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 analtar, whereof they have whereof they have no right to eat   
 no right to eat which serve which serve the tabernacle. 1 For   
 the tabernacle." For the |   
   
 about to introduce. And this view has to eat, no profil to be derived from   
 just so much troth in it, that there is no that on ve, by which we have bee   
 emphasis on the word altar, ‘The altar reconciled to God. But this is 1) false in   
 bears only a secondary place in the figure; fact. We have a right to eat of our Sacri-   
 but still caunot think that it has not a fice, and are commanded so to do. All   
 definite meaning. Others understand by that our Lord says of eating His Flesh and   
 the altar, Christ himself. This again has drinking His Blood Cexpliin it how we   
 so much truth in it, that the Victim will] would be nullified and set aside by   
 is so superior to the altar, as to cast it such an interpretation. And 2) itis directly   
 altogether into shade; but still is not against the whole context, in which the   
 Himself the altar. Some again under- meats, whatever they are, are pronounced   
 stand, the table of the Lord, at which we profitless, and they who walked in them   
 cat the Lord’s Supper. This is so far true, contrasted with us who have higher privi-   
 that that table may be said to represent to leges. To what purpose then would it be   
 us the Cross whereupon the Sacrifice was to say, that we have an altar of which we   
 offered, just as the bread and wine, laid on cannot cat? that we have a sacrifice   
 it, represent the oblation itself: but it is brings us no profit, but only shame? 1   
 not the altar, in any propriety of language, pass over the interpretation which under-   
 however we may be justified, in common ands by the words some particular class   
 parlance, in so calling it. Some again of Christians among the Hebrews, because   
 have interpreted it to mean the heavenly it involves the of a distinction   
 place, where Christ now offers the virtue between clergy and laity certainly   
 of His Blood to the Father for us. This then had no place: and also because it   
 again is so fur trne, that it the antitype would furnish no sense at all suiting the   
 of the Cross, just as the Cross is the anti- passage, referring as it then would to some   
 type of the Lord’s table: but we do not Christians only, not to all. ‘The only true   
 want, in this word, the thing repre- reference of our words, as also that which   
 sented by, any more than the enduring has been all but universally acknowledged,   
 dinance representing, the original historic is that to the Jewish priesthood, and in   
 concrete material alti e want that altar them to those who have part with them in   
 itself: and that altar is, the Cross, on serving the rites and ordinances of the   
 which the Lord suffered. That is our altar : ceremonial law. ‘These have no right to eat   
 not to be emphasized, nor exalted into any of our altar: for just as the bodies of those   
 coniparison with the adorable Victim the beasts whose bldod was brought into the   
 on offered ; but still altar, that sanetuary were burnt without the camp, so   
 we glory thut for which as for our altars. Jesus suifered altogether without the gate   
 we contend: of which our banners, our of legal Judaism, Let us then not tarry   
 tokens, our adornments, our churches, are serving that tabernacle which has no pa   
 full: severed from which, we know not in Him, but go forth to Him without the   
 Christ; laid upon which, He is the power camp, bearing His reproach, For we cleave   
 of God, and the wisdom of God. Aud so it not to any abiding city, such as the earthly   
 is here explained by most of the best Com- Jerusalem, but seek one to come. Let us   
 mentators) to eat of which (see esp. 1 Cor. then not tarry the Jewish tabernacle,   
 ix. 18) they have not licence who serve serving their rites, offering sacrifices   
 the tabernacle (who are these? Some, but offer our now only possible sacrifice,   
 as Schlichting, Morus, and strange to say that of praise, the of a good confession,   
 recently Hofmann, understand by them the acceptable to God through Him, Thus,   
 Christians, as the subject of we and thus only, does the whole context stand   
 have. We Christians have an altar whereof in harmony. Thus the words in they that   
 [even]they who serve the [Christian] taber- serve the tabernacle keep their former   
 nacle have no right to eat : as explained ineanings : see ch. viii. where we have   
 by Hofmann, as the high priest himself did “such as have the delineation and the   
 not eat of the sin-offerings blood was shadow of heavenly things :? and remem-   
 brought into the tabernacle, but they were ber that “ the tabernacle,” barely so placed,   
 burnt without the camp, so we Christians cannot by any possibility mean any part