

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

ART. III.—THE SACERDOTIUM OF CHRIST.

PART III. (*continued*).

WE have been contemplating the grand *opus operatum*—the stupendous sacrifice of the Incarnate Son of God, which rent the veil of the Temple, which shook the power of him that hath the power of death, which broke every barrier down, which opened the kingdom of heaven to all believers.

And before we proceed we must yet again pause for a moment, and ask, Where is this—this grand *opus operatum*—in the view of those who, in the seventeenth century, denied that the shedding of Christ's blood, . . . or His "giving Himself up unto God therein, was His sacrifice, or any part of it, but only somewhat required previously thereunto"—and held that His offering of Himself "is nothing but His appearance in heaven, and the presentation of Himself before the throne of God"? (See Owen, Works, vol. xxiii., p. 301; edit. Goold; see also Vol. xix., p. 196).

And, alas! must we not ask also, Where is this stupendous *opus operatum*, in all the grandeur of its glory, in the full glory of its Divine perfection—where is it in the theology which would teach our faith to see in the sacrifices of masses an oblation of Christ for the quick and the dead? But, further, must we not also ask, Is there no danger of some beclouding of the glory of this grand *opus operatum* in the teachings of a new theology which, albeit so fundamentally different, speaks in utterances which have such a striking resemblance to the language of these Socinians?¹ We have

¹ Schlichtingius had said, "Licet enim non sanguinem suum Christus Deo obluterit sed se ipsum; tamen sine sanguinis effusione offerre se ipsum non potuit neque debuit"—to which Owen justly replied: "The distinction between Christ offering His Blood and offering Himself to God . . . is coined on purpose to pervert the truth. For neither did Christ offer His Blood unto God but in offering of Himself, nor did He offer Himself unto God but in and by the shedding and offering of His Blood. . . . That 'He could not offer Himself without the antecedent effusion of His Blood' seems a kind concession, but it hath the same design with the preceding distinction. But in the offering of Himself He was *θυσία*, 'a slain sacrifice,' which was in and by the effusion of His Blood; in the very shedding of it, it was offered unto God" (Works, vol. xxiii., p. 377. See also vol. xix., p. 196).

In saying this, it will be found, I believe, that Dr. Owen was bearing witness to a truth attested not only by the Scriptures of truth, but scarcely less distinctly by a consensus of Christian teaching through the Ages. But the shedding of the Blood is not to be too literally understood.

recently been taught, "As, then, the shedding of the blood is not itself the consummation, but is the preliminary condition necessary for the consummation of the symbolic sacrifice under the Levitical law; so when we turn to the essential realities, though Calvary be the indispensable preliminary, yet is it not Calvary taken apart, not Calvary quite so directly as the eternal self-presentation in heaven of the risen and ascended Lord, which is the true consummation of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ" (Moberly's "Ministerial Priesthood," p. 246; see also pp. 254, 255).

It is not, of course, suggested for a moment that Professor Moberly has any intention of supporting Socinian views; and I entirely disclaim all contention about the use of words. But the context seems to me to make it impossible to suppose that by "the true consummation of the Sacrifice" he means only what¹ I should call the *application* of the sacrifice, and therefore I am unwillingly constrained to regard his view—so far as it gives a true sacrificial character to our Lord's sacerdotal work in heaven—as derogating from the true perfection of the Sacrifice of Calvary; and, so far, making unhappy approaches to Socinian teaching.

On the notion that the acceptable sacrifice consists not in the death, but in the offering "of the life which has passed through death, and been consecrated by dying" (p. 245), I may refer to my "Doctrine of the Death of Christ" (pp. 70-72, also pp. 19, 20).

We may thankfully recognise what there is to value and admire in the learned Professor's work; and we may be fully in accord with his desire to give prominence to the present sacerdotal function of Christ in the heavens, and that in closest connection with the true view of His finished sacrifice, with its everlasting and everliving results, and of the inexhaustible fulness of grace and blessing which, *in consequence*, He has in store for us. But for this very purpose we need to be very jealous in guarding the doctrine of the perfect work of sacrificial propitiation *finished in the past*.

Just so far as there is an ascription of propitiatory and continuous *sacrificial*—as distinct from sacerdotal—function to the office of Christ in heaven, just so far there must be a

¹ In this sense Aquinas seems to use the term "consummation of sacrifice" (see "Our One Priest," pp. 36, 50, 99). And in a like applicatory sense Dr. Owen speaks of the anniversary sacrifice being "consummated in the Holy of Holies" (Works, vol. xxii, p. 538; edit. Gould: *cf.* vol. xxiii., pp. 231, 232).

deduction from the perfection of the propitiation and expiation (understood in their strict sense) accomplished once for all on the cross, and so far also an approximation to the error of the Socinian scheme of doctrine, with its lack of that which alone meets the need of a soul convinced of sin, and conscious—however feebly—of its 10,000 talents' debt.

Let us not seem to imply that the great redeeming work of Christ is either out of sight or ineffective in the teaching of the Professor. That, we may be sure, would be a grievous injustice indeed. But with every desire to find matter of agreement rather than of difference, we feel sadly constrained to ask some such questions as these :

Where in this new theology is the crown of blessing and honour and glory which belongs to the full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world once for all offered on the cross ?

Where is the miracle-working view of the Son of Man lifted up on the tree, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life ? Is it presumptuous to say that it hardly seems to be where it ought to be ?

Where is the Divine miracle of free justification for the ungodly, through the work of Him who died for our sins, and whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His Blood ? Is it too much to say that there seems to be some bedimming of the light of this adorable miracle of grace ?

Where, oh where, in this new theology, is there room for the full reality of atoning blood ?

Where for the "one" and the "once" of the perfect oblation and the finished expiation ?

Where for the truth that He hath made reconciliation in the body of His flesh through death ?

Where for the true conviction of the soul standing in the silence of its guilt before God, and the "no condemnation," which is the believing soul's starting-point on its heavenly course of victory and life ?

Where for the sound of the truth as taught by our great English Divine: "Let it be counted folly, or phrensy, or fury, or whatsoever. It is our wisdom and our comfort; we care for no other knowledge in the world but this, that man hath sinned and God hath suffered; that God hath made Himself the sin of men, and that men are made the righteousness of God" ? (Hooker, Sermons, ii., § 6. Works, vol. iii., pp. 490, 491; edit. Keble).

And where, oh where, in this New Theology, shall we find room for the saying of one greater than Hooker: "I deter-

mined to know nothing among you save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified"?

And where for the word of One greater than St. Paul, who was heard to say upon the cross "It is finished"?¹

We may well be asked to ponder on the utterance of one who wrote plain words, words easy to be understood, to show the fallacy contained in the earlier form of this subtle error—an error which tends, I fear, to take out of the Gospel of Christ both the offence and the power of the Cross.

In answer to the Socinians, Dr. Owen says :

"(1) This appearance of Christ in heaven is nowhere called His oblation, His sacrifice, or His offering of Himself. . . .

"(2) It no way answers the atonement that was made by the blood of the sacrifices at the altar. . . .

"(3) The supposition of it utterly overthrows the true nature of a proper and real sacrifice. . . .

"(4) It overthrows the nature of the priesthood of Christ"

(Works, vol. xxiii., p. 301; edit. Goold).
So also, as against the Socinians, Bishop Pearson wrote : "It is most evident that the life of Christ was laid down as a price; neither is it more certain that He died than that He bought us. . . . And the price which He paid was His blood. . . . Now as it was the blood of Christ, so it was a price given by way of compensation; and as that blood was precious, so was it a full and perfect satisfaction" ("On Creed: Art. X.," pp. 546, 547; edit. 1840). See especially Deylingius, "Observ. Sacr.," par. iv., p. 559, and Bp. Bull, Apol. pro harm., sect. I., § 9; Works, vol. iv., p. 320; Oxford, 1846.

So again it was well said : "As the Apostle shows—verses 12, 13—after this sacrifice offered, He had no more to do but to enter into glory. So absurd is that imagination of the Socinians, that He offered His expiatory sacrifice in heaven, that He did not, He could not, enter into glory until He had completely offered His sacrifice, the memorial whereof He

¹ I extract the following from the interpretation of a Roman Catholic divine : "Consummatum est sacrificium, quo solo Deus placari potuit. Denique omnia jam parata sunt, finem habet peccatum, jam orietur justitia sempiterna : finem habet lex, succedet Evangelium : jam redemptus est homo, et Deo reconciliatus. . . . Nunc per hanc consummationem certi effecti sumus, hospitium nostrum esse cælum, si modo per fidem Christo inienti fuerimus. Ceterum consummata omnia dicebat esse Christus eo modo, quo agnus dicitur occisus ab exordio mundi : non quod tunc manifeste occidebatur, sed quod occisio Christi semel facta, sparsa est antrosum usque ad ipsum Adam, et retrorsum spargetur usque ad consummationem sæculi . . . sic summus sacerdos noster sacrificium vespertinum consummavit" (Johan. Ferus, "In Evang. Johan.," fo. 470; Antw., 1562). See also Witsius, "Miscell. Sacr.," Lib. ii., Diss ii., § xciii., p. 513; and Owen's Works, vol. xxiii., p. 240; edit. Goold.

carried into the holy place" (Owen on Heb. x., 10; Works, vol. xxiii., p. 481; edit. Goold).

There is abundant evidence from Christian antiquity to the oblation of Christ's all-sufficient sacrifice not in heaven, but upon the Cross,¹ and to the rending thereby of the Old Testament veil for the bringing in the better hope by the which we draw nigh unto God.²

Shall we wonder then that, through the *opus operatum* of this stupendous redemption, this Divine sacrifice for sins should be the transition from the Old Covenant to the New, and therein from the priesthood of the old to the priesthood of the new?

And is it not fitting that we should see in this new priesthood the Mediator of the New Covenant which was established upon better promises—promises which exclude for ever all future oblation for sins—promises in which it was declared: "Their sins and iniquities will I remember no more"?

¹ Of the rending of the veil, Dr. Owen writes: "An evidence this is that the Lord Christ offered His great expiatory sacrifice in His death here on earth, a true and real Sacrifice. . . . Until that Sacrifice was offered the way could not be opened into the Holies; which it was immediately after His death, and signified by the rending of the veil" (Works, vol. xxiii., p. 240; edit. Goold).

² The nearest approach in the writings of Christian antiquity to the new teaching will perhaps be found in Ambrose. It is a passage often quoted: "Ūbra in lege, imago in Evangelio, veritas in cœlestibus. Ante agnus offerebatur, offerebatur et vitulus, nunc Christus offertur: sed offertur, quasi homo, quasi recipiens passionem, et offert se quasi sacerdos, ut peccata nostra dimittat: hic in imagine, ibi in veritate, ubi apud Patrem pro nobis quasi advocatus intervenit" ("De Officiis Min.," Lib. I., cap. xlviii., § 248, Op., tom. ii., p. 63; edit. Ben.; Paris, 1690). Similar language will also be found in his comment on Ps. xxxviii. (tom. i., p. 854). But in both passages the idea first suggested of sacrificial offering in heaven seems reduced to the notion of advocacy in virtue of sacrifice offered: "Ipse quidem nobis apud Patrem advocatus assistit." (See "Albertinus de Eucharistia," pp. 497, 498, and Morton, "On Eucharist," Book VI., chap. ix., sect. ii., p. 479, second edition.)

Waterland says: "He [Ambrose] uses the word *offer* in a lax sense for commemorating, or presenting to Divine consideration" (Works, vol. v., p. 286. See "Doctrine of Sacerdotium," p. 49, and "Our One Priest," pp. 9, 92). On the language of Œcumenius and Theophylact, see Westcott "On Heb.," p. 124.

"Nemo autem adeo cœcutit aut lippit, ut non videat inter 'offerri' proprium, quod per mortem in cruce semel peractum fuit, et inter 'offerri' improprium, quod nunc fiat in cœlis, per illam quam diximus comparisonem, sive in terris per preces, et representationem aut obtestationem et commemorationem peragitur, meram (vocis) homonymiam (in re vero magnam differentiam) intercedere."—Calixtus, as quoted in Cosin's "Notes," Second Series, Works, vol. v., p. 350, A. C. L. See "Missarum Sacrificia," pp. 96, 97, and "Our One Priest," p. 9.

Nevertheless, the distinction between these two very different senses of "offerre" has not always been clearly seen, and seems sometimes to have led the way to much confusion of thought.

I am afraid that the view here given of the date of Christ's sacerdotium may seem to some, at first sight, novel and startling, and bristling with difficulties.

It is not novel;¹ it need not be alarming. Its difficulties, I

¹ See my "Doctrine of Sacerdotium," pp. 74, 75. One who himself rejects this view tells us that "it is an ancient opinion . . . that Christ began to act as priest when He offered Himself on the cross" (Briggs, "The Messiah of the Apostles," p. 264).

So Athanasius: Πότε δὲ ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν γέγονεν, ἢ ὅτε προσερέγκας ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν τὸ σῶμα; (Orat. II., "Contra Arianos," § 7, Op., tom. i., Part I., p. 375; edit. Ben.; Patav., 1777).

So Fulgentius Rusp.: "Idem homo Christus est, qui pro nobis, et Pontifex factus est, dum semetipsum passioni obtulit . . . huic dicitur: *Tu est Sacerdos in æternum, secundum ordinem Melchizedech*" ("Ad Trasimandum R.," Lib. III., cap. xxx., "In Heptas Presulum," p. 476).

It is true, indeed, that in the works of the Greek fathers language is found which seems to indicate a strange inconsistency. This inconsistency shows itself in the most striking form in the words of Chrysostom.

It is the inconsistency of dating the *sacerdotium* of Christ sometimes to His birth, sometimes to His cross.

But the obvious, and, as it seems to me, the *only* explanation of such language is to be found in the fact that they recognised the natural and necessary qualification for priesthood in the Incarnation, while they also recognised that the *sacerdotium* was first entered upon by Christ, and officially conferred upon Him, when He offered His sacrifice on the cross.

So the Jews had been taught to expect that their Messiah (the "glorious One") though not a priest of the order of Aaron, should have an inherent power and right to "draw near" and enter the presence of Jehovah (see Jer. xxx. 21, and Dean Payne Smith's note there in "Speaker's Com.")—that is, should possess in His own nature the true qualification for the high priestly office; and this, it should be observed, in an instruction closely connected with the consequent prophecy of the "New Covenant with the House of Israel and with the House of Judah" (ch. xxxi. 31), and the promise, "I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more" (v. 34); and this again, connected with a word following which carries our thoughts to the high priest's mitre, "Holy unto the Lord" (v. 40; see "Speaker's Com." *in loc.*, and Owen's Works, vol. xx., p. 96).

Chrysostom says: Ἱερεὺς δὲ γέγονεν, ὅτε τὴν σάρκα ἀνέλαβεν, ὅτε τὴν θυσίαν προσήγαγεν (Chrys., "In Ep. ad Heb.," cap. vii., Hom. XIII., Op., tom. xii., p. 130; edit. Montfaucon; Paris, 1735).

Compare the following: "Sacerdos propter carnem assumptam, propter victimam, quam pro nobis offerret a nobis acceptam" (Augustin, "Enar. in Ps. cix.," § 17, Op., tom. iv., Par. II., c. 1240; edit. Ben.; Paris, 1680).

So Cyril of Alexandria would seem sometimes to date the *sacerdotium* of Christ to His Incarnation, doubtless as thereby being possessed of all qualifications needed for its exercise: Τότε γέγονεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἀρχιερεὺς ἐλεήμων, καὶ πρὸς γε τούτῳ πιστός ("In Ep. ad Heb. ii. 14, sqq.," Op., tom. vii., c. 968; edit. Migne). So again he speaks as conceiving that His priestly office (as well as His apostolate) was conferred in the name "Jesus": Ὁνόμασται τότε καὶ Ἰησοῦς, διὰ τῆς τοῦ ἀγγέλου φωνῆς· τότε κερήμεναι καὶ ἀπόστολος καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς (*Ibid.*, c. 969). And again he speaks of His priestly office as the result of His being made like unto us; he

believe, will be found to melt away before a careful and candid consideration of the subject in all its bearings. Mark the words, "He taketh away the first that He may establish the second" (Heb. ix. 10). When was "the first," the ceremonial

regards Him as *ἐν τάξει ἀρχιερατικῇ, διὰ τοι τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς ὁμοίωσιν* (x. 14, c. 988).

Yet this does not hinder his using elsewhere other language—language which must, I think, be understood as the recognition of the truth that Christ's authoritative investment with the sacerdotal office is to be dated to the cross: *Σαρκὶ παθῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, τότε κεχηρμάτικεν ἡμῶν ἀρχιερεὺς* (iv. 14, c. 972). And again: *Ὁ δὲ κρείττων ἀμαρτίας ὑπάρχων ὡς θεός, προσκεκόμικεν ἑαυτὸν, καὶ γέγονεν ἡμῶν ἀρχιερεὺς* (vii. 27, c. 976).

So also he dates to the cross the passing from the Old Covenant (in which Aaron's sons were priests) to the New Covenant (in which the priesthood is Christ's). He says: *Διὰ τοῦτο κατέληξαν μὲν οἱ τύποι, καὶ πέπαιται τῆς ἀρχαίας διαθήκης τὸ ἀνόνητον ἐν σκιάῃς· γέγονε δὲ ἀναγκαίως ἐπισαγωγή κρείττονος ἐλπίδος, δι' ἧς ἐγγίζομεν τῷ Θεῷ, μεσιτεύοντος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἐν τάξει γεγονότος ἀρχιερατικῇ, διὰ τοι τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς ὁμοίωσιν. Προσκεκόμικε γὰρ ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εἰς ὁσμὴν εὐωδίας τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ* (x. 14, c. 988). And again: *Γέγονε γὰρ ἡμῖν Χριστὸς ἱλασμὸς ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης αἰωνίου* (ix. 12, c. 985).

The same inconsistency will be found reproduced in the writings of Euthymius Zigabenus, whose words are thus rendered in the "Bibliotheca Maxima": "Quando factus est misericors, et fidelis Pontifex, nonne tunc, cum per omnia fratribus similis evasit? Tunc autem fuit ejusmodi, cum homo factus est. Et misericors effectus est, cum se *pro nobis offerens* misertus est nostri" (tom. xix., pp. 68, 69). "Tunc et confessionis nostræ Pontifex factus est, *offerens* Deo et Patri fidei nostræ confessionem, et *corpus proprium* tanquam immaculatam hostiam, ut eſt nos expiaret" (p. 112).

Theodoret, indeed, assuming that Melchizedek offered the bread and wine as a sacrifice to God, supposes that our Lord's priesthood after the order of Melchizedek had for its starting-point the Last Supper, when He brake the bread and gave the cup as the shed blood of the New Covenant (see his "Interp. in Ps. cix.," Op., tom. i., p. 1396; edit. Schulze, 1769). This was, no doubt, an innovation, but one which almost of necessity attached itself to the early-developed notion of a sacrificial oblation of the elements in the Lord's Supper. And it was only natural that others should follow in the same track. Thus, e.g., Isychius (or Hesychius) of Jerusalem did not hesitate to say: "Ipse enim propriam carnem immolavit, ipse sui sacrificii pontifex in Sion factus est, quando sanguinis novi testamenti dabat calicem" ("In Bibliotheca Max.," tom. xii., p. 122; in Lev., Lib. v., cap. xvi.).

So also Suidas, although he uses the words *ἐξήγαγεν αὐτῷ* of Melchizedek in his meeting with Abraham.

On this view see especially Jackson, "On Creed," Book IX., chap. x., Works, vol. viii., p. 242; Oxford, 1844.

It is needless to do more than refer to the view of those who (because Melchizedek is described, in a *mystery*, as having neither beginning of years nor end of days, and because the Son of God—to whom he was made like—was begotten from everlasting of the Father) would date the *sacerdotium* of Christ from eternity. See, e.g., Eusebius, "Demonstratio Evang.," Lib. V., cap. iii., p. 223; Paris, 1628; and Ephraem Syrus, "In Gen.," cap. xxi., Op., tom. ii., p. 68; Ven., 1756, who says: "Unum enim est et singulare Christi regnum, et sacerdotium, quod utique nec usquam cœpit, nec unquam finietur." This view needed, of course, to

law of sacrifices, taken away, abrogated, made an end of? When was "the second," the voluntary coming to do the will of God (as revealed in the roll of the book) for the sanctification (*i.e.*, the acceptance as among the holy things¹) of His people established? Surely there is no room for question as to the answer. The first was taken away when the second was established. And the second was established through the offering of the Body of Jesus Christ once for all (*ἐφάπαξ*).² What is the date of that *ἐφάπαξ*? Surely it is the date of the *τετέλεσται* of Calvary.³ And must not then the passing away of the priesthood of Aaron—the priesthood which is abolished

be corrected by the truth that the Divine nature alone did not qualify for the priesthood. The One Mediator between God and men is the *man* Christ Jesus.

See also "Athanasii Opera," tom. i., Par. I., p. 377, and tom. ii., p. 512 : Patavii, 1777.

It is well said: "Secundum quod Dominus natus ex Patre est, gignenti cœternus et æqualis, non est Sacerdos" (Prosper. Aquit., "In Ps. cix.." Op., p. 373). See also "Com. in Ep. ad Heb.," cap. v. in Bedæ Op., tom. vi., c. 783.

¹ See "Death of Christ," pp. 65-67.

² In connection with Ps. xl. 6, 7, 8 (if not as a comment upon it) should be read John iv. 34, in which the force of *ἵνα* should be noted. It points beyond the *present* doing of the Father's will to a future *τελείωσις*—a *finishing* of His work. Westcott observes (p. 75): "The original word (*τελειώσω*) is remarkable. It expresses not merely 'finishing,' 'bringing to an end,' but 'bringing to the true end,' 'perfecting.' It is characteristic of St. John and the Epistle to the Hebrews." Cf. John xvii. 4 ; xix. 28, 30, which will lead to the conclusion that this *τελείωσις* is "the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all," and so explain the words, "by which will we are sanctified." Cf. also *τῇ τρίτῃ τελειοῦμαι*, Luke xiii. 32. See also Owen, "On Heb. v. 9," Works, vol. xxi., p. 534; edit. Goold.

Compare Gal. i. 4 : Τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν . . . κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν.

Compare also the following: "Ecce venio in mundum per Incarnationis mysterium, in capite enim libri Levitici scriptum est de me, ut faciam voluntatem tuam, id est, moriar pro salute generis humani" (Remigius Antiss., "In Ep. ad Heb.," cap. x., in "Bibl. Max.," tom. viii., p. 1107). See especially Witsius, "De Œconom. Fed.," Lib. II., cap. v., pp. 169, 170.

³ Ἡ ὁμοιωσις τοῦ σωτήρος θυσία ἄπαξ γενομένη τετέλειωκε τὸ πᾶν, καὶ πιστῇ γέγονε μένουσα διὰ παντός.—Athan., Orat. II., "Contra Arianos," § 9, Op., tom. i., Par. I., p. 377; edit. Ben.; Patav., 1777.

Τῷ γὰρ τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος θυσία, καὶ τέλος ἐπίθηκε τῷ καθ' ἡμᾶς νόμῳ, καὶ ἀρχὴν ζωῆς ἡμῖν ἐκαίνισεν.—Athan., "De Incarn.," § 10, Op., tom. i., Par. I., p. 45; edit. Ben.; Patav., 1777.

So an ancient writer explains "τοῦτο γὰρ ἐποίησεν ἐφάπαξ ἑαυτὸν ἀνενέγκας" *τουτίστι* διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ θυσιάσας ("Hom. in Occursum Dom.," § 6, in Athan., Op., tom. ii., p. 358; edit. Ben.; Patav., 1777).

Ποῖον ἐστὶ τὸ πρῶτον; αἱ θυσίαι. Ποῖον τὸ δεύτερον; τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Πατρὸς, τουτίστιν, ἢ διὰ σταυροῦ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ θυσία. Εκβάλλονται οὖν ἐκεῖνα, ἵνα σταθῇ καὶ βεβαιωθῇ ἢ διὰ τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ σφαγῆς, προσφορά ἢν θέλησεν ὁ Πατήρ.—Theophylact., "In Ep. ad Heb.," cap. x. 10, Comm.; edit. Linsell; London, 1636; pp. 975, 976.

—the priesthood which had to do with “sacrifice and offering, and burnt-offerings, and offerings for sin”—be dated to the same point of time? And must not, then, the establishment of the New Priesthood, which has to do with the “one offering whereby are perfected for ever those who are sanctified,” be dated also to the same moment?¹

¹ To conceive of anything like a *twofold* priesthood of Christ (in the first of which He offered Himself, while to the second belongs the royal throne) seems somewhat arbitrary. And I fail to see any sufficient warrant for the notion in Holy Scripture. But that in offering His sacrifice on the cross our Lord was doing a work, the type of which was prominent in the Levitical priesthood, and absent from the history of Melchizedek; while in sitting on His throne above He was occupying a position which was typified in the priesthood of Melchizedek, and had no place (unless, perhaps, we see a faint shadow of it in 1 Sam. i. 9; iv. 13) in the Levitical types (see Delitzsch, “On Heb. vii. 25,” vol. i., p. 374)—is a truth about which there need be no question. And Bishop Westcott’s language (p. 227) has, perhaps, been misunderstood, as meaning much more than this (see Briggs, “The Messiah of the Apostles,” p. 265).

The Epistle, however, certainly recognises that the offering on the cross of the Sacrifice of the Cross was a priestly function (Heb. vii. 27; ix. 11, 14; x. 11, 12). And quite as certainly it assigns to our Lord no priestly function and no priestly character after any other order than the order of Melchizedek. Moreover, while it is true that Melchizedek is nowhere called *high priest*, it is also true that our Lord’s *high-priesthood* is set before us distinctly as after the order of Melchizedek (see Heb. v. 10; vi. 20).

If this is so, the priesthood after the order of Melchizedek must date from the Cross—*i.e.*, from the death of Christ, which abolished all other sacrifices for sin, and brought to an end the covenant in which they (and their *sacerdotium*) had place.

But it is not inconsistent with this to maintain (with Westcott, p. 228) that on His ascension “the Lord entered on the fulness of His work as High Priest-King.” See Waterland’s Works, vol. v., p. 166.

This is sufficient answer to the arguments of Roman Catholic divines, who would have our Lord’s sacrifice on the cross to be a sacrifice as of the order of Aaron, and the Supper to be a sacrifice after the order of Melchizedek. Cornelius à Lapide says: “In cruce cruentum obtulit sacrificium, quod proinde potius fuit secundum ordinem Aaron, quam Melchizedek: ergo talis fuit in ultima cœna, cum scilicet Eucharistiam sub specie panis et vini instar Melchizedek Deo obtulit” (“In Gen.,” cap. xiv., Com., tom. i., p. 165; Lugd., 1840).

The interpretation which lies at the base of this strange argument which makes Melchizedek *offer to God*, instead of *bring forth* for Abraham (and his followers) the bread and wine, is refuted not only by the language of the narrative, but by the testimony of Rabbi Salomon, Josephus, and (according to the testimony of Jerome) the Jews in general (see Tertullian, Op., p. 185; edit. Rigaltius, 1689, and note there). A very learned Roman Catholic divine wrote (as against the argument of Maldonatus): “De veteribus patribus respondeo fateri me veteres doctores fere omnes ad sacerdotium Melchizedeci locum transulisse, Cyprianum, Arnobium, Ambrosium, Hieronymum, Augustinum, Cypriani simium, et reliquos pene omnes, non ubique tamen, sed et ante eos non sic exposuere Justinus adversus Tryphonem, Justinumque

Christ enters heaven to sit down on His high-priestly throne. Was He no priest before His session? He enters heaven "by His own blood." Nay, He is raised from the dead in virtue of His blood shed. All is in virtue of His accepted sacrifice. And was that accepted sacrifice never offered before He sat down? And if it was offered, was it not offered by Himself? And was He not then a Priest to offer?¹

Christ, our High Priest, entered the Holy Place once for all, having obtained eternal redemption for us² (*αἰώνιαν λύτρωσιν εὐράμενος*). When was that *αἰωνία λύτρωσις* obtained? If the mere words of the Greek admit of a doubt, the context (as it seems to me) removes all doubt.³ For, in the 15th verse, we are told that it was "by means of death"—that death being "for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament" (*ὅπως θανάτου γενομένου, εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεων*)—that we are to receive the promise of eternal inheritance. We are to look back, then (as it seems to me), to the death of Christ

sequutus et imitatus Tertullianus. . . Porro veterum expositio me nou in magnam trahit admirationem, quos (bona eorum venia dictum velim) ubicunque panis et vini in scripturis inueniebant mentionem, locum fere ad Eucharistiam detorsisse, et hujus illa typum fuisse *σὺν πολλῇ πάβρησίᾳ* scripsisse manifestum est" (P. Picherellus, Opuscula, Append., "De Missa," p. 347; Lugd. Bat., 1629. See also p. 349).

Yet the old error is now strangely revived on the ground that "the young men" had "made their repast before their encounter with the Priest-King" (see Neale and Littledale "On Psalms," vol. iii., p. 451).

The truer view had its survival as late as the time of Charlemagne. See Waterland, "Dist. of Sac.," § xi., Works, vol. v., p. 274; Oxford, 1843. For the first two and a half centuries there seems to be no mention of Melchizedek's sacrificing. See Waterland, vol. v., p. 167.

¹ "Bleek himself cannot withhold the acknowledgment that our author assigns a high-priestly character to our Lord's own oblation of Himself upon the cross previous to His entrance into the heavenly sanctuary, but thinks that he regarded this as merely an inauguration into the dignity of the heavenly high-priesthood. Hofmann very justly contends that it was more than that—that it was an essential part of His High Priest's work, performed in the outer court—that is, in this world."—Delitzsch, "On Heb. v. 9, 10," vol. i., p. 255, E. T.

On this point see Owen's Works, vol. xix., p. 202, *sqq.*

"Had He not been a high priest before that entrance, He would have perished for it; for the law was that none should so enter but the high priest. And not only so, but He was not, on pain of death . . . to enter into it, but only after He had, as a priest, slain and offered the expiatory sacrifice."—Owen, Works, vol. xix., p. 204; edit. Goold.

² "*Αἰωνία λύτρωσις*, expiatio est, cujus valor æternus est, neque iterari debet. *λύτρωσις* autem eandem, quam *λύτρον*, *ἀντίλυτρον*, *ἀπολύτρωσις* vim habet. . . . Philo vocem *ἱλασμός* pro *λυτρώσει* habet, p. 437 B, ac respondit Hebraicum *כַּפַּר*, Exod. xxi. 30, et Job. xxxiii. 24, *כַּפַּר יְחַסְּמֵם*, quod est ipsum *λύτρωσιν εὐράμενος* in textu."—Carpzovius, "In S. Pauli Ep. ad Heb. ex Philone." p. 412; Helmstadii, 1750.

³ *Τὸ ἴδιον αἷμα τῆς ἀπάντων ζωῆς ἀντάλλαγμα δούς, εὐρατο τῷ κόσμῳ ταύτην*

as the priestly function, in virtue of which He is called to His high-priestly session. But on this point I must venture to refer to what I have written in "The Doctrine of the Death of Christ" (pp. 61, 62).

We arrive at the same conclusion from the earlier teaching of the Epistle. The Captain of our Salvation was to be made perfect "through sufferings" (ἔπρεπε . . . διὰ παθημάτων τελειῶσαι, ii. 10). "Being made perfect, He became the Author of Eternal Salvation" (τελειωθείς ἐγένετο . . . αἴτιος σωτηρίας αἰωνίου,¹ v. 9) to all them that obey Him. Is not this the immediate consequent of His sufferings? And now let the reader mark well what follows: "Called of God an high priest after the order of Melchizedek" (προσαγορευθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀρχιερεὺς κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ, v. 10). Is there no clear testimony here to the date which, in the writer's view, is the starting-point of the Divine *sacerdotium*—the priesthood of the Son of God?² "The word of the oath which was after the law appointeth [as high priest] a Son" (vii. 28), who needs no more to offer sacrifice (τοῦτο γὰρ ἐποίησεν ἐφάπαξ ἑαυτον ἀνεύγκας, vii. 27), but is now (in virtue of His One completed offering) made perfect for ever (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τετελειωμένον, vii. 28).

And I need hardly say that this teaching stands in closest connection with the inspired teaching concerning the New Covenant. "For this cause He is the Mediator of the New Covenant." That New Covenant, like other covenants, is made with sacrifice. It is *διαθήκη ἐπὶ γεκροῖς*. That New Covenant is the covenant of remission. Its word of promise

τὴν αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν.—Cyril Alex., "In Ep. Heb. ix. 12," Op., tom. vii., c. 984; edit. Migne.

Προσενήνοχε δὲ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν οὐχ αἷμα ταύρων καὶ τράγων, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἴδιον αἷμα καὶ διὰ τοῦτον τοῦ αἵματος εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνελήλυθεν, οὐχ ὡς οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἕκαστὸς τοῦ ἱεμαντοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐφάπαξ αἰώνιον λύτρωσιν εὐράμενος. Λύτρον γὰρ ἡμῶν γενόμενος, τῆς τοῦ θανάτου δυναστείας ἅπαντας ἡμᾶς ἠλευθέρωσεν.—Theodoret, "Ep. Heb.," cap. ix., Op., tom. iii., p. 600; Halæ, 1771.

So Cajetan: "Quia caremus participio activo præteriti temporis dicimus *inveniens*; intellige tamen quum invenit æternam redemptionem per proprium sanguinem" ("Ep. Pauli," etc., fo. 199, b.; Paris, 1540). See "Death of Christ," p. 61.

¹ The phrase αἴτιος σωτηρίας is used by Philo of the brazen serpent ("De Agric.," § 22, i. 315) and of Noah in relation to his sons. . . . Comp. Isa. xlv. 17: Ἰσραὴλ σώζεται ὑπὸ κυρίου σωτηρίαν αἰώνιον. See Westcott, "On Heb. v. 9," p. 129.

² "Observa ordinem. Christus primo est εἰσακουσθεὶς, deinde τελειωθείς, tandem προσαγορευθεὶς Ἀρχιερεὺς κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ. Ante enim, quam sacrificium pro nobis—i.e., se ipsum, Patri offerret, preces validissimas præmisit, doloresque maximos perpessus est: postea ipsum obtulit sacrificium, et officia sacerdotis ac sponsoris implevit: denique illum Deus sacerdotem nominavit ad similitudinem Melchisedecianæ dignitatis."—Carpzovii, "Sacrae Exercitationes," p. 237; Helmstadii, 1701.

is, "Their sins and iniquities will I remember no more." But remission cannot be (it is so taught, *as a rule*, by the law) apart from blood-shedding.¹ *Χωρίς αίματεκχυσίας οὐ γίνεται ἄφεσις.*² Mark well the Saviour's solemn words, "My Blood of the New Covenant, shed for many for the remission of sins." And where there is remission, there is no more offering for sins. Can there be a doubt, then, as to the date of this New Covenant? Can there, then, be a question as to when the Mediatorship and the Priesthood commences which is the Mediatorship and the high priesthood of this New Covenant in Christ's Blood?³ That Priesthood can hardly be recognised and established before the Covenant. But neither can the Covenant be established and recognised before the priesthood. If the covenant depends on the sacrifice, and the sacrifice demands a *sacerdotium*, it is impossible that the date of entering on the priesthood should be deferred to the day of the entrance into the heavens.⁴

The Covenant of the law holds while man lives. But the law kills, and by death its holding power is broken; and so, by the death of Christ for us, there is a passing quite out from the Old Covenant into the New.

Death—the death of Christ for us—is the gate of transition from one dispensation to another. It is the end of the Old Covenant; it is the starting-point of the New Covenant.

This is the natural and obvious meaning of what we are

¹ Keil, and some other expositors, understand this term of the "sprinkling of the blood." But this is an unnatural interpretation. And Matt. xxvi. 28, *τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν*, is fatal to it (*cf.* Luke xxii. 20). It is therefore rightly rejected by Delitzsch, Kurtz (p. 104), and others, who take it as signifying "shedding of blood, or slaying of a victim." "This," says Cremer rightly, "is the only true meaning" (*Lex.*, p. 71). See "Doctrine of the Death of Christ," p. 62.

² Bengel says: "*Sine effusione sanguinis non fit remissio; hoc axioma totidem verbis extat in Tr. Talmudico Joma. vid. imprius Lev. xvii. 2.*" See also Bishop Saumarez Smith, "Blood of the New Covenant," pp. 35, 36, and "Doctrine of the Death of Christ," pp. 62-65.

³ *Ὁκοῦν ἀφήκεν τὰς ἁμαρτίας, ὅτε τὴν διαθήκην ἔδωκεν· εἰ τοῖον ἀφήκεν τὰς ἁμαρτίας διὰ τῆς μῆς θυσίας, οὐκέτι χρεια δευτέρας.*—Chrysostom, in Cramer's "Catena," tom. vii., p. 234; Oxford, 1844.

⁴ *Ipsam autem Novum Testamentum, non nisi Christi sanguine et morte conscriptum vel confirmatum est. . . . Nempe Dominus noster plane quidem erat antequam pateretur, magnus pontifex unctus sancto Spiritu et virtute, ab ipso initio conceptionis suæ, sed sacras vestes sacerdotii sui non induit, priusquam sacrificium ipse fieret, id est immortalitatis gloria non se vestivit, priusquam per passionem mortis, membra corruptibilia deponeret* (Rupertus Tuitiensis, "In Joan.," Lib. VII., Op., tom. iii., c. 524; edit. Migne).

"Although He was designed for ever, yet He was consecrated on the cross; there He entered upon His priestly office" (Bishop Jeremy Taylor, "Ductor Dubitantium," Book II., c. iii., § 10; Works, vol. ix., p. 538; edit. Eden).

taught in the Epistle to the Hebrews. See chap. vii. 21, 22, 27, with viii. 6, 12; ix. 15, 17; x. 9, 10, 16, 18, 29; xii. 24; xiii. 20. And note especially chap. ii. 14, 15.

If these passages might—one of them, or each of them viewed separately—admit of another interpretation, the impression produced by the view of their combined teaching ought hardly to be regarded as doubtful.

But if any doubt yet remained, this is surely a case in which doubt should be removed, when light from other teachings of Holy Scripture is made to shine upon the ceremonial teaching of the old sacrificial service.

The law could not die, but the law could and did condemn to death, and with death its dominion ended. We, through the law condemned to death, do our dying in Christ's death. Then we are dead to the law, and are as free in respect of the covenant of the law as a woman is free when her husband is dead (Rom. vii. 2). The bond of the law, according to the law, is broken by death.

Christ, who has died for us, is for us the end of the law. The handwriting which was against us by the law, is taken out of the way, nailed to Christ's cross.¹ We who by the law were enemies, are reconciled by the Body of His flesh, through death—peace being made by the Blood of His cross. It is *then*, when He has made an end of sin, and reconciliation for iniquity, bringing in everlasting righteousness—then is the time "to anoint the Most Holy" (Daniel ix. 24). Then He becomes the Anointed indeed—the very Holy of Holies, the High Priest of the true most Holy Place, not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.

And so we pass through death into a new life—the new life, in the new atmosphere of the New Covenant, the Covenant in which we have Christ for our Mediator, and know that we have remission of our sins, because we have Christ for our High Priest, who by His One offering hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.²

N. DIMOCK.

(To be concluded in our next).

¹ Προσηλώσας αὐτὸ τῷ σταυρῷ. "The aorist expresses the historical fact. . . . The thought expressed is similar to that in Gal. iii. 13. As Meyer observes: 'Since by the death of Christ on the cross the law which condemned men lost its penal authority, inasmuch as Christ by His death endured for men the curse of the law, and became the end of the law—hence in the fact that Christ as a *ἱλαστήριον* was nailed to the cross, the law itself was nailed thereon, whereby it ceased to be *ἐν μέσῳ*'" (Professor Abbott, "On Col. ii. 14," p. 257). See also Bishop Lightfoot, "Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul," pp. 301, 302.

² Jewish tradition bore witness to this great transition. See Schoettgen, "Horæ Heb.," De Mess., Lib. VII., cap. i., § 9, 10, tom. ii., pp. 611, 612;