

governs, the meaning is, "a way through the veil of His flesh." The second and third constructions agree in sense. On our choice of the governing word depends the interpretation—"the way of His flesh" or "the veil of His flesh," and as there appear to be no grammatical considerations to determine us, we must have recourse to the *usus loquendi*, by ascertaining whether the flesh of Christ, in Biblical teaching, agrees with the conception of a veil or with the conception of a way.

The flesh of Christ means His humanity, which, as the world's high priest, he offered to God for sin. "Jesus Christ came in the flesh . . . The Word was made flesh . . . Who was manifest in the flesh . . . Put to death in the flesh . . . Hath suffered in the flesh . . . Who in the days of His flesh . . . Reconciled in the body of His flesh through death . . . Having abolished in His flesh the enmity . . . In the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin . . . The seed of David according to the flesh . . . The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give [in propitiatory sacrifice] for the life of the world."

There is no reason whatever for supposing that the veil of the temple was a figure of Christ, but there is reason for believing that the whole temple symbolized Christ. "The Jews, therefore, answered and said unto him: 'What sign shewest thou unto us, seeing that thou doest these things?' Jesus answered and said unto them: 'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.' Then said the Jews: 'Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou raise it in three days?' But he spake of the temple of his body."* Since John thus says: "the temple, that is, His body," how could the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews say, by the same Spirit, "the veil, that is, His flesh?"

The humanity or flesh of Christ is a temple but not a veil. The Divinity was "manifested in the

flesh," not concealed by it. "The Word became flesh and dwelt among us and," (instead of veiling or concealment, "we beheld His glory—glory as of the only-begotten from the Father), full of grace and truth." The veil of the temple concealed the presence-place of God, the ark and the cherubim and the shekinah; but the incarnation and advent of Christ, instead of concealing the Divinity, are the means of manifesting Him. Moses Stuart says: "The actual comparison of the veil of the temple and of Christ's body is confined to the single point that *each is a medium of access to God.*" This is a strange mistake. A veil is never a medium or means of access; it is, on the contrary, simply and solely, a hindrance of access; a hindrance to sight or a hindrance to entrance. No instance can be adduced of a veil as a medium of access. It might as well be said that a curtain, or a mask, or a partition, is a medium of access. Things must be strangely confounded, and words must have totally and strangely changed their meaning, if a veil is a medium of access. It has no such meaning in the New Testament or any other book, and cannot have; and such a meaning should on no account be resorted to as an exegetical shift. In what sense could Christ be said to have consecrated for us a way *through* His own flesh? In no sense at all. The whole thing is incongruous and unwarrantable. And yet this is what the twentieth verse must mean, if the flesh of Christ is a veil; "By a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say, a way through his flesh!"

The humanity (or flesh) of Christ is not a veil but a way. Offered to God for our sins, according to the Scriptures, it is the very means and the only means of access to God. "I am the way," says Christ—not a veil; "No man cometh to the Father, but by me" as the way. He is a new and living or life-giving way, the

* John ii 18-21.