HEBREWS   
   
 ERSION, AVTPORIZE! VERSION REVISED.   
 ‘than Abel.   
 speaketh better things than better things See"   
 that of Ahe?, 25 See that that ye refuse not him that speaketh.   
 ye refuse not him that For ‘if they ‘aped not for refusin,   
 ‘speaketh For if they es- him that spz es on earth, much more   
 caped not who refused him shall not we escape, if we turn away   
 that spake on earth, much   
 more shall away me esenpe,| from him that speaketh from heaven :   
 that speaketh from heaven :   
   
 as it is so important a portion of the body earth (on Mount Sinai), more we   
 Hence, and beeause His resurrection Bod; (chall not escape), who are turning away   
 ms to have been bloodless,—see Luke from him (who speaks) from (the) heavens :   
 xxiv, 32; John xx. 27, and notes,—some —We now come to the somewhat diffienlt   
 have supposed that the Blood of the Lord question, the answer towhich we have taken   
 remains, as it was ont, incorruptible, for granted in the rendering of this verse :   
 in the presence of God, On sucha matter viz, who are intended hy the various   
 T would neither affirm nor deny, but men- objects, “him that speaketh,” —\* him that   
 tion, with all reverence, that which seems speaketh on earth,” —“him heaven.”   
 to suit the requirements of the words be- Let ns take the second of these first, as   
 fore ns. By that Blood we live, wherever furnishing the key to the others.“ Whom   
 it is: but as it is mentioned separately does he mean (says Chrysostom) ? Tt seems   
 from the Lord Himself, as an item in the to me, Moses.” “But this cannot well be.   
 glories of the beavenly city, and as “yet For the participle refusing, manifestly   
 speaking,” it seems to require some sieht refers baek to ver. 19: where it was not   
 view to account for the words used, Beugel Moses, but God, whom they refused. It   
 has here long exenrsus on the point, in must be laid down then as certain, that   
 which he takes strongly the above view. he that speaketh on earth is God. ‘Then   
 Chrysostom also seems’ to have done so. if so, who is he from heaven, or in other   
 The blood of Christ is called “the blood words who is he that speaketh, for these   
 of sprinkling,” inasmuch as, like that two are manifestly the same? Clearly,   
 1 blood of old materially, it is not Jesns: for by the words whose voice,   
 spiritually sprinkled on the conscience of which follow, the voice of this same   
 those who come unto God by Him, com- speaker shook the earth at the giving of   
 pare ch. ix. 13 4f.; 22; xiii. speaking the law: and it ean by no ingennity be   
 better (adverbially ; as in 1 Cor. vii. 38, pretended, that the terrors of the law p   
 doing better is opposed to doing well. cveded from the Son of God; especial!   
 And the adverb refers not to the maazner of the face of the contrast drawn here, and in   
 the speaking, but to the matter spoken; ch. ii, 2 ff. And it would be against all   
 so that “better things” in the English acenraey and deeorum in divine things, to   
 expresses well the meaning) than Abel (not, pass from the speaking of the God of   
 «than that of Abel:” for in i. 4, it Israel to that of our Lord Jesus Christ in   
 Abel himself who speaks, in his blood : see the way.of climax as is here done, with   
 uote there). 25.) This of the blood “much more shall we not eseape.” Add   
 of sprinkling, just mentioned, leads natu- to which, that, if Christ is to be under-   
 rally to the caution not to despise that stood as the subject of vv. 26 ff, we shall   
 voice, nor put it by as they of old did the have Him uttering the prophetic words,   
 “voice of words” from Sinai. Take heed “yet once more, fi.” whervas both from   
 that ye decline riot (see above on ver. 19) be Gop: in the first, as speaking from   
 him that speaketh (i.e, God in Christ, [eompare eh. by His iv. 73 vi. 185 second,   
 see below). For if they did not escape ax speaking from the context of the pro-   
 (how ? in one of two senses: either 1) through itself, must Son. attributed to   
 they did not eseape hearing the voiee on the lie open to one objection, these diffien]-   
 aceount of this their refusal: or 2) whieh ties to be got over? Simply by taking   
 seems more probuble, they did not escape above, the speaker in both ‘eases to   
 God's vengeanee in punishinent: the Writer   
 taking this their refusal of the divine   
 as a sort of sample of their disobedient and   
 unbelieving spirit), declining as they did   
 (not ‘who refused’) him who spoke on