(justifies the assertion by the following citation) **take heed, He says** (supply *God*;  
there can be no doubt of this here, where  
the words following are God’s own), **that  
thou makest all things** (this is not in  
the Septuagint, nor in the Hebrew, but is  
supplied also by Philo) **according to the  
pattern which was shewn thee in the  
mount**. If now we ask what this **pattern**  
was, we are met with various replies.  
Faber Stapulensis interprets it, “that  
what was shewn to Moses in the mount  
was not the truth itself, but only an adumbration and idea of it.” And so Schlichting, concluding, “so that the ancient  
tabernacle was only an example of an  
example, and a shadow of a shadow.”  
This view is strongly controverted by  
Delitzsch, who takes the **pattern** to be  
the veritable heavenly things themselves,  
not seen however by Moses directly and  
naturally, which would be impossible, but  
made visible to him in a vision. I do  
not see that there is much to choose  
between the two views. If the latter be  
taken, then surely the vision thus vouchsafed  
to Moses was itself only an intermediate representation, and so this view  
comes much to the same as the other.

**6.] But now** (the logical, not the  
temporal *now*, as in ch. ix. 26; xi. 16,  
and frequently in St. Paul, meaning, “as  
the fact really is”) H**e hath obtained  
a more excellent ministry** (than that of  
any earthly priests), **in proportion as He  
is also** (**also**, introducing a special reference to an already acknowledged fact,  
as in ch. vi. 7, where see note) **mediator**(the meaning of the word is, one who  
becomes a goer between two persons, assuring to each the consent of the other to  
some point agreed on in common. The  
genitive after *mediator* may either be of  
the *persons between whom*, as in 1 Tim. ii. 5: or of *one of the parties concerned*:  
or of the *object of the mediation*, the  
agreement or covenant. And in this last  
sense is the genitive here. Jesus is the  
inediator, between God and us) o**f a better  
covenant, of one which has been laid  
down** (literally, has been *law-given*, or  
enacted: see on cb. vii. 11. The word  
**law** is also used of the new covenant by  
St. James, i. 25; ii. 12: see also iv. 12,   
and St. Paul, Rom. iii. 27; viii. 2; ix.31)  
**upon** (on the condition of) **better promises**  
(viz. those which are about to be particularized in the following citation. Theodoret says, “For the old covenant had  
joined to it material promises, a land  
flowing with milk and honey, and abundance of children, and the like: but the  
new has eternal life, and the kingdom of  
heaven.” But as Bleek objects, it would  
be very improbable that the Writer should  
intend to refer the promises, on which the  
old covenant was based, to mere earthly  
blessings, in the face of such a designation of the hope of Abraham and the  
patriarchs, as we find in ch. xi. 10—19).

**7.**] *Argumentation*, exactly as in ch. vii.   
11, *from sayings of God, to shew the  
imperfection of the former covenant*.  
**For if that first** (covenant) **were** (or, had  
been) **blameless** (without defect in that  
for which a covenant with God is intended.  
It is the contrary of “*weak and profitless*,” ch. vii. 18), **a place would not be** (not, would not have been) **sought** (i.e.  
space opened, viz. in the words of the following prophecy, which indicate the substitution of such a covenant for the old one.  
Bleek gives a rather far-fetched interpretation,—that the **place** is the place in men’s  
hearts, as distinguished from the tables of  
stone on which the first covenant was  
written; referring to 2 Cor. iii. 3 for a  
similar distinction. But it is far better to