

# THE DAY OF ATONEMENT.

(LEV. XVI.)

ADMITTEDLY the English Bible of A.D. 1611 is the best of the various translations which had been made, by conveying the spirit of the original as well as having an accuracy beyond the others. Yet of necessity there is with any translation an impossibility of carrying over precisely some of the delicacies of thought and figures of speech expressed in the original, because the translators are hampered by the vocabulary and also by the idiom of the language into which the translation is to be made. Hence, when dealing with a matter of such importance as the passage before us, the need of considering the peculiar point and force of the words in which the instruction is given, and of giving full value to the pictorial character of Hebrew, the language chosen in God's overruling providence as the means in Old Testament times through which to make His mind known. Otherwise a danger exists lest the direct teaching be lost and the divine record obscured ; then when doctrines are based upon the translation without recourse to the original, we cannot be surprised at disas-

trous results. Of this, the popular conception of "the atonement" furnishes a particular example. Therefore in taking up this question we are compelled to turn to the original Hebrew and weigh with due care the words selected by the Holy Ghost. (1 Cor. ii. 13.)

Atonement is clearly the basis of the old covenant, which, as we shall see, was provisional and prospective; essentially in contrast to reconciliation, the culmination of the new in virtue of the accomplished death of Christ. Reconciliation is substantive and abiding, for the pleasure of God. All distance has been removed and the will of God established—really the full scope of the gospel. The word reconciliation occurs a few times in our translation of the Old Testament, but strictly it belongs to the new covenant only. And the word "atonement" is once found in Romans v. 11, but "reconciliation" in margin, for in English they were then synonyms, though in the original never.

Any ordinary dictionary meaning given for atonement will not, under the circumstances, be of any avail. We are obliged to refer to the Hebrew Bible, and there we find in Genesis vi. 14, when Noah is commanded to make an ark of gopher\* wood, as a way of

\* The Lexicon can give nothing but conjecture as to gopher; personally I have reason to think that in it is

salvation from the judgment about to fall upon mankind, he is told to "pitch it within and without with pitch"—whatever the actual pitch may have been. This has no connection with the pitch of Exodus ii. 3 or elsewhere. In that verse is the simplest form of a verb chosen by the Spirit of God, of which the root meaning is "to cover," though as far as translation goes is there no doubt rightly translated pitch—the sentence reading literally, "thou shalt cover it within and without with the covering." This verb with its cognate noun is used only that once in its simple or root form, but in its intensive or official form and translated "to make atonement," it is employed as the keynote in the ritual connected with the priests' office. No one except a priest was allowed by God to make atonement, or, as the underlying force of the word truly is when coupled with the preposition "upon," "to put a cover upon" a sinner, that which would shield him from being consumed in the presence of the holiness of God represented by the ark† of the testimony in the

a reference to the word for "dust," "dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return." (Gen. iii. 19; 1 Cor. xv. 47, 48.)

† The ark of Noah and that in which Moses was laid (Exo. ii.) is a word without a history, and altogether different to that for the ark Moses was commanded to make in Exodus xxv.

holies of holies, Jehovah's throne and dwelling-place\*. Therefore we can quickly see that this intensive form is brought into use at the establishment of the priesthood in Exodus xxix, used eight times in that section, and to that office and connection it is confined. Though to translate it into English by saying, "to put a cover upon" a person, a literal and material act, might be misleading, for the Hebrew word is used purely in a moral sense, not in a material sense, and consequent upon the priest having sprinkled the blood of the victim—not upon the sinner, but upon the *altar*. "To make atonement," equally a moral expression, may serve as a translation, and be countenanced by other versions, but it carries a different idea and is by no means equivalent to a word which essentially means "to cover." The old English "to atone" is nothing more than "to set at one," at first being written in the two separate words, and thus as a matter of fact the term "to make atonement" involves rather the result intended, while the original speaks only of the process to bring about such an end.

It is, however, interesting and instructive

\* "Tabernacle" of Exodus 25. 9 is a "dwelling-place," cognate noun of "to dwell" in verse 8 and from that point constantly used, eventually to be fulfilled in Revelation xxi. 3.

to observe that the first time the form of the word under consideration occurs, and indeed the only occurrence before the establishment of the priesthood, is in Genesis xxxii. 20. There it is translated, "I will appease him with the present," that is, Jacob says, I will put something between me and Esau as a cover or shield or protection. I do not doubt it is used in that narrative to teach us the force of the word, before it is taken up by the Spirit in the law of Moses in its specific and technical usage. How truly is Genesis the beginning of everything !

Not, of course, that we can speak of appeasing God. There is no such thought in scripture, but the incident becomes illustrative in a dim way of the necessity of something being brought in, or better, Someone, to remove the distance that existed between God and men. Not to bridge it, but to abolish it, so that in full result fear would be cast out by perfect love.

The direct meaning of the word is further emphasised by the preposition *'y*, upon, constantly attached to it. A cover placed upon or over anything or anybody is plain enough for a child to understand, and it is so put in Exodus xxx. 10, "Aaron shall make an atonement upon [put a covering upon] the horns of it once in a year with the blood of the sin offering

of atonements"; and again in verse 18 of our chapter. Although "for" has more frequently taken the place of "upon" in our Bible, which in a way is to be regretted, because losing something of the exactitude of the original. Thus the priest's office, as standing between Jehovah and the people or a sinner, was to receive and deal with the blood of the victim in a prescribed manner—"for the life of all flesh is the blood thereof," and the blood was given by Jehovah "upon the altar to make an atonement for [strictly, to be a covering *upon*] your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for [is a covering upon] the soul." (Lev. xvii.)

The death of a victim "without blemish," and its blood as the evidence of death, was ordained by God as typical of that one death and blood-shedding of Christ, for there was never a death like that one, which was actually to take place when "in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." (Heb. ix. 26.) Meanwhile it was accepted by Jehovah so that the offerer could have a sense of forgiveness and deliverance. The eight times repeated formula, "it shall be forgiven him," in the ritual of the sin and trespass offerings, has rather the force of "lifted off him"—he would be free of the burden of the sin. Does not this find its answer in the

Apostle Peter's words, one brought up under the old covenant, but who now rejoiced in the glory of the new, when he wrote of "the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot," and of Him "who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree"? (1 Peter ii. 24.) These words take us back to the beginning in Genesis ii. 17, when the tree was made the test of man's obedience, the measure of his responsibility—the failure of which has been met vicariously in that "one offering" and discharged once and for ever.

This brings us immediately to our subject, for the day of atonement goes farther and deeper than the offerings of the first division of this book. (Chaps. i. to vii.) As we have noticed elsewhere, the setting of a scripture has its own lesson and significance, and markedly is it so with the day of atonement, and which must be properly regarded.

For in the opening of the book God shews His desire to be approached, and prescribes the sacrifices by means of which a man might draw near and know his acceptance (chaps. i. to iii.); sacrifices also are provided to meet particular sins and trespasses which would otherwise hinder approach. Following upon this Aaron and his sons are set apart as the priesthood, for the purpose that there should

be those who had understanding of what was due to God, those who could “put difference between holy and unholy” (chap. x. 10), and thus “the due order” of approach be properly maintained, and the people held in relation to Jehovah in an outward way. In the order of the book, then is dealt with, under the type of leprosy, the inward principle of sin in the flesh; that active, subtilely working principle ever and again arising and shewing itself in different forms or degrees, as well as in a variety of ways. The issues and the outgoings of the flesh, even according to nature, as thus poisoned at their source, are noted in chapters xii. and xv., for they all have to be met with the “cover” or “blood of atonement.”

But Aaron’s two elder sons—the best of flesh—quickly proved their insensibility to the holiness of God by offering “strange fire” (chap. x. 1), bringing upon themselves summary judgment. It was summary, yet not arbitrary, for they had missed the meaning of the instruction given them in chapters viii. and ix. and its connection with the seven days “atonement,” which had been made for or upon the altar (Exo. xxix. 36), and also the significance of the change of word when Jehovah gave in commandment the law of the burnt offering and the “burning upon

the altar" (Lev. vi. 9), already referred to in "The Meat Offering" paper, page 6, a word never employed in connection with the burning of the sacrifices, but with the fire of divine judgment, as in Deuteronomy xxxii. 22<sup>\*</sup> and Isaiah xxxiii. 14. All this is intended to mark off and give character typically to the death of Christ. The question of the creature's responsibility, and so of sin, is a more far-reaching one than the enemy has beguiled men into allowing. That He, a divine Person in manhood, spotless and holy, should become the "Lamb of God" is a conception beyond our comprehension, and therefore in the typical system is carefully guarded lest its unparalleled uniqueness be in any way degraded to a human level. So the altar itself was made a spot "most holy," that is, apart from every thought of flesh.

It is after this, the springs within and the issues without being taken into account, and flesh proved unfitted for the presence of Jehovah, as being altogether unclean and unholy, with the judgment of death resting upon it, that in divine patience and forbearance Jehovah speaks to Moses in chapter xvi., and institutes an ordinance to be carried out on a particular day once a year—the tenth day of the seventh month. It was to be an "everlasting statute," when an atonement of such a kind would be made, as to enable Him to

look upon the people as “clean” (ver. 30), and in righteousness bear with them for another year.

What then is the teaching of this momentous climax of the sacrifices of the law of Moses, the centre of instruction in the Book of Leviticus? For this day has been regarded by Jews down to the present time with peculiar sacredness, even by those who pay but scant regard to all else. Primarily, it seems to me, in answer to our question, that it is patent the claims of God could not be dismissed or waived, and to prove Himself “a just God and a Saviour,” as the prophet Isaiah proclaims later (chap. xlvi. 21), these solemn ceremonies are enjoined for the tenth day of the seventh month. Ten, the number of man’s responsibility Godward, and seven suggests the completion of time, or “end of the world,” as the expression runs in Hebrews ix. ; and so “an atonement was made,” or covering placed upon the people once a year. In the day of atonement the position of the people under God’s eye was summed up in its totality and dealt with year by year, in view of that moment when every type and shadow would be eclipsed and surpassed by Him who “through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God.” We must ever bear in mind, “whatsoever things were written

aforetime were written for *our* [emphatic pronoun] learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope." (Rom. xv. 4.)

Afterwards we can consider its present bearing, and if now we look at this chapter, a section in itself, we shall see the type sets out in the fullest and clearest manner the distance man is from God by reason of sin and the judgment of death ; while at the same time by the Person and work of our Lord Jesus Christ that distance was to be removed.

In the first place, what is so noticeable on the surface as one reads the passage is the prominence of Aaron. He, the high priest, and no one less than he, was to do what was never to be done on any other day of the year ; he was to go "within the veil before the mercy seat" into the very presence of Jehovah, though not without the blood of a bullock\* for a sin offering for himself, and the blood of a goat for a sin offering for the people, to make an atonement. When that part of the work was completed he was to come out and send away the live goat into the wilderness bearing upon him "all their iniquities"—again the thought of the "within and without."

\* In the bullock is typified the subdued steadiness of step.

However, before touching the detail of the day's ceremony, I am compelled to call attention to what is half the secret and the emphasis of the ritual, which of necessity is lost in translation, because apparently no connection exists between "to make atonement" and the word "mercy-seat." Whereas in the original that connection is the gist and point of the ceremony. The word mercy-seat and the noun atonement are both derived directly from the root כִּפְרָ, kah-phar, to cover, translated in its intensive form "to make atonement." The mercy-seat being כֶּפֶרְתָּ, kap-po-reth, or the place where "the atonement is made," or covering put; and the noun atonement is כְּפָרִים, kip-pu-rim, "atonement" or covering. The latter is used first in Exodus xxix. 36, also in the expression "a day of atonement" (Lev. xxiii. 27), and altogether eight times in the law of Moses. In Leviticus, only in this chapter is the mercy-seat spoken of, and that seven times, while the verb is employed sixteen times, of which seven occurrences are with the preposition על, upon. Each of these numbers carries its own significance. It is necessary to see this connection of the words, for how can we understand the statute unless we know the meaning and the value of its terms?

Taking now the particulars of this solemn ceremony step by step, we find in the opening sentence explained the reason why and the moment when Jehovah spoke to Moses, and he is charged to "speak to Aaron thy brother," a term not frequently used, but one that brings into view the relationship between himself and Aaron, suggestive, I think, of what comes to light later in the prophet Zechariah xiii. 7, "the man that is my fellow, saith Jehovah," and so too the relationship revealed in John's writings, in "the Father and the Son." Next, for the work here typified to be effected, the garments of the high priest "for glory and for beauty" must be laid aside, and garments of fine linen, holy garments, must be taken up, and a sin offering come before a burnt offering. This day was not one of display and outward glory, but one of humiliation, and afflicting of their souls ; or, as the Spirit says of it in Hebrews x. 3, "a remembrance again of sins every year"—literally, "a calling to mind of sins yearly."

As we read the chapter, we notice without difficulty there are two principal and distinct parts of the work Aaron had to carry out, though the one is directly the outcome of and dependent upon the other. The first part, the basis of all, is the double sin offering, of which the blood was taken within the veil

into the immediate presence of Jehovah and sprinkled under the eyes of the cherubim, upon and before the mercy-seat with his finger seven times ; and the second part, the sending away into the wilderness of the scapegoat. During the first part Aaron was absolutely alone. “There shall be no man in the tabernacle of the congregation when he goeth in to make an atonement in the holy place, until he come out.” This surely is typical of the three hours of darkness when Christ “was made sin” and bore its judgment—quite beyond the creature’s comprehension. The second part when having put the blood of the sin offerings between Jehovah and himself and his household and all the congregation of Israel (ver. 17), he with “both his hands upon the head of the live goat,” confessed upon him all the iniquities of the children of Israel and all their transgressions in all their sins, and sent him away into the wilderness (ver. 21)—graphic, simple, and yet how deep the meaning as we view it all in the light of the death of Christ !

This double sin offering of the bullock and the goat, while adequate witness that, in type, the judgment of death had been executed, has doubtless also a dispensational bearing, because the bullock which Aaron took for himself (ver. 3) he offered for himself and for his

house (ver. 6) and sprinkled with his finger its blood upon the mercy-seat eastward, and before the mercy-seat seven times. After that the goat of the sin offering for the people was killed and its blood taken "within the veil" and sprinkled in the same manner. Also upon the horns of the golden altar the blood of the bullock and of the goat was put, and too was sprinkled upon it with his finger seven times, as if to teach that the flaming sword of the cherubim at the east gate of the garden would be met and the way into the presence of God perfectly cleared ; for the cherubim were "woven" in the workmanship of the veil also. The sin offering of the bullock would suggest the present dispensation when the church, typified by Aaron and his house, enjoys (or may enjoy) all the blessings resulting from the death of Christ, and beyond death in full communion (the golden altar) have access to the tree of life. The sin offering of the goat, which was distinctively for the people, would look forward to the world to come when Israel will be publicly restored and brought into their blessing upon the earth. But deliverance and communion, whether for us or them, is on the ground of that one death and bloodshedding, coupled with the surpassing wonder of the vicarious identification of Christ, in divine love, with all that which

was to be judged and finally put out of sight. This is a matter quite beyond human conception, but plainly taught in the words, "Aaron shall bring the bullock of the sin offering, which is for himself, and shall make an atonement for himself, and for his house," typical, yet in contrast to Christ personally sinless, and afterwards "the goat of the sin offering, that is for the people." It is summed up in the apostle's doctrine when he says, God "hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin" (2 Cor. v. 21)—we can but bow our heads, as the Jew will in the coming day, when he takes Isaiah liii. on his lips.

Combined with this, in the type, is the secret of His Person, for before the blood is taken "within the veil," Aaron is instructed to take the censer filled with burning coals of that holy fire from off the altar, and sweet incense beaten small to put upon it, in order that the cloud of incense might meet the cloud of Jehovah's abiding presence on the mercy-seat. In the cloud of incense was the fitness and perfection, typified in the burnt offering and the meat offering.\* In that suitability Aaron went in with the blood of the bullock and then with the blood of the goat, the life, man's life being forfeited to God, to meet that other cloud, so that all due to the holiness and

\* See the papers on these offerings by A. J. M.

righteousness of God was recognised and maintained. No one less than He, in manhood, and yet who is God. One who could say, I “a man” (John viii. 40), and equally “Before Abraham was [came into existence], I am” (ver. 58)—no one less than He could be antitype of such a type, the one cloud to meet that other cloud of intrinsic holiness. Not many words in the instruction, yet how exact and explicit ! May not the cloud also indicate how God had had to “hide his face,” and in that way give the faith character of the time, until the display of His glory which is to cover the earth as the waters cover the sea ? (Hab. ii. 14 and Isa. xi. 9.)

The going within the second time (ver. 15) though divided from the first, is as closely as possible linked with it, because they are looked at as one (ver. 17) in that he was to be alone “when he goeth in . . . until he come out, and have made an atonement for [or put a covering upon] himself, and for his household, and for all the congregation of Israel.”

That part of the day’s ceremony, the taking the blood within the veil, being concluded, so that atonement was made for the holy place, the tabernacle and the golden altar, or communion God-ward re-established for the people ; then outward expression was given to the value of what had been done within, by Aaron

bringing the live goat and with both his hands upon its head confessing over or upon him all the iniquities of the children of Israel and all their transgressions in all their sins, typically to transfer them from the people on to the goat, and "send it away into the wilderness," "to a land not inhabited," a land of separation as the margin more exactly gives it. As far as a type could go, to shew the outward result was commensurate with the inward. That completed, Aaron had to put off the linen garments, bathe his flesh in water and put on the usual priestly garments, that he might offer his burnt offering and the burnt offering of the people and make an atonement for himself and for the people. (Ver. 24). A ram in each case carries the thought of matured energy. (Heb. v.) May not this change of garments suggest, though hardly typify, resurrection, and find its answer in "the linen clothes" left in the sepulchre of John xx. ?

After that, the fat of the sin offering was burnt as incense upon the altar, but "their skins and their flesh and their dung was burnt [consumed] in the fire without the camp." Again the "within and without." A statute for ever, three times repeated, was this day of atonement to be, for a covering to be placed upon the people of such a kind,

as that Jehovah could regard them as clean from all their sins (ver. 30) ; while on their side it was to be a sabbath of rest and an afflicting of their souls, as they solemnly realised that a work was being done on their behalf and an offering made, in which they took no part—the high priest did all.

Having gone over the ceremonial instructions, let us consider the spiritual teaching of this rite for us to-day. In its completeness we are taught how the authority and the rights of God have been upheld, and yet a way made to the tree of life. How that flaming sword of the cherubim turning every way has been sheathed, as it were, in the body of Christ and communion with God restored. *His* blood being shed, death has come upon and ended for ever in God's eye the old order and condition of the race proceeding from the first man, Adam. In that flesh and blood order "he took part," or laid hold of (Heb. ii. 14), but did not share in common. In order that we might understand the judgment of God has been fully carried out, not in us, but vicariously in Christ, the holy and spotless One, and then what is beyond the type, in His resurrection, how another order of man and another world where sin can have "no place," has been brought into view for faith. This is the Apostle Paul's "gospel of the grace

of God" by which we learn how grace is reigning through righteousness ; his argument being based on the mercy-seat and the day of atonement, now fulfilled in the death of Jesus. But if *He* went into death we have to realise that death having no claim upon or right to Him, it was not possible for death to hold Him ; He must come forth in resurrection. In Him is life. Thus His resurrection means what no type could teach, that all which had been typically "covered" by the blood of the sacrifices has been now actually covered and left behind in His death and burial—never again to appear.

The flood of Noah and the full year he was in the ark with the eight souls who stepped out on to a cleansed earth, referred to by Peter, is the nearest picture of the judgment of death and the resurrection that is given. (1 Peter iii. 21.) And in that connection it is to be recollected that no trace whatever of antediluvian architecture or monument of any kind, literary or otherwise, has ever been discovered. God swept the earth by the deluge in such a manner as that every vestige of man's handiwork was caused absolutely to disappear. Fittingly, therefore, from a clean earth did the burnt offering ascend to Jehovah with "a savour of rest," as it looked forward to the present dispensation, which is in the

full light of accomplished redemption—"the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." Our day, with "glad tidings" of universal bearing—"through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins," (Acts xiii. 38), or better as Acts ii. 38, "remission of sins," because that is the real thought—they are blotted out, as Isaiah xlivi. 25.

Four hundred years ago when the English translations were being made, forgiveness and remission were synonyms, that is, meant the same. Since those days a distinction in their use has developed.

In that phrase, "remission of sins," the Spirit employs the one word, only and always, which I have no doubt is borrowed from its use and force in LXX of Leviticus xvi. 26 in connection with the live goat. Otherwise the old covenant was marked by the phrase, "it shall be forgiven him," in the ordinance of the sin and trespass offerings, in the singular; but when the new is established, "remission of sins" in the plural is the proclamation. It is striking that the one phrase in the singular is used eight times, and in contrast also eight times in the plural, the Lord Jesus pronounces "thy sins are forgiven," or, strictly, remitted, with the additional force of never again to be called in question—remission in the most unqualified sense. It is interesting

that our translators used “remission” on the first of its twelve occurrences. (Matt. xxvi. 28.) We can easily see the difference—if I do you an injury and you forgive me, you cannot cause it or its effects to disappear entirely, but in the death of Christ, sin and all its consequences have gone in divine judgment and are put out of sight for ever ; while in His resurrection another world beyond the reach of sin with another order of life has been brought into existence, not yet displayed, but made known “for the obedience of faith.” That we should forgive one another is right enough, as Ephesians iv. 32, still the word “forgive” is not connected with sin in the New Testament ; sin—God alone can deal with. Under the law the priest never pronounced forgiveness ; until the Lord Jesus came no one could say “Thy sins are remitted,” and then only He, no apostle ever did that. The saints unitedly have acted in the light of the new covenant and in that way have remitted sins by receiving into communion or fellowship, as was done to Saul of Tarsus in Acts ix., but no individual can take that place. Forgiveness, precisely, is connected with the old system ; remission with the work and Person of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Having noticed the prominence of Aaron, so too must be noted how all this day’s cere-

monies had to do with God immediately, even the two goats were distinguished by lots being cast (Prov. xvi. 33), "one for Jehovah and the other for the scapegoat." This latter is spoken of four times and in the margin of verse 8 the Hebrew name is given, to represent which Tyndale doubtless coined the word scapegoat in his Bible of A.D. 1530, and it has never been bettered. Scapegoat (the shortened form of escapegoat, or the goat of going away, escaping) is the literal translation of the Hebrew name, for the verb does not carry exactly the idea of a destination to be reached, but simply a going away and disappearing from sight. Not a commonly used verb, though a good illustration of its value, is found in 1 Samuel ix. 7, where Saul says, "the bread is spent in [marg., gone out of] our vessels"—it had been there, but is there no longer. That is just the force of scapegoat, and foreshadows the Latin-English word remission, preached to-day consequent upon the fulfilment of the type.

The two goats must be viewed as one, or rather two aspects of one, in that the dead goat could not carry away the sins. The second is explanatory of the first, for the death of the bullock and the one goat, which speaks of the closing up of all activities and responsibilities of flesh, the double sin offering

or fulness of death, made it possible for the live goat to be sent away, carrying out of sight and memory all that had necessitated the death of the other. In the future, death and the grave will be cast finally into the lake of fire. The Spirit's argument in the Epistle to the Hebrews is, "If the blood of bulls and of goats could sanctify to the purifying of the flesh, how *much more* the blood of Christ"; therefore for us there is an eternal redemption, a purged conscience and the knowledge that "by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." (Heb. x. 14.) There can be "no more offering for sin."

The thought of the death of a victim without blemish, typically sinless (though Christ personally was made sin and fully bore its judgment) has been the basis of the scheme of God from the moment when sin came in and He commenced the work of man's salvation by making for Adam and for his wife coats of skins and clothing them. In other words, when they had lost their garment of innocence, He covered them with what was obtained through death, before in righteous government they were driven out of the garden. This is elaborated in the law of Moses, particularly in the day of atonement, the lesson book in which we may learn the meaning of that death of Christ.

Wonderful it is to see in the overruling of God how accurately in Him is focussed the fulfilment of every type and shadow of the offerings, culminating in the day of atonement—the bullock and the goats combined—how He was cast out, suffered without the gate, and His precious blood shed ; Himself withal the high priest. This is as far as Leviticus can go. “Crucified by the princes of this world,” truly, but He was not buried by them ! When men and the power of darkness had been allowed to do their worst (Luke xxii. 53), and the wrath of God had been fully borne vicariously, and He entered into the penalty of death, then God, as it were, came in, and that holy body was cared for by hands of reverence and piety, and placed in a suitable tomb, never afterwards seen, save by the eye of faith.

Further, the figure of a “cover” is one running throughout scripture from God’s action in clothing or covering Adam, while in no way altering or abating His judgment of death, and so foreshadowing the burnt offering and the sin offering. Then there was the covering of Noah in the ark, then the blood of the passover lamb which covered the people, so that Jehovah “passed over” them when He smote the land of Egypt, and lastly the day of atonement. All of which, I take it, David had a deep sense of appreciation in saying,

"Oh, the happiness of forgiven transgression, covered sin!" (Psa. xxxii. 1, literally.)

The Apostle Paul, our apostle, quotes this psalm in Romans iv. to emphasise the measure and the sense of deliverance we should enjoy, since the mind and the will of God has found expression and been established in the death of Christ. "For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified, whereof the Holy Ghost is witness to us." (Heb. x. 14.) The Apostle John confirms this from another standpoint, for he writes (1 John ii. 12) to those whose sins have been remitted (using the same word as the Lord used) and among whom there are varied stages of spiritual growth, and says of them, "as he is so are we [present tenses] in this world." (Chap. iv. 17.)

In short, all that had been "covered" by the blood of the sacrifices now has been dealt with and put out of sight in the death of Jesus "through the blood of the everlasting covenant." (Heb. xiii. 20.) There had been "the passing over" (marg. in Rom. iii. 25) of sins, but now the removal in righteousness of all that made necessary His death; while in His resurrection all that is new and holy has been brought into view with a world "where evil enters not," and all will take character from the second Man.

Hebrews has been said to be our Leviticus,

it is in fact a great deal more, because the climax of Leviticus, the day of atonement, was to be repeated once a year, while Hebrews shews us how all the types have been fulfilled and in resurrection a new position established, "the first taken away." Also that "we have such an high priest," One who has accomplished such a work that there can be "no more offering for sin." Indeed, in chapter x. 17 the Spirit Himself explains the thought of remission by the words, "their sins and iniquities will I remember no more," giving a present application to the prophecy of Jeremiah, who speaks of a new covenant yet to be made with the house of Israel and the house of Judah (chap. xxxi. 31), when they will see that the question of "their iniquity and their sin" has been settled, no more to be raised.

For us the hope of Ezra and Nehemiah is fulfilled, the "priest with Urim and Thummim has stood up" in resurrection, and we spiritually can "reckon our genealogy." This it is which underlies Hebrews i. and ii.—chapter i. the Urim, or light of God in Christ as Son ; chapter ii. the Thummim, or perfection of Christ in manhood, the One fitted "to make reconciliation [rather atonement] for the sins of the people" (ver. 17), and whom now "we see crowned with glory and honour." (Ver. 9.)

Light and perfection is the meaning of the two Hebrew words.

I think we may justly regard the two epistles quoted, Romans and Hebrews, as the two foundations of "the apostles' doctrine." In them only is the mercy-seat mentioned (Heb. ix. 5 and Rom. iii. 25), though in the latter place the word is translated "a propitiation." In Romans the sin of man is reviewed with God's dealing in government and His judgment of death. At the same time in setting forth Christ Jesus as a mercy-seat, He has proved His righteousness, and yet His forbearance in "passing over" the sins of the past. In this way He has given clear evidence that "He is just [righteous] and the justifier of him who is of the faith of Jesus," and then too, atonement fulfilled, through Him the risen Lord "we have now received the reconciliation." (Rom. v. 11.)

In Hebrews is taken up the great salvation which began to be spoken of by such an One as described in chapters i. and ii., and who has become "such an high priest" for us who believe. One who can sympathise and who can save to the uttermost; while we on our side, in virtue of His blood, have perfect freedom to enter God's holy presence. (Chap. x.)

One more point is connected with this type

which must not be overlooked. On the day of atonement every fiftieth year the trumpet of the jubilee was to sound throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof, and every man was to return to his possession. Liberty was proclaimed to all. (Chap. xxv. 9.) Every bond and obligation or sale was brought to a conclusion, so that there was a general restitution with a fresh start made by each returning to his inheritance. The fiftieth day, or "new meat offering," has been fulfilled in Pentecost (Greek for fiftieth) (Acts ii.), which introduced the present dispensation, and so for us the fiftieth year, in that all the past has been closed up and left behind in the death of Christ, with a wholly fresh start granted, that we might "walk in newness of life." (Rom. vi. 4.) Also the fiftieth year will yet be fulfilled literally when Israel will be nationally restored to their inheritance and Christ reigns publicly. (Rev. xi. 17.) All is awaiting the display of the glory of that throne in righteousness transcendent, based upon the day of atonement. "The throne is established in righteousness." (Prov. xvi. 12.)

Thus we see God was able to accept as a cover upon the people the blood of the sacrifices, because they all pointed on to that one death and blood-shedding of Christ. On their side they were reminded by this solemn ceremony

that no offence or sin was disregarded, but all was covered or atoned for. That was the spirit of the old covenant which has found its consummation in the death of Christ. Covering or atonement marked the old, but remission and reconciliation mark the new. On the one hand in that death the old order has been covered and removed from under the eye of God ; on the other hand, the new covenant in His blood has been established. And in His resurrection, which is beyond the type, a new world where sin can never come is brought into being with a new order of which He is the Firstborn actually as well as morally. From whom in glory the Holy Spirit has come down and the ministries of the new covenant and of reconciliation committed to Paul, with the climax, "a man in Christ." That, however, lies beyond Leviticus xvi.

As the outcome of this contemplation, may we be filled with joy and peace in believing (Rom. xv. 13), and our souls rejoice in the consciousness of "that world and the resurrection from the dead" spoken of by the Lord (Luke xx. 35), and so not miss "the present truth." (2 Peter i. 12.)

*Ilford.*

ARTHUR J. MARKS.

PRICE TWOPENCE.

G. MORRISH, 20, Paternoster Square, E.C.4.