

νεκρῶν ἔργων, εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν θεῶ ζῶντι; 15. ° Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο δια-
 θήκης καινῆς μεσίτης ἐστίν, ὅπως θανάτου γενομένου, εἰς ἀπολύτρω-
 σιν τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεων, τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν
 λάβωσιν οἱ κεκλημένοι τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας. ὅπου γὰρ δια-
 θήκη, 16. θάνατον ἀνάγκη φέρεσθαι τοῦ διαθεμένου. 17. ° δια-
 ο xii. 24;
 Acts xiii.
 39; Rom.
 iii. 25, et
 v. 6; 1
 Tim. ii.
 5; 1 Peter
 iii. 18.
 Gal. iii.
 15.

worshipper. Works from which a man must be cleansed before he can enter God's presence. A pause might be made before ἔργων, from dead—(not bodies but) works. [καθαρίζω, Hellenistic; see Anz. *Subsidia*, 374. In class. καθαίρω is used, as in Herod. i. 44, τὸν αὐτὸς φόνου ἐκάθηρε, and Æsch. *Choeph.* 72.] This cleansing is preparatory to the worship of the living God εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν θεῶ ζῶντι. The living God, who is all life, can suffer no taint of death in His worshippers. Death moral and physical cannot exist in His presence. λατρεύειν, "ad serviendum, in perpetuum, modo beatissimo et vere sacerdotali" (Bengel).

Ver. 15. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, "And on this account," that is to say, because, as stated in ver. 14, Christ's blood cleanses the conscience from dead works and thus fits men to draw near to God, διαθήκης καινῆς μεσίτης ἐστίν, "He is mediator of a new covenant". The old covenant with sacrifices which could only cleanse the flesh allowed sins to accumulate. But Christ, as above stated, obtained cleansing from sins, and so laid the essential foundation of a new covenant, viii. 12. ὅπως θανάτου γενομένου . . . "that a death having taken place for deliverance from the transgressions [committed] under the first covenant, those who have been called might receive the promised eternal inheritance". Even under the old covenant this inheritance had been promised. A gospel had been preached to them, and they had been invited, iv. 2. God being during that period the covenant God of the people, this involved eternal good. But until their transgressions were atoned for they could not receive the inheritance. The sacrifices under the old covenant could not atone for sin, therefore a new covenant with a death which could atone was necessary; in order that such a death having taken place and their sins being removed they might receive fulfilment of the promise. The retrospective reference of the death of Christ is here affirmed; as in xi. 40 it is stated that without us, i.e., without the Christian dispensation, the O.T. believers could not be perfected,

The words οἱ κεκλημένοι, therefore, include not only the Hebrews addressed but all who had lived under the O.T. dispensation. ἀπολύτρωσιν . . . παραβάσεων, the genitive is of the object from which redemption is achieved, and ἐπὶ is scarcely "against" as in Vaughan, but rather "in the time of," as in ix. 26, Phil. i. 3.

Ver. 16. ὅπου γὰρ διαθήκη . . . The meaning of these words is doubtful. In the LXX διαθήκη occurs about 280 times and in all but four instances translates תְּרִיבָה, covenant. In classical and Hellenistic Greek, however, it is the common word for "will" or "testament" (see especially *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Grenfell and Hunt, Part I., 105, etc., where the normal meaning of the word appears also from the use of ἀδιάθετος for "intestate" and μεταδιατίθεσθαι for "to alter a will"). Accordingly it has been supposed by several interpreters that the writer, taking advantage of the double meaning of διαθήκη, at this point introduces an argument which applies to it in the sense of "will" or "testament," but not in the sense of "covenant"; as if he said, "where a testamentary disposition of property is made, this comes into force only on the decease of the testator". θάνατον ἀνάγκη φέρεσθαι τοῦ διαθεμένου "it is necessary that the death of him who made the disposition be adduced". On the very common omission of the copula in the third singular indicative see Buttmann, p. 136. φέρεσθαι, "necesse est afferri testimonia de morte testatoris" (Wetstein). For passages establishing its use as a term of the courts for the production of evidence, etc., see Field *in loc.* and especially Appian, *De Bell. Civil.* ii. 143, διαθήκαι δὲ τοῦ Καίσαρος ὥφθησαν φερόμεναι. (See also Elsner *in loc.*) φέρειν is apparently even used "to register" in the *Oxy. Papyri*, Part II., 244. The reason of this necessity is given in ver. 17. διαθήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία . . . "for a testament is of force with reference to dead people, since it is never of any force when the testator is alive". On this interpretation the

θήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία, ἐπεὶ μὴ ποτε¹ ἰσχύει ὅτε ζῆ ὁ
 διαθέμενος. 18. ὅθεν οὐδ' ἡ πρώτη χωρὶς αἵματος ἐγκεκαίνι-
 σται. 19. ἡ λαληθείσης γὰρ πάσης ἐντολῆς κατὰ νόμον² ὑπὸ
 Μωυσέως παντὶ τῷ λαῷ, λαβὼν τὸ αἷμα τῶν μόσχων καὶ τράγων,
 μετὰ ὕδατος καὶ ἐρίου κοκκίνου καὶ ὑσσώπου, αὐτό τε τὸ βιβλίον

q Exod.
 xxiv. 5, 6;
 Lev. xvi.
 14, 15, 18.

¹ μὴ ποτε Ἰ^cAD^cEKLP; μὴ ποτε Ἰ*^D*

² T.R. in Ἰ*^c; insert art. with Ἰ^cACD*^c.

words mean that before the inheritance, alluded to in ver. 15, could become the possession of those to whom it had been promised, Christ must die. He is thus represented as a testator. The illustration from the general law relating to wills or testaments extends only to the one point that Christ's people could inherit only on condition of Christ's death. The *reason* of Christ's death receives no illustration. He did not die merely to make room for the heir. The objections to this interpretation are (1) the constant Biblical usage by which, with one doubtful exception in Gal. iii., διαθήκη stands for "covenant," not for "will". On this point see the strong statement of Hatch, *Essays in Bibl. Greek*, p. 48. "There can be little doubt that the word must be invariably taken in this sense of "covenant" in the N.T., and especially in a book which is so impregnated with the language of the LXX as the epistle to the Hebrews". (2) His argument regarding covenants receives no help from usages which obtain in connection with testaments which are not covenants. The fact that both could be spoken of under the same name shows that they were related in some way; but presumably the writer had in view things and not merely words. To adduce the fact that in the case of wills the death of the testator is the condition of validity, is, of course, no proof at all that a death is necessary to make a covenant valid. (3) The argument of ver. 18 is destroyed if we understand vv. 16, 17 of wills; for in this verse it is the first covenant that is referred to.

But is it possible to retain the meaning "covenant"? Westcott, Rendall, Hatch, Moulton and others think it is possible. To support his argument, proving the necessity of Christ's death, the writer adduces the general law that he who makes a covenant does so at the expense of life. What is meant becomes plain in the 18th verse, for in the covenant there alluded to, the covenanting people were received into covenant through death.

That covenant only became valid ἐπὶ νεκροῖς over the dead bodies of the victims slain as representing the people. Whatever this substitutionary death may have meant, it was *necessary* to the ratification of the covenant. The sacrifices may have been expiatory, indicating that all old debts and obligations were cancelled and that the covenanters entered into this covenant as clean and new men; or they may have meant that the terms of the covenant were immutable; or that the people died to the past and became wholly the people of God. In any case the dead victims were necessary, and without them, χωρὶς αἵματος, the covenant was not inaugurated or ratified. Great light has been thrown on this passage by Dr. Trumbull in his *Blood Covenant*, in which he shows the universality of that form of compact and the significance of the blood. The rite of interchanging blood or tasting one another's blood, indicates that the two are bound in one life and must be all in all to one another. On the whole, this interpretation is to be preferred. Certainly it connects much better with what follows. For having shown that by dead victims all covenants are ratified, the writer proceeds ὅθεν οὐδ' ἡ πρώτη χωρὶς αἵματος ἐνκεκαίνισται, "wherefore not even the first,"—although imperfect and temporary—"was inaugurated without blood," *i.e.*, without death. [The perfect here as elsewhere in Hebrews is scarcely distinguishable from the aorist.] Proof that this statement regarding the first covenant is correct he forthwith gives in vv. 19-20.

Ver 19. λαληθείσης γὰρ πάσης ἐντολῆς. . . . "For when Moses had spoken to the people every commandment of the law," this being the needful preliminary, that the people might clearly understand the obligations they assumed on entering the covenant, he then took the blood of the calves and the goats, etc. In Exod. xxiv. 3 ff., an account is given of the inauguration of the first covenant. To that narrative certain

καὶ πάντα τὸν λαὸν ἐρράντισε, 20. Ἔλεγεν, “Τοῦτο τὸ αἷμα τῆς Exod. xxiv. 8; Matt. xxvi. 28. διαθήκης ἧς ἐνετείλατο πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὁ Θεός”. 21. “καὶ τὴν σκηνὴν δὲ Exod. s. 36; Lev. viii. 15, 19, et xvi. 14. καὶ πάντα τὰ σκεύη τῆς λειτουργίας τῷ αἵματι ὁμοίως ἐρράντισε. 22. t Lev. xvii. 11. καὶ σχεδὸν ἐν αἵματι πάντα καθαρίζεται κατὰ τὸν νόμον, καὶ χωρὶς

additions of no importance are here made. In Exodus no mention is made of goats, only of *μοσχάρια*. (See Westcott on this discrepancy.) Probably this addition is due to an echo of vv. 12, 13. *Water*, which was added to the blood to prevent coagulation or possibly as a symbol of cleansing; (cf. Jo. xix. 34; 1 Jo. v. 6) *scarlet wool*, *κόκκινος*, so called from *κόκκος* “the grain or berry of the *ilex coccifera*” used in dyeing (cf. Lev. xiv. 4) and the *hyssop* or wild marjoram on which the wool was tied, are all added as associated with sacrifice in general, and all connected with the blood and the sprinkling. *ἐράντισεν* here takes the place of the *κατεσκεδάσαε* of Exodus and the action is not confined to the people as in the original narrative but includes *αὐτὸ τὸ βιβλίον*, the book itself, that is, even the book in which Moses had written the words of the Lord, the terms of the covenant. Everything connected with the covenant bore the mark of blood, of death. Again, in ver. 20, instead of the *ἰδοὺ* of the LXX, which literally renders the Hebrew we have *τοῦτο τὸ αἷμα κ.τ.λ.*, a possible echo of our Lord’s words in instituting the new covenant, and instead of *διέθετο* of Exod. xxiv. 8 we have *ἐνετείλατο* corresponding with the *ἐντολή* of ver. 19.

Ver. 21. *καὶ τὴν σκηνὴν δὲ...* “And he also in like manner sprinkled with the blood the tabernacle and all the instruments of the service”. The tabernacle, however, was not yet erected when the covenant was instituted. Delitzsch supposes that a subsequent though kindred transaction is referred to; and colour is given to this supposition by the separation of this verse from ver. 19. But against it is the article in *τῷ αἵματι*, “the blood,” apparently the blood defined in vv. 19 and 20; although it is just possible the writer may have meant “the blood” which formed part of the means of service. Neither was it by Moses but by Aaron the tabernacle and the altar were sprinkled with blood and so cleansed on the day of Atonement. When first erected *ἡ σκηνὴ καὶ πάντα τὰ σκεύη αὐτῆς* were anointed with oil (Exod. xl. 9) but Josephus records a tradition that it

was consecrated not only with oil but also with blood (*Ant.* iii. 8, 6). It seems that the author adopts this tradition, and ascribes to Moses at the original consecration of the tabernacle the cleansing rites which afterwards were annually performed by Aaron on the day of Atonement.

Ver. 22. *καὶ σχεδὸν ἐν αἵματι πάντα...* “And one may almost say that according to the law all things are cleansed with blood, and without blood-shedding is no remission”. *σχεδὸν* qualifies the whole clause and not only *πάντα*. Whether it qualifies both clauses, as Bleek, Weiss and others suppose, is more doubtful. Westcott and Delitzsch confine its reference to the first clause. *ἐν αἵματι* “with blood” the usual instrumental *ἐν πάντα*, all things, especially, of course, those that were used in God’s worship or brought into His tabernacle. Water was used for cleansing from certain pollutions. *κατὰ τὸν νόμον*, it was not only a contrivance of man but the law of God which enacted that cleansing must be by blood. *καὶ χωρὶς αἵματεκχυσίας*, “without blood-shedding,” a word which occurs only here in Bibl. Greek. See Stephanus s.v. In all the instances cited in Stephanus it means the shedding of blood. Rendall, then, is quite wrong in maintaining (after Tholuck and De Wette) that it means, not the shedding but the outpouring of the blood at the foot of the altar. “The essential idea attached to the one act was destruction of life, of the other devotion of the same life to God. Hence the typical significance of the two acts was also quite distinct; outpouring of blood typified in fact, not physical death, but spiritual martyrdom by the surrender of a living will to God in perfect obedience even unto death”. Weiss is strictly accurate in his remark, “*αἷμ.* kann ohne eine lokale Näherbestimmung nicht die Ausgießung des Blutes am Altare bezeichnen”. The evidence is furnished by Bleek. The words, if not suggested by, inevitably recall our Lord’s words (Matt. xxvi. 28) *τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον*

αίματεκχυσίας οὐ γίνεται ἄφεσις. 23. Ἀνάγκη οὖν τὰ μὲν ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς τούτοις καθαρῖζεσθαι· αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ
 u vii. 23; ἐπουράνια κρείττοσι θυσίαις παρὰ ταύτας. 24. "οὐ γὰρ εἰς χειρο-
 Rom. viii. 34; I ποίητα ἅγια εἰσῆλθεν ὁ Χριστὸς,¹ ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν, ἀλλ' εἰς
 Joann. ii. 2. αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν, νῦν ἐμφανισθῆναι τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑπὲρ

¹ T.R. CeDb.cEKLP; om. o with \aleph AC*D*, 17, 71, 118.

εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. Cleansing was required of everything connected with God's worship, because it was stained through contact with men. And that this stain was guilt is implied in the use of ἄφεσις. It is by remission of sin the stain is removed. And according to the great law of Lev. xvii. 11, this remission was attained by the shedding of blood τὸ γὰρ αἷμα ἀντὶ ψυχῆς ἐξιλῶσεται. ἄφεσις is used absolutely only here and in Mark iii. 29; elsewhere it is used with ἁμαρτιῶν or παραπτωμάτων. In Luke iv. 18 it signifies "release".

Vv. 23-28. The necessity of cleansing the heavenly sanctuary and the efficiency and finality of Christ's one sacrifice.

Ver. 23. ἀνάγκη οὖν τὰ μὲν ὑποδείγματα. . . "It was necessary, therefore, that the copies indeed of the heavenly things be cleansed with these, but the heavenlies themselves with better sacrifices than these." ἀνάγκη οὖν, the οὖν carries to its consequence ver. 22; and the necessity arises from the injunction of the law there mentioned. τὰ μὲν ὑποδ. the μὲν . . . δὲ show that the second clause is that to which attention is to be given, the first clause introducing it. The statement is almost equivalent to "As it was necessary . . . so it was necessary" . . . The ὑποδείγ. are the tabernacle and its furnishings, in accordance with viii. 5; which see. τοῦτοις, viz., the things mentioned in ver. 19. αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ ἐπουράνια. If the copies were cleansed by material rites, realities being spiritual and eternal can only be cleansed by what is spiritual and eternal, cf. ver 14. κρείττοσιν θυσίαις, the plural is suggested by τούτοις, and states an abstract inference. But do the "heavenlies" need cleansing? Bruce says, "I prefer to make no attempt to assign a theological meaning to the words. I would rather make them intelligible to my mind by thinking of the glory and honour accruing even to heaven by the entrance there of 'the Lamb of God'. I believe there is more of poetry than of theology in the words. For the writer is a poet as well as a theologian,

and on this account, theological pedants, however learned, can never succeed in interpreting satisfactorily this epistle". But it is scarcely permissible to exclude at this point of the author's argument the theological inference that in some sense and in some relation the heavenlies need cleansing. The earthly tabernacle, as God's dwelling, might have been supposed to be hallowed by His presence and to need no cleansing, but being also His meeting-place with men it required to be cleansed. And so our heavenly relations with God, and all wherewith we seek to approach Him, need cleansing. In themselves things heavenly need no cleansing, but as entered upon by sinful men they need it. Our eternal relations with God require purification.

Ver. 24. οὐ γὰρ εἰς χειροποίητα. . . The connection, indicated by γὰρ, is "I say αὐτὰ τὰ ἐπουράνια, for it is not into a holy place constructed by man that Christ has entered, but into heaven itself". Others prefer to connect this verse with κρείττοσιν θυσίαις. "Better sacrifices" were needed, for not into, etc. The humanly constructed tabernacle, being made after the divine pattern, viii. 5, is here called ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν. According to viii. 5 a τύπος of the heavenly realities was shown to Moses, and what he constructed from that model was an ἀντίτυπον, answering to the type. But as here used with τῶν ἀληθ., ἀντίτυπα (in agreement with ἅγια) must mean what we usually speak of as a type, that which corresponds to and prefigures. In the only other instance of its occurrence, 1 Pet. iii. 21, it has the converse meaning, the reality of baptism which corresponds to or is the antitype of the deluge. The ἀντίτυπα are contrasted with αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν, heaven itself [αὐτὸν in contrast to the mere likeness or copy] the ultimate reality, the presence of spiritual and eternal things. "Coelum in quod Christus ingressus est, non est ipsum coelum creatum quodcunque fuerit, sed est coelum in quo Deus est etiam quando coelum creatum nullum est, ipsa