ought to be on Ebrard’s, &c. interpretation. In the meaning, Christ is He that *made* it: and this agrees wonderfully with  
St. Luke’s manner of speaking in that  
text which is in fact the key-text to this:  
*I* **appoint** *unto you, as my Father* **appointed** *unto me, a kingdom:* the same  
verb being used as here, Luke xxii. 29)  
**be implied** (as literally given, i.e., he  
who speaks of *a testament*, at the same  
time, carries in to, involves in, that assertion, the death of *him that made* *it*. On the  
logical connexion, see below).

**17.]  
For** (renders a fresh reason within the  
domain of the former *“for,”* explaining the  
axiom of ver. 16) **a testament is of force**(see on ch. ii. 2, and Rom. iv. 16) **in the  
case of the dead** (literally, **over dead men,**  
the thing predicated being the substratum  
or condition of the subject. Doubtless in  
choosing the plural, and indeed the word  
itself, the Writer has in his mind the  
transition which he is about to make from  
the death of the New Testament to the  
typical deaths of the Old, which were of  
animals, between which and men *dead*  
*things*, not *those who had died*, would be  
the common term), **seeing that it** (a *testament*) **is never availing when he that  
made it is alive.**

**18.] Whence**  
(because death must precede the validity  
of a testament) **neither has the first** (testament) **been inaugurated** (perfect, inasmuch as the rites, &c., belonging to it  
were still subsisting. Notice that the  
reference is, *here*, simply to the first inauguration of the law when it was put  
forth as new: not to any subsequent renewal of sacrifices by death: this is presently alluded to, vv. 21 ff.) **without** (apart  
from, free from the exhibition of) **blood.**

**19.]** **For** (explanation of the assertion in last verse) **when every commandment had been spoken according  
to the law** (these last words, **according  
to the law**, belong not to *precept*, but  
to **spoken**, spoken according to the law,  
i.e. as the law directed, not varying  
from it in any point) **by Moses to all**  
**the people** (see Exod. xxiv. 3), **taking the**  
**blood** (the additional detail of Exod. xxiv.  
5 is omitted, viz, that “he sent young men  
of the children of Israel, which offered  
burnt-offerings, and sacrificed peace-offerings of oxen unto the Lord.” It was of this blood that Moses took) **of the  
calves and goats** (the former only are  
mentioned in Exodus. But this is only  
said of the peace-offerings. The *burnt-offerings* [see above], after the analogy  
of the rites on the day of atonement,  
might be presumed to be goats. Indeed  
the key to the additions made here to the  
text of Exodus is, that the account is filled  
up by subsequent usage. We may presume, that the solemn legal appointment  
of various ceremonial details was in fact  
only a divine sanction of practices already  
existing: sacrifice having been long in use,  
and that under the direction and approval  
of God Himself), **with water** (prescribed,  
in Numb. xix. 6, 17, to be mixed with the  
ashes of the red heifer which were to be  
kept for purifying : compare also Lev. xiv.  
50 f.: see above), **and scarlet wool, and  
hyssop** (see Lev. xiv. 49 ff.: by comparing  
which with Numb. xix. as above, it may  
fairly be inferred, as our text here assures  
us was the fact, that these instruments  
where the ordinary ones in cleansing and  
sprinkling, even before their positive  
enactment as such by the law. The hyssop  
indeed we find thus prescribed, Exod. xii.  
22, in sprinkling the blood on the doorposts at the Passover. As to the manner  
of using, the stalk or bunch of hyssop