within the veil to sprinkle the blood:  
though it was that sprinkling of the blood  
by which the atonement was actually  
made, as it is by the Spirit’s application  
of Christ’s atoning blood to the heart of  
each individual sinner that he is brought  
into reconciliation with God) of the people  
(again, the Jewish people, compare Matt.  
i. 21: Luke i. 68, 77; ii. 10. “Why did  
not he say, the sins of *the world*, but, of  
*the people?* because then the relation of  
the Lord was to the Jews only, and He  
came especially on their account, that  
their salvation might precede the salvation of the rest: notwithstanding that the converse really happened.” Theophylact).

**18.]** Explanation, how the **being  
like His brethren in all things** has answered the end. *that He might become a  
merciful and faithful High Priest.* **For  
He Himself having been tempted in that  
which He hath suffered, He is able to  
succour them that are** (now) **tempted** (the  
construction is much doubted. The sentence is open to several logical arrangements and consequent renderings. 1) *“for  
He is able to help those who are tried by  
the same temptations in which His own  
sufferings have consisted:”* 2) *“for having  
been Himself tempted in that which He  
hath suffered,* &c.:” 3) *“for in that which  
He hath suffered when He himself was  
tempted, He is able to succour those who are  
tempted* [*in the same*]*:”* 4) *“for in that  
in which He himself was tempted and hath  
suffered He is able,* &c.” Of these I much  
prefer 2); because (a) it keeps together the  
prominent members of the logical comparison, between Him being tempted and us  
being tempted, giving *“in that which He  
hath suffered”* as a qualification of *being  
tempted,* and thus explaining wherein His  
temptation consisted. Nor (b) is it at all  
open to Lünemann’s objection, that it  
limits the power of Christ to help, to those  
things merely in which He himself has  
suffered and been tempted: stating as it  
does generally the fact *being tempted*, and  
then specifying in what, viz. *in that which  
He hath suffered.* It also (c) corresponds  
exactly in construction with the similar  
sentence ch. v. 8,—*“He learned, from the things which He suffered, obedience,”* in supplying an object after *suffered*. And  
(a) it seems more natural that an object  
should be required after the perfect, than  
that it should be used absolutely. After  
‘He hath suffered,’ we enquire, ‘What?’—  
after ‘He suffered,’—‘When?’ Christ's  
whole sufferings were a *temptation* in the  
sense here intended: see ch. iv. 15; James  
i.2. The rendering given in the A. V.,  
making *“in that”* a conjunction of inference, meaning *“because,”* seems to be  
quite unauthorized. The ability **to succour** here is not to be understood of the power to which the Lord has been exalted  
through death and suffering to be a Prince  
and a Saviour,—which is not here in question: but of the power of sympathy which he has acquired by personal experience of  
our sufferings. As God, He knows what  
is in us: but as man, He feels it also. And  
by this, wonderful as it may seem, He has  
acquired a fresh power, that of sympathy  
with us, and, in consequence, of helping  
us. See my sermon on this text, in Quebec  
Chapel Sermons, vol iii. p. 84. And this  
is the general view of expositors, both  
ancient and modern).

**CHAP. III. 1–IV. 16.]** THE SON OF  
GOD GREATER ALSO THAN MOSES: AND  
INFERENCES THEREFROM. The Writer  
has arrived, through the reasonings of  
ch. i. ii., at the mention of the High  
Priesthood of Jesus. He might at once  
have passed thence to the superiority of  
His High Priesthood to that of the imperfect priests on earth. But one point yet remains, without which the Gospel would  
not have its entire comparison with the  
law. The law was given by angels in the  
hand of a mediator. Moses was that mediator. Moses was above all others the  
prophet by whom God had spoken to the  
Fathers in times past. Christ therefore  
must be compared with Moses, and shewn  
to be greater than he. This being done,  
he returns again to his central idea, the  
High Priesthood of Christ (ch. iv. 14); and  
from thenceforward treats of and unfolds  
it. Ebrard gives the detailed connexion  
well: “The angel of the covenant came  
in the name of God before the people of