as it is so important a portion of the body.  
Hence, and because His resurrection Body  
seems to have been bloodless,—see Luke  
xxiv, 32; John xx. 27, and notes,—some  
have supposed that the Blood of the Lord  
remains, as it was poured ont, incorruptible,  
in the presence of God. On such a matter  
I would neither affirm nor deny, but mention,   
with all reverence, that which seems  
to suit the requirements of the words before us.   
By that Blood we live, wherever  
it is: but as here it is mentioned separately  
from the Lord Himself, as an item in the  
glories of the heavenly city, and as “yet  
speaking,” it seems to require some such  
view to account for the words used. Bengel  
has here a long excursus on the point, in  
which he takes strongly the above view.  
Chrysostom also seems to have done so.  
The blood of Christ is called “*the blood***of sprinkling**,” inasmuch as, like that  
sacrificial blood of old materially, it is  
spiritually sprinkled on the conscience of  
those who come unto God by Him, compare   
ch. ix. 13 ff.; x. 22; xiii. 12) **speaking  
better** (adverbially; as in 1 Cor. vii. 38,  
*doing better* is opposed to *doing well*.  
And the adverb refers not to the *manner* of  
the speaking, but to the matter spoken;  
so that “*better things*” in the English  
expresses well the meaning) **than Abel** (not,  
“*than that of Abel:*” for in ch. xi. 4, it is  
Abel himself who speaks, in his blood: see  
note there).

**25.**] This voice of the blood  
of sprinkling, just mentioned, leads naturally   
to the *caution not to despise that  
voice, nor put it by as they of old did the  
“voice of words” from Sinai.* **Take heed  
that ye decline not** (see above on ver. 19)  
**him that speaketh** (i.e, God in Christ,  
see below). **For if they did not escape**(how? in one of two senses: either 1)  
they did not escape hearing the voice on  
account of this their *refusal*: or 2) which  
seems more probable, they did not escape  
God's vengeance in punishment: the Writer  
taking this their *refusal* of the divine voice  
as a sort of sample of their disobedient and  
unbelieving spirit), **declining as they did**(not ‘*who refused*’) **him who spoke on  
earth** (on Mount Sinai), **much more we**(**shall not escape**), **who are turning away  
from him** (who *speaks*) **from** (**the**) **heavens:**  
—We now come to the somewhat difficult  
question, the answer to which we have taken  
for granted in the rendering of this verse:  
viz., who are intended by the various  
objects, “*him that speaketh,*”—“*him that  
speaketh on earth,*” —“*him from heaven.*”  
Let us take the second of these first, as  
furnishing the key to the others. “Whom  
does he mean (says Chrysostom)? It seems  
to me, Moses.” But this cannot well be.  
For the participle **refusing**, manifestly  
refers baek to ver. 19: where it was not  
Moses, but God, whom they *refused*. It  
must be laid down then as certain, that  
**he that speaketh on earth** is God. Then  
if so, who is **he from heaven**, or in other  
words who is **he that speaketh**, for these  
two are manifestly the same? Clearly,  
not Jesus: for by the words **whose voice**,  
which follow, the voice of this same  
speaker shook the earth at the giving of  
the law: and it can by no ingenuity be  
pretended, that the terrors of the law proceeded  
from the Son of God; especially in  
the face of the contrast drawn here, and in  
ch. ii. 2 ff. And it would be against all  
accuracy and decorum in divine things, to  
pass from the speaking of the God of  
Israel to that of our Lord Jesus Christ in  
the way of climax as is here done, with  
“much more shall we not escape.” Add  
to which, that, if Christ is to be understood   
as the subject of vv. 26 ff., we shall  
have Him uttering the prophetic words,  
“*yet once more, &c.;*” whereas both from  
our Writer’s habit of quoting prophecy  
[compare ch. i. 1; iv. 7; vi. 13; viii. 8;  
xi, 11], and from the context of the prophecy   
itself, they must be attributed to  
the Father. How then are these difficulties   
to be got over? Simply by taking  
above, the speaker in both cases to  
be GOD: in the first, as speaking from  
Mount Sinai by His Angels: in the second,  
as speaking from His heavenly throne  
through His exalted Son. Thus it is true  
we lie open to one objection, viz. that the