hood, and indeed of all Israel. In treating  
of the Head of so compact a system as the  
Jewish priesthood, it is clearly allowable,  
if any where, to bring in the principle  
that he who acts by another acts himself.  
See ch. vii. 27, where the very same daily  
service is predicated of the high priest)  
**standeth** (no priest nor other person  
might *sit* in the inner court of the temple,  
except the king. There is perhaps more  
than a fortuitous contrast to *“sat down”*  
below: the one posture being proper to  
worshipping, the other to being worshipped,  
as Chrysostom remarks) **day by day ministering** (see note, ch. viii. 2) **and** (brings  
out that in the *service*, which the Writer  
wishes most to emphasize) **often offering  
the same sacrifices, the which** (i.e. of a  
sort which, such as) **can never take away**  
(literally, “strip off all round.” Such a  
word is peculiarly fitting to express the  
removal of that of which it is said, ch. v. 2,  
*“He is surrounded with infirmity,”* and  
which is called, ch. xii. 1, *“sin which is  
easily* [naturally] *cast about us.”* The  
sacrifice might bring sense of partial forgiveness: but it could never denude the  
offerer of sinfulness—strip off and take  
away his guilt) **sins:**

**12.] but He**  
(‘this [man],’ or, [priest]: but such  
rendering should be avoided if possible, as  
should all renderings which import a new  
generic idea into the text, as always  
causing confusion: see for a notable example, 1 Cor. ii. 11 end, in A.V.—where  
there is nothing corresponding to *“man”*  
in the original), **having offered one sacrifice for sins for ever** (**for ever** may be  
joined either with the preceding or with  
the following words. See the matter discussed in my Greek Test. It will there be  
seen that I incline to join them with what  
follows, but would leave it an open question.  
My ground is that the words seem  
  
better to refer to an enduring state, than  
to a past act. The objection taken to this  
arrangement, above, that there will be  
change in the nature of a session at the  
end, when all things shall have been put  
under His feet, may be met by saying that  
such change, being obviously included in  
His ultimate state of reception into God’s  
presence in heaven, does not here *count as*  
a change, where the question is of renewal  
of sacrifice, with regard to which that session is eternal) **sat down on the right  
hand of God ; henceforth waiting until his  
enemies be placed as footstool of his feet**  
(there is no real discrepancy between this  
passage and 1 Cor. xv. 23–26. If this  
seems to date the subjection of all to  
Christ *before* the second advent, and that  
places it *after* the same event, we may  
well say, that the second advent is not  
here taken into account by the Writer,—  
whose object is the contrast between the  
suffering and triumphant Christ,—as it is  
by St. Paul, who is specially giving an  
account of the resurrection, which is so  
inseparably bound up with that *advent.*  
The second advent is no break in Christ’s  
waiting till his enemies be subdued to him,  
but it is the last step but one of that subjection; the last of all being the subjection  
of Himself, and his mystical Body with  
him, to Him that did put all things under  
him. For among the enemies are His own  
elect, who *were* enemies: and they are not  
thoroughly subject to Him, till He with  
them is subject to the Father, the mediatorial veil being withdrawn, and the One  
God being all in all).

**14.]** And He  
need not renew his sacrifice: **For by one  
offering He hath perfected for ever them  
who are being sanctified** (“the Writer  
says not *‘them that are being perfected,’*  
but *‘them that are being* **sanctified**.’ Sanctification, i.e. the imputed and implanted