in subjection to the will of the Father:  
they were all parts of his *being made perfect*, by virtue of which he is now, in the fullest and most glorious sense, our High Priest.  
So that these verses are no digression, but stand directly in the course  
of the argument, as proving the proposition, *“he glorified not himself to be made High Priest.”*

It will be best to mark at once what I believe to be the connexion  
of this much-disputed sentence, and then to  
examine each portion in detail afterwards.  
**Who in the days of his flesh, in that he  
offered up prayers and supplications with  
strong crying and tears to Him that was  
able to save him from death, and was  
heard by reason of his reverent submission; though He was a Son, learned, from the things which he suffered, his obedience; and being made perfect, became the cause of eternal salvation to all who obey  
Him, being addressed by God as High  
Priest after the order of Melchisedec.**  
That is, being paraphrased—“who had a  
course of glorifying for the High Priest’s  
office to go through, not of his own choice,  
but appointed for Him by the Father, as  
is shewn by that sharp lesson of obedience  
(not as contrasted with disobedience, but as  
indicating a glorious degree of perfect obedience, **his obedience**), familiar to us all, which He, though God’s own Son, learned  
during the days of his flesh: when He  
cried to God with tears for deliverance  
from death, and was heard on account: of  
His resignation to the Father’s will [‘not  
my will but Thine be done’], &c.” Then  
as to details: **in the days of his flesh I**  
understand as a general wide date for the  
incident which bout to be brought in,  
as contrasted with His present days of  
glorification in the Spirit.

**with tears** is not distinctly asserted in the  
sacred narrative: but is a most obvious inference from what is there: see Matt. xxvi. 37. There seems no reason for understanding the **strong crying and tears** of any other time than the agony at Gethsemane, as some have done. This is adduced as the most illustrious instance of  
that learning obedience from suffering.  
Epiphanius reports, that this *weeping* of  
the Lord in His agony was once related in some texts of St. Luke: see note on Luke xxii. 43, 44.

**to save him from death** is by some understood to mean,  
not as generally, of rescue from the death  
which He was about to suffer, but of His  
happy deliverance from that death by  
the Resurrection. So also recently Ebrard. But this is not only against the  
usage of the phrase here used, but still  
more decidedly against the truth of the  
sacred narrative: “Father, if it be possible,  
*let this cup pass from me:”* for we must  
of course assume, that in such a designation of the Father, the contents of the prayer made to him are also indicated. The  
clause which follows is rendered in three different ways. 1) *“He was heard on account of His pious resignation.”* 2) *“He was  
heard, and so delivered, from that which  
He feared.”* 3) *“He was heard by Him  
who was His fear”* Gen. xxxi. 42, 43).  
I have discussed all these in my Greek Test., and have rejected 3),  
as far-fetched, and  
inconsistent with the usage of the Greek  
word here used: 2), as also inconsistent  
with the usage of that word, which signifies not terror,—His own fear, or the thing which caused that fear,—but the fear of  
caution, or modesty, or reverence: besides  
that He was not delivered from death, as  
this meaning would assert. So that 1)  
must be accepted; and it fulfils the requirements both of usage and of fact. The religious sense of this cautions fear suits  
remarkably well in our passage. No term  
could more exactly express the reverent  
submission to his Heavenly Father’s will  
which is shewn in those words, “Not my  
will but thine be done:” none the constant humbling of himself in comparison  
with the Father, and exalting him in word and deed, of which our Saviour’s life is full. I have no hesitation therefore in adopting  
this rendering, and feeling entirely  
satisfied with it. Besides the fulfilling the  
requisites of philology and of fact, it admirably suits the context here, where the appointment of Christ by the Father to his,  
High Priesthood and the various steps by  
which that High Priesthood was perfected,  
are in question.

The matter of’ fact represented by the assertion that *He was  
heard* may require some explanation. He