

ART. II.—OUR LORD'S PRESENT WORK AS THE
HIGH PRIEST OF HIS CHURCH.

IN a former article, on this subject¹ it was shown that the intercession of Christ, as at present carried on, is properly sacerdotal. It is as High Priest of His Church that He appears before God and pleads her cause in heaven.

We now proceed to inquire how far Holy Scripture enables us to determine the manner and circumstances of His priestly intercession, and the relation in which it stands to the worship of the Church on earth. It will be remembered that the special object of this inquiry is to discover whether any countenance is lent to the assertion, that

“the most holy Body and Blood of Christ, the alone acceptable Victim to make our peace with God, are offered, that is, continually presented and pleaded by Jesus Himself in heaven, naturally, as we may say, and openly;”

an assertion on which is based the theory, that

“the same most holy Body and Blood are continually presented and pleaded before God by Christ's representatives, acting ‘in His name,’ and ‘by His commission and authority’ on earth.”

In prosecuting this inquiry, we shall confine our attention in the present paper to the evidence to be gathered from the typical institution of the Mosaic economy, by which the priesthood of Christ was foreshadowed; with a view to ascertain what light is thrown by it on the question before us. Other parts of the subject we shall hope to enter upon in the two following numbers of *THE CHURCHMAN*.

Our warrant for seeking evidence from the Jewish institution is to be found in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The law, so that Epistle teaches us, had “a shadow of the good things to come;”² that is to say, it represented them, though it did not contain them; just as the shadow represents, though it is not, the substance. And the shadow which the law had was an accurate shadow, a divine adumbration of the eternal verities which it really and designedly portrayed. As such we may study it with profit, and gain from it a clearer insight into them. And not that only, for if the typical and material institution be indeed a shadow, projected on earth from the heavenly archetype, “the pattern shown in the Mount,”³ then the dimensions and main features of the one must correspond with those of the other. Then from the shadow here we may

¹ *THE CHURCHMAN* for April, 1883. The delay in the appearance of the second Article has been occasioned by the illness of the writer.

² Hebrews x. i.

³ Exod. xxv. 40; Hebrews viii. 5.

argue back to the substance there ; and may, if need be, correct and modify our conception of the spiritual reality, by the divinely delineated material type of it which we possess.

But the Epistle to the Hebrews, which thus supplies the warrant for consulting profitably the Old Testament Institution, supplies also, so far as our present inquiry is concerned, definite limits within which to pursue it. Out of the whole body of types which the Mosaic institution contained, the inspired writer of this Epistle makes choice of one person and one service only as the subjects of his infallible comment. It is not in the Jewish priests generally, but in the high-priest alone that he finds a type of our Lord as Priest.¹ Throughout the Epistle no typical significance is assigned to the ordinary priests of the Jewish economy. One only, the head and chief of the order, the high-priest, is the chosen type of "The Apostle and High Priest of our Confession." All other Jewish priests fall entirely out of consideration.²

Nor is this the only limitation which is imposed by the Epistle to the Hebrews upon our present inquiry. It is not only on the single figure of the high-priest, in his ideal unity,

¹ This is surely a consideration which has an important bearing upon the question whether the ministers of Christ are to be regarded as the successors of the Jewish priests, standing in the same relation to Him as they did to the high-priest of the house of Aaron. We look in vain for any such idea in this Epistle, where, of all places of the New Testament, we should most have expected to find it. It may be remarked in passing that if the theory referred to at the commencement of this article were true, if Christian ministers were Christ's "representatives," in the manner claimed for them, then not "priests" but "high-priests" would be their proper designation ; for the whole typical action, on which the supposed resemblance is based, was that of the high-priest, and of the high-priest alone. The ordinary priests never, in any way, imitated or repeated it.

² The expression (ch. x. 11) "Every priest" may be urged as an exception to this statement. We might answer that the reading is uncertain, that "high-priest," ἀρχιερεὺς, has considerable support, and that the Revised Version, though it does not adopt it, mentions in the margin that "some ancient authorities read *high-priest*." Or, again, if the better-supported reading, "priest," be retained, it might be held to mean, as it has been by some writers, "Every high-priest in succession." Adopting, however, as we prefer to do, at once the better-supported reading and the more natural interpretation, we are prepared to expound with Böhme (quoted by Delitzsch), "Stantibus Judæorum sacrificiis Pontifex cœlestes sedens e regione ponitur." In the grand climax at which he has arrived, the sacred writer brings for a moment into view, not the high-priest only, but all the priests of that earlier dispensation, in all the busy action of their daily-repeated because unavailing service, in order that he may set over against them in strongest contrast Him, Who "after He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever," ceased from His accomplished work of sacrifice and satisfaction, and sat down "in the majesty of calm repose, on the right hand of God." But this is an exception which in no way invalidates the general assertion made above.

that our thoughts are to be concentrated, but on that figure as engaged in the one sacerdotal service of the Jewish Church year, which the high-priest only was permitted to perform, and which he was required to perform alone.

Having described with some minuteness the construction and furniture of the Tabernacle, the writer passes these things by without comment as things which are only subsidiary to his argument, and of which he cannot stop to "speak particularly."¹ He will not linger within the sacred precincts of the Holy Place, to expound the mystery of the golden candlestick and the table of shew-bread, nor of that golden altar of incense, which, occupying the central place in front of the mystic veil, may be reckoned among the furniture of the Inner Sanctuary itself.² Not even on the ark of the covenant, with its golden pot of manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of stone graven by the hand of God Himself, nor on the overshadowing cherubims of glory, will he pause to dwell. The goal to which he is hastening lies through these things and beyond them. It is in the service for which they were prepared, and especially in one particular feature of it, one marked contrast which it afforded, that the Gospel of which he is in search is to be found. By the feet of many priests the floor of that first chamber is trodden daily. Within the awful enclosure of the second chamber the feet of the high-priest alone, on one day only in the year, may presume to enter. By this the Holy Ghost signified that while that "first tabernacle," the Holy Place in which the many priests ministered, was still standing, the way into the most Holy Place, the true access to God Himself, was not yet made manifest.³ Only when that first tent with what it signified had passed away by the destruction of the Jewish Temple and economy, was the second tent, shaking off its material shroud and earthly envelope, transformed into the spiritual reality which it had prefigured. When the true High Priest entered once for all, not into the most Holy Place made with hands, but into heaven itself, then "boldness to enter into the holiest of all by the blood of Jesus" became the privilege of every Christian.

In this most Holy Place, then, and in the service connected with it, the Gospel mystery of the Jewish ritual is enshrined. In other words, it is to the action of the high-priest on the day of atonement, and to what he then did in the most Holy

¹ Hebrews ix. 5.

² Hebrews ix. 3, 4.

³ Hebrews ix. 8. It seems natural that the expression, "The first tabernacle," should have the same meaning in this verse as it has in the second verse of the same chapter, viz., "The first part of the tabernacle," "the Holy Place," as distinguished from "the Most Holy."

Place, that we must confine our attention, if we would learn what the type has to teach us as regards our Lord's present work for us as our High Priest in heaven.

The relation in which the day of atonement stood typically to the rest of the Jewish year, bore a striking analogy to the relation in which the Gospel verity stands spiritually to the whole Jewish figure. On that one day the imperfection of all the ceremonial expiations of the preceding year was plainly confessed. "All the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions, in all their sins,"¹ though by the inferior priests they had already been atoned for in ordinary sacrifices, needed, as the solemn service of that day showed, yet another atonement by the high-priest himself in an extraordinary sacrifice, which gathering them all up as it were in one, should carry them beyond the veil into the presence of God Himself, and there procure forgiveness for them. While, therefore, that day itself was proved by its annual recurrence to be only a type, it was obviously the most significant type which the Jew possessed of the "good things to come." The ritual of the day was briefly this.² Clothed, not in his usual stately dress, but in a garb composed entirely of white linen, the high-priest first brought to the door of the Tabernacle a bullock for a sin-offering, and a ram for a burnt-offering for himself and for his house, *i.e.*, for the whole priesthood; for on that day reconciliation was to be made for all the priests, and for the Tabernacle and its furniture, as well as for the whole nation. Two he-goats were then brought for a sin-offering, and a ram for a burnt-offering on behalf of the people. Upon the goats lots were cast, one for Jehovah, the other for Azazel. The high-priest, as a sinful man (the type herein bearing witness to itself that it was only a type), and therefore obliged to "offer sacrifice first for his own sins," now proceeded to slay the bullock which he had already presented. This he did at the altar of burnt-offering in the court without the Tabernacle. Then, taking a censer filled with burning coals from off that altar, and having both his hands full of incense, he entered the Tabernacle, and passing within the veil into the most Holy Place, he there cast the incense out of his hands upon the burning coals of the censer, and set it down upon the ground, in order that the cloud of smoke thus produced might hide the mercy-seat from his view; for there abode the mysterious Shekinah, the symbol of the presence of the Almighty, and no man might look on God and live. Leaving the censer there, as it would seem, to send up its cloud of smoke until the ministrations of the day within the veil were

¹ Leviticus xvi. 21.

² Leviticus xvi.

completed, he came out again to the altar of burnt-offering in the court, and taking in a bowl some of the blood of the bullock which he had slain, he carried it into the most Holy Place, and there sprinkled it with his finger, once upon the golden cover of the ark, which was called the Caphoreth or Mercy-seat, and seven times upon the ground in front of it. Coming forth a second time to the altar in the court, he now commenced his offering for the people. Slaying the he-goat on which the lot for Jehovah had fallen, he carried its blood into the most Holy Place, and dealt with it there in the same manner as he had dealt before with the blood of his own sin-offering. And now the transactions of the day, so far as the Inner Sanctuary was concerned, were concluded. The bowls of blood and the smoking censer were carried forth, and the mystic curtain fell, barring access to that sacred presence-chamber till another year should have run its course. Here, then, so far as we have now to do with it, the ritual of the day of atonement ended. It remains to be considered what conclusions are to be drawn from it as regards the inquiry in which we are now engaged.

I. It is important to observe that *there was no altar* in the most Holy Place.

There was no altar for animal sacrifice within the Jewish Tabernacle, or Temple, at all. The altar on which the bodies of those beasts, which were offered in sacrifice, were wholly or in part consumed by fire, was the brazen altar, which stood at the entrance of the court without. Standing there, it evermore silently testified to the Jewish worshipper that only through sacrifice, death undergone, blood shed, could access to God be obtained and acceptable worship rendered. In the first division of the Tabernacle, the Holy Place, there was, indeed, an altar, but it was the golden altar of incense, from which the fragrant smoke of spices, the type of prayer and worship, and heavenward aspiration, continually went up. In the most Holy Place, within the second veil, no altar stood. Neither brazen altar of sacrifice, nor golden altar of incense, had there a place. The ministry of the high-priest within the veil was *without an altar*. If, then, the type correspond to the anti-type, if the shadow be an accurate representation of the substance, as both the strict command given to Moses to copy the pattern shown him in the Mount, and the argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews prove that it is, then there is no altar in heaven either.¹ The High Priest of our profession ministers

¹ It is true that an altar is introduced more than once into the imagery of the Book of Revelation, the scene being laid in heaven. But in no such case is there any reference to a priest at all, much less to our Lord as ministering at a heavenly altar. In the first passage,

at no altar there. But if that view be correct, which regards the worship of the Church on earth, especially in the celebration of the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as the counterpart and resemblance of Christ's priestly action for His Church in heaven; if His priests, especially in that solemn service, are doing here by His authority and in His name what He is doing there, then surely it must follow that there can be no altar in the ministrations of the Church on earth, seeing there is none in the ministration of Christ in heaven.

The type, indeed, would seem to go further and exclude altogether the view to which we have referred. Certainly there is nothing in it to sanction the doing by priests on earth, in any sense or manner, what the High Priest is doing in heaven. On the contrary, on the day of atonement, which, as we have seen, is the proper figure of the Gospel verity, all other priestly action was superseded and set aside by the action of the high-priest alone. On that day no other priest was permitted to minister nor to come within the Tabernacle till its special service was completed.

"There shall be no man [no priest, that is, for no other man could ever enter there] in the tabernacle of the congregation when he goeth in to make an atonement in the holy place, until he come out, and have made an atonement for himself, and for his household, and for all the congregation of Israel."¹

But were the resemblance as clearly made out, as it appears to be clearly set aside, between our action as priests on earth and His action as High Priest in heaven, it would still conclusively follow, so far as the teaching of the divinely constituted type is concerned, that we serve not as priests at any altar here, seeing that at no altar He serves so there.

II. Nearly related to this conclusion is another, to which the teaching of the type seems no less inevitably to lead us. There was no altar in the most Holy Place, and of consequence *there was never any victim there.* In point of fact, no victim ever came within the Tabernacle or the Temple at all. The fat of some sacrifices, choice portions of others, the whole carcasses of others, were offered to God on the brazen altar without. But no part of any animal sacrifice, except the blood, was ever brought within the sanctuary. It would have

(vi. 9) St. John sees "under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held." This altar has been thought to answer to the altar of burnt-offering in the court of the Jewish Tabernacle. But whatever interpretation we put upon it, it has obviously nothing to do with our present argument. In other passages (viii. 3; ix. 13.) the *golden* altar, corresponding to the altar of incense in the Holy Place, is distinctly specified.

¹ Leviticus xvi. 17.

traversed the whole idea of sacrifice, in its relation to worship and access to God, if it had been. Sacrifice for sin is the means, not the end. It stands on the threshold, nay, before the threshold, of worship and communion.

But if this be so, does not the view of the Holy Supper with which we are dealing, again transgress the conditions which are plainly imposed upon us by the type? The advocates of that view allege that Christ, as our High Priest in heaven, is not, indeed, *repeating*—any such repetition they emphatically deny—but *representing* Himself as “the alone acceptable victim to make our peace with God,” and that in like manner His Church represents Him, offers, in that sense, Him, His most holy Body and Blood, in the celebration of the Lord’s Supper. The authors of a memorial, presented some few years ago to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and signed, among others, by the late Dr. Pusey, Canon Liddon and Archdeacon Denison, affirm :

“We believe that as in heaven, Christ, our great High Priest, ever offers Himself before the Eternal Father, pleading by His presence His sacrifice of Himself once offered on the cross : so on earth, in the Holy Eucharist, that same Body once for all sacrificed for us, and that same Blood once for all shed for us, sacramentally present, are offered and pleaded before the Father by the priest, as our Lord ordained to be done in remembrance of Himself, when He instituted the blessed sacrament of His Body and Blood.”

But if, as this statement declares, “as” it is done there, “so” also is it done here, how can it be said that His sacred Body is offered here? For assuredly, so far as the type is our guide (and with that alone we are dealing now), it is not offered there. Writers of the school of theology to which these statements belong are wont to speak of our Lord as continuing still the “victim-state” in heaven. But no victim, no flesh, no body of a sacrifice was ever seen in the most Holy Place of which heaven is the antitype. The blood alone was admitted there. It may not be out of place to remark here, though this consideration belongs properly to a later stage of our inquiry, how entirely the Epistle to the Hebrews confirms the correspondence of the antitype with the type in this particular. It is never as “victim,” but always as high-priest, that our Lord is there represented as appearing for us before His Father in heaven. And not only so, but the writer of the Epistle in one place expressly states that the analogy of the type was preserved in this very particular, and that the sacred Body of our Lord was not presented to God in heaven *in the character of a victim*.

“For the bodies of those beasts,” he writes, “whose blood is brought into the most Holy Place by the high-priest for sin, are burned without

the camp. Wherefore [seeing this is so, and that the antitype must answer to the type] Jesus also, that He might sanctify the people with His own blood, suffered without the gate."

The direction of the law was :

"And the bullock for the sin-offering, and the goat for the sin-offering, whose blood was brought in to make atonement in the holy place, shall one carry forth without the camp; and they shall burn in the fire their skins, and their flesh, and their dung."¹

In other words, the bodies of victims whose blood was carried within the veil were to be annihilated. "Wherefore," in order that all things that were written of him might be accomplished, Jesus, Whom these victims represented, suffered not within the enclosure of "the holy city," but in an unclean place, "the place of a skull," outside. And suffering there, He annihilated the "victim-state," brought it for ever to an end; inasmuch as with a body that *could* die, that *could be* a victim, He has never more anything to do. "Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over Him. For the death that He died, He died unto sin once for all."²

Surely, then, if all this be true, and if the view we are combating is to be accepted, we are driven to the strange conclusion, that seeing it is His Blood only that Christ offered in heaven, it can only be that same precious Blood that we offer below in the holy sacrament of the Eucharist. And then does it not follow, that if this be the pattern on which that holy sacrament is modelled, we must needs re-construct the error of the Church of Rome, and deny, not the cup, but the bread, not to the laity only, but to all who are partakers of that holy sacrament? For His "flesh, which is meat indeed," no place would then be found in that holy ordinance.

III. One other point to be noticed in the typical teaching of the most Holy Place is *the presence and the significance of the atoning blood*. There was no altar within the Holy of Holies. The victim never entered there. The blood came alone within the veil. But how did it come? As living blood or as dead? Not as living, but as dead. Not as the emblem of life, lived on unbroken and unimpaired, nor even of life taken up again and lived anew; but, as its separation from the body plainly intimated, of life forfeited, of life parted with—in one word, of death undergone. It is the eternal canon by which the

¹ Leviticus xvi. 27.

² Romans vi. 9, 10. Revised Version, and Margin. The description of our Lord in the Book of Revelation (v. 6) as "a Lamb as it had been slain," as justifying the idea of His retaining the "victim-state" in heaven, will come under consideration in a future paper.

awful sacrifice of Calvary and the sacrifices of the Jewish Tabernacle alike were governed—the shadow in nothing more true to the substance than in this, that without “shedding of blood is no remission.”¹ Nor are we left in ignorance of the principles on which this canon rests. Death is the wages of sin. “In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die,” was the primeval sentence on sin, which has never been repealed. The life is forfeited by sin, and the life must be paid in penalty if remission is to be obtained. But “the life of all flesh is the blood thereof.”² Therefore, the blood was chosen as the instrument of remission.

“The life³ of the flesh,” said God, by Moses, “is in the blood : and I have given it [the blood] to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls : for it is the blood that maketh an atonement, by [virtue of] the life³ which is in it.”⁴

This, then, was the significance of the blood, as it was smeared or sprinkled on the brazen altar of sacrifice, on the golden altar of incense, upon and before the Mercy-seat within the veil. It was a proof given that the penalty of sin had been paid, that the life which was forfeited had been surrendered ; and therefore it made atonement. One life for another ; the innocent for the guilty ; “the just for the unjust,” in the blessed mystery of substitution, had been laid down. Here was the proof of it offered and presented before God. His awful justice was satisfied. The guilty was pardoned and went free. These were the atonements, the “coverings,” as they were significantly called, from which the great Jewish day derived its name.⁵ The sin existed as a fact. It had intruded into all man’s relations with God. It stood as a witness against him even in the most Holy Place, the presence-chamber itself. But the blood, no longer coursing with life-giving energy through the veins, but shed, poured forth, had dropped upon it, and beneath its influence the deep dark stain had melted quite away. The sin was gone, for the penalty was paid. Covered for ever it was from the sight of God Himself, by the virtue of that shed and sprinkled blood.

Again we ask, if this be so, how can the priestly action of Christ in heaven, if it fulfil the type, be the model to which, as it is alleged, the action of His priests in the Holy Supper is in this respect assimilated ? The confusion of thought and metaphor, involved in the view we are combating, appears to

¹ Hebrews ix. 22.

² Leviticus xvii. 14.

³ Or “soul.” It is the same word that is rendered “souls” in the middle of the verse.

⁴ Verse 11.

⁵ יום הכיפורים—Leviticus xxiii. 27, 28 ; xxv. 9.

us to be complete. The resemblance between the supposed action of the High Priest of our profession, now in heaven, and the action of the Jewish high-priest before, and of Christian priests since, He came, alike fails entirely. The Jewish high-priest appeared in the most Holy Place with blood which had been shed without the Tabernacle, and which was now separate from the body in which once it flowed, in his hand. How can that type possibly be fulfilled by our High Priest presenting before God in heaven His most holy Blood, not separate from His sacred Body, not as shed upon the Cross, but as living in closest union with that Body? It is impossible to suppose that the conditions of the type are satisfied by the presence of Christ in the heavenly Sanctuary in His Resurrection Body, composed of flesh and blood united.¹ On the other hand, if our Saviour Christ presents to the Father in heaven His most precious Blood, not as separate from, but as contained in His most holy Body, how can we be said to be doing here what He is doing there, by offering to Almighty God His Body and Blood in the holy Eucharist, not united, but distinctly and emphatically separated, the Body "broken," the Blood "shed," and represented by two separate elements of bread and wine, and by two separate acts both of consecration and administration? The alleged action in heaven is at variance both with the type which prefigured it, and with the service which professes to represent it on earth.

Under this division of the teaching of the type, it is further to be noticed that the blood was not presented continually, but once for all, by the high-priest in the most Holy Place. Twice in one day, as we have seen, first for himself and then for the people, he entered with blood within the veil. But when the blood with which he first entered had been sprinkled on and before the Mercy-seat, the atonement which it procured was perfected. No continuous dealing with it was needed, nor, indeed, was possible, for that first completed act was immediately followed by a second, which could only be entered upon through the completion of the first.

By the one act of once sprinkling, his own sins were put away. And now, being reconciled to God himself, he could discharge the ministry of reconciliation for others. The atoning blood could now in like manner be sprinkled by him for the people. But that too was a single, not a continuous

¹ On a subject like this we are content to accept the statement of the rubric at the end of our Communion Office, "the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven," without discussing the question, which, as is well known, has been raised by some, whether our Lord's risen Body contained blood or not.

act. Done once for all, it was done sufficiently. Repeated, indeed, it was, year by year; but that was to show, not that it was the single type of a continuous action, but that it was the continued type of a single action. Once for all, then, by the ruling of the type, must the Blood of Christ be offered in the true most Holy Place. The virtue of the offering lives on for ever, even as it reached back to "the foundation of the world;"¹ but the type forbids us to believe that the offering itself is continuous. There is, indeed, a continual dealing with that most precious Blood. But of that dealing, earth, not heaven, is the scene. There is a repeated sprinkling of it by Him, the true High Priest. But it is not before the Mercy-seat above, but on penitent and believing hearts here below, that He so sprinkles it.

The teaching, then, of the typical institution clearly is, that the action of the high-priest within the most Holy Place furnishes an accurate, if not a complete, representation of our Lord's action as High-Priest of His Church in heaven. And the analogy which it affords warrants the conclusion (with which we bring this part of our inquiry to a close), that not with altar, nor with sacrifice, but only with blood, and that as shed, and not continually, but once only, and once for all presented, does He minister there. By blood, once shed and once offered, the sins of the whole nation throughout the year were typically and ceremonially atoned for. By Blood, once shed and once offered, the sins of the whole world, throughout all the ages, were really and spiritually taken away.

T. T. PEROWNE.



ART. III.—WEATHER FORECASTS.

"ALMOST everyone," writes the Secretary to the Meteorological Office, in his admirable manual of "Elementary Meteorology,"² "imagines himself to be a born meteorologist." The remark is certainly so far justified, that upon questions connected with the science of meteorology people are in the habit of expressing themselves with a confidence which they would not venture to exhibit in reference to any other science with the principles of which they were not familiar. There are probably few persons who would attempt to predict a solar or lunar eclipse without having first mastered the elements of

¹ Revelation xiii. 8.

² "Elementary Meteorology," by R. H. Scott.