

## INTERESTING QUESTIONS

### ANCIENT WORTHIES NOT REPRESENTED IN COURT

**QUESTION.** – Were the Ancient Worthies in the condition represented by the Court of the Tabernacle?

**Answer.** – In their day the antitypical Priest had not come and the antitypical Tabernacle and Court had not been established; hence, they could not be in it. But according to their hearts, as expressed in their conduct, they must have been members of the household of faith. It is our understanding that, ultimately, they may be granted a place with, and as a part of, the Great Company, the antitypical Levites of the antitypical Court condition.

-----

### "OFFERING" USED IN TWO DIFFERENT SENSES

**Question.** – "*For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp.*" (Heb. 13:11.) Would this show that the Sin-Offering is made in the antitypical Most Holy?

**Answer.** – In general those who have translated anything in the Bible respecting the Tabernacle have seemingly been very careless in the use of the terms *Holy, Most Holy, Holy place*, etc. They did not discern that these terms were used in different senses by the Jews, in connection with different portions of the Tabernacle. Correctly translated, our text reads: "The bodies of those beasts, whose blood is taken into the Most Holy *as an offering for sin*, are burned without the camp." We must remember that the word "offering" is Scripturally used in two different senses. In one sense of the word, our Lord offered himself at baptism, when He gave Himself to do the Father's will. That was His offering of Himself, His gift, when He presented Himself at

Jordan. He finished the offering of His gift when He laid down His life on Calvary; and that life, laid down on Calvary, is an appropriate Sin-Offering. But it remained for the High Priest to ascend up on high, there to appear in the presence of God for us, to make *application* of the Sin-Offering. The sprinkling of the blood on the Mercy Seat was done in the Most Holy. But the presentation of that Sin-Offering was made at Jordan – or, in the type, when the bullock was slain.

-----

### **THE TWO ALTARS CONTRASTED**

*Question.* – "*We have an altar whereof they have no right to eat which serve the Tabernacle.*" (Heb. 13:10.) What is meant by this passage?

*Answer.* – In this passage the Apostle is contrasting the Levitical priesthood, their services in the Tabernacle, and the table in the Holy at which they ate the shew bread, with the antitypical Tabernacle and its better table. In this connection he points out that, so far as the priesthood of Aaron was concerned, not only could the Church not be priests, but our Lord Jesus could not be; for this priesthood sprang from Levi, and Jesus was from another tribe, Judah. Therefore, if Jesus was on earth he could not be a priest. But now God had intended another order of Priests, namely, the Melchizedek Order, saying to David, "The Lord hath sworn and will not repent: Thou art a priest forever after the Order of Melchizedek." (Psa. 110:4; Heb. 5:6.) It is evident, then, that if Christ was to be a Priest after the Order of Melchizedek, He would not be a Priest after the order of Aaron.

When the Apostle has proved that we, as priests, have **[R4868 : page 239]** no right to intrude into the typical Holy or Most Holy, he then shows that they, of the house of Aaron, have no right to our place. They have no right to come into this antitypical Holy, which we enter. If they become members of the Royal Priesthood, they may enter; but their standing as members of the Aaronic priesthood does not give them

the privilege. Thus he shows a discrimination between these two priesthods, the Aaronic and the Melchizedek. We have the "better sacrifices"; we have the better services. We have, on the higher plane, everything that they had, typically, on the lower plane.

-----

### **INCENSE ABODE IN THE MOST HOLY**

*Question.* – Was it necessary that the incense should precede the high priest into the Most Holy when he went in to offer the blood of the goat?

*Answer.* – The offering of the incense originally on the Day of Atonement by the high priest gained for him recognition by the Almighty, and manifested his worthiness to appear in the presence of God. Therefore, there was no need of his offering any other sacrifice than this. All the work of Atonement was divided into two parts. If the type had shown the under-priests as going into the Most Holy, then it would seem to have been necessary for each to stop and offer incense before entering.

We are represented, not individually, but as members of the Body of Christ. So it would not be necessary for the incense to be offered more than the one time. It would seem, however, that the incense *abode* in the Holy and Most Holy. The sacrifice is still appreciated by the Heavenly Father, and always will be.

-----

### **BOTH HAD TO DO WITH JUSTICE**

*Question.* – In the type, was the incense that which satisfied Divine Justice? If not, how is the satisfaction of Justice accomplished, and why was incense burned?

*Answer.* – Both the incense and the blood had to do with the satisfaction of Justice. We read that the incense must cover the Mercy-Seat. (Lev. 16:13.) In other words, unless the incense had gone forth the high priest would not have lived. This shows that unless our Lord had rendered up His human life satisfactorily He would have forfeited His right to life. In consecration He had agreed to this and had surrendered His earthly life-rights. If He proved faithful to His engagement, He would receive a higher life beyond the veil. So the satisfaction of Justice, represented in type by the incense preceding the high priest beyond the veil, would be a satisfaction for *Himself* and would testify that He had faithfully fulfilled the required conditions.

But as for the satisfaction of the sins of the Church and of the world, this is accomplished subsequently, not by the incense, but by the blood.

