**of such sort as** (the word used does not,  
like the simple relative, identify, but  
classifies, the antecedent) **are** (habitually)  
**offered according to** (in pursuance of) **the  
law; then** (more logical than chronological; but used probably in allusion to  
that **then** above, in the passage itself)  
**hath he said, Behold, I am come to do  
thy will. He** (Christ again) **taketh away  
the first** (the sacrifices), **that he may set**  
**up** (establish) **the second** (the will of God).

**10.] In** (the course of, the fulfilment of: not properly *“by:”* the instrumentality belongs more to the *offering*,  
mentioned below) **which will** (viz. the will  
and purpose of God towards us by Christ:  
the will which He came to fulfil. There  
is no real difference, between the will of  
God to redeem us by the sufferings and  
death of Christ, and the will of God as  
fulfilled by Christ’s obedience: the one  
includes the other: the latter was the  
condition of the former) **we have been  
sanctified** (see on the word **to sanctify,**  
and on the use of the present and past  
passive participles of it, note on ch. ii.  
11. Here the perfect is used, inasmuch  
as it is the finished work of Christ in  
its potentiality, not the process of it  
on us, which is spoken of: see ver. 14:  
that final completion is here indicated by  
the perfect), **through the offering of  
the body** (some read, *“of the blood.”*  
But this would, besides losing the reference to the words, *“a body hast thou  
prepared me,”* introduce an inaccuracy  
into the typology. It is by the Blood of  
Christ that we are reconciled to God,  
but by the offering of His Body that we  
are made holy. The one concerns our  
acceptance as acquitted from sin ; the other  
our perfection in holiness by union with  
Him and participation in His Spirit. Thus  
we distinguish the two in the Communion  
Service: “that our sinful bodies may be  
made clean by His Body, and our souls  
washed through His most precious Blood”)  
**of Jesus Christ once for all** (this is to be  
taken with the words, *“the offering, &c.,”*not with *“we have been sanctified,”* as is  
done by many. See the discussion in my  
Greek Test.).

**11–14.]** See summary at ver. 1. **And**  
(introduces a new particular of contrast :  
‘and besides’) **every high priest** (much  
has of late been said against the reading  
**high priest**, as bringing in an inaccuracy  
which our Writer could not be guilty of,  
seeing that the *high* priests did not officiate  
in the daily sacrifice. But all such arguments are worthless against our most ancient MSS., and tend indeed the other  
way, viz. to shew how natural it was to  
alter *high priest* to *priest*, on account of  
this very difficulty. With regard to the  
alleged inaccuracy, I really think that if  
closely viewed, it will prove rather to be a  
fine and deep touch of truth. The high  
priesthood of our Lord is to be compared  
with that of the Jewish legal high priests.  
On the one side is Jesus, alone in the glory  
of his office and virtue of his sacrifice; on  
the other is the Jewish high priesthood,  
not one man but many, by reason of death;  
represented in all its acts, personal or delegated, by its holder for the time, by  
*“every high priest,”* offering not one, but  
many sacrifices. This *High Priest* is the  
representative of the whole priesthood.  
Whether he ministered in the daily service  
of the temple himself or not, it is he who  
embodies the acts and sufferings of Israel  
in his own person. How Delitzsch can  
say that such an idea is foreign alike to  
the Bible and the Jewish mind, I am at a  
loss to understand, considering the liberation at the death of the High Priest, not  
to insist on the ceremonies themselves at  
the day of atonement, when he was clearly  
the centre und representative of the priesthood,