

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

ART. II.—THE SACERDOTIUM OF CHRIST.

PART III. (*concluded*).

WE have now seen how the passing from the Old Covenant to the New is through the grand *opus operatum*—the one perfect sacrifice of Christ, and this as perfectly offered on the Cross. Are we then to suppose that the truth and reality of propitiatory sacrifice, which belongs not to the earthly priesthood, but to the heavenly, is to be sought and found, not above, but below, offered not in heaven, but on earth? Even so. For so it was ordained in the hidden wisdom of God.

I cannot think that any real difficulty is to be found in the words, "If He were on earth, He should not be a priest" (viii. 4). It would surely be a mistake to argue from this that Christ's Priesthood cannot have had its starting-place in this lower world. The contrast is between the priests of the earthly shadows, whose very Holy of Holies was but an earthly type, and the true Priest whose throne and eternal function is in the highest Heaven.¹ That One true High Priest might still have the sacrifice, which is the ἀρχή of His *sacerdotium*, offered upon earth²—not, indeed, within the sphere of the

¹ On this subject see Aquinas, "In Ep. ad Heb.," cap. viii., Lect. I., Com., vol. iii., pp. 283 *sqq.*; Paris, 1874.

"*Si ergo esset super terram.* Subaudi sacerdos terrenus secundum ordinem Aaron."—Primasius, "In Ep. ad Heb.," "In Bibl. Max.," tom. x., p. 264. See especially Deylingius, "Observ. Sacr.," Par. iv., p. 558; also some valuable observations of Gouge, "On Heb.," vol. ii., p. 162, Nichol's Series. See also "Death of Christ," pp. 54-73.

² So Dean Jackson: "By this *one act* [the bloody offering of Himself] of His priesthood He was consecrated to be an everlasting Priest. And if He be an everlasting Priest, He still executes the office or function of an high priest" ("On Apostle's Creed," Book X., chap. lvi., Works, vol. ix., p. 604; Oxford, 1844). And again: "After He was thus consecrated *by death* . . . to be an everlasting Priest after the order of Melchizedec, He was not to offer any sacrifice" (*Ibid.*, p. 605). See "Doctrine of Sacerdotium," p. 75.

So also Bishop Jeremy Taylor, whose language is sometimes at least incautious: "This sacrifice, because it was perfect, could be but *one*, and that *once*. . . Christ was made a priest for ever; He was initiated or consecrated *on the cross*, and there began His priesthood. . . . It began *on earth*, but was to last and be officiated in heaven" ("Holy Living," chap. iv., § 10, Works, vol. iii., p. 214; edit. Heber).

So Brevint: "When He offered Himself in the *lower part of this world*, the upper part of it felt the strength of His sacrifice. . . . So, now that He is in heaven . . . these low and remote parts . . . feel His intercessions from above" ("Missale Romanum," p. 147; Oxford, 1673).

Thus it was well said by Bishop Beveridge: [Atonement, reconciliation, etc.] "were all merited for us 'by the sacrifice of the death of Christ,' and are bestowed [upon us by means of that intercession which

earthly priesthood—not in the precincts of the earthly sanctuary, but “without the camp.” How, indeed, could that sacrifice—the offering of which involved of necessity an *outcasting unto death*, as of a “worm and no man”—have had its place in Heaven?¹ The sacrifice was indeed upon earth, and the oblation was from earth (this is certainly the teaching of this Epistle), and the Priest who offered was then upon earth. But that sacrifice was offered for acceptance and was accepted, not in the earthly tabernacle (where priests offer gifts according to the law; who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things), but was accepted in Heaven itself by Him who dwells in the high and holy place, and who forthwith calls Him, who has offered as Priest after the order of Melchizedec, to take His seat above upon His Priestly throne.²

In point of time, we may perhaps be right in dating to the very same supreme moment (1) the offering and accepting of the One all-sufficient Sacrifice for sin, (2) the rending of the veil, (3) the establishment of the New Covenant in which is brought into view a New Mediator (“the Mediator of the New Covenant,” Heb. xii. 24), now in our human nature (“made like unto us in all things, sin only except”), to be forthwith officially recognised as the newly-begotten Son of God (“declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the

He continually *maketh for us in heaven*, by virtue of the said sacrifice which He once offered up to God for us when He was *upon earth*” (“Church Catechism Explained,” Sect. III., Works, vol. viii., p. 119, A. C. L.).

“His oblation was to be on the earth, but the continuation of the discharge of His office was to be in heaven.”—Owen, Works, vol. xxiii., p. 34; edit. Goold.

“In terra . . . moriebatur, sed vis et efficacia mortis ex cœlo manabat.”—Calvin, “On Heb.,” viii. 4, Op., tom. vii., p. 552; Amst., 1667.

¹ As regards this matter, it is truly said by Principal Edwards: “When the Apostle speaks in this passage (Heb. ix. 28) of Christ’s being once offered, he refers to His death. The analogy between men and Christ breaks down completely if the death of Christ was not the offering for sin. Faustus Socinus revived the Nestorian doctrine that our author represents the earthly life and death of Jesus as a moral preparation for the priesthood which was conferred upon Him at His ascension to the right hand of God. . . . But if Christ was not Priest on earth, His death was not an atoning sacrifice. If He was not Priest, He was not Victim” (“Ep. to Heb.,” p. 169).

Delitzsch has well said: “To instruct concerning that priesthood of Jesus Christ, which, *commencing in His cross* and passion here below, is continued above in a glorious exaltation . . . this is the aim and subject of the whole Epistle” (“On Heb.,” chap. vi. 20, sqq., vol. i., p. 322, E. T.).

² *Νῦν δὲ ἀπέθανε μὲν, ἵνα τὴν θυσίαν προσενέγκῃ, ἀναστὰς δὲ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνελήφθη, ἵνα σχοίῃ τύπον τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἵνα αὐτὸν ἱερεύσῃαι δὲ ἱερεύσῃαι δὲ νόει, τὸ ἐπιτυχάγειν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν* (Chrysostom on Heb. viii. 2 sqq.). See also Ecumenius on Heb. viii. 4.

Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead," Rom. i. 4, *Πρωτότοκος*¹ ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, Rev. i. 5), and to be officially invested with the high dignity of the New Priesthood of the New Order (howbeit of an order older than Aaron), to be a Priest for ever, before whom all other priesthood passes quite away, the Priest made with the solemn oath of Jehovah, the One Divine Priest after the order of Melchizedec. (Compare Heb. vii. 21, 23; viii. 6; ix. 15, 17; x. 9, 10, 16, 18, 29; xii. 24; xiii. 20.)

But in the order of causation it can scarcely be doubted that we are to recognise the Blood, that is the Sacrifice, the Atoning death ("for the redemption of the transgressions which were under the first Covenant," Heb. ix. 15; see "Doctrine of the Death of Christ," p. 63), as that which is first and foremost, and the foundation of all that we look upon in connection with it. It is the peace-making Blood of the Cross. It is from that alone that we have remission of sins. And it is the remission of sins which is the entrance into the New Covenant. It is in that Blood that Christ was "brought again from the dead"² (Heb. xiii. 20). It is through that Blood that He entered into the Most Holy Place (Heb. ix. 12) to sit down on the right hand of God. It is the Blood of the Covenant whereby we are sanctified (*i.e.*, accepted to draw near among the holy things, Heb. x. 29).³ It is in that

¹ Bishop Westcott says ("On Heb.," i. 6, p. 23): "The patristic commentators rightly dwell on the difference between *μονογενής*, which describes the absolutely unique relation of the Son to the Father in His Divine nature, and *πρωτότοκος*, which describes the relation of the risen Christ in His glorified humanity to man. . . ." Compare Bishop Lightfoot, "On Coloss. i. 15."

Augustin's "Hodiernus tuus æternitas, ideo coæternum genuisti, cui dixisti, *Ego hodie genui te*" ("Confess.," Lib. XI., cap. ix., § 16, Op., tom. i., c. 200; Paris, 1679. See also "Enchirid.," chap. xlix., § 14, tom. vi., c. 215) was a natural adaptation of the words of the Psalm to a signification which they were hardly intended to convey. See Westcott, "On Heb.," i. 5, p. 21.

² See "The Death of Christ," pp. 57, 58. The following words of Chrysostom should be well noted, as indicating the true connection of (1) Sacrifice, (2) Remission, and (3) Covenant: *Ἐποκοῦν ἀφῆκε τὰς ἁμαρτίας, ὅτε τὴν διαθήκην ἔδωκε ἡ τὴν δὲ διαθήκην διὰ τῆς θυσίας ἔδωκεν.* (In Heb., Hom. xviii., § 1, Op., tom. xii., p. 175. Ed. Paris, 1735). Chrysostom adds immediately: *Εἰ τοῖων ἀφῆκε τὰς ἁμαρτίας διὰ τῆς μᾶς θυσίας, σὺκέει χρεία δευτέρας*—deducing an obvious corollary, which would warrant quite as obvious a deduction, excluding all *continuation* of sacrifice.

³ In Heb. x. 29 and xiii. 12 we have mention of the blood of the Covenant. In both passages it is set before us as the means of *sanctification*. Archbishop Saumarez Smith observes that "in both passages the context indicates that the term 'sanctification' should be taken to refer not to an *inherent* but to a *relative* holiness. A relation of acceptable service is the immediate consequence of pardoned guilt" ("Blood of the New Covenant," p. 22). See Westcott, "On Heb.," ix. 13, p. 261.

Blood that we have *παρρησία* to enter into the Holiest (Heb. x. 19). And we may doubtless say, in a very true sense, that it is because of the Blood¹, that is the *opus operatum* of the One Sacrifice, that the word is spoken which openly recognises and solemnly establishes the Priesthood² of the New Covenant—the word of the oath which abolishes all other priests, and all other offerings for sin—saying to the Son, “Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec.”

I am far from being insensible to the objections which may probably, at first sight, present themselves in the minds of some to the acceptance of this view. But I submit it for careful and devout consideration. It is as if the Father—looking upon the perfect sacrificial work of the Son, the work for which He had been sent into the world—seeing the true ideal of sacrifice accomplished in the death of Christ, and recognising in that the true and perfect fulfilment of all that was shadowed forth in the sacrificial work of the priests in the earthly sanctuary, and so of all that was required in His eternal purpose to be accomplished for man's redemption, therefore accepting Him and His sacrifice, invests Him solemnly with High-priestly dignity, and confers upon Him the everlasting priesthood, not to offer for sins, not to repeat or continue or add anything to His finished sacrifice, but *because* of his one full and perfect sacrifice for sins once offered, to sit down, a Priest upon His throne, till all His enemies be made His footstool.³

The sayings and doings of the great forty days seem very clearly to indicate that the disciples were then already within the covenant of remission and peace. Was not the Saviour's “Peace be unto you” a bestowal of that which He had purchased with His blood, and brought up with Him from the grave? Did not their investment with the ministerial power of remission imply that remission was already obtained, and obtained to the full? Can we suppose that there

¹ So Theodoret recognises that Christ receives the title of High Priest as the consequence of the sacrifice offered already, not as the qualification for offering in the future: *Ἀρχιερέα δὲ τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν προσηγόρευσεν, ὡς τὴν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν προσενηνοχότα θυσίαν* (“In Heb.,” cap. iv., Op., tom. iii., p. 570; edit. Noesselt; Halæ, 1771.)

² The *διὰ τοῦτο* of ix. 15 clearly connects the mediatorship of the New Covenant with Christ's offering of Himself to God. The office is, in some sense, the result of the sacrifice. And this view is confirmed by the context following, which again clearly connects the New Covenant with the death of redemption.

³ “When Christ suffered on the cross He became a sacrifice of atonement for our sins; and there could be no greater argument that God had accepted it than His receiving the Priest that offered it into heaven” (Stillingfleet, Sermon XL., Works, vol. i., p. 616; London, 1710).

was then a shadow of separation between them and their reconciled Father in heaven—now their Father as His Father, and their God as His God? Surely they were already within the New Covenant of peace, and under the sunshine of its blessedness, though having yet to await for awhile for the showers of its blessing, and the power of its resurrection life, and the fulness of its wondrous gifts for men.

That interval of waiting, while the Priest-King, having finished His work, remains in the land of His outcasting, amid the scenes of His suffering and victory, absent from the throne of His glory, away from the glory of His throne—that interval separates them, indeed, for a little while from the fulness of the blessings which are to follow on His triumphal return, when, as King of Glory, He shall enter, leading His captivity captive, ascending up far above all heavens, that He may fill all things, and be the Head over all things to His Church. But in that interval He could say already, "All power is given unto Me in heaven and earth,"¹ and in that power could give to His apostles their commission, as ministers of the New Covenant, to proclaim the Gospel of His salvation to all the world.

It is not meant, indeed, that the fulness of the blessing of the New Covenant was dispensed in its abundance immediately on the establishment of that covenant of blessing; nor that

¹ "The day of His resurrection is the day wherein the dignity of everlasting priesthood is actually collated upon Him, and as He Himself testifieth, *All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth*. And if *all power*, then as well the power of priesthood as the power royal. And as High Priest, He gives commission to His disciples to teach and baptize. The day of His ascension, or placing at the right hand of God, is the day of His solemn enthronization, and immediately upon this He sends forth *the rod of His strength out of Zion*" (Jackson, "On Creed," Book IX., chap. xxviii., Works, vol. viii., p. 383; Oxford, 1844).

It would certainly be a mistake to argue from "the word of the oath" (Ps. cx. 4) following in the Psalm after the word, "Sit Thou on My right hand, until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool" (verse 1), that the priesthood must have been conferred after the session. Heb. vii. 26, 27 certainly seems to show the sacrifice to be a *High-priestly function* of "the Son." And Heb. x. 11-14 seems quite as certainly to make the date of the oblation of this sacrifice to be antecedent to the fulfilment of the prophetic word in Ps. cx. 1.

It seems needless to add to this argument. It will be seen that the words of the Psalm, as rightly understood, do not at all necessarily lead to such a misunderstanding as is here in view. See Revised Version of verses 1 and 4.

"Intelligitur Dei Filium tum, cum ad vitam immortalem e mortuis resuscitatus esset, ad Sacerdotium sempiternum plane consecratum fuisse. Neque enim dubium, quin *τελειωθεῖς* idem hic sit, quod *consecratus*, ac quidem plenè et perfectè."—Outram, "De Sacr.," Lib. II., cap. i., p. 273; Amst., 1688.

the Mediator of the New Covenant was forthwith, on His acceptance as Mediator, put in possession of the full glory pertaining to His mediatorial office ; nor that, as High Priest of the new law, He attained to the fulness of His Royal dignity as Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec, before His session at God's right hand ; nor that, as the Lord mighty in battle, He received the full fruits of His victory, and was glorified with the glory which He had before the world was, until, on His triumphant entry into the Heavenly City, as One who had overcome, He sat down with His Father, on His Father's throne.

Far be it from us to aim at deducting anything from the glory of the glorious Ascension of our Victorious Redeemer ! And it is no part of our duty or our desire to make a contention about the mere meaning of words. If there are those—as we doubt not there may be—who, meaning *this*, and *only this*,¹ prefer to express their meaning by saying that Christ was *invested* with His Royal *sacerdotium* when He ascended into Heaven, to sit on His throne of glory, we need have, and desire to have, no controversy with such on this matter.

¹ In this sense, I trust, we may understand what Bishop Westcott says : "The offering of Christ upon the cross was a high-priestly act, though Christ did not become 'high priest after the order of Melchizedec'—that is, royal High Priest—till the ascension" (p. 197). But the following seems more difficult of explanation : "From this passage [vi. 20] it is clear that the eternal high-priesthood of the Lord 'after the order of Melchizedec,' king and priest, followed on His exaltation to the throne of God in His glorified humanity" (p. 164).

I can hardly understand how this deduction is to be seen as a necessary result of the language used in chap. vi. 20 ; while it seems to be contradicted by the natural, if not necessary, deduction from chap. x. 12, as read in connection with verse 11, as well as from vii. 27.

More accurately, as it seems to me, Alford says : "We must of necessity determine (against the Socinian view of Christ's high-priesthood . . .) that His high-priesthood was, strictly speaking, begun, as its one chief work in substance was accomplished, here below, during His time of suffering" (On ii. 17, p. 54).

Bishop Westcott adds, however : "At the same time, this view does not exclude the recognition of the Lord's death as a priestly act, whereby He once for all offered Himself" (p. 164).

And this may, perhaps, be understood as explaining away what seems so difficult of explanation in the previous statement. Indeed, it would seem as if it must be so understood, seeing the Bishop says elsewhere (On vii. 27, p. 197) : "Here first Christ is presented as at once the Priest and the Victim."

It is hardly to be supposed that the Bishop means that the glorious priestly act of the High Priest of the New Covenant, the offering of His stupendous Sacrifice, was accomplished long before He was made a priest at all, or qualified to render any priestly service.

"Ubi Salvator noster sanctissimus sacrificium obtulit et mactavit, ibi fuit verus sacerdos" (Deylingius, "Observ. Sacr.," Par. iv., p. 560).

Only *this* we have to remember, and all must be asked to remember it: A king may be a king, and do kingly acts, before the day of his enthronization. And a conqueror can tell of his conquests before the day of his triumph. And a priest may perform sacerdotal functions before sitting down as a priest on his throne. Nay, more, what he has to do in the way of sacrificial service *must* be done before he takes his seat.

And the point we have to insist upon is *this*—that Christ did fully and completely accomplish all that appertained to the work of His sacrifice and oblation on the Cross. And we have to insist on this especially as against the teaching that that sacrifice is now being offered (or ever was offered) in heaven. We have to insist on this because we have to combat the notion that, indeed, that part of the Divine sacrifice which corresponded to the *slaughter* of the sacrificial victim (the *shechitah*, which was not usually a sacerdotal act) was fully accomplished on the cross,¹ but that the *oblation* properly so called (the sacrificial offering to God) had to wait till Christ should be invested with the priesthood, which has its function only in the heavens, and should then, and not till then, take upon Him His *sacerdotium*, and exercise it in offering either once or *for ever* His sacrifice to the Father as a priest *for ever* after the order of Melchizedec.

The truth we have earnestly to contend for is the truth which we find so strongly and constantly urged in the Epistle to the Hebrews—the very truth which has been taught to us in that sublime word, “It is finished”; the very truth that in the one sacrifice on Calvary all was completed; the truth that by the one oblation of Himself, once offered, Christ our High Priest made a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world; so that there is no room for an oblation of Himself as a *hostia* in the heavens any more than there is room for the sacrifices of masses upon earth.

The identification, in point of time,² of the *προσφορά* with

¹ See Delitzsch, “On Heb.,” ix. 12, vol. ii., p. 89, E. T.; and Kurtz, “Sacrificial Worship,” p. 109; and “Doctrine of the Death of Christ,” pp. 44, 45.

² “Venerat in hunc mundum salvator, ut pro peccatis nostris carnem suam offeret hostiam Deo. . . . Ubi vero tempus advenit crucis suæ, et accessurus erat ad altare ubi immolaret hostiam carnis suæ, accipiens, inquit, calicem, benedixit.”—Origen, “In Levit.,” Hom. VII., § 1, Op., tom. ii., c. 477; edit. Migne.

Θυσίαν ἐκάλεσε τὸν σταυρὸν, οὔτε πῦρ ἔχοντα, οὔτε ξύλα, οὔτε πολλάκις προσφέρομενον, ἀλλὰ ἅπαξ ἐν αἵματι προσενεχθέντα.—Chrysostom, “In Ep. ad Heb.,” cap. ix., Hom. XV., Op., tom. xii., p. 150; edit. Montfaucon; Paris, 1735.

the *πάθος* is certainly the obvious deduction from the natural interpretation of Heb. ix. 25-28. Not the *shechitah* merely, but the sacred and sacerdotal oblation¹ of the sacrifice belongs,

Μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ἡμῖν καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. Τί μαρτυρεῖ; "Ὅτι ἀφέθησαν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ἡμῶν, ὅτι τελείως ἡμᾶς ἀπήλλαξεν ὁ Χριστός, διὰ τῆς μιᾶς προσφορᾶς, ὥστε μὴ δεηθῆναι δευτέρως.—Cyril Alex., "In Ep. Heb. x. 14," Op., tom. vii., c. 988; edit. Migne.

Διὰ μὲν τοῦ πάθους τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπέδωκε χρεῖος. . . . "Ἐδείξε προσφορὰν αὐτοῦ γεγενημένον τῶν σωτήριον θάνατον.—Theodoret, "In Ep. ad Heb.," cap. ii., Op., tom. iii., pp. 560, 561; Halæ, 1771.

¹ Compare the ante-Communion prayer attributed to Ambrose: "Summe sacerdos . . . qui Te obtulisti Deo Patri hostiam puram et immaculatam in ara crucis pro nobis." (See Westcott, "On Heb.," p. 462.)

And this from Pope Leo I.:

"Quod unquam sacrificium sacratius fuit, quam quod verus Pontifex altari crucis per immolationem suæ carnis imposuit?"—Leo Magnus, Serm. XII., "De Passione D.," In "Heptas Præsulum," p. 59.

"Foris extra castra crucifixus est, ut veterum victimarum cessante mysterio, nova hostia novo imponeretur altari, et crux Christi non templi esset ara sed mundi."—Leo M., Serm. VIII., "De Passione D.," In "Heptas Præsulum," p. 55.

"Ipse Dominus . . . victima sacerdotii sui, et sacerdos suæ victimæ fuit."—Paulinus, "Ep. v. ad Severum." See Gregor. M., Op., tom. iii., Par. I., c. 389. Venet., 1744.

Also the following statements:

"Christus in passione sua corpus et sanguinem obtulit Deo Patri pro nobis."—Rabanus Maurus, "De Sacris Ord.," cap. xix., Op., tom. vi., c. 1187; edit. Migne.

"Hoc sacerdotio functus est Christus quando semetipsum in ara crucis obtulit Deo Patri pro nobis."—Beda, "Com. in Ps. cix.," Op., tom. viii., c. 832, 833; Colon., 1612.

"Crucifixus . . . et sacrificium pro nobis factus super altare crucis stetit. . . . Taliter stans ipse hostia, crux vero altare erat."—Rupertus Tuit, "In Amos iv.," c. ix., Op., tom. ii., c. 366; edit. Migne.

"Veniet, quando non in templo offeretur, nec inter brachia Simeonis, sed extra civitatem inter brachia crucis."—Bernard, Serm. III., "In Purif. B. Mariæ," Op., tom. ii., c. 246; Venet., 1750.

Also the following: "In distinctione suorum membrorum omnium verus Deus et verus homo semel tantum in cruce pependit, offerens Patri seipsum pro nobis hostiam vivam, et passibilem, mortalem, vivorum et mortuorum redemptionis efficacem" (Gratian, Decret., Par. III., "De Cons.," Dist. II., Can. LI., from August., "In Libro Sent. Prosperi").

Also the prayer of Pope Innocent III.: "Mundet et muniat nos quæsumus Domine unigeniti Filii tui preciosissimus sanguis effusus et Tibi oblati in cruce" (Op., tom. i., p. 419; Colon., 1575). See also the prayer of the old Roman Missal, as quoted from Hincmar in "Sacerdotium," p. 110.

Add the following:

"Habemus altare id est, crucem in qua oblati est Christus" (Nicolaus de Lira, "In Ep. ad Heb.," cap. xiii. 10, "In Biblia Sacra, cum Glossa Ordinaria," tom. vi., c. 957.

"Nunc au. m. sor, est mi. id est, meliorum sacrorum, et hoc fuit offerendo carnem suam in cruce."—*Ibid.*, cap. viii. 6, tom. vi., c. 879; Ant., 1617.

So the "Proper Preface" for Easter Day: "He is the very Paschal Lamb, which was offered for us, and hath taken away the sin of the

according to the teaching of this Epistle, to the very cross of Golgotha, and not to any High-priestly function in the heavens. It is because *there* the Saviour through the eternal Spirit

world," the Latin of which in the Roman Missal is, "qui abstulit peccata mundi." Compare Rabanus Maurus, "De Sacr. Ord. Sac.," cap. xix., and Amalarius, "De Eccles. Offic.," Lib. III., cap. xxxiii. ("In Hittorpius," p. 174): "Sicut passione sua totius mundi tulit offensa"; and Alcuin ("In Hittorpius," p. 74): "Memor beatæ passionis, quæ totius mundi peccata delevit."

So our Homily on Repentance, Part II.: "This holy father [Ambrose] doth understand that, both the priesthood and the law being changed, we ought to acknowledge none other priest for deliverance from our sins but our Saviour Jesus Christ; who, being our sovereign Bishop, doth with the sacrifice of His Body and Blood, *offered once for ever upon the altar of the cross*, most effectually cleanse the spiritual leprosy, and wash away the sins, of all those that with true confession of the same do flee unto Him" (p. 540; edit. Griffiths).

Again, the 2nd Homily, "of the Passion" speaks of Christ's "one oblation and once offering of Himself upon the cross" (p. 428); and the Homily "for Good Friday" speaks of "this only work of Christ's precious offering of His body upon the altar of the cross" (p. 414).

Thus it is well said by Vasquez: "Respondeo Christum . . . functum fuisse ministerio sacerdotis in morte sua: nam ministerium et officium sacerdotis non solum consistet in actione physica mactandi et occidendi animalia, et victimas, sed satis est per modum moralis causæ ad hoc concurrere, nempe offerendo se morti in honorem, et placationem Dei, id quod Christus Jesus reipsa præstitit" ("Disput. in 3^m partem S. Thomæ," tom. i., Disp. LXXXIII., Quæst. XXII., Art. II., p. 843; Ingolst., 1610).

The following testimony of Waterland is of great value in view of the modern teaching, which, in support of "continuous sacrifice," maintains that the sacerdotal oblation has its place not on Calvary, but in heaven, and affirms, "We do not say that He took away the sins of the world at some given moment in the past."—"Though He was *passively* obedient, in submitting to *suffer, bleed, and die* for us, it does not therefore follow that He exercised *no act of offering*, or that He made *no active* sacrifice on the cross. . . . He thus actively offered on the cross His *body, His blood, His soul, His life* to God. . . . He made Himself a voluntary sacrifice, in His death, for the sins of mankind. This is the plain doctrine of the Gospel, which every one that runs may read; and it is confirmed by as *early, as universal, and as constant* a tradition of fifteen centuries, or more, as any point of Christian doctrine whatsoever; from Barnabas, Clemens, and Ignatius, down even to Socinus of the sixteenth century. . . . I shall only hint, further, that from the third century and downwards, *altar of the cross* has been the current language: one certain argument, among many, that the sacrifice was supposed to be made *upon the cross*. And such also is the language of the Greek and Oriental liturgies" (Waterland, "Chr. Sacr. Explained," App., chap. iv., § 3, Works, vol. v., p. 174; see also p. 741; Oxford, 1843).

On the sense in which the *Cross* may be called *the Altar*. See Waterland, Sermon XXXI., Works, vol. v., pp. 741, 742. Oxf., 1843. Archbishop Saumarez Smith says of the reference of Heb. xiii. 10: "It must not, of course, be confined to the literal cross upon which Christ died. 'The Cross of Christ,' like 'the word of the Cross,' is an expression which carries with it an idealized amplification of the literal and historical incident of the crucifixion of Jesus of Nazareth. It is not the cross on Calvary merely which is the Christian's altar . . . it is the sacrificial

offered Himself without spot to God¹ (ix. 14); that the blood of Christ avails to purge our conscience from dead works to serve the living God. It is by that one offering, "the offering of the Body of Jesus Christ once for all" (x. 10), when He "offered up Himself" (vii. 27), that "He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified" (x. 14; compare ix. 26, 28; x. 12).

But our argument appeals not only nor mainly to the teaching of one and another of a collection of isolated texts. Rather we ask to have taken a full comprehensive view of what our faith has given it to behold in the New Covenant of grace.

We have before us the amazing miracle of mercy—the Incarnate Son of God, in our very flesh and blood, forcing His way—spite of all the powers of hell—through the grave and gate of death, and thereby opening for condemned sinners the gate of everlasting life. That gate now stands wide open for all who will enter in. The work was *once* done by ONE who alone could do it. Now IT IS FINISHED—*finished once for all* by Him whose Divine power alone availed to accomplish such a stupendous work—triumphing over principalities and powers of darkness.

And now, from the standpoint of Mosaic ordinances, we look at the same work. We see the same Saviour. We see Him as our great High Priest. We are sure there can be no other. Still He is—He must be—the *one*, and the *only* one. And we see His work. Still it is *once*, and *only once*—*once* and "once for all." It is the offering of Himself a sacrifice for our sins. IT IS FINISHED. There is to be no more offering for sins. The "One" and the "Once" of the Epistle to the Hebrews stand as sentinels for ever against the intrusion of any sacrificial oblation in heaven.² There is no

character of Christ's death as the Crucified One" ("The Blood of the New Cov.," p. 83).

It is impossible to think of the wood of the Cross as "sanctifying the great sacrifice." (See Waterland, p. 742). "The cross might be the *altar* in some respects, and our Lord's own Eternal Spirit might be the *altar* in others" (*Ibid.*). But see also my "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 265, 266.

¹ Even Delitzsch says: "We give up any reference of *προσήμεκεν* here [Heb. ix. 14] to Christ's heavenly *προσφορά*, such as that assumed by Bleek and the Socinian and Arminian commentators. Whenever the sacrifice of Christ is typically and antithetically compared with the sacrifices of the Old Testament, it is *His self-oblation on the altar of the Cross* which is the point of comparison" ("On Heb.," vol. ii., pp. 95, 96, E. T.). So also Westcott, p. 261 (*cf.* pp. 273, 274).

² Outram's chapter, "De Oblatione Christi in Cælo" (Lib. II., chap. vii.), commences thus: "Explicatâ Christi, ut victimæ piacularis, morte; deinceps de oblatione Ejus mortem secutâ agendum est. Neque enim dubium, quin Jesus Christus, Pontifex noster immortalis, in cœleste sanctuarium ingressus, sese, ut victimam piacularem pro peccatis

admission for the idea, there is no room for it. IT IS FINISHED. Now we know that He who died as our Sacrifice lives as our great High Priest, "able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by Him," seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them. Now we rest in the assurance¹

nostris ante cœsam, in cœlo ipso Deo obtulerit" ("De Sacrificiis," p. 326; Amstel, 1688). In support of this assertion he appeals to Heb. x. 12, which appears quite unequal to bear such a weight. And it can hardly be without significance (as it seems to me) that Holy Scripture knows nothing of any offering or oblation, or presentation or representation (not representation) of a sacrifice for sins once offered and accepted. To speak of an *oblatio continuata* (see Outram, p. 332) is as much out of place as to talk of a continuous ransom payment. All *sacrificial* oblation is clearly excluded by the *ἕραξ* of Heb. ix. 28. But a non-sacrificial *oblatio continuata* requires a good deal of explanation. And it is not easy to avoid some confusion of thought if we habitually use language which speaks of an *offering* which is a *non-sacrificial* offering of a sacrifice. And this is a matter in which confusion of thought is specially to be avoided.

At the same time, it behoves us to remember that such language (in which "offering" means simply *offering to view*) has been used in early as well as later times, and that our contention is not about the use of words or phrases. (See "Doctrine of the Death of Christ," p. 66; "Missarum Sacrificia," pp. 96, 97; and Waterland's Works, vol. v., p. 269.) Even Dr. Owen could speak of Christ's carrying the Blood into the most holy place "to complete and perfect the Atonement" (Works, vol. xix., p. 204. Ed. Goold). So also of Christ's oblation he says, it "was offered on the earth, but is *continued* in heaven, as unto the effectual exercise of it" (vol. xxiii., p. 263). And so Litton says: "The sacrifice is never to be repeated, but the virtue and efficacy of it are *continually presented* before the heavenly mercy-seat" ("Church of Christ," p. 255). And in some such sense—as pointing to the *enduring effects for application*—the *oblatio continuata* of Outram may admit of a sound interpretation. See "Our One Priest," pp. 102, 103.

Compare the language attributed (in error) to St. Augustine (see Jewel's Works, vol. ii., p. 756. P.S.), in which Christ is represented as both priest and victim of the altar in heaven, under which the souls of the martyrs were seen in Rev. vi. 9 (Op. Aug., tom. v., Par. ii., c. 365. Append., Serm. CCXXI. In Nat. S. S. Innocentium). The language here used is evidently hyperbolic, and thoughts are transferred from heavenly things to earthly, and from earthly things to heavenly. But some such idea of continuous propitiatory application appears to underlie the general drift of its ambiguous expressions. It should be observed, however, that the writer's teaching here is an addition of human thoughts to a mistaken or doubtful interpretation of the symbolism of a heavenly vision. See "Doctrine of the Death of Christ," p. 71.

¹ The "Scriptures most assuredly testify that the oblation of Christ is a *consummated* act, coincident with His sacrificial death. . . . The application of the virtue of the one sacrifice is continuous; the blood, once shed, continually 'cleanseth'; the offering, once made, is of permanent efficacy. . . . A theologian of deserved repute, in a recent article concerning the Melchizedek High Priesthood of our Lord, propounds a theory of the death of Christ which makes that death only a 'subordinate part of the offering.' In his anxiety to avoid what he considers a narrow view of the Atonement, Dr. Milligan argues that the death of Christ was only

that, "as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment: so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, and unto them that look for Him shall He appear the second time without sin, unto salvation" (Heb. ix. 27, 28).

N. DIMOCK.



ART. III.—THE POSITION OF ROMAN CATHOLICS IN ENGLAND.

NO survey of English religious life would be complete without a notice of the Roman Catholics in our midst to-day. Few sections of the community have so large an influence and prominence in proportion to their numbers, and yet none have lain under such legal restrictions. They own chapels, schools, institutions, conspicuous often both for site and size. Their dignitaries have in recent times competed for social precedence with our own Archbishops. Politically they are a force to be reckoned with in both parliamentary and municipal contests. In the newspapers their lamp is rarely hid. At the same time, laws stand in the Statute-Book expressly forbidding a Roman Catholic to wear the English crown.

They are at once a curiosity and a problem. It is curious to trace how their story has been a career of the phoenix (a favourite metaphor of their own). It is also a story which cannot but oblige thoughtful readers to ask whether the characteristic trends of policy and activity that brought and kept them under suspicion, but yet did so much to win them their present standing in England, are forces that are to be seriously reckoned with in the future, and whether those old suspicions were just, and are still reasonable.

The history of Roman Catholic nonconformity in England dates undoubtedly from February 25, 1570. This was the day on which Pope Pius V. published the Bull that purported to excommunicate and depose the Queen and to absolve her subjects from their allegiance.

Till this move on the part of the Papacy, English Roman

'the initial step' of the offering, and that we should 'think of the offering as going forward everlastingly.' Such a view militates against the Scriptural view of Christ's death as a completed sin-offering; is connected with a strained interpretation of the New Testament passages concerning the blood of Jesus, as pointing to mystic life rather than to actual death; and needlessly confounds the two distinct thoughts of an offering that has been once for all offered, and of the abiding fruit of the oblation once made" (Bp. Saumarez Smith, in "The Church and her Doctrine," pp. 38, 39).