**of** (equivalent to *“after the order  
of”* before) **Melchisedec ariseth a different  
priest** (i.e. Christ, not Melchisedec), **who is  
appointed** (hath become priest), **not according to the law of a carnal commandment** (i.e. not in accordance with, following out,  
the rule and order of an exterior ordinance  
founded on the present: fleshly and decaying state of things), **but according to the power of an indissoluble life** (the two  
clauses closely correspond in rhythm, as is  
much the practice of the Writer. The  
*power* here spoken of does not, however,  
strictly correspond, in its relation to the  
priesthood spoken of, with “the law of a  
carnal commandment” above. That was  
the rule, by and after which the priesthood  
constituted: this, the vigour inherent  
in the glorious priesthood of Christ,—for it  
is of His enduring Melchisedec-priesthood  
in glory that this is spoken—to endure for  
ever. Some have thought the power to be,  
Christ’s power to confer life on other:  
others the enduring nature of the divine  
decree which constituted this priesthood:  
but both are shewn to be wrong by the  
next verse, in which the enduringness of  
the priesthood is the point brought out).

**17.]** *Proof of the last clause from  
Scripture.* The stress of the citation is on  
**for ever. For he** (the different priest) **is  
borne witness of, that thou art a priest for  
ever after the order of Melchisedec.**

**18,19.]** These verses belong to the proof  
of 15–17, expanding the conclusion thence  
derived, and expressing it more decidedly  
than before in ver. 12.

**{18} For moreover there takes place an abrogation of the  
preceding commandment** (the commandment intended is that mentioned in ver. 16,  
according to which the priesthood was constituted, not, as Chrysostom and others think, the whole Mosaic law, however  
much that may be involved in the assertion: compare the parenthesis in ver. 11. This commandment went before—not  
merely in time, but was an introduction  
to and gave way before the greater and  
final ordinance) **on account of its weakness and unprofitableness** (Rom. viii. 3, as Gal. iv. 9, is remarkably parallel, both  
in thought and mode of expression: one  
of those coincidences which could hardly  
take place where there was not community  
of thought and diction),—{19}**for the law  
perfected nothing** (this parenthetical clause  
inserted to explain the implication contained in the words *“the weakness and* *unprofitableness thereof.”* The law had not  
the power to bring any thing whatever to  
perfection, to its appointed end and excellence:—perfection, in any kind, was  
not by the law),—**and an introduction** (*a bringing in besides:* the law being already there, this is brought in to and upon it)  
**of a better hope** (the contrast is between  
the preceding commandment, weak and  
unprofitable, and a better thing, viz. the  
*hope* which brings us near to God), **by  
means of which we draw near to God** (this  
note, of personal access to God, has been  
twice struck before, ch. iv. 16; vi. 19, and  
is further on in the Epistle expanded into  
a whole strain of argument. See ch. ix.  
11 ff.; x. 19 ff. It is that access, which  
was only carnally and symbolically open  
to them by shedding of the blood of sacrifices, but has been spiritually and really