

# The Sabbath-School Worker (1890)

E. J. Waggoner

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LESSON XV	6
LESSON XVI	10
LESSON XVII	12
LESSON XVIII	15
LESSON XIX	21
LESSON XX	24
LESSON XXI	26
LESSON XXII	28
LESSON XXIII	32
LESSON XXIV	36

## LESSON XV

**JANUARY 11, 1890. HEBREWS 8:2-6**

1. In the Mosaic dispensation, did God have a dwelling place among his people?
2. Where was it made? and by whom?
3. What were its two rooms called?
4. Who were permitted to go into the sanctuary? Num. 18:1-7.
5. How often did the priests go into the holy place? Heb. 9:6.
6. Who was permitted to go into the most holy? Verse 7.
7. In what does our priest minister? Heb. 8: 2.
8. Where is the sanctuary in which he ministers? Verses 1, 2.
9. Who made that sanctuary? Verse 2.
10. Where was the blood of the sin-offerings presented before the Lord? Lev. 4:7; 16:14, 15.
11. Could Christ have any priesthood on earth? Heb. 8: 4. See note.
12. Who were the priests that served according to the law? *-lb.* Ex. 28:1.
13. What was the nature of their service? Heb. 8:5.
14. What is meant by the example and shadow? *Ans.*-They were typical.
15. How was the pattern or example obtained? Same verse, last part.
16. Of what is Christ the mediator? Verse 6.
17. How does this compare with the old covenant? *-lb.*
18. What was the old covenant? See Ex. 19:5-8; 24:3-8.
19. What is a covenant? See note.
20. Upon what was the better covenant established? Heb. 8:6.

21. What was the condition of the covenant in Ex. 19:5-8?-It was that which the Lord called *his covenant*.

22. What was his covenant which he required them to keep? Deut. 4:12, 13.

## NOTES

At first glance it might seem that the reasoning is not good, which decides that Christ could have no priesthood on earth; for, if the law which confined the priesthood to the family of Aaron were abolished, what would hinder one serving though he were of another tribe? But it must be remembered that the priesthood and the law ordaining the priesthood stood and fell together. The only law for an earthly priesthood was that law which gave the office exclusively to the family of Aaron, and if any would act as priest on earth he must conform to the law of the earthly priesthood. It was impossible for one of another tribe to act as priest on earth. Further, it must be borne in mind that the service in the temple was still kept up by the Jews at the time when this letter was written, so that the words in this verse were conformable to the facts as they existed, as well as to the facts concerning the change of dispensations. For no one could possibly have then officiated as priest unless he were of the family of Aaron.

Webster gives two principal definitions to the word "covenant." The first is, "A mutual agreement of two or more persons or parties, in writing and under seal, to do or to refrain from some act or thing." The second is, "A writing containing the terms of agreement between parties. But neither of these definitions is extensive enough to cover all the uses of the word in the Bible. For instance, in Gen. 9:9-16 the word "covenant" is used with reference to a promise of God, given without any condition expressed or implied. The common idea of a covenant more nearly fits the transaction recorded in Ex. 19:5-8; yet even here we shall find that the thing called a covenant, which God

9

made with the people, does not in every particular correspond to a contract made between two men. It is only another instance of the impossibility of a perfect comparison between divine and human things. In other places in the Bible the word "testament" or "will" is used with reference to the same transaction, although a *contract* and a *will* are greatly different. The transaction between God and Israel partakes of the nature of both. But it is of little consequence that a human covenant does not perfectly represent the affair, or that the Bible uses the word "covenant" in so widely varying senses. The main point is to understand just what is meant in each instance, and this the Scriptures themselves enable us readily to do.

Still another sense in which the word "covenant" is used in the Bible, is found in the text under consideration. Ex. 19:5-8. The condition of the covenant which the Lord made with Israel, was that they should keep his covenant. Here was something already existing, which God calls "my covenant," concerning which he was about to make a covenant with the people. What God's covenant is, may be found from Deut. 4:12, 13. It is the ten commandments. God's law-called his covenant-was the basis of the covenant between him and Israel. The matter is so

plain that there is no necessity for confusion. It makes no difference that the same term is applied to both; it is sufficient to know that God's covenant-the ten commandments-antedated and is entirely distinct from the transaction at Horeb-also called a covenant. That to which the apostle refers as the first covenant, was, therefore, simply this: A promise on the part of the people to keep his holy law, and a statement on the part of God, of the result to them if they should obey him.

## LESSON XVI

### JANUARY 18. HEBREWS 8:8-13

1. What was the old covenant that was made with Israel? Ex. 19:5-8; 24:3-8.
2. How does the second covenant compare with the first? Heb. 8:6.
3. What was the necessity for the second covenant? Verse 7.
4. Since the second covenant is better than the first, in that it is founded upon better promises, wherein must the first have been faulty? *Ans.*-In the promises.
5. What were the promises of the first covenant? Ex. 19:8; 24:3, 7.
6. What was God's covenant which the people promised to perform?
7. What is said of the nature of those commandments? Ps. 19:7; 119:172.
8. What of those who do them? Ps. 119:1-3; Eccl. 12:13.
9. Then could the children of Israel have promised anything better than to keep God's commandments?
10. Wherein, then, was the fault? Heb. 8:8, first part.
11. What did the people really promise to do? Ex. 19:5, 6, 8. See note.
12. What cannot the law do? Rom. 3:20.
13. What renders the law thus powerless? Rom. 8:3.
14. What is all human righteousness? Isa. 64:6.
15. What is the only true righteousness? Phil. 3:9.
16. In the terms of the first covenant do we find any mention of faith, or of divine assistance?

## NOTES

Let the student note that the promises in the old covenant were really all on the part of the people. God said, "If ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant [the ten commandments], then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people. . . . and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation." God did not say that he would make them such, but that they would be such a people if they obeyed his commandments. It could not be otherwise. The keeping of God's holy law would constitute them a holy people; and as such they would indeed be a peculiar treasure, even as are all who are zealous of good works. All that was set before them was simply what would result from obedience to the law, and that covenant contained no promises of help in doing that. Therefore the first covenant was a promise on the part of the people that they

would make themselves holy. But this they could not do. The promise was a good one; with it alone there could be no fault; the fault lay with the people. The promise was faulty, through the weakness of the people who made it; just as we read in Rom. 8:3 that the law was weak through the flesh.

The first thought in the minds of many, on learning that in the first covenant the people made a promise which they could not possibly fulfill, is that God was unjust to require such a promise. And since they know that God is not unjust, they

12

conclude that the first covenant must have contained pardon and promise of divine assistance, although it contained no hint of it. If the student will wait until the subject of the covenants is concluded, he will see the justice and the mercy of God's plan. But right here let us fasten these two thoughts: First, if the first covenant had contained pardon, and promise of divine assistance, there would have been no necessity of any other covenant. Pardon and divine aid are all that any soul can get, and if the first covenant had had these, it would not have been faulty. But, second, let it not be forgotten that the fact that there was no pardon, and no Holy Spirit's aid, in that covenant does not imply that there was no salvation for the people who lived under it. There was ample provision for them, but not in the first covenant. What the provision was, and why the first covenant was given, will be learned later.

## LESSON XVII

### JANUARY 25, 1890. HEBREWS 8:8-13

1. With whom was the old covenant made? Jer. 31:31, 32.
2. With whom did the Lord say he would make a new covenant? Heb. 8:8.
3. Have Gentiles any part in the covenants? Eph. 2:11, 12.
4. What were the promises of the old covenant?
5. What did the people really bind themselves to do?
6. Wherein was that covenant faulty?

13

7. What made the promises faulty?
8. In what was the second covenant better than the first? Heb. 8:6.
9. Repeat the promises of the new covenant? Verses 10-12; Jer. 31:33, 34.
10. Who makes these promises?
11. What is the order of their fulfillment? See note.
12. What is meant by putting the law into the minds of the people? *Ans.*-So impressing it upon their minds that they would not forget it, and causing them to delight in it, and acknowledge its holiness. Rom. 7:12, 22.
13. What is meant by writing it in their hearts? *Ans.*-Making it the rule of their lives, the spring of all their actions. In other words, making it a part of them.
14. What is said of those in whose hearts the law of God is? Ps. 119:11; 37:31.
15. Whom will such a one be like? Ps. 40:7, 8.

16. What will be the characteristic of those who have the law written in their hearts? Titus 2:14.

17. Is not this the object set before the people in the first covenant? Ex. 19:5, 6.

18. Then wherein is the great difference between the first covenant and the second? *Ans.*-In the first covenant the people promised to make themselves holy; in the second, God says that he will do the work for them.

19. In order that this work may be done, what must men do? James 4:7, first clause; 1 Peter 5:6; Rom. 6:13.

14

20. *What is the reason why man who profess to desire righteousness do not obtain it?* Rom. 10:3.

21. If they would humble themselves and submit to God, what would he do for them? Isa. 61:10.

22. Through whom alone can this righteousness be obtained? Rom. 5:17, 19.

23. What is the condition on which it is given? Rom. 3:22.

## NOTES

The first of the blessings of the gospel is the forgiveness of sins. The term for this in the quotation in Hebrews is. "I will be merciful to their unrighteousness." The next is the writing of the law in the hearts of the people. Then comes the final blotting out of sins: "Their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more." And then comes the close of probation, and the eternal inheritance, when "they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord." Jer. 31:34. Then all the people will be taught of the Lord. Isa. 54:13.

Israel were indeed be called the people of God; but his dealings with them abundantly prove, what the New Testament plainly declares, that only the faithful are really Israel, and no others were truly his people. The Lord sent word to Pharaoh, saying, "Let my people go, that they may serve me." Again he said, "Israel is my son, even my firstborn." He also said he had seen the affliction of his people, and had come to deliver them, and to bring them into the land of Canaan. He did indeed

15

deliver them out of Egypt, but of all the host that went out, only two were brought into the land of Canaan. The rest fell in the desert because of their unbelief. When they rebelled against God, they cut themselves off from being his people. And as he said in the prophecy, and in the text we have been considering, when they refused to continue in his covenant, he regarded them not. To be the people of God in truth, we must have his law in our hearts.

## LESSON XVIII

## FEBRUARY 1, 1890. HEBREWS 8:8-13

1. In what does the difference between the old covenant and the new consist? Heb. 8:6.

2. What were the promises of the old covenant?

3. What are those of the new?

4. Was there any promise of pardon in the old covenant? See Ex. 19:3-8; 24:3-8. These scriptures contain the complete record of the making of the old covenant, but they contain no hint of pardon, or of any help through Christ.

5. Then how did people under the old covenant find salvation? Heb. 9:14, 15.

6. Was there actual forgiveness for the people at the very time they sinned? or was forgiveness deferred until the death of Christ? Ps. 32:5; 78:38. Enoch and Elijah were taken to Heaven, which shows that they had received the same fullness of blessing that those will receive who live until the Lord comes.

16

7. Since there was present and complete salvation for men who lived under the old covenant, and forgiveness of the transgressions that were under the first covenant came only through the second, what must we conclude? *Ans.*-That the second covenant really existed at the same time as, and even before, the first covenant.

8. Tell again what is included in the blessings of the second covenant?

9. What will be received by those whose transgressions are forgiven through the new covenant? Heb. 9:15, last clause.

10. Whose children are all they who are heirs of the eternal inheritance? Gal. 3:29.

11. Of how many is Abraham the father? Rom. 4:11, 12.

12. Did Abraham have righteousness? Gen. 26:5.

13. How did he obtain this righteousness? Rom. 4:3; Gal. 3:6.

14. Through whom did Abraham receive this righteousness? Gal. 3:14, first part.

15. Then could the covenant with Abraham have lacked anything? *Ans.*-No; having Christ, it had all that can be desired-"all things that pertain to life and godliness."

16. Since all the blessings which people receive through the new covenant, they receive as children of Abraham, can there be any difference between the second covenant and the covenant with Abraham?

17. How long before the old covenant was the covenant with Abraham made? Gal. 3:17.

17

18. Then why was that "first" covenant made? See notes.

### NOTES

The question has often been asked, How could any be saved under the old covenant, if there was no pardon in that covenant? That there was no pardon in that covenant is readily seen: 1. There is no hint of pardon in the covenant itself,

as recorded in Ex. 19:5-8, or in the reiteration and ratification of it in chap. 24:3-8. 2. In the sanctuary service there was no blood offered that could take away sin. Heb. 10:4. There was therefore no chance for pardon in that covenant. But to say they were under that covenant settles nothing as to what was in the covenant. All were under that covenant who lived while it endured. But that was not all. They were "beloved for the Father's sake." As children of Abraham, they were also under the Abrahamic covenant, of which their circumcision was the token. John 7:22; Gen. 17:9-14. This was a covenant of faith, already confirmed by the word and oath of the Lord, in Christ, the Seed, and it was not disannulled by any future arrangement. Gal. 3:15-17. All who were of faith were blessed with faithful Abraham. Verses 6-9. Overlooking this plain fact, which indeed lies at the very foundation of gospel faith in the new covenant, which is but the development of the Abrahamic, some have ascribed salvation to the covenant at Horeb. But, according to both Scripture and reason, if salvation had been possible in that covenant, there was no need of the second. Heb. 7:11; 10:1, etc.

Though much dissatisfaction is expressed by commentators with the received rendering of Heb. 9:1, their suggestions do not make it very greatly different. The first covenant is said to have had

18

ordinances of divine service and a sanctuary for this world. But these were superadditions, not at all necessary to the covenant, but quite necessary as types of the sacrifice and priesthood of the new covenant. They all recognized the existence of sin; but no sin was taken away by them. Heb. 10:3, 4. As a sanctuary of this world, and offerings that could not take away sin, were connected to that covenant, these things themselves were but recognitions of the fact that there was no pardon in that covenant. By those things the people expressed faith in the mediation of the new covenant. If any pardon had been contained in that covenant, we must conclude that some means would have been devised to make that fact manifest. But there was not.

The word sanctuary means a holy place, or the dwelling-place of God. Indeed, the same word is often used in the Hebrew for sanctuary and holiness. All can see that it is derived from a verb which signifies to sanctify or make holy. The sanctuary being a holy dwelling, and being divided into two rooms each of course was a holy place. And each is called *the holy*. See Lev. 16:2. Here the word "holy" is used, and we learn only by the description-within the veil before the mercy-seat, which is upon the ark-that the inner holy is meant. Inasmuch as in the second was placed the ark, containing the tables of stone on which were the commandments-the most sacred things committed to them,-it was called the most holy, or, properly, according to the Hebrew, the holy of the holies.

What was in the ark? Few subjects have occasioned more perplexity than this description of what was in the ark. The apostle specifies, as being in the holy place, only the candlestick and the

19

table upon which was the bread; whereas it is certain that the golden altar of incense was also therein. Moses had direction to put the two tables of testimony in the ark. Ex. 26:16, 21. This order he obeyed. Ex. 40:29; Deut. 10:5. But we do

not read of his putting anything else in the ark, or of his being ordered to do so. In 1 Kings 8:9 it is distinctly said that "there was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone, which Moses put there at Horeb, when the Lord made a covenant with the children of Israel." This was spoken of the time when the vessels of the sanctuary were brought into their appropriate places in the temple built by Solomon. Dr. Clarke says:-

"As Calmet remarks, in the temple which was afterwards built, there were many things added which were not in the tabernacle, and several things left out. The ark of the covenant and the two tables of the law were never found after the return from the Babylonish captivity. We have no proof that, even in the time of Solomon, the golden pot of manna, or the rod of Aaron, was either in or near the ark. . . . We need not trouble ourselves to reconcile the various scriptures which mention these subjects, some of which refer to the tabernacle, others to Solomon's temple, and others to the temple built by Zorobabel, which places were very different from each other."

That changes took place is evident. If Paul wrote of the tabernacle in the days of Moses, then the rod of Aaron and the pot of manna had been removed from the ark before the time of Solomon, which some suggest might have occurred while the ark was in the hands of the Philistines. Or, otherwise, Paul was speaking of things as they existed some time after Solomon, of which we have no account in the Scriptures. Which is the case is not at all material.

20

None should allow themselves to be confused by the terms *first covenant* and *second covenant*. While the covenant made at Sinai was called "the first covenant," it is by no means the first covenant that God ever made with man. Long before that he made a covenant with Abraham, and he also made a covenant with Noah, and with Adam. Neither must it be supposed that the first or old covenant existed for a period of time as the only covenant with the people before the promise of the second or new covenant could be shared. If that had been the case, then during that time there would have been no pardon for the people. What is called the "second covenant" virtually existed before the covenant was made at Sinai; for the covenant with Abraham was confirmed in Christ (Gal. 3:17); and it is only through Christ that there is any value to what is known as the second covenant. There is no blessing that can be gained by virtue of the second covenant that was not promised to Abraham. And we, with whom the second covenant is made, can share the inheritance which it promises only by being children of Abraham. To be Christ's is the same as to be children of Abraham (Gal. 3:29); all who are of faith are the children of Abraham and share in his blessing (verses 7-9); and since no one can have anything except as children of Abraham, it follows that there is nothing in what is called the second covenant that was not in the covenant made with Abraham. The second covenant existed in every feature long before the first, even from the days of Adam. It is called "second" because both its ratification by blood and its more minute statement were after that of the covenant made at Sinai. More than this, it was the second covenant made with the Jewish people. The one from Sinai was the *first* made with that nation.



When it is demonstrated that the first covenant-the Sinaitic covenant-contained no provisions for pardon of sins, some will at once say, "But they *did* have pardon under that covenant." The trouble arises from a confusion of terms. It is not denied that *under* the old covenant, *i.e.*, during the time when it was specially in force, there was pardon of sins, but that pardon was not offered in the old covenant, and could not be secured by virtue of it. The pardon was secured by virtue of something else, as shown by Heb. 9:15. Not only was there the opportunity of finding free pardon of sins, and grace to help in time of need, during the time of the old covenant, but the same opportunity existed before that covenant was made, by virtue of God's covenant with Abraham, which differs in no respect from that made with Adam and Eve, except that we have the particulars given more in detail. We see, then, that there was no necessity for provisions to be made in the Sinaitic covenant for forgiveness of sins. The plan of salvation was developed long before the gospel was preached to Abraham (Gal. 3:8), and was amply sufficient to save to the uttermost all who would accept it. The covenant at Sinai, was made for the purpose of making the people see the necessity of accepting the gospel.

## LESSON XIX

### FEBRUARY 8, 1890. HEBREWS 9:1-7

1. What does the apostle say that the first covenant had? Heb. 9:1.
2. Were these a part of that covenant? See Ex. 19:3-6; 24:3-8.

22

3. What is meant by ordinances of divine service? *Ans.*-Ceremonies of divine appointment. There is no divine service without divine appointment.
4. What is meant by a worldly sanctuary? *Ans.*-A sanctuary of the world, in distinction from the one in heaven.
5. Where is the only real sanctuary? Heb. 8:1, 2.
6. What relation did the worldly sanctuary and its services sustain to the heavenly? Verse 5.
7. How many apartments were in the tabernacle? Heb. 9:2, 3.
8. What were the two apartments called? *-Ib.* See note.
9. What was in the holy? Verse 2; Ex. 40:23-27.
10. What was in the holiest of all? Heb. 9:4.
11. What was in the ark? Compare Ex. 25:31; 1 Kings 8:9. See note.
12. What was the cover of the ark called? Heb. 9:5; Ex. 25:21.
13. Why was it called the mercy-seat? *Ans.*-It was there that mercy was dispensed. The sanctuary was God's dwelling-place; the ark represented his throne; and from his throne he dispenses grace, or favor, or mercy. See Heb. 4:16.
14. How often did the priests go into the sanctuary? Heb. 9:5.
15. How often was there service in the most holy? Verse 7.
16. Why was this service performed?

17. What alone is sin? 1 John 3:4.

18. What was the basis of the old covenant?

19. What, then, was it that made it necessary for that covenant to have ordinances of divine service connected with it?

20. Does the new covenant have ordinances of divine service? Heb. 9:1. The word "also" indicates that it had already been shown that the second covenant had ordinances of divine service. This was done in chapter 7 and 8.

21. Then what must be the basis of the second covenant?

## NOTES

Hebrews 9:1 is a text that hinders many from seeing that all of God's blessings to man are gained by virtue of the second covenant, and not by the first. That text reads: "Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary." This, together with the fact that when men complied with these ordinances of divine service, they were forgiven (Leviticus 4), seems to some conclusive evidence that the old covenant contained the gospel and its blessings. But forgiveness of sins was not secured by virtue of those offerings; "for it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins." Heb. 10:4. Forgiveness was obtained only by virtue of the promised sacrifice of Christ (Heb. 9;15), the Mediator of the new covenant, their faith in whom was shown by their offerings. So it was by virtue of the second or new covenant that pardon was secured to those who offered the sacrifices provided for in the ordinances of divine service connected with the old or first covenant.

Moreover, those "ordinances of divine service"

24

formed no part of the first covenant. If they had, they must have been mentioned in the making of that covenant; but they were not. They were connected with it, but not a part of it. They were simply the means by which the people acknowledged the justice of their condemnation to death for the violation of the law which they had covenanted to keep, and their faith in the Mediator of the new covenant.

In brief, then, God's plan in the salvation of sinners, whether now or in the days of Moses, is: The law sent home emphatically to the individual, to produce conviction of sin, and thus to drive the sinner to seek freedom; then, the acceptance of Christ's gracious invitation, which was extended long before, but which the sinner would not listen to; and lastly, having accepted Christ, and being justified by faith, the manifestation of the faith, through the ordinances of the gospel, and the living of a life of righteousness by faith in Christ.

## LESSON XX

**FEBRUARY 15, 1890. HEBREWS 9:8-14**

1. What did the first covenant have connected with it?
  2. Who performed the service in the worldly sanctuary?
  3. How often was service performed in each apartment? Heb. 9:6, 7.
  4. What was signified by this? Verse 8.
- 25
5. What was that sanctuary? Verse 9, first part.
  6. How much was accomplished by the service? -*lb*.
  7. Who is our real high priest?
  8. Where does he minister? Heb. 8:1, 2; 9:11.
  9. Is it necessary that he offer something? Heb. 8:3.
  10. What does he offer? Heb. 9:12.
  11. What does his blood do for us? Verses 13, 14.
  12. With what are we redeemed? 1 Peter 1:18, 19.
  13. What is the blood of Christ called? Heb. 13:29.
  14. Did Christ minister as a priest while he was on earth? Heb. 8:4; 9:8.
  15. When did the first sanctuary cease to stand as a sanctuary? Matt. 23:38; 27:50, 51.
  16. What secured the pardon of transgressions that were committed under the first covenant? Heb. 9:14, 15.
  17. Since Christ did not begin his priestly work of offering his own blood until after the crucifixion and ascension, how could this be? Gal. 3:17; Heb. 6:13-18.

### NOTE

The ordinances of divine service that were connected with the first covenant had no efficacy whatever. They could not make the comer thereunto perfect as pertaining to the conscience. All

26

transgressions committed under that covenant that were pardoned, were pardoned by virtue of the second covenant, of which Christ is Mediator. Yet although Christ's blood was not shed until hundreds of years after the first covenant was made, sins were forgiven whenever they were confessed. That covenant, as we have seen, was for the purpose of directing the minds of the people to the Abrahamic covenant, which God confirmed in Christ. Gal. 3:17. This confirmation was by an oath, in addition to the promise. These "two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie," made the sacrifice of Christ as efficacious in the days of Abraham and Moses as it is now. This is made still more evident by the statement that these two things given to Abraham are the things which give us strong consolation.

### LESSON XXI

**FEBRUARY 22, 1890. HEBREWS 9:15-20**

1. What was effected by the blood of the old covenant?
2. Was any sin ever removed by that covenant?

3. What can the blood of Christ accomplish?
  4. What provision is made for transgressors under the first covenant? Heb. 9:13.
  5. What law did they transgress under the first covenant?
- 27
6. Then if Jesus is Mediator for their transgressions, in behalf of what law is he the Mediator?
  7. By what means did he become their Redeemer? Verse 15.
  8. Who are meant by them which are called? Ans.-All, of all ages and nations, to whom the word of salvation comes, or whom the Spirit of God moves to accept the word. See Acts 2:39.
  9. What may they receive through the priesthood of Christ? Heb. 9:15. See note.
  10. What is necessary where there is a testament? Verse 16.
  11. Why is this the case? Verse 17.
  12. How was the old covenant ratified? Verse 18.
  13. What did Moses speak to the people? Verse 19.
  14. Where is this transaction recorded? Ex. 24:3-5.
  15. What did Moses send young men to do? Verse 5.
  16. Of what did their burnt-offerings consist? Compare Heb. 9:18.
  17. What did Moses do with the blood? -*ib.*, Ex. 24:6, 8.
  18. With what did he sprinkle the blood?

## NOTES

Verse 15 has a fund of instruction underlying the first glance at the language. It is made very sure that Jesus is the Mediator between the people who lived under the first covenant, and the law which God proclaimed to them, of which they

28

were transgressors. And it is absurd to suppose that God will judge the family of Adam, moral agents, by different moral standards. It is the law given to the Jews, which David says is perfect, that it is righteousness, etc. It is the same law that Solomon says contains the whole duty of man, and by which God will bring every work into judgment. The commandments given to Israel in the wilderness are the lively oracles which Stephen said they received to give unto us. Acts 7:38.

In verse 15 is again introduced the contrast which was so successfully argued in chapter 4. Though the children of Israel rejoiced that they had had rest from their wanderings, and that the Lord had subdued their enemies before them, and given them homes for themselves and their children, they were yet subject to cares, to sickness, pain, and death. Joshua gave them a temporal rest. But a greater than Joshua had become the leader of his people, and the rest that remains is an eternal inheritance. And God is so wise and merciful in the provisions of his grace that the faithful even under the first covenant may share their inheritance.

## LESSON XXII

MARCH 1, 1890. HEBREWS 9:20-23

1. Who spoke to Israel in behalf of the Lord when the first covenant was made?
2. What did he do with the blood?
3. What did he then say? Ex. 24:8; Heb. 9:20.
4. Is there any difference in these texts? Ans.

29

-The first says, made; the second, enjoined. The Hebrew word used has a number of significations. The conditions of the covenant were not arranged between the parties, but were matters enjoined.

5. What similar language did Jesus use in establishing the new covenant? Matt. 26:28; Mark 14:24.

6. What more did Moses sprinkle with blood? Heb. 9:21.
7. In the typical law, were all things purified by blood? Verse 22.
8. What was the nature of the exceptions? See Num. 19. See note.
9. What is necessary to the remission of sin? Heb. 9:22.
10. Why was the blood chosen to make atonement? Lev. 17:11.
11. What is meant in Gen. 9:6 by the words, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood"?  
*Ans.*-As the life is in the blood, it is equivalent to saying, Whoso taketh man's life.
12. What should be the fate of him who sheds the blood of man? Gen. 9:6.
13. What does this teach? *Ans.*-That only blood, or life, can atone for life.
14. Whose lives are forfeited to the law? See Rom. 3:19, 23; 6:23.
15. Must we still depend upon blood to be cleared before the law? 1 John 1:7; Eph. 1:7.

16. What was necessary in the earthly sanctuary? Heb. 9:23.

30

17. Were the earthly holy places purified by the blood of bulls and goats? Lev. 16:14, 15, 19.
18. What are the earthly things called? Heb. 9:23.
19. Do the heavenly things need purifying? *-lb.*
20. How did the patterns become defiled? See note.
21. Who takes away our sins? John 1:29.
22. Why did Christ take our sins upon himself? *Ans.*-Because he is our High Priest; the priest bears the judgment of the people. Ex. 28:29, 30.
23. Where is he filling his priestly office? See Heb. 8:1, 2.
24. Are the heavenly things defiled by our sins going to our priest?
25. With what is it necessary for the heavenly things to be cleansed? Heb. 9:23.

## NOTES

Here again in verse 21 is a statement of that which we do not find in the writings of Moses. But we learn that the Jews had a tradition that such was the

case, and in this instance their tradition must have been correct. In the account of the erection of the tabernacle, and the dedication of the holy things, it is recorded that they were anointed with oil, but the sprinkling of blood is not mentioned. This, however, does not involve any contradiction.

The fact that some things, and in some cases persons, were purified without blood, see Numbers 19, does not disagree with the reasonable statement that without shedding of blood is no remission; for, in cases of purification with oil, or water, there was no sin. There were misfortunes, as in certain sicknesses, or accidents, fleshly defilements. But the wages of sin is death, always, and where the penalty is death nothing but life can meet the demand of the law. Now as the blood is the life of man (Deut. 12:23), it is given to make atonement. Lev. 17:11. The offering of blood for life signifies life for life. Hence the statement that we have redemption through the blood of Christ. It means that our lives are purchased with his life, God's appointments are in strict accord with reason and justice.

No objection against the true doctrine of the atonement is more persistently urged than this, that there can be nothing in heaven that needs cleansing. Such pleading for heaven reminds us of the zeal of Peter in vindicating his Lord. Matt. 16:21-23. But to prove that the heavenly sanctuary does need cleansing because of our sins taken by our Priest, and that nothing but the blood of Christ can cleanse it, is the whole drift of the apostle's argument. Take away this great truth, and his labored argument would be without any logical conclusion. Not only were the earthly sacrifices typical of Christ's sacrifice, and the earthly priests typical of his priesthood, but the earthly sanctuary was typical of the heavenly holy places. And of course the cleansing of the sanctuary on earth with the blood of bulls and goats was typical of the purifying of the heavenly things with better sacrifice. In the whole argument of this remarkable letter, nothing is made more plain than this.

## LESSON XXIII

**MARCH 8, 1890. HEBREWS 9:24-28**

1. With what were the earthly holies purified?
2. Whose office was it to cleanse the sanctuary?
3. Do the heavenly things need cleansing?
4. Where has our High Priest entered? Heb. 9:24.
5. Why could not Christ act as priest in the earthly sanctuary? Chap. 8:4.
6. If the earthly was the pattern of the heavenly, must there not be two holy places in the heavenly? Heb. 9:23, 24.
7. What does the word "true" mean in verse 24? Ans.-The true holy places-holy places understood.
8. Where are the true holy places? Verse 24.
9. How often did the high priest enter the most holy on earth? Verse 25.
10. How often does Christ enter the heavenly sanctuary for us? -*lb*. See Verse 12.

11. What is meant by the end of the world, verse 26? Ans.-The last dispensation.

12. For what hath Christ appeared? -*lb.*

13. Whose sins did he come to put away? Compare chap. 7:25.

14. Whose sins does he put away? Ans.-Only those who cease to sin. They who continue to transgress the law of God never have their sins put away; they retain them. Matt. 7:21.

33

15. How did he accomplish this work? Heb. 9:26.

16. What is appointed to all men? Verse 27.

17. What comes after death? -*lb.*

18. What is implied by introducing the judgment as following death? Ans.-That the judgment is consequent upon this life, and for one probation only.

19. What analogy is shown between our probation and the death of Christ? Ans.-As we die one, living but one life, having but one probation, so Christ once died to bear sins.

20. For how many did he die? -*lb.* Compare chap. 2:9.

21. What is meant by the words, "He hath once appeared," Heb. 9:26? Ans.-He has made one advent to this world.

22. Will he appear again? Verse 28.

23. How will he appear? -*lb.* See note.

24. For what purpose will he appear? -*lb.*

25. To whom will he appear unto salvation? -*lb.* See 2 Tim. 4:1, 8.

26. How will he appear to those who do not look for him, nor love his appearing? 2 Thess. 1:6-8; Rev. 6:15-17.

## NOTE

It is to be regretted that commentators have so generally overlooked the true intent of Heb. 9:28, and construed it to mean "without a sin-offering." The original word occurs seventy-three times in the New Testament, and is rendered "sinful," once; "offense," once; "sin," seventy-one times. It

34

is never claimed that it can bear the sense of sin-offering in the New Testament, except in 2 Cor. 5:21, and Heb. 9:28. And we are very confident that it does not in either of these texts. In 2 Cor. 5:21 the contrast and the force are measurably lost by so rendering it. "He hath made him to be sin for us, who himself knew no sin." Our iniquity was laid upon him; he was bruised for our sakes-in our stead. He bore our sin, and suffered as if he had actually been the sinner. The Scripture doctrine of substitution is entirely too strong and clear to admit of this text being changed into sin-offering. In Hebrews 9 there is presented a series of events, mostly in contrast with the things of the earthly service, each of which occurs without being repeated. He offered one sacrifice; he offered it but once; he entered once into the heavenly sanctuary. Man dies once (therefore there is but one probationary life); and after this one death, the judgment. So Christ was once offered to bear sin; and he will once more (a second time) come, without sin. He

was once offered to bear sin; he bore it on the cross; he bears our judgment-the iniquity of his priesthood-before the throne. As a priest he has continually taken sins, except from those who choose to retain them. But when he comes again, he will be separated from sin; he will bear sin no more. As it reads, it signifies that at his second coming his priesthood, his act of sin-bearing, is forever ended.

The difference is evident and material. He might come without a sin-offering, he might not renew his sacrifice, and yet not make an end of his priestly service. He has made but one offering in more than 1,850 years, and his priesthood has continued all these centuries by virtue of that one offering. And it might continue indefinitely, in the

35

same manner, by that one and the same offering. All these centuries he has been receiving the sins of penitents. But he comes without sin, separate or apart from sin, as it really means. This indicates that he will bear sin no more; that he has put it from him. Then he that is unjust must so remain. Rev. 22:10-12.

The following remarks from Dr. Barnes on this text, concerning the coming again of our blessed Saviour, are interesting:-

There is a propriety that he should thus return. He came once to be humbled, despised, and put to death; and there is a fitness that he should come to be honored in his own world.

Every person on earth is interested in the fact that he will return, for 'every eye shall see him.' Rev. 1:7. All who are now in their graves, all who now live, and all who will hereafter live, will behold the Redeemer in his glory.

It will not be merely to gaze upon him, and to admire his magnificence, that they will see him. It will be for greater and more momentous purposes-with reference to an eternal doom.

The great mass of men are not prepared to meet him. They do not believe that he will return; they do not desire that he should appear; they are not ready for the solemn interview which they will have with him. His appearing now would overwhelm them with surprise and horror. There is nothing in the future which they less expect and desire than the second coming of the Son of God, and in the present state of the world his appearance would produce almost universal consternation and despair. It would be like the coming of the flood of waters on the old world; like the sheets of flame on Sodom and Gomorrah.

## LESSON XXIV

### MARCH 15, 1890. HEBREWS 10:1-9

1. What was the nature of the law of sacrifices? Heb. 10:1.
2. Was it exactly like the things of which it was the shadow? -*lb.*
3. What differences were there between the priesthood of Aaron and that of Christ?
4. Could the sacrifices of that law make anyone perfect? -*lb.*
5. If they could, what would have been the result? Verse 2.



6. Why would they have ceased to be offered? *Ans.*-They would have had the same power as the offering of Christ, and would not have needed to be repeated.

7. What is meant by their being remembrances of sin? *Ans.*-Their continued sacrifices were continual acknowledgments of sin. Verse 3.

8. Why were their sins kept in continual remembrance? Verse 4.

9. What is Christ represented as saying when he came into the world? Verse 5.

10. Did this mean that the Lord would not have any sacrifice?

11. From what scripture is this quoted? Ps. 40:6-8.

12. For what can we say a body was prepared him? *Ans.*-For a sacrifice in contrast with those undesirable ones that could not take away sin.

37

13. Where was it written that he should thus come? Heb. 10:7. The volume of the book doubtless refers to the Pentateuch; for the Saviour said that Moses wrote of him, and that all things written in the law of Moses concerning him must be fulfilled. John 5:46; Luke 24:44.

14. For what did he say he came? Heb. 10:7.

15. What two things are spoken of in verses 6 and 7? *Ans.*-Burnt-offerings and the will of God?

16. What do we learn concerning the will of God in the verse from which this is quoted? Ps. 40:8.

17. Is the law the will of God? *Ans.*-There is no difference between the will of God and the law of God. The law of any ruler is his will. See Rom. 2:17, 18, etc.

18. Where did Christ say the law was? Ps. 40:8.

19. Where did God promise to put his law, in the new covenant? Heb. 8:10.

20. Who is the mediator for the fulfillment of this promise?

21. Would he make the sacrifice that he did, to accomplish this, if the law were not in his own heart?

22. What is meant by his taking away the first? Heb. 10:9.

23. What is the second, that he came to establish? See note.

## NOTE

Verse 9 has also been obscured by the unwarranted additions of theologians, who have put their theories into their

38

translations. In a certain translation of the New Testament, of high pretensions, it is made to read, "He taketh away the first will that he may establish the second." But there are no two wills spoken of in the text. The rendering is intended to be equivalent to this: He taketh away the first covenant, that he may establish the second. No one is warranted in putting an idea into a text which is not written in the text, merely because the idea may be true. That construction is altogether foreign to the apostle's train of reasoning. There is a contrast presented throughout in verses 5-9, as follows:-

1. "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire." 2. "I come to do thy will."

He takes away the first, that he may establish the second. In this is found the only contrast in the argument, and it is made very prominent. The sacrifices and offerings of the Mosaic law could not perfect the conscience, could not reform the life, could not write the law of God in the heart. These are taken away, that he may come in whose heart is the law, and who alone can fulfill the promise of the new covenant.

