**God** (some render this first, *“O God,”* but  
apparently without necessity), **thy God,  
anointed thee** (*how?* and *when?* We  
must distinguish this anointing from what  
is said in Acts x. 38, *“God anointed Him  
with the Holy Spirit, and with power,”*  
and the *anointing* of Isa. lxi. 1. For it is  
a consequent upon the righteous course of  
the Son of God in his Humanity, and therefore belongs to his triumph, in which He is exalted above his fellows [see below].  
Again, the *“oil of gladness”* below seems  
rather to point to a festive and triumphant,  
than to an inaugurative unction. We  
should therefore rather take the allusion  
to be, as in Ps. xxiii. 5; xcii. 10, to the  
custom of anointing guests at feasts: so  
that, as the King in the Psalm is anointed  
with the oil of rejoicing above his fellows, because of his having loved righteousness and hated iniquity, so Christ, in  
the jubilant celebration of His finished  
course at his exaltation in heaven, is  
anointed with the festive oil *above His  
fellows* [see below]. There is of course  
an allusion also in the word **anointed**  
(echrīsen) to the honoured and triumphant.  
Name *Christ*) **with oil of rejoicing** (see  
above: oil indicative of joy, as it is of  
superabundance: compare Isa. lxi. 3)  
**beyond thy fellows** (i.e. in the Psalm,  
‘other kings:’ hardly ‘brothers by kin’  
[other sons of David], as Grotius and  
others. But to whom does the Writer  
apply the words? Chrysostom says, “Who  
are the *fellows,* except *men?* And the  
meaning is, Christ received not the Holy  
Spirit by measure.” Theodoret on the  
Psalm, Calvin, Beza, and others, think of  
believers, the adopted into God’s family :  
others, of the High Priests, prophets, and  
kings, in the Old Test., anointed as types  
of Christ: others, of *all creatures:* others,  
as in the Psalm, of *other kings.* Camero  
says, “Christ had in His office no fellows ;  
in His human nature, all men ; in grace,  
all the faithful.” Still we may answer  
to all these, that they do not in any  
way satisfy the requirements of the context. Were it the intent of the Writer to shew Christ’s superiority over his human  
brethren of *every kind,* we might accept  
one or other of these meanings: but as  
this is not his design, but to shew His  
superiority to the angels, we must I think take the word **fellows** as representing other  
heavenly beings, partakers in the same glorious and sinless state with Himself, though  
not in the strict sense, His “fellows.” De  
Wette objects to this sense, that the Writer  
places the angels far beneath Christ: Delitzsch, that the angels are not *anointed,* whereas there is no necessity in the text  
for understanding that these *fellows* are  
also anointed: the comparison may consist  
in the very fact of the anointing itself:—  
and Ebrard, speaking as usual strongly,  
says that “neither the Psalmist, nor our  
author if in his senses, could have applied  
the word to the angels.” But this need not  
frighten us: and we may well answer with  
Lünemann, 1) “that the general comparison here being that of Christ with  
the angels, the fresh introduction of this  
point of comparison in ver. 9 cannot of  
itself appear inappropriate. 2) Granted,  
that just before, in ver. 7, the angels are  
placed far beneath Christ,—we have this  
very inferiority here marked distinctly  
by the terms of this comparison. 3) The  
angels are *next* to Christ in rank, by  
the whole course of this argument: to  
whom then would the Writer more naturally apply the term *fellows,* than to  
them?” I may add, 4) that the comparison here is but analogous to that in  
ver. 4, of which indeed it is an expansion:  
and 5) that thus only can the figure of  
anointing at a triumphant festival be carried out consistently: that triumph having taken place on the exaltation of the Redeemer to the Father’s right hand and throne [ver. 8], when, the whole of the  
heavenly company, His *fellows* in glory  
and joy, being anointed with the oil of  
gladness, His share and dignity was so  
much greater than theirs. It remains that  
we should consider the general import, and  
application here, of Ps. xlv. From what  
is elsewhere found in this commentary, it  
will not be for a moment supposed that I  
can give in to the view of such writers as  
De Wette and Hupfeld, who maintain that  
it was simply an ode to some king, uncertain whom, and has no further reference whatever. Granting that in its first meaning it was addressed to Solomon (for to him the circumstances introduced seem  
best to apply, e.g. the palace of ivory,  
ver. 9, compare 1 Kings x. 18: the gold