fragmentary indications of portions of its  
glory; are but beams of light, which are  
united in it as in a central sun. *Since*  
*when* has Christ in this sense inherited  
this name? The answer must not be  
hastily made, as by some Commentators,  
that the term **inherited** implies the glorification of the humanity of Christ to that Sonship which He before had in virtue of  
his Deity. Evidently so partial a reference  
cannot be considered as exhausting the  
sense of the Writer. Nor again can we  
say that it was at the time of His incarnation, though the words of the angel in Luke i. 35, *“That holy thing which shall  
be born of thee shall be called the Son of  
God,”* seem to favour such a reference :  
for it was especially at His incarnation,  
that He was made *a little lower than the  
angels*, ch. ii. 9. Rather would the sense  
seem to be, that the especial name of SON,  
belonging to Him not by ascription nor  
adoption, but by His very Being itself, has  
been ever, and is now, His: *inherited* by  
Him, “in that He is the very Son of God,”  
as Chrysostom says: the Old Test. declarations being as it were portions of the instrument by which this inheritance is  
assured to Him, and by the citation of  
which it is proved. Observe that the  
*having become better than the angels* is  
not *identical with* the *inheriting,* but *in  
proportion to* it: the triumphant issue of  
his Mediation is consonant to the glorious  
Name, which is His by inheritance: but  
which, in the fulness of its present inconceivable glory [see above], has been put on and taken up by Him in the historical  
process of his mediatorial humiliation and  
triumph) than they.

**5—18.]** *Proof  
from Scripture of this last declaration.*

**5.]** **For** (substantiation of His having  
inherited a more exalted name than the  
angels) **to whom of** (among) **the angels  
did He** (God, the subject of vv. 1,2; as  
the subsequent citation shews) **ever say**  
(this citation from Ps. ii. has brought up  
in recent German Commentators the whole  
question of the original reference of that  
Psalm, and of Old Test. citations in the  
New Test. altogether. These discussions  
will be found in Bleek, De Wette, and  
Ebrard. The latter is by far the deepest  
and most satisfactory: seeing, as he does,  
the furthest into the truth of the peculiar  
standing of the Hebrew people, and the Messianic import of the theocracy. Those who entirely or partially deny this latter,  
seem to me to be without adequate means  
of discussing the question. Ebrard’s view  
is, that the Psalm belongs to the reign of  
David. The objection that ver. 6 will not  
apply to David’s anointing, inasmuch as  
that took place at Bethlehem in his boyhood, he answers, by regarding that anointing as connected with his establishment on  
Mount Zion, not as having locally taken  
place there, but as the first of that series  
of divine mercies of which that other was  
the completion. He further ascribes the  
Psalm to that portion of David’s reign  
when (2 Sam. viii.) Hadadezer, and many  
neighbouring nations, were smitten by  
him: which victories he looked on as the  
fulfilment to him of Nathan’s prophecy,  
2 Sam. vii, 8–17. In that prophecy the  
offspring of David is mentioned in the very  
words quoted below in this verse, and in  
terms which, he contends, will not apply to  
Solomon, but must be referred to the great  
promised Seed of David. He regards this  
triumphant. occasion as having been trented  
by the royal Psalmist as a type and foretaste of the ultimate ideal dominion of the “Son of David” over the kings of the  
earth), **Thou** (the seed of David, anointed  
in God’s counsels as king on his holy hill  
of Sion : see above) **art my Son** (according;  
to the promise presently to be quoted,  
finding its partial fulfilment in Solomon,  
but its only entire one in the Son of David  
who is also the Son of God), **I** (emphatic :  
“I and no other:” expressed also in the  
Hebrew) **this day have begotten thee**  
(first, what are we to understand by this  
term, **have begotten**? Bleck says, “As  
Sonship, in the proper sense, is dependent  
on the act of begetting, so may, especially  
by the Hebrews, ‘to beget’ be figuratively  
used to express the idea of ‘making any  
one a son,’ in which derived and figurative  
reference this also may be meant. And  
we get an additional confirmation of this  
meaning from Jer ii. 27, where it is said  
of the foolish idolatrous Israelites, ‘They  
say to a stock, Thou art my father, and to  
a ‘stone, Thou hast begotten me’ (so the  
Septuagint). Accordingly, the meaning  
here is,—’I have made Thee my Son’ [so  
Ps. lxxxix. 20, 26, 27: ‘I have found  
David my servants with my holy oil have  
I anointed him: .... He shall cry unto