

# The Bible Student

V. 175 1900 (Jan. - June) W. #1 Jan  
 #3 Mar  
 Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.  
 J.P. ... 6 ... vol 2.

## Editors:

WILLIAM M. MCPHEETERS, D. D.  
 BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD, D. D., LL. D. SAMUEL M. SMITH, D. D.  
 GEORGE T. PURVES, D. D., LL. D. DANIEL J. BRIMM, D. D.  
 JOHN D. DAVIS, PH.D., D. D.



## Contents:

I. EDITORIAL NOTES: Individualism in Work. Christ's Dealing with Doctrinal Difficulty. Not Ritual Baptism. Christ's Dealing with the Sinner. Inadequacy of Personal Influence. Scientific Biblical Study. S..... 61

NEW TESTAMENT NOTES: "New Testament Theology." Fragmentary and Incomplete. Adoption. The Son of Man. The Holy Spirit. Why not Synthesize? A Distinction. Reform the Sunday School. International Lessons. Why Not Grade? Seek Teaching. Popular Lives of Christ. B. 66

II. THE SYMBOLISM OF THE LAMB. *John D. Davis*..... 71

III. THE SIN OFFERING. *John D. Davis*..... 72

IV. IS THE CHRONICLER A VERACIOUS HISTORIAN FOR THE POSTEXILIAN PERIOD? No. III. *Willis J. Beecher*..... 77

V. THE LIVING WATER. *Caspar Wistar Hodge*. .... 84

VI. THE NEW BIRTH. *R. A. Webb*. .... 94

VII. SHECHEM AND ITS ENVIRONS. *R. L. Stewart*..... 101

VIII. OUTLINE STUDY OF ISAIAH XL-LXVI. *W. H. Marquess*..... 107

IX. FOREIGN BIBLICAL THOUGHT: Evolution and Theology. Dr. Dickson on Dr. McGiffert. A Fruitless Discussion. The Prophets and the Pentateuch. Scholz on the "Logia." Anglican View of "The Study of Holy Scripture." B. B. W..... 113

The New Theory of Deuteronomy. Prof. Mitchell's Theory. A Dilemma. Dr. Toy on the Origin of the Sabbath. The Tabernacle an Oriental Tent. The Pentateuch the Word of God. KERR D. MACMILLAN. The New "Journal of Theological Studies." Dr. Sanday on Origin of the Creed. Trustworthiness of Acts. An Interesting Feature. Harnack on Haeckel and Thudicum. WM. PARK ARMSTRONG, JR. .... 116

X. BOOKS, PAMPHLETS AND ARTICLES: Robinson's "The Decalogue and Criticism." Stevens' "The Theology of the New Testament." ..... 120

The Bryan Printing Co. Press, Columbia, S. C.

ON SALE BY—FLEMING H. REVELL CO., New York, Chicago and Toronto.  
 JOHN WANNAMAKER, New York and Philadelphia.  
 PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION, Philadelphia.  
 PRESBYTERIAN COMMITTEE OF PUBLICATION, 2001 Main St., Richmond, Va.

[Entered at Post Office at Columbia, S. C., as second class matter.]

# The Bible Student.

CONTINUING

The Bible Student and Religious Outlook.

Vol. I., New Series.

FEBRUARY, 1900

Number 2.

Our Saviour's work seems to have been largely personal, chiefly individual. The disciples were selected singly and called individually; after having chosen and called them, his chief care seemed to be their development by personal association and teaching; the paramount object of his earthly ministry was to train them into instruments fit to carry on the work to be committed to their care when he should leave the world; this was the essential feature of his ministry, all else, however important, was incidental to this.

The first accessions to discipleship were made by individual, personal appeal; Christ calls Andrew and Andrew first findeth his own brother Simon, Christ enlists Philip and Philip brings Nathaniel; thus the gracious call through personal influence is passed on, transmitted as it were through individual contact.

We have record of more than one public address delivered to a large audience, but what may have been the result of such addresses we are left to conjecture alone to deter-

mine, the presumption is that the immediate, visible fruit was small; the fact that three years' work by both Christ and his disciples shows only one hundred and twenty adherents gained, indicates an absence of anything like great gatherings. Wherever there is any certain knowledge of a disciple secured, it was through individual influence, by personal appeal. We find in business a distinction recognized between goods hand-made and machine-made, preference and price being always in favor of the former as presumption of greater care in selection and greater fidelity in construction. The terms are not the choicest in spiritual connections, yet inasmuch as the word "machinery" has won recognition as descriptive of revival measures, it may not be inept to say that Christ's own method is against it, and to note that the individualism that marked his work is strong indication that in the spiritual husbandry, as in the natural, "hand picked fruit" is likely to be sounder and less subject to speedy deterioration than the other sort.

ascribed to Jesus the faultlessness and spotlessness of the sacrificial victim; and with fine sense of propriety he chose for his metaphor from among all available sacrificial animals that one which was hallowed by the most varied and the most tender associations, and that one which in the poetry of popular thought suggested gentleness, guilelessness, submissiveness, and affectionate attachment to man.

JOHN D. DAVIS.

---

### THE SIN OFFERING.

The sin offering made atonement (Lev. iv. 20; xvi. 11). It must be an animal; in extreme poverty an ephah of fine flour might be substituted (v. 11), but then the offering was incomplete.\* Cost did not enter into the idea of the sin offering. Whether the sacrifice was intended to make atonement for the great and populous nation or to atone for an individual, it consisted of one victim only. Numbers did not count. When the tabernacle was dedicated, the prince of each of the twelve tribes brought a rich burnt offering, consisting of a bullock, a ram, and a lamb; and a richer peace offering, two oxen, five rams, five he goats, five lambs; but for a sin offering he brought one kid only. And so always. He who would testify his gratitude to God, and freely dedicate his substance to the Lord, might sacrifice a hecatomb of burnt offerings. He who would make peace offerings, and hold fellowship with God and God's ministers in a feast before the Lord, might drive a herd of cattle to the sanctuary for the purpose. But he who came to seek atonement for sin brought one victim only. Number had no place. The commercial value of the sacrifice counted for nothing.† The importance lay in what was peculiar to the animal in itself alone. The sin offering was the gift

---

\*In case of extreme poverty, a complete sin offering was not demanded. God dispensed with that part which pertained to him, and required only that part of it which corresponded to the fat in the normal sin offering, and which sacramentally, through the acceptance of the meal by God, to whom it ascended in the fire of the altar, assured the offerer of his forgiveness. In going on the altar, the offering shared also in the benefits secured by the blood shed at that altar.

†In the opinion of Schultz, the guilt offering was a gift, ransom or payment made to God to "smooth his countenance," exactly as before a human tribunal a ransom was given under certain circumstances to the offended party; and the

of a life to God. This fact was not left to inference. The blood was emphasized; and of the blood it was said: "The life . . . 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" (Lev. xvii. 11, R. V.) The sin offering, moreover, was possessed of peculiar holiness. It is expressly called most holy, and contact with it rendered ceremonially holy the person or thing touched (vi. 25-27). God's promise of forgiveness was not conditioned upon rich presents, multiplied in proportion to the keenness of the sense of guilt. But the promise of forgiveness was associated with the gift of a life that was holy when offered to God. In eloquent symbolism the life of a holy thing was given to cover the confessed guilt of erring man (Bähr, Oehler, Delitzsch in Riehm's H. W., 1117, Dillmann).

The doctrine that the life of a holy thing was given to cover the confessed guilt of the erring one was the main lesson taught by the ordinary sin offering. It was the great lesson sought to be kept constantly before man's mind. It was the fundamental element in the doctrine of atonement. But the full doctrine was not exhibited. The sin offering furnished this exhibition on one occasion only. That occasion was the day of atonement. On that day the sin offering for the priesthood was advanced one step nearer perfection; and on that day, in the sin offering that was made for the nation, the standard was attained. That offering completed what was necessarily lacking in the symbolism, and brought the doctrine to full typical expression. It was the object lesson. On that day two he goats were taken from the congregation for a sin offering. One was slain; and instead of its blood being altogether disposed of about the altar or in the holy place, a part was carried even into the holy of holies itself. The other goat was not slain. The high priest pressed his hands upon its head, confessed over it the people's sins and placed them on it, and

---

sin offering was an expression of repentance through surrender of property. (Alttest. Theol. 354 f., 359.) This theory is insufficient to account for the facts. The gift, says Schultz, has value solely because God is willing to accept it. But according to the express wording of the law, the offering had value because the blood contains life. Moreover, "the blood is the possession of God alone." it was "*given to man for this purpose*" (Schultz). The blood was not owned by man, it was not his property; so that, strictly speaking, he did not give of his substance. In fact, everything possible was done to make clear that the surrender of the offending man's property is not the idea of the sin offering.

sent it away into the wilderness to "bear upon him all their iniquities into a solitary land" (Lev. xvi. 5, 8-10, 15, 20-22). This was the sin offering in its complete form. It exhibited several truths which could not be feasibly enacted on ordinary occasions. On ordinary occasions the blood could not be carried into the holy of holies. To rush daily, and even hourly, into the most holy place would have destroyed the sacred and significant seclusion of that inmost shrine which it was a chief purpose of the ceremonial law to guard. To send a sin-bearing animal into the wilderness, whenever a sin offering was sacrificed, would have created vast flocks of goats to perish from want or to tempt men to seize typically outlawed beasts, defile themselves with the unclean, and even bring the sin-bearer again into the congregation. The law would not defeat its own object.

What doctrine was exhibited by the sin-bearing goat? The people had been freed from guilt by the blood, and now they are taught by symbolical act that their sins have been carried away, and removed from the sight and presence of themselves and of Jehovah who dwells in their midst (Bähr, DeWette, Dillmann, Benzinger). The two goats together constituted one sin offering (xvi. 5). Two were necessary, because of the physical impossibility of setting forth by one goat the two elements to be exhibited (Hengstenberg, Bähr, Oehler). One object was attained. The life of a holy thing was placed before God, and the sin was thereby removed from the camp. God then treated the congregation as without sin; not merely as though he could not see their sin, but as though it were actually removed. It was not only covered and hidden, so that God did not see it; but it was no longer in the camp, it had been removed, never to return. Such was the symbolical teaching. In the full sense, atonement had been secured; the sin was expiated, and the sinner was accepted as righteous.

Besides this obvious and fundamental teaching on expiation and acceptance, the sin offering was rich in its suggestiveness. Seed truths were in it which, nurtured by providence and fed by truth from other sources, grew and bore much precious fruit. I. In the ordinary sin offering there was the seed thought that the life of a holy thing is required to cover the confessed guilt of erring man. This germ contains in embryo the doctrine of the sub-

stitution or interposition of a holy life of inherent worth, sufficient to satisfy the conscience of man and the demands of God. 2. Another seed truth was associated with the slaughter of the victim. Whatever idea originally underlay this act of violence, it was clear to all that the victim must of necessity die or there could be no atonement. Even though the immediate object of the slaughter was to obtain the victim's blood for display before God, as many believe; even though the sacrifice was slain primarily in order that the means might be secured for making expiation; still for no offense of its own it poured out its soul unto death and thus, as a matter of fact, paid the recognized wages of sin. This thought could not fail to occur to many a penitent, as he led his faultless lamb or goat to the altar and lifted his own arm to smite it; for a truth which pervaded the traditions and literature of the people from the earliest times was that the penalty of sin is death. "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" (Gen. ii. 17). He that beareth his sin, shall die (Lev. xxii. 9, etc.). "The soul that sinneth, it shall die" (Ezek. xviii. 4). "The wages of sin is death." "Apart from shedding of blood, there is no remission" (Lev. xvii. 11; Heb. ix. 22). The sin offering was too intimately associated with sin and guilt to escape association with the constantly inculcated truth that the penalty of sin is death. The animal actually endured what the offender deserved. Historically this association was made, and about it other profound truths clustered. 3. In the sin offering which was made on the day of atonement yet another truth lurks; the goat on which the sins of the nation were laid was made a curse for the guilty people. For, first, the holy thing which by its interposed life covered the sins of the nation and by that act removed them from the congregation, was incidentally banished, through the medium of the second goat, from the congregation. It was only a goat; but in carrying the nation's sins from the midst of the people, it must go into the wilderness, into a separate land, whence return was impossible. It was only a goat; but it suffered banishment from the congregation of the Lord. In the second place, the goat upon which the sins of the people were laid became thereby defiled. To say the least, it had come into contact with the defilement it was bearing away, and was rendered unclean (compare Num. xix.

7-10, 18, 21.)\* For no fault of its own, it was made an unclean outcast. The sin-laden victim became accursed. In exhibiting the truth that on the interposition of the life of a holy thing to cover confessed guilt, God pardons the sinner, casts the sin out of his presence, and accepts the forgiven one as righteous, the goat was incidentally obliged to suffer what the sinner deserved. It was made a curse. This feature was not the prominent nor the essential doctrine in the ritual of the day of atonement; but incidentally it was there, and impressively there, and the special ceremony connected with the sin-laden goat was calculated to spread the doctrinal germ among the people. A few spectators saw the ritual at the sanctuary. Thousands of Israelites, who dwelt between Shiloh or Jerusalem and the wilderness, annually saw the spectacle of the sin-bearing goat being led into banishment. Their thoughts were directed to the sufferings of the innocent victim, to whom their sins had been transferred. They saw the bearer of their sins made a curse and enduring what they should have endured.

JOHN D. DAVIS.

---

\*The man who took the sin-bearing goat into the wilderness was obliged to wash his clothes and bathe his flesh before returning to the congregation (verse 26). This washing of his person and his clothes was not, like that of the high priest (verse 24), required because of his contact with a thing most holy, but because he had become contaminated by the defilement that was being borne away. Contact with most holy things rendered holy, and required the holiness to be washed off in a holy place that it might not be taken into common life and defiled (Bähr). (Lev. vi. 26, 27; xvi. 23, 24; 27, 28 with iv. 12.) Contact with unholy things rendered polluted, and the pollution must be washed off that holy things be not defiled. A holy place is not designated for the ablutions of him that took the goat forth. The washing of his person and clothes was the customary purification required of those who were defiled by contact with an unclean person or thing (xv. 5, 21, 27; xvii. 15; Num. xix. 19).