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Abstract: The theme of atonement is developed through Scripture from its introductory framework in the sacrificial system to its completion in Christ and culmination in his kingdom. This paper approaches the theme of atonement through the framework of biblical theology to trace the development of this theme through four key passages - Leviticus 16:15-19, Psalm 40:6-8, Hebrews 10:1-14, and Revelation 5:9-14. A foundation for understanding atonement is set forth in the sacrificial system which presents atonement as a particular, sacrificial, priestly activity to bring about reconciliation for sin. Psalm 40 develops this idea by explicitly stating the need for obedience and setting forth a type of a kingly, obedient one. Hebrews 10 shows how both Leviticus 16 and Psalm 40 are pointing to Christ - the priest-king who is the perfect, effective, once-for-all sacrifice. Lastly, the allusion to the subjecttion of all to the reign of Christ (Heb. 10:12-13), points forward to Revelation 5 where reconciled people have access to the presence of the reigning Christ.
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INTRODUCTION

While church history has not been without debate over atonement models, there has been another resurgence in recent years. Michael Horton provides a summary of atonement views through history and some of the recent controversies. He notes a significant shift with Abelard between “objective” theories of atonement in which Christ’s work accomplishes some saving act and “subjective” theories in which Christ’s death
provides the example or impetus to live in a certain way. Horton, in a defense of substitutionary atonement, gives a brief summary of some of the debates:

The doctrine of substitution has encountered repeated objections throughout history. According to the Socinians, moral debts cannot be paid by one party on behalf of another. The same argument may be found in the New Haven divinity school and Charles Finney...The Arminians held that Christ's death made it possible for him to forgive sins on a more relaxed basis than perfect conformity to his law and strict justice. More recently, the argument has been pressed by liberation, feminist, and Anabaptist theologies that representing Christ's death as a vicarious sacrifice valorizes domestic violence and social scapegoating.

The conversation is full of tension as it is not merely tradition being battered around, but the basis for restoration to God. This is, at its core, the meaning of atonement. Yarborough defines “atonement” as “God’s work on sinners’ behalf to reconcile them to himself.” Christianity Today published an article entitled, “The Political Tones of Atonement Theories: They were developed in their historical contexts. What does that mean for today?” which demonstrates a growing awareness of historical influences on theology and concludes that perhaps widely accepted views are reflective of the felt needs of our time, “and reminds us, too, of the different stories that explain Christ’s work on the cross.” However, is this really all we can say about the atonement? Are our beliefs merely a product of our political, philosophical setting, a reflection of our own self-perceived needs, or can we still be confronted by the cross? This is where this conversation would benefit from a biblical theology approach that traces the progression of atonement not chronologically through church history but canonically through the progressive revelation of Scripture. This will not resolve the debates, but this approach may reframe the discussion in terms of what is emphasized and answered by the text. This article will attempt to model this on a small scale by looking at four passages that develop themes of atonement. Through the following passages, the pattern of

1 Horton, Michael. The Christian Faith: A Systematic Theology for Pilgrims On the Way. Zondervan, Grand Rapids, MI: 2011, pp. 501—508. Horton covers Origin's ransom theory, Irenaeus' recapitulation theory, Christus Victor, and Anselm's satisfaction theory as pre-Abelard theories of atonement (Horton, 501 — 503). For post-Abelard theories, while there are still several approaches to understanding atonement (he covers Abelard's moral influence theory, Grotius' governmental theory, and considers several newer views as stemming from them), he considers the shift to a subjective view of the cross as central to all of them (Horton, 503 — 508).
2 Horton, 509—510.
5 For this reason, this article does not directly address either later atonement debates or intertestamental literature since it is beyond the scope of a canonical approach.
6 Terminology here can prove difficult because "pattern" can have contrary meanings. It can be understood as the model or design, not the real thing. Alternatively, it can also mean also the real thing/example from which copies are made. This paper is referring to the "pattern" in Leviticus as the copy by which readers later recognize and understand the reality.
sacrifice/blood for atonement is established in Leviticus 16, Psalm 40 develops the idea that what was required was not merely sacrifice but obedience, the fulfillment of the pattern is revealed in Hebrews 10 in Jesus the obedient sacrifice, and the final reconciliation achieved by the blood of the Lamb is pictured in Revelation 5.

METHOD
This paper follows a biblical theology approach to the study of the theme of atonement/sacrifice in Scripture. D. A. Carson provides a helpful definition of this method, "ideally, biblical theology, as its name implies, even as it works inductively from the diverse texts of the Bible, seeks to uncover and articulate the unity of all the biblical texts taken together, resorting primarily to the categories of those texts themselves." Graeme Goldsworthy elaborates on several key assumptions about Scripture within this method - that the text is inspired, cohesive, Christological, and for the church. Because Scripture is held to be inspired and canonical (a manifestation of its coherence), with a unified topic (Christ) and purpose (the church), Goldsworthy concludes that passages can (and should) be read as progressive revelation, particularly using the method of typology, "'Progressive revelation establishes the principle of typology. While the underlying relationship remains the same, the form in which it is given undergoes a certain development or expansion until the fulfillment is reached.'"9

This paper is a brief application of these principles to the theme of atonement/sacrifice. The development of this theme is traced through four passages - the introduction of a paradigm in the Pentateuch, the development of this idea in later Old Testament writings, the Christological interpretation given in the New Testament, and the ongoing eschatological implications of this theme in a second New Testament passage. First, it will look at a foundational introduction to the theme from the Pentateuch - the Day of Atonement in Leviticus 16 - and how this sets a pattern for understanding atonement/sacrifice. Secondly, it explores how the idea of sacrifice is developed through Psalm 40. Next, it considers how the New Testament interprets Christ as the fulfillment of this pattern through looking at Hebrews 10. Finally, it considers how the eschatological implications alluded to in Hebrews 10 reach their culmination in Revelation 5. Each passage is examined inductively (i.e. how does the text itself present sacrifice/atonement) and then also canonically (i.e. how do the later passages build on and even interpret the earlier ones).

DISCUSSION
Leviticus 16:15—19: The Pattern of Blood/Sacrifice for Atonement (Assumptions of Atonement)
In Leviticus, the law is written detailing God’s requirements for his people to live in fellowship with him. Skylar comments that, “Ideally, the Israelites would have addressed such defilement by the sacrifices and rites of Leviticus 4-5 and 11-15,” but notes that not

---

9 Goldsworthy, 67.
all would have, therefore, in Leviticus 16 they are given instructions for a more
generalized sacrifice to cover the sins of the priest and the people on the Day of
Atonement. Skylar adds that chapter 16 has an “ominous beginning” - the death of
Aaron’s sons who had come before the Lord with strange fire (Lev. 10:1; 16:1) and the
restriction that Aaron may not come at any time to the Holy Place (Lev. 16:2). Therefore,
the need for atonement, for reconciliation, is abundantly on display.

Leviticus 16:15-19 operates under several key assumptions. First, the people’s sin
and uncleanness is a barrier to their fellowship with God that must be overcome (implied
in vv. 16-17). Secondly, this can only be overcome by following the method that God
himself has laid out (16:1-2 imply this, as do the specific instructions given here as the
law from God). Thirdly, the people are represented by a high priest who operates on
behalf of the nation. Only he performs the required acts of atonement, others are not even
to come near (v. 17).

**Sacrifice**

Within this framework, the specific method for atonement is laid out. First, atonement is
made through a sacrifice and the sprinkling of blood. Verse 15 describes how Aaron will
kill the goat and sprinkle its blood, and verse 16 concludes, “thus shall make
atonement,” and this atonement is “because of” the “uncleannesses,” “transgressions,”
and “sins” (English Standard Version) of the people of Israel as well as for the tent itself.
The sacrifice is necessary because of sin and provides the absolution for their sin.

**Priestly Representation of the People & Presence**

Secondly, this blood is brought “within the veil” (v. 15) so that it can be sprinkled on the
mercy seat. This is the one time of year that the high priest is allowed into the holy of
holies beyond the veil. Normally, the veil, emblazoned with cherubim (uncoincidentally,
cherubim also guard the garden in Gen. 3:24), serves as a barrier keeping them from
God’s presence (Exo. 26:33). It is only because the priest has already performed
necessary sacrifices for himself and is accompanied by the right (i.e. God-ordained)
incense that he is able to enter here, now on behalf of the people (Lev. 16:11-12). The veil
is a visual emblem of the separation between God and man because of sin, and the
sacrifice and sprinkling of blood is the means of bringing about reconciliation and
restoration. In Leviticus, however, the access to the holy place is limited only to the high
priest, once a year, when accompanied by the proper offerings.

**Repetition**

Lastly, following his entrance into the holy place and sprinkling of the blood there, the
priest returns to the altar and also cleanses it with blood (vv. 18-19). Skylar notes, “This
made the altar fit for use, so the Israelites could confidently draw near to the Lord with
their sacrifices throughout the year.” The altar is readied to be used again,
acknowledging the need for more sacrifice. The Day of Atonement covers what is past,
but still has to be renewed each year, and with other sacrifices in the meantime. Encoded within the ceremony itself is the sign that this is a short-term solution.

Psalm 40:6-8: Obedience Desired and A Type Presented (Atonement Assumptions revisited)

Surprisingly, given the extensive OT instructions on how to sacrifice, Psalm 40 says that this is not God’s delight, or even his requirement (v. 6). Rather, something more is required—obedience. The psalm then presents the psalmist/Davidic king as one who has this internalized law and therefore embodies obedience (vv. 7—8).14

Wilson notes that these verses seem to refer to “the entire sacrificial system.”15 The psalmist is painting with broad strokes, and so it may be that other sacrifices detailed in Leviticus could also be developed in light of this psalm along with those for the day of atonement.16 While it is possibly not the only sacrifice in view, the contrast of sacrifice with obedience (vv. 6 and 8) would likely recall sacrifices for sin in particular.17

Tremper Longman III calls verses 6-8, “the most difficult in the psalm, especially in light of its use in the New Testament.”18 Why are they so difficult? In addition to some translation and exegetical difficulties (and variants in the LXX), is the seeming disregard for the sacrificial system in these verses—how can the psalmist say they are not required or delightful when the Torah has described them as such (Exo. 29:18-25)? The assumption of Exodus is that atonement is needed to reconcile men to God, and that God is the one who institutes the means, namely, the sacrificial system laid out in the Torah. This psalm now highlights obedience as an integral component of the sacrificial system.

In addition to this, the typology is difficult. Plumer comments, “This supposes David, the speaker, to be a type of Christ, and yet to utter things, which cannot but remotely, if at all, have a just application to the type, but are only or fully true of the antitype; yet that so much is literally true of the type as fitly to make him a figure of him that was to come.”19 At this point in Israel’s history, the promise had been focused onto a Davidic-king (2 Sam. 7:13-14) who often acts as representative for the people. Here the psalmist, speaking as a Davidic-king, pronounces his obedience, but in a way that exceeds what readers know of David’s own history.

---

14 Here I am indebted to Dr. Wayne Johnson (Trinity Evangelical Divinity School) for his direction on how this passage not only develops the idea of obedience but also, typologically, points forward to Christ.


16 While he does not develop it at length or in connection with psalm 40, Michael Horton references the idea that Christ’s death encompasses not only “guilt offering” but also “thank offering” (Horton, 496). Considering psalm 40 in relation to this idea is a possible area for further research in biblical theology.

17 Though psalm 40 must first be explored in its own canonical setting, it is also significant, within the scope of a canonical reading, that Hebrews quotes psalm 40: 6—8 in its interpretation of the day of atonement in light of Christ.


**Sacrifice**

The psalmist picks up the theme of sacrifice in the parallels of v.6: “sacrifice and offering ... burnt offering and sin offering.” Beckwith notes that burnt offerings and sin offerings demonstrated commitment and dealt with sin while the Day of Atonement served as the annual “catch-all” sin offering. Wilson notes that the first pair in v. 6, refer to “positive sacrifices, celebrating communion with God,” while the second primarily deal with sin, thus, “implying in this context that it is the entire sacrificial system that is at issue here, not just certain sacrifices.” In so doing, the psalmist gives a sweeping contrast of sacrifices that could deal with sin versus obedience. The pattern laid out in Leviticus - that sacrifice is the way, given by God, to deal with sin - is not completely denounced here, but the hyperbolic contrast serves to strongly demonstrate that there is not a mechanical efficacy to them. Obedience is the real desire and delight.

Obedience is essentially the meaning of “you have given me an open ear.” The various permutations - “an ear you have dug out for me,” and even “a body you have prepared for me” - relate to submission to God’s law. This, then, is not a drastic shift from the Levitical law, as Bray notes, “even in the OT, the external signs of holiness were meant to reflect an inner, spiritual reality.” However, its radical emphasis on obedience prepares the way for verses 7-8 which typify the obedient one.

**Kingly Obedient Representative**

In verse 7, the psalmist, speaking as the Davidic king, then says, “Behold I have come; in the scroll of the book it is written of me.” The emphasis is on the internalized obedience of the Davidic-king. This stands in contrast to Leviticus where even the priest has to offer sacrifices for himself before sacrificing for the people - all must be covered on the Day of Atonement because all have sinned and fallen short. However, now, the king is typified as the obedient one.

21 Wilson, 640.
24 There are a few possible variations of this final phrase. It could be that the scroll is the law and the psalmist is the observer of it (Longman III, *Psalms: An Introduction and Commentary*.
https://eds.s.ebscohost.com/eds/ebookviewer/ebook/bmxtYmttXzkwNDg0Ml9fQU41?sid=a28a0b63-9b63-4656-9c40-0439ed61ea9@redis&vid=2&format=EB&rid=2 188). Alternatively, Broyles argues that this is the scroll recording the righteous (Psalm 87:6), and the psalmist is then included on this list (Broyles, Craig C. *Psalms* Understanding the Bible Commentary Series. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2012. https://eds.s.ebscohost.com/eds/ebookviewer/ebook/bmxtYmttXzU5ME30V9fQU41?sid=f330d9f5-4573-452d-8d90-d1f2dadae781@redis&vid=2&format=EB&rid=6. 191, 351).
Hebrews 10:1-14: Pattern and Type Fulfilled—Jesus as Obedient Sacrifice (Atonement Assumptions Expanded)

Hebrews gives an extensive argument for the better-ness of Christ—his new covenant, priesthood, sanctuary, and sacrifice. In chapter 10, he uses the very instructions from the Day of Atonement to point out its insufficiency and Christ's superior sacrifice. Hebrews points out that the need to renew the sacrifice every year means they are not dealing with sin, and rather are a reminder of sin. He states unequivocally that animal sacrifice is not able to take away sin, and proceeds to quote from Psalm 40. Hebrews interprets this psalm to show that the law is done away with by the sacrifice of Christ, the obedient one, who does actually sanctify, eternally, those covered by his offering. Rather than yearly sacrifice of animal blood, Christ, in the ultimate act of obedience, offers his own blood once and for all effectively cleansing sinners.

Hebrews 10 introduces Day of Atonement connections by referring to the sacrifices, offered year after year as a shadow of the things to come (10:1). The repetition of their yearly nature (v. 3), and the use of both bulls and goats (v. 4) demonstrate the connection to Leviticus 16 - a required yearly sacrifice (Lev. 16:29) which uses both bulls and goats (Lev. 16:14-15). The repetitious nature of the Day of Atonement is a sign of its incompleteness (Heb. 10:2-3); if those sacrifices were sufficient in themselves, there would be no need to sacrifice again (Heb. 10:4). Psalm 40 argued a similar insufficiency of sacrifice alone; however, Hebrews takes it further. It is not just the obedience of the people, the priest, or the king in addition to the sacrifice (even when offered according to the law, 10:8), but the sacrifice of the obedient one who is the priest-king that is needed (Heb. 10:5, 10, 12-14). The author argues that both the repetition of sacrifice, and the phrase "Behold I have come to do your will" (Psa. 40: 7; Heb. 10:7) demonstrate, from the OT, that there is a built in obsoletion encoded in the old covenant that anticipates the coming of Christ.

Sacrifice

Hebrews has already argued that a new covenant was anticipated (8:7-13) and has been inaugurated by the sprinkling of blood in a heavenly sanctuary (9:1-28)\(^\text{25}\). So now, he argues that there is a better sacrifice also. The sacrifice of bulls and goats is repeated because it is ineffective (10:7); it does not actually take away sins. A sacrifice is needed that is not only accompanied by obedience but is by the obedient one and effectively sanctifies those represented by him. In keeping with Hebrew’s use of Scripture as God currently speaking to humanity, he now quotes Psalm 40 as a quotation from Christ as the Davidic-king: “when Christ came...he said” (10:5)\(^\text{26}\). By using the variation of the LXX, “a body you have prepared for me,” the author presents Jesus’ death, the offering of his body, as the ultimate act of obedience and sacrifice. So then, Jesus fulfills the picture of sacrifice given in Leviticus 16 because he is the obedient one of Psalm 40.

\(^{25}\) Which the author argues is not the echo of Leviticus, but rather the reality from which the tabernacle is drawn.

**Priest-King Representative and Presence**

Because Jesus is the obedient one, when he represents humanity, he is able, not only to come into the presence of God (not the “shadow” of the tabernacle, but the heavenly sanctuary), but also to remain there, seated at the right hand of God (Heb. 10:12). This combines imagery of both priest and king. Whereas the Levitical priests made atonement for themselves before representing the people (Lev. 16:11), and were only allowed into the holy of holies one day a year (Lev. 16:2), Jesus enters once with a single sacrifice and stays there (Heb. 10:12). The statement “he sat down at the right hand of God,” uses the kingship language of enthronement (Ps. 2) that the author has already alluded to in connection with Jesus’ sonship (Heb. 1:3, 5). The author has also already alluded to this dual role of priest-king in Hebrews 7:2-3 when he discusses Jesus’ Melchizedekian priesthood. The final development of both priest and king then, meets its culmination in Jesus, who is able, by this dual role, to come to God’s presence as representative for the people and to remain there as enthroned king.

**Eternality and Efficacy**

Because Jesus is without sin, unlike OT priests (Heb. 4:15, 9:7), but rather is the obedient one, who is also the eternal priest-king in the order of Melchizedek (Heb. 7:1, 2, 24, 28), his sacrifice is both effective and eternal in sanctifying those it covers. The author demonstrates that, unlike the OT developments, there is no need to look for further atonement. God has provided, once for all, for the restoration of humanity to God, through his Son.

However, while atonement is accomplished, there is still a sense of incompleteness in Hebrews. While Jesus is seated and reigning, he is also “waiting from that time until his enemies should be made a footstool for his feet” (v. 13). Likewise, while his atonement is effective in sanctification, they are still called those “who are being sanctified” (Heb. 10:14). The pattern and type have been fulfilled in Christ, but the full extent of that atonement - reconciliation with God - is yet future.

**Revelation 5: 9-14: Final Reconciliation (Atonement Assumptions)**

This final reconciliation is pictured in Revelation 5:9-14, in John’s vision of the heavenly throne room and final judgment. Here Jesus, called the Lamb who was slain, is worshipped by all. He is called worthy because his blood is effective ransom for the people of God, and brings in every “tribe and language and people and nation” (v. 9). If, as Yarborough says, atonement is “God’s work...to reconcile,” then this is the consummation of that reconciliation.

Without restating all that Jesus has done, Revelation uses imagery that connects to this atoning work, emphasizes his current victory and enthronement, and pictures a people reconciled both to God, and also to each other as all peoples worship him. He is called the “Lamb” that has been slain (5:6), picking up on the idea of sacrifice, but as Woodbridge points out, “the Lamb in Revelation is both Redeemer and Ruler...both slain

---

27 The Leviticus 16 instructions call for a bull for the priest and a goat for the people while a lamb is used for Passover. However, Woodbridge notes in his article “Lamb,” that NT imagery is often a conjoining of all the various sacrifices in Christ. Woodbridge, P. D. "Lamb.” In *New Dictionary of Biblical Theology*, 620–22. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000. 621.

and triumphant.” This is demonstrated through his titles in 5:5 as well as the description of him as one who has “conquered” and who is worthy to open the scroll and to receive worship.

**Sacrifice**

The content of the “new song” in verses 9-10 states explicitly that the lamb is worthy because of his sacrifice and his redemptive blood which purchased a people for God. The lamb is not only reigning, but has created a people for himself by his reconciling work of atonement. Ian Paul comments, “The praise now makes explicit the connection between the lamb being slain and his being worthy, and combines the language of the sacrificial system (blood) with the distinct election of God’s people.” In Hebrews, Jesus sits after his atoning work, waiting for his enemies to be made his footstool. In Revelation, that final victory is realized - with enemies vanquished, and people from all nations participating in worshipping him.

**Priest & Presence**

In Revelation, because of the sacrifice of the lamb, people from all nations are now invited into the presence of God, and they have been made priests (5:10). Their work is not mediatorial but worship, and like Psalm 40, their response to God’s salvation is a “new song” (Ps. 40:3, Rev. 5:9). This song reveals that people are not only reconciled to God, but through this work people “from every tribe and language and people and nation,” (5:9) are also made into one people that praises him, and creation itself is no longer groaning (Rom. 8:22) but now also participates in this worship (Rev. 5:13).

**CONCLUSION**

In Leviticus, it is established that God’s plan for reconciliation (i.e. atonement) will require sacrifice with blood brought before his presence by a representative priest, in Psalms this is developed to emphasize that obedience is at the heart of the sacrificial system and to anticipate a representative that is also a kingly, obedient one. In Hebrews, these two roles - king and priest - are combined in Jesus who is the obedient one and also the sacrifice. Hebrews, however, does not complete the picture since it anticipates the reign (inaugurated by his death, resurrection, and enthronement) being fully established over the world. Revelation reveals that final judgment and reign where the people of God are reconciled to him by Jesus. Atonement is realized as his people are now allowed in his presence, serve as his priests, and worship him as a people reunited both to God and to each other. This has ramifications for soteriology, eschatology, and ecclesiology. These passages present blood-sacrifice as integral to God’s plan for atonement. This is not merely an Old Testament practice to accommodate the culture/worldview of the readers. Even in psalms, where it could at first appear that sacrifice is being “spiritualized” into obedience, it is never completely done away with, and Hebrews makes that very clear.

---


31 Later, in chapter 6, it is revealed that the scroll he opens releases judgments upon the earth.
with its visceral description of the blood being sprinkled. This is continued through to
Revelation where Jesus is counted worthy because he is the slain one who ransoms by
his blood. Eschatologically, this places believers in this middle state—the work of
atonement accomplished, but the results not fully visible to us yet; Christ enthroned, but
believers not yet in his presence. Church practice then should reflect this ultimate
reconciliation (proclaiming the atonement to all tribes, nations, and people) and living
under the reign of Christ even as we wait for its realization. Finally, demonstrated
through both Psalm 40 and Revelation 5, the fitting ecclesial response to God’s work of
salvation is worship.
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