

# The Covenant in Hebrews 8 & 9

A Monumental Error in Interpretation; the subject here is the Priesthood NOT a New Covenant

By Frank Selch

---

The focal point of this commentary is the New Covenant.

The passage is located in the very heart of a substantial discussion on sacrifice and mediation, which ranges from ch.6:1 to the end of chapter ten and a further reflection in 12:2 – although the word *covenant* is not mentioned in this verse.

The foundation is laid by showing that the sacrifice of Yeshua cannot be valued – it is simply priceless. To reject it is doom for him who does so (6:4-8). The seal on the discussion is in 12:2, which highlights the faith of this High Priest being juxtaposed with all the heroes of faith from Abel onwards.

The original (!) author of the text is highly particular in his explanation and comparison of the excellence of the priesthood of Melchizedek with that of Yeshua (6:20 ff.).<sup>1</sup> It is important for him to highlight the connection of the extraordinary nature of the Melchizedek priesthood with the New Covenant priesthood of the risen and ascended Messiah – for him, the two are intricately intertwined (v.1-3). However, it is not a priesthood established by Torah, i.e. Law, but by oath (6:16-18; 7:20-22). The New Covenant needs a different type of priesthood, one which offers sacrifices of obedience that has been tested to the point of shedding blood. The New Covenant requires priests who will serve and bless the people— rather than themselves; as it was the case in the second temple period.

This focus on the significance of the New High Priest begins in chapter 6:13 and continues through to chapter 10— receiving a final seal in 12:2. Therefore, when the translators arbitrarily insert the word *covenant* in 8:7 and 13; as well as in 9:1, it is entirely out of context— it is an unwarranted and misleading distortion of the topic. It is especially significant, since the word *Covenant* (*διαθήκη*) does not appear in ANY of the Greek texts, nor in the Latin Vulgate, from which those verses are translated. Therefore, if an insertion is warranted, in order to improve the clarity of the text, it ought to be the word *priesthood*, since it is the topic – not only of this section, but of more than five chapters. The insertion of ‘Covenant’ at those points totally deflects the reader from the real issue and introduces a very serious theological problem, viz. the replacement of Israel by the Christian Church. If we then go the last verse in our study, viz.12:2 a further, and extremely serious issue is introduced, namely the total abrogation of the significance of Abraham’s faith. As the translation stands in English, it must appear that faith originated with Yeshua if we accept the word commonly used here, viz *author*. The word for author is sometimes also rendered *originator*. This creates a significant conundrum since Paul – in Romans - points to the Abrahamic Covenant as the basis of the New Covenant and the patriarch is upheld as the model of faith

---

<sup>1</sup> The Epistle to the Hebrews is essentially an anonymous book. Some attribute it to Paul and others to Aquila, while others yet see the hand of Philo in its pages. The author also displays an ignorance of the sacrificial system as taught in the pages of the Torah, but addresses the issue from a Greek perspective. Sacrifice – a Latin term – has acquired a Christian meaning and is disconnected from the Biblical act of *qorban*. *Qorban*, from the Hebrew root *qarav* means to draw near [in relationship], whereas the term *sacrifice* refers to appeasement through suffering.

**The context of this segment is the priesthood and mediation – not the Covenants.**

throughout the New Testament. Furthermore, the God of Israel is identified as the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. **If the translation of 12:2 is allowed to stand in its current form, then there is no question that the New Testament actually endorses the view that the Christian faith reigns supreme over everything else – including the faith of Abraham.** That perspective is of course highly problematic, because it undermines everything and creates a house of cards built next to a fan.

*Let us firstly deal with the word Covenant.* Whilst the author of *Hebrews* is entitled to introduce as many issues as he chooses, it is surprising that he would not have made any attempt at resolving the problem of the replacing the Mosaic Covenant. There should be no doubt that it would have created a massive storm among Jewish followers of Yeshua. History records that this claim did arise in the early days among some of the Gentiles followers of Yeshua. Consequently, the Jewish sages gathered at Jamnia to devise strategies to counter that problem and many subsequent anathemas by Rabbis have their roots in the distortions emphasized here. But that was a long time before the content of the NT was shaped into a formal canon.

Surely, for the author of *Hebrews* to claim the abrogation of the Sinaitic Covenant would warrant a more in-depth commentary than just a few invented, 'throw-away lines'! What renders these insertions particularly serious, is the fact, that they make Yeshua responsible for abolishing the Mosaic Covenant, which is the usual target of commentators and expositors. Since most Jewish people, as well as the vast majority of Christians, do not read Greek, they are not able to verify, or disprove the text in the vernacular and are thus bound to accept whatever translation they choose to trust as Scripture.

8:7 The word covenant is inserted here in all the prominent vernacular versions to modify the word *first* and then introduces this notion of replacement, yet **it does not exist** in this verse in any of the published Greek texts or even the Vulgate. We have the lead-word '*first*' linked with Covenant, which could never apply to the Mosaic Covenant, since – in any case - it was NOT the first Covenant the Most High made with the Children of Israel. Although the Noahic Covenant is – strictly speaking - the first covenant the Creator made with the human race, the Abramic Covenant is the first '*redemptive*' Covenant and **definitely the FIRST** with the Children of Israel.<sup>2</sup>

Is it possible that either the author or (a later) editor was ignorant of the various Covenants the Almighty made apart from Sinai? Although such a question will make many people squirm uncomfortably, but it needs to be asked since much depends on how we answer that point.

Furthermore, if we take the words of Yeshua into consideration, in relation to the Commandments, a massive conflict results that cannot be brushed aside with clever theological wordage. Yeshua points out that "***not one word, yodh or tittle***" will pass away from the Torah. If this is so, then the author of *Hebrews* is blatantly contradicting Yeshua if the established translations are accepted as correct.

---

<sup>2</sup> Dispensationalist, and others, claim the existence of earlier Covenants, e.g. Adamic and Edenic Covenants, but their theory is not sustained by Biblical evidence since the term Covenant does not occur in the Hebrew text until Gen 6:18, besides the fact that Biblical Covenants ALWAYS involve the shedding of blood. The killing of animals for Adam & Eve's clothing does not constitute a Covenant since there are neither conditions nor promises attached.

## The context of this segment is the priesthood and mediation – not the Covenants.

A careful study of the available texts shows that all translators followed the same pattern set by the Authorized KJV by inserting the word Covenant, where it actually means *priesthood*.<sup>3</sup> It is the first priesthood, with whom the Most High found fault and it must be understood that the writer of Hebrews is not merely looking at the written Torah, but at the outworking of the Oral Law, which had been in force since the Babylonian Exile and even strengthened after the destruction of the Temple in the year 70 and of Jerusalem in 135 C.E. Even in the writings of Paul, the Greek word *nomos* (commonly rendered as law) needs to be translated in several places as *Oral Law* or *Traditions of the Fathers* if one is to arrive at a more truthful interpretation.

The subject of the discussion in this section of Hebrews is therefore a comparison of a now heavenly priesthood with a corrupt and faulty, earthly one. The section 8:3-6 is a parenthesis, which is answered in v.7; viz. *'if the first, (or earthly priesthood), was without fault, there would be no point in establishing a heavenly one!'* How could anyone say that the Commandments were faulty, or that they would vanish away, when they contain the moral code for the entire human race? Nor can we say that the vanishing pertains only to a part of the Covenant, because, if we persist in using the term - since nothing else is specified by the translators – it is a blanket declaration that the *first covenant* is faulty and vanishing away! The logic of these words is inconsistent, because if we allow them to stand we are actually declaring a cessation of the 'Abramic' Covenant, which Paul regards as the foundation of the New Covenant (c/f. 6:13-18) – not *just* Sinai!

8:6 is a difficult verse for the Greek-thinker as he is tempted to focus now on the New Covenant rather than what has gone before. However, it is important to remember that a Covenant is only the facilitator; it is the legal framework, in which everything happens. The author has already established that the priesthood of Yeshua is like that of Melchizedek, which is also a better ministry just as the New Covenant is based on greater (rather than better!) promises. The concept, or institution of a mediatorial priesthood is as much part of the new Covenant, as it is part of the Mosaic Covenant. The promises are, that there is now no more need for animals to be sacrificed to atone for human sin and that there is also now an open door into the Commonwealth of Israel for Gentiles – into a reborn Israel, the Kingdom of God.<sup>4</sup> It is the old priesthood that is regarded by the writer to be vanishing away— not the whole Mosaic Covenant. If the Mosaic Covenant were to vanish away as many insist it has, the entire moral code that is intended to regulate human existence on earth would also cease to exist.

It is worth to reprint a comment on Hebr.8:11 in the Douay Rheims Version (1582) of the Bible, to highlight how its translators understood the meaning of the New Covenant, viz. *'They shall not teach, etc. . .So great shall be light and grace of the new testament, that it shall not be necessary to inculcate to the faithful the belief and knowledge of the true God, for hey shall all know him.'* I have underlined the word inculcate to show how entrenched antinomianism was in Christianity at the time of Luther. It is ludicrous

---

<sup>3</sup> **The Douay Rheims Bible** (1582) 8:13 Now in saying a new, he hath made the former old. And that which decayeth and groweth old is near its end. *A new. . .Supply 'covenant'*. Hebrews Chapter 9 *The sacrifices of the law were far inferior to that of Christ.* 9:1 The former indeed had also justifications of divine service and a sanctuary. Inserted comments in bold! The Douay Bible is a translation from the Latin Vulgate into English

<sup>4</sup> See my article on obedience

**The context of this segment is the priesthood and mediation – not the Covenants.**

to assume that no-one needs to be trained in the things, and even the knowledge of God, **‘for all would know him automatically!’**

**8:7** Based on the Greek text, the word πρώτη - first, must be the qualifier for λειτουργίας (service or ministry), i.e. the priesthood and NOT for covenant. In v.6 as the word διαθήκη – covenant, is part of a parenthesis, viz. *‘How much more prominent, higher in rank, preferable or better is a mediator of a covenant on better, or greater promises having been ordained to be Torah.’* The word *covenant* in the English translations does not exist in this verse in any of the Greek texts nor in the Latin Vulgate and its insertion **opens a Pandora’s box of problems** as outlined elsewhere.

**8:8** *‘...finding fault with **them**’* removes the ambiguity, since this statement, being in the plural demands a plural subject, which is the succession of high priests, or the priesthood per se – not Covenant, which is singular!

**8:13** *‘In that He says new, He has made the first (priesthood) obsolete...’*. The letter must have been written prior to the destruction of the temple due its many references to sacrifices, which are useless since they cannot remove sin. The word *‘first’*, therefore, cannot be a reference to the written Torah of Sinai, due to the implication of suggesting that the Commandments are growing obsolete and *‘are ready to vanish away...’*. Therefore, the only other possibility are portions of the Oral Law, or traditions, which had also been under frequent attack by Yeshua during his lifetime on earth.

**9:1** *‘Therefore, even the first (priesthood) had divine services that were established by Torah to serve The Sacred and the earthly.* The text continues comparing the old priesthood with its animal sacrifices that could not remove sin and guilt. Not one more word is said, in the remainder of the Epistle, concerning the abolition of any previous Covenant.

For this reason we **MUST** draw the conclusion that the insertion of Covenant in the places mentioned above is either an (extremely serious) error by the translators; or, a deliberate alteration of the text to establish something new!. The **Covenant of Sinai is of such immense significance to the entire human race**, not just Israel, that its abrogation would surely deserve more explanation than the pure assumption applied by the translators of ALL versions. If the translators had suggested that the death of Yeshua merely signaled the end of the Levitical priesthood, with all of its attendant services, it would still be acceptable— for it refers only to a portion of the Sinaitic Covenant; and could therefore be treated as an amendment without too much difficulty. Rabbinic Judaism found itself confronted with precisely THAT issue when the temple was destroyed. How would they now obtain atonement on Yom Kippur for the nation? An acceptable way to amend the ceremonial law had to be found— which was forgiveness through repentance. However, the clear statement, in ALL major English translations of the New Testament, is made that the New Covenant has put an end to the First Covenant, which most understand (or at least assume) **to be the Mosaic Covenant or Torah!**

**9:15** Therefore he is the mediator of a new testament (or will), so that those who are called may receive the promised eternal inheritance, since a death has occurred that redeems them from the transgressions committed under the first covenant. <sup>16</sup>For where a will is involved, the death of the one who made it must

**The context of this segment is the priesthood and mediation – not the Covenants.**

be established. <sup>17</sup> For a will takes effect only at death, since it is not in force as long as the one who made it is alive. <sup>18</sup> Therefore not even the first covenant was inaugurated without blood. <sup>19</sup> For when every commandment of the law had been declared by Moses to all the people, he took the blood of calves and goats, with water and scarlet wool and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book itself and all the people, saying, “This is the blood of the covenant that God commanded for you.” And in the same way he sprinkled with the blood both the tent and all the vessels used in worship. Indeed, under the law almost everything is purified with blood, and without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness of sins...’

The problem in this passage clearly is the term ‘first covenant’. Verse sixteen and seventeen tell us without ambiguity that the one who made it needs to die to establish its validity. Please consider the implications inherent in this reasoning. In Genesis 9:17 we are told that God made a Covenant with Noah. Based on the above, God would have had to die to enforce it. In Genesis 15:18 we read that God made a Covenant with Abram, but as with Noah, God did not die! In Deuteronomy chapter 26:16 – 29:1 the Almighty instructs Moses to make a further Covenant with Israel— *‘beside the one He made with them at Horeb...’!* Interestingly, there is NO BLOOD involved! Is that Covenant not valid therefore? But did God die on the plain of Moab? There is obviously something not quite right with the way Christian theology understands the entire Covenant concept.

Hebrews 9:22 (above) reminds the reader that *‘... under the law almost everything is purified with blood, and [allegedly] without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness of sins...’!* The latter is an allusion to Leviticus 17:11. The amazing thing we discover in Deuteronomy chapter 30, that the LORD promises a full restoration after a period of backsliding among the nations. What makes this of a particular interest to us is the fact that there is no sacrifice involved in that process of restoration — just wholehearted repentance; viz. *‘[When] you return to the Lord your God and obey His voice ...with all your heart and with all your soul, that the Lord your God will bring you back from captivity ... have compassion on you, and gather you again from all the nations where the Lord your God has scattered you’.* Deut. 30:2-3.

Verse 9:15 also contains some very confusing language, i.e. *‘a death has occurred that redeems them from the transgressions committed under the first covenant’!* Who are the ‘them’? Are they Gentiles? If so, they were NEVER under a Covenant of any kind – except that of Noah.

There is a significant issue with this passage, because it is linked with a verse in 7:27. This is what is written there:

*‘He has no need, like those high priests, to offer sacrifices daily, first for his own sins and then for those of the people; he did this once for all when he offered up himself.’*

The writer of Hebrews is misinformed concerning the Temple sacrifices, since the High Priest did not have to offer sacrifices for himself on a daily basis before making offerings for the nation. In fact the High Priest only made an offering for the nation once a year, which is affirmed in Heb. 9:25. Also, the Levitical sacrifices were not given to take away sin, rather as evidence that the sinner had repented, made restitution and was again at peace with God. Is it possible that the writer of Hebrews presented here a synthesis of Greek and Hebrew ideas?

**The context of this segment is the priesthood and mediation – not the Covenants.**

Also, in verse 9:22 we have this powerful statement, ‘...without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness of sins...’. Since the writer applies that to the death of Yeshua, this verse seems to lock the Christian into the belief that without the death of Yeshua, without the shedding of his blood, no-one can find forgiveness from God.

This, however, runs in contradiction to the teachings of the Torah— indeed the entire T<sup>e</sup>nakh. The Tenakh clearly teaches that forgiveness is irretrievably linked with repentance and the sacrifices were intended to be the evidence of such repentance— not the reverse; c/f Ps. 51.

The famous verse and proof-text quoted above, however, has been read and understood entirely out of its context in Leviticus. Virtually all translators reference Hebrews 9:22 back to Leviticus (17:11), but the Leviticus passage has nothing to do with the forgiveness of sins! As I said: context! In this case it is all of chapter 17 which is closely linked with Genesis 9:1-11. The Torah makes a clear distinction when the flesh of an offering may or may not be eaten. However, there is never an exception where the blood is concerned — it belongs to God alone. The Leviticus chapter deals with two issues. One, all life – including animal life – is to be treated with great respect. Therefore if an animal is killed for food, its blood is to be poured out on the ground – and is not to be eaten (c/f. Gen 9:1-11). If the animal is killed as an offering it belongs to YHWH and its blood must be brought to the altar in a specific location determined by God. Under no circumstances is the animal to be offered to another deity— such a one is to be cut off from the God’s people. The entire passage is about establishing who has sole authority over all life— HaShem!

The Genesis account establishes that all creatures will be held accountable by God for any life they have taken. The blood is the price of the creature that was killed, the blood is the covering (atonement) provided by God and must be returned to Him.

***Hebrews 10:1-10 — ‘...a body you have prepared for me...’!***

The book of Hebrews is riddled with inaccuracies and due to its leaning toward the mystical it should be treated with great caution. This is however not the case; if anything the opposite is true since, alongside the Gospel of John, it provides most of the material for the Christian ‘Atonement’ theology through the abundant images of the necessity of human sacrifice for the forgiveness of sin.

One of those images is projected onto the reader in 10:1-10 by showing that even the Psalms foreshadowed a divinely prepared body to be sacrificed (Ps.40:6 ff.); viz. ‘ *Therefore, when he came into the world, he said: “Sacrifice and offering You did not desire, but a body You have prepared for me. In burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin You had no pleasure. Then I said, ‘Behold, I have come— in the volume of the book it is written of me— to do Your will, O God.’ ”* That, however, is not the case! Both ancient texts, Hebrew and Greek are in agreement here and they do not have the line about a prepared body. Rather, it says, ‘...my ears you have opened (or unblocked)’ and all the major translations carry that thought. So, I ask, how can the book of Hebrews carry that misleading statement and not one translation objects to it?

## **The context of this segment is the priesthood and mediation – not the Covenants.**

Dear reader, how much falsification does it take before we call a spade for what it is? From the above we can see that a theology was written here that uses distorted texts from the Tenakh to make its case. May I suggest, that the author of these texts was a Greek who had some knowledge of the Tenakh to make his case with a Biblically illiterate audience. What we have here is not an innocent misquotation, but a deliberate construction of a doctrine without a foundation in the Tenakh. Look at v.10, viz. ‘... *we have been sanctified through the offering of the **body of Jesus Christ** once for all.*’ Where is the evidence for this claim, apart from a falsified text from a Psalm? There was no mention of a body in Psalm 40, but the writer of Hebrews builds a massive case throughout chapter 10.

What concerns me deeply is the fact that here we have a body of writings that are clearly falsified to support a particular doctrine. If we then build an something that is patently false, where is it leading us?

### ***Further Conflict:***

**12:2** this verse too presents us with a considerable conflict. According to all standard translations we find here the phrase ‘*author and perfecter of faith*’.<sup>5</sup> This expression is supported by the Latin Vulgate and one would assume that it is therefore correct. However! What the translators did not take into account is the fact that the New Covenant is based on the faith of Abraham who is called a friend of God— because of his faith. Abraham did not hesitate to offer his only begotten son as a burnt offering at God’s command and it was counted unto him for righteousness evermore. What the translators are saying that there was no faith until Yeshua, thus denying Abraham’s example for faith for all humanity and basis for all the promises to Israel. Although the Vulgate has fixed the term author, it is the Greek text which undergirds the Latin text and must therefore be regarded as a higher authority. The Greek offers several possibilities for translation. I believe that acceptable renderings could be *prince of faith* or *leader in faith*, for it is certain that Yeshua is the only human being who ever laid down his life in the hope of receiving it back because of his obedience to God. Although **Yeshua is NOT the author of faith**, his faith in the promise of his father to raise him from the dead, makes him truly a **prince of faith**, which he **perfected** through his obedience unto his own death.

### **A final thought:**

The issues outlined in this brief commentary is extremely serious and lies chiefly in this:

- 1) What faces us here are falsification of the most serious kind, **as it has misled** and is misleading countless numbers of people who read that text, into believing that the Christian message here is true and that it has superseded the Covenant of Sinai. It is an extremely serious accusation to make against the Almighty, that He, the All Knowing One, was incapable of making a Covenant with Israel that

---

<sup>5</sup> All major translations, except the NASB (1995 Update) render this text as ‘*perfecter of our faith*’– thus implying a new work of God initiated in and through Jesus.

**The context of this segment is the priesthood and mediation – not the Covenants.**

was free from faults. The text, however, clearly states that **He found fault with the priests** (viz. *them*)!

- 2) The seriousness of the statement concerning the New Covenant is underscored by the fact that it is made in the NT of the Bible – not just in a Commentary. The authority it carries through this is enormous!
- 3) The Bible is routinely challenged concerning its veracity by people from all walks of life and religious back-ground; and here we are faced with deliberate falsifications and mistranslations in the NT.
- 4) How much contempt for the Jewish people has been bred by these passages over their reliance on the Covenant the Most High made with Moses as their salvation. To this day, the faith of the Jewish People is in the Covenant with Abraham to keep them – NOT the Mosaic Law; the observance of the latter to varying degrees is seen as an obligation, out of gratitude and as a sacred duty. Even Yeshua used the Commandments as a means of bringing conviction to the sinner (c/f. Lk.18:18-24).
- 5) The word διαθήκη [Gr. Diatheke] occurs in the book of Hebrews nine times.
- 6) In the fullness of time Yeshua laid down his life as a testimony that he believed what he was preaching. However, for whomsoever who wrote the book of Hebrews to falsify the text of the Tenakh to establish his theological perspective is extremely serious. However, it is even more serious to continue on with the error by refusing to acknowledge its existence when the vast majority of Bible readers have no chance of finding out.

If I am correct with my claims, then the consequences are immeasurable.

Copyright 2011

**Translation of Hebrews 8:1 – 13; 9:1; 12:2**

**8:1** Κεφάλαιον δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις· τοιοῦτον ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα, ὃς ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς,

**2** τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργός, καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς, ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος, καὶ οὐκ ἄνθρωπος·

**3** πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰς τὸ προσφέρειν δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας καθίσταται· ὅθεν ἀναγκαῖον ἔχειν τι καὶ τοῦτον ὃ προσενέγκῃ.

**4** Εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἦν ἐπὶ γῆς, οὐδ' ἂν ἦν ἱερεὺς, ὄντων τῶν ἱερέων τῶν προσφερόντων κατὰ τὸν

**8:1** But it is a main point by those saying we have such a high priest who sat down at the right hand of the throne of the majesty of the heavens.

**2** who is a servant/minister of the Holy Place and of the true tabernacle, which YHWH establishes, not man.

**3** For every high priest is appointed to offer gifts and sacrifices wherefore it is necessary to have which is also what he may bring.

**4** If therefore this is the practice on earth, and it is not a priest, being the one who offers according to law/torah

**The context of this segment is the priesthood and mediation – not the Covenants.**

νόμον τὰ δῶρα,

**5** οἵτινες ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ λατρεύουσιν τῶν ἐπουρανίων, καθὼς κεχηρημάτισται Μωϋσῆς μέλλων ἐπιτελεῖν τὴν σκηνήν, Ὅρα, γάρ φησίν, ποιήσεις πάντα κατὰ τὸν τύπον τὸν δειχθέντα σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει.

**6** Νυνὶ δὲ διαφορωτέρας τέτυχεν λειτουργίας, ὅσῳ καὶ κρείττονός ἐστιν διαθήκης μεσίτης, ἥτις ἐπὶ κρείττοσιν ἐπαγγελίαις νενομοθέτηται.

**7** Εἰ γὰρ ἡ πρώτη ἐκείνη ἦν ἄμεμπτος, οὐκ ἂν δευτέρας ἐζητεῖτο τόπος.

**8** Μεμφόμενος γὰρ αὐτοῖς λέγει, Ἰδοὺ, ἡμέραι ἔρχονται, λέγει κύριος, καὶ συντελέσω ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰούδα διαθήκην καινὴν·

**9** οὐ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην ἣν ἐποίησα τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιλαβομένου μου τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν ἐξαγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου· ὅτι αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἐνέμειναν ἐν τῇ διαθήκῃ μου, καὶ γὰρ ἠμέλησα αὐτῶν, λέγει κύριος.

**10** Ὅτι αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη ἦν διαθήσομαι τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραὴλ μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκεῖνας, λέγει κύριος, διδοὺς νόμους μου εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν ἐπιγράψω αὐτούς· καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς εἰς θεόν, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονται μοι εἰς λαόν.

**11** Καὶ οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν ἕκαστος τὸν πολίτην αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἕκαστος τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, λέγων, Γνωθὶ τὸν κύριον· ὅτι πάντες εἰδήσουσίν με,

the gifts.

**5** Anyone who does so is an example, even a shadow serving the heavenly sanctuary just as Moses being admonished and divinely instructed, “See,” he declares, “you do according to the pattern being shown to you on the mountain”, has worked to accomplish the tabernacle

**6** But now a more excellent service/ministry has come to pass. How much more prominent, higher in rank, preferable or better is a Covenant mediator who on better promises has enacted Torah.

**7** For if the first one (?) was blameless, or without fault, there was no need for a second to seek a place.

**8** for finding fault with them, He says,

“Behold, a day is coming, says YHWH and I will accomplish upon the house of Israel and upon the house of Judah a new Covenant –

**9** not according to the covenant I made with their fathers in the day I took hold of their hand when I led them out of Egypt, because they did not abide in my covenant and I abandoned them, says YHWH.

**10** For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the Lord: I will put My laws in their mind and write them on their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people.

**11** None of them shall teach his neighbor, and none his brother, saying, ‘Know the Lord,’ for all shall know

**The context of this segment is the priesthood and mediation – not the Covenants.**

ἀπὸ μικροῦ αὐτῶν ἕως μεγάλου αὐτῶν.

Me, from the least of them to the greatest of them.

**12** Ὅτι ἕλεως ἔσομαι ταῖς ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν, καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ μνησθῶ ἔτι.

**12** For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their lawless deeds I will remember no more.”

**13** Ἐν τῷ λέγειν, Καινήν, πεπαλαίωκεν τὴν πρώτην. Τὸ δὲ παλαιούμενον καὶ γηράσκον, ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ.

**13** by saying *New/Unprecedented* He declares old the first, which by declaring also grows old and is in the process of vanishing away.

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

**9:1** Εἶχεν μὲν οὖν καὶ ἡ πρώτη δικαιοσύματα λατρείας, τό τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν.

**9:1** Therefore by the first (?) He has also established a righteousness through laws, by sacred services - both holy and earthly.

\*\*\*

\*\*\*

**12:2** ἀφορῶντες εἰς τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτὴν Ἰησοῦν, ὃς, ἀντὶ τῆς προκειμένης αὐτῷ χαρᾶς, ὑπέμεινεν σταυρόν, αἰσχύνης καταφρονήσας, ἐν δεξιᾷ τε τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ κεκάθικεν.<sup>6</sup>

**12:2** ...fixing our eyes onto the example/prince and perfecter of faithfulness, Yeshua, who instead of taking hold of the joy destined (for) him, not only despised shame and endured crucifixion; but (now) also has sat down in a place of authority at the throne of God (c/f. Ps.110:1; Dan.7:13-27)

---

<sup>6</sup> Aland, B., Aland, K., Black, M., Martini, C. M., Metzger, B. M., & Wikgren, A. 1993, c1979. *The Greek New Testament* (4th ed.) (574). United Bible Societies: Federal Republic of Germany