

The Berean

*A Christadelphian Magazine devoted to the exposition
and defense of the Faith once for all delivered
to the Saints; and opposed to the dogmas
of the Papal and Protestant Churches!*

**And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars;
and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and
the waves roaring; ...And when these things begin to come to pass,
then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth
nigh— Luke 21:25, 28 .**

Please send ecclesial communications to:

Bro. Jim Phillips, 592 PR. 3004, Lampasas, TX. 76550 USA

Assisted by bro. Fred Higham

Email: jkphil2222@yahoo.com

"The New Covenant in My Blood" by Robert Roberts	402
The Role of the High Priest in Sacrifice	410
The Tabernacle in the Wilderness (Part Six)	422
The Purchased Servants of God by John Thomas	430
Sacrifice in the Kingdom Age by John Thomas (Part Four, Last)	436
Hints for Bible Markers Postponed a Month	440

**...they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched
the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so."**

CHRIST IS COMING SOON AND WILL REIGN ON EARTH

"The New Covenant in My Blood"

By brother Robert Roberts

When Jesus instituted the memorial supper which we meet each Sunday morning to observe, he was surrounded by his disciples in an upper room in Jerusalem, where he had met them by appointment to keep the feast of the Passover. That feast was part of the Mosaic appointments. The meeting was on the basis of the Law of Moses; for Jesus and the disciples were all Jews, born and bred under that Law, which had been in force for 1,500 years.

It was the last time they met together on that foundation, but not the last time they will eat the Passover together, for he said—

"With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer; for I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God."

The feast had been observed on countless previous occasions, and with an ostentation not to be found in that upper room among those quiet thirteen men; but *never had there been such a momentous celebration of it*. The whole Law, of which the Passover was a part, was converging for its finish in the one sorrowful man who was the center of that group—

"Christ our Passover, sacrificed for us . . ."

—was about to absorb in himself the significance of all that Israel had observed for ages in obedience to the Law of Moses, and therefore of the Passover which he was now about to eat for the last time as a mortal son of Abraham.

The Passover was instituted on the eve of Israel's deliverance from Egypt. It was not merely a *celebration* of deliverance, but a *means* of it, which it is well to bear in mind in judging of its fulfilment in Christ. The angel of Yahweh was about to pass through the land for the purpose of destroying the first born in every Egyptian house, that the Egyptians might be made to consent to Israel's departure.

But there was a possibility that this destroying visitation might extend to the houses of the Hebrews as well. To avert this possibility (we need not stay to inquire in what way), every family in Israel were required to slay a lamb, sprinkle its blood on the door post, and eat its flesh before the morning. The destroying angel seeing the sprinkled blood would *pass over*

the household so protected, for which reason it was called "Passover," as we know. Afterwards Israel were to keep the same Passover in their generations, in celebration of their deliverance, first from the destroying angel and next from the Egyptians.

Before the sacrifice of "Christ our Passover," we have here himself eating the Passover with his disciples, in token of the fact that *he was involved with them in all their woes*, from which his own blood—the blood of the anti-typical Passover—would deliver them all, for though it harmonizes not with orthodox conceptions of the sacrifice of Christ, it is the *truth* that the—

"God of peace brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, the great shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant" (Heb. 13:20).

The passover was *a memorial* of the deliverance effected in Egypt, and a typical *foreshadowing* of the deliverance to be effected in Christ. It looked back, and it looked forward. In both, Jesus was concerned. As the "son of David, the son of Abraham" (Matt. 1:1), he was as much interested retrospectively in the Egyptian deliverance as his disciples, who were to be considered as having come out of Egypt in their fathers. As the son of Mary, partaking of their common sin-caused mortality (for death entered into the world by sin—Rom. 5:12), *he stood in as much need as they of that redemption from death*, which he finally attained through the shedding of his own blood, as the anti-typical lamb of Yahweh's passover—(Heb. 9:12—omit the italic "for us"; also 5:7).

Where he differed was in the *mental state* resulting from the fact that God was his Father in the generative sense. He was God's well-beloved son, in whom God was well pleased, because he abode in His commandments, and did always those things that were pleasing unto Him—John 15:10; 8:29.

He also differed in the *Father's abiding presence*, in the fulness of the Spirit in the vessel so prepared. He was the Father's human manifestation in the midst of Israel for the purpose of laying the foundation of human salvation in harmony with the principle of the Father's supremacy which required—in the blood-shedding of such as partake of human mortality—the *declaration of the Father's righteousness* as the basis of the remission of sin unto life eternal to those recognizing and submitting to it. This work was accomplished in his death and resurrection, by which he became—

". . . the first begotten of the dead" (Rev. 1:5).
—and the Name by investiture with which men may be saved—
"The only name given under heaven for this purpose (Acts 4:12).

When Jesus observed the Passover, the time was at hand for his own offering up by which the significance of the typical feast would be superseded. He, therefore, takes occasion to appoint another institution by which the anti-typical accomplishment itself would be kept before the minds of believers "*until he come.*" Beautifully enough, he finds the elements of the new type in those of the old, for both had their ultimate significance in the same thing. He took bread from the remains of the Passover feast and broke it and said,

"This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me."

This saying, which must have been enigmatical to the disciples at the time of its utterance, was illustrated on the following day, when Jesus surrendered himself to the cross on which his body was cruelly and publicly impaled, underneath an accusation which was no disgrace, but the utterance of the simple truth:

"This is Jesus, the King of the Jews."

This agonising tragedy, so far as the human aspect of it was concerned was the Divinely-arranged *public condemnation of sin in the flesh*—the declaration of the righteousness of God in the offering of the body of Jesus once for all—a body which was at once the condemned nature of Adam and the sinless Son of God, in whose death the righteous law of God had its execution, and in whose resurrection, the perfect righteousness of Jesus had its vindication; and by which double event, a man was provided through whom came the resurrection of the dead without any nullification of any of the ways of God.

All this was involved in the words of Jesus,

"This is my body given for you."

The whole arrangement was "for (or on account of) those who shall be saved," but of course *included in its operation Jesus himself*, who is the "first-born among many brethren" (Rom. 8:29). By his accepted offering, all are sanctified who come unto God through him, confessing their sins, humbling themselves in the obedience of baptism which ceremonially introduces them to the death of Christ.

The same glorious lesson comes out with equal clearness in connection with the *cup*, which he took after the bread, saying—

"Take this cup and divide it among yourselves . . . this cup is the New Covenant in my blood, shed for the remission of the sins of many."

If this must have been a strange saying to the disciples at the time of its utterance, it did not remain so, for it was the topic of conversation after his resurrection. And it is not strange to those in our day who scripturally understand the Truth, for it has been the subject of exposition in the apostolic writings.

But put it to the common run of Christians: "The New Testament (or *Covenant*) in my blood." What understanding have they of its meaning? Ask them a plainer question: What *is* the New Covenant? What are the "covenants of promise" to which believers are no longer strangers? (Eph. 2:12). What are the promises made unto the fathers which Christ came to confirm? (Rom. 15:8).

To these questions there is no response on the part of the common run of Christians, or on the part of their teachers, the so-called "Reverend" gentlemen of all denominations. If the new covenant itself is not known, how can its relations in the blood of Christ be discerned?

We have learnt from the Scriptures what the "New Covenant" is. Its name, as the *New* Covenant, involves an allusion to the *old* one that was established at Sinai when God, by the hands of Moses, promised to bless Israel in the land to which they were going, on condition of obedience; and Israel, on their part, undertook to submit to whatever was required of them.

This old contract, or agreement, or covenant (ratified by the sprinkling of the blood of sacrificial animals), pronounced a curse on every one who should not observe its obligations in every particular; and these were very numerous and entered into every relation of life. Such a rigid and absolute observance being impossible in the infirmity of human nature, Peter styles it—

"A yoke which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear."

No one rendered the exact obedience it required but Christ. It served its purpose, however. *God did not make a mistake in appointing it.* It was "a schoolmaster:" it established the *first principles of godliness* in the midst of Israel, namely, that obedience to God was

the first law of human well-being, and that man was unable to bless himself. Still, so far as practical results were concerned, it cursed all who had to do with it, since none but Christ could fulfil its requirements in the perfect manner required.

This old curse-bringing covenant was about to be done away when Christ ate the Passover for the last time with his disciples. It was about to be done away in him by his dying under it after having perfectly obeyed it, and rising again from the dead because of his righteousness under it; and in him, thus triumphant over the Old Covenant, the New Covenant was to be established and offered—a covenant, says Paul—

" . . . established upon better promises (Heb. 8:6).

These promises, he styles—

"The promises made to the fathers."

What these are we have learnt. They are contained in the writings of Moses and the Prophets. They are promises of future blessedness on earth to Abraham and his seed (Gal, 3:16)—a blessedness connected with the *inheritance of the land of promise* and involving the *bestowal of everlasting life*.

The New Covenant is based upon these. It is a more beneficial covenant than the old. It is an agreement that if we have faith in what God has accomplished in Christ, and bring ourselves into connection with it in a humble, loving, obedient disposition, our sins will be forgiven, and we ourselves made heirs of the blessedness promised to Abraham and his seed.

But why should this covenant be offered in *blood*? Why should Jesus, taking the symbolic cup of wine, say—

"This is the New Covenant IN MY BLOOD"?

There is a simple meaning to this, which we shall get at by a few questions. In what character is *blood* brought forward in the Mosaic shadow from which much of the phraseology of the New Covenant is derived? Lev. 17:12-14 answers this question:

"The life of the flesh is in the blood thereof: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh atonement for the soul."

Blood then, is sacrificially employed to represent *life*, which it is: for

withdraw the blood and you withdraw the life of any creature. If blood represents life, then the shedding of it represents *death*. To pour out the blood of anything sacrificed, was to cause its death. When a worshipper approached God with blood of a slain animal (having placed his hand on the head of the animal before it was slain), it was a confession that before God, as a sinner, he had no right to live, seeing that "Death is the wages of sin," and that death hath passed upon all men through Adam.

It was in fact a *typical declaration of the righteousness of God*, with which God was pleased to be approached; but *only* typical, because there was no natural connection between the slain animal and the consequences of sin; consequently—

"The blood of bulls and of goats could not take away sin."

The type pointed to the purpose of Yahweh to provide a perfect declaration of His righteousness in the blood of an actual wearer of the nature condemned in Adam, who should be acceptable to Him in all things, and whose resurrection could therefore follow his blood shedding. This anti-typical lamb, as we know, was the Lord Jesus, who though made in all things like unto his brethren as regards mortality of nature on account of sin, was himself absolutely free from sin in his own character.

Here was the Lamb of God without spot or blemish, and yet a suitable sacrifice in the possession of the very nature which had come under condemnation because of sin in the beginning. In the shedding of his blood, there was a—

". . . declaration of the righteousness of God" (Rom. 3:25-26).

He was not destined to return to dust; it was necessary that his blood should be spilt and that death should follow, as the ceremonial declaration of Yahweh's righteousness in the public condemnation of *sin in the flesh* (Rom. 8:3) as a basis for the offer of free pardon to all who should recognize the declaration, and identify themselves with it, and come unto God with confession and faith in the Name of the crucified Jesus, as the one great sacrifice through which alone man can acceptably approach God.

In view of all these things, it is evident what force there is in the words with which Jesus introduced the memorial cup to the notice of his disciples—

"This is the New Covenant in my blood, shed for the remission of the

sins of many."

The New Covenant, or agreement, which ensures coming blessedness to the fallen sons of Adam, is *in the blood of Christ*, and nowhere else.

There can be *no blessedness without covenant*, because, apart from the addition of special covenant on the part of God, Who only has the power to bestow blessedness, we are shut up to what we have by nature, and that is, a *poor mortal body that will wear out in due course and disappear in death*.

And there can be *no covenant without sacrifice*, for so has God willed; and we can no more get past His will in this matter than we can in the constitution of heaven and earth.

And there is *no sacrifice but one* with which we can approach God for covenant, and that is the one great sacrifice accomplished in Christ.

And there *is no way of becoming associated with that sacrifice* but by enlightenment in the Promises on which the Covenant is established, and faith in the blood in which it is offered, and legal contact with that blood in baptism, which is the Divinely-appointed mode of association with the death of Christ.

The root of the whole matter lies first in the *greatness*, and then in the *goodness* of God. God is a great and dreadful Majesty, to whom the earth and all flesh belong, for He has made them out of His own energy. He is not only great, but He is *holy*, and jealous of His supremacy. He has been disobeyed on earth and has in consequence given us over to death; and will not be approached by us except in the manner He had appointed.

But He is good, and He will forgive and bestow everlasting life *if we humble ourselves and come to Him in the way appointed*. The way appointed is through the shed-blood of a perfectly righteous wearer of our nature, in whom sin was condemned on our account. He will forgive us if we come in this way; not because that bloodshedding pacifies Him or gives Him anything or pays any debt—for then it would be no forgiveness—but because *His righteousness is declared, and His prerogative recognized, and our position acknowledged* in accepting the lamb of His appointing.

We endorse and proclaim all these glorious things every time we take the

cup into our hands and drink it and say "Amen!" at the giving of thanks for the—

" . . . New Covenant in Christ's blood shed for the remission of sins."

The breaking of bread signifies our acceptance of God's way and is a testimony to the world that they have no hope outside of this way.

We find great comfort in that way ourselves, and we would extend that comfort on the right hand and on the left. But we find many obstacles in the imaginations and *high thoughts that exalt themselves against the knowledge of God* (2 Cor. 10:5). We have even earned the bitterest odium it is possible for men to bear—the reputation of being illiberal and uncharitable and narrow minded and bigoted—because we maintain the teaching of Christ and his apostles on this most vital matter.

What can we do but accept the result with resignation? It is a result that has always more or less attended the testimony of the Truth. It is no new thing for "the preaching of the cross" to be productive of offence. Paul speaks of it in his letters. He says the preaching of the cross was—

" . . . to the Jews a stumblingblock and to the Greeks foolishness."

He accepted the reproach incident to such a situation; he refused to glory in anything save the cross of our Lord Jesus. We are in the best of company when we are in the company of Paul, and we are undoubtedly in his company when we are accused by the modern Greeks (the "scientists" of every grade) of being behind the age and badly informed, and old fogey and sectarian; and by the Jews of being worse than the Christians in the rigidity of our insistence on the original teachings of Christ, and by Christians, of being gloomy retrogressionists, the slaves of a dead letter, and strangers to the "broad life" and "charity" and the "true spirit of the Gospel." To each and all, we can but say,

"We accept Christ because he rose from the dead: and we accept the apostles; and we challenge you all to deny that the conclusions which we maintain are the teachings of these writings. It would be pleasant to come on to your broad platform and to join in your charitable spirit and to share your freedom from the narrownesses and restraints that undoubtedly hamper the profession of the Gospel, as originally delivered, as regards the present evil world. We should have your pleasant society, and your encouraging recognition, and your advantageous patronage, and your general enjoyment of the broad fields of human culture, and pleasure, and good fellowship.

“But wherein should we be the gainers in the day when Christ arrives to sweep away the present order of things, and to reorganize affairs in harmony with Divine principles only, and to give glorious place in his house to those only who do the will of his Father, as written in His revealed Word of truth?”

We should have a poor staff to lean on, in a respectable world which will then dissolve in terror before his face. NO: we have made Christ our portion, and for better or worse, we will accept the isolation and the odium that result from the consequential exclusiveness, confident that experience, shortly to be apparent, will justify an uncompromising adherence to the written Word as the only enlightened policy that can be pursued.

The Role of the High Priest in Sacrifice

The Sin Bearer

In our last lecture, we discussed the purpose and meaning of sacrifice, and why Cain’s sacrifice was unacceptable. We saw that the purpose behind the ritual of sacrifice was to demonstrate that the man bringing the offering recognized that his sin was worthy of death. In this ritual, he placed his sins upon the head of the animal to be slain, confessing his sins and thereby putting them on the head of the animal, and then slaughtered it, demonstrating his agreement that sin was worthy of death.

The pouring out of the blood of the animal now bearing the sin of the offerer, demonstrated that sin was worthy of death. Scripture tells us that the life of the flesh was in the blood.

Lev. 17:11 “For the life of the flesh *is* in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it *is* the blood *that* maketh an atonement for the soul.”

Blood in the flesh represents life. Blood poured out, then, symbolized death, and made an atonement—a covering for sin—for the offerer. Offering fruits of the earth as Cain did, did not demonstrate this principle, for there was no blood shedding.

We saw in our last lecture that the animal sacrificed represented in symbol, or figure, or type, what Jesus would do in reality. Jesus was the fulfillment of all that was prophesied through the ritual of the sin offering.

Jesus was the antitype of the lamb. Like the lamb, he was taken from the flock, showing that he was one of us. Our sins were laid upon him, in his being made our identical condemned human nature. And this nature itself is considered to be

“sin” by God. It is considered sin—not in the sense of moral transgression—but as a physical condition of mankind—the result of Adam’s transgression in the Garden of Eden. This sin-condition is to us a misfortune, not a crime: but it is sin, none the less.

In our last lecture we demonstrated prophesies which discussed Jesus’ relationship to sin. On the outside, he was sinless, morally perfect. But he was “made sin” in that he was made of our identical nature. As such he suffered from the same trials and temptations and weaknesses common to all men.

We showed from Scripture some of the verses that spoke to Christ’s relationship to sin. But of course, there are many more. In our last lecture, we saw Isaiah speaking of Christ, and saying of a burning coal: “Lo, this hath touched thy lips; and thine iniquity is taken away, and thy sin purged.” But we can also see the same principle in the fiery serpent, Moses lifted up on the stake in the wilderness. A curse came upon Israel because of their rebellion, in that serpents were biting and killing them. Now here was the cure for this curse that came upon Israel:

Num. 21:8-9 “And the LORD said unto Moses, Make thee a fiery serpent, and set it upon a pole: and it shall come to pass, that every one that is bitten, when he looketh upon it, shall live. And Moses made a serpent of brass, and put it upon a pole, and it came to pass, that if a serpent had bitten any man, when he beheld the serpent of brass, he lived.”

When the children of Israel looked on the brass serpent, they were healed of the bite of the real serpent. Jesus was that fiery serpent. Jesus himself tells us:

John 3:14-15 “And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life.”

Deity sent serpents among the people that were killing the children of Israel in the wilderness, due to their despising of the manna Deity had provided them, the manna being another symbol of Christ. God had Moses make a serpent of brass and hang it on a pole. When one was bit, they could look on that which was killing them and be healed. Jesus on the cross is the same picture. We see Jesus dying because of his sin-cursed nature on the cross. When we look upon it and believe in the things accomplished in his death—that great declaration of the righteousness of God—then we too can be saved from sin’s bite.

We again see Jesus’ involvement in his own sacrifice in Zechariah. In this prophesy we see Jesus’ glorious entrance to Jerusalem on the Sunday morning of the week he was crucified. Zechariah tells us this from the King James (using the margin translation):

Zec. 9:9 “Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy king cometh unto thee: he is just, and saving himself; lowly, and riding upon an ass, even upon a colt the foal of an ass.”

Now the King James version, and most other versions translate “saving himself” as “having salvation.” But this is improper. The word translated salvation is a verb, “to save” and is in the niphal participle masculine singular tense. This tense indicates a passive or reflexive action, one in which the subject is “being found” or “being done to,” and of course it is in the masculine or male tense. “Reflexive action” is when you do something to or for yourself. “Passive action” is when something is being done to or for you. So the proper translating indicates that Jesus is entering Jerusalem “saving himself”, or “being himself saved.” In either case it indicates that Jesus is the one being saved. But what is he being saved from, if he is sinless and not in need of redemption through his own eventual sacrifice? This shows that his actions over the next week was to save himself first, that he might also save us.

And we also see this same principle exhibited in the New Testament. After childbirth, as we shall discuss in more detail in our next lecture, it was necessary at thirty-three days to offer for purification. We read this from Luke in the New American Study Bible:

Luke 2:22-24 “And when the days for their purification according to the Law of Moses were completed, they brought him up to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord (as it is written in the Law of the Lord: “*EVERY FIRSTBORN MALE THAT OPENS THE WOMB SHALL BE CALLED HOLY TO THE LORD*”), and to offer a sacrifice according to what has been stated in the Law of the Lord: “*A PAIR OF TURTLEDOVES OR TWO YOUNG DOVES.*””

The King James version says the offering was for Mary, but nearly all the rest of Bible translations translate it properly: “the purification of THEM.” Now when we refer back to the Mosaic Law, and ask what were these offerings, we read that they were burnt and sin offerings.

Lev. 12:6 “When the days of her purification are completed, for a son or for a daughter, she shall bring to the priest at the doorway of the tent of meeting a one-year-old lamb as a burnt offering and a young pigeon or a turtledove as a sin offering.”

So here we have Jesus having a sin offering made for him at his birth. Is that not the perfect proof that God made Jesus to be sin for us, though he knew no sin, as the apostle Paul teaches? (2 Cor. 5:21). And is it not confirmation of Jesus in the Psalms who said:

Psa. 51:5 “Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.”

Now, as you can imagine, those who hold the beliefs of Trinitarians—those who believe that Jesus was “consubstantial” with God, (a big word that means “of the same nature as God,)”—which is a perfect, immortal, absolutely too pure to look upon sin—nature: those find this concept abominable. Likewise, those religions who boast that they don’t believe in Trinity yet still believe that Jesus was a

separate creation made before the world began, they also are repulsed by this idea. And even some Christadelphians struggle. They romanticize the life of Jesus to the point that they find the thought of Jesus bearing sin—even in his nature—to be “a defiled or dirty Christ.” A fellow who was a popular Christadelphian in some circles, once asked me if I had read Malachi 1, which talks about offering the sick and the lame. His claim was that a sin-defiled Christ would be an offering that God would not accept. Yet the truth is that it is only a sin-bearing Christ who could condemn sin in his flesh and thereby demonstrate the righteousness of God.

Uniformly, these three classes tell us that sin can only be moral. They tell us that there is no such thing as physical sin. And since they believe that sin can only come from moral transgression, they deny that Jesus could have anything to do with sin. Some, especially the mainstream Christian churches, believe that we are born guilty of Adam’s moral sin, which is one of the reasons they baptize babies, so that babies can be redeemed from Adam’s sin. Others believe that Jesus’ divine parentage on his Father’s side, made his life free from Adam’s moral sin. Still others teach that since sin can only be moral, there is no sin—Adam’s or anyone else—in the nature. And there are various arguments based upon the above statement, that sin can only be moral. A typical argument from those claiming to be Christadelphians is that sin can be used as a metaphor for our nature, but if we haven’t sinned, there can be no actual sin there.

Where the idea that sin can only refer to moral transgressions comes from is a mystery to me. Certainly, it doesn’t come from the dictionary meaning of the word. If we look at the modern Webster’s Dictionary, we find this for the meaning of sin:

a: transgression of the law of God

b: a vitiated state of human nature in which the self is estranged from God.

That is pretty clear in modern English. Sin is the fallen state of human nature. If we look at the 1904 version of Webster’s Dictionary, we read this:

“Original sin, as generally understood, is native depravity of heart to the divine will, that corruption of nature or deterioration of the moral character of man, which is supposed to be the effect of Adam’s apostasy; and which manifests itself in moral agents by positive act of disobedience to the divine will, or by the voluntary neglect to comply with the express commands of God, which require that we should love God with all the heart and soul and strength and mind, and our neighbor as ourselves. This native depravity or alienation of affections from God and his law, is supposed to be what the apostle calls the carnal mind or mindedness, which is enmity against God, and **is therefore denominated sin** or sinfulness.” [My Emphasis—JP]

Denominated means named, or called. So, we can see that the dictionary definition of sin is that it is moral, *and* it is also physical. This is man’s thoughts on the word, but what does God show us about the term in the Bible. We probably can see this the clearest through the Mosaic Law.

The apostle Paul explained to us how we should view the Mosaic Law. Paul explained that nearly all things in the Law of Moses symbolized Christ. Speaking of the elements of the Law, the Apostle Paul wrote:

Heb. 9:22-23 “And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission. It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens [that is the elements of worship, the altar, mercy seat, etc.] should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves [that is Christ] with better sacrifices than these.”

The patterns of things in the heaven are the various aspects of the Mosaic Law. There are many different items in the law, most of which represent Christ. There is the brazen altar where the animal was slain. There was the laver or large bath where the priests washed before making their sacrifices. There was the tabernacle, which was divided into two sections, the first, usually (but not always) called the Holy Place, where the priests worked. This area held the golden candlesticks, the table of show bread, and the altar of incense. Then there was the second, inner section called the Most Holy Place, separated from the first by a veil of red, purple, blue, and white. This section was only entered by the High Priest, who only did so once a year on the Day of Atonement. In the second section was the Cherubim of Glory, which was made up of two cherubs, one on each end whose wings stretched towards each other, and between them was the ark of the covenant, a box which held (1) the two stones upon which the law was written, (2) manna, and (3) Aaron’s rod that budded. The top of the box was covered in gold and was called the Mercy Seat, and the cherubims were beaten out of the same piece of gold which covered the ark. All of these things either represented an aspect of Christ, or some relation to him. But all these things were inanimate. They were items made by human craftsman. They could not morally sin.

Now what do we find about these inanimate objects under the law. We read again of Aaron’s duties on the great Day of Atonement.

Lev. 16:15-16 “Then shall he kill the goat of the sin offering, that *is* for the people, and bring his blood within the vail, and do with that blood as he did with the blood of the bullock, and sprinkle it upon the mercy seat, and before the mercy seat: And he shall make an atonement for the holy place, because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins: and so shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation, that remaineth among them in the midst of their uncleanness.

Note in the above, that Aaron sprinkles the blood of the sin offering on the Mercy Seat, and before the Mercy Seat, making atonement for the Holy Place, the area of the second section, inside the veil which we might normally call the Most Holy Place. The immediate question is, if sin can only be moral, why did these inanimate objects require atonement from sin?

Of course they wouldn't. But these inanimate objects were regarded as in need of atonement from sin through sacrifice. Going on with the ritual:

Lev. 16:18-19 “And he shall go out unto the altar that is before the LORD, and make an atonement for it; and shall take of the blood of the bullock, and of the blood of the goat, and put *it* upon the horns of the altar round about. And he shall sprinkle of the blood upon it with his finger seven times, and cleanse it, and hallow it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel.”

So here we have a better explanation of what is happening. Aaron is next to make atonement for the altar, another inanimate object. He makes atonement for it to cleanse it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel. The uncleanness of the children of Israel defiled the altar simply for being in their midst. Was this defilement moral? Of course not. How could the altar be responsible for anything, let alone how could it sin? It was a physical defilement, the consequence of residing within an unclean nation.

The chapter goes on:

Lev. 16:33-34 “And he shall make an atonement for the holy sanctuary, and he shall make an atonement for the tabernacle of the congregation, and for the altar, and he shall make an atonement for the priests, and for all the people of the congregation. And this shall be an everlasting statute unto you, to make an atonement for the children of Israel for all their sins once a year. And he did as the LORD commanded Moses.”

Here we see some of the commands repeated. Aaron shall make atonement for the Holy Sanctuary, that is, the entire structure; and make atonement for the tabernacle, and the altar—again, all inanimate objects. Now some object saying it was due to the sins of Israel. True, it was. But the altar etc., are all individually in need of atonement, though they, of themselves could not sin. So, we ask, was not Jesus in the same situation. He didn't sin, but he walked among the children of Israel, being defiled by their sins. He wasn't guilty of those sins any more than the Mercy Seat could be guilty of sin; but he still, like the Mercy Seat, needed atonement from sin—that is, from the nature he shared with the uncleanness of the children of Israel.

This is not a small insignificant detail. It is among the most prominent features of the Mosaic Law, and a necessary teaching to understand how the righteousness of God was exhibited in the death of Jesus, which is the only basis we are given for how and why our sins are forgiven. Deity gave Israel three offerings that it was mandatory for them to perform. First, the Burnt Offering, which was required at the start and close of every day. There were multiple burnt offerings on certain days. Next, there was the trespass offering. This was an offering made when a man sinned and knew he sinned. The third mandatory offering was the sin offering. This was an offering a man made when he learned that he had unwittingly sinned in some action of the past. And now finding out about it, he was required to offer a sin offering.

Now as we said, the Burnt Offering is a mandatorily required daily offering, but there is no specified sin related to the Burnt Offering. It is an offering for sin without mentioning any sin. That this is an atonement for sin in the absence of any specified sin shows that our unclean nature by itself, unfits us for approach to Deity apart from this recognition of our uncleanness.

Lev. 1:3-4 (NASB) "If his offering is a burnt offering from the herd, he shall offer a male without defect; he shall offer it at the doorway of the tent of meeting, so that he may be accepted before the LORD. And he shall lay his hand on the head of the burnt offering, so that it may be accepted for him to make atonement on his behalf."

Now in offering the burnt offering, the entire animal is consumed. The entire animal is burnt, the body, and the insides. And the purpose was that it might rise as a sweet-smelling savor to Deity. At the end of the instructions pertaining to the Burnt Offering, we read:

Lev. 1:17 "...and the priest shall burn it upon the altar, upon the wood that *is* upon the fire: it *is* a burnt sacrifice, an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the LORD."

We were once told that this couldn't be the right explanation, for such a sacrifice wouldn't be a sweet-smelling savor to God. But we ask, what would be more pleasant to Him than the complete destruction of sin's flesh? Is it not in fact, the plan of Deity that after the Millennial reign of Christ, all sin—moral and physical—will be obliterated from the earth. So why would a sacrifice that so perfectly demonstrated this principle not be pleasing to Deity?

So, we come back to the question, what was the sin which Paul said God made him to be? What was the iniquity which Jesus lamented in the Psalms to be more than the hairs of his head? And what was his sin from which he needed to be purged or purified, that from which Jesus needed remission?

It was not transgression, his own or Adam's, or anyone else's. The Scripture state that he was tempted as we are, yet without sin. The sin that God made him to be was the sinful nature he inherited by his human descent through Mary. The iniquity he bore was his "flesh full of sin" nature. By bearing this nature, he bore the sins of many, as Peter says:

1 Pet. 2:24 "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed."

Sins born in a body prove that body to be unclean, and further, it properly fits it for the purpose of God through Jesus: the condemnation of sin *in* the flesh.

The sin that God made Jesus to be, was the sin he bore in his nature—the consequence of his being born of a woman, of the seed of David, Abraham, and

Adam. This is not moral transgression. This is not something he was guilty of. This is a misfortune, not a crime. But this physical characteristic is sin, none the less. It was the plan of Deity that one should come who would bear our sin, while at the same time, be pure and spotless from actual transgression. Like the lamb who prefigured him in the Law of Moses, he was outwardly perfect and spotless, but still capable of death. "The wages of sin is death," so the existence of death proves the existence of sin. So just as that lamb symbolized moral perfection, Jesus, though spotless, would bear the nature of sin and be put to death on account of it, condemning sin in his death.

To understand the ritual of sacrifice, we need to understand the role of the High Priest and the Lamb in the act of sacrifice. The purpose of the High Priest was to bear the iniquity of the people. This comes out very clearly in the Law of Moses.

Num. 18:1 "And the LORD said unto Aaron, Thou and thy sons and thy father's house with thee shall bear the iniquity of the sanctuary: and thou and thy sons with thee shall bear the iniquity of your priesthood."

Num 18:23 "But the Levites shall do the service of the tabernacle of the congregation, and they shall bear their iniquity: *it shall be* a statute for ever throughout your generations, that among the children of Israel they have no inheritance."

This was the purpose of the priesthood. They were to bear the iniquity of the children of Israel, that the nation should not be destroyed. In bearing the iniquity of the children of Israel, as we have already seen, it would have been necessary to put the sin bearer to death, to destroy sin. This would have been an impossible situation for the children of Israel and the priesthood, if the priest himself should annually die to bear the sins of the people.

To make the matter more practical, (though it turned the ritual from a reality into a symbolism) an animal was provided to die in the place of the priest. The lamb or bullock or goat died as a substitute for the priest. This is why the priest, bearing the sins of Israel, confessed those sins, placing them (the sins) upon the head of the animal, after which it was slain.

Had Deity allowed the matter to rest here, the churches would be right. If symbolism could take away sin, it would not have been necessary for Christ to have been made of our sin-filled nature, in order for sin to have been condemned there. The whole matter could have been left as a figure, a symbolic condemnation of sin. But Deity decided that symbolism and figures and types could not take away sin, hence the blood of bulls and goats could not do so. Rather, Deity required an actual, literal destruction of sin. So, Christ was made sin, so that sin could be condemned in his flesh. The apostle Paul clarifies the matter this way:

Heb. 10:1 “For the law having a shadow of good things to come, *and* not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect.”

Note Paul’s emphasis that the sacrifices of the Mosaic Law were shadows. They were types and symbols. They signified something greater. They were not the very image or the reality of what was being done. He goes on:

Heb. 10:4 “For *it is* not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins.

This is because the blood of bulls and goats were only shadows, symbolically bearing the sins of the people, having been symbolically placed upon the head of the animal by the actual sin-bearer, the priest. Thus, sin is only symbolically destroyed in these rituals. It would take a real ritual, the real, actual destruction of sin in the High Priest bearing the very image, or the reality of the sins of the people. This Jesus did in his body. Hence Psalms 40 is quoted of Paul:

Heb. 10:5 “Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me:”

A body was prepared for Jesus, a sin-body, which would actually be slain to take the place of the shadows and symbolism of the law. That prepared body was the body of sin Jesus bore. When it was destroyed on the cross, sin was actually destroyed, and the righteousness of God was vividly displayed. The apostle Paul explained it perfectly in Hebrews 2:

Heb. 2:14-15 “Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; And deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.”

Paul says that Jesus destroyed the Devil, or the Diabolos on the cross. Did he destroy Christendom’s fallen angel who they imagine tempts us? No, he destroyed the body of flesh that he bore. The body which Jesus denied being “good.”

Matt. 19:16-17 “And, behold, one came and said unto him, Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? *there is* none good but one, *that is*, God:”

Why would Jesus have disclaimed the title of “good” if he were of the same nature as God? He disclaimed the title because of the diabolos—sin in the flesh—dwelt in him as it did in all those who took part of our flesh and blood nature, after the fall in the garden of Eden. He denied the title because his experience with our nature was the same as Paul’s:

Rom. 7:18 “For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but *how* to perform that which is good I find not.”

Looking to the guidance of the flesh, all we can see is a will contrary to Deity. Even Jesus found a will within himself which was not in harmony with the divine plan. Of course, where we all yield to temptation, Jesus, having inherited his Father's character was able to overcome all temptation and live a morally sinless life.

Paul tells us we have to look to His Spirit-word for salvation, because it can't be found in the thinking of the flesh:

Rom. 8:6-8 (Young's Literal Translations) "For the mind of the flesh is death, and the mind of the Spirit is life and peace; because the mind of the flesh is enmity to God, for to the law of God it doth not subject itself, for neither is it able; and those who are in the flesh are not able to please God."

Did Jesus have this same will as Paul, and all mankind? We see him in his most agonizing moments before yielding to the command of God and yielding to the Jews for his crucifixion:

Matt. 26:38-39 "Then saith he unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death: tarry ye here, and watch with me. And he went a little further, and fell on his face, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt."

So, when Jesus destroyed the devil or the diabolos in his death, what he destroyed was the flesh and blood nature in which dwelt no good thing. He didn't destroy Christendom's evil angel. According to Christendom, that evil angel is still alive and doing well. All he destroyed was the body prepared by Deity for the condemnation of sin in the flesh of sin, that he might exhibit the righteousness of God.

The great statement made on the cross as Jesus hung there was this. "This is how sin needs to be treated in harmony with the righteousness of Deity. It is fit only for destruction." When we acknowledge that, then God is willing to forgive us our sins. Paul explained it this way:

Rom. 3:25-26 "Whom God hath set forth *to be* a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; To declare, *I say*, at this time His righteousness: that He might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."

This is the only verse in the Bible that explains *why* our sins are forgiven through the death of Jesus. There are a number of verses that tell us that they are, but none explain *why*.

God set Jesus forth as a propitiation: the word propitiation here, means the Mercy Seat. This, remember, is the golden top cover of the ark of the covenant. It is the

place where the blood of the sacrifice was to be offered. It was the place where Israel received the forgiveness of sins. That is who God set Jesus out to be.

Now Paul says that Jesus is our Mercy seat, *if* we have faith in his blood. That is, if we have faith in the things accomplished and the principles established through his blood. What were those things?

First, his blood demonstrated what was due to sin. That it was only fit for destruction.

Second, it demonstrated the end of the first covenant—the Mosaic—and the beginning of the New Covenant in Christ.

Third, it demonstrates that Jesus was now cleansed from sin, so that he could appear a second time—without sin—unto salvation.

Finally, it demonstrated that Jesus, our Great High Priest, was now in a position to mediate for us, between God and man.

Now in order for Jesus to be that great High Priest after the order of Melchizedek who would be the sin-bearer for the world, Jesus was to be ordained the High Priest, not after the Law of Moses, but after the oath of Deity. Five Hundred years after the Law was given, and a thousand years before his birth, Jesus was sworn to be a High Priest after the order of Melchizedek.

Psa. 110:4 “The LORD hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou *art* a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.”

The Melchizedek Priesthood was superior to, and replaced the Mosaic Priesthood, for the very reason that the Mosaic, being figures and symbols, could not take away sin. It took a different Priesthood, the one prefigured in the Mosaic Law to actually take away sins. The apostle Paul wrote:

Heb. 7:11-12 “If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law,) what further need *was there* that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron? For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.”

Jesus was that great High Priest after the order of Melchizedek that would take away their sins. The Aaronic Priesthood, like all things under the law, was a type of the greater things that should be fulfilled in Christ. The Levitical High Priest was a type of the Melchizedek High Priest, who was Christ. Paul makes this point in Hebrews 7 about how much greater the Melchizedec Priesthood is, compared to the Levitical.

Heb. 7:9-10 “And as I may so say, Levi also, who receiveth tithes, payed tithes in Abraham. For he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchisedec met him.”

Levi paid tithes to Melchizedek through Abraham, demonstrating the superiority of the Melchizedec Priesthood. Paul's point is that this made Christ's priesthood so much greater than the Levitical, which was only a type or symbol. And we see this in the life of Jesus. While he was ordained the Melchizedek High Priest 1000 years before he was born, he began officiating as High Priest on the banks of the Jordan river, where he was baptized by John. This was the equivalent to the High Priest washing in the laver, when he was beginning to executing his duties on the great Day of Atonement.

Aaron could not enter into the Most Holy Place of the Tabernacle without first being adorned and glorified with garments of splendor and holiness and therefore styled "holy garments." And he wasn't permitted to enter with these, unless he had been previously washed or baptized. The Law said:

Lev. 16:4 "He shall wash his flesh in water, and so put them on."

He was not permitted to officiate as the High Priest in his ordinary garments. He had to must "put off" and "put on" the holy linen robe of blue, the blue symbolizing the divine healing power of Deity. Now, had he put this on without bathing his flesh in water, and proceeded to officiate, this unbaptized High Priest of Israel would have been struck dead.

When finally dressed in all the Holy Garments and the golden plate attached to his head, the Aaronic High Priests were "Holy to Yahweh" (Exod. 39:30), and as such, symbolized Jesus in his character and his priestly office. The symbolism relative to the High Priest was the "righteousness" to be fulfilled by Jesus before he could enter into the Most Holy Place, and exercise his ultimate role as our great High Priest, now over the Household of God, and ultimately over the Twelve Tribes of Israel.

The Tabernacle in the Wilderness

PART SEVEN

The ground of the interdict which excluded both Moses and Aaron from the realization of the hopes and anticipations which they had cherished for so many long and weary years, being that of speaking *unadvisedly* (Psa. 106:32-33), it not only concerns the two faithful men of God in question, but also every servant of the living and true God, both before and since the days of Moses and, therefore, is a matter worthy of our most careful attention.

In comparing the reference to this incident in the Psalms with the Mosaic narrative (Num. 20:12), we see that speaking *unadvisedly*—*whether* in anger or howsoever—especially in matters in which the sanctity of God is involved, is the language of *unbelief*.

Here, then, we have before us an *object-lesson* of the first importance, which should engage the special attention of all occupying positions as teachers of others, examples of the believers, faithful, good soldiers of Jesus, workmen that need not to be ashamed.

The record of God's mind in this matter, and the exhibition of the consequences attaching to unadvised speech, is one of the innumerable self-contained proofs of the divinity of the record, and is therefore unspeakably valuable in enabling us to discern the *effect* of this particular form of speech upon the mind of the "great and dreadful God" to Whom belongeth holiness and righteousness.

This particular sin is not only of frequent occurrence in connection with the ordinary affairs of life in moments of anger and ebullition of feeling, but even in *the exercise of defending what we believe to be the Truth* against those who differ from us. How unlike is this to our great exemplar, Jesus Christ—

"... who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not, but committed himself to Him that judgeth righteously" (1 Pet. 2:23).

An unbridled tongue, says James—

"... is a fire, a world of iniquity...it defileth the whole body, and setteth on fire the course of nature...it is an unruly evil, full of deadly poison.

"Therewith bless we God, even the Father; and therewith curse we men which are made after the similitude of God. Out of the same mouth proceedeth blessing and cursing.

"My brethren, **these things ought not so to be**" (James 3).

If, therefore, we would please God, we should make it our *most urgent business* to look after "the little member," that we may belong to the class referred to by James—

"If any man offend not in word, the same is a **perfect man**, and able also to bridle the whole body" (James 3:2).

—and also described by Paul as those whose warfare consists in—

". . . casting down imaginations and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and **bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ**" (2 Cor. 10).

It is folly to say the standard is "too high," and cannot be reached. Rather let us say that—God *helping us*—as His children we will try and try again, if by any means we may attain to that relative perfection which must surely follow such a course.

And if, in the strenuous effort so made, the consciousness of shortcomings should cause sorrow of heart, let us avail ourselves of the refuge provided in Christ, and the solace and comfort of the merciful provision in him for the forgiveness whereby our post-baptismal sins are prevented from being fatal (1 John 1:7-9; 2:1).

The frailty of human nature, as represented by Moses and Aaron, was also the experience of David, whose attitude in relation to it is given to us to copy. He says (Psa. 39:1-4)—

"I will take heed to my ways, that I sin not with my tongue. I will keep my mouth with a bridle."

The importance of the matter before us is emphasized by the very numerous allusions in the Scriptures to the tongue as an instrument for good or evil. Solomon says (Prov. 15:2-4)—

"The tongue of the wise useth knowledge aright; but the mouth of fools poureth out foolishness. A wholesome tongue is a tree of life, but perverseness therein is a breach in the spirit."

If we remember the sobering words of Jesus, that—

"Every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. For **by thy words** thou shalt be justified, and **by thy words** thou shalt be condemned."

—and the frequent exhortations of the apostles in this direction, they will be a help to us in our endeavor to curb and keep in check **the active little member which, after all,** is but the *medium of communication of the thoughts and intents of the heart*, and becomes at once the messenger of the new or of the old man.

Hence the irregularity and incongruity of the messages that emanate from it, complained of by James. We must not, however, dwell too long upon this, but before we pass on we ask the reader to consult the following texts, and to endeavor to carry into practice the lessons they teach—Eph. 4:29; 5:4; Col. 4:6; 1 Thess. 5:11; Tit. 2:8; 1 Pet. 3:10; Prov. 4:24; 10:19.

Under the distressing circumstances of the evil moment of forgetfulness, which deprived Moses and Aaron of their long-looked-for pleasure of being the honored instruments in the hands of God of leading Israel into the Land of Promise, and seeing them safely ensconced therein as the Kingdom of God in its preliminary stage of existence among the surrounding nations—we can sympathize with our fellow-pilgrims in the disappointment they suffered.

But we are also comforted with them in the assurance that, although subjected for the time being to the righteous chastisement of the great God on account of their indiscretion on the occasion before us, they will occupy an exalted position with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets in the Kingdom (over which—in its initial stage—they presided in the kingly and priestly offices) when it shall have reached the stage in which Christ shall be the glory-bearer and shall sit and rule as King and Priest on his throne—of whom they were typical representatives.

In this connection we have only to turn our eyes upon the vision of glory on the occasion of the transfiguration of Christ, and there behold Moses enswathed in glory as one of the associates in the eternal Kingdom with him of whom he wrote and prophesied in the day of his pilgrimage of tears—and to listen with our ears to the "*song of Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb*," in the apocalyptic visions of glory.

Before leaving Kadesh, Moses dispatched messengers to the king of Edom soliciting permission for Israel to pass through his country, as the more direct and convenient way to the land of their promised inheritance, giving him the necessary assurance that neither injury nor loss in any shape should be sustained by him or his people by reason of his compliance with the request, and recounting before him the Divine protection and guidance under which Israel had proceeded from Egypt.

Pharaoh-like, however, the king of Edom absolutely refused to listen to any such proposal and prepared at once to oppose by force any attempt in that direction and actually came out against them. They, therefore, abandoned the passage through Edom and, leaving Kadesh, came to Mt. Hor, by the coast of the land of Edom:

"And the Lord spake unto Moses and Aaron in Mt. Hor, saying, Aaron shall be gathered unto his people: for he shall not enter into the land which I have given unto the children of Israel, because ye rebelled against My word at the water of Meribah.

"Take Aaron and Eleazar his son, and bring them up unto Mt. Hor: and strip Aaron of his garments, and put them upon Eleazar his son; and Aaron shall be gathered unto his people, and shall die there" (Num. 20:23-26).

Only four months previously Moses had laid his sister Miriam in her desert grave at Kadesh, and now he has to part company with his brother Aaron, who had accompanied and shared with him the vicissitudes of a long, dreary, wilderness life.

So, we behold the two aged brothers repairing to the Tabernacle together for the last time in order that the High Priest might array himself in his garments of "glory" and "beauty" before they were assumed by his son and successor in the priestly office. Thus clad, we see the venerable representative of the "great High Priest that is passed into the heavens" in company with Eleazar his son, and Moses, leaving the Tabernacle and winding their way through the midst of the camp to his final resting place appointed by God.

As the solemn procession passes along beside the tents of the encampment the scene becomes most affecting—all faces suffused with tears and embedded in hands uplifted in sorrow. Amid the sobbings and wailings of a crowd of weeping onlookers, his heart must

have been well-nigh breaking.

Still onward moves the procession, until it reaches the elevated area of the mount which had been appointed as the resting-place of Aaron, God's faithful high priest, who is about to surrender his life in willing obedience to Him Who gave it; and, doubtless, in "full assurance of faith" and "hope" that, "*at the time appointed,*" he will come forth unto the "*resurrection of life,*" to bask forever in eternal glory in the presence of his august Lord and Savior, the shedding of whose blood for sin was typified in that of the slain lambs which he had so profusely offered before the Most High on his own behalf and for the people whom he represented.

The affecting scene still lingers for a few moments, and then Moses is seen in the act of stripping Aaron of his priestly garments, and putting them upon Eleazar, Aaron's son, that there might be no gap in the high priestly office. Eleazar, thus clothed, stands in the presence of his father as the representative of the people.

There now only remains the few solemn moments devoted to prayer which, as sweet incense, ascends from the loving and confiding hearts of these men of God as they commit to His care and keeping the life of their spiritual chieftain, who calmly sinks into that peaceful and undisturbed repose, from which he will not awake until the blast of the "trump of God" shall call him forth to the possession of the honor and glory reserved in heaven for him, along with the faithful of all ages, and which has been preparing from that time down to our own. At that time, we may reasonably hope to see our dear brother, and converse with him upon the wonderful things which typically converged upon his personality and surroundings, as they will then be seen and realized in him of whom he was but the shadow.

But we may ask—is this solemn event, the death of God's high priest, without *typical* significance? Has it no bearing upon the things of the New Covenant in relation to the everlasting occupation of the Promised Land by Israel, under the "righteous branch raised unto David"?

The typical cities of refuge will furnish us with a clue to the answer. These places of safety from the avenger of blood were divinely appointed for the rescue from *death* of all who fled there under the provisions which conferred the right to deliverance. In these life-

saving retreats (representing Christ) the refugees were to *abide until the death of the high priest* officiating at and during the time of refuge, when they would be *free* to return in safety to their own several cities from which they had fled.

Here, then, we see illustrated the Divine principle of *death freeing from death*. We are considering this principle, of course, from a *typical* point of view; and from this illustration we may discern that the freedom from death which the refugees enjoyed on the death of the high priest was equivalent to their *resurrection*.

And we may add, to make the more perfect agreement between the type and antitype appear, that the clothing of the successor of the deceased high priest with the typical garments of his predecessor was also the equivalent of the resurrection of the deceased high priest himself, as the type of Christ.

Applying this principle, then, to the case of the death of Aaron, we may discern—in the clothing of his son, Eleazar, with the official insignia of the high-priesthood—the typical resurrection of Aaron (the Christ representative), and we perceive in this enigma the *necessity of the death of Aaron*, from the typical point of view, as the confirmation of the covenant, *before* entrance into the Promised Land could be gained, and as was required of the anti-typical High Priest under the New Covenant.

With this before us, we may *anticipate* likewise the application of this same principle to *Moses* also, for the simple reason that the two offices respectively held by Moses and Aaron concenter in Christ who is both *King* and *High Priest*. Therefore, from the *typical* point of view, Moses' predecease was also a necessity, and his resurrection was enigmatically represented by the appointment of his successor, Joshua, to lead Israel into the Promised Rest.

What confidence in the *real and substantial* fulfilment of all God's precious promises do these Divine, shadowy forecasts generate in the minds of those who grasp them! How is it possible that the shadow and the substance—so widely separated from each other—should present such perfect agreement, if this is not evidence of the Divinity of their origin, and consequently the infallible exhibition of the mind of Him Who alone can prophesy?

While, however, the children of Israel were not attacked by the *Edomites* who had forbidden them a passage through their territory and had guarded all the approaches unto it, *a tribe of Canaanites*, under command of their king Arad, who dwelt in the south of Canaan, fell on them and took some of them prisoners—

"And Israel vowed a vow unto the Lord, and said, If Thou wilt indeed deliver this people into my hand, then I will utterly destroy their cities. And the Lord hearkened to the voice of Israel, and delivered up the Canaanites; and they utterly **destroyed** them and their cities: and he called the name of the place Hormah" (Num. 21:1-3).

The partial success of this king proved unto him a snare, for the time had arrived of which God had spoken to Abraham, saying—

"The **iniquity of the Amorites** is not yet full" (Gen. 15:16).

It had then 470 years to run—430 from the typical confirmation of the covenant to the Exodus, and 40 years in the wilderness after leaving Egypt. The full measure of their iniquity having been reached, the threatened judgments upon the Canaanitish nations were initially inaugurated in the destruction of this fierce tribe and their cities. God's command to Israel was to *destroy the nations in possession of His land*, for their wickedness.

We have all heard the familiar objection that *such a command* could never have emanated from a good and beneficent God. Surely, if it is inconsistent on the part of a good God, in His Providence, to *command* the extermination of peoples, it must be equally inconsistent on His part to *permit* such extermination, for He had the power to prevent it, and all things come within the realm of His control (Isa. 50:2).

We can understand such an objection being raised by an *unbeliever* in God's existence or in the moral government of the world by a righteous Governor; but when such objections are raised by those professing to be *Christians*, and consequently *believers in the Scriptures*, we doubt whether they have any real belief in the true God at all.

For if He be the *Lawgiver* (which He proclaims Himself to be), and if *His* law has (what *all* laws must have) rewards and penalties, then what else can be expected than that where a people have been surpassingly guilty, as were the Canaanites (see Exo. 34:10-16; Lv. 18:3, 21, 24-29), that people should be judicially visited?

"My Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh" (Gen. 6:3).

"Man, whose breath is in his nostrils...wherein is he to be accounted of?" (Isa. 2:22).

"They are but flesh, a wind that passeth away and cometh not again" (Psa. 38:39).

"All flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass" (1 Pet. 1:24).

Shall *such an one* reason with *God* as to what is right and wrong for Him to do! Listen, ye unbelievers, and tremble at His word! —

"See now that I, even I, am He, and there is no God with Me. I kill, and I make alive; I wound, and I heal; neither is there any that can deliver out of My hand.

"For I lift up My hand to heaven and say, **I live forever.**

"If I whet My glittering sword, and Mine hand take hold on **judgment**, I will render vengeance to Mine enemies, and will reward them that hate Me. I will make Mine arrows drunk with blood, and My sword shall devour flesh" (Deut. 32:39:42).

Again (Isa. 40:17)—

"All nations before Him are as nothing, and they are counted to Him less than nothing, and vanity."

Remember the wholesome rebuke of the apostle Paul—

"Nay, but, O man, **who art thou** that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor and another to dishonor?" (Rom. 9:20-23).

(TO BE CONTINUED NEXT MONTH, IF THE LORD WILL)

The Purchased Servants of God

By brother John Thomas

"The Apocalypse of Jesus Christ" is then *for the servants of God*:—for those who believe the Gospel of the Kingdom it exhibits; and have been "washed from their sins in his blood," in being baptized into his Name.

"Know ye not that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of SIN unto death, or of OBEDIENCE unto righteousness?" (Rom. 6:16).

Here are two masters; the first, the Lord of the world; the last, the ruling principle of Yahweh's people. "Sin is the transgression of law;" and because this is the natural tendency of our nature, "*sin*" is sometimes used for "*the flesh*." He, therefore, that serves his own lusts—"the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life," which not only constitute the man, but the world, or aggregate of such—is sin's servant or slave.

Such a man serves sin unto death. Being of the world he speaks of the world, and the world hears him—1 John 4:5. He is essentially a man-pleaser, who holds men's persons in admiration for the sake of advantage; and therefore cannot be the servant of Christ—Gal. 1:10; Jude 16.

The thinking that characterizes such is termed "*the thinking of the flesh*." What they think and give expression to is palatable to those who do not know the Scriptures, which is a great cause of error in the world. Their thoughts and reasonings are at issue with the thoughts and ways of God; and therefore, the thinking of the flesh is said to be at enmity with God, not subject to His law, neither indeed can be—Rom. 8:7.

When a clergyman or layman thinks on God and His purposes; on what would be pleasing to Him; on his own destiny or that of nations and the earth; and judges of these—not *according to what is written in the Bible*, but according to the institutes of theological schools and seminaries—such thinking and judgment is the thinking of Sin, and inevitably at variance with the mind of Christ. Sin reigns in his thoughts, in his flesh, and in his ways. He is Sin's servant, and though a slave, being free from righteousness, he serves him with delight.

Paul reminds the Saints in Rome that they were all the servants of Sin once; but thanks God on their behalf, that they had been freed from Sin, and were now the servants of Righteousness,

" . . . having obeyed from the heart a FORM OF TEACHING, unto which they were delivered (Rom. 6:17).

They obeyed a form of teaching which emancipated, liberated, or set them free, from the lordship of Sin. This was Paul's mission—to invite men to a change of masters. He addressed himself to free men and slaves, all of whom, whatever their political or social position, *were in bondage to the devil or sin*. He did not invite slaves to abscond from their fleshly owners; on the contrary, he told men to remain in the several callings of life in which they were when they first heard the Truth.

"Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called. Art thou called being a slave? Care not for it; but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather" (1 Cor. 7:20-21).

As if he said, "Social or political liberty is a small matter in view of what men are invited to by the Gospel." My mission is to—

" . . . open men's eyes, to turn them from darkness (of mind) to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins and inheritance among the sanctified by faith (which leads) into Jesus" (Acts 26:18).

He invited Sin's servant to become Yahweh's servants upon the principle of purchase; so that, in addressing those who had abandoned the synagogue and temple for the house of Christ, he says:

"Ye are bought with A PRICE."

They were "not their own," being bought bodily and spiritually. "Therefore," said he,

"Glorify God with your body and your spirit, which are God's."

When a man's body and spirit become another's property, *all property in himself is surrendered to the purchaser*. All that he used to call his before he was sold, is transferred to his owner; and, if allowed to retain it, *he must use it as the steward of his lord*.

Redemption is release for a ransom. All who become God's

servants are therefore released from a former lord by purchase. The purchaser is Yahweh; and the price, or ransom, paid, the precious blood of the flesh through which the Anointing Spirit was manifested (1 Pet. 1:18)—

"Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conduct paternally delivered; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without spot or blemish."

If this Christ-Lamb had not been slain, vs. 5 & 6 of Rev. 1 could not have been written; the "New Song" of 5:9 could never have been sung; the 144,000 could never have been sealed, the robes of the saints, the palm-bearers of 7:9, could never have been washed white in blood; there would have been no Altar, no worshippers thereat, nor souls underneath it in death (9:1; 6:9); and there would have been no "fine linen, clean and white," to clothe the body guards of "the King of kings" (19:8-14). All these parts of the Apocalypse are based on the slaying of the Christ-Lamb as the redemption price of the servants of God.

Satan took the price of release. In the day of his power he valued the blood at 30 pieces of silver (Zech. 11:12-13)—

"They weighed for my price 30 pieces of silver: and cast it to the potter: a goodly price that I was prized at of them."

The life being purchased for this amount of blood money, Satan nailed the Christ-Lamb to the tree; and poured out his life with a spear. Jesus entered no protest against the arrangement. On the contrary, he lovingly laid down his life for the sake of those who had died under the law of Moses, walking in the steps of Abraham's faith; and for them also who should afterwards become Abraham's children by adoption through himself.

With the first class, as a man, he had no personal acquaintance; with the last, comprehending multitudes of his contemporaries, his acquaintance cost him his life. Unknown by the one, and condemned and persecuted by the other, he nevertheless laid down his life to purchase their release from bondage to Sin and Death.

"I am the good Shepherd. The good Shepherd giveth his life for the sheep; and I lay down my life for them of myself. No man taketh it from me" (John 10: 11-18).

He regarded this as the greatest evidence of love, as Paul reasons:

"Scarcely for a righteous man will one die: yet perhaps for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth His love toward us in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Rom. 5:7-8).

Well, therefore, may it be said,

"Unto him who loved us, to him be glory and dominion for the Aions of the Aions" (Rev. 1-5-6).

The "servants of God, sealed in their foreheads," are represented by the square of 12; so that their measurement is 144 cubits, and their numerical representation 144,000 (Rev. 7:3-4; 14:1; 21:17). This square is the sum of all released from bondage to Satan, consequent upon "obeying the form of teaching delivered unto them."

The releasing them, of course, is an affair of the ages, seeing that the redeemed do not belong to one and the same nation and generation. Jesus died and rose again for the release of these—his sheep scattered among the nations and generations of centuries. In the providence of God, "the Form of Teaching" is brought before them; and being of his sheep, they discern in the teaching the Great Shepherd's voice, and follow it (John 10:26-27): and as he said to Paul at Corinth,

"Be not afraid, but speak, and hold not thy peace; for I am with thee, and no man shall set on thee to hurt thee: for I have much people in this city" (Acts 18:9-10).

After this encouraging admonition, Paul continued speaking in Corinth a year and six months, *for the manifestation of this people*. They heard; they believed; and they were baptized. They believed "the teaching," and "obeyed the form." The teaching was the Gospel of the Apocalypse of Jesus Christ. He tells us:

"Christ sent me to preach the gospel, which is the power of God for salvation to every one believing; for therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith" (1 Cor. 1:17; Rom. 1:16-17).

In preaching this, he says,

"I came declaring the Testimony of God . . . speaking the hidden wisdom of God in a mystery, which had been hid from the Aions and the Generations, but NOW is made manifest to His

Saints: to whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; which is CHRIST IN YOU, the hope of glory" (1 Cor. 2:1,7; Col. 1:26-27).

In the teaching, *he* taught them "*the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the Name of Jesus Christ*;" so that, as the result of his instruction, they came to be—

“washed, sanctified, and justified in the Name of the Lord Jesus, and in the Spirit of God" (1 Cor. 6:11)

—and to wait for his Apocalypse (1:7). Here was a form of teaching or doctrine presented to them in the formula of the Name.

He told them about the Kingdom and glory to be apocalysped when the hour should arrive for Jesus Christ to hurl Satan, their master, like lightning from the heaven. His testimony to this effect was confirmed among them by—

". . the demonstration of Spirit and power, that their faith might stand in the power of God" (1 Cor. 1:6; 2:4-5).

Having convinced them of this, he invited them to a cooperation with Jesus in the overthrow of Satan, and in the government of the nations when Satan should be cast into the abyss, and shut up, and sealed, so that he could deceive them no more (Rev. 20:2-3).

But, at the same time, he taught them that that government which was to succeed Satan's, was to be a *pure, indestructible, divine, and righteous dominion*; and that consequently, flesh and blood, or mortals, and the unrighteous, could not possibly have any share in it (1 Cor. 6:9; 15:50).

This declaration, attested by the Spirit, brought up the inquiry, "*What does God require a believer of His promises to do* that he may become righteous, and capable of inheriting them? In other words, what must he do to become the subject of the righteousness of God?—of that righteousness, which Paul says is "witnessed by the Law and the Prophets"?

The answer to all who believe the promises, and that Jesus is the Anointed Son of Yahweh, in whose crucified flesh sin was condemned; and that he rose from the dead for the justification of all given to him for brethren by the Father—the answer to such is:

Do what Peter commanded the same class to do in Acts 2:38;

Do what is prescribed in Acts 3:19;
 Do what the Samaritans did in Acts 8:12-16;
 Do what the Cushite officer did in Acts 8:38-39;
 Do what Paul himself did in Acts 9:18; 22:16;
 Do what Peter commanded the devout Gentiles to do
 (Acts 10:48);
 Do what was prescribed to the Philippian house
 (Acts 16:33);
 Do what the Corinthians did in Acts 18:8—
 For they all did the same thing. They believed the same
 teaching, and *"obeyed the" same "form,"* in conformity
 with the command to *"be baptized into the name of
 Yahweh."*

In becoming thus enlightened and obedient they became "the servants of
 God," purchased from Satan at the price of blood sold to him for 30 pieces
 of silver. By right of purchase, God calls upon all the purchased in Satan's
 household to leave his service and come over to Him.

"The Lord knoweth them that are His."

This is the seal of His foundation (2 Tim. 2:19); and He sent out His
 trumpeters to make proclamation, and to invite His own to present heirship
 of the Kingdom and eternal glory, for which He purchased them of the
 enemy (1 Th. 2:12; 2 Th. 1:5; Jam. 2:5).

"He that receiveth the testimony of Jesus hath set to his seal that God
 is true" (John. 3:33).

He endorses understandingly all that God hath done. He rejoices in the
 purchase; refuses any longer to serve sin, and sings:

"Unto him that loved us, and redeemed us to God by his blood out
 of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and washed
 us therein from our sins, and hath made us kings and priests for
 God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for the Aions of
 the Aions" (Rev. 1:5-6; 5:9).

These immersed believers of the exceeding great and precious
 promises covenanted to the fathers, and confirmed in Jesus, the
 Minister of the Circumcision (Rom. 15:8), by obeying the form of
 teaching, were brought into a patient waiting for what they believed
 in and hoped for. In writing to some of them at Corinth, Paul says that
 they came behind in no gift,

". . . waiting for the COMING of the Lord, the Anointed Jesus"

Thus, it reads in the English Version; but in the original "the coming" is expressed by *ten apokalupsin*, THE APOCALYPSE. They waited for the Apocalypse of Yahweh, the Anointed Jesus.

IS THE RESTORATION OF SACRIFICE COMPATIBLE WITH THE PRINCIPLES OF THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST?

**By bro. John Thomas
Part Four (Last)**

JEWS AND GENTILES IN RELATION TO THE NEW COVENANT AND THE BLOOD THEREOF.

We come now to the consideration of the difficulty seemingly involved in Paul's doctrine when regarded in the light of Ezekiel's testimony. Jesus is now the high priest of God, and the only one that exists, or will ever exist in relation to man. He has had no rival since the Mosaic Covenant "vanished away." He is God's high priest for those, both Jews and Gentiles, who have been reconciled to God through his name—that is, who believe God's promises concerning the kingdom, and the things concerning Jesus, and have been united to his name by baptism. This is equivalent to saying, who have been reconciled through the belief and obedience of the gospel of the kingdom—through the obedience of faith. Of the things concerning Jesus are the things pertaining to his divine sonship, his spotless and unblemished character, his sacrificial death and resurrection, &c, constituting him God's Lamb, holy and without blemish, having neither spot, nor wrinkle, or any such thing, of his own free will once offered to bear the sins of *many*. Thus, he was at once the sacrifice and the priest; for " he offered up himself; as he said, "I lay down my life *for the sheep*. Therefore, doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it up again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it up again. This commandment have I received of my Father."¹ Being thus the Lamb slain, he resumed his life, and entered into the presence of God before whom he stands as the blood sprinkled Ark of the Covenant,² in whom is

¹ Rom. 7:27; John 10:15,17,18

² Rev. 11:19

deposited the Law hereafter to go forth from Zion, and the life of his sheep,³ whose sins he bears away;⁴ and thus they are sanctified by the dedicated covenant through the once offering of his body: so that “by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified.”⁵

Now these sanctified ones are a purified people, whose “hearts,” or minds and dispositions, have been “purified by faith”⁶—faith in the promises of God, and in “the blood of sprinkling which speaks better things than the blood of Abel.” The blood of Jesus is the blood of sprinkling which gushed forth from his side as “an offering” or purification “for sin.” The poor in spirit and the meek, the honest and good hearts, that by faith appreciate the virtue of this sprinkled blood, and have become the subjects of repentance and remission in his name, are said to be “sprinkled from an evil conscience,” and to have “washed the body with pure water.”⁷ They are “the children of the promise,” or covenant; because in becoming Christ's they have believed the promises, and been purified by “the blood of the covenant.” As yet they walk by faith in the things believed, and not by sight. Faith, which is “the substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things unseen,” is the mirror which reflects the things of the approaching future and presents them to the believer's mind as though he were beholding, and personally in the presence of, the very things themselves. Hence, it is said to such, “Ye are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, to Jerusalem the heavenly, and to myriads of angels, to a general convocation even to an assembly of firstborns enrolled for the heavens (*en ouranois*) and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of the just made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the New Covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling which speaks better things than that of Abel”⁸—*ye are come by faith* to these things, which at present ye do dimly contemplate; but which ye shall see no longer as through a glass darkly, but face to face in the presence of the Lord.

Now these, whose hearts are sprinkled and their bodies washed, are the only people on the earth since the entrance of Jesus into the presence of God, for whom he officiates as “high priest over the House of God.”⁹ They are “God's temple,” “the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not

³ Col. 3:3

⁴ Heb. 9:28

⁵ Heb. 10:10,14

⁶ Acts 15:9

⁷ Heb. 10:22

⁸ Heb. 12:22

⁹ Heb. 10:21; 3:6

man.”¹⁰ For forty years this temple coexisted with that in Jerusalem; but since the destruction of the latter it is the only temple of God upon the earth, where gifts and offerings called “spiritual sacrifices,”¹¹ are offered acceptably to his name. They become acceptable in being presented through Jesus Christ. They who do the worship (and they are all the faithful) enter into this holy place, or heavenly, which as a whole they constitute, with the sprinkled blood of the covenant upon their hearts. Purified once through faith in the blood sprinkled covenant of promise, hereafter to become the law of the kingdom, there is in their case no more sacrifice for sin; “for by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified.” Yet, though thus sanctified, they continue to offer spiritual sacrifices. All this is worshipping the Father in spirit and in truth, which is the only service acceptable to Him while His kingdom is in ruins, and prostrate at the feet of the Gentiles.

But this worship in spirit and in truth, expressed in confession of the hope,¹² &c. praise, and prayer; in baptism; and in eating and drinking of the symbols on the table of the Lord, is the unburdensome privilege of those only who through faith in the Covenant and its blood have become “heirs of the kingdom.” When this is set up in Palestine, the service is changed *in form but not in principle*; and from social becomes national. In the national service, the higher priesthood, which consists of Jesus and the “children God has given him” all immortal by resurrection or transformation, though they offer the fat and the blood, it is for the people and not for themselves. They need no more sacrifice for sin; but being “priests unto God,”¹³ there needs must be something for them to offer on account of the worshippers for whom they officiate. The New Covenant, which we now accept as a matter of faith and hope, has not yet been made with the House of Judah and Israel. If it had, they would now be a united nation in Palestine. It will be made with them when they are grafted into their own olive tree and not before. At the engrafting, there will be a great national celebration, called “*a delivering of the covenant*”¹⁴—*be-masorel ha-berith*—A delivering of the new covenant from Zion.¹⁵ with a glorious, but not with such a terrible, display of power as when the covenant was delivered from Sinai. The nation, or Twelve Tribes, having been brought

¹⁰ Heb. 8:2

¹¹ 1 Pet. 2:5,9

¹² Heb. 10:23 *Hornologia tet elpidos*, “confession of the hope,” and not “profession of our faith,” as in the king's version. Rom. 1: 9,10.

¹³ Rev. 5:10

¹⁴ Ezek. 20:37

¹⁵ Micah 4:2

at length to acknowledge Jesus as High Priest and king, are received into favor ; and being under the New Covenant, as in former years they were under the Old, Yahweh becomes merciful to their unrighteousness, and proclaims everlasting oblivion of all their past individual and national offences by virtue of the royal blood of the covenant, the preciousness of which they then perceive and appreciate. This amnesty, however, benefits that generation only to which the covenant is delivered and by which it is accepted. It affects not the generations of Israel's rebellious dead; they are the "cut off from the people."

Now, the question remains, when thus reconciled to God through the blood of His Son, is the nation to have a religious service or worship; and if they are, what is to be *its principle*, and what *its form*? No one who understands the Bible would affirm, that the Twelve Tribes of Israel were to live in their own land under the new covenant for 1000 years without any national religious worship. To affirm this would be to say in effect, that God had prepared a Royal Priesthood for his kingdom, but had provided no service for them to perform. This is inadmissible for a moment. There will be a service under the New Covenant as there was under the Old. Its principle will be memorial, not typical; even the extension of the principle upon which is now celebrated the death and resurrection of Jesus; hence, the "reconciliation" will *be a memorial reconciliation made perfect by the blood of the Covenant which institutes it*. The reconciliation of the old covenant was typical and imperfect; because the dedication blood, being merely that of bulls and goats could not perfect the conscience in taking away of sins. When the Prince under the New Covenant "prepares for himself, and for all the people of the land a bullock for a sin offering,"¹⁶ it is memorial of his own sacrifice of himself, and memorial of the reconciliation which the people enjoy through the blood of the Covenant with which, through faith in it, their hearts will be sprinkled then, as the true believers are at present.

Such is the principle of the amended "service which pertains to the Israelites."¹⁷ The form thereof is detailed in Ezekiel more at large than we can present it here. It is a service not of spiritual sacrifices, but of bloody sacrifices of spiritual significance. The lower order of the priesthood, mortal Levites, slay them for the people, and pass the fat and blood from the tables at the north gate to the Altar, where they are burned and sprinkled by the higher or immortal priests, "the seed of Zadok," before

¹⁶ Ezek. 45:22

¹⁷ Rom. 9:4

the Lord. The past sins of the nation having been amnestied at the delivering of the Covenant, there is thenceforth no more remembrance of sins once a year. The old Mosaic annual atonement on the tenth day of the seventh month, at which the tribes were to "afflict their souls," is not revived under the New Covenant. It will form no part of the service then. It was one of those things made, or appointed, that was removed when the Lord shook the Mosaic heaven by the Roman power. There will be no Laver of water between the Temple and the Altar for the seed of Zadok to wash themselves before they enter the temple. These washings and carnal ordinances are also abolished; for those who approach the altar and enter in, are like their Prince, holy and undefiled, being devoid of evil in the flesh.

Much more might be said upon these interesting and important matters, but we must at present refrain. Knowing the ignorance that prevails upon the subject here exhibited, we did not feel at liberty to answer our beloved sister's letter in fewer words. We have endeavored to unfold what has been revealed as the best exhibition of the agreement between the prophets and the apostles. The reader being now, therefore, in possession of the premises, will be able to draw many more conclusions for himself than at present occur, or can be conveniently reported at this time.

Hints for Bible Markers

Bro. Beryl was under the weather this month, and unable to provide his hints. He will continue next month, Lord Willing.

Continued next month should the Lord will

bro. Beryl Snyder