opened to us by the shedding of Christ’s  
blood once for ail, so that we being justified  
by faith can approach the very throne of  
God. The verb here used is the technical  
term in the Septuagint for the *drawing  
near* of the priests in their sacrificial ministrations. It remains to treat of the connexion of the above sentence, vv. 18, 19,  
which has been entirely mistaken by many,  
and among them by the A. V. The ending clause, *“but the bringing in of a better hope,”* has been wrongly joined with *“for  
the law made nothing perfect:”* and that,  
either 1) as A. V., *“but the bringing in  
of a better hope did.”* Beza appears here,  
as in so many other cases, to have led our  
translators into error: or 2) *“For the  
law perfected nothing, but was the introduction,”* &c. This latter is successfully impugned by Beza, on the ground  
that the law was not an *introduction* at  
all, from the very meaning [see above]  
of that word. See the rest of the matter  
argued in my Greek Test.).

**20–22.]** See summary at ver. 11.  
*Further proof of the superiority of the  
Melchisedec priesthood of Christ—in that  
he was constituted in it by an oath*, thus  
giving it a solemnity and weight which that  
other priesthood had not.

**{20} And inasmuch as** [it was] **not without an oath** (the  
ellipsis here is variously supplied. Some  
fill it up out of what follows, *“that  
He became surety.”* And this seems on  
the whole more natural, and more agreeable to the style of our Epistle, than to put in, as A.V., *“he was made priest,”*  
or as Bleek, and others, *“this* [the bringing in of a better hope] *took plac*e): {21} **for they** [**as we know**] **without swearing  
of an oath are made priests** (*are made*,  
as strongly marking the existence of these  
priests at the time of writing); **but He  
with swearing of an oath by Him who  
saith** (i.e., certainly not the Psalmist, who cannot be said to have spoken this *unto Him*, unless indeed we take *“unto”*  
in the mere secondary sense of “with  
reference to.” In the following citation it  
is the words of address only to which this  
refers: the former part is the mere introduction to them. Not seeing this has led to the above mistake. It was God who  
addressed Him, God who made Him priest,  
God who sware unto Him) **to Him, The  
Lord** (Jehovah) **sware and will not repent** (i.e. the decree stands fast, and shall undergo no change), **Thou art a priest  
for ever:— {22} of so much** (in that same proportion, viz. as the difference between the oath and no oath indicates) **better a testament** (the meanings of the word thus rendered [*diatheké*], 1) an appointment,  
without concurrence of a second party, of  
somewhat concerning that second party,—  
of which nature is *a last will and testament,* 2) a mutual agreement in which all parties concerned consent,—*a covenant,*  
in the proper sense,—being confessed, our  
business here is, not to enquire what is the  
fixed theological acceptance of the word, and  
so to render it here, irrespective of any subsequent usage by our Writer himself; but to enquire 1) how he uses it in this Epistle,  
2) whether he is likely to have used it in  
more than one sense:—and to render accordingly. Now it cannot well be doubted, that in ch. ix. 16, 17, he does use it in the  
sense of *“testament.”* And just as little  
can it be questioned, that he is speaking  
there of the same thing as here; that the  
*“new testament”* there answers to the **better testament** here, this first mention  
of it being in fact preparatory to that  
fuller treatment. I therefore keep here to  
the A. V.) **also hath Jesus become surety**  
(“Jesus is become the surety of the better  
covenant, i.e. in His person security and  
certainty is given to men, that a better  
covenant is made and sanctioned by God.