word rendered “*censer*” by A. V. in Levit.  
xvi. 12, is a shallow basin, in which the  
high priest on the day of atonement was to  
take incense from the incense-altar into the  
holy place. Besides which, it is not specified as golden; nor was it kept in the Holy of holies. Indeed it could not have been,  
or the high priest would have been obliged  
to fetch it from thence before burning in-  
cense in it, which is most improbable. Of  
these, the first-mentioned objection is not  
decisive; for our Writer is speaking, not of  
Mosaic usage only, but of several things  
outside the provisions of the law itself; and  
thus our explanation of any difficulty need  
not be sought in the provisions of the law  
only, but also in subsequent Jewish usage.  
If now, influenced by the above difficulties, we adopt the interpretation “*altar  
of incense*,” a difficulty arises, certainly  
not less than any of those adduced above.  
On the one hand the word **having** at  
first sight seems to admit of no other  
meaning than a local one, “*containing*.”  
The parallelism with **wherein was** above  
appears to demand this, and the fact  
that the other things mentioned are beyond question intended to be *in*, not merely  
belonging to, the Holy of holies. On  
this, see more below. Taking it as  
our first impression, we are startled by  
the fact, that the altar of incense *was  
not in* the Holy of holies, but *outside it.*Hence Bleck, De Wette, and Lünemann,  
suppose that the Writer has fallen into a  
mistake, and Bleek infers from this that he  
was not an inhabitant of Palestine, but an  
Alexandrine. But as Delitzsch observes,  
whichever he were, he must have been  
perfect monster of ignorance, to have fallen  
into any such error. “ Then,” continues  
Delitzseh, “ since we cannot submit him to such an imputation, is there any intent  
which our Writer may have had, inducing  
him to ascribe the altar of incense to the  
Holy of holies, notwithstanding that he  
knew its local situation to be in the Holy  
eP” There is such an intent, recognized even by Bleek himself: “The Author,” says Bleek, and after him Tholuck,  
“treats the Holy of holies, irrespective of  
the veil, as symbolical of the heavenly sanctuary, and had also a motive to include in  
it the altar of incense, whose offerings of  
incense are the symbol of the prayers of the saints, Rev. viii. 3 ff.” And even so it  
is. Not only the New Test. writings, but  
the Old Test. also, Isa. vi. 6, speak of a  
heavenly altar, which is the antitype  
there of the earthly. Considering the  
fact that this antitypical altar belonged  
to the Holy of holies, into which Christ entered through the torn veil, it was obvious  
for our Writer to reckon the typical altar  
also among the things belonging to the  
Holy of holies. Our second question then  
whether our Writer is justified, having  
this motive, in reckoning the altar of incense among the furniture of the Holy of  
holies. And our answer is, Entirely so:  
the following considerations have weight:  
a) that the altar of incense, by Exod. xxx.  
6, xl. 5, is to be placed before the ark of  
the covenant, or before the Capporeth  
[mercy-seat], ie. in the middle between  
the candlestick on the right and the table  
of shewbread on the left, so that its place is  
subordinate to the ark of the covenant:  
b) that on the day of atonement, it, as  
wall as the mercy-seat, was sprinkled with  
the blood of the sin-offering: c) that  
1 Kings vi. 22, as well as by our Writer,  
it is reckoned to the Holy of holies, being  
there culled the altar belonging to the  
sanctuary [A, V. *“the altar that was by  
the oracle”*). The solution to be gathered  
from this would be, that the altar of incense, being appointed by the Mosaic ordinance to stand in immediate contiguity to  
the veil separating the Holy of holies, and  
being destined in its use especially for the  
service of the Holy of Holies [for this, notwithstanding the objection brought by  
Delitzsch, might have weight; the exterior  
altar of burnt-offering did not belong in  
any such strict sense to the sanctuary and  
mercy-seat], and being described in more  
than one place of Scripture [e.g. Exod. xxx. 6; 1 Kings vi. 22] as connected with the sanctuary, is taken by the Writer as  
appertaining to the Holy of holies: he  
choosing, thus to describe it, the somewhat ambiguous word **having**, and not  
*“wherein was,”* as before. I have thus given  
both views of the solution to be sought:  
and will now state the result. 1) On either  
hypothesis, **having** cannot be kept to its  
stricter meaning of *containing*. For neither  
the censer nor the incense-altar was *kept  
in* the Holy of holies. 2) The language of  
the Mischna concerning the golden censer  
is very strong, and more weight still is