

THE TREATMENT OF THE MOSAIC LAW IN THE
EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS WITH SOME
COMPARISON OF THE PAULINE ATTITUDE

A thesis submitted to the University of Edinburgh in partial
fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy.

Gwilym George Lloyd, B.A., B.D.

1944



CONTENTS

Page

Preface.....		
Introduction.....		1
Chapter I.	The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Old Testament.....	12
	Christ and Angels.....	50
	Jesus Christ and Moses.....	58
Chapter II.	The Law in the Epistle to the Hebrews.....	72
Chapter III.	The Law in Hebrews (continued).....	95
Chapter IV.	The Argument of the Epistle in Summary....	116
Chapter V.	The Sacrificial Aspect of the Law.....	125
Chapter VI.	Comparison and Contrast between the Old Testament Sacrificial Ritual, and the Work of Christ in Hebrews.....	140
Chapter VII.	The Melchisedeck Order of Priesthood.....	183
	Jesus Christ - Priest and High Priest	201
Chapter VIII.	The Old Covenant Sacrifices and the One Sacrifice of Christ.....	226
Chapter IX.	The Influence or Affinity of Alexandrian Thought on the Epistle to the Hebrews...	243
Chapter X.	The Use of the Old Testament in St. Paul..	267
Chapter XI.	St. Paul's Attitude to the Law.....	286
	Paul and Justification.....	332
Chapter XII.	The Use of Sacrificial Terms in St. Paul's Epistles.....	339
	A Comparison of the Author of Hebrews and Paul in their use of Sacrificial terms.....	364
Chapter XIII.	A Comparison and Contrast of Hebrews' Attitude to the Law and St. Paul's.....	377
Conclusion.....		396
Bibliography.		

P. 1. Halakah.

P. 2. Paul (he).

3. Tarsus Moffatt.

7. Rosethal.

P R E F A C E

The main purpose of this thesis is adequately indicated by its title. The attitude of the Epistle to the Hebrews to the Law is dealt with in the first and greater portion of the thesis. The Pauline attitude is then stated, with reference primarily to the Epistles to the Galatians and Romans. The closing Chapter is taken up with a comparison of the two attitudes.

Considerations of time have imposed restrictions on this work, especially in these last weeks, owing to my liability to be called for service with the Church of Scotland Huts in the Middle East, at very short notice.

Deep appreciation is due to Principal Curtis, who has given me unstintingly of his time and assistance. I have used freely in the course of the work ~~as~~ my Notes from Principal Curtis' lectures on the Epistle to the Hebrews. Also to Professor Rankin and Professor W.R. Williams for their guidance and valuable help.

G. G. Lloyd.

POST SCRIPT TO THE PREFACE.

Passages in square brackets are to be read
as footnotes. *S.G. Lloyd.*

I N T R O D U C T I O N.

In the time of Christ the Law embodied in itself, as it has done ever since, all the essential features in the life and faith of the Jewish people. Palestine and its people were under the yoke of Rome, and their freedom was lost. The voice of the great prophets was no longer heard, prophecy seemed to be dead, and the effect of all these circumstances was to make the people, particularly the more devout, turn with an ever greater earnestness to the study and observance of the Law.

John the Baptist, largely reminiscent of the great prophet Elijah, had already appeared, and had summoned the people to repentance in preparation for the arrival of the "Coming One" long expected of the people. Jesus had spent his life in Nazareth in Galilee. The population of Galilee at this time was very mixed, counting amongst its inhabitants many who were not Jews. In this complex racial environment Jesus lived the life of a loyal Jew. Of this the Gospels afford us ample evidence. The home in which he was brought up was a Jewish home zealously observant of the religious practices of the Jewish faith.

The two primary religious institutions of Judaism at this time were the Synagogue and the Temple. It is clear

from the Gospels that for both of these institutions Jesus had profound respect and appreciation.

During his ministry, the synagogue was the scene of many of his activities,¹ and St. Mark gives a summary of the first half of Jesus' ministry in the words "And he went into their synagogues throughout all Galilee, preaching and casting out devils."²

In St. Luke's Gospel we are told that Jesus' parents went every year to Jerusalem at the feast of the Passover, and that when Jesus was twelve years of age he went with them.³ When his parents had lost him, and had come back searching for him, they found him in the temple "sitting in the midst of the doctors hearing them and asking them questions."

Towards the end of his ministry we find him again in the temple, teaching in its porches and expelling those who had made the house of prayer a den of robbers.

It is difficult to determine what the facts are concerning the charge which was brought against him that he threatened to destroy the temple.⁴ It is likely that he spoke of the destruction of the temple as a punishment visited upon the nation rather than as God's judgment on the temple itself.

1. Mark I 21; III 1; VI 2.

2. Mark I 39.

3. Luke II 41 ff.

4. Mark XIV 58; XV 29. c.f. XIII 2 ff.

The loyalty of Jesus to the religion of Israel is made abundantly evident on the Gospel pages, and from the teaching of some of the Rabbis we see how closely related is Jesus' teaching to theirs on certain points, especially on the Law. Hillel summarised the Law in these words "What is hateful to thyself, do not to thy neighbour; this is the whole Law, the rest is commentary." Again Akiba said, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself; this is the greatest general principle of the Law." These sayings are very near to Jesus' summary of the Law "All things therefore whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye also unto them for this is the Law and the prophets."⁵

The leading party in Judaism at this time was the Pharisaic party. The Pharisees laid very great stress on the traditional ritual and ceremonial practices. They had exalted the precepts of the oral Law to equality with these of the written Law. Jesus dealt freely with both written and oral Laws. For him the ethical element in the Law was all-important, and he relegated the ritual duties to a secondary position compared with the ethical requirements of the Law. He did not allow the Law of the Sabbath to stand between him and the performance of deeds which were of service to men. He consorted with publicans and sinners, ate from dishes that were 'unclean', and declared that the eating of prohibited

5. Math. VII 12.

foods did not defile a person in the sight of God. The primary duty of the Law as Jesus taught it was love; all other precepts, though enjoined in the Law, were subordinate to that duty. If any precept in the Law conflicted in any way with obedience to the basic moral principle of the Law, then that precept must be disregarded. An example of this teaching is the Corban discourse. If the Law upheld an oath pronounced over a gift making it illegal for the gift to be used for the relief of needy parents, then this part of the Law must be set aside, because God's Law rightly understood, requires care and respect for parents. In such a situation, it would be mockery to apply the precept "Thou shalt perform thy oaths." The Saducees^d did not accept the oral Law, but they held the written Law to be binding in its entirety. But, as is evident from the Gospels, Jesus dealt freely with both the written and oral Law, declaring that the will of God is summed up in certain basic commands of a positive religious and ethical character, to which all else is subordinate.

Jesus' treatment of the Law led his opponents to bring the charge against him of destroying the Law and the prophets. Jesus' answer to the charge is "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I came not to destroy, but to fulfil. (πληρῶν)" ⁶ He came to bring the Law into full expression, and into completion. "According to

6. Math. V 17.

Jesus, love to God as Father, and love to man as God's child and as brother is the summary of the Law and the Prophets, that is of scriptural religion."⁷

It is clear from the Gospels that Jesus regarded the Jewish Scriptures, and in a special degree the books of the Law as divinely inspired writings. When he quotes Psalm CX. 1,⁸ he says that David, whom he regarded as author of the Psalms, spoke "in the Holy Spirit" *ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ*. The citations from the Rabbinic literature given in Strack-Billerbeck's Kommentar⁹ make it clear that this formula was used with reference to prophetic inspiration or inspiration by the divine spirit. Now if Jesus spoke of the Psalms as spoken "in the Holy Spirit," it is certain that he regarded the books of the Law in the same way, for the book of Psalms was later, and less revered than the Pentateuch. The attitude Jesus adopted towards the Scriptures is made clear throughout the Gospels. He quotes Law Prophet or Writing as the final authority in matters of religion. He turns to the Scriptures for support and defence. When his disciples are criticised for plucking corn on the Sabbath, he refers to David and the shewbread as precedent.¹⁰ When he has driven out from the Temple those who had made it a den

7. Principal W.A. Curtis "Jesus Christ the Teacher" 184.
 8. Mark XII. 36.
 9. Vol. II. 134-7.
 10. Mark II. 26.

of robbers, he quotes Isaiah and Jeremiah as revealing the true purpose of the temple.¹¹ The last words on his lips were from the twenty second Psalm.¹²

It is clear that all the evangelists accepted without question the inspiration and authority of the Old Testament. They quote from it as from revealed literature, and they seek to show how its prophecies have been fulfilled in Jesus Christ.

The Christian Church in its earliest days had to decide what its attitude towards the Jewish Law was going to be. If the Old Testament contained the revelation of God's will for men, then the question had to be faced, were not all the precepts contained therein binding, and the Jewish ceremonial a divine requirement?

When the Gospels came to be written, this problem had already received a practical answer. Paul and other missionaries had founded churches amongst the Gentiles in which no allegiance was felt towards the Jewish Law. This, then was the atmosphere in which the Gospels were compiled.

Clement of Alexandria¹³ states that Mark's Gospel emanates from the Gentile wing of the Church, and this is borne out by the internal evidence of the Gospel. Jewish customs and terms are explained by the writer,¹⁴ and the Aramaic phrases

11. Mark XIV 17.

12. Mark XV 34. For a statement of the relation of Jesus to the Hebrew Scriptures see Principal Curtis' Book "Jesus Christ the Teacher" 49-57.

13. H.E. VI 14, 5.

14. Mark VII 3, 4; XV 42.

are translated for the benefit of the readers.¹⁵ The absence of quotations by the writer of Mark's Gospel is remarkable. He records numerous references made by Jesus to the Old Testament, but there are only two quotations.¹⁶ We do not find in Mark so strong an approval of the more permanent parts of the Jewish Law, or so severe a denunciation of the Pharisees who exalted the external adjuncts of the Law, as we do in Matthew's Gospel. When we ask what is the view of the writer of Mark's Gospel concerning the validity of the Mosaic legislation with regard to the cultus and ritual duties, the answer is clearly suggested in the Gospel itself. In the conflict over eating with unwashed hands Mark gives Jesus' reply that "nothing from without the man can defile him."¹⁷ When the disciples later ask him the meaning of this parable, the writer adds to Jesus' reply the words "making clean all foods" *καθαρίξων πάντα τὰ βρώματα.* The writer's view clearly is that the distinctions between foods as clean and unclean are done away with. The Laws of the Sabbath are set aside with the words "The Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath." The idea of Jesus as a new Lawgiver is present in the Gospel, and his authority is even greater than that of Moses.

The Gospel of St. Matthew quotes the Old Testament frequently, that the readers may see that Jesus is the

15. Mark VI 41; VII 11, 34; XV 34.

16. Mark I 2, 3; XV 28; from Mal. III 1, and Is. XL 3; LIII 12.

17. Mark VII 15.

realisation of the hopes of the Jewish prophets. The writer seems to have the Old Testament continually before him, and its pages are lit up for him as he realises that the life and work of Christ is the fulfilment of its promises and expectations. In the middle of the Gospel we have Isaiah's picture of the servant of God, for it is the Old Testament portrait of Christ.¹⁸ The Messianic quotations are introduced with the words "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet" or "then was fulfilled." What the writer wants to convey to his readers is that Jesus is the Messiah in whom was fulfilled the Law and the Prophets.

The Gospel of Matthew comes from a Christian group which belonged to the Hellenistic rather than to the strictly Jewish section of the Church. In Matthew's Gospel the mission to the Gentiles is taken for granted, the Gospel must be preached to the whole world before the Parousia,¹⁹ and the Gospel ends with the great commission to make disciples of all the nations. The authority of the Jewish Law is no longer binding, for Jesus is another Moses who has brought a new Law which brings into fulfilment the older revelation. The first great mass of teaching is presented in the Sermon on the Mount, after the analogy of the Law in the Old Testament delivered from Mount Sinai. This new Law does not destroy, but fulfils the older Law, and the duty of the Church now is to obey the

18. Math. XII. 18-21.

19. Math. XXIV. 14.

Law of Jesus and not the Law of Moses.

The word that best describes St. Luke's Gospel is "Catholic". The writer displays no antipathy towards Judaism. He represents Jesus as fulfilling the Law, and as quoting from the Old Testament and declaring that "it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one tittle of the Law to fail."²⁰ He is a Gentile writing for Gentiles, and is eager to bring the Gentiles into the Church, proof of which is the whole book of Acts.

It is, however, difficult to find out what is the attitude of Luke in his Gospel towards the Jewish Law. He omits the three leading passages in Mark in which Jesus' attitude to the Law is treated - the controversy over eating with unwashed hands, the discussion on the Mosaic Law of divorce, and the question as to the chief commandment. In his discussion of the second and third ~~topics~~ he goes to other sources for his material ignoring what Mark has to say, while elsewhere he is faithful to the Marcan source when teaching Marcan material.

In the book of Acts one of the central issues is the conflict about the observance of the Jewish Law by Gentile converts into the Church. The account given by Luke does not reflect the bitterness, and the far reaching effects of the controversy which are made manifest in the Pauline letters.

20. Luke XVI 17.

The impression his account makes is that the whole matter was much easier settled than the epistles of Paul allow us to believe.

For Luke the Gentiles are free from the Law, and the body of the evidence is in favour of the view that Luke did not regard the Jewish Law as essential to any Christian, whether Jew or Gentile. The vision of Peter at Joppa, sweeps away the differences which keep Jews and Gentiles apart, and the Gentiles are recipients of the same blessings as the Jews. The salvation of both Jews and Gentiles is regarded as independent of observance of the Mosaic Law, but he did not, probably in apologetic interest, make bold to teach that Christians of Jewish origin should no longer observe the laws and customs of the Jewish Law.

Like the writers of the Synoptic Gospels, the writer of the Fourth Gospel too is acquainted with the Old Testament. He not only reports the use of the Old Testament or reference to it by Jesus and others, but, like the first evangelist, he frequently quotes or refers to it himself and points out the fulfilments of its prophecies in the life of Jesus.²¹ The quotations he makes from the Old Testament show clearly that he believes in the authority of the scriptures and in the divinely given prophecies. He is moreover familiar with the Hebrew language, as some of his quotations imply an acquaintance

21. John II 17, 22; XII 14, 38-41; XIX 24, 28, 36, 37;
XX 9.

with the Hebrew. Some of his quotations come not from the LXX, but are apparently his own translation of the Hebrew.²²

But there is no book in the New Testament more interspersed with references to, and quotations from the Old Testament than the Epistle to the Hebrews. From beginning to end the author's mind moves along the pages of the LXX and as he reads in the light of the good tidings now preached to the Christians the Old Testament pages are lit up for him, and in the revelation of the Law and the prophets he recognises the shadow of the glory and of the blessings of the new and final revelation of God in Jesus Christ. We now turn to the use made of the Old Testament in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

22. e.g. XIII 18; XIX 37.

C H A P T E R I.

The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Old Testament.

For the author of Hebrews the whole of the Old Testament was inspired. In it God spoke through Moses and the prophets. As he, and those whom he addressed took their Septuagint, the voice which spoke to them from its pages was the voice of God who had by 'divers portions' and in 'divers manners' spoken unto the Fathers. He reads the Old Testament with a vividly imaginative mind, and it is for him the voice of God conversing with him. As Nairne remarks¹ "We are not surprised to find that he uses the mere written word somewhat boldly. He selects what suits him. In Ch. I, his argument is that angels are not, as certain men were, called Sons of God. But they are so called in Job, and even in Genesis; he ignores that. In Exodus it is said that Moses was afraid, and fled from Egypt. It is possible to make XI 27 agree with this, but the natural interpretation of the passage shows the author deliberately contradicting what the whole narrative led him to consider inconsistent with the character of Moses. These are trifling liberties, but the sweeping away of the whole Levitical ordinance is a bolder stroke than any St. Paul ventured. There are two justifications for it. First that he takes a

1. Epistle of Priesthood, 259.

wide view of the Old Testament as a whole, instead of submitting to the express, but really limited authority of some passages. Secondly that he hears the teaching of the Holy Spirit not only in the written word, but also in the signs of the times; as the age moved on, it had become clear that God intended those ordinances to pass away." He thus reserved for himself a certain freedom in treating the Old Testament Scriptures as the Spirit guided him to the truth. For the most part in the Epistle the Holy Spirit is represented as the spirit of God who inspires the Old Testament. The author cites his quotations in general as though they were the direct words of God. All the quotations from the Old Testament are made anonymously, the writer of the books from which the words are taken is not referred to, for he was only the instrument which God used to declare His message.

Many of the Old Testament quotations are ascribed to God as the speaker e.g. "Unto which of the angels said he at any time Thou art my Son ..." ² "But of the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever." ³

Other quotations are ascribed to Christ as speaker e.g. "For which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren ..." ⁴ "Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not ..." ⁵

2. Heb. I. 5.

3. Ibid. I. 7.

4. Ibid. II. 11-12.

5. Ibid. X. 5.

There are two passages in which the Holy Spirit specially is named as the speaker - "Wherefore, even as the Holy Ghost saith, To-day if ye shall hear His voice ..."6

"And the Holy Ghost also beareth witness to us; for after he hath said, This is the Covenant that I will make with them ..."7

But these words ascribed to the Holy Spirit in the two instances cited are elsewhere in the Epistle ascribed to God - "Again He (God) defineth a certain day, saying in David, after so long a time, To-day, as it hath been before said, To-day if ye shall hear His voice, Harden not your Hearts."8 And "For finding fault with them, He (God) saith, Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant..."9

To demonstrate the extent to which the mind of the auctor ad Hebraeos turns in the Old Testament we shall give first the quotations from the Pentateuch, the Law of Moses, and then the allusions to the Pentateuch. We shall do the same with the Psalter - the Jewish book of common devotion, and lastly the prophets.

The quotations from the Pentateuch in Hebrews are nine, with three other passages used verbally, but not formally quoted. Four of the quotations are from Genesis, four from Deuteronomy, three from Exodus, and one from the Book of Numbers.

The quotations are given below in the order in which they occur in the Epistle.

6. Heb. III. 7

7. Ibid. X. 15-16

8. Ibid. IV. 7.

9. Ibid. VIII. 8.

Heb. I. 6. And again, when he bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him.

Deut. XXXII, 43. LXX. *καὶ προσκυνήσωσιν αὐτῷ υἱοὶ θεοῦ*

Heb. IV. 4. For he hath said somewhere of the seventh day on this wise, And God rested on the seventh day from all His works.

Gen. II. 2. And on the seventh day God finished His work which He had made, and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made.

Heb. VI. 13 ff. For when God made promise to Abraham, since he could swear by none greater, he sware by himself, saying, Surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee.... For men swear by the greater.

Gen. XXII, 16 ff. By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son. And in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heavens....

Heb. VII. 1. For this Melchizedek, King of Salem, priest of God Most High, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the Kings, and blessed him, to whom also Abraham divided a tenth part of all (being first, by interpretation, King of Righteousness, and then also King of Salem, which is

King of peace; without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but made like unto the Son of God) abideth a priest for ever.

Gen. XIV, 17 ff. And the King of Sodom went out to meet him, after his return from the slaughter of Chedorlaomer and the Kings that were with him, at the vale of Shaveh (the same is the King's vale) And Melchizedek King of Salem brought forth bread and wine: And he was priest of God Most High. And he blessed him and said, Blessed be Abraham of God Most High, possessor of heaven and earth: and blessed be God Most High which hath delivered thine enemies into thy hand. And he gave him a tenth of all.

Heb. VIII, 5. For, See, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern that was shewed thee in the mount.

Exod. XXV. 40. And see that thou make them after their pattern, which hath been shewed thee in the mount.

Heb. IX. 20. This is the blood of the covenant which God commanded to you-ward.

Exod. XXIV. 8. And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the Covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words.

Heb. X. 30. For we know him that said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense.

Deut. XXXII. 35. Vengeance is mine and recompense.

Heb. X. 30. The Lord shall judge his people.

Deut. XXXII. 36. For the Lord shall judge his people.

Heb. XI, 18. Even he to whom it was said, In Isaac shall thy seed be called.

Gen. XXI. 12. And God said unto Abraham, Let it not be grievous in thy sight because of the lad, and because of thy bondwoman, in all that Sarah saith unto thee hearken unto her voice; for in Isaac shall thy seed be called.

Heb. XII. 20. For they could not endure that which was enjoined, If even a beast touch the mountain, it shall be stoned.

Exod. XIX. 12 ff. And thou shalt set bounds unto the people round about, saying, Take heed to yourselves, that ye go not up into the mountain, or touch the border of it: whosoever toucheth the mount shall be surely put to death.

Heb. XIII. 5. For himself hath said, I will in no wise fail thee, neither will I in any wise forsake thee.

Deut. XXXI. 6, 8. Be strong, and of a good courage, fear not, nor be affrighted at them: for the Lord thy God, he it is that doth go with thee; he will not fail thee nor forsake thee.

And the Lord, he it is that doth go before thee; he will be with thee; he will not fail thee, neither forsake thee;

fear not, neither be dismayed.

In addition to the quotations from the Pentateuch we have a larger number of allusions to the contents of the Pentateuch and many passages which are reminiscent of the language of the LXX.

The allusions to the Pentateuch are given in the order in which they occur in the Epistle:-

Heb. III. 1 ff. Consider the Apostle and High Priest of our Confession, even Jesus, who was faithful to him that appointed him, as also was Moses in all his house. For he hath been counted worthy of more glory than Moses, by so much as he that built the house hath more honour than the house.

Numb. XII. 7. My servant Moses is not so, he is faithful in all mine house.

Heb. III. 17. And with whom was he displeased forty years? Was it not with them that sinned, whose carcasses fell in the wilderness?

Numb. XIV. 32. But as for you, your carcasses shall fall in this wilderness.

Heb. VI. 7 f. For the land which hath drunk the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them for whose sake it is also tilled, receiveth blessing from God: but if it beareth thorns and thistles, it is rejected, and nigh unto a curse; whose end is to be burned.

Gen. I. 11 f. And God said, Let the earth put forth

grass, herb yielding seed after its kind, and tree bearing fruit, wherein is the seed thereof after its kind: And God saw that it was good.

Heb. VI. 8. But if it beareth thorns and thistles, it is rejected and nigh unto a curse; whose end is to be burned.

Gen. III. 17 ff. And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in toil shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee, and thou shalt eat the herb of the field.

Heb. VI. 19... Which we have as an anchor of the soul, a hope sure and steadfast and entering into that which is within the veil.

Lev. XVI. 2, 12. And the Lord said unto Moses, speak unto Aaron thy brother, that he come not at all times within the veil.

And he shall take a censer full of coals of fire from off the altar before the Lord..... and bring it within the veil.

Heb. VII. 1 ff. For this Melchizedek, King of Salem, priest of God Most High, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the Kings, and blessed him, to whom also

Abraham gave a tenth part of all.....

Gen. XIV. 18. And Melchizedek, King of Salem, brought forth bread and wine, and he was priest of God Most High, and he blessed him, and said, Blessed be Abram of God Most High.....

Heb. VIII. 2. A Minister of the sanctuary and of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, not man.

Numb. XXIV. 6 ~~LX~~ differs from Hebr. - *καὶ ὡσεὶ οὐρανὸν ὃς ἐπηξεν κύριος.*

Heb. IX 2. ff. For there was a Tabernacle made, the first, wherein was the Candlestick, and the Table, and the Shewbread, which is called the Sanctuary. And after the second veil, the Tabernacle which is called the Holy of Holies.

Exod. XXVI. 33. And thou shalt hang up the veil under the clasps, and shalt bring in thither within the veil the ark of the testimony: and the veil shall divide unto you between the holy place and the most holy. And thou shalt put the mercy seat upon the ark of the testimony in the most holy place, And thou shalt set the table without the veil, and the candlestick over against the table on the side of the Tabernacle toward the south, and thou shalt put the table on the north side.

Heb. IX. 4. ...having a golden censer, and the Ark of the Covenant overlaid round about with gold wherein was a golden pot holding the manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant, and above it cherubim of glory.

overshadowing the mercy-seat.

Exod. XVI. 33. And Moses said unto Aaron, Take a pot, and put an omerful of manna therein, and lay it up before the Lord, to be kept for your generations.

Heb. LX. 7. But into the second the High Priest alone once in the year, not without blood, which he offereth for himself, and for the errors of the people.

Exod. XXX. 10. And Aaron shall make atonement upon the horns of it once in the year: with the blood of the sin-offering of atonement once in the year shall he make atonement for it throughout your generations: it is most holy unto the Lord.

Heb. IX. 12 f. Nor yet through the blood of goats and calves, but through his own blood, entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption. For if the blood of goats and bulls, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling them that have been defiled, sanctify unto the cleanness of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ.

Lev. XVI. 18. And he shall go out unto the altar that is before the Lord, and make 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.

Heb. IX. 13. For if the blood of goats and bulls, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling them that have been defiled, sanctify unto the cleanness of the flesh....

Exod. XIX. 10. And the Lord said unto Moses, Go unto the people, and sanctify them to-day and to-morrow, and let them wash their garments.

Heb. IX. 4, 13. having a golden censer, and the ark of the covenant wherein was a golden pot holding the manna, and Aaron's rod that budded. For if the blood of goats and bulls, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling them that have been defiled, sanctify unto the cleanness of the flesh...

Numb. XVII. 8. And it came to pass on the morrow that Moses went into the tent of the testimony; and behold the rod of Aaron for the house of Levi was budded, and put forth buds and bloomed blossoms, and bare ripe almonds.

Also. Numb. XIX. 9. And a man that is clean shall gather up the ashes of the heifer, and lay them up without the camp in a clean place, and it shall be kept for the congregation of the children of Israel for a water of separation: it is a sin-offering.

Heb. X. 28. A man that hath set at nought Moses' law dieth without compassion on the word of two or three witnesses.

Deut. XVII. 6. At the mouth of two witnesses or three witnesses, shall he that is to die be put to death, at the mouth of one witness shall he not be put to death.

Heb. XI. 4. By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, through which he had witness

borne to him that he was righteous, God bearing witness in respect of his gifts; and through it, he being dead yet speaketh.

Gen. IV. 4. And Abel, he also brought of the firstling of his flock, and of the fat thereof, and Jehovah, had respect unto Abel and unto his offering.

Heb. XI. 5. By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and he was not found, because God translated him for before his translation he hath had witness borne to him that he had been well pleasing unto God.

Gen. V. 24. And Enoch walked with God, and he was not, for God took him.

Heb. XI. 7. By faith Noah, being warned of God concerning things not seen as yet, moved with godly fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house.

Gen. VI - VII. The account of Noah building and entering the Ark.

Heb. XI. 8, 9. By faith Abraham when he was called, obeyed to go out unto a place which he was to receive for an inheritance; and he went out, not knowing whither he went. By faith he became a sojourner in the land of promise, as in a land not his own, dwelling in tents, with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise.

Gen. XII. 1. Now the Lord said unto Abram. Get thee out of thy country and from thy kindred, and from thy father's

house, unto the land that I will shew thee.

also Gen. XXIII. 4. I am a stranger and a sojourner with you.

Heb. XI. 12. Wherefore also there sprang of one, and him as good as dead, so many as the stars of the heaven in multitude, and as the sand which is by the sea-shore innumerable.

Gen. XXII. 17. That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven and as the sand which is on the sea-shore.

Heb. XI. 13. These all died in faith, not having received the promises but having seen them and greeted them from afar, and having confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth.

Gen. XXIII. 4. I am a stranger and a sojourner with you.

Heb. XI. 17. By faith Abraham, being tried offered up Isaac.

Gen. XXII. 1 f. And it came to pass after these things, that God did prove Abraham and said unto him, Abraham, and he said, Here am I. And he said, Take now thy son, thine only son whom thou lovest, even Isaac, and get thee unto the land of Moriah, and offer him there for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of.

Heb. XI. 20. By faith Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau, even concerning things to come.

Gen. XXVII. The account of Isaac blessing Jacob and Esau.

Heb. XI. 21. By faith Jacob, when he was a dying, blessed each of the sons of Joseph, and worshipped, leaning upon the top of his staff.

Gen. XLVII. 31. differs from Hebr. *καὶ προσεκύνησεν Ἰσραὴλ ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥαβδου αὐτοῦ. (LXX)*

Heb. XI. 21. By faith Jacob when he was a dying, blessed each of the sons of Joseph, and worshipped, leaning upon the top of his staff.

Gen. XLVIII. 16, 20. The angel which hath redeemed me from all evil bless the lads.

And he blessed them that day saying, In thee shall Israel bless...

Heb. XI. 22. By faith Joseph when his end was nigh, made mention of the departure of the children of Israel, and gave commandment concerning his bones.

Gen. I. 24. And Joseph said unto his brethren, I die; but God will surely visit you, and bring you up out of this land unto the land which he sware to Abraham to Isaac and to Jacob.

Heb. XI. 23. By faith Moses, when he was born, was hid three months by his parents, because they saw he was a

goodly child; and they were not afraid of the King's commandment.

Exod. II. 2, 11. And the woman conceived and bare a son; and when she saw him that he was a goodly child, she hid him three months.

And it came to pass in those days, when Moses was grown up, that he went out unto his brethren, and looked on their burdens.

Heb. XI. 28. By faith he kept the passover and the sprinkling of the blood, that the destroyer of the first born should not touch them.

Exod. XII. 21 f. Then Moses called for all the elders of Israel, and said unto them, Draw out, and take you lambs according to your families, and kill the passover. And ye shall take a bunch of hyssop and dip it in the blood that is in the bason, and strike the lintel and the two side-posts with the blood that is in the bason.

Heb. XII. 3. For consider him that hath endured such gainsaying of sinners against themselves, that ye wax not weary, fainting in your souls.

Numb. XVI. 38. Even the censers of these sinners against their own lives.

Heb. XII. 15. Looking carefully lest there be any man that falleth short of the grace of God; lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble you, and thereby the many be defiled.

Deut. XXIX. 18. Lest there should be among you man or woman or family or tribe, whose heart turneth away this day from the Lord our God, to go to serve the gods of those nations; lest there be among you a root that beareth gall and wormwood.

Heb. XII. 16. Lest there be any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau who for one mess of meat sold his own birthright.

Gen. XXV. 33. And Jacob said to him, swear to me this day, and he sware unto him, and he sold his birthright unto Jacob.

Heb. XII. 18. For ye are not come unto a mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, and unto blackness and darkness and tempest.

Deut. IV. 11. And ye came near and stood under the mountain and the mountain burned with fire unto the heart of heaven with darkness cloud and thick darkness. And the Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire; ye heard the voice of words, but ye saw no form, only ye heard a voice.

Heb. XII. 19... and the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words; which voice they that heard entreated that no word more should be spoken unto them.

Deut. V. 23, 25. And it came to pass when ye heard the voice out of the midst of the darkness, while the mountain did burn with fire, that ye came near unto me....

..... for this great fire will consume us: if we hear the voice of the Lord our God any more, then we shall die.

Heb. XII. 21. And so fearful was the appearance that Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake.

Deut. IX. 18. And I fell down before Jehovah as at the first, forty days and nights.

Heb. XII. 24... the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better than that of Abel.

Gen. IV. 10. And he said, what hast thou done? The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground.

Heb. XII. 29. For our God is a consuming fire.

Deut. IV. 24. For the Lord thy God is a devouring fire, a jealous God.

Heb. XIII. 2. Forget not to show love to strangers, for thereby some have entertained angels unawares.

Gen. XVII - XIX. The story of Abraham entertaining the three men who went on to Sodom and saved Lot and his house.

Heb. XIII. 11, 13. For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the holy place by the High Priest as an offering for sin, are burned without the camp.

Let us therefore go forth unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach.

Lev. XVI. 27. And the bullock of the sin offering, and the goat of the sin-offering whose blood was brought in

to make atonement in the holy place, shall be carried forth without the camp; and they shall burn in the fire their skins, and their flesh, and their dung.

Heb. XIII. 15. Through him then let us offer up a sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of lips which make confession to his name.

Lev. VII. 12. If he offer it for thanksgiving, then he shall offer with the sacrifice of thanksgiving unleavened cakes mingled with oil.

Next to the Pentateuch, the Book of Psalms is most frequently quoted in our Epistle. We have eleven quotations from it and two allusions to it. They are taken from the Greek Psalter, and the frequency with which the author quotes and refers to the Psalter throughout the epistle testifies to his own and the readers' familiarity with the book. The Psalter was to them the book of common devotion.

The following are the quotations in the order in which they occur in the Epistle.

- | | | | |
|--------------|--------|--------------------|--|
| Heb. I. 5. | quotes | Psalms II. 7. | Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee. |
| Heb. I. 7. | " | Psalms CIV. 4. | Who maketh winds his messengers flames of fire his ministers. |
| Heb. I. 8 f. | " | Psalms XLV. 6. ff. | Thy throne, O God is for ever and ever. A sceptre of equity is the sceptre of thy Kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness and hated wickedness. Therefore God, thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. |

- Heb. I. 10 ff. quotes Psalm CII. 25 ff. Thou Lord, in the beginning didst lay the foundation of the earth and the heavens are the works of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou continuest. And they shall all wax old as doth a garment, and as a mantle thou shalt roll them up as a garment, and they shall be changed, but thou art the same.
- Heb. I. 13. " Psalm CX. 1. Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool.
- Heb. II. 6 ff. " Psalm VIII. 4 ff. What is man, that thou art mindful of him? and the Son of Man that thou visitest him? For thou hast made him but little lower than God. (In Epistle to Hebrews 'lower than angels' LXX). And crownest him with glory and honour. Thou makest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands. Thou hast put all things under his feet.
- Heb. II. 11 ff. " Psalm XXII. 22. I will declare thy name unto my brethren. In the midst of the assembly will I praise thee.
- Heb. III. 7 ff.)
also IV. 1-3) " Psalm XCV. 7 ff. To-day, Oh that ye would hear his voice. Harden not your hearts as at Meribah as in the days of Massah in the wilderness when your fathers tempted me, proved me and saw my work. Forty years long was I grieved with that generation, and said, it is a people, that do err in their heart, and they have not known my ways. Wherefore I swear in my wrath that they should not enter into my rest.

- Heb. V. 6. quotes Psalm CX. 4. Jehovah hath sworn, and will not repent, thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.
- Heb. X. 5. " Psalm XL. 6 ff. Sacrifice and offering thou hast no delight in; mine ears hast thou opened; burnt offering and sin offering hast thou not required. Then said I, Lo I am come, in the roll of the book it is written of me. I delight to do thy will. The Author of Hebrews follows LXX.—
ὡμῶν δὲ κατὰ τὴν τῶν ψαλμῶν.

The following are the two allusions to the Psalms.

- Heb. XI. 26. alludes to Psalm LXIX. 9. The reproaches of them that reproach thee have fallen upon me.
- Heb. XII. 14. " Psalm XXXIV. 14. Depart from evil, and do good, seek peace, and pursue it.

In Hebrews we have only four quotations from the prophetic books — one each from Isaiah, Jeremiah, Habakkuk, and Haggai.

- Heb. II. 13. quotes from Isaiah VIII. 17. And I will wait for Jehovah that hideth his face from the house of Jacob, and I will look for him. Behold I and the children whom Jehovah hath given me are for signs and wonders.
- Heb. VIII. 8. " Jeremiah XXXI. 31 f. Behold the days come saith Jehovah, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah. Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt (N.B. different in LXX.)

- Heb. XII. 21. quotes from Haggai II. 6. For thus saith Jehovah of hosts, yet once, it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens and the earth and the sea and the dry land.
- Heb. X. 37. " " Habakkuk II. 3 f. For the vision is yet for the appointed time and it hasteth towards the end, and shall not lie, though it tarry, wait for it, because it will surely come, it will not delay... but the righteous shall live by his faith.

In the course of the Epistle the author alludes ten times to passages in the prophets.

- Heb. II. 16. alludes to Isaiah XLI. 8 ff. But thou Israel, my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend.
- Heb. V. 9. " " Isaiah XLVI. 7. But Israel shall be saved by Jehovah with an everlasting salvation.
- Heb. IX. 28. " " Isaiah LIII. 12. ... he bare the sin of many and made intercession for the transgressors.
- Heb. X. 27. " " Isaiah XXVI. 11. Jehovah thy hand is lifted up, yet they see not, but they shall see thy zeal for the people and be put to shame, yea fear shall devour thy adversaries.
- Heb. X. 37. " " Isaiah XXVI. 20. Come my people, enter thou into thy chambers, and shut thy doors about thee, hide thyself for a little moment, until the indignation be overpast.

- Heb. XII. 12. alludes to Isaiah XXXV. 3. Strengthen ye the weak hands and confirm the feeble knees.
- Heb. XIII. 20. " " Isaiah LXIII. 11, LV. 3. Where is he that brought them up out of the sea with the shepherds of his flock? Incline your ear and come unto me, hear and your soul shall live and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David.
- Heb. XI. 33. " " Daniel VI. 22. My God hath sent his angels, and hath shut the lions' mouths and they have not hurt me.
- Heb. XIII. 15. " " Hosea XIV. 2. Take with you words and return unto Jehovah: say unto him; take away all iniquity, and accept that which is good, so will we render as bullocks the offering of our lips.
- Heb. XIII. 20 " " Zechariah IX. 11. As for thee also because of the blood of thy covenant, I have set free thy prisoners from the pit wherein is no water.
- Proverbs is once quoted in XII. 5. My son, regard not lightly the chastening of the Lord...
Prov. III. 11 ff.
- And there is one allusion to Prov. IV. 26. in Heb. XII. 13 - Make level the path of thy feet and let all thy ways be established.
- There is only one quotation from the historical books of the Old Testament.
- Heb. I. 5. quotes II. Samuel VII. 14. I will be his Father, and he shall be my son.

As Westcott¹⁰ points out, some striking facts emerge from an examination of the use made of the Old Testament in the Epistle. The Pentateuch and the Psalms are the favourite sources of quotation and allusions.

According to tradition the whole Pentateuch was given to Moses by God on Sinai, and whenever the law was read, the voice that spoke to the people in and through it was the voice of God.

Portions of the Pentateuch were read in the synagogues on the Sabbath, and on Holydays, and other stated times of the year. In this way the Torah became the property of the whole people of Israel. Every Jew became versed in its contents. Josephus¹¹ ascribes the origin of the custom of assembling to hear the Law to Moses, the Lawgiver himself. The book of Acts (XV 21) also ascribes the custom to Moses, and it is thus clear that in the minds of the Jews the custom had behind it the authority of no less a person than the Lawgiver himself.¹²

In this way the Law became the standard with which life in its different aspects was to conform. In the Law there were enactments relating to civil and criminal Law, as well as moral, religious and ceremonial enactments. The author of Hebrews does not concern himself with the civil and moral side of the Law; the aspect of the Law he brings into

10. See Epistle to Heb. p. 472 f.

11. Contra Apionem II. 17. See also Companion to the Bible ed. T.W. Manson p. 455-6.

12. See Jewish Encyclopedia. vol. VII. p. 647 f.

the forefront all through the epistle is the ritual aspect, the Law as a constitution under which the people worshipped. Jesus Christ, the founder of the New Covenant is contrasted with Moses the founder of the old. Certain circumstances and incidents attendant upon the establishing of the old covenant are related - Moses on the mount beholding a pattern of the Tabernacle, the sprinkling of the people with blood in order to ratify the covenant, the people forbidden to touch the mountain on peril of death.

The order of Priesthood to which Jesus belongs is "the order of Melchizedek," the King Priest of whom the people had read in Genesis.

Reference is made to the solemn rites of the Day of Atonement. As Aaron, with the blood of the sin-offering of the Atonement entered once in the year into the Holy of Holies, so Christ the Great High Priest has entered into the very presence of God having made the final sacrifice for sin. The author thinks of the Person and Work of Christ in terms of the Mosaic mode of worship. Worship is a drawing near to God to commune with Him. Sin hinders communion, and separates man from God. In the Mosaic Tabernacle the High Priest's task was to offer sacrifice for sin, so that the broken communion of the people with God could be restored. The Levitical priests performed this much for the people year in year out.

But what they did for the people was not adequate to remove the barrier which sin raised between them and God. The blood of bulls and goats could never cleanse the conscience, it served only "to sanctify unto the cleanness of the flesh" (IX. 13). But Christ the High Priest after the order of Melchizedek who by eternal spirit offers his own blood on the altar is able to remove sin, and cleanse the conscience from dead works to serve the living God. The Levitical ordinances pointed to something beyond themselves which they could not effect for the people. The inadequacy and failure of the Levitical priesthood was made perfect in the Melchizedek Priest and through him men have access to God, for sin is put away through His sacrifice. This is the theme followed all through the epistle, and the ground on which the exhortation is based - Christ is "such a High Priest who has sat down on the right hand of the throne of the majesty in the heavens" (VIII. 1.), therefore "let us draw near with a true heart in fullness of faith" (X. 23).

The author makes use of the history of the people of God as recorded in the Pentateuch for the purpose of warning and exhortation. In Chapter III. he reminds his readers how many of those who came out of Egypt fell in the wilderness before reaching the rest of Canaan. Their disobedience and unbelief deprived them of the rest when they were standing on

the very threshold of Canaan. Having warned the readers against unbelief, and its terrible consequence, he exhorts them not to be hardened by the deceitfulness of sin, but while it is called 'To-day' to become partakers in the Christ, (*Τοῦ Χρῆστοῦ*) of whom they have read in the Old Testament as the hope of their fathers.¹³

In Genesis we read that as a result of Adam's sin, the earth became cursed, and brought forth thorns and thistles. The consequences of sin are always the same, our author repeats to his readers. "The land which hath drunk the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them for whose sake it is also tilled receiveth blessing from God. But if it beareth thorns and thistles, it is rejected and nigh unto a curse, whose end is to be burned." (VI. 7-8) Shrinking from the terrible thought that such will be their end, (they who have been enlightened *φωτισθέντες* who were made partakers of the Holy Spirit and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the age to come), he re-assures himself, and writes that he is persuaded better things of them, and things that will lead them forward unto full salvation.

He quotes from ^{the} Pentateuch for didactic purpose. In order to prove the vast superiority of Jesus Christ as High

13. See Westcott Ep. to Hebrews p. 86.

Priest to the Levitical High Priests, the author takes his readers to the book of Genesis to Melchizedek, King of Salem, and Priest of God Most High. He is a greater Priest than Levi. To him Abraham himself the great father of the race, gave tithe of the choicest spoils. The tribe of Levi according to the Mosaic Law, had the right to receive tithes from the other tribes. It was the priestly tribe. But Melchizedek did not count his ancestry from the tribe of Levi, and yet he received tithe from Abraham, and gave him a blessing. By common consent, states the author, "the less is blessed of the better."¹⁴ Again, no one of the tribe of Levi is able to remain always in the office of High Priest, for death removes him and his place is filled by another. But Melchizedek, who received the tithe from Abraham is one who, according to the testimony of Scripture, lives for ever. The author of Hebrews goes a step further, and states that Levi himself, the tithe-receiver, in Abraham paid tithe to the High Priest Melchizedek. Now Jesus Christ is a priest after the order of Melchizedek. It was a well known fact to them all that he was not a member of the tribe of Levi; and as belonging to the order of Melchizedek he remains a priest forever.

14. Heb. VII. 7.

The vast majority of the allusions to the Pentateuch are made by the author in the contrast he draws between the worship of the Old Covenant and that of the New. He describes the Tabernacle, built according to the pattern shown Moses in the Mount and the gifts and sacrifices offered in it by the priests. A minute description is given of the solemn rites of the Day of Atonement. Over against the old he sets forth the new, the mode of worship and approach to God which has become possible in Jesus Christ the Melchizedek High Priest. Jesus Christ takes the worshipper into God's very presence, and thus fulfils all a priesthood was meant to do.

By demonstrating to his readers the defects of the old covenant, and how Christ fulfilled all that a priest was meant to do, he establishes, not only the superiority of the new covenant to the old, but the finality and perfection of the revelation given in Jesus Christ.

Finally in Chapter XII. 18 ff. in words charged with deep and earnest concern about the step his readers will take, he seeks to impress upon them how tremendous the issue of their choice will be. In the present crisis he warns them that they have not come near Mount Sinai, "a mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, and unto blackness and darkness...."

terrible though that experience had been to the people of old, but now they stand near to Sion, the mount and city of the living God, Jerusalem in heaven above. The two dispensations are contrasted - the first sensible and very awful in the manifestations of God, but the second supersensible and heavenly, and gathering together in one all things that can be named realities. Here we have the author's grand finale to all the exhortations throughout the epistle. If they escaped not who refused to hear God speaking in the revelation given on Mount Sinai, how shall they escape who turn away from him who now speaks from heaven?¹⁵

They are now living in the new age, under the new covenant, the Mediator of which is Jesus, whose "blood of sprinkling speaketh better than that of Abel."¹⁶ The blood of Jesus still speaks, it is his "life" given for men, Westcott¹⁷ points out that the thought of the blood as the life, and still living, finds expression in the record of the death of Abel in Gen. IV. 10 - "The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground." 'The voice of the blood of Jesus' is doubly contrasted with the voice of the blood of Abel. That, appealing to God, called for vengeance, and making itself heard in the heart of Cain brought despair; but the blood of Christ pleads with God for forgiveness, and

-
15. See Davidson's Hebrews (Handbooks for Bible Classes) pp. 242-244.
 16. Heb. XII. 24.
 17. Epistle to Hebrews p. 417.

speaks peace to man. The blood that is the abiding virtue of Christ's offered life is in heaven, inseparable from the glorified King and Priest.¹⁸

Another of the personages of the Pentateuch to whom reference is made for the purpose of warning and exhortation is Esau. He is the type of the profane *βέβηλος* person, who recognises nothing as higher than earth, the word sacred has no meaning for him, and he is devoted to earthly pursuits, having no love or appreciation for what is noble and spiritual. Esau in order to satisfy an immediate appetite sold his birthright. "His birthright embraced not merely rights which primogeniture gave him to possessions, but the right that the spiritual blessings of the covenant should descend to him, and through him to the world."¹⁹ The author foresees clearly the terrible danger of his readers bartering their inheritance as people of the new covenant for something that is quite as paltry and worthless as Esau's 'one mess of meat'. In his discussion of Esau's selling his birthright, H. Appel suggests that the author here has in view the fatal significance of the cult meal for the Jewish Christians living in that time of persecution. "He warns the readers from the example of Esau, who cast away his birthright for a meal. ^{For} ~~For~~ in XII. 23 he regards the Christians as firstborn, and participation at a single meal could be disastrous to their ^{birthright.} ~~faith.~~"²⁰

18. Westcott Ibid. p. 417. cf. Davidson Hebrews p. 249.

19. Davidson's Hebrews p. 241.

20. H. Appel Enleitung in das Neue Testament 93.

The author goes to the Psalms for many of his quotations on the Person and work of Christ. The Psalms were widely used in the services both of the Temple and Synagogues. Professor Snaith²¹ remarks that the Psalter must have been extensively used, and that it is probable, that as we have it now it was formed expressly for Temple use. Wherever the readers of our Epistle dwelt, they would be familiar with the Psalter, and when the author draws his proofs and illustrations from it, he is drawing from a book that was both familiar and dear to his readers.

At the very beginning of the Epistle the divine Sonship of Christ is proclaimed. To establish this point he turns to Psalm II. 7. "Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee."

Again he cites Psalm XLV. 6 ff. to demonstrate Christ the Son of God as the sovereign of the divine Kingdom. "Of the Son, he saith,

Thy throne O God, is for ever and ever;
 And the sceptre of uprightness, is the sceptre of
 thy Kingdom.
 Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity;
 Therefore God thy God hath anointed thee
 With the oil of gladness above thy fellows.
 (I. 8 -10)

As in the quotation from Psalm II our Lord's inheritance of the name Son is illustrated from passages in which that title is given to anointed, so in the passage from Psalm XLV. the attributes of a King who is addressed as God are assigned to the Son.

21. Companion to the Bible ed. T.W. Manson. 443.

In the quotation from Psalm CII

Thou Lord, in the beginning hast laid the
foundation of the earth.....(I. 10 f.)

the attributes of Him who is Lord God of Israel are associated with the Son. As creator he is superior to creation, while nature decays, the Son as the 'very image of His substance' abides.

The superiority of the Son to the angels is established by the application to the Son of words from Psalm CX which dominates in the Epistle:-

Sit thou on my right hand
Till I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet.(I.13)

The Son is exalted to a position of equality with God the Father in Kingly rule. In X. 12, "When he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God," the Son's co-equality with God is reiterated.

The Christ as Priest is presented in the words of Psalm CX. 4. "So Christ also glorified not himself to be made a High Priest, but he that spake unto Him, Thou art my Son,"

This day have I begotten thee (Ps. II. 7.)

as he saith also in another place,

Thou art a priest for ever,
After the order of Melchizedek"(Ps.CX.4) Heb.V. 5 ff.

In the first place the words of these two Psalms referred to the "Christs" of the Old Testament, but now attention is concentrated on the consummator of their Christhood.²² The words speak to the Son who is now the

22. See Nairne Hebrews Cambridge Bible p. 37.

Priest-King. Echoes of this Psalm are heard throughout the epistle - I. 3, V. 6, 10; VI, 20; VII. 11, 15, 17, 21, 24, 28; VIII. 1; X. 12 f; XII. 2.

Jesus fulfils the destiny of man. Psalm VIII speaks of the grandeur of creation, and the frailty and littleness of man. But in Genesis I. 26, God had promised man dominion over all the creatures of creation, and had created him in his own image. -

Thou madest him a little lower than the angels (LXX)
 (Hebrew - than God\$ אֱלֹהִים)
 Thou crownest him with glory and honour.
 And didst set him over the works of thy hands.
 Thou didst put all things in subjection under his feet.

Man's subjection to the angels is only temporary, for man will be crowned with glory and honour. But as yet we do not see man arrived at his destiny, but we do now see Jesus, who was like man, made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death crowned with glory and honour. That which the Psalm predicts of man, has been fulfilled in Jesus who is the Son of God made man, and he is the captain ἀρχηγός who leads men to where he himself is.²³

23. Some scholars see in Psalm VIII a direct prophecy of Jesus. "This it might well enough be in itself, but several things are against it, 1 - an exclamation of wonder ver. 6. (of chapter II) that God should be mindful of his Son is not conceivable. 2 - the insertion of the explanatory name ver. 9. is without meaning, if the him in the preceding clause "We see not yet all things put under him" already referred to the son. This is so much felt that Lunemann naively remarks that the word Jesus might have been omitted. 3 - There is also in the words "Many sons to glory" ver. 10. an undoubted return upon "glory and honour" ver. 7. (Davidson's Hebrews P. 62 footnote).

Jesus the Son of God identifies himself with men.

"Both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren." (II. 11.)²⁴ The word 'one' in this connection is to be taken as God. The "Many sons" are brought into glory by the Captain of their salvation who is Son of God, and the relation in which the son stands to them is brother. Psalm XXII. 22-

I will declare thy name unto my brethren,
In the midst of the congregation will I sing praise unto thee.

These words are taken as directly prophetic, expressing already in the Old Testament the relation between the Christ and those he saves, and their common relation to God. Those who believe in Christ are his brethren, fellow members of one great congregation.

The quotation from Psalm XL. 6 ff. presents Jesus Christ as the ideal priest offering the ideal sacrifice. The efficacious sacrifice of the Christ is placed in contrast with the inefficacy of the Levitical sacrifices. The Psalm contains the reflection of some Old Testament Saint (believed by some to be David towards the close of his persecution by Saul, when the promised Kingdom was now in near view. Westcott Hebrews p. 307-8) on the inadequacy of the Levitical sacrifices, and his belief that no offering of that which is external to the

24. See Davidson's Hebrew P. 66.

worshipper can constitute the true and real offering of man to God. The Psalmist will no longer bring sacrifice and offerings and burnt offerings because God desires them not. But with God's law within his heart he will come with the one offering in which God delights - the performance of God's will.

As Davidson²⁵ remarks, in the Psalm the contrast is between animal offerings and obedience to the will of God. But in Hebrews X. 5 ff. the sense is somewhat different. The contrast here is between animal offerings, and the offering of Himself by the Son. "A body hast thou prepared for me"²⁶ and through this he can do God's will. The animals of sacrifice, and the fruits of the earth in the offerings are all external to him, and on that account are inadequate as the means of expressing his consecration to do the will of God. The utter consecration of his will to God finds expression in the dedication of his body.

To the author of Hebrews these words in the Psalm are the words of the Son coming into the world, and they express the mind and will of the Son as he came into the world. He is himself the Priest and victim. He offers not beasts or the fruit of the earth, but his own body, and by his own blood inaugurates the new covenant.

Turning to the books of the prophets of the Old

25. Davidson Hebrews P. 193.

26. This differs from Hebrew which reads "ears hast thou opened for me." See Westcott Hebrews P. 308.

Testament we see that the author of Hebrews makes sparing use of them. He quotes once from each of the following books, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Habakkuk. Dwelling as he does on the inefficacy of the ritual sacrifices, and their endless, almost tiresome repetition, we might have expected him to quote from some of the passages in the prophets which attack vehemently the endless sacrifices offered by the people, e.g. Isaiah I. 10 ff, Amos V. 21-27. But there is no quotation from or allusion to such passages, the use he makes of the symbolism of worship under the Mosaic Law is essentially distinct.

The book of Ezekiel, the prophet whose aim was to restore the full worship of the temple after the exile does not claim a single quotation or allusion throughout the Epistle.

It is very surprising that the author of Hebrews has not drawn much more from Isaiah LIII. In IX. 28 the phrase *εἰς τὸ μολῶν ἀνευθεῖν διαρκῆς* derives from Isaiah LIII, but there is no further use made of this chapter, much as we would think it to suit the argument of Hebrews.

From the book of Jeremiah he derives a passage which is one of the most important in the whole argument of the Epistle - Jer. XXXI. 31 ff. The first covenant was not faultless, and was destined to give place to a new and better covenant. As early as Jeremiah's day, a new covenant is

mentioned, and the first is even then characterised as old. Jesus Christ inaugurates the new and better covenant, and through him the blessings of the new covenant become available to men.

On a review of the Old Testament passages in the Epistles, whether quotations or allusions, we see that they are the foundation stones on which the author builds the super-structure of the whole epistle. The principal topics discussed in the Epistle are, the coming of another priesthood (VII); a more perfect sanctuary (VIII. 1-6. IX. 1-10); a better sacrifice (XI. 18); a new covenant (VIII. 7-13) and the 'rest' (III) that awaits the people of God, and to establish each of these, the author reasons on the Old Testament. On the pages of the Old Testament the author saw the revelation of God which was preparatory to the full revelation which has been given in the Son. *πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως πάλαι ὁ θεὸς λαλοῦσας τοῖς πατέράσιν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις... ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν υἱῷ* The three great personages of the former revelation are given - Abraham, who received the promises (VI. 13. VII. 1 ff); Moses, who received the Law (III. 2 ff. VII. 14; VIII. 5; IX. 19; X. 28; XII. 21) and David the King. from whose house the Messiah was to come (IV. 7). In Chapter XI. the author gives an account of all the heroes of faith from Abraham the father of the nation down to the time of the Maccabean martyrs, men who had struggled against the

powers of darkness believing that God would fulfil the promises. In Jeremiah when the nation was cast down and in despair, there was given the promise of a new covenant, which would bring a complete forgiveness, and personal communion with God. In the revelation of the Old Testament there was a perpetual looking forward. In Jesus Christ the Son of God, all the expectations stirred up in men's hearts by the Old Testament revelation, have been fulfilled, men now live under the new covenant, in the new age, inaugurated by Jesus Christ the Son of God as the full and final revealer of God.

CHRIST AND ANGELS.

[In the opening verses of the Proem of his Epistle, the author gives a summary of the main subject - the finality of the absolute Revelation in Christ as contrasted with the preparatory revelation under the old covenant. For the recipients who were Jews, the whole of the Old Testament Scriptures was the word of God and in it was God revealed. The part of the Old Testament held in the highest esteem and most frequently consulted as the revelation of God's will to men was the Pentateuch with the Law of Moses. And the opening words of this epistle falling on the ears of its recipients could not fail at once to take their minds to the Law - God had spoken in the prophets to the fathers. Most unmistakeable of all had God's voice been heard by Moses on Mount Sinai, when He gave the Law to His people. Westcott maintains²⁷ the title prophets in this context is used in its widest sense as it is applied to Abraham (Gen. XX. 7) to Moses (Deut. XXXIV. 10) to David (Acts. II. 30) and generally to those inspired by God.

Moses is implicitly termed a prophet in Deuteronomy, (ref. above), "And there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face."

The revelation given to the fathers is described as piecemeal. There were many human agents ^{through} whom God used to reveal himself to man - the Law was given through Moses,

27. Westcott Ep. to Hebrews p. 6.
also Bruce Ep. to Hebrews p. 27-8.

chroniclers gave the history of Israel, and the way God dealt with Israel, poets gave the songs of the Sanctuary, the prophecies of the Messiah were given by Isaiah and Jeremiah and other prophets. All these contributions summed together do not give a complete revelation of God, all the fragments do not make a whole. The full and final revelation is made in a 'a Son'. In the language of St. John "the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father. He hath declared Him." (St. John I. 18.) The superiority of Jesus Christ as Revealer of God is made to rest on the foundation of his 'Sonship'. All the other agents of revelation - Moses, the prophets and even the angels cannot share the status of sonship with Christ, they are on a lower plane. Hence the revelation they have brought has not the character of absoluteness and finality which belongs to Christ's revelation. Although the author, for the sake of his argument, is constantly comparing and contrasting the revelation given in Christ, and the revelation given in the Old Testament, especially in the Mosaic Law, he makes it clear that it is God who is revealing Himself in both dispensations. "The Unity of the Revealer is the pledge and ground of the unity of the revelation, however it may be communicated."²⁸ God is the author of revelation in

28. Westcott Ep. to Hebrews p. 5.



the old dispensation and in the new, and the new revelation in Christ is thus a continuation of the old. God spoke in the prophets *ἐν τοῖς προφήταις* and God hath now spoken 'in a Son' *ἐν υἱῷ*.

The attributes ascribed to the Son in the Proem fit Him to be the full and final revealer of God's mind. The first attribute is that of heirship - *κληρονόμων πάντων*. The Son is heir, and all things exist for him.²⁹ Following on this we are told that by Him, God made the worlds. It is very likely that the author here is influenced by the Logos idea. He makes the Son, as the Logos, the Divine idea of the world, its rational basis. He is the ideal origin of the world, as well as the world aim. Next the Son is said to be the effulgence *ἀπαύλασμα*, of God's glory and the exact image *ὁμοεικής* of His essence, and He upholds all things by the word of His power. No previous agent used by God to reveal Himself ever possessed these attributes. The Son when He speaks for God, eclipses all other speakers, and it is the Son of God Himself, the author tells his readers, who "having made purification for Sin - a work which the Law and its ordinances could not effect - hath sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." This phrase about the 'purification of sins' prepares us for the main thought of the Epistle - the

29. Bruce Ep. to Hebrews p. 36 f.

High Priestly work of Christ. As High Priest Christ has performed once and for all *ἑφάπαξ* what the Levitical High Priest could not do. Now that His work as High Priest is complete, He has taken his seat at the right hand of the Majesty. The Priests of the Tabernacle and Temple always stood in the performance of their office, "and every Priest indeed standeth day by day ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices.... but he, when he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God." (Heb. X. 11-12)

In the Textus Receptus of Heb. I. 3, the means of purification are specified - *δι' ἑαυτοῦ καθαρισμὸν ποιησάμενος τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν*, when he had by Himself purged our sins. But the best codices *Ⲙ A B* omit the words *δι' ἑαυτοῦ* which are, no doubt, a gloss to make the thought suggested by the middle *ποιησάμενος* more distinct. It was quite natural for these words to be entered into the text by a reader, for they emphasise one of the leading ideas of the Epistle, viz: that Christ's offering as High Priest was Himself, and not any victim such as a sheep or goat, which was the offering made by the High Priest in the Tabernacle in the Temple. But as Bruce points out³⁰ "The writer was too skilful a master of the art of persuasion to bring in so distinctive, and for his

30. Bruce Ep. to Hebrews p. 42.

readers, so difficult a truth, before he could make more of it than was possible at the outset. Therefore he contents himself with stating Christ's priestly achievement, in the barest terms, reserving developments for a later stage." - Heb. VIII. 3; IX. 11 f.

The author proceeds in I. 4 ff. to state the supremacy of Jesus over the angels. Jewish theology at the beginning of the Christian era assigned very high rank to angels. The growth of this reverence for angels as messengers of God can be traced from centuries before Christ. "When in the sixth century B.C. Israel came into contact with a wider world than that which she had hitherto known, she had already developed a theology which made her God, Jehovah, the Lord of the whole Universe. But that universe had grown suddenly and as a natural corollary, God had receded. Jewish thinkers, therefore, were ready to accept a doctrine of intermediate beings, standing between God and man in the cosmic order, such as that offered by Persian religion. These angels were subordinate to God, and acted as His servants; their duties including the carrying of divine messages to men. They were well recognised personalities, and even in our New Testament we can see how the early Church simply accepted the doctrine. Jesus too, was in the same sense a divine messenger and a place had to be found for Him in the celestial hierarchy."³¹ The

31. Robinson Ep. to Hebrews p. 6-7.

Gnostics argued that God is the absolute being, and therefore God cannot be the actual creator of the world. They maintained that between God and the material universe, there was a whole series of emanations, each emanation on the downward path from God less divine than the one before it. When we arrive at the material universe, the element of Divinity is entirely lost, so far removed is it from God. These emanations were the angels, and thus they were mediators between men and God. The angels were regarded as messengers or apostles from God, and reconcilers or priests for men. St. Paul in the Epistle to the Colossians rejects these ideas and it is possible that the error which St. Paul encountered in Colossae is encountered also by the author of Hebrews.

It was a common Jewish belief that the Law was ministered by angels. We find that the author of Hebrews accepts this belief - "For if the word spoken through angels proved steadfast....."(Heb. II. 2.) St. Paul also accepts this belief, "It (the Law) was ordained through angels, by the hand of a mediator."(Gal. III. 19.) Also Stephen in the book of Acts - "Ye who received the Law as it was ordained by angels" (Acts VII. 53.) This idea of the Law having been ministered by angels, first appeared in Hellenistic Judaism." Josephus (Ant. XV. 136 *ἡμῶν δὲ τὰ κάλλιστα τῶν δογμάτων καὶ τὰ ὀσιώτατα τῶν ἐν τοῖς νόμοις δι' ἀγγέλων παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ μαθόντων*) repeats this tradition, but it went back to the LXX which

altered Deut. XXXIII. 2. into a definite proof of angelic co-operation (*ἐκ σεξίων αὐτοῦ ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ*) and brought this out in Psalm LXVIII. 18"³² In Rabbinic circles this idea was elaborated, and it was commonly accepted among the Jews of the time in which Hebrews was written.

We can now see why our author dwells at such length on the superiority of Jesus over the angels. The readers must not think of Jesus as an emanation from God, having the rank of an angel. "Jesus, the Son of God, is the visible image of the invisible God, He was before all creation, and by right of primogeniture Heir of all, Creator of the highest angels, Himself being before they came into existence. Such He is before His assumption of humanity. But it pleased God that in Him, also as God-man, all the plenitude of the divine attributes should dwell, so that the Mediator is not an emanation, neither human nor Divine, but is Himself, God and man." (Col. I. 15-19)³³

The series of Old Testament texts (all from LXX-) adduced present in a most impressive way the superiority of the Son. The angels dwindle into insignificance when Christ is described as the first born of God, Himself Divine, performing creative functions, everlasting, sitting on a divine throne, victorious over all foes, and exercising righteous rule. In contrast with the Son, the angels are worshippers, "ministering

32. Moffat†Ep. to Hebrews I.C.C. p. 18.

33. T.C. Edwards Ep. to Hebrews p. 22.

spirits sent forth to do service" (I. 14) and created beings, perishable like all created beings. The author's purpose in this contrast of Jesus with the angels is to demonstrate the superiority of the Son to the angels, of Him in Whom God has spoken unto us, to the mediators through whom He gave the Law.

In the midst of this discussion on the superiority of the Son to the angels, the author brings in a word of exhortation and warning. (II. 1 f.) He reminds the readers, that the Law given through the angels, was not transgressed with impunity - 'The soul that doeth ought presumptuously the same reproacheth the Lord and that soul shall be cut off from amongst his people' (Num. XV. 30). If it was so with the revelation given through the angels, how shall we escape God's anger if we contemptuously neglect a salvation so great that no one less than the Son could have revealed it? The author in II. 3. contrasts salvation with Law. What has come to men in the revelation given in Jesus Christ is nothing less than salvation. It is God's merciful offer to men, and it is a greater sin to despise God's free and merciful offer of eternal life than it was to transgress the commandments of His justice as revealed in the Law. The Law given by angels was clearly of divine origin, and disobedience to the Law met with unsparing retribution. But the Gospel is proved to be of God by still more abundant evidence - the personal testimony of the Lord Jesus and the witness of those who heard Him - how then shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?]

JESUS CHRIST AND MOSES.

The Epistle to the Hebrews was addressed to readers who had the greatest veneration for the name of Moses, and for all they associated with his name. The whole Pentateuch was believed to have come from his hand and to him God had spoken face to face on Mount Sinai when the revelation contained in the Law was given.

In Heb. III. - IV. the author compares and contrasts Jesus Christ, the agent of the full and final revelation of God, and Moses, that great figure in the religion of the old Testament. The purpose here, as in the comparison of Jesus with the angels as agents of revelation, is to demonstrate the superiority of Jesus as the full and final revelation of God to men. Jesus Christ is in the new religion what Moses was in the old, and, as the author goes on to prove, far more besides.

Dwelling on the relation between Jesus and Moses in the new and old dispensations, many parallels are seen in their lives. Both in the days of their childhood had to be protected from violent hands that would put them to death. Moses, born in the land of Egypt had to be protected from Pharaoh who was alarmed over the strength of the Israelites he kept captive in his country. Jesus Christ on the other hand, found refuge in that land of Egypt from the danger of Herod who sought to destroy Him (Math. II. 13 ff.) Both, having thus been protected from danger and death were destined to be

the deliverers of their people.

In the epistle to the Hebrews it is clear that the author is thinking of Jesus appearing on the stage of history to assume the role of Moses, to be "the Apostle and High Priest of our confession" (III. 1.) Jesus is able to carry into perfection and completion the work which Moses could not perform. The life and work of Moses are now seen as a shadow and forecast of what Jesus alone can perform for men. Moses was the Apostle and High Priest of the old religion, but Jesus of the new. "In the description of Jesus as *Τὸν Ἀπόστολον καὶ Ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν, ὁμολογία* is almost an equivalent for "our religion" as in IV. 14 (c.f. X. 23). Through the sense of a vow (LXX) or of a legal agreement (papyri and inscriptions) it had naturally passed into the Christian vocabulary as a term for the common and solemn confession or creed of faith."³⁴ The position occupied by Moses is occupied in our confession by Jesus Christ. The author calls Jesus Christ Apostle, and as Bruce remarks, "the use of this epithet in reference to our Lord is one of several indications of the fresh creative genius of the writer, and of the unconventional nature of his style."³⁵

The apostleship of Moses suggests at this point the word *ἀπόστολος* to be used of Christ. In Exod. III. 10. Moses

34. Moffatt Ep. to Heb. p. 41. also Robinson Ep. to Heb. p. 29.

35. Bruce Ep. to Heb. p. 131. also quoted by Moffatt Ep. to Heb. p. 41.

is sent to Pharaoh to negotiate the release of the children of Israel from Egypt. The LXX version runs, *καὶ νῦν δεῦρο ἀποστείλω σε πρὸς φαραῶ βασιλέα Αἰγύπτου, καὶ ἐξάξεις τὸν λαόν μου τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου.* Moses was sent forth by God to lead the Israelites out of their captivity into the Promised Land. In the fulness of time Jesus Christ is sent forth by God to redeem men from bondage to sin. Jesus Christ is Apostle in the sense that Moses was Apostle.

Moffat³⁶ maintains that the author of Hebrews avoids the use of the word *ἀπόστολος* in its ecclesiastical sense. In Heb. II. 3. the word *ἀπόστολος* is avoided to designate those who had heard the Lord. For the author *ἀπόστολος* carries the usual associations of authority. *ἀπόστολος* is Ionic for *πρεσβευτής*, not a mere envoy, but an ambassador or representative sent with powers, with authority to speak in the name of the person who has despatched him.

Also in applying the title *ἄρχιερεὺς* to Jesus Christ, the author is thinking of Moses. Moses was the founder of priesthood as it became known in Israel. "The conception of Moses as priest is apt to be overlooked in studying the early history of Israel, partly because Moses has so many other aspects, and partly because the priestly functions are more generally associated with Aaron. Yet the priesthood of Moses is fundamental. Before the appointment of Aaron (as the

36. Ibid. 41.

present form of the narrative tells us) Moses exercised the priestly functions, both in matters strictly religious and in the equally ecclesiastical role of judge."³⁷ Moses assumes the function of priest when the people are gathered before Sinai - "And the Lord said unto Moses go unto the people and sanctify them (*ἀγιάσου αὐτοὺς* LXX). Jesus Christ in Heb. II. 11. is called He that sanctifieth *ὁ ἀγιάζων*.

Moffatt³⁸ does not think that the antithesis to Moses is clearly implied in the use of *ἀρχιερεύς* for Christ, and states that while Philo³⁹ often refers to Moses as *ἀρχιερεύς* this idea is never prominent, and is never worked out in Hebrews. Westcott also commenting on *τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ καὶ ἀρχιερέα*, makes *ἀρχιερέα* refer to Aaron, "In Christ the functions of Moses and Aaron are combined"⁴⁰ It is true that when the author goes on to elaborate on the idea of the priesthood of Christ, he contrasts Christ with Aaron, but here for the moment the author is thinking of the origin of all priesthood in Israel, and that he finds in Moses.

Having introduced Jesus Christ as "Apostle and High Priest of our Confession" the author keeps the aspect of Christ as Apostle in view from III. 1 - IV. 14, at which point the aspect of Christ as High Priest, the central theme of the Epistle is taken up.

37. Robinson Ep. to Hebrews 29.

38. Moffatt Ep. to Hebrews 41.

39. e.g. de Vita Mosis II. 1. *ἔγένετο γὰρ προνοία θεοῦ βασιλεύς*

40. Westcott Ep. to Hebrews p. 74. *τὸ καὶ νομοθετὴς καὶ ἀρχιερεύς καὶ θεοφύτης.*

The parallel between Moses and Jesus Christ is first suggested in II. 10. *Τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας*, the author or captain of their salvation. The word *ἀρχηγός* is a "romantic" title which sounds an echo of soldiership as well as plain sense of "beginner."⁴¹ Moffatt emphasizes the idea of originator or personal source which the word conveys.⁴² It is quite clear that the author has the history of the ancient people of God in mind. As the Israelites had for their *ἀρχηγός* Moses, to guide and lead them in their march from the land of bondage to Canaan, so now the subjects of the greater salvation have their *ἀρχηγός* who conducts them to their better inheritance. The great historical type of God's work of redemption was the deliverance of Israel from Egypt, and that deliverance is in the author's mind as he presents to his readers the Captain of salvation under the new dispensation.

The author's purpose in this section which refers to Moses is, as in the section which refers to the angels, to demonstrate the superiority of Jesus. Moses had been appointed by God to found the Jewish Theocracy and Jesus to found the Kingdom of God. Having established the superiority of Jesus to the angels, it might have seemed unnecessary to establish again the superiority of Jesus to Moses. "But the position of Moses in regard to the actual Jewish system, made it

41. Nairne Epistle of Priesthood p. 408.

42. Moffatt Ep. to Heb. p. 31.

necessary in view of the difficulties of Hebrew Christians, to develop the truth independently. And further, the exact comparison is not between Moses and Christ, but between Moses and Jesus. Moses occupied a position which no other man occupied (Num. XII. 6 ff). He was charged to found a Theocracy, a Kingdom of God. In this respect it became necessary to regard him side by side with Christ in His humanity, with the Son, who was the Son of Man no less than the Son of God. In the Apocalypse the victorious believers 'sing the song of Moses and the Lamb.'⁴³ (Apoc. XV. 3.)⁴³

In the parallel the author runs between Jesus and Moses, the followers of the Captains of salvation are thought of as *μέτοχοι*, fellows, or according to other commentators, partakers. In III. 1. the author addressed his readers as *κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι*. How natural, that in a passage which runs a parallel between Moses and Jesus Christians should be thought of as the companions or comrades of the New Testament Captain of Salvation, just as the sons of Israel were the companions of Moses in the march through the wilderness to the promised land.⁴⁴ Bruce⁴⁵ maintains that in III. 1. as in I. 9 *μέτοχοι* is used in reference to a person, the Christ, and can therefore be translated fellows, or

43. Westcott Ep. to Hebrews p. 72.

44. Bruce Ep. to Hebrews p. 148.

45. Ibid. 147.

companions, rather than 'partakers of', which meaning the word bears when it is used with reference to things. Westcott⁴⁶ adopts 'partakers of' - Vulgate *participes* - to render *μέτοχοι* and distinguishes the word from *κοινωνός* which suggests the idea of personal fellowship, *μέτοχοι* describes participation in some common blessing or privilege, or the like. The bond of union lies in that which is shared, and not in the persons themselves. When we view Christ as a compendium of salvation, in which the Hebrew Christians share, in the same way as Moses' followers shared in the redemption wrought by him, the rendering 'partakers of' seems to be adequate. But in the context, when the author goes on to speak of the Christians as God's house and addresses them as Holy brethren, the rendering, 'fellows' is to be preferred. The Israelites in the wilderness were the fellows and companions of Moses, although many of them did not remain faithful to the end as Caleb and Joshua did. Those who have given their allegiance to Jesus, the Captain of Salvation under the new dispensation, are likewise His 'fellows'. But the author is aware of the terrible danger of some of them falling off like the Israelites in the wilderness, thereby denying the significance of the title conferred upon them. Only those who hold fast the beginning of their confidence steadfast unto the end are the *μέτοχοι* of Christ in truth. The author sees a striking resemblance between the

46. Westcott Ep. to Hebrews p. 73.

situation of the 'Hebrews' whom he addresses, and that of the Israelites of old. The Israelites had entered into covenant relationship with God, and had been sanctified (Exod. XIX.10-15). The Law had been revealed to them, and from Mount Sinai they had set out in order to attain the rest that was promised to them. Their Captain was Moses who was faithful in all God's house (Num. XII. 7.). The readers of Hebrews have likewise dedicated themselves to the service of Christ, and as Holy Brethren have set out on their course to follow Him who is the Captain of their salvation. From this course there must be no turning back, or flinching - the fate of those who fell in the wilderness serves as a warning lest they also come short of attaining the rest because of unbelief. This is the basis of the exhortation the author has to give to his readers - if they escaped not who made light of the divine mission of Moses, how can they escape if they neglect the mission of One Who is greater than Moses?

In III. 1-6. the comparison of Jesus and Moses is dwelt upon, for they are the founders of the two dispensations. The point of contrast is to be found in the fact that Jesus is Son over the house of God, while Moses was servant within it. The writer calls upon his readers to consider Jesus, who was faithful to Him that appointed Him. The phrase *τῷ ποιῆσατε αὐτόν* in III. 2. was probably suggested by the LXX in I Sam. XII. 6 *Κύριος ὁ ποιῆσας τὸν Μωϋσῆν καὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ -*

"It is the Lord that appointed Moses and Aaron." In the same way God had appointed Jesus, who was faithful like Moses.

"Moses and Jesus agree in faithfulness, the point of superiority of the latter does not lie here, but in the appointment or sphere within which he is faithful.....Moses was faithful in all God's house as a servant, but Christ is faithful as a Son over God's house."⁴⁷ Moses, it is true, combined the two offices of Apostle and High Priest, but not as a Son, only as a servant. Bruce⁴⁸ points out the great skill with which the author establishes the superiority of Jesus to Moses. "The task of exalting Christ above Moses was a delicate one, requiring careful handling; but the tact of the writer does not desert him here. With rhetorical skill, he first places the lesser apostle beside the greater One, as one, who like Him had been faithful to his commission. In doing this, he simply does justice to the familiar historical record of the Jewish hero's life, and to God's own testimony borne on a memorable occasion, the substance of which he repeats in the words, "As also Moses (was faithful) in his house." "My servant Moses, faithful in all My house, he," God had said emphatically to silence murmuring against him on the part of his brother Aaron and his sister Miriam. In presence of such strong commendation proceeding from the divine lips, our author

47. Davidson Ep. to Hebrews p. 81.

48. Bruce Ep. to Hebrews p. 134-5.

writing to Hebrews proud of their great Legislator, might well have been afraid to say anything which even seemed to disparage him; and one wonders what words he will find wherewith to praise Christ, and set him above Moses, without appearing to set aside the testimony of Jehovah to the worth of His servant. But the gifted Christian doctor knows how to manage this part, as well as all other parts of his argument. He lays hold of the suggestive words "house" and "servant", and turns them to account for his purpose, saying in effect "Moses was as faithful as any servant in a house can be: but still he was only a servant, while He of Whom I now speak was not a mere servant in the house, but a Son; and that makes all the difference."

There is some difficulty in III. 3-6a arising out of the apparent confusion of designating both Jesus and God as the builders of the house, and of representing Moses first as the house (verse 3) and then as servant in the house (verse 5). In verse 3, Jesus is the builder - "For He (Jesus) has been counted worthy of more glory than Moses, by so much that he that built the house hath more honour than the house." But in verse 4 God is the builder - "but He that built all things is God." There is no real inconsistency here. In I. 2. the Son is the agent through whom God made the worlds, and in the present context God is using the Son as His agent to build the

spiritual house. "Philo⁴⁹ commenting on 'the house of God' in Gen. XXVIII. 17. interprets it as including the whole sensible Universe, and the wording of the verse under consideration (III. 4.) suggests that the writer of Hebrews adopted Philo's allegorisation. Every house has a builder, and the builder of the Universe is God, whose creative agent (see Heb. I. 2.) is Christ."⁵⁰ Davidson⁵¹ too observes that though Jesus built the house, it was under God, for God is He who built all things.

The other difficulty in the section III. 1-6. is the representation of Moses both as the house, and as servant in the house. This difficulty disappears when we regard *oikos* in this context as used in a comprehensive sense. *oikos* may denote either a material house, or the members of a household. (II. Tim. IV. 19.)⁵² The word does not refer to the stone and timber here, but rather to the household or establishment of servants. In verse 3 *oikos* is evidently used in the latter sense, because the whole argument turns on a comparison between the servants who collectively constitute 'the household' and the Son who orders it. The house referred to in these verses is the House of God, neither Moses' nor Christ's. The original context of the statement about Moses from the mouth of God in

49. De Somn. 1. XXXII.

50. Hebrews Clarendon Bible 1930. p. 91.

51. Vide Davidson Ep. to Hebrews p. 83.

52. Rendall Ep. to Hebrews p. 28. 1883.

Num. XII. 7. decides this - "My servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all mine house." The targum of Onkelos too makes it clear that the house is God's - "But not so (with) My servant Mosheh; over all My house faithful is he."⁵³

Moses then, being a servant in the house of God was truly a part of the house, and lower than the builder of the house. Here is the essence of the contrast between Jesus and Moses. Jesus is Son over the house and Moses servant in the house. The house is one, and God's, although it varies in form under the two different dispensations. That house is the Church in the first dispensation it was the Jewish Church, now it is the Christian Church. This Church in the time of Moses, as in the time of Christ is the organised society in which God dwells, it is "the house of God." Vaughan⁵⁴ points out that the two metaphors, 'building' and 'family' are applied to the church in various places: the former, for example in I. Cor. III. 9.; Eph. II. 21.; II. Tim. II. 20.; the latter in I. Tim. III. 15. The two senses of *oikos* "house" and "household" run into one another in many passages, but when the author of Hebrews speaks of Moses as servant in the house, and Jesus as Son over it, the sense uppermost in his mind seems to be that of household, although the other sense too is present. At one time Moses was active in this house of God as servant,

53. The Targums on the Pentateuch Etheridge vol. II. p. 276.

54. Ep. to Hebrews p. 59. Macmillan 1890.

but later Christ came to be over the house of God, in its perfect form. As Nairne⁵⁵ says, "He who is Christ is Kin to God, Son of God, and as Son is Lord over the house, not servant in it, Himself a part of God's revelation, not one who points to a revelation from outside it." Moses on the other hand, was faithful in the house as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were afterward to be spoken⁵⁶ (III. 5.). The work of Moses was provisional and typical, it looked forward with expectation to the fuller revelation now given in Christ. "The Law, in both its parts, the moral and ceremonial, was a testimony borne to the need and the hope of a Saviour: the moral acting as an experimental revelation of sin (Rom. VII. 7. etc.); the ceremonial as a perpetual prophecy of atonement (Heb. X. 3. etc.)"⁵⁷ The Law on its moral side revealed sin as sin, and the sacrifices offered under the Law indicate the felt need of the people for a cleansing from sin. Although the blood of goats and bulls could never satisfy that need, it served to point beyond itself to a day when the blood of Christ, offered 'by eternal Spirit' (Heb. IX. 14.) would be efficacious to cleanse the people from sin. All that was done under Moses pointed toward a spiritual antitype. The

55. Nairne Ep. of Priesthood p. 317.

56. Rendall Ep. to Hebrew p. 29 does not believe that the phrase "testimony of the things which should be spoken" can be interpreted as Moses' testimony to future Gospel revelation.

57. Vaughan Epistle to Hebrews 61.

Tabernacle was *σκήνη τοῦ μαρτυρίου* (Num. XII. 5.) in a deep sense. In the comparison of Jesus with Moses, the author of Hebrews in no way disparages the greatness of the great Lawgiver. Moses was servant in all God's house, *ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκῇ αὐτοῦ* (III. 5.). Other prophets had been entrusted only with part.

C H A P T E R I I .

The Law in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

From the days in which our Lord "preached the Gospel of God" (Mark I. 14) the question of the relation of this Gospel to the Law had been a burning one. Our Lord took His stand upon the Old Testament. It was not His purpose to bring in a wholly new religion, but to demonstrate how what was shadowed forth dimly in the Law was brought into fulfilment in Himself, and in all He stood for. As it has been said, He might well have adapted one of His significant expressions to describe the gradual progress of revelation from Old Testament times down to Himself - First the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear (Mark IV. 28.).

The most important part of the Old Testament in Jewish eyes was the Law of Moses as embodied in the Pentateuch. For the Jews, and especially so for the Scribes the Law of Moses was a repository of external rules and distinctions admitting of endless subdivision and extension to which they could turn for guidance in every circumstance of life.

Jesus too, was a true and loyal Jew, and when the lawyer comes to him saying "Master what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" he answers "What is written in the Law, how readest thou?" (Luke X. 25-26.). He is not antagonistic to

the Law, but its importance for Him is not in the punctilious observance of its letter, but in the fulfilment of its spirit. Jesus fulfilled the Law in His own person, and realised the ideal which the Law contemplated. That ideal was righteousness, and Jesus Christ was a perfectly righteous person. The aim of the Law had been to produce righteousness in its observers, but in this it had failed. "Think not that I came to destroy the Law and the prophets, I came not to destroy but to fulfil." All the elements of permanent value and validity in the Law and the Prophets have become part and parcel of the Gospel. With the approaching glory of the Gospel "the glory that surpasseth" (II. Cor III. 10), the glory of Law and Prophets is eclipsed.

The synoptic Gospels make it clear that the attitude of Jesus to the Law was not that of an iconoclast. He was a Jew who cherished all that the Law stood for, and was loyal to the religious institutions of His age. The two great religious institutions of His age were the Synagogue and the Temple, and for both of them Jesus had the deepest respect. From the Gospel of St. Mark we learn that the Synagogue was the scene of many of the great works of His ministry.¹ Wherever He and His followers went they made the Synagogue the centre of their activities. When Jesus is told by Simon that the people of Capernaum seek Him, He answers "Let us go elsewhere to the next

1. Mark I. 21; III, 1; VI. 2.

towns, that I may preach there also, for this end came I forth. And He went to their synagogues throughout all Galilee, preaching and casting out demons."²

Mark does not mention Jesus in connection with the Temple until the last days in Jerusalem when we find Him daily in the porches of the Temple teaching,³ and most significant of all, cleansing the Temple by driving out the money changers and those who bought and sold, declaring the Temple to be God's dwelling place.⁴

We are not told in Mark about Jesus often taking part in the religious festivals of the Jews, but this seems to have been simply an omission, and does not indicate in any way that Jesus did not take part in those festivals, much less that He was antagonistic to their observance. But Mark does tell us of the last Passover feast and its observance by Jesus⁵ and the way in which the evangelist gives the account of this Passover observance seems to imply that it was the usual custom of Jesus to observe this festival and that it was by no means a departure from his usual custom.

When we look at the teaching of Jesus, we see that many of the subjects which He discusses are those discussed in Jewish religious circles. The Coming of the Kingdom of

2. Mark I. 38-9.

3. Mark XI. 27; XII. 35; XIV. 49.

4. Mark XI. 15-18.

5. Mark XIV. 12 ff.

God, the nature of that Kingdom, and the mode of its coming, foods clean and unclean, the observance of the Sabbath, the commandments, divorce, payment of taxes due to the Emperor, all these were discussed among the Jews, and we find that they loom largely in the teaching of Jesus. What Jesus taught was expressed through the medium of Judaism, and was not in opposition to it. Jesus regarded his mission as to Jews and not to the Gentiles. When He went away into the borders of Tyre and Sidon, he wished the journey to be secret.⁶ In His dress also Jesus was a Jew. He wore the *MS'S* which served as a Jew's uniform whereby he was recognised and distinguished from a Gentile.⁷

When Jesus had healed the man with leprosy, He said to him, 'Go show thyself to the priest and offer for thy cleansing the things which Moses commanded, for a testimony to them.'⁸ We have here an example of Jesus acting in strict accordance with what the Law enjoined in such cases.

Jesus quotes the Law as well as prophets as the final authority in the matters of religion. When the Saducees^d came to him with their question about the resurrection Jesus quotes to them as proof - 'I am the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob,'⁹ insisting on the literal interpretation of the passage quite in the fashion of the rabbis.

6. Mark VII. 24.

7. See Mark VI. 56.

8. Mark I. 44.

9. Mark XII. 26.

We have many instances of Jesus turning to the Scriptures for His defence and using the Scriptures in a free way. His opponents accuse Him of allowing His disciples to break the Sabbath by plucking the ears of corn. Jesus' answer is to remind them of what David and his followers did when they ate the shewbread.¹⁰

Jesus' opponents accuse Him of denying the authority of the Law in connection with divorce, but He draws their attention to words in the book of Genesis in support of His view.¹¹

When Jesus is asked by one "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" He answers him, directing his attention to the Law, "Thou knowest the commandments, do not commit adultery, do not kill, do not steal, do not bear false witness, defraud not, honour thy father and thy mother."¹²

Referring to the Scriptures Jesus calls them collectively *τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ*, which he sets over in contrast against the *παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων*. 13.

The Scriptures for Jesus contained the revelation of God. The synagogue in which the word of God was read and expounded had influenced Him deeply. The temple in Jerusalem claimed His deepest reverence, and the sacrifices he approved.¹⁴

10. Mark II. 26.

11. Mark X. 6.

12. Mark X. 17-19.

13. Mark VII. 8.

14. Math. XXIII. 17 & 19.

all these things He was a loyal Jew.

When we discuss His attitude to the oral Law, we find that there is conflicting evidence in the Gospel. One thing is certain - that Jesus did not differentiate between the written and oral Law to the extent that he accepted the one and entirely rejected the other. The oral Law was derived from the written, and it is thus a priori likely that Jesus accepted much that it enjoined. We have proof in the Gospels that Jesus did agree with certain things the oral Law prescribed. Jesus Himself paid the temple tax of half a shekel, and His disciples followed his example.¹⁵ This tax was not enjoined in the written Law, but in the oral Law. The oral Law prescribed that grace should be said at meals and we find Jesus at the feeding of the five thousand taking the loaves and the fishes and blessing them before breaking.¹⁶ It is thus clear that the oral Law in certain of its requirements met with the approval of Jesus, but he does not hesitate to cast aside both the written and oral Law when their observance as conceived by the people came into conflict with the principles of life and righteousness which He taught as e.g. in questions of the Sabbath and Corban.

While there is little or no trace of the author of Hebrews engaging himself in discussion of the requirements of

15. Math. XVII. 24.

16. Mark VI. 41.

the oral Law and the tradition of the fathers, we can imagine the declaration of Jesus that He had come to fulfil the Law gripping his imagination and the whole epistle is written to persuade his readers that Jesus has fulfilled the Law, thinking of the Law on its sacrificial, ritual, and worship side. The Law was a shadow, the new dispensation is the reality of which the old was a shadow. The Gospel is fulfilment of the Law, and that is the message the author has to bring to his readers in the time of trial which had come upon them. They were Jewish Christians, and a very difficult question confronted them. The question for them was, "What must they do with the Jewish Bible?" It might have seemed that there was nothing for them to do, but either to cling to the letter of the Jewish Bible, or reject it altogether.¹⁷ The Epistle to the Hebrews contains the answer to the anxious questionings of the Christians of that age. The Law and the prophets must by no means be cast aside, but the readers must see the old illuminated in the new. There is a fundamental oneness between the Old Dispensation and the New, and the author is at pains to convince his readers of this oneness. Accepting the view that the readers were Jews brought up in Judaism, it seems that they were Hellenists, and as Nairne says, were "touched with Philosophy."¹⁸ They had viewed Christianity as a Reformed Judaism, and had identified themselves with the Christian Church

17. Westcott Ep. to Hebrews 492.

18. Nairne Ep. of Priesthood 14.

without the full realisation of what the Church stood for, and without facing the question of all its implication to them as Jews. There is a distinct Alexandrine colour on the whole of the Epistle - its terminology and its philosophical background. We may conclude that the recipients were in a position to understand, and that it was natural for them to think and express themselves in similar terms to those in the Epistle. If they were such, and the view is at least tenable, it is possible that they found much in the faith of the church, crude and hard to accept - e.g. the Messianic expectation of the church. At the time the letter was written circumstances seem to have been such as to tempt those Jewish Christians to fall back into Judaism, and give up their new faith. There is much to be said for the view that the crisis through which these Christians are passing was the Jewish war with Rome. Appeal was now being made to all Jews to unite together in defence of Jerusalem and the ancient religion. This appeal had come to the Christians addressed in our Epistle, and they felt bound by a kind of honour to align themselves with this cause. But their allegiance to Christianity would not allow them to do this. Their roots were deep in Judaism and their Christianity was superficial, and thus the temptation was hard to resist. But our author writes to them at this time to help them to make the right choice, which is a hard choice, for

it involves a break with Judaism, and pressing forward towards a fuller faith in Christ. "Let us therefore go forth unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach." He summons his readers to leave the observance of the dead works of the old system, and to see in the new the reality to which the old, however inadequately, pointed.

The first verses of Chapter VI. rebuke the readers for their backwardness and lack of progress in the new faith. Their eyes have not been opened to the full glory of the new religion which they have rather half-heartedly accepted. Throughout, the Epistle is planned to persuade men to a fuller creed, who have accepted Jesus of Nazareth as the Christ, but have not understood nearly all that was contained in that title. "A prophet He might be to them like one of the prophets, (I. 1 f.) and a sinless man - for the author seems to have taken for granted that they reverence His sinlessness (IV. 15; VII. 26.)"¹⁹ But the full significance of the title Christ they had not realised. They do not see Jesus Christ as the Son of God. In I. 2 f. the author declares that Jesus is the Son of God in and through whom God has spoken and given the final revelation of Himself. The Son is the heir of all things through Him the worlds were made. He is the effulgence of God's glory, and the very image of His substance. Jesus Christ is He who, when He had made purification for sin, sat

19. Nairne Ep. of Priesthood 32 f.

at the right hand of the Majesty on high.

He is also one with the Christ who manifested Himself, however obscurely in ancient days. Proof of this is that in the Old Testament there are words addressed to the Christ, e.g. 'Thou art my son, to-day I have begotten thee' (Psalm II. 7.) "Sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool." (Psalm CX. 1.) "Moses in his own day, accounted the reproach of the Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt." (Heb. XI. 26.)

Christ is the Saviour of all men by virtue of His death. "We behold.....Jesus because of the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour, that by the grace of God He should taste death for everyman." (Heb. II. 9.) "And having been made perfect, He became unto all them that obey Him, the author of eternal salvation." (Heb. V. 9.) The Christ of Whom they had heard from those who heard the Lord (II. 3.) is now seated at the right hand of God. "He when He had sacrificed one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God." (Heb. X. 12.) "Looking unto Jesus, the author and perfecter of our faith.....who hath sat down at the right hand of the throne of God." (XII. 2.)

The Christ is endued with life indissoluble, in which He continually intercedes for men. "Wherefore also He is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them." (VII. 25.)

The Christ will "appear again a second time, apart from sin, to them that wait for Him, unto salvation" (IX. 28.). The Christ of whom the readers had heard and to whom they have given their allegiance, is the Son of God, Who will return again in the fulness of time, - "This Jesus, which was received up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye beheld Him going into Heaven." (Acts I. 11.) The author is at pains to take his readers with him along these lines, and to convince them that Jesus is the Christ, and the Son of God.

To Christ, the whole of the Old Testament leads, and the author interprets all in terms of the Old Testament. He speaks more especially in terms of the Levitical ordinances and ritual. The author thinks of the Levitical system and its works in their relation to the Gospel. By the works of Christ Who fulfilled and by fulfilling annulled the Law, the element of life was drawn from these which had a provisional and only a provisional vitality. They now became dead works. The ritual ordinances were imperfect at best, but their value had been in this, that they prefigured the true mode of access to God. "The finality of the new religion, as the author of Hebrews apprehends it, consists in this - that it has established the perfect worship. All the spiritual endeavour of past ages, has at last come to fruition, since in Christ we have obtained a direct and perpetual access to God."²⁰ The end

20. E.F. Scott. The Ep. to the Hebrews p. 27.

and purpose of all religion has now been attained - access to, and communion with God. The devout Jew had been coming to the Tabernacle and to the temple at Jerusalem with his offering, but into the immediate presence of God he could not enter. The veil between the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies was a constant reminder of what we may call the inaccessibility of God under the Old Covenant. When Christ entered the heavenly sanctuary through His own blood, the veil was rent, and henceforth worshippers come into the very presence of God following Him Who is the "forerunner" *πρόδρομος* (VI. 20.).

"Christianity is the religion of unrestricted fellowship with God."²¹ In view of this, the author invites his fellow Christians to draw near to God - "Let us therefore draw near with boldness unto the throne of grace." (IV. 16.) "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the Holy Place by the blood of Jesus.....let us draw near with a true heart in fullness of faith." (X. 19-22)

The author contrasts the Gospel, which is the new covenant with the old covenant which has been given in Judaism, and he proves that at every point the new is superior to the old. And not only is it superior to the old, but perfect and final. Christianity has consummated the mode of worship which is enjoined in the Old Testament. Religion is conceived of

21. Bruce Ep. to the Hebrews 393.

in terms of worship. It is the Old Testament conception of religion - "The approach to God in which religion consists, is regarded in this epistle as an act of worship, and is described in the language of Old Testament ritual. Paul can speak of a 'reasonable service' - an inward disposition which has now taken the place of mere ceremonial forms. The Fourth Evangelist declares plainly that the day of visible temples is past, and that the Father desires to be worshipped in spirit and in truth. But the writer of our epistle still clings to the ancient conception. He recognises the imperfections of the ritual ordinances, but still thinks of them as prefiguring, in some real and literal sense, the true mode of access to God.²²" Consequently the element of the Mosaic Law most in evidence in Hebrews is the Temple order, its ritual and liturgy. The Law is looked upon, not so much as a set of statutes to be obeyed as a religious constitution under which the people worshipped. Hebrews thinks of the Law as ritual, the medium, divinely appointed, through which the Israelites worshipped. The whole of this system was a shadow, the reality of which is in heaven itself. The influence of Alexandrian Platonism is seen running right through the Epistle. The visible world is a shadow of the eternal verities. Earth possesses a pattern only of the realities which are in heaven. We can see that this is the philosophical background of the writer to Hebrews,

22. E.F. Scott Ep. to Hebrews 79.

e.g. "It was necessary therefore that the copies of the things in the heavens should be cleansed with these, but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these." "But Christ entered not into a Holy Place made with hands, like in pattern to the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us." (IX. 23-24.) "For the Law having a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image of the things....." (X. 1.) The writer goes on the assumption that over against this visible world there is an invisible world, and all things on earth are types and symbols of their heavenly originals. In the case of the ritual constitutions this symbolism is worked out in detail. All the rites of the Tabernacle as well as the Tabernacle itself are symbolical. Moses was warned of God "See, saith He, that thou make all things according to the pattern that was showed thee in the Mount." (VIII. 5.)

There is no suggestion in the Epistle that because the earthly things are shadows, they are of no worth or deceptive. They serve to point us to those things beyond themselves which are real. This explains the very frequent use made in the epistle of the word *τελειωσις* "perfecting." In Hebrews the word means a completion, a bringing into maturity. "A distinction is made between a lower phase of existence in which all is tentative and rudimentary, and a higher one in which the anticipation has grown to fulfilment. Thus Christ

is the "Perfect" High Priest inasmuch as he finally accomplishes what the Levitical Priests have done partially. He ministers in the Perfect tabernacle, where the service offered in earthly temples is carried to its consummation. He has "perfected" God's people by bringing them into a relation to God such as they could only surmise under the old covenant. So in the diverse application of this word we can always trace the general idea of a realisation, the completing of something already begun. A certain value is conceded to the earthly things, but it consists not in what they are but in what they suggest and promise. By their very defects they speak to us of a world of perfection on which the "shadows of things to come" will give place to "the very image of the things" (X. 1.)²³ What has happened in Christianity the author would have his readers understand is this bringing into 'perfection' of the shadows of Levitical ritual by their giving place to "the very image of the things." There is now access to the higher world and to its realities. The argument of the whole Epistle could be summed up in a sentence - Jesus Christ is the perfect and ideal Priest and he has offered the perfect and ideal sacrifice in the perfect and ideal tabernacle.

The author contrasts Christianity and Leviticalism as eternal and transient respectively. The tabernacle and its ritual were 'a parable for the time now present' (IX. 9.), to

23. E.F. Scott Ep. to Hebrews 83.

pass away when the eternal would be revealed to men. The author presents Christianity as the final and absolute religion, "not a religion, in the sense in which it might concede a legitimate place to others, but religion simpliciter, because it does perfectly what all religion aims to do. "This is what is expressed in his favourite word *αἰώνιος* (eternal)"²⁴ All that Christianity is and what it brings, is eternal. Jesus Christ is the author of eternal salvation, - "having been made perfect He became to all them that obey Him the author of eternal salvation" (V.9.). All that salvation can mean is secured by Him. The elements of Christianity include preaching on "eternal judgment." (V. 12.) Christ has obtained for men an eternal redemption. "But Christ, having become a High Priest of the good things to come, through the greater and more perfect Tabernacle....nor yet through the blood of goats and calves, but through His own blood, entered in once for all into the Holy Place, having obtained eternal redemption." (IX. 11-12.) So different is the work of Christ as a Priest from what the High Priest does annually on the day of Atonement in the Tabernacle or in the Temple. The High Priest's act must be repeated, its efficacy is not abiding, not eternal, whereas Christ *ἑφάπαξ*, once for all offers Himself, and obtains eternal redemption.

Christ has offered Himself through "eternal spirit"

24. James Denney. The Death of Christ 207 f.

(IX. 14.), therein lies the whole difference between the offering Christ makes, and the offering of animals made by the priests in the Tabernacle or Temple.

"Those who are called receive the promise of an eternal inheritance" (IX. 15.). The eternal inheritance is in contrast to the earthly Canaan which the Israelites did inherit it is true, but later they were deported from their Canaan, and were exiles in a strange land. The eternal inheritance which comes to men under the New Covenant will never be taken from them. It is "the city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." (XI. 10.) This is the inheritance for which Abraham looked, and it is the inheritance of those who avail themselves of the blessings of the New Covenant.

Again the blood of Christ is the blood of an "eternal covenant" (XIII. 20.). The first covenant with the Israelites is referred to as not being faultless. "For if that first covenant had been faultless, *ἀνεπιτήδευτος*, then would no place have been sought for a second." (VIII. 7.) Jesus Christ has inaugurated a new age under the New Covenant which is eternal. There will never come a time when the eternal covenant will become faulty, its efficacy will stand to eternity. The whole epistle is dominated by this conception of finality in everything that belongs to the New Covenant, in contrast to the transient and temporary character of the old.

On every page of the epistle we find this comparison of the new and the old. The Jewish ceremonial worship and the higher realities of the Christian faith are compared and contrasted. "The author delights to turn back to the details of the old ceremonial system, while as a Christian he places over against the old background of foreshadowing ritual, the eternal meaning of the sacrifice of Christ. As is natural to one who is looking at the new faith in the light of the old, the author sets forth the redemptive work of Christ, under the form of a High-Priestly sacrifice. Jesus Christ is the great High Priest of our confession. The older priesthood belonged to a changing and temporary order; that of Christ is an eternal and unchanging priesthood. The older priesthood was based on birth, and ritual regulation. Christ is the Priest of unique Divine appointment. The Older Priests ministered in a visible sanctuary; Christ carries His 'ministering' service into the true tabernacle of heaven itself, there to make continual intercession for His people. The earlier priests had to offer sacrifice for their own sins as well as for the congregation; Christ is the sinless, spotless High Priest. Other Priests offered in sacrifice the blood of bulls and goats, Christ offered Himself. All these contrasts are summed up in the thought that the sacrifice of Christ is incomparably superior to the older sacrifices, they were but the shadows, Christ's sacrifice is the substance."²⁵

25. Dick Fleming Redemption 73-4.

Throughout the Epistle to the Hebrews we find the assumption that there is a spiritual meaning in the whole of the Old Testament. All the details therein recorded have their significance, and even the silence of the narrative suggests important thoughts as in VII. 3. where Melchizedek is described as 'without father, without mother, without genealogy.'²⁶

The Mosaic ritual especially has in it a spiritual meaning, and the author is at pains to reveal this meaning to his readers, and to lead them on to a deeper insight of the purpose of the old dispensation. Now the old is passed away, because all it stood for has been fulfilled and consummated in the new dispensation under which they live. Generally it may be said that Christ and the Christian dispensation are regarded as the one end to which the Old Testament points, and in which it finds its complete accomplishment, not as though the Gospel were the answer to the riddle of the Law, but as being the consummation in life of that which was prepared in life. Those therefore who acknowledged Jesus as the Christ, when they realised His nature, could not fail to see that He had abrogated the outward system of Judaism by fulfilling it. Henceforth the Hebrews must not cling to the shadow which the Law was, but must move forward to lay hold on the reality to which the shadow had borne witness.

26. Westcott Ep. to Hebrews 483-4.

The author went into the Old Testament for aid to interpret the new dispensation and its provisions. As Westcott maintains,²⁷ "the use which the author makes of Holy Scripture, is not dialectic or rhetorical but interpretative. The quotations are not brought forward in order to prove anything but to indicate the correspondences which exist between the several stages in the fulfilment of the divine purpose from age to age. The Christian faith is assumed, and on this assumption the Hebrews are taught to recognise in the Old Testament the foreshadowings of that growing purpose which the Gospel completes and crowns. This being so, the object of the writer is not to show that Jesus fulfils the idea of The Christ, and that the Christian Church fulfils the idea of Israel, but, taking this for granted, to mark the relation in which the Gospel stands to the Mosaic system, as part of one divine whole. Looking back therefore over the course of the divine discipline of humanity, outlined in the Old Testament, he indicates how Christ, Lawgiver and Priest, fulfilled perfectly the offices which Moses (Ch. III) Aaron (Ch. V.) and Melchizedek (Ch. VII.) held in typical and transitory forms; and yet more than this; how as Man, He fulfilled the destiny of fallen man through suffering (Ch. II.). In regard to God the whole history of the Bible is, according to the teaching of the author of Hebrews, a revelation of the progress of the unchanging method

27. Westcott Ep. to Hebrews p. 481.

of salvation through which creation is carried to its issue. In regard to man it is a revelation of the necessity and the power of faith, by which he attains to a realisation of the eternal and the unseen, through suffering and failure, in fellowship with the Christ"(XI. 26.)

Revelation is one and continuous. The God who has spoken 'at the end of these days' (I. 1.) is the God who had spoken 'in the prophets by divers portions, and in divers manners' (I. 1.). The author regards Israel and its history as a special means whereby God revealed Himself. But the revelation by Israel was not final. The final revelation has been given in the Son. The one thing characteristic of the revelation under the old dispensation was that it perpetually pointed forward to something beyond itself. It could never satisfy completely those who lived under it. As the veil in the Tabernacle reminded the worshippers there was a Holy of Holies into which they could not as yet enter. But with the advent of the Son, the final and complete revelation has been given, and men now live in the new age. The author shows throughout the Epistle how the symbols of the old dispensation pointed forward to what has now become a fact in the experience of the worshipper. There is no longer a veil outside which the worshipper must stand, but the Son who is the Priest, the Great High Priest, has opened the way into the very presence of God. Pfleiderer observes²⁸ that "the Epistle

28. Pfleiderer Primitive Christianity Vol. III. 297.

to the Hebrews looks at Judaism from the point of view of the Cultus, the central point of which was the ritual of atonement, and therefore places it in a positive relation to Christianity as a symbolical preparation for it. As a consequence of this, it sees the Christian system of salvation under the forms of the Old Testament ritual: Christ is the High Priest, His saving work is the priestly sacrifice of atonement which purifies and consecrates the sinful people; faith is a priestly service, its fruit is an offering well-pleasing to God, the final perfection is a Sabbath rest, Christians are the people of the Lord, their consciousness of salvation is free access to the heavenly sanctuary." The author dwells on the Law on its ceremonial side, for it had moulded the religious life of his readers and of himself. The Books of the Law were the most sacred of all in their sight; and were devoutly read. So vividly does the author in his imagination picture the activities of the Tabernacle as described in the Mosaic books, that he speaks of them as though going on at the time of writing, (IX. 6.). The use of the present tense in this context has been thought to indicate that the reference is to the Temple in Jerusalem, and has been used as an argument for an early date (before A.D. 70) for the Epistle. But it is the vividness of the author's imagination, and also the fondness with which he dwells on the ritual of the Tabernacle that makes

him speak in the present tense. Nothing can be inferred from this use of the present tense as to whether the Temple at Jerusalem stood or not, for the author does not think of the Temple, but of the Tabernacle, or rather of the ideal Tabernacle which he has constructed for himself in his imagination as he reads in the books of the Law the description of the Tabernacle of the Wilderness built by Moses. But much as he and his readers cherished the Tabernacle and its ritual, they can no longer observe them, for they have now come to see that the Tabernacle and all that was performed within it was only the shadow of the reality which has come with Jesus Christ the Son of God. "The Tabernacle with its characteristic institutions, divisions, limited approaches to God, was a parable, he says, for the time now present, (IX. 9.). It had lessons to teach. It witnessed to the needs of men and yet the whole ritual which it embodied could not reach beyond the outward and visible (IX. 10, 13).²⁹ The Tabernacle had served its purpose inasmuch as by its very existence it testified to man's desire to have access to God, and as a shadow of what was to be in the new age, it suggested the reality to which it bore witness.

29. See Westcott Ep. to Hebrews p. 486.

C H A P T E R I I I .

The Law in Hebrews (continued)

Our task now is to ascertain what the Law meant to the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. At once we become conscious of a wide difference between what Law stands for in the Epistles of Paul generally, and what it stands for in Hebrews. A variety of reasons accounts for this difference. Both writers were Jews, but their religious history and experience had been very different. The Law for St. Paul was the moral Law, the moral requirements of the Holy God. But for the author of Hebrews, the Law stands for the ritual of worship, the means ordained whereby men drew near to God in worship under the old dispensation. One of the key-words of the Epistle repeated time and again, is *προσέγγιστε*. Let us draw near.¹ It is the word used in the Pentateuch (LXX) of the priests approaching the altar to perform their duty before God, e.g. Lev. IX. 7; XXI. 17, and also of the people drawing near to God under the ministry of the priests, e.g. Lev. IX. 5; Deut. IV. 11.

In Hebrews the predominating conception of religion is worship, and the author sees in the worship of the Tabernacle and Temple, as embodied in the Pentateuch the shadow of what has been fulfilled in the coming of Christ.

1. IV. 16; VII. 25; X. 1, 2; XI. 6; XII. 18, 22.

The most prominent feature in the worship of the Tabernacle was the priesthood, and the writer of Hebrews cannot think of the Law apart from the priesthood. "The Mosaic νόμος could not be worked for the Λόγος without a priesthood to deal with the offences incurred. The idea of the writer is always that νόμος or διαθήκη depends for its validity and effectiveness upon the ἱερείς or ἱερεῖς by whom it is administered. Their personal character and position are the essential thing. Every consideration is subordinated to that of the priesthood."² It is not surprising then, that the great theme of this epistle is the priesthood and high-priesthood of Christ. The central part of the Epistle (VII. XI) turns around this subject. Whereas under the Mosaic Law access to God was impossible except through the mediation of a priest and through sacrifice, under the new covenant, the mediation of the human priest, and the offering of the animal sacrifice is no longer necessary, for Christ the high priest after the order of Melchizedek, has by his self-sacrifice made access to the very presence of God possible to all men. "Having then a great high priest, who hath passed through the heavens..... Let us, therefore, draw near with boldness....." (IV. 14-16) The author is conscious of living in a new age, in which all that was shadowed forth by the Law, but which it could not attain, has become a reality and truth in the life of the followers of Christ (VI. 5).

The Law and its ordinances must now pass away, it has served its day and purpose, for now the blessings of the new covenant are within the reach of the worshippers of God.

Although the author of Hebrews states emphatically to his readers that the Law and its ordinances are now set aside as having performed their functions, there is no disparagement of the Law. It is regarded with sympathy, and even with affection, for by it the writer himself had been led, step by step, to see the meaning of the Gospel, which has come as the fulfilment of the Law. Westcott states in this connection "From first to last it is maintained that God 'spoke to the fathers in the prophets'. The message through the Son takes up and crowns all that had gone before. In each respect the new is the consummation of the old. It offers a perfect and absolute Revelation, carrying with it a perfect and absolute Mediation, and establishing a perfect and absolute Covenant, embodying finally the communion of God and Man. There is nothing in the old that is not taken up, and transfigured in the New."³

In the opening verse of the Epistle, God is stated to have spoken in the prophets "by divers portions, and in divers manners" (I. 1) and as we read through the epistle we are shown how the preparation was made step by step for the final revelation of God which came in Jesus Christ. The recipients

3. Westcott Ep. to Hebrews LVIII.

of the piece-meal revelation were the Chosen People, and the Mosaic system pointed in a special way to Christ, the great High Priest, who is the final revelation of God to men.

We are not surprised then to find the epistle full of quotations from, and allusions to, the Old Testament, especially the Pentateuch. These Old Testament words are produced by the author to show that the process of revelation is one, and continuous, but that in Christ, all that the Old Testament pointed to, however imperfectly and inadequately, is fulfilled and realised. Coming to the Old Testament as a Christian, the author of Hebrews finds its ordinances and ritual illuminated⁴ for him. They are seen clearly as pointing to Christ who once and for all fulfils what could not be realised through them.

The writer is anxious to instruct his readers how, as Christians, they are to regard the Old Testament, and in particular the Law and its ordinances. He wants them to see in the work and in the death of Christ the fulfilment of the Law.

He does not treat the Mosaic legislation as having a symbolic meaning only, and without historical and disciplinary value at all. This is the way Barnabas in his epistle views the Mosaic legislation, and the contrast with Hebrews is striking.⁵ The author of Hebrews sees in the Mosaic system a

4. For author of Hebrews Christians were "those who had been enlightened," *φωτισθέντες* VI. 4.

5. See Barnabas IX. 4 where he deals with the rite of circumcision.

discipline suited for the training of those to whom it was given. It had been fashioned after a heavenly pattern - "For the law having a shadow of the good things to come, and not the very image of these things" (X. 1). The Law was not meant to be final, but a stage only in the revelation of God and preparatory to a fuller and final revelation to come. It had educational value and was in St. Paul's language the tutor (*παιδαγωγός* Gal. III. 24) to lead the children of men to Christ. The sacrifices offered under the Mosaic Law, served to keep alive the sense of sin in the worshippers, and as this sense of sin deepened, the felt need for a true deliverance from the power of sin deepened at the same time. As Westcott says^{5a} "The educational value of the Levitical system is affirmed in the Epistle, both in respect of its general character (VIII. 5; IX. 24) and even in details (IX. 21, 23). As a copy (*ὑπόδειγμα*) it could not but carry the thoughts of the devout worshipper to the archetype; as a shadow it suggested the reality to which it bore witness. The ordinances testified with eloquent insistence to the two central facts of man's inner life, that he has no free access to Him. In other words they kept before the faithful Israelite, the essential conception of man's destiny and man's sin." The ideal which the Law held out to the worshipper was communion with God, but it could not bring the worshipper into that unrestricted communion which was

5a. Westcott Ep. to Hebrews 487.

his desire, for his sin unatoned stood as a barrier between him and God. The sacrifices were the prescribed means of removing transgression against the ceremonial law, but were powerless to deal with sins done with a high hand. Nevertheless the sacrifices suggested to the worshippers that there must be a way whereby these heinous sins can be removed. Thus the sacrifices and the priesthood and high priesthood suggested thoughts which they did not satisfy. They pointed to something beyond themselves which they could not achieve, and thus constituted a stage in a process of revelation which was not yet complete.

The priests themselves did not officiate for the people on the ground of their own worthiness, nor because they could perfectly bring to effect the purpose for which priesthood existed - the bringing of men into communion with God. The high priest acknowledged his unworthiness when "he offered up sacrifices first for his own sins, and then for the sins of the people" (VII. 27). He entered through the veil into the Holy of Holies on the great Day of Atonement as the representative of the people. But the people could not follow him, they had to remain outside, for the veil was an ever present reminder to them that the immediate presence of God was not for them to enter into. And yet all through the years ever since Moses was bidden to build the Tabernacle "after the pattern shown him in the Mount" (VIII. 5) the priests and the high

priest had performed their functions year in year out, first in the Tabernacle and latterly in the Temple in Jerusalem. The people had gathered outside the court bringing victims to be sacrificed, now as a peace offering and thank offering for God's goodness, now as a guilt offering and sin offering because of transgression, and in front of the altar they laid their hands on the victim and then the priest killed it and took the blood and sprinkled it on the appropriate place. Again on the Day of Atonement, the people had gathered to take part in the solemn programme of that day, to see the goat killed for their transgressions, and its blood taken into the Holy of Holies to be sprinkled there before God, and the other goat driven off to the wilderness bearing the sins of the year then closing. But in all this there is a sense of failure to achieve what the people in their inmost souls desired - communion and fellowship with God. The following year they would return again, and the High Priest on their behalf would perform the same function. There was no finality about the sacrifice, and its effect was not abiding. The victims that were offered as a token of the worshippers' desire to enter into communion with God were irrational beasts, and no beast voluntarily surrenders its life. And yet somehow the worshipper believed that the blood of the victim availed to repair the broken fellowship with God which was the result of his transgression. But, as the author of Hebrews puts it, the Tabernacle

and all that took place in it "is a figure for the time now present' (IX. 9) it was only a shadow (*σκιά*) of what in the fulness of time would be accomplished once and for all (*ἐφίταξε* IX. 12) by one fitted especially for that purpose. The author of Hebrews declares emphatically "It is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins" (X. 4; IX. 9-10, 13-14). But the blood of these victims kept alive the sense of cleansing by blood which was to become a reality and truth in the experience of men at a later day when the perfect sacrifice would be voluntarily offered by One who was Himself Man and the sympathetic High Priest (X. 5 ff.).

The whole course of divine revelation is surveyed in the first four verses of the epistle. "God having of old time spoken unto the Fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in a Son." (I. 1-2). One message is borne by the different agents God has used to communicate Himself to his people. In the successive stages of history the message must be presented in such a way as to be apprehended by the recipients. Throughout the voice that speaks is the voice of God, and at the end of these days God's last word has been spoken, and the self-revelation of God is fulfilled in His Son.

From a reading of *προς Ἑβραίους* it is clear that the readers, like the author were familiar with the Old Testament and its history of the chosen people of God. The

Pentateuch, embodying the Mosaic Law with all its ordinances, they were particularly familiar with. There they had the system whereby they worshipped. And on the whole, the Epistle confirms the view that the readers were Jews, Hellenistic Jews, who have accepted Christianity as a reformed Judaism.⁶ But scholars are by no means agreed on this question. Generally speaking, opinion has oscillated between a community in Italy of Gentile Christians, as readers, and a community of Jewish Christians not necessarily in Jerusalem. Scholars like Westcott, Hort, Wickam, Nairne, Müller, Windisch and Peake favour the latter view. But we find scholars of equal reputation holding the former view, e.g. McGiffert, Von Soden, while Moffatt thinks that the author was addressing Christians irrespective of any distinction between Jews and Gentiles.

Much can be found in the epistle to support the view that it was meant for Gentile readers, e.g. the enumeration of elementary doctrines, Hebrews VI. 1-2. This it is said would suit those who came to Christianity from paganism, even though they came via the synagogue, rather than those who came from Judaism. It is also said that many of the exhortations of the Epistle would be superfluous if addressed to Jewish Christians. But as Peake says: "For positive proof that the readers were Jewish Christians, we may cheerfully abandon some

6. See Nairne Ep. to Hebrews Camb. Bible. Introd. 49 ff.

of the inconclusive arguments which have been adduced, and lay stress on the epistle as a whole. The author's method of handling his argument seems to be conclusive on this point. He writes no academic dissertation, but a word of exhortation to save his readers from threatened apostasy, and this was apostasy, not as is often said, to paganism or irreligion, but to Judaism." ⁷

It seems to have been a right instinct that labelled the epistle *προς Εβραίους*. The view that the epistle was written to Gentile Christians gains a certain plausibility if we fix our attention on phrases such as 'fall away from the living God'. But when we take the epistle as a whole, which we must do, this view becomes untenable. If the author feared apostasy on the part of his readers to paganism, we would expect him to attack and expose that paganism which was seeking to reclaim them. We find nothing of the kind. From beginning to end the author seeks to demonstrate the superiority of Christianity to Judaism. Peake rightly maintains that the author's argument has force only if his readers accepted the Old Testament independently of their acceptance of the Gospel. The Gentiles had no interest in the Old Testament apart from Christianity, and it would be pointless to demonstrate to them the fulfilment of the signs and promises of the Old Testament in Christianity.

The period in which the Epistle was written was the

7. Peake Critical Introd. to N.T. p. 75.

period of translation from Judaism to Christianity. The author is writing to a church, or more probably to a group of people within a church, to help and guide them to complete this transition to Christianity, the final and perfect religion. The readers are reluctant to break finally with Judaism, they cling to the Levitical rites, unable to see that when the perfect has come, the rudely imperfect must pass away. The readers are people with whom the author is acquainted, and their welfare and spiritual needs lie as a burden on his heart. Throughout the Epistle he addresses them with warmth and urgency. "Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our confession, even Jesus" (Heb. III. 1). "Take heed brethren, lest haply there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in falling away from the living God." (Heb. III. 12). "Having therefore brethren, boldness to enter into the Holy place by the blood of Jesus, by the way which he dedicated for us, a new and living way through the veil, that is to say His flesh; and having a great priest over the house of God, let us draw near with a true heart, in fulness of faith.... Let us hold fast the confession of our hope that it waver not." (Heb. X. 19-23). The author is anxious to persuade his readers that to refuse to have done with Judaism is to prefer the shadow to the substance and reality. In addition to the very great difficulties the readers had to overcome in their transition from Judaism into

Christianity, there were perils without to which they were exposed. They had already suffered persecution on account of their faith - "But call to remembrance the former days, in which, after ye were enlightened, ye endured a great conflict of sufferings, partly being made a gazingstock both by reproaches and afflictions, and partly, becoming partakers with them that were so used." (Heb. X. 32, 33.) There are many hints in the Epistle that even worse persecution is about to break upon them, which will be a crucial testing time to all. "And let us consider one another to provoke unto love and good works; not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the custom of some is, but exhorting one another, and so much the more, as ye see the day drawing nigh." (Heb. X. 24-25.) In Chapter XI. the great army of martyrs is described for the inspiration of the readers in their struggle, and to make them steadfast in the race they have already started. For this race they must cast away from them everything that hinders - "Therefore, let us also.... lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us looking unto Jesus, the author and perfecter of our faith, who for the joy that was set before him, endured the Cross, despising the shame, and hath sat down at the right hand of the throne of God." (Heb. XII. 1-2.) The noble army of martyrs and above all Jesus the Captain or Pioneer, ἀρχηγός, are the source of inspiration to the sorely tried Christians in their hardships.

As to the spiritual condition of the readers we can glean much from the hints that are given us here and there throughout the Epistle. They are in danger of breaking off from their Christian moorings - "Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip". (Heb. II. 1.) From Chapter V. 11-14 we can see that the author is disappointed with their progress in the Christian faith - "For when by reason of the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need again that someone teach you the rudiments of the first principles of the oracles of God." They have not attained spiritual manhood, and must still be fed with milk. They have had their advantages, but do not seem to have made the increase they ought. "For the land which drinketh the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herb meet for them for whose sake it is tilled, receiveth blessing from God, but if it beareth thorns and thistles, it is rejected and nigh unto a curse, whose end is to be burned." (Heb. VI. 7-8.) By gradual drifting they will eventually break away, and turn their backs on Christianity finally. The author can see this peril approaching, and throughout he endeavours to bring home to them what he himself has realised to the full - the incomparable worth of the Christian religion.

But the readers were finding great difficulties hindering them from accepting wholeheartedly this new religion.

They have had "the good tidings preached to them," but there is a danger of their "coming short" of the final goal because they keep glancing backwards to the religion they have left, failing to sever themselves from it altogether. Bruce⁸ observes that there are three things connected with Christianity which were stumbling blocks to the Hebrew Christians. (a) "The superseding of an ancient, divinely appointed religion by what appeared to be a novelty and an innovation." This is not to be wondered at, because Leviticalism was of divine and ancient institution, and it was very difficult for the Jew to believe that this ancient appointed method of approaching and worshipping God could ever pass away. (b) "The Hebrew Christians found another stumbling block in the humiliation and suffering of Jesus regarded as the Christ. They were unable to reconcile the indignity of Christ's earthly experience with the dignity of His Person as the Son of God, and promised Messiah." The cross is to them a stumbling block as St. Paul tells the Corinthians. They could not see how the Son of God could through suffering and the shame of the cross save His people. We only have to turn to the Gospels to see that the apostles could not reconcile their idea of the Messiah with suffering and persecution. It was a truth that they learnt gradually. [When we meet St. Peter in the Gospels, he cannot think of the Messiah accomplishing His work through suffering and death. When the Lord began to teach them that the Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected

8. Bruce Epistle to Hebrews 11 f.

and be killed, Peter rebukes Him, "Be it far from thee, Lord, this shall never be unto thee." The portrait we have of Peter in the book of Acts reveals that he has not yet realised the significance of the suffering and death of Christ. The Old Testament foretells the servant of God's sufferings, but in Acts Peter thinks of suffering and death of Jesus as a terrible crime committed by the Jews, of which he accuses them in the sermon on the day of Pentecost in Jerusalem. But when we come to the First Epistle of Peter, written in all probability when Peter was advanced in years, we find he is able to reconcile the two ideas of the Messianic glory, and suffering. There is no longer any incompatibility between them.⁹ "The way of the Cross is the way of light and blessedness - *via crucis via lucis*". If this truth was brought home to Peter in this gradual and slow manner, we are justified in assuming that in the case of the common members of the Church, there would be even greater difficulties hindering them in their acceptance of it.] (c) The other stumbling block for the Jews Bruce points out, in Christianity, is the absence of a priesthood and a sacrificial ritual.¹⁰ It was impossible to think of religion without a priest, and without sacrifice and an altar. The readers thought of the Temple with its priests and its victims for the altar, and all the ceremonies of sacrifice. In Christianity there was none of this. There was not even a priest. Jesus Christ could not lay claim to

9. See G.B. Stevens 'The Theology of the New Testament' 295.
 10. Bruce Epistle to Hebrews 13.

priesthood. He did not belong to the tribe of Levi, He was not of the house of Aaron, neither did He bring anything to the altar for an offering. Their ideas of priesthood and sacrifices were naturally formed in accordance with what they had seen in the Temple or had read about in the Books of Moses. They were not yet able to see that Christ was at once a Priest and a sacrifice. His Priesthood is not that of Aaron, but He belongs to another priesthood which is recognised in the Old Testament, and an earlier priesthood than that of Aaron - the royal priesthood of Melchizedek. The author elaborates on this point, in order to demonstrate the superiority of Christ as a priest over the Levitical priests. The priests of the Temple had to repeat their sacrifice, but the High Priest after the order of Melchizedek has 'entered in once and for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption'. (Heb. IX. 11-12).

The author of Hebrews does not concern himself very much with the events of Jesus' earthly life. He is in possession of knowledge of His earthly life. Proof of this is found in the Epistle e.g. (Christ) "Who, in the days of His flesh, having offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death, and having been heard for his godly fear, though he was a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which he suffered." (Heb. V. 7-8.)

But the special interest of the author is in Christ's nature and Person and redeeming work. In all this Christ is seen as the fulfilment and completion of all that is found in the Old Testament. God had of old time spoken unto the Fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, but at the end of these days, he has spoken in a Son. In the whole of Israel's past history God had revealed Himself. He had used different agents and instruments - Moses, Aaron, Joshua, angels, prophets, the priesthood, the Tabernacle and the Temple with all their ceremonies and sacrifices. On all these God was revealing Himself, but in Christ the final revelation is given. Christ is 'the Word' - the "effulgence of His glory, and the very image of His substance." In the words of St. John's Gospel "He that hath seen me, hath seen the father." (John XIV. 9.) For the author of Hebrews there is a continuity in the revelation of God, and the culmination point is the coming of Christ and His performance of His work. In the Old Testament we have the shadow, the reality and substance being Christ. All the ritual and ceremony and sacrifice of the Tabernacle and Temple were types, which are no longer necessary and must vanish. Moses and Aaron and Joshua all point to Christ. Jesus is in all things superior to the agents God used in the Old Testament. Jesus as the revealer is contrasted with the Old Testament agents of revelation, angels and prophets. Christ "is made so much better than the angels, and hath inherited a more excellent name

than they." (Heb. I. 4.) They are all ministering spirits. He is also superior to the prophets. The revelation given in the prophets was fragmentary, but the Son, who is 'the very image of God's substance' brings a full and final revelation. He is the only revealer in the new era, and those who see Him are witnesses, with nothing new to reveal, but bear witness to the revelation that has been made in Christ.

Jesus as redeemer of men is contrasted with the agents of redemption whose life and work the Old Testament records. These are Moses and Joshua. Moses led the Israelites out of the land of bondage, setting them free from the tyranny which held them fast. In this work, Moses was a shadow of *ἡλιόσωτος* Christ is able to perform this work for all men, by redeeming them from bondage to sin. Joshua was the successor of Moses, and he led the people into the Promised Land, into their place of rest. For the author of Hebrews Jesus is the new, the second Joshua, who leads the people into the land of Canaan. This epistle has striking similarities to the Book of Joshua in the Old Testament.¹¹ In the book of Joshua we find the Israelites on the threshold of the Promised Land. The leader *ἡνὸσειμα* is Joshua. The Lord bids him be strong, and of a good courage, and he in turn fortifies the people for the undertaking before them. Joshua bids the people remember the word which Moses the servant of the Lord commanded them. "The

11. Principal W.A. Curtis.

Lord your God, hath given you rest, and hath given you this land."¹² The Epistle to the Hebrews too is written to fortify its readers, it bids them be strong and courageous, and not to yield to influences which would turn them aside from the goal which they have set before them. All through the Epistle we find exhortations to remain steadfast. The author exhorts his readers to "draw near with boldness unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and may find grace to help in time of need." (IV. 16.) "Cast not away therefore, your boldness, which hath great recompense of reward." (X. 35.)

Again in his exhortations he reassures himself and his readers that they will not be found lacking in courage and fortitude when the testing time comes - "But we are not of them who shrink back into perdition, but of them that have faith unto the saving of the soul". (X. 39.) The one who goes before the people to lead them in this epistle is Jesus, He is the ἀρχηγός who alone can lead His people into the promised rest. Jesus, is the new Joshua of the new dispensation (IV. 8) and He leads His people into possession of the rest that is awaiting them as the people of God. "The rest of the land of Promise, was the visible symbol of the eternal rest entered by God when the work of creation was finished, and destined by Him for His people in all ages.... The word 'rest' reaches their heart in the turbulent times to which they have been born. A rest in the eternal

12. Joshua I. 13.

invisible sphere, a rest which subsists in the midst of danger, a rest, not like the military success of Joshua but one with the seventh day rest of the Creator, still remains open for the people of God. Into such a rest, the readers are actually entering, if they make their one bold venture.¹³

God's promise of a rest to His people has not been exhausted in the occupation of the promised land in the time of Joshua, for in the days of David, the Lord said, "Today, if they shall enter in", thus showing that the rest still remained unrealised. "For if Joshua had given them rest, he would not have spoken afterward of another day" (IV. 8.). The rest therefore still remains, and the epistle is a call to the readers to enter in. "Let us therefore give diligence to enter into that rest, that no man fall after the same example of disobedience." (IV. 11.) Those who were disobedient, and who sinned against God in the wilderness never saw the land of promise, nor did they enjoy the rest it provided. Their "carcasses fell in the wilderness". They alienated themselves from God, through unbelief. In Hebrews solemn warning is given again and again, lest the same fate overcome those whom the author addresses. "Let us fear therefore, lest haply a promise being left of entering into his rest, any one of you should seem to have come short of it." The way now is Jesus just as Joshua was the way and leader in the days of the

13. Nairne, Epistle of Priesthood 321.

wilderness and Canaan.

The author of Hebrews thus takes up incidents in the history of the Jewish people, the giving of the Law, the first covenant at Sinai, the entering into Canaan, and demonstrates how all these things were shadows of better things to come. In the main, when the epistle to the Hebrews speaks of the Law, the Law as the constitution under which the people worshipped is meant, the ritual law. The whole epistle is the author's plea that the ritual law whereby worshippers drew near to God has been set aside by Jesus, who has once and for all fulfilled in Himself all the Law was meant to achieve, but was powerless to attain.

C H A P T E R I V .

The Argument of the Epistle in Summary.

The main theme of the whole epistle is brought before us in the opening verses. It is the finality of the Christian religion. God had spoken in old time unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners according as the fathers were able to receive the revelation. But at the end of these days the final revelation of God has been given in a Son. The Son is the effulgence of God's glory, and the very image of his substance, and is thus fitted to be the final revealer of God.

This new revelation is contrasted with the special revelation that had been given on Sinai when the People received the Law. The Law according to tradition was mediated through Angels. But the Mediator of the new revelation is none other than the very Son of God, and the author proceeds to demonstrate the superiority of Jesus to angels. (I. 5.; II. 18.).

The founders of the old economy were Moses and Joshua, the founder of the new is Jesus (III - IV. 13.). Moses was faithful in all his house as a servant, but Christ as a Son over the house of God. Joshua was the redeemer who brought the Ancient People of God into Canaan, but Jesus is the

redeemer who brings his people into the rest of God.

The third contrast is that between the Son, the Melchizedek High Priest, and the Old Testament Levitical or Aaronic High Priest (IV. 14 - X. 18.). The author's conception of religion is that of a covenant between God and men, a state of relation between God, and a people who worship him. In this central section of the Epistle IV. 14 - X. 18., the author traces the steps which led to the dedication of the New Covenant. The people now live under the perfect covenant - the New Covenant, of which Jesus, the High Priest who lives for ever is surety *ἑγγυος* (VII. 22.) Jesus Christ is the forerunner *προδρομος* who has entered into the presence of God whither we may now follow. By the one offering of the Son of God, the sins of the People (II. 17.) and the transgressions under the first covenant (IX. 15.) have been finally put away (IX. 26.). When the Son, the representative High Priest of the People, through his own blood, entered into the Sanctuary, within the veil, God's very dwelling place, the eternal covenant state was realized, and henceforth it continues for ever expressed in the Son's sitting at the right hand of the Majesty, and presenting Himself before God for us. (IX. 24.)

In the first two chapters of the Epistle we have the two great dispensations delineated. The respective heads of these two dispensations are the Son and the Angels, and the

author seeks to demonstrate to his readers that the Christian dispensation excels the old dispensation to the degree that the Son, the great High Priest as its founder, excels the Angels. The Son in whom God has spoken is heir of all things, and of the world to come. He is especially fitted to be the founder of the New Dispensation because he is Son of God and heir of all things (I. 2.), and fulfils in Himself the destiny of man. Man was destined by God to attain to lordship over all things, but man has failed to realize his destiny. The Son became man, and as man he attained to lordship over all things thus realizing the destiny of man. He passed through the sufferings of man, and was crowned with glory because he suffered death (II. 9.). The Son thus became the leader *ἀρχηγός* of salvation, he tasted death for every man, and as the Great High Priest he has made access to God possible to the worshipper. The end of this first section is apologetic, designed to show how it befitted God, when he brought many sons to glory, to make the leader of their salvation perfect through suffering. To become a merciful and faithful High Priest, and to make expiation for the sins of the people, it was fitting that the Son should be made in all things like unto his brethren. For in that He Himself hath suffered being tempted, He is able to succour them that are tempted.

Having presented the Son to the readers as the merciful High Priest, able to succour those who are tempted

(II. 18), the author invites his readers at the beginning of the second section (III. - IV. 13.) to consider this Apostle and High Priest of their confession. He is first and foremost the Son over the house of God. He is faithful to him who appointed him as Moses was; but Moses was servant only within the house. The Son has been counted worthy of greater glory than Moses, and they who hold fast their confession to the end will receive the promised heritage - the Rest of God. Through unbelief, Israel to whom the promise was made, did not attain. But God says "To-day, if ye shall hear his voice." This is a new promise of the rest, and the time for entering it is 'To-day', - the Christian Age, and this voice that speaks is the voice of God speaking in his Son. In this section the revelation of the Son is identified with the voice of God which is heard in Psalm XCV promising the rest anew. The 'To-day' mentioned in the Psalm is the Christian Age which has now dawned. The Christian salvation is entering into the rest of God. Those of whom the Old Testament tells us that they did not enter into the rest, could not enter in because of unbelief (III. 19.). The author exhorts his readers therefore 'to fear lest haply a promise being left of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to have come short of it.' (IV. 1.) This section closes with a solemn call 'to diligence to enter into that rest that no man fall after the same example of disobedience. For the Word of God is living and active...' (IV. 11 ff.

The author exhorts his readers again and again to hold fast to their confession (III. 6, 12, 14; IV. 1, 11.) and in the third section he reveals to them how they may receive help to enable them to hold fast their confession. This way of help is to draw near to the throne of grace, through their great High Priest, that they may receive mercy, and may find grace to help them in time of need. This section extends from IV. 14. to X. 18., and the theme now is the priesthood of the Son, and here we have the kernel of the Epistle. As Davidson¹ says "the importance of this theme to the author arises from his view of the place of priesthood in any economy of salvation. The Priesthood is the basis of the economy. This is a general principle. Consequently the nature of the economy or covenant will depend on the nature or the character of its priesthood. The nature of the priesthood the author calls its order, by which he means the character of the priestly person, not at all his functions. The functions or ministry of all priests of whatever "order" are virtually the same consisting of an approach unto God, with an offering within a Sanctuary. It is the difference in the order, that is, really in the person of the priest, that causes any differences in the worth of the ministry of one priest from that of another."

Firstly the author dwells on the character of the Son as a true sympathising High Priest. In this he does not differ

1. Hebrews Handbooks for Bible Classes p. 104.

from all High Priests of whatever order they be (IV. 14. - V. 10.) like every other High Priest, the Son must be duly appointed. The Christ of the Old Testament, the King of Israel, was addressed not only as Son, but as Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek (V. 5-6). The Son of God who is the Great High Priest has inherited these Old Testament appellations and his sympathy with men has been made manifest in what he suffered. (V. 7-10.) There follows then a practical appeal (V. 11. - VI. 20.). The author rebukes his readers for their backwardness, and utters words of warning and encouragement (V. 11. - VI. 12.).

The Son who is High Priest after the order of Melchizedek is now contrasted with the Levitical High Priest. (VII.). Melchizedek is a representative of the eternal High Priest, the Son of God. He is a greater priest than Aaron, for he has sprung from another tribe than Aaron's, the royal tribe of Judah. He has been made, not after the Law of a Carnal Commandment, but after the power of an endless life. Moreover, he has been appointed by the oath of God, and ever liveth to make intercession for us.

The priest after the order of Melchizedek has entered heaven itself and into God's actual presence, (VIII. 1-2). As High Priest he must have somewhat to offer. His ministry is more excellent than that of the Levitical priesthood, for the Melchizedek High Priest is the mediator of the New Covenant which had been promised in the Old Testament. "In that

he saith, a new covenant, he hath made the first old. But that which is becoming old, waxeth aged, and is nigh unto vanishing away." (VIII. 13.).

There follows in IX. a description of the ritual of the first covenant. Its defects are brought out. It provided no real access to God's presence, and was meant to last only till a time of reformation. (IX. 10.) In contrast to the old ritual he presents the ministry of the new covenant with its true sanctuary, victim and priest. It provides what the old only suggested, eternal redemption, and cleansing of conscience.

The Law had the shadow of the good things to come, and in its sacrifices there was made a memorial of sins. But Jesus Christ, the sacrificing priest, has made a real offering of Himself of his own free will (X. 5-10.). This offering needs no repetition, for it is final and complete. In Him the promise made in Jeremiah has been fulfilled, - remission of sins is a fact in the worshipper's experience. This was the barrier between the worshipper and God, but it has been removed, and "Where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin." (X. 18.)

The doctrinal part of the epistle has now come to an end, and there follows the practical and hortatory portion. The readers are exhorted to enter into the Holy place by the blood of Jesus, for they have confidence now through Christ's blood, and they have their hearts sprinkled

from an evil conscience. They must encourage one another to love and do good works, and preserve the unity of the house of God. The day of the Lord is drawing near, and on that account they must be the more vigilant and diligent. (X. 25.) But if they fall away, after they have received the knowledge of the truth, the punishment visited upon them will be a terrible thing. (X. 26-31.) But the author shrinks from believing that such will be his readers' case, and by reminding them of their former noble stand in the face of trials, he seeks to infuse vigour and steadfastness into them to face their future trials (X. 32-39.). The faith of his readers will carry them safely through their afflictions, and in XI. he unfolds before their eyes the long roll of Old Testament worthies who lived and endured by their faith. They died in faith, and now they wait for us to realise with them the promise they trusted. (XI. 40.) They stand around us now a great cloud of witnesses, watching us as we prepare ourselves for the race that is set before us. Our eyes must be firmly fixed on Him who is the type of faith in the midst of sufferings; He endured the Cross despising the shame, and has now taken his seat at the right hand of the throne of God. (XII. 1-2.)

The author points out to them the right way to view their afflictions, - afflictions are the discipline of a father, anxious to correct his sons. They must not shrink

from the chastisement of the Lord, for it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness.

The readers are exhorted to live at peace with all, and to seek that consecration without which they shall not see God's face. In their effort after peace and holiness, they will be on their guard lest any root of bitterness will spring up and defile them, and lest there be any fornicator, or profane person as Esau, who for the sake of pleasure and ease, sold his birthright. The author closes this section with a striking contrast between the two revelations of God, - the one on Sinai, where matters were transacted in the shadowy sphere of earth, and yet terrible, the other the heavenly and final revelation, where all is transacted in the city of the living God, the Heavenly Jerusalem. If they escaped not when they refused Him that warned them on earth, much more shall we not escape who turn away from him that warneth from heaven. The last chapter is given to exhortations to various duties - love of the brethren (1-3), honour of marriage (4), contentment (5-6). The readers are bidden to remember their rulers, and imitate their faith.

The Son was put to death outside the gate, - Let us therefore go forth unto Him without the camp, bearing his reproach (13).

Finally the author asks for his readers' prayers for him (18-19) and offers his own prayer for them (20-21) and the epistle closes with a farewell and greetings.

C H A P T E R V.

The Sacrificial Aspect of the Law

Sacrifice both as an idea and an institution is rooted very deep in the Old Testament, and its influence on the development of Christian beliefs and practices has been very profound. The influence of the sacrificial conceptions of the Old Testament is very marked in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Much of the language and terminology is borrowed directly from the Books of the Law, which contain the instructions about the sacrifices. "Blood", "covenant", "High Priest", "Sprinkling", "sacrifice of bulls and goats"; all these terms are taken from the sacrificial vocabulary of the Pentateuch.

While the Old Testament does not give an explanation of the rationale of sacrifice, it presents it as the appointed means of approach to God.¹ Man in his sin cannot enter into communion with the Holy God, he must bring a sacrifice to be offered at the altar. This sacrifice is the best and most costly he can provide - "cost is always essential to sacrifice"² and the sinner identifies himself with it as it is placed upon the altar. The sacrifice makes atonement for sin, and enables the offerer to enter into communion with God. Leviticus XVII. 11 states "for the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I

1. See G.F. Moore, Judaism, vol. I. 500.
 2. Evelyn Underhill 'Worship' 50.

have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls, for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life." Man cannot hide or do away with his own sin, but God has provided a way whereby sin can be covered or atoned, - "I have given it (the blood) to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls." The blood on the altar covered the sin of man, that it could no longer come between him and God. Vincent Taylor³ in this connection states "In general the sacrifices are expiatory, rather than propitiatory. They are appointed means whereby sin is 'covered', so that it no longer stands as an obstacle between the worshipper and God. This fact is illustrated by the many examples of the use of Kipper, the Piel form of the verb Kaphar 'to cover' or to 'wipe away'.

The linguistic usage of Kipper is of great interest. In cases where it means to 'appease' or 'pacify' the reference is to man.⁴ In other passages it is used of expiation for sin apart from sacrifice⁵ and where God is the subject, the meaning is to 'forgive' or 'purge away'. The commonest use of the verb is in connection with the sacrificial rites and here the thought is that of covering ritual imperfections or of expiating sins."

Taylor gives the following examples;

Lev. XVI. 33. "And he shall make atonement for the Holy Sanctuary."

Ezek. XLIII. 26. "Seven days shall they make atonement for the

3. See Jesus and His Sacrifice 51-53.

4. Cf. Gen. XXXII. 20 and Prov. XVI. 14.

5. Cf. Exod. XXXII. 30; Num. XVI. 46 f.; XXV 13; II Sam. XXI. 3.

altar and purify it."

Lev. I. 4. "And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the burnt offering, and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him."

Numb. XV. 25. And the priest shall make atonement for all the congregation of the children of Israel, and they shall be forgiven.

II. Chronicles XXIX. 24. "And they made a sin offering with their blood upon the altar to make atonement for all Israel."

While, as Taylor⁶ maintains, it would be unsafe in all passages of this kind to press the root meanings of 'covering' or 'wiping away', the echoes of these ideas, especially that of 'covering' can be found in most cases. The idea of cleansing is expressed in Lev. XVI. 30 - "On this day shall atonement be made for you, to cleanse you: from all your sins shall ye be clean before the Lord."

C.H. Dodd⁷ in his discussion of *ἱλίσθησαι* and cognate words states that 'the LXX translators did not regard Kipper (when used as a religious term) as conveying the sense of propitiating the Deity, but the sense of performing an act whereby guilt or defilement is removed. Thus Hellenistic Judaism, as represented by LXX, does not regard the cultus as a means of pacifying the displeasure of the deity, but as a means of delivering man from sin, and it looks in the last

6. Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice* 52-3.

7. *Bible and the Greeks* 93.

resort to God Himself to perform that deliverance, thus evolving a meaning of *καλοκεσθη* strange to non-Biblical Greek."

For the worshipper under the Old Covenant, the various sacrifices served as a means of expression for his innermost religious strivings. F.C. Hicks⁸ brings out the significance of the various elements which constitute the act of making sacrifice on the altar. Six stages are pointed out -

1. The worshipper 'draws near' with his offering.
2. He lays his hands or leans or rests them on the victim's head.
3. He himself, and not the priest slays the victim.
4. The priest presents the blood to God by pouring it upon, or dashing it against the altar.
5. The flesh or part of it is burnt and so is transformed in order that it may ascend to heaven, the dwelling place of God.
6. A portion of the offering is eaten by the priests and the worshipper, except in the case of the ^{whole} burnt offering, while the flesh of the sin offering and the guilt offering is reserved for the priests except when atonement is made for their own sin.

These different stages give expression to man's desire for fellowship with God. Man draws near desiring God's fellowship. He knows that he is unworthy and burdened with sin. The offering

8. The Fullness of Sacrifice 11-14.

he brings is laid on the altar, and is slain by himself so that the blood which is the life can be released to be presented to God. With that life presented to God, the offerer identifies his own life. The flesh or part of it is burned, so that thus etherealised, it can ascend into the presence of God in Heaven. It thus represents the offerer in the very presence of God Himself. A portion of the flesh is eaten by the priests and the offerer, and the meal itself is an act of communion with God. But the most important act in the offering of the sacrifice is the releasing of the victim's blood which is its life, and presenting it to God. "More and more students of comparative religion and of Old Testament worship in particular, are insisting that the bestowal of life is the fundamental idea in sacrificial worship."⁹ E.O. James stresses the same point. "The fundamental principle throughout is the same, the giving of life to promote or preserve life, death being merely a means of liberating vitality. Consequently the destruction of the victim, to which many writers have given a central position in the rite, assumes a position of secondary importance in comparison with the transmission of the soul-substance to the supernatural being to whom it is offered."¹⁰ By means of the blood, the offerer could enter into communion with God. The obstacles which had broken this communion were removed, and the fellowship with God renewed. There is abundant evidence in the history of the Patriarchs, and in the

9. Vincent Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice* 55.

10. E.O. James, *Origins of Sacrifice* 256 (quoted by Taylor 55 footnote).

ritual of the Mosaic Law that the way of approach to God for sinful man is the way of sacrifice. No covenant between God and man is represented as having been made without sacrifice. And sacrifice means the death of a victim, and the release of its blood to be presented to God, and also to be sprinkled on the people. When the Lord made a covenant with Noah after the deluge, Noah built an altar, and offered upon it burnt offerings of every clean beast and of every clean fowl. "And the Lord smelled the sweet savour, and said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake. (Gen. VIII. 20 f.) The Lord made a covenant with Abram (Gen. XV. 8-18) to assure Abram that the promise of God would be fulfilled. Abram offered a heifer, and a she-goat and a ram and a turtle dove and a pigeon, 'and in that day Jehovah made a covenant with Abram, saying, unto thy seed I have given this land.....' (Gen. XV. 18).

The covenant which God made with the people at Sinai is represented as having been made with sacrifice. Having received the words of Jehovah, Moses wrote them, and built an altar under the Mount. "And he sent young men of the children of Israel who offered burnt offerings and sacrificed peace offerings of oxen unto Jehovah. And Moses took half of the blood in basins and half of the blood he sprinkled on the altar. And he took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people. And they said, all that Jehovah hath spoken

will we do, and be obedient. And Moses took the blood and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant, which Jehovah hath made with you concerning all these words." (Exod. XXIV. 4-8). In Psalm L. 5 God is represented as saying "Gather my Saints together unto me, those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice." Every covenant between God and man is sealed by sacrifice, by means of which the people have access to God. Davison¹¹ commenting on this verse in Psalm L. says "The ratification of the covenant of Canaan is by a commanded sacrifice, as a federal rite, sacrifice was the seal of that covenant. The same federal rite is renewed in the Mosaic covenant. In both instances, it is the type of the federal sacrifice which seals and ratifies between God and man the covenant of the Gospel. Hence I understand that summons and designation of God's people, 'Gather my saints together unto me, those that have made a covenant with me *by* sacrifice, to be descriptive of His public church in every age, in the days of Abraham, of the Law and of the Gospel. The same federal rite of sacrifice is common to all."

[The author of Hebrews in ~~IX~~. 16, according to some commentators meant the word *Συνθήκη* to stand for covenant not for testament. If so Hebrews then states it as a universally acknowledged fact, that where a covenant is, there must also be the death of the covenanter. The death of the victim

11. Davison, An Inquiry into Primitive Sacrifice, 149.

is representative of the death of the covenanter, its blood signifies the life of the person who makes the covenant sacrifice as presented to God in newness of life. A covenant is ratified over dead victims *ἐπὶ νεκροῖς* adds the author of Hebrews. But there is no agreement amongst commentators as to how the word *συνθήκη* should be translated throughout this passage in Heb. IX. 16-17. "Certain commentators would retain covenant throughout the passage as in verses 15 and 18 mainly on the ground that justice must be done to the author's language whether we can perceive his drift or not. This is a strong argument in the abstract. When, however, it is asked, what did the writer probably mean when he said, "where a covenant is, there must be the death of the covenanter" (verse 16), "and a covenant is of no force while the covenanter, or he who made it liveth"? - the answer hazarded is unsatisfactory. The passage refers to a general fact, which it brings to bear upon the particular case of the death of the Son. Now in most covenants, God is the covenanter or he who made it. In what sense can his death be said to be necessary? Or if man be supposed to be the covenanter, what is meant by saying that a covenant is of no force while he that made it liveth? The suggestion made is this: a sacrifice accompanied the making of the covenant. The death of the victim represented the death of the contracting parties. They died - that

is, either they died to the past, old scores were held wiped out, and bygones were bygones; or they died to the future: so far as their action or will was concerned the covenant now made would be as inviolable as if they were both dead. It will take some reasoning, however, to show that the death of the sacrifice in the Hebrew Covenant had any such meaning."^{12]}

From the history of the Patriarchs, and from the ordinances of the Mosaic law, it is clear that the altar and sacrifice are the divinely ordained means of entering into communion with God.¹³ Under the Mosaic dispensation the fire on the altar of burnt-offerings must not be allowed to go out by day or by night. The smoke ascended to heaven in order to preserve uninterrupted the intercourse between God and His people. This intercourse between God and the people was hindered by sin, sin became a barrier between God and the people, and the blood of the sacrifice alone was able to remove this barrier, and restore the right relationship. On the great Day of Atonement, the High Priest could not enter the Holy of Holies without the blood of the sacrifice, both for himself and for the people. And in order to preserve the sanctuary itself as a place of communion and fellowship with God, the very altars had to be atoned for and cleansed year by year on the Day of Atonement. In harmony with this teaching of the Pentateuch,

12. Davidson's Handbook on Hebrews 183-4 footnote.

13. See Gen. XII. 7, 8; XIII. 4, 18; XXVI. 25; XXXIII. 20; XXXV, 1, 3, 7; XLVI. 1.

we find the author of Hebrews teaching that it is through the blood of Christ, sacrificed for us that we now have the right of approaching God: "Having therefore, brethren boldness to enter into the Holy Place, by the blood of Jesus, by the way which he dedicated for us, a new and living way, through the veil, that is to say, His flesh, and having a great Priest over the house of God, let us draw near with a true heart in fullness of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our body washed with pure water." (Heb. X. 19-22).

In the Pentateuch we have detailed instructions as to the ritual of sacrifice. The worshipper who brings his offering to the altar is guided in every step of the procedure by the enactments of the Mosaic Law. The prominent feature in the ritual varies with the different kinds of offering. If the worshipper draws near to offer a sin-offering, the sprinkling of the blood is the most prominent feature. If he offers a burnt offering, the burning of the victim on the altar over-shadows all the other actions. And if it is a peace offering the meal that follows is the most prominent feature of the ritual. In all animal sacrifices the first action in the ritual was the bringing of the animal by the worshipper to the entrance of the Court of the Tabernacle, "And he shall bring the bullock unto the door of the tent of meeting before the Lord, and he shall lay his hand upon the head of the

bullock, and kill the bullock before the Lord."¹⁴ These three preliminary acts were performed by the worshipper who wished to make the sacrifice, the work of the priest only beginning with the sprinkling of the blood of the victim. The laying on of hands on the victim's head formed part of the ritual in the offering for sin,¹⁵ the burnt offering,¹⁶ and the peace offering.¹⁷ By laying his hands on the victim, the offerer identified himself with his offering, and gave its blood on the altar in order that it might remove the barrier which sin had placed between him and communion with God.

The slaying of the victim was the offerer's act, not the priest's. The only time a priest killed the victim was when he brought a sacrifice for his own sin, e.g. Lev. IV. 3, 4. Then he was acting not as a priest, but as a sinner. On the Day of Atonement the High Priest killed the sin offering, the bullock for himself and the goat for the people (Lev. XVI. 11, 15). But in this instance too, the priest kills the bullock as a sinner for his own sins, while he kills the goat as the representative of the people.

With the sprinkling of the blood, the work of the priest begins.¹⁸ The offerer can do no more, he has brought the victim to the entrance of the Tabernacle, and has solemnly

14. Lev. IV. 4. See also Lev. IV. 14, 23, 28: V. 6; 18, XVII, 4, 9.

15. Lev. IV. 4, 15, 24.

16. Lev. I. 4.

17. Lev. III. 2, 8, 13.

18. Lev. I. 5, 11; III. 2, 8; IV. 6.

laid his hands upon it, and has killed it to release the blood which is the life he seeks to offer. But further he cannot go. The Priest, who is the Mediator between God and sinful men must take the blood and sprinkle it on the altar, for he is specially commissioned by God to do this work. In this way the fellowship between the offerer and God, which has been disturbed by sin, is renewed.

The place of sprinkling the blood of sacrifice varied with the different sacrifices. When a burnt offering or a peace offering was brought to the altar, the priest would sprinkle the blood round about the brazen altar that is at the door of the tent of meeting (Lev. I. 5 also III. 2, 8). The blood of the sin-offering was sprinkled upon the horns of the altar of burnt offering and then poured out at the base of the altar of burnt offering. (Lev. IV. 25, 30.)

But the most solemn presentation of the sacrificial blood was that of the Day of Atonement. The blood of the bullock for the Priests' sins, and of the goat for the people's sins was taken through the veil, into the Holy of Holies, and was sprinkled upon the mercy seat above the ark, and seven times before the mercy seat (Lev. XVI. 14-15).

As to the guilt offering, after the blood had been sprinkled, the fat of the bullock¹⁹ was arranged on the altar to be consumed by the holy fire. In this way the offering

19. See Exod. XXIX. 14 (at the consecration of the priests) Lev. IV. 11 (sin offering for the Priests) Lev. IV. 21 (sin offering for the congregation.)

ascended to heaven as a fragrant offering pleasing to God. St. Paul in Eph. V. 2, is thinking of the sacrifice thus consumed when he refers to Christ as having given himself up for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for an odour of a sweet smell."

But on the Day of Atonement, the whole of the bullock and the goat were burned outside the camp.²⁰ The difference between the burning on the altar and the burning outside the camp is brought out by the two different words used for 'burn' in these contexts. Of the fat of the bullock burned on the altar the verb used is רָחַף which means to exhale odour, and it is used of the smoke of incense ascending to heaven. This word is used Lev. IV. 10 $\text{וְהִקְטִיבְתָּ אֹתוֹ מִן־הַבֵּיתִי$ of the fat of the sin offering of the priest being burnt on the altar, but in the verse 12, the verb שָׂף is used of the flesh and skin and head of the victim being burnt outside the camp. $\text{וְשָׂף אֹתוֹ$
 $\text{וְשָׂף אֹתוֹ מִן־הַבֵּיתִי}$ This same word is used in Lev. XVI. 27 of the bullock and the goat of the Day of Atonement being burnt outside the gate. The LXX brings out the difference between the two verbs by using διδυόσσει where רָחַף is used for the fat being burned on the altar (Lev. IV. 10) and reserving κατακύσσειν to translate שָׂף which is used for the burning of the flesh and the skin and the head outside the camp.²¹ The burning on the altar is to make a fragrant

20. Lev. XVI. 27.

21. See Lev. IV. 19 & 21 LXX.

odour to ascend to heaven - it is called ^{to go up on} ~~to ascend~~ ^{on altar} - but the burning outside the camp is to destroy utterly and consume by fire.

In the peace offering the characteristic feature was the meal. The offering was presented to God in the same way as in other sacrifice, and thus, when the offerer partook of the victim in the meal, he did so as God's guest. It was God who gave the meal, and this was a pledge of friendship and peace with Him.

For the performance of these divinely appointed rites, there was a divinely appointed place - the Tabernacle. This Tabernacle was constructed in accordance with the pattern which had been shown to Moses on the Mount when he held communion with God there for forty days and forty nights. Exodus XXV - XL contains the detailed instructions as to how it should be constructed in all its parts, and a description of how the work was actually carried out. It is a very elaborate account in all its details and few scholars attribute it to Moses. We need not accept the elaborate picture of the Tabernacle drawn in Exodus, which is clearly a reflection back into an earlier period of Solomon's temple. But we may be sure there was an earlier tent, wherein dwelt the earlier presence of Jehovah, where men might meet Him, and where from time to time there appeared manifestations of the divine glory.²² The Tabernacle

22. See Oesterley and Robinson, Hebrew Religion - its origin and development 162-3.

was divided into two parts divided by a curtain.²³ The inner chamber was the Holy of Holies in which the Ark of the Testimony and the Mercy Seat and the Two Cherubims were lodged.²⁴ Into the Holy of Holies the High Priest alone, on the Day of Atonement entered with the blood of the sin offering for himself and for the people. The other chamber was called The Holy Place.²⁵ The Holy Place contained the altar of incense, the Table of shewbread, and the Golden Candlesticks. Before the Holy Place stood the Court of the Tabernacle which was not covered, but bounded by pillars.²⁶ The most important furniture of the Court were the Laver of brass²⁷ and the Altar of Burnt offering.²⁸ In the laver of brass the Priests washed their hands and feet before approaching the altar.

23. Exod. XXVI. 31.
24. Exod. XXV. 10-22.
25. Exod. XXVI. 33.
26. Exod. XXVII.
27. Exod. XXX. 17-21.
28. Exod. XXVII. 1-8.

C H A P T E R VI.

Comparison and Contrast between the Old Testament Sacrificial
Ritual and the Work of Christ in Hebrews.

The recipients of the Epistle were men versed in the Old Testament, and their conception of worship was that which they found in the Pentateuch - God must be approached through the medium of a priest offering a sacrifice. Some of them might have visited the temple in Jerusalem and have witnessed the solemn rites of the Day of Atonement, but whether they had been to the temple or not, from their reading of the Law of Moses, they visualised the rites which took place in that sacred place in the name of the nation. Moreover, they paid annually the temple tax towards the upkeep of the temple services, and to that extent felt that they had a part in the ministrations.¹

In Hebrews the discussion turns almost entirely on the ritual ordinances as set forth in the Levitical books. The work of Christ for man is approached from the ritual or worship side. Here he differs from St. Paul who approaches the transaction which Christ effected between God and man from the forensic or judicial side. The whole idea of salvation in Hebrews is a sacerdotal one, and we only have to read the opening verses to hear the key-note of the whole epistle -

1. See Schurer Jewish People in time of Jesus Christ. (Eng. Trans.) Division II. Vol. II. pp. 288-291. Also Philo de Monarchia Book II. par. 3. (quoted by Schurer p. 289.).

Καθάρσιον τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος ἐκάθισεν (I. 3.)

Jesus Christ is a priest, and the author makes use of terms and ideas from the Levitical ritual in order to demonstrate that Jesus Christ as Priest performs in perfection what was only suggested by the ritual of the old covenant. In the main our Lord is presented as the perfect High Priest entering into the heavens into the very presence of God, of which act the Aaronic High Priest's annual entry into the Holy of Holies was a type or antitype. But this does not prevent the author from making use of the other typology which he finds in the Pentateuch. Professor Davidson's observations in this connection sum up admirably the use made of the typology of the old covenant worship, - "While his typology mainly runs upon the line of the High Priest's ministry in the holiest, to which Christ's offering of Himself is parallel, the author combines with this ministry other Old Testament ceremonies that have no immediate connection with it, such as the ceremony with the ashes of the red heifer (IX. 13.) and the sacrifice that inaugurated the covenant (IX. 15; X. 29.) to all of which the sacrifice of Christ affords an analogy. He even throws out fragments of what might be called other typological systems, that cannot be harmonised with the main system of the Day of Atonement nor fitted into it. For example the comparison of the veil to our Lord's flesh or human nature (X. 20.), which had to be rent ere entrance could be obtained into the holiest in the presence of God, a

profound and beautiful thought, containing a typology in itself, is one that cannot be adapted into the main typological scheme pursued, but lies quite outside of it. Similarly the comparison of the death of Jesus outside the gate to the burning of the remnants of the sin-offering without the camp (XIII. 11.) is one that quite disjoins the ritual of the Day of Atonement. For the suffering of Christ certainly took place before His blood entered into the holiest, while the burning of the sin-offering followed the bringing in of its blood by the High Priest. The comparison indeed is a mere isolated analogy, intended to point a lesson (XIII. 13.) and however deep the truth be which it suggests, it cannot be made a link in the typological chain of the Day of Atonement. This combination of elements in the Old Testament ritual that are independent, though of the same general meaning, prepares us to find a similar grouping together of points connected with the offering of Christ. In such a scheme, prominence will be given to those events that find a parallel in the Old Testament ritual, such as Christ's entry into the sanctuary on high, while other things, such as the resurrection and forty days sojourn upon the earth, having no analogy in the Old Testament ritual or worship, are passed over.² The author looks at the different elements of the Old Testament ritual of worship, and seeks how he can make these elements which are so familiar to his readers, the vehicles to bring home to them the superiority and finality of the mode

2. Davidson's Hebrews p. 196-7.

of worship which has become possible for them through Jesus Christ. The officers of the old covenant worship were the priests, they mediated between God and man. Under the new covenant Christ is the Priest, who has gone before as a pioneer. *ἀπαρτί* (II. 10.) and is able to bring men into the very presence of God. The place in which the priests ministered was the Tabernacle or temple. The place where the ministry of Jesus is performed is in Heaven itself (IX. 24.). Just as the priest was not able to approach God without an offering, so Jesus Christ brings also an offering which is His own blood. All through the Epistle the corresponding features of the two dispensations are brought out, and in each case the vast superiority of the new over the old is demonstrated. The relation subsisting between them is that between substance and shadow.

For the most part the author chooses to state the effect of the work of Christ in terms of the sacrifice and rites which accompanied the inauguration of the first covenant (Exod. XXIV. 6 ff.) and in terms of the sacrifices and rites of the Day of Atonement. By the sprinkling of the blood on the people, Moses sanctified the people to be the people of God. The sprinkling of the blood ratified the covenant into which they had entered with God. The sacrifice of the Day of Atonement was a sacrifice for the sin of the people, in order to restore the broken communion with God. Now the standpoint of the author of Hebrews is that religion is fellowship with God, but

sin disturbs this fellowship, and means must be found to remove sin that it may no longer separate the worshipper from God.

From the opening verses of Chapter VI. we can derive a fair idea of what the Christian life constituted in the eyes of the author. The author writes that he will not again dwell on the first principles of Christ (VI. 1.), but gives us, nevertheless, a summary of what he regards as the foundation stones of the Christian life. First of all he mentions 'repentance from dead works' and then 'faith towards God', 'baptisms', and 'the laying on of hands' (VI. 2.). In VI. 4-5, he speaks of 'those who were once enlightened,' and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and tasted the good word of God and the powers of the age to come. At the head of this list we have repentance from dead works, from sins. The consciousness of sin estranged the worshipper from God's presence, and until a means of cleansing man's conscience had been found, worship in the full sense of the term was impossible. What Christ effected for men was the taking away of sins, and thus removed the obstacle to communion with God. James Denney emphasises the same point - "until sin is expiated, the sinner has a bad conscience, and as long as a man has a bad conscience he cannot begin to be a good man. It is because Christ's death deals effectually with the responsibility of sin, and puts right with God the man who believes in Him, that it can do for our nature what Law could never do - break sin's power."³

3. James Denney "Death of Christ" 189.

The author of Hebrews derives his conception of God from the Pentateuch.⁴ What has impressed the author most is the transcendent greatness of God. Man dare not and cannot approach him except through a mediator to whom he can bring his offering, the symbol of his repentance. There is no hiding from His piercing eye - "All things are naked and laid open before the eyes of him with whom we have to do." (IV. 13.) God is judge of all, and he seeks through discipline and chastisement, to bring men to be partakers of his holiness. Without sanctification, no man shall see God. The Author's mind is steeped in the Pentateuch where we read that the people must be cleansed before they can approach God.⁵

What Christ did was to make cleansing from sin possible. He had put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself (IX. 26.). From the author's readers' knowledge of what happened on the Cross through the preaching of those who had heard the Lord, the need of repentance, and cleansing had come home to them, and the assurance of forgiveness had revealed to them that the way of communion with God was now open to them. They were now, as believers in Christ, and in the efficacy of his sacrifice "cleansed, and had no more consciousness of sins." (X. 2.) Through the blood of Christ, eternal redemption had become theirs (IX. 12.). The result of this putting away of sin by

4. See Vincent Taylor "Atonement in the New Testament Teaching" 163-4.

5. See Gen. XXXV. 2; Exod. XIX. 10-11; Numb. VIII. 7. ff.

Jesus Christ is that the worshipper can come with boldness (*παρρησία*) to the throne of grace, (IV. 16.) for sin no longer forms a gulf separating him from God.

As has been stated above, the author makes use in the main of the terminology and imagery of the great Covenant Sacrifice and of the Day of Atonement, in his statement of what Christ has effected for men. But he also makes use of other Old Testament ceremonies to bring out the fullness of Christ's sacrifice. He lays hand on everything in the ritual of the Mosaic law, which would serve his purpose of demonstrating to his readers that in Christ and the New Covenant they have in perfection all that was suggested in the ordinances of the Old Covenant.

In Chapters V. 1, VIII. 3, and IX. 9, the author states that one essential necessity in a high priest is that he should have somewhat to offer. "Every high priest is appointed to offer both gifts and sacrifices, wherefore it is necessary that this high priest also (Jesus Christ) have somewhat to offer." In this context the author does not expressly specify the kind of offering Jesus has to make. But later it becomes evident that it is of the kind the High Priest made on the Day of Atonement - an offering for sin. The purpose of all sacrificial worship was communion with God, the sin-offering being the means of restoring the broken fellowship. The phrase "gifts and sacrifices" (*δωρεὰ καὶ θυσίας*) mentioned in this connection

is "a generic term for sacrifices or offerings without any distinction"⁶ When we look at the Levitical scheme of worship we find that the idea and practice of sacrifice had been worked into a ritual system which expresses now the thankful (*ḥāpa*) and now the guilty consciousness of the people (*ḥōḥā*). But the sacrifice which Jesus as High Priest has to offer is conceived in the Epistle to Hebrews pre-eminently as a sacrifice for sins, after the manner of the Aaronic High Priest on the day of Atonement. We shall deal with the sacrifice of Jesus as a sacrifice for sins in the Chapter on Jesus Christ as Priest.

In Chapter IX. 13-14 the author draws a comparison between the blood of beasts, and the other means of purification in the Levitical ritual, and ^{the} blood of Christ. The purificatory rites of Judaism sanctified to the purifying of the flesh only, and were thus far inferior to the blood of Christ which availed to purge the conscience from dead works. The author accepts the principle that blood shed on the altar is effectual to purify the flesh, and he knows that the readers accept the same

6. Moffatt Epistle to Hebrews (I.C.C.) 62. c.f. Delitzsch Commentary on Hebrews Vol. I. 227. (English Translation) who maintains that *ḥāpa* stands for sacrifice made without blood-shedding, *ḥōḥā* for those of which the slaying of a victim formed the principal part.

principle.⁷ He then proceeds to state how much more the blood of Christ is effectual for the purifying of the conscience.

We have two of the Levitical media of purification referred to here, - the blood of goats and bulls, which have reference to the ceremonies of the Day of Atonement and will be dealt with below, and the ashes of a heifer. According to Numbers XIX., pollution through contact with a dead body could be removed by washing in fresh water mixed with the ashes of a heifer (*ἡ σπόδος τῆς Σαμάρειας*). The heifer had to be red in colour unblemished and unyoked. It was burnt entire without the camp and with it was burnt cedar wood, and hyssop and scarlet.⁸ Then a man that was clean gathered up the ashes, and laid them in a clean place outside the camp, so that anyone who came into contact with a dead body, thereby incurring an uncleanness of seven days, could be sprinkled with these ashes on the third and seventh day, and thus be made clean again.⁹

7. The author does not give a rationale of sacrifice, either of the Levitical or of Christ's, because it was unnecessary. See Moore's Judaism Vol. I. p. 500-504 - "In a revealed religion, it is idle to seek a theory of the way in which sacrifice expiates sin. God commanded sacrifice and that is all we need to know." See also Moffatt Hebrews I.C.C. 122 on Rabbi Jochanan ben Zakkai who tells his disciples that men must not inquire into God's reasons. God has appointed the sacrifices and the sprinkling, and that is all men need to know. See also Davidson Theology of the Old Testament 325.
8. Numbers XIX. 6.
9. See further on this subject R.S. Macalister in E.R.E. XI. 36a.

While unclean, the person was cut off from the services of the sanctuary, to which, on being purified he was restored again. "To restore one to such fellowship with God is to 'sanctify' him; this was the effect of purifying his flesh. "Sanctify to the purity of the flesh" may mean, sanctify, producing purity of the flesh, in which case the last words define what sanctify means; or, sanctify in reference to the purity of the flesh - defining the sphere within which the sanctity is produced. The latter is more probable."¹⁰ In contrasting the sacrifice of Christ in its purificatory power, the author shows that the purificatory media of the Levitical law had a limited validity. It dealt with that which was outward. It removed outward or ceremonial defilement, and gave to a person outward or ceremonial purity. The sphere of the Levitical media was the outward, and in that sphere it availed. The purification which the Levitical media afforded restored to the worshipper the right to engage in the services of the Tabernacle, and gave him again a place with the Covenant people. But the author declares that the sphere in which the blood of Christ is effectual for purification is not the flesh, but the conscience (IX. 14.). Confronted by the holy God, the real obstacle to man's communion with Him was not ceremonial defilement such as contact with a dead body, which defilement the ashes of a heifer

10. Davidson Epistle to Hebrews 176.

served to cleanse, but the guilty conscience. It was at that point the worshipper most needed help and it was precisely at that point that the Law with all its ordinances and ritual utterly failed (X. 4, 11.). The author's mind is still moving in the Pentateuch whence he learnt that the Law provided for cleansing of sins of inadvertence only. It had no provision against sins committed with a high hand.¹¹ The blood of Christ cleanses the conscience, and puts the worshipper in that relationship with God in which worship and communion is possible. The ashes of the heifer cleansed a person from contact with dead bodies, the blood of Christ cleanses the conscience from dead works, i.e. sin in the moral sense, which is the obstacle to a free serving (*λατρεύειν*) of the living God. The word *λατρεύειν* (VIII. 5; IX. 9, 14; X. 2; XII. 28; XIII. 10.), is the liturgical term for service and worship, in a sanctuary, and as F.D.V. Narborough says,¹² we have in Chapter IX. 14 the author's characteristic contention that Christ's sacrifice by cleansing our conscience makes it possible for us to worship.

Another comparison our author makes use of is that of the Tabernacle veil to our Lord's flesh. The veil¹³ which separated the Holy of Holies from the Holy place in both Tabernacle and Temple continually reminded the worshippers that the immediate presence of God was not yet open to them. It was for

11. See Vincent Taylor "Jesus and His Sacrifice" 55 f. Also Davidson Theology of the Old Testament, p. 310; 315.
12. Hebrews Clarendon Bible 118.
13. Exodus XXVI. 31 ff.

the High Priest alone on the Day of Atonement to pass through the veil as a representative of the people with the blood of the people's and that of his own sacrifice. The epistle to the Hebrews has much to say about the boldness *παρρησία* (III. 6; IV. 16; X. 19: cf. good conscience XIII. 18) with which the worshipper can now approach the divine presence in virtue of what our Lord has accomplished for us. All through the Epistle there is brought out the grandeur of the position in which the Christian is placed as compared with that of the worshipper under the old covenant. One of the ways in which this grandeur is brought out is by the author's claim that our Lord has consecrated a new and living way through the veil for us into the presence of God. (X. 20.) His mind all the time is moving in the Pentateuch and is full of the imagery of the Levitical system. He is thinking of the people assembled for worship in the Tabernacle or Temple. The priests and the High Priest act as representatives of the people. But the mode of worship failed to bring the worshipper into the very presence of God where the worshipper desired to be. The veil hid from him the presence of God. Thus under the old covenant, perfect worship was impossible. And there was in the hearts of the worshippers a longing for a day to come when the veil would no longer separate them from God's presence. That day came when our Lord as the perfect High Priest offered the Perfect Sacrifice

for sin. The way into the Holiest has been opened by the blood of Jesus (X. 19) and in High Priestly fashion he has entered as forerunner, *προδρομος*, and thence all worshippers may follow.

Chapter X. 20 tells us that our Lord had entered in "by the way which he dedicated for us, a new and living way through the veil, that is to say His flesh." The most natural way is to connect the words *Τούτ' ἐστὶν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ* with 'veil', thus representing Christ's flesh as the veil through which he passed into the Holiest. This symbolism becomes clear in reference to the rending of the veil of the Jewish temple at the time of the Lord's death, thereby exposing to view the Holy of Holies itself.¹⁴ The rending of the earthly temple veil at the crucifixion was an emblem of that of which the writer is thinking in this connection. As Delitzsch¹⁵ puts it "While He was with us here below, the weak, limit-bound and mortal *σάρξ* (V. 7.) which He had assumed for our sakes, hung like a curtain between Him and the divine sanctuary into which He would enter, and in order to such entrance this curtain had to be withdrawn by death, even as the High Priest had to draw aside the temple veil in order to make his entry into the Holy of Holies. The Lord in death laid aside the Adamite conditions of His human nature, to resume it again transfigured and glorified; and in this way He reconciled (*ἀποκαταλλάξεν*) us

14. Matth. XXVII. 51.

15. Delitzsch Epistle to Hebrews (Eng. Trans.) Vol. II. 172.

in the body of His flesh through death (Col. I. 22.) so that as now between Him and God, so also between God and us, the flesh should be no more a separating barrier."

Other commentators maintain that *ΤΟΥΤ' ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ* in X. 20 should be connected not with *κατὰ μετέωρατος* but with *ὁδόν*. The meaning then would be that the way for Christians through the veil into the world of spiritual realities is the way of Christ's flesh, the way He took in the days of His flesh. (V. 7.) This interpretation has much to commend it, and is in keeping with the great importance attached throughout the Epistle to the humanity of Christ. Westcott¹⁶ who connects this phrase with *ὁδόν* aptly remarks that it is surprising that the flesh of Christ should be treated in any way as a veil, an obstacle, to the vision of God in a place where stress is laid on His humanity." Notwithstanding, the more natural interpretation is that which connects *ΤΟΥΤ' ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ* with *κατὰ μετέωρατος* and as Nairne¹⁷ says the "common sense" of readers of all ages takes to this interpretation more readily than to the other. The author allegorises the veil here as the flesh of Christ. Our Lord, as great High Priest could not enter the Holy of Holies in the Heavens without blood, and the veil of His flesh had to be rent before the blood could be shed. *πρὸς Ἐβραίους* does not expressly

16. Westcott Hebrews p. 320.

17. Nairne Epistle of Priesthood 381.

state the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers, but he describes the access of worshippers to God in the terms used in the Pentateuch of the Priests drawing nigh to God (X. 21-22.) "having a great High Priest over the house of God let us draw near with a true heart in fulness of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our body washed with pure water." Having stated that through the self-sacrifice of Christ in death, the way into the presence of God has been opened to us (X. 19-20) he exhorts his readers in X. 22 to draw nigh - *προσερχώμεθα* the word used in Pentateuch LXX of the priests drawing nigh to God.¹⁸ Christians are not priests with right of entry in virtue of a sacrifice they bring, as it was in the case of the High Priests, but whereas under the old covenant to approach God was a prerogative of the priests alone, now it is the prerogative of all worshippers. The sacerdotal metaphor is continued in the words *ἑραυτομένοι τὰς καρδίας... καὶ δλουσμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι καθαρῷ.*

In the Pentateuch we learn that on two occasions only were the people sprinkled with blood in the Levitical ritual. After Moses had read to the people the book of the covenant, and the people had declared that they would be obedient to all that the Lord had said, Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said "Behold the blood of the covenant which

18. e.g. Lev. IX. 7, 8.

the Lord has made with you concerning all these words."¹⁹ The sprinkling with blood was a token of the people's consecration.

The other occasion on which blood was sprinkled was at the consecrating of Aaron and his sons to the priestly office - "And thou shalt take of the blood that is on the altar, and of the anointing oil, and sprinkle it upon Aaron and upon his garments, and upon his sons, and upon the garments of his sons with him: and he shall be hallowed he and his garments, and his sons, and his sons' garments with him."²⁰ Here again the significance of the sprinkling was consecration for service to God.

Whereas in the Levitical ritual the outward persons and garments were sprinkled, in the Christian dispensation, the blood of Christ, speaking metaphorically, is sprinkled on the hearts of the worshippers, effecting not an outward cleansing, but a cleansing from an evil conscience, ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως ἠορητής. The worshippers, priestlike, draw nigh (προσέρχονται) to God to serve Him (Ἀπευθύνω) in perfect worship.

Washing with water was a feature of the ceremonial of the consecration of a priest to his office - "And Aaron and his sons thou shalt bring unto the door of the tent of meeting, and shalt wash them with water."²¹ As Moffatt²² suggests, the

19. Exod. XXIV. 8.

20. Exod. XXIX. 21.

21. Exod. XXIX. 4. See also Lev. XVI. 4. on bathing of High Priest in preparation for the Day of Atonement; also Numb. V. 17 ff. on the water of cleansing.

22. Moffatt Hebrews I.C.C. 144. also Westcott Hebrews 323.

author is no doubt thinking here of Christian baptism as corresponding to the bathing of priests in preparation for their sacred office and duty. Christian worshippers too, in baptism, were bathed with pure water like the priests. Their cleansing was something more than the cleansing of the body and the garments, it was the cleansing of the heart through the blood of Christ. It was the realisation of that which could not be effected by the ablutions performed under the Levitical Law. There, under the Old Covenant, it had been deeply felt that the one prerequisite for approaching God was purity. God was holy and the worshipper too must be cleansed before he could enter into the presence of the holy God. They who draw near to God in service must be like Him in character. Now this purity which was striven after could not in reality be found in any person, and what could not be secured in reality was expressed in symbol.²³ The priests who were the representatives of the Covenant people before God, had to be men perfectly free from all kinds of bodily blemish.²⁴ After this demand was satisfied, the candidate for priesthood had to undergo numerous washings and purifications to make him fit for his sacred office.²⁵ Then as a sign that the purity necessary for the office had been attained, the priest was clothed in white linen. Under the new covenant, all the worshippers in priestly fashion (borrowing

23. See Davidson Theology of Old Testament 306-311.

24. Lev. XXI. 16. ff.

25. Lev. VIII.

the ideas and vocabulary of the Pentateuch) had their hearts, not their bodies or garments sprinkled from an evil conscience, and had their bodies washed with pure water in baptism which was the symbol of the new life within. It is thus established by the author of *προς Εβραίους* that under the New Covenant through the blood of our Lord, the worshippers have attained in reality what could only be attained in symbol under the old covenant, viz. a cleansed conscience which gives the worshippers boldness to enter into God's presence by the new and living way, (*ὁδὸν πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν* χ. 20.).

One of the main aspects in which the self-sacrifice of Christ is presented to us in Hebrews is that of a Covenant sacrifice. Every Jew was familiar with the account in Exodus XXIV. of the covenant between God and his people. That was the type in the Pentateuch and whereas it had been external and confined, the covenant inaugurated by Jesus, the antitype, has a spiritual and eternal validity. As is often the way with the author of Hebrews, he mentions a subject he wants to discuss a few times before he comes to the actual discussion of it. So he does with this subject of the new covenant (*καινή διαθήκη*). In VII. 22. Jesus is designated the surety, (*ἕγγυος*) of a better covenant, but nothing further is said of the covenant till VIII. 6. where Jesus is designated the mediator (*μεσίτης*) of a better covenant, which hath been enacted on better promises. The better covenant is contrasted

with the first covenant of Exodus. The first covenant was an order of religious fellowship inaugurated upon some historical occasion by sacrifice. So is the new covenant also an order of religious fellowship inaugurated by the self-sacrifice of Jesus. The aim of the former covenant had been worship, fellowship with God, and this is the aim of the new covenant too. But fellowship with God is only possible when on the one hand God forgives the sin of the people and they obey His law on the other. The new covenant is superior to the first covenant precisely at this point - that it will effect what the old covenant aimed at but could not accomplish. In the new covenant, the Law will be written in men's hearts, and God will remember their sin no more. The author finds in the Old Testament itself dissatisfaction with the first covenant. If that first covenant had been faultless, then would no place have been sought for a second. For finding fault with them he saith, 'Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and the house of Judah.....' (VIII. 7 f.). As early as the time of Jeremiah, the new and superior covenant had been sought. But the author's mind moves still in the Pentateuch, although he quotes from Jeremiah in support of the need felt for a new covenant. There is nothing in the oracle he quotes from Jeremiah about the sacrificial ritual with which the new covenant would be inaugurated. The author of Hebrews fills the picture in from the

Pentateuch account of the inauguration of the first covenant. For him it was impossible to conceive any covenant being inaugurated without a sacrifice, and the sprinkling of the blood on the people. The greatest blessing of the new covenant was to be the forgiveness of sins, and for him cleansing from sin could in no way be effected apart from sacrifice.

In IX. 18 we have the statement "Wherefore, even the first covenant hath not been dedicated without blood." The covenant consecration of the people at Sinai (Exod. XXIV.) was effected by the sprinkling of the blood of the sacrifice on the people. Davidson²⁶ says that "the word מִן־בְּרִית covenant connected perhaps with $\text{חָרַטְּ מִן־בְּרִית}$ = to cut, means any agreement entered into under solemn ceremonies of sacrifice. Hence to make a covenant is usually $\text{חָרַטְּ מִן־בְּרִית}$ to cut a covenant, i.e. slay victims in forming the agreement, giving it thus either a religious sanction in general, or specifically imploring on one's self the fate of the slain victims if its conditions were disregarded." After the Law had been declared to the people at Sinai by Moses, and they had unanimously declared their willingness to accept the duties and the privileges of the covenant as explained to them by Moses, an altar was built, and young oxen were offered upon it as burnt offerings and peace offerings. Half of the victims' blood was sprinkled on the altar, and half was put in basins. Then Moses read the book

26. Davidson Theology of Old Testament 239. See also Gesenius's Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon p. CXXXIX. Under חָרַטְּ

of the Covenant to the people, and after they had pledged themselves to live and act in accordance with the precepts of the book of the covenant, he took the blood which was in the basins, and sprinkled it on the people and said, "Behold the blood of the covenant, which Jehovah hath made with you concerning all these words."²⁷ Having been sprinkled with the blood, the people had solemnly pledged themselves to be God's people, and He would be their God. That is the picture the author of Hebrews had in his mind, when he sought to present Jesus to his readers as the inaugurator of the new covenant; Jesus is the Moses of the new dispensation, who administers the blood of the New Covenant. The author speaks metaphorically of the sprinkling of the hearts of the people, "having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience" (X. 22), as a token of their being the covenant people.

But the allusion to the sprinkling of the blood in IX. 19-21 deviates in several points from the account given in Exod. XXIV. 1. It speaks of Moses as using the blood of calves and goats *τῶν βοῶν καὶ τῶν τριγῶν* whereas the Pentateuch mentions calves only. In the Mosaic law goats are reserved for sin offerings e.g. for Day of Atonement.

2. In addition to the blood used for sprinkling, it mentions water, scarlet-wool, and hyssop used also for sprinkling.

27. Exod. XXIV. 8.

3. It describes not only the nation, but the book of the covenant, the Tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry as having been sprinkled with blood. Now as to the first deviation from the Pentateuch account, the author of Hebrews instinctively used the phrase *To' αἵμα τῶν θυσιῶν καὶ τῶν ἑλισσῶν* because it is likely that the phrase was in common use for Old Testament sacrifices²⁸ in general.

As to the second deviation, water, scarlet-wool and hyssop would readily come to his mind in thinking of the ritual of sprinkling, for these were used in the consecration of the Levites²⁹ who were also sprinkled with water.

The author of Hebrews was familiar with the idea of the sprinkling of the Tabernacle and its furniture from the ceremonies of the consecration of the priests.³⁰ The Tabernacle and its furniture were not in existence when the covenant was concluded at Sinai. But in the whole of this paragraph, the thought uppermost in the author's mind is that of consecration by means of blood, and all the cases familiar to him from the Pentateuch in which blood was so used, come crowding into his memory. But nowhere in the Pentateuch are we told that the book of the Covenant was sprinkled with blood. It is possible that there was a tradition to this effect with which the author of Hebrews was familiar.

28. So Moffatt Hebrews 129.

29. Numb. VIII. 7.

30. Lev. VIII. 10,11. c.f. Exod. XL. 9-11. Narborough Hebrews (Clar. Bible) 120 ascribes the deviations from Old Testament to defective memory on part of author.

In the Pentateuch³¹ the Sanctuary and its furniture are sprinkled with oil, and not with blood as Hebrews has it, the priests alone being sprinkled with blood and oil. Again it is possible that the author of Hebrews is drawing on traditional data here, and Josephus is in agreement with his statement. Josephus³² refers not only to the priests and their clothes, but also to the tabernacle and its furniture *τῶν τε σκηνῶν καὶ τὰ περὶ αὐτῶν σκεύη* as being sprinkled with oil and sacrificial blood. But *Hebrews* does not mention oil. As Moffatt³³ aptly remarks "Our author with his predilection for blood as a cathartic, omits the oil altogether, and extends the blood to everything."

But not only is the blood of Jesus efficacious for the cleansing of the conscience, it is the blood through the shedding of which the New Covenant has been inaugurated. Just as the blood of the victim sprinkled by Moses on the people ratified the first covenant, so the blood of Christ is the means of the ratification of the New Covenant between God and man. The New Covenant is based on the efficacy of the blood of Christ for the cleansing of conscience - "And for this cause he is the mediator of a New Covenant, that a death having taken place for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant" (IX. 15). Men now stand in a new relation to God as a result of the work of Christ; they are of the New

31. Lev. VIII. 30.

32. Ant. III. 8, 6.

33. Hebrews (I.C.C.) 130.

Covenant. "The blood - the Life of Christ - which was the source and support of the life, was the seal of the Covenant."³⁴

The first Covenant had proved incapable of bringing men into perfection, hence a new Covenant took its place. But, before the New Covenant could be established, there was one prerequisite - the discharge of man's existing obligations. The sins which the Law had set in a clear light could not be ignored. The atonements provided for sin under the Law had proved inadequate. But Christ had now offered the final and efficacious sacrifice, to which all the sacrifices of the first Covenant pointed, and this sacrifice was the basis of the New Covenant. When this necessary condition had been fulfilled - 'a death having taken place for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant' - they who had been called are able to receive the promise of the eternal inheritance. The contrast between the first covenant and the new is still carried on in the writer's mind. Moses, who was God's agent in the inauguration of the first covenant, secured to the people an inheritance, a material inheritance, which was only a figure of the eternal inheritance which is now vouchsafed to those who are called *οἱ κεκλημένους* in virtue of the atoning death of Christ.

Throughout his discussion of Jesus as the inaugurator of the New Covenant, the author of Hebrews is thinking of the

34. Westcott. Hebrews 263.

blood of Jesus as ratifying the covenant, and also as cleansing the people's conscience from sin, both ideas being derived from the ritual of the Mosaic Law.

The use of the word *διαθήκη* sets a train of associated thoughts going in the writer's mind, and he plays on the word. Moffatt in his commentary³⁵ brings out clearly the author's play on the word *διαθήκη*. We give Moffatt's translation of IX. 15-18 - "He mediates a new covenant for this reason, that those who have been called may obtain the eternal inheritance they have been promised, now that a death has occurred which redeems them from the transgressions involved in the first covenant. (16) Thus in the case of a will, the death of a testator must be announced. (17) A will only holds in the cases of death, it is never valid so long as the testator is alive. (18) Hence even the first *(ἡ πρώτη sc. διαθήκη)* as in IX. 1) covenant of God's will was not inaugurated apart from blood."

Now *διαθήκη* is the word used regularly in LXX for covenant *ἰσχυρῶς*. The ordinary Greek word for covenant - *συνθήκη* - is used rarely in LXX. A *διαθήκη* could be between two men, or two groups of men, or between God and his people. All Jews are familiar with the word in this latter sense. No covenant, whoever the parties to it be, was valid until the representative victim had been slain, and its blood had ratified

35. Hebrews 125.

it.³⁶ A death had to take place to make the covenant valid. In Classical Greek *διαθήκη* stood for testament or will. This meaning was familiar to the author of Hebrews and his readers, and he plays on the double meaning of the word. No will or testament is valid until the testator *ὁ διαθέμενος* is dead. As Moffatt³⁷ states the common idea of both meanings of *διαθήκη* being that benefits are "disponed", and that the *διαθήκη* only takes effect after death.³⁸ The writer has spoken of an eternal inheritance (IX. 15), which has become within the reach of men only as a result of the atoning death of Christ. He is the testator *ὁ διαθέμενος* (c.f. Luke XXII. 29 *Καὶ ἡ διαθήκη ἐπιτίθει*). That same death inaugurated the new covenant, the blessings of which are now within the reach of men. The greatest of these blessings, as the Jeremiah oracle proclaims is the forgiveness of sins.

It is more difficult to follow the author's argument on the *διαθήκη* in English, for there is no single English word to convey the two different meanings which *διαθήκη* readily conveyed to the readers of this epistle. It is true that the illustration of Jesus as testator, with the will coming into force after his death, has its defects, for there was nothing more certain in the author's heart, than that Jesus was

36. See Davidson Theology of O.T. 239 ff.

37. Hebrews I.C.C. 127.

38. See Nairne Hebrews (Camb Bible) LXXIX. He inclines to the view that the language of Testamentary law does not enter into Heb. IX. 15-18 at all. The governing thought all through according to Nairne is Christ's fulfilling of Israel's covenant hope. So Westcott in his valuable note on the meaning of *διαθήκη* Hebrews 298-302.

living. The defects became pronounced only when we press the illustration beyond what the writer meant to imply. Jesus had died, but His death was not an ordinary death, it was a death which inaugurated the new covenant and He lives for evermore.

The question arises in connection with the discussion of Hebrews on the covenant, Why does the writer not directly refer to the new covenant as inaugurated by our Lord at the Last Supper? The account of the Last Supper in the upper room must have been familiar to all Christians, and the memory of our Lord's actions and words there is certainly in the background of the writer's mind as he speaks of the new covenant. Throughout the epistle there is no reference to the Passover and its ritual, and as Moffatt remarks³⁹ - the reason is plain. The passover was a non-sacerdotal feast, and as such it would not have suited the argument of the Epistle. The purpose of the Epistle is to present Jesus as the great High Priest who has consummated in Himself all that a priest was meant to do. But in the Passover ritual, each Israelite was his own priest performing the ritual for himself and his family.⁴⁰ It is natural therefore that the author of Hebrews refrains from making any use of the Passover ritual in his argument.

39. Moffatt, Hebrews 128.

40. Philo De Decalogo XXX. "the day called by the Hebrews in their own tongue Pasch on which the whole people sacrifice, every member of them without waiting for their priests, because the law has granted to the whole nation for one special day in every year the right of priesthood and of performing the sacrifices themselves."

In contrasting the first and the new covenants, the author states that the first covenant was not faultless *ἄμεμπτος* (VIII. 7), and that the second covenant is enacted on better promises, (VIII. 6, 10-12). St. Paul in Gal. III, 15,17, speaks of a covenant with Abraham, but Hebrews speaks of promises to Abraham (VI. 13; VII. 6) and knows of only one covenant in the Old Testament, that of Sinai between God and His people. The promises made to Abraham were not realised under the first covenant - "And these all having had witness borne to them through their faith, received not the promise" (XI. 39). The new covenant is effectual to realise the promises made to Abraham - "And for this cause he is the mediator of a new covenant, that a death having taken place, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant, they that have been called may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance." (IX. 15) The author of Hebrews views the promises made to Abraham as referring to something beyond both covenants, the covenants being the means of attaining the promises. The language used in Hebrews to describe the blessings which are within the reach of the people of the new covenant is largely borrowed from the Pentateuch history of the people of the first covenant. In Chapters III and IV the author speaks of the promise left to us of entering into God's rest. The rest of Canaan was promised to "all those who came out of Egypt by Moses" (III. 16). But they sinned by unbelief

and disobedience, and their carcasses fell in the wilderness. They never entered into God's rest. On this grave danger of unbelief and disobedience, is based one of the most earnest exhortations of the whole epistle. "For indeed we have had good tidings preached unto us, even as also they, but the word of hearing did not profit them because they were not united by faith with them that heard." "Let us therefore give diligence to enter into that rest, that no man fall after the same example of disobedience" (IV. 2, 11). The writer is thinking of the Hebrew people and the possession of Canaan promised to them. The Hebrew Christians to whom the epistle is written are also the people of God by the new covenant, and there remains to them a Sabbath rest *σαββατισμός* (IV. 9). The Author uses two different words for rest - *κατάπαυσις* (IV. 1,3) and *σαββατισμός* (IV.9). The former is the word used of Canaan as the rest promised to the people, and the latter of the rest of the Sabbath.⁴¹ These were the types of the rest into which the people of the new covenant can now enter.

Again Hebrews speaks of the people of the first covenant as seeking the heavenly country (XI. 16), and the city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God (XI. 10). They did not attain the promises which had been given, 'all they died in faith, having seen the promises and having greeted them from afar.' (XI. 13). For the covenant under which they lived

41. See Davidson Hebrews 97 ff. on Rest of God.

was not effectual to realise the promises. But the people of the new covenant "receive the Kingdom that cannot be shaken" (XII. 28), they live in the new age, under the new covenant which is effectual for the realisation of all the promises because it is a better covenant mediated not through man as Moses, nor by the hands of angels, but by the Son of God Himself.

The first covenant had failed, and throughout the epistle the author shows that where the first had failed the new and superior covenant realizes the purpose behind it. There was a condition to the continuance of the first covenant - that the people should keep the Law. But this condition was not fulfilled by the covenant people. "For they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not saith the Lord" (VIII. 9). But the God whose love had chosen Israel to be His covenant people promises in the prophet Jeremiah a new covenant which will be a better than the first.

The first covenant was defective because its institutions could not remove the transgressions that were done under it. Hebrews X. 4 states categorically "For it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins." The transgressions under the first covenant remained over until the death of the mediator of the new covenant effected redemption from them (IX. 15). The continual repetition of the sacrifices prescribed by the Law did not cleanse the guilty conscience, they served rather as a constant remembrance of

sins year by year. (X.3.) The consciousness of the imperfections of the first covenant is manifested in the quotations the author draws from the Psalter and from Jeremiah. Psalm CX. 4 speaks of a "priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek". Hebrews speaks of this priest after the order of Melchizedek as "Another Priest" (VII. 15) who is the High Priest of the New Covenant. Again he speaks of a better sacrifice (IX. 23) and in X. 5 f, he describes that better sacrifice in the words of Psalm XL. 6 f. In Jeremiah XXXI. 31 he finds the new covenant expressly referred to, and its blessings foretold.

The first covenant is conceived as a state of relation between God and His people. The central figure in the covenant as a state of relation between God and men was the High Priest. He stood on the Godward side⁴² of the people, He ministered the solemn ritual of atonement and was the people's representative before God and God's representative before the people.

In accordance with the central place which the High Priest occupied under the first covenant (VII. 12) the central place under the new covenant is occupied by the Melchizedek High Priest, and the greater part of the Epistle is given to discuss the High Priesthood of Jesus Christ, the Mediator of the new covenant (IV. 14 - X. 18).

In its High Priesthood, in the very structure of the

42. See Nairne Hebrews Cambridge Bible p. LXV.

tabernacle and all the furniture it contained, the first covenant had a shadow of the good things to come, and to that extent served the beneficial purpose of introducing the new and better covenant.

The purpose of the first and new covenants was the same - to bring men into fellowship with God. To have fellowship with God man must be cleansed from sin. This, which the first covenant had failed to effect, the new has effected. God forgives His people's sins on the one hand, and the people have God's law written on their hearts, and not a law external to them on the other.

Just as the first covenant had been made, not with individuals, but with a people, so is also the new. The new covenant is made with the believing people. Davidson⁴³ demonstrates how the new covenant in the epistle is regarded as made with the people of Israel "As the new covenant was promised to Israel Jer. XXXI. 31, it has been made with Israel. "We who have had good tidings preached to us, and do enter into the Rest (IV. 2, 3) to whom the words of Psalm XCV 7-8 were spoken (III. 7); who are the house of God in truth (III. 6) and apart from whom the fathers were not made perfect (XI. 40) - are the believing Hebrews to whom the epistle is addressed. The People of Israel as believing is the People of God." Although the author of Hebrews does not refer to the position of Gentiles

43. Davidson, Hebrews 166.

in relation to the covenant, it can be inferred from the epistle that the position of believers in relation to the covenant will be the same whether they be Hebrew or Gentile. The strictly Levitical priesthood has been set aside by the rise of another priest "touched with the feeling of our infirmities.... in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin" (IV. 15). The Priest after the order of Melchizedek is the priest of humanity; he will bring to God all who believe in him. When the priesthood has been changed, there is of necessity a change of the Law. (VII. 12.) Because the Law had not the power to make anything perfect it was annulled, for it was unprofitable and weak. In the concluding chapter of the epistle the author calls upon his readers to sever all connections with unbelieving Israel. 'Let us go forth therefore unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach' (XIII. 13). The true sin-offering is Christ Himself, Who suffered outside the gates of Jerusalem - an occurrence all the more striking and suggestive because the Law demanded that the sin-offering should be burnt outside the camp. Believing Israel must join Him outside the camp, and share His reproach and rejection. Outside the camp the mediator gathers the people of the new covenant. The legal barriers have no force there, and all believers, Jewish and Gentile, are on an equality.

The final reference to the new covenant *See by Kings vs 25* is in XII. 18-29. It is the final exhortation fraught with all

the earnestness and urgency the writer could command. The basis of the exhortation is the idea which runs through the whole epistle - that the new covenant in every respect excels the first, and that it is the final revelation of God. The believing people, those like the readers of the Epistle who are Christians, are already living in the new age. Ye are come *προσελήλυθατε* unto Mount Zion and unto the city of the living God..." (XII. 22). The passage is the climax of the argument and as T.C. Edwards⁴⁴ states, is to be considered as the practical result of the whole epistle.

The section XII. 18-24 gives the characteristics first of the first covenant (18-21) and secondly the characteristics of the new covenant (22-24). The dominating note in the description of the first covenant is terror, of the second grace, but invoking awe in the worshipper.

Moffatt⁴⁵ in his translation brings out this contrast so forcibly that we quote the passage:-

"(18) You have not come *προσελήλυθατε* to what you can touch, to "flames of fire" to "mist" and "gloom" and "strong blasts, (19) to the blare of a trumpet and to a Voice" whose words made those who heard it refuse to hear another syllable (20) (for they could not bear the command - "If even a beast touches the mountain it must be stoned") - indeed so awful was the sight that Moses said "I am terrified and aghast."

44. Hebrews (Expositor's Bible) p. 294.

45. Hebrews (I.C.C.) 214.

You have come *προσεληλύσατε* to Mount Sion, the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, to myriads of angels in festal gathering, (23) to the assembly of the first-born registered in heaven, to the God of all as judge, to the spirits of just men made perfect (24) to Jesus who mediates the new covenant, and to the sprinkled blood whose message is nobler than Abel's."

The position of Christians is set over in contrast with the position of the Israelites when the first covenant was made at the giving of the Law. The writer takes his readers to the Pentateuch (LXX) and enumerates the circumstances attendant on the revelation of God by the Law and first covenant. The awe-inspiring scene at Sinai is described. Sinai revealed the terrible side of God's character, his unappeased wrath. God spoke out of the midst of "flames of fire" and "mist" and "gloom", and when the people heard the voice, "they refused to hear another word, for they could not endure the command". The people desired to draw near to God, but they could not endure God's command because of their sin, and their sense of guilt before the all holy God. God commanded that if even a beast touched the mountain, it must be stoned. God was the "wholly other" with whom man in his sin and guilt could have no communion. So fearful was the scene at Sinai that Moses himself, the mediator of the covenant, who alone of all prophets was allowed to speak to God face to face, said "I exceedingly

fear and quake." The picture in the Pentateuch of the revelation of God on Sinai is one designed to bring out the relationship subsisting between a God of wrath on the one hand, and a guilty people on the other. The people beseech Moses to speak for them - the first covenant knew nothing of the boldness

παρρηγοία which the people of the new covenant exercised in their approach to God.

Having described the scene at Sinai with its awe-inspiring accompaniments, the writer turns to the position of Christians; the revelation given at Sinai was sensuous, the revelation in the possession of Christians a spiritual revelation. The superiority of the new covenant is forcibly brought out in the writer's words "Ye have not come unto a mount that might be touched..... but ye have come to Mount Zion....."

The terrible appearances on Mount Sinai have been vividly delineated in order to heighten the contrast with Mount Zion with its festal gatherings and assembly of the first born. Awe and fear is inspired by Sinai, but calmness, joy and serenity by the picture of Mount Zion. The rhythm of the author's language in XII. 18-24 brings out this contrast most effectively. After the fearful confusion, strain and awe reflected in 18-21,⁴⁶ the following two verses with calmness and dignity describe the Mount Zion of the new covenant.

46. It is reflected in words like *ψηλαφώνενω και κεκαυμένω πυρι και γνόφω και φόφω και θυέλλα και σάλπιγγος ήχω και φωνή ενμάτων: θηρίου θύγη: αβοβοδηθήσεται: φοβερόν: εκφοβο: εντέρας.*

To describe the mountain and city of God, the author borrows from the holy city of Jerusalem. Zion is the throne of God, and the heavenly Jerusalem the abode of His people. They are the spiritual archetypes of which the earthly Sion and Jerusalem are types.⁴⁷

As Moffatt remarks⁴⁸ from the *πόλις* the author passes to the *πολιταί*. In XII. 22-24 the writer describes the persons to whom Christians have come. Although the obvious contrast the author means to set up is between the two mountains - that of Sinai and that of Sion, as we read through these verses, the idea of Mount Sion seems to recede, and the idea of the holy place in the heavens into which the mediator of the new covenant has entered, returns to the narrative. The blood of the sprinkling has sanctified the covenant people, and the same blood has opened the way into the holy of holies. The veil is drawn and the "hosts of angels, and the general assembly and the church of the first born" are in the "presence of God, the judge of all." Just as angels had been mentioned in connection with the first covenant at Sinai (I. 4 f) so they figure in the consummation of the new covenant. But, as Westcott observes⁴⁹ the angels are no longer separated from men, as at Sinai, by signs of great terror, but united in one vast assembly.

47. c.f. Revel. XXI. 2, 10; III. 12; Gal. IX. 26 on the Heavenly Jerusalem.

48. Hebrews (I.C.C.) 216.

49. Westcott Hebrews 413.

In the throng that makes up the great assembly are the "spirits of Just men made perfect", and "church of the first-born enrolled in heaven". It is natural to take both these classes referred to as the just men (*Σίκαιος* X. 38) who lived under the old covenant, and who are referred to in XI. 40, - "that they without us, should not be made perfect". They had to await the sacrifice of Christ, before they were "perfected".

As Nairne remarks⁵⁰ "church" *ἐκκλησία* is no part of this epistle's terminology for the Christian life, and here as in the first eight chapters of Acts, the word probably refers, as a title, to the Old Testament Church, or to the founders of that church, the patriarchs who in Genesis lived in "ideal simplicity and closeness of communion with God."

Some commentators however⁵¹ take "spirits of just men made perfect" (XII. 23) to mean the servants of Jesus Christ who have died in the faith, and thus they are able to divide the description of the heavenly Jerusalem into two parts, the first including the elect of the old world, and ending with the thought of "God judge of all", the second consecrated to the "world that was to come", and grouped round Jesus the mediator of the new covenant. This division is attractive, but it does seem more convincing, that the "spirits of just men made perfect" does not refer to servants of Jesus Christ who have died in the

50. Nairne Epistle of Priesthood 415. c.f. Delitzsch Hebrews II. 351, who takes *ἐκκλησία* to refer to the present living church.

51. e.g. Nairne 415. Delitzsch II, 352 takes *πνεύματι Σικίων τετελειωμένων* to embrace the righteous of both old and new dispensations.

faith, but rather to those Old Testament righteous and faithful, "who died in faith not having received the promises, but having seen them and greeted them from afar" (XI. 13).

When the author states that Christians have come to the God of all as judge (*Κεῖτῃ Θεῷ πάντων* XII. 23) he states that the promise of the new covenant has now been fulfilled, "I will be to them a God (VIII. 10). The authorised and revised versions fail to bring out the force of *Κεῖτῃ Θεῷ πάντων* rendering 'to God, the judge of all'. The point the author is anxious to stress is that we have come to God as judge, to whom we shall have to account for our life. Some commentators⁵² understand judge in this verse as defender or vindicator. But in view of IX. 27 "and after this the judgment" and of X. 30 where the word judge *Κεῖρω* is used in a punitive sense, it is difficult to accept the judge as defender or vindicator. It is true that the author of Hebrews has brought out the terror of Sinai in contrast to the God of grace revealed on Mount Zion. But it would be a great mistake for the readers of the Epistle to conclude from that, that He is an easy-going God. He is judge of all, and although we have access to His presence through Christ we cannot draw nigh to Him without being possessed with a sense of awe and fear. This is not inconsistent with the boldness, *παρρησία* which Christians have in their approach to God's presence.

52. e.g. Delitzsch Hebrews Vol. II. p. 352.

In XII. 24 Jesus, the mediator of the new covenant (*διαθήκης νέας*)⁵³ is in the presence of God, and hither He has brought all believers. His sacrificial blood, sprinkled upon the people has made them parties to the new covenant, and He has gone before them *ἀρχηγός* (II. 10. XII. 12) *πρόδρομος* (VI. 20) by virtue of His own blood, and made access to God possible to all men. The mention of the covenant is naturally followed by that of the blood which sealed it. In IX. 18, 22, we are told that no covenant is inaugurated without blood, and that there can be no forgiveness of sins without the shedding of blood. The mediator of the new covenant shed His own blood for the sprinkling of the people, and through the shedding of His blood, forgiveness of sins is possible to the covenant people.

The contrast between Mount Sinai, as the scene of the first covenant, and Mount Sion, where the people of the new covenant are gathered is still carried on. The voice that was heard at Sinai was terrible, and inspired terror, but the "blood of sprinkling" in the new covenant has a better message to the people. The writer now introduces a new element into the contrast - Jesus' blood is contrasted with the blood of Abel. Gen. IV. 10 speaks of the blood of Abel crying to God from the

53. The word used of the covenant now is *νέας* not *καινῆς*. The writer draws attention to the newness in time of the *διαθήκη* compared with the first covenant at Sinai. The point made is the recent establishment of the covenant, and not its being *καινῆ* in character. cf. Moffatt Hebrews 218 where he maintains that *νέας* is simply a synonym for *καινῆς*.

earth. The blood, which is the life, is regarded as still living. The blood of Christ, his life set free by death, is still living, and in the presence of God pleads for men. But the blood of Christ speaks better (*κρείττον* an adverb as in I. Cor. VII. 38 cf. T.R. *κρείττονα* - better things) than that of Abel. The unconscious appeal of Abel's blood from the earth demanded the excommunication of the transgressor. Christ's blood in its intercessory role in the heavenly sanctuary does not cry for the expulsion of the sinner from God's presence⁵⁴ but rather calls the sinner to draw near to God, and proclaims peace and forgiveness to him.

After he has demonstrated to his readers, that the privileges they enjoy are superior to the privileges of the people under the first covenant, the author goes on (XII. 25-28) to declare that consequently their responsibility is greater. The revelation given to them as Christians is the final revelation, it is God Himself speaking in the Son. The Israelites rejected the first revelation which was given on the earthly Sinai; how then shall we escape if we reject him that speaketh from heaven? The earth was shaken then,⁵⁵ (XII. 26) and that

54. See Enoch XXII. 6 f. The seer has a vision of the spirit of Abel appealing to God to take vengeance on the murderer Cain. Raphael answers the seer - "This is the spirit which went forth from Abel, whom his brother Cain slew, and he makes his suit against him, till his seed is destroyed from the face of the earth, and his seed is annihilated from amongst the seed of men." (R.H. Charles. Book of Enoch. 48)
55. The author of Hebrews here has forsaken the LXX of Exod. XIX. 18 which reads *καὶ ἐξέστη πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἠφόδρα*. "And all the people were greatly amazed." The Hebrew reads "And the whole mount quaked greatly."

was the symbol of the shaking of earth and heaven which is to take place now, when an order which cannot be shaken is introduced. The author cites the words of Haggai II. 6. "Yet once more it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens and the earth" as pointing to the "moving of things that are shaken, and of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain." There is a parallel between the time in which Haggai lived and the time in which Hebrews was written. In Haggai's time the second temple was being built, and a new hope for the Jewish people was arising out of the ruins and out of the calamity that had befallen them. They were conscious of a new age on the threshold of which they were standing. As our author was writing his epistle the clouds were gathering, and Jerusalem and the temple were being threatened. This too was the beginning of a new age. The earthly tabernacle and temple no longer were necessary, for the mediator of the new covenant had entered into heaven itself, and access to God was open through Him. The Kingdom that cannot be shaken (*Βασιλείαν ἀσάλευτον*) is within our reach, and our response as people of the new covenant must be gratitude (*ἔχωμεν χάριν*) finding expression in service to God (*λατρεύωμεν*). The author's fundamental conception of religion is worship, and all men now, priestlike, can offer God service (*λατρεία*). Our service is offered with thankfulness and fear *μετὰ εὐλαβείας καὶ δέους* "for indeed our God is a consuming fire".

The first and new covenants differ, the new is vastly superior, but the God Who gave both is one. In the account of the theophany on Sinai in Deut. IV. 24 the Lord is described as a devouring fire, a jealous God. In X. 27, the author of Hebrews speaks of "fierceness of fire" (margin R.V. jealousy of fire *πυρὸς ζήλος*) which will devour the adversaries - those who sin wilfully after receiving knowledge of the truth. The God of both covenants is the same God, and it befits those who approach Him in worship to approach with thankfulness and godly fear.

CHAPTER VII.THE MELCHIZEDEK ORDER OF PRIESTHOOD.JESUS CHRIST PRIEST AND HIGH PRIEST.

Of all the New Testament writers, the author of Hebrews alone designates Jesus as priest *ἱερεύς* and High Priest *ἄρχιερεύς*.¹ For him, and for his readers too, there could be no religion without a priest, no access to God without a sacrifice, and no remission of sins without shedding of blood. The background of the whole epistle is in the Tabernacle as depicted in the Pentateuch, and in the Temple. The Jews of the *διασπορά* idealised the temple service, and it afforded them great comfort to remember that in the temple daily sacrifice was offered. The point the author wants to bring home to his readers is that the tabernacle and temple services were but a shadowy outline of what has now once and for all been accomplished by Jesus who is the "high priest of our confession" (III.1.) Henceforth they must look unto Jesus, the author and perfecter of our faith (*ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελεωτήν*: XII.2) for in His function as High Priest He had mediated the direct access of the people to God. This function he has performed so fully and finally that Christians have simply to avail themselves of the new and living way (X.20) He has dedicated for them

1. Hints of Christ as Priest are found in Rom.VIII.34; Rev. 1.12. and in the Prayer of the Supper Room John XVII.

into God's presence.

The term High Priest ἀρχιερεύς was evidently familiar to the readers. It is only found once in the Pentateuch LXX.² But it is clear from rabbinic tradition and also apocalyptic that the High Priest was held in very great respect, and his office was looked upon as one of dread responsibility. In the tractate Joma we read of the elaborate and exacting preparations which the High Priest had to undergo for the solemn rites performed by him on the Day of Atonement.³ The Maccabean high-priests were called "priests of God Most High"⁴ In Josephus⁵ Hyrcanus II is designated 'high priest of God Most High' (ἀρχιερεύς θεοῦ ὑψίστου). Some of the readers of the epistle to the Hebrews might have visited Jerusalem and have witnessed the ritual of the temple, but the impression the epistle as a whole gives is that the readers' knowledge of Israel's ritual was in the main derived from the written page. They lived out of the Holy Land, but like the author of Hebrews, they cherished the Book of the Law, and knew it through and through.⁶ As F.B. Westcott states, "It was not the 'Holy Place' that bulked large in their thoughts, it was the 'Holy Books'. For them the Past is the Present. The Israel of their love

2. Lev. IV. 3.

3. See Joma I. 1-8 (Danby Mishnah 162).

4. Cf. Jubilees XXXII. 1, where Levi is called Priest of the Most High God.

5. Ant. XVI. 1. 6.2. See Charles Book of Jubilees 191.

6. The High Priesthood of our Lord. 5.

is the Israel of the Desert, the Israel of the Pentateuch". Their knowledge of priest and high priest, and of the various sacrifices was derived from that source. The readers had taken the step which took them from Judaism to Christianity, and the author is at pains to demonstrate to them that the latter is the fulfilment of all to which the former pointed; he seeks to convince them of the excellency of Christianity over against Judaism. Jesus as Son, is in every sense, superior to Moses who was servant (111. 2-6) and Jesus the priest and high priest is superior to all the Aaronic priests, and on the ground of his superiority is priest for ever. (*Ἐρεῦς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* V.6) after the order of Melchizede κ.

The first four chapters of the Epistle are taken up mainly by a discussion of the superiority of Jesus over Moses and Aaron and the angels, all of whom played conspicuous parts in the early history of Israel, especially in the mediation of the Law to the people. In the course of these chapters, however, the idea of the high priesthood of Jesus is introduced casually a number of times, preparing the readers for the unfolding of the main theme of the Epistle which is the high priesthood of Jesus Christ. The first hint of the priestly function of Jesus is given in the great proem of the epistle - 'when he had made purification of sins' (*Καθαροῦ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος* I.3).

In 11.17 Jesus is for the first time designated

high-priest - "that he might be a merciful and faithful high-priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people". But not until we come to IV. 14 is the high-priesthood of Christ discussed at any length. Jesus the Son of God, Who is our great high priest, has passed through the heavens (IV.14) whither all worshippers may follow in His name. The essence of the idea of priest-hood, as it is presented in the Epistle to the Hebrews, is mediation between God and the worshipper. The priest represents God to the worshipper, and the worshipper to God. The priest declares to them who would draw nigh to God, God's Law, and performs on their behalf certain ceremonies directed towards God; he is appointed for men in things pertaining to God (*ἕνεκεν ἀνθρώπων καὶ βίωσάτων τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν* V.1.)

There are certain requirements which must be satisfied before any one can function as a priest. Broadly, as the author of Hebrews sees them, they are, firstly, a high priest must be a man (IV.15); secondly, he must have sympathy (V.2); and thirdly, he must be appointed by God (V.4 - 10). The discussion of the third requirement in the person of a priest, and consequently in Jesus Christ as priest, leads the author of the Epistle to his treatment of the Melchizedek order of priesthood to which Jesus Christ belongs. We now turn to the author's presentation of Jesus as priest after the order of Melchizedek.

The question arises as to what is the author's aim in introducing the Melchizedek order of priesthood as that to which Jesus belongs. Uppermost in his mind, no doubt, was the apologetic purpose. It was well known that Jesus was not of the lineage of Levi - "For he of whom these things are said belongeth to another tribe, from which no man hath given attendance at the altar. For it is evident that our Lord hath sprung out of Judah, as to which tribe Moses spoke nothing concerning priests." (VII. 13-14). Yet despite the fact that Jesus did not possess the legal qualifications for the Levitical priesthood, He is none the less a priest and as the author goes on to demonstrate, a priest of an order which is superior even to the Levitical order - the order of Melchizedek. Psalm CX.4 mentions this order of priesthood, and to this order Jesus belongs. Among the points of superiority of this order over the Levitical order of priesthood, is mentioned the fact that this is the oldest type of priesthood known to history. The Levitical order came into existence long after the Melchizedek priest-
⁷hood. Neither was the Levitical priesthood introduced to supersede the more ancient order of priesthood as being imperfect and inadequate. It would be natural for the readers of the Epistle as Jews to think that the Levitical

7. cf. the use made by the author of Hebrews of the priority in time of the Melchizedek priesthood to the Levitical with the similar use made by Paul in Gal. III of the priority of the promise to the Law. The purpose of both writers tends in the same direction - the establishing of the worth of Christianity over against Judaism.

priesthood was superior to the Melchizedek. To fortify his readers against the danger of such an error, he opens up to them the full significance of Psalm CX. in this connection. That Psalm, which was regarded by the Jews everywhere as a Messianic Psalm, refers to the priesthood after the order of Melchizedek not as a primitive and inferior priesthood, but as the highest order of priesthood, in fact as the ideal priesthood, - "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek". The priesthood after the order of Melchizedek has been established by an oath "The Lord sware, and will not repent himself - Thou art a priest for ever". Along these lines the author seeks to make clear to his readers that though Jesus was not of the house of Aaron, nor of Levitical descent, he was yet a priest, belonging to the highest order of priesthood.

The author turns to the book of Genesis for the account of Melchizedek meeting Abraham, and in true Alexandrian style allegorises the story. In V.11 he states that he has much to say about Melchizedek and hard of interpretation. As the narrative is given in Genesis, no mention is made of the parentage or genealogy of Melchizedek, and this, reasons the author of Hebrews, is significant. For in the case of the Levitical priests, parentage and genealogy are of vital importance. As descendants of Levi alone can they be admitted into the priesthood. But Melchizedek was ἀπάτωρ ἀμήτωρ

8. The relative pronoun in V.11 μετ' οὗ is most naturally taken to refer to Melchizedek. Some commentators take it to refer to Christ, and some, to the whole subject of the eternal priesthood.

ἀνεκδόγητος (VII.3) and as priest he must belong to another order than that of the Levitical. Melchizedek therefore, according to the author of Hebrews is priest in virtue of his own personal worth, and not in virtue of external and genealogical qualifications. Neither does the Genesis narrative mention the birth or death of Melchizedek, and this too has its significance. The priesthood of Melchizedek is an eternal priesthood, and Psalm CX. emphasises the eternity of the order - "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek."

Philo made use of the method of reasoning from
⁹ silence but while the author of Hebrews in connection with Melchizedek argues after the manner of Philo, he does not derive his treatment of Melchizedek from Philo.
¹⁰ Philo mentions this mysterious King-Priest but once; he calls him King of Peace and says that God appointed him "priest to Himself" (*ἱερεὶς ἑαυτοῦ*). Philo also calls him the "righteous King", but there is no further resemblance between his treatment of Melchizedek and that of the author of Hebrews. The interest of Hebrews in Melchizedek lies in the parallel to Christ, and the parallel for him is that Christ is "high-priest for ever" (*ἀρχιερεὺς γενόμενος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* VI.20) like Melchizedek. In the sacred

9. See Siegfried Philo von Alexandria p.179.

10. Leg. Alleg. Bk.111. XXV, XXVI. Josephus also refers to Melchizedek in Ant. Bk.1. Xa,2.

writings, Melchizedek appears as one who remains a priest for ever *τοῦ ἑλεῖος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* V.6; VI.20. VII.17,21; *εἰς τὸ συνέκεις* VII. 3). The author of Hebrews fastens on this point of the eternity of the priesthood of Christ after the likeness of Melchizedek, reiterating the resemblance seven times.

He does not enlarge on the resemblance of Jesus to Melchizedek as King of Righteousness, and King of Peace. We might expect him to develop the thought of Christ's sinlessness, and the function of Jesus as the Son of the "God of Peace" (XIII.20) when he discusses the resemblance between Jesus and Melchizedek. But his interest is elsewhere, in the priesthood as eternal.

The author wishes to exalt the priesthood after the order of Melchizedek in order to prepare his readers for the statement to come later, that the Levitical priesthood has been superseded - "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the Law (VII.12). Abraham himself, the great father of the nation, made obeisance to Melchizedek, for he gave to him a tenth out of the chief spoils (VII.4). Melchizedek blessed Abraham, and "without any dispute, the less is blessed of the better". (VII.7)

Now the Levitical priests had the privilege of

taking tithes from their brethren, and the author now institutes a comparison between their tithe-taking, and Melchizedek's. Under a statute in the Law the Levitical priests are entitled to tithe the people though they are all descended from the same father. Melchizedek was not of Levitical descent, and therefore had no legal right to tithe Abraham, but he nevertheless did tithe him. But the tithe was given to Melchizedek by Abraham spontaneously on account of the greatness and personal worth of Melchizedek, which prompted this act on Abraham's part. The Levitical priests did not command the tithe from their brethren on the ground of their greatness and personal worth, but on the ground of the statute in the Law. The fact that they received tithes did not prove personal superiority on their part. The priesthood of Melchizedek then must be of a much higher order than the Levitical priesthood which was based merely upon Levitical genealogy.

The great superiority of Melchizedek is evident from the fact that the receiver of the blessing was none less than Abraham, who had the promises. This Melchizedek must indeed have been very great to have blessed the great father of the nation. Melchizedek is thus proved to be greater than Abraham, and therefore greater than all his

11. "And unto the children of Levi, behold I have given all the tithe in Israel for an inheritance in return for their service which they serve, even the service of the tent of the meeting." Numb. XVlll.21.

descendants. He is greater than the Levitical priests because his personal worth and greatness commanded the tithe which he received. Also, when Abraham paid tithe to Melchizedek, the tribe of Levi virtually paid tithe to him - "and so to say, through Abraham, even Levi, who received tithes, hath paid tithes, for he (Levi) was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchizedek met him." (VII.10.)

He is again superior to the Levitical priests in this, that whereas they receive tithes as men that die, "he as one of whom it is witnessed that he liveth" (VII.8). This argument the author bases on the silence of scripture.

12

As Bruce says, the story does not say that Melchizedek continued to live, it simply omits to say that he died. The Levitical priests who received tithes, served their time and then died, and their claim died with them. But the true priest never dies, he abides for ever. Melchizedek is one that liveth, and to his order of priesthood Jesus belongs.

When he has demonstrated the indisputable superiority of the Melchizedek order of priesthood to the Levitical, the author goes on to make this superiority even more clear by making use of the oracle in Psalm CX. The very mention of a different priesthood, i.e. a non-Aaronic priesthood in this Psalm, which is later than the Pentateuch in which the Levitical priesthood is established, goes to prove that the Levitical priesthood was inferior and inadequate.

The author has now arrived at a vital point in his argument, the point at which he tells his readers that with the change of priesthood, there is of necessity a change of the Law (VII.12). They must no longer put their trust in the Levitical priest and high-priest, the rites prescribed by the Law cannot bring perfection, they are but the shadows which fell before the substance and the reality which is revealed to them in Jesus the High Priest after the order of Melchizedek. When the Priesthood is changed, the whole Law is also changed, for as the author implies, the Law rests on the priesthood. As Moffatt states "The Mosaic νόμος could not be worked for the *ἱεῖς* without a priesthood, to deal with the offences incurred." ¹³

Psalm 110 states that the priesthood of the Messiah is other than Levitical, and the mere mention of the priesthood after the order of Melchizedek amounts to abolition of the whole Law. "Now if there was perfection through the Levitical priesthood (for under it hath the people received the Law) what further need was there that another priest should arise after the order of Melchizedek, and not be reckoned after the order of Aaron? For the priesthood being changed there is made of necessity a change of the Law. For he of whom these things are said belongeth to another tribe, from which no man hath given attendance at the altar, for it is evident that our lord hath sprung out

Judah, as to which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priests. And what we say is yet more abundantly evident, if after the likeness of Melchizedek there ariseth another priest, who hath been made, not after the Law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life." (VII. 11-16). The whole Law with its priesthood had failed in that which it was meant to do - bring men into perfection *τελειώσις*, and establish communion between men and God. It could not secure an adequate forgiveness of sins, and without the removal of sin, real access to God and fellowship with Him was impossible. The priesthood that went with the Law was made after the Law of a carnal commandment, *κατὰ νόμιον ἐν-τολῆς σαρκίνης*. The requisite for the office of a priest under the Law was physical descent from Levi, and unblemished physique. The qualifications demanded in the priest were of an outward kind. But the new priest, after the order of Melchizedek to whom Psalm CX refers is not a priest because he has these outward qualifications. He is not of the tribe of Levi, but of the tribe of Judah and the Law gives no one of this tribe the right to attend in priestly service at the altar. This then amounts to a breach of the Mosaic Law, and to its abrogation.

The priesthood of Christ after the order of

Melchizedek is not after a law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life (*Κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς ἄκαταλύτου*). The principle of the Melchizedek priesthood is contrasted with the principle of the Levitical priesthood. The basis of the priesthood after the order of Melchizedek is not external, nothing in the Law, but the power of an indissoluble life. Hereditary succession as in the Levitical priesthood is opposed to the inherent personality of Jesus as priest. The main point the author wants to make in the contrast between the two orders of priesthood, seems to be the eternity of the Melchizedek priest over against the mortality of the Levitical. It is testified of Melchizedek in VII. 8. that "he liveth", and in VII. 25 it is said of Jesus that His priesthood is unchangeable and that "he ever liveth to make intercession for them". The new priesthood then involves a disannulling of the old law, because it is morally inefficacious, it makes nothing perfect (*οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελείωσεν* VII. 19), it is weak and unprofitable, and must give way to the "better hope" (*κεεῖττος ἐλπίδος* VII. 19) which opens up for the worshipper a way leading into the very presence of God. Here again we meet the author's favourite conception of religion as the approach of the worshipper to God (*προσεύχεσθαι, and ἐγγίζομεν* in VII. 19). The law with its priesthood was meant to bring the worshippers into the presence of God, but it had failed in this.

Jesus who is priest after the order of Melchizedek, does for the worshipper what the Law could never do, and in this way abrogates the Law by fulfilling its end and purpose.

The author has yet another proof of the superiority of the priesthood after the order of Melchizedek. In Psalm CX. Jesus is proclaimed priest by an oath, and this solemn divine oath ratifies the priesthood of Jesus as permanent, and establishes the superiority of the covenant which necessarily goes with the new priesthood. The words of Psalm CX.4 "The Lord sware, and will not repent Himself, Thou art a priest for ever" have a profound significance for the author of Hebrews; they guarantee the finality and the eternity of the priesthood of Jesus.¹⁴ In contrast, the Levitical priesthood was appointed without an oath,¹⁵ and as Davidson says "the want of it characterises the Old Testament priesthood as provisional". The oath which accompanies the consecration of Jesus as priest as Psalm CX.4 records it, makes the priesthood eternal and unchangeable (ἀναξίβατον VII.24). The priesthood of Jesus is not transferable like the Levitical priesthood. The priesthood after the order of Melchizedek, and the covenant of which Jesus is the surety (ἑγγυος) are eternal, their eternity and unchangeableness being indicated by the

14. cf. Philo on God swearing an oath in de Sacrificio XXVIII-XXIX. He states that men who are disbelieved swear by an oath in order to win credence, but that God's mere word must be believed, and therefore God's words are in no sense different from oaths as far as assurance goes. He regards the idea of God swearing an oath simply as an anthropomorphism.

15. Davidson's Hebrews 141.

Jesus who is priest after the order of Melchizedek, does for the worshipper what the Law could never do, and in this way abrogates the Law by fulfilling its end and purpose.

The author has yet another proof of the superiority of the priesthood after the order of Melchizedek. In Psalm CX. Jesus is proclaimed priest by an oath, and this solemn divine oath ratifies the priesthood of Jesus as permanent, and establishes the superiority of the covenant which necessarily goes with the new priesthood. The words of Psalm CX.4 "The Lord sware, and will not repent Himself, Thou art a priest for ever" have a profound significance for the author of Hebrews; they guarantee the finality and the eternity of the priesthood of Jesus.¹⁴ In contrast, the Levitical priesthood was appointed without an oath,¹⁵ and as Davidson says "the want of it characterises the Old Testament priesthood as provisional". The oath which accompanies the consecration of Jesus as priest as Psalm CX.4 records it, makes the priesthood eternal and unchangeable (ἀναεὶ βασιλευ Vll.24). The priesthood of Jesus is not transferable like the Levitical priesthood. The priesthood after the order of Melchizedek, and the covenant of which Jesus is the surety (ἑγγυος) are eternal, their eternity and unchangeableness being indicated by the

14. cf. Philo on God swearing an oath in de Sacrificio XXVlll -XXlX. He states that men who are disbelieved swear by an oath in order to win credence, but that God's mere word must be believed, and therefore God's words are in no sense different from oaths as far as assurance goes. He regards the idea of God swearing an oath simply as an anthropomorphism.

15. Davidson's Hebrews 141.

divine oath. But the Levitical priesthood, and the first covenant are not eternal, the priesthood was established without an oath, and when the priesthood goes, the covenant under which the Law was received is also dissolved.

The contrast between the two orders of priesthood is contained in the statement that the Levitical priests were many (*πλείονες* VII.23) and the priesthood was continually changing hands because death removed those who exercised it. But death has no dominion over Jesus. He remains for ever (*εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* VII. 24) and is "able to save to the uttermost" (*εἰς τὸ παντελές*) them that draw near unto God through Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them" (VII.25). It is now clear that Jesus as priest brings within the reach of the worshipper the perfection (*τελείωσις*) which the Levitical priesthood pointed to but could not effect. Jesus can save to the uttermost (*εἰς τὸ παντελές*) He can bring the worshipper through all that hinders him in his communion with God. This could not be said of the Levitical priesthood, for there were sins under the old covenant for the atonement of which the Law made no provision. As high priest Jesus intercedes for the people before God. This function belonged to the office of high priest under the old covenant. The High Priest

16. Some commentators prefer to take *εἰς τὸ παντελές* in the temporal sense as simply a variant of *πάντοτε* e.g. Moffatt I.C.C. p.100 and Narborough Clarendon Bible p.109. cf. Davidson Hebrews 142, who takes it to refer not to time, but to degree or perfection of salvation.

appeared before God for the people. So Jesus in the heavenly sanctuary intercedes for all men, there he has presented Himself as the offering for the people, and his intercession is continual. But while the Levitical high priest was regarded as making intercession for the people, a function with which the author invests Jesus in this connection, it must be borne in mind that orthodox Jewish writers assigned the function of intercession to angels, particularly to Michael.¹⁷

In the last three verses of Chapter VII. we are given a summary of the whole character and ministry of the Melchizedek Priest - "For such a high priest became us, holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners, and made higher than the heavens." In these words the author describes the high priest which we needed (*ἡμῶν καὶ ἐπρεπεῖν*). He is holy (*ἅγιος* - moral epithet) in virtue of his reverence (V.7), his humility towards God (V.5) his obedience (V.8. X 5-7) and his faith and loyalty (XII.2). He is harmless (*ἀκακος*) i.e. innocent, without evil feeling towards men. This quality in Jesus the High priest is exhibited in His compassion (II.17) and in His sympathy with men in their sinful infirmities. He is undefiled (*ἀμίαντος*), there is no defilement in Him that renders Him unfit for his function as priest. As the author enumerates these qualities of

17. Dan. XII.1. Job XXXIII. 23f. Also Test. of Levi III.5.

Jesus as priest, he has in mind no doubt, the qualities required in the Levitical priest before he could be consecrated for his office.¹⁸ In Jesus the qualities that fit Him for office are ethical qualities, while ritual purity was that which was demanded in the Levitical priest.

Again the sphere in which the priesthood of Jesus is exercised is higher and nobler than the sphere of the Levitical priest. The Levitical priest serves in the earthly tabernacle or temple, and is in daily contact with sinful men, but Jesus is "separated from sinners" (*κεχωρισμένος ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν*) "and made higher than the heavens". In this sphere He is in the immediate presence of God, and His ministry in that sphere is far superior to the ministry of the Levitical priest in the Tabernacle or temple. The Levitical priest had to offer for himself and for the people, and he had to offer daily.¹⁹ But Jesus exercising His ministry in the heavenly sanctuary has to offer for the people only, and has made this offering once for all (*ἑφάπαξ*) when He offered Himself (Vll.27). The Levitical high priest had need to repeat his offering, but the offering of Jesus was of such infinite value, that it did not need to be

18. Lev. XXI. 10-15. Also Josephus Ant. Bk.111. XII. 2.

19. This phrase has occasioned much difficulty. The author has referred to the High Priest making an offering first for his own sin, and then for the sins of the people, obviously referring to the procedure on the Day of Atonement (Lev.XVI.). But as Davidson, p.144 suggests, it is likely that the author combines loosely in his thought the daily ministrations of the priests in the Tabernacle, and the yearly ministrations of the High Priest, when he uses the phrase *καθ' ἡμέραν*.

repeated. The Levitical priesthood consisted of priests many, who offered sacrifices many. Jesus as priest of the order of Melchizedek is an eternal priest and his offering is eternal in its efficacy; it has been offered once for all.

The author rounds off the discussion on the Melchizedek high priest by pointing out again the difference between his ministry and that of the Levitical high priest (Vll.28). The Law appoints men who have infirmities, priests, and because of their infirmities they have to offer for themselves. The sacrifices which they offer "can never take away sin" (Xll) and because of their inefficacy they are repeated. But the word of the oath which he finds in Psalm CX.4, coming after the Law, and therefore annulling the Law, appoints a Son, who is perfected for evermore (Vll.28). The author has now brought together the teaching of the two quotations from Psalms ll.7 and CX.4 to which he refers in V. 5-6. "Thou art my Son" and "Thou art a priest for ever". Jesus is the Melchizedek High priest, because he is the Son perfected for evermore (*Υἱὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τετελειωμένον*). The priests appointed by the law err, and are weak like other men, but Jesus as Son is now apart from sinners, and perfected, and forever discharges his sacred function as High Priest.

JESUS CHRIST - PRIEST AND HIGH PRIEST.

When the author of Hebrews has demonstrated to his readers that the order of priesthood to which Jesus belongs is the order of Melchizedek, he has only proved the everlasting duration of His priestly office. He has by no means yet exhausted what he has to say about Jesus as priest and high priest, and he uses the Aaronic priesthood to convey to his readers an idea of the nature of Christ's priestly functions. The story of Melchizedek with which his readers were familiar from their knowledge of the Pentateuch, and also of the Psalter, has nothing to say about expiation or atonement. If there was to be a real access to God for the people, through Jesus as high priest, then Jesus must in some way be able to remove the sins of the people which kept them estranged from the presence of God. In 11.16 the author has written, "wherefore it behoved him in all things to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God to make propitiation for the sins of the people," (*εἰς τὸ ἐλπίσκειν τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ*). In chapters VIII - X we have the author's statement of Jesus's work as high priest. The offering of the blood of bulls and goats (IX.13) by the Aaronic high priest, sanctified only to the cleanness of the flesh, but the self oblation of Jesus as High Priest was efficacious for the cleansing of the conscience and opened the way into the very presence of God. The work of Jesus is described in priestly terms and

with the aid of priestly metaphors - what the priests and high priests sought to effect for the worshippers in the Tabernacle and in the Temple has been done once and for all by Jesus as High Priest.

In the earlier part of the epistle, the author has given here and there a few hints about the priesthood of Christ e.g. II.17-18; III.1, "The apostle and High Priest of our confession"; IV.14 "Having then a great High Priest who hath passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our confession. For we have not a High Priest that cannot be touched with the feelings of our infirmities, but one that hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin"; V.5 "So Christ also glorified not Himself to be made a high priest, but he that spake unto him, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee." Then follows in Chapter VIII the statement of the Melchizedek order of Priesthood in contrast with the Levitical order. Now the author deals with the nature of Christ's priestly functions, having continually in his mind the functions of the Levitical priests and high priests in the Tabernacle.

The qualifications of a high priest have already been enumerated in Chapter V 1-4. Every high priest is taken from among men, and is set to minister for men in things pertaining to God; he offers gifts and sacrifices for sins. Moses was commanded by God - "Take the Levites from among the children of Israel" and Moses cleansed them in

preparation for their duty as priests to offer the sacrifices of the Tabernacle. The priest was thus a representative figure, representing men before God, and representing God before men. Because he is taken from among men, he can bear gently with the ignorant and erring, for that he himself also is compassed with infirmity, and by reason thereof is bound, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins. As A.C. Benson writes ² the priest will be "such a man who from long and intimate relations with humanity, will have a very deep knowledge of the human heart. He will be surprised at no weakness or frailty, he will be patient with all perverseness and obduracy; he will be endlessly compassionate, because he will realise the strength and insistence of temptation; he will be endlessly hopeful, because he will have seen, a hundred times over, the flower of virtue and love blooming in an arid and desolate heart. He will have seen close at hand the transforming power of faith, even in natures which have become the shuddering victims of evil habit." The *Quator ad Hebraeos* thinks of Jesus as such a priest or high priest (for he draws no sharp distinction between *ἱερεὺς* and *ἀρχιερεὺς*) and all the time it is clear that the Tabernacle is before his mind's eye, or the description of it and its worship in the Pentateuch. He and his readers may have known a high priest who merited the description given

2. From a College Window. 170.

here of a high priest, who could bear gently with the ignorant and erring, and could enter with understanding and sympathy into the difficulties of the people. All these noble qualities which the author admired in a priest, are found in Jesus. He goes on to show how thoroughly he had identified Himself with man. The prayers and supplications offered up by Jesus in the days of His flesh, and the crying and tears (undoubtedly referring to Gethsemane) are proof how truly Jesus shared the lot of man on earth.³ Jesus was indeed touched with the feelings of our infirmities, and in all points tempted like as we are, but without sin. Herein he differs from the high priest of the Levitical order. On Atonement day, the high priest offered a sacrifice for himself and for his household, as well as for the people.⁴ But Jesus has no need to offer for Himself, for He is without sin (*χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας*).

Jesus as priest then is qualified to minister for men, because of his power to sympathise with men in their weakness and infirmities. He is also qualified to represent God, and is acceptable to God as priest. While sympathy made him acceptable to men, obedience made him acceptable to God, - "Son though he was, he learned obedience by the things which he suffered" (V.8). In XII.5f the author points out, that

3. Some commentators (Davidson, Peake, Lünemann, Holtzmann) take these trying experiences of Jesus while on earth as proof that his vocation was not self-sought but one to which God had appointed him.

4. Lev. XVI. 6-17.

every son, because he is son has to suffer. Here the remarkable thing is, that Jesus had to suffer, not because, but although He was Son (*Υἱός*). It is clear then that Jesus is son in a unique sense. This idea is further developed in X. 5-9 where Jesus is spoken of as entering the world to do God's will.⁵

No man takes the honour of being priest to himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron. Jesus is at one with Aaron here too for "Christ glorified not himself to be made a High Priest" (V.5) but God gave him that glory when he said to him, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee", and, "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek". The glory and honour of priesthood according to Hebrews, came to Jesus, not by his seeking it but in the way of obedience to God's will. As McNeile puts it⁶ "He learnt all there was to know about obedience by suffering all there was to be suffered." Along that path Jesus was made perfect (*Τελεωθεῖς* V.9) and became to all them that obey him the author of eternal salvation. The word *Τελεωθεῖς* used here of Jesus carries with it the conception of Christ's complete preparation for the execution of his priestly office, and suggests the contrast between His priestly action and that of Aaron. He was able to offer the perfect sacrifice because he was perfected and became the Saviour of men.⁷ Mackintosh sums up the relation between the

5. The same idea is found in Phil.11.6-8 "Jesus obedient even unto death."

6. N.T. Teaching in the light of St. Paul, 239.

7. The Person of Jesus Christ, 505.

obedience of Jesus and His perfection(*Τελείωσις*) in these words, "The sustained approach of the Deus humilis finds its essential counterpart in that rising perfection that *Τελείωσις* as it is described in Hebrews, which He acquired as He success-
:ively seized the occasions which His vocation as Saviour placed before Him." As the way for Jesus was the way of obedience, it is also the way for those who would follow Him; He is to all them that obey Him the author of eternal salvation.

The author having shown that Christ possesses completely the qualities necessary in a high priest for men (V.1-10), and that he belongs to that higher order of priesthood, - the order of Melchizedek (VII), proceeds to show how Jesus discharges the duties of his priesthood, and by doing so sets aside for ever the Levitical priesthood and the Law.

Of all that the author of Hebrews has to say about Jesus, the chief point (*Κεφάλαιον*) is this, "We have such an high priest who sat down on the right hand of ^{the} throne of the majesty in the heavens, a minister of the sanctuary and true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, not man" (VIII.1-2). The author takes his readers to the scene of Christ's high-priestly work, it is the heavenly tabernacle which the Lord pitched, not man. It is characteristic of the epistle that all the arguments from the worship of Judaism which it contains are drawn from the institutions of the Tabernacle. The

author regards the tabernacle as having been constructed after a heavenly pattern, which was shown to Moses on Sinai. The tabernacle, and all its furniture served as a figure, "a parable for the time now present" (IX.9), its signs and prophecies have been fulfilled at the coming of Jesus Christ. Westcott states that the Tabernacle in the history of the Hebrew nation presented three main ideas, the ideas of the dwelling of God among men, of his Holiness, and of his conversableness. It was that through which he was pleased to make His presence and His nature known under the conditions of earth to His people Israel. The antitype of the tabernacle, whether in earth or in heaven, must fulfil the same office, and fulfil it perfectly. The heavenly tabernacle is the place where God abides, and to which through Christ the worshipper has access. In the heavenly sanctuary, Jesus performs His ministry. At this point, the idealist philosophy of the author of Hebrews comes into full play. This philosophy is evident in the general assumptions which underlie the whole argument of the epistle, the existence of of a spiritual world, which is the real world, beyond and above the appearances of earthly life, the world into which Christ has passed as the forerunner (VI.20) a world towards which all faithful souls are making their pilgrimage (XI.)

The old visible Tabernacle was only a manufactured

copy of this "greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this creation" (IX.11). The author of Hebrews is concerned to show that all the truth of Judaism is gathered up in the fuller revelation in Jesus Christ. To indicate to his readers that Judaism provided only carnal copies (VII.16) of things in heaven, he refers to the command given to Moses to construct the Tabernacle after the pattern shown to him in the Mount. The whole Law had a 'shadow' (X.1) only of ultimate reality, but in Christ we have its "very image". Since the Jewish Tabernacle was only a copy of the heavenly Tabernacle, it was of necessity inferior to it.

When the author has stated that Jesus has entered into the heavenly sanctuary, he goes on to say that as priest there he must have an offering to offer. A sanctuary is for him essentially a place where sacrifice is offered, and the essence of priesthood is the having of somewhat to offer to God. Christ is the minister (*λεειτουργός*) of this heavenly sanctuary. This sacerdotal term with its cognates, and *λατρεύειν* occur frequently in the epistle - (I.7; X.11; VIII.6; IX.21; I.14; IX.1,6; VIII.5; IX.9,14; X.2; XII.28; XIII.10). These words are used in the LXX of the service of the priests and Levites. ¹⁰ While *λεειτουργεῖν* may be used also of service rendered to kings and to men in general, the word *λατρεύειν* is used always of a

9. Exod. XXV. 40.

10. e.g. *λεειτουργεῖν* is used in Exod. XXVIII.31,39.
I Chron. XVI. 4,6. (LXX).

divine service, a service to God. The noun *λατρεία* is used of the whole religious ritual of the Law, e.g. *ἡ λατρεία* Rom. IX.4, and in Heb. IX.6 *τὰς λατρείας* marks the different elements of the service.

Jesus could not perform His high priestly function on earth, for the exercise of priestly functions on earth was given by the Law exclusively to those of the tribe of Levi, from which tribe Jesus was not descended. Those priests served that which is a copy and shadow (*ὑποδείγματε καὶ σκιᾷ*) of the heavenly things, and their ministry was therefore, necessarily inferior to the ministry of Jesus, as the sanctuary in which they performed their functions was inferior to the heavenly. But the ministry of the earthly Tabernacle served as a shadow, prophesying of the fulfilment which it could not effect. The sacrifices of law represented the need of the forgiveness of sins (X.3) but the sacrifice of Christ satisfied that need.

On the basis of the superiority of Christ's priestly service in the heavenly sanctuary, a new covenant has been mediated between God and men. The worship of God by Israel is conceived in the Old Testament as based upon a covenant relationship. Access to God would be obtained by the people if they conformed with certain conditions which God had laid down. The covenant had been enacted upon promises, that communion with God would be possible to those who fulfilled the conditions laid down in the covenant. But the old

covenant was not faultless, for in the time of Jeremiah a new covenant is spoken of, for the imperfection and transitoriness of the first covenant was already manifest. If the first covenant had completely fulfilled the purpose to which a covenant between God and men is directed, then no need for another would have been felt. The new covenant, of which Jesus is the mediator, is enacted upon better promises than those of the first covenant. The important phrase in the passage from Jeremiah for the author of Hebrews is the last phrase, "And their sins will I remember no more." Before the worshipper can enter into communion with God, he must have the assurance that his sins are forgiven. He must be cleansed before he can enter the sanctuary; the penalties imposed on an unclean person who entered the Tabernacle or Temple were severe. For the Christian, Jesus the High Priest after the order of Melchizedek has offered the perfect sacrifice for his sins, and by His life and death has made possible a new and closer worshipping relationship with God. He has inaugurated a new covenant under which God will be merciful, and will remember their sin no more. God's Law will no longer be on tablets of stone like the Mosaic Law, but inscribed on the hearts of the people. The new covenant rests on the forgiveness of God extended to his people in virtue of the ministry of Jesus as high priest, and not on performance on the part of man. The sacrifice of Jesus has made the sacrifice and ritual of Tabernacle and Temple

unnecessary, for He has attained in His sacrifice what they could never attain, and by fulfilling their purpose, He has abrogated them.

The writer has now presented Jesus to his readers as the High Priest Who has entered into the heavenly sanctuary, and as the inaugurator of the new covenant spoken of by Jeremiah. But he is aware of the difficulty of his Hebrew readers to accept the new High Priest and his ministry in the heavenly unseen sanctuary. The newness of the entire dispensation of Jesus Christ of which the author speaks does not readily make itself acceptable to the conservative minds of his Hebrew readers. Devoted as they were to their Pentateuch with its elaborate ritual for the purgation of sins through the worshipper's humble approach to the priest standing at the altar, there to present the offering which would send him away with peace in his heart, it was hard for them to believe that that way was now wholly obsolete, and that there was a new and better way of access to God. In order to lead and establish his readers in this new and living way, the author goes on to consider the High-priestly work of Jesus in comparison with that of the Levitical system (IX).

With affectionate reverence he describes the ordered arrangements of the Old Tabernacle, and its furniture, and the necessity of the Levitical high priest on the Day of Atonement. For him, as for his readers, there was something

noble and attractive in these ordinances of worship, and he dwells fondly on these glories of the old covenant. And the point he has in view is that contemplation of those ordinances will help in the understanding of the excelling glory of the new covenant, for in the new covenant there is a celestial counterpart to the ritual provision of the old order.

The first covenant had ordinances of divine service (*δικαιώματα λατρείας*) and its sanctuary of this world *ἕγιον κοσμικόν*. The tabernacle was constructed after the fashion of a double tent. The furniture of the first tent consists of the candlestick and the table on which the showbread is placed. This tent is called the "Holy Place". Beyond the inner veil is a second tent which is called the "Holy of Holies". The ritual of this Holy of Holies is mainly connected with the altar of incense and the ark of the covenant. The altar of incense is golden, and the ark is overlaid with gold. In the Holy of Holies the pot containing the manna is kept, also the rod of Aaron which budded, and the tablets on which the words of the covenant at Sinai were written. Above the ark itself are the cherubim, - the angels of the Lord's presence, their wings overshadowing the mercy-seat.

After he has spoken of the structure of the Tabernacle and its most important furniture "of which things we cannot now speak severally" (1X.5) the author goes on to speak of the ministry performed in the Tabernacle by the priests and high-priest. The priests go in continually

into the first tabernacle accomplishing the services (*Τὰς*
λατρείας), but into the second tabernacle, the high-priest
alone enters, and that once in the year, not without blood,
which he offers for himself and for the ignorances (*ἁγνομάτων*)
of the people (IX. 6-7). Under the Mosaic order it was clear
that there was no free access to God. God could be approached
only through the priests and high priest who represented the
people, and even they had no free access into the Holy of
Holies. The high priest alone could enter within the veil
once in the year on the Day of Atonement, the ministry of
the priests being confined to the outer tabernacle. In
this section of the epistle, the ritual of the Day of Atonement
is continually in the writer's mind. In the course of the
epistle he looks at other forms of sacrifice, (VIII.3; X.4-18),
and presents the death of Christ as the inauguration of the
new covenant, VIII.6-13; IX.15-22; X.29; XIII.20; but in
the main his interest is in the sin-offerings of the solemn
day of Atonement, II.17; VII.27; IX.7-9, 11-14, 24, 28; X.19-22;
XIII.10-13; and it is with the ministry of the high-priest
on this day that the author of Hebrews compares the high-
priestly ministry of Jesus. As Davidson says "The author
approaches the atonement not as St. Paul from the forensic
or judicial side, but from that of ritual or worship, and
consequently the epistle is largely a parallel between the
Old Testament sacrificial ritual, and ways in which the
death of Christ may be viewed. The culminating point of the

Old Testament ritual was the sacrifice on the Day of Atonement. Here the high priest took part, and the atonement was for the sins of the people."

The high priest, as the day was approaching, prepared himself by a retirement of seven days, for the solemn duties he had to perform. On the day itself, after bathing, he put on his white linen robes as representing the people before God, while the golden robes were appropriate to the messenger of God to the people.¹² The victims for the people and for the high priest were brought to the high priest to be killed and offered. On this day the high priest himself killed the victim offered for the people, whereas in other sacrifices the offerer killed his victim, and the priest's part began in the taking of the blood. But as the representative of the people on the Day of Atonement, the high priest killed the victim himself. For a sin offering for the high priest himself a bullock was presented, and two goats for the people. A ram for the high priest and a ram for the people were also offered for burnt offerings.¹³ Of the two goats brought for the sin offering of the people one was assigned by lot to God, and the other to Azazel, an evil spirit. When all was ready the high priest killed the bullock, and bearing the blood, entered into the holy place under a cloud of incense, to make atonement for himself and for his house. While the

12. Lev. XVI.4. Also Hermann Strack Joma III. 1-7 with notes pp.13-15. Also Wisdom of Ben Sira XLV 6ff. on Aaron as Priest.

13. See Westcott Hebrews 281-2

14. Lev. XVI. 3,5.

cloud of the incense covered the mercy-seat from his sight 'that he die not' he sprinkled the blood on the mercy seat and before it seven times. When the high priest had done this for himself he then acted for the people. The goat assigned to God by lot, which was the sin offering for the people was then killed by the high priest, and its blood was taken into the Holy of Holies and sprinkled on and before the Mercy Seat as had been done with the blood of the bullock. After the sin-offering for both himself and his house, and for the people¹⁵ has been made, the high priest makes atonement for the Holy Place and for the tent of meeting and the altar because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel. The solemn proceedings ended with the high priest "laying both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confessing over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions, even all their sins, and he shall put them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a man that is in readiness into the wilderness. And the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a solitary land, and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness"¹⁶. Having completed his ministry in the Holy of Holies until "The Day" וְיִמְּ (Yom Kippur) comes round again, the high priest took

15. Lev. XVI. 16 ff.

16. Ibid. XV. 21-22. This is the only case in the sacrificial ritual of the Law in which the sin of the offerer is transferred to the victim by his laying his hands on the victim's head. In this case the victim is dedicated not to God, but to Azazel, an evil spirit. Ep. to Heb. makes no reference to this part of the ritual, unless it is suggested in the quotation from Is. LIII 'to bear the sins of many' LX 28.

off his white linen in the holy place, washed himself, and put on his usual robes, and offered the burnt offerings for himself and for the people. Then the bodies of the animals whose blood had been offered in the Holy of Holies were carried without the camp, and wholly consumed.

The Day of Atonement was thus the solemn day on which the people had access to God in the person of the high priest. The people were in covenant with God, but their sins had disturbed that relationship with God. By the sacrifice of this day, the fellowship with God was restored, and the people went away on that day with joy in their hearts because they knew that once more, their sins had been cleansed by the provision which the Law made for that purpose.

The chief point *κεφάλαιον* the writer makes is that Jesus too is a priest and a high priest, but the sphere of his ministry is the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, not man. In presenting Jesus as high priest and describing his ministry, he follows closely the steps of the Old Testament ritual, making central of course the entrance into the Holy of Holies and the offering of the blood. Davidson ¹⁷ remarks that a few points, which may almost be called ritual axioms have to be remembered in the representation the author gives of Jesus as fulfilling the duties of high priest. The first

17. Hebrews 199 ff.

of these points which Davidson enumerates is that the blood makes atonement. In Lev. XVII. 10f. the use of blood as food is prohibited, and blood is set apart for the purpose of atonement - "I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls, for the blood it atones through the life" ($\text{לֶחֶם} \text{ וְ\text{שֶׁמֶן}$).¹⁸ In the second place the altar is the place at which any offering is made to God, the point where it comes into relation with God. The offerer killed his victim, but the offering itself was not "offered" until the priest had taken the blood to the altar. Then and only then it became an offering to God.

In the third place, if a living gift be offered to God, its death must necessarily take place, otherwise it could not be made over to God, but would still remain in its own possession or in that of its owner. The blood thus released was not the symbol of the life, but life itself, and sacrifice was the offering of this life (שֶׁמֶן) on the altar, to make atonement.

The author of Hebrews applies all the above points to the sacrifice of Jesus as High Priest in the true sanctuary. He illustrates the efficacy of Christ's blood by a parallel with the sacrifice and service of the Day of Atonement by which the people's broken fellowship was again restored. The Christian worshipper has "boldness to enter

18. See Westcott the Epistles of St. John 34 ff. on the idea of Christ's blood in the New Testament.

into the holy place by the blood of Jesus" (Xl9). But there is another parallel by which the writer illustrates the efficacy of the blood of Jesus Christ - that of the covenant sacrifice by which the people of Israel came in the first place into fellowship with God. These two parallels are in close association in the author's mind when he speaks of the blood of Christ. The blood of Christ is the blood of the new covenant.¹⁹ Just as the people were ratified as the covenant people in the time of Moses by the sprinkling of the blood, by the sprinkling of the blood of Christ the worshipper of the new covenant is brought into fellowship with God. The blood of Christ which is the life of Christ offered for men, is the means of atonement, which opens the way into God's presence, where Jesus now abides as the surety (²¹εγγυος) of the eternal covenant. The author of Hebrews thus draws a close parallel between the ministry of Jesus as high priest and the elements of the ritual of the Day of Atonement. This arises from the author's conception of religion as a covenant, or state of relation between God and a worshipping people, in which the high priest occupies the place of preeminence. On the Day of Atonement, the High Priest was the one and only officiant. Everything in connection with the sacrifices of that day was performed by him. It was he alone who could enter the

19. See Math. XXVI.28; Mark Xlv.24; Luke XXII.20; 1.Cor. XI.25,27.

Holy of Holies with the blood to sprinkle it on and before the Mercy Seat. But Christ has "become the High Priest of the good things to come (*τῶν μελλόντων* ²⁰) through the greater and more perfect Tabernacle not made with hands, that is to say not of this creation, nor yet through the blood of goats and calves, but through His own blood, entered in once for all into the Holy Place, having obtained eternal redemption". (IX.11-12). The points of contrast between the Levitical High Priest and Jesus, the Melchizedek High Priest are many. The benefits which the Levitical high priest obtained for the worshippers were shadowy and failed to satisfy their real and deepest needs. The gift and sacrifices offered could not, as touching the conscience make the worshippers perfect. They were only carnal ordinances inspired until a time of reformation (IX.9-10). Jesus, however, was high priest of the good things to come, of the reality and substance shadowed forth in the Law and its ordinances. The Levitical high priest officiated in the Tabernacle of this world, a mere copy of the real and perfect Tabernacle "not of this creation"(IX.11) in which Jesus exercises his ministry. The blood offered by the high priest in the earthly tabernacle was the blood of bulls and goats, blood that was shed by force, but Jesus entered in by his own blood voluntarily shed (IX.12). The Jewish high priest entered into the Holy of Holies once in the year

20. μελλόντων & A D^c ω L (vg): γενομένων B D* L (vt) 1611 1739

obtaining for the people not eternal redemption but redemption from the sins of a year. He only abode in the Holy Presence for a short time, and then returned to the people. The veil was still there, ever reminding the people that there was not for them a true and permanent access to God. Jesus entered in once for all and obtained for all men 'eternal redemption', and abides in the very presence of God, - "Having offered one sacrifice for sins for ever He sat down on the right hand of God." "He is a royal Priest, who does not stand ministering like the sacerdotal drudges of the tribe of Levi (Chap. X.11), but while He ministers, interceding for men, sits in regal state."^{21.}

In order to convince his readers of the superiority and finality of the sacrifice which Jesus has offered once for all for sins, the author makes use of one of his a fortiori arguments - "For if the blood of goats and bulls and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling them that have been defiled sanctify unto the cleanness of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal spirit offered himself without blemish unto God, cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" (IX.13-14). The Jew, before he could participate in worship of the Tabernacle, had to be ceremonially pure. Otherwise he would be excluded from the privileges of his

21. Bruce Epistle to Hebrews 291.

covenant worship until he had availed himself of the means of cleansing provided for him in the Law. Some of the Levitical ceremonies had been instituted merely for the purpose of restoring ceremonial purity to a person who had contracted defilement. Such was the ritual of 'the ashes of a heifer'²². It served to purify any person who had come into contact with a dead body. But this was not true of all the Levitical ceremonies. The Jews believed that the blood of the goat on the Day of Atonement was efficacious to cleanse them from sins of a far more serious nature than ceremonial impurity. But the point the author makes would be readily seen by the readers, if purely external ordinances can remove external ceremonial uncleanness "how much more shall the blood of Christ, Who through eternal spirit offered Himself, cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" The sacrifice of Christ is a true sacrifice because it is an affair of the spirit, it "was offered in the realm or order of the inward spirit, not of the outward and material, it was no

δικαίωμα σαρκός, but carried out *διὰ πνεύματος* i.e. in,²³ or in virtue of, his spiritual nature". Jesus offered himself through eternal spirit (*διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου* 14).

πνεύμα αἰωνίου is probably synonymous with *ἕως ἡ ἀκατάλυτος* (V11.16). He is without moral

22. Numb. XLX.

23. Moffatt Hebrews 124.

blemish, whereas the animals offered in the Tabernacle were only without physical blemish and reluctant victims. The Sacrifice of Jesus obtained eternal redemption because it operated in an eternal order of spirit, and it availed to purify the conscience because it was the action of a sinless personality. The ashes of a heifer cleansed the body from the defilement incurred by contact with a dead body, the blood of Christ cleanses the conscience from dead works, which are the expression of man's spirit. The object of the cleansing which Jesus effects is that men may serve the living God (Εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν Θεῷ ζῶντι IX.14). Having his conscience cleansed, the worshipper can have access to God to offer his worship. This is characteristic of the author of Hebrews, for him true religion is worship and what the sacrifice of Christ does is to make it possible for men to worship.

In IX.21 the cleansing of the Tabernacle and its furniture with blood is mentioned, and this thought suggests a singular notion to the author which he deals with in IX.23, - "It was necessary therefore that the copies of the things in the heavens should be cleansed with these (i.e. blood of calves and goats) but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these." The Law in the Pentateuch

has nothing to say about the sprinkling of the Tabernacle with blood, but the same statement of the sprinkling with blood of the Tabernacle and its furniture is found in Josephus.²⁴ [Josephus states that Moses killed a bullock and a ram and a kid in the court of the Tabernacle as God had commanded, and with the blood sprinkled Aaron and his sons, purifying them with spring water and oil that they might be the priests of God. Likewise, Josephus adds, Moses sanctified the Tabernacle and all its vessels, anointing them with fragrant oil and sprinkling them with the blood of bulls and rams and goats.] The author of Hebrews says in effect, if the copy, the Tabernacle of earth must be purified by blood to fit it for its high purpose, then something analagous, fulfilling the type, must take place in the heavenly Tabernacle which is the archetype of that on earth. The tabernacle of the Pentateuch was regarded as defiled by the sins of the people in whose midst it was pitched,²⁵ but it is not likely that the author of Hebrews thought of the contamination of the sins of the people as reaching into the heavenly Tabernacle. It is significant that *καθαρίξασθαι* is not repeated in the second clause of LX.23 in reference to the heavenly things (*τὰ ἑπουράνια*) as though the writer shrank from the

24. Ant. III. 8, 6.

25. "And he shall make atonement for the holy place, because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions, even all their sins, and so shall he do for the tent of meeting, that dwelleth with them in the midst of their uncleanness". Lev. XVI.16.

26. Clarendon Bible 121. (see over)

idea of cleansing required for the heavenly things.

²⁶
Narborough connects the word purify (καθαρίξασθαι) in this connection with dedicate (ἐνεκαίνισεν) in X.20, "by the way which he dedicated for us", pointing out that the author of Hebrews is almost prepared to say that the entry of Jesus into the heavenly places consecrated them to be a sanctuary, a place of offering. The word ἐγκαίνισεν is used in the LXX of the dedication of the altar, of the temple, of the kingdom, and of a house. ²⁷ But it is obvious that the parallelism here between the earthly and Heavenly tabernacles requiring cleansing is forced, and must not be pressed too far.

As the High Priest on the Day of Atonement entered in before "the face of the mercy seat" κατὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ ἑλασθηρίου ²⁸ so Christ has entered in to appear before the face of God for us (νῦν ἐμφανισθήναι τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν IX.24). At the end of the ages or at the consummation of the ages he has once (ἀπαξ) put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. The act of Christ's sacrifice was not repeatable as the act of Levitical high priest was repeated. It is appointed that men should die once, and Jesus Christ had identified Himself with men "it behoved Him in all things to be made like unto his brethren" (II.17). It is possible to make the complete offering of life in death but once. This offering Christ made, and its efficacy remains, unlike the sacrifice of the Day of

27. 1.Sam. XI.14. Deut.XX.5;
26. See previous page.

28. Lev. XVI.15.

Atonement which had to be repeated year by year. Having been offered to bear the sins of many, Christ shall appear again "a second time, without sin unto salvation". These words have as their background the scenes at the Tabernacle on the Day of Atonement. The people, gathered together for the ceremonies of the great day, watched the High Priest bearing the blood, disappear through the veil into the Holy of Holies. While he was inside the veil applying the blood for the removal of their sins, they waited eagerly for his reappearing, for he came to them with the forgiveness of God, and sent them away with peace in their hearts, for atonement was consummated. ²⁹ Now Jesus has entered into the Holy of Holies in the heavens with His own blood, and when He appears again, it will be unto salvation, for his sacrifice is efficacious.

-
29. The joy at the reappearance of the High Priest is reflected in Ben Sirah (Eccles.) L. 5 ff.
 "How glorious was he when the people gathered round him at his coming forth out of the house of the veil! As the morning star in the midst of a cloud, as the noon at the full, as the sun shining forth at the Temple of the Most High, and as the rainbow giving light in clouds of glory."

Chapter VIII.THE OLD COVENANT SACRIFICES AND THE ONE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST.

In the course of the epistle the writer has spoken of the Mosaic covenant as having grown old and waxed aged VIII.13; it was the law of a carnal commandment, it was set aside because of its weakness and unprofitableness, it was already in Jeremiah's time nigh unto vanishing away. In Chapter X. the writer brings his argument to a close by contrasting the shadow and the substance, the unavailing sacrifices of the Law, which only brought sins again into remembrance, and the one sacrifice of Jesus, the High Priest after the order of Melchizedek, which has fulfilled the will of God. The author has pointed out (IX), the completeness and finality of the one single high-priestly work of Christ in comparison with the crowning services of the old dispensation on the Day of Atonement. Jesus stands out in contrast to the Levitical high priests. What they performed for the people was imperfect and had to be repeated. This thought is now extended to all the sacrifices made by the Levitical priests - "For the Law having a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image of the things, they can never with the same sacrifices year by year which they offer continually, make perfect them that draw nigh" (X.1).

¹
As Bruce says of this passage, "We may conceive the writer

1. Hebrews 373 - 374.

making a pause to collect himself, that he may deliver his final verdict on Leviticalism in a solemn, deliberate, authoritative manner. This verdict we have here, rapid in utterance, lofty in tone, rising from the didactic style of the theological doctor to the oracular speech of the Hebrew prophet, as in the peremptory sentence, "It is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins." The notable thing in it is, not any new line of argument, though that element is not wanting, but the series of spiritual intuitions it contains, stated or hinted, in brief pithy phrases: the law a shadow, Levitical sacrifices constantly repeated inept, the removal of sin by the blood of brute beasts impossible; the only sacrifice that can have any real virtue that, by which God's will is fulfilled."

In the opening verses of Chapter X, more than anywhere else in the epistle it is evident that the Law for the author of Hebrews is the ritual law which by his self-oblation on the Cross Jesus Christ has fulfilled and abrogated.

³ As Moffatt observes "The Law is for the writer no more than the regulations which provided for the cultus; the centre of gravity in the Law lies in the priesthood (VII. 11) and its sacrifices, not in what were the real promises of the Law historically. The writer rarely speaks of the law by

3. Hebrews I.C.C. 135.

itself. When he does so as here, it is in this special ritual aspect, and what really bulks in his view is the contrast between the old and the new *Σαθ'ηκη*, i.e. the inadequate and the adequate forms of relationship to God. Once the former was superseded, the Law collapsed, and under the new *Σαθ'ηκη* there is no new Law. Even while the Law lasted it was shadowy and ineffective, i.e. as a means of securing due access to God. And this is the point here made against the Law, not as Paul conceived it, but as the system of atoning animal sacrifices."

All the Law at its best had was a shadow (*σκιὰ*) of good things to come, and not the substance (*ἔκτισιν*) of them. Here the author conveys to his readers an idea of the comparative merits of Leviticalism and Christianity and asks them to make their choice between the two.

As a shadow of the good things to come the Law had fulfilled its purpose, and must now give place to the substance.

4

Bruce enumerates a few points at which the ceremony of the Day of Atonement was a shadow of the real and lasting atonement effected by Jesus Christ, "In its comprehensive references as an atonement for the whole people; in the sin offering presented by the high priest for himself, before offering for the people; in the dress

worn by the high priest on that occasion; in the proximity of the solemn season to the feast of tabernacles, which followed four days after, and to the jubilee, which began on the evening of the same day - the religious ceremonial of the tenth day of the seventh month bore a shadowy resemblance to the transaction by which the sin of the world was really atoned for. It foreshadowed an atonement for all, by a perfectly holy Person, humbling Himself unto death, and procuring for men true liberty, peace and joy." But in the light of the full day in which the Christians live, with all the abiding privileges of the new covenant within their reach, the Law with its shadow of the good things to come sinks to nothingness. As Bruce puts it ⁵ "How rude and barely recognisable the resemblance! The atonement, annual, partial, putative; the holiness of the priest, not real but ritual; his humiliation an affair of dress, not an experience of temptation, sorrow and pain; the feast of the Tabernacles a halcyon period of seven days; the year of Jubilee, a twelve months of freedom, preceded and followed by fifty years of servitude, not an unending era of freedom and gladness. Looking at a shadow on a wall, you can tell it is the shadow of a man, not of a horse or a tree, but of what particular man, even if it were your own brother, you know not. Who, reading the sixteenth chapter of Leviticus, could guess what the ideal redemption would be like?"

5. Hebrews 376.

Since the Law had only a shadow of good things to come, it could never by continually offering the same sacrifices, make the worshippers perfect. If the Law could remove the sins of the people, that would have been an end of its sacrifices, because, once purified, the people would have no longer a consciousness of sins, and therefore no feeling of need to sacrifice. But the sacrifices had been offered continually because the need for them was felt, and this need would ever remain because the blood of bulls and goats could never take away sin. The whole system of sacrifice year by year brought home in various aspects the thought of sin to the worshipper. The physical suffering and death of irrational beasts, brought to the altar by force could never make atonement for men's sacrifice which Christ made in perfect fulfilment of the will of God. Because of their ineffectiveness, it was not God's will that the sacrifices of the Law should continue, but that one offering should be made by one especially fitted for the work - God's own Son. The author finds in the Old Testament an expression of this truth. Psalm XL (LXX,) represents the son as saying "Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body didst thou prepare for me; in whole burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin, thou hadst no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I am come (in the roll of the book it is written of me) to do thy will O God". The author points that this prophecy of

the oracle in Psalm XL, has been fulfilled in the life and death of Jesus Christ. He has offered his body once for all, and through His offering the people have been sanctified as the people of a new covenant.

5

As Westcott observes the two pairs of words, "sacrifice and offering" and "whole burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin" give a complete view of the Jewish sacrifices. The first pair describe them according to their material, the animal offering and the meal offering ($\text{קֹרְבָּן} \text{ מִנְחָה}$). The second pair give in the burnt offering (עֹלָה) and the sin offering ($\text{זָבַח} \text{ חַטָּאת}$), representative types of the two great classes of offerings, eucharistic offerings, which belonged to the life of the covenant, and expiatory offerings which were provided for the restoration of the life of the Covenant." The offering of Jesus gathers up all the Jewish sacrifices and transcends them. To the first sacrifices mentioned in the Psalm, - sacrifice and offering, corresponds the body of Christ "a body didst thou prepare for me." The second, "whole burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin", expressed aspirations and desires which are completely satisfied by the fulfilment of the will of God through the suffering and death of Jesus Christ.

The author of Hebrews assumes that the will of God requires some sacrifice.⁷ The sacrifices of the Law had failed to achieve the desired end, but the sacrifice of Christ had succeeded once for all. As Moffatt makes clear, the point of the author's argument in the oracle from Psalm XL. is not a contrast between animal sacrifices, and moral obedience to the will of God, but a contrast between the death of an animal which is irrational and reluctant to give its life blood, and the death of Jesus, which means the voluntary acceptance by Him of all that God requires for the expiation of sin. To do the will of God is for the author of Hebrews a sacrificial action which involved for Jesus an atoning death. It was God's will to redeem his people, to draw them near to him in fellowship and communion. But a means of putting away sin must be found before men can hold communion with God. This the sacrifices of the Law were meant to effect, but had failed. Jesus came into the world, fully conscious of the failure of the sacrifices of the Law to effect atonement, and gave Himself, the only sacrifice that could fulfil the redeeming will of God. This is the triumphant note in the epistle, the Law is fulfilled in Christ, and by His doing the will of God, we are sanctified (*ἐν τῷ θελήματι ἡγιασμένοι ἔσμεν*) through the offering of the

7. See Davidson Hebrews 191; Moffatt Hebrews I.C.C. 138. Also H.V. Soden Hebräerbrief in Hand-Commentar zum N.T. Dritter Band 68 - 70.

body of Jesus Christ once for all" (X.10) "Christ did not come into the world to be a good man; it was not for this that a body was prepared for him. He came to be a great High Priest, and the body was prepared for Him that by the offering of it, He might put sinful men for ever into the perfect religious relation to God."

Finally the Levitical service is once again contrasted with the surpassing ministry of Jesus (X.11-13). The Levitical service consists of repeated acts which are the same day by day and year by year, and they are not able to cleanse the conscience of the worshipper. "But Christ, when he had offered one sacrifice for sin for ever, sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made the footstool of his feet."

Bruce aptly calls the picture presented "The Sacerdotal Drudge, and the Priest upon the Throne."

The author had commenced his discussion on the high-priestly and sacrificial service of the new covenant by adducing from the Old Testament itself the prophecy of that new covenant to come, the oracle in Jeremiah XXXI. At the close of the argument in the epistle he returns to the oracle again. The great blessing of the New Covenant was the forgiveness of sins. "Their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more." And he adds "Now where remission

8. Denney 'The Death of Christ' 224, quoted by Moffatt 139.

9. Hebrews 381.

of these is, there is no more offering for sin" (X.18).

The self-oblation of Jesus Christ, remains perpetually efficacious.

The author has now completed his argument, he has established his view of the relation of Christianity to Judaism, as its complete fulfilment, the substance answering to the shadow. He goes on now (X.19 to the end) to apply his conclusions to his readers, urging them to lay hold on their privileges as Christians, and pointing out to them their responsibilities and duties.

[Under the first covenant, the Law prescribed that the high priest alone, on one day in the year could enter into the Holy of Holies. But what was the high-priest's privilege under the Law, has become under the new covenant the privilege of all - Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the Holy place by the blood of Jesus, by the way which he dedicated for us, a new and living way, through the veil, that is to say His flesh.....Let us draw near "(προσερχώμεθα X. 19-22). He calls upon his readers to realise for themselves the privileges which belong to them as Christians.]

By his emphasis on access to God, and boldness (παρρησία) to enter God's presence, the author establishes the superiority of the Christian religion to Judaism.

The Law kept the people at a distance from God. The veil hung between them and the Holy of Holies, the abode of the divine Presence, and no one dared pass through it except the High Priest alone. The way into the Holy of Holies, has now been dedicated (*ἑνεκάγειν*) for us by Christ the High Priest; He as Pioneer (*ἀρχηγός*) and Forerunner (*πρόδρομος*) has gone before us whither we may follow. The way is described as 'living way' (*ὁδὸν... ζῶσαν*). The way of access to God under the Old Testament ~~the~~ cultus, was by the "blood of victims which were dead, but the Christian's way of access is by the blood of Christ, who is alive. Delitzsch contrasts the living way with "the lifeless pavement trodden by the High Priest." of the Old Covenant.

The people of the first covenant never entered into the Holy of Holies, as the author invites his readers now to do - *προσερχώμεθα*. They were only represented by the High Priest in there, when he took the blood of the goat to atone for their sins on the Day of Atonement. The Christians on the other hand, enjoy continuous fellowship with God, in virtue of the blood of Christ. "The entrance of the Old Testament High Priest therefore corresponds to the sacrifice of Christ, and to the access of Christians which the ~~blood~~ of Christ secures. On the

one hand, Christ is our High Priest (X.21); through his self-sacrifice in death the presence of God has been thrown open to us (X.19-20.) This is the primary thought. But in order to express our use of this privilege, the writer has also to fall back upon language which suggests the entrance of the O.T. High Priest (c.f. X.19 *ἐν τῷ αἵματι*^{Ἰησοῦ} with IX 25). He does not mean that Christians are Priests, with the right of entry in virtue of a sacrifice which they present, but as to approach God was a priestly prerogative under the older order, he describes the Christian access to God in sacerdotal metaphors. *προσερχόμεθα* is one of these.¹⁰ The sacerdotal metaphors are continued when he speaks of having our hearts sprinkled, and our bodies washed with pure water. Moses "took of the blood which was upon the altar, and sprinkled it upon Aaron.....and upon his sons,"¹¹ in that way sanctifying them for their priestly office. Washing with water is also enacted as a feature in the ceremonial of the consecration of a Jewish Priest.¹² The Christians whom the author addresses have been sanctified, priestlike let them now avail themselves of the privileges which are theirs in virtue of the sacrifice of Christ who has sanctified them.

But the path for them will not be easy. They have already encountered hardships and endured much. He

10. Moffatt Hebrews 144.

11. Lev. VIII. 30.

12. Exod. XXIX. 4.

exhorts them to consider one another 'to provoke unto love and good works' (X.24) for another day of trial is at hand. If they fail in these things and neglect their duties and fall away from Christ, the vengeance of God will be terrible. "A man that hath set at nought Moses' Law dieth without compassion on the word of two or three witnesses: of how much s~~e~~rer punishment think ye shall he be judged worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith He was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the spirit of grace?" (X.28-29). The author shrinks from the thought that any of his readers would fall in such a terrible way, and he is confident that their faith will stand them in good stead, they are "of them that have faith unto the saving^{of the} soul"(x.39). This mention of faith leads him to enumerate the long and famous roll of Old Testament heroes who lived and died in faith, having received from God the testimony that they were pleasing to Him. The author wants his readers to realise that they too are enrolled in this great company of the faithful, and they must follow in their steps.

The heroes of faith realised promises (XI.33) in their life time - Isaac was born to Sarah (XI.11). but the promise of the Messianic age, to which they all looked

forward from first to last, they did not obtain. This was not because their faith was defective, but on account of God's far reaching purpose in history. It was God's purpose that the consummation (*Τελείωσις*) should be for all together, "God in His good providence reserved the Messianic *Τελείωσις* of Jesus Christ until we could share it. This *Τελείωσις* is now theirs (IX.15 X11.23), as it is ours - if only we will show a like strenuous faith during the brief interval before the end." Jesus Christ told his disciples "that many prophets and righteous men desired to see the things which ye see, and saw them not, and to hear the things which ye hear, and heard them not" and I. Peter speaks of the prophets searching diligently, prophesying of the sufferings of Christ and the glories that should follow them, "things angels desired to look into". The Christians are now living in that age in possession of the privileges of the new covenant. In the language which the author has used throughout the epistle, Christ has opened the way into the Divine Presence, the way which under the Old Covenant was closed by the veil. Into the Divine Presence he exhorts his readers to enter, and to receive the Kingdom which cannot be shaken (X11.28)

Once again in X11. 18-29 the author contrasts the

13. Moffat Hebrews 191.

14. Math. X11. 17.

15. I. Peter I. 10-12.

two dispensations. The dispensation of Sinai, though very terrible in the manifestations of God, was only provisional. "But ye are come *προσεδυάσθε* unto Mount Zion and unto the city of the living God." (XII.22.) The sanctuary to which they have come is not Sinai, but Zion, the real Holy Place in the heavens. The new dispensation is the final one, for it gathers up in itself all the truth and reality which the former dispensation shadowed forth in various ways. The author issues a solemn warning to his readers. If they who refused to hear God speaking from Sinai, the earthly tangible mount, escaped not, much less shall we escape if we turn away from Him who speaks from Mount Zion in heaven itself.

The most difficult word of all however, is the author's last word which is the issue of all that he has endeavoured to do throughout the epistle. Christianity, he has maintained fulfils the Law in all its aspects and abrogates it. He has dwelt primarily on Jesus Christ as a High Priest - "We have a High Priest (VIII.1) who has fulfilled perfectly the office of High Priest, and has brought us into the presence of God, Now he adds "We have an altar" (XIII.10) and it is an altar of which they who still continue to serve the Tabernacle, who cling to the old order, have no right to eat. "Let us therefore go forth unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach" (XIII.13) for those who will regulate their religious life by the principles of the Old

Testament ordinances are precluded from any part in the offering of Christ. The offering which Jesus made was a sin-offering and the author has described it in terms of the offering made on the Day of Atonement. According to the Law the priests did not partake of the flesh of the offering of that Day, but it was removed outside the camp to be consumed by fire. The expression "we have an altar" may contain a reference to the Supper, though not necessarily so, "but it implies that Christians participate in their sacrifice and eat of their altar."¹⁶

Christ has fulfilled the prophecy which the author finds in the Law which enacts that the sin-offering on the Day of Atonement must be burned outside the camp. He suffered¹⁷ outside the gate of Jerusalem, and was thus a true sin-offering. But, though He died as the sin-offering outside the gate, He lives, and of His life Christians are partakers (111.14). The sufferings of Christ outside the gate was the symbol of Christ having been cast out from the community of Israel. As He abandoned the camp, so must His followers. Unbelieving Israel has rejected Him, "Let us therefore go forth unto Him without the camp, bearing His reproach." The Christians cannot abide in the Old Testament Israel, which refuses to avail itself of the privileges of the new covenant. They

16. Davidson Hebrews 255.

17. John XIX. 20.

must now bear reproach as they join Him outside the camp. Nowhere on earth have they an abiding city, but they seek for the city that is to come. As citizens of that city they will offer through Christ "the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is the fruit of lips which make confession to His Name." The medium of the Old Testament ritual ordinances is no longer required, the sacrifice of praise is made through Christ. The way into the presence of God is now open, and man can continually bring to God his offering of praise.

18

Westcott observes how the Jewish teachers had given expression to this thought. "R. Pinchas, R. Levi and R. Joanan said in the name of R. Menachem of Galilee: One day all offerings will cease, only the Thank-offering will not cease: all Prayers will cease, only the Thanksgiving Prayer will not cease" (Jer. XXXIII. 11; Psalm LVI. 13). These words have now been fulfilled. The High Priest after the order of Melchizedek has offered the perfect and final offering for sin, and it remains for his followers to offer continually the sacrifice of praise (*θυσίας τῆς ἀνεύσεως* Lev. VII. 12). This was an offering made under the Law, not in fulfilment of a vow, nor in general acknowledgement of the

goodness of God, but for a special favour which God had bestowed on the worshipper. The sacrifice took the form of praise to God, the fruit of the lips confessing God's name, and doing good to men. There are the sacrifices with which God is well pleased.

Chapter IX.

The Influence or Affinity of Alexandrian
Thought in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

The author of Hebrews belongs to the Hellenistic section of the Church, and the Hellenistic ideas in terms of which he has construed the Gospel bear the stamp of Alexandrian philosophy. The chief exponent of this Alexandrian philosophy was Philo. A study of the language parallels between Hebrew and the writings of Philo has led many scholars to conclude that Philo is the source not only of many of the writer's phrases, but also of the peculiar Hellenistic tone of the whole epistle. Siegfried in his book "Philo von Alexandria" p. 321 ff has dealt in detail with the parallels between Hebrews and Philo, and observes "It is universally admitted that the writer of the Epistle had been educated in the Alexandrian School" but he does not take this in itself as proof that he had read Philo.¹ Siegfried points out many resemblances to Philo in Hebrews, e.g. certain similarities in their use of Scripture, indicated in an indefiniteness of citation,² and the use made of the silence of scripture. The resemblance is found also in their theological ideas, e.g. the logos doctrine, their view of faith, and a certain agreement in their teaching on the efficacy of sacrifice.³

1.	Siegfried	Philo	von	Alexandria	321.
2.	"	"	"	"	321-323
3.	"	"	"	"	324-326.

But as Siegfried contends, we are not warranted from these resemblances in themselves to assume that the author of Hebrews was dependent on Philo for his methods of writing and his theological ideas.

When we turn to the Jewish Wisdom literature we find that the resemblances in thought and expression to Hebrews are quite as striking and as close as those to the Philonic writings. The words "Effulgence of glory and express image" (Heb. I 3), appear to be an exact quotation from Philo,⁴ but the phrase also occurs in Wisdom of Solomon,⁵ which is almost certainly not dependent upon Philo. The resemblance of the opening verses of Hebrews to the Philonic logos doctrine is so striking that dependence on Philo has at once been assumed.

For the idea of the preexistence of Christ, and the idea of Christ's part in creation which are inferable from the Epistle to the Hebrews, the author need not have gone outside Palestinian thought. In Ecclesiasticus XXIV 1-4 we find the words "God having created it from the olden time" and in Wisdom of Solomon IX 9 "And with Thee is wisdom, which knoweth thy works, being also present (with Thee) when Thou madest the world!" The same idea occurs frequently in

4. Creation of the World. LI
 5. Wisdom of Solomon VII 25 26.

the Pseudepigrapha. ⁶ While many scholars agree that nearly all the ideas of Hebrews can be found in Palestinian Judaism, they prefer to make exception of the Melchizedek episode, and the idea of the logos as High Priest. Windisch observes "Philo sees in Melchizedek a vision of logos, who is also a priest, and who brings peace and righteousness to the soul. In this point one cannot regard Hebrews absolutely independent of Philo." ⁷ Whether the author of Hebrews is dependent on Philo or not in his treatment of the Melchizedek priesthood, there is a great difference between their respective descriptions of the priesthood. Philo writes of Melchizedek "who had received a self instructed, self taught priesthood." ⁸ Again "Melchizedek the righteous, the King of Salem," gives instruction how men can have a good voyage through life "being steered by the good Artificer and Pilot who is right reason." Again Melchizedek brings forward wine, and gives drink to souls, "For reason is a priest having self-existence and entertaining high and magnificent thoughts about him." ⁹ All this is very different from the accounts of the Epistle to the Hebrews of the Melchizedek priesthood. The high priest in Philo is

-
6. Similitudes of Enoch XLVIII 3,6; Apoc. Bar. IV 3, LIX 4; Assum. Moses I, 14, 17.
 7. Windisch, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Der Hebräerbrief 59
 8. Instructions XVIII.
 9. Alleg. Laws Bk II XXVI.

10
described thus "God commands the High Priest neither to rend his clothes,... he may show himself superior to pity, and pass the whole of his life exempt from sorrow. For the Law designs that he should be partaker of a nature superior to that of man.." We have only to set by its side the description of Hebrews V 2-7 to realize the total difference - "touched with the feeling of our infirmities"... having compassion on the ignorant, compassed with infirmity, supplications with strong crying and tears."

The term High-Priest, *ἱερεὺς* is never applied to Melchizedek by Philo. Neither does he speak of the priestly duty of the logos as that of making intercession, and when he speaks of Moses Aaron and Melchizedek as high priestly representatives of the logos, they are never conceived as having personality, but are only allegorical identifications. All this is in the region of abstract ideas, and the Epistle has nothing of it.

When we turn to the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical literature of Palestine, we find that the priesthood of Christ has some parallels in these writings, just as the preexistence of Christ, and his part in creation has parallels in this literature. In the Wisdom of Sirach we find the words "I

10. Monachy II, XII.

11. Windisch Hebraerbrief 48 states that neither in Philo, LXX. nor Josephus is Melchizedek called *ἱερεὺς*. Philo calls him *ὁ μέγας ἱερεὺς*.

12. De Migr. Abram. XIV.

13. XXIV 10.

ministered before him in the Holy tent, and so I was established in Zion." The function of mediating which has been performed by religious leaders on earth, is thought of as continued by them in heaven. Michael was thought of as the High Priest making intercession in heaven, and Buchanan Gray suggests that the author of Hebrews may have had this in mind. Oesterley gives numerous examples from the Targums in which "Memra" is represented as Israel's intercessor before God.

As already stated, the point at which scholars have been most ready to admit dependence of Hebrews on Philo is the Melchizedek high-priesthood. In this connection it must be noted that Philo never uses Ps CX, while it is just this Psalm which throughout the major portion of the Epistle is the basis of the argument of the author of Hebrews, and not Genesis XIV which he brings in at the end as a commentary on all he had been saying. The Messianic psalm is the clue to the source of the thought of the author of Hebrews, and although Christ as priest is his dominating theme, he does not forget the kingly office. We have no passage in Philo which shows conclusively that he identified Melchizedek with Messiah. These considerations tend very

-
14. Cf. Eccles. VII 8,9, with Heb. IV 14-16, VII 25.
 15. Enoch LXVIII 3-4.
 16. Sacrifices in the Old Testament 173-174.
 17. The Jewish doctrine of Mediation 87 ff.
 18. cf. Moffatt Hebrews (I.C.C.) XXXII "Philo had already identified Melchizedek outright with the logos or possibly even with Messiah.

strongly to establish the view that the author of Hebrews was not dependent on Philo in his discussion on the high-priesthood after the order of Melchizedek.¹⁹

Jewish and Christian apocalyptists envisaged the difference between imperfection and perfection, primarily under the categories of time, distinguishing between this age and the age to come. While the author of Hebrews gives a place to this concept, and refers to the terrors of judgment at the close of the present^{en} age (VI 2; IX 27; X 27; XIII 4;) far more important in his scheme is the distinction between this world and the heavenly world of spiritual realities.²⁰ This is due to the Platonism, the idealist philosophy of the author with its contrast between the heavenly world and the physical universe which is its shadow or copy. But this idea of heavenly counterparts is not alien to Judaism.

²¹Harnack says "According to the theory held by the ancient Jews, and by the whole of the Semitic nations, everything of real value that from time to time appears on earth has its existence in heaven."

²²Platonism pervaded all Alexandrian thought, and Moffatt states that "the philosophical element in the view of the world and God in Hebrews is fundamentally Platonic,

19. For a discussion of the high-priesthood in Philo see Belkin's *Philo and Oral Law* 78-88.
20. On the spiritualised eschatology of Philo see Kennedy 'Philo's Contribution to Religion' 134 ff, also Brehier *Les idées Philosophiques et Religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie* 240 ff.
21. "History of Dogma" 318.
22. I.C.C. Hebrews XXXI.

like Philo and the author of Wisdom he interprets the past and the present alike in terms of the theory that the phenomenal is but an imperfect shadowy transcript of what is eternal and real." The Levitical cultus on which the author of Hebrews dwells so much was but a faint copy of the heavenly archetype. The Levitical priests and high Priest, the Tabernacle, and all the sacrifices offered therein were nothing more than a shadowy copy of the real, as manifested in Jesus with his self-sacrifice, his death being, as Sabatier²³ says "une fonction sacerdotale, un acte transcendant de purification rituelle, accompli hors de l'humanité."

The Platonic doctrine of the two worlds is present throughout the epistle. The author defines his subject as the "world to come" (II 5). The Christians to whom he writes have tasted the power of the age to come (VI 5). The kingdom which Christians receive is 'a kingdom that cannot be shaken' (XII 28) Christians seek a city which is to come (XIII 14). In that city the people of God will have their Sabbatic rest *σαββατισμός* (IV 9). The heavenly city, the world to come, is the heavenly reality of which this age is only the earthy shadow and copy (X 1). The author does not call it future *μέλλουσαν* (XIII 14)

23. Sabatier "La Doctrine de l'Expiation" p.37 (quoted by Moffatt I.C.C. XXXII).

because it is only to be realised at a future time, but because it has not yet been fully realised in time. As ²⁴ Nairne puts it, "the seeming confusion of past, present, and future is removed by his Platonic conception of eternity as reality, not length of time."

In order to find the locus classicus of this doctrine of the heavenly counterparts, we turn to the ²⁵ Timaeus. Plato says here that it is "wholly necessary that this Cosmos should be ^a copy of something" (πᾶσα ἀνάγκη τόνδε τὸν ^{Τινὸς εἶναι} κόσμον εἶκόνα) It is not an original or pattern, ^{πλάδευμα}. The outward visible Cosmos, which is material and imperfect must have been fashioned after the pattern of the unchangeable and eternal. If we turn now to Philo's account of the divine plan in creation, we shall see how markedly it reflects ²⁶ the argument of Plato. Philo states that God realised that a beautiful copy (μίμημα) could not come into being apart from a beautiful pattern (πλάδευμα) and that when he designed to create this visible world he first formed the ideal world, so that he might produce the bodily by the use of an incorporeal and most Godlike pattern, the later modelled on the earlier, and intended to contain as many classes of things apprehensible by the sense, as there were ideas in the

-
24. C.G.T. 41. quoted by Newton Flew "The Idea of Perfection" 76. See 73 ff.
 25. Timaeus 28-29 Loeb Classical Library.
 26. De Opificio Mundi IV. 16.

archetypal world.

For Plato and for Philo, there were thus two orders of things existing side by side, a higher and a lower, the eternal, and the temporal, the heavenly reality, and the earthly universe. The author of Hebrews has imbibed the same doctrine of the two worlds, and it runs through the whole epistle in large measure determining his attitude to the Law. His interest in the Law lies in the ritual of worship in the Tabernacle. What takes place in the earthly Tabernacle is only a shadow of the reality in the heavenly Tabernacle. The Law has^a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of those things. (X 1) He describes Christ who has entered into the heavenly sphere as High Priest, who performed his priestly function in the Sanctuary, the real Tabernacle which the Lord erected, not man (VIII 2). The Levitical priests serve a mere pattern and shadow of the heavenly, for Moses was instructed, when he was about to execute the building of the Tabernacle, "See" said God, "that thou makest everything according to the pattern shown thee on the mountain" (VIII 5). When Christ had accomplished his work, the author says of him that he passed through the greater and more perfect Tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this creation, and entered in once for all into the Holy place, having obtained eternal

redemption (1X 11-12). The Platonic doctrine of ideas is surely behind passages like these. The author directs his readers' minds to the rites of the old covenant, seeking to convince them that they were only the earthly shadows of the heavenly realities. What Christ has done for them through his perfect obedience is to open a way into the eternal world. The Law had a shadow only of the bliss to come, and could never perfect those who draw near with their sacrifices. The sacrifice of Christ brings men into the very presence of God, in the eternal world.

As is clear from the writings of Philo, the Platonic doctrine of ideas was a prominent element in Alexandrian philosophy and from a study of the Epistle to the Hebrews, it is abundantly clear that the author was deeply influenced by this doctrine. This Platonic strain of thought is combined with the primitive Christian beliefs in Hebrews, and when we compare the Epistle's doctrine of the two worlds with the ideas of Philo, we find that there are very marked differences between them. The primary interest of the author of Hebrews is in the question of worship. The ritual ordinances whereby men under the old covenant had been accustomed to draw nigh to God were copies of the divine originals. There is in heaven, then, a perfect Sanctuary, where perfect worship is attained. But the idea of a higher

world of existence over against the world of sense is never fully worked out as it is in Philo. While for Philo the divine realities resolve themselves into moral and spiritual abstractions, in Hebrews they are conceived in a literal and concrete fashion. They are actual things corresponding on a higher plane to their earthly copies. The priesthood of Christ, which he exercises in the heavenly Sanctuary, is in no merely figurative sense, the counterpart of the Levitical priesthood. "In Philo we have an idealism of the genuine Platonic type, which ascribes to the intelligible forms of things an existence apart, like that of a plan of a building in the mind of the architect. The writer of Hebrews adopts this metaphysical conception, but interprets it in the light of Jewish typology. He thinks of the realities laid up in the higher world, as not merely ideal forms, but as heavenly patterns, such as were revealed to Moses in the Mount.²⁷"

The author of Hebrews does not attempt to be philosophically consistent. He takes hold of the doctrine of the two worlds, and seeks to work out the contrast in the sphere of religion alone. The central interest throughout the Epistle is religious, and all else is subordinated to this religious interest.

When we come to deal with Philo's attitude to the

27. E.F. Scott the Epistle to the Hebrews p. 117.

Law, and compare it with the attitude of the author of Hebrews, we find that the two views are not totally different from each other.

For Philo the law, Torah, *νόμος* meant the divine revelation of truth contained in the Pentateuch. When he uses the Greek word *νόμος* he does not mean the specific laws only, although he uses *νόμος* in this sense, but the word connotes also what Torah conveyed to Jewish ears. The Hebrew word תּוֹרָה in its literal sense means "instruction" or "teaching". In the Old Testament it is frequently used of instruction given by parents or by other men, e.g. "My son hear the instruction of thy father, and forget not the teaching תּוֹרָה of thy mother." ²⁸ The prophets used the word to describe the message which the Lord had given them to ²⁹ proclaim. But The Torah תּוֹרָה was the books of Moses, full of divine instruction for the people. When the Hebrew scriptures were translated into Greek תּוֹרָה was translated *δὸ νόμος*, our English "the law." Many scholars have pointed out how peculiarly unfortunate this translation is, for the ³⁰ Pentateuch contains much besides legal rulings. It is not merely a code of commands and prohibitions, as the term *δὸ νόμος* suggests, and there are developments of the Jewish doctrine of Torah, which the word "Law" tends rather to

28. Proverbs I 8. See also Prov, III 1, Psalm LXXVIII. 1.

29. Isaiah I 10, VIII 16.

30. See Travers Herford, The Pharisees 54; G.F. Moore Judaism Vol. 1 263; Schechter Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology 117.

obscure.

Philo uses the word νόμος in the sense of divine revelation of truth, as well as in the sense of specific laws. Everything in the Pentateuch is Law for him. He quotes non-legalistic parts of the Pentateuch as Law, e.g. the account of Rebecca at the well,³¹ of the tower of Babel,³² of Abraham's migration,³³ of the appointment of Aaron as Moses' spokesman.³⁴ As Goodenough remarks, "such use of νόμος is meaningless in Greek; it is a purely technical term used by Jews to indicate the Hebrew conception of Torah."³⁵ "We have in Philo, then, two senses of the word νόμος, the one referring to the Jewish Torah in general, and the other to the specific commands which at times he limits as the Decalogue."³⁶

It is clear from Philo's writings, that, when he speaks of the Torah, he means the Pentateuch. In presenting Judaism to the Gentiles, he ignores the books of the Old Testament outside the Pentateuch. Goodenough observes that in course of the entire Exposition, there is not a single reference to any Jewish writer or document but Moses and the books ascribed to him. But when he writes for Jews in

-
31. De Posteritate Caini XXXIX 132.
 32. De Confusione Linguarum II 5.
 33. De Migratione Abrahami XXXII 117.
 34. De Migratione Abrahami XXXI 169.
 35. By Light, Light. 74.
 36. See De Praemiis et Poenis I 2.

the Allegory, in the Quaestiones[†] and in the De Exsecrationibus he does on occasion quote other writings. These writings however, were not in Philo's opinion on a level with the books of Moses. He regarded them as inspired, but not as Torah in the sense in which the Pentateuch was Torah. He divided the Scriptures into Law, the Prophets, and the Hymns and other writings.³⁷ Here he is in agreement with the Palestinian tradition of the time, but differs from that in the way he reserves the word Torah exclusively for the Pentateuch.³⁸ In the first Epistle to the Corinthians Paul quotes Isaiah XXVIII 11 as Law,³⁹ and John quotes Psalm LXXXII 6 as Law. The Scriptures throughout are a revelation of religion. "They are all Torah, not by an extension a potiori of the name of the Pentateuch to all the Scriptures, but because in them all, πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως (Heb. I 1), God has revealed what He has chosen to make known of his character and his ways, and what he requires of men in relation to him and to their fellows The conviction that everywhere in his revelation God is teaching religion and that the whole of religion is contained in this revelation is the first principle of Jewish hermeneutics."⁴⁰ Philo however

37. De Vita Contemplativa III 25.

38. I Cor. XIV 21.

39. John X 34.

40. G.F. Moore Judaism Vol. I 248.

does not extend the use of Torah, Law to the non-Mosaic books of the Old Testament.

As has been pointed out in Chapter 1, the majority of the quotations and allusions in the Epistle to the Hebrews are from the Pentateuch. This characteristic the author shares with Philo. When Philo quotes from the Historical books and the Prophets, the words are quoted as an oracle of God, but in these cases the words are represented in their context as spoken by God in the first person. For Philo these books outside the Pentateuch are not oracles of God in their entirety but they contain divine utterances. In De Confusione Linguarum, he quotes from Joshua I 5 introducing the oracle with these words "and therefore the merciful God has delivered an oracle full of loving kindness. It is to this purport 'I will not let thee go, nor abandon thee'." The impression Philo gives in these passages is that the book from which it is taken is not on the level of the books of Moses. The book as a whole is not Scripture, but it contains oracles of God.

When we turn to the Epistle to The Hebrews we find that all the Scriptures are law Torah for him. In this he is ⁱⁿ agreement with the Palestinian tradition. When he quotes

41. De Confusione Linguarum XXXII 166. See also De Mutatione Nominum XXIV 139.

the Psalms and the Prophets, he does not mention the name of the writer. From these books the voice of God speaks through the person of the writer, e.g. I 5 "Unto which of the angels said he (God) at any time?" I 7 "And of the angels, he (God) saith..." Again we find words in the Old Testament attributed to Christ, e.g. X 5 "Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, sacrifice and offering....." The Holy Spirit too is represented as the speaker, e.g. X 15 "and the Holy Ghost also beareth witness to us.... this is the covenant..." The same words from Jeremiah are also quoted as words of God VIII 8. Thus while Philo regards the non-Mosaic books of the Old Testament of inferior value to the Mosaic books, the author of Hebrews puts all on the same level and quotes them all as from the Torah which for him comprises all the sacred writing. But like Philo, he makes far more use of the Books of Moses than of all the other books of the Old Testament.

42

Goodenough contends that this extreme concentration in Philo on the Pentateuch is accentuated by the absence of any sense of a verbal tradition that could be appealed to alongside the written Law. He agrees with Heinemann that Philo's references to the "Unwritten Law" cannot be taken as a reference to the "Oral tradition" of Pharisaic Judaism.

43

42. By Light, Light 78.

43. Heinemann. Bildung pp 10, 476, 528, 540.

As Goodenough states, the interesting question arises as to whether Philo's attitude to the Law was influenced by the Sadducees. Josephus has stated the attitude to the Torah taken up by Sadducees. "The Pharisees have delivered to the people a great many traditional observances handed down from their fathers, which are not written in the Laws of Moses, and for that reason it is that the Sadducees reject them and say that we are to esteem these observances obligatory that are in the written word, but are not to observe what are derived from the tradition of our forefathers." Goodenough goes on to compare what we know of the Sadducees with Philo's positions. "The points where Heinemann finds him (Philo) in agreement with Palestinian tradition, the actual usages of the temple cultus, the strict conception of the oath, the dating and nature of certain offerings, the use of God's name in the temple, the regulation of the temple ordeal for a woman accused of adultery, are all matters that were largely the concern of the Sadducean group as high-priests." The party of the Sadducees was a wealthy, conservative, and priestly led group, and we know that the appeal of the Sadducees was to men of wealth and of great social distinction.

44. Josephus Ant. XIII 10, 6.

45. By Light, Light 78-79.

46. Josephus Ant. XIII 29 ff.

While it cannot be proved that Philo was influenced by the Sadducees, it is interesting to notice that his devotion to Judaism is along the lines of ^{the} Sadducees' devotion to it. His loyalty to the Pentateuch is most earnest, and his interest in the temple and its priesthood and sacrifices, ⁴⁷ and his lack of interest in the oral tradition all seem to point to a kinship between him and the Sadducees.

Some of the elements in Philo which suggest Sadducaic influence are also found in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The main concern of the author of Hebrews is with the Law on its sacrificial and ritual side. His theme from ~~from~~ beginning to end is worship. What he presents to his readers is the way of true worship, access to the very presence of God is possible through Jesus Christ the High Priest. He is concerned with the cultus, and is anxious to show how all that was shadowed forth by it, has now been fulfilled in the ministry of Jesus as High Priest. While it cannot be proved that the author of Hebrews had been brought up in a Sadducaic atmosphere, or that he was of a priestly family, the tone of the whole epistle suggests that he was as close to the Sadducees as Paul to the Pharisees. The sphere of influence of the Sadducees was the Temple and its worship. The interest of the author of Hebrews is

47. De Specialibus Legibus Bk I discusses laws concerning Circumcision priesthood and sacrifices.

concentrated on worship, and on Christians as a worshipping people. But the basis of his remarks about worship is the description of the Tabernacle as it is given in the Pentateuch rather than the Temple of Herod in Jerusalem. The same is true of Philo especially when he discusses the mystery of Aaron in *De Vita Mosis*, *Exposition* and in the *Quaestiones*. Like the author of *Hebrews* he discusses the significance of the different parts of the Tabernacle,⁴⁸ and the functions of the high priest. The fact that both writers⁴⁹ discussed the Tabernacle rather than the Temple does not diminish the probability of Sadducee influence upon them, for the central interest is in worship, which is one and the same whether it be carried on in the Tabernacle of the Old Testament or in the Temple at Jerusalem.

We have referred to the absence of references to the Oral Law in the writings of Philo. The Sadducees⁵⁰ rejected the Oral Law, whereas the Pharisees accepted it. In Pharisaic circles the Oral Law had as much authority as the written Law. It contained the large mass of interpretations and rulings and traditions which scribes had evolved as explanations and

-
48. On general significance of the Tabernacle for Hebrews, Josephus, and Philo. See Westcott *Hebrews* p. 233-240.
49. Philo has much to say about the Temple as well as the Tabernacle e.g. *De specialibus legibus* XII -XIV.
50. See Moore *Judaism* Vol. 1 30-34 251-253. Moore maintains that the Sadducees had an Oral tradition of their own, for the directions concerning the ritual as given in the Pentateuch are inadequate for their operating, and an Oral tradition would naturally come into existence.

applications of the Laws of the Pentateuch. The Oral Law did not concern itself with the moral character alone, but with ceremonial observance as well, and made the latter of equal importance with the former. "The Jewish teachers recognised the distinction between acts which the common conscience of mankind condemns as morally wrong, and such as are wrong only because they are made so by statute; but the former are not the more properly sin because of their quality, nor the latter less so because in themselves they are morally indifferent. The sin is in either case the same, violation of the revealed will of God." The influence of the Pharisees was predominant on the Jewish people in the first century of our era. Branscombe says "It is clear from Josephus, the Gospels and the Talmud that the Pharisees had the complete leadership of the nation's life and thought by the beginning of the Christian era...., speaking of their popular influence, Josephus says plainly 'whatsoever they (the people) do about divine worship or prayers or sacrifices they perform according to their directions' " (Antt. XVIII 1,3).

In the Gospels Jesus clashes with the Pharisees, not solely because they are ardent observers of the Oral Law, but because they have put first and foremost the meticulous observance of the Law written and oral, and have

51. Moore Judaism Vol I 462.

52. Branscombe Jesus and the Law of Moses 17.

neglected the weightier matters of the Law. In the book of Acts and in his Epistles Paul invites his hearers to come to Christ for "by him everyone that believeth is justified from all things from which he could not be justified by the Law of Moses." ⁵³ The Law had become a yoke on the people's shoulders, a burden which they could not carry, and in any case, it was important to satisfy their need.

Turning to the Epistle to the Hebrews there is nothing of the feeling that the Law was a burden and a yoke from which the author seeks to set his readers free. The Law had a shadow of the good things to come, and the author seeks to show that the good things are now within the reach of the worshippers and henceforth they have no need of the shadow. The author has never felt that the Law with its ritual and ceremonial has been a hindrance to him, but rather has he seen in Jesus Christ as High Priest the ideal and final fulfilment of what the Levitical priests were able to do so imperfectly. His Old Testament, especially the Pentateuch was flooded with light for him by the death and work of Christ. His main theme is the high priesthood of Christ, and the way he has opened through the veil into the presence of God. It is by no means improbable that the

53. Acts XIII 39.

atmosphere in which he had spent his life was Sadducaic, and further, he may have been born of a priestly family.

This interest in the cultus and in worship he shares with Philo, but the interest is more likely due to the fact that both came under the influence of the Sadducees, rather than that Philo exerted his influence on the Auctor ad Hebraeos in this direction.

There are very many points in Hebrews concerning which scholars have been of the opinion that the author is dependent in thought and word upon Philo. ⁵⁴ Pfeleiderer maintains that "the allegorical treatment of the Old Testament Scriptures, the view of Christ as the great and sinless high priest, not sprung from among men, both the mediator of creation, and the sustainer of the universe, the view of the ritual sacrifices as means, not for the forgiveness of sins, but for reminding us of them, all are Philonic." Again Pfeleiderer points out that the author of Hebrews shares with Philo the mistake regarding the daily offering of the high priest, and that in agreement with Philo a passage is cited in a form which is nowhere found in the Old Testament.

"Finally" states Pfeleiderer, "the fundamental thought of the Philonian system, the antithesis between the higher prototypal world of the "ideas" (*Κόσμος νοητός ἐκ τῶν ἰδεῶν*)

54. Primitive Christianity Vol. III 283. For an elaborate argument in favour of the acquaintance of author of Hebrews with Philo see Siegfried Philo von Alexandria 321-330.

ουοταβείς) and the earthly, sensible, antitypal world is made by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews the basis of his Christian speculation, and applied to the relationship of Christianity to Judaism." The characteristic of the logos in Philo, as mediator between the two worlds, and as High Priest and representative of man, are said to be transferred by the author of Hebrews to Jesus Christ.

But as has been stated already, the Auctor ad Hebraeos had no need to go outside Palestinian literature for many of the ideas for which he is often believed to be indebted to Philo. The points at which he bears resemblance to Philo by no means necessarily prove that he had read Philo's writings, for side by side with the similarities between him and Philo, we can set a large amount of dissimilarity. Furthermore, as Zeller points out, there is much in Philo which is characteristic of all Alexandrian thought. The Platonic doctrine of the two worlds pervaded all Alexandrian thought and philosophy, and, either through development of latent ideas, or through the influence of Hellenistic ideas, a parallel movement of thought obtained among the writers of Jewish Apocalypses. The author of Hebrews had received an Alexandrian education, and without

55. See Dorner History of the Development of the Doctrine of Person of Christ I 19-41.

56. Zeller Outline of Greek Philosophy (Trans. fr. German by Alleyne and Abbott) 320-5.

being a philosopher in the sense Philo was a philosopher, he would have acquired a number of more or less philosophical terms which were in general circulation, with which he expresses his thoughts.

The Epistle to the Hebrews is thus broadly Alexandrine rather than Philonic, and the term Alexandrine is legitimate only as far as we recognise in the epistle thought forms and rhetorical methods which are found in the Alexandrian writers.

CHAPTER XTHE USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN ST. PAUL

Quotations from the Pentateuch in the
Epistle to Galatians.

Gal. III 6. Even as Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness.

Gen. XV 6. And he believed in the Lord, and he counted it for him righteousness.

Gal. III 8. And the scripture foreseeing that God would justify the Gentiles by faith, preached the Gospel beforehand unto Abraham saying, In thee shall all the nations be blessed.

Gen. XII 3. And I will bless them that bless thee, and him that curseth thee will I curse, and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed.

Gal. III 10. For as many as are of the works of the Law are under a curse: for it is written cursed is everyone which continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law to do them.

Deut XXVII 26. Cursed be he that confirmeth not the words of this Law to do them. And all the people shall say Amen.

Gal. III 12. And the Law is not of faith, but he that doeth them shall live in them.

Lev. XVIII 5. Ye shall therefore keep my statutes, and my judgments which if a man do, he shall live in them; I am the Lord. (c.f. Exod XXII 13, Neh. IX. 29)

Gal. III 13. Christ redeemed us from the curse of the Law, having become a curse for us: for it is written, cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree.

Deut. XXI 23. His body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt bury him the same day: for he that is hanged is accursed of God; that thou defile not thy land which thy Lord thy God giveth thee for an inheritance.

Gal IV 30. Howbeit what saith the scripture? Cast out the handmaid and her son; for the son of the handmaid shall not inherit with the son of the free woman.

Gen. XXI 10. Wherefore she said unto Abraham, cast out the bondwoman and her son; for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac.

Gal. V. 14. For the whole Law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.

Lev. XIX 18. thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.

Quotations from the Pentateuch in Romans

Rom. IV 3, For what saith the scripture? And Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness. 22. "Wherefore also it was reckoned unto him for righteousness.

Gen. XV 6. And he believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness.

Rom. IV 18. Who in hope believed against hope, to the end that he might become a father of many nations, according to that which had spoken, so shall thy seed be.

Gen. XV. 5. And he brought him forth abroad, and said Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars if thou be able to tell them; and he said unto him, So shall thy seed be.

Rom. IV 17. As it is written, a father of many nations have I made thee.

Gen. XVII 5. Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham; for a father of multitude of nations have I made thee.

Rom. VII 7. What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Howbeit I had not known sin, except through the law: for I had not known coveting, except the law had said: Thou shalt not covet.

Exod XX 14, 17. Thou shalt not commit adultery.

Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his man servant nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbour's.

Rom. IX 7. Neither because they are Abraham's seed, are they all children; but in Isaac shall thy seed be called.

Gen. XXI 12. And God said unto Abraham Let it not be grievous in thy sight because of the lad and because of thy bondwoman; in all that Sarah saith unto thee, hearken unto her voice: for in Isaac shall thy seed be called.

Rom. IX 9. For this is a word of Promise, According to this season will I come, and Sarah shall have a son.

Gen. XVIII 10. And he said, I will certainly return unto thee when the season cometh round; and lo, Sarah thy wife shall have a son.

Rom. IX 12. It was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger.

Gen. XXV 23. And the Lord said unto her

Two nations are in thy womb,

And two peoples shall be separated from thy bowels:

And the one people shall be stronger than the other people

And the elder shall serve the younger.

Rom. IX 15. For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I have compassion.

Exod. XXXIII 19. And he said, I will make all my goodness pass before thee, and will proclaim the name of the Lord before thee: and I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will show mercy on whom I will show mercy.

Rom. IX 17. For the scripture saith unto Pharaoh, For this very purpose did I raise thee up, that I might show in thee my power, and that my name might be published abroad in all the earth.

Exod. IX 16. but in every deed for this cause have I made thee to stand for to show thee my power, and that my name may be declared throughout all the earth.

Rom. X 6, - 8 But the righteousness which is of faith saith thus: Say not in thy heart, who shall ascend into heaven? (that is to bring Christ down) or, who shall descend into the abyss? (that is to bring Christ up from the dead) But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is, the word of faith, which we preach:

Deut. XXX 11-14. For this commandment which I command thee this day, it is not too hard for thee, neither is it far off. It is not in heaven that thou shouldest say, who shall go up for us to heaven, and bring it unto us, and make us to hear it, that we may do it? Neither is it beyond the sea, that thou shouldest say, who shall go over the sea for us, and bring it unto us, and make us to hear it that we may do it? But the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it.

Rom X 19. But I say, Did Israel not know? First Moses saith, I will provoke you to jealousy with that which is no nation, with a nation void of understanding will I anger you.

Deut. XXXII 21. They have moved me to jealousy with that which is not God. They have provoked me to anger with their vanities. And I will move them to jealousy with those which are not a people: I will provoke them to anger with a foolish nation.

Rom. XIII 9. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not covet, and if there be any other commandment, it is summed up in this word, namely thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. (cf. Gal. V. 14; Lev. XIX 18)

Exod. XX 13 ff. Thou shalt do no murder,
 Thou shalt not commit adultery,
 Thou shalt not steal,
 Thou shalt not bear false witness
 against thy neighbour.
 Thou shalt not covet.

Rom. XV 10. And again he saith rejoice, ye Gentiles with his people.

Deut. XXXII 43. Rejoice, O ye nations with his people.

Quotations from the Pentateuch in I Corinthians.

1 Cor. VI 16. Or knew ye not that he that is joined to a harlot is one body? for, the twain, saith he, shall become one flesh.

Gen. II 24. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh.

1. Cor. IX 9. For it is written in the Law of Moses, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn.

Deut. XXV 4. Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn.

1 Cor. X 7. Neither be ye idolaters, as were some of them; as it is written the people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play.

Exod. XXXII 6. And they rose up early on the morrow and offered burnt offerings and brought peace offerings, and the people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play.

1 Cor. XV 45. So also it is written, the first man Adam became a living soul.

Gen II 7. And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life: and man became a living soul.

Second Corinthians and the Pentateuch.

II Cor. III 13. and are not as Moses, who put a veil upon his face that the children of Israel should not look steadfastly on the end of that which was passing away.

Exod. XXXIV 33. And when Moses had done speaking with them, he put a veil upon his face.

35 And Moses put a veil upon his face again, until he went in to speak with him.

II Cor. VIII 15. As it is written, he that gathereth much had nothing over; and he that gathereth little had no lack. Exod. XVI 18. And when they did mete it with an omer, he that gathereth much had nothing over, and he that gathereth little had no lack.

Quotation from the Prophets in Galatians

Gal. IV 27. for it is written, Rejoice thou barren that barest not, break forth and cry, thou that travailest not, for more are the children of the desolate than of her which hath the husband.

Is. LIV 1. Sing O barren, thou that didst not bear; break forth into singing, and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail with child; for more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife, saith the Lord.

Quotations from the Prophets in Romans

Rom. I 17. For therein is revealed a righteousness of God by faith unto faith, as it is written, But the righteous shall live by faith (cf. Gal III 11.)

Heb. II 4.

Rom. II 24. For the name of the Lord is blasphemed amongst the Gentiles because of you.

Is. LII 5.

Rom. IX 13. Even as it is written: Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated.

Mal I 2f.

Rom IX 26. And it shall be that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, There shall they be called sons of the living Christ.

Hos. I 10f.

Rom. IX 27. And Isaiah crieth concerning Israel, 'If the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, it is the remnant that shall be saved.

Is. X 22 ff.

Rom. IX: 29. And as Isaiah hath said before,
 Except ~~the~~ the Lord of Sabaoth had left us a seed,
 We had become as Sodom, and had been made like
 unto Gommorah.

Is. I 9.

Rom. IX 33. Behold I lay in Zion a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence, and he that believeth on him shall not be put to shame.

Is. VIII 14. and Is. XXVII 16.

Rom. X 15. And how shall they preach, except they be sent? even as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that bring glad tidings of good things?

Is. LII 7.

Rom. XVI 6. But they did not all hearken to the glad tidings,
for Isaiah saith, Lord, who hath believed our report?

Is LIII 1.

Rom. X 20 ff. And Isaiah is very bold and saith,

I was found of them that sought me not;

I became manifest unto them that asked not of me.

Is. LXV 1.

Rom XI 8. According as it is written, God gave them a
spirit of stupor, eyes that they should not see, and ears
that they should not hear, unto this day.

Ix. XXIX 10 and Deut. XXIX 4.

Rom. XI 26. And so all Israel shall be saved even as it is
written: There shall come out of Zion the deliverer, he shall
turn away ungodliness from Jacob.

Is. LIX 20.

Rom. XI 34 f. For who hath known the mind of the Lord?
or who hath been his counsellor?

Is. XL 13.

Rom. XIV 11. As I live, saith the Lord, to me every knee
shall bow, and every tongue confess to God.

Is. XLV 23.

Rom. XV 12. And again Isaiah saith

There shall be the root of Jesse

And he that ariseth to rule over the Gentiles;

On him shall the Gentiles hope.

Is. XI 10.

Rom. XV 21. but, as it is written: They shall see, to whom no tidings of him come, and they who have not heard shall understand.

Is. LII 15.

Quotations from the Prophets in I and II Corinthians

I Cor. I 19. For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and the prudence of the prudent will I reject.

Is. XXIX 14.

I. Cor. I 31. that according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.

Jer. IX 24.

I Cor. II 9. but as it is written, Things which eye saw not, and ear heard not, and which entered not unto the heart of man, whatsoever things God prepared for them that love him.

Is. LXIV 4.

I Cor. XIV 21. In the law it is written: By men of strange tongues and by the lips of strangers will I speak unto this people; and not even thus will they hear me, saith the Lord.

Is. XXVIII 11, 12.

I Cor. XV 32. If after the manner of men I fought with beasts at Ephesus, what doth it profit me? If the dead are not raised, let us eat and drink for to-morrow we die.

Is. XXII 13.

I Cor. XV 54 f. But when this incorruptible shall have put on incorruption Death is swallowed up in victory, O death where is thy victory? O death where is thy sting?

Is! XXV 8 and Hos. XIII 14.

II Cor. VI 2. for he saith, At an acceptable time I hearkened unto thee, and in a day of salvation did I succour thee, behold, now is the acceptable time; behold now is the day of salvation.

Is. XLIX 8.

II Cor VI 16 f. And what agreement hath a temple of God with idols ... even as God said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come ye out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch no unclean thing, and I will receive you, and will be to you a Father, and ye shall be to me sons and

daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.

Lev. XXVI 12. Ezek. XXXVII 27. Is. LII 11.

Quotations from the Psalter in the
Epistle to the Romans.

Romans III 10-12. There is none righteous, no, not one,
There is none that understandeth, There is none that seeketh
after God; They have all turned aside, they are together
become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no,
not so much as one:

Psalm XIV 1 - 3. Psalm LIII 2 - 4.

Rom. III 13. Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their
tongues they have cried deceit; the poison of asps is under
their lips.

Ps. V 9; Ps. CXL 3.

Rom. III 14. Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness.

Ps. X 7.

Rom. III 15-17. Their feet are swift to shed blood;
Destruction and misery are in their ways; And the way of
peace have they not known.

Ps. LIX 7 - 8.

Rom III 18. There is no fear of God before their eyes.

In typical Rabbinic method, St. Paul in Rom. III 10-18 strings together quotations from the Old Testament (in this case from the Psalter) to prove that all men, Jews and Gentiles alike, are included under sin.

Rom. III 4. That thou mightest be justified in thy words, and mightest prevail when thou comest into judgment.

Ps. LI 4.

Rom. III 20. By the works of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight.

Ps. CXLII 2.

Rom. IV 7f. Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not reckon sin.

Ps. XXXII 1 - 2.

Rom. VIII 36. for thy sake we are killed all the day long, we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter.

Ps. XLIV 22.

Rom. X 18. Their sound went out into all the earth, and their words into the end of the world.

Ps. XIX 4.

Rom. XI 1f. I say then, Hath God cast off his people? God forbid; For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham,

of the tribe of Benjamin. God did not cast off his people which he foreknew.

Ps. XCIV 14.

Rom. XI 9. Let their table be made a snare, and a trap, and a stumbling block, and a recompense unto them.

Ps. LXIX 22.

Rom. XV 3. The reproaches of them that reproached thee, fell upon me.

Ps. LXIX 9.

Rom. XV 9. Therefore will I give praise unto thee among the Gentiles, and sing unto thy name.

Ps. XVIII 49.

Rom. XV 11. Praise the Lord, all ye Gentiles; and let all the people praise him.

Ps. CXVII 1.

Quotations from the Psalter in I and II Corinthians.

I Cor. III 19 - 20. He taketh the wise in their own craftiness.

The Lord knoweth the reasonings of the wise, that they are vain.

Ps. XCIV 11 (also Job V 13.)

I Cor. X 26. The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof.

Ps. XXIV 1 (also Dent. X 14)

I Cor. XV 27. For He put all things in subjection under his feet. But when he saith, All things are put in subjection, it is evident that he is excepted who did subject all things unto him:

Ps. VIII 6.

II Cor. IX 9. He hath scattered abroad, he hath given to the poor; his righteousness abideth for ever.

Ps. CXII 9.

A glance at the Old Testament passages quoted by Paul reveals that his interest is different from that of the Author of Hebrews. Paul is not interested in the worship of the Old Covenant and its liturgy, and consequently the Levitical books do not loom largely in his quotations. The reason for this is obvious - he was the apostle to the Gentiles, and not to the Jews. His use of the Old Testament, as is to be expected, is coloured by the polemic purpose with which he sets out, particularly in the Epistles to the Galatians and Romans. The Judaizers have endeavoured to enforce the yokes of the Law on Gentile converts coming into the Church. Paul throws open the door of the Church to Jews and Gentiles alike, not on condition of observance of the Law, but on condition of faith

in Christ. He argues that both Jews and Greeks stand on an equality before God, they are all included under sin.

For the Author of Hebrews, far more so than for Paul, there is in the Old Testament a foreshadowing of what the Gospel completes and crowns. The author of Hebrews looks back over the course of the divine discipline of humanity as it is outlined in the Old Testament, and indicates how Jesus, Lawgiver and Priest, fulfils perfectly the offices which Moses Aaron and Melchizedek held in transitory form. For him the forms of worship under the Old Covenant are eloquent of the ideal mode of worship which has become possible under the New Covenant. The continuity and the oneness of the Old and New are not so forcibly brought out in Paul.

Nowhere is the contrast between the use of the Old Testament in Hebrews and Paul seen more clearly than in their respective use of the Psalter. The Auctor ad Hebraeos takes the primary passages which he adduces to illustrate the true nature of the Person and work of Christ from the Psalms. Jesus Christ speaks in the Psalms as the ideal Priest who has come to do God's will, fulfilling perfectly the function of the Aaronic priesthood. Paul on the other hand does not seek in the Psalter prophecies of the fulfilment and perfection of the Old Covenant in the New. That is not his purpose. Confronted with the Judaizers who boasted in the Law and glorified in their righteousness as though it was a personal achievement and not a divine gift (I Cor. IV 7), St. Paul quotes from the Psalter (especially in ROM III 10-18) to prove

that both Jews and Gentiles are sinners before God. "There is no one righteous, no not one". The way of acceptance with God, for Jew and Gentile alike is through faith in Christ. Such is the background of Paul's thoughts, and it is reflected throughout in the use he makes of the Old Testament. Before his conversion Paul had been an ardent observer of the Law, and his deep concern for righteousness before God as a Christian is rooted in his struggle for righteousness by observance of the Law in the days before his conversion, and the forensic mould in which much of his thought is cast is traceable to the same source.

The situation with which Paul is confronted is very different from that of the Author of Hebrews. The people addressed by the author of Hebrews are not faced with the problem of the admission of the Gentiles into the Church. The question for them was not the universality of Christianity, justification by faith and not by works, but the fact that Christ, the ideal priest, had done away once and for all with the need of sacrifice. To meet their readers' problems and difficulties, both Paul and the author of Hebrews go to the Old Testament to draw from it in proof and demonstration of their arguments.

CHAPTER XI.ST. PAUL'S ATTITUDE TO THE LAW.

In giving an account of St. Paul's attitude to the law, we are greatly helped by the information we have in the Epistles and in the Book of Acts about Paul's personal history. The author of Hebrews keeps himself back, and does not give us directly even a glimpse of his own personal history in his epistle. He comes before us like Melchizedek "without father, without mother, without genealogy" and we are left only with the impressions he makes on us in this one epistle to form a rough picture of the man he is likely to have been. Not so with St. Paul. He frequently gives us many flashes into his own life history, and the book of Acts supplies us with a history of Paul from his conversion.

But the evidence we have for the life of Paul deals with the middle and later periods of his life, and for the early part, our evidence is very meagre. The tradition is found in Jerome¹ that Gishala in Galilee was Paul's home.² Deissmann states that this tradition in Jerome is probably derived from the tradition of the family which traced back its origin to Gishala.³ But Paul in Acts

-
1. Philemon 23 and De viris illustribus 5.
 2. Paul 90 Note 5.
 3. XXII 2.

tells us that he was a Jew born in Tarsus of Cilicia, whither we may conclude his family had emigrated from Gishala in Galilee. Deissmann⁵ points out that it is strong evidence that Paul's family was Galilean as the Jerome tradition maintains, that he calls himself "Hebrew of the Hebrews",⁴ for by Hebrews in the Imperial period, we are to understand Jews who spoke Aramaic.

Paul's youth had been mainly passed in Jerusalem, where at the feet of Gamaliel he had devoted himself to the study of the Law.⁵ Hillel was the founder of the school to which Gamaliel belonged, and one of his sayings implies that it is the duty of the Jew to bring salvation to the Gentiles by teaching them the Law. As a young man in Jerusalem, Paul displayed boundless enthusiasm for the strict observance of the Law in which he was now so learned. "He was learned in the scriptures, especially in the interpretation of the Law, and the subtle reasonings by which the sacred text was made into a code of ordinances covering every detail of life. He promised to be one of the leaders of the nation, and a powerful force in developing the Pharisaic ideal of holiness and extending the influence of the Law in Jewish life."⁶ The most prominent characteristic of the Pharisees at this time, was their zeal for righteous -

4. Phil. iii. 5.

5. See James Mackinnon The Gospel in the Early Church 48 who maintains that Paul lived in Tarsus until he was fifteen when he went to Jerusalem to study under Gamaliel.

6. Wilfred Knox St. Paul. 27-28.

ness, and this zeal Paul shared to the full, and he allowed it to carry him into fanatical extremes in order to attain the Pharisaic standard of righteousness before God. The way of righteousness was by fulfilling the injunctions of the Law. The merit thus gained secured to each person salvation from God's hand. But even in his childhood, as he relates in the autobiographical fragment of Roman VII 9 - 11, it had been borne home to him that the way of the Law was an impossible way to attain righteousness in the sight of God, and to attain to salvation.^{7.} "For I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died, and the commandment which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me." The period to which he refers as the time when he lived without the law, is his childhood, when sin and guilt had not as yet become facts in his experience. But this period of childlike innocence ended and "there came a sorrowful day never to be forgotten: the Law, the dumb parchment rolls which he had seen from far as a child in

7. Weiss Das Urohristentum 399 Note 1 inclines to the view that this section in Romans is not autobiographical, but general. c.f. C.H. Dodd's Romans 107 who takes the first personal pronoun in this section and generally in Paul to refer to himself. Wrede Paulus 82, Rawlinson N.T. Doctrine of Christ 88 f and Machen "Origin of Paul's Religion" 65, think that Paul here is only putting a supposed case.

the synagogue with awe and curiosity as they lay in their embroidered coverings - that law itself entered for the first time peremptorily into his conscience, with its 'thou shalt', no doubt conveyed through the mouth of a parent. But the Law's 'thou shalt' was closely followed by the child's 'I will not' and transgression. Paul does not say what the occasion was. But he indicates that this first conscious sin wrought terrible havoc in his sensitive young soul. He felt himself deceived, it was as though he had tasted death:-

"I died"⁸. Paul was a Pharisee⁹ and tried with fanatical enthusiasm by the fulfilment of the Law to attain righteousness, - "For ye have heard of my manner of life in time past in the Jews' religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the Church of God, and made havock of it, and I advanced in the Jews' religion beyond many of mine own age among my countrymen, being more exceedingly zealous for the tradition of my fathers."¹⁰ But having applied himself unsparingly to the observance of the Law after the manner of the Pharisees, he was nevertheless left with a bitter sense of dissatisfaction and failure. It had become clear that the Law upheld a conception of man's duty towards God which no observance of its prescriptions would enable him to fulfil. The Law made it clear to him how he ought to live but could give him no aid to live as he ought. The

8. See Deissmann 'Paul' 92.

9. Phil. 111 5; Acts XXIII 6. Acts XXVI. 5.

10. Gal. 1. 13-41. c.f. Acts XXII, 3. Phil. 111. 5-6.

Law held out the perfect standard of holiness which God required, and his continual failure to live up to that standard filled him with despair. The effect of this despair which crept into his soul was to lead him into more fanaticism for his faith, which in turn led him into even deeper despair. He plunged himself more eagerly into the life to which Law and tradition seemed to beckon him. But "he found that the more keenly he pursued his ideal, the further it receded. The righteousness on which his heart was set stood afar off, mocking his endeavours."¹¹ The Law challenged Paul to work out his own salvation, and this challenge he took up with unflinching determination. The whole purpose of life for Paul was the fulfilment of God's demand revealed in the Law. But if the Law was not fulfilled in its entirety, it profited him nothing, for "whosoever shall keep the whole Law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all."¹²

This inner conflict raged in Paul's breast until the life-transforming experience of the Damascus way. Dissatisfaction with Judaism, and the sense of its utter failure to give his soul peace with God was ever growing within him. Paul, even if he had not seen Jesus, could not have failed to acquire information about Jesus and his teaching from his Pharisaic associates and acquaintances

11. J. S. Stewart, "A Man in Christ" 83.

12. James 11. 10.

¹³
 in Jerusalem. He tells us how he had 'persecuted the Church
¹⁴
 of God, and wasted it.' He had seen with what devotion to
 their Master, and courage, the Christians had taken the
 spoiling of their goods, and had even faced death with
¹⁵
 utter calm and serenity as in the case of Stephen. Their
 spirit had been unbreakable despite the bitterness of their
 persecutions, and they possessed joy and peace which Paul
 their persecutor had never known. All these things could
 not have escaped Paul's eye, and had in all likelihood,
 in moments of deep reflection, made him wonder, whether
 after all, he was on the wrong track altogether, and the
 Christians he persecuted so relentlessly as blasphemers of
 God and the Law and the temple were in possession of the
 pearl of great price - peace with God, which he himself so
 ardently sought and desired.

The conflict which was raging in Paul's soul could
 not for ever be stifled and repressed, and while on the way
 to Damascus on a mission to crush out of existence the
 followers of the Christian faith who had undermined the very
 foundations of his own faith by their conduct and demeanour
 in the face of his cruel persecutions, the dissatisfaction
 which he had felt so long in his own soul burst forth into
 a sudden and violent realisation of the truth. Suddenly

13. On the question whether Paul had seen Jesus in Jerusalem.
 see Anderson Scott Christianity according to
 St. Paul 11 ff.
14. Gal. 1.13.
15. On what impression the death of Stephen must have made
 on Paul see T.R. Glover Paul of Tarsus 59-61.

a light from heaven shone round about him, and a voice said unto him "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" The voice was the Lord's whom he persecuted, and having been taken to Damascus, and having been visited by Ananias ¹⁶ through whom he received his sight again, after a time he departed into Arabia, now a "chosen vessel to bear the name of the Lord before the Gentiles and Kings and the Children of Israel." ¹⁷ In Arabia he was able to retreat and adjust his beliefs to the new light which had come into his life.

Ever after the experience on the way to Damascus Paul had the certainty that the risen Christ whom he had encountered, had bestowed the power upon him to conquer sin, and to attain to righteousness before God. All this the Law purported to do but had hopelessly failed in his experience. He now lived a new life 'in Christ', having died to the old order. Under the Law, life for Paul had been a continual struggle after an unattainable ideal. But after his experience and knowledge of Christ, the ideal which he had previously striven to attain was now attained not by his own efforts, but through the power of Christ in him. Thus Paul declares that the Law is no longer necessary, and when he has cast the Law away, he has removed the barrier which had kept the Gentiles away from coming into the knowledge of God.

16. Acts 1X 10 f

17 " 1X 15.

Circumcision in particular had always repelled the Gentiles, and Paul has no objection to the Jews observing this rite, but it must not be made incumbent on the Gentiles to observe it, for it belongs to the old order, from which as new creatures in Christ, they have been set free.

After the death of Stephen, the apostles and leading Christians had to flee from Jerusalem, and travelled as far as Phoenicia, Cyprus and Syrian Antioch.¹⁸ At Antioch many of the Gentiles believed and when the Church in Jerusalem heard of the work done in these regions, it sent forth Barnabas as far as Antioch. Barnabas went to Tarsus, and brought Paul back with him to Antioch. The work of the Church in Antioch and the surrounding area went on for a long period, probably about ten years. It was a Gentile church which made no pretence of observing the Law. There was little traffic between it and the Jerusalem church, otherwise the storm over the non-observance of the Law by the Antiochian Christians would probably have arisen much sooner than it did.

In the year 48 A.D. however, occasion arose for a representation of the Antiochian Church to visit the mother Church in Jerusalem.¹⁹ Agabus, who amongst other prophets had come down from Jerusalem signified that there should be a great famine over all the world, which came to pass in the

18. Acts XI 19 ff.

19. Josephus Ant. XX 5. tells us of a Judean famine which reached its climax in 46 A.D. If this is the famine referred to the visit to Jerusalem must be placed 44-46 A.D.

20

days of Claudius. The Church at Antioch had taken heed of the words of Agabus and had collected alms which they now decided to send down to Jerusalem by the hands of two of the leading men of the Church, Paul and Barnabas. Others also went with them, and among them was Titus, a young Gentile convert, and one of Paul's most trusted disciples. In a spirit of great amity the Antiochian delegates conferred with Peter and John and James the Lord's brother, who held a position of great dignity in Jerusalem. But during this visit, it was discovered that Titus was uncircumcised, at which the Jewish Christians took great offence.²¹ Paul's account of this incident in his epistle to the Galatians is so obscure that it is difficult to say whether he allowed Titus to be circumcised for the sake of peace at Jerusalem, or not.²² But it does seem probable that Paul allowed Titus to be circumcised for the sake of peace while at the same time refusing to admit the justice of the Jewish demand.

Nevertheless before the delegation from Antioch left Jerusalem, the leaders of the Church, James, Cephas and John, perceiving the grace that was given to Paul, gave him and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship recognising

20. Act XI. 27-28

21. Gal. II. 3 - 4.

22. Lightfoot and Ramsay both conclude that Titus was not, and could not have been circumcised, that Paul could not possibly have conceded the point in the case of Titus a Gentile, as he did in the case of Timothy, the half-Jew. Kirsopp Lake inclines to the view that Titus was circumcised. See Galatians Clarendon Bible, A.W.F. Blunt 75-76 who also inclines to the view that under pressure from the leaders of the Jerusalem Church Paul yielded to circumcise Titus for the sake of peace.

their mission as to the uncircumcision, and their own as to
 23
 the circumcision.

Not long after Paul's visit to Jerusalem, Peter visited Antioch. On his arrival he had no scruples about joining the meetings of the community and partaking of the common meal of the Church of which both Jews and Gentiles partook together. But some of the stricter Jews of Jerusalem arrived at Antioch, and displayed great displeasure at Peter's conduct. Peter gave way, and separated himself from the Gentiles, and by his action called down upon himself a public denunciation from Paul. For Paul, it was mere hypocrisy in Peter to object to eating with the uncircumcision while he at the same time ignored all the traditions which were as necessary as any other part of the Law. But Paul's contention is that the Law in no measure is necessary at all for salvation. The Judaizers who had come from Jerusalem are not on common ground with Paul. They were Christians, but had brought over with them into Christianity the whole apparatus of Judaism. They maintained that justification is by the works of the Law, provided faith in Christ is added. Paul maintained that justification is by faith alone, and not by the works of the Law. Paul did not deny that a Jewish Christian might, if he wished, continue in his observance of the Mosaic law, but he must not seek justification by such works, for justification is by faith

alone in Christ. Paul's opponents saw in Christ the fulfilment of the Jewish Messianic hope, whereas for Paul, Christ was that and more, He was the Son of God. By fulfilling the Messianic hope of the Jews, He had rendered the observance of the Law unnecessary, while for the uncircumcision, He offered the way of Salvation immediately, without any question of the need for them to observe the Jewish ordinances as a gateway into the new life.

After the delegation returned to Antioch, the Christian Church of Antioch began on its first missionary task, and sent Barnabas and Saul on their first missionary journey.²⁴ When the Jews rejected the missionaries' message, they left the synagogue and preached to the Gentiles. The Church was now established as an organisation separate from the synagogue. Each Church established by the missionaries had its own elders, after the pattern of the synagogue, whose duty it was to direct the services of worship and to act as rulers.

The message of the missionaries from Antioch on this first mission is well summed up in Paul's closing words in his address in the synagogue of Pisidian Antioch - "Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins. And by him, all that believe are justified from all things,²⁵ from which ye could not be justified by the Law of Moses".

24 Acts XlI. 1 ff.

25 Acts XlI 38-39

Paul clearly states that salvation is by faith in Christ and not by observance of the Law.

The church in Antioch received the missionaries back with great enthusiasm and rejoiced because of the way "God had opened a door of faith unto the Gentiles."²⁶ But the strict Jews at Jerusalem heard with dismay how Paul and his associates were receiving the Gentiles into the church free from the Law. They began a campaign against Paul both in Antioch, and in the Galatian Churches which he had founded, claiming that the Gentiles entering the Church must be circumcised, and must observe the Law of Moses. These Judaizers were finding some support in the Pauline Churches of Galatia, and when it came to Paul's ears that some of his converts were wavering in their loyalty to the faith as preached to them by him, in great indignation and haste he wrote to them the letter which has come down to us as the Epistle to the Galatians, which with the Epistle to the Romans, is our richest source of information on Paul's attitude to the Law. The difficulty felt about the admission of the Gentiles into the Church free from observance of the Law, had now assumed such proportions, that it was decided in Antioch to send the leaders of the Church up to Jerusalem to discuss the whole question with the elders of the Mother Church.²⁷ The outcome of this Council

26. Acts XLV. 27

27 Acts XV. 2.

in Jerusalem was the decision that the Gentiles henceforth should be left free from the obligations of the Jewish religion and the demand for circumcision was abandoned, which was the main point at issue. Circumcision had been the insuperable obstacle to the conversion of the Gentiles, to whom the whole idea was especially repellent. What the Council demanded of the Gentile Christians was that they should separate themselves from idolatry, and the sins of the Gentiles, and "such an observance of the Law with regard to clean and unclean meats as would make it possible for Jewish Christians to take part in the common meals of the Church."²⁸ This was a victory for Paul and the Church at Antioch, for circumcision no longer would be a stumbling block in the Gentiles' way into the Church, and although the opposition of Jewish Christians to Paul did not finish immediately, we do not hear again the demand for the enforcement of the Law on Gentile converts. It must be remembered, as Beyschlag²⁹ points out, that the narrow Judaistic view was insistently adopted by certain zealots for the Law, and not by Peter, and John and James the leaders of the Jerusalem Church who maintained a brotherly attitude towards Paul throughout the controversy. The letter dispatched from the Jerusalem Church to Antioch makes it clear that the Jerusalem Church as a body, much less its leaders, did not share the fanatical zeal of the

28. Wilfred Knox St. Paul, 79.

29. Beyschlag N.T. Theology Vol. 1. 326-327.

Judaizers for enforcing the Mosaic Law upon the Gentile
 Christians.³⁰ Henceforth the Apostle Paul is free and
 untrammelled to pursue his great work among the Gentiles,
 and soon after his return from the Council in Jerusalem sets
 out on his second missionary journey with Silas as his
 companion.

It is thus clear from the book of Acts that the
 primitive Church in Jerusalem had at first no thought of
 separating itself from Judaism. This is not to be wondered
 at, for Jesus was believed to be the Messiah, and the
 Messianic movement was of Jewish origin. The salvation
 of the Messianic age was considered to be meant for the
 Jewish people, and the hope was entertained of winning the
 whole Jewish people to be partakers of that salvation. It
 is true that Peter in his sermon on the Day of Pentecost
 tells his hearers "The promise is unto you, and to your
 children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as
 our Lord God shall call."³¹ But his words do not prove
 that the Church as yet contemplated a mission to the
 Gentiles for the furtherance of the Kingdom of God.

We have ample evidence that the members of the
 primitive Church in Jerusalem took part in the services
 of the Jewish temple, and Paul on his missionary journeys

30. Acts XV. 24 - 29.

31. Acts II. 39.

32

visited the Jewish synagogues. The specifically Christian meetings they held took place either in a hall in the temple, or more often in private houses, but in these meetings a spirit and atmosphere prevailed very different from that in the public Jewish worship.

Although the primitive Church of Jerusalem did not separate itself from Judaism, and its members took part in the services of the Jewish temple, we are not warranted to believe that they continued their observance of the Law as a means of attaining righteousness before God, and that they did not seek their righteousness now in Christ. These Christians of Jerusalem were children of Israel living in their mother country, and the observance of the Mosaic customs came to them as natural as the air they breathed. To discontinue this observance of the Law would be to deny their nationality, and St. Paul does not demand that Jewish Christians should cast the Law from them.

For the Pharisees of the time, the way of the Law alone was the way of righteousness. They believed that if all Jews observed the Law perfectly but for one Sabbath, the Kingdom of God would come. But we have no right to assume

32. See Acts 11. 46. "And they continued daily with one accord in the temple."
 " " 111. 1. "Now Peter and John went up together to the temple at the hour of prayer"
 " " LX. 20 "And straightway he (Paul) preached Christ in the Synagogues."
 " " XXI 20-24.

33 See I Cor. VII. 17- 20.

that all pious Israelites of the time of the primitive Church were in the Pharisees' camp, and hoped to merit God's favour by their keeping of the Law. The piety of the prophets and Psalms was by no means extinct in Palestine of this period. There were pious Israelites who confidently trusted in the grace of a God who was rich in forgiveness attained by observance of the Law. The greatest gift the Christians had received was forgiveness of sins, and on the basis of that gift experienced in their own lives, each one had become a Christian. Peter in the book of Acts ³⁴ declares openly that there is no other way of salvation than Christ, "for neither is there any other name under heaven that is given among men, wherein we must be saved." This is to reject altogether the way of righteousness by the works of the Law. Paul in the epistle to the Galatians confirms the view that the leaders at least of the Jerusalem Church sought their salvation in Christ knowing that righteousness before God could not be attained by the works of the Law - "We being Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, yet knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, save through faith in Jesus Christ, even we believed on Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by the works of the law; because ³⁵ by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified."

34. Acts. IV. 12.

35 Gal. II. 15-16.

Nevertheless there were Christians within the Church who regarded righteousness by faith in Jesus Christ as a complement of righteousness by the works of the Law, and when the time came for Gentiles to be admitted into the Church, they insisted that they must obey the Law, for otherwise their salvation could never be complete. It was with this class of Jewish Christians that Paul came into controversy. It was their activity amongst his converts that called forth both the Epistle to the Galatians and to the Romans. The effect of this controversy was that Paul made of Christianity a distinct and independent religion. The primitive Gospel, as we have seen from the book of Acts combined the observance of the Jewish cult and legal system with the faith in the risen and exalted Christ. When the Judaizers sought to make observation of the legal system obligatory on the Gentile Christians, Paul answered by working out his doctrine of justification sola fide, invalidating the Law for the Christian believer.

While the tremendous importance of the step Paul took to make Christianity a religion distinct and independent of Judaism cannot be minimised, it must be remembered that his doctrine of justification sola fide, and not by works of the Law, is by no means the whole of Paul's teaching nor indeed is it the primary thing in his system. As T.W. Manson states

36

36. Judaism and Christianity Vol. III. Law and Religion 132
(edited by E.I. Rosenthal)

"The faith and works controversy has obtained an undue emphasis through our reading of Paul in the light of the soul strivings of Luther". In the Protestant world much study has been made since Luther of the relation of conscience to the Law, and of Jesus Christ as deliverer from the Law's bondage, whereas too little study has been devoted to the other - the sacrificial and priestly aspect of the Law - the aspect prominent in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

First and foremost in importance in the Pauline teaching is the fact of salvation (*σωτηρία*) in his own experience and in the experience of all who are "in Christ".
³⁷
 Christ Jesus has laid hold of them and called them, and by responding to His call, they had passed into a new sphere of life, the sphere of salvation. The proof of this was that
³⁸
 they had received the Holy Spirit. Paul's doctrine of salvation is found in his epistles "in the answers which he gives, or may be inferred to have given to the question, What must have happened in order to make this experience possible? In the first place, what barriers had been removed, - barriers which were holding back salvation? And the answer falls into three parts, according to the nature of the barrier as it presents itself to him under different aspects. Before these things could have happened, men must have been 'redeemed' (emancipated from every form of servitude),
³⁹
 'justified' (exonerated, acquitted), and 'reconciled' to God."

³⁷ Phil. 111, 12.

³⁸ Gal. 111. 1 - 5.

³⁹. Anderson Scott Christianity according to St. Paul 26.
 See whole of Chapter 11 on salvation in Paul.

When Paul speaks of men having been 'redeemed', and having received 'redemption' (*ἀπολύτωσης*) the underlying idea is that they had been held in servitude by a hostile power or powers from which now they have been set free.⁴⁰ Christians are no longer in servitude, but are free from all dominion other than the direct dominion of God.

Among the powers which held sway over man keeping him in bondage, and from which Christ has redeemed him, is the Law. He speaks of man being redeemed from spirit forces of evil which he calls 'the rudiments of the world'⁴¹ 'the princes of this world'⁴² 'angels, thrones, principalities and powers',⁴³ 'the prince of the power of the air'.⁴⁴ Paul lays the greatest emphasis of all on Christ's power to redeem man from bondage to sin. Sin in Paul is largely regarded as a personified force. This conception is clearly present to Paul's mind in Romans VII where he speaks of 'sin' as dead apart from the law, as springing into life, as slaying him, as entering into the world. Again he speaks of the 'wages of sin', and as being 'sold under sin' and of 'sin reigning' over men,⁴⁵ until Christ came to redeem them.

It is thus clear that the Law is only one of the

40. On meaning of *ἀπολύτωσης* see Westcott Hebrews 295-297, Abbott, Ephesians 11-13.
41. Gal. IV. 3.
42. I Cor. II 6,8
43. Rom. VIII 38, also Eph. I,21; III,10; VI,12; Col. II,15.
44. Eph. II. 2
45. See Aulén Christus Victor. 82-89 (Eng. Trans. by A.G. Herbert) on the drama of redemption in the Pauline Epistles.

powers from bondage to which Paul declares Christ to have redeemed him. But from the standpoint of the Jew, zealous in his observance of the law, accepting Paul's statement that righteousness before God was possible through faith alone in Christ, and not by works of the Law, meant nothing short of a revolution and an entire change of the whole fabric of his religious life. From the standpoint of the Gentile Christian on whom the Judaizers had attempted to impose the observance of the Law, the rejection of the Law meant that the 'wall of partition'⁴⁶ was now removed, and he no longer occupied the inferior position within the Church which had been accorded him by the zealous Jewish Christians. Holtzmann remarks thus of the setting aside of the Law as a means of attaining righteousness by Paul - "Of all the stars which fell to earth in the violent firmament-shaking experience of Paul's conversion,⁴⁷ the greatest was the Law."

Throughout his Epistles when dealing with the Law Paul's thesis is that salvation is possible only through Christ and not by the Law. Man is saved not by the merit he accumulates by performing the Law, but solely by the grace of God. This is directly contrary to the tenets of the Pharisees, who made the observance of the Law of supreme importance, and the only way of salvation. These tenets, Paul knew so

46. Eph. 11,14. E.F. Scott Ephesians (Moffatt Commentary) 171 suggests the reference here is to the dividing wall of temple in Jerusalem.

47. Neutestamentliche Theologie 11. 37.

well from his own experience in his pre-Christian days. Paul's experience had been that what the Law could not effect, the Gospel had effected for him. "For what the Law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and as an offering for sin, condemned sin in the flesh."⁴⁸ The Gospel was for Paul thus a new thing, and independent of the Law. He defines the Gospel by contrasting it with the Law. There is a radical antithesis of the Law and the Gospel as in II Corinthians, where Paul speaks of "ministers of the New Testament, not of the letter (*γράμματος*), but of the spirit (*πνεύματος*), for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." The same antithesis is carried on again in the words 'ministration of death', and 'ministration of the spirit', 'ministration of condemnation'⁴⁹ and 'ministration of righteousness'. Again in the Epistle to the Romans we find the contrast between Law, and faith - Abraham was not justified by works of the Law, but by faith in believing, which was reckoned unto him for righteousness.⁵⁰ 'To him that worketh the reward is not reckoned as of grace, but as of debt (*οφείλημα*). But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is reckoned for righteousness.' Again wages and promise are contrasted, He whose relation with God is of a legalistic nature obtains wages, he makes a

48. Rom. VIII, 3.

49. See II Cor. III, 6-9.

50. See Rom. IV, 2-6.

claim on God, but he who has received the promise, i.e. Abraham, believes by faith, and his faith is reckoned for righteousness. And yet despite the way St. Paul so often insists on the antithesis between the Law and the Gospel, he does not deny the connection of the new religion with the old. 'The righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ' as he characterises the Gospel has been manifested apart from the Law (*χωρὶς νόμου*) but is being witnessed by the Law and the prophets.

It is thus clear that there is an ambiguity in St. Paul's use of the term law. On closer study it becomes evident that Paul is using the term now in reference to the Law as a system whereby men can secure for themselves righteousness by merit - the Law as thought of by the Pharisees, and now in reference to the contents, or preferably the moral contents of the Law, - the Law as embodying for all time the requirements of God in the character and conduct of man. When St. Paul states that Christ has redeemed us from the Law and from the curse of the Law and has 'blotted out the bond written in ordinances that was against us, and He hath taken it out of the way, nailing it to the cross' and that 'Ye, my brethren also were made dead to the Law through the body of Christ, that ye should be joined to another, even to Him who was raised from the dead'- he is thinking of the Law

51. Rom. III, 21-22, C.F. Rom. 1,2, 17. X 5 f.

52. Gal. III, 13.

53. Col. 11, 14.

54. Rom. VII,4.

in the former sense, as a system whereby men sought to secure salvation, but in vain. As such the Law was a yoke of bondage from which Christ redeems men, and in this sense 'Christ is the end of the Law unto righteousness to every one that believeth'.⁵⁵ When Paul thus speaks he is giving expression to his deep conviction which came to him at his conversion, that legalistic religion will never give man peace with God. However long he strives to fulfil the Law's commands, even if he lives for a thousand years, that path leads only to hopelessness and despair - 'O wretched man that I am who shall deliver me out of the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord.' As Aulen puts it;⁵⁷ "the fact that Christ brings the Law to an end means that the righteousness of Law can no longer say the last decisive word in regard to the relation between God and the world. The Divine Love cannot be imprisoned in the categories of merit and of justice; it breaks them in pieces."⁵⁸

When on the other hand Paul exalts the Law, and ascribes to it divine authority, he is thinking of the moral content of the Law which ever abides in force. ⁵⁵ Examples

55. Rom. X, 4.

57. Aulen Christus Victor (Eng. Trans.) 84.

58. There are instances of the use of the word Law *νόμος* in Paul where he is thinking not of the Mosaic law exclusively but of the entire Old Testament as containing the revelation of God to men e.g. Rom. 11,19; I Cor. XIV,21.

of the use of the term Law in this sense are the following -
 59 'The Law is holy, and the commandment holy and just and good'.
 60 'For we know that the Law is spiritual'. 'Circumcision is
 nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of
 61 the commandments of God'. 'Do we then through faith cancel
 62 the Law? Not at all. We establish the Law'.

63 James Denney discussing the use of the word Law
 in Paul remarks "In Galatians the reference is mainly to
 what we should call law in its ritual aspect, for the claim
 made on the Christians of Galatia by the Judaizers was that
 they should submit to be circumcised; in Romans on the
 other hand, it is the moral law which is the subject of dis-
 :cussion. Yet this distinction is not one which would be
 present, at least vividly to St. Paul's mind. He thinks
 of the law as one and as the law of God."

A very helpful and suggestive path through the
 ambiguities and complications we find in the use of the
 term Law by Paul, has been opened up by Professor Maurice
 64 Goguel at a conference on "L'Évangile et la Loi". Professor
 Goguel traces many of the ambiguities in St. Paul's use of
 the term Law to two main causes. The terminology at Paul's
 disposal was insufficient to express his experience, and
 his Jewish pre-conceptions hindered its reform. The term

59. Rom. VII, 12. :
 60. Rom. VII, 14. :
 61. I Cor. VII, 19. :
 62. Rom. III, 31. :
 63. Articles on Law in New :
 Testament H.D.B. III, 77 b.) :
 64. A report of the Conference
 including Professor Goguel's
 contribution and the main address
 by M. Fernand Ménégoz appeared in
 the Revue d'Histoire et de Phil-
 :osophie religieuses 1957.

Law νόμος stands for two quite different things. It means, on the one hand, the whole code of prescriptions which were embodied in Jewish ritual, in the keeping of which, as the Jews believed, lay man's hope of salvation. The conversion of Paul on the Damascus way issued in his complete renunciation of this conception of the way of salvation. Ever since the day of his conversion, salvation for Paul depended alone on Christ, and he taught that the prescription of the Law had no validity for the Christian. But Paul could not shake off the influence of his Jewish upbringing, and this together with the Jewish view on Scripture, prevented him from thinking that the Law was merely human. The Law had come from God, and if it was no longer valid for Christians, the reason must be that it was only intended to have a provisional character. Christ had now come in accordance with the Divine promise, and the dispensation of the Law had been brought to a close. There was, nevertheless for Paul another strain in the Old Testament Scriptures, a prophetic strain in which the Law was more inward and spiritual being the expression of a moral ideal given by God and based on his eternal nature and his purpose for man. In this sense the Law had not passed away.⁶⁵ To understand Paul's treatment of the Law, it is of the highest importance to bear in mind the distinction which was present to Paul's mind, though perhaps not always consciously, between the Law

65. See C.H. Dodd, Romans (M.N.T.C.) 50, 63-64, 165.

as a system, of which Christ was the 'end', and the Law as moral, which would never pass away. Failure to bear this distinction in mind has led certain scholars to accuse Paul of inconsistency in his treatment of the Law— Albert Schweitzer speaks of 'The question of the peculiarly inconsistent attitude of the Apostle to the Law.'⁶⁶

For the Jews of Paul's time the word Torah often stood for the whole of the sacred scriptures as well as specifically for the Mosaic Law coupled with the great mass of interpretations and traditions, which centuries of later scribes had built upon that foundation. It is not always readily clear in what sense Paul means the term Law to be taken in his epistles, and this, no doubt, in certain parts of Paul's arguments, made him the more hateful and repulsive in his opponents' eyes when they understood Law as referring to the whole revelation of Old Testament, whereas Paul meant it in the narrower sense of Mosaic Law. Nothing could exasperate Paul's opponents more than his statement: 'the power of sin is the law',⁶⁷ if they understood by Law in this context the whole Old Testament revelation, which they probably did. But Paul was thinking of the legal system as it had been evolved by the Pharisees including the Mosaic prescriptions and the traditional data which had been accumulated on the basis of the Mosaic Law. Nothing could be more monstrous and impious

66. Paul and his Interpreters (Eng. Trans. by W. Montgomery) 160.

67. I Cor. XV 56.

than for Paul to speak of the whole Old Testament revelation in the words 'the strength of sin is the law'. It would be intolerably blasphemous in their sight for Paul to speak thus of the Mosaic prescriptions and the traditions, but it would be infinitely more so if they were thinking of the Old Testament revelation as a whole.

As stated above the great blessing Christ had brought to Paul was salvation (*σωτηρία*). He had redeemed him from bondage to the devil, from bondage to sin, and from bondage to the Law. For years he had sought to attain salvation by observance of the Law, but had found that method an utter failure. Gradually he had come to realise the Law's utter powerlessness to save and to bring peace into his heart. Christ came into the world to do what the Law could not do 'in that it was weak through the flesh'⁶⁸. The Law itself was spiritual (*πνευματικός*)⁶⁹ but man was a creature of the flesh, and unable to fulfil the demands of the Law. If man were spiritual too, and able to fulfil the Law's demands, then salvation would be by the observance of the Law. From bitter experience and disillusionment Paul had come to realise that the way of the Law led only to despair. The whole of mankind Jew and Gentile alike, lay in this hopeless state until Christ came to redeem them. Both Jew and Gentile have transgressed against God - the Jew has transgressed under the revealed law,

68. Rom. VIII 3.

69. Rom. VII 14.

and the Gentile under the natural law of conscience.⁷⁰ The desperate condition of mankind is universal, the monarch who reigns undisputed over men is sin, and the wages sin pays is death - 'Therefore as through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin, and so death passed unto all men, for that all sinned.'⁷¹

Because God is righteous, He must take account of the transgression of his Law, whether by Jews of the Law as revealed, or by the Gentiles of the natural law of conscience. Hence 'the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who held down the truth in unrighteousness'.⁷² Man, being in subjection to sin, and its slave, is in a state of enmity towards God, and God's wrath is directed against man's sin. Both Jew and Gentile have disregarded the forbearance and long suffering of God which should have led them to repentance, 'despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and long suffering, not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance? but after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up for thyself wrath in the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; who will render to every man according to his works: to them that by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honour and incorruption, eternal life: but unto them that are factious, and obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness,

70. Rom. II 12 f.

71. Rom. V. 12. See also Rom. VI 6, 16 f, 20, 23; VII, 11, 14, 23, 25.

72. Ibid. I 18. Also II 8; IV 15; Col III 6.

shall be wrath and indignation, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that worketh evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Greek For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law, and as many as have sinned under law shall be judged by law; for not the hearers of a law are just before God, but the doers of a law shall be justified'.⁷³

Paul gives a lurid picture of the depraved state of the Gentiles in the first chapter of Romans, how because 'they refused to have God in their knowledge, God gave them up unto a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not fitting; being filled with all unrighteousness wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, malignity;.. who knowing the ordinance of God, that they which practice such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but also consort with them that practice them.'⁷⁴ Then he turns to the Jew who has had the privilege of the special revelation of the Law, which has only served to increase his responsibility⁷⁵ and concludes⁷⁶ that all are under sin 'There is none righteous, no not one'. What God has done in Christ is to bring this terrible state of affairs to an end, He has redeemed men, and the Gospel, of which Paul is not ashamed, 'is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.'⁷⁷

Paul gives in his epistles a full picture of what God has done to bring salvation to men. Man was in a fallen state,

73. Rom II 4 - 13.

74. Ibid. I 28 - 32.

75. Ibid. II 17 f.

76. Ibid. III 9 - 10.

77. Ibid. I 16.

as a result of Adam's sin, and in the history of man's salvation there are for Paul three turning points: the Promise to Abraham the giving of the Law at Sinai, and the fulfilment of the Promise in Christ.

Paul lays the greatest emphasis on the Promise to Abraham in opposition to Judaism where the supreme emphasis is laid on the giving of the Law at Sinai. The Jews guarded the Law very zealously as a special revelation given to them as a nation chosen by God. The covenant of Sinai was a covenant between God and the Jewish nation, and the Jews insisted that if any Gentile wished to share the salvation which was through the Law, he must submit himself to the Mosaic Law in all its requirements. Those were the conditions of his being proselytised. This zeal for the Law as a way of salvation had manifested itself within the Jewish Christian Church, and had caused great controversy between the Apostle of the Gentiles and the Judaizers.

Paul, having been himself an enthusiastic protagonist of the way of salvation through observance of the Law, but having now seen how futile it was to seek salvation along that path, shifts the emphasis from the giving of the Law to the Promise of Abraham. The whole of mankind is in a desperate state, sold under sin, and the Promise to Abraham is universal in its scope, embracing the whole of humanity, and not the Jewish family only, as the Jews would believe. Abraham received the Promise before he was circumcised - 'Is this blessing then pronounced upon the circumcision or upon the

uncircumcision also? for we say, To Abraham his faith was reckoned for righteousness. How then was it reckoned? When he was in circumcision or uncircumcision? Not in circumcision but in uncircumcision; and he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had while he was in uncircumcision that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be in uncircumcision, that righteousness might be reckoned unto them.⁷⁸ And because the Promise was made to Abraham when he was uncircumcised, i.e. not as a Jew, Paul concludes that the scope of the Promise is as wide as humanity. Of Abraham, the scriptures said, 'In thee shall all the nations be blessed, and they which be of faith are the sons of Abraham, and they are blessed with the faithful Abraham.'

In the promise to Abraham God has foreshadowed the establishment of a new relation between Himself and man, based on His side on free grace, and on the side of man on faith and trust, and it is precisely this promise God fulfilled when He visited His people to redeem them in Christ. The blessings of this new relation between man and God established in Christ are now within the reach of all; Jews and Gentiles, who are by faith united to Christ.

The Law, in the period between God's promise to Abraham, and His final intervention in the coming of Christ, came in as a parenthesis (*παρεσσήλθεν*) and in a subordinate

78. Rom. IV 9 - 11.

capacity with certain purposes to perform which Paul mentions in his Epistles to Romans and Galatians. The promise had not yet been fulfilled, but the covenant of God with Abraham based on the gracious promise of God and the trustful confidence, and faith of man, was in no way affected by the giving of the law, - 'A covenant confirmed beforehand by God, the law, which came four hundred and thirty years after, doth not disannul so as to make the promise of none effect.'⁷⁹

A covenant even between men is irrevocable - 'Though it be but a man's covenant, yet when it hath been confirmed, no one maketh it void, or addeth thereto.'⁸⁰ If so among men how much more so of a covenant to which God is a party? The irrevocability of God's covenant with Abraham, and its priority in time to the giving of the Law, precludes in Paul's thought the possibility of the Law disannulling the covenant. It is inferior to the promise for another reason, - according to Jewish belief the Law was 'ordained through angels by the hand of a mediator.'⁸¹ It had thus reached man through the angels who mediated it to Moses, who mediated it to men. But God in giving the promise spoke direct to Abraham.

The question then arises What is the Law for?

Has it any reason for being? for from the day it was revealed it was marked as something destined to pass away

79. Gal. III, 17.
 80. Ibid III, 15.
 81. Ibid III, 19.

⁸²
(Καταργουμένου) a fact symbolised by Moses putting a veil over his face so that the people would not see the fading of the glory.

Paul states what he conceives to be the functions of the Law in the history of salvation in the sections of his Epistles which are the most obnoxious of all in the eyes of certain Jewish scholars to-day, ⁸³ and must have been even more so to Paul's own contemporaries.

The first function he ascribes to the Law is that it brings the knowledge ⁸⁴ (ἐπίγνωσις) of sin. 'I had not known sin, except through the Law, for I had not known ⁸⁵ coveting, except the Law had said, 'Thou shalt not covet'. The Law served as an absolute standard of morality by which those living under it could test their lives. Failure to fulfil the demands of the Law was transgression, and this labelling of such failure as transgression led to the recognition of sin as sin in men's lives.

Paul goes further and states that not only does the Law bring full knowledge of sin, but it also brings the doom which inevitably must follow sin. 'The law worketh wrath'. There is a curse of the Law which comes upon all who violate it, and anyone who has consciously violated the Law, knows that he is subject to this curse. When man becomes conscious that he is a sinner as he does when he

82. II Cor. 111,13.

83. e.g. Montefiori 'The Old Testament and After' 275. and Schechter 'Some aspects of Rabbinic Theology' 117.

84. Rom. 111,20; 1V,15; VII1, 7-25.

sees the contrast between his own life and the righteous requirements of the Law, he realises that not life, but death, which is the necessary consequence of sin, awaits him.

Finally Paul makes the daring statement about the Law that it stimulates sin and that it was given to act as a stimulus to sin, - 'And the law came in beside that the trespass might abound'⁸⁶. What then is the law? It was added because of transgression' (*παρὰ βλάβου χάρις*)⁸⁷. To illustrate the way the Law has served as a stimulus to sin, he relates how in his own experience, the tenth commandment of the Law addressed to him had wrought in him all manner of coveting. 'I had not known sin, except through the Law, for I had not known coveting, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet - but sin, finding occasion, wrought in me through the commandment all manner of coveting; for apart from the law sin is dead.'⁸⁸ Paul here bases his reasoning on the psychological fact that prohibition of anything increases the desire for it, and in opposition to the Law's 'Thou shalt not' there arises man's rebellious 'I will'.

As Denney points out, the peculiarity is that Paul represents God as availing Himself of this trait in human nature in order to prepare man for salvation. When Paul states that the purpose for which Law came in was that

86 Rom. V.20.

87. Gal. III,19, cf. Rom. VII,13.

88 Rom. VII, 7-8.

trespass should abound, the purpose is conceived as God's purpose. It is as though God saw that the only way to get man to accept His righteousness, was to make him despair of his own, and the way to make him despair of his own was to subject him to a discipline under which the sin that was in him would reveal its exceeding sinfulness, its irresistible tyrannical strength, and annihilate all his hopes. The Law had thus served as a tutor and guide, to bring men to Christ because it had deepened the sense of sin, and had brought home to man his own hopelessness and powerlessness face to face with sin. Having despaired of his own power to overcome sin which the Law only aggravated, man, as in Paul's own experience, de profundis called forth and craved for the righteousness which was possible through Christ. The moment man took that step of renouncing his own righteousness, and casting himself on the righteousness which is through Christ, the Law had nothing more in him.

Such is Paul's characterisation of the function of the Law, and for the Judaizers, nothing could be more blasphemous, 'That the Law given ceremonially to the nation by Moses, the privilege and pride of the chosen people, should not only be powerless to promote righteousness, but actually serve to let sin loose, bearing the brand of terrible guilt, and that the whole history of the chosen people from the time of Moses should be simply an illustration of the truth of this dictum - nothing more than this was needed to stamp

the name of Paul with utter infamy among Jews everywhere.....
 This alone amply explains the opposition which came to him
 from the Judaizers.⁹¹

In all St. Paul has to tell us about the Law as bringing the full knowledge of sin, and acting as a stimulus to sin that sin may abound and grace abound more exceedingly, we have an account of what St. Paul himself had known in his own experience. He had found the law setting an ideal before him, a standard of righteousness too high for his moral capacity. It beckoned him forward, but gave him no help to go forward. And most tormenting of all, the Law proclaimed a curse on every one who did not perform the Law in its entirety, - 'For as many as are of the works of the Law are under a curse; for it is written, cursed is every one which continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the Law to do them', 'Yea, I testify again to every man that receiveth circumcision, that he is a debtor⁹² to do the whole law.' Paul thus declares that no one is justified by the Law in the sight of God, and they who would⁹³ be justified by the Law are severed from Christ. The function of the Law in Paul's estimation is thus purely negative, it is to condemn and not to justify. The only positive function St. Paul can accord the Law with is that by means of its merciless condemnation of man's failure to observe it, it may force man in his sin to turn to Christ for deliverance. In

91. Holtzmann Neutestamentliche Theologie, II, 31.f.

92 Gal. III, 10, V. 3. Deut. XXXVII, 26.

93. Ibid V, 4.

this connection he states that 'the law hath been our tutor (*Παιδαγωγός*) to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But now that feith is come, we are no longer under a tutor.'⁹⁴ The whole principle of the Law, Paul maintains, was wrong. It was based on the legalistic idea of recompense for keeping the commandments, and penalty for failing to keep them. The attitude the Law encouraged towards God was that of making a claim upon Him, and Paul describes this attitude as 'boasting' no doubt envisaging in his mind the Pharisees' way of life which he knew so well. He turns to the example of Abraham, 'For if Abraham was justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not toward God. For what saith the Scripture? And Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto Him for righteousness... To him that worketh the reward is not reckoned as of grace, but as of debt.'⁹⁵ It is thus clear that the Promise, which has been fulfilled in Christ, is on a different basis altogether from the Law. What the Promise involves is a free gift from God appropriated by faith on man's part, while the Law involves a reward from God which man considers he has earned by his good behaviour. But not only is the legalistic attitude to the relation between God and man a wrong and presumptuous attitude, it has nothing to offer man. What man seeks is life, and the one condition on which the Law offers it to man - by fulfilling the whole Law, is a condition man can never fulfil. And for this reason the Law leads to despair, out of which Christ alone is able to rescue man.

94 Gal. III, 24-25;

95 Rom IV, 2-4, cf. Eph. II, 9.

The Law was destined to pass away; 'for Christ is the end of the Law unto righteousness to everyone that believ-
⁹⁶
 :eth.' Under the Law the end in view was righteousness, but to seek righteousness by the works of the Law was like pursuing a phantom which receded at every step, - that way was an utter failure, and God had opened a new way, by which righteousness was not earned, but received through faith in Jesus Christ.

The way of redemption through Christ has been a costly way, and the realisation of the sufferings of Christ leaves Paul in wonder and adoration. Before his conversion he had never known peace with God, but after his conversion his soul has tasted that peace which God alone could give. Formerly, like all his Jewish brethren, he was under the curse of the Law which he had, despite his zeal, so miserably failed to fulfil. 'Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, having become a curse for us, for it is written, cursed is everyone that hangeth upon a tree.'⁹⁷ The curse as Paul understands it in this passage is the curse of the Law or of legalism, not the curse of God. "The passage has often been interpreted by reference to the penal justice of God as if it taught that Christ endured the actual curse of God. In Calvin's words 'Christ bore the weight of the divine anger, that smitten and afflicted, He experienced all the signs of an angry and avenging God'⁹⁸. Or as Luther puts it 'He had in His tender

96 Rom. X 4.

97 Gal. III 13.

98 Institutes (1559 ed) II Sec. 11.

and innocent heart to feel God's wrath and judgment against sin, to taste for us eternal death and damnation, and, in short, suffer all that a condemned sinner has earned, and must suffer eternally.⁹⁹ If that be St. Paul's interpretation of Christ's death, then, not grace, penal justice, was still for him the final principle of God's rule, for only when the claims of penal justice had been satisfied by Christ's endurance of the curse of the Law, was the way of grace available to men.¹⁰⁰ What Paul has in mind is the legalistic conception of religion, and knowledge of Christ and his redemption brought that in his life to an end. By becoming a curse for us, Christ redeemed us from the curse of the Law, although he does not clearly state how Christ's endurance of the curse of the Law has set man free from the law.¹⁰¹

As Burton points out, to miss the fact that Paul is referring in Gal. III 10 - 13 to the curse which the legalistic passages of the Old Testament pronounced on those who do not perfectly obey the statutes of the Law and not to a curse which is the judgment of God, is wholly to misunderstand Paul. The Law unequivocally states, 'Cursed is everyone that continueth not in all the things that are written in the book of the Law to do them.'¹⁰² Those who live under the Law know that since

99 From a sermon of the year 1537 Weimar Ed. XLV p. 240.

100 Sidney Cave The Gospel of St. Paul 102.

101 The Epistle to the Galatians I.C.C. 168. See also Everett, The Gospel of Paul, 145.— "He who bore the curse was not crucified because He was accursed; He was accursed because he was crucified."

102 Deut. XXVII 26.

keeping the whole Law is impossible, all men are consequently under the curse of the Law. They believe that God deals with men on this legalistic basis, and that only those who perform the whole Law are accepted of God. Paul seeks to prove that God's dealing with men is not on this legalistic basis of re-compense for observation of the Law, and penalty for failure to observe the Law. Christ has by his death on the cross destroyed for ever the ground for belief that God's dealing with men is on such a basis. 'Christ redeemed us from the curse of the Law, having become a curse for us, for it is written: 'Cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree' (Deut. XXI 23). As Burton states it 'Law and he who takes his stand on Law, must say that Christ having died on the cross, is a sinner - i.e. that under law no one could come to such a death who was not himself guilty of sin - as vividly the law says in the words of the quotation. But in that verdict of legalism it condemns itself, and in the fact that Christ the righteous died the death of the cross, it is evident that the government of God is not one of legalism, but of love, and of vicarious suffering, the righteous for the wicked.'¹⁰³ The Law has thus become a dead letter, and no longer can hold men in bondage. Paul would have his Galatian readers renounce the whole legalistic conception of religion, and turn to the true conception, the way of faith, which as he points out, was

103 Burton Galatians I.C.C. 173-4.

prior to the giving of the Law, and is the way of life consummated in the Christian age.

In the Epistle to the Colossians Paul depicts in a pictorial way how 'Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness to everyone that believeth'¹⁰⁴ and that by becoming Himself a curse he has redeemed men from the curse of the Law. Christ, by His death upon the Cross, 'blotted out the bond, written in ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us: and he hath taken it out of the way, nailing it to the Cross.'¹⁰⁵

There may be in this verse a reference to the practice in some ancient cities of proclaiming the abrogation of a decree by running a nail through it, and hanging it up where the public could see it.¹⁰⁶ E.F. Scott¹⁰⁷ maintains that "most likely Paul here has in mind the Roman practice of suspending over the head of a victim the charge on which he had been condemned. This practice as we know from the Gospels was followed at the Crucifixion; the Cross bore the superscription, 'The King of the Jews'. But Paul having in mind the curse of the Law which had so long enslaved him and still enslaved the Judaizers with whom he had had so much trouble, imagines that he sees on the Cross of Jesus Christ the curse pronounced on mankind by the Law, now nailed through and abrogated by His becoming a

104 Rom. X 4.

105 Col. II 14.

106 Lightfoot Colossians 187 suggests this, but states there is no direct evidence for the custom.

107 Colossians, Philemon and Ephesians (M.C.N.T.) 47

curse for us. By His death he has ended the claims of the Law on man. The term Law in this context obviously stands for the legalistic system, for the moral content of the Law which was 'holy and righteous and good' remains ever binding on men.

The Judaizers had insisted that the Gentile Christians should be circumcised, without which they could not enjoy full membership in the Church. They wanted to impose the Mosaic Law upon them, the basis of which was that righteousness before God is possible only by observance of its demands. Paul answers the Judaizers by saying that righteousness is by faith in Christ, and not by works of the Law, and henceforth circumcision and the ceremonial elements of the Mosaic Law are unnecessary and redundant. If the Judaizers were right, - 'if righteousness is through the Law, then Christ died for nought'. The Galatian Christians must make their choice between Christ and legalism, the two cannot be combined, for they are in Paul's estimation mutually exclusive.

¹⁰⁹ Elsewhere St. Paul rejoices that Christ by abolishing legalism as the way of righteousness has ended the feud between Jew and Gentile. 'For he is our peace, who made both one, and brake down the middle wall of partition, having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; that he might create in himself of the

108 Gal. II 21.

109 Ephes. II 11 ff. (Assuming the Pauline authorship of this disputed epistle)

twain one new man, so making peace; and might reconcile them both in one body unto God through the Cross, having slain the enmity thereby:" In St. Paul's experience the Law was a wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles in the Christian Church, and he seeks to demonstrate how Christ had once and for all removed the barrier which kept them apart. In the temple at Jerusalem there was a dividing wall, and it was a grave offence for a Gentile to be found inside the Jewish area. E. F. Scott suggests that Paul had this wall of partition in mind here, and thus his words have added force when he declares what Christ has done, - how he has made peace between the twain by abolishing the Law, the wall that separated them. The Gospel is "the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth," 'God is not a God of the Jews only, but of Gentiles also' and Abraham was father not only of 'them which are of the Law, but of us all'. St. Paul well knew the loathing with which the Jews regarded the Gentiles, but within the Christian community there was no room for this racial difference and racial superiority. Historically - for it could not otherwise be, the Gospel was preached first to the Jews, and St. Paul on his missionary journeys preached to the Jews first and turned to the Gentiles only when the Jews had rejected his message. But this gave no precedence to the Jews, for all within the Christian

110 Ephesians (M.N.T.C.) 171.

111 Rom. I 16.

112 Ibid. III 29.

113 Ibid. IV 14, 16.

Church met on common ground. The Gospel was the power which could terminate the racial tension and replace it with complete harmony and mutual love and trust - 'For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free, and were all made to drink of one Spirit.'¹¹⁴ In Christ Jesus there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, scythian, bondman, freeman; but Christ is all and in all.'¹¹⁵

But the Jews, who enjoyed much advantage in every way, - for they were entrusted with the oracles of God - by their rejection of the Gospel had forfeited any position of eminence to which they might have been entitled. They were 'the root'¹¹⁷ which went back to the history of the Jewish people in the Old Testament. They were the 'good olive tree' into which other branches had been grafted. But because of their unbelief, the branches from the olive tree were cut off and the Gentiles were ingrafted to share the life of the good olive tree.¹¹⁸ The Christian Church for Paul was thus the direct descendant of the Jewish Church. Under the Law the Church was co-terminous with the Jewish nation, except for those prosyletised into it who occupied a somewhat inferior position. But the Christian Church, while a continuation of the Jewish Church embraced the whole of mankind - all those

114 I Cor. XII 13.

115 Col III 11.

116 Rom. III 1-2.

117 Ibid. XI 16-18.

118 Ibid. XI 24.

who believed in Christ, while many of those who originally belonged to the Church were now outside - the branches which had been cut off because of their unbelief. The 'Israel of ¹¹⁹ God' now is the Christian Church and not the Jewish people exclusively, and on many occasions Paul refers to Abraham as the father of those who live by faith alone, even though they are not circumcised. ¹²⁰ In the story of Hagar and Sarah, ¹²¹ Hagar and her son are the Jews who have forfeited what they considered to be their place of unique privilege in the Church - 'Now this Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to the Jerusalem that now is: for she is in bondage with her children.' Hagar and her son are cast out for the son of the handmaid cannot inherit with the son of the freewoman. ¹²² Sarah and her son Isaac are of the household of Abraham, which in this allegory is the Church, and all the Christians are as Isaac was 'Children of Promise'.

119 Gal. VI 16.

120 e.g. Gal. III 7 - 9 Rom. IV 11.

121 Gal. IV 21-31.

122 Gen. XVI.

PAUL AND JUSTIFICATION.

Under the dispensation of Law as well as under the new dispensation inaugurated by Christ, the end sought by Paul was righteousness. It was the pre-requisite of all who desired to enter into communion with God. But under the Law, as St. Paul had realised to the full, righteousness before God was unattainable. The Law was the Law of God, it contained the requirements of the Holy God. Face to face with this Law man stands condemned, for he can never arise to its standard. The Law held an ideal before him, but gave him no help to attain it. As in Paul's own experience, the more enthusiastically he sought to perform the works of the Law, the more he realised his miserable failure to do so, and the deeper the despair into which that path led. The Law however, when it has brought home to man his own powerlessness, has according to Paul, performed its mission, - it has done its work as the tutor leading men to Christ. In Jesus Christ, a new way is opened, the way of justification by faith in Him, and it is the one and only way of salvation. All righteousness of man's own, must be renounced, and he must avail himself of the righteousness of God made available to him through faith in Christ. This righteousness man earns by his observance of the Law. In Christ God was reconciling the world to Himself, not reckoning

123
 unto them their trespasses.' St. Paul expresses the same truth when he states that God 'justifies men freely by his grace.'¹²⁴ When Paul speaks of justification he derives his imagery from legal procedure. The ideas with which he works are represented by the words 'unrighteous' (*ἀδικος*) condemnation (*κατάκριμα*) righteous and righteousness (*δικαιος δικαιούνη*).

125
 As Anderson Scott remarks, St. Paul in his handling of the subject of justification, looks on sin and the sinner much more from the Old Testament point of view than from the point of view from which we naturally regard sin. "According to that a man knew himself to be a sinner not through what we call the voice of conscience, but because he had contravened some positive law or regulation, or because he found himself suffering what he recognised as punishment. Thus an 'unrighteous' man was one who had lost his innocence in the sight of the Law or of some paramount authority; he was under 'condemnation'. Similarly he could be pronounced guiltless by some competent authority; and this involved 'remission of sins' (*ἀφεσις τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν*) which is not identical with 'forgiveness' and resulted in his being 'justified' or 'righteous' (*δικαιος*). From this point of view therefore 'righteousness'

123 11. Cor. V. 19.

124. Rom. 111. 24.

125 Christianity according to St. Paul 54-55.

(δικαιοσύνη) does not describe an ethical quality in a man's character, but a status which is conferred upon him; it denotes the way in which he is regarded by some competent authority."

It was a commonplace of Jewish teaching that men required to be declared righteous before God, and the way of attaining that status was strict observance of the Law. "It shall be our righteousness, if we observe to do all these commandments".¹²⁶ 'Thou shalt surely restore to him the pledge when the sun goeth down, that he may sleep in his garment, and bless thee: and it shall be righteousness unto thee before the Lord thy God'.¹²⁷ The Pharisee's attitude was that a man by observing the Law, both written and oral, piled up for himself a righteousness before God, which God was bound to reward. That was the road Paul had so assiduously traversed up till his conversion. Along that road he had found no peace with God, but despair, because he had realised that he could not fulfil the Law, and that he could not establish a claim to be declared righteous before God. The great message of the Gospel to Paul was that 'in Christ' he had 'peace with God,'¹²⁸ here and now, and this peace which he experienced in his soul was proof to him that God had justified him or treated him as righteous in and through Christ.¹²⁹ In the epistle to the Romans

126 Deut. VI. 25.

127 Ibid XXIV. 13.

128 Rom. V. 1.

129 Ibid. III. 20 f.

he declares that 'by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight ... But now apart from the law a righteousness of God hath been manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets, even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ unto all them that believe! He who believes in Christ, and has experienced peace with God because God justifies him by faith in Christ, is done with the Law as a way of attaining righteousness before God. The believer who is buried with Christ in baptism dies with him unto sin, and rises with him unto a new life of righteousness, and in this new life there is freedom not only from sin, but also from Law. The Christian is made dead to the Law through the body of Christ, and Paul illustrates the death of the Christian to the Law by the Jewish and Roman Law touching marriage.¹³⁰ The law of marriage only binds a woman while her husband lives, when her husband dies, the law which binds her becomes a dead letter. But there is some confusion in the illustration or allegory St. Paul uses, for later on he says, not that the law is dead but 'ye were made dead to the Law'. As the wife was bound by the law of the husband while he was alive, but is released when he is dead, so the Christian before he came to Christ was, as it were, wedded to his old sinful state, and all that time he was subject to the religion of Law, - the Jew of the Mosaic Law, the Gentile of the law of his own conscience. But when the Christian identified himself with Christ in his

death, he became dead to the old law, and espoused himself to Christ in a new life in which he bears fruit unto God.

When Paul has said that the believer, when joined to Christ, has died to the Law, he does not mean that the Law is sinful and unholy. 'God forbid'. The believer's death to the Law means that the Law has fulfilled its purpose, which was not to make righteous, - that it could not do, but to convince of sin.¹³¹ Paul draws from his own experience in illustration of this - it was the Law that led him into a conviction of his sin, and from that conviction to the realisation of his fleshly nature which was evil, and which made it impossible for him to attain righteousness. The release from the 'body of this death'¹³² came to him through Jesus Christ, who introduced him into the new life in the Spirit, a life which was holy and eternal. Under the regime of Law man stood condemned, for he could not fulfil perfectly the Law's injunctions, and 'whosoever shall keep the whole Law, and yet stumble in one point, he is become guilty of all.'¹³³ The Law was thus a yoke and a burden, that made him who sought to fulfil it despair. The believer 'in Christ' had been set free from the burden of the Law - 'There is therefore, now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, for the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and of death.'¹³⁴

131 Rom. VII. 7 f.

132 Ibid. VII. 24.

133 James II 10 cf. Rom. X. 5.

134 Rom. VIII. 1 - 2.

In contrast with the time when he was in bondage to the Law, Paul now is at peace with God, and at peace with himself. He attributes this new peace and confidence and joyous sense of reconciliation to the new relationship with God in Christ - 'The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us'¹³⁵ and 'sonship to God is sealed by the Spirit in our hearts crying Abba.'¹³⁶ Judaism had none of this peace and joy to offer its adherents, and on this ground Paul rejects what has now become obnoxious in his sight - the idea of observing the Law as a means of attaining righteousness. "Paul on the basis of his personal experience and by means of his entirely religious nature, realised that Judaism was distorted as a system, and that its attitude towards religion was from the outset perverted; he regarded as chimerical the theory that by means of works man could force God to deal out reward and salvation in fulfilment of a contractual obligation, moreover, this attitude towards God, which seemed to regard him as a contracting party with rights and claims not superior to those of man, was recognised by Paul as impious and as a blasphemous misrepresentation of the position of man, in view of his entire dependence upon God. The irreligious aberrations of Pharisaism consisted in this 'boasting before God', as Paul calls it, or as we may paraphrase it, 'in self-glorification upon the ground of past achievement, in making

135 Rom. V. 5.

136 Gal. IV. 6.

demands of God'. This mad 'going up to heaven' to bring salvation down from thence, and this unseeing 'reckoning' with God which is entirely characteristic of all Jewish thought, are the by-products of a pietism which, like heathenism, professed to exert compulsion upon God; heathen magic, sacrifice and prayer, was here replaced by the practice of righteousness to which God was unable to refuse reward. Paul himself had shared this passionate zeal for the Law, this painful *ἐργάζεσθαι* and the attempts to take heaven by storm and bring salvation down to earth; he had realised profoundly the hopeless nature of this labour, of the "pursuit after righteousness" wherein the fair object was seen only as a *fata morgana*, unattainable, attractive and yet mocking all attempts (Rom. IX. 21 *δίκων...*

οὐκ ἔφθασεν) - it was this experience which enabled Paul not merely to conquer certain outposts of Judaism, but to show that the system must be rejected as absolutely incompatible with the Gospel.¹³⁷"

CHAPTER XII

THE USE OF SACRIFICIAL TERMS IN
ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES.

There are in Paul's Epistles a number of passages in which the blood of Christ is mentioned in close connection with the subject of salvation, and passages in which the death of Christ is connected with the idea of sacrifice.

The most outstanding of these passages is Rom.iii. 25 "Jesus Whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, by His blood, to show His righteousness because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God". In traditional exegesis this passage has been made the basis of the doctrines of Christ's death as a ransom paid to the devil, as a propitiation of the wrath of God, as the satisfaction demanded by God's justice and afforded by Christ's vicarious endurance of the penalty of sin. Professor C. H. ¹ Dodd by a close examination of the language used by Paul to describe the work of Christ in this verse, has shown that Paul had not in his mind what the traditional exegesis has attributed to him. Fresh study of ancient thought and language has helped to bring us nearer to Paul, and to understand what was in his mind.

The traditional exegesis of Rom. iii. 21-26 starts from the view that the righteousness of God to which these verses refer must be understood as an attribute of the divine

1. See Romans M.N.T.C. 48-61. Also 'Bible and the Greeks' 82 f.

being. This righteousness of God was thought to have been compromised 'because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God.' It was then inferred that the purpose of Christ's sacrificial death was to put the righteousness of God beyond any dispute, and to propitiate God. Now as Dodds² has pointed out the word *ἑλεοκτήριον* is derived from a verb which in pagan writers and inscriptions has two meanings: a) to placate a man or a god, b) to expiate a sin, i.e. to perform an act by which its guilt is annulled. But in the Septuagint the meaning to placate is practically unknown where God is the object. "The scriptural conception of *ἑλεοκτείναι* is not that of appeasing one who is angry with personal feeling against the offender but of altering the character of that which from without occasions a necessary alienation, and interposes an inevitable obstacle to fellowship This being so, the *ἑλεοκτήριος* when it is applied to the sinner, so to speak, neutralises the sin."³ Sin is the obstacle between the Holy God and the sinner, and when Paul speaks of Christ set forth as *ἑλεοκτήριον* propitiatory, he means that he has the power to remove that which kept man and God apart, and in this way he reconciles man to God. On the traditional interpretation it was God that needed to be reconciled to man. Christ was set forth to propitiate

2. Romans (M.N.T.C.) 54. Bible and the Greeks 94. Sanday and Headlam Romans 87 f take the word *ἑλεοκτήριον* to mean 'means of propitiation'. Buchsel Theolog Wörterbuch III. 321 is in favour of the rendering 'mercy-seat'.

3. Westcott. The Epistles of St. John. 85-87.

a wrathful God. But the New Testament never speaks of reconciling God to man, but vice versa. As Westcott says "such phrases as 'propitiating God' or 'God being reconciled' are foreign to the language of the New Testament". It is all the doing of God who reconciled us to himself through Christ. God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself.⁴ We were reconciled to God by the death of his Son.⁵ "Where reconciliation is spoken of in St. Paul, the subject is always God, and the object always man. The work of reconciling is one in which the initiative is taken by God and the cost borne by Him; men are reconciled in the passive or allow themselves to be reconciled ... We never read that God has been reconciled. He was engaged in Christ in reconciling the world - or rather nothing less than a world - to Himself."⁶

If we thus conclude that it is reconciliation, and not propitiation in the sense commonly given to the word, that is effected by Christ as *ἱλασθῆναι*, it does not follow by any means that Paul did not regard the death of Christ as a sacrifice. But Paul does not move like the author of Hebrews among the representations of Levitical symbolism. For the author of Hebrews 'without the shedding of blood there is no remission'.⁷ These words could hardly have

4. 11. Cor. V.18, 19.

5. Rom. V.10.

6. James Denney Death of Christ 143.

7. Heb. IX. 22.

come from the lips of one who had been brought up in Paul's circumstances. The Jews of the Diaspora could not be very deeply influenced in their personal religion by the Temple sacrifices offered at Jerusalem for the people's sin. Very few of the Diaspora Jews were able to visit the Temple and see for themselves the sacrifices. The statement of the epistle to the Hebrews, 'without the shedding of blood there is no remission' by no means represents the universal view of Judaism with regard to forgiveness. According to the purest thought of Pharisaic Judaism, God forgave the sins of man on the ground of man's repentance. This is based on the teaching of the Old Testament, e.g. 'Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him, and he will abundantly pardon.'⁸ 'To the Lord our God belong mercies and forgivenesses though we have rebelled against him'.⁹ 'He hath not dealt with us after our sins, neither rewarded us according to our iniquities'.¹⁰ 'Return ye backsliding children and I will heal your backsliding'.¹¹ This conviction that God in his mercy is ready to forgive on the single ground of repentance runs through the prophets and the Psalms and as Anderson Scott points out 'The Rabbinic Judaism in which Paul has been brought up definitely attached itself to that

8. Is. LV. 7.

9. Dan. IX. 9.

10. Ps. CIII. 10.

11. Jer. III. 22.

12. Christianity according to St. Paul 81.

conviction. It rested its confidence in the Divine forgiveness, on God's justice - based on his knowledge of human nature, and on his mercy - based on his love.¹³ In practice, however, the presence and sincerity of repentance was established by the presence of 'works' or by the offering of sacrifices, and as has so often happened in the history of religion, the performing of works or the offering of sacrifices which in themselves cannot be regarded as worthy and acceptable by God, resulted in the barren legalistic system which brought such despair into the life of Paul.

The question we have to ask then is this, does Paul feel it necessary to explain the efficacy of Christ's death in terms of the priestly theory of Atonement? According to the priestly view, which we find in the Epistle to the Hebrews, there could be no remission without the shedding of blood (*ἀιματεκχυοία*). But as has been pointed out that is not the only view found in the Old Testament, and G.A. Smith¹⁴ observes that in the Pentateuch P alone ascribes atoning value to the shedding of blood or life and P^{re} presents the latest stratum in Pentateuchal legislation. In the Prophetic writings, and the Psalms God is often represented as averse to the priestly idea of blood sacrifice for sin,

13. See Israel Abrahams "God's Forgiveness" in Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels I. 139 ff.

14. Deuteronomy 172.

because it was practised without the piety and sincerity
of which it ought to be the expression. ¹⁵ ¹⁶ Amos insists that
God desires justice and righteousness and not sacrifice.
The teaching of the prophets is that God forgives on the
ground of true repentance, the necessity of a blood sacrifice
for sin as a condition of forgiveness is not put forward by
them.

On a reading of the Pauline Epistles, we find that
Paul's spiritual home is amongst the prophets, and not
amongst the priests. The condition of forgiveness was
repentance on man's part. On God's side, forgiveness was
unconditional. God's love was so unbounded and overflowing,
that he commended his love towards us while we were yet
sinners in and by the death of Christ. ¹⁷ God was in Christ
reconciling the world unto himself. ¹⁸ The effect of such
an amazing demonstration of God's love is to disarm man's
hostility towards God, the neutralising and removal of that
which estranged man from God - sin, and the flooding of man's
heart with the love of God, that henceforth he responds to
the love directed towards him in the crucifixion and death
of Christ. Man has been reconciled to God. This seems to

15. For treatment of the attitude of the prophets to the
cultus see F.H. Robinson Hebrew Religion 201 f.
W. Eichrodt Theologie des Alten Testaments I. 64-
82. R.H. Kennet Church of Israel 120-8.

16. Amos v. 21f; see also Hos. VI. 6; Is. I. 11; Jer. VII.
22, 23; Ps. XL. 6.

17. Rom. V. 8.

18. 11. Cor. V. 19.

be the innermost heart of all that St. Paul has to say about the death of Christ. He does not think of the death on the Cross, and the shedding of the blood very prominently in terms of the Levitical sacrifices, as the author of Hebrews does. The language and ways of the altar were in all probability foreign to Paul, and he does not see in Christ the High Priest entering with the blood into the Holy of Holies, which having been sprinkled, cleansed the people from their sin. What gives Paul victory over sin is realisation of the love of God who set his only begotten son on the Cross to bleed and die, and has brought him into a state of reconciliation with God, in which no longer by his own righteousness, but by the merit of Christ he has access to God's presence. "In the last resort, nothing reconciles but love, and what the soul needs which has been alienated from God by sin, and is suffering under the divine reaction against it, is the manifestation of a love which can assure it, that neither the sin itself nor the soul's condemnation of it nor even the divine reaction against it culminating in death is the last reality in the universe. The last reality is rather love itself, making 'our sin' its own in all its reality, submitting as one with us to all the divine reactions against it, and loving us to the end through it, and in spite of it. Reconciliation is achieved when such a love is manifested and when in spite of guilt, distrust and fear, it wins the confidence of the sinful."

While Paul does not pre-eminently think of the death of Christ on the Cross, and the shedding of his blood as a sacrifice, but rather as the act whereby God has reconciled man to himself, we must not conclude from this that Paul does not at all think and speak in sacrificial terms. His interest in and emphasis on the reconciling power of the death of Christ precludes him from explaining the efficacy of Christ's death solely by analogy with the sacrifices of the Levitical system, which is the method adopted by the author of Hebrews. The sacrifice of the Day of Atonement was regarded by the worshippers as the efficient cause of forgiveness of sins. When the blood had been applied in the Holy of Holies by the High Priest the people's sins for the year had been wiped away. Paul does not think of the death of Christ and the shedding of his blood in this way at all. As Anderson Scott ²⁰ points out, the passage in Romans III. 21-26, does not explain how it was made possible through satisfaction offered to His justice for God to forgive sin, but how through the sacrifice of Christ, men might become forgivable ... The sacrificial death of Christ secured forgiveness because it rendered forgiveable those who had faith in Him."

We now turn to passages in the Pauline epistles in which the death of Christ is connected with the idea of sacrifice, and salvation in its different aspects is conceived

as secured through the blood of Christ. The most important passages of this type are: "In whom we have redemption through his blood"²¹ "being justified in his blood"²² "We have been reconciled to God through the death of his son"²³ "through him to reconcile all things unto himself, having made peace through the blood of his cross"²⁴ "yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death"²⁵ "But how in Christ Jesus ye that once were far off are made nigh in the blood of, Christ"²⁶ As Anderson Scott²⁷ remarks it is by no means easy to say what is the significance to be attached to this language when we cease to read it in the light of the propitiation passage of Romans III. 21-26 as traditionally interpreted.

On the surface we have many weighty considerations to prompt us to give these passages in the Pauline epistles the explanation which comes natural from the analogy of the Levitical sacrifices in the Old Testament. Other writers in the New Testament do seem to have found their explanation of the efficacy of Christ's death in the analogy of Levitical sacrifice.²⁸ What the sacrifices of the old testament aspired to do, has been perfectly done by the sacrifice of Christ.

-
21. Ephes. I. 7. 22. Rom. V. 9. 23. Rom. V. 10.
 24. Col. 1.20. 25. Ibid.1.22. 26. Eph.11.13.
 27. See Christianity according to St. Paul 85-97, which we closely follow in this section.
 28. e.g. John I. 29; I. John I. 7; IV. 10; Heb. IX. 22 ff.; I. Pet. I. 19.

The blood of Christ is thought of as the instrument by which the blessings of salvation have been brought within man's reach - man is justified and redeemed and at peace with God through the blood of Christ as instrument.

The tendency among students of Paul has been to take the Pauline use of sacrificial language as proof that Paul thought of the death of Christ as one or other of the sacrifices offered in the Tabernacle or Temple, preferably the sacrifice of the Day of Atonement when the blood was taken into the Holy of Holies, and the carcasses of the victims burned outside the gate. But Paul ascribes to the blood of Christ a large variety of functions; by it man obtains justification, redemption, reconciliation, is brought near to God. From this fact, Scott rightly concludes "that we are in the presence not of a technical but of a general idea. The efficacy which is thus assigned to the blood goes far beyond the scope claimed for it in Leviticus, where its effect is only negative, the 'covering' or neutralising of that which forbids safe or acceptable worship of God. These varied and positive effects which Paul ascribes to the 'blood of Christ' though they may find a faint analogy in the Levitical sacrifices, point to a much wider meaning for the phrase. It stands for the death of Christ in its completeness and in all the horror of its circumstances. That death was for Paul a necessary link in the process whereby God wrought the salvation of man in all its forms and implications." ²⁹

It is not surprising that St. Paul, who was a son of the synagogue and not of the temple, does not in any of his epistles make a formal and direct identification of the sacrifice of Christ with any of the Levitical or Old Testament sacrifices. The nearest approach to such identification is his statement "For our Passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ."³⁰ But in this context the Apostle's main point is his appeal for purity, and to drive home this appeal he wants his readers to think of Jesus as their Passover sacrificed for them, a thought which would suggest to them the need for purity of the "unleavened bread of sincerity and truth."

Anderson Scott makes the point that "continuity with the Levitical theory of sacrifice is further weakened to a thin analogy by the wide difference in regard to the character of the sins which sacrifice was understood to deal with".³¹ Sacrifice could atone for sins of ignorance and error only, the sins done with a high hand threw those committing them outside the covenant relation, that is outside the sphere in which God was gracious. There was no sacrifice for such sins, and the offender was left face to face with the anger of God.³² But it was with this very class of sins that Paul

30. 1. Cor. V. 7.

31. Op. cit. 87.

32. Davidson Old Testament Theology 316-324.

was concerned, the sins forbidden by the moral law, and not the sins forbidden by the ceremonial and ritual law, and it was from these he had realised that Christ set him free, and cleansed his conscience. The author of Hebrews dwells on the fact that the blood of bulls and goats could never take away sins, could never cleanse the worshipper's conscience. The blood of such victims dealt with the cleansing of the body, whereas the blood of Christ cleanses the worshippers' conscience. His religious history - in all probability having been brought up in the temple, and his sacramentarian temperament brought such language to his lips as naturally as the air he breathed. To a far greater degree than is true of St. Paul, he beholds in the old dispensation a foreshadowing of the new. The law and its ritual was a type of which the ministry of Christ was the antitype, whereas Paul is much more of an iconoclast and does not find the old illuminated by the new, with the result that there is an antithesis of the Law and ^{the} Gospel, and even antagonism between them.

We are not surprised that St. Paul does not downright identify the sacrifice of Christ with any of the sacrifices of the Levitical cultus, for the scope of Christ's sacrifice is so much wider than that claimed for the Levitical sacrifices - it dealt with the class of sins which the Levitical cultus openly declared to be outside its power to deal with. Paul has much more in common with the prophets of the Old Testament than with the priests. Many of the prophets had

sharply criticised the sacrificial system, but it must be borne in mind that it was the abuse of the system which they denounced. At the same time we do not find in them any support or recognition of the expiating and 'atoning' value of the blood of the sacrifices.

The question we have to ask then is this; In what sense did Paul regard the death of Christ as a sacrifice? It is clear that he did so regard it. There are three passages in the Pauline epistles which preeminently connect the death of Christ with sacrificial language. The first is Rom. 111. 25, "Whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, by his blood, to shew his righteousness, because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God." But we have concluded that the force of this verse is to be sought not in Christ as propitiating God in the sense of placating his anger, nor as a sacrifice the blood of which cleansed from sin, but rather in Christ as exercising reconciling power on men. This reconciling power operates on men through faith, that is, the faith which the sacrificial death of Christ calls forth. God commends his love to men in the Cross of his Son, and whoever responds to that love of God is reconciled with God, and a righteousness of God, which is apart from the Law, has been revealed and become available to men.

The two other passages connecting the death of Christ with sacrificial language are Ephesians V. 2; and 1. Cor. V. 7, and it will be seen on careful examination

that neither of these throws light on the character of the sacrifice. In the Ephesian passage Christ is spoken of as "having given Himself up for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for an odour of a sweet smell." This is the only passage in Paul where he uses the word sacrifice *θυσία* for Christ, and the phrase "for an odour of sweet smell" *εἰς ὄσμήν εὐωδίας* is used in the Old Testament only of free will offering.³³ "The force of this, the only passage in which Paul describes Christ as a sacrifice (*θυσία*) is considerably weakened by the facts: 1) that the phrase is a combination of reminiscences from the Psalms. As Dr. Armitage Robinson says, *προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν* is probably borrowed half consciously from Psalm XL. and the second phrase *εἰς ὄσμήν εὐωδίας* is certainly so. 2) Paul himself elsewhere uses both phrases, with no apparent difference of meaning, to describe human acts of devotion and self-surrender. In Rom XII. 1. he uses both 'sacrifice' and 'offering' of the act and life of self-surrender apart from any deeper connotation of sacrifice; and in Romans XV. 16 'offering' with the same meaning. "For a sweet-smelling savour" appears once in connection with the gifts sent by the Philippians to himself (Phil. IV. 18) a fact, says Dr. Robinson 'which should warn us against pressing it too strongly to a doctrinal use' in the passage in Ephesians.³⁴ Due consideration given to

33. So Westcott Epistle to the Ephesians 75.

34. J. Armitage Robinson, St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians 196.

their history, and to the context in which they stand, these phrases in Ephesians appear rather to describe our Lord's surrender and submission of Himself as complete and acceptable, than to ascribe any definite character to His sacrifice.³⁵"

The other instance of the use of definitely sacrificial language connected with the death of Christ has been already referred to - 1. Cor. V. 7., 'for our passover has been sacrificed, even Christ'. This passage makes it clear that Paul did think of the death of Christ as a sacrifice, although it does not help very much to determine the character of the sacrifice. In its context the phrase is introduced to support an appeal for purity, for Christ their Paschal lamb had been slain for them as Christians and they are celebrating the feast of remembrance.³⁶ As Scott remarks, it must be borne in mind that the Passover rite, had passed through many changes in the course of its history, changes both of form and significance, and we do not know which stage of its history addressed itself to Paul. The primary significance of the Passover rite was the ritual use of the blood of the Passover lamb. But later this side of the Passover rite had largely lost its significance, and the rite was thought of more and more as a domestic feast. Now if this side of the Passover was in Paul's mind when he speaks of Christ as our Passover sacrificed

35. Anderson Scott op. cit. 90-91.

36. Anderson Scott op. cit. 91. See G.B. Gray Sacrifice in Old Testament 376.

for us, then this passage throws very little light indeed on Christ's death as a sacrifice.

We thus conclude with Anderson Scott³⁷ that 'apart from the presupposition created by the traditional exegesis of Rom. 111. 25, there does not appear in Paul's language connected with sacrifice anything to show what precise character he assigned to the sacrifice of Christ.'

The path for us now to follow is to seek in the Pauline epistles for more general indications as to the way the death of Christ is conceived as a sacrifice by Paul. From a consideration of these general indications we find that 1) the sacrifice of Christ was 'on our behalf' *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*³⁸ "The Son of God who loved me, and gave Himself for me"³⁸ "Christ died for us *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*"³⁹ "God spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all."⁴⁰ He gave Himself up 'for us' and for the Church.⁴¹ 'All died' because 'one died for all'.⁴² We note, that in all these passages the preposition St. Paul uses is *ὑπὲρ* not *ἀντὶ* and this is strong proof that he did not regard the death of Christ as substitutionary. It was on our behalf and for our benefit, not instead of us

37. Anderson Scott op. cit. 92.

38. Gal. 11. 20.

39. Rom. V. 8.

40. Ibid. VIII. 32.

41. Ephes. V. 2, 25.

42. 11. Cor. V. 14 f.

that Christ died. There is however one instance in which Paul speaks of Christ dying instead of us in the first epistle to Timothy 11. 6 *ἀντὶ πάντων ὑπὲρ πάντων*. But as Kirk⁴³ remarks, the statement there is made only with a strong qualification and 1. Timothy may not be Pauline,⁴⁴ and as he further remarks 'a statement like Dr. Rashdall's "It is impossible to get rid of this idea of substitution, of vicarious punishment from any faithful presentation of St. Paul's doctrine" is infinitely more sweeping than the facts warrant.'

2) The sacrifice of Christ was a sacrifice 'on account of sin' *ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν*.⁴⁵ Although there is no saying of Jesus in the Gospels which connects His death with sin, it is clear that when Jesus spoke of His life given as a 'ransom for many',⁴⁶ He was thinking of the many as sinners and when He spoke of His blood as covenant blood He was thinking of the reconciliation of men as sinners with the holy God. Thus in 1. Cor. XV. we find St. Paul giving as a fundamental belief the creed of the early Christian community, which he shared and endorsed. 'I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received, how that Christ died for our sins (*ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν*) according to the

43. Kirk Epistle to Romans Clarendon Bible 60-61. The *ὑπὲρ* virtually destroys the force of *ἀντί*.

44. Idea of Atonement 92. See also Vincent Taylor Atonement in N.T. 123 f. who does not believe Paul's doctrine to be substitutionary.

45. 1. Cor. XV. 3.

46. Mark X. 45.

Scriptures'. Again 'Our Lord Jesus Christ who gave himself
 for our sins.'⁴⁷ 'Jesus our Lord, who was delivered up for
 our trespasses'.⁴⁸ In passages where the work of Christ is
 described as redemption (*ἀπολύτρωσις*) the sacrificial death of
 Christ has a relation to sin. 'In whom we have our redemption
 through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses'.⁴⁹ 'In
 whom we have our redemption, the forgiveness of our sins.'⁵⁰

Again the sacrifice of Christ was made 'in connection
 with sin' *περὶ ἁμαρτίας*.⁵¹ The Revised Version renders 'as an
 offering for sin', and is no doubt right in this, for the phrase
περὶ ἁμαρτίας is used in LXX for the sin offering. "But the
 allusion is certainly not central. All that St. Paul actually
 says is that Christ came 'concerning sin' (to deal with sin -
 Moffatt) and we need read no more into his words. Even if he
 deliberately chose this phrase rather than any other because of
 its Old Testament significance (an hypothesis which can only be
 assumed) it is hazardous to assert that he did so in order to
 convey that the death of Jesus performed in every sense of the
 function of a sin offering, and in particular the function of
 appeasing the wrath of God against guilty mankind. It is far
 more probable that the allusion (if any was intended) is purely

47. Gal. 1. 4.

48. Rom. 1V. 25.

49. Ephes. 1. 7.

50. Col. 1. 14.

51. Rom. VIII. 3.

literal and casual, and cannot be pressed to extremes such as this.⁵²"

Again Paul presents the death of Christ in relation to sin in yet another aspect. Using a legal analogy, he thinks of sin as a defendant in the court, a defendant upon whom sentence has already been pronounced,⁵³ and God, sending His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and as an offering for sin, 'condemned sin in the flesh'.⁵⁴ When he speaks of 'being now just-ified by his blood'⁵⁴ Paul bases God's activity in declaring men righteous upon the sacrifice of Christ.

3) The sacrifice of Christ had as its purpose the re-storing or establishing of "a relation of amity, love and son-ship between men and God; it achieved that by 'commending to them his love'.⁵⁵ What Christ effected was the reconciliation of men with God.

4) The sacrifice of Christ was necessary because without it men would still be subject to the powers which held them in bondage. What God did in Christ was 'despoiling the principal-ities and powers, making a show of them openly, triumphing over

52. Kirk Romans 66, c.1. Taylor Atonement in New Testament 93 - In Rom VIII. 3. the statement that God sent forth His Son *πρὸς ἁμαρτίας* in view of the usage of the Septuagint, may be a reference to the sin-offering, but in the absence of an emphasis upon this idea in the Pauline Epistles, it should probably be rendered 'for sin'.
Sanday and Headlam Romans (I.C.C.) 193 take the phrase *πρὸς ἁμαρτίας* to refer to the 'sin offering' in Lev. IV, but do not suppose the phrase, to be necessarily limited to the sense of 'sin offering'.

53. Rom. VIII. 3.

54. Ibid. V. 9.

55. Anderson Scott op. cit. 92.

them in it'.⁵⁶ Hostile powers, 'the rulers of this world'⁵⁷ and the rudiments of the world (*στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*⁵⁸) the Law,⁵⁹ the principalities, powers, world-rulers of this darkness, the spiritual hosts of wickedness in heavenly places,⁶⁰ held men in bondage, and God⁶¹ in Christ, gained the victory over those powers and like a victor with the vanquished He led them in triumph. Without this victory in Christ, salvation would be as far off from men as ever.

5) The sacrifice of Christ in Paul is presented as being in accordance with the mind and will of God, and as giving effect to His purpose.⁶² Jesus regarded His own death as taking its origin in His Father's purpose. At Caesarea Philippi and Gethsemane He declares 'The Son of Man must suffer many things. Jesus says this must be. It is the *δεῖ* of divine necessity. 'For God appointed us not unto wrath, but unto the obtaining of salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us'.⁶³ From the beginning it had been God's purpose to justify men, and the righteousness which is mediated through Christ was witnessed by the Law and the prophets in the Old Testament. Justification and reconciliation are presented as the acts

56. Col. 11. 15.

57. 1. Cor. 11. 8.

58. Gal. 1v. 3, 9. Col. 11. 20.

59. Col. 11. 14.

60. Ephes. VI. 12.

61. In Col. 11. 12. it seems that God is the subject throughout.

62. Anderson Scott op. cit. 93.

63. 1. Thes. V. 9-10.

sets of God Himself performed through the ministry of Christ -
 'All things are of God, who reconciled us to Himself through
 Christ, and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation; to
 wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself,
 not reckoning unto them their trespasses, and having committed
 unto us the word of reconciliation.'⁶⁴ Christ has been set
 forth by God 'for the showing of His righteousness, that he
 might be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in
 Jesus.'⁶⁵ The Christ crucified whom Paul preaches is the power
 of God and the wisdom of God.⁶⁶ It was God, when the fullness
 of time came, who sent forth His son,⁶⁷ and the whole redemptive
 ministry of Christ was undertaken 'that he might deliver us out
 of this present evil world, according to the will of our God
 and Father.'⁶⁸

6) In the sacrifice which Christ offered he appeared
 as a representative. He represented God to man on the one
 hand, and man to God on the other. "God was in Christ pronounc-
 :ing the doom of sin, breaking its domination over man, as well
 as that of all the other forces of evil, waiving the legal
 demands of a broken law, drawing men, reconciling the world
 unto Himself."⁶⁹ But Christ also represented man to God, and

64. 11. Cor. V. 18-19.

65. Rom. 111. 25-26.

66. 1. Cor. 1. 24.

67. Gal. 1V. 4.

68. Gal. 1. 4.

69. Anderson Scott op. cit. 93.

the suffering of Christ was a representative suffering for men.

As Scott ⁷⁰ points out, we are confronted with the idea of solidarity when we think with Paul of Christ as the representative of humanity and as the Lord of a new humanity. The ancient world was quite familiar with this idea, and not in the least baffled with it as we are. What the King as the head of his people, or the father as the head of his family, did, was as much the doing of the whole people or whole family as it was that of the head. ⁷¹ As Adam was the head of the old

humanity, so Christ, the second Adam, was the head of the new humanity. This idea of Christ as the representative of a new humanity comes out very clearly in the Epistle to the Romans.

"For as through the one man's disobedience (Adam's) the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the one (Christ's) shall the many be made righteous." Again 'as

through one trespass the judgment came unto all men to condemnation; even so through one act of righteousness the free gift came unto all men to justification of life.' ⁷² We have the

same thought of Christ as representative explicit in the following passages 'The love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that one died for all, therefore all died.' ⁷³ The same

idea is implied in the words 'Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us.' ⁷⁴ Jesus Christ was

70. Anderson Scott op. cit. 93.

71. e.g. Achan and all his family are stoned for Achan's sin. Josh. VII.

72. Rom. V. 19, 18.

73. 11. Cor. V. 14.

74. Gal. III. 13.

man's representative before God, and the death which he died on the cross all those who are united with Christ also died. 'They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh'⁷⁵ and as Christ was raised from the dead, so also have the Christians risen to newness of life, and^{live} henceforth 'in Christ'. Christ, the Son of God united himself with us, and surrendering our lives to Him, we identify ourselves with Him. He represents God to us, and us to God, and we plead his righteousness before God -

Look Father, look on His anointed face
And only look on us as found in Him.

7) The feature in the sacrifice of Christ to which Paul does give prominence and significance is his obedience.⁷⁶ The one act which has transformed everything for men is the obedience of Christ. "For as through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous."⁷⁷ The disobedience of Adam had disturbed the relation between God and man and because of sin man had become estranged from God. In that state of estrangement and enmity towards God man remained until Christ came, and as the representative of the new humanity he lived a life of obedience to God which culminated in the supreme act of obedience in his death on the cross. This act of obedience performed by

75. Gal. V. 24.

76. Anderson Scott op. cit. 94.

77. Rom V. 19.

Christ cancelled for all who belong to him by faith the act of disobedience on the part of Adam who was the first representative man. The consequences of Adam's sin are now undone and men can share in the righteousness of Christ. The 'one act of righteousness' to which St. Paul refers in Rom. V. 18. is the sacrificial death of Christ upon the Cross. No further proof of Christ's obedience to the Father's will could be given - 'He humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea the death of the Cross.'⁷⁸ As Anderson Scott observes "there is probably a closer relation than appears on the surface between the idea of obedience and that of sacrifice. The condition of receiving the divine forgiveness being true repentance, not merely sorrow for sin, but a change of mind or attitude towards God and possibly towards men, an obvious difficulty presented itself; and that was the difficulty of making sure that the repentance was sincere. Hence arose the demand for acts of penitence, such as fasting, alms-giving, 'works meet for repentance'. And alongside of these, sacrifice also had an important function in guaranteeing that the sinner was truly repentant. Just as almsgiving came to be identified with 'righteousness', so a close relation might be observed between obedience, or an indefeasible act of obedience, and sacrifice. The death of Christ was a sacrifice in as much as it was a supreme act of submission to the will of God.

And what was in Him obedience, was for those whose representative He was the equivalent of a guarantee of their

78. Phil. 11. 8.

obedience, an obedience which in their case required and implied repentance. Seeing that this guarantee was completely and sufficiently provided in the sacrificial death of Christ, it is possible to understand now Paul could see in the *ἀίμα* the out-poured life of Christ, the instrument whereby salvation in any of its forms had been secured.

The shedding of the blood is the consummation of the obedience, its irrefragable demonstration. And as the obedience of One, the Head and Representative, was the indispensable condition of justification for those whom He represented, it would be natural for the Apostle to use such language as 'justified by His blood.'⁷⁹ The apostle calls upon his readers in the second epistle to the Corinthians to 'take every opposing design prisoner, and bring it into the condition of submissive obedience to the Christ,'⁸⁰ the path of obedience which He trod, is their path too.

79. Anderson Scott op. cit. 96.

80. 11. Cor. X. 5. Plummer's translation I.C.C. Corinthians 277.

COMPARISON OF THE AUTHOR HEBREWS AND PAUL
IN THEIR USE OF SACRIFICIAL TERMS.

In our discussion^{of} the use made by St. Paul of sacrificial terms in his description of the death of Christ, we saw that he does not identify Christ's death outright with any of the sacrifices of the old covenant. He uses sacrificial language, but he is by no means near to the old covenant cultus. The main emphasis fell on Christ's obedience - the death of Christ is a sacrifice inasmuch as it was a supreme act of submission to the will of God. He was obedient unto death, yea, the death of the cross. The author of Hebrews too, emphasises the obedience of Christ, but his epistle far more so than any of the Pauline epistles, is interspersed with sacrificial language. The setting of the whole epistle is in the Tabernacle where he brings before the reader the whole gamut of sacrifice at the altar by Priest and High Priest, and the worshippers drawing nigh with their offerings. The fundamental note of the whole epistle is that the death of Christ was a sacrificial act for sinful men. The words characteristic of the epistle are the following: - *προσφορά* offering (X. 10, 14) *θυσία* sacrifice (IX. 26; X. 12) *ἀναφέρειν* to offer up (VII. 27) *προφέρειν* to offer (IX. 14, 28. X. 12) *ἐλάσκειν* to make expiation (II. 17). *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* offering for sin (XI. 18), the covenant sacrifice (IX. 11-28) and the word 'blood' so often used with sacrificial

associations (e.g. IX. 12, 14; X. 19; XII. 24; XIII. 20).

In addition to these words which come from the vocabulary of the altar and tabernacle, there are passages in which it is unequivocally stated that Jesus Christ performed the task of a priest, Himself both priest and victim. The most important of these passages are:-

- Heb. 1. 3. When he had made purification of sins.
- Heb. 11. 17. Wherefore it behoved him in all things to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make expiation for the sins of the people.
- VII. 27. This he did once for all, when he offered up himself.
- IX. 11f. But Christ having come a high priest of the good things to come through the greater and more perfect Tabernacle through his own blood, entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption.
- IX. 14. How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through his eternal spirit offered himself without blemish unto God, cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?
- IX. 26. But now once at the end of the ages hath he been manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.

- IX. 28. So Christ also having been once offered to bear the sins of many
- X. 10. By which will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.
- X. 12. But he, when he had offered once sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God.
- X. 14. For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.
- X. 19-23. Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the Holy Place by the blood of Jesus, by the way which he dedicated for us a new and living way, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; and having a great priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in fulness of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our body washed with pure water; let us hold fast the confession of our faith that it waver not, for he is faithful that promised.
- XI. 24. And to Jesus the Mediator of a new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better than Abel.
- XIII. 11f. For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the Holy Place by the High Priest as an offering for sin, are burned without the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that he might

sanctify the people through his own blood,
suffered without the gate.

Xl11. 20f. Now the God of peace who brought again from the dead the great shepherd of the sheep with the blood of the eternal covenant, even our Lord Jesus, make you perfect in every good thing to do his will, working in us that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ, to whom be the glory for ever and ever. Amen.

The author of Hebrews, as has been pointed out, makes use of the symbolism of the different sacrifices and rites of the old covenant in order to present to his readers the ministry and work of Christ. He has continually in mind the sacrifices offered under the direction of the Law - the burnt offering, the meal offering, peace offering, sin offering, guilt offering, which are in general expiatory, appointed means whereby sin is 'covered' so that it no longer stands as an obstacle between the worshipper and God. The sacrifice of Christ is presented as a covenant sacrifice which ratifies the new covenant, and the blood of the sacrifice metaphorically speaking is sprinkled on the worshippers' hearts. Paul and the author of Hebrews are at one in representing the death of Christ as the sacrifice which inaugurates and ratifies the New Covenant. In 1. Cor. XI 25 Paul passes on to the Corinthians what he had received from the Lord. Over the

cup at the Last Supper the Lord had said, "This cup is the New Covenant in my blood." But Paul, unlike the author of Hebrews, does not elaborate on the details of the sacrifice which inaugurated the first covenant at Sinai.

Christ is the sin offering - he suffered outside the gate, where the carcasses of the sin offering on the Day of Atonement were burnt. Just as the ashes of a heifer sprinkled on the unclean body made them clean, so the blood of Christ cleanses the conscience. The central theme of the epistle is the presentation of Jesus Christ as High Priest after the order of Melchizedek, who has accomplished, by the offering of himself, the one thing necessary to bring man into the presence of God. The sacrificial system of the old covenant could not achieve what it pointed to. It was weak for various reasons. The passive character of the altar victim detracted from its value as a sacrifice. Again the victim's purity and innocence were non-moral. The perfection of sacrifice is in Christ "who through the eternal spirit offered himself without blemish unto God." The range of the old covenant sacrifices was limited, they had to do with ritual transgressions alone, but not so the sacrifice of Christ, it avails to cleanse the conscience from dead works, and those whose hearts through his sacrifice, have been cleansed can draw near to God with courage and confidence

1. Heb. IX. 14.

assured that their fellowship with him is being maintained.

In both the epistle to the Hebrews and Paul, the bearing of the death of Christ upon the salvation of men is central, and its final issue, which is the redemption of men, Paul calls justification of believers, while the author of Hebrews calls it the perfecting *τελειωσις* of the worshippers, and the two are virtually identical. Both writers recognise that in consequence of sin man is in bondage, and alienated from God. The powers which hold man in bondage according to Paul have been referred to.² The author of Hebrews states that Christ 'through death has brought to nought him that had the power of death'.³ Christ has delivered men from a present tyranny - he has delivered 'all them who through fear of death were all their life-time subject to bondage'.⁴ He has delivered men from an obligation contracted in the past - "For this cause, he is the Mediator of a new covenant, that a death having taken place for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant, they that have been called may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance."⁵ Through his sacrifice 'He has obtained eternal redemption',⁶ and remission (*ἀφεσις*).⁷ Both writers are at one in their emphasis on man's need of redemption and forgiveness, which Christ alone can vouchsafe

2. See Chap. XI 304.

3. Heb. 11. 14.

4. Heb 11. 15.

5. Heb. 1X. 15.

6. Heb. 1X. 12.

7. Heb. IX. 22.

assured that their fellowship with him is being maintained.

In both the epistle to the Hebrews and Paul, the bearing of the death of Christ upon the salvation of men is central, and its final issue, which is the redemption of men, Paul calls justification of believers, while the author of Hebrews calls it the perfecting *τελειοῦν* of the worshippers, and the two are virtually identical. Both writers recognise that in consequence of sin man is in bondage, and alienated from God. The powers which hold man in bondage according to Paul have been referred to.² The author of Hebrews states that Christ 'through death has brought to nought him that had the power of death'.³ Christ has delivered men from a present tyranny - he has delivered 'all them who through fear of death were all their life-time subject to bondage'.⁴ He has delivered men from an obligation contracted in the past - "For this cause, he is the Mediator of a new covenant, that a death having taken place for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant, they that have been called may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance."⁵ Through his sacrifice 'He has obtained eternal redemption',⁶ and remission (*ἀφεσις*).⁷ Both writers are at one in their emphasis on man's need of redemption and forgiveness, which Christ alone can vouchsafe

2. See Chap. XI 304.

3. Heb. 11. 14.

4. Heb 11. 15.

5. Heb. IX. 15.

6. Heb. IX. 12.

7. Heb. IX. 22.

for him through this sacrifice of himself. But the pre-
 :suppositions of the redemptive process are different in the
 two writers. In Paul, while the conception of sacrifice is
 present only as one element in his construction, the interpreta-
 :tion of Christ's death is set forth more by the means of
 juridical categories - he speaks of deliverance from the curse
 of the Law, of condemnation of sin in the flesh, and reconcilia-
 :tion to God through the death of His Son. In Hebrews on the
 other hand the conception of sacrifice is the controlling
 conception - Christ's death is the inaugural sacrifice of
 the new covenant, and his death is discussed after the analogy
 of other sacrifices and rites of the old covenant. The
 difference between the two writers is determined by their
 different temperaments, which in Paul's case was probably
 determined by the fact that he was a Pharisee and a synagogue
 man while the author of Hebrews seems to have been acquainted
 with the temple service. It cannot be proved that he was of
 a priestly and Sadducean family, but he seems to belong to those
 circles as much as Paul belongs to Pharisaic circles.

For Paul sin was transgression of law, and an offence
 against God. As such, it involves guilt, and the problem from
 this point of view is how man can be absolved from the guilt of
 sin, and attain the righteousness which God requires. It is
 through Christ alone that this is done. No observance of the
 Law however assiduous can gain for man righteousness before God.
 But in the Gospel there is revealed to faith a righteousness of
 God apart from the Law, it is "the righteousness of God through

faith in Jesus Christ unto all them that believe".⁹ The sinner is justified on the ground of faith in Jesus Christ, and in his ex-position of justification he uses legal terms. The words 'just' *δικαιος* and justifying *δικαιοῦν*, are themselves suggestive of a court of law. Again *δικαιοσύνη* righteousness and *λογίζεσθαι* to reckon up.¹⁰ Paul speaks of what Christ has effected for man in these forensic terms because his choice of terms was determined by the controversy about legalism in religion in which he was engaged. It was the kind of religion in which he himself had been brought up - observance of the Law merited reward, transgression of it, punishment. But Paul's meaning when he uses these legal terms escapes altogether from legal idea.¹¹ There can be in law no such thing as 'justifying' or acquitting freely as a gift 'by grace', and to speak of 'justifying the ungodly',¹² or acquitting the guilty, is a contradiction of legal judgment. St. Paul's message is that God is not a God who reckons up man's sin, and writes down man's debt to Him. He does not deal with men by strict recompense. Rather is God a God of grace, and to justify means not the sentence of a judge, but the forgiveness of a father. This knowledge of God as Father has brought light and hope into Paul's life, and he rejoices ascribing all glory to the God of grace revealed in Jesus Christ - 'for all things are of God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ.'¹³

9. Rom. 111. 22.

10. Ibid. IV. 6. 11. Cor. V. 19

11. See Dodd Romans 51 f.

12. Rom. IV. 5.

13. 11. Cor. V. 18.

The whole statement that God justifies the ungodly is a paradox,
 and as Dodd says ¹⁴ 'the real moral is that the personal relations
 of God to men cannot be described in legal terms at all. The
 revelation of his righteousness is apart from law altogether'.
 "Justification is the most incomprehensible thing that exists.
 All other marvels are miracles on the circumference of being,
 but this is the miracle in the centre of being, in the personal
 centre. Justification means this miracle, that Christ takes our
 place, and we take His."¹⁵

For the author of Hebrews on the other hand sin was
 not transgression of law, but defilement, man is sin-stained
 and needs cleansing. God in His holiness cannot be approached
 by sin-stained man. He must be cleansed and then will God
 receive him. It is the temple or Tabernacle conception of
 sin which we find in the Pentateuch. He who had touched a
 dead body was ceremonially unclean, and must be cleansed by
 the sprinkling of the ashes of a heifer, and the blood of the
 sacrifice served to cleanse the worshippers in order to restore
 them into communion with God. In his Epistle the author re-
 :peatedly refers to cleansing, and this shows that he regards
 sin as leaving a stain upon human nature, and particularly
 upon the conscience of man. Having spoken of the blood of
 bulls and goats and the ashes of a heifer as serving to sanctify
 unto the cleanness of the flesh, he asks how much more shall the
 blood of Christ cleanse your conscience from dead
 works to serve the living God?"¹⁶ Again he speaks of clēnsing

14. Dodd op. cit. 52.

15. Emil Brunner. The Mediator (Eng. Transl.) 524.

16. Heb. IX. 14.

as a condition of access to God. "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our body washed with pure water"¹⁷. In this verse the author has in mind the washing¹⁸ of the priests in preparation for their consecration and the bathing of the High Priest on the Day of Atonement.¹⁹ The worshipper's sin is the barrier and hindrance to his communion with God, and in the first chapter, of the epistle he sums up the work of Christ as making purification, or cleansing from sins - *Καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν*. For this removal of sins he uses other expressions as well as that of purifying or cleansing. He speaks of the 'putting away of sins' *εἰς ἀβύθου τῆς ἁμαρτίας*,²⁰ of taking away sins *ἀφαιρῆν περιαιρῆν*,²¹ of bearing sin *ἀναφέρειν*²² probably bearing in mind the scapegoat sent to the wilderness on the Day of Atonement bearing the people's sin.²³ Again he speaks of sacrifices for sin, and of making expiation for the sins of the people *εἰς τὸ ἐλάττωσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ*²⁴. In most of these phrases and words he uses in regard to the removal of sin, if not in

17. Heb. X. 22.

18. Exod. XXIV. 4

19. Lev. XVI. 4.

20. Heb. IX. 26.

21. Ibid. X. 4, 11.

22. Heb. IX. 28.

23. e.g. X. 6, 8.

24. Heb. 11. 17.

all of them, there is the idea of sin as something that attaches itself or clings closely to man, something that must be purged away from the conscience, and for the author of Hebrews with his interest so deeply in the Pentateuch and in the ministry of altar and priest the only efficient cathartic is blood - the blood of Jesus Christ avails to purify and cleanse the sinner and to bring him into communion with God. Man of himself can never effect the removal of sin. He emphasises repentance, but it is quite clear that for him much more than repentance was necessary if the barrier of sin between man and God is to be removed. Its removal has become possible through the blood of Jesus Christ, the great High Priest of our salvation. Hebrews speaks of hallowing *ἁγιασθεῖν* and cleansing *καθαρίσειν* and perfecting *τελειοῦν* as the work of Christ. Christ's purpose was the hallowing of men, "Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people through his own blood, suffered outside the gate"²⁵ The blood of Jesus as²⁶ the blood of the new covenant sanctifies the people.

Unlike the sacrifices of the old covenant the blood of which could only remove outward defilement and so make the worshipper ceremonially fit to draw near to God, the blood of Christ can cleanse, *καθαρίσειν* the conscience, can remove spiritual defilement and make the worshipper morally fit to come before God.²⁷ The word *τελειοῦν* make perfect, is used by the

25. Heb. X111. 12.

26. Ibid. X. 29. See also II. 11; X.10.14 on Christ as sanctifier.

27. The following are instances of *καθαρίσειν* in Heb.
1. 3; IX. 14; IX. 23; X. 2.

author of Hebrews to express the full result of the work of Christ for men, very much in the same way as Paul uses the word *δικαιῶν* to justify.

The sense of the word *τελειῶν* in Hebrews as in other writers is the reaching of full maturity, attaining the end for which a person or thing was created, and destined, a complete development of powers. The aim of the religious system of the old covenant was perfection *τελειῶν*, i.e. to bring men to their true end, which is communion and fellowship with God. But in this the old religious system had failed - 'If there was perfection through the Levitical Priesthood..... what further need was there that another priest should arise after the order of Melchizedek?'²⁸ but the religion of the new covenant was able to bring men to this perfection. Jesus Christ the Captain of salvation was made perfect through sufferings,²⁹ and thus fitted to be the author of eternal salvation to all men,³⁰ for he is Son perfected for evermore.³¹ On the ground of His own perfection and the perfection of his offering, he can bring into perfection all those who are in fellowship with him - 'for by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified'.³² Contrasting the old and the new, Mount Sinai and Mount Zion, the author of Hebrews tells his readers that they have come now to the presence of God as judge of all, and to the spirit of just men made perfect

28. Heb. VII. 11.
 29. Ibid. 11. 10.
 30. Ibid. V. 9.
 31. Ibid. VII. 28.
 32. Ibid. X. 14.

πνεύματος Σικαίων Τετελειωμένων³³.

The author of Hebrews has a deep love for the Psalter, and he is steeped in the poetry of the Psalms especially of those Psalms which use the language of the Sanctuary e.g. Ll. Sin is an offence against the holiness of God, and the language of forgiveness for him, as it is in Ps. Ll. is that of the cleansing of the unclean sinner. "Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin. Purify me with hyssop (with which sacrificial blood was sprinkled see Lev. XIV. 7, c.f. Heb. IX. 19) and I shall be clean, wash me and I shall be whiter than snow. Create in me a clean heart O God, and renew a right spirit within me. Cast me not away from thy presence and take not thy Holy Spirit from me." ³⁴ The language is the language of the sanctuary and it is the language we have in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The sinner is unclean and needs the atoning blood. The blood of Jesus who has entered into the sanctuary on high is efficacious to cleanse the sinner from all his sins and bring him into the presence of God. The language of Paul with his forensic terms is absent, instead he chooses the language of the sanctuary to express how Jesus perfects for evermore those who draw nigh to God in His name.

33. Heb. XII. 23. The adjective perfect *Τελεος* is found in V. 14 & IX. 11 - the abstract noun perfection in VI. 1 & VII. 11. The noun perfecter in XII. 2. The verb to perfect in II. 10; V. 9; VII. 19; VII. 28; IX. 9; X. 1; X. 14; XI. 40; XII. 23.

34. Ps. Ll.

CHAPTER XIII.

A COMPARISON AND CONTRAST OF HEBREWS' ATTITUDE TO THE
LAW AND ST. PAUL.

It has become manifestly clear from our study of the treatment of the Mosaic Law in the Epistle to the Hebrews and in the Pauline Epistles, that the two writers belong to a different tradition and that their religious history has been different. The atmosphere which the Epistle to the Hebrews breathes is very different from that of the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, and nowhere is this difference more pronounced than in the treatment of the Law.

Both writers are Jews, but whereas Paul's spiritual home is in the synagogue, and as he tells us himself, he has been brought up a Pharisee, the author of Hebrews is as near the priests in outlook and sympathy as is Paul to the Pharisees. Throughout the Epistle to the Hebrews we are kept not a stone's throw away from the Tabernacle or Temple. Whoever the author was, he was familiar with the spectacle of the worshippers coming to the Temple with their offering. The priest met them at the altar as they came amid the different circumstances of life - now a worshipper would draw nigh to the altar with a thank-offering to God for His graciousness to him and his family; now he would draw nigh amid the clouds and heart pangs of guilt because of transgression, bringing to the altar the offering for his sin as an expression of his penitence before God. He had

also seen the solemn ministrations of the Day of Atonement, The Day (Yom Kippur). The high priest killed the victims for sacrifice both for himself and for the people, and the most solemn moment of all was that when he disappeared within the veil bearing the blood to sprinkle on the mercy seat. The scape goat was driven to the wilderness bearing the sins of the people, and the carcasses of the sin-offering victims were burnt outside the camp. The ceremonies of this great day over, the people went away with peace of mind and heart because they knew their sin was 'covered'.

The author of Hebrews' favourite reading and meditation was in the Pentateuch and Psalter. The Pentateuch was the fundamental book of Law, and the Psalter the book of common devotion. For him the Law was the constitution under which the people worshipped. Man desired to enter into communion with God, and the book of the Law prescribed for him the way of approach to the Holy God.

We do not know when he became a Christian, whether when he was young, or later in life, but the impression the whole epistle gives is that he grew gradually into the new religion beholding the old illuminated before his eyes as he grew more and more into the knowledge of Jesus Christ and His work for men. There is nothing to suggest a sudden violent life-transforming experience marking the end once and for all of one kind of life, and the beginning of the new, as

it was in the case of St. Paul. The author of Hebrews never felt that the worship of the old covenant had tricked and deceived him. As he dwells on its sacrifices and means of grace to the people, there is no suggestion of disappointment with it and of bitterness towards it. Its inadequacy he is the first to admit, its sacrifices could not cleanse the conscience, it failed where its help was needed most. But it had been a shadow of the good things to come. It had been throughout the ages the agent to bring the worshipper into a full consciousness of what he needed - forgiveness of sins, peace and communion with God. The ministry of priest and High Priest and the sacrifices for sin kept alive and deepened men's consciousness of sin and brought home to them the hard fact that access to God's immediate presence was not yet possible for them. Was the veil that hung between the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies not a constant reminder to them of this? The conception of God was still the Sinaitic conception - God in His holiness terrible and dreadful cannot be approached by man engulfed in his uncleanness and sin. In the coming of Jesus, and supremely, for the author of Hebrews, in His sacrificial death, Himself both priest and victim, the way into the Holy of Holies had been opened, and He had entered in as the ἀρχηγός the captain or pioneer, and πρόδρομος the forerunner into the Father's presence,

where he now sits at the right hand of God, having accomplished his priestly work. He did what no priest before him ever did, he became *ἀρχηγός* and *πρόδρομος* the implication being that the worshipper may follow him into God's presence, because the blood of his sacrifice avails to cleanse the conscience, and thus cleansed the worshipper has access to the very presence of God. As the Gospels put it, on the day of the Crucifixion of our Lord, the veil of the Temple was rent, and thus the Holy of Holies became not the place which the High Priest alone, with fear and trembling entered once every year with the blood of the sin-offerings, but the place into which all men, priestlike, have access in virtue of the self-oblation of Jesus Christ.

The realisation of what Christ had accomplished by His priestly work, brought the need of the sacrifices and ritual of the old covenant to an end. They were a "parable" and a "shadow" of the good things to come, and when the reality has come, the shadow must flee before it. This is the argument of the epistle from beginning to end, all that was shadowed forth in the Law and its ordinances, has come in its fullness and glory in Jesus Christ. God had spoken in scattered accents in the Old Testament *πολυμερῶς καὶ ἠσπασμένως*, but in Christ the full revelation has come,

1) Math XXVII. 51
 Mark XV. 38
 Luke XXIII. 45.

God has in the end of these days spoken in a Son. The Son is the High Priest who has offered the ideal sacrifice in the ideal tabernacle, and the offering is once for all (*ἑφάπαξ*), it need not, it cannot be repeated, and access to God's presence is vouchsafed to the worshippers in His name. The Law as a shadow has been eclipsed and set aside by the light of the new covenant inaugurated by Christ, and it would be ignorance and foolishness to practise the Law's ordinances under the new and better covenant.

The Law as a system of worship is evidently the sphere of the author of Hebrews' interest, and not the Law as moral which is the side of the Law in which St. Paul is interested. The ritual Law as a system of worship leads the worshipper to the altar, and via the Priest into the Holy of Holies. This is the path along which the author of Hebrews takes his readers 'looking unto Jesus the author and perfecter of our faith' (XII.2). It was the path along which he and his readers in their pre-Christian days had found peace of soul, having been cleansed from their defilements, temporary and shortlived though that peace had been in their hearts.

In the Pauline epistles the way traversed for the attainment of peace with God is very different, it was a harder and more rough way which Paul in his pre-Christian days had traversed, and a way so far from bringing peace

at all, but rather led him deeper into despair. St. Paul was a son of the synagogue where the parchment rolls of the Torah were kept and read to the people. From their reading Sabbath after Sabbath, the commandments of the Law were brought home to Paul, and his conception of religion was the Pharisaic conception - fulfilment of the letter of the Law both written and oral. There was no righteousness apart from the fulfilment of the Law's commands, and to fail in one of the Law's commandments was to fail in all.

Of this conception of religion there is no trace in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The author of Hebrews' conception of religion is a Temple or, more correctly, a Tabernacle one. He is a preacher or expositor of scripture like anybody else in the synagogue, but for him peace of mind had come by the ministry of altar and priest. At the altar, God is the person of the priest and high priest called the worshipper to draw nigh unto him with repentance bringing his offering, and the worshipper went away with the peace of God in his heart. The author of Hebrews had often seen a peasant entering Jerusalem with the best of his flock to offer for himself and his family, and as soon as the worshipper saw the smoke of the sacrifice ascending over the sacred place, his best given to God, he was confident

that he and his family were accepted of God, and with joy and peace he returned to his cottage bringing with him the peace of God to his household. The whole of the epistle to the Hebrews reeks of sacrifice, and from beginning to end the author keeps before the reader's eye the whole Old Testament background of a Temple or Tabernacle, and altar, and offering, a priest and the offerer.

While he teaches that in Jesus Christ, the High Priest after the order of Melchizedek, the Law and its ordinances have been fulfilled, and now must pass away, there is no disparagement of the method of approach to God under the old covenant, much less antagonism between the two ways of approach. In fact, there are no two ways, no old and new way, the way is one and the same under the old covenant and the new - the way of sacrifice on the altar, and the entry of the High Priest into the Holy of Holies with the blood of the sacrifice. The difference between the way of approach to God under the old and the new is not one of kind, but efficiency. The former was imperfect, the blood of bulls and goats could never cleanse the conscience and make perfect communion finally with God possible for the worshipper. But the blood of Christ avails for the cleansing of the conscience, and through His ministry men are brought into the very presence of God. In all the ritual and ordinances of the Law, the author of Hebrews saw the promising

light of Jesus Christ, and Christ came as the fulfilment and perfection (Τελέωσις) of the Old Testament types.

2)
When the author of Hebrews met Jesus, he was illumined, he saw in Him the fulfilment and perfection of what he was so familiar with through the worship and ritual of the Law. But when Paul met Jesus on the Damascus road, his experience was very different. Paul was struck with blindness, and this bespeaks a different attitude to the Law in Paul and Hebrews. The author of Hebrews is an evolutionist or rather perhaps a typologist. In Jesus Christ he saw the fulfilment of the Law, i.e. realisation in substance of what old time institutions and instruments had more or less dimly or clearly foreshadowed.

St. Paul on the other hand had been brought up in the synagogue, and his conception of religion was the synagogue one. In the synagogue there was no altar or priest, and as the worshipper entered, his eye fell on a chest containing parchment rolls of the Torah, and around these rolls of parchment which occupied the place of the altar, the congregation assembled Sabbath by Sabbath to pray and to listen to the scriptures being read and expounded to them, not by a priest, but by a minister or any person judged competent so to do. For the synagogue worshipper

2) Heb. VI. 4. For as touching those who were once enlightened...

who heard the commandments of the Law Sabbath after Sabbath, going up to the feast in the Temple, much as he prized the opportunity of doing that, was a secondary thing to the moral duties of religion. In the synagogue the Law was presented as a code of duty, whereas in the Temple or Tabernacle the side of the Law in prominence was the provision it made for the people as a worshipping people drawing near to God by the way of the altar and sacrifice with the blood of the sacrifice cleansing them from sin.

The synagogue was the sphere of influence of the Pharisees and as St. Paul tells us he was 'as touching the Law a Pharisee'³⁾. He had been trained in the legalism of the Jewish religion, and just as the author of Hebrews, keenly interested~~ed~~ as he was in the sacrificial side of the Law, brings this special interest to bear eminently upon his interpretation of the Gospel, so Paul brings his special interest in the Law as a means of attaining righteousness before God to bear eminently upon his interpretation of the Gospel.

As St. Paul makes perfectly clear in the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians, the regulating principle in his pre-Christian religious life was that he who keeps

3). Phil. 111. 5. "The Pharisees made the Law the centre of all their activity. To them belonged the scribes who copied the Law and explained it, - the oral law." Oesterley and Robinson History of Israel 413.

the Law is rewarded, and he who does not keep it is punished. "To him that worketh, the reward is not reckoned as of grace, but as of debt." To this ideal of performing the whole Law Paul had given himself entirely and unreservedly, and at the very time of his conversion he was bearing upon himself permission to arrest the Christians whom he believed to be a menace to the Jewish religion and blasphemers of God.

The experience of the Damascus road came to Paul as a life transforming experience. Henceforth he is done with his pre-Christian life, and is reorientated in that experience for a new kind of life in which the centre of gravity has been shifted altogether from observation of the Law as a means of justification before God to God's grace or graciousness justifying (*δικαιοῦν*) the sinner not on the ground of his own achievements in relation to the Law, but solely on the ground of the sinner's faith in Christ. Paul is a conversionist, he breaks with the old life, and defines the Gospel by contrast with the Law, and for him they are mutually exclusive. In this he is very different from the author of Hebrews, whose doctrine of Law is much more restrained. He too uses contrast in his definition of Law and Gospel, but Law and Gospel for him are not

4). Rom. IV. 4.

anti thetical as in Paul, inasmuch as the Law was in a very real sense the shadow of the Gospel. "Hebrews attaches greater importance to the connection between the old and the new covenants, it emphasises more strongly the typological character of the Law, and it regards the Old Testament faith as more akin to the New Testament." ⁵⁾ In the observance of the Law Paul had gone to extreme lengths, seeking peace of mind which he now found out the Law could never give. The Law had made him the persecutor and enemy of the true people of God, and Paul can never forgive the Law for this. Because of this bitter quarrel with the Law, Paul puts the Gospel over against it, and defines it in opposition to it. Christ has become the end of the Law for Paul, because he inaugurated a new way of righteousness by faith which had abolished the legalism which misrepresented God's dealing with the race, but for the author of Hebrews, Christ is the end of the Law, because he fulfilled perfectly the Law's intentions.

It must, however, be borne in mind, as Professor ⁶⁾ Kirk points out, that St. Paul in his diatribe against the Law has more in mind than the Mosaic Law. While his primary reference is to the Mosaic Law "he is using it simply

5). Olaf Moe Article on Law, ⁴N.T. Dictionary of Apostolic Church 692.

6). Epistle to the Romans Clarendon Bible 69 f.

as a typical example of the moral law as such, and we can rightly understand the works of the Law to apply to both Jew and Gentile in the sense of all moral effort considered in itself apart from the dispensation of grace. St. Paul's purpose in fact, is to expose the futility of moralism, the inevitable failure of every attempt, Jewish and pagan alike, to live by a code of rules.^{7.} As Sidney Cave observes⁸ "it was not the ceremonial law as such which oppressed him, it was the law as a system of commands. The tyranny of the Law was for him the tyranny of legalism, that conception of God's dealing with men which demanded what could never be fulfilled - that a man should earn by obedience to the law "a righteousness before God." For Paul the whole principle of the Law is wrong. It was based on the legalist idea of recompense for keeping the commandments, and penalty for not keeping them, and keeping the law is the very thing man cannot do for he is in bondage to sin.

It is little wonder that, Paul adopting this attitude towards the Law, few of his Jewish opponents found his arguments convincing. No Jew would be ready to admit that God's grace and mercy were foreign ideas to him, and that he purported to be saved by his own works alone. The Jew, as the prophets and Psalms demonstrate, put his trust

7. Epistle to the Romans, Clarendon Bible 70.

8. The Gospel of St. Paul 132.

in God's mercy. "What Paul really does is to abstract the dominant principles of Judaism from their concrete setting and press them to their logical conclusion. His criticism shows clearly enough the influence of the two-age doctrine. As the old age and the new are set over against each other in sheer opposition, so also are their respective religious institutions—the Law and the Gospel. On the one side lies the reign of recompense and the flesh, on the other, the reign of grace and the spirit. There we have a ministration of condemnation, here of righteousness. There all is bondage and here all is liberty, there the passing, and here the abiding." St. Paul's conception of the Christian life is that of a life of complete freedom from the flesh and the Law, a freedom brought about by his mystical union with Christ in His death and resurrection. It is the divine life in man. 'I live, yet not I, but Christ lives in me.' Here we detect a difference between Paul and the Epistle to the Hebrews, and we may also add, James. The author of Hebrews agrees with Paul that the old covenant has been abrogated, but he presents the abrogation as due not to the fact that the new is radically different from the old, but that the old is imperfect and only a shadow of that which is perfectly realised in the new covenant. The author

of Hebrews and James are not done entirely with the idea of Law as conceived by Paul, they regard the Christian life as the faithful and continued observance of God's will by which a man finally secures salvation. Under the new covenant men are saved by faithful and continued obedience and by patient endurance to the end. In Hebrews salvation is thought of more as a future blessing than as a present possession as in Paul. In Hebrews faith, on which he lays great stress, is little more than a motive which leads men to become disciples of Jesus Christ, to obey the Law of God, and to endure in the great enterprise to the end. There is little of what faith meant to St. Paul in the Hebrews conception. For Paul faith was a most profound spiritual act by which he identified himself with Christ in his death and resurrection. It was that which effected the union of himself with Christ (*ἐν Χριστῷ*). Thus we find Paul setting faith and Law in opposition, an idea which is totally absent from Hebrews.

While Hebrews does not speak of the Christian being 'in Christ' as St. Paul does, he does speak of Christians as 'partakers of Christ' (*μέτοχοι γὰρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ γεγονήμεναι* 111.14) and as 'partakers of the Holy Spirit' (VI.4) and as 'partakers of God's holiness' (XII. 10.). But it is of interest to note that in 111.14, and XII. 10. the author

is thinking not of the present state of the Christian but of the state he will reach if he endures to the end. The Christian in Hebrews is not so prominently as in Paul in possession of present salvation, and consequently here and now 'in Christ through faith in Him.'

There is no Law in the new covenant for Paul, it is all of grace, and God's will is performed by men not by observance of Law, but in and through the divine life in them. For the author of Hebrews however, the new covenant is at once of Law and of Grace. The new covenant will put God's law in the people's minds and write it in their hearts, and by its observance people will be saved, and their sins, will be forgiven. This is in keeping with the continuity and oneness which the author of Hebrews stresses between the new and the old covenants. They are in principle the same, but whereas the old is imperfect and a shadow, and new is perfect. The experience of the author of Hebrews with the Law had not been like St. Paul's, and the part of the Law abrogated by Christ for him was the sacrificial and ritual part, a part of the Law with which Paul is not consistently concerned. For Paul the Law had been a source of the knowledge of sin, an irritant to sin, and a murderer of hope, and in his epistles he ascribes to it the same function as the moral education of mankind. For these reasons St. Paul declares that the Law and the religion

of the Law must go. The author of Hebrews too has arrived at the same conclusion, - the Law must go but he has arrived by a different way. He has gained his insight into the transient character of the Levitical religion, and the surpassing glory of Christianity, not through a fruitless attempt at keeping the Law with Pharisaic scrupulosity, but through a mental discipline enabling him to distinguish between shadow and substance, symbol and reality. It would perhaps be true to say that Paul speaks of the Law too much as a whole, as was natural to one who had passed through his experience. He tried to make the Law everything, and having failed, he went to the opposite extreme, and pronounced it nothing. "Paul said the Law must be everything in salvation, or nothing. To the Judaistic compromise, Law and Grace, he replied by Either-or, Either the Law or Grace, choose your alternative. The same Either-or reappears here (i.e. in the Epistle to the Hebrews) in an altered form. Either perfection must come by the Levitical Priesthood, the soul or kernel of the Law, or that priesthood must pass away as unprofitable and give place to a different order of priesthood which can perform the task for which it had been found incompetent. And 'the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the Law' (V11.12)

10. A.B. Bruce. The Epistle to the Hebrews 264.

The central thought of the Epistle to the Hebrews is the High Priesthood of Christ, and around this thought the whole epistle turns. The High Priest and his ministrations under the first covenant shadowed forth the ministry and work which Jesus Christ has accomplished once for all.

In the account of the Tabernacle and its ritual and worship the author of Hebrews finds the illustrations with which he expounds to his readers the work of Christ as Priest. He wants them to see, as he has seen, that the ordinances of the Law for worship are no longer necessary, for their day and function is over, since what they prefigured and pointed to has come in its fullness and glory in and through the ministry of Jesus Christ.

Turning to St. Paul, it is remarkable that despite the fact that he often insists on the mediatorial work of Christ, he does not once call him "Priest" or "High Priest." We have seen that he makes sparing use of sacrificial terms compared with the author of Hebrews, although there are times when he too must go to the Temple, and only the language of the altar and of atonement suffices for him to express his thoughts. But while the author of Hebrews writes to Jewish Christians, St. Paul turns his energies to the Gentiles, and consequently he had no occasion to labour the fulfilment

of the sacrificial system, and of the priesthood in Christ. It may well be that he deliberately avoided developing his soteriology in this direction owing to the danger of misapprehension on the part of his Gentile readers to whom sacrificial terms might have conveyed impressions reflected from their heathen surroundings. But the feeling forces itself upon us, that the deepest reason why St. Paul does not emphasise the fulfilment of the sacrificial system and of the priesthood in Christ is that he was a synagogue man, and a Pharisee, and consequently did not naturally think in sacrificial and altar terms. That aspect of the Law had largely receded into the background for him, and the Law was presented in the synagogue more in the fashion of a moral code to be obeyed.

The whole of the Epistle to the Hebrews on the other hand suggests that its author was more acquainted with the Temple than with the synagogue. The imagery he uses to convey his thoughts are those of the altar, the sacrifices and the priesthood. The oneness and continuity of the old and the new is thus much more evident in the epistle to the Hebrews than in Paul. His conversion divides Paul's life into two separate parts. Goguel remarks that "under the influence of the thought of Jesus Paul saw his ^hParisaical assurance of salvation by keeping of the Law crumble within

11. In revue D'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses p. 30.

him. It has been said, and rightly that conversion implied for Paul a transposition of values. One would say with equal justification that its consequence was a reversal of the movement of the moral and religious life. In Saul the Pharisee it was from obedience to the Law towards salvation. In the Apostle it was directed from salvation not yet completed, but nevertheless already real, to an obedience to the Law of God made possible only by the Spirit creating in the believer a new creature". Before his conversion Paul was a slave to the Law, but as a Christian he realised the tremendous truth that fundamentally a legalist religion, a religion which puts its chief stress on obedience and finds its motive power in Laws, cannot be ultimately satisfactory. As a Christian the motive power of Paul's religion was not Law, but love of Christ.

CONCLUSION.

From our study of the Law in the Epistle to the Hebrews and in Paul, it has become clear that the two writers were interested in different aspects of the Law. This difference of interest is accounted for by the religious experience through which each had passed, and by the situation with which each was confronted amongst those to whom he wrote. The author of Hebrews was an evolutionist, a believer in development, and this unbroken development he traced from the Old Testament, coming into its crowning and final perfection in the revelation of God in Jesus Christ. The Law foreshadowed in all its sacrifices and liturgy the perfect offering of Jesus Christ, and the perfect mode of worship which he has made possible for men. The worship of the first covenant was a shadow of things to come, and by the coming of Jesus Christ the shadow has been replaced by the reality and truth. The author of Hebrews harbours no antagonism towards the Law, but rather speaks with reverence and affection of its ministrations.

St. Paul's religious history on the other hand, had been very different. He is a revolutionist. Before his conversion he had sought by observance of the Law, to attain righteousness before God. But his experience at the

hand of the Law proved hard and bitter, and after his conversion he renounced completely his former method, and the Law became in his estimation a deceiver and murderer of hope. Thus we find in Paul the antithesis of Law and Gospel. The aspect of Law with which Paul deals is not the sacrificial and worship, but rather the Law as a moral code, the observance of which accumulated righteousness for the observer. For Paul, after his conversion, no observance of the Law can make him 'righteous', his righteousness is in Christ in whose name alone man is accepted of God.

St. Paul was writing in the main to Gentiles and the Jews he addressed were people whose interest in the sacrificial side of the Law was little or none. The Judaizers were eager to impose certain rites of the Law, e.g. circumcision, on the pagan converts coming into the Church, maintaining that observance of the Law, together with the stipulations of the Tradition of the Elders must be observed before membership of the Church is secured. But for St. Paul 'Christ is the end of the Law', and he throws the Church open to the Gentiles on an equality with the Jews. Continually in Paul's epistles the Law is viewed from the Pharisaic standpoint - it is a body of injunctions, observance of which earns justification on the ground of merit, and failure to observe it brings punishment.

For the author of Hebrews too 'Christ is the end of the Law'. In fact the principle underlying the argument

in the Epistle to the Hebrews and in St. Paul, particularly in the Epistles to the Galatians, and Romans, is the same, namely the sufficiency and the efficacy of Christ. The Law had come in as a parenthesis (Rom. V. 20) it was not meant to abide, it was a ^{12.} *Mittelstation*. The End of the Law, its substance and reality for both writers is Jesus Christ, Although they have travelled by a different road, they have arrived at the same point.

In the two writers we find two complementary aspects of the Law. For Paul it was a body of commandments imposed on man's obedience, while for the author of Hebrews it is a system of ritual provided by God's mercy. For Paul before his conversion, it had been life under external statutory authority, but as a Christian it was life under inspiration. For the author of Hebrews it had been life under the shadowy, the unreal, that which could bring nothing to perfection, while under the new covenant it was life under the real, the eternal, that which makes perfect for ever. Both reveal how the Law fails to satisfy man's need. It had served its purpose in preparing the world for Christ, and like all outworn things it must now take itself off the stage. In the new age, under the new covenant, it has neither place nor right.

12. Holtzmann Neutestamentliche Theologie 11. 35.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALEXANDER, J.P. A Priest for Ever London 1937
- APPEL, H. Einleitung in das Neue Testament 1922
- AYLES Destination Date and Authorship
of the Epistle to the Hebrews London 1899
- BACON, B.W. The Priesthood without a Pedigree.
Expository Times XIII. May 1902
- BACON, B.W. Jesus and Paul London 1921
- BADCOCK, F.J. The Pauline Epistles and the
Epistle to the Hebrews in their
Historical setting. London 1937
- BARTH, K. The Epistle to the Romans.
Trans. by
E. Hoskyns London 1933
- BELKIN, S. Philo and the Oral Law. The
Philonic Interpretation of
Biblical Law in Relation to
the Palestinian Halakah. Cambridge Mass. 1940
- BLUNT, A.W.F. The Epistle of Paul to the
Galatians. (Clarendon Bible) Oxford 1925
- BURKITT, J.V. "Paul" Encycl. Britt.
Vol. XVII. 14th Edition.
- DU BOSE The Gospel according to St.
Paul New York 1906
- DU BOSE High Priesthood and Sacrifice
Longman's Green 1908
- BRANSCOMBE, B.N. Jesus and the Law of Moses London 1930
- BREHIER, E. Les idees philosophiques et
religieuses de Philon
d'Alexandrie Paris 1908

- BURTON, E. A Critical Exegetical Commentary
on the Epistle to the Galatians.
I.C.C. Edinburgh 1921
- BOX, G.H. Article "The value and signifi-
cance of the Old Testament in
relation to the New Testament"
in 'The People and the Book'
Edited by A.S. Peake.
- CALVIN, J. Commentary on the Epistle of
Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews.
Trans. by
J. Owen Edinburgh 1853
- CAVE, S. The Gospel of Paul London 1928
- CURTIS, W.A. Jesus Christ the Teacher. A
study of His Method and Message
based mainly on the earlier
Gospels London 1943
- DALE, R.W. The Jewish Temple, and the
Christian Church. A series of
discourses on the Epistle to the
Hebrews. London 1880
- DAVIDSON, A.B. The Epistle to the Hebrews.
(Handbook for Bible Classes) Edinburgh 1882
- DAVIDSON, A.B. The Theology of the Old
Testament.
Edited by S.D.F. Salmond. Edinburgh 1904
- DAVIDSON, J. An Inquiry into the Origin and
Intent of Primitive Sacrifice,
and the Scripture Evidence
respecting it London 1825
- DEISSMANN, A. St. Paul. A study in Social
and Religious History London 1912
- DELITZSCH, F. Commentary on the Epistle to the
Hebrews. Trans. by
T.L. Kingsbury
2 Vols. Edinburgh 1868
- DENNEY, J. The Death of Christ, its place
and interpretation in the New
Testament London 1902

- DODS, M. The Epistle to the Hebrews
(Exposit. Greek Testament Commentary)
- DODD, C.H. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans
(Moffat Commentary) London 1933
- DODD, C.H. The Bible and the Greeks London 1935
- DODD, C.H. The Apostolic Preaching and its
Developments London 1936
- DORNER, J.A. History of the Development of the
Doctrine of the Person of Jesus
Christ Edinburgh 1861
- DRUMMOND Philo Judaeus 2 Vols. London 1888
- DEANE, A.C. St. Paul and His Letters London 1942
- DALMAN, G. Jesus-Jeshua Trans. by
Livertoff S.P.C.K. 1929
- EDWARDS, T.C. The Epistle to the Hebrews
(Expositor's Bible) London 1888
- EICHRD, D.W. Theologie des Alten Testaments Leipzig 1939
- EVERETT, C.C. The Gospel of Paul London 1893
- FAIRBARN, P. The Typology of Scripture 2 Vols Edinburgh 1870
- FAIRWEATHER, W. The Background of the Epistles Edinburgh 1935
- FEINE, P. Theologie des Neuen Testaments Leipzig 1910
- FIELD, J.E. The Apostolic Liturgy and the
Epistle to the Hebrews London 1882
- FINLAY, G.G. Epistle to the Galatians LONDON MCMX
- FORSYTH, P.T. The Person and Place of Jesus
Christ London 1909
- GAYFORD, S.C. Sacrifice and Priesthood London 1924
- GLOVER, T.R. Paul of Tarsus London 1925
- GOODENOUGH, E.R. By Light, Light New Haven 1935
- GOODENOUGH, E.R. An Introduction to Philo
Judaeus New Haven 1940

- | | | | |
|-----------------|---|-----------|--------|
| GORE, C. | Epistle to the Romans 2 Vols. | London | 1900-1 |
| GRAY, G.B. | Sacrifice in the Old Testament | Oxford | 1925 |
| GOGUEL, M. | L'Evangile et la Loi. Revue
d'Histoire et de Philosophie
religieuses 1937 20-30 | | |
| GARDNER, P. | The Religious Experience of Paul
Williams and Norgate | | 1911 |
| HEADLAM, A.C. | A Critical and Exegetical Commen-
tary on the Epistle to the
Romans. With W. Sanday | Edinburgh | 1930 |
| HICKS, F.C.N. | The Fullness of Sacrifice | London | 1930 |
| HOLTZMANN, H.J. | Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen
Theologie | Tubingen | 1911 |
| JULICHER, A. | An Introduction to the New
Testament Trans. by J.P. Ward | London | 1904 |
| KENNEDY, H.A.A. | Philo's Contribution to Religion | London | 1919 |
| KENNEDY, H.A.A. | The Theology of the Epistles | London | 1919 |
| KELLY, W. | An Exposition of the Epistle
to the Hebrews | London | 1905 |
| KLAUSNER, J. | From Jesus to Paul | New York | 1943 |
| KIRK, K.E. | The Epistle to the Romans
(Clarendon Bible) | Oxford | 1937 |
| KNOX, W.F. | St. Paul | London | 1932 |
| KNOX, W.F. | St. Paul and the Church of
Jerusalem | Cambridge | 1925 |
| KNOX, W.F. | St. Paul and the Church of
the Gentiles | Cambridge | 1939 |
| KURTZ | History of the Old Covenant
Trans. by
J. Martin | Edinburgh | 1859 |
| KENNEDY, H.A.A. | St. Paul and the Law
Expos. XIII | | |
| LAKE, KIRSOPP | Paul, his Heritage and his
Legacy | London | 1934 |

- LIGHTFOOT, J.B. Notes on Epistles of St. Paul London 1895
- LIGHTFOOT, J.B. St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians Cambridge 1876
- LIGHTFOOT, J.B. St. Paul's Epistle to Philippians Cambridge 1878
- LIGHTFOOT, JOHN The Temple Service as it stood in the days of our Saviour London 1671
- LUNEMANN Handbook to the Epistle to the Hebrews Trans. by R.M.S. Evans Edinburgh 1882
- LOEWE, H. (Editor) Judaism and Christianity Vol.II The Contact of Pharisaism with other Cultures.
- MACGREGOR, G.H.C. Jew and Greek: Tutors Unto Christ. The Jewish and Hellenistic background of the New Testament, with A.C. Purdy London 1914
- MACHEN, J.G. The Origin of Paul's Religion London 1921
- MACKINTOSH, R. Christ and the Jewish Law London 1886
- McFADYEN Through Eternal Spirit Edinburgh 1924
- MACNEILE, H.L. The Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews Chicago 1914
- McNEILE, A.H. The New Testament Teaching in the Light of St. Paul's Cambridge 1923
- McNEILE, A.H. Introduction to the New Testament Oxford 1927
- MANSON T.W. A Companion to the Bible Edited by T.W.M. Edinburgh 1939
- MOFFATT, J. Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament Edinburgh 1912
- MOFFATT, J. The Epistle to the Hebrews (I.C.C.) Edinburgh 1924
- MONTEFIORE, C.G. The Old Testament and After London 1923
- MONTEFIORE, C.G. Judaism and St. Paul London 1914

- MORGAN, W. The Religion and Theology of Paul Edinburgh 1917
- MOORE, G.F. Judaism in the first Centuries of the Christian era. 3 vols. Cambridge 1927-30
- MILLIGAN, G. The Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews Edinburgh 1899
- MENEGOZ, F. La Theologie de l'Epitre aux Hebreux Paris 1894
- MENEGOZ, F. L'Evangile et la Loi. Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses 1937 - 2-19
- MOFFATT, J. Paul and Paulinism 1910
- NAIRNE, A. The Epistle of Priesthood Edinburgh 1913
- NAIRNE, A. The Epistle to the Hebrews (The Cambridge Greek Testament) Cambridge 1917
- NAIRNE, A. The Alexandrine Gospel (Sirach, wisdom, Philo, The Epistle to the Hebrews) London 1917
- NARBOROUGH, F.D.V. The Epistle to the Hebrews (The Clarendon Bible) Oxford 1930
- OESTERLEY, W.O.E. The Jewish Doctrine of Mediation. London 1910.
- OESTERLEY, W.O.E. (Editor) Judaism and Christianity Vol. I The Age of Transition.
- PEAKE, A.S. The Epistle to the Hebrews (Century Bible) Edinburgh 1907
- PFLEIDERER, O. Paulinism Trans. by E. Peters 2 Vols. Edinburgh 1877
- PLUMMER, A. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on I. Corinthians with A. Robertson (I.C.C.) Edinburgh 1911
- PULLAN, L. The Books fo the New Testament London 1901
- RAMSAY, W.M. A historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians London 1899.

- TAYLOR, V. Jesus and His Sacrifice London 1937.
- TAYLOR V. The Atonement in New Testament Teaching London 1940.
- TAYLOR, V. Forgiveness and Reconciliation London 1941.
- VAUGHAN, C.J. The Epistle to the Hebrews 1890
- WARFIELD, R.B. Article on 'Christ our Sacrifice' in Princeton Theological Review July 1917
- WELCH, A. The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews Edinburgh 1888
- WEISS, B. Handbuch über der Hebräerbrief Gottingen 1888
- WEISS, J. Paul and Jesus London 1909
- WESTCOTT, B.F. The Epistles to the Hebrews London 1892.
- WESTCOTT, B.F. The Epistle to the Ephesians Cambridge 1906
- WESTCOTT, F.B. St. Paul and Justification London 1913
- WESTCOTT, F.B. The High Priesthood of our Lord as set forth in the Epistle to the Hebrews Cambridge.
- WEINEL, H. St. Paul, the Man and his Work London 1906.
- WREDE, W. Paul Trans. by F. Lumnis London 1907.
- WILLIS, E.F. The Worship of the Old Covenant, considered more especially in relation to that of the New Oxford 188P.
- HASTINGS Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels
- HASTINGS Dictionary of the Bible.
- HASTINGS Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics.

Old Testament and New Testament Revised Version.

Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint.
 Edited by H.B. Swete.

Dictionary of Apostolic Church.

JOSEPHUS	Antiquities.	Loeb Class.	Library.
PHILO	Colson and Whitaker	"	"
JEROME	Selected Letters	"	"