

Study for the Month of December, 2007

The Sacrifices of the Daily Service

Part VI of Christ's Perfect Atoning Sacrifice at Calvary & Character-Perfecting Work as Our High Priest

Focusing on: The Trespass Offering & Sin-Trespass Offering

By Nathaniel Fajardo

FIRST, let me greet you and your families a blessed and peaceful Christmas, in the spirit of the true significance of Christ's birth---which should be the central focus and reason for any Christian Christmas celebration and festivities.

Note: Many Bible Christians know that December 25 was celebrated as the birthday of Mithra, *the heathen sun god*, long before Christ was born,—and Christ was not born during winter time else the shepherds would not be out in the freezing fields of Palestine watching their flocks, but in their homes with their sheep in the safety of their folds.

When thus celebrated with this realization, Christmas time can truly be *a season and reason for holy joy* among God's people! The **incarnation** of God Creator into our human flesh and blood nature is truly a mystery that angels desired to look into for ages but now has been revealed to the saints of God on earth! Col. 1: 25-27.

Only one Person in heaven and earth and throughout the universe will ever experience *incarnation*—Christ alone---the Creator, and Redeemer and Savior of mankind. He *forever* retains this incarnated human nature “in the body prepared for Him,” bearing the scars of the crucifixion. It will be the only reminder of the man's fall in the terrible experiment with sin, and the exceeding sinfulness of the nature of sin that required this *infinite* price in order to uphold the perfect righteousness and immutability of the Decalogue: the law that governs heaven and the whole universe.

The *instantaneous* change that takes place “in the twinkling of an eye” at Christ's second coming is not “reverse incarnation” but a change of the corruptible flesh into the incorruptible, glorified flesh, the mortal body to the immortal one, the sinful nature to the sinless nature. Both the 144,000 living saints and the unnumbered resurrected saints will be changed in these two fundamental aspects of the fallen human nature—else they cannot enter the heavenly portals. The characters of the 144,000 were fixed beyond all change *at the close of earth's probation* when Jesus ends His ministration in the most holy; the characters of the resurrected saints are fixed beyond all change *at death*.

All the saved who will experience these final changes begun with an earlier change—the spiritual rebirth “by watery death,” the baptism of repentance. This was followed by a daily, progressive growth of the moral character by the baptism of the Holy Spirit thereafter, until “Christ is formed within,” “unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ.” Col. 1: 26, 27; Eph. 3: 13.

Angels, in their angelic nature, will never fully comprehend incarnation's significance for they never will feel, by experience, what *fallen human nature* means and is, and the terrible, despotic power of temptation over it—which Christ, in our nature, infinitely suffered by experience because of His absolute purity. Having gained the perfect victory over all temptation and sin in this incarnated human nature, He freely offers mankind His victorious *human life* as the free gift of divine empowerment. If received and appropriated by faith, all may “overcome even as He overcame.” Rev. 3: 20, 21.

This is the grand object of the everlasting gospel, the plan of redemption and salvation, the true object of education: **“To restore in man the image of his Maker, to bring him back to the perfection in which he was created, to promote the development of body, mind, and soul, that the divine purpose in his creation might be realized--this was to be the work of redemption. This is the object of education, the great object of life.”** – *Education*, pp. 15, 16.

“The angels from heaven did not come to the school of the prophets and sing their anthems over the temple and synagogues, but they went to the men who were humble enough to receive the message. They sang the glad tidings of a Savior over Bethlehem's plains, while the great men, the rulers, and honorable men were left in darkness, because they were perfectly satisfied with their position and felt no need of piety greater than that which they possessed.”- *This Day With God*, p. 319.

“In the fields where the boy David had led his flock, shepherds were still keeping their flock by night. Through the silent hours they *talked* together of the promised Savior, and *prayed* for the coming of the King to David's throne. ‘And lo, the angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord shone round about them: and they were so afraid. And the angel said to them, Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the city of David as Savior, which is Christ the Lord.’

At these words, visions of glory filled the minds of the listening shepherds. The Deliverer has come to Israel! Power, exaltation, triumph, are associated with His coming. *But the angel must prepare them to recognize their Savior in poverty and humiliation.* ‘This shall be a sign unto you,’ he says; ‘You shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger.’

The heavenly messenger had quieted their fears. He had told them how to find Jesus. With tender regard for their human weakness, he had given them time to become accustomed to the divine radiance. Then the joy and the glory could no longer be hidden. The whole plain was lighted up with the bright shining of the hosts of God. Earth was hushed, and heaven stooped to listen to the song,--‘Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men.’ Oh that today the human family could recognize that song! The declaration then made, the note then struck, will swell to the close of time, and resound to the ends of the earth. When the Sun of Righteousness shall arise, with healing in His wings, that song will be re-echoed by the voice of a great multitude, as the voice of many waters, saying, ‘Alleluia; for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth.’ Rev. 19:6.” – *The Desire of Ages*, pp. 47, 48.

IV. The Trespass Offering

Stephen Haskell says:

“The trespass-offering was a sin-offering, and many Bible students make no distinction between it and the regular sin-offering. In some places the terms ‘sin-offering’ and ‘trespass offering’ seem to be used synonymously, as in Lev. 5: 1-13, but in other places they are spoken of as being two separate things. Eze. 46: 20.”

“A close study of the passages that speak directly of the trespass-offering, shows that it was offered more specially for *sins ‘in the holy things of the Lord’* (Lev. 5:15), as when a person had

trespassed by not following God's instructions in regard to the holy things. He may have *withheld his tithe* (Lev. 27:31), *eaten the first-fruits* (Exo. 43:26), or *sheared the first-born sheep* (Deut. 15:19); whatever the trespass, he was to bring a *ram* for an offering (Lev. 5:18; 6:6). This offering was disposed of much the same as the ordinary sin-offering, except that the blood was sprinkled 'round about upon the altar,' instead of touching the horns with the blood as in the sin-offering (Lev. 7:1-7).

It would seem from this that the trespass-offering did not always represent sins as public as the common sin-offering represented, but was often used for *sins known only to the individual himself*. If the person had taken any of the holy things from his own use, had been dishonest in his dealings with his neighbor, or had appropriated articles that had been lost, etc., he was not only to restore the full value, but was to add one fifth to the estimation of the priest.

The restitution was always made to the one wronged. If the individual had dealt dishonestly with the holy things of the Lord, the restitution was made to the priest as the representative of the Lord. If he had wronged his fellow-men and the one wronged had died, then the restitution was made to his kinsmen; but if there were no kinsmen, the restitution was made to the Lord (Num. 5: 7, 8).

There was no virtue in offering the lamb for a trespass-offering, unless the restitution was made in full for the wrong done. One special object of the trespass-offering was to atone for dishonest dealings with either God or man, and always required the restitution of the wrong *besides the ram* for the offering. *It taught very clearly that wherein we have dealt falsely with God or man, simply confessing the sin and bringing an offering will not suffice; we must make amends for the wrong.*

Zacchaes understood the law of trespass-offering, and as soon as he surrendered his life to Christ, he was ready to go even beyond the requirements of the law, and restore 'four-fold' to all whom he had wronged. Luke 19:8.

The trespass-offering was *a more complete offering* than the ordinary sin-offering; besides atoning for the sin, it also, in figure, *covered* the results of the sin. The prophet Isaiah used the trespass-offering as a special type of Christ. He was truly the antitypical trespass-offering when He shed His blood, not only to free the souls of men from guilt, but to remove forever the last trace of sin from the universe of God.

We quote Isaiah 53: 10 from the Jewish translator Leeser, as follows: "The Lord was pleased to crush Him through disease" *when (now) His soul hath brought the trespass-offering, then shall He see (His) seed, live many days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in His hand.*

There are many precious promises to the one who will present his trespass-offerings to the Lord. He who would be victorious in God cannot be content with merely confessing his sin to God; he must make restitution and restoration. This is taught in the Savior's words, 'If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest *that thy brother had aught against thee*; leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; *first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift.*' Matt. 5: 23, 24).- "*The Cross and Its Shadow*, pp. 143-145.

The Sin-Trespass Offering

M.L. Andreasen discusses at length a *combined or an intermediate* offering, calling it the *sin-trespass* offering, and proceeds to explain in detail how and why (emphasis mine):

"Sin offerings were for sins done ignorantly or in error, and did *not* cover sins done willingly or knowingly. When an Israelite had unwittingly done 'somewhat against any of the commandments of the Lord,' he was not held responsible *until it come to his knowledge.*' As soon as he was made aware that he had done wrong, he was to bring an

offering 'for his sin which he hath sinned.' Lev. 4: 27, 28. But, as stated, sin-offerings did not in any way avail for transgression done knowingly. Sins of this nature were called trespasses, and demanded a different kind of treatment.

"Ordinarily, a trespass is a willful sin, knowingly committed, a deliberate 'stepping over.' It might at times be unwittingly committed, but in such cases it was held that the man not only might have known better, but that he should have known better, and that he therefore was responsible for his ignorance. The Hebrew word for trespass-offering, *asham*, might well be translated guilt or debt offering. It denotes a *greater degree of guilt* than the sin offering, though the sin itself may be no greater.

"There are some sins which partake of the nature of a trespass. *They are partly sin and partly trespass.* A person may to some degree be ignorant of the wrong he has done, and yet not be entirely ignorant of it. *It is doubtless for this reason that some transgressions mentioned in the first part of the fifth chapter of Leviticus are spoken of as both sins and trespasses.* To these belong:

- [1] **the withholding of information (verse 1)**
- [2] **the touching of any unclean thing (verse 2)**
- [3] **the touching of the uncleanness of man (verse 3)**
- [4] **swearing rashly (verse 4).**

"In these cases the sinner was commanded to bring a 'trespass offering unto the Lord for the sin which he had sinned, a female from the flock, a lamb or a kid of the goats for a sin offering.' Verse 6. *It will be noted that the offering is called both a trespass and a sin offering.* In verse 9 it is called a sin-offering. Some Bible commentators treat these offerings as sin offerings' others count them as trespass offerings. In view of the fact that they are called both sin and trespass offerings, we may consider them as a kind of **intermediate offering** between the two, and call them sin-trespass offerings.

"A person who sinned in any of the above-mentioned things was to bring a female from the flock, a lamb, or a kid of the goats for a sin-offering. Verse 6. If he was unable to bring a lamb, he might bring a turtledove or a young pigeon. The blood was sprinkled upon the altar of burnt offering and the rest of the blood was poured out at the foot of the altar, the same ritual as the sin-offerings mentioned in the preceding chapter. Verses 7-9.

"If the sinner was unable to bring a turtledove or a young pigeon, he might bring for his offering the tenth part of an *ephah* of fine flour for a sin-offering. He was not, however, permitted to put oil or frankincense thereon. The reason for this is given: 'It is a sin offering.' The priest, in offering this, took a handful of flour and burned it for a memorial upon the altar. The remnant belonged to the priest the same as the meat offering. Verses 11-18.

NOTE: An ephah was "originally an Egyptian measure of a capacity as yet unknown, taken over by the Hebrews as measure for grain. The Hebrew ephah (Judges 6:19, etc) was equal to the bath* in volume, and equivalent to about 22 liters, or 2.5 pecks U.S. dry measure." A peck is "the fourth part of a bushel; a dry measure of eight quarts."- *SDA Bible Dictionary/Wesbter's Collegiate Dictionary, 4th edition.*

A seeming contradiction to the blood atonement requirement:

Paul says that "without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins. If we isolated ourselves to many such verses that clearly specify that *blood obtained through the death of the sacrifice* is the efficacy of the sacrifice for the remission and atonement for sin, we would be left in quandary as to why a specified portion of fine flour, a bloodless offering, was also accepted as a sin-offering. Andreasen addresses this, as follows:

"We are here face to face with a remarkable development. Ordinarily a **sin offering** should be a blood offering, that is, the life of some animal must be taken and the blood sprinkled, Here,

however, *a tenth part of an ephah of flour is accepted*. It is definitely stated that the priest should take a handful of this flour and burn it on the altar, ‘and the priest shall make an atonement for the him as touching his sin that he hath sinned in one of these, and it shall be forgiven him.’ Verse 13. Lest any should think that this is an ordinary meat-offering, it is twice stated, ‘it is a sin offering.’ Verses 11, 12. It seems clear, therefore, that in this case at least, a sin-offering was accepted that did not contain blood, yet made atonement for sin.

This calls attention to the statement found in the twenty-second verse of the ninth chapter of Hebrews. ‘*Almost all things are by the law purged by blood; and without the shedding of blood there is no remission [or forgiveness].*’ While it is true in general that in the typical service there could be no remission of sins without the shedding of blood, we are not to forget the exemption here noted. The American Revised Version says, ‘According to the law, I may almost say, all things are cleansed with blood, and apart from the shedding of blood there is no remission.’ That is, the rule that there is no remission without the shedding of blood, holds good, though in the types there is the exception here mentioned.

A similar situation confronts us with reference to the *red heifer* discussed in the preceding chapter [which we studied in our previous issue]. There was no immediate application of blood in the cleansing process there mentioned, but only of water and ashes. Yet it was a purification for sin, a sin offering. Num. 19:9.”

Indeed, I often wondered in the past as to what was meant by the passage, “*Almost all things are by the law purged by blood,*” meaning, there are *exceptions*. But as to *how*, *why*, and to *what* or *whom* they applied remained unanswered. I could not find an immediate satisfactory explanation,—till now.

M.L. Andreasen provides valuable insight that satisfies me seeing that it does not contradict the principles of the Scripture nor of the plan of salvation which definitely is “broad enough to embrace the whole world.” His view takes on the merciful side of the gospel. Notice:

“It is not our contention that sins are ever forgiven without the sacrifice on Calvary. The death of Christ is necessary for our salvation. It is, however, significant that in the above-mentioned types atonement and forgiveness of sin were sometimes accomplished *without immediate and direct use of blood*.

In searching for an application of this in the Christian economy [in contrast to the Jewish economy], *may we not believe that it signifies and applies to such persons as have no direct or definite knowledge of the Savior and yet are living up to all the light they have, doing God’s will as far as they understand it? May it not signify such heathen as have never heard of the name Jesus and yet to a greater or lesser extent partake of His Spirit?* We believe that there are those who have never hear the blessed name of the Master, who know nothing of Calvary or of the redemption wrought for them at the cross, who have exhibited the Christ-spirit and *will be saved* in the kingdom of heaven? To such, we believe, it applies.”

This insight does not, and should not bring us to the erroneous conclusion that it relieves any one who has received the light of the third angel’s message, somehow or somewhat, from the burden of bringing this message to “every people, tongue, tribe, and nation.” Far from it! What is meant, I believe, is that we often forget that it is not by human might or power that the work will be finished; it is by the Holy Spirit of God working in and through the hearts and minds of the penitent sinner and the human channel.

“Even the rocks will cry out.” If the sinner *cherishes* whatever light or impression of the Holy Spirit is made available to his personal circumstance, such will be accounted as *imputed righteousness* adequate to secure him an entrance to heaven at the resurrection morning. There he will grow in the knowledge of God and the plan of redemption throughout the ceaseless ages of eternity till he “is filled with all the fullness of God.”

1. The sin of withholding information

It is often said that there are two kinds of sins; the sin of commission and the sin of omission. To the latter class the following belongs (emphasis mine):

“The first case mentioned in the *fifth chapter of Leviticus, verse one*, it that of withholding information *when* under oath. ‘If a soul sin, and hear a voice of swearing, and is a witness, whether he hath seen or known it; if he do not utter it, then he shall bear his iniquity.’ The ‘voice of swearing’ is called the ‘voice of adjuration’ in the American Revised Version, and has reference to the oath administered in a Jewish court. When Christ was on trial, ‘The high priest answered and said unto Him, I adjure Thee by the living God, that Thou tell us whether Thou be the Christ, the Son of God.’ Matt. 26:63. Under these circumstances Christ could not keep silence, but answered, ‘Thou hast said.’ He felt compelled to answer when the adjuration was invoked, though He previously ‘held His peace.’ Verses 63, 64.

It is such a case as is here under consideration. The man us under oath or adjuration; he ‘is a witness,’ and has been asked ‘whether he has seen or known’ of the transgression. He refuses to answer; he does not ‘utter it.’ In that case, ‘he shall bear his iniquity.’ He sins on this point.”-Andreasen.

The inspired writer provides a practical magnification of the ninth commandment, the sin of “bearing false witness against your neighbor” to which this sin will be more specifically measured and judged by, although if we break one we break *all*, revealing the perfect unity of the Ten commandments (see James 2: 10). This is with reference to the all-embracing principles of the ninth commandment of which the apostle James wrote of regarding the “untamed tongue” (See James 3: 1-18).

E.G. White wrote in *Patriarchs & Prophets*, p. 309 (emphasis mine):

“The ninth commandment requires of us an inviolable regard for the *exact truth* in every declaration by which the character of our fellowmen may be affected. The **tongue**, which is kept so little under the control of the human agent, is to be bridled by strong, conscientious principles, by the law of love toward God and man. *False-speaking* in any manner, every attempt or purpose to deceive our neighbor, is here included. *An intention to deceive is what constitutes falsehood.*”

What are the prevalent ways in which we all are guilty of this magnified meaning of falsehood in one way or another, either now or at some place in time?

1. Body language! Actions speak louder than words.

“By a glance of the eye, a motion of the hand, and expression of the countenance, a falsehood may be told as effectually as by words.”

2. The spoken and written word are more directly addressed here. Exact truth should be the law of speech. Words are an index to one’s character for “out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh.” Matt. 12: 34.

“All intentional overstatement, every hint or insinuation calculated to convey and erroneous or exaggerated impression, even the statement of facts in such a manner to mislead, is falsehood.

But the ninth commandment forbids even more: character-assassination and the suppression of truth!

“This precept forbids every effort to *injure our neighbor’s reputation* by misrepresentation or evil surmising, by slander or tale-bearing [gossip]. Even the *intentional suppression of truth*, by

which injury may result to others, is a violation of the ninth commandment.”- *Patriarchs & Prophets*, p. 309.

And still goes even further!

“He [Jesus] teaches that the exact truth should be the law of speech. ‘Let your speech be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: and whatsoever is *more* than these is of the evil one.’ Matt. 5: 37, R.V.

“These words condemn all those meaningless phrases and expletives that border on profanity. They condemn the *deceptive compliments, the evasion of truth, the flattering phrases, the exaggerations, the misrepresentations in trade, that are current in society and in the business world. They teach that no one who tries to appear what he is not, or whose words do not convey the real sentiment of the heart, can be called truthful.*

Even facts may be so stated as to convey a false impression. “If these words of Christ were heeded, they would check the utterance of evil surmising and unkind criticism; *for in commenting upon the actions and motives of another, who can be certain of speaking the exact truth? How often pride, passion, personal resentment, color the impression given! A glance, a word, even an intonation of the voice, may be vital with falsehood. Even facts may be so stated as to convey a false impression. And ‘whatsoever is more than truth truth, ‘is of the evil one.’*

It is not easy to speak the exact truth. “Everything that Christians do should be as *transparent* as the sunlight. Truth is of God; deception, in every one of its myriad forms, is of Satan; and whoever in any way departs from the straight line of truth is betraying himself into the power of the wicked one. Yet it is not a light or easy thing to speak the exact truth.

Why speaking the exact truth does not come easy to sinners. “[1] We cannot speak the truth *unless* we know the truth; and how often [2] preconceived opinions, [3] mental bias, [4] imperfect knowledge, [5] errors of judgment, prevent a right understanding of matters with which we have to do! We *cannot* speak truth unless *our minds are continually guided* by Him who is [the way], the truth, [and the life].”

Jesting, joking, and unchaste conversation condemned. “Through the apostle Paul Christ bids us, ‘Let your speech be always with grace.’ Col. 4: 6. ‘Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good to the use of edifying, that it may minister grace unto the hearers.’ Eph. 4: 29. In the light of these Scriptures [see Eph. 5: 4-6], the words of Christ upon the mount are seen to condemn *jesting, trifling, and unchaste conversation* [and empty words]. They require that our words should *not only be truthful, but pure.*

Simple, straightforward, and true in speech and life. “Those who have learned of Christ will ‘have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness.’ Eph. 5:11. *In speech, as in life, they will be simple, straightforward, and true;* for they are preparing for the fellowship of those holy ones in whose mouth ‘was found no guile.’ Rev. 14:5.”- *Mount of Blessing*, pp. 67, 68.

2 & 3. The sin of touching any thing unclean.

“Verse two and three refer to touching anything unclean, of ‘whatsoever uncleanness it be.’ The man may have done it unwittingly; it may have been ‘hidden from him,’ but ‘when he knoweth it, then he shall be guilty.’- *Andreasen*.

To this apply the Scriptures that says, “Therefore to him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not; to him it is sin.” James 4: 17. Knowledge is what makes a person accountable. But *neglect* to know and search for truth is equally sinful.

The Sin of Keeping the Feasts again.

Referring to the Old Testament ordinances of the *types* which lessons we are currently studying, but which were all “nailed to the cross,” the apostle Paul warns: “Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to the ordinances; *Touch not; taste not; handle not;* which are all to

perish with the using; after the commandments and doctrines of men”? Col. 2: 20, 21. Such ordinances mentioned were circumcision, meat-offering, drink offering, holydays, new moons or the seven annual Sabbath days “which are a shadow of things to come.” Verses 13-17. To continue partaking of them is to *reject* the sacrifice of Christ Himself, of which the former were merely types and shadows of.

Sadly, some Adventists, of all people, have been deceived into keeping the Old Testament feasts and convocations again; and as such, have joined the Jews in their rejection of Christ! Of these the word of God says, “*Touch not; taste not; handle not*” for they “are all to perish with the using”! This is a serious warning: “*which are all are to perish with the using.*” I take this passage to mean two things, namely: (1) those who persist in keeping the Mosaic feasts again will eventually perish with the Jews who rejected Christ as the Messiah (2) no matter how sincere the person is in keeping these Mosaic ordinances again, it will avail of nothing since they are “mere husks of the kernel.”

The sense of touch is a powerful thing. The woman afflicted with an issue of blood for 12 years simply touched the garment of Christ and was instantly healed. Matt. 9:20, 21; Mark 5: 25-34. Hers was the touch of pure, childlike faith, which Christ honored.

When Mary turned to the risen Christ but who had not yet ascended to the Father in heaven, He told her, “Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to My Father.” John 20: 17. He had not yet presented His body as a sacrifice to the Father. Hence, His body which He had perfected here on earth by doing the will of the Father by “magnifying the law and making it honorable,” which was glorified at His resurrection, could not be touched by *any* human being till it was declared accepted by the Father. This was the “body that was made for Him in the beginning according to the volume of the book.” Heb. 10: 5-7; cf. Ps. 40: 7, 8.

When the Holy Spirit was poured out at Pentecost it signified that Christ’s sacrifice was accepted and that He had now assumed His office and work as High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary. The Third Person of the Godhead, the Holy Spirit, then became Christ’s vice-gerent on earth until earth’s probation closes when Christ ends His high Priestly mediatorial work in the most holy on the heavenly sanctuary.

Paul wrote: “It is good for a man *not to touch a woman*. Nevertheless, because of sexual immorality, let each man have his own wife, and let each woman have her own husband.” 1 Cor. 7: 1, 2, NKJV. This is one compelling reason why women should try as hard as they can to find a female doctor, particularly when a gynecologist is needed, and vice versa. The temptation is great. However, the case may be made that with the “coming out from the closet” of homosexuals no one can be too sure or picky.

In the classic warning against being “unequally yoked with unbelievers” Paul adds, “Come out from among them and be separate, says the Lord. *Do not touch what is unclean*, and I will receive you. I will be a Father to you, and you shall be My sons and daughters, says the Lord Almighty.” 2 Cor. 6: 17, 18.

The touching of forbidden things is both literal and spiritual. The intent of the touch is what puts the stamp to the act. The “touching” of forbidden flesh meat with the intent to *taste or eat* it is not quite the same as touching an animal classified as “unclean” such as dogs, camels, etc., merely to pet it, as in a petting zoo. A medical personnel who has to “touch,” meaning, transport or attend to a wounded or sick woman who works as a

prostitute is not the same as a man “touching” her in order to use her corrupt services, etc.

4. The sin of swearing rashly

“The fourth case is that of a man who swears ‘rashly with his lips to do evil or to do good, whatsoever it be that a man shall utter rashly with an oath.’ A.R.V. When he knows it, he also ‘shall be guilty.’ Verse 4.

In each of these cases, the appropriate offering was to be brought by the sinner for his transgression, ‘and it shall be forgiven him.’ Swearing here is primarily that which refers to oath-taking, and that swearing that is, in fact, cursing. Of the former may be included the thoughtless or presumptuous co-signing of loans that you are aware the main borrower is probably incapable of paying off because of bad habits or a track record or irresponsibility.

Andreasen observes that: “It is sometimes urged that God in olden times did not require confession and restitution in order to grant forgiveness, but only asked the sinner to bring the required sacrifice.”

A similar, if not worse position is taken by those who have embraced the extreme ideas of “New Theology.” They assert that “because of Christ’s death we are *already forgiven; therefore, there is no more need for confession, much less repentance.* We are already saved.” These were the very words of a dear friend of mine who stated these so positively as though it was gospel truth. I do not doubt his sincerity but that does not make it truthful nor the truth of the matter!

John, in the Testament reiterates this fundamental truth of the plan of salvation: “If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.” 1 John 1: 9. The object lesson taught by the ritual of the trespass offering should correct this terrible error! Notice what the Bible says:

“Confession was definitely required. ‘When a man or woman shall commit any sin that men commit, to do a trespass against the Lord, and that person be guilty; then they shall confess their sin which they have done.’ Num. 5: 6, 7.

Moreover, “general confession was not sufficient,” a common practice when we pray, particularly public prayers. We simply say, “forgive us from *all* our sins.” What’s wrong with that, you may ask, as Jesus taught us how to pray “forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors.”? True, but these words and phrases merely contain the instructions on how, why and in what spirit we are to pray. The mere repetition of the exact words of “the Lord’s Prayer” in and of themselves, are in vain if they do not convey the true sentiments of the heart and do not address those specific sins that are being repented of.

This, however, must be qualified with the knowledge that secret sins are to be confessed in secret between God and the confessor only, while public sins must be confessed publicly. When the great leaders of Israel repented of their sins and that of their people, they confessed publicly as to what sins they were guilty of—whether pride, avarice, following after the manner and practices of the heathen, etc.

But not only is confession but restitution as well is required according the Scriptures.

“It shall be, when he shall be guilty in one of these things, that he shall *confess* that he hath sinned in *that thing*.’ Lev. 5:5. This statement is definite and decisive. He is not only to confess, but he is to confess that he has sinned in ‘that thing.’ It is ‘that thing’ that counts. Only as he thus confesses can he receive the atonement.”

In cases where *fraud* was involved, confession was not enough, even though the confession was specific. *There must also be restitution*. This restitution consisted of one fifth of the sum involved besides the principal. ‘He shall recompense his trespass with the principal thereof, and add unto it the fifth part thereof, and give it unto him against whom he hath trespassed.’ Num. 5:7. In case it was not possible to restore the sum to the man against whom the trespass had been made, either because of death or otherwise, and there was no near relatives, the recompense was to be made to the priest. Verse 8. This restitution was *in addition* to the ram of the trespass offering.”

From this consideration it is clear that God demanded *more* of His people than the bringing of an offering. *He demanded confession and restitution*. If it still be urged that nothing is said of repentance, the obvious answer is that God here deals with the outward acts of worship only. Had repentance been demanded as a requisite for forgiveness, it would have been possible for a priest to deny a sinner atonement even though the man had otherwise complied with God’s ordinance. It would have left with the priest the decision regarding whether the man had really repented or not. *This is too dangerous a power to give any man. So God wisely reserved that to Himself*. If any doubt remains as to what God demands by way of repentance, and how the people understood God’s demand, read the prayer of Solomon at the dedication of the temple, especially 1 Kings 8: 46-53. Or listen to David’s supplication: ‘Thou desirest not sacrifice; else would I give it; Thou delightest not in burnt offering. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit: a broken and a contrite heart, O God, Thou wilt not despise.’ Ps. 51: 16, 17. Israel had abundant occasion to know that what God wanted was not sacrifice, but a broken and contrite heart. Had they wanted to, they could have made their worship both beautiful and spiritual, as doubtless some did.”- *Andreasen*.

It is quite clear that genuine repentance takes place at the heart, or it is no repentance at all. Public remorse does not necessarily mean repentance although repentance includes it, together with a turning away from the sin repented of. Furthermore, since it is a heart work it need not be overtly stated in order for it to be accepted by God, for “God looketh upon the heart but man looketh on the outward appearance.” 1 Sam. 16:7.

The Cleansing of Lepers

As a background, we first quote the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Dictionary, Commentary Reference Series Vol. 8*, on its entry on leprosy:

“**Leprosy**. A chronic disease, prevalent in certain parts of the world, affecting first, the skin and then the deeper tissues of the body. The symptoms listed in Leviticus 13 include a ‘rising’ a ‘scab,’ or a ‘bright spot’ (v. 2 KJV), described in the RSV as a ‘swelling or an eruption or a spot.’ As the disease developed, the hair in the leprous areas turned white, indicating that the disease had become deep-seated (v. 3). If after 14 days of quarantine the symptoms had not spread, the priest pronounced that the disease was not leprosy (vs. 4-6). Some other symptoms were ‘raw flesh’ (v. 14), a certain type of infection of the head or beard, accompanied by thin, yellow hair (vs. 29, 30).

An analysis of the various symptoms discloses that the term ‘leprosy’ was evidently used in a more general sense than it is today. Some have suggested that Leviticus 13 comprehends 7 different diseases under the general term ‘leprosy.’ Most of the symptoms described more closely resemble *psoriasis*, rather than true leprosy, often called Hansen’s disease, although true leprosy is certainly included.

Lepra vulgaris, one form of psoriasis, is a scaly disease, often beginning with small circular white patches about the knees or elbows, then spreading until these patches meet and become red in the center. The disease eventually covers the back and front of the body and sometimes spreads to the head. Though curable it has a tendency to recur.

The 'rising' mentioned in v. 2 may be similar to the tubercles characteristic of *lepra tuberculoides*, which affects mainly the skin and mucous membranes, or possibly *lepra anaesthetica*, which among other things produces numbness in the peripheral nerves.

These 2 last mentioned diseases and *lepra maculosa*, a disease characterized by spots and streaks, are 3 different manifestations of *elephantiasis graecorum*, or modern leprosy. This disease is considered curable only in its early stages. Even then the 'cure' is merely arrested progress of the disease. It must be remembered that medical science as we know it today did not exist in Mosaic times; hence the priests would have difficulty differentiating between diseases of similar symptoms. The 'leprosy' of clothing (Lev. 13: 47-59) and of houses (ch. 14: 34-48) which appeared as red-green streaks, was probably of some form of mildew or fungus, which made the garments and houses unsafe for use by human beings.

In non-Biblical writings the Greek *lepra* was used to describe what was apparently *psoriasis*. It has been suggested that Luke, being a physician, probably used that term in that sense (Luke 5: 12, 13). Josephus' observation adds feasibility to such an identification (*Ant.* 11. 11. 4). He describes lepers by saying merely that they had a misfortune in the color of their skin. He further states that some lepers held important public offices, such as captains of armies (cf. 2 Kings 5:10, and were permitted to enter into the holy places and temples.

True leprosy is a fearful thing, and in its advance stages presents a loathsome sight. The nose, fingers, and toes atrophy and drop off, the eyelids disappear, the sight vanishes, and the sufferer takes on a most dreadful and pathetic appearance. The voice deteriorates and disappears; the breath becomes most foul; the joints are often dislocated or engulfed by the tubercles associated with the disease; and patches of gray, necrotic flesh, appear about the body. The hair, nails, teeth, tongue, and palate are often consumed.

According to Levitical instructions, the victims were very strictly segregated. The victim was sent away from home (2 Kings 15: 5) and society (Num. 5:1-4; 12: 9-15) and he was forbidden to enter any walled city (see 2 Kings 7:3, 4; Luke 17:21), and was not permitted to enter the sanctuary (2 Chron. 26: 21). He was to wear torn clothes and let his hair hang loose, and whenever approached by any other person, he was required to cover his lips and cry, 'Unclean, unclean' (Lev. 13: 45, 46)."

It is to *true leprosy*, with its devastating effects, physically and psychologically, that *sin* is compared to in the Bible. In symbolic yet graphic language the gospel prophet describes the sinful condition of fallen man as, "The *whole* head is sick, and the whole heart faints. From the sole of the foot even to the head, there is *no* soundness in it, but wounds and bruises and *putrefying sores*; they have not been closed or bound up or soothed with ointment." Isa. 1: 5, 6, NKJV. It will take a heart yielded to the conviction of the Holy Spirit to accept this truth. The obstinate in heart, the self-righteous, and the willingly ignorant will not accept the divine revelation that there is absolutely not an iota of good or goodness in the fallen, sinful human nature, not a shred of righteousness that can be called intrinsic to his nature. All life, goodness, and righteousness come from Jesus Christ alone—the Creator and Redeemer. Apart from Him all is absolute despair, hopelessness, and eternal death.

E.G. White, in *Desire of Ages*, points out the truth regarding the leprous nature of sin even more distinctly:

"Of all diseases known in the East the leprosy was most dreaded. It incurable and contagious character, and its horrible effect upon its victims, filled the bravest with fear. Among the Jews it was regarded as a judgment on account of sin, and hence was called the 'stroke,' 'the finger of God.' Deep-rooted, ineradicable, deadly, it was looked upon as a symbol of sin. By the ritual law, the leper was pronounced unclean. Like one already dead, he was shut out from the habitations of men. Whatever he touched was unclean. The air was polluted by his breath. One who was suspected of having the disease must present himself to the priests, who were to examine and decide his case. If pronounced a leper, he was doomed to associate with those only who were similarly afflicted.

The law was inflexible in its requirement. Even kings and rulers were not exempt. A monarch who was attacked by this terrible disease must yield up the scepter, and fell from society. Away from his friends and kindred, the leper must bear the curse of his malady. He was obliged to publish his own calamity, to rend his garments, and to sound the alarm, warning all to flee from his contaminating presence. The cry, 'Unclean! Unclean!' coming from mournful tones from the lonely exile, was a signal heard with fear and abhorrence." – *"Thou Canst Make me Clean"* chapter, p. 262.

The Gospels record that one persistent leper in the region of Christ's ministry was healed of this terrible disease--the first one since the days of Elisha the prophet. The precious lesson taught in this miraculous healing is explained thus:

"The work of Christ in cleansing the leper from his terrible disease is an illustration of His work in cleansing the soul from sin. The man who came to Jesus was 'full of leprosy.' Its deadly poison permeated his whole body. The disciples sought to prevent their Master from touching him; for he who touched a leper became himself unclean. But in laying His hand upon the leper, Jesus received no defilement. His touch imparted life-giving power. The leprosy was cleansed.

Thus with the leprosy of sin,--deep-rooted, deadly, and impossible to be cleansed by human power. "The whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint. From the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it; but wounds, and bruises, and putrefying sores." **Isa. 1: 5, 6.** *But Jesus, coming to dwell in humanity, receives no pollution.* His presence has healing virtue for the sinner. Whoever will fall at His feet, saying in faith, "Lord, if Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean," shall hear the answer, 'I will; be thou made clean.' **Matt. 8: 2, 3.** R.V.

In some instances of healing, Jesus did not at once grant the blessing sought. But in the case of leprosy, no sooner was the appeal made than it was granted. When we pray for earthly blessings, the answer to our prayer may be delayed, or God may give us something other than we ask, but not so when we ask for deliverance from sin. It is His will to cleanse us from sin, make us His children, and to enable us to live a holy life." –*Ibid*, p. 266.

Regarding the situations when both trespass and sin offerings were necessary, Andreassen, says:

"There were other occasions that demanded both trespass and a sin offering, and hence belong to the category now considered. *One of these was the cleansing of lepers.* After being examined by the priest and proclaimed clean, the leper was restored to society and citizenship by a special cleansing ceremony described in **Leviticus 14: 1-8.** Another ceremony was necessary, however, to restore him to church fellowship and permit him to take part in the sanctuary service. This is recorded in verses 9-32. The leper was to provide a trespass offering as well as a sin offering, in addition to the regular burnt and meal offering. The trespass offering, a lamb, was killed, and the blood sprinkled, not on the altar, but upon "the *right ear* of him that is to be cleansed, and upon *the thumb of his right hand*, and upon the *great toe of his right foot*: and the priest shall take some of the log of oil, and pour it into *the palm of his left hand*." Verses 14, 15.

After that the priest was to take oil and 'sprinkle of the oil with his finger seven times before the Lord.' Verse 16. He was then to anoint the leper, doing with the oil as he had with the blood. The priest was to put it 'upon the tip of the right ear of him that is to be cleansed, and upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot, upon the blood of the trespass offering: and the remnant of the oil that is in the priest's hand he shall pour upon the head of him that is to be cleansed: and the priest shall make an atonement for him before the Lord.' Verses 17, 18. After this the priest was to offer the sin and the burnt offering.

If the leper was poor, he might substitute for the two lambs, two turtledoves, or young pigeons, 'such as he is able to get.' Verses 21, 22. This statement occurs several times in the narrative. God asked only that which the man was able to provide.

It is significant that leprosy demanded a trespass as well as a sin offering. *Are we to draw the conclusion from this that leprosy is the result of known transgression? We do not think so.* It is better to believe that the ritual in the case of leprosy is merely *illustrative* of the fact that there are

sicknesses which result from willful transgressions and which cannot be charged to mere ignorance. Such is undoubtedly the case, though it would be hazardous for man to pronounce finally in any specific case.”

The defiling of a Nazarite

Andreasen brings out a very important yet often ignored truth taught in the case of the a Nazarite who defiles his vow *during* his days of separation. Note:

“Another occasion that called for a trespass offering was the defiling of a Nazarite during the period of his separation. If this occurred, he was to “bring a lamb of the first year for a trespass offering; but the days that were before shall be lost, because his separation was defiled.’ Num. 6: 12. **Note the statement that even though atonement was made for him, yet ‘the days that were before shall be lost.’ Meaning, “forgiveness may be had, yet in many cases there is a definite loss.** This agrees with the New Testament statement: “If any man’s work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire.’ 1 Cor. 3: 15. The man is saved, but he suffers loss.”

E.G. White amplifies this important truth in one of the most controversial passages I have ever come across in her writings. And yet upon pondering upon it (and I continue to do so) in humility, I am convinced of its validity. The following quote describes the awesome magnitude and extent of the true harvest principle,—that it indeed carries on to eternity! I could not but accept its sobering truth, although my feeble mind is still boggled by its awesome ramifications. Notice (emphasis mine):

“Every sin, every unrighteous action, every transgression of the law of God, *tells with a thousandfold more force upon the actor than the sufferer.* Every time one of the glorious faculties with which God has enriched man is abused or misused, that faculty loses forever a portion of its vigor and will never be as it was before the abuse it suffered. Every abuse inflicted upon our moral nature in this life is felt not only for time but for eternity. **Though God may forgive the sinner, yet eternity will not make up that voluntary loss sustained in this life.** To go forth into the next, the future life, deprived of half the power which might be carried there is a terrible thought. **The days of probation lost here in acquiring a fitness for heaven, is a loss which will never be recovered. The capacities of enjoyment will be less in the future life for the misdemeanors and abuse of moral powers in this life. However high we may attain in the future life, we might soar higher and still higher, if we had made the most of our God-given privileges and golden opportunities to improve our faculties here in this probationary existence.**” —*This Day With God*, p. 350/ Letter 41, Dec. 7, 1877, to F.E. Belden, a 19-year old nephew.

This matter should be presented wisely, at its proper time, and with great tact when sharing the practical details of the plan of salvation else it provoke debate, confusion, and skepticism, toward the “spirit of prophecy.” God’s true health reform message, which is “the “right arm of the gospel,” boldly declares, “For whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap” (Gal. 6: 7, 8; cf. Hos. 8: 7; 10:12; Rom. 8:13)—which is but the re-echoing of the Golden Rule “on which hang all the law and the prophets.” Matt. 7:12.

The effect is *greater* upon the actor than the sufferer. How? First, I choose to believe that this is particularly applicable to the *willful, presumptuous sinner*, following the principle that: “for everyone to whom much is *given*, from him much will be required; and to whom much has been *committed*, of him they will ask the more.” Luke 12: 48. Apostle James adds, “Therefore, to him who *knows* to do good and does not do it, to him it is sin.” James 4: 17, NKJV. Knowledge, as well as neglecting or squandering the opportunity granted to acquire that knowledge increases the guilt.

This, however, does not in any way to diminish the responsibility of *each* person to search for the truth himself and to hunger and thirst after righteousness. Our judgment will not be because we believed a lie but because we were negligent in our duty to know the truth, and then plead ignorance or forgetfulness of God's requirements. Notice:

"Habits of negligence should be resolutely overcome. Many think it a sufficient excuse for the grossest errors to plead forgetfulness. But do they not, as well as others, possess intellectual faculties? Then they should discipline their minds to be retentive. *It is a sin to forget, a sin to be negligent.* If you form a habit of negligence, you may neglect your own soul's salvation, and at last find that you are unready for the kingdom of God." – *Christ's Object Lessons*, pp. 358, 359.

Indeed it is sinful to be negligent. There is even such a thing as criminal negligence. But is it a sin to simply forget things as a mere mortal? No! The type of forgetfulness that is condemned of God is the one associated with or a result of negligence, and not the forgetfulness or lapses of memory that come with old age, illnesses, or certain medications.

Thus the willful sinner is both the actor and the sufferer. He wears two cumbersome hats, and desperately searches for excuses to justify his deeds. Some claim to have been "forced or coerced" into committing the sin. Others say "it was out of a necessity" of one kind or the other. Still others, like King Saul, use a "religious reason" in order to disobey God's command, etc. Such willful and premeditated transgressors inevitably suffer their just consequences sooner or later.

But the special insight here is that the actor and his actions are the *cause*; the sufferings he suffers are merely the *effect*. He is the author, engineer, driver, instigator, and the *mastermind*. In this respect the sinner's sufferings *began way before* the effects kicked in. While planning to commit sin, the silent voice of the Holy Spirit had already begun its "work of fire" upon his conscience. As someone put it, "a guilty conscience does not need a hangman's jury." A tortured conscience can drive its possessor to spiritualism, insanity, or acts of despair and despondency that often expresses itself in heinous crimes, or suicide as the last resort.

Hence the effect is greater upon the actor than the sufferer.

While this seems to be not only bad but depressing news, the other half of it is *wonderful and comforting news* to those of us who abused our bodies and faculties when we were yet following after the manner of the world *before* we met Christ in our individual "road to Damascus experience."

And what is this good news? We can, and must *fully repent and forsake* all those sins that "easily beset us," including those considered "unpardonable" by human moralists with their self-righteous standards. Yes, we can receive forgiveness (or justification) full and complete through the imputed righteousness of Christ, and be considered of Him as though we never committed those sins at all! But it does not stop there. He continues, "*But go and sin no more lest a worse thing happen to you.*" (John 5:14; cf. 8: 11).

As the familiar hymn goes, "And *if* we meekly follow our Savior here below, He'll give us of the fountain whose streams eternal flow!" We will be eternally saved in the future life, and that is all that matters now to me—even if "deprived of half the power which might be carried there." I cannot change my past; neither does God. What must be changed is

the present and whatever remains of our time and our faculties. The mind-set and the attitude must be changed. As Paul says by inspiration and experience, "Let this mind be in you, which was *also* in Christ Jesus. . . *He humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.*" Phil. 2: 5, 8.

I fully accept by faith the righteousness and immutability of the law, and the mercy, justice and *fairness* of God, its Author. He affirmed all these by submitting to the unyielding demands of His own law and paying the price of its transgression with His own life. Amazing grace! Praise God that those who make all efforts to continually and progressively grow in the knowledge of His will, as revealed throughout the Bible, and diligently apply them to their practical lives *will enjoy all the just rewards*, both here and in the hereafter. Likewise, the same holds true for those who do *less*.

This is what is comprehended in Christ's last recorded promise, "And behold, I come, and My reward is with Me to give to man according to his works." Rev. 22: 12.

Trespass offerings must include restitution

Haskell says (emphasis mine), in p. 144:

"It would seem from this that the trespass-offering did not always represent sins as public as the common sin-offering represented, *but was often used for sins known only to the individual himself*. If the person had taken any of the holy things for his own use, had been dishonest in his dealings with his neighbor, or had appropriated articles that had been lost, etc., *he was not only to restore the full value, but was to add one-fifth the estimation of the priest* (Lev. 5: 16; 6:5)."

"The restitution was always made to the one wronged. If the individual had dealt dishonestly with the holy things of the Lord, the restitution was made to the priest as the representative of the Lord. If he had wronged his fellow-men and the one wronged had died, then the restitution was made to the kinsman; but if there was no kinsman, the restitution was made to the Lord. (Num. 5: 7, 8).

"There was *no virtue* in offering the ram for a trespass-offering, *unless the restitution was made in full* for the wrong done. One special object of the trespass offering was to atone for the dishonest dealings with either God or man, and always required the restitution of the wrong besides the ram for the offering. *It taught very clearly that wherein we have dealt falsely with God or man, simply confessing the sin and bringing an offering will not suffice; we must make amends for the wrong.*"

Zacchaeus understood the law of the trespass-offering, and *as soon as he surrendered his life to Christ*, he was ready to go even beyond the requirements of the law, and restore 'fourfold' to all whom he had wronged. (Luke 19:8).

Q. Was the trespass-offering a more complete offering than the sin-offering?

Andreasen believes so. He explains thus:

"Besides atoning for the sin, it also, in figure, *covered* the result of the sin. The prophet **Isaiah used the trespass-offering as a special type of Christ. He was truly the antitypical trespass-offering when He shed His blood, not only to free the souls of men from guilt, but to remove forever the last trace of sin from the universe of God.** We quote Isa. 53: 10 from the Jewish translator Leeser, as follows: 'The Lord was pleased to crush Him through disease: *when (now) His soul hath brought the trespass-offering, then shall He see (His) seed, live many days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in His hand.*' (itals. in the original). There are many precious promises to the one who will present his trespass-offerings to the Lord. **He who would be victorious in God cannot be content with**

merely confessing his sin to God; he must make reconciliation and restoration. This is taught in the Savior's words, "Therefore if you bring your gift to the altar, and there remember that your brother has something against you, leave your gift there before the altar, and go your way. First be reconciled to your brother, and then come and offer your gift." Matt. 5: 23, 24, NKJV.

This, perhaps, is one of the greatest wants among the members of the remnant church at the present time--which helps explain its persistent Laodicean lukewarmness. Many have only *partially* surrendered their lives to Christ. Hence, they find no compelling power or feel any urgency to go beyond confessing their sins and returning their tithes and giving liberally of offerings--*as commendable as these are compared to those who no longer even confess their sins claiming "we are already saved."* They are reluctant to make *reconciliation* with their brethren on matters where there has been a falling out among them. Misunderstandings and wounded feelings are allowed to fester unattended; they avoid restitution and restoration. But we must learn from Zacchaeus!

The distinction between the sin and trespass-offering.

Andreasen points out that the one distinction between the sin and trespass offering is that of the sprinkling of the blood. Note:

"In the sin offering, the blood was put upon the *horns* of the altar of burnt offering. Lev. 4: 25, 30, 34. *This is not mentioned concerning the trespass offering.* According to Leviticus 7:2, the blood of the trespass offering was sprinkled round about upon the altar, the same as the blood of the burnt and peace offerings. It is thought by some that the statement: 'As the sin offering is, so is the trespass offering: there is one law for them' (Lev. 7:7), has reference to the sprinkling of the blood. In that case, the blood of the sin offering as well as that of the trespass offering would be sprinkled round about the altar and also put on the horns of the altar. *However, it appears that the 'one law' has special reference to the eating of the flesh.* In the absence of any clear statement concerning this, we conclude that the blood of the sin offering was put upon the horns of the altar, that of the trespass offering sprinkled round about upon the altar, and that in both cases the remainder was poured out at the base of the altar of burnt offering." – *The Sanctuary Service*, pp. 152-3.

Haskell, however, says that:

"In none of the types was the individual worshipper brought into so close touch with the sanctuary service as in the sin-offering."

"There is no part in the religious worship that brings the individual worshipper into such close touch with the Lord as when he kneels at the Savior's feet, confessing his sins, and knowing the strength of the promise [1 John 1: 9 quoted]. It is then that the repentant sinner touches the hem of the Master's garment, and receives His healing power in the soul.

Sin is the transgression of the law of God. The one who had 'done somewhat against any of the commandments of the Lord' was guilty of sin; and in order to be free from sin, he must bring an offering, that by seeing the innocent victim die for his sins he might more fully comprehend how the innocent Lamb of God could offer His life for the sins of the world. If the sinner was priest, filling that holy office where the influence of his wrong course would cause others to stumble, then he was to bring a bullock, and expensive animal, as a sin-offering; but if he was one of the common people, he could bring a kid or a lamb. The value of the animal to be offered was determined by the position held by the transgressor. . . .

"The sinner, by confessing his sins over the lamb, in type and shadow transferred them to the lamb. The life of the lamb was then taken instead of the life of the sinner, typifying the death of the Lamb of God, who would offer His life for the sins of the world. The blood of the animal was

powerless to remove sin (Heb. 10:4), but by shedding its blood *the penitent revealed his faith* in the divine offering of the Son of God. Every sin-offering was to be without blemish, thus typifying perfect sacrifice of the Savior.

In some offerings the blood was not taken into the sanctuary, but in every sin-offering the blood was poured out at the base of the altar or burnt-offering in the court."

The eating of the flesh of the sacrifice

"When the blood was not taken into the first apartment of the sanctuary, a portion of the flesh of the sin-offering was eaten by the priest in the holy place. (Lev. 10:18).

As the priest assimilated the flesh of the sin-offering, and it thus became a part of his own body; and as he performed the work of the sanctuary, he strikingly typified how 'Christ bare our sins in His own body on the tree' (1 Pet. 2: 24), and then entered the heavenly sanctuary with that same body to appear in the presence of God for us.

The priest ate only the flesh of the sin-offering when the blood was not taken into the sanctuary. The command in regard to this was very plain [Lev. 6:30 quoted]. To violate this command would ignore the significance of the type. The priest entering into the sanctuary to present the blood of the sin-offering before the Lord was a forcible symbol of Christ who, by His *own* blood, entered into the heavenly sanctuary, 'having obtained eternal redemption for us' (Heb. 9: 11, 12). *By the blood and by the flesh the confessed sins of the sinner were in type transferred to the sanctuary.* They were hid from view, for no human eyes, except the eyes of those who officiated as priests, gazed within the sanctuary.

The type was beautiful, but how much more beautiful the antitype! When the sinner lays his sins on Christ, 'the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world,' those sins are hidden, covered by the blood of Christ. (Rom. 4: 7, 8). They are still recorded in the books of heaven (Jer. 2: 22); but the blood of the Savior covers them, and if he who sinned is faithful to God, they will never be revealed, but will finally be destroyed in the fires of the last day. The most wonderful part is that God Himself says He will cast them behind His back (Isa. 38:17) and will not remember them. (Isa. 43:25). Why need anyone carry the burden of sins when we have such a merciful Savior waiting to receive them?"

This is the life-and-death question that every one will have to answer for himself: "Why need anyone carry the burden of sins when we have such a merciful Savior *waiting* to receive them?" One reason why many are not presently *burdened* with this question is that they do not think sin is a burden! They, in fact, indulge in it! Why? First, they do not know, much less *love the law of God "more than fine gold" as David did,* and that the Biblical definition of sin is that it is "the transgression of law" (1 John 3: 4), the "wages" of which "is death." Rom. 6:23 Second, if everyone will be eventually saved, as Universalism claims, then why even bother knowing what sin is? Third, when the popular teaching in the pulpits of Christendom says "no one can become morally perfect," even though Jesus Himself proclaimed in the Sermon on the Mount, "Be ye therefore perfect even as your Father in heaven is perfect" (Matt. 5: 48), can we expect their credulous followers to think otherwise?

But "when the Father gave His Son to live and die for man, He placed *all* the treasures of heaven at our disposal. [Therefore], *there is no excuse for sin.* God has given us all the advantages He possibly could give, that we may have the strength to withstand the temptations of the enemy. . . . Every human being will have to give an account to God for the way in which he used his entrusted talents. We are under obligation to use our powers aright that we may be qualified for eternal life in the kingdom of God. *God demands perfection from every human being. We are to be perfect in this life of humanity, even as God is perfect in His divine character.*"- *This Day With God*, p. 318.

Sins that are truly repented of and confessed are *covered* by the blood of Christ,--meaning, they are not seen, yet they *remain* on the books of record awaiting the time

when they are blotted out at the end of Christ's mediatorial work during this investigative judgment time. However, these sins will only be blotted out if the sinner remains a faithful overcomer of his sins, by God's enabling grace, till death.

"In every sin-offering **two things** were essential on the part of the sinner: **first**, to realize his own sinfulness before God, and to prize pardon sufficiently to make a sacrifice to obtain it; **second**, to see by faith beyond his offering, the Son of God through whom he is to receive his pardon, "for it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins." (Heb. 10:4). The blood of Christ alone can atone for sin."

After the blood was presented before the Lord, there was yet an important work for the sinner to perform. *With his own hands he was to remove all the fat from the different organs of the animal offered as a sin-offering (Lev. 7: 30, 31), and give it to the priest, who burned it upon the brazen altar.* At first thought this might seem a strange ceremony, but when we remember that the fat represented sin (Ps. 37:20; Isa. 43: 23, 24), we see that it is a fitting ceremony."

I have often referred to Ps. 73: 2-17 whenever I am asked why it seems that the worldly and wicked seem to be prospering while the faithful are suffering—that the sanctuary message had the answer. But I did not have the precise reason as to why—until now! Stephen Haskell's insight made it plain to me! Notice what he presents:

"It was evidently viewing this service in the sanctuary that saved David from backsliding. He had beheld the prosperity of the wicked, and was envious of them, until his 'steps had well-nigh slipped;' but when he went into the sanctuary, then he understood the end of the wicked (Ps. 73: 2-17). We can imagine him watching the sinner separate the fat and the priest placing it upon the great altar, and presently nothing remained but ashes. In it he saw ashes only as the final end of all who would not separate from sin (Mal. 4: 1-3); for if the sin was a part of themselves, then when the sin was burned, they would be burned with it. **The only reason God will ever destroy a sinner is because the sinner keeps sin in his own character, and will not separate from it.** This was an impressive type, the priest waiting for the sinner to separate the fat from the offering, ready to take it as soon as it was offered to him. So Christ, our great High Priest, is waiting for each sinner to *confess* his sins and *give* them to Him, that He in return can clothe the sinner with His own robe of righteousness (Isa. 61:10); and consume his sins in the fires of the last day. Paul evidently refers to this part of the sanctuary service in Heb. 4:12."

"The burning of the fat was a 'sweet savor unto the Lord.' (Lev. 4: 31). . . .it typified the sin consumed and the sinner saved. God takes no pleasure in the death of the wicked (Eccl. 3: 11); but He delights in the destruction of sin separated from the sinner. When the redeemed of the Lord from within the shelter of the New Jerusalem behold the fires of the last day consuming all the sins they have committed, it will be indeed a sweet savor to them (Rev. 20: 8, 9)."

Summary of the Trespass Offering in Type and Antitype

Referring exclusively to the Scriptures, Haskell summarizes for us, thus:

TYPE	ANTITYPE
Lev. 5: 15, 16. The trespass-offering atoned for the result of sin as well as for the sin.	Isa. 53: 10-12. The death of Christ, the great trespass-offering, not only atones for the sin, bet destroys all effects of sin.
Lev. 6: 1-7. The sacrifice without the restitution was not accepted.	Matt. 5: 23-26. Our prayers are of no avail if we Cherish evil in our hearts.

In the model prayer Jesus gave His disciples, as recorded in Matthew 6: 9-13, we often fail to consider the two verses following it that further magnify the conditions by which this prayer will be answered. It says: "For if you forgive men of their *trespasses*, you heavenly Father will also forgive you. But if you do not forgive men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses."

In contrast, verse 12 specifies: "Forgive us our *debts* as we forgive our debtors." Debts and trespasses are not quite the same by definition. Debts is the Greek *opheilema* which means "something owed, i.e., figuratively, a due; morally, a fault; debt." Trespasses is the Greek *paraptoma* which means "a side-slip (lapse or deviation), i.e., unintentional error or willful transgression; fall, fault, offence, sin, trespass." - *Strong's Greek Lexicon*.

From these definitions, coupled with this brief study of the trespass and sin-trespass offerings, it is not difficult to see that trespasses are far more serious and far-reaching in their ramifications and consequences than debts are. And yet this is precisely how Jesus concludes His instructions for the model prayer. We may forgive those who are indebted to us but if we do not also forgive their trespasses against us—sins requiring reconciliation, restoration, and restitution in addition to repentance, confession, and sacrifice, neither will God forgive us of both our debts and trespasses against Him!

Let us conclude this particular study on the trespass and sin-trespass offerings with the following counsels from the inspired writer:

"Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered." Ps. 32: 1, KJV. That God who marks the fall of a sparrow, marks your deportment and your feelings; He marks your envy, your prejudice, your attempts to justify your action in the least manner of injustice. When you misconceive the words and acts of another, and your own feelings are stirred, so that you make incorrect statements. . . . God requires that you . . . shall confess your fault, not only to the one that you have injured, but to those who through your influence have been led to regard your brother in a false light. . . .

By repentance and confession you can have pardon registered against your name; or you can resist the conviction of the Spirit of God, and during the rest of your life, work to make it appear that your wrong feelings and unjust conclusions could not be helped. But there stands the action, there stands the evil committed, there stands the ruin of those whose hearts you planted the root of bitterness. . . .

Whatever character of your sin, confess it. If it is against God only, confess only to Him. If you have wronged and offended others, confess also to them, and the blessing of the Lord will rest upon you. In this way you die to self, and Christ is formed within." - *Sons & Daughters*, p. 309.

"True holiness is wholeness in the service of God. This is the true condition of Christian living. Christ asks for unreserved consecration for individual service. He demands the heart, the mind, the soul, the strength. Self is not to be cherished. He who lives to himself is not a Christian.

Love must be the principle of action. Love is the underlying principle of God's government in heaven and earth, and it must be the foundation of the Christian's character. This alone can make and keep him steadfast. This alone can enable him to withstand trial and temptation. And love will be revealed in sacrifice. The plan of redemption was laid in sacrifice,—a sacrifice so broad and deep and high that it is immeasurable.

Christ gave all for us, and those who receive Christ will be ready to sacrifice all for the sake of their Redeemer. The thought of His honor and glory will come before anything else.

If we love Jesus we will love to live for Him, to present our thank-offering to Him, to labor for Him." - E.G. White, *Christ's Object Lessons*, pp. 48, 49.

We will focus more on the sin-offering in our next issue for the month of January, 2008.
