

Hebrews

Chapter 9:11-28

¹¹ ***But when Christ appeared as a high priest of the good things having come, (He entered) through the greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made by hands, that is, not of this creation;***

There are two sets of comparative couplets found in the beginning of this lesson ... verses 11 + 12 ... and 13 + 14.

Pink > The 9th chapter of Hebrews contains a particular exemplification of this general proposition: Christ is the substance of the Levitical shadows ... Christians have an High Priest who is a Minister of the true tabernacle. Here in chapter 9 confirmation is given of what was pointed out at the close of chapter 8, namely, that Christ's bringing in of the new covenant did abrogate the old. In exemplifying this fact mention is made in Hebrews 9:1-10 of sundry shadows of the law, in verse 11 and onwards it is shown that the antitypical accomplishment of them was in and by Jesus Christ.

But > Verses 1-10 described the earthly tabernacle and the Levitical worship rituals performed there

Appeared > Strong's > *paraginomai* > *para* > *from beside, by the side of, by, beside + ginomai* > *to come into being, to happen, to become* > to be beside, to arrive. Usage > to come on the scene, appear,.

Precept Austin > conveys the sense of Messiah's arriving upon the scene of human history at His first advent ... The same verb was used to describe the appearing of John the Baptist, Matthew recording "Now in those days John the Baptist came, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, saying, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

Having come > KJV translates as > *to come* Vincent > It should be "of the good things realized,"

(He entered) through > Precept Austin > The preposition is better rendered "by means of." Wuest explains it this way - The word "*through*" is the translation of *dia*, the preposition of intermediate agency.

The translation above is carried along with the beginning of verse 2 > *and not through the blood of goats and calves, but through His own blood,*

More perfect > *teleios* > having reached its end, complete, perfect

HELPS > teleios > *mature* (consummated) from going through the necessary stages to reach the *end-goal*, i.e. *developed* into a consummating *completion* by fulfilling the necessary *process*

¹² and *not through the blood of goats and calves*, but through His own blood, He entered the holy place *once for all time*, having obtained eternal redemption.

Not > Precept Austin > indicates absolute negation - "absolutely not through the blood of goats and calves"

Not through the blood if goats and calves > Utley > The goats were for the people's sin (cf. Lev. 16:11) and the calves were for the high priests' sin (cf. Lev. 16:11). The sacrificial system of the OT (cf. Leviticus 1-7) was God's gracious provision of allowing (as a foreshadowing of Christ's death) an unblemished animal to pay the death penalty for human sin (cf. Lev. 17:11).

Once for all time > Utley > This is an (Greek grammar) which denotes a completed act emphasizing the subject's participation and interest.

¹³ For if the blood of goats and bulls, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling those who have been defiled, *sanctify for the cleansing of the flesh*,

Sanctify > Strong's > to make holy, consecrate, sanctify

Wuest > The unclean Israelite was, therefore, "out of bounds," so to speak, so far as participation in the tabernacle service of Israel was concerned, and also his service to God. When he fulfilled the Levitical ritual that had to do with his position and his restoration to a participation in the worship of Israel, he was sanctified, that is, set apart for God again.

For the cleansing of the flesh > Barnes > Makes holy so far as the flesh or body is concerned. The uncleanness here referred to related to the body only, and of course the means of cleansing extended only to that. It was not designed to give peace to the conscience, or to expiate moral offences.

Constable > The blood of goats and bulls adequately removed ceremonial guilt, but it could not remove moral guilt. The ashes of a heifer removed ritual pollution, but they could not remove spiritual defilement.

¹⁴ *how much more* will the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit *offered Himself without blemish to God, cleanse your conscience from dead works* to serve the living God?

How much more > Strong's > how much? how great?

Who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself > Pink > There has been considerable difference of opinion as to whether the "eternal Spirit" has reference to the Divine nature of Christ animating and sustaining His humanity, or to the third Person of the Trinity.

Offered Himself without blemish to God > I keep on being blessed and humbled by the Lord's word as He reveals these truths. Jesus said, "Let Me be the lamb."

Dead works > Utley > This same phrase appears in **Hebrews 6:1** as referring to OT rituals and procedures as a means of gaining salvation.

Hebrews 6:1 > *Therefore leaving the elementary teaching about the Christ, let us press on to maturity, not laying again a foundation of repentance from dead works and of faith toward God,*

Cleanse your conscience from dead works > Wuest > "The superior nature of Messiah's sacrifice is seen in its deeper effect. While the Levitical ritual accomplished only formal ritual expiation, and left the inner man untouched, the sacrifice of Messiah reaches the very center of the moral and spiritual being of the individual. It cleanses the conscience of dead works, in that it changes the character of the works done by the individual. Before salvation, the sinner did so-called good works in the strength of his own sinful nature. They were *dead works*. After salvation has wrought its mighty transformation within the individual, the good works are motivated, empowered, and produced by the Holy Spirit. They are, therefore, living works. Thus, the person serves the living God.

Look at this comparison within a comparison! *cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?*

Constable > A notice on a church marquee warned: "Most people want to serve God, but only in an advisory capacity."

¹⁵ **For this reason He is the mediator of a new covenant, so that, since a death has taken place for the redemption of the violations that were committed under the first covenant, those who have been called may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance.**

For this reason > Strong's > through, on account of, because of

Covenant > Strong's > *diatheke* > testament, **will**, covenant

There is a very important distinction made here ... the word used is not the normal *suntheke* ... but, rather, *diatheke*. Both Barclay and Precept Austin brought this out in their earlier presentations ...

Barclay > For all normal uses, the Greek word for an agreement (covenant) is *sunthēkē*, which is the word for a marriage covenant or bond and for an agreement between two states. Further, in all normal Greek, *diathēkē* means not an agreement but a will. Why should the New Testament use this word for a covenant? The reason is this: *sunthēkē* always describes an agreement entered into on equal terms. The parties to a *sunthēkē* are on the same level, and each can bargain with the other.

But God and human beings do not meet on equal terms. In the biblical sense of a covenant, the whole approach comes from God. We cannot bargain with God; we cannot argue about the terms of the covenant; we can only accept or reject the offer that God makes.

(Barnes > It is not the word which a "Greek" would have employed to denote a "compact" or "covenant." ... the word properly expressive of a "covenant" or "compact" *sunthēkē* - is "never" used in the New Testament. In all the allusions to the transactions between God and man, this word never occurs.)

Precept Austin > It was a commonly used in the Greco-Roman world to define a legal transaction in settling an inheritance. *Diatheke* denotes an irrevocable decision, which cannot be cancelled by anyone. A prerequisite of its effectiveness before the law is the death of the disposer and thus *diatheke* was like a "final will and testament".

Then > Utley > This term is first used in Heb. 8:8,13, but alluded to in Heb. 7:22. This shocking term is found in only one OT text (cf. Jer. 31:31-34) and described in Ezek. 36:22-36. Verses 15-18 are a play on the word "covenant," with its two meanings of legal contract or agreement (Hebrew) and last will and testament (Greek and Latin).

Lastly > Pink > To sum up what has been said on this difficult but important subject: throughout the New Testament the Holy Spirit has intentionally used only the one word "diatheke" though there was another in the Greek language ("syntheke") which more exactly expressed a "covenant" because it was capable of a double application, and that, because the Son of God is not only the Mediator of a new covenant, but also the Testator of His own gifts.

He is the mediator of a new covenant > Pink relays an interesting comment > Now the "mediator" of the "Old Testament" was Moses, and it was not until his death, though immediately after it, that Israel entered their inheritance, the land of Canaan! Looked at from the standpoint of God's government, the death of Moses was because of his sin (Numbers 20:10-12); but considered in relation to his official position, as "the servant over the house of God," it had another and deeper meaning as Deuteronomy 3:26 shows, "*the Lord was wroth with me for your sakes*" how blessedly did this foreshadow the reason why God's wrath was visited upon Christ: Christ, as Moses, must die before the inheritance could be ours.

Since a death has taken place ... > Constable > Since we have obtained eternal redemption (v. 12) through the death of our Mediator and the eternal Spirit (v. 14), we can have hope in an eternal inheritance. In contrast, believers under the Old Covenant enjoyed mainly temporary blessings and had comparatively little understanding of eschatological rewards.

Redemption > Precept Austin > *apolutrosis* > from *apo* = marker of dissociation or separation + *lutroo* = to redeem (from *lutron* = ransom) ((from *lúo* = loosen what is bound, loose any person tied or fastened)) is the payment of a price to ransom

Promise > Precept Austin > originally referred to an announcement or declaration (especially of a favorable message) but in later Greek came to mean a declaration to do something with the implication of obligation to carry out what is stated (thus a promise or pledge). (It) was primarily a legal term denoting summons, a promise to do or give something, but in the NT speaks primarily of the promises of God

Inheritance > A very important transition word! This ties the whole concept above to those expressed by the next verses. Vincent quotes Rendall as to the confusion that happens if a person doesn't understand the "Will" side of the Greek word used for "Covenant" ... "The English Version has involved this passage in hopeless obscurity by introducing the idea of a testament and a testator." (Seen in the KJV of verses 16 and 17 below)

¹⁶ *For where there is a covenant, there must of necessity be the death of the one who made it.* ¹⁷ *For a covenant is valid only when people are dead, for it is never in force while the one who made it lives.*

For where there is a covenant ... > Barnes > ... These considerations show that it was the common sentiment, alike among the Hebrews and the pagan, that a covenant **with God** was to be ratified or sanctioned by sacrifice; and the statement of Paul here is, that the death of a sacrificial victim was needful to confirm or ratify such a covenant with God. It was not secure, or confirmed, until blood was thus shed.

Death > Precept Austin > Death in the New Testament is treated not as a natural process but as a destroying power related to sin and its consequences.

(Remember Pink's previous comment about Moses?)

Valid > Strong's > firm, secure

When people are dead > Barnes > Prof. Stuart > The proper translation is, "upon, or over the dead."

In force > Strong's > to be strong, have power

Made > Strong's > to place separately, dispose of by a will

¹⁸ *Therefore even the first covenant was not inaugurated without blood.*

Therefore, even the ... > Do you see the tie-in? Death/Blood

Inaugurate > Strong's > *egkanizo* > to renew, inaugurate

NAS > from *en* and *kainos*

en > in, on, at, by, with

kainos > recently made, fresh, recent, unused, unworn

¹⁹ *For when every commandment had been spoken by Moses to all the people according to the Law, he took the blood of the calves and the goats, with water and scarlet wool and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book itself and all the people,* ²⁰ *saying, "This is the blood of the covenant which God commanded you."* ²¹ *And in the same way he sprinkled both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry with the blood.*

For when every commandment had been spoken by Moses > Pink > This intimates the particular character of the Old Testament. It consisted primarily of commandments of obedience), promising no assistance for the performance of them. The "New Testament" is of another nature: it is one of promises, and although it also has precepts requiring obedience, yet is it (as a covenant) wholly founded in the promise, whereby strength and assistance for the performance of that obedience are given to us.

He took the blood of the calves and the goats, etc. > Barnes > This passage has given great perplexity to commentators from the fact that Moses in his account of the transactions connected with the ratification of the covenant with the people, Exodus 24, mentions only a part of the circumstances here referred to.

Constable (commenting on verses 18-21) The Old Covenant went into effect when the Levitical priests shed the blood of animal substitutes and sprinkled that blood on all the covenant beneficiaries. The beneficiaries were the Israelites (Exod. 24:6-8) and the tabernacle (cf. Exod. 40:9-15). The New Covenant went into effect similarly when Jesus Christ shed His blood and God applied it to its beneficiaries spiritually (cf. Matt. 26:28).

²² *And almost all things are cleansed with blood, according to the Law, and without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness.*

Almost all things > Vincent > Rend. "and I may almost say, it is in blood," etc.

Almost all things are cleansed with blood > Barnes > This rule was not universal, for some things were purified by fire and water, Numbers 31:22-23, and some by water only; Numbers 31:24; Leviticus 16:26, Leviticus 16:28. But the exceptions to the general rule were few.

Cleansed > Precept Austin > *katharizo* > pure, clean, without stain or spot; English words - catharsis = emotional or physical purging, cathartic = substance used to induce a purging,

Without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness > Barnes > That is, though some things were purified by fire and water, yet when the matter pertained to the forgiveness of sins, it was "universally" true that no sins were pardoned except by the shedding of blood.

Forgiveness > Precept Austin > *aphesis* from *aphiemi* = action which causes separation and is in turn derived from *apo* = from + *hiemi* = put in motion, send. *Aphiemi* literally means to send away or to put apart. And thus the root meaning of forgiveness is to put away an offense.

²³ *Therefore it was necessary for the copies of the things in the heavens to be cleansed with these things, but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these.*

Copies > Precept Austin > *hupodeigma* from *hupo* = under + *deiknúo/deíknumi* = to show, to point to something, to make known the character or significance of something) means literally that which is shown below ... Barclay writes that *hupodeigma* means "a specimen, or, still better, a sketch-plan."

But the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these:

- Barnes > The use of the word "purified" here applied to heaven, does not imply that heaven was before "unholy," but it denotes that it is now made accessible to sinners; or that they may come and worship there in an acceptable manner.
- Utley > The concept of things in heaven having been polluted by mankind's sin on earth is unusual, but not unique to this author (cf. Rom. 8:18-22).
- Robertson > To us it seems a bit strained to speak of the ritual cleansing or dedication of heaven itself by the appearance of Christ as Priest-Victim. But the whole picture is highly mystical.
- Vincent > The expression is rhetorical and figurative, and appears to be founded on that feature of the Levitical ritual according to which the high priest was required, on the Great Day of Atonement, to make an atonement for the sanctuary, "because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel."
- Spurgeon > Was the heavenly place itself defiled? No, that cannot be. But if you and I had gone there without atonement by blood, heaven would have been defiled.

²⁴ *For Christ did not enter a holy place made by hands, a mere copy of the true one, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us; ²⁵ nor was it that He would offer Himself often, as the high priest enters the Holy Place year by year with blood that is not his own.*

For Christ did not enter a holy place made by hands > Barnes > The Jewish high priest alone entered into the most holy place; and the other priests into the holy place. Jesus, being of the tribe of Judah, and not of Levi, never entered the temple proper.

Copy > Interesting word! Look at the Strong's definition > *antitupos* > *anti* > *over against, opposite, instead of* + *tupos* > *a die (as struck), i.e. (by implication) a stamp or scar; by analogy, a shape, i.e. A statue, (figuratively) style or resemblance; specially, a sampler ("type")* ... therefore, an *antitype*

Appear > Strong's > to exhibit, appear (in person), to declare

Wiersbe > Did you notice that the word appear is used three times in Hebrews 9:24–28? These three uses give us a summary of our Lord's work. He has appeared to put away sin by dying on the cross (**Heb. 9:26**). He is appearing now in heaven for us (**Heb. 9:24**). One day, He shall appear to take Christians home (**Heb. 9:28**). These "three tenses of salvation" are all based on His finished work.

- **Hebrews 9:26** > (Past) ²⁶ *Otherwise, He would have needed to suffer often since the foundation of the world; but now once at the consummation of the ages He has been revealed to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself.*
- **Hebrews 9:24** > (Present) ²⁴ *For Christ did not enter a holy place made by hands, a mere copy of the true one, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us;*
- **Hebrews 9:28** > (Future) ²⁸ *so Christ also, having been offered once to bear the sins of many, will appear a second time for salvation without reference to sin, to those who eagerly await Him.*

Nor was it that He would offer Himself often > Pink > Such is the absolute perfection of the one offering of Christ, that it stands in need of, that it will admit of, no repetition in any kind. Therefore, does the apostle declare that if it be despised or neglected, "*there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins*" (Hebrews 10:26).

²⁶ *Otherwise, He would have needed to suffer often since the foundation of the world; but now once at the consummation of the ages He has been revealed to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself.*

He would have needed to suffer often since the foundation of the world > Pink > The force of the apostle's argument rests upon two evident suppositions. First, that the "offering" (verse 25) and "suffering" (verse 26) of Christ are inseparable. It was in and by His suffering that the Lord Jesus offered Himself unto God, and that because He was Himself both the Priest and the Sacrifice. Aaron "offered" repeatedly, yet he never once "suffered," for he was not the sacrifice itself.

It was the bullock which was slain, that suffered. But Christ being both Priest and Sacrifice could not "offer" without "suffering," and herein does the force of the argument principally consist.

But now once at the consummation of the ages He has been revealed to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself > Pink > Second, the apostle's argument here is also built on the fact that there was a necessity for the expiation of the sin of all that were to be saved from the foundation of the world. Sin entered the world immediately after it was founded, by the apostasy of our first parents ... This expression "end of the world" or more literally, "consummation of the ages" is here used antithetically from "since the foundation of the world" which usually has reference to the first entrance of sin into the world.

²⁷ *And **just as it is destined for people to die once**, and after this comes judgment, ²⁸ **so Christ also, having been offered once** to bear the sins of many, will appear a second time for salvation without reference to sin, to those who eagerly await Him.*

Just as it is destined for people to die once ... so Christ also, having been offered once

Morris > There is a finality about it [death] that is not to be disputed. But if it is the complete and final end to life on earth, it is not, as so many in the ancient world thought, the complete and final end. Death is more serious than that because it is followed by judgment. Men are accountable, and after death they will render account to God.

Precept Austin > Because Jesus Christ died once, for our sins, we do not need to fear condemnation after death, but we can look forward to ultimate deliverance.