substitution in Old Testament sacrifice would be meaningless. Hence, it will be necessary at this juncture to examine the principal sin-offering in the Mosaic sacrificial system, the great Day of Atonement, in which this transference is expressly declared to be effected from the people to their substitute victim.

*The Day of Atonement.* The annual Day of Atonement, יוֹם הַכִּפּוּרִים is set forth in Leviticus 16 as the supreme act of national atonement for sin, and illustrates most forcibly the conception of substitution in Old Testament worship. It took place on the tenth day of the seventh

---

<sup>713</sup>Cf. also Matthew 9:18; Acts 9:12, 17.

<sup>714</sup>Leviticus 1:4; 3:2; 4:4-15; 16:21; II Chronicles 29:23.

<sup>715</sup>In the Yoma of the Mishnah the high priest is said to have confessed the following over the head of the second goat: "O God, thy people, the House of Israel, have committed iniquity, transgressed, and sinned before thee. O God, forgive, I pray, the iniquities and transgressions and sins which thy people, the House of Israel, have committed and transgressed and sinned before thee. . . ." *op. cit.*, p. 169.

month, Tisri, and fasting was commanded from the evening of the ninth until the evening of the tenth, in keeping with the unusual sanctity of the Day. On this day an atonement was effected for the people, the priesthood, and for the sanctuary because it "... dwelleth with them in the midst of their uncleannesses."<sup>716</sup> Atonements were made for the people at other times and as the need arose, as is seen in the case of the individual offerings and offerings on behalf of the nation; and, therefore, this notable offering and atonement was based upon the assumption that the others may have been insufficient, and that the atoning blood of one comprehensive sacrifice must be brought yearly into the very presence of God.

1. The Ritual. The ritual of the Day of Atonement was divided into two acts; one performed on behalf of the priesthood, and one on behalf of the nation Israel. The High Priest, who had moved a week previous to the Day from his own dwelling to the sanctuary, arose on the Day of Atonement, and having bathed and laid aside his regular high priestly attire, dressed himself in holy white linen garments, and brought forward a young bullock for a sin-offering for himself and for his house.<sup>717</sup> The other priests, who, on other occasions, served in the sanctuary, on this day took their place with the sinful congregation for whom atonement was to be made.<sup>718</sup> For it was commanded: "And there shall be no man in the tent of meeting when he goeth in to make atonement in the holy place, until he come out, and have made atonement for himself, and for his household, and for all the assembly of Israel."<sup>719</sup> He then slew the sin-offering for himself; next he entered the Holy of Holies with a censer of incense so that a cloud of incense might fill the room and cover the ark in order that he die not. Then he returned with the blood of the sin-offering and sprinkled it upon the mercy-seat (כַּפֶּרֶת) on the east; and then seven times before the mercy-seat for the symbolic cleansing of the Holy of Holies, defiled by its presence among the sinful people, and having made atonement for him-self, he returned to the court of the sanctuary.

---

<sup>716</sup>Leviticus 16:16.

<sup>717</sup>According to the *Midrash Rabbah* the meaning of "his house" signifies "his wife." Rabbi Dr. H. Freedman and Maurice Simon (eds.). *Midrash Rabbah* (London: Soncino Press, 1951), IV, p. 260.

<sup>718</sup>Nicoll (ed.), *op. cit.*, p. 261.

<sup>719</sup>Leviticus 16:17.

He next presented the two goats, which had been secured as the sin-offering for the people, to the Lord at the door of the Tabernacle and cast lots over them, one lot marked "for Yahweh," and the other, "for Azazel."<sup>720</sup> The goat upon which the lot had fallen for the Lord was slain, and the High Priest repeated the ritual of sprinkling the blood as before, and in addition cleansed the Holy Place by a seven-fold sprinkling, and lastly, the altar of burnt-offering was cleansed. It is in the ritual which followed all this that the full import of the doctrine of substitution comes into view.

## 2. The Goat for Azazel.

And he shall take the two goats, and set them before Jehovah at the door of the tent of meeting. And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats; one lot for Jehovah, and the other lot for Azazel. And Aaron shall present the goat upon which the lot fell for Jehovah, and offer him for a sin-offering. But the goat, on which the lot fell for Azazel, shall be set alive before Jehovah, to make atonement for him, to send him away for Azazel into the wilderness.<sup>721</sup>

And when he hath made an end of atoning for the holy place, and the tent of meeting, and the altar, he shall present the live goat: and Aaron shall lay both hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions, even all their sins; and he shall put them upon the head of the goat, and he shall send him away by the hand of a man that is in readiness into the wilderness: and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a solitary land: and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness.<sup>722</sup>

In the second stage of the ceremony the live goat, the goat for Azazel, which had been left standing at the altar, was brought forward; and the high priest, laying hands upon him, confessed over him all the

---

<sup>720</sup>According to Rashi: "He places one goat at his right hand and the other at his left. He then puts both his hands into an urn and takes one lot in his right hand and the other in the left. These he places upon them. . . ." *Pentateuch with Targum Onkelos. Haphtaroth, and Prayers for Sabbath and Rashi's Commentary*, trans. M. Rosenbaum and A. M. Silbermann (London: Shaplo, Vallentine & Co., 1945), p. 73.

<sup>721</sup>Leviticus 16:7-10.

<sup>722</sup>Leviticus 16:20-22.

sins of the people, after which he was sent away bearing the iniquity of the nation of Israel into an uninhabited wilderness. Hence, it is expressly stated that the guilt is transferred to the animal substitute. The precise significance of this part of the ceremony for the doctrine of substitution is determined by the meaning which is attached to the expression "for Azazel" (A.V., "for a scapegoat"). Basically there are four interpretations of the meaning of Azazel: (1) it is a place; (2) a person; (3) a verb used as an abstract noun; (4) the goat himself is designated Azazel.

a. Azazel is the place to which the second goat was sent. Two variations of this view are found: (1) the place is a lonely region in the desert to which the goat was banished, and (2) the term Azazel designates a precipitous mountain as the place from which the goat was thrown head long to its death.<sup>723</sup> The derivation of the term Azazel is reached, by this view, in one of two ways: (a) אֲזָזֵל comes from the two Hebrew words אָזַז ('azaz), and אֵל ('el), forming a compound אֲזָזֵל ('azaz 'el), meaning rough mountain of God"; or (b) the term designates the rock or rugged cliff from which the goat was cast who had symbolically carried away the sins of the people.<sup>724</sup> The chief objections to this view are that if Azazel designated some district in the wilderness to which the goat was banished, such a localized place would have been left behind during the constant movement of Israel in her journey to Canaan. Further there is no evidence that the term connotes an abstract noun of place.

b. Azazel is the name of a person. Those who advocate this view contend that the language of Leviticus 16:8 favors such an interpretation. "And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats; one lot for Jehovah, and the other lot for Azazel." The opinion that Azazel designates the name of a person, either Satan or an evil spirit, is widely supported by such expositors as Kellogg, Spencer, Keil, Gesenius, and

---

<sup>723</sup>According to Eben Ezra, Azazel designated a rugged valley not far from Sinai. It corresponds to the Arabic *jil azaz*, a rugged mountain. Others take it as the Arabic broken plural, *nghrazazel*, lonesomeness, solitude, desert. John Pye Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 228. The Hebrew *Soncino Chumash* traces the source of Azazel to *azaz*, "to be strong," and compounded with *el*, "mighty," it denotes a precipitous cliff. It was a height near Mount Sinai from which the goat was hurled. Cohen, *op. cit.*, p. 706.

<sup>724</sup>John Rea, "The Meaning of Azazel in Leviticus 16:8, 10" (unpublished Critical Monograph, Grace Theological Seminary, May, 1951), p. 33.

in a modified form by Hengstenberg, who held that Azazel was an evil spirit whose abode was in the wilderness. The act of sending the goat to him was the means by which the kingdom of darkness was renounced, the sins thus being sent back to the prince of this kingdom, who, by them, had hoped to enslave the people.<sup>725</sup> Others have viewed Azazel as Satan, who is designated in Scripture as the Adversary and accuser of God's people (Job 1; Zechariah 3; Revelation 12:10). Keil holds that Azazel is a personal being in opposition to Yahweh, who is afterwards called Satan in the Old Testament.<sup>726</sup> To the Accuser, Azazel, the second goat was sent symbolically carrying the sins of Israel, now covered and forgiven. By this act it was graphically announced to Satan that the sin, which had been temporarily the source of his power and victory over Israel, had now been covered and sent away. Another form of this second view, postulated by critical scholarship, is that Leviticus 16 records the relic of ancient demon worship in which one goat is given to God and the second sent to appease the evil spirit.<sup>727</sup>

The supporters of this view have argued that since the term Azazel appears without the article it must, therefore, be a proper name. But as Meyrick shows in his commentary on Leviticus, when a noun in Hebrew expresses an office or function, and has the preposition לְ prefixed, it does not take the article. Attention is called to I Kings 19:18 where the Hebrew is לְמֶלֶךְ "for king" and לְנָבִיא "for prophet" (Cf. also: I Samuel 25:30; II Samuel 7:14). Again, it is contended that if one is for a person (Yahweh), then the other must be for a person also (Azazel). But this argument cannot be maintained on any grounds of evidence, since it all depends on what the writer himself had in view.<sup>728</sup>

The two basic objections to this view are that (1) the name Azazel is nowhere else mentioned, and this could not be the case if he were so important a person as to divide with Yahweh the sin-offering on the most significant day of the year; and (2) to bring Satan into such prominence in this great religious rite—to place him in sort of juxtaposition with God—has an offensive connotation, and finds no parallel

---

<sup>725</sup>Fairburn, *op. cit.*, p. 468.

<sup>726</sup>Keil and Delitzsch, *op. cit.*, p. 398.

<sup>727</sup>Nicoll, *op. cit.*, pp. 269-71.

<sup>728</sup>Spence and Exell (eds.), *op. cit.*, II, p. 239.

in the whole of Scripture.<sup>729</sup> This view is also too closely associated with the critical idea that this is a relic from demon worship, and that the second goat is an appeasement of an evil spirit. It is not only alien to the whole spirit of Mosaic worship, but just such a form of idolatry is condemned in the same law code in Leviticus 17:7-9, which immediately follows.<sup>730</sup> Furthermore, both goats are said to be presented to Yahweh, and both are called an atonement.

c. Azazel is an abstract noun meaning "dismissal," or "complete removal." This view teaches, as does Brown, Driver, and Briggs' Hebrew Lexicon, that אֲזַזֵּל is an abstract noun from the reduplicated verb אֲזַז, a stem which does not occur in Hebrew, but whose cognate in Arabic means "to remove." The reduplicated intensive form if used as an abstract noun signifying "entire removal." The resultant form אֲזַזֵּל is softened to אֲזַזֵּל.<sup>731</sup> The meaning and significance of this interpretation, in which the second goat symbolizes the removal or carrying away of Israel's sins, is in agreement with the fourth view which is now to be considered.

d. Azazel designates the goat itself. In this view Azazel is also derived from the reduplicated form of the verb אֲזַז, but is taken as abstract noun referring to an *agent*, rather than an impersonal abstraction, "entire removal," as set forth in the third view. That it is the goat designated by the word Azazel is supported by Bonar, Josephus, Symmachus, Aquila, Theodotion, Luther, Ewald, the LXX, the Vulgate, et al.<sup>732</sup> This concept must certainly have been in the minds of the translators of the Authorized Version who rendered Azazel, "the scapegoat." Therefore, taking Azazel as a noun of agent it would signify "the removing goat." Leviticus 16:8 could then be translated: "And

---

<sup>729</sup>Fairburn, *op. cit.*, p. 469.

<sup>730</sup>Leviticus 17:7: "and they shall no more sacrifice their sacrifices unto the he-goats [לְשִׂעִירִים], after which they play the harlot. . . ." The word for "he-goat" is translated "devils" in the ASV and "satyrs" in the RSV, but literally means "he-goat," "buck," "shaggy goat" (see II Chronicles 11:15; Isaiah 13:21; 34:14). This is believed to be a reference to the worship of goat-like spirits of the woods and fields which prevailed in Egypt from which Israel had come. According to Herodotus goat worship was prevalent in Egypt.

<sup>731</sup>Cf. Gesenius' Grammar, p. 102 (30n.).

<sup>732</sup>The LXX: ἀποπομπῆος. Luther rendered Azazel "The acquital goat"; the Geneva Version of 1805, "the goat destined to be thrown over the precipice" Calvin left Azazel untranslated. John Pye Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 228.

Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats; one lot for Jehovah, and the other lot for A REMOVER OF SINS [Azazel]."

The substitutionary significance of the Day of Atonement is set forth in the symbolic ritual involving the two goats. The three fundamental ideas in the ceremony were: (1) both goats were called an atonement; (2) both goats were presented to the Lord for a sin-offering; and (3) both goats were looked upon as *one* offering to which the sins of Israel were symbolically transferred, while its death, on the one hand, effected a vicarious atonement (covering), and sending it away removed those sins forever from God's presence. Since it was physically impossible to depict these two ideas with one goat, the two goats were necessary as a single sin-offering of the people. The first goat, by the shedding of blood, symbolized the atonement for sins, the other symbolized their complete removal.<sup>733</sup> The first goat provided the *means* for forgiveness, while the second goat depicted the *effect*. The two goats were a part of one truth the Lord wished to convey. An analogy is to be found in the offering of purification for a leper upon cure, as is recorded in Leviticus 14:4-7, in which one bird was offered upon the altar and on then set free, symbolically carrying away the impurity of the leper.

The Slaying of the Victim. The meaning of the slaying of the victim in the blood sacrifices is important in the concept of substitution. "The original sentence pronounced by God upon all sin, from the commencement, was death. Genesis ii. 17; iii. 3, 17, 19. The Apostle declares that the principle abides forever that 'the wages of sin is death.' Romans vi. 23."<sup>734</sup> The sinner having presented the victim as his substitute, and having laid his hands upon his head, confessed his sins. Then the priest slew the victim to make an atonement for him. In the case of the burnt, sin, and trespass-offerings the victim was slain on the north side of the altar (Leviticus 1:11), the "north" having a connotation of adversity and ominousness in Old Testament thought.<sup>735</sup> The life of the victim atoned for the life of the guilty offender and was executed as his substitute.

---

<sup>733</sup>Cf. Psalm 103:12.

<sup>734</sup>Hodge, *op. cit.*, p. 136.

<sup>735</sup>Cf. Joel 2:20; Jeremiah 1:14; 4:6; 10:22; Isaiah 41:25; Daniel 11:44.

And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the sin-offering, and kill it for a sin-offering... and the priest shall make atonement for him touching his sin that he hath sinned, and he shall be forgiven.<sup>736</sup>

Some expositors make no distinction in the slaying of the victim and the sprinkling of the blood. The slaying of the animal is simply to be regarded as the means of obtaining the blood, and the penal character of the substitute victim's death is denied. The slaying merely completed the exhibition of the sinner's self-surrender, and enabled the priest to obtain the blood for application Godward to the altar to signify this idea. Hence, Schultz sees nothing atoning in the blood upon the altar. "When this blood is in sacrifice brought again into the presence of God, and poured out on His altar, the victim's life is thereby given back to him."<sup>737</sup> But penal suffering and death is implicit in the ritual of the slaying of the innocent substitute victim and the application of its blood upon the altar. Fairbairn's insight is appropriate here:

... the slaying of the sinner's offering, solemnly destined to death, that its soul might be accepted in lieu of the sinner's, could not but wear the aspect of a doom or judgment: it was a death not incidentally alone, but formally associated with sin as its immediate cause.... People were not in a condition, at the sight of such a spectacle, to make nice discriminations: here, on the one hand, was the sin crying for condemnation, and there, on the other, was the slain victim that the cry might be silenced. Could people look at this, or take part in it, and feel that there was nothing of punishment?<sup>738</sup>

The Sprinkling of the Blood. All that preceded, the imposition of hands, the confession of sins, and the infliction of the vicarious penalty of death executed upon the substitute, were alike in all blood sacrifices. The priest, with the blood of the victim, now performed the central function of the sin-offering. In the case of the burnt-offering and peace-offering, the blood was sprinkled on the sides of the altar only, symbolically presenting the blood of atonement to God. In the case of the sin-offering, the blood was not only sprinkled on the sides of the altar, but

---

<sup>736</sup>Leviticus 4:33, 35.

<sup>737</sup>Schultz, *op. cit.*, I, p. 385.

<sup>738</sup>Fairbairn, *op. cit.*, p. 466.

applied directly to the horns of the altar, these being the most conspicuous and sacred parts.<sup>739</sup> In the case of a sin-offering for the high priest or the congregation, the blood was brought into the Holy Place and applied to the altar of incense and sprinkled seven times before the veil of the Holy of Holies. On the Day of Atonement, when the most exact representation the Mosaic sacrifices could portray of the substitutionary atonement of Christ was given, the blood of the substitute victim was taken into the Holy of Holies itself and sprinkled upon the Kapporeth of the Ark of the Covenant.

The Old Testament record indicates that the sacrifices instituted by God under the Mosaic economy were vicarious and atoning. The death of the blood sacrifice was a vicarious punishment, and the life of the victim was substituted for the life of the offerer. The Socinian, as well as the later critical view, is that the death of the animal victim was no essential part of the ritual, and instead of being vicarious and substitutionary was simply the means of obtaining the blood which signified the "life" of the victim.<sup>740</sup> According to the *Interpreter's Bible* no Israelite was, under any circumstances, to eat the blood of an animal, a practice common among primitive religions. Since the blood was identified with the life, then underlying this prohibition was the idea that a man who eats the blood takes into himself the life, power, and virtue of the slain animal, rather than the blood being substitutionary on the altar, a life for a life.<sup>741</sup> Others saw in the sprinkling of the blood upon the altar the symbolic giving away or returning back to God the life of the offerer. This was merely an expression of his sense of gratitude, obligation, and dependence. Hence, God was laying claim to the love and devotion of his heart and demanding complete self-surrender of his life, represented by the life (blood) of the slain animal. This view is enunciated by those who hold to a "moral theory" of the atonement and reject any idea of substitutionary atonement.<sup>742</sup>

---

<sup>739</sup>Leviticus 4:7, 18, 25, 30, 34.

<sup>740</sup>Burney reasons that the importance of the blood lies in ancient superstition. Since the blood was absorbed by the earth and disappeared, it was assumed to be consumed by the gods; hence it was regarded as most sacred. Burney, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

<sup>741</sup>Nathaniel Micklem, "The Book of Leviticus," *The Interpreter's Bible* (New York: Abingdon Press), II, p. 90.

<sup>742</sup>Hodge, *op. cit.*, pp. 127-30.

However, Leon Morris gives evidence in his book *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross*, that the association of *nephesh* with *dam* (blood) in Leviticus 17:11, as well as in numerous other Old Testament passages, shows that the life of the animal was not thought to be still existent in the blood after the blood had been poured out upon the altar. But rather the meaning is of *life given up in death*. The "life of the flesh" that is said to be in the blood (Leviticus 17:11) is precisely the life which ceases to exist when the blood is poured out. Thus the Suffering Servant in Isaiah 53:12 is said to pour out "his *nephesh* unto death."<sup>743</sup>

In the Holy of Holies the Ark of the Covenant, ארון הַבְּרִית, was the symbol of the presence and revelation of Yahweh among His people. The Ark was called His throne in Jeremiah 16-17, and His footstool in I Chronicles 28:2.<sup>744</sup> Its spiritual meaning is seen in its parts, especially the Kapporeth (Mercy-seat), and the tables of the Law within it. Covering the Ark of the Covenant was a thick golden plate or lid called the Kapporeth, כַּפֹּרֶת, signifying in Hebrew, "propitiation," from the verb כָּפַר, "to cover over," "to propitiate," "to pacify," "to atone."<sup>745</sup> The Kapporeth was the most important part of the Ark, for to it was attached the manifestation of the divine presence. "And I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat, from between the two cherubim which are upon the ark of the testimony...."<sup>746</sup> It was here that the highest act of atonement was executed when the high priest entered into the Holy of Holies with the blood of the atonement and sprinkled it upon the Kapporeth which covered the tables of the Law. The import of the relationship between the Ark, as God's throne, the Kapporeth or propitiatory which covered the Ark, and the tables of Law within the ark, is threefold, and is of special significance to the doctrine of substitution in the Old Testament.

First it testified that God sat enthroned in Israel on the basis of the Law-Covenant made with them at Sinai. Israel's election was within the covenant where the special grace and divine favor of God were operative toward the nation. On the basis of the grace shown to Israel in her divine election and the institution of the covenant, she was obligat-

---

<sup>743</sup>Morris, *op. cit.*, pp. 112-113.

<sup>744</sup>Cf. Psalm 99:5; 132:7.

<sup>745</sup>Brown, Driver, and Briggs, *op. cit.*, p. 497.

<sup>746</sup>Exodus 25:22.

ed to consecrate herself and all she had to God. This devotion was to be expressed in acts of worship, in a continual drawing near to God with prayer and sacrifice to which God responded in blessings of grace, the greatest being His own presence among them. Symbolically then, God sits enthroned upon the Kapporeth over the tables of Law and on the basis of this Law Covenant. Secondly, this very fact stood as a continual testimony against Israel because of her sins and transgressions and emphasized her need of making propitiation. But thirdly, it is significant that the Kapporeth (mercy-seat) covered the tables of Law which had been violated by Israel's transgressions; hence, it was God's grace which constantly provided an atonement, or covering, over the broken law and prevented His wrath from breaking forth upon the people.

With the idea of substitution in view, God, as it were, provided in His own Person a covering for the iniquity of the people until the blood of atonement, shed annually, could be sprinkled upon the mercy-seat to propitiate the divine wrath because of the violated law. It was the meeting place of justice and mercy—it was the locus of justice since the ritual requirement was that the blood of the sacrifice must be solemnly presented before Yahweh Himself and sprinkled upon the Kapporeth in order to propitiate the wrath of the divine Law. Atonement by blood, as a condition of the forgiveness of their transgressions, was necessary because of the righteous and holy character of God, who could not overlook transgression nor pardon iniquity by a simple fiat. Sin must be atoned for, and judicial wrath must be propitiated. This was accomplished through the appointment, for the transgressor, of a substitutionary victim, which in Mosaic sacrifice was made an indispensable condition for the pardon of sin. Hence, the Kapporeth was also a place of mercy, due to the perpetual presence of God who provided the necessary covering or propitiation over the broken law until such time that He Himself would provide the final and perfect Substitute as a propitiation for man's sin. "And he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world."<sup>747</sup> The Psalmist expresses the theological significance of the Kapporeth, the Mercy-seat, when he writes,

Mercy and truth are met together;  
Righteousness and peace have kissed each other.<sup>748</sup>

---

<sup>747</sup>John 2:2.

<sup>748</sup>Psalm 85:10.

The Burning of the Victim. Unlike the whole burnt-offering in which the entire animal was burned, being consumed as an offering of fire of a sweet savour unto Yahweh, and signifying one's complete dedication and consecration to God, the fat only was burned upon the altar in the sin-offering. The choicest part having been dedicated to God, the remainder of the victim was given to the priests as their portion. But in case of a sin-offering for the priest himself, or when included in the congregation on the Day of Atonement, the priest could not eat of the flesh. Neither could it be burned upon the altar, which would confuse it with the whole burnt-offering, and thus it was burned on wood without the camp.

The sanctity of the sin-offering was seen in that only the priests were to eat of it and it was called "most holy." Further, everything touching the sin-offering became holy. Any garment upon which any of the atoning blood had been sprinkled was to be washed in a holy place; vessels in which the flesh of the sin-offering had been boiled, if earthen, had to be broken and destroyed. In offerings burned without the camp the priest was to wash himself and his clothes before returning to the camp. The purpose in these requirements was to impress upon the consciousness of Israel that the blood of the innocent substitute, shed for the remission of sins, was sacred and most holy and could not come into contact with anything unholy or unclean.

Conversely the idea of substitution is emphasized in the fact that the guilt of the sinner passed over to the sacrifice. This is seen in that the substituted victim is called תִּזְבֹּחַת חַטָּאת, Sin; its entire character as a sacrifice is thus summed up in that it is now a substitute for the sinner, and that its death is vicarious punishment for the guilt of the offender.

That the guilt of the sinner passed over to the sacrifice is seen also in the fact that in order to accomplish its complete removal, there was a necessity for its being brought into a closer relation to the priesthood as the mediators between God and man. Hence, the flesh of the sin-offering, in cases where the blood did not come into the Holy Place, was eaten by the priests. This view is described in Leviticus 10:17, where Moses said to Aaron who had failed to accomplish this act of removal, "Wherefore have ye not eaten the sin-offering in the place of the sanctuary, seeing it is most holy, and he hath given it to you to bear the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before

Jehovah?" Since the victim now stood as the substitute for the sinner, and was personified as תִּשְׂקָה, it was a universal principle of the Law that because of this relationship, he for whose sin it was offered could not eat of its flesh. Hence, the sacrificial meal, observed in case of the peace-offering, is noticeably absent in the sin-offering. One could not eat of his representative, his substitute, who was to provide atonement for his iniquities.<sup>749</sup>

### *The Declared Effects of the Sin-Offering*

Sin, unforgiven, excluded an individual from the covenant society of Israel. When atoned for and forgiven, the person was cleansed and restored to covenant standing. As the Pentateuch shows, the purpose of the sin-offering and the trespass-offering was to abolish the interruption of the covenant relation caused by some transgression. The idea of atonement, by the shedding of the innocent blood of a substitute, is basic in the sin-offering. The sin-offering, in case other types were offered also, must always precede them all, in order to restore the offending party to covenant relationship. Both in the burnt-offering and peace-offering Israel was taught that substitutionary atonement was necessary. This was seen in the sprinkling of the blood of the substitute victim in these offerings upon the altar before the burnt or peace-offerings themselves were acceptable as consecration and fellowship. Therefore, for particular acts of sin and transgression the sin-offering and trespass-offering were instituted. Their purpose was to atone for sin through the death of a substitute victim, and to restore the breach in the covenant relationship.

The Scriptures declare, as has been shown under the discussion of the doctrines of divine wrath and propitiation, that the effect of these sacrifices was to *cover over* the sin of the offender and to *propitiate* God.<sup>750</sup> The effect is said to be to "... make atonement for him...," and the promise always attached is "... and he shall be forgiven...."<sup>751</sup> Forgiveness was the immediate end sought, promised, and obtained. These sacrifices secured the remission of the penalties of the Law and resulted in divine forgiveness. This raises an important question with

---

<sup>749</sup>Hengstenberg, *loc. cit.*

<sup>750</sup>Especially Cf. pp. 164ff.

<sup>751</sup>Leviticus 4:31.

respect to the doctrine of substitution which must now be dealt with at length; namely, "The Problem of the Efficacy of Old Testament Sacrifice."

## The Problem of the Efficacy of Old Testament Sacrifices

The problem of the efficacy of the Old Testament Levitical sacrifices is important with respect to the doctrine of substitution. To deny any kind of efficacy with respect to the Mosaic sacrifices, as many scholars of all schools of thought have done, presents an important problem as to their substitutionary character. This question has already been raised under the discussion of the moral and ethical nature of the Levitical sacrifices. It was noted then that it is one thing to say the Mosaic sacrifices were typical, but quite another to say they had no efficacy in any sense of the term in connection with them, or that they had respect only to the removal of ceremonial defilement. A denial of their moral, ethical, and spiritual reference is tantamount to a denial of their substitutionary character; for if they could not make atonement for moral and ethical sins as well as ceremonial, then why should there be any need of substitutionary sacrifice at all? To ignore or deny the moral and spiritual nature of sacrifice is to make the whole complicated system meaningless, and to contradict the express claims of Scripture to the contrary.

### *The Basic Problem*

Of the Levitical sacrifices some were eucharistical and were called peace-offerings and burnt-offerings, by which the sacrificer acknowledged the blessings of God, the payment of vows, or expressed love and devotion to God. Others were propitiatory and atoning, namely the sin-offering and trespass-offering, which signified that man is a sinner under the displeasure and condemnation of God; that God was to be propitiated so that man might be pardoned; and that God would not justly forgive sin without atonement, which required the death of the offender, but being tempered by mercy, He would accept a ceremonially pure sacrifice in his stead.<sup>752</sup> Guilt under the Mosaic dispensation could be contracted in two ways which could be removed by

---

<sup>752</sup>Cruden, *loc. cit.*

substitutionary sacrifice—*typical* and *real*. Typical or ceremonial guilt resulted from the breach of a ceremonial precept which had no relation to morality, such as the touching of a dead body, leprosy and other accidental diseases, childbirth, and the Levitical defilements in general. Such an individual became ceremonially defiled and was excluded from sacred and/or civil society. Since these pollutions were penal, merely on the basis of the revealed will of God for the purpose of education in cleanliness and holiness, He allowed such guilt to be cleansed by sacrifice. Thus the Apostle writes that the blood of these sacrifices sanctified "... unto the cleanness of the flesh,"<sup>753</sup> that is, they effected a legal purity to the offerers and restored to them access to the holiness of God. The reason for these institutions was that the legal impurity might typify the true defilement incurred by sin; and the offerings which removed the guilt were to prefigure the one final sacrifice which would permanently remove all defilement which interfered with access to the presence of God.<sup>754</sup>

Real or moral guilt, with respect to the conscience, resulted from a breach of the moral element of the law, and subjected the offender to death, both temporal and eternal. Nevertheless this guilt was also to be atoned for by the Levitical sacrifices, namely, the Sin and Trespass-offerings. Since, in the divine purposes of God, they had a typical relation to the substitutionary sacrifice of Christ, they signified the removal of not simply ceremonial defilement, but also moral guilt, freeing the sinner from that temporal death to which he was liable, and represented the freedom from eternal death made efficacious by the blood of the cross.<sup>755</sup>

The typical nature of Old Testament sacrifice does not mean that it was simply an external ritual, but there was contained within the Levitical system a vital relation both to the contemporary life of the Hebrews and the future and final work of Christ. This has too often been overlooked. The Hebrew philosopher Spinoza reflects a fallacious trend of thought when he says: "... ceremonies are no aid to blessedness, but only have reference to the temporal prosperity of the kingdom; for

---

<sup>753</sup>Hebrews 9:13.

<sup>754</sup>Cruden, *loc. cit.*

<sup>755</sup>*Ibid.*

the rewards promised for their observance are merely temporal advantages and delights...."<sup>756</sup>

Many expositors in their zeal to make a clear distinction between the dispensation of Law and the dispensation of Grace have unwittingly characterized Old Testament worship, and especially the Levitical sacrificial ritual, as merely typical without any real value or meaning. To say the least, this not only does an injustice to the whole comprehensive and meaningful system of Levitical worship, but it also violates a basic hermeneutical principle, which is the all too frequent practice of interpreting Old Testament concepts and thought, not in the light of their meaning for the Hebrew under Levitical law, but on the basis of contemporary theological understanding.

### *Views as to the Efficacy of Old Testament Sacrifices*

To what extent did the Mosaic sacrifices atone? Several views have been proposed by Old Testament expositors. On the one hand, it has been asserted that the Levitical sacrifices had no power to atone for moral transgressions, but simply ceremonial offenses. Keil and Delitzsch extend this view to include all transgressions, and thereby seemingly render the Old Testament sacrifices meaningless:

... as sin is not wiped out by the death of the sinner, unless it is forgiven by the grace of God, so devoting to death an animal laden with sin rendered *neither a real nor symbolical* satisfaction or payment for sin, by which the guilt of it could be wiped away; but the death which it endured in the sinner's stead represented merely the *fruit and effect* of sin.<sup>757</sup>

A second view holds that sin was not removed once for all by an animal sacrifice under the law, but simply for a time.—from the interval of one sin-offering to another, or from one day of atonement to another. A third position is that the Mosaic sacrifices, especially the sin and trespass-offerings, made a real atonement for all sins, moral as well as ceremonial, as long as the sacrifices were presented in humble faith and repentance.

---

<sup>756</sup>[Baruch Spinoza], *The Philosophy of Spinoza* (New York; Carlton House, 1927), p. 89.

<sup>757</sup>Keil and Delitzsch, *op. cit.*, p. 305. Italics mine.

In the first view the atoning sacrifice simply reinstated the Israelite to his position as a legal citizen of the covenant community; the second view holds sacrifice to be a temporary relief from divine wrath with no final and complete purging of the conscience. "Else would they not ceased to be offered? because the worshippers, having been once cleansed, would have had no more consciousness of sins."<sup>758</sup> The third position contends that the sacrifices were the divinely appointed means of obtaining a real forgiveness of sins, which would be regarded as valid in the counsels of God, and which reinstated the Israelite, not simply to his position as a citizen of the covenant community, but to his position of fellowship with God. It will not be the purpose of this study to show that the first view is unbiblical, the second view inadequate, but when the second and third views are combined the two form an adequate expression of the nature of substitutionary atonement in the Old Testament Levitical sacrifices.

The basic weakness of the position that the sacrifices had no power beyond restoring an offender to the civil status he had forfeited by some breach of ceremonial or civil law, and that they could never cleanse moral guilt, is that it is unbiblical, since the Old Testament itself makes no distinction between the moral, civil, and ceremonial elements of the Law. The Law of Moses was a unity which knew nothing of the modern subtleties which dissect the one Mosaic law code with its three elements into three separate laws, a moral law, a civil law, and a ceremonial law. To argue for such a distinction is to argue from a strictly human arrangement of the Mosaic code.

The first view is stated by one writer as follows: "These Old Testament sacrifices availed to 'the flesh,' to ceremonial ends... the sacrifice of Christ avails for the 'conscience,' and the removal of guilt in the moral sphere."<sup>759</sup> This artificial distinction between the moral and ceremonial efficacy of Old Testament sacrifice finds support by its advocates in the alleged denunciations of sacrifice in the prophets and psalms. Such a view of the relation of the ceremonial element to the moral element in Levitical sacrifices is not the Old Testament view at all. In the Levitical law there was, to be sure, a great ceremonial system and ritual, but it was ceremony with an inward meaning. The sacri-

---

<sup>758</sup>Hebrews 10:2.

<sup>759</sup>Sanday, *op. cit.*, p. 80.

fice had no efficacy apart from its meaning, but because of the very nature of sacrificial ritual the ceremonial aspect could, and often was, separable from its true inwardness. It is to this that the prophets address their denunciations, the separation of the ritual from its inward meaning, the perfunctory observance of outward forms without a due sense of their meaning and value. The prophets, therefore, cannot be appealed to in order to force an artificial distinction between the nature of Levitical sacrifice and the sacrifice of Christ. It will, therefore, be shown that the difference between the sacrifice of Christ and the Levitical sacrifices is not that His atonement covered moral transgressions, whereas the Old Testament pertained only to those offenses that were ceremonial in nature, since the Levitical sacrifices obtained forgiveness for all sins, ceremonial, civil, and moral. The difference between the Old and New Testament sacrifice lies not in the *kinds of sins* atoned for, but in the *nature and purpose* of the *two kinds of sacrifices*.

When the Law itself is consulted as to the effects of these sacrifices upon ceremonial, civil, or moral transgression, it is *always* stated that the effect is the *removal of uncleanness and the forgiveness of sins*, with the Israelite restored to both covenant and spiritual standing. The conscience of the pious Israelite, oppressed and burdened with sin, accepted with divine assurance the fact that his sins were removed. This is not the same as saying, however, as the writer of Hebrews observes, that the frequent animal sacrifices effected a permanent peace and satisfaction for the conscience "Else would they not ceased to be offered?"<sup>760</sup> Animal sacrifices were never intended to effect such relief, nor could they, since they did not possess that powerful operation as the once for all efficacious sacrifice of Christ. Animal sacrifices, on the other hand, had to be offered again and again for the atonement of sins.

But the reality of forgiveness is vouchsafed by the divine promises contained within the Law itself. All sins of weakness and rashness were completely atoned for by the sin-offerings whether done knowingly, or unwittingly;<sup>761</sup> by the trespass-offering such sins as lying, theft, fraud, perjury, and debauchery were atoned for;<sup>762</sup> and on the Day of

---

<sup>760</sup>Hebrews 10:2.

<sup>761</sup>Leviticus 4-5.

<sup>762</sup>Leviticus 6:1-7.

Atonement forgiveness was obtained for all the transgressions of Israel, whether people or priests.<sup>763</sup>

### *The Nature of the Efficacy of Old Testament Sacrifice*

With respect to the efficacy of the Old Testament sacrifices, Thomas J. Crawford's work, *The Doctrine of Atonement*, is instructive in resolving this question. He writes,

So far as we can learn from the terms of the Mosaic statutes, the sacrifices seem to have been of unfailing benefit in all cases in which they were punctually and exactly offered. Their efficacy, such as it was, belonged to them *ex opere operato* [by outward acts]. The strict observance of the prescribed form was sufficient to secure for any Israelite the acceptance of his sacrifice, to the effect of "making an atonement for his sin that he had committed, so that it should be forgiven him."<sup>764</sup>

Therefore, on the one hand, it seems evident that the Mosaic sacrifices had a certain efficacy ascribed to them in Old Testament Law. It is written again and again in the Book of Leviticus that when the prescribed ritual had been duly performed by the worshipper, the sacrifice offered, and the blood sprinkled, that "... it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him."<sup>765</sup> On the Day of Atonement complete cleansing and removal of sins is clearly taught in the ritual of the two goats, in which one was slain and his blood sprinkled upon the mercy-seat in the Holy of Holies to propitiate judicial wrath by covering the sins; and the other, after the sins of the people were confessed over it, was sent away into the wilderness bearing the iniquities of the people, thus symbolizing sin's complete removal. It is significant that there is not a word in the ceremony that this great sacrifice made an atonement only with respect to ceremonial sins, but on the contrary, it was an atonement for *all* the sins of the people. "And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions, even all their sins."<sup>766</sup> In the individual sin-offering it is promised that "... the priest

---

<sup>763</sup>Cave, *op. cit.*, p. 151.

<sup>764</sup>Crawford, *op. cit.*, p. 249.

<sup>765</sup>Leviticus 1:4.

<sup>766</sup>Leviticus 16:21.

shall make atonement for him as touching his sin that he hath sinned, and he shall be forgiven."<sup>767</sup> From all this it is evident that a real atoning efficacy was in some way related to the Mosaic sacrifices by divine appointment. "Nor is there a word said to indicate that this efficacy depended either on the inward dispositions of the worshippers, or on any prefigurative reference, whether understood or not, which their offerings may have had to the great sacrifice of the cross."<sup>768</sup>

On the other hand, the New Testament teaching, especially the Epistle to the Hebrews, is very emphatic in its declarations that "... the law having a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image of the things, can never with the same sacrifices year by year, which they offer continually, make perfect them that draw nigh."<sup>769</sup> These were sacrifices, he continues, "... which can never take away sins."<sup>770</sup> For they "... cannot, as touching the conscience, make the worshipper perfect,"<sup>771</sup> since the blood of goats and bulls availed only to "... sanctify unto the cleanness of the flesh,"<sup>772</sup> but "how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal spirit offered himself without blemish unto God, cleanse your conscience from dead works...,"<sup>773</sup> "For it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins."<sup>774</sup>

Here would appear to be two apparently opposite views of the efficacy of the Levitical sacrifices. But the reconciliation of the difficulty lies, not in a denial of either the Old or New Testament teachings, but in a harmonization of both. This is accomplished through a study of the two different aspects under which sacrifice is regarded in the Mosaic economy and by the Hebrews' Epistle respectively. Or, stated differently, the difficulty may be resolved by noting the two-fold purpose of Levitical sacrifices in their relation to the covenant nation of Israel.

First of all, in the Book of Leviticus, sin, of whatever description, whether consisting in a breach of ceremonial observances, or in a vio-

---

<sup>767</sup>Leviticus 4:35.

<sup>768</sup>Crawford, *loc. cit.*

<sup>769</sup>Hebrews 10:1.

<sup>770</sup>Hebrews 10:11.

<sup>771</sup>Hebrews 9:9.

<sup>772</sup>Hebrews 9:13.

<sup>773</sup>Hebrews 9:14.

<sup>774</sup>Hebrews 10:5.

lation of moral precepts, is viewed primarily as affecting the position and privileges of the offending party as a member of the commonwealth of Israel. That is not to say that it is not committed against God, since it is always required that the sin be confessed and the judicial anger of the holy God be propitiated;<sup>775</sup> but He is propitiated and sins are remitted on the basis of the blood covenant made at Sinai. That covenant was to subsist on offerings and sacrifices of atonement which were the ground of the Mosaic system of worship and life within the covenant community. Remission of sins by the Levitical system of sacrifice within the covenant community was then, first of all, *for the purpose of abolishing the breach of the covenant relationship and restoring to the sinner his forfeited privileges as a member of the covenant community of Israel.*

The significance of this is that sins in the Old Testament, in a sense not true of the believer of whom the Hebrews' Epistle is concerned, affected the Israelite's temporal privileges and standing within the covenant community. This is not to say that sin had no spiritual or moral significance and consequences, for the message of the prophets would disprove any such view. "For I desire goodness, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt-offerings."<sup>776</sup> But it does mean that the Israelite's life was orientated to the covenant community; and sin, whether ceremonial or moral, always resulted in his being cut-off from the commonwealth of Israel, since by his transgression he had violated the covenant, and forfeited his privileges and standing within the covenant community. The Old Testament habitually speaks of sin as exemption of the offender from the covenant community. In Exodus 12:4 the eating of leavened bread in the passover meal will result in the transgressor being *cut off from Israel.* " ... for whosoever eateth leavened bread from the first day until the seventh day, that soul shall be cut off from Israel." In Exodus 31:14, whoever fails to honor the Sabbath shall be *cut off from among his people.* "Ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore; for it is holy unto you: every one that profaneth it shall surely be put to death; for whosoever doeth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people." According to Leviticus 7:21, any Israelite who ate of the peace-offering when un-

---

<sup>775</sup>Note Leviticus 5:19 ". . . he is certainly guilty before Jehovah."

<sup>776</sup>Hosea 6:6; Cf. Isaiah 1; Jeremiah 22:3-9; Amos 5, etc.

clean was *cut off from his people*. Even before the Mosaic covenant was promulgated at Sinai, this concept of sin affecting one's relationship to the chosen people was manifest. When God gave unto Abraham the covenant of circumcision in Genesis 17, He warned that the failure of the Hebrew male to submit to circumcision would result in his being *cut off from his people*. "And the uncircumcised male who is not circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant."<sup>777</sup> Further evidence of this concept is seen in the fact that wilful sin with a high hand not only resulted in that soul being cut off from his people, but capital punishment was to be administered, not by an executioner, but at the hands of the *whole congregation* of Israel. His offense was, to be sure, against God; but it was at the same time sin within the covenant community, and resulted in his being excised from the community of Israel and punished at their hands. "But the soul that doeth aught with a high hand,... the same blasphemeth Jehovah; and that soul shall be cut off from among his people." "... The man shall surely be put to death: all the congregation shall stone him with stones..."<sup>778</sup>

The account of the sin of Achan lends support to this. Israel, under the leadership of Joshua, had witnessed the fall of Jericho, and had moved on to Ai where they were signally defeated. The reason, they discovered, was through the trespass of Achan, one of the Israelite soldiers, who had violated God's prohibition against taking of the spoil at Jericho. This, under Israelite Law, was sin with a high hand, and was, therefore, subject to capital punishment at the hands of the congregation. Since there were no legal provisions in the Levitical sacrificial system for a sacrifice to atone for sins with a high hand, then gross, wilful sins were dealt with by capital punishment. This did not, however, always necessarily imply that the offender was spiritually and eternally lost and cut off from the presence of God, since, as in the case of Achan, he could repent, confess his sin, and be forgiven. But one thing it did mean was that gross, wilful sin always resulted in the Israelite's temporal judgment—he was cut off from the visible covenant community.

---

<sup>777</sup>Genesis 17:14.

<sup>778</sup>Numbers 15:30,35.

This view of sin respecting the covenant community, which affected the Israelite's outward standing and temporal privileges, is seen to be a primary Old Testament concept; and the Levitical system of sacrifice was instituted to maintain the covenant relationship between God and the offending member of the covenant community. The strict observance of the prescribed form secured for the Israelite his forfeited privileges and covenant standing by making atonement for his sins and securing forgiveness.

This does not mean, however, that the Old Testament worshipper simply went through meaningless ritual, which had no efficacy attached, for there is another aspect to the Old Testament idea of sacrifice. It is expressly stated in Leviticus that the effect of his sacrifice was pardon from sin, for "... the priest shall make atonement for him as touching his sin that he hath sinned, and he shall be, forgiven."<sup>779</sup> The meaning of the language is plain, and it is evident that the Mosaic sacrifices had some manner of efficacy attached to them. Therefore, *from the worshipper's standpoint* the Levitical sacrifices were, in a sense, efficacious in a two-fold way: (1) they healed the breach of covenant relationship which resulted from either ceremonial or moral transgression, and kept secure their civil and ecclesiastical privileges; and (2) they procured also, when offered with unfeigned penitence and humble faith, actual forgiveness for the sinner in that it is clearly stated the sacrifice "... shall make *atonement* for him as *touching his sin* that he hath sinned, and *he shall be forgiven*."

It is dishonoring, it seems, to God's word and promise, which is repeated over and over, to contend that the sins under the first covenant were only symbolically, but never really, forgiven. This is to fail to comprehend the meaning and purpose of Old Testament sacrifice and to reduce it to vague and meaningless ritual. To be sure, the Levitical sacrifices were but shadows of the true, and most assuredly the *blood* of *bulls* and goats can never take away *sins*, but this is looking at the matter both from the New Testament's and from God's viewpoint. That is to say, it is one thing to view the matter from the Old Testament worshipper's viewpoint, who actually participated in the objective ritual of the animal sacrifice, and to whom there was not a word spoken as to these sacrifices being simply objective symbols of inward spiritual

---

<sup>779</sup>Leviticus 4:35.

truths, for on the contrary, it is expressly stated "he shall be forgiven." It is another matter, however, to look at the question from this side of the cross, in the light of full revelation, and too, to view it from the standpoint of God's intended purposes with regard to sacrifices. It should be noted, however, that this does not mean that a certain understanding of the meaning of the forms was absent, since the ritual ceremonies were educational in value—a process of working from outward form to inner meaning, which resulted in a consciousness of inward communion with God.

The covenant relationship between God and Israel was expressed in ritual worship. Since the aim of the covenant was the process of sanctification expressed by the words in Leviticus 19:2: "... ye shall be holy: for I the Lord your God am holy," the Mosaic ritual was intended as a conscious symbol of this truth.<sup>780</sup> However, the ritual was not simply a system of outward signs of internal truths; but from the standpoint of the worshipper and of the Levitical law, it was the *necessary vehicle* for the actual realization of forgiveness, and for communion and fellowship between God and Israel within the Covenant. This means that a sacrifice did not symbolize forgiveness of sins and propitiation of God apart from the actual realization of these effects. Sacrifice, in the Old Testament, was not *merely* a symbol or type, for this is to rob it of all immediate meaning and purpose; but it expressed the transference of legal guilt to the substitute and the imposition of the capital punishment due the sinner, carried out in the act of sacrifice itself. Thus, from the worshipper's standpoint, and on the basis of God's own promises in Leviticus, the Mosaic sacrifices were efficacious in this two-fold sense; they maintained a covenant relationship between God and Israel, and when offered in humble faith and penitence, they secured for the worshipper a valid atonement and the forgiveness of all sins, moral or ceremonial.<sup>781</sup> It is, however, quite a different matter to

---

<sup>780</sup>Ecclesiasticus 8:31, in the Apocrypha, confirms the purpose of sacrifice as sanctification: "Fear the Lord, and honour the priest; and give him his portion, as it is commanded thee; the firstfruits, the trespass-offering, and the gift of the shoulders, and the sacrifice of sanctification. . . ." *The Apocrypha* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode Ltd., [n.d.]), p. 141.

<sup>781</sup>In considering the exact purport and efficacy of the Mosaic sacrifices, there must be made a distinction between their theocratical and their spiritual offices. Strong writes, "They were, on the one hand, the appointed means whereby the offender could be restored to the outward place and privileges, as [a] member of the theocra-

view the Levitical sacrifices in the light of New Testament revelation and from the standpoint of God's ultimate purposes. It must be carefully observed, therefore, that whatever *efficacy* was ascribed to the Levitical sacrifices, it was not *inherent* within the animal itself, and did not, strictly speaking, belong to the sacrifices themselves, which were symbols, from God's viewpoint, of the Lamb of God.

Levitical sacrifices were the divinely appointed means of objectively signifying to Israel that man was sinful and that sin was a serious matter which required the forfeiting of one's life and the shedding of blood. Therefore, the Israelites offered animal sacrifices in token of contrition and as a *medium* of pardon; "not merely a confession of dependence and trust; but also a confession of sins, and of faith that in connexion with the substitution of an animal-victim those sins might be forgiven."<sup>782</sup> The worshipper might not fully understand how pardon and sacrifice were connected, yet by relying on the divinely appointed medium, he was actually delivered from the fear which guilt produced, with respect to that particular transgression. The worshipper who confessed his sin over the head of the victim, the blood of which was then applied to the altar, was in a real sense professing the *assurance* of pardon. If sacrifices only signified living surrender or devotion there was an incongruity between the sign and the thing signified. The blood signified the life, and therefore the shedding of blood could not express living service. Rather the blood represented life *ended*; and if sacrifice indicated that the offerer deserved to suffer for his sins, then the death of the animal as his substitute signified what was apparent in the suffering and death of the victim. The sacrifice was therefore needed as a visible medium of the assurance of divine pardon.<sup>783</sup> The divinely appointed efficacy of Old Testament sacrifice is summarized in the following quotation from Campbell's *Israel and the New Covenant*:

---

cy, which he had forfeited by neglect or transgression; and they accomplished this purpose irrespectively of the temper or spirit with which they were offered. On the other hand, they were symbolic of the vicarious sufferings and death of Christ, and obtained forgiveness and acceptance with God only as they were offered in true penitence, and with faith in God's method of salvation." Strong, *op. cit.*, p. 724.

<sup>782</sup>Newman Hall, *Atonement* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., Ln.d.), pp. 21-22.

<sup>783</sup>*Ibid.*

The observance of the ritual of the Old Testament was designed to be a divinely appointed ordinance for the forgiveness of the daily sins of the sincere believing worshipper. But it was not efficacious because of any intrinsic merit in the offerer or in the offering, but simply because the offering or the worship was performed in obedience to the commandment of God, because it was accompanied with sincere repentance and humble confidence in the promise and mercy of God, and because it was performed in sincere conformity to the terms of the covenant.<sup>784</sup>

The direct and immediate efficacy of the sin-offering, on the basis of God's promises, was the securing of forgiveness of sin for the penitent Israelite, and for the entire covenant community on the great Day of Atonement. Atonement was secured, as has been shown, as a result of, and never apart from, the actual ritual sacrifice and death of the animal. Thus the sacrifice itself was the necessary vehicle for securing forgiveness of sins. But it has also been stated that the efficacy did not lie inherently in the animal itself, nor in the Israelite's understanding that the sacrifice he was making was only a shadow and type of the Messiah's sacrifice. How then could God promise the truly penitent worshipper *actual* forgiveness if the prescribed ritual was properly observed? The solution lies in God's eternal purposes in the Old Testament sacrifices and religious institutions. While they truly atoned for the sins of the worshipper, yet the Old Testament sacrifices, in fact every single atonement of sin, were validated in the mind of God on the basis of the all-sufficient, truly efficacious sacrifice of the Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world. It is categorically true that the blood of bulls and goats could never take away sin; but then the Old Testament *never says that it did*. What God promised to Israel was the *forgiveness of sins* and *restoration to covenant standing* to be accomplished through the death and shedding of the blood of an innocent substitute victim. It was the forfeiting of a life for a life, which was declared in the sprinkling of the blood, "For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the

---

<sup>784</sup>Roderick Campbell, *Israel and the New Covenant* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1954), p. 291.

life."<sup>785</sup> Many expositors attempt to prove too much about the typical and symbolic nature of Old Testament religious institutions on the basis of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The writer of the Epistle, under the inspiration of full and complete revelation,<sup>786</sup> reveals the shadowy and typical nature of the Levitical sacrifices and rightly declares that the blood of bulls and goats could never *take away* sin. Such was never God's intention, nor His declaration.

However, on the basis of the grace shown to Israel in her divine election and the institution of the Covenant, God provided, by His mercy, a means for the sinner to draw near to Him continually. This was the Levitical system of sacrifices. He did not command Moses to tell the children of Israel that a lamb without blemish could *in itself* expiate sins, but He did promise to accept the life of an animal, ceremonially pure, in substitution for the life of the actual transgressor, and in view of this act, would *forgive* his iniquities.

The meaning and usage of the Hebrew term for atonement is significant here. Literally כִּפֶּר means "to cover over" or "to propitiate." Thus the priest, with the blood of the innocent substitute victim, made a "covering" for sin and propitiated the judicial anger of God. Underlying all these sacrifices is the conception that the sins are covered by that which was acceptable to God. It must not be forgotten that it was *God Himself* who instituted sacrifices, specified the procedure, and promised forgiveness. Nor is this all, for it is expressly stated that the sin-offering actually cleansed the offerer of his sins. With respect to the sin-offering on the Day of Atonement God said:

... on this day shall atonement be made for you, to cleanse you; from all your sins shall ye be clean before Jehovah.<sup>787</sup>

---

<sup>785</sup>There exists some disagreement as to the proper translation of Leviticus 17:11. Instead of ". . . for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life [nephesh]," some would take the preposition ב in , as "the blood atones as the בְּנֶפֶשׁ soul," i.e. in place of the soul, or in the character of the soul. Hengstenberg makes the preposition refer to the object and renders it "the blood expiates the soul." But these interpretations overlook the distinct words of the passage itself which states that ". . . the life [nephesh] of the flesh is in the blood. . . ." Fairbairn, *op. cit.*, p. 461.

<sup>786</sup>Hebrews 1:1-2.

<sup>787</sup>Leviticus 16:30.

This is likewise said of the purification and cleansing of the Levites:

And the Levites purified themselves from sin, and they washed their clothes;... and Aaron made atonement for them to cleanse them.<sup>788</sup>

On the annual Day of Atonement the blood of the first goat was sprinkled upon the Ark and the altar to propitiate God and provide a covering for the sins of Israel. The second had confessed over it the sins of the people and was then driven out into the wilderness, thus signifying sin's removal. In view of all this it is evident that we are not concerned here with meaningless ritual having respect merely to ceremonial defilement. On the basis of God's own promises and sacrificial provisions an atonement was actually effected and sins were forgiven. But it must be carefully observed that this is not to say that the sins were *expiated by the blood of the animal sacrifices*, "For it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins."<sup>789</sup> Old Testament sacrifices were efficacious with respect to God's forgiving grace, not with respect to expiation, since the actual efficacy of the atonement did not belong inherently to the animal. Forgiveness was promised and guaranteed on the basis of God's future purposes in Christ—the Lamb of God,

Whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, in his blood, to show his righteousness because of the passing over of sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God.<sup>790</sup>

"This verse," notes Haldane, "beautifully indicates the ground on which Old Testament saints were admitted into heaven before the death of Christ."<sup>791</sup> Through the all sufficient sacrifice of Christ for sins, God's righteousness was at last vindicated. The Apostle in Romans 3:25 and Hebrews 10:4 confirms the fact that while the Old Testament sacrifices provided *forgiveness* for the pious Israelite, yet those sins

---

<sup>788</sup>Numbers 8:21.

<sup>789</sup>Hebrews 10:4.

<sup>790</sup>Romans 3:25.

<sup>791</sup>Robert Haldane, *Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans* ([Evansville, Ind.: Sovereign Grace Publishers,] 1955), p. 152.

could never be *purged away* by the blood of bulls and goats, hence they were "passed over" by the forbearing grace of God until expiated by the sacrifice of Christ.

*On account of the eternal purpose of God to punish sin and provide an atonement in His Son, God pardoned or remitted the sins of His people under the Old Testament Mosaic dispensation, but they were not actually purged away until covered by the blood of Christ.* Owing to the forbearance of His grace He accepted the animal substitutes to make a covering for sin and propitiate His judicial wrath against sin, until in the fulness of time He through His own Lamb would *validate* all forgiveness obtained through atonement by animal types. This means that Christ's atonement was made and accepted in God's sovereign counsels and foreknowledge before the foundation of the world (I Peter 1:20; Revelation. 13:8), so that the humble and repentant worshipper with his sacrifices of the Old Testament was accepted on the ground of it.

### *The Relationship between the Typical Nature of Old Testament Sacrifice and the Vicarious Sacrifice of Christ*

Having established, it is believed, the validity of the efficacious and substitutionary nature of Old Testament sacrifice, it remains to be shown that the Mosaic sacrifices were, in this sense, typical of the sacrifice of Christ Himself, which has been the fundamental purpose of this dissertation. Since the substitutionary nature of Christ's death is denied by the higher critics, then it was necessary, first, of all, to establish the substitutionary nature of Old Testament Levitical sacrifices, and secondly, to indicate the real and vital relationship that exists between the Old Testament type and the vicarious atonement of Christ, the Anti-type. This means, in effect, that the principles of vicarious suffering and death seen in the Levitical animal sacrifices are *identical* with those met with in the substitutionary death of Christ. The relationship between the typical nature of Old Testament sacrifice and the vicarious sacrifice of Christ is to be discerned in (1) direct statements of Scripture and (2) the Biblical words and phrases employed.

#### Direct Statements of Scripture

In order to determine what it was in the death of Christ that constituted it a substitutionary atonement, it is necessary to ascertain

what it was in the Jewish sacrifices which was considered as making atonement. It is evident that the ritual of the priests did not make atonement. They were simply the divinely appointed instruments by which the atoning sacrifices were offered, and this is all that is implied when they are spoken of in Leviticus as making atonement. Again, God required the animals that were offered to be free from blemishes. But the atonement did not consist in ceremonial purity. This was a prerequisite that pointed to the purity of the Antitype. The atonement, however, consisted in the sacrifice itself, or according to Leviticus 17:11, the blood or life of the substituted victim. "The blood is not a symbol of the life, it is this life, or contains it. The offering of the blood to God is the actual offering up of the life in death. Thus God assures the Israelite that the element of Jewish sacrifices whereby they were considered atoning and efficacious with respect to forgiveness, was in the blood or life of the beast offered upon the altar. This clearly leads to the conclusion that the atonement of Christ consisted in His offering up His life in death, or shedding His blood; otherwise the Levitical sacrifices were not proper representations of this final propitiatory sacrifice. For how could these sacrifices be types, and Christ's sacrifice the antitype, if the atonement of the Old Testament sacrifices consisted in the shedding of blood and taking of the life, but the atonement of Christ consisted in something different?<sup>792</sup>

Some New Testament scholars seem as much perplexed in seeking to discover the principle of atonement in the New Testament as many scholars and expositors are in the Old. There is one passage in particular in the New Testament which is generally misinterpreted in its relation to the meaning of Old Testament sacrifice. The passage is Hebrews 10:1-10, a portion of which is quoted:

For it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins. Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, But a body didst thou prepare for me. In whole burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hadst no pleasure: Then said I, Lo, I am come ... to do thy Will, O God.

---

<sup>792</sup> *The Atonement*. Discourses and Treatises by Edwards, Smalley, Maxcy, Emmons, Griffin, Burge, and Weeks (Boston: Congregational Board of Publication, 1859), p. 479.

The general interpretation of this passage is that Christ substitutes for the mere material sacrifices of the Old Testament, an ethical obedience to the will of God. But this ignores the fundamental meaning of the author and fails to consider the close relation between Old Testament sacrifice and its Antitype in the death of Christ. The Apostle is not here making a contrast between the Old and New Covenants (which he clearly has already done in chapter 9), but "the author's argument is that Christ having done what was declared in Scripture to be God's final will in regard to sacrifice, His sacrifice is final."<sup>793</sup> Hence, he goes on to say that Christ ". . .had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, ..."794 It is not simply obedience to the will of God which the Apostle refers to, but specifically His obedience which caused Him to offer His body as a substitutionary sacrifice. What are contrasted are not two disparate things, namely, the material Levitical sacrifices and Christ's so-called moral sacrifice or obedience, but two things of the same class, the Old Testament sacrifices which were typical and the glorious Antitype—the vicarious sacrifice of Christ—once for all. "It is not a new principle, but a more conclusive application of the old principle."<sup>795</sup>

The typical nature of Old Testament sacrifice is testified to by the Lord Himself; in fact, He declared that the entire Old Testament in all its divisions, not only the Law but the Prophets and Psalms as well, spoke of Him and His sacrificial work and ministry.

And he said unto them, O foolish men, and slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken! Behooved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and enter into his glory? And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself.<sup>796</sup>

And he said unto them, These are my words which I spake unto you, While I was yet with you, that all things must needs be ful-

---

<sup>793</sup> Davidson, *op. cit.*, p. 356

<sup>794</sup> Hebrews 10:12

<sup>795</sup> Davidson, *op.cit.*. 357

<sup>796</sup> Luke 24:25-27

filled, which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms concerning me.<sup>797</sup>

This comprehensive statement by Christ indicates that one should be able to discern in every division of the Old Testament testimony to the sacrificial and vicarious work of Christ. That this is a valid assumption can easily be verified by a few citations. John, who witnessed the crucifixion, testified that the body of the Lord was not subjected to mutilation “ ... that the scripture might be fulfilled, a bone of him shall not be broken.”<sup>798</sup> The significance of John's statement is that it bears irrefutable testimony to the identification of Christ's vicarious atonement with the typical Old Testament sacrificial system. The place in the Old Testament where the statement is made that “a bone of him shall not be broken” is in Exodus 12:46 and Numbers 9:12, and the reference here is to the Passover lamb. Since the paschal lamb was quite clearly a vicarious sacrifice, then the Apostle John's identification of the sufferings and death of Christ, which he beheld, with the death of the Old Testament passover lamb, is clearly an announcement of both the typical nature of the paschal lamb and the vicarious nature of Christ's sufferings and death on the cross. To this the Apostle Paul adds confirmation when he writes, "For our passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ."<sup>799</sup> Besides this clear citation from the Law of the sacrificial nature of Christ's death, the Apostle Peter confirms the substitutionary nature of His work with a reference from the Prophets.

For hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example, that ye should follow his steps: who did no sin, neither was guile round in his mouth: who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously: who his own self bare our sins in his body upon the tree, that we, having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness; by whose stripes ye were healed.<sup>800</sup>

---

<sup>797</sup> Luke 24:44

<sup>798</sup> John 19:36

<sup>799</sup> I Corinthians 5:7

<sup>800</sup> I Peter 2:21 -24

Peter's reference in the last clause is to Isaiah 53:5, where the prophet prophesies of the vicarious sufferings of the Messiah on behalf of His people. In fact the entire reference alludes to Isaiah 53:4-9 which Peter cites in I Peter 2:21-25. That it is a sacrifice to which Isaiah refers is manifest from the Prophet's language in Isaiah 53:7, "... as a lamb that is led to the slaughter, and as a sheep that before his shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth." And that it is to be seen as a vicarious and substitutionary sacrifice is evident in both Isaiah's prophecy and Peter's citation of the prophecy, "... Christ also suffered for you. . . , "who his own self bare our sins in his body upon the tree. . ." "by whose stripes ye are healed."

References to His sacrificial death in the Psalms are numerous and possibly two of the most familiar are to be found in Psalm 16:10 and Psalm 22 which speak of the Messiah's sufferings and death and are cited in the Gospels and Acts with reference to Christ's death on the cross and subsequent resurrection from Sheol-Hades.<sup>801</sup> The previously mentioned quotation by the Apostle John that "a bone of him shall not be broken," is also alluded to in Psalm 34:20. "He keepeth all his bones: Not one of them is broken." This reference is without doubt Messianic and alludes to Exodus 12:46 and Numbers 9:12 and their directions concerning the paschal lamb. In addition, the implication in the prophetic cry of the Psalmist, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" when repeated by the sinless Son of God on the cross, is that God had turned away from Him who knew no sin, because He had now become sin for His people. The indirect allusion to substitution cannot be gainsaid.<sup>802</sup>

Briefly, then, it is seen that the three major divisions of the Old Testament—the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms—relate the typical nature of the Mosaic sacrificial system inseparably to the substitutionary death of Christ. The sacrificial terminology is repeatedly used with reference to the sacrificial work of Christ. Peter writes, "...ye were redeemed, not with corruptible things...but with precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, even the blood of Christ."<sup>803</sup>

---

<sup>801</sup> Matthew 27; John 19; Acts 2.

<sup>802</sup>Alva J. McClain, "The Doctrine of Christ" (mimeographed notes, Christian Theology, Grace Theological Seminary, Winona Lake, Indiana, 1960, p. 39.

<sup>803</sup> I Peter 1:18-19

The Apostle Paul in Hebrews states that, "For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified."<sup>804</sup> And again, "nor yet through the blood of goats and calves, but through his own blood, entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption."<sup>805</sup> The Epistle to the Hebrews is filled with sacrificial language and is written for the express purpose of witnessing to the typical nature of Old Testament sacrifice and the finality of Christ's voluntary and substitutionary sacrifice.

The New Testament everywhere depicts an analogy between the Mosaic sacrifices and the substitutionary sacrifice of Christ. The former, especially in the Book of Hebrews, are said to be patterns, types, and shadows of the latter. The New Testament holds that Christ, on analogy with Mosaic sacrifices, was "made sin" (Hebrew offering); a burnt-offering; a ransom; a propitiation; a reconciliation; and that the Mosaic sacrifices are fulfilled in His work is clearly indicated in such passages as follows:

1. *Texts which depict Christ as:*

a. Dying for sinners:

Matthew 20:28; Mark 10:45; Luke 22:19,20; John 6:51; John 10:11,15,18; John 15:12,13; Romans 5:6-8; 8:32; II Corinthians 5:14,15,21; Galatians 2:20; 3:13; Ephesians 5:2,25; I Thessalonians 5:9,10; I Timothy 2:5,6; Titus 2:14; Hebrews 2:9; I Peter 3:18; I John 3:16.

b. Dying for sins:

Romans 4:25; 8:3; I Corinthians 15:3; Galatians 1:4; Hebrews 10:12; I Peter 3:18; Isaiah 53:5,8; I Corinthians 15:17.

c. Bearing our sins:

Hebrews 9:28; I Peter 2:24; Isaiah 53:6,11,12.

d. Made sin and made a curse for us:

II Corinthians 5:21; Galatians 3:13; Romans 8:3; Hebrews 13:11-13.

---

<sup>804</sup> Hebrews 10:14

<sup>805</sup> Hebrews 9:12

## 2. *Texts which ascribe to Christ:*

### a. The remission of sins:

John 1:29; I Peter 1:19; Revelation 5:9; Hebrews 9:26; Matthew 26:28; I John 1:7,9; 2:1,2; Luke 24:46, 47; Acts 10:43; 13:38,39; Ephesians 1:6,7; Colossians 1:13,14; Revelation 1:5,6.

### b. The deliverance of the believer from the penal consequences of sin:

John 3:14-17; Romans 8:1-4; Galatians 3:13; I Thessalonians 1:10; 5:9,10; Romans 5:8-9.

## 3. *Texts which ascribe to the death of Christ:*

### a. Justification from sin:

Isaiah 53:11; Romans 5:8,9; Romans 3:24-26; II Corinthians 5:21; Romans 5:18; 8:33,34; John 5:24; Titus 3:7; Romans 5:1,2.

### b. Redemption from sin:

Matthew 20:28; Acts 20:28; Romans 3:23-24; I Corinthians 6:19; Galatians 3:13; 4:4,5; Ephesians 1:7; Colossians 1:14; I Timothy 2:5,6; Titus 2:14; Hebrews 9:12; I Peter 1:18,19; Revelation 5:9.

### c. Reconciliation unto God:

Romans 5:10,11; Romans 11:15; II Corinthians 5:18,19; Ephesians 2:16; Colossians 1:21,22.

### d. Propitiation for sin:

I John 2:2; I John 4:10; Hebrews 2:17; Romans 3:25.

### e. Sacrificial character:

Isaiah 53:7; I Corinthians 5:7; Ephesians 5:2; I Peter 1:18-21; Revelation 5:9-10; 7:14-15; Hebrews 7:26-27; 9:12-14; 9:22-28; 10:11-14; John 1:29; Matthew 24:28.

## 4. *Texts which speak of Christ as a:*

### a. Priest:

Psalm 110:4; Hebrews 2:17; 3:1; 5:6,10; 4:14; 7:26; 10:21.

b. Representative:

Hebrews 7:22; Romans 5:12,18-19; I Corinthians 15:20-22; 45-49; John 10:11-18; John 17:19; Galatians 2:20; Colossians 2:20.

5. *Texts which speak of the mediation of Christ as:*

a. Delivering believers from the dominion of Satan:

I John 3:8; John 12:31,32; II Corinthians 4:4; Ephesians 2:2; 6:12; Hebrews 2:14-15; I Corinthians 15:55-57; Romans 8:38-39; Genesis 3:15.

b. Obtaining for the believer eternal life:

John 3:16; 5:24; 6:40,47,51; 10:27-28; 14:2-3; 17:1-2; Romans 5:20,21; 6:23; II Timothy 2:10; Hebrews 5:9; 9:15; I Peter 5:10; I John 5:11; Jude 21.

The death of Christ has not less, but more about it to justify the use of sacrificial terminology than the Jewish ordinances themselves. Thus the sacrificial phraseology applied in the New Testament to the death of Christ is not used because of its similarity to the Jewish sacrifices in points of a merely superficial character, but because of the resemblance which it bears to them at fundamental and essential points. Hence, these passages unequivocally testify in direct terms to the unmistakable relationship between the Levitical sacrifices, the type, and the substitutionary sacrifice of Christ, the Antitype.

### Biblical Terminology

The correct understanding of the meaning and nature of substitutionary sacrifice is not to be determined by philosophical speculation, nor by a study of the nature of sacrifice in the non-Semitic religions, but is to be sought in the Old Testament itself. It is in terms of the Old Testament Levitical system that the New Testament speaks; and it is in light of Old Testament conceptions, institutions, and usages that the New Testament conceptions and usages are to be interpreted.

The sacrificial language of the Mosaic ritual is frequently applied with reference to Christ. The Scriptures unfold the substitutionary meaning and significance of Christ's death under various Levitical terms. Christ's vicarious death on analogy with Old Testament usage is designated as: (1) a Redemption; (2) a Ransom; (3) a Reconciliation;

(4) a Sacrifice; namely, the burnt-offering, the peace-offering, the sin-offering, the trespass-offering, and the Passover; and (5) His death is designated a Propitiation. Each of these Levitical sacrificial designations will now be examined as to their Old Testament typical and New Testament antitypical significance with respect to the idea of substitution. Christ's vicarious death is designated as:

*A Redemption.* "In whom we have our redemption through his blood."<sup>806</sup> This concept has as its background the Old Testament Levitical laws, as contained in such passages as Exodus 13; Leviticus 25,27; Numbers 19, etc. The root meaning of the Hebrew לַאֲדָ is to redeem, or act as a kinsman. "Redemption is often described as involving the process of 'buying' even as the English word 'redeem' suggests."<sup>807</sup> The underlying thought of the Hebrew term is the obligation that rests upon a kinsman to buy back the freedom of an Israelite who had sold himself into slavery or servitude<sup>808</sup>. Hence, to perform such an act was to redeem the man as Leviticus 25:48f. shows. The same idea is expressed in the story of Ruth and her kinsman Boaz who fulfilled the part of her redeemer (בֹּאֵז).<sup>809</sup> The same verb is used in connection with another, but parallel, idea. According to Hebrew justice, if a person was murdered his shed blood must be avenged by a kinsman. The kinsman was described as a בֹּאֵל הַדָּם, an avenger (redeemer) of blood.<sup>810</sup>

The implications of Old Testament theology are the framework for the New Testament concept of Christ as Redeemer. The implication is that an obligation for help and assistance rests upon blood kinship. God is described as the בֹּאֵל of Israel, the kinsman-vindicator and redeemer of His people. Isaiah 43:1: "... Fear not, for I have redeemed thee; I have called thee by thy name, thou art mine." There is not, in

---

<sup>806</sup> Ephesians 1:17

<sup>807</sup> Eugene A. Nida, *God's s Word in Man's Language* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1952), p. 139.

<sup>808</sup> According to S. R. Driver, לַאֲדָ is to assert (by purchase) a right (Lev. 25:29ff.; 27:13,15); hence figuratively to *reclaim, rescue*, especially from servitude, oppression, etc. (Ex. 15:13; Ps. 72:14; Isa. 41:14; 43:1; 44 :23) • And so the בֹּאֵל הַדָּם is the vindicator of the rights destroyed by bloodshed—he is the avenger of blood. S. R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950), p. 418.

<sup>809</sup> Ruth 4:1-6

<sup>810</sup> Deuteronomy 19:6f

the Old Testament, the idea that He is one with them in blood; but it is a societary word.<sup>811</sup> God was in covenant with Israel, and thereby like a בָּאֵל to Israel, and thus He would do the part of a kinsman and redeem His own people. The Jewish sacrificial system was regarded as having redeeming significance since it provided by means of substitutionary atonement the means for setting men free from the guilt and penalty of sin. God's favor, as it were, was "bought back" through atonement for guilt and propitiation of judicial disfavor. The sacrificial language is appropriately applied to Christ "in whom we have our redemption through his blood." God Himself, as Redeemer, effects the redemption and sets men free from sin and its effects. Hence, the believer, as the direct result of the substitutionary death of Christ, is said to be redeemed: from the curse of the Law (Galatians. 3:13); redeemed from all iniquity (Titus 2:4); redeemed unto God (Revelation 5:9); and a partaker of an eternal redemption (Hebrews. 9:12).

*A Ransom.* "For even the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many."<sup>812</sup> The Old Testament basis for the term is grounded in the Hebrew word פְּדָה, to ransom, the fundamental idea being the payment of an equivalent for what is released or secured, or the price paid in compensation for a life forfeited. Thus the Levitical law stipulates a compensation for the owner who knowingly permits a dangerous ox to remain at large and becomes criminally liable for its goring a human being. "If there be laid on him a ransom, [כֶּפֶר] then he shall give for the redemption of his life whatsoever is laid upon him."<sup>813</sup> According to the Law<sup>814</sup> the first-born of both man and beast belonged to God. They were to be redeemed (פְּרִיה), or ransomed from Him. The concept of a ransom is closely associated with the idea of redemption. The ransom is the purchase price paid to redeem; the redemption is the re-

---

<sup>811</sup>But is it seeing too much in the concept of בָּאֵל to predicate a literal relation of blood kinship existing between Jesus and His brethren as a result of the Incarnation? "Since then the children are sharers in flesh and blood, he also himself in like manner partook of the same ...," "wherefore it behooved him in all things to be made like unto his brethren ... " Hebrews. 2:14,17.

<sup>812</sup>Mark 10:45

<sup>813</sup>Exodus 21:30

<sup>814</sup>Exodus 13:12, 13; 21:30; 34:20; Numbers 18:15ff; 35:31-32

lease obtained by the payment of a ransom. Hence, the Hebrew גְּאֻלָּה, redemption, is the result and in consequence of the כִּפּוּר or פְּדוּת.

In this concept in the New Testament the idea of substitution is clearly evident, since it is God in Christ who redeems men and sets them free by something He does on their behalf. This redemption is no mere announcement of the fact, but it is an accomplishment of God Himself. It is a costly act on His part whereby He redeems men; it is the payment of a ransom, the life of His Son. Christian redemption is a redemption whereby God determines the price to be paid and then pays it Himself; Christ's blood was a ransom paid by God Himself to reconcile the attributes of love and justice within His own nature.<sup>815</sup> The means of release from bondage is described as a ransom as seen in Matthew 20:28 and I Timothy 2:6. The ransom is required by the Law in that Christ's people must be redeemed from its curse. The price to be paid cannot be met by those who have violated its commands, and thus it must be provided by a substitute who is qualified to make the purchase.

The Scriptures set forth the effect of the atoning work of Christ, as it relates to the sinner himself, as a redemption and as it bears upon the curse of the Law, and as a deliverance from its curse, by the payment of a ransom. The words used to express this are: ἀγοράζειν, *to buy*, "ye are bought with a price...",<sup>816</sup> ἐξηγόρασεν *to redeem*, "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law...",<sup>817</sup> λύτρον, *to ransom* (I Peter 1:18); and Christ is called a λύτρον *ransom* (Matthew 20:28); and the ἀντίλυτρον, *substituted ransom* (I Timothy 2:6). The Septuagint very frequently translates the Hebrew גָּאֹל to redeem and פָּדָה to ransom with the Greek λύτρον.<sup>818</sup>

The so-called "commercial" language that represents Christ's saving work as a redemption, and as a deliverance from the curse of the law by the payment of an equivalent ransom price, is not the invention of orthodox theologians as some contend, but is rather the very frequent language of the Holy Spirit, deliberately chosen to set forth the nature of the substitutionary atonement. John Armour writes:

---

<sup>815</sup>Fausset, *op. cit.* p. 61.

<sup>816</sup>I Corinthians 7:23

<sup>817</sup>Galatians 3:13

<sup>818</sup>Hodges, *op.cit.*, p.191

Scripture without hesitation and without explanation represents salvation by Christ as a transaction analogous to the payment of debt, the ransom of a captive, the redemption of a forfeited inheritance. From the beginning to the end of the Bible there is no note of warning, no intimation that these comparisons may be misleading. It is always assumed that they do plainly set forth Christ's work of redemption.<sup>819</sup>

The principles of justice and standard of right seen in the financial transactions among mankind are identical with the requirements of law in the highest sphere. The Scriptures in teaching that Christ paid a ransom price and redeemed transgressors by satisfying their obligations to the law purposely indicate that the reader is intended to discern a close analogy between the discharge of a commercial debt by a surety and Christ's work of substitution. The difference does not lie in the nature of the transaction, and hence the "commercial" language is not to be denied; but the point of distinction is found in the *nature and value* of the ransom price paid. The Apostle Peter confirms this when he writes,

Knowing that ye were redeemed, not with corruptible things, with silver or gold,... but with precious blood as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, even the blood of Christ.<sup>820</sup>

*A Reconciliation.* "... God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself..."<sup>821</sup> "Reconciliation implies the rebellion of man and the initiative of God."<sup>822</sup> The term reconciliation is for all practical purposes synonymous with justification, as seen from Romans 5:9-10.

Much more then, being now justified by his blood, shall we be saved from the wrath of God through him. For if, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, shall we be saved by his life.

In verse 9 Paul speaks of being justified by the blood of Jesus, and in verse 10 he speaks of being reconciled through the death of His son.

---

<sup>819</sup> Armour, op.cit., p. 158

<sup>820</sup> I Peter 1:18-19

<sup>821</sup> II Corinthians 5:19

<sup>822</sup> Nida, op. cit., p. 140

The Romans' Epistle begins with the revelation of wrath against Jew and Gentile alike. Chapter 5 indicates that a removal of this wrath is effected by faith in the work of Christ which results in reconciliation. Reconciliation is therefore the removal of God's wrath toward man.<sup>823</sup> "Reconciliation implies an estrangement which has been overcome, so that happy relations are again possible for the estranged."<sup>824</sup> Although the word is infrequently used in the Old Testament, yet the Hebrew religion is first and fundamentally a religion of reconciliation.

The Hebrew term translated "to reconcile" in the Old Testament is the familiar word כָּפַר, which is rendered in the Piel, "to cover over," "pacify," "to atone," "to propitiate." In the Authorized Version it is translated "to reconcile" in Leviticus 6:30; 8:15; 16:20; II Chronicles 29:24, but is more correctly rendered "to atone" in the American Standard Version. However, the American Standard Version translates the same term "to make reconciliation" in Daniel 9:24, and while permissible it is somewhat inconsistent. The Revised Standard Version translates כָּפַר to atone, throughout. The Authorized Version renders the Greek καταλλαγήν "atonement" in Romans 5:11, whereas the American Standard Version renders it "reconciliation." The significance of all this is not so much that the versions are inconsistent when they translate the identical Hebrew word as "atonement" and "reconciliation," but rather they give evidence of the close relationship that exists between the two terms. It is through atonement that reconciliation is effected. Thus reconciliation is seen to be the effect of the atonement. Man by sin and disobedience has broken his relationship with God, and for communion to be restored this hindrance to fellowship must be removed. The Jewish sacrificial system was instituted to bring about this necessary reconciliation. The sacrifices were offered as an atonement and propitiation, hence there is seen a close relation between reconciliation and atonement in both testaments. Forgiveness, based on substitutionary sacrifice, constituted the medium of reconciliation.

In the New Testament it is chiefly Paul who sets forth the doctrinal aspects of reconciliation. But there is a difference in that the sacrifice is not now made by the sinner—it is rather made on his behalf by another. It is the substitutionary aspect of Old Testament sacrifice ac-

---

<sup>823</sup> Strong, *op. cit.*, p. 719.

<sup>824</sup> Miller and Miller, *op. cit.* p. 603

centuated and heightened, since it is God who takes the initiative both in seeking reconciliation and providing the vicarious sacrifice. Thus Paul speaks of the substitutionary work of Christ as a "... ministry of reconciliation."<sup>825</sup>

*A Sacrifice.* "For this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God."<sup>826</sup> The typical relationship between Christ's work and the Old Testament sacrificial system is evident in this statement by the Apostle, while the substitutionary nature of the sacrifice, as a sin-offering, has already been shown at length. Here in Hebrews 10:12, Christ is expressly called a sacrifice for sin, or sin-offering. In fact the Epistle to the Hebrews contains the key to the whole Mosaic sacrificial system in its relation to the work of Christ. The primary object of the Epistle is to show the typical and probationary character of Old Testament sacrifices. Hence, the material sacrifices, and especially the sin-offering, conveyed a two-fold meaning. On the one hand, they depicted the vicarious nature of the atoning sacrifice, and at the same time they were but shadows of the things to come. As a substitutionary sacrifice, the work of Christ has its many facets described in the New Testament. He is depicted as a:

*Burnt-Offering.* The Apostle Paul in the letter to the Ephesians exhorts the believers to consecrate their entire lives to God in imitation of Christ who "... also loved you, and gave himself up for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for an odor of sweet smell."<sup>827</sup> The Authorized Version renders it, "... for a sweetsmelling savour." The Apostle was making an obvious reference here to the whole burnt-offering as set forth in the first chapter of Leviticus where the burnt-offering is described as "... an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto Jehovah."<sup>828</sup>

The question presents itself as to what aspect of the sacrificial work of Christ did the Old Testament burnt-offering typify? The principle thing in the whole burnt-offering was the complete consumption of the victim in the fire of the altar. The Hebrew name for the burnt-offering was *עֹלָה* from *עָלָה* "to go up," or "ascend," hence, "that which

---

<sup>825</sup> II Corinthians 5:18.

<sup>826</sup> Hebrews 10:12

<sup>827</sup> Ephesians 5:2.

<sup>828</sup> Leviticus 1:9.

ascends," namely the whole burnt-offering on the altar, in contrast to the other offerings where only a portion was burned. In poetic usage this offering was also called כָּלֵל from כָּלַל "to be complete" and thus signified the complete or whole burnt-offering.<sup>829</sup> In the Septuagint, in 33:10, it is called the ὁλοκαύτωμα "the holocaust," or the offering completely consumed by fire<sup>830</sup>. The purpose of the offering, which was voluntary, was to express the offerer's adoration and complete devotion to God. As in all offerings, in virtue of the blood sprinkled, it was also propitiatory, and it made one " ... accepted before Jehovah"<sup>831</sup> and it was "... to make atonement for him."<sup>832</sup>

The significance of the complete burning of the substitute victim was that the ascending of the offering symbolized one's consecration to God. It taught the Israelite that complete consecration to God was essential to fellowship. Nothing remained for self as in the other offerings, but it was all for God—it was entire self-surrender. Symbolically, therefore, the whole burnt-offering typified Christ as representing His people in perfect consecration and entire voluntary self-surrender unto God.<sup>833</sup> It was a perfect obedience. This truth is set forth throughout the New Testament in such statements as, "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,"<sup>834</sup> "And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea the death of the cross ,"<sup>835</sup> "...who through the eternal spirit offered himself without blemish unto God... ,"<sup>836</sup> "And for their sakes I sanctify [consecrate] myself ... "<sup>837</sup> Hence, as Christ's substitutionary

---

<sup>829</sup> Deuteronomy 33:10; Psalm 51:21

<sup>830</sup> *Septuaginta*. *Id Est Vestus Testamentum Graece Iuxta LXX Interpretes*. Editio Alfred Rahlfs. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt. 1935, I, p. 158.

<sup>831</sup> Leviticus 1:3.

<sup>832</sup> Leviticus 1:4.

<sup>833</sup> Girdlestone seems to miss the import of the Levitical burnt-offering when he interprets the symbolic nature of this offering in the work of Christ as follows: "... the ascent of the slain animal in the form of a cloud of smoke into the heavens typified the bringing of Christ up from the grave, and His ascension to the right hand of God." Girdlestone, *op. cit.*, p. 190.

<sup>834</sup> John 10:17,18.

<sup>835</sup> Phillipians 2:8.

<sup>836</sup> Hebrews 9:14.

<sup>837</sup> John 17:19.

death in the sin-offering procured for His people righteousness, the burnt-offering typifies the procuring of the believer's sanctification.

And for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they themselves also may be sanctified in truth.<sup>838</sup>

... we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.

Peace-Offering. The Hebrew name for this sacrifice is זָבַח הַשְּׁלָמִים, "the sacrifice of the peace offering," or simply שְׁלָמִים -peace-offering. The name is derived, as noted under the sacrificial terms in the appendix, from one of two ideas. (1) From שָׁלַם "to be complete, entire, sound," and as the Aramaic also signifies "to be unharmed," and the Arabic "to be safe," "peaceful."<sup>839</sup> Hence, in this concept the offering signifies one who is in a complete, prosperous, or peaceful relation to God. When offered in conjunction with the sin-offering the offering for sin always came first, evidence of the peaceful relation existing between the offerer and God. (2) Others derive the meaning from the Piel form of שָׁלַם, which is שָׁלַם, "the act of offering peace offering" since the Piel form is the technical word for the act of offering this sacrifice. Hence, the שְׁלָמִים, peace-offering, in this sense was a return for some benefit already obtained, or in supplication for blessings desired, as Saul indicates in I Samuel 13:9.<sup>840</sup> The first view, however, seems more likely the basic meaning in view of the main object of the peace-offering. It was a sacrifice which terminated in a joyful festive meal expressing friendship, fellowship, and peace with God obtained by the shedding of the atoning blood of the substitute victim.

The Israelite sought peaceful communion and fellowship with God within the covenant. The ritual of peace-offering taught him how it was to be obtained. He was first to bring and present to God a sacrificial victim, and then followed the ritual of the imposition of hands with confession of sin; the slaying of the victim; the sprinkling of the atoning blood; and lastly, the offering upon the altar of the choicest parts. Until this was accomplished, until in symbol atonement had thus been made

---

<sup>838</sup> Ibid.

<sup>839</sup> Brown, Driver, and Briggs, *op. cit.*, p.1022.

<sup>840</sup> Oehler, *op.cit.*, p. 287.

for the Israelite's sin, there could be no sacrificial meal which testified to his friendship and fellowship with God.

This offering was a shadow and type of the reconciling work of Christ at Calvary. Man, through his sin, has become estranged from God and is out of communion and fellowship with Him. The peaceful relationship that once existed before sin's entrance into the world no longer exists, and man is alienated from communion with God. There is nothing in the Levitical symbolism that typifies the substitutionary atoning ministry of Christ more than the meaning of the feast of the peace-offering. The sinner, estranged from God and an enemy, finds in the substitutionary death of Christ the means of reconciliation and the restoration of peaceful communion. Romans 5 is the peace-offering translated into words.

Being therefore justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ; through whom also we have had our access by faith into this grace wherein we stand ... <sup>841</sup>

But God commendeth his own love towards 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. For if, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, shall we be saved by his life; and not only so, but we also rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received the reconciliation. <sup>842</sup>

The peace-offering is in view here as the Apostle, using the typical language of sacrifice, affirms the believing sinner's reconciliation to a joyful and peaceful relationship with God. As the Levitical ritual required that the slain victim be used in a sacrificial meal by the offerer and his household in the presence of God within the sacred precincts of the tabernacle, thereby symbolizing fellowship and reconciliation, God now has provided, in the offering of Christ, a Lamb who is the "Living Bread," and invites the penitent believer to His table of fellowship. The Mosaic sacrifice taught that "the same victim whose blood was

---

<sup>841</sup> Romans 5:1,2.

<sup>842</sup> Romans 5:8-11

shed and sprinkled in atonement for sin is now given by God to be the redeemed Israelite's food, by which his life shall be sustained." <sup>843</sup> That not all the Jews had learned this significance, or the typical nature of the Levitical peace-offerings, is to be seen in the question the religious leaders asked in regard to Jesus' claim to be the heavenly peace-offering. "I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever: yea and the bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world." <sup>844</sup> In reply they asked, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" <sup>845</sup> What they had failed to see was that the Levitical peace-offering had but foreshadowed the work of the Lamb of God, who was to provide an atonement through His substitutionary sacrifice, and was to accomplish this by symbolically offering His flesh as bread for the life of the world. This symbolism is graphically illustrated in His words at the last supper when He commanded, concerning the bread, "... Take, eat; this is my body." <sup>846</sup> Christ thus becomes not only the propitiation for sin as the sinner's substitute, but He symbolically becomes the flesh or food of the peace-offering. And therefore as the penitent sinner appropriates Christ crucified as his substitutionary atonement, so by faith in His sacrificial offering, the believer appropriates the risen Christ as his life. The whole work of Christ in regard to the believer's peace is seen here in type. He *made* peace (Colossians 1:20); He *proclaimed* peace (Ephesians 2 :17); He *bestowed* peace (John 14:27); He *mediated* peace (Romans 5:1-11); He *is* our peace (Ephesians. 2:14).

Sin-Offering. Inasmuch as the nature of this sacrifice has already received rather extensive treatment, it will not be dealt with here at length, but its typical nature only will be emphasized. The burnt, meal, and peace offerings were called the sweet savour offerings, ... so called because they typified Christ in His own perfections, and His affectionate devotion to the Father's will." <sup>847</sup> The sin-offering and the trespass-offering typify Christ as bearing the whole demerit of the sinner and were known as the non-sweet savour offerings. All were sub-

---

<sup>843</sup> Nicoll, op.cit., p. 96

<sup>844</sup> John 6:51.

<sup>845</sup> John 6:52

<sup>846</sup> Matthew 26:26

<sup>847</sup> Scofield, *The Holy Bible*, Scofield Reference Edition of the authorized version of 1611 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1945), p. 29.

stitutional, but typified different aspects of His work. In the burnt-offering Christ substituted for the sinner's lack of devotedness and consecration. In the peace-offering God and the sinner meet in peace through Christ's substitutionary sacrifice. "Every meal-offering<sup>848</sup> pointed to Christ in His consecration of all His works to the Father ... For that which, at the best, we do so imperfectly and interruptedly, He does in our behalf perfectly ..."<sup>849</sup>In the sin-offering Christ is typified as laden with the believer's sins, standing as a substitute in the sinner's place. The Levitical sin-offering typifies, not the aspect of the sweet savour offerings, but the penal nature of His death as depicted in Isaiah 53; Psalm 22; Matthew 26:28; I Peter 2:24; 3:18.

Him who knew no sin  
He has made to be sin on our behalf ...<sup>850</sup>

Trespass-Offering. The Hebrew term is  $\text{זָבַח}$  offense, guilt; trespass-offering (called in the AV: Guilt-Offering), The sins committed under this category were trespasses on the rights of others, either God or man, with respect to ownership that could be estimated and covered by compensation. While atonement was the fundamental idea in the sin-offering, in the trespass-offering it was satisfaction. In the ritual the victim was presented, followed by imposition of hands and confession of the guilt; next the animal was slain, the choice fat pieces burned and the remainder was given to the priests as in the sin-offering. But the blood was only sprinkled around the altar and not applied to the horns of the altar as in the sin-offering, since the guilt of trespass could only be fully removed through restitution to the wronged person. That which had been unjustly taken, held back, or trespassed against, whether from man or God, was to be restored in full with a penalty of one-fifth added.<sup>851</sup>

Trespasses against God were two-fold: those in which the value could be determined and those cases where the trespass could not be precisely measured. For instance, a man might unwittingly eat the flesh of a firstling of his flock, or eat the flesh of a sin-offering, or eat the

---

<sup>848</sup> A bloodless offering but always made in connection with blood sacrifices.

<sup>849</sup> Nicoll, *op. cit.*, pp.80-81.

<sup>850</sup> II Corinthians 5:21

<sup>851</sup> Leviticus 5-7.

consecrated shewbread, or use the tithe for himself. The penalty was a sacrifice of an unblemished ram in addition to full restitution with one-fifth added. When the amount of trespass could not be determined only a ram for a trespass-offering was required. The consequences of trespassing against the sanctity of Yahweh were extended even to the heathen. The Philistines were smitten with a pestilence for their presumptuousness. For the injury done to Yahweh by trespassing upon His holy property by having taken the sacred Ark captive, the Philistines were instructed by their priests to send back with it a trespass-offering (זֶבַח־עֲוֹן) consisting of five golden tumors and five golden mice (I Samuel 6:4).

Trespasses against man required sacrifice and restitution. Five types of sin are recorded: (1) a trespass against a neighbor's property in a matter of deposit, i.e. misuse of a deposit; (2) fraud in a bargain; (3) robbery; (4) oppression; and (5) finding a lost object and denying it to its rightful owner.<sup>852</sup>

The trespass-offering thus was prescribed for those sins which involved a defrauding or injuring of another in respect to property, whether God's or man's, and whether knowingly or inadvertently. "The law was one and unalterable for all; the condition of pardon was plenary restitution for the wrong done..."<sup>853</sup> The Israelite was thus taught by this law that God claims from man certain rights of property and will not allow Himself to be defrauded. Nor could the sanctity of certain things be trespassed against as in the case of the eating of a sin-offering by other than the consecrated priest, etc. Likewise man had certain rights granted by God, and His law provided that no injury done by man to his neighbor in material things was to be passed over, but restitution must be made to the offended party. It was a testimony to genuine repentance.

The peculiar nature of Christ's sacrificial work as a trespass-offering is set forth in Isaiah 53:10 and will receive extensive treatment in the concluding section of this dissertation, and at this point the typical nature only will be considered. The trespass-offering like the other sacrifices pointed to Christ. While, as the believer's burnt-offering

---

<sup>852</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>853</sup> Nicoll, op. cit., p.165

Christ became his righteousness in full self-surrender and consecration; and as his peace-offering He became his life; and as his sin-offering He became the expiation for sins; so in the guilt or trespass-offering " ... he made satisfaction and plenary reparation in our behalf to the God on whose inalienable rights in us, by our sins we had trespassed without measure."<sup>854</sup> Isaiah 53:10 clearly testifies that God shall " ... make his soul [*nephesh*] an offering for sin..., " and the Hebrew word here used (as the revised versions indicate) is the identical word used in the Levitical law and rendered "trespass-offering," אֲשֶׁ֣ר (אֲשֶׁ֣ר). Hence, the Suffering Messiah, the Servant or Yahweh, will make His own soul a trespass-offering for sin in substitution for His "seed." The words of S. H. Kellogg in his commentary on the Book of Leviticus are enlightening here.

In that Christ's sacrifice was thus a guilt-offering in the sense of the law, we are taught that, in one respect, our sins are regarded by God, and should therefore be regarded by us, as debts which are due from us to God. This is, indeed, by no means the only aspect in which sin should be regarded; it is, for example, rebellion, high treason, a deadly affront to the Supreme Majesty, which must be expiated with the blood of the sin-offering. But our sins are also of the nature of debts. That is, God has claim on us for service which we have never met; claims for a portion of our substance which we have withheld, or given grudgingly, trespassing thus in "the holy things of the Lord." Just as the servant who is set to do his master's work, if, instead, he take that time to do his own work, is debt-or to the full value of the service of which his master is thus defrauded, so stands the case between the sinner and God. Just as with the agent who fails to make due returns to his principal on the moneys committed to him for investment, using them instead for himself, so stands the case between God and the sinner who has used his talents, not for the Lord, but for himself, or has kept them laid up, unused, in a napkin.<sup>855</sup>

Hence, because of the very nature of man's sin as a trespass against the rights of God, the essential nature of Christ's substitutionary sacrifice was a trespass-offering, and was, therefore, of the nature of the payment of a debt in behalf of sinners. The significance of this

---

<sup>854</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 169

<sup>855</sup> *Ibid.*, p.170.

concept of trespass and debt is, seen throughout the New Testament. The Lord taught His disciples to pray, "And forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors."<sup>856</sup> And they were warned, "But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses."<sup>857</sup> Sinners are said to be dead in sins *and trespasses*.<sup>858</sup> And finally, the substitutionary nature of Christ's atoning work as a trespass-offering secured for the believer a payment of his debt to God and full restitution. To this the Apostle Paul testifies in his Colossian Epistle.

And you, being dead through your trespasses ... did he make alive together with him, having forgiven us all our trespasses.<sup>859</sup>

Passover. "For our passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ." Here, Christ in I Corinthians 5:7, is lastly called a passover-sacrifice. The Passover sacrifice according to Exodus 12 had special significance. It was the first to be instituted under the Mosaic economy while the Israelites were still in Egypt. The Passover, פסח, was instituted for the purpose of commemorating the deliverance of Israel from Egyptian bondage and the providential sparing of their first-born when the destroying angel smote the first-born of the Egyptians. On the tenth day of the first month, the head of each Israelite family was to set apart a male lamb or kid without blemish. On the fourteenth day of Nisan he was to sacrifice the lamb at sunset, and with a sprig of hyssop sprinkle the victim's blood on the lintel and doorposts of the house as a protection against the judgment of death. The passover lamb was to be roasted whole and not a bone was to be broken. Unleavened bread and bitter herbs were to be eaten with the sacrifice. Each person was to eat the meal in haste, having his loins girded, shoes upon his feet and his staff in his hand. Any portion remaining over was to be burned in the morning as it was sacred and was not to become corrupted.

Two questions must be answered with regard to the passover which have bearing on the substitutionary nature of Christ's work as

---

<sup>856</sup> Matthew 6:12.

<sup>857</sup> Matthew 6:15.

<sup>858</sup> Ephesians 2:1.

<sup>859</sup> Colossians 2:13.

the believer's Passover Lamb. First, is the passover a sacrifice or simply a feast, and second, if it is a sacrifice, to which class does it belong?

The passover is seen to be more than a feast as a memorial of the Exodus, as it partakes also of the nature of a sacrifice. Deuteronomy 12 permits the killing of animals for food anywhere, but sacrificial animals were always slain at the sanctuary. It is seen from Deuteronomy 16 that after the initial passover celebration in Egypt and the construction of the tabernacle that the passover lamb was always killed at the sanctuary,<sup>860</sup> which gives absolute evidence as to its sacrificial character. Its sacrificial nature is also testified to by the fact that: (1) the fat was burned upon the altar; (2) the blood was sprinkled upon the altar; (3) it is specifically called a sacrifice in Exodus 12:27,<sup>861</sup> זָבַח-פֶּסַח הוּא לִיהֲוֶה; and (4) the Apostle Paul describes the passover as a sacrifice in I Corinthians 5:7: "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us" (AV). If then the passover is more than a memorial feast and has sacrificial significance, to which class of the Levitical sacrifices does it belong? Hengstenberg classes the passover as a type of sin-offering. "But," as Oehler notes, "this view is absolutely irreconcilable with the most important feature of the Passover, viz. the consumption of the sacred animal by the family in whose name it was offered."<sup>862</sup> Also it may be noted that in the sin-offering the animal is cut up, while in the passover the animal was roasted whole and not a bone was to be broken. These two factors categorize the passover sacrifice in the class of peace-offerings. Since there could be no peace-offering without an atonement effected by the shedding of the blood of a substitute victim, the passover sacrifice provides the necessary atonement through the application of the blood of the paschal lamb.

The Passover, therefore, was not only commemorative, but was also typical of the deliverance from the bondage of sin wrought in the sacrificial work of the Lamb of God. According to the divine purpose the lamb slain typified Christ the Lamb of God slain for the sins of the world. It is a passing over of the judgment which the sinner deserves for sin, when the blood of Christ is applied to the doorway of the heart of faith. Hence, the passover of Egypt "... was not only to be a memori-

---

<sup>860</sup> Deuteronomy 16:2,5-6.

<sup>861</sup> Cf. Exodus 34:25.

<sup>862</sup> Oehler, *op. cit.*, p. 348.

al of a past and temporal deliverance, but the type of a future and spiritual one."<sup>863</sup> The substitutionary nature of Christ's sacrifice is emphasized in the authorized version which renders I Corinthians 5:7, "For even Christ our passover is sacrificed *for us*." This follows many Greek manuscripts which contained the substitutionary term ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, "for us."<sup>864</sup> As in the other sacrifices the innocent victim was substituted for the individual that it was to represent and received its penalty of death.

The title of the paschal lamb is given here to Christ, not only in regard of his meekness and innocence, but in regard of his being a sacrifice, whence he is called "the Lamb slain," Rev. v. 12; the Lamb that "redeems us by his blood," I Pet. i. 8. <sup>865</sup>

The purpose and design of the Passover was to set forth Christ. All the Old Testament sacrifices were appointed by God to be a perpetual reminder of the fall of man, his demerit because of sin, and to undergird his faith in a promised Redeemer. All those institutions were not designed for any virtue in themselves, but as notices of the purpose of God that He designed to take away sin by the shedding of blood and death; and so the design of the passover was that it should represent the Messiah by whose blood He would effect spiritual deliverance from sin. He is, therefore, called the Lamb of God, being foreshadowed by the paschal lamb of the Old Testament; not a bone of Him was broken as the instructions in Exodus 12:46 commanded with regard to the paschal lamb also.

The passover lamb resembles the Redeemer in several other ways. The lamb, a meek creature, hurts none, is hurt by all, cries not out when led to slaughter, and thus is a perfect emblem of the Messiah of whom the prophet Isaiah says, "He was oppressed, yet when he was afflicted he opened not his mouth; as a lamb that is led to the slaughter, and as a sheep that before its shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth."<sup>866</sup> Again, it was to be a lamb without blemish (Exodus 12:5)

---

<sup>863</sup> Stephen Charnock, *Christ Our Passover* (Evansville, Ind.: Sovereign Grace Publishers, 1959), p. 10.

<sup>864</sup> So rendered in the following Greek texts: Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Wordsworth, etc. Nestle omits.

<sup>865</sup> Charnock, *loc. cit.*

<sup>866</sup> Isaiah 53:7.

for the passover. So too Christ as God's Passover Lamb is said to be " ... a lamb without blemish and without spot ..." <sup>867</sup> and " .. holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners ..." <sup>868</sup> Finally, there is to be seen a resemblance in the effects of the two Passovers—that of Egypt in type and its antitype. As there was a diverting or the destroying angel from judgment by the sprinkling of the blood or the lamb, so the blood of the Redeemer preserves the souls of His people from the consuming wrath of God against sin. Secondly, not only did the blood spare from judgment, but it wrought deliverance and set at liberty those held in bondage. The death of Christ is the procuring cause of the full deliverance of His people. As Pharaoh was overcome and Israel set free, so too the effect of the divine Passover delivers the believer from spiritual captivity and bondage. It is then a redemption from divine wrath and a deliverance to spiritual life and liberty through the substitutionary offering of God's Passover Lamb on behalf of sinners. <sup>869</sup>

A Propitiation. <sup>870</sup> " ... ' Christ Jesus: whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, in his blood ... " <sup>871</sup>

The Biblical view of sacrifice holds that the necessity of the atonement is grounded in the holiness of God. There is a moral and ethical demand in the divine nature which requires judicial satisfaction or propitiation for transgressions and moral violations of His righteousness. "It is a demand that cannot be evaded, since the holiness from which it springs is unchanging. The atonement is therefore a satisfaction of the ethical demand of the divine nature, by the substitution of Christ's penal sufferings for the punishment of the guilty." <sup>872</sup>

The classic passage with reference to the atonement is Romans 3:24-26, which clearly teaches that Christ's sacrifice was a propitiation, with its first and primary effect upon God's holiness and righteousness, by which satisfaction He was enabled to justify the believer.

---

<sup>867</sup> I Peter 1:19.

<sup>868</sup> Hebrews 7:26.

<sup>869</sup> Charnock, *op. cit.*, pp. 11-18.

<sup>870</sup> Inasmuch as a detailed study of the idea of propitiation, both doctrinally and linguistically has already been set forth, it will not be repeated here.

<sup>871</sup> Romans 3:25

<sup>872</sup> Strong, *op. cit.*, p. 752.

Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, in his blood, to show his righteousness because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God ... that he might himself be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus.

Hence Christ's death, as it regards God, is a propitiatory sacrifice which effects a reconciliation between God and the sinner. Christ's death satisfied divine justice, the main object being the removal of the obstacle that stands between God and man, enabling God to be both just and the justifier of the unrighteous. The thought is that between the sinner and the holy God now stands the guiltless substitute, so that the judicial eye of God looks not upon the sinner, but the substitute, and in the blood of the innocent victim, offered unto God upon the altar, a covering (כַּפָּרִים) or propitiation is made for the sin. Propitiation removes the judicial displeasure of God and restores the sinner to divine favor. The entire Levitical sacrificial system was instituted for the express purpose of propitiating God to regain His favor and effect reconciliation. The propitiatory aspect of the Mosaic sacrifices has been completely absorbed in the death-offering of Christ which is the climax of the sacrificial system of the Old Testament.

### *The Significance of Isaiah 53 in the Doctrine of Substitutionary Atonement*

Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows; yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.  
But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities;  
The chastisement of our peace was upon him;  
And with his stripes we are healed.  
All we like sheep have gone astray;  
We have turned everyone to his own way;  
And Jehovah hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.<sup>873</sup>

### The Nature of the Prophecy

The significance of Isaiah 53 with respect to the doctrine of substitutionary atonement has been recognized and acknowledged by

---

<sup>873</sup> Isaiah 53:4-6.

Hebrew and Christian scholars in every age, but the importance of Isaiah 53 as the *transitional point* in the Old Testament doctrine of substitutionary sacrifice has by no means been fully appreciated. While it is true that the full meaning and import of the relation between the typical nature of the Old Testament animal sacrifices and its antitype, the sacrificial death of Christ, is a New Testament revelation, nevertheless, it is an injustice to Old Testament revelation to fail to recognize the incomparable significance of Isaiah 53 to the whole concept of vicarious sacrifice. For here, fully seven centuries before the actual fulfillment of the Old Testament prophecies concerning the Messiah, there was given to the Prophet Isaiah the clearest and most profound revelation in all the Old Testament. It was here in Isaiah 53 that the discerning Israelite could see that there was formed a bridge, as it were, between the typical and the antitypical sacrifices. That is to say, those spiritual truths, symbolized and typified in the animal sacrifices of which the pious Israelite was aware, would find actual realization in the Suffering Servant, who as God's Lamb was to have " ... laid on him the iniquity of us all." The Lamb in Isaiah 53, who was to offer His soul as a Trespass-Offering for sin, becomes the connecting link in Old Testament thought between the typical and the antitypical.

The importance of Isaiah 53 to the doctrine of the atonement is to be seen in its immediate application to the sufferings and death of Christ by the risen Lord Himself in Luke 24 and in the apostolic preaching as is recorded in Acts. The sermon of Peter in Acts 3 makes reference to Isaiah 53 when he declares: "But the things Which God foreshowed by the mouth of all the prophets, that Christ should suffer, he has thus fulfilled."<sup>874</sup> The designation Servant is applied to Him in the twenty-sixth verse of this chapter as it is again in 4:24-31. Philip likewise preached Christ to the Ethiopian eunuch from Isaiah 53.<sup>875</sup> The Apostle Paul in his address before Agrippa cites the prophetic truth of Isaiah 53 that Christ must suffer.<sup>876</sup> Hence, the post-resurrection apostolic doctrine of the vicarious atonement is based largely on Isaiah 53, the central Old Testament passage relating the Mosaic sacrifices to the work of the Messiah, on the one hand, and the death of Christ to the

---

<sup>874</sup> Acts 3:18.

<sup>875</sup> Acts 8:26-31.

<sup>876</sup> Acts 26:22-23.

Old Testament prophecies concerning the Messiah on the other. When the question was raised by the early Jews, Why the death of Jesus of Nazareth if He is our Messiah?, the apostles had immediately available an answer—Isaiah 53.<sup>877</sup> The history of the early church bears ample testimony to the fact that it was so used.

The typification of the atonement of Christ is to be found in the historical and ceremonial types provided by God in the Old Testament. By the typical system God was educating Israel for the future salvation and deliverance to be wrought at Calvary on the one hand, and also preparing a technical *language* to be the medium of the revelation of His grace in Christ. That is to say, that both the work of Christ and the symbols and language used to describe His work are rooted and grounded in the Old Testament Levitical system of sacrifice. For example, the terms "Lamb of God," "blood of Christ," "propitiation," "sacrifice," "redemption," "reconciliation," "sin," "altar," "priest," "ransom," "redeemer," "atonement," "forgiveness," etc., and the many doctrinal statements of the Epistles, which are phrased in the language of types, have no real significance, and in fact are unintelligible, apart from the historical and ceremonial typology of the Old Testament. The types were prophecies, or forecasts of things to come. The Old Testament types were a method of instruction of the manner in which God was to remove the sins of His people by the vicarious and substitutionary work of the Messianic Lamb described in Isaiah 53.

Immediately after the Fall the Scriptures record the institution of types prefiguring the substitutionary atonement. In the divine clothing of Adam and Eve with "coats of skins" (Genesis. 3:21), there was illustrated the suggestion that fallen man required a covering to enable him to stand before God, and that he could not produce this himself, but God must provide it through the life of an innocent victim. In the offering of Abel (Genesis 4:4) God accepted it on the basis that it was, unlike Cain's, an animal or bloody sacrifice offered by faith. The propitiatory effect of sacrifice is signified in Genesis 8:21 where Noah offered from the animals of the Ark; and it is seen again in the offerings of Job's friends. The efficacy of the blood of a substitute is clearly indicat-

---

<sup>877</sup> John Scott Lidgett, *The Spiritual Principle of the Atonement* (3rd ed.; London: Charles H. Kelly, 1901), pp. 69-72.

ed by the Passover sacrifice in Exodus 12. At Sinai God more fully revealed the sacrifices and ritual that were to foreshadow the future redemption by substitution. The Levitical sacrifices emphasized the magnitude of sin and the need of atonement which was to be borne by a substitute. The principal thing they were designed to exhibit was the indispensable necessity of sin's removal by vicarious atonement.<sup>878</sup>

Isaiah 53 is the theological landmark of this concept. As the transitional point between the Old Testament type and the New Testament fulfillment by the Messianic Lamb of God, the theological importance of Isaiah 53 cannot be overemphasized. It is because of its foundational position upon which both Old and New Testament theology meet and rest that any misinterpretation of the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah invariably results in a faulty and unbiblical theological position with regard to the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice, as well as to the Scriptures as a whole. That this is true may be seen from the fact that the failure of the negative critical school to recognize in Isaiah 53 the prophecy of the substitutionary atonement by a personal Messiah has resulted in two other theological errors, one grounded in the Old Testament, the other in the New. By rejecting the historic interpretation of the most important prophetic passage in the Old Testament, they are compelled, by logical necessity, to discount any suggestion of the idea of substitution in the Levitical system of animal sacrifice, and likewise to deny or depreciate the New Testament doctrine of the vicarious atonement. Hence, two things become obvious from the consideration of the nature and importance of the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah; first, the transitional nature of the prophecy comes sharply into focus, as the connecting link between the substitutionary type prefigured in the Levitical animal sacrifices and the Messiah as the antitype; second, the mediating nature of the prophecy, linking Old Testament type with New Testament fulfillment, will influence one's entire theological position with reference to the central doctrine of the Scriptures—the Substitutionary Atonement. In view of this, it would be relevant at this point to examine the various interpretations of the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah.

---

<sup>878</sup> Arthur W. Pink, *The Satisfaction of Christ* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1955), pp. 270-72.

## Critical and Unbiblical Interpretations of Isaiah 52:13-53:12.

In the eighth chapter of Acts the following words are recorded:

Now the passage of the scripture which he was reading was this,

He was led as a sheep to the slaughter;  
And as a lamb before his shearer is dumb,  
So he openeth not his mouth:  
In his humiliation his judgment was taken away:  
His generation who shall declare?  
For his life is taken from the earth.

And the eunuch answered Philip, and said, I pray thee, of whom speaketh the prophet this? of himself, or of some other?<sup>879</sup>

This was the question proposed by the Ethiopian eunuch to Philip with reference to the meaning of the prophetic oracle contained in Isaiah 52:13-53:12. It might be well to note from the outset the direct answer Philip gave in reply to this question as a prelude to an examination or the various evasive and unbiblical answers proposed by critical scholarship to this passage. "And Philip opened his mouth, *and beginning from this scripture, preached unto him Jesus*" (Acts 8:36). The eunuch had reference to the identification of the individual who, according to Isaiah 53, was to be led to his death, and which was according to the clear teaching of the passage a vicarious death (Cf. Isaiah 53:4-6 which immediately precedes the verses quoted by Luke in Acts 8:32-33). Philip clearly identified the person as the Messiah, Jesus Christ. But his interpretation has not, by any means, been accepted by all, as an examination of some of the writings of both Jewish and non-Jewish theologians will reveal. The most popular and significant of these views will now be examined.

"The Messianic interpretation of the chapter was universally acknowledged by the Jews until the time of Aben Ezra (about A.D. 1150).<sup>880</sup> Almost all Christian expositors held this view down to the nineteenth century and the rise of negative criticism. The Jews abandoned the traditional interpretation under pressure of the Christian tes-

---

<sup>879</sup> Acts 8:32-34.

<sup>880</sup> Spence and Exell, *op. cit.*, X, p.294.

timony that the passage found fulfillment in Jesus of Nazareth. They began to apply the prophecy to certain ones of the prophets, or to the nation of Israel itself. Beginning with the nineteenth century a number of expositors have adopted one or other of the Jewish interpretations, either categorically or with certain modifications.<sup>881</sup>

H. H. Rowley in his work, *The Servant of the Lord*, sets forth the reason critical scholarship rejected the traditional Christian view that Isaiah 53 was a Messianic prophecy. He writes:

With the advent of the critical era in Old Testament studies, and the recognition that from chapter 40 the book of Isaiah could not be regarded as the work of Isaiah of Jerusalem, but as the work of an exilic prophet in Babylonia, there came a growing tendency on the part of Christian scholars to accept the common Jewish view that the Suffering Servant was none other than the Israelite nation.<sup>882</sup>

Although the interpretations range all the way from an identification of the Servant with Jeremiah on the one hand, to the nation of Israel on the other, yet they can be divided into two general divisions; namely, those who consider the term "the Servant of Yahweh" as descriptive of a *class*, and those who view it as denoting an *individual*. The former view is subdivided into two classes: those who view the Servant as descriptive of the Nation of Israel, and those who interpret the Servant to be the pious remnant within Israel.

Those who view the Servant as the nation Israel contend that she is called this in Isaiah 41:8, which reads: "But thou Israel, my servant ..." This school contends that Isaiah 52:13-53:12 pictures the vicarious sufferings of the nation in the Babylonian Exile.<sup>883</sup> One interpreter contends for this when he writes:

---

<sup>881</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>882</sup> H. H. Rowley, *The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1952, p. 4.

<sup>883</sup> Andrew Fuller asks "If ... the sufferer be Israel personified, and this nation, on account of its injuries, may be said to have borne the iniquities of the whole world, how comes it to be said—'for the transgressions of MY PEOPLE was he stricken?'" Fuller, *op. cit.*, p. 582.

It is a doctrine of representative suffering, although there is a substitutionary element in it. Israel has paid double for its sins, but this is all in Yahweh's purpose. The nation is to be a missionary prophet for Yahweh to the Gentiles. Its sufferings are to form a sacrificial offering for the sins of the world - 53:10,12. "Yet it pleased Yahweh to bruise him, He hath put him to grief; when thou shalt make his soul a guilt offering for sin, He shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of Yahweh shall prosper in his hand. Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he poured out his soul unto death, and was numbered with the transgressors, yet he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors."<sup>884</sup>

The writer thus interprets the Servant to be Israel who, as the pious remnant within the nation, suffers vicariously for the sins of the world. He reasons thus, Does not the prophet say they paid double for their sins? For what purpose except as an *offering* to God for their *own sins and those of others*? The sight of these sufferings moves the nations to repentance, when they are interpreted in the light of God's redemptive purpose in Israel and no longer solely as punishment for Israel's sin. He adds further, "If the substitutionary element is present in the sense that the Servant bears the consequences of the sins of others ... Israel was to be a 'saving remnant'... Israel is to rule the world from a cross, and to save the world through a cross."<sup>885</sup>

One almost hesitates to reply to such an unscriptural and unworthy interpretation of this majestic passage, and may it suffice to simply observe two or three obvious and glaring weaknesses in this view. First of all, the writer has, in his view, sinners suffering vicariously on behalf of sinners. The Exiles could hardly be called a "pious remnant!" for it was their sins that sent them into captivity; and even though there had been a pious remnant, they would still, as sinners, be an unacceptable substitute to God on behalf of other sinners. To deny this is theological suicide, since the very basis, in fact the only basis, upon which a valid substitution can rest is that the substitute be blameless with respect to the guilt or penalty he undertakes to bear for an-

---

<sup>884</sup> E. C. Rust (mimeographed notes, Old Testament Theology, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, 1958), p. 60.

<sup>885</sup> *Ibid.*

other.<sup>886</sup> Israel, paying *double* for her sins (Isaiah 40:1-2), could not change the fact that she was still sinful. It would seem superfluous to add that the meaning of this statement is not that proposed by Old Testament critics, but on the contrary, the Scriptures themselves plainly teach the principle that Israel, because of her privileged position as a result of her election and special revelation, must therefore undergo a severer judgment than the heathen nations. To this fact the prophets continually testify.

You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will visit upon you all your iniquities.<sup>887</sup>

For mine eyes are upon all their ways; they are not hid .from my .face, neither is their iniquity concealed from mine eyes. And first I will recompense their iniquity and their sin double, because they have polluted my land with the carcasses of their detestable things, and have filled mine inheritance with their abominations.<sup>888</sup>

Yea, all Israel have transgressed thy law, even turning aside, that they should not obey thy voice: therefore hath the curse been poured out upon us, and the oath that is written in the law of Moses the servant of God; for we have sinned against him. And he hath confirmed his words, which he spake against us, and against our judges that judged us, by bringing upon us a great evil; for under the whole heaven hath not been done as hath been done upon Jerusalem.<sup>889</sup>

Another fallacy in this critic's interpretation is his statement that "the sight of these sufferings moves the nations to penitence..."<sup>890</sup> One needs simply to ask, when *did this happen?* His further statement that Israel, as a substitute, " ... bears the consequences of the sin of others,"<sup>891</sup> quite obviously needs no reply.

---

<sup>886</sup> This has clearly been shown elsewhere. Cf. "The Essential Conditions of Suretyship," and "The Divine Provision for Substitution by the Law," etc.

<sup>887</sup> Amos 3:2.

<sup>888</sup> Jeremiah 16:17-18.

<sup>889</sup> Daniel 9:11-12.

<sup>890</sup> Rudt, *loc. cit.*

<sup>891</sup> *Ibid.*

The other unscriptural interpretations all present weaknesses equally as destructive to their views as this. Those who view the Servant as a group interpret Isaiah 53 as referring to Israel, or on the other hand suppose it to be the pious remnant of the nation; others the family of David or the priests, or finally the prophets as a class. Of the second view who see the Servant as an individual, some refer him to the good king Hezekiah, or king Uzziah, or king Josiah; others to the suffering prophet Jeremiah; and others the prophet and author of the Book of Isaiah himself.<sup>892</sup>

Rudolph, Kittel, and Oesterley hold that the Servant is both an unknown contemporary of the prophet and also an eschatological figure. Gressmann and Gunkel were exponents of the mythological view of Isaiah 53. This view maintains that Isaiah 53 was based upon the Adonis-Tammuz cultic myth which influenced the writer of "Deutero-Isaiah," who took the idea from one of the ritual songs of the cult of the dying and rising god.<sup>893</sup> "Ewald was so struck with the personal characteristics of this prophecy that he dropped his former view that the ideal Israel is meant, and settled on some unknown sufferer...some single martyr."<sup>894</sup> Albert Schweitzer's view of the death of Christ is, as it were, the logical conclusion necessitated by these unbiblical interpretations of the identity of the Suffering Servant. Schweitzer, who contends that Jesus expected the Kingdom of God to appear at once. was disappointed when it failed to appear. Therefore "... Jesus came to the conclusion, from Isaiah 53, that as Messiah he must first die for his people. So he foretold his death, then deliberately went to Jerusalem and provoked the authorities to crucify him, expecting in that way to bring about his own second coming and the kingdom of God."<sup>895</sup>

Rawlinson in his commentary on Isaiah aptly dismisses all these conjectures on two grounds, namely (1) that the portrait of the Servant depicted here has so strong an individuality and such marked personal features that it cannot possibly and justifiably be a mere per-

---

<sup>892</sup> John Brown, *The Sufferings and Glories of the Messiah* (Evansville, Ind.: Sovereign Grace Publishers, 1959), p. 173 •

<sup>893</sup> Rowley, *The Servant of the Lord*, pp. 23-24.

<sup>894</sup> Aaron Judah Kligerman, *Messianic Prophecy in the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1957 ), p. 87.

<sup>895</sup> Henry A. Rodgers, "Albert Schweitzer", *Ten Makers of Modern Protestant Thought* (New York: Association Press, 1958), pp. 24-25.

sonification of a collective body, whether it be Israel, a righteous remnant, the priesthood, or the body of prophets, et al; and (2) the passage goes infinitely beyond anything of which mere man was ever capable, so that it could refer to no other personality save Jesus Christ Himself, to whom, negative criticism to the contrary, it is applied in Matthew 8:17; Mark 15:28; Luke 22:37; John 12:37,38; Acts 8:32,33; Romans 10: 16; and I Peter 2:24,25.<sup>896</sup>

### The Vicarious and Sacrificial Nature of Isaiah 52:13-53:12

Side by side in Israel's experience two streams of truth had been developing: the one, that somehow redemption was to be obtained by sacrifice; and the other, that somehow redemption was to be obtained by the seed of woman which should one day bruise the serpent's head. What part, in their opinion, had the slain animal victim to play in the work of redemption? They knew more, as the Old Testament bears out, than criticism is often prone to admit.

They knew that death had been decreed upon the race for its transgression; they saw that by divine permission, suggestion, and command, sheep and oxen became their substitutes, and paid the mortal penalty in their stead.<sup>897</sup>

In addition to the sacrificial teaching, the promise of a future deliverance had been growing more and more explicit throughout Hebrew history. The general promise of Genesis 3:15 became a definite promise of salvation through Shem;<sup>898</sup> then it passed to Abraham through Isaac;<sup>899</sup> and later to Jacob was given a promise that the Prince was to come through Judah's loins.<sup>900</sup> It would not be expected in the early periods that they would have connected the two revelations, redemption by sacrifice and redemption by a coming deliverer; but nevertheless the two ideas were ever present and were to develop and grow and were finally to come into sharp focus at a later period when the two streams would meet, for the devout and discerning Israelite, in the vicarious sacrificial death of the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53.

---

<sup>896</sup> Spence and Exell, op. cit., X, p. 294.

<sup>897</sup> Cave, op. cit., p. 51.

<sup>898</sup> Genesis 9:27.

<sup>899</sup> Genesis 22:18.

<sup>900</sup> Genesis 49:10.

Pre-eminently, therefore, among the Old Testament prophecies concerning the vicarious sufferings of Christ stands the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. Its prominence is to be noted from the fact that it is repeatedly referred to by the New Testament writers as a prophecy foretelling the vicarious sufferings and death of Christ. In John 12:38 the unbelief of the people is cited as a fulfillment of Isaiah 53:1; Mark 10:33-34 and John 1:10-11 fulfill Isaiah 53:3, whereas Matthew 8:17; John 19:7; Hebrews 9:28; Romans 4:25; I Corinthians 15:3; and I Peter 2:24 affirm the fulfillment of Isaiah 53:4. I Peter 2:25 fulfills that of Isaiah 53:6 and Matthew 26:63; 27:12-14; and Acts 8:32 fulfills Isaiah 53:7, etc. Because of the multiplicity of citations from Isaiah 53 by the apostles it stands as the outstanding witness of the Old Testament to His substitutionary work.

The substitutionary or vicarious nature of His sufferings and death as the Suffering Servant is clearly set forth under several aspects in Isaiah.

*He Suffers and Dies as an Innocent Person.* The occasion of His suffering and death was not due to His own guilt and sin. This is seen in the statements concerning Him that "... he had done no violence, neither servant ..., who will " ... justify many ... " Hence , His suffering is vicarious, since He Himself is innocent and righteous.

*He Suffers and Dies as an Innocent Person by Divine Appointment.* "... although he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth. Yet it pleased Jehovah to bruise him... ." "... Jehovah hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." Inasmuch as God delivers the innocent from judgment, and yet it pleased Him to bruise His Righteous Servant, the implication is quite evident that He must have had a signal purpose in mind. That this is true was declared by the Apostle Peter, who said that the sufferings of Christ proceeded from the "... determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God ..." <sup>901</sup> The divine purpose to be realized through His sufferings and death is found in the prophet's declaration that God would "... make his soul an offering for sin..." Substitutionary sacrifice which would propitiate judicial wrath, honor His Law, and reconcile the world unto Him, was the end in view in the divine ordination of the suffering of the Lord's Righteous Servant. For "... God

---

<sup>901</sup> Acts 2:23.

was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses ... ."902

*The Character and Design of the Servant's Sufferings and Death Are Clearly Sacrificial.*

Yet it pleased Jehovah to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul a trespass-offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of Jehovah shall prosper in his hand. 903

C. von Orelli in *Die Propheten Iesaia und Jeremia* writes,

But the purpose which God had by the infliction of these sufferings was to make a guilt-offering, which (according to verse 12) would make free many of the guilty; [and] to make a substitute offering for the obedience, of which the entire people was obligated, but (according to verse 6) had not made. Here it is clearly displayed by the prophecy that the atoning work of the Servant of God, concerns the realization of the ideas which are shadowed in the sacrificial cultus. 904

It is to be remembered that the trespass-offering was a sacrifice to cover those sins in which a trespass had been made on the rights of others, whether God or man, in respect to ownership, in which the amount of injury could be estimated and covered by compensation. The trespass-offering, unlike the other sacrifices, speaks most clearly of redemption and satisfaction being rendered. In the burnt-offering the fundamental idea was complete consecration; in the peace-offering that of fellowship; in the sin-offering atonement, but God purposely designated the death of Christ as a trespass-offering with the view to magnifying the idea of redemption, particularly in terms of the payment of ransom. 905 In the Mosaic economy when an individual had trespassed against the rights of God by withholding the tithe, failing to offer the first-born, and the like, restitution was to be made by payment of

---

902 II Corinthians 5:19.

903 Isaiah 53:10.

904 C. von Orelli, *Die Propheten Iesaia und Jeremia*. (Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung (Oskar Beck), 1891), p. 181.

905 Hamilton, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

the full amount of the trespass plus one-fifth added. Hence, since the nature and consequences of man's sin are a trespass against the rights of God, the essential nature of Christ's vicarious death was a trespass-offering, and was of the nature of the payment of a debt on behalf of His people. "The trespass offering ... was a compensatory offering—a sacrifice of restitution—involving, symbolically, the payment of price."<sup>906</sup>

The most important aspect of the prophecy of Isaiah 53 is that of the deliberate description in *sacrificial* language of the work wrought by the righteous Servant. The soul of the Servant is called a trespass-offering. The sacrificial aspect is seen further in the description of Him as a lamb. Some suggest that the priestly act of sprinkling, either the water of purification, or the anointing oil, or the blood of atonement, is applied to Him whose "... visage was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men, so shall he sprinkle many nations ..."<sup>907</sup> The sacrificial language is further indicated in the recurring expressions such as "... he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities ...,"<sup>908</sup> "... and Jehovah hath laid on him the iniquity of us all."<sup>909</sup> The same truth is apparent in the frequent assertions about the Servant who "... hath borne our grief's, and carried

---

<sup>906</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 97-98.

<sup>907</sup> Isaiah 52:15 — הִפְתִּיז the Hiphil of הִפְתִּיז to spurt, spatter, sprinkle. Various interpretations have been suggested by the expositors, perhaps in some cases to avoid the sacrificial reference. Brown, Driver, and Briggs' Hebrew Lexicon suggests an alternative meaning on analogy with the Arabic verb meaning "to leap," but admit that it is dubious; hence, "so shall he cause to leap (i.e. in joyful surprise, or startle) many nations." However, in every case the Hiphil form of הִפְתִּיז is invariably used in the Old Testament to describe the priestly act of sprinkling. It is used, for example, as the technical term for the sprinkling of water at the consecration of the Levites (Numbers 8:6-7); or for the sprinkling of oil in the consecration of the Tabernacle (Leviticus 8:1f.); and the sprinkling of blood and oil at the consecration of the priesthood (Exodus 29:21). Since in every other case it is used to signify the priestly act of sprinkling, either in the act of purification or atonement, it would appear inconsistent to search for some dubious cognate meaning here in Isaiah 52:15. On analogy with the regular usage of this verb, the idea would be that the Messiah shall, by the sprinkling of His atoning blood upon the nations, cleanse and sanctify them and make atonement for them.

<sup>908</sup> Isaiah 53:5.

<sup>909</sup> Isaiah 53:6.

our sorrows ..., <sup>910</sup> ". "...and he shall bear their iniquities ... , <sup>911</sup> and "... he bare the sins of many .. <sup>912</sup>

*The Nature and Effects of His Sufferings and Death are Expiatory and Substitutionary.*

Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows; yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned everyone to his own way; and Jehovah hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. <sup>913</sup>

By oppression and judgment he was taken away; and as for his generation, who among them considered that he was cut off out of the land of the living for the transgression of my people to whom the stroke was due? <sup>914</sup> .

Yet it pleased Jehovah to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of Jehovah shall prosper in his hand. He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by the knowledge of himself shall my righteous servant justify many; and he shall bear their iniquities. Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he poured out his soul unto death, and was numbered with the transgressors: yet he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors. <sup>915</sup>

The Servant is said to " ... bear their iniquities," <sup>916</sup> and that " ... he bare the sins of many.. <sup>917</sup> The Hebrew verb נָשָׂא "to bear," is frequently used of the undertaking of the responsibilities or sins of others

---

<sup>910</sup> Isaiah 53:4.

<sup>911</sup> Isaiah 53:11

<sup>912</sup> Isaiah 53:12.

<sup>913</sup> Isaiah 53:4-6.

<sup>914</sup> Isaiah 53:8

<sup>915</sup> Isaiah 53:10-12.

<sup>916</sup> Isaiah 53:11.

<sup>917</sup> Isaiah 53:12.

by substitution or representation. The high priest was to bear (אָנִיִּן) the name of the children of Israel before the Lord (Exodus 28:12). In Leviticus 10:17 the expression "... to bear the iniquity of the congregation... ." is equivalent with making atonement for them before the Lord. The scapegoat, Azazel, was said to bear (אָנִיִּן) the iniquity of the people (Leviticus 16:22). A different Hebrew term סָבַל, "to bear a burden," is used in Isaiah 53:11, where it is said of the vicarious sufferings of the righteous Servant that "... he shall bear their iniquities." In the following verse, 53:12, אָנִיִּן occurs again, where it is said "... he bare the sins of many... ." and the two Hebrew verbs are used together in the fourth verse. The verbs are manifestly important for the doctrine of substitution, for they clearly testify to the fact that the Servant, as He gathers up in His Person all the significance and meaning of the Old Testament animal sacrifices, is said to bear the sins of many.<sup>918</sup> Moreover the emphatic Hebrew personal pronoun is used.<sup>919</sup> To this truth the Apostle Peter bore testimony when he wrote in I Peter 2:24: "Who his own self bare our sins in his body upon the tree... ." The use of סָבַל and אָנִיִּן, when used in respect to sin, distinctly depicts the *vicarious bearing* of sins for others. This is the meaning also with respect to the Greek usage in John 1:29. "...Behold, the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world."<sup>920</sup>

The principle of vicarious expiation by the Messiah is so clearly taught in Isaiah 53 that "... the only alternatives," writes John Brown, "presented to a reflecting mind are, the admission of the doctrine of vicarious atonement, or the denial of the Messiahship of Jesus

---

<sup>918</sup> Girdlestone, *op. cit.*, p. 137

<sup>919</sup> Alexander sees in the introduction of the emphatic pronoun in the phrase, "... and he will bear their iniquities," a suggestion of the idea of exchange or mutual substitution. *They will receive His righteousness and He shall bear their burdens.* Joseph Addison Alexander, *Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1953), p. 305.

<sup>920</sup> "Here the word ἀφω answers to אָנִיִּן, and implies the lifting up or taking a burden upon oneself, and consequently the delivering others from it." Girdlestone, *op. cit.*, p. 138. The Greek word ἀναφέρω is used by the Septuagint to translate סָבַל, "to bear" in Isaiah 53 :11. *Ibid.* It is used of the offering of sacrifices in Hebrews 7:27; 13:15; James 2:21; I Peter 2:5. It is twice used in the sense of "bearing sin" in Hebrews 9:28: "So Christ also, having been once offered to bear the sins of many ...," a citation from Isaiah 53:12; and again in I Peter 2:24: "who his own self bare our sins in his body upon the tree.."

Cbrist.<sup>921</sup> His sufferings are represented here as wounds, bruises, chastisement, and stripes. The term "wounded" properly signifies "to pierce," and is used for severe and mortal wounds which result in death. The term "bruised" signifies "to be crushed," indicating pain and overwhelming adversity. "Chastisement" indicates punishment, hence the pain and death inflicted to procure peace for the sinner. "Stripes" indicate scourging, with reference both to blows inflicted by His enemies (Matthew 27:26,30), and to the judicial scourging by God (Matthew 27:46). The effects of these violent sufferings are seen to be vicarious and expiatory for ". . . with his stripes we are healed." "If vicarious suffering can be described in words," writes Alexander, "it is so described in these verses ..."<sup>922</sup>

"These violent, severe, fatal, numerous, diversified sufferings of the Messiah were to be penal. They were to be sufferings for sins, for iniquities."<sup>923</sup> They were not disciplinary sufferings, but were vicarious—He was wounded for iniquities, but they were the iniquities of others—He was bruised for transgressions, but they were the transgressions of others. The Messiah was cut off, but not for Himself. His penal sufferings were substitutionary as Isaiah 53 clearly indicates.

---

<sup>921</sup> Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 232.

<sup>922</sup> Alexander, *op. cit.*, p. 298.

<sup>923</sup> Brown, *op. cit.*, p 236.

## CONCLUSION

In view of the assertions of liberal theology, perhaps the most fundamental question which ought to be considered in conclusion is with respect to the necessity of blood atonement. Was the substitutionary atonement a necessary prerequisite for the work of reconciliation and redemption, or could God have found another way, irrespective of substitutionary sacrifice? The problem is significant because it cannot be gainsaid that the nature of one's answer to this question will reveal, quite clearly, the main thrust of his theological position.

In the history of theological development diverse views have been held on this vital question. Augustine contended earnestly for the necessity of Christ's death as the basis of remission of sins. He viewed His death as a sacrifice to God, as substitutionary in the endurance of punishment in the sinner's stead, and as a ransom.<sup>924</sup> Anselm also stressed the absolute necessity of the atonement, while his great opponent, Abelard, on the other hand, asserted that God could have forgiven man and granted reconciliation apart from penal punishment of sin. Thomas Aquinas in a certain sense denied the absolute necessity of the atonement, but regarded it, nevertheless, as the most satisfactory method of reconciliation. Duns Scotus moved beyond Aquinas and asserted the atonement depended simply on the arbitrary will of God, and that there was nothing in the nature of God that required atonement. The Reformers, Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin, may be said to have avoided the express statement of the absolute necessity of the substitutionary atonement, and ascribed to it a hypothetical or relative necessity, based upon God's sovereign decree. Such a decree, determined by the divine will, was, however, in harmony with His whole inner Being and thus determined by His holy moral character.<sup>925</sup> Reformed theologians since that time have regarded, in general, the absolute necessity

---

<sup>924</sup> Walker, *op.cit.*, P. 181.

<sup>925</sup> Calvin in his *Institutes of the Christian Religion* does not minimize the necessity, however, for he writes, "We could not escape the fearful judgment of God; and Christ, that he might rescue us from it, submitted to be condemned ... For, in order to remove our condemnation, it was not sufficient to endure any kind of death. To satisfy our ransom, it was necessary to select a mode of death in which he might deliver us, both by giving himself up to condemnation, and undertaking our expiation." Calvin *op. cit.*, I, p. 438.

of the penal substitutionary atonement, and have grounded it primarily in the punitive justice of God. "They who deny the necessity of a penal substitutionary atonement, by implication also disown the strict punitive justice of God, in virtue of which He must necessarily punish sin."<sup>926</sup>

One essential feature of the Levitical law of sacrifice was the shedding of blood of the substitute victim as a covering or atonement for sins. "For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life."<sup>927</sup> The view that "... apart from shedding of blood there is no remission,"<sup>928</sup> is discredited by modern criticism, which holds that the blood rites are to be explained from the ideas of primitive animism.<sup>929</sup> In defense of this unbiblical contention passages are cited where the Pentateuch speaks of atonement by other means than the effusion of sacrificial blood. For instance, whenever a census was taken, every Israelite was required to give half a shekel as atonement money " ... to make atonement for your souls."<sup>930</sup> If the question be asked, by way of discrediting the Levitical necessity for the shedding of blood for atonement, whether or not the Law did recognize other means of atonement, "... the reply must be in the affirmative, but the inference must be denied."<sup>931</sup> It is true that the Law in some specific cases did speak of atonement by other objective means than the shedding of sacrificial blood. This was true in the case cited above. Again, when the Israelites returned from the slaughter of the Midianites and numbered their forces, they gave of their spoils—bracelets, earrings, and golden chains—"to make atonement for our souls before Jehovah."<sup>932</sup> After the death of Koran and his rebellious company, Moses commanded Aaron to wave the incense taken from the Holy Place among the congregation so as to avert the plague that was beginning and in so doing he would " ... make atonement for them."<sup>933</sup> Priestly intercession, rather than the shedding of sacrificial

---

<sup>926</sup> Berkhof, *Vicarious Atonement*, p. 51.

<sup>927</sup> Leviticus 17:11.

<sup>928</sup> Hebrews 9:22.

<sup>929</sup> Robinson, *op. cit.*, p.147

<sup>930</sup> Exodus 30:16

<sup>931</sup> Cave, *op. cit.*, p. 145.

<sup>932</sup> Numbers 31:48-54.

<sup>933</sup> Numbers 16:46.

blood, was again seen in connection with the golden calf incident, when Moses through prayer made atonement for their sin.<sup>934</sup>

These facts are correct, but the inferences drawn from them are not. The author of Hebrews suggests that the Levitical law with respect to the shedding of blood for atonement is not necessarily an absolute one. He says, "And according to the law, I may *almost* say, all things are cleansed with blood, and apart from shedding of blood there is no remission"<sup>935</sup> The modifying force of *σχεδόν*, "almost," is not in reference to the verb, or "in blood," as if there were any doubt about the cleansing or efficacy of the blood, but has respect to *πάντα*, "all," implying that the writer does not wish to commit himself to an unqualified assertion that everything was cleansed with blood.<sup>936</sup> In view of this, therefore, it is evident that the Law does not necessarily forbid God's making provision for atonement in other ways, if He so purposed, without the shedding of blood.

But a more direct solution to this problem is to be noted from several considerations. To begin with it must not be forgotten that there was no efficacy in the blood itself, but rather the blood was the life and symbolized life given up in death, or the exacting of a life for a life. "For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life."<sup>937</sup> This means simply that the efficacy of the atonement was in the method established by God and did not lie merely in the blood. It is futile, therefore, to contend that there is a contradiction between Levitical practice and its laws, or that the shedding of blood is not the prescribed way for the atonement of sin and the direct command of God.

Again, it should be obvious that the cases cited where atonement was effected without a blood sacrifice are clearly exceptions as can be seen from the circumstances. They in no wise invalidate the method appointed by Law for the atonement of sins by animal sacrifice.

---

<sup>934</sup> Exodus 32:30.

<sup>935</sup> Hebrews 9:22.

<sup>936</sup> A. C. Kendrick, *The Epistle to the Hebrews; An American Commentary on the New Testament* (Philadelphia: The American Baptist Publication Society, 1890), VI, p. 123.

<sup>937</sup> Leviticus 7:11.

In the case of the money exacted upon the numbering of Israel, and the giving of offerings from the spoils after the successful Midianite campaign, this silver and gold was necessary for the service and upkeep of the sanctuary and therefore presents no theological problem. "And thou shalt take the atonement money from the children of Israel, and shalt appoint it for the service of the tent of meeting..."<sup>938</sup> Additional confirmation that this is an exception, and does not invalidate the other Levitical law, is seen in the latter part of this same verse "that it may be a *memorial* for the children of Israel before Jehovah, to make atonement for your souls."<sup>939</sup> Even more obvious is the exceptional and imperative nature of the Korahite rebellion and golden calf apostasy, when ordinary means of atonement by animal blood would never have atoned for the sins of rebellion, since there was no legal provision in the Levitical law for a sacrifice to cover *wilful sins or sins with a high hand*. If Israel was to be spared at all from the righteous wrath of God it could only come through the personal intercession of the High Priest Aaron with the incense from the golden altar signifying holy and imperative prayer, and from the Prophet Moses who interceded strongly and urgently on behalf of Israel. But no Hebrew or priest, because of these signal exceptions, ever dared rely simply on prayer or an offering of money to effect an atonement for sins, but availed himself of the appointed means—the forfeited life of an animal substitute. For what was symbolized was that sin could not be forgiven without *capital punishment or death*. Under the Levitical economy this legal remission of guilt was vitally connected with the ritual of the shedding of blood, which indicated the vicarious suffering and death of the innocent substitute victim.

Punishment of sin is to be defined as a vindication of the personal rights and claims of God against those who have transgressed His law of righteousness. There can be no valid separation made between the law of righteousness and the divine will, and, therefore, the infliction of punishment upon the transgressor becomes a moral necessity. The right to punish is inseparable from the obligation to punish—it is, in a word, an immutable duty by a sovereign and holy God, for there is an irreconcilable antagonism between God and sin.

---

<sup>938</sup> Exodus 30:16.

<sup>939</sup> Italics mine.

While liberal theology will admit to the moral necessity of punishment upon evil and violations of law, without which there can be no moral universe, yet they can offer no satisfactory interpretation of the extent and purpose of punishment. Suffering inflicted upon the transgressor to make him better in the future is not punishment, but discipline. It is thus that one contemporary liberal theologian interprets the divine purpose in punishment. He contends that if God is sovereign, if God is saving love, then divine love cannot ultimately consign men to eternal punishment. "Hell has a school and a door in it, and no man can be finally lost."<sup>940</sup> Admittedly, punishment inflicted by arbitrary authority is injustice. What one would suffer from the mere anger or displeasure of another is not punishment, but persecution, unless the suffering is the result of moral indignation provoked by actual wrongs committed against the person by whom punishment is inflicted. "That the suffering inflicted is deserved is a necessary element in the conception of punishment."<sup>941</sup>

Since the righteousness and justice of God are revealed in the most severe punishment against the innumerable transgressions of the eternal law of righteousness; and since there is this irreconcilable antagonism of God against sin, and those who persist in sin, then it is patent that the principle that sin deserves to be and will be punished can never be abrogated. Because of the immutability of this principle, if man is, therefore, to be redeemed, God must assert, not a new principle, but that *same* principle in some other way.<sup>942</sup>

This is quite clearly an a priori conclusion. In other words, if God does not assert the morally necessary principle that sin deserves punishment by punishing it upon the head of the actual transgressor, He must then assert that principle in some other satisfactory way. "Some Divine act is required which shall have all the moral worth and significance of the act by which the penalties of sin would have been inflicted on the sinner."<sup>943</sup> The doctrine of the *substitutionary blood atonement* is the realization of this divine moral necessity.

---

<sup>940</sup> Soper, *op. cit.*, p.83.

<sup>941</sup> Dale, *op.cit.*, p. 384.

<sup>942</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 392.

<sup>943</sup> Dale notes this necessity in his work, *The Atonement*, " ... if the punishment of sin is a Divine act—an act in which the identity between the Will of God and the eternal Law of Righteousness is asserted and expressed—it would appear that, if in any case the

The principle that suffering is the just desert of sin is not suppressed in the doctrine of substitutionary atonement, which is foreshadowed in the Old Testament vicarious sacrifices and fulfilled in the death of Christ. This principle could have been adequately asserted had God chosen to simply inflict upon the sinner the deserved penalties of his transgressions.. But "it is asserted in a still grander form ... which in its awful sublimity and unique glory infinitely transcends the mere infliction of suffering on those who have sinned."<sup>944</sup> The doctrine of substitution is the divine solution to the dread necessity of asserting the principle that sin must be punished. "It belonged to Him to assert, by His own act, that suffering is the just result of sin. He asserts it, not by inflicting suffering on the sinner, but by enduring suffering Himself."<sup>945</sup> God's righteousness demands absolute obedience, or eternal punishment for all failure to obey and conform to His righteousness; but God is love, and because of this, love provided another way without violating the divine principle—*God met His own demands Himself!* Thus the doctrine of substitutionary atonement is not simply the placation of an angry Deity as the critics assert, but on the contrary it is the ultimate expression of Divine love.

The idea that the evangelical doctrine of propitiatory sacrifice and substitutionary atonement is fundamentally unethical and morally offensive, because it portrays God as an angry Monarch pouring out his wrath upon an innocent victim, is not a Biblical conception. "But such a moral sense in its protest against the doctrine of substitution wrongly assumes its own infallibility, and the conception of God that it evolves has its roots in speculation rather than in the Divine self-revelation."<sup>946</sup> Biblical theology sets forth two fundamental truths as self-evident with respect to man and God: that an absolutely holy God demands, uncompromisingly, holiness from His creatures; and that moral guilt must be punished in a moral universe where holiness reigns supreme. "If the claim of the law or the punishment of sin is relaxed in but a single province of the moral universe, the Divine ethical govern-

---

penalties of sin are remitted, some other Divine act of at least equal intensity, and in which the ill desert of sin is expressed with at least equal energy, must take its place." *Ibid.*, p. 391.

<sup>944</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 392.

<sup>945</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>946</sup> Henry, *op. cit.*, p. 365.

ment is to that extent dishonored and weakened,"<sup>947</sup> writes Carl F. H. Henry. In the moral necessity of God's punishment of sin the Scriptures declare that either the sinner himself must bear it, or an adequate substitute be provided to legally assume the guilt and bear the punishment. "Now in so far as man is a finite being and incapable of satisfying divine justice in an infinite measure, the infinite being himself must take the matter in charge; he must have recourse to substitution."<sup>948</sup>

"The Cross is the center of the moral universe, unveiling God's absolute refusal to suspend his law of holiness... .It stands as the supreme obstacle to making sin relative, to reducing the justice of God to anthropomorphic projections, to concealing his moral indignation and ethical anger."<sup>949</sup> Those who deny the penal substitutionary atonement as an offense to the enlightened moral sense, by implication deny the absolute moral holiness and righteousness of God. It assumes that God does not take His holiness, nor man's sin, seriously; and that He is willing to overlook or pardon sin without an adequate satisfaction of justice. But the Scriptures themselves are an immutable testimony to the fallaciousness of this assumption. They declare that pardon can only come through vicarious atonement supremely expressed in

... the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, in his blood, to show his righteousness because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God.<sup>950</sup>

---

<sup>947</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 367.

<sup>948</sup> Wilbur Marshall Urban, *Humanity and Deity* (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1951), p. 125.

<sup>949</sup> Henry, *op. cit.*, p. 367.

<sup>950</sup> Romans 3:24-25.

# APPENDIX I

## HEBREW SACRIFICIAL TERMINOLOGY<sup>951</sup>

### *The Generic Terms*

As an aid to the substantiation of the Biblical doctrine of substitutionary sacrifice, and to lessen the difficulties which have arisen from the ambiguity in the various translations of the Hebrew sacrificial terms, it is important to designate the various Hebrew sacrificial terms in the Old Testament and the classification of the Levitical sacrifices used in this dissertation. Etymology and usage indicate that the terms are used in the Old Testament under two specifications, generic and specific.

#### **מִנְחָה** (minchah)--gift, present, offering

The מִנְחָה is from a root מָנַח, to give, lend. A comparison of the various uses of the term indicates that it primarily signifies a *gift to God* in its technical sense; but in its widest sacrificial application it is used to summarize all varieties of offerings, animal or vegetable, atoning or eucharistic (it also signifies a gift to man, Genesis 32:13). The term is employed in the following usages: (1) meal-offering—used thus in its most restrictive sense (Leviticus 2); (2) sometimes used with wider significance and represents the bloodless as opposed to blood sacrifices (Psalm 40:7; Isaiah 29:21; Daniel 9:27); (3) occasionally it denotes a blood sacrifice, such as the morning and evening offering of a lamb (I Kings 13:29; II Kings 3:20; Psa., 112:2); (4) more generally used to designate any sacrificial gift (Genesis 4:3-5; -I Samuel 26:19). Synonyms for the generic term מִנְחָה in English are: (1) meal offering in its limited usage; (2) bloodless sacrifice, or sacrifice and offering, in its general application.<sup>952</sup>

#### **זֶבַח** (zevach)—sacrifice

זֶבַח is from a root זָבַח, to slaughter, with respect to food or sacrifice. The generic term is used as follows: the general name for all sacri-

---

<sup>951</sup> For an exhaustive study reference may be made to Alfred Cave's *The Doctrine of Sacrifice and Atonement*; Oehler's *Theology of the Old Testament*; Brown, Driver, and Briggs' *Hebrew Lexicon*, at al.

<sup>952</sup> Cave, *op. cit.*, p. 511.

fices used at feasts, i.e. a sacrifice which *culminates in a sacrificial meal* (Numbers 25:2; Deuteronomy 12:27; I Samuel 2:13); it is associated with various concepts: (1) the covenant sacrifice between Jacob and Laban, its first mention in the Old Testament (Genesis 31:54) also the covenant sacrifice between God and Israel (Exodus 24:5), where it is called the זִבְחֵי שְׁלָמִים, the sacrifices of peace-offerings; (2) the Passover sacrifice (Exodus 34:25); (3) the annual sacrifice (I Samuel 1:21); (4) the thank-offering Leviticus 7:12); (5) the varieties of the peace-offerings (Leviticus 3:1); (6) the slaughter of hostile nations is also a זִבְחָה offered by God Himself.<sup>953</sup> The common name for altar, מִזְבֵּחַ, designates it as a place of sacrifice (זִבְחָה). According to its etymology the common meaning of the generic term, זִבְחָה, is an animal sacrifice, which culminated in a sacrificial meal as can be noted from its customary usage in the Old Testament. The זִבְחָה is distinguished, therefore, from the עֹלָה, which was completely burned on the altar, and from the חֲטָאת and אֲשָׁם, which were never eaten by the offerer and were thus never called זִבְחָהִים.

### אֲשָׁה ( 'ishsheh) --an offering made by fire

The אֲשָׁה is a technical designation for every sacrifice on the altar, whether animal or bloodless. The etymology reveals that it is from אָשׂ, fire, and the word thus signifying an offering made by fire. The word is used chiefly of blood sacrifices by fire offered to God (the burnt-offering where all was consumed by fire and offerings where only a portion was burned); but it was also used of the meal-offering, מִנְחָה (Leviticus 2:11).

### קָרְבָּן (qorban) --offering, oblation

The קָרְבָּן is a general term, as is also the מִנְחָה used to designate all kinds of Old Testament offerings—animal, vegetable, and mineral. It first appears in Leviticus 1:2 where it applies to the burnt-offering (Leviticus 1:10, 14); the meal-offering (Leviticus 7:14); and offerings of gold and silver (Numbers 31:50; 7:13). The word is from the root קָרַב, to come near, approach; hence the noun signifies an offering by which approach is made to God. It is not restricted to any offering in particular, but represents the various ways the worshipper might approach

<sup>953</sup> Brown, Driver, and Briggs, *op.cit.*, p. 257-58.

God and find acceptance. The generic meaning is, therefore, a gift (offering) to God, which is confirmed in Mark 7:11 where it is translated by the Greek word for gift δῶρον (καρβᾶν ὃ ἐστὶν δῶρον).

### *The Specific Terms*

#### **עֹלָה** (‘olah) --whole burnt-offering

The עֹלָה is not from the root עָוַל, meaning to glow or burn, as some have maintained, but from the root עָלָה, to go up, ascend. This word is found in Genesis 19:28 where it signifies the ascent of smoke, and in Judges 20:40 it signifies anything which when burned turns to smoke. The עֹלָה is exclusively used for that variety of animal sacrifice which was completely consumed by burning upon the altar. Its synonym in Hebrew terminology is כָּלִיל, whole burnt-offering. It is sometimes referred to as holocaust, since it was the complete and unreserved animal sacrifice. Since it was the offering made morning and evening on behalf of Israel, it was also designated as the continual burnt-offering.<sup>954</sup>

---

<sup>954</sup> *Ibid.*, p 506

## זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים (zevach shelamin) --sacrifice of the peace-offerings

Two derivations of the שְׁלָמִים have been suggested. The name is derived from שָׁלַם, to be complete, sound, whole (noun: שְׁלוּם, completeness, peace); hence, one who is in a peaceful relation to God obtained through the sacrifices. The other derivation is from the Piel form of the same root שָׁלַם, to compensate or recompense, and would thus be sacrifices of restitution, or a return for benefit received. Usage, however, favors the former view. First, it should be noted that these offerings were not merely made upon receipt of blessings, but sometimes for blessings anticipated. Secondly, when more than one sacrifice was offered, sin-offerings came first, then burnt-offerings, and lastly, peace-offerings. If the peace-offerings were intended to heal a breach by recompense, they would have been presented first. Thirdly, the ritual of the peace-offering always concluded with a sacrificial meal indicating a complete or peaceful relationship between God and the offerer.

Three varieties of the שְׁלָמִים are to be distinguished (1) זֶבַח תּוֹדָה the thank (praise)-offering; (2) זֶבַח נְדָר the vow (votive)-offering; (3) זֶבַח נְדָבָה free-will offering. The thank-offering was presented in gratitude for some benefit already received, which had not been previously promised. The vow-offering was a promised offering, presented usually after the reception of some benefit previously entreated. The free-will offering was a voluntary free gift for which there was no occasion except the free-will of the worshipper to express thankfulness for all God's blessings and goodness; it was an expression of love for God.<sup>955</sup>

## חֲטָאת (chattath)--sin; sin-offering

The word is from a root חָטָא, to miss a mark; hence, to go wrong, to sin. Its noun derivative means sin, or in the abstract, sinfulness. As its secondary meaning it is used to designate that variety of sacrifice known as the sin-offering. The word in the Old Testament applied to a variety of sacrifices, but all of which had the same essential significance as sin-offerings. It was used of: (1) the sin-offering of individuals, the priesthood, rulers, and people; (2) the sin-offering for the nation on the Day of Atonement, and on festal celebrations, as well as at the monthly New Moon; (3) it was also used for sacrifices commanded to remove uncleanness (Leviticus 14:22; 15:15,30); and (4) for the bullock killed at the consecration of

---

<sup>955</sup> Oehler, *op.cit.*, p. 287.

Aaron (Leviticus 8:12), and for the calf and kid at the consecration of the Tabernacle (Leviticus 9:2-3).<sup>956</sup> The sin-offerings (1) removed sins committed against man; (2) against God; and (3) purified from sins of ceremonial uncleanness incurred through contact with the dead, etc. The water of sprinkling, made from the ashes of a burnt heifer, constituted a sin-offering.

### אָשָׁם ('asham) --offense, guilt, trespass, trespass-offering

The trespass-offering was a sacrifice for sin to compensate for trespasses upon the rights of property belonging to God or man. The trespass-offering was reserved for those cases in which reparation had to be made. "Thus, if a man failed to pay his tithes and offerings to the Lord ... he must bring his trespass offering; or if he refused to restore a deposit to his neighbors ... he must bring his trespass-offering."<sup>957</sup> His trespass-offering was received on the condition that he had made restitution to the wronged party, plus one-fifth. In addition there were trespass-offerings for the cleansed leper, Nazarlite defilement, and unchastity with the slave of another. The fundamental idea of the sin-offering was atonement, whereas in the trespass-offering it was satisfaction.<sup>958</sup>

### מִנְחָה (minchah) –meal-offering

The מִנְחָה was both a generic and specific term. Generically it was used to signify all classes of offerings, animal or vegetable, since its root meant "to give," hence, "a gift to God." In its most limited and specific application it designated the bloodless or meal or grain offerings. Sometimes it is referred to as the vegetable offering, and in the Authorized Version is called "meat-offering," an old English term for bread or grain. The מִנְחָה as vegetable offerings were of three kinds: (1) ears of grain (<sup>959</sup>אֶבִיב) roasted in fire; (2) flour (סֶלֶת) to which both oil and incense were added; (3) unleavened cakes (offerings -). The meal<sup>960</sup> מִצָּה

---

<sup>956</sup> Cave, *op. cit.*, p. 508.

<sup>957</sup> Spence and Exell, *op. cit.*, II, p. 79.

<sup>958</sup> Cf. the use of 'asham in Isaiah 53:10.

<sup>959</sup> אֶבִיב is also the name of the first month when the green ears formed and in which the Exodus and Passover took place.

<sup>960</sup> Leviticus 23:17 is not a contradiction to this in that leavened bread is required, since it was, first of all, loaves of the bread of the firstfruits signifying the consecration of that food used in ordinary daily life; and too, it did not come upon the altar, but was simply waved before the Lord and given to the priests.

were always preceded by some form of blood sacrifice, either the burnt or peace-offering. It consisted of that which served as common nourishment of man and was produced by human toil. As the burnt offering represented consecration of the whole life, the meal-offering signified consecration of the fruit of man's labors and a recognition of God's claim on the whole.

### נִסֵּךְ (nesek) --drink-offering

The term is from the root נָסַךְ, to pour out, and in the Piel means "to pour out as a libation." The drink offering, נִסֵּךְ, consisted of wine which was, according to Josephus, poured about the altar.<sup>961</sup> Drink offerings accompanied gifts of meal in connection with the sacrifices of animals (Exodus 29:40; Numbers 28:7), wine being the customary libation.<sup>962</sup> Wine is the representation of joy, and hence an expression of the offerer's cheerful acquiescence in the sacrifice at the altar. Too, like the water of the well of Bethlehem poured out by David, it expressed the heart poured out.<sup>963</sup> Cave understands the libation to signify basically that which is poured out in honor to God.<sup>964</sup> As in the meal-offering, the wine would constitute that which represented man's labors and sustenance and thus a consecration of his possessions and toil.

### שֶׁמֶן (shemen)—oil

This oil was for use in cakes or unleavened bread (Leviticus 2:1); used in the Lamp of the Holy Place; and in early times constituted an independent offering (Genesis 28:18; 35:14).

### Libation of Water

A custom of offering libations of water to Yahweh has often been inferred from the occurrences in I Samuel 7:6 and II Samuel 23:16 (I Chronicles 11:18). In I Samuel 7:6 the people assembled at Mizpah to proclaim a fast and confess their sins, and are said to have drawn water

---

<sup>961</sup> *The Life and Works of Flavius Josephus*, trans. William Whiston Philadelphia: The John C. Winston Co., [n.d.], Book III, Ch. 9, p. 106.

<sup>962</sup> Judges 6:19f. mentions broth and I Samuel 7:6 suggests the use of water as a libation.

<sup>963</sup> Bonar, *op. cit.*, pp 53-4.

<sup>964</sup> Cave, *op.cit.*, p. 510.

and poured it out before the Lord. In II Samuel 23:16 David, unwilling to drink the water of Bethlehem for which three of his men had risked their lives to obtain, poured it out before the Lord. The word used here is נָסַךְ “to pour out as a libation.” This passage proves specifically only that David regarded it as holy and consecrated it as a sacrificial libation to God. The former passage, however, seems to have definite sacrificial implications and was an accepted practice, although not enjoined by any specific Levitical precept. In later Jewish history, in the observance of the Feast of Booths, it was customary to make libations of water on the altar. Its significance appears to be, on the basis of its usage in I Samuel 7:6, a symbolical pouring out of the heart in penitence expressing sorrow for sin. It is thus interpreted by the Chaldee Paraphrast: “They poured out their heart in penitence like water before the Lord’ (comp. Ps. xxii. 14).”<sup>965</sup>

### *The Prominent Old Testament Sacrificial Term*

The most prominent and important sacrificial term used in the Old Testament is כָּפַר, to cover over, pacify, atone, make propitiation. It is usually translated in the Authorized Version by "to make atonement, reconciliation, propitiation." The usual verbal forms are the Piel and Pual.

There is no precise agreement as to the etymology of the word כָּפַר "atonement," although most scholars derive it from a root meaning "to cover." However, there is a close connection between the word כָּפַר and the noun כֹּפֶר in Old Testament usage as Morris observes in his book *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross*. In Exodus 30:12-16 *kipper* and *kopher* occur together and their connection is clearly seen. The passage deals with the half shekel to be paid at the census as a *kopher* in order that there be no plague. Here the atonement (*kipper*) is effected by the payment of a sum of money as a ransom (*kopher*). A similar meaning is also seen in other non-cultic passages as Numbers 31:50; Genesis 32:20; Exodus 32:30; II Samuel 21:1-14; Numbers 35:33, etc. Likewise, in the cultic use of *kipper*, the sacrifices and offerings themselves constituted the *kopher*, or ransom, by which reconciliation was effected. Morris holds, therefore, that the verb *kipper*, "atonement," is a denominative from *kopher*, "a ransom." *Kipper* would

---

<sup>965</sup> Spence and Exell, *op. cit.*, IV, p. 122.

mean "to offer a *kopher* (ransom) whereby wrath is propitiated and reconciliation effected."<sup>966</sup>

Others derive the meaning of כָּפַר from Arabic, a cognate language, where it means "to cover, or hide." This usage is found also in the Hebrew as seen from Genesis 6:14 where God tells Noah to pitch the ark within and without. "Make thee an ark of gopher wood ... and ... pitch [literally "cover," כִּפְרָת] it within and without with pitch [literally "a covering, כֶּפֶר]." The nouns כֶּפֶר and כִּפְרָת are also used to signify a village or hamlet, probably signifying an enclosure or covered place. Since the noun כֶּפֶר "ransom," probably means "a covering," it thus came to signify in its technical usage a gift or offering (ransom), which acted as covering over an offense, or over the face of the offended party, whereby he did not see the offense and was thereby pacified or propitiated. This is clearly seen in the case of Jacob and Esau where Jacob to appease his brother's wrath says: "I will cover his face [propitiate his anger] with an offering" (Genesis 32:21). In the Levitical use of the word it, is always the sin that is covered over by the blood of the *kopher*, which hides it from God's view and propitiates His wrath.

The root signifies, therefore, as in the cognate dialects, "to cover."<sup>967</sup> In spiritual usage כָּפַר indicates that the covering of a person would refer to the covering of his sins as Leviticus 4:35 reveals in the Hebrew: "עָלִיו הַכֹּהֵן עַל־חַטָּאתוֹ אֲשֶׁר־חָטָא וְכָפַר" "and the priest shall make a covering over him, over the sin which he hath sinned."<sup>968</sup> The spiritual implication in כָּפַר is that the priest is to put a covering over the man, that is, over his sin, hiding it from the face of God by means of the atoning blood of the sacrifice. Jeremiah 18:23 confirms this concept where "to cover iniquity" is paralleled by "blotting from sight." But the concept conveys the additional meaning of a covering of such nature so as to appease the divine wrath.

The effect of כָּפַר is to abolish divine anger as noted from the following instances. "But he, being merciful, forgave [כָּפַר] their iniquity, and destroyed them not; yea, many a time turned he his anger away,

---

<sup>966</sup> Morris, *op. cit.*, pp. 142-48.

<sup>967</sup> The cognate of כָּפַר in Arabic means "to cover, or hide"; in Aramaic it means "to wipe away." Richardson, *loc. cit.*

<sup>968</sup> The ASV renders Lev. 4:35 "and the priest shall make atonement for him as touching his sin that he hath sinned."

and did not stir up all his wrath."<sup>969</sup> Again, in the rebellion of Korah, when God's wrath had broken forth upon the people, Aaron was dispatched by Moses with a censer *to cover* the people from His anger (Numbers 16:46).<sup>970</sup> It is this conception of turning away the punitive wrath of God by covering it with sacrificial blood that prevails in the use of כָּפַר. The result is forgiveness of sins as seen from such passages as: Leviticus 4:28,31,35; 5:10,13,16,18,26; Numbers 15:28, etc. A frequent synonym for כָּפַר is כָּסָה (Piel כָּסָה), "to cover," and is used to indicate a covering of transgressions and iniquity in Job 31:33; Proverbs 17:9; 28:13; Psalm 32:1. "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven [נָשׂוּי], whose sin is covered [כָּסוּי]." Here both נָשׂוּי and כָּסוּי appear in close relation to כָּפַר, to atone, cover. Other verbs which are frequently used with כָּפַר are הִטָּא "to purify from sin"; טָהַר "to cleanse or purify"; and קָדַשׁ "to consecrate or set apart."<sup>971</sup>

---

<sup>969</sup> Psalm 78:38.

<sup>970</sup> Cf. Numbers 8:19; 17:11.

<sup>971</sup> Cheyne and Black (eds.), *op.cit.*, IV, p. 4220

## APPENDIX II

### THE CLASSIFICATION OF THE LEVITICAL SACRIFICES

The Levitical sacrifices are to be classified according three divisions: (1) national sacrifices: those offered in the name of Israeli (2) official sacrifices: those offered for the ecclesiastical and political orders; (3) personal sacrifices: those offered: for the individual.

#### *The National Sacrifices*

##### The Serial Offerings

The Serial Offerings were those which were offered daily, weekly, and monthly on the nation's behalf.

##### *Everyday*

Everyday, morning and evening, on behalf of Israel a burnt-offering of a lamb a year old, with appropriate meal and drink-offerings was offered (Exodus 29:38-42; 6:1-4; Numbers 28:3-8). Because it was offered daily it was called "the continual burnt-offering" (Exodus 29:42).

##### *Every Sabbath.*

Morning and evening, every Sabbath." the daily burnt-offering was doubled (Numbers 28:9-10).

##### *Every Month*

This offering constituted two types:

The New Moon Sabbath. On the first day of the month (i.e. the new moon) there were offered: (1) two bullocks; a ram; seven lambs. with the appropriate meal and drink-offerings; (2) the regular daily offering; (3) a kid sacrificed for a sin-offering (Numbers 28:11-15).

The New Moon of the Seventh Month. This was designated as the "Feast of Trumpets." In addition to the regular daily and monthly offerings an additional offering was made of a bullock, ram, and seven lambs (Leviticus 23:23-25; Numbers 29:1-6).

## The Festal Offerings

The Festal Offerings followed the Levitical calendar: The Passover cycle and the cycle of the seventh month.

### *The Passover Cycle*

The Passover Cycle consisted of three general divisions.

The Lord's Passover. This consisted of an unblemished lamb or kid slain on the fourteenth of Nisan at evening and eaten in the paschal meal.

The Feast of Unleavened Bread. The Paschal Feast began on the fifteenth of Nisan and lasted seven days, the first and last days constituting a sabbath of rest. Every day after the regular daily offerings two bullocks, a ram, seven lambs, and meal and drink offerings, in addition to a kid for a sin-offering, were sacrificed.

Pentecost. Fifty days after the Paschal Supper came the Feast of Harvest, or Feast of the First-fruits; or Feast of Weeks, as it was variously designated, which lasted but one day. The sacrifices offered were burnt meal, peace, and sin-offerings.

### *The Cycle of the Seventh Month.*

Three important festivals were observed in the seventh month with appropriate sacrifices.

The Feast of Trumpets. This was held on the first day and was the festival of New Year's Day, the month Tisri being the first month of the Civil year. The offerings have already been noted under the New Moon of the Seventh Month.

The Day of Atonement. This was held on the tenth day of the seventh month and constituted a day of fasting and national atonement for sin. For the priesthood, a bullock and a ram were offered for a sin-offering; for the congregation there were offered two goats and a ram.

The Feast of Tabernacles. It is also designated as the Feast of Ingathering and held on the fifteenth day of the seventh month. The sin of Israel removed by the sacrifice on the Day of Atonement, the last and greatest feast of rejoicing was celebrated, and lasted for an entire

week. Seventy bullocks were offered on an ascending scale during the week, together with other offerings.

### *The Offerings for the Service of the Holy Place*

These offerings consisted of oil, incense, and shewbread.

#### Holy Oil

Holy Oil was used for the daily replenishing of the golden lampstand. It was furnished by the people who were required to bring pure olive oil.

#### Incense

Incense was burned daily upon the golden altar.

#### Shewbread

The Shewbread was to be laid before the Lord as a memorial of the sons of Israel.

### *The Extraordinary Offerings*

These constituted the unusual and exceptional national offerings: (1) The offerings given at the erection of the tabernacle and temple; (2) The consecration of Aaron; (3) The surrender of the mirrors of the Hebrew women to make the brazen laver for the priests' washing; (4) Sin offerings presented by the congregation for special sin as in the case of Achan and the rebellion of Korah.

### *The Official Sacrifices*

#### The Priestly Offerings

These were offerings for the ecclesiastical leaders. (1) The special sin-offering for the priest who had inadvertently erred in the discharge of his calling (Leviticus 4:3); (2) The daily offering of meal by the high priest, morning and evening (Leviticus 6:14). (3) The Day of Atonement began with the expiation of the priesthood's sin. (4) Offerings at the consecration of the high priest, priest, or a Levite.

## The Offerings for Rulers

These were the offerings for the civil leaders, princes, and king, and were elaborate offerings made on special occasions. (1) At the dedication of the tabernacle; temple; David's return of the Ark to Jerusalem; etc.; (2) Sin-offerings made for rulers (Leviticus 4:22-26).

## The Personal Sacrifices

### *The Blood Sacrifices*

These were of four kind: the burnt-offering; peace-offering; sin-offering; trespass-offering.

### *The Bloodless Sacrifices or Vegetable Offerings*

This type was made up of: (1) the meal-offering; (2) drink-offering; (3) the offerings of the firstfruits; (4) redemption money of five shekels; (5) free-will offerings for the construction and maintenance of the tabernacle and vestments of the priesthood (Exodus 25:20-29); (6) wood-offerings for the altar (Nehemiah 10:34; 13:31); (7) the tithes (Leviticus 27:30-33; Numbers 18:21-32); (8) spoils taken in battle (Numbers 31:48-54); (9) exceptional vows for self, house, cattle, or land (Leviticus 27).

The important feature of all the blood sacrifices was the six-fold ritual in connection with the offerings which was as follows: (1) the presentation of the victim; (2) the imposition of the hands upon the head of the substitute victim; (3) the slaying of the victim; (4) the sprinkling of the blood upon the altar for an atonement for sin; (5) the burning of the sacrifice upon the great altar; (6) the sacrificial meal. The first three steps in the ritual were the same in all sacrifices; in the last three, differences occurred in the ritual in the various sacrifices, with the sacrificial meal being obviously omitted in the burnt-offering.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## A.. BOOKS

- Allis, Oswald T. *The Five Books or Moses*. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1949.
- Anderson, Bernhard W. *Understanding the Old Testament*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958.
- Armour, John M. *Atonement and Law*. Philadelphia: Christian Statesman Publishing Co., 1885.
- The Atonement*. Discourses and Treatises by Edwards, Smalley, Maxcy, Emmons, Griffin, Burge, and Weeks. Boston: Congregational Board of Publication, 1859.
- Baab, Otto J. *The Theology of the Old Testament*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1949.
- Baxter, W. L. *Sanctuary and Sacrifice: A Reply to Wellhausen*. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1896.
- Berkhof, Louis. *Principles of Biblical Interpretation*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1950.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Vicarious Atonement Through Christ*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1936.
- Bonwck, James. *Egyptian Belief and Modern Thought*. Indian Hills, Colo.: The Falcon's Wing Press, 1956.
- Boston, Thomas. *Human Nature in Its Fourfold State*. Evansville: Sovereign Grace Publishers, 1957.
- Bouquet, A. C. *Comparative Religion*. London: Pelican Books, 1954.
- Brown, John. *The Sufferings and Glories of the Messiah*. Evansville, Ind.: Sovereign Grace Publishers, 1959.
- Brunner, Emil. *Revelation and Reason*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946. Translated by Olive Wyon.

- Bruce, W. S. *The Ethics of the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895.
- Burney, C. F. *Outlines of Old Testament Theology*. London: Rivingtona, 1930.
- Bushnell, Horace. *The Vicarious Sacrifice*. London: Alexander Strahan, 1866.
- Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Translated by Henry Beveridge. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1953.
- Campbell, Roderick. *Israel and the New Covenant*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1954.
- Cave, Alfred. *The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice and Atonement*. Revised ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1890.
- Chafer, Lewis Sperry. *Grace*. 8th ed. revised. Wheaton, Ill.: Van Kampen Press, 1947.
- Charles, R. H. *A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1913.
- Charnock, Stephen. *Christ Our Passover*. Evansville, Ind.: Sovereign Grace Publishers, 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Existence and Attributes of God*. Evansville: The Sovereign Grace Publishers, 1959.
- Conner, Walter T. *Christian Doctrine*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1937.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Revelation and God*. Nashville: The Broadman Press, 1936.
- Crawford, Thomas J. *The Doctrine of the Holy Scripture Respecting the Atonement*. 4th ed. revised. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1954.
- Culver, Robert D. *Daniel and the Latter Days*. Westwood, N. J.: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1954.
- Dabney, Robert L. *Christ Our Penal Substitute*. Richmond, Va.: The Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 1898.

- Dale, R. W. *The Atonement*. London: Congregational Union of England and Wales, 1895.
- Dana, H. E. *Searching the Scriptures*. Kansas City: Central Seminary Press, 1946.
- Davidson, A. B. *The Theology of the Old Testament*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904.
- Driver, S. R. *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950.
- Edersheim, Alfred. *Prophecy and History in Relation to the Messiah*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1955
- Edwards, Jonathan. *The History or Redemption*. Evansville: Sovereign Grace Publishers, 1959.
- Enslin, Morton Scott. *Christian Beginnings*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1938
- Ewald, Heinrich. *Revelation - Its Nature and Record*. Translated by Thomas Goadby. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1884.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Antiquities of Israel*. Translated by Henry Shaen Solly. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1876.
- Fairbairn, Patrick. *The Typology of Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, [n.d.]
- Fisher, George P. *The Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1885.
- Francisco, Clyde T. *Introducing the Old Testament*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1953.
- Fuller, Andrew Gunton. *The Complete Works of the Rev. Andrew Fuller*. London: G. and J. Dyer, 1846.
- Gilbert, Joseph. *The Christian Atonement*. London: William Ball, 1836.
- Girdlestone, Robert Baker. *Synonyms of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Erdmans Publishing Co., [n.d.] A reproduction of 1897 edition.
- Gray, George Buchanan. *Sacrifice in the Old Testament*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1925.

- Hall, Charles Cuthbert. *The Gospel of the Divine Sacrifice*. New York: Hodder & Staughton, 1896.
- Hall, Newman. *Atonement*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., [n. d.]
- Hamilton, Edith. *Mythology*. New York: The New American Library of World Literature, Inc., 1955.
- Hassell, Cushing Biggs. *History of the Church of God from the Creation to A.D. 885*. Revised and completed by Sylvester Hassell. New York: Gilbert Beebe's Sons, Publishers, 1948.
- Henry, Carl F. H. *Christian Personal Ethics*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1957.
- Hicks, P. C. N. *The Fullness of Sacrifice*. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1930.
- Hocking, William Ernest *et al.* *Preface to Philosophy*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1947.
- Hodge, A. A. *The Atonement*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1867.
- Hodgson, Leonard. *The Doctrine of the Atonement*. London: Nesbet & Co., Ltd., 1951.
- Horton, Walter Marshall. *Christian Theology*. New York: Harper & Brothers publishers, 1955.
- Hoyt, Herman A. *All Things Whatsoever I Have Commanded You*. Winona Lake, Ind.: The Brethren Missionary Herald Co., 1948.
- Hughes, H. M. *What is the Atonement?* London: James Clark & Co., Ltd., [n.d.]
- Jacob, Edmond. *Theology of the Old Testament*. Translated by Arthur W. Heathcote and Phillip J. Allcock. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1958.
- Jarrel, W. A. *Old Testament Ethics Vindicated*. Greenville, Texas: W. A. Jarrel Publisher, 1882.
- Kidner, F. D. *Sacrifice in the Old Testament*. London: The Tyndale Press, 1952.

- Kligerman, Aaron Judah. *Messianic Prophecy in the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1957.
- Kohler, Ludwig. *Theologie des Alten Testaments*. Qubingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1953.
- Lazarus, M. *The Ethics of Judaism*. Part II of 4: parts. Translated by Henrietta Szold. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1901.
- Lidgett, John Scott. *The Spiritual Principle of the Atonement*. 3rd ed. revised. London: Charles H. Kelly, 1901.
- The Life and Work. of Flavius Josephus*. Translated by William Whiston. Philadelphia: The John C. Winston Co., [n.d.]
- Lofthouse, W. F. *Ethics and Atonement*. London: Methuen & Co., 1906.
- Magee, William. *Discourses and Dissertations on the Scriptural Doctrines of Atonement and Sacrifice*. New York: James Eastburn, 1812.
- The Meaning of the Glorious Koran*. An explanatory translation by Mohammed Marmaduke Pickthall. New York: Mentor Books, 1955.
- Mercer, Samuel A. B. *The Religion of Ancient Egypt*. London: Luzac & Co. Ltd., 1949.
- Morris, Leon. *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1955.
- Mozley, J. K. *The Doctrine of the Atonement*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916.
- Nichols, James Albert, Jr. *A Critique of the Theory of Vital Atonement*. New York: Vantage Press, Inc., 1955.
- Nida, Eugene A. *God's Word in Man's Language*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1952.
- Noss, John B. *Man's Religions*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1956.
- Oehler, Gustave Friedrich. *Theology of the Old Testament*. Translated by George E. Day. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, [n.d.]

- Orr, James. *Revelation and Inspiration*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1952.
- Owen, John. *Justification by Faith*. Evansville: Sovereign Grace Publishers, 1959.
- Pedersen, Johs. *Israel, Its Life and Culture*. 2 vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1947.
- Petrie, Sir Flinders. *Religious Life in Ancient Egypt*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1924.
- Pfeiffer, Robert H. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1948.
- Pink, Arthur W. *The Satisfaction of Christ*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1955.
- Ramm, Bernard. *Protestant Biblical Interpretation*. Revised edition. Boston: W. A. Wilde Co., 1956.
- Ramsey, Paul. *Basic Christian Ethics*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954.
- Robinson, H. Wheeler. *The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament*. 2nd ed. revised. London: Gerald Duckworth and Co., Ltd., 1956.
- Rodgers, Henry A. "Albert Schweitzer." *Ten Makers of Modern Protestant Thought*. New York: Association Press, 1958.
- Rowley, H. H. *The Faith of Israel*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1952.
- Rule, U. Z. *Old Testament Institutions*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1910.
- Sanday, W. (ed.) *Different Conceptions of Priesthood and Sacrifice*. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1900.
- Schultz, Hermann. *Old Testament Theology*. Translated by J. A. Paterson. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1898.
- Smith, C. Ryder. *The Bible Doctrine of Salvation*. Revised edition. London: The Epworth Press, 1946.

- Smith, John Pye. *Four Discourses on the Sacrifice and Priesthood of Jesus Christ*. Edinburgh: William Oliphant and Co., 1859.
- Soper, David Wesley. *Major Voices in American Theology*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953.
- [Spinoza, Baruch.] *The Philosophy of Spinoza*. New York: Carlton House, 1927.
- Strong, Augustus Hopkins. *Systematic Theology*. Philadelphia: The Judson Press, 1907.
- Terry, Milton S. *Biblical Hermeneutics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan publishing House, (n. d.)
- Tidwell, J. B. *The Bible Book by Book*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1953.
- Trine, Ralph Waldo. *In Tune with the Infinite*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 1897.
- Trueblood, David Elton. *The Logic of Belief*. New York: Harper and Bros. Publishers, 1942.
- Tulga, Chester E. *The Case for the Atonement of Christ*. Chicago: Conservative Baptist Fellowship, 1951.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Case Against Neo-Orthodoxy*. Chicago: Conservative Baptist Fellowship, 1951.
- Unger, Merrill F. *Introductory Guide to the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1951.
- Urban, Wilbur Marshall. *Humanity and Deity*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1951.
- Vischer, Wilhelm. *Das Christuszeugnia des Alten Testaments*. Zurich: Evangelischer Verlag A. G. Zollikon, 1946.
- Walker, Williston. *A History of the Christian Church*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954.
- Wellhausen, J. *Sketch of the History of Israel and Judah*. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1891.
- Wright, G. Ernest. *God Who Acts*. London: S C M Press Ltd., 1952.

Young, E. J. *An Introduction to the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans publishing Co., 1954.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Study of Old Testament Theology Today*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1959.

## B. COMMENTARIES

Alexander, Joseph Addison. *Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1953.

Baron, David. *The Visions & Prophecies of Zechariah*. London: Hebrew Christian Testimony to Israel, 1951.

Bonar, Andrew A. *A Commentary on the Book of Leviticus*. Evansville, Ind.: The Sovereign Grace Publishers, 1959.

Cohen, A. (ed.) *The Soncino Chumash*. Hindhead Surrey: The Soncino Press, 1947.

Dodd, C. H. *The Johannine Epistles*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1946.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. The Moffatt New Testament Commentary*. New York: Harper and Brothers publishers, [n.d.]

Gray, James Comper, and Adams, George M. *Gray and Adams' Bible Commentary*. 5 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, [n.d.]

Haldane, Robert. *Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans*. 5 vols. [Evansville, Ind.: Sovereign Grace Publishing.] 1955

Hengstenberg, E. W. *Commentary on Ecclesiastes*. Translated by D. W. Simon. Philadelphia: Smith, English, & Co., 1860.

Jamieson, Robert, Fausset, A. R., Brown, David. *A Commentary Critical and Explanatory, on the Old and New Testaments*. 2 vols. Glasgow: William Collins, Sons, and Co., 1873.

Keil, C. F., and F. Delitzsch. *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament*. 3 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909.

- Kendrick, A. C. *The Epistle to the Hebrews. An American Commentary on the New Testament.* 7 vols. Philadelphia: The American Baptist Publication Society, 1890.
- Micklem, Nathaniel. *The Book of Leviticus.* Vol. II of *The Interpreter's Bible.* 12 vols. New York: Abingdon Press.
- Midrash Rabbah.* Translated under the editorship of Rabbi Dr. H. Dreedman and Maurice Simon. 10 vols. London: Soncino Press, 1951.
- Murphy, James G. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Leviticus.* Andover: Warren F. Draper, Publisher, 1872.
- Nicoll, W. Robertson ed.). *The Epositor's Bible.* The Book of Leviticus by S. H. Kellogg. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1891.
- Orelli, C. von. *Die Propheten Iesaia und Jeremia.* Munchen: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung (Oskar Beck), 1891.
- Pentateuch with Targum Onkelos, Haphtaroth and Prayers for Sabbath and Rashi's Commentary.* Translated by M. Rosenbaum and A. M. Silbermann.. 2 vols. London: Shapiro, Vallentine & Co., 1945.
- Skinner, John. *Genesis. The International Critical Commentary.* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1930.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah. Chapters XL-LXVI. The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges.* Cambridge: University Press, 1954.
- Spence, H. D. M., and Exell, J. S. (eds.) *The Pulpit Commentary.* 23 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1950.

## C. GRAMMARS, LEXICONS, TEXTS

- Abbott-Smith, G. *A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament.* 3rd ed. revised. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1953.
- American Standard Version of the Bible.* New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1901.
- The Apocrypha.* London: Eyre and Spottiswoode Limited, [n.d.]

- Brown, Francis, Driver, S. R., and Briggs, Charles A. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. 2nd ed. revised. London: Oxford University Press, 1955.
- Kautzsch, E., and Cowley, A. E. (eds.) *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1956.
- Kittel, Rudolf (ed.). *Biblia Hebraica*. Textum masoreticum curavit P. Kahle. Stuttgart: Privilege. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1954.
- The Mishnah*. Translated by Herbert Danby. London: Oxford University Press, 1949.
- Nestle, D. E. (ed.) *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1952.
- Revised Standard Version of the English Bible*. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1953.
- Robertson, A. T., and Davis, W. Hersey. *A New Short Grammar of the Greek Testament*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1933.
- Scofield. C. I. *The Holy Bible*. Scofield Reference Edition of the authorized version of 1611. New York: Oxford University Press. 1945.
- Septuaginta*. Id Est Vestus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX Interpretes. Editit Alfred Rahlfs. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935.
- Souter, Alexander. *A Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1946.
- The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch*. Translated by J. W. Etheridge. 2 vols. London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green, 1865.
- D. DICTIONARIES, ENCYCLOPEDIAS CONCORDANCES**
- Cheyne. T. K., and Black, J. Sutherland. (eds.). *Encyclopaedia Biblica*. 4 vols. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1903.
- Cruden, Alexander. *Cruden's unabridged Concordance*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1954.

- Fallows, Samuel (ed.). *The Popular and Critical Bible Encyclopaedia and Scriptural Dictionary*. 3 vols. Chicago: The Howard-Severance Co., 1909.
- Fausset, A. R. *Bible Cyclopaedia Critical and Expository*. Hartford: The S. S. Scranton Co., [n.d.]
- Frazer. James George. *The Golden Bough*. 12 vols. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1935.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The New Golden Bough*. New York: Criterion Books, 1959.
- Funk, Isaac K., et al (eds.) *A Standard Dictionary of the English Language*. New York and London: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1905.
- Hastings, James (ed.). *Dictionary of the Bible*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (ed.) *Encyclopedia., of Religion and Ethics*. 12 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921.
- Jackson, S. M. (ed.) *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*. 13 vols. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1909.
- McClintock, John, and Strong, James. *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*. 13 vols. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1891.
- Miller, Madeleine S., and Miller, J. Lane. *Harper's Bible Dictionary*. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1952.
- Onions, C. T. (ed.) *The Oxford Universal Dictionary*. Prepared by William Little, H. W. Fowler, and J. Coulson. 3rd ed. revised. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1955.
- Orr, James (ed.). *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*. 6 vols. Chicago: The Howard-Severance Co., 1915.
- Richardson, Alan (ed.). *A Theological Word Book of the Bible*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1951.
- Smith, W. R., and Hatch, Edwin. "Sacrifice," *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*. 25 vols. Chicago: The Werner Co., 1894.
- Torrey, R. A. *The New Topical Text Book*. Revised edition. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1935.

Von Allmen, J. J. (ed.) *Vocabulary of the Bible*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1958.

## E. ARTICLES AND PERIODICALS

Cook, S. A. "The Theory of Sacrifice." *The Journal of Theological Studies*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1921. Vol. XXII.

Kraeling, E. G. "The Real Religion of Ancient Israel." *Journal of Biblical Literature*. Vol. XLVII. New Haven: Published by The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, 1928.

Nicole, Roger. "Propitiation." *Christianity Today*. I, No. 14 (April 15, 1957), pp. 7-8.

\_\_\_\_\_. "C. H. Dodd and the Doctrine of Propitiation." *The Westminster Theological Journal*. XVII, No. 2 (May, 1955), pp. 117-157.

Ranson, Guy H. "The Primary Emphasis in Christology." *Review and Expositor*. LII, No.3 (July, 1955), pp. 290-309.

## F. DOCUMENTS

Bettenson, Henry (ed.). *Documents of the Christian Church*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1954.

## G. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Hamilton, Benjamin. "The Place of the Trespass Offering in God's Plan of Redemption." Unpublished Master's thesis, Grace Theological Seminary, 1952.

McClain, Alva J. "The Doctrine of Salvation." Mimeographed notes, Christian Theology, Grace Theological Seminary, 1960.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Doctrine of Christ." Mimeographed notes, Christian Theology, Grace Theological Seminary, 1960.

Rea, John. "The Meaning of Azazel in Leviticus 16:8,10." Unpublished Critical Monograph submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity in Grace Theological Seminary, May, 1951.

Rust, E. C. Mimeographed notes, Old Testament Theology, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky., 1958.

Ward, W. E. "The Doctrine of Man." Mimeographed notes, Christian Theology, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky., 1958.

# APPENDIX (Not Part Of Original Manuscript)

## Index of Greek and Hebrew Terms

Numbers in parenthesis are page numbers in original manuscript.

καρβᾶν ὃ ἐστὶν δῶρον	(58), 50
that is to say, a gift Mark7:11	ἀνάθευα
(431), 302	a substitute
οἴσχεδόν	(293), 208
almost Hebrews 9:20	ἀναφέρω
(420), 295	to offer
ἀγοράζειν	(415), 291
to buy I Corinthians 7:23	ἀντί
(373), 261	a tooth for. . . Matthew 5:38
αἶρω	(208), 150
take away	an eye for. . . Matthew 5:38
(241), 172	(208), 150
taketh away John 1:20	answer to the English preposition "for"
(415), 291	(209), 151
taking away by bearing its punishment	evil for good Genesis 44:4
(241), 172	(209), 151
αἶρων	for, 150
represents the Hebrew term נָשָׂא	(208), 150
(241), 173	Greek preposition
ἀλληγορία	(208), 150
a description of one thing under the image of another	in his stead Deuteronomy 10:6
(180), 132	(209), 151
ἀμαρτάνω	in the room of Matthew 2:22
failure or falling short of the goal	(208), 150

instead of Genesis 4:25, Sept	a sacrifice
(209), 151	(112), 86
Matthew 20:28	θύω
(210), 152	to offer sacrifice, 87
ἀντί λύτρον ὑπέρ	ἰλασθητί υοι
a ransom for all I Timothy 2:6	be thou propitiated toward me a sinner
(208), 151	Luke 18:13
ἀντίλυτρον	(257), 184
substituted ransom I Timothy 2:6	ἰλάσκεσθαι
(373), 262	Dodd refuted
ἀποπομπαίος	(261), 187
Azazel (LXX)	(262), 187
(323), 229	propitiation
δῶρον	(259), 185
gift	to cover sin by blood sacrifice
(431), 302	(255), 182
ἔγγυος	to propitiate an offended deity
surety Hebrews 7:22	(253), 181
(145), 108	ἰλάσκομαι
ἐξηγόρασεν	to appease Genesis 32:20 Sept
to redeem Galatians 3:13	(257), 184
(373), 261	ἰλασμός
Ἔρ	propitiation I John 2:2
Kronos	(256), 183
(161), 119	propitiation
θέρω	(253), 181
bearing of sin	ἰλαστήριον
(241), 173	propitiation
θυσία	(253), 181
	(254), 182

propitiation through His blood Romans  
3:25  
(253), 181  
propitiation of Christ Romans 3:24-25  
(258), 185  
ίλασμός  
Dodd  
(260), 186  
Dodd refuted  
(261), 187  
Dodd's hypothesis  
(260), 186  
propitiation implied  
(259), 185  
καταλλαγή  
reconciled  
(253), 181  
reconciliation  
(37), 36  
to change or exchange  
(253), 181  
καταλλάγή  
reconciled  
(253), 181  
καταλλαγὴν  
atonement Romans 5:11 Authorized  
Version)  
(375), 264  
reconciliation Romans 5:11 ASV  
(375), 264

καταλλάσειν  
propitiation  
(253), 181  
to change or exchange  
(253), 181  
λαυβάνω  
bearing of sin  
(241), 173  
λογίζουαι  
to count, reckon (impute)  
(239), 171  
λύτρον  
a ransom Matthew 20:28  
(373), 262  
λύτρον  
price for a slave's freedom  
(208), 150  
ransom  
(161), 119  
redemption  
(208), 150  
λύτρον ἀντι πολλῶν  
a ransom for many Matthew 2:28  
(208), 150  
λυτρόω  
to ransom  
(373), 262  
όλοκαύτωμα  
holocaust, or the offering consumed  
by fire

(378), 265	for
πάντα	(206), 149
all Hebrews 9:22	for every man
(420), 295	(207), 150
περί	Galatians 3
for	\13
(209), 151	(210), 152
Greek preposition	is the usual preposition for the notion
(209), 151	of substitution
Romans 8:3	(207), 150
(210), 152	on behalf of
περί ἁμαρτίας	(143), 107
for sin Romans 8:3, (ASV)	(42), 40
(209), 151	on behalf of II Corinthians 5:20
περί ἁμαρτιῶν	(143), 107
for sins I Peter 3:18	on behalf of II Corinthians 5:21
(209), 151	(143), 107
περί τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν	one should find no trouble
for our sins Galatians 1:4	(207), 150
(209), 151	the righteous for the unrighteous
σώζω	(207), 150
to deliver, to save	used by A. T. Robertson
(68), 57	(207), 150
τὸ γὰρ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἀντὶ τῆς ψυχῆς	ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν
ἐξιλιάσεται	having become a curse for us
Leviticus 17:11	(207), 150
(209), 151	made to be sin on our behalf
ὑπέρ	(207), 150
carries the idea of substitution	ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν
(206), 149	for us

(391), 274  
 ὑπέρ παντός  
 that He should taste death for every man  
 (207), 150  
 ὑπέρ πάντων  
 one died for all  
 (207), 149  
 ὑπέρ σοῦ  
 in thy behalf  
 (207), 149  
 ὑπέρ Χριστοῦ  
 on behalf of Christ  
 (206), 149  
 אָבִיב  
 ears of grain  
 (435), 304  
 first month when green ears formed  
 (435), 304  
 אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד  
 tent of meeting  
 (197), 143  
 אָנָּף  
 to be angry  
 (247), 177  
 אַף  
 anger  
 (247), 177  
 אֲרוֹן הַבְּרִית

Ark of the Covenant  
 (329), 232  
 אֵשׁ  
 fire  
 (430), 301  
 אִשָּׁה  
 an offering made by fire  
 (111), 86  
 (430), 301  
 an offering made by fire  
 (430), 301  
 אָשָׁם  
 guilty  
 (60), 52  
 (64), 54  
 legally guilty (Christ)  
 (64), 55  
 אָשָׁם  
 guilty  
 (61), 52  
 אָשָׁם  
 sins of omission (advocated)  
 (61), 52  
 to be guilty  
 (57), 50  
 (58), 50  
 (60), 52  
 (61), 52

transgressor himself was aware of (advocated) (61), 53	trespass-offering (237), 170
אֲשָׁם trespass offering Amos 8:14 (257), 183	אֲשָׁם trespass-offering (310), 219
אֲשָׁם guilt or offense (60), 52 guilt or trespass offering (Suffering Servant) (65), 55 guilty (60), 52 offense, guilt, trespass, trespass- offering (434), 304 trespass (guilt) offering (61), 52 offense, guilt (384), 270 trespass-offering (61), 52, 53 trespass-offering (387), 271 trespass-offering (430), 301 trespass-offering I Samuel 6:4 (385), 270	בֹּאֵל Redeemer of Israel Isaiah 43:1 (370), 260 Redeemer to Israel (370), 260 בֹּאֵל redeemer Ruth 4:1-6 (370), 259 בֹּאֵל redeemer (370), 260 בֹּאֵל הַדָּם an avenger of blood Deuteronomy 19:6f (370), 260 kinsman-redeemer (370), 259 רַפָּה בְּיָד with a high hand (61), 52 with a high hand (310), 220 בְּנֶפֶשׁ the life of the flesh
אֲשָׁם	

(355), 249	to assert a right
בְּעִבּוֹר	(370), 259
on behalf of, for the sake of	translated λυτρόω by Septuagint
(282), 200	(373), 262
בְּעַד	גָּאַל
on behalf of	to redeem
(214), 154	(369), 259
(215), 155	גֹּאֵל
אַכְפְּרָה בְּעַד חַטָּאתְכֶם	redeemer-kinsman
atonement for your sin	(165), 122
(215), 155	גְּאֻלָּה
בְּעֵדָךְ	redemption, the result of redemption
for thee Genesis 20:7	(372), 261
(214), 155	גִּבּוֹר עִמִּיתִי
בְּעֵדְכֶם	the man who is my fellow Zechariah
on your behalf Job 42:8	13:7
(215), 155	(285), 203
בְּפִשִּׁי	הַיְדְּעָנִים
my nephesh	the knowing ones" (familiar spirits) II
(46), 42	Kings 21:6
בְּרִית	(47), 43
covenant relationship	וְאֵין לוֹ
(70), 58	and there is nothing for him (Daniel
covenant relationship	9:26)
(72), 60	(287), 204
בְּרִית	וַיַּעַד הָעָם וַיִּכְפֹּר בְּעֵדָךְ
covenant relationship	make atonement for
(70), 58	thysel, and for the people Leviticus 9:7
גָּאַל	(215), 155
	וַיִּחְשְׁבֶהָ
	it was reckoned to him Genesis 15:6

(239), 171  
 וְלֹא לֹו  
 and not for himself (Daniel 9:26 ASV)  
 (287), 204  
 וַתִּנְכַּחְהוּ  
 killed it  
 (104), 81  
 זָבַח  
 sacrifice  
 (429), 301  
 זָבַח  
 sacrifice  
 (429), 301  
 זָבַח  
 sacrifice  
 (104), 81  
 (111), 86  
 (89), 71  
 to slaughter  
 (104), 81  
 translated θυσία, "a sacrifice" and by  
 θύω meaning "to offer sacrifice"  
 (112), 86  
 זָבַח  
 slaughter of hostile nations  
 (430), 301  
 זָבַח  
 sacrifice  
 (430), 301

זָבַח  
 animal sacrifice  
 (430), 301  
 זָבַח  
 an animal sacrifice which culminated  
 in a sacrificial meal  
 (430), 301  
 זָבַח  
 animal sacrifice  
 (430), 301  
 זָבַח  
 kill of thy herd  
 (105), 82  
 mayest kill  
 (104), 81  
 root to slaughter  
 (429), 301  
 slaughter for food or for sacrifice  
 (104), 81  
 slaughtered for food  
 (105), 82  
 זָבַח הַשְּׁלָמִים  
 the sacrifice of the peace offering  
 (379), 266  
 זָבַח־פֶּסַח הוּא לַיהוָה  
 passover called a sacrifice Exodus  
 12:27  
 (390), 274  
 זָבַח וְשְׁלָמִים

sarifice of the peace offerings (432), 302	sins of commission (advocated) (61), 52
זְבָחִים שְׁלָמִים the sacrifice of peace offerings Exodus 24:5 (429), 301	sins that others were aware of (advocated) (61), 52 to miss, or sin (61), 52 to sin, to miss (57), 50
זָדָת sacrifice (89), 71	חַטָּאת sin (312), 221 Sin (236), 169 (316), 223 sin-offering (171), 126 (236), 169 (310), 219 (61), 53 (62), 53 sin-offering Ezekiel 44:27 (257), 183
קָטָא to purify (440), 308	
קָטָא root, to miss a mark (433), 303	
חַטָּאת sin-offering (430), 301	
חַטָּאת sin, sin-offering (433), 303	
חַב feast (111), 86	חַטָּאת Sin (229), 165 (333), 234, 235 sin-offering (237), 170
חָטָא sin (57), 50	

חֶסֶד

His faithfulness

(73), 60

חָשַׁב

count, reckon (impute)

(239), 171

imputed Leviticus 7:18

(238), 171

reckoned

(239), 171

to impute

(238), 171

to think, account, reckon, impute

(237), 170

טָבַל

borne

(240), 172

borne Lamentations 5:7

(240), 172

to bear

(237), 170

to to bear sin

(239), 172

טָהַר

be clean

(123), 94

טָהַר

to cleanse or purify

(440), 308

יום הכִּפּוּרִים

day of atonement

(316), 223

יָנַח

Hiphil of נָנַח to spurt

(412), 289

יָכַפֵּר

covered

(39), 37

יָקַרַת

he shall be cut off

(287), 204

יְשׁוּעָה

salvation

(68), 57

יָשָׁם

impute (II Samuel 22:15)

(238), 170

יְשׁוּצָה

salvation

(68), 57

יָשַׁע

to deliver, to save

(68), 57

כָּלִיל

holocaust

(431), 302

the complete or whole burnt offering  
Deuteronomy 33:10

(378), 265	(211), 152
קָלִיל	(212), 153
whole-burnt offering	(213), 154
(99), 78	(214), 154
קָלַל	(437), 306
to be complete	covering for a person and his sins
(378), 265	(439), 307
כָּסָה	covering the guilt of sin
covered Piel	(254), 182
(440), 308	forgave
כָּסָה	(440), 308
covered	in Aramaic "to cover or hide"
(440), 308	(439), 307
כָּסוּי	make atonemen Letiviticus 10:17 t
covered	(255), 182
(440), 308	propitiate Genesis 32:20
כָּפַכ	(257), 184
to cover	propitiation
(37), 36	(259), 185
to cover, to atone	rendered atone
(89), 71	(39), 37
כָּפַר	to atone
to cover	(253), 181
(37), 36	to atone RSV
כָּפַר	(375), 263
atone,in regard to sin a covering	to atone, cover
in respect to God a propitiation	(440), 308
(254), 181	to cover
atonement	(262), 187

(439), 307	(301), 214
(440), 308	(303), 215
to cover	(304), 216
(440), 308	כָּפַר
to cover over	redemption
(329), 232	(372), 261
(356), 249	כָּפַר
to cover over or propitiate	ransom
(253), 181	(438), 306
to cover over, pacify	כָּפַר
(437), 306	pitch [literally "a covering\
to cover sin by blood sacrifice	(439), 307
(255), 182	כָּפַר
to cover, atone, propitiate	village or hamlet
(253), 181	(439), 307
to cover, to hide	כָּפַר
(438), 307	ransom
to make atonement	(439), 307
(213), 154	כָּפַר עָלָיו
(215), 155	atonement for him
to propitiate	(214), 154
(255), 182	כַּפָּרִים
to reconcile Leviticus 6:30	atonement Numbers 5:8
(375), 263	(257), 183
כָּפַר	atonement or covering
ransom, the noun Exodus 21:30	(303), 215
(371), 261	כַּפָּרִים
כָּפַר	a covering, propitiation
ransom	(394), 277

כַּפֶּרֶת	for prophet (321), 227
pitch [literally "cover\ (438), 307	לְשֵׁעִירִים
כַּפֶּרֶת	he-goats (322), 228
mercy seat (257), 184	מוֹעֲדֵי יְהוָה
mercy-seat (317), 224	the set feasts of Yahweh (202), 146
propitiatory (197), 143	מִזְבֵּחַ
the propitiary, mercy seat (254), 181	an altar (105), 82 common name for altar (430), 301
כַּפֶּרֶת	מִנְחָה
Kapporeth (329), 232	general term for offering (431), 302
כָּרַת בְּרִית	gift, present, offering, 300, 304 (434), 304
cutting a covenant (299), 212	meal-offering (430), 301 (434), 304
לְכַפֵּר	to make atonement (39), 38
לְכַפֵּר עוֹן	מִנְחָת
to make reconciliation for iniquity Daniel 9:24 (288), 205	gift or offering (111), 86
לְמֶלֶךְ	מִנְחָה
for king (321), 227	a present (100), 79
לְנָבִיא	מִקְרָא קֹדֶשׁ
	holy convocations

(203), 147	(437), 306
מְשִׁיחַ	נֶפֶשׁ
Anointed One Daniel 9:26	nephesh
(288), 205	(45), 42
זְבַח נְדָבָה	the dead body
free-will offering	(46), 43
(432), 303	נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה
זְבַח נְדָר	living being
vow (votive) -offering	(46), 42
(432), 303	(48), 43
נָזַח	נֶפֶשׁ מֵת
to spurt, to spatter, sprinkle	dead person
(412), 289	(46), 43
to spurt, to spatter, sprinkle	נֶפֶשׁ תַּחַת נֶפֶשׁ
(412), 289	life for life (Exodus 21:23)
נִזְר	(216), 156
I.consecration, crown, separation, Nazariteship	life for life Exodus 21:23
(200), 145	(216), 156
נִזְר	נֶפֶשׁנוּ תַּחַת־תֵּיכֶם
to keep sacredly separate	our life for yours Joshua 2:14
(200), 145	(216), 156
נֶסֶךְ	נִצָּד
drink-offering	away from, about, on behalf of
(435), 305	(211), 152
נֶסֶךְ	Girdleston's contention
root to pour out	(213), 153
(435), 305	Job 42:8
to pour out as a libation	(215), 155
	on behalf of

(211), 152

בְּצַדִּיקֹן behalf of

(213), 154

נָשָׂא

bear her iniquity Numbers 16:20

(240), 172

to bear

(238), 171

נָשָׂא

to carry

(237), 170

נָשָׂא

to bear sin

(239), 172

נָשָׂא

to bear sin being penally responsible

(240), 172

נָשָׂא

the goat for Azazel bore Israel's iniquities Leviticus 16:22

(240), 172

נָשָׂא

bearing sins for the express purpose of removing them

(241), 172

נָשָׂא

represents the Hebrew term נָשָׂא

(241), 173

נָשָׂא

bearing of sin

(241), 173

נָשָׂא

to bear

(414), 290

נָשָׂא

to bear the name of the child of Israel

(414), 290

נָשָׂא

to bear the iniquity of the people

(414), 291

נָשָׂא

he bare

(414), 291

נָשָׂא

to bear

(415), 291

נָשָׂא

to bear

(415), 291

נָשָׂא

forgiven

(440), 308

נְשֵׁמַת חַיִּים

breath of life

(48), 43

נְשֵׁמַת רוּחַ חַיִּים

the breath of the spirit of life

(48), 44

סָבַל	(323), 228
to bear a burden	עֲזָאוּל
(414), 291	Azazel
(415), 291	(320), 226
tp bear	עֲזָאוּל
(415), 291	entire removal
סָהַר	(323), 228
to be clean, or pure	ע. ז. ז. א. ל
(122), 93	'azaz'el
(123), 93, 94	(320), 226
סְלִיחָה	עֲזָל
forgiveness Psalm130:4	Arabic cognate meaning "to remove"
(257), 183	(323), 228
סֹלֶת	עֲזָאוּל
flour	entire removal
(435), 304	(323), 228
עָוָה	עָלָה
to bend, twist	root, to go up
(58), 50	(431), 302
to commit iniquity	to go up, ascend
(58), 50	(378), 265
עוֹל	עָלָה
to glow	a burnt sacrifice
(431), 302	(430), 301
עוֹן	whole burnt offering
iniquity, guilt(	(431), 302
58), 50	עָלָיו
עֲזָאוּל	for him Leviticus 4:35 (ASV)
reduplicated verb עֲזָל	(211), 152
	וְכַפֵּר עָלָיו הַכֹּהֵן עַל־חַטָּאתוֹ אֲשֶׁר־חָטָא

and the priest shall make a covering over him (439), 307	(372), 261 translated λυτρόω by Septuagint (373), 262
עֲלֵיךָ on thy behalf I Kings 2:18 (212), 153	פָּשַׁע rebellion against God (59), 51
עֲלֵיכֶם on your behalf Job 42:8 (215), 155	to rebel (57), 50 (58), 51
עֶרֶב surety Genesis 44:32 (145), 108	צַדִּיק the righteous (58), 50
פְּדָה to ransom (371), 260	צֹלֶת תְּמִיד morning and evening sacrifice (202), 146
פְּדוּת redemption (372), 261	צָזַל Arabic cognate "to remove" taken as abstract noun (323), 228
פָּלַל to pray (215), 155	צַל account of (210), 152 for, 152 (211), 152 Job 42:8 (215), 155 on behalf of (211), 152, 153 (212), 153
פָּנָה root to give, lend (428), 300	
פֶּסַח Passover (389), 273	
פָּרָה redeemed	

(213), 153  
 on behalf of  
 (213), 154  
 on behalf of the kingdom II Chronicles  
 29:21  
 (212), 153  
 over  
 (213), 154  
 (214), 154  
 upon, over, to, on behalf of  
 (211), 152  
 כָּסָה צֶלֶל  
 cover over the sea  
 (215), 154  
 on behalf of  
 (213), 154  
 צִלָּה  
 burnt-offering  
 (378), 265  
 צִלָּה  
 burnt-offering  
 (89), 71  
 whole burnt-offering  
 (99), 78  
 אֱלֹהִים צֶלֶם  
 image of God  
 (52), 46  
 צֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים  
 ruach in man

(53), 47  
 קִדְּשׁ  
 to set apart, consecrate, sanctify  
 (89), 71  
 קִדְּשׁ  
 to consecrate or set apart  
 (440), 308  
 קִדְּשׁ קְדוּשָׁה  
 God's holiness  
 (131), 99  
 קָצַף  
 wrath  
 (247), 177  
 קָצַף  
 to be wroth  
 (247), 177  
 קָרַב  
 to come near, to approach  
 (431), 302  
 קָרָבָן  
 general term for offering  
 (431), 302  
 קָרָבָן  
 offering, oblation  
 (431), 302  
 רוּחַ  
 the spirit  
 (53), 47

רוּחַ

breath or wind	(380), 267
(49), 45	peace-offering
spirit	(379), 266
(47), 43	שָׁלֵם
רוּחַ חַיִּים	to be complete, sound, entire, sound
spirit of life	(379), 266
(48), 44	שָׁלֵם
רְחִי	to be complete, sound, whole
my spirit	(432), 302
(46), 42	שָׁלֵם
רָשָׁע	to compensate or recompense
to be wicked	(432), 303
(57), 50	שָׁמֶן
(58), 50	oil
שׂוֹם	(436), 305
impute (II Samuel 22:15	תּוֹדָה
(238), 170	thank offering
שָׁלוֹם	(111), 86
completeness, peace	זִבַח תּוֹדָה
(432), 302	thank (praise) offering
שָׁלֵם	(432), 303
to compensate	תִּזְבַּח
(380), 267	thou mayest kill
שָׁלֵם	(104), 81
to be complete, sound, entire, sound	מַחַת
(380), 267	in the place of Leviticus 14:42
שָׁלֵם	(216), 156
peace offering of some benefit already	in the stead of Genesis 22:13
obtained	(216), 156

instead of  
(216), 156

underneath, below, instead of  
(211), 152

תַּחַת

Girdlestone's contention  
(213), 153

in his father's stead Leviticus 16:32  
(216), 156

instead of  
(216), 156

instead of, in the place of  
(216), 156

תַּחַת בְּנוֹ

in the stead of his son  
(272), 194

תִּכְפֹּר

is covered  
(39), 37

תִּכְפְּרֶם

wilt forgive  
(40), 38