

COMMENTARY

THE LIGHT FROM THE THRONE

(Part Two)

EDITORIAL

This first quarter of 1989, the Sabbath School lessons for the Adult Division center on the book of Leviticus. Written by two conservative Seventh-day Adventist scholars, there was cause for hope that some of the previously questionable conclusions regarding the sanctuary service might be corrected. However, this is not the case.

In Lesson 4, January 28, near the close of Section I, subtitled - "Sins of Ignorance" - the traditional explanation is found as to what was transferred to the sanctuary. The first sentence of the note reads - "Priest transfers sin to the sanctuary:" This error should be transparent. It was blood only that the priest took into the sanctuary for sin and fingerprinted on the Altar of Incense, and sprinkled before the veil. Now the blood is the life. It is the blood that maketh atonement. (Lev. 17:11) If, therefore, it is sin, then sin makes the atonement. No, a thousand times no! The blood is the record that the penalty has been paid, and the sinner forgiven.

Further thought reveals why sin is not transferred to the sanctuary. It is already recorded at the moment of transgression. The whole ceremony of Leviticus 4 has to do with sins of ignorance, not on God's part, but on the sinner's part. When the sinner was convicted, a prescribed ritual was performed. Why then double record sin? This is not what the sinner needs. He needs the assurance of forgiveness and that the penalty for his sin as recorded has been paid. We nullify a key lesson of Leviticus 4, when we assume that it is teaching the transfer of sin to the sanctuary. There was a transfer of sin, but it was the transfer to the sacrifice.

It was the recognition that a sin had been committed; the transfer of that guilt through the substitute required; and the assurance of forgiveness which is taught in the law of the sin offering. I repeat, while the animal became sin through transfer and was destroyed when the blood was taken within the sanctuary, it was the blood, the life, indicating that the penalty for sin had been paid that was recorded.

The other method to get sin into the sanctuary as noted by the authors of the Sabbath School lessons was, that the priest who ate of the victim in the case of a ruler or common person's sin, ministered in the daily services offering incense, thereby "symbolically transferred" the sin "to the sanctuary." (Teacher's Quarterly, p. 54) Transfer is accomplished in the type by the symbolic laying on of the hand. Where is such a record in the type for the transfer of sin to the sanctuary when the priest ate of the sacrifice? In fact, even in the services on the Day of Atonement, the bullock which was offered as a sin offering for Aaron and his house, never

To page 7, col. 1

The most important service performed in the daily ministration of the sanctuary rituals was that performed in behalf of individuals - the sin offerings. The sin offering did not relate to sin or sinfulness in general, but to a particular manifestation. "If a soul should sin through ignorance" (in error), prefaced the explanation of the law of sin offerings (Lev. 4:2) These were sins which arose out of the weaknesses of the flesh. Those committed with a high hand, that is, "presumptuously," were to be punished by extermination. The offender was to be "utterly cut off." (Num. 15:28-31)

The appeal of the Gospel was based upon the superior ministration of Jesus Christ because "through this Man is preached unto you forgiveness of sins; and by Him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." (Acts 13:38-39) Jesus Himself declared that there was only one sin which could not and would not be forgiven "in this world" nor "in the world to come" and that was the sin of "blasphemy against the Holy Spirit." (Matt. 12:31-32)

While the law of the sin and trespass offerings are one (Lev. 7:7), the steps of the ritual are given only for the sin offerings. (Lev. 4) It is through this outline that we catch glimpses of the reality of the provision made for man to receive victory over the sin problem. The sin offerings pertained to two categories of sin - corporate and individual - and to two groups in each category; namely, the high priest in his official capacity and the entire congregation; the rulers and the ordinary individuals. It was under the category of "ruler" that the priests as individuals were covered. In Numbers 3:32, the word translated, "chief" (nasi) is the same as translated "ruler" in Lev. 4:22.

In the sin offerings, the kind of animal sacrificed, the disposition of the blood, and the status of the priest who ministered, differed depending whether the sin was corporate or individual. Being a burnt offering, rules governing the basic burnt offering as first outlined in Leviticus applied. It was to be offered "at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation." (Lev. 1:3; 4:4) The offerer was to place his hand upon the head of the sacrifice. (Lev. 1:4; 4:24) The sacrificial animal was to be "accepted for him to make atonement for him." (Lev. 1:4; 4:26) In each instance, the one bringing the sacrifice,

slew the animal. (Lev. 1:5; 4:29)

The first category of corporate guilt concerned the High Priest, the spiritual leader of the people. The instruction was that "if the anointed priest sins, bringing guilt on the people" (Lev. 4:3 NKJV), he was to bring a bullock, the largest of all the sacrificial animals, and equal to that required for the whole congregation. (Lev. 4:3,14) While the priest brought the offering as a corporate individual, he ministered the sacrifice in his office as high priest. (4:4-5) The blood was brought into the sanctuary and sprinkled seven times before "the veil of the sanctuary." It was fingerprinted "upon the horns of the altar of sweet incense before the Lord," and the remainder of the blood was poured at the base of the altar of the court. (4:6-7) The fat was removed from the inwards, the kidneys and the folds above the liver. The fat and the kidneys were burned upon the Altar of Burnt Offering. (4:8-10) The rest - "the whole bullock" - was carried "without the camp" and there burned. (4:12)

The same procedure was to be followed when the whole congregation sinned. (4:13-21) Note again - it was the high priest who ministered the sacrifice, and the blood was brought into the sanctuary. It is important to note these two basics in the law of the sin offering. These applied to corporate sin; individual sin was dealt with differently.

When a ruler or a "common" person sinned, the sacrificial animal became a goat instead of a bullock. Three other distinct differences need to be noted. For the individual, be he a ruler or a common person, one of the sub-priests ministered the sacrifice. The blood was not taken into the sanctuary, and the whole animal was not burned without the camp. Instead, the blood of the sacrifice was placed on the horns of the altar of the court, and the balance of the blood poured at the base of the altar. (4:22-26) The officiating priest was to eat of the victim in the court, designated in this instance as a "holy place."

(Lev. 6:25-26) This was explained by Moses to mean that by this act these common priests were to "bear the iniquity" of the individual members of the congregation "to make atonement for them before the Lord." (Lev. 10:17-18) The result to the individual and to the congregation as a whole of the mediation of the sin offering was forgiveness. (4:20, 26, 31) Only in the case of the high priest, when he sinned in such a way as to cause guilt to come upon the whole congregation, is it omitted that forgiveness resulted.

The significance of this difference in the mediating of forgiveness needs to be pondered long by those who stand as spiritual guardians of the people. The record of confession was marked on the horns of the altar of incense, but how God related to it in type, and how He will relate in reality is not given. Christ spoke fearful woes upon the spiritual leaders of His day who caused the people to reject truth. (Matt. 23:13-33)

[See Chart below outlining the details noted above.]

The lessons and glimpses of the Reality as revealed in the Law of the Sin Offering need to be carefully considered.

WHAT WAS TRANSFERRED?

Basic to salvation is transference. We can not pay a penalty for our sins and live. What, then, was transferred when in the sanctuary ritual, the sinner placed his hand upon the head of the sacrifice he brought to the door of the tabernacle? This is no idle question. It was over this question that E. J. Waggoner stumbled. A letter was found on his desk after his sudden death, May 28, 1916, which he wanted the one to whom it was written to consider it "as a confession of faith." In it he wrote:

The self-evident truth that sin is not an entity but a condition that can exist only in a person, made it clear to me that it is impossible for there to be any such

→ → →

SUMMARY OF LEVITICUS 4

SINNER	OFFERING	OFFICIANT	DISPOSITION OF THE BLOOD*	DISPOSITION OF THE VICTIM	RESULT TO THE SINNER
High Priest (Causing the Nation to Sin) (4:3)	Bullock (4:3-4)	High Priest (4:5)	Sprinkled before the Second Veil; Marked on the horns of the Altar of Incense (4:6-7)	Fat and Kidneys burned on the Altar of the Court; rest burned without the camp (4:8-12)	
Congregation (4:13)	Bullock (4:14)	High Priest (4:16)	Same as Above (4:17-18)	Same as Above (4:19-21)	Forgiveness (4:20)
Ruler (4:22) Included the Priests (Num. 3:32)	Kid of the Goats (M) (4:23)	Common Priest (4:25)	Blood marked on the horns of the Altar of the Court (4:25)	Fat and Kidneys burned on the Altar (4:26) +	Forgiveness (4:26)
Common Person (4:27)	Kid of the Goats (F) (4:28)	Common Priest (4:30)	Same as Above (4:30)	Same as Above (4:31) +	Forgiveness (4:31)

*In all the sin offerings, the residue of the blood was poured at the base of the Altar in the Court.

+The priest ate a small portion of the victim (Lev. 6:25-26), and designated parts of the remainder were to be the possession of the officiating priest (Lev. 7:7-8).

thing as the transferring of sins to the sanctuary in heaven, thus defiling that place; and that there could, consequently, be any such thing, either in 1844 A.D., or at any subsequent time, as the "cleansing of the sanctuary." (The Confession of Faith, p. 14)

It can be seen that the question as to what was transferred in the typical sanctuary ritual has been a source of contention in the teaching of the sanctuary truth. Actually, there was and is no need for the transference of sin to the sanctuary, whether in type or Heavenly Reality. As we noted in the previous Commentary, all sin the moment committed is recorded in "books", or in modern terminology, a "computer bank." (III-1, p. 6, col. 2) The very inference of the language used in outlining the sin offering ritual indicates the recording of the sin committed. The law reads - "If his sin, wherein he hath sinned, come to his knowledge." (Lev. 4:23, 28) The fact of sin preceded the perception of that sin. When perceived, it was not the recording of the sin that the sinner needed, but the means to escape from the penalty of the sin.

Review the steps outlined in the model for one category. When the common person became conscious of his sin, he brought the designated animal. Putting his hand upon the head of the victim, he confessed "that he hath sinned in that thing." (Lev. 5:5) The sacrificial animal was "accepted for him to make an atonement for him." (Lev. 1:4) What did the atonement require? Death! Life had to be forfeited, for the wages of sin is death. (Rom. 6:23) The sinner slew the animal. The blood, which "is the life of all flesh" (Lev. 17:14), was taken by the priest and finger-printed on the Altar in the court. This record is saying loud and clear, the penalty had been paid. Confession had been made; therefore, forgiveness can be extended to the transgressor. This is exactly what the law of the sin offering stated - "and the priest shall make an atonement for him, and it shall be forgiven him." (4:31, 35) It does not say that the priest shall make an atonement for him and record his sin. What salvation would that be?

"The offerer transferred the consciousness of sin and the desire for forgiveness to the head of the animal that had been brought in his stead, by the laying on of his hand; and after this the animal was slaughtered, and suffered death for him as the wages of sin." (Keil-Delitzsch, Commentary on the Old Testament, Vol. I, p. 305) Thus the record of sin already there is offset by the fact that the penalty has been paid for by some other living creature.

THE LAW OF THE SIN OFFERING

This is the law of the sin offering: In the place where the burnt offering is killed shall the sin offering be killed before the Lord: it is most holy.

The priest that offereth it shall eat it: in the holy place shall it be eaten, in the court of the tabernacle of the congregation. (Lev. 6:25-26)

So full of meaning was this law that when the sons of Aaron violated it, Moses became "angry" with them. (Lev. 10:16) He asked emphatically - "Why have ye not eaten the sin offering in the holy place, for it is most holy, and He has given it to you to take away the iniquity of the congregation, to make

atonement for them before Jehovah? Behold, its blood has not been brought into the holy place inside. You should certainly have eaten it in the holy place as I have commanded." (Lev. 10:17-18 Heb.)

The offering was a "goat," thus a sin offering for an individual. (Lev. 4:23, 38) Such being the case, the common priest ministered the blood (4:25, 30), and because it was not brought into the sanctuary, he should have eaten of the sacrifice, so as to bear in himself the sin.

In the sin offerings over which the High Priest ministered, the blood was brought into the sanctuary. In this differentiation between the individual and corporate sins as to whom ministered, and what each category of ministering priests did, we see the dual role of Christ both as common priest, and as High Priest.

Every high priest was taken from among men (Heb. 5:1), so Christ to become the great High Priest had to become man. In becoming man, He "partook of the same" flesh and blood as is common to humanity. (Heb. 2:14) He "took upon Himself the slave-form of man" (Phil. 2:7, Gr.) coming in "the likeness of sinful flesh" (Rom. 8:3), being made "to be sin for us." (II Cor. 5:21) In His earthly ministry, Jesus was both "that prophet" (John 1:21), and "common priest." As "that Prophet" He would "build the temple of the Lord" even as Moses the earthly type. As "the Common Priest," He "offered sacrifice, Himself the priest, Himself the victim." (See AA, p. 33) Ministering in the "court" of this earth, He bestowed "forgiveness" even as the common priests of Israel did upon the individual offerer. To the scribes and Pharisees who became incensed because He said to a palsy stricken man - "Thy sins are forgiven thee" - Jesus demonstrated "that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins" by telling the man, "Arise, and take up thy couch, and go into thine house." And he did! (Luke 5:18-24)

Here in the court of earth, the shadowy type was meeting "the very image" of the good things which it prefigured. In ministering the law of the sin offering, the priest would "make atonement" for the sin which the individual "committed, and it [would] be forgiven him." (Lev. 4:35) So Jesus the "anointed One" declared forgiveness to the sin-burdened souls who came to Him. Not only did He forgive sins, but He provided a "forgiveness of sins" which "justified from all things" beyond the scope of the shadowy "law of Moses." (Acts 13:38-39) Having provided the sacrifice, He ministers, at the Throne of Grace, mercy and grace to all who come boldly "in full assurance of faith." (Heb. 4:16; 10:22)

The earthly high priest ministered only corporate sin offerings wherein the blood was brought into the sanctuary, and thus did not eat of the offering, partaking of its symbolic sin. Christ preserving the purity of His divine character, was called to be the High Priest after the Order of Melchisedec. In this mediatorial work, He is not only "able to save to the uttermost" those who "come unto God by Him," but He is also "holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and

made higher than the heavens." (Heb. 7:25-26) In Christ, the law of the sin offering finds its reality, both in His work as a Common Priest while on earth, and in His work as High Priest in the Heavenly Sanctuary.

THE FAT OF THE SIN OFFERINGS

Four times during the instruction of how the sin offerings were to be ministered, the Lord told Moses the fat was to be removed and burned "as the fat of the sacrifice of the peace offerings." (Lev. 4:10, 26, 31, 35) The peace offerings had been detailed just prior to the instruction concerning the sin offerings. (Lev. 3) All "the fat that covereth the inwards,... and the two kidneys, and the fat that is upon them, which is by the flanks, and the caul (fold) above the liver, with the kidneys, it shall [the priest] take away." (3:9-10) These were to be burned upon the altar.

The fat and the kidneys are declared to be "the food [Heb - bread] of the offering made by fire for a sweet savour" unto the Lord. (Lev. 3:11, 16; 4:31) "All the fat" the Lord claimed as His, and with the blood, forbade that it should be eaten. (3:16-17)

What is the significance of this part of the ritual? What do the kidneys represent? What is the meaning of the fat and why is it cut away and burned?

First, the kidneys: The kidneys "were regarded as the seat of the tenderest and deepest emotions." (Keil & Delitzsch, *op cit.*, p. 306) Gesenius in his Hebrew lexicon states that the word for kidneys (*k'layoth*) was used metonymically to represent "the mind, soul, as the seat of the desires, affections, passions," and is often coupled with "heart" (*lév*) Observe closely the following texts. Note the use of the Hebrew word for "kidneys" as a figure of speech. In each instance, the word is translated "reins" in the KJV:

The righteous God trieth the hearts and reins. (Ps. 7:9)

Examine me, O Lord, and prove me; try my reins and my heart. (Ps. 26:2)

Thus was my heart grieved, and I was pricked in my reins. (Ps. 73:21)

But, O Lord of hosts, that judgest righteously, that triest the reins and the heart. (Jer. 11:20)

I the Lord search the heart, I try the reins,... (Jer. 17:10)

How are we to understand this in relationship to the sin offering? God met Israel at the level of their perception. The "seat of emotion, desires and passions" was removed from the body and burned on the altar. But before this could be done, the "fat" had to be stripped from the kidneys, and also burned. The full comment found in Keil & Delitzsch is interesting. It reads:

Now, if the flesh of the victim represented the body of the offerer as the organ of the soul, the fat portions inside the body, together with the kidneys, which were regarded as the seat of the tenderest and deepest emotions, can only have set forth the better part or inmost kernel of the man. (*op. cit.*)

While this comment relates the separation from the body of certain parts of the sin offering, and differentiates between the "outer" and "inner man," it still leaves

unexplained, why the fat had to be separated from the kidneys. Paul addresses the "outer" and "inner" man concepts. He wrote, "For I delight in the law of God after the inner man." (Rom. 7:22) To him, "though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day." (II Cor. 4:16) He explained how this could be. He wrote - "I die daily." (I Cor. 15:31) Self, "the reins," was crucified with Christ. (Gal. 2:20) The kidneys were burned on the altar. Yet the offerer lived because he was forgiven.

In this service, the fat stripped from the inwards parts as well as the kidneys, was also burned. Into "smoke" it was consumed away. What does this mean, and what is this ritual saying to us? In the Scriptures, the Hebrew word, "fat" (*hélev*) was used to refer to the best, and most abundant. Pharaoh offered Joseph for his family, the "good of the land of Egypt," and said that they "shall eat of the fat of the land." (Gen. 45:18) But "fat" is also associated with disobedience, sins, and backsliding. Observe the following texts:

Samuel said to Saul - "To **obey** is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." (I Sam. 15:22) In this experience, the "fat" was substituted for obedience. To have followed fully the instruction God gave in reference to the Amalekites (15:3), there would have been no fat to offer.

God through Isaiah said of Israel - Thou hast not "filled me with the fat of thy sacrifices: but thou hast made me to serve with thy sins, thou hast wearied me with thine iniquities." Then God declared of Himself - "I, even I, am He that blotteth out thy transgressions for my own sake, and will not remember thy sins." (Isa. 43:24-25) How was this "blotting" out not symbolized by Israel? Israel had not brought the "fat of [the] sacrifices."

Ezekiel stated, of the priests who had charge of the sanctuary, that "when the children of Israel went **astray**" from God, they were to come near and offer to God "the fat and the blood." (Eze. 44:15)

It is objected that "fat" cannot be associated with sin because nothing which represented sin was permitted on the Altar of Burnt Offering. Besides, the offering of the fat of the sin offering was considered a "sweet savour unto the Lord." (Lev. 4:31) How then could this be associated with sin? It is further questioned, how can "fat," if it symbolized sin in any way, be considered as "the bread of the offering," and as being "the Lord's"? (See Lev. 3:11, 16)

In support of the first objection, the exclusion of "leaven," a symbol of sin, from the meal offering is cited. (Lev. 2:11) There is, however, a difference between leaven and fat. Leaven would be introduced into the meal, while fat is an integral part of the animal sacrifice. In the case of the individual sin offering, major parts of the sacrificial animal became the actual possession of the ministering priest. But in all instances, the fat was excluded, cut away, and burned.

The whole of the sin offering was considered "most holy" unto the Lord. (Lev. 6:25) Is it unreasonable to assume that any representation whereby sin is removed either from the

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE HOLY PLACE

As the sinner (except the priests as individuals) stood at the Altar of Burnt Offering, he had approached the closest he could ever come to the presence of God in the Most Holy Place. He had come willingly exercising his own will in harmony with what God required. (Lev. 1:3) He had placed his hand upon the head of the sacrificial victim, confessed his sin, and had slain the animal. Then he had watched as the priest took of the blood, fingerprinting it on the horns of the Altar before him, pouring the residue at its base. He had observed the priest separate the fat from the inward parts of the animal and place it on the Altar with the kidneys. Then he heard the priest say to him - "Thy sin is forgiven thee."

He left the court to return to his daily routine. He was still a sinner by nature. He would hear Moses proclaim the word of Jehovah to all the congregation - "Ye shall be holy: for I the Lord your God am holy." (Lev. 19:2) As holy in his sphere as the One who dwelleth between the cherubim is in His? How was this to be? He was not left to forget that beyond the Court, other services were being performed, and he was to be involved in that mediation both individually and collectively as a member of a covenant people. While his sin had been forgiven him, there was an on-going atonement.

In the Holy Place were only three articles of furniture. Into this place, only the priests could come to minister. In the original sanctuary services, it appears that only Aaron, the high priest, could come and minister at the Altar of Incense; could fill the lamps of the Candlestick; could place the bread upon the Table of Shewbread. (See Ex. 30:7-8; Lev. 24:1-8) Further it appears that when the two of the sons of Aaron intended to offer incense, they were killed by a flash of "fire from the Lord." (Lev. 10:1-2) However, when the priestly functions were set up by courses, the common priests ministered in the holy place as evidenced in the service of Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist. (See Luke 1:9)

Whatever the meaning of the three articles of furniture, the fact remains that the significance to the individual, who had come to the Court with his sin offering, required the mediation of a priest. The sinner was, however, to be involved in this on-going daily and weekly service as a member of the collective community. The congregation was to supply the "pure olive oil" for the lamps, and the "fine flour" for the shewbread. (Lev. 24:1-8) Among the very first directives which God had given to Moses for the erection of the sanctuary and its services was the instruction that along with the "oil for the light," the children of Israel were to bring an offering of "spices for anointing oil,

and for sweet incense." (Ex. 25:6)

We have recognized in our perceptions of the typical sanctuary that the articles of furniture in the Holy Place were symbolic of the promised Messiah (Anointed One) as the Word or Bread of Life, as the Light of the world; and the Holy Spirit as the continuance of that Light guiding into all truth. We have connected the Altar of Incense with prayer, even as the children of Israel did. (See Luke 1:9-10) In the Old Testament, little is found giving definitive symbolic significance to these articles. Isaiah captures the imagery of the golden candlesticks as the Spirit which was to rest upon the promised Messiah, the Branch who would grow out of the stem of Jesse. The central column was itself "the spirit of the Lord" and the six branches describe the fulness of that Spirit: - "the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord." (Isa. 11:1-2)

The Table of Shewbread - literally "the bread of His presence" - was to be renewed each Sabbath, and eaten by the priests. Malachi states that the priest was to be "the messenger of the Lord of hosts" and that his "lips should keep knowledge" and that the people "should seek the law at his mouth." (Mal. 2:7) This was vital to the spiritual well-being of the people in the time when the instruction which God had given for Israel could not be reproduced as can be done to day, through printing presses. The priests were to function as "the messengers of the Lord of hosts." Apostasy in Judah was marked when "for a long season Israel had been without the true God, and without a teaching priest, and without law." (II Chron 15:3) The linchpin in this situation was the priest and his failure to teach the people the Word of God on the Sabbath. He would eat of the symbolic bread; he would carry out the ceremonial functions; but the real need he did not meet to help the covenant people in their on-going atonement with God. Forgiven sinners they were - they had brought the penalty for their transgression - but they were still in their uncleanness. Only the word and the blood applied, cleanses. (John 15:3; I John 1:7; Rev. 1:5) The word reveals the lost image of God in man, and the provision for its restoration - the Spirit of life sent forth because of the mediation of the true blood. (Eph. 4:23-24; Rev. 5:6)

The same spiritual decline as was evidenced in ancient Israel is all too vivid in the experience of God's professed Israel today. Again the linchpin are the men of the pulpit who do not understand that the gift of pastoring on the Sabbath is but one gift interlocked with teaching. (See Eph. 4:11 Greek) The ritual is performed - the order of service or liturgy is carried out - but for the most part, the people who come to be fed the Word of God, the bread of His presence, leave the service as starved as when they came.

In the book of Revelation, Jesus on the Sabbath is pictured as walking in the midst of His people, and holding in His right hand, His messengers. [Gr. *angelos*; KJV - "angels," a word transliterated, but not translated] It was God's intention that His people be fed with the bread of His presence ministered by Jesus through the Spirit on the Holy Sabbath. Here is the basis for the cold formality and

and lukewarmness which marks many of the Sabbath services of Laodicea. And the substitution of "celebration" is but offering of "strange fire" before the Lord. There is no substitute for the preaching of the Word!

[It should be noted the seven golden candlesticks in the first chapter of Revelation are not the same as the "seven lamps of fire burning before the Throne" in chapter four (4:5). The candlesticks are defined as "the seven churches," while the "lamps of fire" are denoted as "the seven spirits of God." That there is a close relationship cannot be denied for to each of the seven churches is given the admonition to "hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches."]

In the sanctuary service of the model, God gave only three symbols to represent the means whereby the sinner could experience a victorious life day by day. These symbols stand for prayer, the hearing of the Word, and the guidance by the light of the Holy Spirit into all truth. Connected with each symbol was the ministry of the priest. He could not "walk" alone. The reality of this symbolism can be summarized by one verse - "As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in Him." (Col. 2:6) As the sinner places his full dependence in the sacrifice provided at Calvary, so he must also place his full and unreserved confidence in the Holy Spirit to guide his daily life, "for it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." (Jer. 10:23)

COMMUNICATION RESTORED

If one word could be used to summarize the significance of the Holy Place, that word would be - communication. This is not a communication of managed news releases, or propaganda, but rather an educational process of spiritual development. In the on-going at-one-ment, God would commune with those who had complied with the provisions made for the penalty for sin. In speaking with Moses concerning the Ark of the Covenant, God had said:

And thou shalt put the mercy seat above upon the ark; and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony that I shall give thee. And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy seat, from between the two cherubims which are upon the ark of the testimony, of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel. (Ex. 25:21-22)

Moses was to stand in relationship between God and the people as that "Prophet" whom God would raise up in Whom He would put the words of His mouth. (Deut. 18:18; John 12:49-50) However, after detailing the morning and evening offering, God said to Moses:

This shall be a continual burnt offering throughout your generations at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the Lord: where I will meet you, to speak there unto thee. And I will meet with the children of Israel, and Israel shall be sanctified by my glory. (Ex. 29:42-43, margin)

God would commune with "justified" Israel. It would be done from the Holy Place, and in the communication, Israel would be "sanctified" by His glory. Even as the typical service indicated the ministrations of priests in behalf of the individual, so also the reality requires the ministry of Jesus at

every step of the way, even in the process of sanctification. For Jesus "is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." (I Cor. 1:30) He came to identify with us, to tabernacle among us as the revealed glory of God, "full of grace and truth." (John 1:14) In becoming the Substitute for the penalty of sin, He revealed the fullness of grace. In being in Himself, the truth, He provided the means of sanctification. He prayed - "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth." (John 17:17) The Word made flesh revealing the glory of the Father sanctifies His covenant people through the truth, pure and unadulterated.

Paul puts it this way: Jesus "was delivered for our offences, and was raised for our justification. Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God [and can once more communicate with Him] through our Lord Jesus Christ: by whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." (Rom. 4:25-5:2)

Due to our American system of education, we fail to grasp the significance of the communication envisioned in the typical "holy place." In the Hebrew system, a teacher (rabbi) and his students constituted a school. In this "school," there was communication built on confidence, love and respect. This resulted in the pupils reflecting the ideas and philosophy of their teacher. As a man thinketh in his mind, so is he. Jesus formed such a school, and after three years, there were eleven graduates and one drop-out. The same hierarchy who had delivered Jesus over to the Romans for crucifixion, when confronted with graduates from this school of Christ "marvelled; and took knowledge of them, that they had been with Jesus." (Acts 4:6, 13)

"In the highest sense the work of education and the work of redemption are one." Sanctification is not perfection but communication, an education whereby we come to reflect the philosophy, ideas and thoughts of Jesus. "God ... hath shined in our [minds], to give the light of the knowledge of [His] glory in the face of Jesus. But we have this treasure [from communion with Jesus] in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us." (II Cor. 4:6-7)

The "model" reflected the simplicity of the process - just three articles - symbolic of the Word, the Spirit of truth ("a teacher of righteousness" - Joel 2:23, margin), and the science whereby we interrelate to the instruction received, prayer.

This message of the Holy Place is desperately needed to day when every wind of doctrine is blowing, and "false prophets" abound professing to be teachers of "historic Adventism," seducing God's concerned people. John wrote that the alternative to "them that seduce you" was "an unction from the Holy One" and this "anointing teacheth you all things, and is true, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in Him." (I John 2:26, 20, 27)

I have heard the voice of Jesus;
Tell me not of ought beside.
I have seen the face of Jesus;
All my soul is satisfied.

From page 4, col. 2

sinner, or whereby provision is made for its extinction, that such a sacrifice would be as a "sweet savour" unto God?

The fat cannot be considered in the same category as the "kidney" as it was separated from it, even though both were burned. If the "kidney" stood for the very "reins" of the person, and was burned on the altar, is the concept of sin not introduced to the altar? Does not the Scripture teach that "the heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked"? (Jer. 17:9) Is not the significant meaning of this part of the ritual saying - Since you have been forgiven; the wages of sin have been paid in the mediation of the blood; but to go and sin no more, excesses and abundance must be cut away. And the how is clearly indicated. While the sinner slew the victim, taking its life, it was the priest who separated the fat from the kidneys and the inward parts. The offerer could not do it, and not until he died symbolically in the sacrifice could the priest do it!

How does this pertain to the Reality? We must be crucified with Christ. Then living "by the faith of the Son of God," we are "strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man." (Gal. 2:20; Eph. 4:16) The excesses of life are cut away; the abundances are placed in God's service; and we become "a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God." (Rom. 12:1) Whenever sin is separated from the life, and all is surrendered to God, it is indeed to Him, "a sweet smelling savour."

Editorial from p. 1

had a hand laid upon its head. (Lev. 16:6)

There is further evidence from the Day of Atonement ritual that sin was not transferred to the sanctuary, but had been previously recorded. During the year, no blood was ever taken into the Most Holy Place. The closest the blood, denoting that the penalty had been paid, ever came to the Most Holy Place, was that blood which was sprinkled before the veil separating the two apartments. On the Day of Atonement, when the cleansing ritual did bring blood into the Most Holy Place, it was stated that it was being done "because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins." (Lev. 16:16) If for sake of argument, we should grant that the record of blood was a record of sin, and not a record of the penalty paid for sin, then how did the transgressions and sins get into the Most Holy Place when no such blood over which confessions were made ever entered there?

What we have failed to realize is that the sanctuary services in type are an adjunct to the Reality of the Heavenly Sanctuary explaining how an individual in covenant relationship with God can escape the finality of the judgment. We refuse to face up to the meaning of Jesus' promise in John 5:24. This verse does not destroy the sanctuary doctrine as some have sought to do with it; but rather it does focus on an area of teaching which needs to be corrected and brought into line with the true revelation of the sanctuary model. This issue of the Commentary will seek to do just that, as well as the issue to follow.

Some have cited Jeremiah (17:1) as proof that sin was transferred to the sanctuary. I, too, have so used this text in times past. Sensing that such a use of this text violates the meaning of the ritual of the sin offering in Leviticus, I checked the context in which Jeremiah was writing. The verse in Jeremiah reads:

"The sin of Judah is written with a pen of iron, and with the point of a diamond: it is graven upon the table of the heart, and upon the horns of your altars."

The next verse introduces "the Asherim" (KJV - "groves") which were worshiped by the green trees on the high hills. The connection between the idolatrous worship on the "hills" and the blood placed on the horns of the altars of the temple must be related to the prophecy of the verses that follow. God would give these "high places for sin" to the spoiler (ver. 3), and Judah herself would serve their enemies in a strange land because what they did provoked the anger of the Lord (ver. 4). The sin that came upon the altars was a sin so engraved upon their hearts that it could not be erased. Keil and Delitzsch comment as follows:

"It was because the altars and the images of the false gods had entwined themselves as closely about their hearts as their children, so that they brought the sin of their idolatry along with their sacrifices to the altars of Jahveh. The offerings which they bring, in this state of mind, to the Lord are defiled by idolatry and carry their sins to the altar, so that, in the blood which is sprinkled on its horns, the sins of the offerers are poured out on the altar. Hence it appears unmistakably that ver. 1 does not deal with the consciousness of sin as not yet cancelled or forgiven, but with the sin of idolatry, which, ineradicably implanted in the hearts of the people and indelibly recorded before God on the horns of the altar, calls down God's wrath in punishment as announced in vers. 3 and 4." (Vol. 8, p. 278)

To cherish the sin for which we ask forgiveness and for which we present the Substitute is duplicity and makes of "the blood of the covenant... an unholy thing." The sin of the heart is retained while outwardly confessing its surrender. This is hypocrisy which God hates. In the typical service, this stage acting brought sin upon the altars of the sanctuary which God did not intend should be done.

A second error occurs in this same section of the Quarterly. It states - "In the case of the sin offering for a fellow priest, or for the whole congregation" the blood was taken into the first apartment of the sanctuary. The authors failed to see, and the editors did not catch, that the offering for the priest wherein the blood was taken into the sanctuary, only pertained to the High Priest when he in his official capacity had sinned causing the whole congregation to transgress. The text reads - "If the anointed priest shall sin so as to bring guilt on the people, then let him offer for his sin... a young bullock." (Lev. 4:3 ARV) As an individual sinner, the priest was included in the category of a ruler. See Numbers 3:32, where the same Hebrew word translated "ruler" in Leviticus 4 is there translated, "chief."

We suggest a careful study of all the material which is presented in this Commentary comparing Scripture with Scripture.

#

+++++++

Commentary is published intermittently by the Editor of "Watchman, What of the Night?" for the Adventist Laymen's Foundation of Mississippi, Inc., P. O. Box 789, Lamar, AR 72846, USA

Editor

Elder Wm. H. Grotheer

Any portion of this Commentary may be reproduced without further permission by adding the following credit line - "Reprinted from Commentary - Lamar, Arkansas, USA."

First copy free upon request; duplicate copies - 50¢.

+++++++