

# PROPTIATION

BY

## BLOOD.

*A BRIEF INQUIRY INTO THE TEACHING OF  
SCRIPTURE CONCERNING IT.*

BY

C. E. STUART.

---

LONDON:

E. MARLBOROUGH & CO., 51, OLD BAILEY.

# PROPTIATION BY BLOOD.

---

ATONEMENT by blood is a cardinal truth of the Christian faith. In many ways and at various times this fundamental truth has been the object of the enemy's attack, and doubtless will be till the Lord returns to reign. Meanwhile, and ere the saints are caught up to meet Him in the air (1 Thess. iv. 17), the faith once for all delivered to the saints will have at times to be earnestly contended for, as Jude (ver. 3) has warned us. The Ephesian elders were advertised by the Apostle of what would take place among them after his departure (Acts xx. 28—31). Timothy and Titus were solemnly admonished as to the duty of maintaining the truth. All this shows us, not only that controversies must be expected, but that God, who instructed His servants to sound the notes of warning, has ever at heart the real welfare of His saints. To feed, or to shepherd, the flock of God at Ephesus was the work entrusted to the overseers, or bishops, of that assembly. Such a service is needed still; and, in proportion as that is remembered, controversy, if called for, will not be barren of results. For then the maintenance of God's truth, and the profit of God's saints, will be objects kept in view by those who have to engage in it. In this spirit the writer desires to pen some remarks on *atonement*, and especially on that element of it called *propitiation*.

With both these terms are we made acquainted by the Word of God. The former is only really met with in the Old Testament, and more frequently in the Pentateuch; the latter is only found in the pages of the

New Testament. For teaching, then, about them, fundamental truths as they are of the Christian faith, we must turn to the only book which treats of them with an authority which none should call in question. Human writings may help us, in so far as they are shown to be in harmony with the teaching of the inspired Word. But to no other book in the world can we go for authoritative teaching on such subjects. No one on earth can know anything about them, and no one is able even in measure to answer such a question as *The Atonement: What is it?* except as he or she has been instructed therein from the Scriptures of truth.

To atonement by blood, and not to atonement in any mere governmental sense, is the reader now asked to turn his attention. A wonderful and blessed subject it is—a theme of praise for those who share in it now; a theme of praise for God's saints in heaven for ever and ever. Who first spoke of it? It was God, on Mount Sinai, when giving revelations to Moses (Exod. xxix.). Who first thought of it? It was God, and that before the foundation of the world. Who provided what was needful for it, whether in type or in reality? It was God, we must again reply. None but God could have known what was requisite to make atonement; for no one but God could know, apart from Divine revelation, what would fully vindicate His holiness and righteousness, and maintain them untarnished, and allow mercy and grace to flow out to guilty and hell-deserving creatures.

On the mount, then, when Moses was alone with God, that welcome truth—atonement by blood—was first *distinctly* communicated, as far as we know, to any human creature. Thenceforward the Divine revelations about it were frequent. Let us pause for a moment to consider that God did not speak of the need of it without at the same time teaching, in type though it then was, that He would provide for it. He did not mock His creatures by speaking of it as imperative, and yet

leave them in ignorance as to the manner of its being effected. By an offering only could it be made—an offering brought to God's altar, and there consumed, either wholly or in part, by the sacred fire which was ever burning thereon. And that offering, as portrayed in type, except in one special case, where the poverty of the Israelite was taken into account (Lev. v. 11—13), spoke of life surrendered to God, expressed by the blood of the victim being shed. As Lev. xvii. 11 teaches, "The life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar, to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul."

Now this truth was interwoven into the home as well as into the national life of the people of Israel. Each morning and each evening after that the Tabernacle had been reared up, and the sanctuary service established, the lamb of the burnt-offering proclaimed it (Lev. i. 4). At each sacred festival, by the burnt-offerings and the sin-offerings, the people were reminded of their need of it (Numb. xxviii., xxix.). At the consecration of the priests, and in the offerings of the Levites, they witnessed that none could take part in the service of the Tabernacle apart from it (Lev. viii. 34; Numb. viii. 12). So, in the home life of the Israelite, of atonement by blood he was constantly reminded. Was his heart overflowing with mercies received, which could only find fitting expression in a burnt-offering brought to God's altar? As he stood there and saw it consumed, he could know, from the word of Jehovah, his God, that it was an atonement for him (Lev. i. 4). Was a mother rejoicing in God's goodness in making her womb fruitful? The offerings she brought on the day of her cleansing witnessed of her need of atonement (Lev. xii.). Had an Israelite sinned in any way which allowed of a sin-offering or of a trespass-offering being brought to the altar, atonement, which could only be made by blood for that offence, the sacrifice prefigured. So with the leper and the Nazarite. The former, who had been

unclean by reason of his disease, and the latter, when he had sinned by the dead, had both of them to acknowledge their need of it (Lev. xiv.; Numb. vi.), as well as those who were unclean in any other way (Lev. xv.).

So far in the Book of Leviticus we see how God ever pointed His people to it, and intimated what was needed to make it. In the sixteenth chapter of the same book, however, fresh lessons were taught them and us—viz., what are constituent elements of atonement, which to state them briefly, as there set forth, are the death of the victim (ver. 6); the scapegoat on which the sins were laid (ver. 10); the dealing with the blood in the holiest, by which propitiation was made (ver. 16); and the consuming of the burnt-offering, as well as the appointed parts of the sin-offering on the brazen altar (ver. 24). This last symbolises Divine judgment borne by the victim, for the fire which burnt thereon came down from heaven (Lev. ix. 24), and was never to go out (vi. 13). Over the scapegoat the High Priest confessed "all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins," putting them on the head of the goat, and sending it away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness (ver. 21). Within the veil he made propitiation by blood an essential element of atonement, "because of the uncleannesses of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins" (ver. 16). This distinction should be noticed. Iniquities, transgressions, and sins were confessed on the scapegoat, whilst propitiation was made because of the uncleannesses of the children of Israel, as well as because of their transgressions and their sins. This throws some light on the subject of propitiation.

Now this was a service done wholly within the sanctuary, when the High Priest had passed out of the sight of men. Some might have seen the victims killed. They might have seen Aaron in his white linen pontifical garments placing his hands on the head of

the scapegoat. All might have caught sight of the volume of smoke ascending up from the brazen altar, the token that on it were being consumed the burnt-offerings and the appointed parts of the sin-offerings. But no mortal eye could see the High Priest, after he disappeared behind the curtain of the entrance to the Tabernacle, till he reappeared outside, having made propitiation in the holy of holies within. He only could be engaged in that service, and when alone with God. For to do it he entered the innermost sanctuary, on the floor of which no mere priest could ever tread when the Tabernacle was in order. What he did within the veil all Israel knew. But he did it alone, and in the presence of God; for the action of making propitiation was Godward, not manward. It was for God, to meet His holiness and His righteousness, that He might be able, consistently with all that He is, to allow of creatures who had sinned against Him having a perfect standing in His holy presence. He would have them at home before Him, provided they approach in the appointed way (Heb. x. 19—22). But He can only have them thus in His presence, because the blood of the sin-offering has been first presented before Him to make propitiation for their sins. Accordingly, the High Priest first sprinkled of the blood on the mercy-seat; and then he sprinkled of it seven times before it. Once on the mercy-seat. That was enough for God. Then seven times before it, to assure the sinner of a perfect standing before Him, for seven is symbolical of perfection or completeness, being the highest prime indivisible number. How different are God's thoughts from ours. We should first have provided for our need, and so have sprinkled the blood first *before* the mercy-seat. He first cares for His nature, and so caused it to be sprinkled first *upon* the mercy-seat.

Short and silent was the service. Aaron sprinkled the blood as directed, and came out. No provision was there in that ritual for a prayer inside the veil. The blood spoke, not Aaron, and it spoke to God. The

cherubim, the supporters of God's throne, gazed, as it were, on it; and the action of that throne, which must otherwise have been in judgment, could by virtue of it go out in grace. In the bright light of the Divine presence, the blood was put on the mercy-seat, and there remained; for, typical of the blood of His Son, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, nothing but holy perfection could be seen in it. Having dealt with the blood in the prescribed way, Aaron came out. Propitiation for the sins of the people had now been made. God's nature had been rightly cared for, and He could act in grace towards guilty ones consistently with His holiness and His righteousness, thus maintained and fully vindicated. When the devil in the garden of Eden forced God, as it were, because of His holiness, to judge His creature man, and to pass sentence on the serpent likewise, he surely had no idea of the provision that God would make by the blood of His Son to maintain untarnished His holiness, and yet in perfect righteousness to allow the vilest of men to draw nigh with boldness unto the holiest.

At this point it may be convenient to draw the reader's attention to the difference between *propitiation* and *substitution*, as illustrated in Lev. xvi. Closely, and, we may say, indissolubly connected, they can yet be plainly distinguished; and it is very important, if we would have correct and distinct thoughts about them, to mark the distinction. Let us look at the two goats, the sin-offering for the people, which will best exemplify the matter. They were, though two animals, yet but one sin-offering (ver. 5). The goat on which the Lord's lot fell was killed in sacrifice. The other was sent away alive into the wilderness. By the blood of the former goat propitiation was made inside the veil, and by the parts of it which were burnt on the altar of burnt-offering, the bearing Divine judgment was typically portrayed. Now, if we speak of substitution in all its fulness and solemnity, we speak of the bearing away of our sins, and of the bearing Divine judgment

in the sinner's stead. By Christ's one offering of Himself on the cross both have been effected. Our sins were borne (1 Pet. ii. 24), and Divine judgment was endured (1 Pet. iii. 18; Ps. xxii. 1). But neither of these, essential to atonement, are to be confounded with propitiation by His blood. It was the blood of the goat, of which the inwards were burnt on the altar, by which propitiation was made in the holiest. Indissolubly connected, then, propitiation and substitution are, yet they can be clearly distinguished; and if that is not done we are in danger of broaching most unsound doctrine. What went on within the holy of holies, as has been already remarked, was hidden from the eyes of men, and had to do especially with the maintaining untarnished, and fully vindicating the claims of God's nature. This is what is meant by making propitiation. What went on when the High Priest confessed the sins of the people on the scapegoat, or when officiating at the brazen altar, Israel might see. All that spoke of substitution. Closely connected these two were, we would again repeat, for the two goats formed but one sin-offering. And the blood which was taken into the holiest, and sprinkled on the mercy-seat and before it, was, be it remembered, the blood of that very goat, the inwards of which were burnt on the brazen altar, whilst the rest of it, the carcase, was burnt outside the camp.

This leads us to another thing needful to be noticed ere passing on. We have spoken of constituent parts of atonement. We would now direct attention to an act done that same day distinct from, yet a necessary consequence resulting from it. We refer to the burning the carcase of the sin-offering outside the camp (ver. 27). Now, atonement was completed, according to that day's ritual, when Aaron had finished his ministrations at the brazen altar (ver. 24); and it will be found that the burning or the eating of the carcase of the sin-offering, whichever was the appointed way of dealing with it, was never designated as an act



for making atonement. Atonement was viewed as completed ere the carcase of the sin-offering was dealt with at all. I quote the Scriptures in proof of this: "And the bullock for the sin-offering, and the goat for the sin-offering, whose blood was brought in to make atonement in the holy place, shall one carry forth without the camp; and they shall burn in the fire their skins, and their flesh, and their dung" (Lev. xvi. 27). The difference of language in this verse from that met with in verses 6, 10, 16, 24, will make this plain to the simplest reader. Turning to Lev. iv. 20, 21, we shall see it confirmed: "And he shall do with the bullock as he did with the bullock for a sin-offering, so shall he do with this: and the priest shall make an atonement for them, and it shall be forgiven them." Now, what follows? "And he shall carry forth the bullock without the camp, and burn him as he burned the first bullock: it is a sin-offering for the congregation." Atonement, it will be seen, is spoken of when the services in the sanctuary and at the altar (16—20) are treated of, but not a word about it when the bullock was burnt outside the camp. Again, in vi. 30, we have the same teaching: "And no sin-offering, whereof any of the blood is brought into the tabernacle of the congregation to reconcile (or, to make atonement) withal in the holy place, shall be eaten: it shall be burnt in the fire." For the carcase was either burnt or eaten, not to make atonement, for that was in each case already made, but in token that *no imputation of guilt for that sin could rest on those on whose behalf the victim had been offered*; for, if the body of the victim, to which the sin had been transferred by the laying on its head of the offerer's hands, could not be found, the sin thus put on its head could never be found. It was gone. An encouragement to the sinner, and an evidence of God's desire to set him perfectly at rest as to the future. Was the carcase then burnt outside the camp as *execrable*, as we have been informed? Was it deserving to be cursed, very hateful, abominable? If

so, sin must have attached to the person of the Lord *after* atonement was completed. Was that true? God declared the carcase of the sin-offering was most holy (Lev. vi. 29). "God made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin" (2 Cor. v. 21). Yes. But when and where? In His sacrifice on the cross. Now, the altar was in the camp in the court of the Tabernacle. There was none outside the camp where the carcase was burnt. Such a statement aims a blow at the spotlessness of His person.

To return to the subject of propitiation. Let us trace out something of what we are told of it in the New Testament. There it is mentioned expressly. We have seen that it was God who first spoke of atonement by blood, and revealed in type how it could be effected. We now learn, in the pages of the New Testament, that we owe it to His love that propitiation by blood could be made at all. "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins" (1 John iv. 10). We may well pause and meditate with adoring hearts over such a revelation. "Herein is love, not that we loved God" (how true that was), "but that He loved us." Yes, we were enemies to God; enemies in our minds by wicked works; with a nature which is not subject to the law of God, neither, indeed, can be. Hopeless then must our case have ever been had it depended on us to conciliate the Divine favour. But there was, there is, love in God, for it is His nature. He is love (1 John iv. 8, 16), and He acts in love, because of what He is. But He is light (1 John i. 5) as well as love, so can only act consistently with all that He is. Hence this revelation: "He sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins." He sent His Son, His only begotten Son, His well-beloved. His heart is thus made known. His love is thus proved. The condition of the sinner, too, is disclosed in a full, yet awful way; for nothing could meet his case, desperate as it was, and ever must otherwise have been, save the sending of His Son by God a propitiation for sins.

Poor, indeed, are our thoughts as we meditate on such a theme. Feeble, very feeble, must be the strongest, the most emphatic, the most eloquent of human language when handling such a subject. But, thank God, it is not the strength of human language, but the subject itself which speaks to the heart, as no eloquence of men or angels ever could. Yet, alas, it manifests how dull, how cold are the hearts to which it addresses itself, so little moved, as they are, by such glad tidings. God sent His Son! What an association of ideas! God, to whom all His creatures owe unfaltering obedience, sent the special object of His love—His Son—to be the propitiation for our sins.

In Leviticus God set before His people the need and the efficacy of sacrifice, as typified in the offering of bulls and of goats. In the Prophets He announced that the true sacrifice must be a person. By David, who had sinned in a way for which the Mosaic ritual could make no provision (Numb. xv. 36), was announced the advent of the One who would be the true sacrifice. "Sacrifice and offering Thou didst not desire; mine ears hast Thou opened: burnt-offering and sin-offering hast Thou not required. Then said I, Lo! I come: in the volume of the book, it is written of me, I delight to do Thy will, O my God" (Ps. xl. 6—8). What this One would suffer in making atonement, the same prophet set forth (Ps. xxii.); whilst the treatment He would receive at the hands of His creatures both the prophets David (Ps. lxxix.) and Isaiah (l., liii.) wrote of in words familiar to very many.

But what would be His name amongst men? and who would know Him when He came? At last His forerunner appeared; and John the Baptist beholding Jesus, the Virgin's Son, proclaimed Him as the Lamb of God. Now He to whom John gave that title has revealed Himself as the only begotten Son of God (John iii. 18), whom God gave, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life (iii. 16). Can we wonder, then, that it is written:

"Herein is love," &c.? What else could it have been? But what love! God provided a propitiation which could alone meet the full requirements of His nature. Did He, then, need to be propitiated? There is not such a thought in the Word. His sending His Son as a propitiation condemns at once any such suggestion. Propitiation was needed for Him, who is light as well as love, to act righteously in grace. But estrangement from man was not found in His heart; for, unasked by any, He sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins.

Now, this subject receives further elucidation from the Hebrews, the Romans, and 1 John ii. From the Hebrews we learn when the Lord Jesus could make propitiation. In the Romans we read of effects of it when made. And in 1 John ii. we are taught of its abiding value in God's sight.

In Hebrews we read (ii. 17): "Wherefore in all things it behoved Him 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: for in that He Himself hath suffered being tempted, He is able to succour them that are tempted." Having passed through trials even to death—the death of the cross—in order to make propitiation for the sins of the people, He is fully able, as having suffered being tempted, to succour them that are tempted.

His past sufferings fit Him for the exercise of His present priestly service of helping His saints. Again: "But Christ being come an High Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood He entered in once for all into the holy place, *i.e.*, holy of holies, having found an eternal redemption." Again, "Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, figures of (or, like in pattern to) the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us" (ix. 11, 12, 24). Again, "A

minister of the sanctuary (or holy places), and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man" (viii. 2). These passages tell us of the *when* and of the *where*. *When* could He make propitiation? When He became High Priest. *Where* could He make it? In the heavenly sanctuary, contrasted, as we see it is, in chapter ix., with the earthly one in which Aaron officiated. To make propitiation at all He must be High Priest. But He could not, we read in Heb. viii. 4, be a priest upon earth—that is, on this side of death. He must die before entering on His High Priesthood, and this is confirmed in a way which cannot be gainsaid, for He entered the heavenly sanctuary by *His own blood*. For Aaron to enter the earthly sanctuary on the day of atonement the blood of the sacrifice must have been first shed. For the Lord to enter the heavenly sanctuary, to make propitiation for the sins of the people, the blood of the sin-offering must likewise have first been shed. But Aaron went in whilst in life; the Lord only after death. For He entered in by *His own blood*. Hence there was a double reason for His death, if propitiation by blood was really ever to be effected. He must die as the victim, and He must die as a necessary prelude to His entering upon His High Priesthood. Now, unless these two points are kept in remembrance, we shall not understand the subject. "If He were on earth He would not be a priest at all," so runs the Revised Version. "If then, indeed, He were upon earth, He would not even be a priest," so Mr. J. N. Darby translates it—that is to say, He could not be a priest on this side of death.

Does this sound strange doctrine? It is both Scriptural and simple. Nor should it excite one moment's surprise in anyone who studies the Mosaic ritual. For the priest, it will be there seen, had no *locus standi*, in an ordinary way, till the sacrifice had been slain. Exceptions to this were in the case of a bird being offered, and on the day of atonement. In the case of the bird, the nature of the offering probably neces-

sitated a departure from the ordinary rule, and, therefore, the priest, not the offerer, wrung off its head. On the day of atonement the high priest represented those on whose behalf atonement was to be made. So that would present no difficulty, seeing it was the offerer's place, as a rule, to kill the victim. Priestly work began, normally, only after death had taken place.

Next, turning to Romans (iii. 25, 26), we learn what God can do by virtue of the propitiation which has been effected. He has set forth Christ a mercy seat, through faith in His blood, for the showing forth of His righteousness in respect of the passing by the sins that had taken place before, through the forbearance of God (*i.e.*, the sins of Old Testament believers): for the showing forth of His righteousness in the present time; so that He should be just, and justify him that is of the faith of Jesus. For as the Israelite of old could have his attention directed to the blood-besprinkled mercy seat on the day of atonement, so God now points us to His Son who has died, and by whose blood propitiation has been made, as the evidence that He was righteous in His ways of mercy in the past, and is righteous now in justifying ungodly ones who believe on His Son.

Lastly, we are taught in 1 John ii. 2 of the full and abiding efficacy of propitiation made once for all by the blood of Christ. There is no other. He is it, and it abides in value in the sight of God. Hence the failing saint can righteously be restored to communion with his Father, against whom he has sinned. "He is," says the Apostle, "the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the whole world." Not, mark, for *the sins* of the whole world, but for the whole world. For that blood which ever speaks to God has fully met the claims of His nature, who is both holy and righteous, and who has displayed His righteousness in justifying ungodly ones. Now if He can act in that way towards one sinner, as far as His nature is concerned, He can act thus towards all.

We learn then what propitiation does. It meets the nature of God, and enables Him to act in grace to sinners, whether in pardoning a soul at the outset, or in forgiving a child who has erred. One calls attention to the words of the Apostle John, because they may help the reader to get, if he had it not before, a clear thought of what propitiation by blood accomplishes. It is, we have said above, an act Godward in its application. It meets the claims of His nature. Had they not been met, and all that He is vindicated and glorified, no one could have been saved, for God's holiness and righteousness must otherwise have stood in the way. But, to use the language of the type, the blood on the mercy seat meets fully His holiness and righteousness, so that He is proved to be righteous when acting in grace toward those who have sinned. So the Lord Jesus Christ is the propitiation for the whole world, but not the substitution for it. If the latter were the case, all must be saved. Since the former is the case, God can save, consistently with all that He is, any one and every one who accepts salvation on the grounds on which He offers it. Now this element of atonement it is, so much forgotten, which is expressly set forth by the high priest making propitiation by blood in the sanctuary to which he has access.

Here it may be well to direct attention to the terms *atonement*, *propitiation*, and *expiation*, for, unless we are using terms intelligently and correctly, there is little hope of understanding one another. Are, then, these terms synonymous? By no means. The two first are met with in Scripture, so we may learn from its pages the sense in which the sacred writers use them. The last is a purely human term. Now of both propitiation and expiation we can say that they are included in the thought of atonement, but neither by itself expresses all that is meant by atonement, as we see in Lev. xvi. We could not then, in accordance with Scripture teaching, use these two terms inter-

changeably. Expiation has in it the thought of satisfaction made for a crime, the extinguishing guilt by suffering, or by penalty. So a malefactor expiates his crimes on the scaffold. He suffers for them. He can make expiation for his offence by suffering what he deserves. Did he make propitiation for his guilt he would not suffer for it. The one offended against would then be propitious to him. One sees at once the difference. Now the Lord is the propitiation for the whole world. By virtue of His blood, God can righteously act in grace towards any who come to Him in the appointed way. He could, as far as the claims of His holiness and righteousness are concerned, save the whole world. But could we say, the Lord has made atonement for the whole world? If so, all would be saved. For atonement includes substitution as well as propitiation. Could we say, He has made expiation for the whole world? Then He must have borne the judgment for the whole world. That brings in again the thought of substitution made for the whole world, which is not true. He is the propitiation for the whole world. He has not borne the sins of the whole world. 1 John ii. 2 is the key to the right understanding of the difference. The blood on the mercy seat tells of propitiation made by the Lord. The scapegoat, and especially all that was consumed on the brazen altar in that day's peculiar service, speak of expiation made by Him for all who believe on Him. Guilt can be expiated by suffering or by penalty. But God's nature required propitiation to be made for sins and for uncleannesses, as is taught in Lev. xvi.

With the teaching of the Word, then, before us, the following points connected with the subject come clearly out:—1st, The Lord, as the victim or sacrifice, must have died ere propitiation could have been made at all. 2nd, Made by Him in His official character as High Priest, who could not be a priest at all on earth, it involved His death taking place before He could enter on that office. 3rd, Made in the



sanctuary, as Lev. xvi. teaches us, when the High Priest was alone with God, and hidden from the eyes of men, propitiation by blood could only be made by the Lord in the heavenly sanctuary; for He never did, nor ever could, have entered as High Priest the holy of holies at Jerusalem. Hence it is self-evident, surely, that all that was needful for the making of atonement by the Lord Jesus, if Lev. xvi. correctly instructs us as to its component parts, could not by any possibility have been completed in this world. To affirm that all was done in this world is to ignore the need of His death ere He could be a priest at all, not to mention other grave consequences which must ensue. For by His death He left this world (John xiii. 1; xiv. 19; xvi. 28).

Propitiation by blood made, God could, as we have said, righteously act in grace on the ground of it; for blood has ever a voice for God. The blood of Abel cried to Him. The blood of sprinkling speaks, too, to Him. Of old it spoke to Him, as soon as it was rightly dealt with in His presence, and that was on the day that the sacrifices were slain; for in the order of that day's ceremonial the making propitiation, and what was connected with it, was the first service in which the High Priest was engaged after the death of the victims. Now, had not propitiation been made, atonement could not have been effected. It was an integral part of it. Turning to the Lord's atoning sacrifice, of which the service on the tenth day of the month Ethanim, or Tisri, was typical, we mark a difference in the order of things as they took place. The last service of Aaron in making atonement was the dealing with the appointed offerings on the brazen altar, which were then consumed by the fire which had originally come from heaven, this part of the ritual being typical of the Lord's endurance of Divine judgment on the cross for us. Now, all this, we thankfully own, was suffered by Him on the cross ere He expired. The darkness was over before He commended His Spirit to His Father.

But though the order was different, the connection between the several essential elements of atonement was as close as in the type.\* Inseparably connected they were, though they can be distinguished. When Aaron began that day's work, he did not stop till he had finished it. In the garments, too, in which he killed the victims, and also confessed the people's sins on the scapegoat—in these same garments did he enter the holiest, and make propitiation by blood. When the Lord offered Himself to make atonement, did He not accomplish it ere the sun had set? If not, it were a departure in His case from all previous teaching in connection with sacrifice; and if there had been such departure, would not Scripture have indicated it?

Now, bearing in mind what was effected by propitiation—viz., the meeting the claims of God's nature, that He might, in perfect consistency with all that He is, act in grace towards sinners—it seems inconceivable, unless Scripture can be adduced in support of it, to suppose that till the Lord ascended, which was six weeks after His death on the cross, that essential

---

\* A question has been raised, Why was this difference in the order of that which took place? To this it may be replied, One plainly sees from the Gospels in what order all that the Lord had to do and to suffer in making atonement must of necessity have taken place, having regard to the One through whose atoning death it was effected. Turning to Leviticus, we trace a moral order in that chapter in a double way. *First.* God taught, what had not been so plainly made known before, that the claims of His nature had to be met for sinners to be accepted. Hence, propitiation had the prominent, the first, place in that day's ceremonial. *Second.* As we may see in the arrangement of the subjects in the whole book, so in those of that chapter God had respect to the future history of Israel, and gave His directions about the service in view of it. He knew, what none then did surely, that Israel must wait for the coming out of the High Priest from the sanctuary to know of their sins being forgiven. When they see Him—not till then—will they know it, and learn who really bore them away into a land of forgetfulness. Invert the order in Leviticus, and that outline in type of their history would be lost.

element of atonement was lacking. Let us look a little into this.

The Lord died on the cross, and the veil was rent. Now, the rending of the veil, as Heb. x. 19, 20, teaches us, was the opening for us by God of a new and living way into His presence, through the flesh of Christ. Was that new and living way opened up by God (for did He not rend the veil?) before His nature had been properly cared for, and He glorified, through propitiation by the blood of His Son? On that same day the graves were opened, the token, surely, that death now would have no power to retain the bodies of God's saints one moment longer than He would permit it. Was that effect of the Lord's sacrificial death manifested, and atonement not completed? On that same day the penitent thief, whose death took place subsequent to that of the Lord (John xix. 32, 33), was with Him in paradise. Can any Scripture be pointed to which teaches he could be in that place of bliss with the Holy One after he had died, whilst as yet propitiation was not made? The Lord's side was pierced ere His body was taken down from the cross, and forthwith came thereout blood and water, this speaking to us, as John teaches (1 John iv. 9, 10), of life and propitiation provided by His death, and flowing forth when He was dead (v. 11). Was that fact witnessed by the Evangelist ere propitiation was accomplished? By His sacrificial death He took away the Jewish sacrificial ritual (Heb. x. 9). Was that then removed, and no atoning sacrifice completed and accepted by God till He ascended up from Bethany, in sight of the eleven, six weeks later? Was there during that interval no High Priest accepted of God on behalf of His people?

Then, the Lord was raised for our justification (Rom. iv. 25). Could that have been said if the claims of God's nature had not already been met, and glorified by the blood on the mercy seat? Where in the volume of inspiration can we find anything to authorise such a surmise? Where shall we find any passage which

teaches that atonement was not completed till the Lord ascended from the Mount of Olives? Let His words, His acts, on the day of His resurrection be closely scanned. Is there anything He said, anything He did, which could in the slightest degree countenance such an idea? He sent a message by Mary to His brethren such as they had never heard before (John xx. 17). He appeared also to the two disciples on their way to Emmaus, held intercourse with them, and opened up to them the Scriptures. Did he intimate to her, or to them, that His sacrificial work was incomplete? He told her that He would ascend to His Father, and their Father; His God, and their God. Was that to complete atonement and to return? His words convey nothing of the kind, nor do they imply any thought of His return after He had ascended. With Cleopas and his companion He talked. "Ought not the Christ," He said, "to have suffered these things, and to enter into His glory? And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself" (Luke xxiv. 26, 27). Was it possible that the teaching from the day of atonement (Lev. xvi.) was passed over on that occasion? The language of the Evangelist—in *all the Scriptures*—forbids that supposition. What did He intimate that He then anticipated? The completion of the work of atonement? No; His entering into His glory.

On that same evening He met the eleven and those with them, commissioning them to preach repentance and remission of sins in His name, unto all the nations (Luke xxiv. 46—49), and authorising them to act on earth for Him in remitting or retaining sins (John xx. 22, 23). Did He charge them to do all this, when atonement was still unaccomplished? Let any one read that passage in Luke, and then answer that question. For forty days He was seen of them, and spake to them. What was the subject of His communications? The approaching completion of atonement? Not a hint of it. He spake unto them "of the things pertaining to the

Kingdom of God." Then, on His departure, when He gave them a hope, what was it? Propitiation to be made? No. But power for them for service by the coming of the Holy Ghost (Acts i. 8) upon them. Turn, then, where we will; look at God's acts on the day Christ died; scan the Lord's communications after He rose; is there a hint, a trace of such a thought as that propitiation by blood was not yet effected, and that He must ascend according to Ps. cx. to accomplish it?

All that is told us would assuredly lead us to the belief that it was finished. "For by one offering He hath perfected for a continuance them that are sanctified" (Heb. x. 14). By one offering begun at the cross and finished after the ascension? Is that what we are to understand? Surely the intelligent reader will say he must reject such a thought, unless Scripture could be adduced in support of it. "When He had by Himself purged sins, He sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high" (Heb. i. 3). "But this one, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for a continuance sat down on the right hand of God" (Heb. x. 12). All surely was done to make atonement ere that day closed. Shall we not say all was seen to have been done by the rending of the veil, though not all done *in this world*, as some would teach. Both propitiation and substitution were accomplished facts. Yet, without the latter atonement was incomplete, as Lev. xvi. teaches in type, and Heb. ix. 11, 12, by the reference to that day's ceremonial, distinctly intimates. Till He had died, all could not be accomplished; for "without shedding of blood is no remission" (Heb. ix. 22). Having died, He entered as High Priest the heavenly sanctuary by His own blood, to make propitiation for the sins of the people. But, if any think ascension was needed to complete atonement, I, for one, should not enter into contention with them, believing, though I do, that they are mistaken. Such a view admits two essential points—viz., the Lord's death in order to make propitiation, and His making it in the heavenly sanctuary—and contravenes

no fundamental truth that I am aware of. Time, and the patient study of the Word, may help to clear such. Meanwhile, "whereto we have attained, let us walk in the same steps" (or, by the same path) (Phil. iii. 16).

I would now turn to meet a few objections.

It is said—All this is reasoning. If to draw right conclusions from Scriptural premises is reasoning to be condemned, be it so. We need not, however, be ashamed of such a practice. The Master did that when confuting from the Pentateuch (Exod. iii. 6) the Sadducean heresy which denied resurrection. The Apostles did the same when, in council at Jerusalem, they concluded from the silence of Scripture on the subject, that converts from the Gentiles were not to be circumcised (Act xv. 13—20). To draw right conclusions from Scripture, on matters about which no formal text can be cited, is clearly not wrong. Let none be scared by such an accusation. Only, let us be sure that the premises are right, and the conclusions sound.

But there is a kind of reasoning in the things of God which should be condemned, and that is the exercise of the human mind apart from the Word, or in opposition to it. Now this is just what some, perhaps unwittingly, are doing when they ask, How could the Lord, "in the disembodied state," enter as High Priest the heavenly sanctuary, to make propitiation for the sins of the people? An objection of this kind is entitled to no consideration, because it views the Lord as if He were a *mere* man, forgetful that the mystery of His person no creature can comprehend; forgetful, too, that He could speak of Himself, when on earth and before His cross, as the Son of Man which is in heaven (John iii. 13); forgetful also that none of us, apart from any Divine revelation, could possibly say how He should enter the holiest as High Priest to be alone there with God. On this Scripture is silent. So we must be silent. It was a question for God and Himself, with which none of us have to do. There, if we would not be wise above what is written, let us leave it.

A third objection deserves consideration. It is affirmed that the Epistle to the Hebrews knows of but one entrance—*i.e.*, on His ascension. This really begs the question, assuming, what has to be proved, that the Lord's entrance as High Priest into the heavenly sanctuary, and His ascension to God's right hand, are one and the same thing. Now it is remarkable that, whereas there is no epistle which treats more constantly of His being in heaven than that to the Hebrews, yet throughout the doctrinal part certainly, which dwells on the Lord's High Priesthood, and that at great length, the *act* of His ascension is never once named, though His session at God's right hand, and His being crowned with glory and honour, of course, refer to it, and prove it. Other portions of the Divine Word, as we shall see, are by no means reticent on this point. The Epistle to the Hebrews, however, one might almost say, seems to avoid any direct statement of it. He entered, it tells us, into the holy place, heaven itself (ix. 12, 24). He passed through the heavens (iv. 14). He sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on High, or on the right hand of God (i. 3; viii. 1; x. 12; xii. 2). All this is plainly stated, but the act of ascending is unnoticed. Why is this? Of course, there is a reason for it, though we may not know it. Will it be "incredible rashness" to suggest as a reason that the Lord's entrance into the heavenly sanctuary as High Priest, and His ascending to God's right hand, are two different events? And hence the sacred writer, treating of the Lord's High Priesthood in heaven, passes imperceptibly, as it were, from His entrance on His service as High Priest to make propitiation to His present High-priestly service of intercession on high. He had entered as High Priest before He ascended from Bethany.

But as this may require some further elucidation, let us now turn to consider it. The writer in the Hebrews points out an analogy between the entrance of God's High Priest on the day of atonement and that of the Lord after His death. Both entered God's sanctuary—

the former the earthly one, the latter the heavenly one. Both entered by blood—the former with the blood of bulls and of goats, the Lord by His own blood. Blood characterised their entrance. It was an essential characteristic of the High Priest's entrance, for He went in to do a special work—viz., to make propitiation by it. Both, too, entered in their official character as representative of others, and the Lord entered as High Priest *solely* on behalf of others. Did He, we may ask, *ascend* solely on behalf of others? We profit by His ascension. But His exaltation to glory was due to Him as respects His person (John xvii. 1—4), and in consequence of His humiliation to death, the death of the cross (Phil. ii. 9). Now, how does Scripture speak of His ascension? “He was received up into heaven” (Mark xvi. 19). “He was taken up” (Acts i. 2, 9, 11, 22). “He was received up into glory” (1 Tim. iii. 16). He was to enter by it into His glory. “He was carried up into heaven” (Luke xxiv. 26, 51). It reminds us too of triumphs over the powers of evil, and exaltation above all created intelligences (Ephes. iv. 8; 1 Pet. iii. 22). And He Himself tells us, He would then ascend to His Father (John xx. 17). Was there anything answering to all this when Aaron entered into the holiest? Was there any triumphant display over the powers of evil hinted at in connection with it? Did Aaron on that occasion approach God as the Father? The Lord on ascending went to His Father. The Lord, too, in ascending, entered into His glory. Did He enter His glory by His own blood? Did He ascend to God's right hand by His own blood? Yet He could not have entered the sanctuary as High Priest except by His own blood. His ascension, then, to glory and His High-priestly entrance into the sanctuary on high, are, I submit, events quite distinct. Did Aaron, I would ask, enter in and sit down in the holiest? The Lord, when He had ascended, sat down at God's right hand for a continuance.

But we are reminded that He entered in once for all. Surely He did, but as High Priest into the heavenly



sanctuary (Heb. ix. 12). Now, since He went in as High Priest, He has not come out, nor will He, till, answering to the type, He reappears to the view of His earthly people Israel. On the real day of atonement He went in; Israel saw Him no more. On their great day of mourning (Zech. xii.) He will again be seen by Israel, having at length come out. On this last point, the time of His coming out of the sanctuary, I believe there is perfect agreement between those I regret to call opponents and myself. But does "once for all" clash with His appearance between these two events to saints who partake of the heavenly calling? If Scripture is to give the answer, we must say, No; for He will personally *descend from heaven* to meet His heavenly saints in the air (1 Thess. iv. 16), and return thither again before He *comes out* of heaven to be seen in person by His people Israel. To this time, yet future, 2 Thess. i. 7; Rev. xix.; Zech. xii. 10; Isa. lii. 13—liii. 12, refer. If, then, His descending from heaven, when He comes to meet His heavenly saints in the air, will not necessitate His leaving for one moment the heavenly sanctuary into which He has entered once for all, why should His appearance on earth, to some of that very company, after His resurrection, be incompatible with an uninterrupted continuance in that sanctuary as High Priest from the day that He died?

The Lord's resurrection from the dead was in no way a coming out of the holiest on high. He entered in *once for all*, having found eternal redemption. His entrance was not a consequence of what He had found. By His entrance He found it.\* So *once for all*—not a second time—did He enter as High Priest. It is this that the sacred writer insists on—viz., what He has found by

---

\* Attention has been drawn to the fact that the participle *εὐράμενος* "having obtained," is in the middle voice. Hence some would translate it "obtaining." Without insisting on that translation, it is evident that the redemption found is a consequence of His entering into the holiest, and not the reason for it. "Redemption was accomplished by His *entering*," as one has expressed it.

His entrance once for all. Now, if the reader keeps these words in mind, *once for all*, he will find them to be the clue to the point in that passage in the Hebrews, and the test by which to judge and reject a mistaken application of it, to which reference will be made in the Appendix. In this controversy, as in others in past times, the language of Scripture, when carefully noted, is the key for the removal of difficulties.

Just one word more. In the New Testament redemption, as at present enjoyed, is connected with forgiveness of sins (Ephes. i. 7; Col. i. 14) and justification (Rom. iii. 24); whilst we wait for adoption, the redemption of our body (Rom. viii. 23). Now, when did our High Priest obtain or find the redemption we at present enjoy? In this world—*i.e.*, before He had died? Impossible. For without shedding of blood is no remission (Heb. ix. 22). Was it only after His ascension? Impossible, again, we must surely say. For He was raised again for our justification (Rom. iv. 25), and on that same day commissioned His disciples to preach repentance and remission of sins (Luke xxiv. 47). This Scripture, then (Heb. ix. 12), when that which is included in present redemption is understood, confirms the doctrine taught in the preceding pages—*viz.*, that propitiation for our sins was made by our High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary, after He had died, and before He ascended.

Here I close this part of the subject—the positive teaching of Scripture on propitiation by blood—reserving for an Appendix remarks on some recent critics who advocate what is really subversive of atonement.

## APPENDIX.

---

A THEORY has been started thus expressed, that "the whole work on which our souls rest with divine certainty was accomplished in this world, not in heaven." And that the Lord entered heaven, "as we know, by His own blood ; but let us beware of the thought that He did so to make atonement or propitiation." To this we must offer the most strenuous opposition, seeing that it would rob us of propitiation, and, by consequence, of the cardinal doctrine of atonement. This theory, with other doctrines from the same pen, I had occasion to notice in *Recent Utterances* (pp. 40—43). As was natural, the author, Mr. Pinkerton, has sought to clear himself from what was brought against him by the publication of a pamphlet, entitled *Atonement, what is it? and was it made in this world or in heaven?* I pass over a great deal, and notice only a few salient points to show the character of the publication.

FIRST—To turn to the chapter on Atonement. Curiously enough, the writer, whilst desirous to make a confession of his own personal faith as to the atonement, has not quoted in the chapter one single passage about it from the Word of God—the *only* book which can authoritatively teach us anything on the subject. He prefers, and that we can all understand, to confess his faith in the language of another. But the reader is left unfurnished by our author with any scriptural test, by which to judge of the correctness of the statement which is adopted. *Atonement, what is it?* is the title of the pamphlet. *Atonement, what is it?* the reader may well say, as he comes to the conclusion of the chapter. And as he still further peruses the pamphlet, he will often be constrained to say, But Scripture? we want Scripture for the statements.

Next follows a chapter on Propitiation, attention to which only confirms the judgment expressed in *Recent Utterances*. For, FIRST our author teaches a propitiation made without blood, without a High Priest, and without a sanctuary, which, to borrow his own language, is "a myth of fancy or a fiction of the intellect" (p. 20). "I believe," writes Mr. Pinkerton, "and affirm that Christ accomplished the atonement in all its aspects and parts, fully, perfectly, and for ever, when He was in this world suspended on the

cross between heaven and earth, rejected of man, and forsaken of God" (p. 14). "I believe that our adorable Lord and Redeemer committed His spirit into the hands of His Father, after the cup of wrath had been drunk, and the divine majesty had been maintained, yea, and propitiated also; when, as we say, Justice itself was satisfied and said, It is enough" (p. 20). Clear and explicit are these statements, but wholly irreconcilable with God's word. "Without shedding of blood is no remission," God has told us. If He were on earth He could not be a priest, the Holy Ghost has revealed. "The atonement was accomplished in all its aspects and parts . . . when He was in this world, forsaken of God." That is Mr. Pinkerton's belief, and he affirms it. Let the reader mark, death, both of the victim and of Him who had to die to become High Priest, both fulfilled by the Lord's death on the cross, are wholly excluded by this theory. According to it they were not essential to atonement. No theory could be better contrived to rob us of atonement by blood. According to it, all was done *before* the Lord died. Twice over the reader may see, and in language which leaves no room for uncertainty as to his meaning, Mr. Pinkerton teaches that propitiation, which could *only* be made by blood, was effected ere the Lord died. That is really to teach what is not propitiation at all. So again, to use Mr. Pinkerton's own language, one must say, "It is not a true atonement at all, but a false one which is thus defined" (p. 22).

SECOND—And no wonder, because he makes it perfectly clear he has not understood of what it is that propitiation properly speaks. His opening sentence of this chapter shows this: "We come now to the grave question forced upon us by Mr. S.: *When and where was atonement made?*" I had asked, "Where and when was *propitiation* made?" Mr. Pinkerton has not perceived that, and uses apparently *atonement* and *propitiation* as interchangeable terms. Now Scripture would lead us, as has been already pointed out, to distinguish between them. Then Mr. Pinkerton mixes up *substitution* and *propitiation*. He writes (p. 13), "Propitiation and substitution are but two different aspects of the same thing—the sufferings of the Son of God." Again, "The true doctrine is, that there was righteous wrath pressing on the holy soul of our Divine Redeemer in *propitiation* as well as in substitution. To affirm that substitution alone required the hiding of God's countenance, and the presence of His wrath, implies that propitiation was something of a different nature altogether, and could be accomplished in some other way without any suffering at all." Again (p. 16), "Atonement, in any sense or aspect of it, means wrath, righteous wrath." Definite statements these are, but, as usual, without any attempt to bring Scripture in support of them. Indeed, it were impossible to do that, for they are really contrary to its teaching. And it needs

but a little understanding from the Divine word of what was effected by propitiation, and also when it was made, to see the nature of such assertions.

Now propitiation, of course, was closely connected with suffering, for it was the blood of the sin offering, by which divine judgment was borne, that was taken into the holiest, therewith to make propitiation before God. But to affirm that "righteous wrath was pressing on the holy soul of our Divine Redeemer in propitiation as well as in substitution," is to assert, to any one who understands the terms used, that the Lord, after death, and in the heavenly sanctuary, had righteous wrath pressing upon Him—a conclusion from which we must recoil, and one which Mr. Pinkerton himself really rejects, though his statement, unknown to him, implies it. No better illustration could there be of the need of distinguishing things that differ than the words of our critic, which would land him in that which in his soul he repudiates.

THIRD—Passing over some points which might well be noticed, let us turn to his misapplication of Scripture in his endeavour to make good his teaching. Two examples shall be cited. On page 22 he writes: "The Spirit of God, in Hebrews, speaks plainly, and is careful *not* to say that Christ did so after He entered heaven. He entered there, 'having obtained eternal redemption for us;' not to obtain it. Having offered one sacrifice He sat down." Now he misses *the* point in the passage. Remember the point on which the sacred writer is insisting, and his application of the passage will be seen, if I understand him, to be a mistake. He entered in *once for all*. That is *the* point insisted on. He entered in, not annually as Aaron and others, but once for all, having found eternal redemption. The passage does not teach that all was done ere He entered in. It teaches just the reverse. Once every year Aaron entered (Heb. ix. 7); once for all the Lord entered (12).\* Mr. Pinkerton has evidently overlooked this, so he omits the important words, "once for all," and hence applies the passage in a manner unwarranted.

The other instance referred to is furnished by his remarks on Heb. ii. 17, a passage impossible, as it stands, to harmonise with his theory. Accordingly we read (p. 17): "I have had a difficulty about Heb. ii. 17, but my difficulty does not trouble me at all, for it does not lie in the line of Mr. Stuart's system. I have not the slightest hesitation in rejecting the use he makes of it in connecting it with chap. viii. 4, in order to educe therefrom the theological conclusion that our Lord, as High Priest, left earth after death and in heaven completed the

---

\* Let the reader note the contrast Aaron entered *ἅπας τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ* once a year. The Lord entered *ἐφ' ἅπας* once for all.

atonement. I have far too much plain, positive Scripture, setting forth the nature and aspects of the atonement, and the time and place of its accomplishment, for me to accept such a conclusion, however skilfully arrived at; or to fear that clearer light on Heb. ii. 17 will shake my faith and require me to re-learn the whole scope of truth relating to the atonement."

We may well ever take the place of learners in the things of God; and surely, if Scripture is any authority on such a subject as propitiation by the blood of Christ, the true doctrine of it is *not* found in the pages of his pamphlet before us. But if he is furnished with plenty of Scripture setting forth the nature and aspects of atonement, and the time and place of its accomplishment, why not allow his readers to share it with him? It would settle the question for all who will bow to the Word. That help, however, is denied us, and we are directed instead to a note on page 47 of the pamphlet, the perusal of which only confirms the impression already made, that, with all the assertion of abundance of Scripture in support of his theory, there is none forthcoming.

Turning to the note, we read: "My question is whether it be not a propitious or compassionate dealing with the sins of the people, or with the people in respect of their sins. It is founded, no doubt, on atonement, but the action itself (not merely a favourable state of mind) would more properly connect with His bearing the iniquity of the holy things (Numb. xviii. 1), and the exercise of priesthood towards the people by the way."

I have quoted the above for the reader's benefit, that he may understand from Mr. Pinkerton's own words what his position is. Unfortunately for our critic neither of his suppositions will stand. For not only does Heb. ii. 17 mean to make propitiation for the sins of the people\*—witness the Revised Version, and that by Mr. J. N. Darby, and others; but the present exercise of the Lord's High Priesthood for the people by the way is, as taught us expressly in Hebrews, to meet *not* the question of their sins, but that of their infirmities (Heb. iv. 15). No one, I had thought, knew that better than Mr. Pinkerton. To what shifts is he reduced to support his theory. This remark receives further elucidation, as we read on p. 22, "But did not the Jewish High Priest enter into the holiest and sprinkle the blood on the mercy seat? And as this act, of necessity, succeeded his entrance, does it not follow that in the antitype, the second act must also succeed the first? I answer, there are two typical

---

\* Examples in Hellenistic Greek of ἐξιλάσκομαι (more frequently used by the LXX. than ἱλάσκομαι) with the accusative (as in Heb. ii. 7) are met with in Dan. ix. 24; Sirach iii. 3, 30; xx. 28; xxviii. 5; xxxiv. 19.

acts here: one of them his entering, of which I have already spoken; but his other act of sprinkling the blood, seven times before and once upon the mercy seat, is in itself a type to be considered alone, and in its fulfilment it does not succeed the other at all." He entered in *by His own blood*, says Scripture, and Scripture cannot be broken. The difficulty in which Mr. Pinkerton's theory evidently puts him needs no words from another to make it clear to any reader possessed of ordinary comprehension. How was the blood put on the mercy-seat but by the High Priest?

On the two other chapters of his pamphlet a remark or two will suffice. In the one, entitled *Christ's Entrance into Heaven*, he admits, if I correctly apprehend his meaning, that the Lord did not enter there *in virtue of His own blood*.\* We are all liable to make mistakes, and he is the most correct expositor of Scripture amongst ordinary men who makes the fewest. With his admission, then, before us, one would say no more on that matter. The other chapter, entitled *Authority, Throne, Kingdom*, was written, I conclude, to explain, if possible, his words, to which grave objection had been taken: "Alas for the theory on which I am commenting, for it pictures our God as on a throne after the agony of Calvary had been endured." The assertion implied in these words is indefensible. The explanation offered at the bottom of page 38, most will probably think, is unsuccessful. With this remark I leave it. One need not here pursue every point.

And now let Mr. Pinkerton himself tell us the effect of

\* I add in a note for the information of any who have not access to them, some remarks of Mr. Darby on the *real* meaning of the phrase, "He entered in once for all by His own blood." "He entered in once *διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἱματος* (ver. 12). This refers to *ὁν χάρις αἱματος* of verse 7. I do not think it means that that was the means of His entering in simply. As to Himself, His Person, we all know it was not so: He says, 'The Son of Man who is in heaven,' and could, as to the external fact, have had twelve legions of angels. This is not the question. But even as to us it is not simply that it was needed, but that was the way and state in which He entered in; not He *got in* by that means even as to us, but He went in in that way. The glorious work, according to the importance and character of the place, would not otherwise have been suitably done, but He did so enter in *διὰ*, for it is the force of *διὰ* I enquire into here. *Χάρις αἱματος*, there could have been no fitting association, however small, between Israel and the most holy place, and He entered in thus offering it (*προσφέρει*). Christ as our High Priest, and representing us, could not enter thus without blood, or, as

advocating an unscriptural system of doctrine : "No man in the presence of the light we have all had, can bring in a system of his own without, sooner or later, coming in contact with the very foundations of our Christian faith ; for he has too many objections to answer, and too many things to account for, for his system to be introduced and defended without its touching vital truth" (p. 26). How true. But surely he little thought whom, and what, he was condemning. And no wonder. For, to quote him again, we shall learn from a source, which he will not question, the effect an unscriptural system has on its upholders : "Christian reader, the power of delusion is rapidly increasing, and there is no blindness like that which results from despising or trifling with the light—it soon becomes judicial" (p. 18). True. And what shall we say of a theory, he must pardon my so calling it, which teaches a propitiation made without blood, without a high priest, and apart from a sanctuary ? What shall we think of its defenders, from whom we might have hoped for better things, upholding a theory, which, as another has remarked, lands its advocates in a position analogous to that of the upholders of the Romish doctrine of the Mass ? Both really advocate a theory of a sacrifice without blood shedding, and both probably would say they did not mean it.

Another person has come into the field, Mr. William Kelly, who has given us two editorial notices in his own periodical, the *Bible Treasury*, for December, 1886, and January, 1887. I regret the necessity for a few remarks in reply.

As usual, a common feature in this controversy, Scripture is not brought forward which refutes what had been advanced. Assertions, adjectives, *italics*, notes of admiration, are not wanting, each useful in their way, but they cannot supply the

---

regards us, God would not have been glorified : so He entered *διὰ* His own, showing, indeed, His own worth and perfectness, not only to be there Himself, but to obtain the entrance of others, and (before that) guilty ones ; and as priest He enters in with this to present in its power and efficacy for others. It was the witness that He had put away their sins, so that they could come to God, and God was fully glorified. The holiness of the place required this blood-shedding, seeing sin had come in, but according to a holy redemption, in which the innocent never could have been. So He entered in *διὰ* His own blood. Man could have had that place in no other way. And He had taken up man's cause (Christ's personal place is more in the cloud of incense, which is not in question here). This is a little obscure, but right. It was His act, not His necessity ; He entered in with that in its power, and not (as I have said) got in by it."

—*Collected Writings*, Vol. XIII., p. 193.



lack of Scripture ; and, when resorted to in the absence of the latter, they demonstrate to a bystander the weakness of the cause sought by such means to be defended. He upholds Mr. Pinkerton's doctrine, that propitiation was accomplished in this world, not in heaven ; thereby committing himself to a defence of what is unscriptural and really impossible. It is unscriptural, I would repeat it, to teach that propitiation could be made for our sins without the shedding of blood, without a high priest, and apart from a sanctuary. It is impossible that the Lord could have made it without first shedding His blood, and that on the Cross.

Again, as has also been manifested by others of late, Mr. Kelly subverts his own doctrine. Mr. Pinkerton, with consistency, tried to get rid of the plain interpretation of Heb. ii. 17, which doubtless he felt was destructive of his position. Mr. Kelly rightly rejects Mr. Pinkerton's application of that passage, and has no doubt that it "does strictly and solely refer to atonement for sins," . . . "the high priest's peculiar work on the day of atonement, in the antitype Christ being alike victim and high-priestly offerer." Now on the day of atonement, to which he admits (Heb. ii. 17) refers "strictly and solely," the blood of the sacrifice was shed, ere the High Priest could enter the sanctuary. He alone could make propitiation, and in the holiest when alone with God. Mr. Kelly's admission, therefore, refutes Mr. Pinkerton's doctrine, and is condemnatory of himself for supporting it. Propitiation, then, could not have been made in this world.

Then with strange inconsistency, and—may I venture to use his own words?—with "incredible rashness," he hazards the statement that Mr. Pinkerton "holds in common with all rightly taught believers, that propitiation was accomplished in this world, not in heaven." And that he rightly denies that "Christ entered heaven to complete it." Strange that such a statement should appear in the very periodical which witnesses to the contrary. 'Tis strange, 'tis passing strange, that such a statement should deliberately be made by one whose editorial labours, extending over a good number of years, attest the very opposite. In the *Bible Treasury*, vol. iii., 1860, 1861, some papers called *Thoughts on Hebrews*, tell a different tale. Years afterwards these *Thoughts* reappeared in *Collected Writings of Mr. J. N. Darby*, edited by Mr. W. Kelly, vol. xxvii. Other passages in these same writings could be cited to the same effect. Nor are we confined to the writings of Mr. Darby, passages might easily be culled from others commonly regarded as rightly taught believers, who did not teach that all was done in this world, not in heaven. Challenged by a correspondent as to the correctness of his assertion, Mr. Kelly, in the January number of the *Bible Treasury*, forgets apparently what he had averred, and endeavours to

answer his questioner by raising a different issue, really shifting his ground. Asserting, as he did, that all rightly taught believers held Mr. Pinkerton's doctrine, how comes it—and it is this that he has to explain—that he had for years, in his capacity of editor, issued, without any warning, statements which do not agree with his announcement? Can he meet this? He attempts it, in the January number of his periodical, by quoting some words of Mr. Darby from Vol. XV. of *Collected Writings*. The reader may judge for himself whether Mr. Kelly's reference to them does, or does not, bear out his assertion which was challenged. I quote them, not in support of anything I have written—for I desire that to stand only as it is in accordance with the Word of God. But I quote them that the reader may judge for himself whether Mr. Kelly has dealt fairly by the author in the use he has made of his words: "Though contrasted with the Jewish priesthood, infirmities, help, intercession, ever living to make it, and these alone are identified with His priesthood, save the fact of propitiation in chapter ii., which is admitted to be an exceptional case, in which the high priest represented the people (not a proper act of priesthood, though of the high priest on the day of atonement)."

Some points raised by my critic have been met by anticipation in the preceding pages, so I pass them by here, only remarking, as to Heb. ix. 11, 12, that the analogy which the sacred writer draws between Aaron's entrance on the day of atonement and that of the Lord as High Priest is set at nought by his advocacy of Mr. Pinkerton's doctrine; and his admission on page 191, "Christ's entrance into heaven was in no way to effect propitiation; His atoning blood had already done so," is really fatal to his position, and unwittingly goes far to support the doctrine which he condemns. Christ's atoning blood, he admits, had *already*—i.e., before His ascension—effected propitiation. Well, how? Scripture tells us He entered in by His own blood (Heb. ix. 12). Does it teach a presentation of the blood to God apart from the presence there of the High Priest Himself? No. They are connected in the closest way. Then that entrance as High Priest took place before ascension. The Lord's ascension, therefore, and His entrance into the heavenly sanctuary as High Priest, are different events accomplished at different times. Did he first enter the sanctuary *after* He rose? What Scripture teaches that? As with Mr. Pinkerton, so with Mr. Kelly, the theory they uphold involves them in hopeless contradictions; and the former, in words already quoted (page 33), has told us why. "The Epistle to the Hebrews knows of but one entrance—i.e., on His ascension," writes Mr. Kelly. His admission quoted above as to the Lord's blood really refutes this.

Here I close. Mr. Kelly's advocacy of Mr. Pinkerton's doctrine his own statement as to Heb. ii. condemns. His assertion regarding all rightly taught believers his past editorial labours

refute. He surrenders, too, his ground when he writes, "His own blood had already done so;" for that could only be presented to God by the High Priest Himself on His entrance into the holiest. And as with Mr. Pinkerton, so, I regret to say it, with Mr. Kelly, the plain teaching of the word must be set aside to maintain what they write. Mr. Pinkerton endeavours to neutralise the effect of Heb. ii. 17. Mr. Kelly as unsuccessfully attempts to neutralise the teaching of viii. 4, as he writes (p. 191), "This"—*i.e.*, what Heb. ii. 17 refers to—"was not the function of the priest in the sanctuary (which alone is the point in Heb. viii. 4), but the high priest's peculiar work on the day of atonement," &c. True, the High Priest only, of course, could make atonement, and viii. 3, 4, refers to that, calling attention, as it does, to the Lord's sacrificial service as High Priest (ver. 3), and to the fact that He could not be a priest at all on earth (ver. 4); this last explanatory of what had been stated, that He was a minister of the holy places, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man. Now, the Lord's sacrificial service was restricted to His atoning sacrifice (Heb. ix. 25-28), of which the making propitiation, a work peculiar to the High Priest, was one essential element. The real point in viii. 4 is the contrast between the earthly sanctuary and the heavenly one, rather than between priest and high priest. "Error annulling the cross," which Mr. Kelly attributes to me, is too foolish a charge to notice.

---