

XXI. The Blood of Bulls and Goats

October 16/17/18, 2018

Hebrews 9:23-10:4

Aim: To reject the idea that Christ is continually being sacrificed for us time and again; rather, His once-for-all sacrifice resulted in our purification, our access to God the Father, and our hope of final salvation when Jesus returns again.

A. The Superiority of Christ's Sacrifice (Hebrews 9:23-28)

Phillips: Hebrews 9:23-28 recounts Christ's return into heaven after His death and resurrection. We must always remember that Christ's ascension is linked to the cross; it is all part of one integrated work in His first coming. Jesus was born of a woman in order to be a fitting representative for man. He was made perfect under the law, so that He would have an accomplished righteousness to offer up to God. Both of these truths have frequently been emphasized in the Book of Hebrews (e.g., 2:10-18; 5:9; 7:28). Jesus died on the cross to bear our sins, was raised from the dead by the Father in acceptance of that sacrifice, and finally ascended into heaven to reign forever as priest and king and to send the Holy Spirit for the salvation of His people. All of this forms one integrated work, centered on the cross. Hebrews 9:23-28 focuses on the culminating event of that whole work, namely, Christ's entry into heaven, having offered His own blood for our sin.

Hughes: Having demonstrated the importance of blood/death in inaugurating the old covenant, the writer now describes the surpassing effect of Christ's sacrifice in establishing the new covenant.

1. The Sanctuary of Christ (9:23-24)

a) Purification (9:23)

(1) Copies of the Heavenly Things (9:23a)

²³*Thus it was necessary for the copies of the heavenly things to be purified with these rites...*

Schreiner: 'Therefore' reaches back to 9:15-22. Since blood was necessary for the old covenant to be enacted and is required for believers to receive an eternal inheritance under the new covenant as well, it demonstrates that death was indispensable for the forgiveness of sins. The word 'necessary' reveals God's perspective and demand. Even the 'copies' (*υποδειγματα, hypodeigmata*) of the things in the heavens had to be purified with blood. Earlier, the word 'copy' was used of the tabernacle under the old covenant (8:5), which functioned as a copy and shadow of what was in heaven. In other words, they were not the substance and reality itself; they pointed both vertically and temporally to a greater reality.

Bruce: With the blood of sacrificial animals, then, the material sanctuary and its accessories were cleansed from defilement and hallowed for the worship of God. Our author does not deny that such ritual cleansing was real and effective as far as it went. What he does deny is that cleansing of this kind could be of any use for the removal of inward and spiritual defilement. The various installations which were cleansed and fitted for the worship of God by the blood of animal sacrifices were but copies of the spiritual realities; where the spiritual realities themselves are concerned, and a superior sacrifice and more effective cleansing must be forthcoming.

Hebrews – Lesson 21

MacArthur: The ‘copies of the things in the heavens’ were the things of the old economy. They were but sketches, or outlines, of the realities of heaven. It was necessary for these copies to have sacrifices. It was therefore necessary for the better covenant, the better economy, to have ‘better sacrifices.’ All the blood of the Old Covenant was just a copy, a faint picture, of the shed blood of Jesus.

(2) The Heavenly Things Themselves (9:23b)

...but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these.

Schreiner: Heavenly realities, on the other hand, warrant better sacrifices. The sacrifices under the old covenant suffice to cleanse what is earthly, but they can hardly suffice for what is heavenly. The imagery should not be pressed, as if somehow heaven itself is defiled by human sin. The writer uses spatial and typological language to communicate the effectiveness of Christ’s sacrifice, but it is unwarranted to conclude that he actually believes there are heavenly places that literally need cleansing. We have seen that the author often writes typologically when citing the OT, and thus the reference to the cleansing of heavenly places should not be understood literally or univocally but analogically.

Hughes: He begins by stating that the better sacrifice of Christ brings better purity. What are the ‘heavenly things’ that are purified? Nothing less than *us*! Just as the tabernacle had to be anointed and purified so that God might show His presence there, even so the people of God must be cleansed and sanctified so as to become ‘a dwelling place for God by the Spirit’ (Eph. 2:22; cp. 1 Pe. 2:5; 1:2, 19). The blood of Christ makes us acceptable to God and makes our presence and praise more acceptable than that of angels!

Bruce: It has frequently been asked in what sense ‘the heavenly realities needed to be cleansed; but our author has provided the answer in the context. What needed to be cleansed was the defiled conscience of men and women; this is the cleansing which belongs to the spiritual sphere. The argument of v. 23 might be paraphrased by saying that while ritual purification is adequate for the material order, which is but an earthly copy of the spiritual order, a better kind of sacrifice is necessary to effect purification in the spiritual order. We have already had reason to emphasize that the people of God are the house of God, that His dwelling-place is in their midst. It is they who need inward cleansing, not only that their approach to God may be free from defilement, but that they may be a fit habitation for Him. Just as the tabernacle in the wilderness, together with its furniture, had to be anointed and sanctified so that God might manifest His presence there among His people and they might serve Him there, so the people of God themselves need to be cleansed and hallowed in order to become ‘a dwelling place of God in the Spirit’ (Eph. 1:22).

Phillips: What does it mean that Christ has purified the heavenly things themselves with His better sacrifice? The commentators offer a number of views regarding ‘the heavenly things themselves.’ One compelling proposal comes from F. F. Bruce, who connects the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary with the cleansing of our consciences, a theme that dominates this chapter. While his viewpoint is true, it does not adequately explain what the writer of Hebrews is talking about here. Verse 24 is clearly discussing Christ’s entry into heaven. Furthermore, the writer of Hebrews has stated that Israel’s tabernacle was an earthly version of the heavenly reality. This does not mean that there are an actual lampstand and table of showbread and altar of incense in heaven, but rather that those things symbolized features of God’s relationship with man.

Hebrews – Lesson 21

Phillips: What, then, was the significance of the application of the blood, which was sprinkled on everything in the tabernacle? The furnishings in the earthly tabernacle spoke of the great privileges arising from our fellowship with God. But since we have fallen into sin, we are not worthy of these privileges. The lampstand spoke of God's revealing light, though sinners are not worthy of any revelation save that of God's wrath. The table of showbread spoke of intimate fellowship with the living God. But the very thought of sitting down to table with sinners is repugnant to God's holy character. The incense altar spoke of the privilege of access in prayer, but man in sin deserves no such access. Without the blood, apart from a sacrifice, everything in the tabernacle speaks to privileges that sinners must be denied. There could only be the piercing gaze of God, the tablets of the law open before Him while the sinner stands condemned.

Phillips: You see, therefore, what the blood accomplished. For when you apply the blood of the sacrifice—the sacrifice that has borne the sin in the sinner's place, the sacrifice that has satisfied God's justice and turned His wrath aside—the whole situation is changed. Now when God turns to the lampstand and sees the sprinkled blood, He gladly shines forth His light to the sinner. Why? Because the blood speaks of the way He has provided through Jesus Christ, the forgiveness of sins through the blood. The same is true of the table of bread; God receives and feeds us because the blood of the Lamb has been applied. The same is true with regard to full and open access to God in prayer, symbolized by the altar of incense. Because of the blood, for us God's throne is a throne of grace, and our prayers are received as those of dear children. 'Without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness of sin' (9:22). But with the blood, applied to every aspect of our relationship with the God who lives in heaven, there are forgiveness, acceptance, blessing, light, and life. The cleansing blood provides us with a relationship with God in this life and secures for us a place in heaven. The blood of Christ has made heaven a home for us.

b) *Presence of God (9:24)*

²⁴*For Christ has entered, not into holy places made with hands, which are copies of the true things, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God on our behalf.*

Schreiner: Verse 24 further explains verse 23. Christ did not enter into a holy place made with hands. The holy place on earth is 'made with hands,' (*χειροποίητα, cheiropoiēta*). Remarkably, this term is regularly used of idolatry in the OT (Lev. 26:1, 30; Is. 2:18; 10:11; 16:2; 19:1; 21:9; 31:7; 46:6; Dan. 5:4, 23; 6:8). Paul uses the term to indict Athenian idolatry in Acts 17:24. It doesn't seem likely that the author of Hebrews is making precisely the same point here. After all, the tabernacle was commanded by God and typologically points to God's presence in heaven. Nevertheless there is a criticism implied in the use of the word. If the recipients of the letter turn to the Levitical cult and sacrifices now that the 'better' has come, then such a move would be comparable to idolatry. Stephen uses the word 'made with hands' with the same import in his critique of those who gave undue prominence to the temple (Acts 7:48), as does Paul regarding circumcision (Eph. 2:11). The critique of the tabernacle, then, is both spatial (it is earthly, not heavenly) and eschatological (it belongs to the old age, not the new). Still, Hebrews does not criticize the tabernacle per se. It had a legitimate function for a certain period of salvation history. The tabernacle has a typological function: it is a 'model' (*αντιτυπα, antitypa*) of the 'true' holy place, which is heaven itself (the dwelling place of God).

Bruce: It is not into any material sanctuary that Christ has gone as His people's high priest, but into the presence of God in heaven. One who is personally 'holy, free from guile and defilement' (7:26) is at home and acceptable in the presence of God. But He appears now in the

Hebrews – Lesson 21

presence of God not only on His own behalf but on behalf of others, and those others are sinners. If sinners are to appear before God, even by proxy, through the representation of a sinless high priest, they must be cleansed from sin, or else the very presence of God would be polluted. And this cleansing Christ has effected, so that He can minister on His people's behalf in 'the true tabernacle' which no human hands have erected.

MacArthur: Christ did not go into an earthly Holy of Holies. He went into the presence of God—the heavenly, real Holy of Holies. And He did it 'for us.' How beautiful to realize that when He went in, *He took us with Him!* He has ushered us into the very 'presence of God.'

Hughes: Next, Jesus blood grants us a better representation before the Father. As soon as He took His seat at the Father's right hand, He began His intercession for us. What is more, He was in His newly acquired human body, perfectly sensitized to our humanity by His life and death.

2. The Sacrifice of Christ (9:25-26)

a) *Repeated Offering? (9:25)*

²⁵*Nor was it to offer himself repeatedly, as the high priest enters the holy places every year with blood not his own...*

Schreiner: Another contrast between the heavenly and earthly tabernacle is exploited. When Jesus entered into heaven (the presence of God), He didn't need to offer Himself repeatedly (*πολλακις, pollakis*). The author contrasts the offering of the high priest with the offering of Jesus. The high priest entered the most holy place every year and needed a new offering every time (Lev. 16:3, 5-11, 14-20, 24-25). But Jesus' offering doesn't need to be renewed. By one definitive offering He procured cleansing once for all so that further offerings were superfluous.

Bruce: Moreover, when Christ entered into the heavenly sanctuary, He entered once for all. His entrance into the presence of God on His people's behalf, by virtue of His own blood, is set in sharp contrast to the entrance of Israel's high priest into the material holy of holies on the Day of Atonement. Having entered in to present the sacrificial blood ('blood not his own'), Israel's high priest had to come out again immediately, to enter in and repeat the same ceremony the following year, and the year after that, and so indefinitely. But the sacrifice of Christ, being a real sacrifice and not a token one, is perpetually effective and therefore calls for no repetition.

MacArthur: Nor did Christ have to 'offer Himself often,' as did the earthly high priests, who had to make the offering of atonement every year. Jesus' sacrifice was better because He takes His people into the heavenly Holy of Holies with Him and because He had to make an offering only once.

b) *Repeated Suffering? (9:26a)*

...²⁶*for then he would have had to suffer repeatedly since the foundation of the world.*

Schreiner: If more than one offering were required so that Jesus had to offer Himself repeatedly, then He would be required to suffer often from the foundation of the world. His sacrificial and cleansing work would never be finished if His one offering wasn't sufficient. Such a state of affairs doesn't pertain to reality.

MacArthur: If Jesus' sacrifice had not been once for all, He would have had to suffer from the 'foundation of the world,' that is, from the beginning of humankind. He would have had to die continuously, as it were, since the time Adam first sinned. Like the work of the Levitical

Hebrews – Lesson 21

priesthood, His atoning work would never be finished. But, praise God, His sacrifice does not have to be repeated—not even once. It is finished, completely finished.

Bruce: If His sacrifice did call for repetition, then He would have to endure suffering and death times without number throughout the ages of world history. But that involves a patent absurdity: ‘it is appointed for human beings to die once,’ and the Son of Man, who became ‘like His brothers’ in all things, cannot and must not die more than once. To talk about His sacrifice as ‘the eternal sacrifice’ can therefore be misleading. If it means (as it does for many who use it) that He is eternally offering Himself in heaven (with the corollary that in the Eucharist His sacrifice is repeatedly reenacted on earth), then it is in plain contradiction to the emphatic teaching of this epistle. He appears eternally in heaven for His people on the basis of ‘His own sacrifice,’ presented and accepted once for all.

MacArthur: The idea of the perpetual offering of Christ is a heretical doctrine that for many centuries has contradicted this and the many other clear biblical teachings about the finished work of Christ. It maintains that, inasmuch as the priesthood of Christ is perpetual and sacrifice is an essential part of priesthood, therefore the sacrificial offering of Christ must also be perpetual. Ludwig Ott, a Roman Catholic theologian, explains this perpetual sacrifice dogma, which was made official by that church at the Council of Trent in the middle of the sixteenth century. ‘The holy Mass,’ he writes, ‘is a true and proper sacrifice. It is physical and propitiatory, removing sins and conferring the grace of repentance. Propitiated by the offering of this sacrifice, God, by granting the grace of the gift and the gift of Penance, remits trespasses and sins however grievous they may be.’ In other words, God’s satisfaction regarding sin depends upon the weekly mass. That is why attending mass is so important to Catholics.

MacArthur: But the theory of the perpetual offering of Jesus Christ is in absolute and direct opposition to Scripture. No doubt some Catholics know Christ, but in holding to the doctrine of the perpetual offering of His sacrifice, they undermine the power and significance of Christ’s one-time and only true sacrifice. This false doctrine is plainly reflected in the crucifix, the ubiquitous symbol of Roman Catholicism. Whether in pictures, in statuary, or wherever, the cross is rarely empty in Catholic representation. To Catholics, Jesus is still being crucified. In Communion, or the Lord’s Supper, we *remember* Christ’s sacrificial death, as He commanded us to do. But He is not re-sacrificed. The Lord commanded His disciples to remember His death, not to try to redo it.

c) *Once for All Sacrifice (9:26b)*

But as it is, he has appeared once for all at the end of the ages to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.

Schreiner: The efficacy of what Jesus accomplished in His incarnation stands out. He ‘appeared’ (*πεφανερωται, pephanerōtai*) at a particular junction in history. Here we have an indication of the incarnation, which is expressed more clearly in John 1:14. Indeed, Jesus’ appearance was ‘at the end of the ages’ which echoes the opening of the letter: ‘In these last days, He has spoken to us by His Son’ (1:2). The last days, the end of the ages, and the fulfillment of God’s promises have arrived in Jesus Christ. Peter argues similarly that the end time has arrived with the coming of Jesus Christ (1 Pe. 1:20). Paul also says that the end of the ages has arrived (1 Cor. 10:11). Certainly the notion that the last days have come in Jesus Christ is taught pervasively in the NT. Hebrews reminds us what Christ accomplished and what He did when He came to earth. He removed (*αθετησιν, athetēsīn*) sin by the sacrifice of Himself. Sin has been set aside not through animals offered by the high priest but through the self-sacrifice of the Messiah.

Hebrews – Lesson 21

Hughes: A further evidence of the superiority of Jesus' shed blood is its efficacy. Christ's sacrifice was sufficient and thus needed no repeating. He is our constant high priest, but this in no way suggests that He is perpetually offering Himself. Some have ignored the truth of Scripture and have instituted in the celebration of the Eucharist a repeated reenactment here on earth. How utterly contradictory to our text—and how misleading. The sacrifice was so monumental and efficacious that it could only be once-for all. His blood is totally sufficient.

Bruce: As it is, Christ has manifested on earth 'once for all' at the time of fulfillment, in order to deal conclusively with sin. It is not that Christ happened to come at the time of fulfillment, but that His coming made that time the time of fulfillment. The purpose of His coming is stated to be the removal or cancellation of sin. 'His own sacrifice,' like 'His own blood' in v. 12, is emphatic, marking once more the contrast between His priestly action and that of Aaron and his successors, who made expiation with the blood of others, namely of sacrificial animals.

MacArthur: His one sacrifice of Himself was made at the 'consummation of the ages.' He was the consummation of the ages because of His once and for all sacrifice. He put away sin. He did not simply cover sin, as the old sacrifices had done; He removed it.

Phillips: This cleansing of heaven for us by the blood of Christ is the turning point of history. This is what verse 26 means when it says that Christ 'appeared once for all at the end of the ages.' That expression marks this as the decisive point of history, when God's redemptive plan comes into full focus as the climax of all history. Before Christ went into the heavens, having died on the cross and been raised from the dead, there was no way for sinners to have fellowship with the holy God. It had been promised and symbolized, that is true. That is what Old Testament Israel was all about. But when our great high priest entered into heaven with His own saving blood, everything changed forever for those who come to God through Him. His appearing there for us is the definitive act of history so far as the salvation of sinners is concerned.

3. The Salvation of Christ (9:27-28)

a) *Final Judgment (9:27)*

²⁷ *And just as it is appointed for man to die once, and after that comes judgment...*

Schreiner: A comparison is introduced between the life of human beings and the work of Jesus Christ. The first part of the comparison is found in verse 27, and it is completed in verse 28. Reflecting on human life, the author posits that human beings are appointed to die once and then comes the judgment. Human life is not repeated over and over again. There is a finality and distinctiveness about human existence. Certainly what is said here rules out any notion of reincarnation. Life is lived once before the one true God who is the Creator of all, and then comes the judgment. Death is not followed by nothingness, nor is there a promise of happiness without reservation. Rather, when human beings die, they encounter the Creator God as the Judge of all. He will assess the lives of all and determine their future existence.

MacArthur: All men have 'to die,' and our death is by divine appointment. It is one appointment everyone will keep. After death comes 'judgment,' which is also appointed by God. And since men are not able to atone for their own sins, God's judgment demands that they pay or have a substitute pay for them.

Phillips: The point verse 27 makes is important. People want to know—or at least they should want to know—what happens after they die. Are they disintegrated into nothing, or absorbed

Hebrews – Lesson 21

into a great impersonal cosmic sea? That was the general view of the ancient Greeks. At best their hope was a vague ‘if.’ People who look to the Eastern tradition of reincarnation have a hope that is hardly better. They think of souls returning to the earth for near-endless toil in one life after another, until finally they merit the reward of oblivion. The Christian answer to this question could not be more different. What happens after we die? ‘It is appointed for man to die once, and after that comes judgment.’ Therefore, there are no multiplications of a person’s life. There is this life and death, and not others, after which comes judgment before God’s holy throne. There is a resurrection for both the just and the unjust. All will die, and after death come to stand before God to be measured according to the perfect standard of God’s holy law. This rules out the many ‘second-chance’ theories that are occasionally popular in Christian circles. People like to think that even if we deny Christ in this life and then die in our sins, we can have another chance when we see Him after death. Not so, says this passage. After death is judgment.

Phillips: If you have not reckoned on this reality, if you have not made provision for your coming judgment, a judgment that is as near to you as your death, the date of which you do not know, let this warning apply to you. Ahead of you is death, but that is not the end. It leads to judgment, a judgment in which sinners cannot stand. Jesus taught about the judgment of unforgiven sinners, saying, ‘These will go away into eternal punishment’ (Mt. 25:46). But Jesus has made provision for the forgiveness we need. He has died in our place on the cross, taking up our sins, and then appeared before God in heaven with the marks still on His hands and feet, His blood bearing testimony to His redeeming work for all who look to Him in faith. If you trust in Jesus Christ, you have no fear of judgment to come, for Christ has exhausted the fury your sins have deserved. For you, judgment will be an open door to life everlasting, a portal to eternity as beloved children of God.

b) *Final Offering (9:28a)*

...²⁸so Christ, having been offered once to bear the sins of many...

Schreiner: The other half of the comparison is completed here, and the central point in verses 27-28 is set forth. Since death is a once-for-all event, so too Christ’s death cannot be repeated. His singular death definitively removed sins forever. In describing Christ’s death, the author doesn’t use the word ‘die’ (*αποθανειν, apothanein*) as he did in verse 27. He uses the verb ‘offered’ (*προσενεχθεις, prosenechtheis*), focusing on the sacrificial character of His death. Every human being dies, but Jesus’ death was distinctive in that He died as a sacrificial offering, giving His life for the sake of others. The word ‘once’ (*απαξ, apaz*) is, therefore, emphatic, conveying the finality of Jesus’ sacrifice. The sacrificial character of Jesus’ death is affirmed by the phrase ‘to bear the sins of many.’ The clause designates purpose, explaining why Jesus offered Himself, confirming that His death was sacrificial. The phrase almost certainly alludes to Is. 53:12, where the Servant of the Lord ‘bore the sins of man.’ The substitutionary character of the Servant’s sacrifice is patently clear in Isaiah 53 (vv. 4-6, 8, 10-12). The author implicitly suggests here that the OT itself envisions in the suffering of the Servant the setting aside of Levitical sacrifices. For the Servant by His sacrifice bears the sins of all, and thus the need for the Levitical sacrifices is cancelled.

Bruce: Men and women die once, by divine appointment, and in their case death is followed by judgment. Christ died once, by divine appointment, and His death is followed by salvation for all His people. This is so because in His death He bore ‘the sins of many,’ offering up His life to God as an atonement on their behalf. The language here is a plain echo of the fourth Servant

Hebrews – Lesson 21

Song—more especially of Is. 53:12, ‘He bore the sin of many,’ but also of vv. 10, ‘He makes Himself an offering for sin,’ and 11, ‘by His knowledge shall the righteous one, my servant, make many to be accounted righteous, and He shall bear their iniquities.’ His bearing of sin implies the removing of sin from others, and the consequent liberation of those who enter into the benefits of His self-oblation.

MacArthur: Like all men, Jesus Christ was divinely appointed to die once. But unlike all other men, He will never face judgment. Because He took our sins upon Himself, He took our judgment upon Himself. But the judgment was for our sins, not for His, for He had none. God ‘made Him who knew no sin to be sin on our behalf, that we might become the righteousness of God in Him’ (2 Cor. 5:21). He died the one death that judgment demanded.

Phillips: The particular point our writer has in mind, however, is to show that Christ’s death—His shedding of blood, and His appearance in heaven as Redeemer of His own—is a once-for-all event that changes everything. Since Christ died to remove our sin, this need happen only once. His blood is sufficient to the task, so there is no need for a repetition. The accounts are settled. It is finished. The debt is paid. Christ has taken away our sin. His work was directed to that end, and it is done once-for-all and forever. This was the designed intention of the saving work of Christ, all of which is now declared in the past tense. He was sacrificed...He entered heaven to appear for us. It is a definitive work, accomplished, secure, and finished. Yes, we still have to contend with sin; it is defeated but not removed. Therefore we eagerly await Christ’s return to save us from this struggle. But while we wait, we are secure in Him.

c) *Final Coming (9:28b)*

...will appear a second time, not to deal with sin but to save those who are eagerly waiting for him.

Schreiner: Hence He will not come again to die (since death is a one-time event). Instead He will come to establish final and complete salvation. The notion of a second coming of Christ is explicitly communicated here. Jesus is coming again, but He is not coming to offer His life as a sacrifice again. His sacrificial work has been completed forever. Hence He will not be coming the second time ‘to bear sin’ since the penalty for sin has been fully atoned for. Literally, the words are ‘without sin’ (): Jesus will appear a second time ‘without sin.’ Obviously this phrase does not mean Jesus was sinful at His first coming. Virtually all English translations rightly interpret this to mean that Jesus will not come the second time to deal with or atone for sin. When Jesus appears the second time, He will bring salvation to those who await Him. By salvation the author means here eschatological deliverance. Believers, who are cleansed and forgiven through Jesus’ sacrifice, will enjoy the new creation at Jesus’ second coming (11:10, 13-16; 12:22; 13:14).

MacArthur: The people waited expectantly on the Day of Atonement for the high priest to come out from the Holy of Holies. If He did anything wrong, if he failed to follow God’s precise instructions, he would die. So there was always a sigh of relief, for their own sakes as well as for his, when he reappeared. That is the situation being alluded to in 9:28. If the people were so eager to see the former high priests reappear from the earthly Holy of Holies, how much more should Christians look eagerly for their great High Priest to reappear from the heavenly Holy of Holies? This will occur at the Second Coming. When the high priest walked out of the old sanctuary, the people knew that his sacrifice had been accepted. He had done everything right. Jesus Christ’s reappearing will be one more confirmation that He did everything right, that His Father is satisfied with Him. And because the Father is satisfied with Him, He is satisfied with

Hebrews – Lesson 21

us, for we are in Him. When He comes back, our salvation will be full. When He appears a second time to those who expect Him, it will not be to deal with sin. Sin only needs to be dealt with once, and this He did on the cross. When He comes again, it will be ‘without reference to sin.’

Bruce: The Israelites who watched their high priest enter the sanctuary for them waited expectantly for his reappearance; that was a welcome sign that he and the sacrifice which he presented had been accepted by God. His reappearance from the holy of holies on the Day of Atonement was an especially welcome sight. Ben Sira celebrates the joy with which the people saw the high priest Simon the Just emerge from the ‘house of the veil’ after completing this sacred ministry (Sirach or Ecclesiasticus 50:5-10). Our author thinks of Jesus as going into the heavenly holy of holies, to reappear one day in order to confirm finally to His people the salvation which His perfect offering has procured for them. Meanwhile they wait expectantly for His parousia. When He appears the second time to those who expect Him, it will not be to deal with sin once more. Sin was dealt with decisively at His first appearing. All the blessings which He won for His people at His first appearing will be theirs to enjoy in perpetual fullness at His second appearing. Therefore, let them not grow faint and weary but persevere in patience and faith.

Hughes: Finally, Christ’s blood gives us a better hope. Here we have a brilliant and fresh perspective on the return of Christ. The force of the perspective comes from the analogy of the sequence of events in the Day of Atonement. On that great day the congregation watched the high priest enter the sanctuary with a basin of sacrificial blood and then waited breathlessly outside until he emerged, at which time they breathed a corporate sigh of relief. His emergence told them that his offering on their behalf had been accepted by God. The sense of excitement that greeted the high priest’s reappearance was given by Joshua ben Sira, who was present in Jerusalem when Simon II the Just (a priest 219-196 BC) officiated at the Day of Atonement (see Sirach or Ecclesiasticus 50:6-10). Our Lord Jesus entered the heavenly sanctuary ‘to appear in the presence of God on our behalf’ (v. 24), and he ‘will appear a second time, not to deal with sin but to save those who are eagerly waiting for him’ (v. 28). Hallelujah!—He is coming again as both King and priest.

Phillips: Although Christ’s death and appearance in heaven for us is the turning point of history, it is not the end of history. Christ will appear a second time. What remains, then, but the extension of this gospel, the ingathering of the redeemed through faith in Christ? History had a beginning in the creation of things. History had a problem, namely, man’s fall into sin and condemnation. History has a focal turning point that answers our every need: the first coming of Christ, with His death, resurrection, and ascension into heaven as our Savior. History also has its culmination: the return of Christ not in weakness but in glory, ‘not to deal with sin but to save those who are eagerly waiting for Him.’ What a great hope this provides to all who believe, but struggle in this world. Judgment is inevitable, but sin is not. We will not have to put up with sin forever. It is not simply the way things are or always will be. It has been dealt with, and even as we war against it still, we know a victor’s crown lies not far ahead.

B. The Inferiority of Animal Sacrifices (Hebrews 10:1-4)

Schreiner: Hebrews 10:1-4 is in the midst of a section where the author argues that Jesus’ sacrifice is better than Levitical sacrifices. The OT cult was inferior because it did not truly bring one into the presence of God (9:1-10). Christ, on the other hand, entered God’s presence

Hebrews – Lesson 21

and cleansed the conscience with His blood (9:11-14). Believers, as beneficiaries of the new covenant, enjoy the promise of an eternal inheritance through Christ's sacrifice, for God's covenant promises in both the old covenant and the new are based on the shedding of blood (9:15-22). Since blood was necessary, Christ shed His own blood to grant believers access to heaven itself (9:23-24). Furthermore His sacrifice atoned for sins once for all and hence does not need to be repeated (9:25-26). Believers await now the experience of final salvation (9:27-28). In 10:1-4, the dramatic difference between Christ's sacrifice and the Levitical sacrifices is sketched in.

Phillips: It seems that we never really understand something until we no longer need to, until we can look back with the enhanced vision of hindsight. A similar phenomenon is set forth at the beginning of Hebrews 10. The writer of Hebrews is looking back on life under the law in old covenant Israel, with insights that really were not possible to those who were in it. His concern, as it has been all through this epistle, is that his fledgling Christian community have a proper perspective on Judaism—a new covenant perspective—and thereby resist the temptation and persecution that were seeking to draw them back into former ways.

1. The Shadowy Nature of Animal Sacrifices (10:1a)

¹*For since the law has but a shadow of the good things to come instead of the true form of these realities...*

a) *Shadow*

Schreiner: The inadequacy of the law and its accompanying sacrifices is explained. The law points forward to something better, to genuine forgiveness of sins; but the law itself doesn't truly forgive sins, and this is evident since the sacrifices are repeated continually. The law is only a 'shadow' (*σκια*, *skian*) of the good things that are coming. The law isn't evil; it isn't contrary to the will of God. It actually foreshadows the good things that are coming and in that sense partakes of goodness. Still, the law is not ultimate or final.

MacArthur: 'Shadow' (*skia*) refers specifically to a pale shadow, as contrasted with a sharp, distinct one. The law and the ceremonies and rituals together were only a pale shadow of the things Christ would bring. They were form without substance. They portrayed something real, but were not themselves real.

Bruce: 'Shadow' is used not so much in the Platonic sense of a copy of the heavenly and eternal 'idea' as in the sense of foreshadowings. The sacrificial law of Israel provides 'a shadow of the good things to come'; the writer things of Christ and His new order as the perfect reality to which the earlier ordinances pointed forward.

Hughes: As 'a shadow,' the Law is only a pale reflection, a mere outline or silhouette, and is thus unsubstantial. The Ten Commandments, the Book of the Covenant, and the tabernacle cultus only foreshadow the reality of Christ. And as a shadow, the Law had substantial imperfections that the writer proceeds to spell out in 10:1b-4.

Phillips: A relationship is established here, a sequence between the old covenant, the new covenant, and the good things that are still to come at the end of redemptive history. The writer of Hebrews says that the law was no more than a shadow of the heavenly realities. By shadow he means a sketchy outline. The main emphasis here has to do with the roughness of the picture available to the Old Testament saints.

Hebrews – Lesson 21

b) *Reality*

Schreiner: Hebrews insists that readers must not turn back from ‘the good things’ to the shadow. The law is not ‘the actual form’ (*εικονα, eikona*) or ‘the true form’ of the realities that have now dawned in Jesus Christ. The word here is often translated ‘image.’ The word ‘image’ bears the same meaning as it does in Col. 1:15 where Christ is said to be ‘the image of the invisible God.’ In Colossians, Christ being the image means He partakes in the essence or nature of what it means to be God. So too here, the law is inferior because it doesn’t participate in the reality of what it foreshadows or forecasts.

Bruce: The ‘good things which were to come’ have now come (9:11); they embrace the unrepeatable sacrifice of Christ and His present high-priestly ministry, which carry with them eternal redemption and uninhibited access to worship the living God. The shadow is but a shadow; the ‘image (*eikōn*)—especially ‘the very image—is an exact replica, not an imperfect, partial reproduction, but a manifestation adequate to the reality itself. The ‘image’ is thus something superior to the ‘copies’ or ‘patterns’ of 9:23ff.

MacArthur: The ‘very form’ (*eikōon*), on the other hand, indicates an exact replica, a complete representation, or detailed reproduction. If photography had been in existence then, the writer possibly would have called it a photograph—a clear, sharp, detailed photograph in full color. The Spirit is saying that the old system was a shadow, whereas the new system is the actual substance, the very reality. Before Christ, no one could get closer to the good things of God than the shadows of them.

Phillips: In most English translations, the shadow of the law is contrasted with ‘the true form’ of these realities (ESV) or with ‘the realities themselves’ (NIV). In the original Greek text, the word is *eikona*, which is a form of the word *eikōn*. Greek lexicons translate this as ‘image’ or ‘likeness.’ This is the same word Paul uses of Christ in Colossians 1:15: ‘He is the *image* of the invisible God.’ The KJV does a much better job translating 10:1, rendering it as ‘the very image’ rather than ‘the realities.’ There is the reality, which awaits us in the last days. There is the true image, the detailed picture of that reality represented in Christ. He is the ‘way and the truth’ (Jn. 14:6); in Him we now have the true likeness of heavenly things. But we are not yet in heaven. Cast back from Christ is His shadow in the law. It is a rough outline, but with real continuity with things to come. This image depends on a real unity between the two testaments, while also explaining the difference between the two.

MacArthur: Judaism today is even without many of the shadows. Jews have the Scriptures, what we refer to as the Old Testament, and they continue to celebrate certain feast days. But they have no tabernacle or temple or priesthood, and therefore no sacrifices—daily or yearly. Yom Kippur is still observed, but with a high priest, without an altar, and without a sacrificial lamb. Because modern unbelieving Jews refuse to recognize the New Covenant God made with them, even the Old has lost much of its significance. What at best was pale has faded even more. What was always indistinct has become even more indistinct.

c) *Observations*

Phillips: This statement sets up some important observations for interpreting the Old Testament in light of the New. First of all, this passage affirms a basic continuity between the Old and New Testaments. Some Christians deny this; they maintain that only the New Testament is valid for us. This view is found particularly within the older forms of dispensational theology, although this excess is generally corrected by dispensationalists today. Because of this logic, some people reject such vital portions of Scripture as the Ten Commandments, and even the Lord’s Prayer,

Hebrews – Lesson 21

since it was taught to Jews under the law. This interpretation led to the proliferation of Bible editions featuring only the New Testament, along with the Psalms and Proverbs. Our passage emphasizes a basic unity, however. The Old Testament is the reality in Christ projected backward, redemptively speaking. Old Testament saints were saved by the blood of Christ, to which the animal sacrifices merely pointed.

Phillips: Another thing we want to observe about the Old Testament is that its subject matter is Christ. To be sure, it is Christ in shadow form through various types and representatives in the Old Testament. But the subject is Christ nonetheless. Any time we interpret the Old Testament with results opposed to the gospel, or that have no relevance to Christ and His saving work, we have forgotten this vital principle and wrongly understood the Old Testament. Jesus Himself emphasized this after His resurrection as He taught the disciples on the road to Emmaus (Lk. 24:27). Christ is not found only in selected Old Testament passages, but ‘in all the Scriptures.’

Phillips: Our passage in Hebrews informs us, however, that the pictures of Christ in the Old Testament will be rough ones. We should not be surprised if each type of Christ, each prophetic anticipation, and each promise made in the old covenant provides only rough outlines and not a point-by-point correspondence. The old covenant was a shadow, and by its very nature a shadow is better understood when the reality is there to be seen. A rough draft is better filled in by those who have the final version to consult. It is for this reason that the Christian with the New Testament is able to give the proper interpretation of the Old Testament. Christians have a better understanding of the Old Testament than did those who lived under it, and certainly a better one than unbelieving interpreters of the Old Testament today.

2. The Inadequate Result of Animal Sacrifices (10:1b-3)

a) *Imperfect Cleansing (10:1b)*

...it can never, by the same sacrifices that are continually offered every year, make perfect those who draw near.

Schreiner: The fundamental problem with the law and its sacrifices is disclosed here. It can't ‘perfect’ (τελειωσαι, *teleiōsai*) those drawing near to God. Earlier we say that ‘perfection’ (τελειωσις, *teleiōsis*) could not be obtained through the Levitical priesthood (7:11). ‘The law perfected (ετελειωσεν, *eteleiōsen*) nothing’ (7:19). The sacrifices ordained in the law can't ‘perfect (τελειωσαι, *teleiōsai*) the worshiper's conscience’ (9:9) in contrast to the sacrifice of Christ (10:14). The word ‘perfect’ here, then, communicates the idea of a true cleansing of the conscience that brings one into God's presence. The law and its sacrifices did not and cannot accomplish such, and hence they function as a shadow of the good that has come in Jesus Christ, where such perfection becomes a reality. What is striking is how emphatic the language is to underscore the law's inferiority. Temporal words are piled up to express the idea. The law can ‘never’ (ουδεποτε, *oudepote*) perfect worshipers. Sacrifices under the old covenant are offered ‘continually’ (εις το διηνεκες, *eis to diēnekes*), but true forgiveness is not attained. Indeed, the ‘same’ sacrifices are brought ‘year after year’ (κατ ενιαυτον, *kat eniauton*). The law is not identified as evil, and yet there is a futility and frustration in the law and its sacrifices, for it is like a merry-go-round that never stops.

MacArthur: The great cry in the hearts of Old Testament saints was to be in the presence of God (cp. Ex. 33:15; Ps. 16:11). But they really had no way of getting there. Even the high priest on the Day of Atonement could not take the people inside the veil, where, symbolically, God dwelt. All the old ceremonies and sacrifices, though offered continually, year after year, could *never*

Hebrews – Lesson 21

‘make perfect those who draw near.’ They could never save, never bring access to God. To ‘make perfect’ (*teleioō*) is to bring to completion, to bring to the intended end. The end to which the Old Covenant *pointed* was access to God, full salvation, but it was never intended to *bring* men to God. It did not make perfect because God never intended for it to make perfect. Its purpose was to picture, not to perfect.

Phillips: If the law was a shadow, a rough outline, then its sacrifices cannot be expected to function adequately. Anyone who relied upon the mechanics of Old Testament animal sacrifice would be horribly let down by the actual results. They did not, as v. 1 puts it, ‘make perfect those who draw near.’ This was all made clear by the simple fact that the sacrifices were ‘continually offered every year.’ The fact that nothing had been done to remove the guilt of the people made perfectly clear the need for a more real system of atonement.

Bruce: In any case, the old order could never bring those who worshiped under it to a state of perfection; this was plain enough from the fact that, as circling times moved round and year succeeded year, the same sacrifices had to be repeated over and over again. The sacrifice which is uppermost in our author’s mind is still the annual sacrifice on the Day of Atonement.

MacArthur: Again the writer stresses that the same sacrifices were offered ‘year after year ... continually.’ The repetition of the old sacrifices is a theme that itself is repeated many times in Hebrews. You can pile shadow on shadow on shadow, and you still have no substance. Repetition of a symbol is like multiplying with zero. No matter how many times you repeat the process, the result never increases. Why, then, did God go to all the trouble to establish the Old Covenant, with its shadow ceremonies, its shadow rituals, its shadow sacrifices? What was the point? As we have learned, the first point was simply that, even as a shadow, it had a *purpose*—to reflect the reality of which it was the shadow. It pointed to the salvation that was to come. It was to make God’s people expectant. Second, the purpose of the shadow sacrifices was to remind God’s people that the *penalty* of sin is death. The people were constantly being reminded that the wages of sin is death, because death was going on all day long throughout their history as animals were being slaughtered. Third, God gave His people the sacrifices as a *covering* for sin. Even a shadow is better than nothing if it can to some degree cover sin. When properly offered from a true heart of faith, the old sacrifices removed immediate, temporal judgment from God. Those sacrifices were temporal and they had some temporal effect and value. They could not bring a person into God’s presence, but they were important in maintain a demonstration of a person’s covenantal relationship to Him.

b) *Imperfect Consciences (10:2)*

²*Otherwise, would they not have ceased to be offered, since the worshipers, having once been cleansed, would no longer have any consciousness of sins?*

MacArthur: With their shadow, the animal sacrifices could cover, but never remove, sin. Yet removal of sins is what men need. Sin and guilt eat away at us. But the old system could not remove sin or guilt. If it could have, the sacrifices would have stopped. Once having removed sin, they would no longer have been necessary.

Schreiner: In verse 2, support is adduced for the notion that the law doesn’t bring perfection. If perfection were truly achieved, the sacrifices would have ceased. There would no longer be a need for them. The nub of the issue is addressed here. If the sacrifices were effective, the worshippers, having been cleansed (*κεκαθαρισμενουσ, kekatharismenous*), would no longer be conscious of their sins. They would be assured that full and final forgiveness had been

Hebrews – Lesson 21

accomplished and would be free from the defiling guilt of sin. The content of 9:14 is remarkably similar, though there the author speaks positively about the efficacy of Christ's sacrifice. Two words from 10:2, 'purified' (*κεκαθαρισμενους, kekatharismenous*) and 'consciousness' or 'conscience' (*συνειδησιν, syneidēsin*) are also used in 9:14: Christ's blood 'cleans[s] our consciences' (*καθαριει την συνειδησιν ημων, katharizei tēn syneidēsin ēmōn*) so that believers can serve God.

MacArthur: 'Consciousness' in verse 2 translates the same Greek word (*suneidēsis*) as does 'conscience' in 9:9; 10:22; and 13:18. The basic meaning is the same in all four places. The word has to do with man's innate awareness of wrong in his life and of his sense of guilt because of it. Conscience is built into man's makeup. It acts on our minds and hearts much as pain acts on our bodies. Guilt reacts to moral and spiritual injury in much the same way that pain reacts to physical injury. Both are warning systems. Neither is enjoyable, but both serve a good purpose. Old Testament believers were never freed from the presence and awareness of guilt or, consequently, from the anxiety and tension that it brings (see Rom. 5-6). It is a wonderful blessing for Christians to know that there is no condemnation to those who are in Christ (Rom. 8:1). It is a wonder thing to be free from guilt and to recognize that our sins are continually being forgiven by the grace of God through the death of Christ. But there was no such freedom of conscience under the previous covenant. In fact, the more faithful and godly the person was, the guiltier he was likely to feel, because he was more aware of and sensitive to God's holiness and his own sinfulness. He was torn between his knowledge of God's law and his knowledge of his own breaking of that law. We only have to read Psalm 51 to realize how deeply David felt his guilt. He was 'a man after God's own heart,' and yet he was never free from his consciousness of his guilt before God.

Hughes: Because the old system could not take away their sin, it produced a second imperfection—a guilty conscience. Of course, one's conscience can be seared or defaced. But one's conscience under the old covenant always had a pervasive sense of disease. One's inner moral discernment always registered a floating guilt, and in some, this was a raging, unquenchable guilt.

Bruce: If the old order had been able to bring 'perfection'—access to God without the constant necessity of removing the barrier of freshly accumulated sin—then surely the sacrifices which belonged to it would have come to an end. If the old sacrificial order had possessed true cleansing efficacy—that is to say, if it had been able to cleanse the *conscience*—then the worshipers would have enjoyed unrestricted communion with God. It is the presence of sin in the conscience that hinders such communion. The implication of our author's argument is that the true inward cleansing is permanently effective and therefore unrepeatable. When he speaks of the worshipers as having been 'cleansed once for all,' he emphasizes this by his use of the perfect tense. But such a cleansing as this, which means that those who receive it are thenceforward 'clean' without requiring any repetition of the cleansing, was unknown to the Levitical law.

Bruce: The natural implication of the question 'Otherwise would they not have ceased to be offered?' is that the sacrificial ritual was still practiced in the temple at Jerusalem. It is simplest to regard these words as an incidental pointer to the dating of the epistle before 70 AD.

c) *Imperfection Remembered (10:3)*

³*But in these sacrifices there is a reminder of sins every year.*

Hebrews – Lesson 21

Schreiner: Instead of cleansing and purifying from sin, OT sacrifices remind people of their sins. And the reminder comes ‘every year’ (*κατ ἐνιαυτον, kat eniauton*). This phrase is picked up from verse 1 and clearly refers to the Day of Atonement. Undergoing the entire ritual specified in Leviticus 16 year after year testifies to the continuing presence of sin. Perhaps the readers were attracted to Levitical sacrifices because they concretely and clearly ‘offered’ forgiveness of sins. But it is just the opposite according to the author. They summon sins to mind, showing that genuine purification has not occurred under the Levitical system.

Bruce: As it is, the annually recurring ritual of the Day of Atonement involved a ‘reminder’ of sins year by year. This reminder (as regularly in biblical usage) is more than a calling to mind; it involves some appropriate form of action. The remembrance of sins may involve repentance for them, or it may involve persistence in them. But the remembrance of sins *in the sight of God* involves appropriate action on *His* part, either pardon or retribution. A pardon which has to be bestowed repeatedly—as far at least as its ceremonial expression is concerned—cannot convey the same peace of conscience as a pardon bestowed once for all. And there is a manifest contrast, to our author’s mind, between the old order in which ‘there is an annual reminder of sins’ and the new covenant which embodies God’s promise to His people” ‘I will remember their sins no more’ (8:12).

Phillips: Verse 3 makes the telling remark that far from removing sin, the Old Testament system of atonement was ‘a reminder of sin every year.’ The sacrifices pointed not to themselves as a solution, but away from themselves. Their main teaching was not what they could do, but what they could not do.

MacArthur: The old sacrifices not only did not remove sin, but they were a continual *reminder* that they could not. ‘In those sacrifices there is a reminder of sins year by year.’ Even the covering of sin was temporary. It lasted only until the next sin. It was a burdensome, disappointing system.

Hughes: The result was, as verse 3 points out, that the sacrifices remained as ‘a reminder of sins every year.’ As a matter of fact, the Day of Atonement increased the burden of those with sensitive hearts. The Day’s well-defined ritual was constructed to aggravate one’s conscience. The shadow of the old covenant law and sacrifice inflamed the unrequited need for *forgiveness* and a *clear conscience*. The photograph, so to speak, pictured what could be and activated an ache for the reality.

Bruce: It would not have occurred to an observant Jew under the Mosaic covenant to say that the Day of Atonement involved an annual ‘reminder’ of sins; he would have said, rather, that there was an annual *removal* of sins. Our author might have replied, truly enough, that the ritual designed to effect the removal of sins necessarily involves their remembrance; but he is influenced chiefly by the promise that under the new covenant God will remember His people’s sins no more. Since the new covenant is contrasted with the old, the implication is that there was no such absolute wiping out of sins from the divine record under the sacrificial law.

3. The Ultimate Failure of Animal Sacrifices (10:4)

⁴*For it is impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sins.*

Schreiner: But why is it the case that Levitical sacrifices don’t cleanse the conscience? Why must they be repeated year after year? The answer given is that it is impossible for the blood of sacrificial animals to remove sin. Animals could scarcely provide atonement. They didn’t

Hebrews – Lesson 21

realize why they were slain and had no consciousness of the significance of their death. They certainly didn't give their life voluntarily for the sake of sinners but were coerced to die against their will. Hebrews doesn't claim that the death of animals was a mistake from the beginning or contrary to the will of God. The sacrificial system was, after all, instituted by God Himself. Hence the blood of animals functioned typologically and symbolically, pointing forward to the blood of Christ, which truly cleanses from sins. OT sacrifices had their place before the coming of Christ, but now that the good things have come (v. 1), they are no longer needed. Something better, someone better, is needed to cleanse the heart from sin.

MacArthur: The old sacrifices were also ineffective, because they were only external. They never got to the heart of the problem. Sin is very often manifested outwardly, but its cause is always internal. The old sacrifices had no way of reaching inside of a person and changing him. 'For it is impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sins.' These sacrifices only sanctified 'for the cleansing of the flesh,' the external, but 'the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without blemish to God' (9:13-14), cleanses our consciences, the internal. There was no real relationship between a person's sin and an animal sacrifice. The relationship was only symbolic, typical. It was impossible for the blood of an amoral animal to bring forgiveness for a man's mortal offense against God. Only Jesus Christ, the perfect union of humanity and deity, could satisfy God and purify man. Only His death could be the ultimate sacrifice, the only effective sacrifice.

Bruce: 'It is impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sins.' This impossibility has only to be stated plainly like this for its truth to be obvious. Moral defilement cannot be removed by material means. Such spiritual value as the sacrificial ritual might have lay in its being a material foreshadowing or object-lesson of a moral and spiritual reality. The writer to the Hebrews was not the first man to appreciate this; the truth had been grasped centuries earlier, as by the penitent psalmist who prayed (Ps. 51:10, 16ff.). And he was only one among other psalmists and prophets who made substantially the same affirmation. The relatively easy adaptation of the Palestinian synagogue to the new conditions after the destruction of the Temple in 70 AD shows that the principle of the insufficiency of animal sacrifice had been widely grasped. Yet the Pharisees took part in the sacrificial cultus as long as it endured, and when it disappeared they had to give serious thought to the question how sin was now to be expiated. The seriousness of this question must be appreciated by all who understand the 'exceeding sinfulness' of sin. Our author understood it well enough; but he could bid farewell to the sacrificial cultus the more cheerfully because he knew of a sacrifice, presented on quite another plane, which effectively dealt with sin as the old cultus could not.

Hughes: Of course, the author of Hebrews was not the first to understand that animal blood would not atone for sins. Scriptural writers had been alert to this for hundreds of years. David's repentant words head the list: 'You will not delight in sacrifice, or I would give it; you will not be pleased with a burnt offering. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and contrite heart, O God, you will not despise' (Ps. 51:16-17; cp. also. 1 Sam. 15:22; Is. 1:11-13a; 66:3-4; Jer. 7:21-23; Hos. 6:6; Amos 5:21-24; Mic. 6:6-8). It is a factor that at the time of Christ many pious Jews honored the sacrificial system and even offered sacrifices, but realized that those sacrifices could not remove sin. That is why, when the temple was destroyed and the sacrifices ended, the people so easily adapted. They understood that animal sacrifice was insufficient to obtain forgiveness.

For next time: Read Hebrews 10:5-18.