**himself** (carrying the stress of the sentence); **but (only when) called by God,  
as indeed was Aaron** (see Exod. xxviii. 1, xxix. 4; Levit. viii. 1; Num. iii. 10; but especially Num. xvi.–xviii Schöttgen quotes from the Rabbinical book  
“Moses said to Korah and his fellows, If  
Aaron my brother had *taken to himself* the  
priesthood, ye did rightly in rising against  
him: but now God has given it to him.”

This divine ordinance of Aaron and  
his sons to he High Priests endured long  
in the Jewish polity: but long before this  
time the rule had been disturbed: Josephus  
relates how Herod, when put into the kingdom by the Romans, no longer took the high priests from the Asamonæan family,  
but gave the office to any obscure persons,  
except in the one case of Aristobulus).

**5.] Thus Christ also** (as well as those others) **did not glorify** HIMSELF **to  
be made High Priest** (i.e. did not raise  
*Himself* to the office of High Priest. The  
word **glorify** is here used in its most general sense, of all those steps of elevation by which the dignity might be attained: se  
especially John viii. 54, which is exceedingly  
useful to the right understanding here);  
**but He** (i.e. the Father) **who spake to  
Him, Thou art my Son, I have this day  
begotten thee** (see ch. i. 5, where this  
same saying is similarly adduced as spoken  
by the Heavenly Father to the Son. It  
must be carefully observed, that the Writer  
does not adduce this text as containing a  
direct proof of Christ’s divine appointment  
to the High Priesthood: that follows in  
the next verse: nor again, does it merely  
assert, without any close connexion, that  
the same divine Person appointed Him  
High Priest, who said to Him, “Thon art  
my Son:” but it asserts, that such divine  
appointment was wrapped up and already  
involved in that eternal generation to the  
Sonship which was declared in these words. Then again, we must beware of imagining that **he that spake unto him,** &c. is  
mere periphrasis of *the Father*, as some  
have done. The true account seems to be  
this: the word **glorified** contains in it the  
whole process of exaltation [through suffering] by which the Lord Jesus has attained the heavenly High Priesthood. This  
whole process was not *his own work*, but  
the Father's, John viii. 54. And in saying  
this, we involve every step of it, from the  
very beginning. Of these, unquestionably  
the first was, His eternal generation by the  
Father. He did not constitute himself the  
Son of God, in virtue ultimately of which  
sonship He *became High Priest.* And  
therefore in proving this, the sacred Writer  
adduces first the declaration of the Father  
which sets forth this His generation as Son  
of God, on which all His process of glorification depended, and then, when He was completed by sufferings, vv. 7–10, the direct  
declaration of his High Priesthood, also by  
the Father). **Even as also he saith in another** (**place**: see on ch. iv. 5), **Thou art priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec** (on the relation of this Psalm to Christ, see generally on ch. i. 13. I may add to what  
was there said, that it is thus declared,  
that He, in whom all the theocratic promises find their fulfilment, in whom the true Kingdom of God comes and is summed  
up, was to be, as in Zech, vi. 12 ff., “a priest upon His throne,” and such a priest [i.e. necessarily High Priest, if a King; as  
indeed the word is given in ver. 10 and ch. vi. 20], as should be after the order of Melchisedec. In examining this last predication, we find that **after the order,** according to the ordinary meaning of the  
word, imports, *according to the office or  
the rank,* which Melchisedec held).

**7 ff.]** The *sufferings* of Christ are  
adduced, as a portion of his *being glorified*to be made High Priest. They were all