

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.—THE HEAVENLY REALITY IN RELATION TO THE EARTHLY TYPES, AS ILLUMINED BY THE WORD OF PROPHECY AND THE LIGHT OF THE GOSPEL.

HAVING now viewed the typical shadows of the true *sacerdotium* in relation to the Grand Reality of the New Covenant, and having marked, in some important particulars, the *differentia* of the Heavenly Antitype, we must proceed in the present paper to fix our attention on the *sacerdotium* of Christ as seen in relation, not only to ceremonial types, but to the unfolding of the Divine Revelation, which was as a light shining more and more unto the perfect day.

We have already been led to recognise as the basis of this true *sacerdotium* the Divine Sonship of our Great High Priest.

In the light of the New Testament it can scarcely be necessary to observe that it must be impossible to take a true view of the *sacerdotal office* of Christ, apart from the true view of the *Incarnation* of the Son of God, and His Nature as the Only-begotten of the Father, very God of very God, and His relation to the Eternal counsel ordained before the world unto our glory. "We have a great High Priest, that is passed through the heavens, JESUS, THE SON OF GOD" (Heb. iv. 14).

Very observable is the collocation of two quotations from the Old Testament which we find in the fifth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. There, following on the assertion that "no man taketh this honour [of Priesthood] unto himself," the writer says, "So also Christ glorified not Himself to be made an high priest; but He that said unto Him, Thou art My Son, to-day have I begotten Thee. As He saith also in another place, Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec" (vers. 5, 6). Observe the first word alleged as constituting Him by Divine appointment the Great High Priest of the new order is the word which speaks directly of Divine Sonship, "Thou art My Son."¹ Upon this *follows* the

not apparent that the critical process is purely subjective? The critic makes out of the narrative just what he pleases, selecting such portions as suit him, and discarding the rest. The result is a mere speculative fancy, without the slightest historical value." If Professor Green has rightly represented the facts here, is it quite candid of Professor Driver to tell the student (as he does in his "Introduction," p. 15) that "in chap. xxxiv. the analysis is not throughout equally certain," and to add no more on the divergence of the critics?

¹ Viewing the quotation from Ps. ii, in its relation to 2 Sam. vii., we may doubtless see in it more than an affirmation of the Divine Sonship of the Messiah. It has been said: "Jesus, who is the Messiah, is . . .

word which speaks of sacerdotal dignity, "Thou art a Priest for ever."

Doubtless we are intended to connect the ideas conveyed by these two quotations. Both apparently are to be dated together, and, if so, we can hardly be wrong in dating both, with St. Paul (Acts xiii. 35),¹ to the point of time when the world's Burden-bearer, having finished His burden-bearing work—having through death brought to naught the power of him that had the power of death—that is, the devil—entered on His resurrection life, begotten again from the dead by the Father's power through the blood of the everlasting Covenant, to live for ever the Man Christ Jesus, the Mediator of the

similar to Aaron in this, that like him He is called of God in the high priesthood, called in the prophecy of Nathan itself, and in the two Psalms, which refer to that prophecy, which represent the future Messiah as Mediator of men with God, and the second of which even names Him 'Priest' (Ebrard, "On Heb.," p. 181). See Perowne, "On Psalms," vol. i., p. 8.

"If the Messiah is to be a priest after the order of Melchisedec, then to him also is ascribed not the Levitical hereditary priesthood, but an independent priesthood having *its root in HIS OWN PERSON.*"—*Ibid.*, p. 214.

¹ Clemens Alexandrinus, indeed, would make this declaration of Ps. ii. 7 belong to the day of our Lord's baptism. But this is obviously the result of a misquotation (Pædag., Lib. I., cap. vi., Op., tom. i., p. 113; edit. Potter; Venice, 1757). See also Justin Martyr, "Dial. cum Tryph.," chap. lxxxviii; Lactantius, "De Vera Sapientia," Lib. IV., chap. xv.; Augustin, "Enchiridion," chap. xlix., § 14, Op., tom. vi., c. 215; Paris, 1685.

So others would date our Lord's priesthood to His baptism. This view is maintained by P. Damiani, who says: "Ipse cum sacramento Baptismatis et veri Sacerdotii jura suscepit" (Opusc. VI., cap. iv., Op., tom. iii., p. 44; Paris, 1743). See also Ferus, "In Pent.," f. 159, b, col. 1574.

And possibly such language may seem to some to admit of a sense which may be justified by regarding our Lord's baptism as the initial stage of His consecration to the *Sacerdotium* of the New Testament. See Lev. viii. 6. See also Luke iv. verses 14 and 18.

Dr. Owen, relying on John xvii. 19 (*ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐγὼ ἀγιάζω ἑμαυτόν*), says: "In that prayer of our Saviour—John xvii.—do I place the beginning and entrance of the exercise of His priestly office" (Works, vol. xix., p. 154; edit. Gould).

But (1) let the proleptical character of this prayer be noted (see, e.g., ver. 4 and ver. 11: "I am no more in the world"). And then (2) let it be granted that this dedication (to use Owen's own words) "doth also respect the sacrifice which He was to offer: 'I consecrate and give up Myself to be a sacrifice.'" And then the Saviour's words will be found rather to confirm the view taken in the text.

On the sense of John xvii. 19 see Outram, "De Sacrificiis," pp. 286, 293, 294; edit. 1688; and Deylingius, "Obser. Sacr.," Par. iv., p. 560.

Lightfoot speaks of Christ being *sealed* "for the High Priest," both at His baptism and at His transfiguration, by which we are apparently to understand the recognition by Divine attestation of the qualification contained in His Divine Sonship. (See "Horæ Hebraicæ," on St. Matt., chap. xvii., ver. 2, vol. ii., p. 242; Oxford, 1859.)

New Covenant; to be exalted on our behalf; to enter the Most Holy Place, a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec.¹

But further. We can hardly doubt that we are to see in

¹ "This day" of Ps. ii. 7 may, indeed, strictly be referred to the morning of Christ's resurrection—the day on which He was raised from "the womb of the earth, the 'Firstborn from the dead' (Col. i. 18), and had bestowed on Him the incommunicable prerogative of being 'Heir of all things' (Heb. i. 2)" (Kay, "On Psalms," p. 9). See Pearson, "On Creed": "Christ must therefore be acknowledged the *Son of God*, because He is raised immediately by God out of the earth unto immortal life" (p. 162; London, 1840).

But then it must be noted that this begetting anew is the result not only of what Christ was by nature, but also and rather of what in that nature, and in virtue of that nature, He had accomplished in His death—viz., the perfect Atonement of His sacrifice for sins (see 1 Cor. xv. 3, 17, 20). He was raised from the dead "in the blood of the Everlasting Covenant" (Heb. xiii. 20; cf. Rom. iv. 25, where the natural force of *dià* with an accusative ought not to be explained away. See Dr. Moule's admirable note on Romans, pp. 126, 127, and cf. Rom. viii. 10). He was "declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead" (Rom. i. 4; cf. Ps. xvi. 10; and Acts ii. 25, *sqq.*, with xiii. 35). It is well said by Bishop Bull: "In loco . . . Act. xiii. 32, 33, *Apostolus Paulus verba Davidis in Psalmo II^o. Tu es Filius meus, ego hodie te genui, Christi ex mortuis resurrectioni accommodat, contra novos Artemonitas notandum est, id non ita accipiendum esse, quasi demum per et post resurrectionem Christus cœperit esse excellentissimo modo Dei Filius, et ab eo gigni, sed quia tum potentissime per resurrectionem verus atque unigenitus Dei Filius declaratus atque ostensus fuerit. Hic enim est Scripturæ mos, ut res tum dicantur fieri, cum manifestantur et sese produunt"* ("Judicium Eccles. Cath.," v. 7; Works, vol. vi., pp. 113, 114; Oxford, 1846). See also Owen, "On Heb. vii. 26," Works, vol. xxii., p. 550; edit. Goold; and "On Heb. v. 9," vol. xxi., p. 534.

If the second quotation (from Ps. cx.) is also to be dated to the same day, then the same principle of interpretation should be adopted. Christ is addressed as, and declared to be, what He had been before, and as having an office in which He had been accepted before—although the function and its recognition had been in suspense, as it were hid behind a cloud, during the brief period in which the Christ (see Westcott, "On Heb.," p. 122), the anointed Priest, was "a dead man" (*νεκρὸς*, Rev. i. 18).

In all this there is nothing that should be seen as contravening the truth that the Old Covenant came to an end in death, the death of Christ for us; and that when the blood of the New Covenant was shed for remission, the New Covenant in that blood was established, although the resurrection life of the New Covenant, and with it the *declared* recognition of the *Sacerdotium* of the New Covenant, with the confirmation of the Divine oath, waited for the fulfilment of the sign of the prophet Jonah.

Dean Jackson's view is doubtless the result of much thoughtful study of the subject. He holds that from the day of Christ's resurrection, "and not before, doth His endless everlasting priesthood commence" ("On Creed," Book IX., chap. iv., Works, vol. viii., p. 215; Oxford, 1844). But on the cross He was "a priest in *feri*, though not in *facto*, or a priest *inter consecrandum*." (p. 214). Thus "the sacrifice of the Son of God" is regarded "an intermediate (though an especial) part of His consecration to the priesthood after the order of Melchizedec; not the

the first quotation that which is the qualification for the office assigned in the second. In other words, we are to see in the priesthood of the One High Priest an office which, in a very true sense, belongs to His nature. The nearness, the mediatorial nearness, of the sacrificing priests who ministered in the shadows of earth was a nearness of merely elective calling. But the nearness of the One Mediator of the New Covenant, the One Priest after the order of Melchizedec, is inherent in His eternal relationship to the Father.¹ The glory

ultimum esse, or accomplishment of it" (p. 215 ; see also p. 245). Yet this does not hinder the Dean's recognition of the truth that "the everlasting sacrifice whereby He is consecrated an everlasting Priest was then accomplished, and the cessation of the Aaronical priesthood proclaimed, when He said, *Consummatum est*, and commended His spirit unto God" (chap. xxviii., p. 379).

It may, perhaps, be open to question whether Dean Jackson may not have gone somewhat too far in arguing, as regards Christ's consecration to the priesthood, from the ordinances of the Aaronical priesthood to the priesthood of the new order (see p. 212).

Certainly, if it be so that "the word of the oath since the law" (Heb. vii. 28) did then (at the Resurrection) make Him (*καθίστησιν*) priest (cf. iii. 2, *τω ποιῆσαντι αὐτόν*), and that because of the sacrifice offered and accepted—then that very making must have been a formal and solemn recognition of His high priestly work accomplished before, for which work He must have been (in some sense) fully qualified before that solemn and formal recognition. And is not this very qualification indicated to us in the words which follow the telling us of His making—His making by the word of the oath? That word makes whom? *Υἱὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τετελειωμένον* (vii. 28).

On this point see Owen, "On Heb. v. 9," Works, vol. xxi., p. 534 ; edit. Goold.

¹ So Cyril Alexandrinus speaks of Christ's priesthood as implicitly contained in His Divine Sonship, and its calling, therefore (after the order of Melchizedec), as differing from that after the order of Aaron : *Κέκληται τοῖνον καθ' ἑ καὶ Ἀαρῶν, πλὴν οὐκ ἐν ἴσῳ τρόπῳ ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐχρίετο πρὸς ἱεροουργίαν, καὶ ἦν οἰκέτης, ὁ δὲ ὡς Υἱὸς καλεῖται, καὶ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ ἱεροουργεῖ τῷ Πατρὶ* ("On Heb.," v. 5, Op., tom. vii., c. 973 ; edit. Migne). It is the calling to an office of sacerdotal nearness, which nearness was (in some sense) His before, because His by nature.

"The position of sonship includes every special honour, kingly or priestly. He to whom this had been given could not be said to 'glorify Himself.' The second quotation (Ps. cx. 4) defines the particular application of the first. The kingly priesthood of Melchizedec was promised to Christ. Such a priesthood naturally belongs to the exalted Son."—Westcott, "On Heb. v. 5, 6," p. 122.

"Christ, as sinless man, could approach God for Himself ; but He waited for His Father's appointment, that He might approach God as Son of man for sinful humanity. Comp. John viii. 54, 42 ; Acts iii. 13."—Westcott, "On Heb. v. 5," p. 122.

"Priorem adducit locum [Ps. ii. 7] quia in antecedente capite i. 5 quum Jesu Christi *διαφρόνητα* præ Angelis demonstrasset, eo usus erat ; quo ipso in animum revocat superiora, et de veritate magis convincit. Alludit etiam ad illum versu 8, quum de dignitate et eminentia sacerdotii exponit, *καίπερ ὢν Υἱὸς*. Innuvit, Christum ab eodem vocatum esse ad

which He has entered upon after His suffering is the very glory which He had with the Father before the worlds were. And after He had emptied Himself, and taken upon Him the form of a servant, made of a woman, made under the law, still the voice of the Father testified, "This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." This was testimony to Him, indeed, when, in the days of His flesh, He was on our side, on sin's side, of the veil; yet it was testimony to that in Him which was to rend the veil, and to hear the word, "Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee." Now, in the nearness which knows no separation, the mediatorial nearness of the man Christ Jesus, the nearness of the Priesthood after the order of Melchizedec, He ever liveth at God's right hand to make intercession for us.

But further. There is a teaching most important to be added here which has relation not only to the nature, but to the past work of our great High Priest. If we are right in the date to be assigned to the word which officially confers (or rather perhaps solemnly recognises) the priestly dignity, that word falls on His ear after He has finished His sacrificial work. Does such a statement strike some as strange and paradoxical? It may be asked, Are we, then, to suppose that our great High Priest glorified Himself to be made a high priest, and took upon Him to offer His sacrifice as high priest before He had received His appointment as high priest?

We have here before us a problem which seems to have led some reverent minds astray—seeking to find a way to escape from what may have appeared to them its perplexing difficulties—some falling into the error of supposing that the true *oblation* of the sacrifice was not made on the cross, but waited for the sacerdotal ministry of Christ in the heavens. Yet, as I am persuaded, the inspired Word not only leads us towards a light shining in our darkness, but in that light is seen pointing to a solution which leaves no difficulties, and brings the typical teaching of priesthood and sacrifice into line with the revealed mystery of God's redeeming love and His justifying grace in the Gospel of His dear Son.

It is not for nothing, we may be sure, that in the Epistle to the Hebrews, side by side with the teaching concerning the Priesthood, and the transition from that of Aaron to that of Melchizedec, we have set before us the true view of the relation

Pontificatum, a quo esset genitus, et a quo dictum ei esset *Υἱός μου ἐστὶν ὁ* ε. σ. γ. σ."—Carpzovii, "Sacrae Exercitationes," p. 229; Helmstadii, 1701.

"Qualem nobis Filium manifestavit Deus? an nullo honore, nullaque facultate præditum? imo ut inter se et homines Mediator esset. Ergo *sacerdotium continet genitura.*"—Calvin, "On Heb. v. 5," Op., tom. vii., p. 537; Amst., 1667.

of the Old Covenant to the New. The New casts forth the Old.¹ The Old Covenant had its teaching, typical shadows: the New Covenant has its blessed realities. The realities of the New do not belong to the shadows of the Old. They have no standing-place among them. Again, the shadows of the Old have no place among the realities of the New. The Old and the New are to be seen as clearly distinct one from another. They are not to stand together.² They are to be viewed in their distinction. Faith is to see them as separate. Yet there is a passage from the legal types to the realities of the Gospel. The Old was intended to lead to the New. But there is only

¹ Εἶπε, κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελησιδεκ. τοῦτο τὴν Λαρῶν ἱξίβαλεν . . . εἰ τοῖνυν ἱερῶσύνῃ εἰσήκται ἄλλη, δεῖ διαθήκην εἶναι ἑτέραν.—Chrysostom, "In Ep. ad Heb.," cap. vii., Hom. XIII., Op., tom. xii., p. 129; edit. Montfaucon; Paris, 1735. So also Johannes Damascenus, "In Ep. ad Heb.," chap. vii., Op., tom. ii., p. 242; Paris, 1712.

In the series of contrasts, in which the writer sets before us, in Heb. vii., the change, or transference, which accompanies the transition of the priesthood, we have:

(1) In verses 11-14, a change of law—νόμου μετάθεσις—a transference from law to law.

(2) In verses 15-17, a change from law to power of life—κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου.

(3) In verses 18-22, a change from the weakness and unprofitableness of the law to a better covenant, with Jesus as ἕγγυος, with a better hope, with nearness to God (cf. x. 19).

(4) In verses 23-25, a change from the many to the One, with no more need of transference, seeing the One is able to save to the uttermost, ever living to make intercession.

(5) In verses 26, 27, a change from many sinful priests, needing daily sacrifices for themselves and for the people, to the One who is holy, and higher than the heavens, having once for all offered Himself in sacrifice for sins.

(6) In verse 28, a change from men with infirmity to the Son—Υἱὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τετελειωμένον.

This last sums up and crowns all the foregoing. The transcendent dignity of the Divine Priesthood of the Son of God naturally demands a corresponding dignity of a new order of things, before which the old things are to pass away.

"When, at the death of our great High Priest, the veil . . . was rent in twain from the top to the bottom, there was clear demonstration that all those rites and services were abolished; and that the office of the high priest, which was distinguished from the other priests only by those usages [entering in the Holy of Holies], was now determined and brought to its full period. The pontificate, therefore, drawing its last breath, prophecies concerning the redemption of mankind by the great High Priest and Bishop of souls, 'that He should die for the people,' etc."—Lightfoot, "Horæ Hebraicæ," on John xi. 51, vol. iii., p. 372; Oxford, 1859.

² This was clearly seen and forcibly expressed thus: "Tamdiu enim debuit umbra manere et sacerdotium legis existere, quousque verus sacerdos verum sacrificium offerret in significato tabernaculo et veritate" "In Ep. ad Heb.," cap. viii., Comment., fol. 232, b.; edit. 1533; perhaps by Anselm of Laon, or rather Herveus. See Cave's "Hist. Lit.," p. 439.)

one way of transition from the one to the other. What is that one way? For those who accept the teaching of God's Word there is no room for question about the answer. The one only way is the Death of the Incarnate Son of God, the Atonement made by the Cross of Christ, the Redemption effected by His precious Blood, the Peace made by the Blood of the Cross.

Contemplate that death of Christ for a moment as the sure word of prophecy sets it before us in Isa. liii.¹ There we

¹ Thus the prophetic word interprets the typical sacrifice for sin. It is very noteworthy that this typical import of the sacrifice actually did develop itself (as Kurtz observes, p. 121, E. T.) in the heart of Judaism, without any New Testament influence. "Not only is it expressed from the pre-Christian standpoint of an Isaiah (chap. liii.), but from the equally pre-Christian standpoint of many of the later Rabbins, who maintained very decidedly that the animal sacrifices would cease with the coming of the Messiah, because *He would perform in the most perfect manner all that the sacrifices had been designed to accomplish.*"

Indeed, the juridical interpretation of sacrifice (the death of the victim being regarded as a *pœna vicaria*) has been the one generally received from the time of the Rabbins and the Fathers (see Kurtz, p. 123). It is impossible to explain away the undeniable fact that the doctrine of Isa. liii. as an exposition of sacrificial efficacy is in accord with the later Jewish theory which saw in the sin-offering a substitutional death (*Ibid.*, p. 107). See also "The Death of Christ," pp. 86, 87, and 46, 47.

The Revised Version of Lev. xvii. 11, which is generally approved by modern critics as preferable to the Authorised Version, need by no means be understood as excluding from the sense the idea of *pœna vicaria* (see Girdlestone's "Synonyms of the Old Testament," p. 129). Indeed, the LXX. version—though as a translation it may be discredited—may be regarded as bearing good witness to the sense in which the teaching was understood by Jewish authorities. (See Streane's "Age of Maccabees," p. 243; and Girdlestone's "Synonyms," p. 9.) And, indeed, there is elsewhere abundant evidence on this point. See Outram, "De Sacri," Lib. I., cap. xxii., § xi., pp. 258, 259 (Amst., 1688). Thus R. Salomon Jarchi wrote: "Anima omnis animantis est in sanguine. Quare eum dedi ad expiandas animas vestras. Veniet anima et animam expiabit." And Abenezra: "Sanguis expiat animã, quæ sibi inest, sensusque est; animã vice animæ." And R. Moses Ben Nachman: "Eum [sanguinem] in aram dedi, ut anima pecudis pro illius anima expiationem faciat." And so Isaac Ben Arama understands "animam scilicet vice animæ." And R. Lipmannus: "Victimæ animam vestrarum animalium vice dedi." And so Isaac Abrabanel: "Erit etiam pecudis sanguis (quia anima sentiens in eo inest) pro anima hominis. Anima nimirum vice animæ." And so Alenezra spoke of the sin-offering as "*pœnæ cuique debitæ λύτρον.*" The Hebrew of all these quotations may be seen in Outram. See also Schoettgen, "Horæ Heb.," tom. ii., p. 650 *et seq.*

Moreover, when it is admitted that "the juridical idea that the victim in the Mosaic sacrifices took the place of the sinner, and suffered vicariously, is certainly found in Isa. liii., and seems to be taught in Deut. xxi. 1-9 (comp. Exod. xxi. 23)" (see Oehler, in Schaff's "Encycl. of Herzog.," vol. iii., p. 1687; article "Offerings"), can it be doubted that in the Divine counsel there was that in the Mosaic sin-offering which was intended to convey the idea of *pœna vicaria*? See also Magee

see it in its relation, indeed, to the ceremonial types of the Law. It is an offering for guilt (ver. 10). Yet it is such an offering as the Law knows nothing of—the Servant of Jehovah, the Man of Sorrows, stricken for our transgressions, bearing the chastisement of our peace, so that “He shall see of the travail of His soul and be satisfied” (ver. 11).

But yet again contemplate that death for a moment, as it is set before us (apart from the dim light of typical teaching) in the clearer and fuller light of the Gospel revelation. Behold Christ dying, the just for the unjust, to bring us to God, redeeming us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us—made to be sin for us who knew no sin—that God may be just, and yet the justifier of the justly-condemned sinner believing in Him who justifieth the ungodly. Contemplate that solemn hour—nay, rather, that supreme moment—in the history of the Universe, when the Death of Christ for us brings to an end the Old Covenant with its condemnation, and ushers in the New Covenant with its justification for the justly condemned. The Old, with its typical ordinances and its earthly tabernacle, has now no standing before God. Now the truth of all is made ours. Now old things have passed away, and all things are become new. And now, in the light of that which is new, we see how the truth of the New is the fulfilment and explanation of the shadows of the Old, and perceive the death of Christ the fulfilment and explanation of expiatory sacrifice, not only of sacrificial blood shedding, but of the sacerdotal offering and oblation to God.

The death of Christ the truth of sacrifice and of sacrificial oblation? But, then, offered by whom? By none other than Himself, who, possessing in His own person all the qualifications¹ of the order of priesthood after the order of Melchizedec,

“On Atonement,” pp. 70, 71, 94, 97; edit. 1849; and Archdeacon Perowne’s “Our High Priest in Heaven,” pp. 35-38, second edition.

¹ Ἀρχιερεὺς γὰρ ἐστὶ μόνος πιστὸς ὁ Υἱὸς, δυνάμιμος τοῦτοις, ὃν ἐστὶν ἀρχιερεὺς, ἀπαλλάξαι τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων.—Chrys., “In Ep. ad Heb.,” cap. ii., Hom. V., Op., tom. xii., p. 52; edit. Montfaucon; Paris, 1735.

τί συμβάλλεται τὸ τοιοῦτον πρὸς τὸ ζητούμενον; καὶ πανύγε· προκατασκευὴ γὰρ ἐστὶ τοῦ ὑπὸ Θεοῦ χειροτονηθῆναι.—*Ibid.*, cap. v., Hom. VIII., p. 82.

So Theodoret, after expounding the typical significance of the silence of the inspired record concerning the particulars in the case of Melchizedec, adds: ὁ μὲντοι Δεσπότης Χριστὸς φύσει καὶ ἀληθῶς τούτων ἕκαστον ἔχει.—“Ep. Heb.,” cap. vii., Op., tom. iii., p. 585; edit. Noesult; Halæ, 1771.

Compare the following:

Σοφῶς δὲ αὐτὸν εἰδείξεν οὐκ ἀρχιερίᾳ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ Υἱὸν προσαγορευόμενον, καὶ καινὴν τινα καὶ παράδοξον ἀρχιερωσύνην δεξάμενον.—Theodoret, “Ep. Heb.,” cap. v., Op., tom. iii., p. 573; Halæ, 1771.

Ἄλλ’ ὅμως ἐπανθρωπήσας ὁ μονογενὴς τοῦ Θεοῦ Υἱὸς, καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς ἡμῶν ἐγένετο κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ, οὐκ ἀξίωμα προσλαβὼν, ἀλλὰ τὴν θείαν κατακρύψας ἀξίαν καὶ τὴν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡμετέρας σωτηρίας καταδεξάμενος ταπεινότητα.—*Ibid.*, cap. vii., Op., tom. iii., pp. 585, 586; Halæ, 1771.

received not the title of Priest while the Old Covenant was standing, because the Old Covenant had its priests of another order; and while the law stands, the priests of the law are to stand. Christ is no Priest of the Law. He has no Priesthood after the order of Aaron. His priesthood has no standing-place while the law stands. But when the Old Covenant falls in His death, immediately that death is recognised as the One Atoning Sacrifice. And He Himself is to be recognised as the One Priest—the Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec¹ the Priest, not now a Priest in virtue of His Priesthood to offer sacrifice or to do the work of sacerdotal oblation in the future, but rather in virtue of His One Sacrifice in the past, to be invested with the dignity of the Royal Priesthood, King of Righteousness and King of Peace, to sit a Priest upon His throne for ever.²

If, in the statement of this view, some details may be open to question, there can hardly be any question about the truth that, in transferring our ideas from the shadows to the realities, a difference, and one of the most important of differences, to be recognised is this: that, whereas in the shadow, sacrificial propitiation is the end and purpose of priesthood, in the corresponding reality the one atoning sacrifice is the starting-point, not the end, the ἀρχή, not the τέλος, of the priestly function. The importance of this point must plead an apology for again and again insisting upon it.

If we would view this matter in the truth of the Divine reality, we must recognise the stupendous *opus operatum* which was typified by the throwing open of the Holy of Holies, when the veil of the Temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom. That veil was a shadow—the typical shadow of a truth of most awful significance for outcast sinners—condemned to eternal outcasting. But it was the shadow of a reality which belonged to the Old Covenant, and has no place in the new. By that veil—the Holy Ghost thus signified that the way into the holiest was not yet made manifest while as yet the first tabernacle had

¹ Bishop Pearson says: "Neither was the death of Christ necessary only in respect of us immediately for whom He died, but in reference to the Priest Himself who died, both in regard of the qualification of Himself and consummation of His office" ("On Creed," Article IV., under section "Dead," p. 328; edit. Hobson, 1840).

² See Jewel (Works, ii., p. 738, P.S.): "Christ only is that priest for ever according to the order of Melchizedec. He hath made an endless sacrifice; He Himself hath offered up Himself unto God His Father upon the cross. Therefore God the Father saith unto Him, 'Thou art a priest for ever'; not any mortal creature or worldly wight, but Thou (only), being both God and man, are that priest for ever."

its standing.¹ The high priest of the shadow ministered once a year on the other side of the veil. The true High Priest, having made His way through the veil, that is to say, His flesh (*i.e.*, the life of the flesh which He took for us), ministers behind no veil. The days of the veil were the days of the Old Covenant which are past—the days in which He lived the life of our flesh upon earth. The Holy of Holies is now thrown quite open, and we have boldness to enter into the Holiest by the blood of Jesus—not once a year, but every day; not because every day is a day of atonement, but because the atonement of that one day has done its perfect work, and left the way quite open, and open for ever. Our High Priest is the Priest, not of a hidden place behind the veil, but of the rent veil, of a rent veil and an open heaven²—a throne of grace with nothing between—“no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus.”

When Christ overcame the sharpness of death,³ He opened the kingdom of Heaven to all believers.

Here the limits of our space require us not to stop, but to pause. We cannot stop, for we are just about to enter on ground which we have been aiming at in our progress hitherto. But we may well pause in admiring and adoring view of the one grand *opus operatum* which now stands before us—may we venture to say, stands as some snow-white mountain-peak against the sky, all on glow in the sunlight of heaven?

N. DIMOCK.

(To be continued.)

¹ Ὁσπηρ πολὺ τὸ μέσον Ἀαρὼν καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοσοῦτον ἡμῶν καὶ Ἰουδαίων τὸ μέσον. ὄρα γάρ· ἄνω ἔχομεν τὸ ἱερεῖον, ἄνω τὸν ἱερέα, τοιαύτας ἀναφέροντες θυσίας, τὰς ἐν ἐκείνῃ δυνάμενας τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ προσφέρεισθαι· λέλυται γὰρ τὰ τοῦ νόμου. ἀντεισενήνεκται δὲ ἡ λογικὴ λατρεία, τὰ διὰ Πνεύματος, ὅσα μὴ δεῖται σώματος, μὴ ὀρδίνων, μὴ τόπων. — Chrysostom, in Cramer's "Catena," tom. vii., p. 523; Oxford, 1844.

² Διεῖρηγνυτο καὶ τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ, τοῖς εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεύουσιν ἐκκαλίπτου ἤδη τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων, καὶ τὰ ἰσωτάτω δεικνύου· ὡς οὐκέτι μὲν ἐχούσης στάσις τῆς πρώτης σκιμῆς, πεφανερωμένης δὲ ἡδὴ τῆς τῶν ἁγίων ὁδοῦ, δῆλον δι' ὅτι τῆς εἰς τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων. — Cyril Alex., "Adv. Nestor," Lib. V., cap. v., Op., tom. ix., c. 236; edit. Migne.

It may be worth observing (lest we should follow the example of some German divines, and fasten our thoughts too much on the very physical αἷμα, instead of the sacrificial death of Him "who died the just for the unjust") that the veil was rent, not when the blood of life flowed from the pierced side, but when the life of this blood was poured out unto death—when παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ (Isa. liii. 12, LXX.).

³ Tu, devicto mortis aculeo: aperuisti credentibus regna cœlorum." This is the Canticle's recognition of the true sacrificial work of the Sacerdotium of the New Covenant. It knows none other.