in the next sentence by *‘made perfect by sufferings’* [which words themselves are a witness that suffering and  
exaltation, not suffering and degradation,  
are here connected]. But emphatic they  
could not be in the *former* connexion,  
coming as they would only as an explicatory clause, after *“made a little lower than the angels.”* Again, the latter connexion entirely satisfies the context, the sufferings of Christ being treated of as  
necessary to His being our perfect Redeemer. And this connexion will be made  
even clearer by what will he said on the  
next clause), **crowned with glory and  
honour** (viz. at His exaltation, when God  
exalted Him to His right Hand: not, as  
some, at His incarnation, or His establishment as Saviour of the world: see  
above, ver. 7); **in order that** (how is this  
logically constructed? It depends on the  
last clause, which clause it will be best to  
take in its entirety, *“on account of His  
suffering of death crowned with glory  
and honour.”* The full connexion we  
cannot enter into, till the three other  
questions arising out of our clause are  
disposed of: **by the grace of God,—for  
every man,—and, that He should taste  
death) by the grace of God** (how is this  
to be understood? At all events we have  
strong Scripture analogy for such an expression. In Gal. ii. 21, the Apostle’s confession of faith in the Son of God, he  
says, *“I do not make void the grace of  
God; for if righteousness be by the law,  
then Christ died without cause.”* And in  
Rom. v. 8, we read, *“God giveth proof  
of His own love toward us, in that, while  
we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.”*  
And in Titus ii. 11, *“The grace of God  
was manifested, bringing salvation to all  
men.”* So that, in point of meaning, no  
difficulty need be found in the words. It  
was by the love and grace, the *kindness*  
and *love towards men* of the Father, that  
all Redemption was effected, and above  
all that One Sacrifice which was the  
crowning act of Redemption. The remarkable various reading (see margin) is  
discussed at length in the notes to my  
Greek Testament. I have there concluded,  
that it does not seem possible to assign to the words *“except God,”* or, *“without God,”* a meaning in accordance with the  
demands of the context, and the analogy  
of Scripture. This indeed would be no  
argument against a reading universally  
and unobjectionably attested by external  
authorities; but where no such attestation  
exists, may well be brought in to guide us  
to a decision) **He might for** (‘on behalf  
of,’ ‘for the benefit of:’ where this ordinary meaning of the preposition suffices, that of vicariousness must not be introduced. Sometimes, as e.g., 2 Cor. v. 15, it is necessary. But here clearly not, the  
whole argument proceeding not on the  
vicariousness of Christ’s sacrifice, but on  
the benefits which we derive from His  
personal suffering for us in humanity; not  
on His substitution for us, but on His  
community with us) **every man** (in the  
original the word may be neuter or masculine; every *thing*, or every *man*. If  
the latter, to what is it to be referred?  
Origen and others take it as neuter,  
and apply it either to all nature, or to all  
reasonable beings. The latter see discussed  
below. The former can hardly be here  
meant: for of such a doctrine, however  
true, there is no hint. Then taking the  
adjective masculine, are we to understand  
it *“for every one, angels included ?”*  
So Ebrard: but where do we find any such  
usage of *“all,”* or *“every,”* absolutely  
as here? And where in this chapter again  
is any room for the position, that Christ  
suffered death for angels? In the logical  
course of the argument, we have done  
with them, and are now treating of man,  
and of Him who was made man to be  
our High Priest and advocate. And therefore of none other than man can this word *“every one”* be here meant, in accordance indeed with its universal usage elsewhere. If it be asked, why *every man*  
rather than *all men*, we may safely say,  
that the singular brings out, far more  
strongly than the plural would, the applicability of Christ’s death *to each individual man:* and we may say that this  
again testifies to the sense *“every man,”*  
as there would be no such reason for individualizing other rational beings, as there is for showing that the whole nature of