brought in in the argumentation below):  
**since** (in that case) **it were necessary  
that He should oftentimes suffer** (not,  
*‘have suffered,’* as A. V.; by *it were  
necessary* we are already carried back  
to a time antecedent to the supposed repeated acts indicated by *suffering*, and  
therefore do not need another carrying  
back in time. Notice, as against the  
Commentators mentioned above under the  
words *“offer Himself,”* and others, that  
this suffering is here not equivalent to that  
*offering*, but is emphatically placed as a  
new necessity, involved in that; the **often**  
being common to both: the *often offering* necessitated the *often suffering.*  
If Christ’s view in entering heaven was, to  
offer, present, himself often to God, then, as  
a condition of that frequent presentation,  
there would be an antecedent necessity for  
Him to *suffer* often: because that self-presentation is in fact the bringing in before  
God of the Blood of that his suffering : and  
if the one was to be renewed, so must the  
other be likewise. So that the meaning  
is not, that Christ must again and again  
have descended on earth and died. To  
such a descent there is no allusion, as there  
is none to a renewed entrance into the *holy  
places* in heaven. That entrance Christ  
has effected once for all: this lies, as a  
“fait accompli,’ at the ground of the hypothesis. But the rejected hypothesis is, that  
*once being in* the celestial holy place,  
Christ intended to renew often his oblation of Himself. And in that case, says  
our Writer, it would be necessary that He  
should often suffer, often die: because  
each such oblation necessitated as its condition a corresponding *suffering.* When, as in the ease of the Jewish high priests,  
the *blood* was *that of others*, such repetition  
was possible [see Lev. xvi. 14, 15]:  
but not so, when the blood was His *own*)  
**since the foundation of the world** (why  
this addition? Not, as often understood,  
so as to bring under the merits of the  
Suffering, all the sins of mankind past as  
well as future,—which thought arising  
from the erroneous view of a frequent  
repeated *entrance* into heaven being sup-  
posed, has nothing whatever to do with the argument; but, inasmuch as the  
theatre of Christ’s sufferings is of necessity this present world, pointing out that  
those supposed repeated sufferings must.  
necessarily in that case take place within  
the temporal limits indicated by the phrase  
*“from the foundation of the world:”* that  
such sufferings would be spread over the  
space of time from the *foundation of the  
world* till He entered into the presence  
of God, each oblation of Himself there  
being the sequel of, and conditioned by,  
one such *suffering* since the world  
been. I may mention, that no parenthesis is here admissible. The words of  
this clause are strictly and indispensably  
a link in the argument): **now, however**(**now**, not *temporal*, but meaning, “as the  
state of the case is”), **once** (for all without need of renewal) **at** (as close upon,  
put in immediate contiguity with) **the end  
of the ages of time** (i.e. when the whole  
period above indicated by *from the foundation of the world* is gathered up and  
brought to an end. Between the first  
and second coming of Christ, the New Test.  
Scriptures know of no intermediate interposition of the divine dealings with  
men: in Him we are *perfect*, and at His  
appearing, our *ages* had their *accomplishment*. All these centuries which have been  
since, are merely the lengthening out of  
the time in the mercy of God. The first  
Christians universally spoke of the second  
coming of the Lord as close at hand, as  
indeed it ever was and is: the *fatlings*  
are *sacrificed*, and all is ready: but the  
long-suffering of God waits while the guests  
are being gathered in: or, in the other:  
view of His coming, while the ark is a  
preparing) **hath He been manifested** (viz.  
at His first coming in our flesh : the *manifestation in the flesh*, spoken of 1 Tim. iii.  
16; 1 Pet. i. 20. On the other meaning  
given, see below) **for the putting away  
of sin** (see ch. vii. 18 note : putting away,  
i.e. abrogation, “both of the guilt and  
power of sin”) **by means of His sacrifice**  
(i.e. in the *sense*, ‘the sacrifice of Himself’ but not here so expressed in the  
original.

By very many expositors,  
the construction of this verse is differently