

APPENDIX NINE

Quotations Regarding The Antithetical Nature Of The Sanctuary Type

Quotations Regarding The Antithetical Nature Of The Sanctuary Type

The priesthood is the basis of the economy, vii. 11. And what is important in the priest is his order. The kind of sacrifice he offers, the place where he ministers it, the nature of his approach unto God, and consequently the nature of the covenant relation between God and the People, and the degree to which the redemptive promises of God are realized — all depend upon his order or kind of personality. The first covenant had a priesthood after the order of Aaron, created by the law of a fleshly commandment — mortal men, having infirmity, vii. 16, 28; its sanctuary of this world, ix. 1, the very construction of which intimated that the way into the presence of God was yet barred, ix. 8; its ministry there, ix. 7; and its sacrifices which could not reach the conscience, ix. 9, nor take away sin, x. 2, 3. The new covenant has its priest after the order of Melchisedec, vii. 11, made a priest according to the power of an indissoluble life, vii. 16; a minister of the true Tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, not man, vii. 1, 2, that is, heaven, where God is present in truth, ix. 24 — with his ministry in that sanctuary, vii. 3-6, ix. 11, 12; and its sacrifice truly removing sin, ix. 12, and cleansing the conscience, ix. 14, and perfecting for ever them that are sanctified, x. 14; comp. vii. 11, ix. 13, 14. Each of these two sets of things hangs together in itself, and the two sets are incapable of confusion; no element of the one series can be introduced into the other.

The Melchisedec high priest goes through the same priestly acts as the Levitical or Aaronic, but his order, that is, virtually the nature of his person, alters the character of these acts, and makes them, instead of being fleshen and figurative, spiritual and possessing ideal validity.

... the only high-priestly act of ministry referred to is the entering of the high priest within the veil on the day of atonement, to which Christ's entrance into the sanctuary on high corresponds.

The order of Melchisedec is that He is a priest for ever. This point, which concerns the Priest Himself, does not cause Him to perform other priestly acts from those performed by Aaron, but it implies that His priestly acts are final, and that through them He dedicates an eternal covenant, which He ever liveth to sustain.

In truth, "heaven," the region of realities and things themselves and God's presence, and "Levitical" or Aaronic, the region of the copies of things and "this world," mutually exclude each other. But, further, the reasoning in vii. 11, etc., shows that in the view of the Epistle, the Son's descent from Judah, and not from Levi, threw Him outside of the order of Aaron (see notes). Our Lord, therefore, was never a priest after the order of Aaron, but always, from the moment He was a priest at all, a priest after the order of Melchisedec.

His ministry corresponds to that of the high priest. A ministry consists of three things: a place of ministration or sanctuary; priestly action there and an approach unto God; and an offering or sacrifice. The ministry of the ordinary priests is not here important: the priests go in continually into the first Tabernacle, accomplishing their services (ix. 6). The comparison lies between the ministry of Christ and that of the high priest: into the second goeth the high priest alone, once in the year, not without blood, which he offereth for himself and for the errors of the people (ix. 7). Corresponding to this: Christ, an High Priest of the good things that were to come, through a greater

Tabernacle, and through His own blood, entered in once for all into the holiest, and obtained eternal redemption (ix. 11, 12).

Aaron entering in once in the year into the holiest, for a moment, the veil closing behind him again when he returned, and obtaining no true and permanent access to God (x. 1-4, 11); Christ entering in once for all into the holiest, from which He comes no more out, — for to enter into the true holiest with His offering is to obtain eternal redemption (ix. 12-14, x. 10, 14, 18), and in virtue of the redemption obtained He is enabled to enter in, and there to abide for us, the surety of an eternal covenant (vii. 22, ix. 24, x. 19): Having offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, He sat down on the right hand of God.

This comparison speaks for itself. No mind but one already possessed by preconceptions derived from other sources or suggested by itself could fail to perceive that what is here exhibited is no solemn scenic repetition on a higher stage of the drama of the Atonement already enacted elsewhere, but the culminating scene of that very drama itself.

A.B. Davidson, *Hebrews* (Edinburgh, 1882), pp. 148, 149, 150, 198-199.



Beginning with verse 25 another word, important for the understanding of Christ's high-priestly ministry, is emphasized, namely, the word "once." The one sacrifice of Christ is valid once and for all; it need never be repeated. Its efficacy is so comprehensive, so vast in scope, that it has taken away the sins of "the many." It comprises "the whole history and all of mankind."

The "once" stands over against the "oftentimes." Again and again, year after year, a sacrificial animal had to be slaughtered in the Old Covenant; ever and anon the high priest had to go into the Holy of Holies in order to bring the atoning blood into God's presence. The word "often" betrays the inadequacy of the Old Testament order. The work of Christ is not marked by the word "often" but by the word "once." But "once" means once and for all.

G. Vos, *Hebrews* (Edinburgh, 1855), p. 90.



May we discern a motive which might have influenced the writer of this epistle, though well acquainted with the local position of the incense-altar in the outer sanctuary, to assign it nevertheless to the holy of holies? Such a motive may certainly be discovered, and is indeed recognised by Bleek himself. "*The sacred writer*" so says Bleek, and after him Tholuck, "*regards the holy of holies without its veil as a symbol of the heavenly sanctuary, and had therefore a direct interest in regarding the altar whose incense-oblation symbolized the prayers of saints* (Rev. vii. 3 sq.) *as pertaining to this inner sanctuary.*" This is the exact truth.

F. Delitzsch, *Hebrews* (Edinburgh, 1872), p. 55.



... the writer uses "the Holy Place" and not the Holy of Holies and what the high priest did there when he is bringing out the inadequacy of the Tabernacle and its function. He

is wise in this procedure. The very fact that the Tabernacle has this anterior chamber shows that this could not be the final Sanctuary that had been designed by the Spirit for the expiation of our sins. As long as the Holy Place stood before the Holy of Holies, the latter was marked as not being the final Sanctuary.

R.C.H. Lenski, *Hebrews* (Columbus, 1946), p. 287.

★ ★ ★

Many things ensued on the weakness and imperfection of the types which would not allow that there should be a perfect, complete resemblance in them of the substance itself, that all things between them should exactly answer unto one another. Hence they did at best but obscurely represent the good things to come, and in some things it was not possible but there should be a great discrepancy between them.

J. Owen, *Hebrews* (Edinburgh, 1855), p. 387.

★ ★ ★

What has been said illustrates the freedom with which the writer treats the typical relation between the Levitical ceremonies and the spiritual realities which he sees behind them. The correspondence which he insists on permanently is in general idea, not of detail with detail. The truths imaged are themselves described in figures, figures borrowed generally from the typical “copies;” and the figures change.

E.C. Wickham, *Hebrews* (London, 1910), pp. 83-84.

★ ★ ★