inasmuch as his glorified Body, in which  
He triumphs sitting at God’s right hand, is  
itself created, and is the sum and the centre  
of creation) **so much better than** (the usual  
word of general and indefinite comparison  
in our Epistle, whether of Christian with  
Jewish [ch. vii. 19, 22; viii. 6; ix. 23],  
heavenly with earthly [x. 34; xi. 16; xii. 24], eternal with temporal [xi. 35]: see also vi. 9; vii. 7; xi. 40. It is used only  
three times by St. Paul, and never [unless  
1 Cor. xii. 31, in the received text, be counted]  
in this sense: but thirteen times in this  
Epistle) **the angels** (of God; the heavenly  
created beings; afterwards, ver. 14, called  
*“ministering spirits.”* All attempts to evade  
this plain meaning are futile; and proceed  
on ignorance of the argument of our Epistle,  
and of the Jewish theology. But *why*  
should the angels be here brought in? and  
why should the superiority of the Incarnate Son of God to them be so insisted on and elaborated? Bleek gives a very insufficient reason, when he says that the mention of God’s throne brought to the  
Writer’s mind the angels who are the  
attendants there. The reason, as Ebrard remarks, lies far deeper.  
The whole Old Test. dispensation is related to the New Test. dispensation, as the angels to the Son. In the former, mankind, and Israel  
also, stands separated from God by sin: and  
angels, divine messengers [as in the expression “the angel of the covenant”),  
stand as mediators between man and God.  
And of these there is, so to speak, a chain  
of two links: viz., Moses, and the angel of  
the Lord. The first link is a mere man,  
who is raised above his fellow-men by his  
calling, by his office, the commission given  
to him,—and brought nearer to God; but  
he is a sinner as they are, and is in  
reality no more a partaker of the divine  
nature than they are. The second link is  
the angelic form in which God revealed  
Himself to his people, coming down to their  
capacity, like to man, without being man.  
So that Godhead and Manhood approximated to one another: a man was com-  
missioned and enabled to hear God’s word:  
God appeared in a form in which men  
might see Him: but the two found no  
point of contact; no real union of the Godhead and the Manhood took place. Whereas in the Son, God and the Manhood not  
only approximated, but became personally one. God no longer accommodates Himself to the capacities of men in an angelophany or theophany, but has revealed the fulness of his divine nature in the man  
Jesus,—in that He, who was the *brightness* of his glory, became man. The argument of the Writer necessarily then leads him to  
shew how both Mediators, the angel of the  
Old Test. covenant, and Moses, found their  
higher unity in Christ. First, he shews  
this of the angel or angels [for it was not  
always one individual angelic being, but  
various] by whom the first covenant was  
given: then of Moses, ch. iii. iv. This first  
portion is divided into two: vv. 4—14, in  
which he shews that the Son, as the eternal  
Son of God, is higher than the angels [see  
the connexion of this with the main argument below]: then, after an exhortation [ii. 1–4] founded on this, tending also  
to impress on us the superior holiness of  
the New Test. revelation, the second part  
[ii. 5–18] in which he shews that in the  
Son, the manhood also is exalted above the  
angels), **in proportion as he hath inherited**  
(as his own: the word being perhaps chosen  
in reference to the Old Test. prophecies,  
which promised it to Him : see below. The  
*perfect* is important, as denoting something  
belonging to His present and abiding state,  
not an event wholly past, as *“sat down”*  
above, indicating the first “setting himself  
down,” though that word might also be  
used of a permanent state of session) **a  
more distinguished** (or, **more excellent**)  
**name** (to be taken in its proper sense, not  
understood to mean precedence or dignity  
as ver. 5 shews: whence also we get an  
easy answer to the enquiry, *what name* is  
intended : viz. that of **Son**, in the peculiar  
and individual sense of the citation there. ‘The angels themselves are called *“sons of God,”* Job i. 6; ii. 1; xxxviii. 7: Dan. iii. 25, and Gen. vi. 2 [see Jude 6 note, and Introd. to Jude, § v. 11]: but the  
argument here is that the title “SON OF  
GOD” is bestowed on him individually, in  
a sense in which it never was conferred  
upon an angel. See as a parallel, Phil. ii.  
9 ff. It must be remembered, as Delitzsch  
beautifully remarks, that the fulness of  
glory of the peculiar name of the Son of  
God is unattainable by human speech or  
thought: it is, Rev. xix. 12, *“a name which  
none knoweth but Himself.”* And all the  
citations aud appellations here are but