mention is made of Christ’s having offered  
Himself. Henceforward it becomes more  
and more familiar to the reader: “once  
struck, the note sounds on ever louder  
and louder,” Delitzsch).  
**28.]** *Final bringing out of the contrast  
between the Aaronic priests and Christ.*  
**For** (gives the reason for the difference in  
the last verse) **the law makes men** (emphatic, opposed to **the Son** below) **high  
priests, who have infirmity** (compare  
ch. v. 2, of the human high priest, and  
see below. The expression here involves,  
from the context, liability to sin, and subjection to, removal by, death. Christ had  
not the first, and therefore need not offer  
for his own sin: he was freed from the  
second, and therefore need not repeat His  
sacrifice); **but the word** (utterance; or,  
purport) **of the oath which was after the  
law** (these words, “the oath which was after  
the law,” belong together, which ought to  
be marked in the A. V. by the omission of  
the comma after “oath.” This oath is recorded in David, i.e. subsequently to the  
giving of the law, and therefore as antiquating it and setting it aside. The argument is similar to that in Gal. iii. 17),  
(**makes**) **the Son, made perfect** (in this participle, as Delitzsch remarks, lies enwrapped the whole process of the Son’s assumption  
of human *infirmity*, and being exalted  
through it: for this *being made perfect*  
was *through sufferings*, ch. ii. 10, v. 9.  
Those priests, by their infirmity, were removed away in death, and replaced by  
others: He, by that infirmity, which He  
took on Him, went out through death into  
glory eternal, and an unrenewable priesthood) **for evermore** (these words belong  
simply and entirely to the participle, *“made perfect.”* The A.V. has obliterated both sense, and analogy with ch. ii. 10 and v. 9, by rendering this participle, *‘consecrated’*).

**CHAP. VIII. 1–13.]** *Not only is Christ  
personally, as a High Priest, above  
the sons of Aaron, but the service and  
ordinances of the covenant to which His  
High Priesthood belongs are better than  
those of that to which they belong.*

**1.] Now the principal matter**  
(the word here used also signifies *sum  
total*, and this other meaning would be  
apposite enough here, were the sense confined to ver. 1, which has been treated of  
before: but ver. 2 contains new particulars, which cannot be said to be the *sum*  
of any things hitherto said) **in** (**in**, or **upon**:  
lying as it were, by, and among) **the things  
which we are saying: We have such  
an High Priest** (emphasis on *such*, which  
refers, not to what preceded, but to what is  
to follow, viz. *“who sat down,”* &c.), **who  
sat down** (“in ch. i. 3, the sitting at the  
right hand of God was mentioned as a  
pre-eminence of the Son above the angels,  
who stand as ministering spirits before the  
presence of God: here, where the same is  
said of Christ as High Priest, Schlichting  
and others rightly remark that there is  
again a pre-eminence over the Jewish high  
priests: for these, even when they entered  
the holiest place, did not sit down by the  
throne of God, but only stood before it for  
a moment: compare ch. x. 11, 12.” Bleek.  
Lünemann calls this fanciful: but such  
distinctions are not surely to be overlooked  
altogether) **on the right hand of the throne  
of majesty in the heavens** (better thus,  
than “of *the* majesty in the heavens”);  
**2.] a minister of the holy place, and of the**