**eternal Spirit offered** HIMSELF (emphatic)  
**without fault to God** (first, *when* did He  
offer Himself? Clearly not, as Socinus,  
and others, when he presented himself to  
God in heaven. For, as Delitzsch rightly  
observes, when Christ is antitypically or by  
way of contrast compared with the *victims*  
of the Old Test. sacrifices, as the ritual  
term **without fault** here shews that He is,  
then beyond question the offering on the  
cross is intended, which corresponds to the  
slaying the victim and offering him on the  
altar. Besides which, the ‘oblation in the  
holy place’ was but the completion of the  
‘oblation on the altar,’ and, when Christ’s  
self-offering is spoken of generally, we are  
to take the whole from the beginning, not  
merely that which was the last act of it.  
This will guide us to the meaning of the  
somewhat difficult words, **through the eternal Spirit.** The animals which were offered  
had no will, *no spirit* of their own, which  
could concur with the act of sacrifice.  
Theirs was a transitory life, of no potency  
or virtue. They were offered *through the* *law* rather than *through* any consent, or  
agency, or counteragency, of their own  
But Christ offered Himself, with His own  
consent assisting and empowering the sacrifice. And what was that consent? The  
consent of what ? of the spirit of a man?  
such a consent as yours or mine, given in  
and through our finite spirit whose acts are  
bounded by its own allotted space in time  
and its own responsibilities ? No: but the  
consenting act of His divine Personality—  
His *“eternal Spirit,”* His Godhead, which  
from before time acquiesced in, and wrought  
with, the redemption-purpose of the Father.  
Thus we have *spirit* contrasted with *flesh*  
in speaking of our Lord, in several places:  
see Rom. i. 3, 4; 1 Tim. iii. 16; 1 Pet. iii.  
18. This divine Personality it was, which  
in the Resurrection so completely ruled and  
absorbed His *flesh:* this, which causes Him  
to be spoken of by St. Paul in 1 Cor. xv.  
45 as a *“life-giving Spirit,”* and in 2 Cor.  
iii. 17 f. as absolutely *“the Spirit.”* Not  
however that any confusion hence arises in  
the distinction of the divine Persons : *“the  
eternal Spirit”* is not the Spirit of the  
Father dwelling in Christ, nor is it the  
Holy Spirit given without measure to  
Christ, but it is the divine Spirit of the  
Godhead which Christ Himself had and  
was in His inner Personality. And the  
relevancy of such a clause here is, that the  
eternal Spirit is absolute spirit, divine  
spirit, and thus self-conscious, laying down  
its own course purely of itself unbound by:  
conditions, simply and entirely free: so  
that Christ’s offering of Himself *through  
the Eternal Spirit*, is, as such, a moral act  
of absolute worth.

**through**, i.e. by virtue  
of: so that His divine Spirit was the agent  
in the **offering**, penetrating and acting on  
the Humanity.

**without fault**, as  
above observed, is the regular word of the  
ritual in reference to the victims which  
must be without spot when offered. Therefore to understand it of the perfection of the glorified human nature of the ascended  
Saviour, as the Socinian interpreters, is  
clearly beside the meaning, and contrary  
to analogy), **purify our** (the question of  
reading, **our** or **your**, is one not easy to  
settle. At the word *“purify”* we unfortunately lose the evidence of the great Vatican  
MS. : as it terminates there, and has been  
completed by a later hand. From all analogy it would seem that we must infer our English word *conscience* does not reach the fulness of the term here used, the *self-consciousness as regards to God*, the inner consciousness of relation to Him.  
This is, by the blood of Christ, shed in the  
power of the divine Spirit, thoroughly  
purified, freed from the terror of guilt,  
cleared from alienation from Him and  
from all selfish regards and carnal pretences, and rendered living and real as  
He is living and real) **from dead works**  
(just as death was under the old law the  
fountain of ceremonial pollution, and any  
one by touching a dead body became unclean, so carnal works, having their origin  
in sin, with which death is bound up, pollute the conscience. They are like the  
touching of the dead body, rendering the  
man unclean in God’s sight, as not springing from life in Him: inducing decay and  
corruption in the spirit. See on ch. vi. 1,  
and Chrysostom there quoted. Here, the  
reference to the dead body can hardly be  
set aside, being more pointed than there,  
where I have rather advocated the general  
sense. The Writer does not here set