

dalism, it completely fulfilled it. With this view he presents the sanctuary, the priests, and the sacrifices, to set forth Christ, and as figures to illustrate Christ's mission and work. Had the Jews a tabernacle and sanctuary? So had the Christians: — a "true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man." (viii. 2.) Had the Jews a high priest? So had the Christians: — a "great high-priest that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God." (iv. 14.) — "a high-priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hands." (ix. 11.) Had the Jews a sacrifice? So had the Christians. But the Christians' high-priest "needed not daily, as the high-priests of the Jews did, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's; for this he did once when he offered up himself." (vii. 27.) *He offered up himself.* I ask you to mark this. Here the priest and the sacrifice are identical. This is self-dedication — self-sacrifice. In Christ it was unreserved, complete, perfect. As such it was the consummation of all that was typified and shadowed forth by the former ritual.

For, when we come to reflect upon the matter, what is the fundamental idea involved in all sacrifice? Is it not this — the acknowledgment of God's right and dominion over man, and over all that man possesses, whether of inward faculty or outward thing? In sacrifice, man, by offering a part, sets forth his obligation to God for the whole. In ritual times the extent of the obligation was sometimes forgotten, and the substantial idea lost sight of. Then the rite became a hollow form, and was displeasing to God. The priest might practise his ritual, as he was bound to do, but when he and people alike lost